

G. Gochin v Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania (LGGRTC)
(Administrative procedure)

FACTS

Grant Gochin is a Lithuanian citizen, having full spectrum of rights granted by Constitution, including, Art. 30, the right to defend his interest in court. Captain Jonas Noreika (AKA General Storm) operated in the area Grant's family lived and therefore murdered Grant's family. When Grant discovered that Noreika was a national hero, he tried to have Noreika's honours revoked. No NGO's would do it, so Grant litigated it himself with his own funds.

In 2016 Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania (LGGRTC), a budget institution accountable to Parliament, conducting official historical research of Soviet/Nazi crimes & Lithuanian resistance during and post WWII, published a historical memorandum on Noreika, who was the head of Siauliai district during 1941-1943 and signed orders on Jewish ghettoization and isolation in Zagare ghetto as well as numerous orders on the confiscation of Jewish property.

In their memorandum (Certificate) all accusations and testimonies on Noreika's participation in the Holocaust and his giving personal orders were dismissed as unfounded. Noreika was portrayed as a victim of war who was involved in Nazi administration against his will, he was unaware of the consequences of the orders he signed, and he did no wrong because his position as Head of the Siauliai district office was a mere civil institution. He himself was not involved with bodies executing or transferring Jews. The memorandum is very fragmented. It is silent about Noreika's leadership in pro Nazi political parties - Lithuanian Activist Front (LAF) and Lithuanian Nationalist Party (LNP), his personal orders and personal history of antisemitism and his murderous comrades. Albeit numerous glorifications in regards his national resistance movement are made.

The name LGGRTC is deceptive as it leads one to think of the Convention of the Prevent and Crime of Genocide. To the contrary, it is a propaganda machine mitigating the issue of the butchering of Jews by Lithuanians, and resurrecting the butchers as national heroes.

A summary list of Grant's litigation is here: <https://www.grantgochin.com/summary-of-legal-actions-5-10-15-6-22-20/>

ISSUE

Numerous documents were found relating to the events of 1941, evidencing that Noreika took an active role in the Holocaust in the Zemaitija region. Documents signed by him or his office, documents evidencing his leadership in Lithuanian Activist Front - anti Soviet - pro Nazi resistance movement, etc. Collected historical documents show contrary to what was stated in the memorandum, Noreika's war crimes are interpreted contrary to Nuremberg statute and Genocide convention.

LGGRTC is in breach of its statutory obligation to reveal truth, in breach of main administrative law principles of objectivity, due use of powers, non damage to residents, in breach of mass media law requirements for objectivity & non disinformation.

The historical memorandum is denial of Holocaust, causing suffering to applicant, who's relatives were murdered in Siauliai district, therefore LGGRTC should be given court order to review memorandum in the light of historical documents submitted to court, covering aspects indicated in claim.

HOLDING

2019-03-27 Vilnius County Administrative Court decision is taken to dismiss the claim. No evaluation of Genocide Centre issued memorandum was made.

RATIONALE

Complaint sent to LGGRTC is not to be held as a claim to start administrative procedure (evaluate memorandum, evaluate arguments and negative consequences caused to applicant, take action) but a mere request to provide information, which was rendered to applicant in a good manner - in a complete neglect answer given to applicant earlier. Therefore LGGRTC did not breach administrative procedures.

HOLDING (appeal)

2020-04-01 Lithuanian Supreme administrative court order is taken to dismiss appeal, reverting the court order.

RATIONALE (appeal)

LGGRTC performs two types of activities one which fall in scope of administrative law (i.e. sustainability of resistance veterans) whereas historical research and publication fall outside administrative powers. Court of first instance went too far saying that answer given to applicant was served in a good manner, claims falling outside administrative capacity of institution are not in jurisdiction of administrative courts, therefore claim is dismissed as not adjudicated, earlier court arguments on due service eliminated from decision and decision reverted accordingly.

G. Gochin v LGGRTC (Civil procedure)

FACTS

Same as in administrative procedure with the addition of LGGRTC subsequent publication of a new memorandum in December 2019 claiming that Jonas Noreika was leader of a ring that was saving Jews from Nazi crimes in Siauliai district. This new memorandum was under severe public opposition by Lithuanian chief historians, the Dean of Vilnius University History Faculty, and the head of the Lithuanian History Institute, all of whom who declared memorandum unfounded, null and void.

