



## Input by civil society organisations to the Asylum Report 2026

Dear Colleagues,

The production of the *Asylum Report 2026* is currently underway. The annual [Asylum Report](#) presents an overview of developments in the field of international protection in Europe.

The report includes information and perspectives from various stakeholders, including experts from EU+ countries, civil society organisations, researchers and UNHCR. To this end, we invite you, our partners from civil society, academia and research institutions, to share your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2025 by topic as presented in the online survey (**'Part A' of the form**).

We also invite you to share with us any publications your organisation has produced throughout 2025 on issues related to asylum in EU+ countries (**'Part B' of the form**).

These may be:

- reports;
- articles;
- recommendations to national authorities or EU institutions;
- open letters and analytical outputs.

Your input can cover information for a specific EU+ country or the EU as a whole. You can complete all or only some of the sections.

Please note that the Asylum Report does not seek to describe national systems in detail but rather to present key developments of the past year, including improvements and challenges which remain.

All submissions are publicly accessible. For transparency, contributions will be published on the EUAA webpage and contributing organisations will be listed under the [Acknowledgements](#) of the report.

All contributions should be appropriately referenced. You may include links to supporting material, such as:

- analytical studies;
- articles;
- reports;
- websites;
- press releases;
- position papers.

Some sources of information may be in a language other than English. In this case, please cite the original language and, if possible, provide one to two sentences describing the key messages in English.





The content of the Asylum Report is subject to terms of reference and volume limitations. Contributions from civil society organisations feed into EUAA's work in multiple ways and inform reports and analyses beyond the Asylum Report.

***NB: Similarly to last year, this year's edition of the Asylum Report will be leaner and more analytical, with streamlined thematic sections. The focus will be on key trends in the field of asylum rather than on individual developments. For this reason, information shared by respondents to this call may be incorporated in the Asylum Report in a format different than in the past years. It will also feature prominently as info boxes in the [country overviews](#).***

Your input matters to us and will be much appreciated!

\*Please submit your contribution to the Asylum Report 2026 by **Friday, 9 January 2026**.\*





## Contact details

---

Name of organisation: Lithuanian Red Cross Society

Name and title of contact person: Senior Lawyer Justė Remytė

Email: [juste.remyte@redcross.lt](mailto:juste.remyte@redcross.lt)

I accept the provisions of the EUAA [Legal and Privacy Statements](#)

## General Observations

---

Before sharing information by thematic area, please provide your general observations on asylum developments as indicated in the following three fields:

### 1. What areas would you highlight where important developments took place in the country/countries you cover?

In 2025, the start of the Reception and Integration Agency (Agency) operations marked a significant structural change in Lithuania's asylum reception system, taking over responsibilities previously managed by the SBGS (SBGS) and other bodies.

In 2025, access to the asylum procedure at the Lithuanian borders remained severely restricted. The number of asylum applications accepted at the border crossing points (BCP) in 2025 decreased compared to 2024. Russian nationals were effectively barred from applying for asylum, and only Belarusians and Ukrainians were admitted. Push-backs were frequent, and irregular arrivals were generally only admitted under exceptional humanitarian circumstances. Investigations by the Seimas Ombudsperson and a court ruling in a May 2025 administrative case against the SBGS, found systemic failures in registration, procedural safeguards, and proper use of body-camera recordings. The Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania reaffirmed that all third-country nationals have the right to apply for international protection, including at the border, regardless of irregular entry, and ruled that forcible removal without access to the asylum procedure violated national and EU law. Despite these rulings, the SBGS continued to practice restricting effective access to asylum.

A key concern in 2025 was the mandatory quarantine imposed on all newly arriving asylum seekers at the Pabradė Reception Centre. This practice was applied indiscriminately, without individual health assessments, and often lasted from 10 days up to nearly a month. It effectively amounted to detention under EU law, restricting liberty without individualized justification.





Following advocacy by the Lithuanian Red Cross (LRC), the practice was revised in autumn 2025: quarantine is now applied only in exceptional cases, following individual health assessments.

The Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour introduced a three-stage age assessment procedure for unaccompanied minors in 2025, combining psychosocial evaluation and medical examination

## 2. What are the areas, where only few or no developments took place?

The asylum decision-making system in Lithuania demonstrates a clear pattern of institutional ping pong, where responsibility and accountability for protecting asylum seekers' rights are repeatedly shifted between the Migration Department and the courts. After the courts identify serious procedural and substantive deficiencies, including failure to assess risks properly, reliance on incomplete or inaccurate country-of-origin information, and disregard for EU law and prior court rulings, the Migration Department often reiterates formalistic or abstract arguments challenging judicial findings and prolonging the process. At the same time, judicial outcomes vary depending on the composition of the judge panel, leading to inconsistent assessments of the same factual circumstances. As a result, asylum seekers experience repeated cycles of application, rejection, appeal, and re-examination, creating legal uncertainty and delaying access to protection.

## 3. Would you have any observations to share specifically about the implementation of the Pact on Migration and Asylum in the national context of the country/ countries you cover?

The LRC involvement in consultations on the implementation of the Pact on Migration and Asylum (hereafter – the Pact) and access to information about the implementation of the Pact is limited. The Ministry of Interiors (hereafter - MoI) invited the LRC for consultations only regarding the implementation of the monitoring mechanism (in 2024).

## PART A: Contributions by topic

---

Please share **your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2025 by topic**. Kindly make sure that you provide information on:

- ✓ New developments and improvements in 2025 and new or remaining challenges;
- ✓ Changes in legislation, policies or practices, or institutional changes during 2025.

### 1. Access to territory and access to the asylum procedure (including first arrival to territory and registration, arrival at the border, application of the *non-refoulement* principle, the right to first response (shelter, food, medical treatment) and issues regarding border guards)

For the fourth year, the LRC has been monitoring the situation, how (if) access to the territory and asylum procedure is ensured, as provided for by the law. The number of asylum





applications submitted at the BCPs in 2025 decreased sharply and, based on the available data, it can be reasonably stated that this was not due to a decrease in the number of asylum applicants *per se*, but to the failure to ensure effective access to the asylum procedure.

In 2025, significantly fewer asylum applications were accepted at the external border with Belarus and the Russian Federation than in 2024. SBGS officers accepted only five applications, which is five times fewer than the previous year.

