

Abbreviations

P. – "Page number" N/A – Not available

I. OATRI – DAVID AVEN

| Page in the PDF | Date | Description of the document | Other |
|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 1 | 20 Nov, 2014 | Email annexing the International capture order against Aven. | - |
| 2-22 | 17 Jul, 2014 | International arrest warrant for extradition emitted by Judge Viquez Cordoba (Tribunal Penal de Puntarenas Sede Aguirre y Parrita) against David Aven | P.5 – reference to Francisco Iglesias and Gabriel Alberto Montero Arce as personal hired by AVEN to drain a wetland of approximate 13.500 square meters. P.6 – Wetland GPS location: 1054150-444340 north- west; 1054150580 north-east; 1054950-55580 southeast; 105395044390 southwest. p.11 – Defines the felony attributed to David Aven. It is |
| | | | important to mention that the felony is a minor one, as the penalty is between 1-3 years of prison. |
| 23-44 | 20 Nov, 2014 | Email between local authorities and the INTERPOL San José chief to request the red alert to capture Aven. Annexing the document described on P.2-22. | |
| 45-46 | 1 Dec, 2014 | First follow up email to the INTERPOL to ask if the red alert against AVEN was emitted. | The notice of intent was filed on January 2014. This could explain the interest of Costa Rica to sabotage the Avens' position. |
| 47-48 | 9 Dec, 2014 | Second follow up email to the INTERPOL to ask if the red alert against AVEN was emitted. | |
| 49-50 | 9 Dec, 2014 | Email attaching the red alter notice emitted by INTERPOL against AVEN | |
| 51 | 8 Dec, 2014 | INTERPOL red alert against AVEN | |



| 52-53 | 9 Dec, | Email notification to the Tribunal de Juicio de | |
|-------|-----------------|--|---|
| | 2014 | Aguirre y Parrita of the red alert emitted by INTERPOL | |
| 54-56 | 16 Feb, 2015 | Email exchange between Elias Carranza and San José Interpol Chief regarding the results of the Red Alert | In the body of the mail it is mentioned that the statue of limitations are about to be reached. |
| 57-59 | 22 Apr, 2015 | Email exchange between the Public Minister (Prosecutor) and the Judge of Tribunal de Juicio de Aguirre y Parrita regarding the order to put down the red alert in the INTERPOL website. | Notice that the direct contact of the prosecutor to the Judge without noticing the Defendant is a manifestation of procedural imbalance. Statute of limitations, according to the Judge, was on April 15, 2015. |
| 60-62 | 23 Apr, 2015 | Answer of the Judge of Tribunal de Juicio de Aguirre y Parrita " <i>correcting</i> " the statue of limitations originally stipulated on April 15, 2015 and establishing that it will not apply since the constructions are still in place. | The unilateral contact between prosecutor and the Judge is a clear example of the lack of independence and impartiality of the Judge, which is reflected in the amendment of the date in which the statue of limitations would be rendering effects. |
| 63-65 | 24 Apr, 2015 | Notification to the INTERPOL San José office that the statue of limitations will be corrected, in order to emit the red alert against AVEN for a second time. | |
| 66-68 | 24 Apr, 2015 | INTERPOLs' reply requesting the new order to emit the red alter order against AVEN | |
| 69-72 | 9 Jun, 2015 | Email by the Ministerio Público (Elias Carranza Maxera- prosecutor) requesting the judge a new order with the clarification that the charges against AVEN are still in place and that the reference to the statue of limitations was a mistake. | Lack of impartiality and independence. |
| 73-94 | 9 Jun, 2015 | Answer by the judge annexing the "corrected" order. | P.87-90 Correction of the statue of limitations of the charges against AVEN. If compared with P.14-17 of the original request emitted by the Judge to enact the red alert against AVEN it can be established that is simply a COPY PASTE motivation with a formal change establishing that no statue of limitations has been reached. |
| 95-97 | 9 Jun, 2015 | Email by the prosecutor Elias Carranza to INTERPOL forwarding the International Arrest Warrent against AVEN in order for the | |



| 00.00 | a 0 b | | |
|---------|---------------------|---|--|
| 98-99 | 28 Aug, 2015 | INTERPOL's General Secretary email requesting additional information in order to enact the red alert diffusion against AVEN | |
| 100-102 | 28 Aug, 2015 | Prosecutor answer to the INTERPOL's General Secretary request of information. | |
| 103-121 | 25 May, 2015 | "corrected" International Arrest Warrent against AVEN. | |
| 122-124 | 9 Set, 2015 | INTERPOL's General Secretary declining emitting a red alert against AVEN | INTEPOL's Secretary General explains that the request does not fulfill art.83.1.a.i of the INTERPOL's internal regulation due to the fact that the crime against AVEN is not considered to be a serious one. |
| 125-127 | 22 Oct, 2015 | Prosecutor Carranza email to the judge requesting her help in order to submit a reconsideration to the INTERPOL's general secretary office. In the email he sets up 4 questions: If there was a conviction. The amount and the quantification of the environmental damages. If Public servants were involved. If the demolition of the Works could be ordered. It also requested pictures of the environmental damage. | |
| 128-129 | 27 Oct, 2015 | Prosecutor Carranza email to Silvia Solis Davila requesting her help in order to submit a reconsideration to the INTERPOL's general secretary office. | From the document it cannot be establish who Silvia Solis Davila is. |
| 130-136 | 28 Oct, 2015 | Judge answer to Prosecutor Carranza email of 22 oct, 2015. Regarding the pictures, it is mentioned that those are in a CD. | The amount quantified for the ecological sums up to the amount of three million colones (aprox. Six thousand dollars). The Counterclaim by Respondent must be re- considered. Once again, lack of impartiality of the Judge. |
| 137-140 | 30 Nov, 2015 | Silvia Solis Davila (environmental prosecutor) answer to Prosecutor Carranza email from 27 oct, 2015 | |



| 14 | 41-144 | 25 Nov, 2015 | | The amount quantified for the ecological sums up to the amount of three million colones (aprox. Six thousand dollars). The Counterclaim by Respondent must be re- considered. |
|----|--------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
| | 145 | N/A | Not identified pictures. | |