ISSUE

The historical memorandums are illegal, in breach of mass media law, it is a denial of Holocaust, causing suffering to applicant. LGGRTC memorandums are causing moral damage to applicant, continuous tort, therefore memo's should be upheld illegal & removed from public domain, in this way rectifying the situation and eliminating the source of applicant's suffering. Even though civil code does not grant such rectification of tort, Lithuanian Constitution and Constitutional court doctrine indicates that all damage caused should be rectified.

HOLDING

2020-06-08 Vilnius regional court order is taken not to accept the claim as not adjudicated.

RATIONALE

One may raise claims only in his own name and interest, to defend personal rights. Requested litigation does not influence rights and obligations of applicant therefore "such litigation is useless" as court decision will not impact scope of applicant's rights or obligations. Requested satisfaction for moral damages in tort (removal of memorandums from public domain) is not enshrined in civil code, providing only monetary means of compensation.

HOLDING (appeal)

2020-07-16 Vilnius district court order is taken to dismiss appeal.

RATIONALE (appeal)

One may defend only his own rights and obligations. Historical memorandums do not speak or mention applicant or his relatives, therefore upholding them illegal will not impact material rights or obligations of applicant. Claim seeks compensation of moral damage however there is no request for monetary remuneration as per civil code. Therefore court of first instance was right not accepting the claim.

HOLDING (cassation)

2020-09- Lithuanian Supreme court declines request for cassation review.

RATIONALE (cassation)

Standard decline. Issues raised in the cassation claim are not affecting current Lithuanian jurisprudence.

Summary of legal actions – 5/10/15 – 8/18/20

Grant Gochin June 22, 2020

I have traced around one hundred family members who were murdered in Lithuania, during the Holocaust. Most of this occurred in the region governed by Jonas Noreika.

My efforts to remove monuments for Holocaust perpetrators, and Noreika specifically, began in earnest in 2015. This followed Mayor Simasius (Vilnius) removal of artistic monuments that glorify Soviets.

I became disturbingly aware of multiple National Honors bestowed on Lithuanian Holocaust perpetrators in 2011. I started to address these honours with Lithuanian officials in 2012. I realized the futility of an appeal to non-existent morality; thus I turned to the Law in 2015.

Attached is a list of my legal efforts against Lithuanian Governmental Holocaust Revisionism to show to show the preponderance of rejection / revision, and discounting of facts in relation to Lithuanian actions during the Holocaust. These egregious “errors” are not accidental. This shows a complicated strategy meant to revise, erase, and twist Holocaust history in Lithuania.

I have only included certain documents to and from members of the Lithuanian government. I endeavored multiple times to reach out to the Lithuanian Genocide Center (LGGRTC):

5/10/15 Communication with Vilnius Mayor Simasius suggesting that he remove the memorial plaque honouring Jonas Noreika, on the Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences building, in Vilnius, a Heritage listed site, received no response whatsoever.

10/21/16 only then did Mayor Simasius with a refusal. He stated that he does not wield the Administrative Power to make such a change. He claimed that the City of Vilnius does not have proprietary interest over the monument. (a false statement). He sent me further afield by referring the matter to the CEO of the Academy of Science.

7/2/15 LGGRTC (The Lithuanian Genocide and Resistance Research Center), provided a report to Mayor Simasius claiming that Jonas Noreika participation in Holocaust atrocities is unproven and he is therefore innocent. They claim there exists no reliable information that Noreika ever participated in human rights violations or atrocities of any kind.

7/23/15 A petition by nineteen Lithuanians opposing any honours for Noreika was submitted to Vilnius Mayor Remigijus Simasius. He ignored any attempt at communications.

10/2015 An official memorandum declaring Noreika innocent of any wrongdoing is published by LGGRTC. It was sent to the heads of the governing bodies, the President, Parliament, and other government dignitaries.

11/16/2015 A public statement claiming blasphemy by the nineteen signatories, besmirching true Lithuanian Patriots. It is claimed that this petition is yet another by “Agents of the East (enemies of the State), Jews and other stupid people.

8/26/16 [Letter to Mayor Simasius](#) – Follow up communications to Mayor Simasius, requesting removal of the Noreika monument, included my letters dated 11/1/15, 5/10/15, and 8/26/16.

