

NATIONS  
EESHIP  
ICIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

T/1536  
27 May 1960  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

ty-sixth session  
la item 4

ACTION TAKEN ON RESOLUTION 1961 (XXIV) OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL IN  
RESPECT OF THE PETITION FROM MR. A. BIGIRANEZA (T/PET.3/91):  
INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY THE BELGIAN GOVERNMENT AS ADMINISTERING  
AUTHORITY FOR RUANDA-URUNDI

(Circulated in accordance with rule 90, paragraph 6, of the rules of  
procedure of the Trusteeship Council)

1. With reference to the events on which the Bubanza Police Court had handed down its judgement on 9 June 1958, the Parquet Court of Urundi, in the judgement which it pronounced on 22 February 1960 after reviewing the case, set aside the judgement of the Bubanza Court whereby Mr. Bigiraneza had been found guilty of arbitrary arrest and of assault. Thus, the competent judicial authorities have given satisfaction to the petitioner.
2. With reference to the suit between Mr. Bigiraneza and certain Tutsi squatting on his land, the Administrator of the District of Bubanza has stated that the matter had never been laid before the Chiefdom Court, which was competent to deal with it. Normally under rule 81 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, petitions shall be considered inadmissible if they lay before the Council a dispute with which the courts have competence to deal.
3. Mr. Bigiraneza was recently given a hearing at the Office of Political, Administrative and Judicial Affairs, which he had approached with a request for information as to the action that would be taken on his grievances.
4. It would appear, from the rather involved explanations given by the petitioner, that:
  - (a) He does not consider that the review judgement has given him satisfaction, even though the Court found in his favour and quashed

/...

the judgement whereby he had been found guilty; he is of the opinion his opponent, a man called Ruhanyura, should have been punished.

(b) He categorically refuses to submit his customary dispute (unauthorized occupation of his land) to the Chiefdom Court, on the ground that the President of the Court dislikes him; Mr. Bigiraneza also refuses to bring his cause to the Administrator of the District who may preside over Chiefdom Court ex officio.

-----