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Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant (continued)

Third periodic report of Lithuania (continued) (CCPR/C/LTU/3; CCPR/C/LTU/Q/3 and Add.1)

1. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of Lithuania took places at the Committee table.

2. The Chairperson invited the delegation to respond to the questions posed by the Committee during the previous meeting.

3. Ms. Urbonė (Lithuania) said that the Government intended to take various measures to prevent all forms of violence against detainees, including having those held in pretrial detention undergo medical examinations performed by public-sector nurses to check that they were in good health. The police had issued instructions that all persons placed in pretrial detention should undergo an examination to ascertain and record any physical injuries they had received beforehand. Any allegations that staff in detention centres had committed acts of violence against detainees were investigated and could lead to criminal proceedings. When a person filed a complaint about ill-treatment during the preliminary investigation stage, the administrative service receiving the complaint would forward it to the competent body if it did not consider itself competent to examine the complaint. If it failed to do so, an inquiry would be initiated and those responsible would be punished. Minors and adults were held in separate cells both during pretrial and post-trial detention. In pretrial detention facilities, minors were grouped by age and according to their physical and mental state.

4. Ms. Bukantaitė-Kutkevičienė (Lithuania) said that the Government was aware that detention centres in Lithuania did not meet international standards for the detention of minors and that they were overcrowded. However, the Criminal Code contained very strict provisions on the separation of minor and adult detainees, and no complaints had been filed in Lithuania in that regard as yet.

5. Ms. Vyšniauskaitė-Radinskienė (Lithuania) confirmed that the corporal punishment of children was prohibited in detention centres. Since there was no general law prohibiting violence against children in other contexts, such as at school, Lithuania had drawn up a bill to prohibit corporal punishment and other cruel, humiliating or degrading treatment of children. Children were already covered by the Law for Protection against Domestic Violence.

6. Women had a large presence in the public sector, where they comprised around 75 per cent of civil servants. The two highest positions in the Government, the offices of President and Speaker of Parliament, were held by women. The Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Finance were also headed by women.

7. Mr. Valenčukėvičius (Lithuania) said that, in the case of administrative offences, the law stipulated that detention could not exceed 5 hours. Offences such as illegally crossing a border were governed by other provisions. If persons could not be identified, for example, because they did not have identity papers, they could be placed in administrative detention for up to 48 hours. The maximum duration of detention for criminal offences was also 48 hours. Beyond that, the prosecution service, which intervened only in criminal cases, had to submit a duly substantiated request to the examining magistrate to have the period of detention extended or have other measures applied, such as a ban on leaving the country or placement under house arrest. The adoption of more severe measures had to be decided by a judge. The Code of Criminal Procedure established a period of pretrial
custody of 3 to 9 months, according to the severity of the offence. At the end of that period, the prosecutor could ask the Prosecutor General to authorize an extension. If more than 1 month had elapsed since the first time the suspect had been interrogated, the defence could file an appeal before the courts requesting a decision as to whether the case would be brought to trial or not. If, according to the defence, procedures were too slow, it could file for the proceedings to be terminated.

8. The Charter of the International Military Tribunal of Nürnberg formed part of international jurisprudence and was taken into account in criminal proceedings against those suspected of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Lithuania applied international law, including the Geneva Conventions and the Hague Conventions. Since 1990, when Lithuania had gained independence, 70 criminal cases had been brought against Nazis for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. In three of them, officials of the regime in place during the German occupation had been tried but had not been sentenced to prison because they had health problems associated with old age. The SS and Wehrmacht detachments in Lithuania had not had Lithuanian citizens among their ranks.

9. The Chairperson thanked the delegation for its replies and invited Committee members to make further observations.

10. Mr. Thelin said that he appreciated the clear description provided by the delegation of the Covenant’s place in the country’s domestic legislation. He recommended that the State party should consider clearly stating in its domestic legislation that the definition of torture contained in article 1 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment was the definition that must be applied in practice.