The LRC recorded ten incidents in 2025 during which asylum applications were rejected at the external border with Belarus and the Russian Federation. If cases involving the same individuals—who attempted to apply multiple times at the same or different BCPs—are counted only once, this number is reduced by three incidents. As in 2024, no asylum applications from Russian nationals were accepted in 2025. All asylum applications submitted at BCPs in 2025, including three submitted at international airports, were accepted only from Belarusian and Ukrainian nationals.

Regarding the situation at road border BCPs located on the border with Belarus, for the first—and only—time in 2025, an asylum application was accepted in mid-October, which was approximately one year and two months after the last registered asylum application (the other two applications in 2025 were accepted at the railway BCP).

Typically, on arrival at the BCPs, asylum seekers were issued documents denying entry (refusal of entry), and the SBGS emphasized the fact that person(s) did not have proper travel documents or a residence permit as the basis for the refusal of entry and denied that the individuals concerned had applied for asylum. Following the deteriorating situation regarding access to the asylum procedure at the SBGS BCPs, the Seimas Ombudsperson's Office of the Republic of Lithuania undertook an independent investigation in 2025, having concluded that the SBGS creates unjustified obstacles to exercising the right to apply for asylum in Lithuania.

The LRC advocacy team initiated a case against the SBGS regarding access to asylum at the BCP. On 21 May 2025, the Šiauliai Chamber of the Regional Administrative Court of Lithuania examined a complaint lodged by a Russian citizen N.D., against the SBGS (SBGS) (case no. e13-9842-621/2025). The applicant challenged the SBGS decision of 19 February 2025, refusing her entry into Lithuania and failing to accept her application for asylum. The Court found that the applicant had clearly expressed her intention to apply for asylum, both orally and in writing, while at the Kybartai border crossing point. However, the SBGS failed to accept and register her asylum application and did not take appropriate steps to ensure that it was properly examined. The Court noted serious procedural shortcomings. In particular, SBGS officers failed to comply with mandatory rules on the use and preservation of body-camera recordings. No recordings from officers' personal recorders were provided to the Court, and the submitted CCTV footage was incomplete, with unexplained gaps. The Court concluded that the SBGS acted in breach of the principle of good administration, the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens, and the national rules governing asylum procedures. As a result, the Court annulled the SBGS decision of 19 February 2025. However, it rejected the remainder of the applicant's claims, including the request to oblige the authorities to admit her to the territory and accept her asylum application directly.





In a separate ruling, the Court informed the Head of the SBGS of the identified violations and ordered the Service to take measures to prevent similar breaches in the future. The SBGS was also required to inform the Court within one month about the measures taken.

These court decisions, read in light of the findings of the Seimas Ombudsperson, demonstrate that the SBGS fails to comply with the requirement to properly use body-cameras, raising serious concerns.

The ‘embassy procedure’ (applying at the Lithuanian Embassy in Minsk) continues to remain ineffective. Two members of the Lithuanian Parliament have proposed eliminating the provision on the possibility of submitting an asylum application in the embassy, because "the crisis is over and the situation is stable and under control," and such a measure is no longer needed.

As for irregular arrivals, like in previous years, exceptions to cross the ‘green border’ were made only for Belarusian and, in exceptional cases, Russian nationals, with prior information and agreement. Only in two known cases were exceptions made for nationals of other countries, usually for humanitarian reasons - critical health conditions. One person had his limbs amputated due to frostbite, in another case, an exhausted woman was hospitalized (a relative who was with her was also allowed to remain in the territory, while another person who was with them got separated and was later found dead in the territory of Lithuania).

On 30 December 2025 Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania issued a decision in case No. eA-820-552/2025<sup>1</sup>. The court found that on 23 October 2023, the applicant was forcibly pushed back from Lithuanian territory to Belarus and was not given a real opportunity to apply for asylum. Although the applicant entered Lithuania irregularly, the appellate court emphasized that he was the weaker party and that ambiguities should be assessed in his favor. It criticized the court of first instance for relying almost exclusively on the explanations of the SBGS (SBGS) and for failing to properly assess all available evidence, including the applicant’s statements and subsequent conduct.

Relying on the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), the court reaffirmed that every third-country national has the right to apply for international protection, including at the border, regardless of irregular entry or the likelihood of success. It was therefore concluded that the actions of the SBGS were unlawful, as the applicant was forcibly removed from Lithuanian territory without being afforded access to the asylum procedure.

In 2025, the number of persons who irregularly entered the EU through Latvia and subsequently moved through Lithuania, or were apprehended in Poland and readmitted to Lithuania, was higher than in 2024. In 2025, new countries of origin appeared that had not previously been widely observed, such as Somalia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Sudan. A significant number of these individuals were unaccompanied children. In 2025, approximately 400 unaccompanied children were accommodated at their designated place of accommodation, the Rukla Reception Center (Rukla RC). Most of them disappeared during the process, while some were transferred to

---

<sup>1</sup> Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, 30 December 2025 ruling in administrative case, access: [liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=1909f8e5-97a8-4867-a3eb-d9633cba8fed](https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=1909f8e5-97a8-4867-a3eb-d9633cba8fed)





Latvia based on readmission. Only unaccompanied children were not detained during the year. All others—adults and children accompanied by adults—were detained by decision of the SBGS with an aim to promptly transfer them to Latvia. Any attempts by individuals in the readmission procedure to apply for asylum were ignored, very limited information was provided, and access to state-guaranteed legal aid was possible only if the SBGS applied to a court for further detention or for an alternative to detention measure. In most cases, access to the asylum procedure became possible only when Latvia refused to recognize that an individual had previously been on its territory. It is worth noting that only a very small proportion of unaccompanied children sought to obtain asylum status.

In 2025, the SBGS continued to declare that all third-country nationals who are push-backed and not allowed to enter the country at the ‘green border’ (there was about a 40 percent increase compared to 2024) are given packages of clothes, shoes, food, water, etc. Once persons have entered the territory of Lithuania and been detained at the border units, the most necessary measures were ensured. However, it is noteworthy that at the initial stage (until, for example, a person acquires a status of asylum seeker or while awaiting transfer to Latvia), persons were usually not able to use a shower, they were not allowed to contact their relatives, etc. The same applies to unaccompanied children, who were delivered to the Rukla RC in extremely poor condition - with dirty clothes and shoes, without being examined by doctors, etc.