1/27/17 [Letter submitted](#): A communique was submitted to Lithuanian President Grybauskaite, complaining of Holocaust denial at LGGRTC. She bounced the information back to LGGRTC to ‘police themselves’. [She states](#) that all is in good order, no changes are needed, within the structures of the Lithuanian Supreme Court and State Security Department.

2/2017 A letter was sent to the President Grybauskaite about Kazys Skirpa, another perpetrator. A jumbled mixture of non information was the response received.

3/2/17 [Complaint to Ombudsman](#) about Noreika’s exculpatory findings

3/7/17 Complaint about Monument sent to National [Heritage Department](#), under the Ministry of Culture. I requested an investigation as to the legality of the Noreika monument within the legal requirements of a Heritage Building site, which, it did not. The Heritage Department declined to answer that specific point and simply responded with filler and nonsense.

3/14/17 [Response from Ombudsman](#)

5/30/17 I filed a [Lawsuit](#) against the Heritage Department. The suit was dismissed on a suspect technicality, followed by an appeal submitted to the Lithuanian Supreme Administrative Court. This appeal was granted and the case was sent back to the Lower Court which then rejected the case on a different technicality, brought by the same Judge from the previous dismissal. [No further action taken.](#)

8/11/17 An inquiry was sent to LGGRTC concerning the murderous actions of [LNP](#).

10/14/17 [LGGRTC reply on LNP](#) – They gave a veiled threat as a reply, an insufficient and insulting response.

10/31/17 [Complaint to Parliament](#)

10/31/17 Additional complaint to [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#)

10/31/17 Additional complaint submitted to [Prime Minister](#)

11/14/17 In frustration, a complaint was sent directly to the President. [complaint to President](#)

2/2/2018 [Ombudsman confirmed violations by LGGRTC](#)

3/16/18 [Letter sent to Ombudsman](#) of Parliament. Communication pointing out that LGGRTC distributed false information regarding Brazaitis, another Holocaust perpetrator.

6/2018 A letter containing additional information on Jonas Noreika sent to President Grybauskaite, received an irritatingly non responsive response, designed to shut down communication.

6/2018 [Official request submitted to LGGRTC](#) – I filed a claim with the Lithuanian Genocide Center (LGGRTC), demanding review and withdrawal of their false Holocaust findings on Captain Jonas Noreika “(General Storm)”. Public intimidation of academics in Lithuania proved almost insurmountable, as only one American resident academic would accept this research job, Dr. Andrius Kulikauskas. He accepted on condition that he alone would construct and provide the historical study. He submitted 42 pages of questions such as why such false statements were published, and why was there nothing but resolute silence about the actual history.

6/18/18 I requested that Vilnius Mayor Simasius should re-evaluate his earlier decision, based upon the new and current research findings.

July 2018 [Mayor Simasius communicates](#) with LGGRTC

7/18/18 [LGGRTC responds](#) to the historical study. An 11 page response followed. The response was made public, without the claim. I was then accused of (possible) infringement of the Constitution and Criminal Codes.

7/18/18 LGGRTC [published their response](#) to the 6/20 academic study. LGGRTC only provided answers to selected questions. They avoided the most deeply disturbing issues regarding Jonas Noreika’s involvement in the Holocaust. The entire body of response was designed quite simply, to protect Noreika, and keep his reputation unblemished. He was then, unsurprisingly declared to be innocent of any and all crimes by presenting the “Eichmann Defense” “the Germans made him do it”. The researchers were recast as dilettantes, and unprofessional historians.

7/24/18 [Second request to Public Prosecutor](#)

7/30/2018 [Ethics case](#) against Terese Burauskaite, the Director of LGGRTC.

8/17/20 [Prosecutor declined](#)

8/2018 I filed a [lawsuit against LGGRTC](#) in the Vilnius County Administrative court demanding retraction of the false findings.

CLAIM ARGUMENTS (A claim summary)

In the claim submitted before the Vilnius Administrative Court, I argued that the public dissemination of false historical research involving Jonas Noreika infringes on the principles of good administration presented in ART 3, in the Law of Public administration; using the following

objectivity (meaning that all decisions should be objective and unbiased),

comprehensiveness (meaning that public body answering the claim or request should indicate legal acts it relied on and circumstances impacting the assessment of claim and make a comprehensive, reasoned decision),

non abuse of power (meaning that public entity should seek only the goals enshrined in law).

