

REDRESS

Ending torture, seeking justice for survivors

The Redress Trust (REDRESS)

Unit G01, 65 Glasshill Street

London SE1 0QR

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)20 7793 1777

Webpage: www.redress.org

Contact: chris@redress.org

**Submission to the Human Rights Council's
Universal Periodic Review Working Group regarding the Review of
the Republic of Lithuania**

17 July 2026

COVER PAGE

INFORMATION ABOUT THE ORGANISATION MAKING THIS SUBMISSION:

REDRESS is an international human rights NGO based in the United Kingdom and The Netherlands with a mandate to deliver justice and reparation for survivors of torture, challenge impunity for perpetrators, and advocate for legal and policy reforms to combat torture. REDRESS was established in 1992 and has been in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council since 2011. REDRESS represents Mr. Mustafa al-Hawsawi in relation to his claims outside the United States of America arising from his torture and enforced disappearance in the CIA's Rendition, Detention and Interrogation Programme.

**Submission to the Human Rights Council's
Universal Periodic Review Working Group regarding the Review of the Republic of Lithuania**

17 July 2026

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Redress Trust (REDRESS) makes this submission as part of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of Lithuania, to be held in January 2027. It focuses on the lack of follow-up of issues raised in the State's UPR in 2011, 2016 and 2022 in relation to Lithuania's complicity in, and facilitation of, the United States' (US) Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)'s Rendition, Detention and Interrogation (RDI) Program.
2. This submission is based primarily on REDRESS' experience of pursuing truth, justice and accountability on behalf of Mustafa al-Hawsawi, a Saudi national who has been identified as one of the so-called High Value Detainees (HVDs) under the CIA RDI Program. He was detained in Lithuania for an undisclosed period of time between 2005 and 2006, during which he was subjected to torture and ill-treatment.¹ Mr al-Hawsawi faces the death penalty in a trial before a US Military Commission in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, where he remains in detention, in poor physical health.²
3. In 2011, Lithuania accepted a number of UPR recommendations to "further pursue investigations on human rights implications of counter-terrorism measures, such as secret detention programs, with a view to identifying allegations of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of detainees" and to "strengthen its measures to ensure effective investigations into all allegations of torture and ill-treatment committed by law enforcement officials."³ Similarly, in 2016, Lithuania received and supported a recommendation to "complete the investigation on its involvement in Central Intelligence Agency rendition and secret detention programmes, within a reasonable time".⁴ It is noted with concern that Lithuania did not accept similar UPR recommendations in 2022, instead opting to examine and "respond in due course" to requests to investigate its participation in the Central Intelligence Agency's secret detention programme, and provide reparation for victims.⁵
4. In any event, Lithuania has made no tangible progress in investigating allegations of torture or other ill-treatment of detainees in the framework of the CIA's RDI Program. This remains a particular concern in the light of the judgements of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in 2018 in the case of Abu Zubaydah, the first individual to be detained in the CIA's RDI Program, and in 2024 in the case of Mustafa al-Hawsawi. In both cases, the ECtHR found the State in breach of its procedural obligations within Article 3 (prohibition of torture and ill-treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights (European Convention) precisely for failing to conduct an effective investigation into the applicants' allegations of torture and undisclosed detention within the CIA's RDI Program.⁶

II. LITHUANIA'S COMPLICITY IN THE CIA'S RDI PROGRAM

5. Lithuania's complicity in the CIA's RDI Program has been extensively reported since at least 2009.⁷ The Lithuanian Parliamentary Committee on National Security and Defence (Seimas CNSD) conducted an inquiry into Lithuania's involvement in the CIA's secret detention program, which in 2009 confirmed that Lithuanian authorities had agreed to a request from the CIA and authorised the construction and equipment of two facilities in Lithuania suitable for holding detainees.⁸
6. Lithuania's further implication in the CIA's RDI Program has been revealed in reports and relevant resolutions adopted by the European Parliament in 2012, 2013 and 2015,⁹ and NGO Reports.¹⁰ In 2019, the Rendition Project published the Report "CIA Torture Unredacted: An Investigation into

the CIA Torture Programme”, which provides the most comprehensive public account of the CIA RDI programme.¹¹ It concludes that the CIA black site called DETENTION SITE VIOLET was in Lithuania, operated from February 2005 to March 2006,¹² and that Lithuania was involved in the RDI Program from as early as 2003.¹³