## **2. Access to information and legal assistance (including counselling and representation)**

Access to relevant information in 2025 was one of the most problematic, especially concerning persons in *de facto* detention (who are detained by a court decision or by the SBGS decision or who are assigned an alternative measure to detention with a restriction of freedom of movement).

Access to information at the Pabradė Center (both parts—administered by the SBGS and by the Agency) was particularly problematic in 2025. Most of the buildings were taken over by the Agency from the SBGS at the beginning of 2025. The situation began to improve only toward the end of the year, and even then, only partially.

Throughout the year, most of the buildings in which foreigners with various legal statuses were accommodated or detained lacked adequate information about the internal rules of both parts of the center, the complaints mechanism, access to the asylum procedure, state-guaranteed legal aid, relevant contact details, monthly allowances for asylum seekers, and the practical functioning of alternative measures to detention, such as regarding permission to temporarily leave the center.

As the number of accommodated foreigners in the Pabradė Center began to grow, people were spontaneously accommodated on previously uninhabited floors and corridors. As a result, in certain cases, absolutely no information was available on the site. For a certain period (until autumn 2025), a quarantine regime was applied in many places in the Pabradė Center, which meant that people had no opportunity to move within the Center and obtain information.

Another problematic aspect was the growing diversity of languages. Only at the end of the year did the practice of translating relevant written information into more languages begin to be





applied (leaflets, posters prepared by the Agency, and a newly designed information app reached the centers in many languages).

The LRC legal team continues to provide legal counselling to asylum seekers. LRC legal aid includes consultations and assistance with the preparation of documents for asylum procedures, as well as litigation support. The LRC has access to border crossing points (BCPs), accommodation centres (Pabradė, Rukla, Naujininkai, Girionys), remand prisons, and correctional facilities.

It should be noted that at BCPs and at the Pabradė Foreigners' Registration Centre (hereinafter – FRC) under the SBGS (SBGS), the LRC has access only to registered asylum seekers. Consequently, if a person crosses the border irregularly and their asylum application is not registered, they do not have access to legal counselling. At the Agency, LRC lawyers have access to all accommodated foreigners.

It should also be noted that from 1 January 2025 until mid-September 2026, the Agency quarantined all foreigners upon arrival at the centre, and access to legal services was highly restricted. However, since mid-September, following successful advocacy efforts, this practice has changed, and foreigners are now quarantined only in exceptional circumstances when there is a serious concern regarding their health.

As of 1 January 2025, asylum seekers are no longer entitled to free legal aid when appealing first-instance court decisions in asylum cases to the Supreme Administrative Court (the second-instance court). However, on 2 July 2025, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania in its case No. eA-1880-525/2025<sup>2</sup> concluded that “<..> the provision of free state-guaranteed legal aid to asylum seekers is primarily oriented toward proceedings before the court of first instance. However, the established regulation does not deny asylum seekers the right to receive free state-guaranteed legal aid also before the appellate court, since the court is vested with the authority to decide on the provision of state-guaranteed legal aid to foreigners <...>”. This case law has provided a basis for asylum seekers to request the court for the appointment of a lawyer to represent them in proceedings before the Supreme Administrative Court, and in the majority of cases, such requests are granted.

### **3. Provision of interpretation services** (e.g. introduction of innovative methods for interpretation, increase/decrease in the number of languages available, change in qualifications required for interpreters)

A provision of interpretation services in 2025 raised concerns. After the EUAA staff had left Lithuanian centers and after the establishment of a new institution - the Agency - translation/interpretation services were provided by the Agency. It is noteworthy that the Agency also provided services to the SBGS.

While interpretation was ensured during procedural actions—such as the issuance of detention decisions, interviews, interrogations, and vulnerability or age assessment procedures carried out by the Agency—translation and interpretation services were largely lacking in daily life at accommodation centers, including at the household level and when individuals were being informed of decisions affecting them. For example, the SBGS usually did not provide detailed

<sup>2</sup> Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, 2 July 2025 ruling in administrative case, access: [litateko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=768b0c6f-5672-4032-9cc1-e76991d32470](https://litateko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=768b0c6f-5672-4032-9cc1-e76991d32470)





explanations of decisions in individual cases. In some instances, only the basic information regarding the decision was translated without a translation of the part by which the reasoning is presented. There was also a lack of oral explanations and interpretation.

In practice, interpreters were most often used remotely. Moreover, in 2025, the need for additional languages became apparent. As noted above, in addition to the commonly requested Arabic and Farsi, there was significant demand for languages such as Somali, Tigrinya, and Amharic. As there are very few interpreters for these languages in Lithuania, and most are based in other countries, interpretation services were usually provided remotely.

There were cases when some medical institutions, for example, providing psychiatric services, refused to work with a remote interpretation.

During the year, the Agency acquired special electronic translation tools.

**4. Dublin procedures** (including the organisational framework, practical developments, suspension of transfers to selected countries, detention in the framework of Dublin procedures)

N/A

**5. Special procedures** (including border procedures, procedures in transit zones, accelerated procedures, admissibility procedures, prioritised procedures or any special procedure for selected caseloads)

**The fiction of non-entry** creates several challenges for asylum seekers who are *de facto* present in the territory (usually in an accommodation centre) but are not considered to be *de jure* in the territory. First, under the law, persons in this situation are not issued a foreigner's registration card, which serves as an identity document for asylum seekers. In practice, this leads to situations when an asylum seeker has the right to leave the accommodation centre but does not possess any document proving their legal status. If such an asylum seeker is requested by an authority to present identification, they are unable to demonstrate their legal status.

Moreover, asylum seekers who are not considered to be *de jure* in the territory do not receive social benefits, which are granted to asylum seekers admitted to the territory. This causes significant confusion among asylum seekers, as frequently both groups often have the same right to move freely within the territory.

Additionally, asylum seekers who arrive in the same manner, and even as part of the same group, are treated differently—some are admitted to the territory, while others are not. This creates legal uncertainty.

Since 1 January 2025, **vulnerability assessments** have been available for asylum seekers who do not reside in accommodation centres. An asylum seeker may approach the Agency to request that a vulnerability assessment be carried out. This change is a significant improvement, especially given that asylum seekers from Belarus—one of the largest groups of asylum seekers in Lithuania—do not reside in accommodation centres and have usually experienced ill-treatment in their countries of origin.