I argued against the objectivity claimed by LGGRTC publications. They do not present many historical facts needed concerning the Holocaust in Lithuania. Their research diminishes and negates the responsibility of Lithuanians. There is a distinct lack of issues, documents and facts presented in the claim. Facts in evidence should have included the two pro Nazi political parties, LNP & LAF, the close ties of direct involvement in the rounding up, the transporting, the senseless marauding, and the slaughter of Jewish Lithuanians. The response to this presentation was ridiculous and contraindicative according to Art 4 of LGGRTC law. One of the most important tenets of the LGGRTC is the constant restoration of historical truthful facts. Numerous documents relating to the shameful events of 1941, proved that Noreika played an active and participatory role in the atrocities committed in the Zemaitija region. These documents signed by, or on behalf of him evidenced his prominent leadership in Lithuanian Activist Front (LAF). This was an anti Soviet, pro Nazi resistance movement. Also in evidence were historical documents showing a complete reversal of what had been originally stated in the memorandum.

Noreika's war crimes must be interpreted according to Nuremberg statutes and the Genocide Conventions, which LGGRTC does not do.

Instead, his brutal acts are either softened or completely whitewashed.

This is Holocaust Denial. This continues to cause my personal suffering over the loss of my murdered relatives. LGGRTC is in opposition of the stated obligation to reveal the truth. It is a breach of Administrative Law, the principles of objectivity, and is completely damaging to Jewish Lithuanians and a flaunting of true mass media law.

The court was requested to annul the original LGGRTC response given to me. They are caused to order documents listed in the original court claim. This included memberships to certain political parties, ties with like minded antisemitic comrades, orders to confiscate Jewish private property, transferring Jews to ghettos, details of payments to volunteer soldiers for the period of the Zagare ghetto liquidation. This involved eleven aspects in total.

The Granddaughter of Jonas Noreika, Silvia Foti, gave testimony confirming her horror and dismay in learning her grandfather was a willing mass murderer of Jews.

8/2018 First [Submission to Vilnius Public Prosecutor's office](#) to investigate LGGRTC for Holocaust denial. Submission summarily denied.

9/26/2018 [Second submission](#) to Vilnius Public Prosecutor's office to investigate LGGRTC for Holocaust denial. Submission once again, refused.

9/26/18 [Complaint to Ombudsman](#) of Parliament

10/1/2018 [LGGRTC legal response](#).

DEFENSE

LGGRTC argued that Noreika was completely innocent. They ignored most aspects of the claim. They blamed the Nazi administration for the Holocaust. They insisted that Noreika could not have possibly understood that the implementation of his orders would lead directly to the wholesale slaughter of the Jews. Once again, they made the point that the poor fellow was just following orders. He was the head of the region's administrative body, a civil, not a judicial or military institution, although all police forces were in direct command of this organization. The conclusion therefore that they presented was that Noreika held no supreme or active powers. He was yet another cog caught in the Nazi machine.

2017 – 2019 Three separate requests submitted to the Ombudsman of the Lithuanian Parliament complaining that the LGGRTC does not answer, or gives outlandishly false assertions. Ombudsman recommendation calls for a later Parliamentary discussion, and a pandering public service improvement order. No following communication ever received.

11/12/18 – [Public Prosecutor](#) declines second request to prosecute LGGRTC for Holocaust denial.

2/2019 – Ombudsman of the Parliament forwarded to the Journalistic Ethics Department, a complaint concerning the LGGRTC's completely unethical behaviors. Once again, this garnered no response of any kind.

3/21/2019 – Complaint to [Journalistic Ethics Inspector Service](#)

3/27/19 [Court dismissed](#) complaint.

HOLDING

3/27/19 Decision made by the Vilnius County Administrative Court to dismiss the claim. No subsequent evaluation or explanation of the Genocide Center memorandum was made.