7. In 2018, the ECtHR in *Abu Zubaydah v. Lithuania* found “beyond reasonable doubt” that the CIA detention facility codenamed DETENTION SITE VIOLET was in Lithuania, having operated either from 17 February 2005 or 18 February 2005 until its closure on 25 March 2006.¹⁴ This conclusion has since been reaffirmed in the ECtHR cases of *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania* (2024)¹⁵ and *al-Nashiri v Lithuania* (2026).¹⁶
8. As regards Lithuanian authorities’ knowledge and complicity in the CIA’s Program, in *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania* the ECtHR found “beyond reasonable doubt” that the authorities (i) “knew of the nature and purposes of the CIA’s activities on its territory”, (ii) “cooperated in the preparation and execution of [such] operations on its territory”, and (iii) thus “knew that, by enabling the CIA to detain terrorist suspects [...] on their territory, they were exposing them to a serious risk of treatment contrary to the Convention.”¹⁷ These conclusions were similarly reaffirmed in the ECtHR cases of *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania* (2024)¹⁸ and *al-Nashiri v Lithuania* (2026).¹⁹

III. FAILURE TO EFFECTIVELY INVESTIGATE LITHUANIA’S COMPLICITY IN THE CIA RDI PROGRAM

9. The first criminal investigation by Lithuanian authorities on the matter was launched on 22 January 2010 and was limited to abuse of office (Article 228(1) of Lithuania’s Criminal Code). This investigation was terminated in January 2011 citing lack of evidence of criminal activities and statute of limitations. The authorities refused to take effective investigative measures relating to information submitted by the human rights organisation Reprieve in September and November 2010 regarding confidential allegations that Mr. Abu Zubaydah had been held in detention in Lithuania.²⁰
10. On 13 September 2013, REDRESS and the Human Rights Monitoring Institute of Lithuania (HRMI) filed a request with the Lithuanian Prosecutor General’s Office to open an investigation into the extraordinary rendition, secret detention, torture and ill-treatment of Mr Mustafa al-Hawsawi. This request was denied on 27 September 2013. However, when an appeal court found the denial unlawful, the prosecutor in February 2014 opened a criminal inquiry, limited in scope to “unlawful transportation of persons across the state border” (Art. 292.3 of Lithuania’s Criminal Code).²¹
11. On 22 January 2015, following requests made by REDRESS and HRMI to take new evidence into account, the Lithuanian Prosecutor General’s Office re-opened the criminal inquiry into abuse of office, which had been closed in 2011, and combined the two investigations (one in respect of Abu Zubaydah and the other regarding Mustafa al-Hawsawi) under No. 01-2-00015-14.²² This investigation was limited to “abuse of office” and “unlawful transportation of persons across the state border”.²³ It is this joint pre-trial investigation which continues to date.
12. In relation to the scope of the pre-trial investigation, in November 2018 Lithuanian authorities finally decided to conduct an investigation under Article 100 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code,²⁴ which prohibits “treatment of persons” that is “prohibited by international law”, thus allowing the investigation to encompass allegations of torture, ill-treatment, enforced disappearance, arbitrary deprivation of liberty and the range of other serious violations of human rights alleged.

Lack of effective investigation

13. However, this broader scope of the investigation will be meaningless if no effective investigative measures are undertaken by the authorities, which seems to be the case. REDRESS has been making submissions to international bodies for over 10 years regarding the deficiencies in the investigation undertaken, and these concerns have been consistently and repeatedly recognised in the reports of various UN bodies. Some of the most recent examples include the following:

- a) The Concluding Observations of the UN Committee against Torture dated 21 December 2021²⁵ recalled its own previous concluding observations in relation to the same case, and those of the Human Rights Committee and Committee on Enforced Disappearances, and stated:

“...the Committee regrets the lack of significant progress in the investigation of the alleged instances of extraordinary rendition, secret detention, torture and ill-treatment under the extraordinary rendition and secret detention programme carried out by the United States Central Intelligence Agency in the State party, in particular in relation to Abu Zubaydah and Mustafa Ahmed al-Hawsawi. The Committee notes that, notwithstanding the findings of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Abu Zubaydah v. Lithuania* and the execution process currently ongoing in relation to the judgment, no tangible results have been achieved thus far in identifying those responsible and bringing perpetrators to justice...”²⁶