**6. Reception of applicants for international protection** (including information on reception capacities – increase/decrease/stable, material reception conditions – housing,





food, clothing and financial support, contingency planning in reception, access to the labour market and vocational training, medical care, schooling and education, residence and freedom of movement)

**Situation at the accommodation centers.** The most problematic aspect of the material reception conditions in 2025 was the provision of seasonal clothing and footwear to people newly transferred to the Pabradė Center. The LRC monitoring team periodically provided recommendations to the Agency, but it was only in late autumn that people finally received full sets of clothing and footwear. Before that, people wore clothes that they had themselves, even in cold weather; they were only given slippers. Additionally, NGO Caritas contributed some clothing/footwear. The Agency representatives explained that people allegedly refused clothes or threw them away; however, this situation was caused by, most likely, the dynamics of the center - a rapid and unplanned increase in the number of people and their high turnover (transfer to Latvia or absconding).

The situation in the Rukla RC, especially with unaccompanied children, was much better in this regard. Unaccompanied children were immediately and fully provided for as soon as they were transferred to the Rukla RC from the SBGS border units.

Another issue was the reduced organization of leisure and recreational activities at the Pabradė Center. Many individuals who were de facto detained had little or nothing to do in their spare time. It is worth noting that persons held in SBGS detention had very limited access to telephones—only one hour every second day. Although the situation was partially mitigated by the activities of various NGOs during the year, a significant lack of leisure and recreational opportunities remained an issue for those detained under the authority of the SBGS.

During the year, problems arose with the payment of monthly allowances to asylum seekers. In some cases, individuals were not aware that they needed to apply to receive the allowance, and in other cases, Agency employees were not informed that a person's legal status had changed while the individual was in detention under the SBGS. In some cases, a change of status allowed foreigners to apply for an allowance; therefore, the lack of information sharing caused misunderstandings.

A positive change is that since the beginning of the year, asylum seekers living on their own can apply to the Agency and also receive monthly allowances, which was not previously possible.

**Access to the labour market.** According to Article 71(1)(10) of the Law on the Legal Status of Foreigners, asylum seekers have the right *to take up employment or engage in self-employment if, within six months from the lodging of the application for asylum, the Migration Department has not taken a decision on the granting asylum in the Republic of Lithuania through no fault of the asylum applicant.* This provision is derived from Article 15(1) of Directive 2013/33/EU, which obliges Member States *to ensure that applicants have access to the labour market no later than 9 months from the date when the application for international protection was lodged if a first instance decision by the competent authority has not been taken*





and the delay cannot be attributed to the applicant. In this regard, Lithuanian national law establishes more favourable conditions for asylum seekers – a shorter period for getting access to the labour market. However, the application of this provision in practice sometimes results in a situation where persons who have been in the asylum procedure for 9 months or more are still unable to exercise the right to work.

The issue of acquiring the right to work is related to the fact that the 6-month period established in national law is identical to the period within which the determining authority (Migration Department) must make a decision on the asylum application. Accordingly, granting the right to work to an asylum seeker is possible only in the case when the Migration Department violates the deadline for examining the application established by law, therefore, it is likely perceived by the institution as a kind of “punishment” for such a violation. In such circumstances, in all cases when the relevant decisions are made “on time”, i.e., without violating the established deadlines, the Migration Department is unwilling to admit that the asylum seeker could have acquired the right to work. However, several recurring situations pose problems:

a) The Migration Department takes the position that a decision on the transfer of an asylum seeker pursuant to the Dublin III Regulation is indeed “*a first instance decision*” within the context of Article 15(1) of Directive 2013/33/EU. Accordingly, if a decision on the transfer of an asylum seeker to another Member State is made within 6 months, he or she can no longer acquire the right to work, even if the actual transfer takes place significantly later or does not take place at all (e.g. after a court annuls the transfer decision). In its practice, the Migration Department ignores and does not follow the interpretation provided by the Court of Justice of the European Union in the judgment of 14 January 2021 in joined cases C-322/19 and C-385/19 on the application of Article 15 of Directive 2013/33/EU<sup>3</sup>. The case-law of national courts on this issue is ambiguous. For instance, on 22 October 2025 the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania adopted a ruling in administrative case No. eA-2433-1188/2025<sup>4</sup>, essentially stating that the decision to transfer the applicant to another Member State was adopted within the 6-month period from the submission of the applicant's application, thus the applicant could have not acquired the right to work. The judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 14 January 2021 is not mentioned at all in this ruling of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania and is not followed. On the contrary, on 29 December 2025, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania adopted a ruling in another, analogous administrative case No. eA-2817-442/2025<sup>5</sup>, in which it explicitly relied on the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 14 January 2021 and found that the decision to transfer the applicant to another Member State was not “*a first instance decision*” within the meaning of Article 15(1) of Directive 2013/33/EU, therefore the applicant had acquired the right to work.

---

<sup>3</sup> Court of Justice of the European Union, 14 January 2021 judgement in Joined Cases C-322/19 and C-385/19, ECLI:EU:C:2021:11

<sup>4</sup> Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, 22 October 2025 ruling in administrative case No. eA-2433-1188/2025, access: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/82dd22a4b69811f09105e65d686755d5>

<sup>5</sup> Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, 29 December 2025 ruling in administrative case No. eA-2817-442/2025, access: <https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=a3c500b8-9e28-43ad-8581-ab9785ef1211>





b) In the practice of the Migration Department, the aforementioned 6-month period applies only to the first examination of an asylum application. That is, if, for example, a decision refusing to grant a person asylum was made within the 6-month period, the asylum seeker permanently loses the opportunity to acquire the right to work, regardless of how long he or she will remain in the asylum procedure. If the asylum seeker appeals such a decision to a court, which annuls this decision and returns the case to the Migration Department for re-examination (not to be confused with a subsequent application), this does not affect access to the labour market. After re-examining the application, the Migration Department may again make a decision not to grant the person asylum, which may again be appealed to the court and may again be annulled, repeatedly returning the case for re-examination. This cycle can go on for years, with the person “stuck” in the asylum procedure without the possibility to acquire the right to employment, simply because the first “*first instance decision*” that had been effectively null and void for years, was indeed taken within the 6-month period. There is currently no relevant national case law on this issue, although in the aforementioned administrative case No. eA-2433-1188/2025 the situation was exactly like this – with the “*first instance decision*” being annulled by the court. Nevertheless, both the Migration Department and the courts of both instances essentially proceeded on the assumption that the subsequent “*annulment*” of the decision does not change the fact that it was “*taken*” within the 6-month period, thus permanently preventing the asylum seeker from accessing the labour market.