RATIONALE

Court finds that the complaint sent to LGGRTC is not to be held as a claim to start an administrative procedure (evaluate memorandum, evaluate arguments and negative consequences caused to applicant, take action) but they converted the claim to a mere request to LGGRTC provide information, which the Court then declared had been rendered to the applicant in a good manner. Therefore, the Court found that LGGRTC did not in fact breach the Public Administration law. They provided what was considered to be timely, comprehensive and motivated. Following this rationale, therefore, there were no grounds to either annul the answer or order new research. Essentially the Court claimed that historical factual assessment was neither their responsibility nor their domain.

4/2019 The Presidential “[International Commission](#) for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania” wrote a public letter to LGGRTC condemning and refuting their findings.

4/2019 [Case appealed to the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania](#) –

APPEAL

I argued that the Court was deficient in their assessment of historical fact, which were central to this case. The Lower Court’s finding that the LGGRTC response was objective and comprehensive, is baseless.

I claimed the Court did indeed breach Art 80 & 86 of the Law on Administrative Procedure. I indicated that they failed to provide an adequate assessment of the evidence. They should have indicated which circumstances were important.

Hiding behind the assertion that this claim was merely a request for information, the Court completely misinterpreted Art 15 of the Public Administration Law. The Court refused to honor the request for a new review. The LGGRTC answer included that “it did not find substantive evidence to change review”. This was despite numerous previous communication to and from LGGRTC that had been presented and substantiated with historical documents. The Courts illegal decision did in fact breach Art 147 of the Law on Administrative Procedure.

At no time were the LGGRTC’s assertions supplemented with facts, questions, nor testimony. The rejection of this claim was rejected without substantiating motivation.

4/2019 Request communicated to Vilnius Mayor Simasius that he rectify the outlandishly incorrect information concerning the ownership and maintenance of the Noreika monument. Received no reply whatsoever.

4/7/2019 Law Professor Stanislovas Tomas destroyed the Noreika plaque. In order to prosecute this crime, Mayor Simasius miraculously found the receipts of monuments ownership belonged to the City of Vilnius. Yet in 1.5 years in 2015, he was unable to find them and claimed they did not exist.

This was his assertion every time I sought an answer. Somehow the receipts appeared instantaneously when needed. Subsequently, Tomas was sentenced to 90 days in prison, which he never served having fled the jurisdiction. Damages were put at over 2,000 Euro’s to be paid to the City of Vilnius that they had declared had no ownership.

8/29/2019 I revised, amended and submitted a new [claim to LGGRTC](#) I insisted that their Noreika findings be dismissed.

9/25/19 [Congressman Brad Sherman](#) writes to PM of Lithuania to identify LGGRTC misstatements of facts, and misuse of US Congressional documents in their Holocaust revisionism.

10/30/2019 Intimidation tactics were employed: [Complaint to Parliament Ombudsman](#)

10/19 [LGGRTC denies this application](#) Apparently, I failed to provide sufficient evidence to prove that Noreika was indeed a vicious Holocaust perpetrator. Furthermore, I was told my submission had not been sufficiently scientifically approached, and the methodology was dodgy.

11/2019 [Third submission to Vilnius Public Prosecutor's office to investigate LGGRTC for Holocaust denial.](#) For the third time, submission denied.

12/2019 LGGRTC issues “new findings” claiming that Noreika was actually a rescuer of Jews. (Stancikas Memo). This finding is a fantasy. This mythical finding was ridiculed by many academics in Lithuania. In fact, the author of this finding was not in any way a historian. He is in fact a geologist in government employ.

12/27/19 The Director of LGGRTC, still claiming my academic researchers were “dilettantes” said: “History Education Not Important, Belief in Research Results Is”

1/8/20 [Letter to LGGRTC](#) I asked why the less culpable Cvirka, whose victims were ethnic Lithuanians as opposed to Jewish Lithuanians, was considered a collaborator, yet Noreika still was not.

1/16/20 [Request to LGGRTC](#). I requested clarification and facts as to dismissal of their December (Stancikas) findings. Once again, my request was flatly denied. LGGRTC stubbornly and willfully refused to satisfy the claim. They argued that their research findings were conclusive and and that this research supplements previous publications on Jonas Noreika. LGGRTC held that the dismissal request is „unmotivated“ and claims this finding is based on their research. The geologist who authored it, claimed it was merely his opinion, yet the finding remains the Official finding of the Lithuanian Government.