In the light of this the Committee again urged Lithuania to “complete the investigation within a reasonable time and hold perpetrators to account, ensuring transparency and a sufficient degree of public scrutiny of the process, as well as providing appropriate redress and reparation to victims”.²⁷

- b) Most recently, the UN Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (WGEID) undertook a visit to Lithuania in November 2024, at the conclusion of which its report stated that, “[i]n light of the unanimous calls by international mechanisms, the Working Group is concerned that pre-trial investigation No. 01-2-00015-14 remains open since February 2014 without any tangible results having been achieved”.²⁸ It noted that, although Lithuania has made several unsuccessful requests to other States for information, “some questions, such as whether Lithuanian authorities knew or should have known about the enforced disappearance and torture perpetrated on the territory of Lithuania, could be answered without international cooperation.”

Insufficient investigative efforts

14. In December 2024, as part of its continuing efforts to ensure the implementation of the ECtHR judgments in *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania* and *al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe decided that “the criminal investigation carried out by Lithuania in the period after the delivery of the *Abu Zubaydah* judgment [in 2018] had so far been ineffective, but that there were no insurmountable practical obstacles to carrying it out”.²⁹

15. In April 2025, REDRESS sent a letter to Lithuania asking 24 questions to try to understand the steps already taken in the investigation and to prompt further possible investigative actions.³⁰ The questions were prepared following a detailed analysis of publicly available information regarding the investigative steps utilized in similar rendition cases in other European States. Lithuania has since failed to respond to any of these questions, and failed to provide any more specific details of their investigation save to cite again a EUROJUST meeting in March 2024 at which “Lithuanian and Polish prosecuting authorities in charge of the domestic investigations concerning the CIA’s Detention and Interrogation Program [met] with a view to share the experience in investigating similar cases, including on the best practices collecting the relevant data.”³¹ Otherwise, their

response continues to be extremely vague, continuing to assert most recently that “the main evidentiary material is in the possession of foreign jurisdictions”, and noting that they have not had “tangible results” in their efforts to collect such evidence.³²

16. However, there are several other lines of inquiry which could be pursued, and which have been pursued in comparable situations by other European States, some of which were recommended by REDRESS in its communication to Lithuania in April 2025 (see paragraph 15 above). The WGEID have also recognised that certain investigative steps would not require assistance from other countries (see paragraph 13(b) above). Lithuania has persistently failed to identify any significant steps taken to investigate its own authorities’ involvement in the CIA RDI program, since most relevant evidence in that regard would lie within its own institutions. The ECtHR’s 2024 judgment reaffirmed that the lack of US cooperation “cannot justify the apparent lack of any substantial progress in the investigation...”³³

Failure to provide victims and public with access to information

17. To date Mr al-Hawsawi has not been granted victim status and, consequently, cannot participate in the inquiry, access the case file, be heard or enjoy other basic procedural rights. Despite a renewed request in 2024 following the ECtHR’s ruling, Lithuanian authorities once again denied him this status, claiming that the ECtHR’s decision and its factual findings do not provide sufficient basis to recognise him as a victim in the domestic investigation. This refusal was appealed in April 2025, but again refused on 7 May 2025. Lithuania continues to assert that no-one has been granted victim status because “there is no evidence in this case that meets the standards of criminal procedure concerning the persons who have been victims of the criminal offence”.³⁴ The fact that this right to ‘victim status’ has also been denied to Abu Zubaydah and Mr al-Nashiri suggests a systemic failure to address this issue.³⁵
18. The Lithuanian authorities’ failure to provide meaningful information to the public is an issue of significant concern and has been raised by UN treaty-bodies. This hinders the assessment of the steps taken (or not) by the Lithuanian authorities to secure further evidence, and provide accountability of those responsible. In *Abu Zubaydah v. Lithuania* and *al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, the ECtHR stressed that, considering the relevance and gravity of the issues involved, the authorities must ensure that, “without compromising national security”, as much information as possible about allegations and evidence should be disclosed to the parties in order to allow a sufficient degree of public scrutiny of the investigation”.³⁶