11. There was no set deadline for pretrial investigations. It was unclear whether the 18-month period for formalizing charges was a fixed maximum or could be extended. The question about whether it was mandatory or up to the discretion of the courts to deduct time spent in pretrial detention from a prison sentence had not been answered. Nor had the question about reparation for persons who had spent time in pretrial detention and subsequently been acquitted. Data on the ratio between the non-custodial measures and pretrial detention measures applied would be appreciated.

12. Mr. Salvioli asked how the new programmes to combat gender-based and domestic violence were financed. With regard to the subjection of persons with disabilities to forced abortions, he asked whether the State party intended to take specific measures to ensure that the wishes of persons with disabilities were taken into consideration.

13. Mr. O’Flaherty asked whether the State party planned to reopen the investigation into secret holding centres and possible collusion in the illegal transfer of suspects in the light of the conclusions of the special rapporteurs of the United Nations Human Rights Council and the European Parliament and the recent information provided by non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

14. Certain elements of the Law on the Protection of Minors against the Detrimental Effect of Public Information went beyond what was acceptable under article 19 of the Covenant. According to NGOs, the provisions aimed at prohibiting the promotion of homosexual, bisexual or polygamous relations were still in force, and he asked the delegation to confirm whether they had indeed been repealed. He also asked whether, as some NGOs claimed, there was a proposal to amend the Civil Code with a view to prohibiting gender-reassignment surgery.

15. Considerable emphasis had been placed on the Roma culture in the national action plan, but the access of the Roma to public services also needed to improve. The hate crime figures provided by the delegation showed that the public prosecution service was taking the problem seriously. He had still not learned, however, what percentage of the cases had
resulted in convictions. As to the independence parade in Klaipeda in which swastika banners had been displayed, he had seen photographs of the banners in question and there was no doubt as to the meaning of the symbol in that context. Apparently, the public prosecution service had appealed against the judges’ rulings in the case; if that was so, he would like to know where the proceedings now stood. Most hate speech on the Internet was directed against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons, and he enquired about the measures taken by the State party to ensure respect for that vulnerable and threatened group’s place in society.

16. **Mr. Bouzid** said that, according to the delegation, prevention of the corporal punishment of children was guaranteed under the Law on Protection against Domestic Violence. The State party seemed to have reneged on its promise, made on 24 November 2011, to adopt a law on child welfare. He asked whether the change of mind was due to popular resistance to the idea of criminalizing corporal punishment given its entrenchment in Lithuanian tradition.

17. **Ms. Urbonė** (Lithuania) said that the maximum duration of pretrial investigations under article 127 of the Criminal Code was 18 months for cases involving adults and 12 months for those involving minors. Placement in administrative detention was an exceptional measure ordered only if the other measures taken had not made it possible to achieve the objectives of the investigation. The national register of persons who had been charged and convicted showed that 711 persons had been placed in pretrial detention in 2010. Under the Civil Code, all persons who had suffered damage as the result of an illegal act committed by an agent of the State could seek compensation. The time spent in pretrial detention was always taken into account when determining the duration of prison terms.

18. **Ms. Bukantaitė-Kutkevičienė** (Lithuania) said that she wished to provide more information on the possibility of prison sentences being reduced when trials had been exceptionally long. Lithuanian courts now abided by the case law of the European Court of Human Rights on the matter and thus reduced sentences accordingly. The Government had also submitted a bill to amend the Civil Code so as to enable persons who went through excessively long investigations, preliminary proceedings or trials to obtain compensation.

19. **Ms. Skaisgirytė Liauškienė** (Lithuania), responding to Mr. Salvioli’s question on domestic violence, said that the delegation would provide the requested statistics in writing.

20. **Ms. Urbonė** (Lithuania), responding to Mr. Salvioli’s question about obtaining the consent of persons with mental disabilities for abortions and other medical procedures, explained that such decisions were made by the courts and that such persons were represented by their guardians in the corresponding proceedings.

21. **Ms. Skaisgirytė Liauškienė** (Lithuania), replying to the questions asked by Mr. O’Flaherty, said that the proposed legislation he had referred to had not been put forward by the Government and would not necessarily be adopted as it stood. It was impossible to provide a precise answer to the question, since it was a hypothetical one. As to the existence of secret places of detention, the Prosecutor General and the special committee set up by the Lithuanian parliament had not uncovered any new facts that would justify reopening the inquiry.