**7. Detention of applicants for international protection** (including detention capacity – increase/decrease/stable, practices regarding detention, grounds for detention, alternatives to detention, time limit for detention)

**De facto detention.** The courts systematically apply the alternative measure to detention - accommodation with the possibility to leave the accommodation centre only with permission of the head of the centre - which amounts to the *de facto* detention measure. Asylum seekers are accommodated in the building surrounded by a fence, and it has a small yard. After the Agency took responsibility for this building, asylum seekers were allowed to leave the premises; however, this permission was not granted consistently. A major concern is that the Agency does not issue a written decision when an asylum seeker is not permitted to leave the centre. Instead, the individual is informed orally. In such circumstances, the asylum seeker is unable to appeal the decision and does not receive any written reasoning for the refusal.

**Quarantine practice.** During 2025, the practice of mandatory isolation for the purpose of health check-ups, applied to the persons newly accommodated at the Pabradė Reception Centre, was observed. According to the collected data, mandatory isolation at the Pabradė Reception Centre was automatically applied to all people newly arriving at the said centre, including those who, before being accommodated in the centre, had legally resided in Lithuania for a certain period of time, and those who were transferred to Lithuania from other European Union Member States after passing a “fit-to-fly” medical examination before the flight. No individual health assessment was carried out before the person was isolated, nor were individual decisions made regarding the necessity of isolation. According to the testimonies of the people interviewed, they had to stay in isolation for different periods of time (e.g., 10 days, 2 weeks, 27 days).





The observed practice was incompatible neither with the specific legal regulation for the accommodation of foreigners in reception centres nor with the general provisions of national law governing the prevention and control of communicable diseases. From a legal point of view, the mandatory medical isolation in the Pabradė Reception Centre under the observed conditions was tantamount to detention within the meaning of Article 2(h) of Directive 2013/33/EU.

In view of this, the LRC has taken advocacy actions to change the practice of mandatory medical isolation of the newly arrived at the Pabradė Reception Centre, primarily by ensuring effective prevention of the spread of infectious diseases, but at the same time not restricting the right to liberty of people accommodated in the centre for an unreasonably long time, especially when individual assessment is not carried out and individual decisions are not being made. In the autumn of 2025 the practice described has changed. Currently, the health status of people newly arriving at the Pabradė Reception Centre is individually assessed immediately upon arrival, and longer medical isolation is applied only in cases where it is individually justified.

**8. Procedures at first instance** (including relevant changes in: the authority in charge, organisation of the process, interviews, evidence assessment, determination of international protection status, decision-making, timeframes, case management – including backlog management)

Several aspects of the asylum procedure at first instance raise concerns:

- If an asylum seeker does not reside in Vilnius, where the Asylum Division of the Migration Department is located, the majority of interviews are conducted remotely.
- The Migration Department systematically requires asylum seekers to substantiate their claims of persecution with documentary evidence, particularly in cases involving Belarusian or Russian nationals who fear return to their country of origin due to their political opinions. For example, asylum seekers are often required to submit documents proving that criminal or administrative proceedings have been initiated against them. If such documents cannot be provided, the Migration Department conducts a check in the Interpol database and, in the absence of recorded charges, concludes that there are no proceedings against the applicant and that the fear of persecution is therefore not well-founded. It should be emphasized that the majority of asylum seekers do not claim that criminal or administrative proceedings are currently pending against them in their country of origin; rather, they claim to fear future proceedings due to their political opinions. Nevertheless, the Migration Department systematically considers such fears to be well-founded only if the asylum seeker submits evidence confirming that criminal or administrative proceedings have already been initiated; otherwise, the fear is assessed as hypothetical.
- The Migration Department has prepared a country of origin information report on Belarus, in which it concludes that political repression in Belarus is decreasing. However, in a journalistic investigation published by the media portal *Delfi.lt*, a representative of Viasna commented on the practices of the Lithuanian Migration Department. According to Viasna, the conclusion that the intensity of political repression in Belarus has decreased is incorrect. Information on political repression is concealed by the Belarusian authorities, and Viasna can identify only about half, if not





fewer, of the cases of political repression. Moreover, in addition to arrests and imprisonment, a variety of other forms of punishment and restrictions have emerged; therefore, a decrease in the number of criminal or administrative cases does not indicate a decrease in political repression. According to Viasna, individuals who participated in protests have been identified and recorded, and it is only a matter of time before they are targeted. Despite public criticism, the Asylum Division of the Migration Department continues to rely on this report and to maintain that the level of repression is decreasing.

The Migration Department also continues to delay decisions on asylum applications and does not comply with the statutory time limits for examining such applications, namely six months under the regular procedure and ten working days under the accelerated procedure.

In addition, the Migration Department initiated several revocation procedures against Syrian nationals who had been granted international protection in Lithuania. In one case, the revocation was initiated because the individual had reached adulthood.

**9. Procedures at second instance** (including organisation of the process, hearings, written procedures, timeframes, case management – including backlog management)

**Application of CJEU judgement *Torubarov v Hungary* (C-556/17).** One of the highlights of 2025 was the issuance of repeated negative decisions by the Migration Department despite earlier court rulings favourable to asylum seekers. Instead of correcting the deficiencies identified by the courts, the Migration Department systematically used repeated procedures as an additional opportunity to contest and effectively re-argue the courts' findings. As a result, the application of the CJEU judgment in *Torubarov v Hungary* (C-556/17) became a relevant issue in domestic court jurisprudence.

On 29 October 2025 the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania in its case No. eA-2604-624/2025 clarified its approach to applying the CJEU judgment in *Torubarov v Hungary* (C-556/17), refining its own case law. The Court reaffirmed the general principle that national courts may not assume the functions of public administration authorities, such as directly granting refugee status. However, it acknowledged that an exception applies under EU law where this is necessary to ensure effective judicial protection under Article 47 of the EU Charter, in line with the *Torubarov* judgment (para. 37). In the present case, although the proceedings have been ongoing since 2021 and the Migration Department repeatedly adopted negative decisions, the Court held that the exceptional circumstances required to substitute the administrative authority's decision did not arise. Nevertheless, the Court confirmed that earlier final judgments had established, as a binding and non-contestable fact, that the applicants met the legal criteria for refugee status. Consequently, the Migration Department is obliged to accept this finding when re-examining the asylum application.

