OPINION 2103 (Case 3219)

Vilcunia periglacialis Cei & Scolaro, 1982 (currently Liolaemus periglacialis; Reptilia, Sauria): not given priority over Liolaemus hatcheri Stejneger, 1909

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that priority should be maintained for the Patagonian tropidurine lizard name Liolaemus hatcheri Stejneger, 1909. A proposal had been made to give precedence to the junior subjective synonym Liolaemus periglacialis Cei & Scolaro, 1982.
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Ruling
(1) It is hereby ruled that the name Vilcunia periglacialis Cei & Scolaro, 1982 is not to be given priority over Liolaemus hatcheri Stejneger, 1909 whenever they are considered to be synonyms. The Principle of Priority is upheld and the name Liolaemus hatcheri Stejneger, 1909 has priority over Vilcunia periglacialis Cei & Scolaro, 1982 whenever they are considered to be synonyms.

(2) The name hatcheri Stejneger, 1909, as published in the binomen Liolaemus hatcheri, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3219
An application to conserve the usage of the name Vilcunia periglacialis Cei & Scolaro, 1982 by giving it precedence over the name Liolaemus hatcheri Stejneger, 1909 whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms was received from José A. Scolaro (Centro Nacional Patagónico, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas CONICET, Puerto Madryn, Chubut, Argentina) and José M. Cei (Departamento de Ciencias Naturales, Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Córdoba, Argentina) on 21 September 2001. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 59: 275–277 (December 2002). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments on this case were received. The application was sent to the Commission for voting on 1 March 2004. The case received a majority of the votes cast but failed to reach the required two thirds majority (12 votes FOR and 9 AGAINST).

On 1 September 2004 the application was submitted for a second vote under Bylaw 35.

Decision of the Commission
On 1 September 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote again on the proposals published in BZN 59: 276. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2004 the votes were as follows: 10 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 14 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Ng was on leave of absence.

Voting against, Brothers, Mahnert, Papp and Štys stressed that priority should be maintained in this case.
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