22. With regard to freedom of expression and the use of signs that could be interpreted as Nazi or Hindu symbols, depending on the context, the Lithuanian Government was perfectly aware that the matter was a delicate one. It should be noted that, up until 10 years or so ago, the Holocaust had not been covered in Lithuanian school syllabuses and the generations of citizens schooled during the Soviet era had received no teaching whatsoever on that feature of the Second World War. It was therefore a learning process for all Lithuanian society.
23. Ms. Vyšniauskaitė-Radinskienė (Lithuania), replying to Mr. Bouzid’s question about the corporal punishment of children, said that such punishment was prohibited in detention centres and that violence against children was a criminal offence. The law prohibited all forms of violence, including domestic violence, but there was currently no law specifically prohibiting corporal punishment in schools. That gap should be filled with the passage into law of a bill covering all types of situations and establishments.

24. Ms. Bukantaite-Kutkevičienė (Lithuania) said that she would provide details of the Lithuanian Government’s policy on gender-reassignment surgery. The bill that had been mentioned the previous day established the procedures, such as presentation of proof of domicile, for changing one’s civil status after undergoing such surgery. It in no way infringed upon the right to change one’s sex.

25. The Chairperson thanked the Lithuanian delegation for its replies and invited the Committee members to pose additional questions on paragraphs 16 to 25 of the list of issues.

26. Mr. O’Flaherty said that the delegation’s written replies to the issue set forth in paragraph 16 were appreciated. He wished to know if, beyond the data provided on the number of victims, suspected perpetrators and convicted perpetrators, there was a mechanism for analysing human trafficking in the country to determine to what extent Lithuania was simultaneously a country of origin, transit and destination for trafficking in persons. It would also be interesting to know whether human trafficking was carried out solely for sexual exploitation or for other purposes as well, such as to supply farm labour. Given the small number of victims and offenders registered, he asked the delegation whether the Government was taking steps to ensure that no trafficking cases went unreported. He wished to know whether victims received support outside the context of criminal proceedings, for example, when they did not wish to testify. Perhaps the delegation would indicate the steps taken to combat demand, by, for instance, educating and sensitizing both the population in general and potential users of the services provided by trafficking victims.

27. Mr. Salvioli, referring to the written replies to the question asked in paragraph 18 of the list of issues, asked the delegation to provide information on the limits placed on the use of video surveillance in order to respect the right to privacy.

28. Though sensitive to Lithuania’s painful past, as evoked by Ms. Skaisgiryte Liauskienė, he was still very concerned by the recent racist and neo-Nazi-like demonstrations that had taken place. The first demonstration might have caught the authorities by surprise, but that had not been the case with the subsequent ones. It was easy to find shocking racist slogans posted on the Internet by groups like the Lithuanian National Centre. The State party had a duty of care and protection and would be internationally called to account if it did not take the necessary measures. Moreover, according to reports received, pro-tolerance organizations had been denied permission to demonstrate and the 48-hour time frame they had been given to file an appeal against the decision seemed inadequate.

29. The delegation was asked to indicate whether a code of ethics for journalists had been adopted in Lithuania, as recommended in 2011 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It would be useful to know if measures were in place to guarantee the freedom of expression of members of the LGBT community which was reportedly being seriously attacked at present.

30. Mr. Bouzid said that he appreciated the delegation’s replies regarding the protection of children’s rights. He requested figures in respect of children who had been removed from their family environment and information on the measures taken to help those children. With regard to the studies carried out by the Children’s Rights Ombudsman, he wished to
know if the 2008 study of the sexual abuse of children in institutions care and special education establishments had detected any problems or led to inquiries or convictions. He also requested detailed information on the sentences handed down in child abuse cases and the results of the 2009–2013 Programme for Juvenile Justice.