On 11 November 2025, the Court in its case No. eA-2729-602/2025 again reaffirmed the general principle that national courts may not assume the functions of public administration authorities, such as directly granting refugee status, as this competence normally lies with the Migration Department. Applying this framework to the case at hand, the Court found that the *Torubarov* exception did not apply. Unlike in *Torubarov*, where asylum had been refused three





times despite repeated judicial annulments, the Migration Department's decisions in the present case were annulled only twice, and one more decision had become final because it was not appealed by the applicant. Therefore, the Court held that the situation did not justify the court taking over the administrative function of granting asylum, and it dismissed the applicant's request to decide regarding refugee status. For the third time, the court obliged the Migration Department to re-examine the case, once again identifying deficiencies in the proceedings.

Another highlight is the **inconsistency of court decisions, which leads to legal uncertainty**. As an example could be taken the asylum and later forced return case of the applicant, a Belarusian national. His case has been under judicial review since 2021, with multiple decisions issued between 2023 and 2026. The case reflects both the individual risk faced by the applicant and the repeated failures of the Lithuanian Migration Department to address established threats adequately, as well as the inconsistency of decisions issued by the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.

On 30 August 2023, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania in its case No. eA-2224-520/2023 acknowledged that the applicant had participated in the 2020 protests in Belarus and had sustained injuries during these events. The Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania concluded that the applicant was identified as a protester who could face persecution in his home country. After reviewing the case again, the Migration department again did not grant refugee status to the applicant. On 18 September 2024, the same Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, however, a different judge panel, in its case No. eA-2144-463/2024 issued a decision stating that the applicant had engaged in protests and non-governmental organization activities, but his actions were not sufficiently active or consistent to justify a well-founded fear of persecution. Additionally, information regarding the persecution of other individuals with similar profiles was deemed insufficient, as persecution claims must be based on concrete factual evidence and assessed individually. Consequently, the applicant's appeal was denied, and he has lost the status of asylum seeker and the right to remain in the territory. The Migration Department issued a forced return decision. The Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania reviewed the validity of this forced return decision on 30 July 2025 in case No. eA-2349-575/2025 and concluded that Belarusian authorities were aware of the applicant's protest participation and that he had been directly threatened. The court emphasized that the applicant had been actively involved in protests and, as a result, faced a very high likelihood of detention, prosecution, and torture if returned. The court concluded that returning the applicant would constitute treatment contrary to Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which prohibits torture and inhuman or degrading treatment, and annulled the Migration Department's decision. Despite this decision, the Migration Department again issued a forced return decision. In its recent decision (07 January 2026), the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania in case No. eA-1395-552/2026 reaffirmed the conclusions from the 30 July 2025 decision, noting that the applicant demonstrated a real risk of persecution and mistreatment if returned to Belarus. The court found that the Migration Department and first-instance court decisions lacked adequate factual and legal justification.

The judicial review of this case demonstrates a clear inconsistency in the assessment of the applicant's risk depending on the composition of the judicial panel. While some panels recognized the substantial evidence of persecution and the real threat to the applicant's safety (it has to be noted that during all court proceedings, the same set of evidence was submitted by





the applicant), others minimized or dismissed the same factual circumstances, leading to conflicting decisions over the years.

At the same time, the Migration Department has repeatedly failed to recognize its own errors. Despite multiple court rulings confirming the applicant's well-founded fear of persecution, the Department has continued to issue negative decisions, often reiterating abstract or formal arguments rather than addressing the substantive findings of the courts. This persistent refusal to acknowledge and correct its mistakes has contributed to prolonged litigation and uncertainty for the applicant, undermining both the effectiveness of the asylum process and compliance with national and EU human rights standards.

This example highlights a systemic problem in the protection of asylum seekers, emphasizing the need for clearer standards, accountability mechanisms, and adherence to established court findings to prevent repeated and avoidable violations of fundamental rights.

#### **10. Issues of statelessness in the context of asylum** (including identification and registration)

N/A

#### **11. Children and applicants with special needs** (special reception facilities, identification mechanisms/referrals, procedural standards, provision of information, age assessment, legal guardianship and foster care for unaccompanied and separated children)

**Age assessment.** Since 2025 the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour adopted Order on the approval of the description of the procedure for the accommodation of unaccompanied minor foreigners, the search for family members or other legal representatives of unaccompanied minor foreigners who are not asylum seekers, the determination of their legal status and the performance of other procedural actions related thereto, as well as the determination of the age of foreigners. This order outlines a three-stage age assessment procedure. The age determination assessment consists of a psychosocial evaluation (Stages I and II) and a medical examination of the foreigner (Stage III). At the end of the year, it was noticed that the number of minors for whom a medical examination was conducted had increased.

The level of absconding among minors is high, and many are leaving before age assessment procedures are finished.

**Statistics.** According to the Agency, in 2025, out of 371 unaccompanied children who were accommodated in the Rukla RC, 265 were assigned guardianship.

According to the Agency, the average duration of unaccompanied children's stay in the Rukla RC until they abscond or are transferred to Latvia is about 10-14 days. The longest time of those left in the center was a bit more than 2 months. Only a small number of the children who absconded was returned back to the Rukla RC, majority of them disappeared and any connection with them is lost.

According to the data provided by the Agency, since June 2025, 92 age determination assessments have been initiated, 36 final decisions have been made (21 persons have been determined to be minors, 15 – adults).





**Best interest of the child assessment.** For the past few years, the LRC has been working with a refugee family whose children became unaccompanied minors after their father failed to fulfill his parental duties and ensure their well-being. A court removed the children from the father and placed them under temporary guardianship. The children’s mother could not come to Lithuania at the same time, but she sought legal entry—a process that took over three years. Systemic problems in Lithuania’s legal framework became evident when the State Child Rights Protection and Adoption Service sought to restrict the mother’s parental authority, claiming she had failed in her duties. Current laws and regulations do not adequately ensure the best interests of unaccompanied minors or support family reunification.

Determining a child’s best interests for unaccompanied minors remains the biggest concern. The Ministry of Social Security and Labour issued non-binding Guidelines, which recommend identifying relatives or guardians to protect the child, but state institutions do not always follow them.