IV. Conclusion

19. It is important to recall that, without the cooperation of States like Lithuania, the CIA’s RDI Program could not have functioned and the prolonged incommunicado detention, enforced disappearance and other forms of torture and prohibited ill-treatment which CIA detainees like Mr al-Hawsawi were subjected to would not have been possible.
20. Despite the comprehensive evidence available, and the findings in the cited ECtHR judgements, the Lithuanian authorities have still not completed an effective investigation into Lithuania’s complicity in the CIA’s RDI program, over 21 years since the opening of the CIA detention facility in its territory in 2005. Although the status of its investigation into these matters has often been unclear, Lithuania recently confirmed to us in correspondence (dated 9 March 2026) that “the pre-trial investigation is ongoing” (see letter at **Annex 1**). Nonetheless, it is clear that the limited investigative efforts carried out to date are insufficient, and the Lithuanian authorities have manifestly failed to clarify the extent of the State’s involvement in the program or to hold any individuals involved accountable.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the pending investigation is completed within a reasonable time, and in compliance with international human rights standards, including the UN Manual on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (the Istanbul Protocol);
- Take concrete steps to establish the truth, pursuing all relevant lines of inquiry to enable the identification and accountability of the persons responsible for crimes that may have occurred in connection with and within secret CIA detention centres established in Lithuania;
- Ensure victims and/or their representatives are granted the right to full participation in the investigations in conformity with the internationally recognised right of victims of human rights violations to effective redress;
- Publicise the results and steps taken during the investigation to enable a significant degree of public scrutiny;
- Bring to justice in fair trials any individuals identified as responsible for those violations of human rights.

¹ International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), “Report on the Treatment of Fourteen ‘High Value Detainees’ in CIA Custody”, February 2007, (**‘ICRC HVDs Report’**); *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, App no. 6383/17 (ECtHR, 16 January 2024) (**‘Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania’**), paras 58-78.

² *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, paras 75-82.

³ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lithuania*, 19 December 2011, UN Doc. A/HRC/19/15, para 88.43, p. 16 (Brazil).

⁴ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lithuania*, 27 December 2016, UN Doc. A/HRC/34/9, para 100.171, p. 25 (Islamic Republic of Iran); Human Rights Council, ‘Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lithuania, Addendum, 1 March 2017, UN Doc. A/HRC/34/9/Add.1, para. 3.

⁵ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lithuania*, 14 April 2022, UN Doc. A/HRC/50/10, paras. 138.34 (Belarus), 138.35 (Islamic Republic of Iran), 138.36 (China), and 138.37 (Syria).

⁶ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania* App no. 46454/11 (ECtHR, 31 May 2018) (**‘Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania’**), paras 617 and 621; *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, paras 188-196. Note that the investigations in both cases were joined on 6 February 2015.

⁷ Matthew Cole, “Officials: Lithuania Hosted Secret CIA Prison to get ‘Our Ear’”, ABC News, 20 August 2009, at <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/story?id=8373807>. See also Dick Marty, “Time for Europe to come clean once and for all over secret detentions”, 21 August 2009, at: <https://pace.coe.int/en/news/2549>.

⁸ Seimas (of the Republic of Lithuania), “Findings of the Parliamentary Investigation by the Seimas Committee on National Security and Defence Concerning the Alleged Transportation and confinement of persons detained by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States of America in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania”, 22 December 2009, at <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201203/20120326ATT41867/20120326ATT41867EN.pdf> (**‘Seimas Report’**), p. 7. The data collected during the Seimas CNSD inquiry was not made public due to state secrecy.

⁹ See for example, European Parliament, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, “Report on alleged transportation and illegal detention of prisoners in European countries by the CIA: follow-up of the European Parliament TDIP Committee report”, 2 August 2012, at:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&mode=XML&reference=A7-2012-266&language=EN>;

European Parliament, “Resolution on alleged transportation and illegal detention of prisoners in European countries by the CIA: follow-up of the European Parliament TDIP Committee report”, 2012/2033(INI), 11 September 2012, at https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-7-2012-0309_EN.html; European Parliament, “Resolution on alleged transportation and illegal detention of prisoners in European countries by the CIA”, 2013/2702 (RSP), 10 October 2013, at https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-7-2013-0418_EN.html; European Parliament, “Resolution on the US Senate report on the use of torture by the CIA, 2014/2997 (RSP), 11 February 2015, at https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-8-2015-0031_EN.pdf.