2/2/20 [Letter to LGGRTC](#). I requested that retraction of false information made by Director of LGGRTC given to the media.

2/2/20 [Letter of complaint](#) to Lithuanian Supreme Court

3/17/20 [Administrative case against Stancikas “Jew Rescuer” memorandum](#) – awaiting translation

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE (second administrative claim)

LGGRTC published new “research findings” in December 2019 claiming that Jonas Noreika was the leader of a gang that actually was saving Jews (Stancikas memo). This supposedly new finding was vigorously, severely and publicly opposed by Lithuanian chief historians, Dean of Vilnius University History Faculty and the head of their History Institute, all of whom declared the findings without merit, null and void.

In 2020 January, I filed yet another claim against LGGRTC, insisting upon the annulment of this new information. I furthermore asked for removal from the public domain, and an official statement of this removal through the Baltic News Service Agency.

Once again, LGGRTC steadfastly refused to satisfy the claim.

With no expectations of truth or justice, I filed yet another claim in the Vilnius Administrative Court against LGGRTC. The rationale and substance of the claim was based on opinion given by the mentioned historians. It is claimed and supported that false research resulted in ongoing psychological damage to me.

RULING (second claim) 3/17/20

Law on Administrative procedure Art 17 s 1 indicates that claims may be raised in regards public entities acts or omissions.

Law on Administrative procedure Art 23 s 1 indicated that I have the right to claim that my basic human rights were violated.

The Vilnius Administrative Court refused to even accept the claim. They reasoned that the historical research is not meant for, nor solicited by me. It therefore does and indeed cannot influence my rights or responsibilities since it is only information without and administrative mandatory character. This fictitious finding still remains the official State opinion, resulting from an administrative act. Once again I was told that my application had no merit.

4/1/20 [Supreme Administrative Court dismisses case](#)

HOLDING (Appeal)

4/1/20 The Lithuanian Supreme Administrative Court ordered dismissal of the appeal.

RATIONALE (Appeal):

In defense of their activities both within and outside the purview of Administrative Law, LGGRTC performs two types of activities. Once again, historical research or publication are beyond Administrative powers.

The jurisdiction of the Administrative Courts does not include Public Service. My request was determined to be Public Service. Therefore, the Administrative Court simply felt my claim must be terminated, not adjudicated as per Art 103 of the Law on Administrative Procedure.

Even the appearance of a good faith response by the Lower Court was absurd.

The Supreme Administrative court made an unprecedented decision, since traditional Court practice usually followed that chain of adjudication.

5/6/20 [Appeal of Stancikas memo](#) – awaiting translation

APPEAL (second claim)

Once again, my issue was watered down into a petty dispute over appropriate jurisdiction. I filed an appeal before the Supreme Administrative Court. I argued that their interpretation of the Law of Administrative Procedure and all subsequent articles were interpreted too narrowly and without substance.

Once again, I asserted the intentional violation of my rights which inflicted and continues to inflict psychological suffering to me, as my family was murdered by the person whom they proclaim had saved Jews. To back up this argument, I provided a recitation of the Supreme Administrative Court case of 2012, in which it is stated that moral damage may not be evaluated nor paid in currency. Only in rare cases may a non binding proclamation of unintentional violation of personal rights serve as a positive remedy and grant me satisfaction.

RULING (second claim)

As usual, Supreme Administrative Court dismissed my appeal on the grounds of denied jurisdiction.

5/20 [Lawsuit filed against LGGRTC in Vilnius Regional Court](#). I filed a Civil claim in the Vilnius Regional Court. My claim was based on tort doctrine, not a solid defense in Lithuania, but elsewhere based on the right of the supplicant requiring the need to act in a lawful way, and compensate any damage caused by any unlawful activities of which they may be accused. Sadly, the administrative information, once again, claimed that Jonas Noreika was saving Jews from Nazi crimes in the Siauliai district.

This is Holocaust denial. It continues to leave me and others who have lost loved ones in the Holocaust, suffering.

Such information should never be distorted by personal prejudice or interest. There should not be, and cannot be any groundless accusations or justifications that should promote public disinformation.

All of the LGGRTC disinformation continues to cause me emotional damage. The situation demands to be rectified and in doing so, will eliminate the source of my torment.