Another problem concerns social services. While Lithuanian law provides social services to residents, foreigners without a residence permit—such as a mother living abroad—cannot access these services, even if needed to support her children. In this case, services were only provided to the father and children, leaving institutions unable to assess the mother’s situation and address the children’s needs fully.

Finally, professionals in Lithuania often lack knowledge on ensuring unaccompanied minors’ best interests in family reunification cases. Existing models rely on domestic law, court, and institutional practice, but do not always consider international standards or the realities of unaccompanied minors.

- 12. Content of protection** (including access to social security, social assistance, health care, housing and other basic services; integration into the labour market; measures to enhance language skills; measures to improve attainment in schooling and/or the education system and/or vocational training)

N/A

**13. Return of former applicants for international protection**

It is noticed that the number of Iraqi nationals forced return to their country of origin increased in comparison to the previous years. Some cases of forced return were publicly discussed<sup>6</sup>. However, the official statistics on forced returns are not available.

- 14. Resettlement and humanitarian admission programmes** (including EU Joint Resettlement Programme, national resettlement programme (UNHCR), National Humanitarian Admission Programme, private sponsorship programmes/schemes and ad hoc special programmes)

---

<sup>6</sup> [Iš darbo kirpykloje – tiesiai į lėktuvą? Irakiečio Ali kova už teisę likti Lietuvoje drasko širdį | Gyvenimas | 15min.lt, access: <https://www.15min.lt/gyvenimas/naujiena/pokalbiai/is-darbo-kirpykloje-tiesiai-i-lektuva-irakiecio-ali-kova-uz-teise-likti-lietuvoje-drasko-sirdi-1040-2533038>](https://www.15min.lt/gyvenimas/naujiena/pokalbiai/is-darbo-kirpykloje-tiesiai-i-lektuva-irakiecio-ali-kova-uz-teise-likti-lietuvoje-drasko-sirdi-1040-2533038)





Lithuania will accept half of the migrants allocated to it under the European Union's solidarity mechanism next year and pay a financial contribution for the remainder<sup>7</sup>.

**15. National jurisprudence on international protection in 2025** (please include a link to the relevant case law and/or submit cases to the [EUAA Case Law Database](#))

The relevant case law is cited in the text.

**16. Other important developments in 2025**

**The new management of the Migration department.** In November 2025, the term of office of the long-time Director of the Migration Department, E. Gudzinskaitė, ended. By the end of the year a new head of the Migration Department had neither been appointed nor even selected. Currently, the Migration Department is temporarily headed by E. Gudzinskaitė's deputy, L. Voišnis. It cannot be ruled out that a change in leadership may have a certain impact on the practices of the Migration Department in the future, since a significant part of the observed problematic aspects are related specifically to the interpretation and application of legal norms in practice. On the other hand, changes of this nature would not necessarily be favourable to asylum seekers. On 7 January 2026, the new manager, Indrė Gasperė was appointed<sup>8</sup>.

**The closure of borders.** In 2025, there was a period when arrival through the BCPs at the border with Belarus was not possible at all. On the night of October 21 to October 22, due to the approach of meteorological balloons used for smuggling purposes into Lithuanian airspace, by the decision of the Commander of the SBGS, both BCPs operating on the border with Belarus – Medininkai and Šalčinkai – were temporarily closed.

Due to the recurring situation with meteorological balloons and periodic restrictions on the operation of the Vilnius International Airport, on 29 October 2025 the Government of the Republic of Lithuania decided to suspend traffic through Šalčininkai BCP until 30 November. The Government also restricted traffic through Medininkai BCP for the same period. It was determined that when traveling through Medininkai BCP, restriction will not apply only to diplomatic personnel; persons traveling with a simplified transit document (i.e. Russian citizens who can travel through Lithuania to or from the Kaliningrad region with such documents); Lithuanian citizens returning to Lithuania and their family members; citizens of an EU Member State, a state of the European Economic Area or the Swiss Confederation arriving in Lithuania and their family members; foreigners returning to Lithuania with a valid residence permit in Lithuania; foreigners arriving in Lithuania with humanitarian visas issued by Lithuanian missions; citizens of Andorra, Monaco, San Marino, the Holy See, Ukraine and their family members, as well as technical staff of diplomatic missions of the aforementioned countries in Belarus who are citizens of Belarus; in other exceptional cases, for which the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs mediates. The Government also instructed the SBGS to organize

---

<sup>7</sup> [Lithuania to accept half of EU-assigned refugees next year, pay for rest - LRT, access: https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/2764319/lithuania-to-accept-half-of-eu-assigned-refugees-next-year-pay-for-rest?srsId=AfmBOoqmB5TVJBjNn8wAIBuhRNJPXxOP-KLjLFdyYm\\_We8Pgb1UHqzK](https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/2764319/lithuania-to-accept-half-of-eu-assigned-refugees-next-year-pay-for-rest?srsId=AfmBOoqmB5TVJBjNn8wAIBuhRNJPXxOP-KLjLFdyYm_We8Pgb1UHqzK)

<sup>8</sup> [Migracijos departamentui vadovaus I. Gasperė - Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerija, access: https://vrm.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos/migracijos-departamentui-vadovaus-i-gaspere-3shN/](https://vrm.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos/migracijos-departamentui-vadovaus-i-gaspere-3shN/)





and ensure the implementation of the provisions of this resolution, including the admission of persons to or release from Lithuania on humanitarian grounds. The SBGS confirmed that access to the asylum procedure will not be affected by the closure of the BCPs. During the relevant period, the LRC did not record any incidents related to rejected asylum applications.

Three weeks later, both road BCPs on the border with Belarus were opened. However, it should be noted that after the situation regarding meteorological balloons remained unresolved and Vilnius International Airport was constantly experiencing disruptions, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania declared a state-level emergency on 9<sup>th</sup> December.

Media outlet “Delfi” conducted a **journalistic investigation about malpractices of the Migration Department:**

- “Belarusian woman wonders about the Migration Department: maybe if a person tells how they were raped, they will sit and laugh” ([liet. Baltarusė stebisi Migracijos departamentu: galbūt jei žmogus papasakos, kaip ji išprievartavo, jis sėdės ir juoksis](https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/baltaruse-stebisi-migracijos-departamentu-galbūt-jei-žmogus-papasakos-kaip-ji-isprievartavo-jis-sėdės-ir-juoksis)) available at: <https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/baltaruse-stebisi-migracijos-departamentu-galbut-jei-zmogus-papasakos-kaip-ji-isprievartavo-jis-sedes-ir-juoksis-120117299>
- “When fleeing violence is not enough: what asylum seekers in Lithuania experience” ([liet. Kai pabėgti nuo smurto neužtenka: ką išgyvena prieglobščio prašytojai Lietuvoje](https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/kai-pabėgti-nuo-smurto-neužtenka-ka-išgyvena-prieglobščio-prašytojai-Lietuvoje)), available at: <https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/kai-pabėgti-nuo-smurto-neužtenka-ka-išgyvena-prieglobščio-prašytojai-lietuvoje-120119836>
- “After decisions by the country's services - imprisonment in Belarus” (liet. Po šalies tarnybų sprendimų – įkalinimas Baltarusijoje), available at: <https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/po-salies-tarnybu-sprendimu-ikalinimas-baltarusijoje-120123640>
- “Ukrainian woman living in Lithuania: I was shocked at the Migration Department” ([liet. Lietuvoje gyvenanti ukrainietė: Migracijos departamente patyriau šoką](https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/lietuvoje-gyvenanti-ukrainiete-migracijos-departamente-patyriau-soka)), available at: <https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/lietuvoje-gyvenanti-ukrainiete-migracijos-departamente-patyriau-soka-120126444>

## Part B: Publications

---

1. If available online, please provide links to relevant publications produced by your organisation in 2025:

“LIETUVOJE PRIEGLOBSTĮ GAVUSIŲ ASMENŲ TEISĖS Į ŠEIMOS SUSIJUNGIMĄ ĮGYVENDINIMO IŠŠŪKIAI”, available at: <https://redcross.lt/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/LIETUVOJE-PRIEGLOBSTI-GAVUSIU-ASMENU-TEISES-I-SEIMOS-SUSIJUNGIMA-IGYVENDINIMO-ISSUKIAI-LT-2025.pdf>

2. If not available online, please share your publications with us at: [Asylum.Report@euaa.europa.eu](mailto:Asylum.Report@euaa.europa.eu)





3. For publications that due to copyright issues cannot be easily shared, please provide references using the table below.

	Title of publication	Name of author	Publisher	Date
1	"Socio-Economic Insights Survey (SEIS) Lithuania 2024" <sup>9</sup>	UNHCR	UNHCR	26 February 2025
2	"DEVELOPMENT OF REFERRAL PATHWAYS FOR REFUGEE AND ASYLUM-SEEKING VICTIMS OF GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE (GBV) IN LITHUANIA 2025" <sup>10</sup>	UNHCR	UNHCR	OCTOBER 2025
3	PAŽYMA DĖL SEIMO KONTROLIERĖS INICIATYVA ATLIKTO TYRIMO NR. 5D-2025/2.1-465 DĖL PRIEGLOBSČIO PROCEDŪROS PRIEINAMUMO LIETUVOS RESPUBLIKOS PASIENIO KONTROLĖS PUNKTUOSE <sup>11</sup>	Parliamentary Ombudsperson	Parliamentary Ombudsperson	July 2025
4	PAŽYMA DĖL SEIMO KONTROLIERĖS INICIATYVA ATLIKTO TYRIMO NR. 5D-2025/2.1-389 DĖL PRIEGLOBSČIO PROCEDŪROS PRIEINAMUMO LIETUVOS RESPUBLIKOS PASIENIO	Parliamentary Ombudsperson	Parliamentary Ombudsperson	July 2025

<sup>9</sup> Access:

[https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/114716?\\_gl=1\\*1073115\\*\\_gcl\\_au\\*MTc5NjIzMjI0LjE3NjAzMzc4Mk.\\*\\_ga\\*MTA5MjE4MTO2Ny4xNzUxNDQ0OTc2\\*\\_ga\\_C75J3BKOKJ\\*czE3Njc1OTIzNTYkbzMkZzAkdDE3Njc1OTIzNTYkajYwJGwwJGgw\\*\\_rup\\_ga\\*MTA5MjE4MTO2Ny4xNzUxNDQ0OTc2\\*\\_rup\\_ga\\_EVDQJTJ4LjE3NjAzMzc4Mk.\\*\\_ga\\*MTA5MjE4MTO2Ny4xNzUxNDQ0OTc2\\*\\_ga\\_C75J3BKOKJ\\*czE3Njc1OTIzNTYkbzI0JGcwJHQxNzY3NTkyMzU2JGo2MCRsMCRoMA..](https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/114716?_gl=1*1073115*_gcl_au*MTc5NjIzMjI0LjE3NjAzMzc4Mk.*_ga*MTA5MjE4MTO2Ny4xNzUxNDQ0OTc2*_ga_C75J3BKOKJ*czE3Njc1OTIzNTYkbzMkZzAkdDE3Njc1OTIzNTYkajYwJGwwJGgw*_rup_ga*MTA5MjE4MTO2Ny4xNzUxNDQ0OTc2*_rup_ga_EVDQJTJ4LjE3NjAzMzc4Mk.*_ga*MTA5MjE4MTO2Ny4xNzUxNDQ0OTc2*_ga_C75J3BKOKJ*czE3Njc1OTIzNTYkbzI0JGcwJHQxNzY3NTkyMzU2JGo2MCRsMCRoMA..)

<sup>10</sup> Access: <https://www.unhcr.org/nordic-and-baltic/media/unhcr-gyb-study-lithuania-pdf>

<sup>11</sup> Access: <https://www.lrski.lt/documents/pazyma-del-seimo-kontrolieres-iniciatyva-atlikto-tyrimo-nr-5d-2025-2-1-465-del-prieglobscio-proceduros-prieinamumo-lietuvos-respublikos-pasienio-kontroles-punktuose/>





	KONTROLĒS PUNKTUOSE <sup>12</sup>			
5	PAŽYMA DĒL X SKUNDO NR. 5D- 2025/2.1-828 PRIEŠ LIETUVOS RESPUBLIKOS AMBASADĄ BALTARUSIJOS RESPUBLIKOJE	Parliamentary Ombudsperson	Parliamentary Ombudsperson	1 December 2025

<sup>12</sup> Access: <https://www.lrski.lt/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/PA-136.pdf>