31. **Mr. Thelin**, referring to the written replies to paragraph 17 of the list of issues, asked for more information on the two types of legal aid provided. The delegation was invited to specify whether the aid was also available in criminal cases and to what extent defendants were free to choose their attorney. It seemed that the courts did not participate in decisions regarding the provision of legal aid even though they were undoubtedly better placed than the administrative branch of the justice system to determine whether it was required. He wished to know the number of applications for legal aid that had been rejected and on what grounds they had been rejected so as to be able to assess the workings of the legal aid system, which otherwise seemed to meet the usual standards. NGOs, however, contested the claim made in paragraph 91 of the written replies that free legal aid was provided for cases involving retirement issues or the recognition of legal capacity, since, according to the NGOs, such proceedings would be non-contentious and thus have no bearing on the right to legal representation. Given that the most vulnerable persons should be priority recipients of legal aid, he would appreciate clarification of the matter.

32. As to the cultural projects for national minorities mentioned in the replies to paragraph 24 of the list of issues, perhaps the delegation could provide data on the proportion of national minorities, in urban and rural areas, that actually benefited from those projects. Information on any tools used to assess the outcomes of the projects would also be welcome.

33. With regard to the implementation of article 11 of the Covenant, he asked whether compliance with contractual obligations should not fall under the Civil Code rather than the Criminal Code as indicated in the written replies. He also asked whether individuals who could not afford to pay a fine imposed in criminal proceedings were placed in detention, a practice which had been abolished in some countries.

34. In regard to the spread of hate speech in the media, more information on the implementation of article 170 of the Criminal Code and its links to article 24, paragraph 4, of the Constitution would be welcome. In addition to statistics on the complaints filed, it would be helpful to know the follow-up given to the complaints, including the prosecutions instigated and the sentences handed down as a result. He wished to know if there were procedures for withdrawing broadcasting licences, for example, in the case of repeated violations.

35. Finally, he requested clarification about article 137 of the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens, which seemed to authorize the expulsion of foreigners who were deemed to pose a threat to national security or State action. The criteria established in the law were so vague that their application could constitute a violation of the principle of non-refoulement. The delegation was invited to provide more information on the matter.

*The meeting was suspended at 11.20 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.*

36. **Ms. Urbonė** (Lithuania) said that, after parliament’s ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings in June 2012, a number of amendments had been made to the Criminal Code to strengthen the provisions aimed at suppressing trafficking. The Criminal Code now also punished the use of the services of trafficking victims and the exploitation of their labour. Persons identified as trafficking victims were included in police inquiries and were monitored by social workers throughout the corresponding investigations, as well as afterwards. They were classified as victims of serious crimes and thus had certain rights, such as the right to anonymity when testifying in criminal proceedings and the right to close protection, as provided for by law. They were
also entitled to free legal advice. The Code of Criminal Procedure established additional procedural safeguards for minors, including the right to testify before the trial began so as not to have to face the defendant in court. Sexual exploitation was the main purpose of trafficking in Lithuania. It was difficult to gauge the scale of the problem with any accuracy since trafficking-related activities were invariably clandestine and victims rarely came forward. Awareness campaigns were carried out to sensitize the public to the problem of human trafficking, and efforts were made to ensure that victims had access to information about their rights. The website of the Lithuanian police contained detailed information, as well as an e-mail address, that victims and persons with information about instances of human trafficking could use to alert the police. The police also worked closely with numerous NGOs on the ground and cooperated with the police forces of other countries. A joint operation by the Lithuanian and British police had recently led to the arrest of a gang of traffickers who had been brought to trial and convicted.

37. Ms. Bukantaitė (Lithuania) said that the Law on the Legal Protection of Personal Data was in line with European law, specifically Directive No. 95/46/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council, and therefore did not apply to the handling of data by private individuals in a purely personal or domestic capacity. As to video surveillance, anyone who felt that their privacy had been violated had the right to file a complaint with the State Data Protection Inspectorate. The large number of complaints received by the Inspectorate in 2009, the year in which the regulations on video surveillance had come into force, showed that the population was properly informed of that right.

38. Mr. Velkas (Lithuania) said that there were no special measures to help promote the ideas of LGBT persons. The means of expression available were the same for all interest groups. A Code of Ethics for Journalists had been in place since 1996, but it did not contain specific provisions on the use of web portals. The owners of certain sites, such as the highly popular Delfi (http://www.delfi.lt/), had however, undertaken to draw up their own codes of conduct. A distinction should be drawn between articles published by such media and the comments posted by readers, which, even on the Delfi site, often contained racist remarks or incited hatred.

39. Neither the Administrative Code, nor the Criminal Code punished homosexual relations or the defence of such relations. The Law on the Protection of Minors against the Detrimental Effect of Public Information defined information with a potentially detrimental effect on minors as information that encouraged the sexual abuse of minors or sexual relations between minors or that denigrated family values and marriage. The Law made no mention of homosexual relations.

40. Mr. Valentukevičius (Lithuania) said that a dozen persons who had participated in neo-Nazi demonstrations had been prosecuted under article 170 of the Criminal Code, on incitement to hatred, and had been fined as a result. Government authorities at the highest level, including the President of the Republic, had severely criticized the demonstrations.

41. Ms. Vyšniauskaitė (Lithuania) said that the 2006 Law on Social Services guaranteed children removed from their family environment access to the services required for their welfare and development. The number of persons employed full-time in those specialized care services had been 556 in 2007 and exceeded 600 at present. Multi-year statistics showed that, on average, some 2,000 cases of child abuse were registered each year, of which 6 per cent involved sexual abuse. There were no disaggregated statistics to show the number of cases of child abuse recorded in establishments for children. In 2009, an emergency helpline had been set up for child victims of violence. Children in distress could use the line to get in touch directly with the corresponding social services, who could then quickly provide them with the assistance required. The study conducted by the Children’s Rights Ombudsman in 2008 on the sexual abuse of children in care institutions and special education establishments had consisted of collecting anonymous testimony. The
study had thus made it possible to gauge the scale of the problem, but not to record individual cases for prosecution purposes. The Ombudsman was, however, legally bound to report any allegations of child abuse to the public prosecution service, which would then decide whether it was appropriate to institute an inquiry.

42. **Mr. Vidtmann** (Lithuania) said that about 120 schools provided teaching in one or more of the languages used by national minorities. Free Lithuanian courses were offered to children and adults from minority communities, particularly in the regions where the communities were large. The National Minorities Policy Development Strategy applied to all the known minorities registered as such in the country. Under the strategy, 1 million litai had been allocated to the organizations representing minorities. The authorities maintained an ongoing dialogue with the organizations, which came together under the Council of Minorities.

43. **Ms. Bukantaitė** (Lithuania) said that secondary legal aid was available for civil, administrative and criminal procedures. As far as criminal procedures were concerned, the law stipulated in which cases legal aid could be granted regardless of the applicant’s financial situation, such as when the defendant was a minor or on trial for a crime that was punishable with life imprisonment. In other cases, legal aid was subject to means testing. According to data provided by the legal aid service, 16,833 applications for legal aid had been filed in 2011, of which only 283 (1.7 per cent) had been rejected. Legal aid was guaranteed for all stages of civil, administrative and criminal procedures. In civil procedures, the legal aid service ruled on applications for aid. In administrative and criminal procedures, the decision was made by the prosecution service and the courts. Persons declared without legal capacity were eligible for legal aid. It should be noted, in that regard, that Lithuania had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the associated Protocol in 2010 and was making every effort to fulfil its obligations under those instruments. The Committee might wish to know that the legal aid system of Lithuania had been commended on several occasions by the Council of Europe.

44. **Mr. Valentukevičius** (Lithuania) said that, according to the Criminal Code, when a person found guilty of a crime was unable to pay the ensuing fine, he or she could perform community service or serve up to 90 days in prison instead. When the fine was high, spending 3 months in prison at the State’s expense might seem preferable to some persons to paying the fine and compromising to a greater or lesser extent their future financial situation. In contractual matters, it was the Civil Code that applied, and fines and damage payments could not be replaced with a custodial sentence if the defendant was unable to pay the amount due.

45. **Ms. Urbonė** (Lithuania) said that the grounds for deportation set forth in article 26 on the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens were limited and only a court could order a deportation. Article 130 of the Law prohibited the deportation of foreigners to a country where they would be at risk of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Appeals did have a suspensive effect. International organizations and NGOs could monitor the execution of deportation orders.