Although the Civil Code does not in and of itself grant tort rectification, there is a moral imperative that all damage inflicted must be rectified, and in some way, compensated. I fear that I will never be granted any such emotional rectification of tort (including only monetary) as directly applicable to the Lithuanian Constitution Art. 30. Such doctrine states that any and all damage, without specifically referencing physical, emotional, and psychological damage must be put right. There is no one remedy; I just wish to attain some level of satisfaction and closure.

6/8/20 [Vilnius Regional Court dismissed the case](#).

The Court refused to accept my claim. They argued that my assertions did not meet Civil Procedure Code merits. Apparently, one may raise arguments only in his own name and interest, to defend personal rights.

According to them, I was incapable of indicating exactly which of my rights were violated. Apparently, it is up to the Court to assess any and all changes / modifications within the scope of personal rights, wherein the damage claimed is fundamentally abstract and thus cannot be adjudicated within the scope of this Court.

According to the Court “Such litigation would be useless”.

According to the Court, I was accused of seeking to change historical fact and context by turning

it toward my own opinions without evidentiary merit.

Apparently, historical discussion or anything resulting therefrom cannot be called Civil Process. This resulted in an outright refusal of the latest claim as it does not belong within the scope of Civil Codes. There is no satisfaction guaranteed for emotional distress in tort. None of these delicate emotional points can be found within the Civil Code. Their only remedy or means of compassionate compensation, would be monetary. This outcome would be useless and inflict even further hurt upon myself and my immediate family, all of whom have had to live this nightmare with me.

6/17/20 [Appeal submitted to the Vilnius District Court.](#)

I filed yet another an appeal to the Vilnius District Court, once again insisting on acceptance of my claim.

Once again, I affirmed then, and still do, that Holocaust denial causes immense emotional damage to me as I am forced to revisit the gaping hole left in my life by the Holocaust murders of my relatives. My sanity has been questioned, my standing as a reputable source has been blemished and my honor has been repeatedly attacked – – all egregious breaches of my most basic rights.

The citing of numerous ECHR cases, X v Germany 1982 para 198, reiterating that Holocaust denial is an attack against the entire Jewish community and every single member and family independently. There are citations of Lithuanian Supreme Court doctrine concerning genocide, as with cases against USSR hired assassins for inflicted emotional damage victims compensation in accordance with the spirit and law of the 1946 Nuremberg Statutes. A direct application of the Lithuanian Constitution article 30 remuneration regime, states that there should not be any situation where emotional damage is disregarded or left uncompensated, especially in cases of genocide.

7/16/20 [Vilnius District Court heard appeal. Denied.](#)

Apparently, I failed to provide clarity within my statements as to which rights have been violated and how this violation must be soothed.

They further claim that neither I nor my relatives merit mention in the historical research. A forthright assertion that this research hurts me is deemed to be of abstract nature.

One may raise claims only in his own name and self interest, in defense of personal rights. They feel that demanding litigation in such an area has little to do with influencing the rights or obligations of any applicant. Therefore, in their eyes “such litigation is useless”.

Any and all parts of my claim were legally rejected as not adjudicable, and without merit.

8/10/20 [Appeal filed with Lithuanian Civil Supreme Court](#)

Cassation review is possible only if the law is incorrectly applied or interpreted. This also breaks new ground with no prior case law as history. I was infuriated that the Courts refused to apply Constitution Article 30 directly and as such, is a deviation from previous practice of the Supreme Court.

This must therefore be accepted, as the case is relevant to new jurisprudence. There was also a constant and disturbing equating of the USSR’s inflicted Lithuanian Genocide and the wholesale slaughter of the Lithuanian Jewish population in the Holocaust.

The Vilnius District Court misinterpreted a Supreme Court case, using it on a non meritorious

basis. The substantial statement to be taken in considering this case, “virtue not enshrined in law cannot be a self-sufficient primary ground for claim”.

Article 22 of the Constitution, gives personal right to basic non distorted facts related to a person’s life, while the LGGRTC has distorted facts related to the irrefutable death of my relatives by spreading untrue information about persons involved. This is the very essence and definition of Holocaust denial.

8/18/20 [Civil Supreme Court issued decision – Denied.](#)

Basically, the Supreme Court does not regard as legal anything that is not directly used for the formation of new applicable jurisprudence.