¹⁰ See for example, Constitution Project, Task Force on Detainee Treatment, 2013. Available at: <http://detainee-taskforce.org/read>; Open Society Justice Initiative, Globalizing Torture: CIA Secret Detention and Extraordinary Rendition, 2013; Amnesty International, Breaking the Conspiracy of Silence: USA’s European ‘Partners in Crime’ Must Act after Senate Torture Report, 2015; Reprieve, Briefing and Dossier for the Lithuanian Prosecutor General: CIA Detention in Lithuania and the Senate Intelligence Committee Report, 11 January 2015. See also, United Nations, “Report of

the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson: Framework Principles for securing the accountability of public officials for gross or systematic human rights violations committed in the context of State counter-terrorism initiatives”, A/HRC/22/52, 1 March 2013, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session22/A-HRC-22-52_en.pdf.

¹¹ Raphael S, Black C and Blakeley R, *CIA Torture Unredacted* (The Bureau Investigative Journalism; The Rendition Project 2019), (**The Rendition Project Report**), available at <https://www.therenditionproject.org.uk/documents/RDI/190710-TRP-TBIJ-CIA-Torture-Unredacted-Full.pdf>

¹² The Rendition Project Report, p. 36-37.

¹³ The Rendition Project Report, p. 39.

¹⁴ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania*, para 532.

¹⁵ *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, para 143.

¹⁶ *Al-Nashiri v Lithuania* App. No. 31908/22 (7 July 2026) (**‘al-Nashiri v Lithuania’**), para 138.

¹⁷ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania*, para 576.

¹⁸ *Mustafa al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, paras 161-164.

¹⁹ *Al-Nashiri v Lithuania*, paras 176-177.

²⁰ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania*, paras 191-195.

²¹ See, Vilnius Regional Court ruling upholding appeal, 28 January 2014. See: <https://redress.org/news/lithuanian-court-urges-prosecutors-to-investigate-guantanamo-detainee-rendition-claims-vilnius-lithuania/>

²² Human Rights Committee, *Concluding observations on the third periodic report of Lithuania, Addendum, Information received from Lithuania on follow-up to the concluding observations*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/LTU/CO/3/Add.2, 12 Feb 2016, para 34.

²³ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania*, para 208-211; *al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, para. 279.

²⁴ Committee of Ministers, *Communication from Lithuania concerning the case of Abu Zubaydah v. Lithuania (Application No. 46454/11) to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe*, DH-DD(2019)396, 9 April 2019, available at <https://rm.coe.int/native/090000168093de2b>. Although this communication refers to the case of *Abu Zubaydah v. Lithuania*, it must be stressed that the investigation regards allegations of human rights violations suffered by Mr Abu Zubaydah and Mr al-Hawsawi (pre-trial investigation No. 01-2-00015-14): see *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania* App no. 46454/11 (ECtHR, 31 May 2018), paras 207-211.

²⁵ Committee against Torture, *Concluding observations on the fourth periodic report of Lithuania*, 21 December 2021, CAT/C/LTU/CO/4.

²⁶ *Ibid*, para. 19.

²⁷ *Ibid*, para. 20.

²⁸ WGEID, *Preliminary observations of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances at the conclusion of its visit to Lithuania*, 26 November 2024, pages 4-6, available at:

<https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/issues/disappearances/statements/WGEID-EOM-Statement-Lithuania-20241126.pdf>

²⁹ CM/Del/Dec(2024)1514/H46-23 - 1514th meeting (3-5 December 2024) (DH) - H46-23 *Abu Zubaydah group v. Lithuania* (Application No. 46454/11), para. 4, available at: <https://search.coe.int/cm?i=0900001680b2967d>. For the purposes of implementation of the ECtHR judgements, the cases of *Abu Zubaydah* and *Mustafa al-Hawsawi* have been grouped together in the ‘*Abu Zubaydah group v Lithuania*’.