46. **Mr. Velkas** (Lithuania) said that Lithuania respected freedom of expression, but the right to that freedom was not absolute. The Constitution, the Criminal Code and the Law on the Provision of Information to the Public contained provisions prohibiting incitement to hatred. The Inspector of Journalism Ethics, appointed by parliament, oversaw the implementation of the Law on the Provision of Information and the Law on the Protection of Minors. The Office of the Inspector worked to ensure that principles such as accuracy and objectivity were upheld and that the rights to dignity and privacy were respected. The Office investigated alleged violations of the corresponding legal provisions either on its own initiative or in response to complaints received. The complaints procedure was governed by the principles set forth in article 19, paragraph 3, of the Covenant. The
Inspector could issue warnings or impose administrative sanctions but could not censor publications or demand that journalists reveal their sources.

47. **Mr. O’Flaherty** said that he was concerned about the application of the provisions of article 16 of the Law on the Protection of Minors against the Detrimental Effect of Public Information since, in the light of article 19 of the Covenant, they seemed to be too restrictive. He had noted the observation made by Ms. Skaisgirytė Liauškienė that the State could not prohibit rallies even if they were hate rallies, but recalled that freedom of assembly was not an absolute right and that the State had an obligation to impose restrictions in some cases, especially when human rights were at risk of being violated. He drew attention to the extremely worrying situation of LGBT persons in Lithuania and invited the State party to adopt a national plan of action, building on the experience of Brazil and other countries, to promote their rights.

48. **Mr. Salvioli** said he understood that the State could not control every person with a video recorder or a camera, but he was still concerned that monitoring bodies were not authorized to handle complaints about the use of video surveillance recordings that possibly constituted an invasion of privacy. He differed from the Lithuanian delegation on the issue of freedom of association and the right to demonstrate. The Committee took pains to ensure that freedom of expression was protected, but that freedom had its limits, specifically those listed in article 19 of the Covenant. He had noted with concern the delegation’s statement that there was no legal mechanism for prohibiting hate rallies. Articles 11 and 12 of the law governing demonstrations in fact prohibited demonstrations that would pose a danger to the State or to public security, health or morals or to the rights and freedoms of the population. Given the existence of those provisions, he wondered why the competent authority had been authorizing blatantly neo-Nazi demonstrations since 2009 and overlooking the fact that they violated people’s rights and freedoms.

49. **Mr. Thelin** said that the provisions of article 137, paragraph 3, of the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens seemed to restrict the application of the principle of not returning foreigners to a country where they would risk being tortured or subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The Law had previously stated that the principle of non-refoulement was not applicable to foreigners who, “for serious reasons”, posed a threat to national security, but the phrase “for serious reasons” had been left out of the new version. He wished to know whether the law had already been amended or whether the new wording was just a proposal and asked about the compatibility of the new provisions with the Covenant and with article 33 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

50. **Ms. Vyšniaukaitė-Radinskienė** (Lithuania) said that the National Anti-Discrimination Programme also applied to LGBT persons and aimed to promote tolerance and respect and to inform the public of the harmful effects of discrimination, not only on the victims, but on society as a whole. In a competitive bidding process in which various human rights organizations had participated, the Lithuanian organization for the defence of the rights of LGBT persons had won financial aid for implementing a programme that had already been extended for 2012–2014.

51. **Ms. Bukantaitytė-Kutkevičienė** (Lithuania) said that the Law on the Legal Protection of Personal Data established that all victims of the illicit use of their personal data could file for financial compensation and other forms of reparation. Consequently, even somebody using video surveillance equipment for their personal use was legally liable for any infringement of the law.

52. **Ms. Skaisgirytė Liauškienė** (Lithuania) said that the Lithuanian delegation would provide written replies to the questions that were still pending. She had noted the Committee’s observations and recommendations with great interest and would bring the
shortcomings identified to the attention of the competent Lithuanian authorities. Lithuania intended to maintain a close and constructive dialogue with the Committee.

53. **The Chairperson** declared that the Committee had completed its consideration of the third periodic report of Lithuania.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*