³⁰ Committee of Ministers, *Communication from the applicant (05/06/2025) in the case of al-Hawsawi v. Lithuania (Application No. 6383/17) (Abu Zubaydah group)*, 10 June 2025, DH-DD(2025)670, available at: <https://search.coe.int/cm?i=091259488027ce3f>

³¹ Committee of Ministers, *Communication from Lithuania concerning the case of al-Hawsawi v. Lithuania (Application No. 6383/17) (Group Abu Zubaydah)*, 16 October 2024, DH-DD(2024)1167, p. 5, available at: <https://search.coe.int/cm?i=09125948802623d1>

³² The latest information is contained in: Committee of Ministers, *Communication from the authorities (30/06/2025) concerning the Abu Zubaydah group of cases v. Lithuania (Application No. 46454/11)*, 8 July 2025, DH-DD(2025)773, pages 3-4, available at: <https://search.coe.int/cm?i=091259488027d1e8>

³³ *Al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, para 192.

³⁴ *Answers of the Republic of Lithuania to the preliminary questions of the United Nations Committee Against Torture (CAT) about the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in Lithuania (CAT/C/LTU/5)*, 4 December 2025, p. 32. The grounds for refusal of victim status are summarised in Committee of Ministers, *Communication from the authorities (30/06/2025) concerning the Abu Zubaydah group of cases v. Lithuania (Application No. 46454/11)*, 8 July 2025, DH-DD(2025)773, pages 3-4, *ibid*; see also *al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, paras 103-104.

³⁵ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania*, para 410; *al-Nashiri v Lithuania*, para 122.

³⁶ *Abu Zubaydah v Lithuania*, paras 619-620; *al-Hawsawi v Lithuania*, para 185.

ANNEX 1

Letter from Lithuania's Ministry of Justice to REDRESS dated 9 March 2026



LIETUVOS RESPUBLIKOS TEISINGUMO MINISTERIJA
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

Budgetary agency, Gediminas Ave. 30, LT-01104 Vilnius,
tel. +370 600 38 904, fax +370 526 62 854, e-mail: rastine@tm.lt, <https://tm.lrv.lt>
Data have been accumulated and stored in the Register of Legal Entities, code 188604955

Chris Esdaile
Senior Legal Advisor
Redress
chris@redress.org

9 March 2026

BY E-MAIL TRANSMISSION ONLY

REGARDING THE EXECUTION OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CASE *AL-HAWSAWI V. LITHUANIA* (NO. 6383/17)

In reply to your request to provide information on the execution of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in case *Al-Hawsawi v. Lithuania*, hereby we provide further information on certain issues related to the domestic pre-trial investigation in a capacity and limits we are allowed to.

The pre-trial investigation is ongoing. At the end of October in 2025 the General Prosecutor's Office submitted a repeated request for the international legal assistance to the U.S. authorities, the response is still awaited. The request has been submitted after an informal meeting organized in August 2025 with the representatives of the U.S. State Department to secure continuous cooperation at the expert level.

We are not in a position to disclose the consultations with the Polish prosecuting authorities on the investigation of similar cases which were organized with the assistance of EUROJUST. Please be informed that the liaison with EUROJUST is handled by the prosecution service, specifically the Prosecutor General's Office.

Further, we would like to specify that the classification of certain data as State secret does not preclude the access of the prosecuting authorities to it. In the case at issue the prosecuting authorities had a possibility to consult all the relevant materials¹.

As regards the process of declassification and possibility of the judicial review of the classification of data, it must be explained that within the legal system of Lithuania the decision on the scope of the declassification lies with the institution that classified the relevant data,

¹ See e.g. Action Plan of 8 April 2019 in case Abu Zubaydah v. Lithuania <[https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=DH-DD\(2019\)396E](https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=DH-DD(2019)396E)> where it was indicated that within the course of the relevant investigation the Prosecutor General's Office closely co-operated with the State Security Department also emphasizing that the investigative authorities have access to all the classified information which constitutes State secret.



however there is a special formation, the Commission for Secrets Protection Coordination, which could examine the validity of the classification and its decisions are subject to the judicial supervision. The mentioned Commission resolves disputes between entities of secrets, also disputes between entities of secrets and other persons arising over the classification of information, the storage, use, declassification and control/supervision of the protection of classified information; it also submits conclusions regarding the validity of the declassification of information or application of classifications to information.

Finally, we would like to inform that all the communication with the UN bodies is conducted through the diplomatic channels.

In conclusion we would like to reiterate that adherence of the Lithuanian to their commitment to execute the Court's judgment in the case at issue and we are ready to continue cooperation with you in this process.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized capital 'R' followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Ričard Dzikovič
Agent of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania