TO: OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR GENERAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA
Rinktinės g. 5A, LT-09233 Vilnius
Email: generaline.prokuratura@prokuraturos.lt

SUBMITTED BY:
Grant Arthur Gochin
Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania
10900 Winnetka Avenue, Chatsworth, CA 91311, USA
Email: ggochin@gmail.com
Telephone: +1 818-515-0989

DATE: September 17, 2026

REPORT OF A POSSIBLE CRIMINAL OFFENSE AND REQUEST TO COMMENCE A PRE-TRIAL INVESTIGATION

Possible violation of Article 170² §1 of the Criminal Code arising from public historical entries in Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija (VLE)

This English document is a courtesy translation attached to the operative Lithuanian filing. In the event of any difference, the Lithuanian text controls.

I. REQUEST AND PROCEDURAL BASIS

Under Article 166 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (BPK), I request that this document be registered as a report of a possible criminal offense and that a pre-trial investigation be commenced into a possible violation of Article 170² §1 of the Criminal Code (BK).

Article 166(1) provides that a pre-trial investigation begins upon receipt of a complaint, application, or report of a criminal offense, or when a prosecutor or pre-trial investigation officer independently identifies signs of a criminal offense.

If the Prosecutor's Office considers factual clarification necessary before deciding whether to commence an investigation, I request use of the clarification mechanism in Article 168(1). That provision permits non-coercive steps, including obtaining data and documents from state institutions and organizations, and requires such clarification to be completed as quickly as possible but no later than ten days.

I request that electronic editorial evidence be preserved first, so that later institutional explanations or changes to public webpages do not eliminate evidence of their prior state.

II. A NEW AND INDEPENDENT MATTER

This submission is not a repeat of my 2018–2019 Article 170² complaints. The 2018 matters concerned the Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania and were registered as AP-21510 / M-2-02-00825-18 and AP-28340 / M-2-02-01123-18; the 2019 matter was registered as AP-31212 / M-2-02-01142-19. The present submission concerns a different publisher and institutional system—VLE, the Science and Encyclopedia Publishing Centre, and the Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania—and different publications documented in September 2026.

In addition, after those earlier submissions, the Supreme Court of Lithuania issued a directly relevant interpretation of Article 170² on December 9, 2025, in Criminal Case No. 2K-173-1073/2025 concerning omissions and removal of responsible persons from historical narratives. There is therefore no basis to treat this submission as procedurally precluded merely because I previously invoked Article 170² in unrelated matters.

III. PUBLISHER AND DETERMINABLE CLASS OF RESPONSIBLE PERSONS

As of January 1, 2023, the Science and Encyclopedia Publishing Centre (MELC) became a structural part of the Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania. The National Library is a state budgetary institution. Article 20 of the Criminal Code provides that the State and state institutions and agencies do not incur criminal liability under the Code. Accordingly, this submission does not ask that the National Library, as a legal person, be prosecuted. It asks that the conduct of potentially responsible natural persons be established.

The request is to identify the natural persons who, for each general VLE entry listed below, performed the act of public publication, editing, approval, or a later substantive update. The class of persons is determinable: the authors and/or editors of the specific entries and the persons who approved or updated their editorial content. Their identities, dates of action, and version histories are held by the National Library and the VLE content-management system.

A job title alone is not a basis for treating any person as a suspect. Responsibility must be tied to a specific publication or editorial act and its required subjective elements.

IV. FACTUAL BASIS

The public webpages described below were checked on September 17, 2026. The exhibit bundle provides, for each page, a dated public-source locator, a material excerpt or precisely stated evidentiary proposition, and the URL. Because reliable native VLE webpage PDFs/screenshots could not be generated in this environment, the filing expressly asks the Prosecutor's Office to preserve the native VLE page versions, revision histories, and CMS metadata first. If a public page later changes, its state at the time the report is received should be preserved for the investigation.

A. Core episodes for investigation

Semeliškės. The general VLE entry states that on October 6, 1941, 962 Jews were murdered in Semeliškės “by order of the Nazi German occupation authorities.” VLE's specialist Trakai County ghetto entry identifies German security police, the Ypatingasis būrys (German: Sonderkommando), local and Trakai County policemen, and separately states that Semeliškės policemen marched the Jews in columns to the killing site. (Exhibits A1, B1, B2.)

Trakai. The general Trakai history attributes the September 30, 1941 murder of 1,446 people at Varnikai to an order of the Nazi German occupation authorities. VLE's specialist entry additionally identifies local policemen, policemen from Aukštadvaris, Onuškis and Lentvaris, local activists/white-armbanders, the Ypatingasis būrys, and a German NCO. (Exhibits A2, B1.)

Vievis. The general Vievis entry states that several hundred Vievis Jews were shot in Dargoniai forest on October 6, 1941 on the instruction of the Nazi German occupation authorities. The specialist entry states that the arrests involved Germans, local policemen, the Ypatingasis būrys and town activists, and that local police and activists guarded the transfer to Semeliškės. (Exhibits A3, B1, B2.)

Onuškis. The general Onuškis entry states that on September 30, 1941 the Jews of Onuškis were murdered at Varnikai by order of the Nazi German occupation authorities. The specialist VLE entry identifies Onuškis policemen as guards of imprisoned Jews in Trakai and identifies local police and white-armband participation at Varnikai. (Exhibits A4, B1.)

Žasliai. The general Žasliai entry states that most Žasliai Jews were shot in Strošiūnai forest in August 1941 on the instruction of the Nazi German occupation authorities. The specialist county entry describes the role of local activists and police and identifies Rollkommando Hamann, local policemen and white-armanders in the August 29 shootings. (Exhibits A5, B1.)

Žiežmariai. The general Žiežmariai entry states that Jews from Žiežmariai and the surrounding area were shot in Strošiūnai forest in August 1941 on the instruction of the Nazi German occupation authorities. The specialist VLE entry identifies Žiežmariai police chief Teofilis Kelbauskas, local

policemen, and other specific acts by local police in arresting, confining, and transferring Jews into the killing process. (Exhibits A6, B1.)

B. Contextual episodes — not pleaded as independent core Article 170² acts

Aukštadvaris and Kaišiadorys are offered as context concerning editorial pattern and possible intent, not as independent core Article 170² episodes. The general Aukštadvaris page merely notes that a synagogue existed before the Second World War, while the specialist county entry records 296 Jews arrested and murdered. The general Kaišiadorys page gives a count of 1,911 murdered Jews but names no perpetrator. These pages are weaker as objective-act cases; their role here is contextual. (Exhibits C1-C2.)

V. QUESTIONS UNDER ARTICLE 170² §1

A. Protected crimes; the victims' connection to Lithuania

The episodes concern the persecution and mass murder of Lithuanian Jews during the Nazi German occupation. VLE itself describes the victims as Jews of Semeliškės, Vievis, Onuškis, Žasliai, Žiežmariai, Trakai, and surrounding localities. The heading of Article 170² and the territorial/residency limitation formerly contained in its second limb were changed by Law No. XIV-3060, adopted November 7, 2024, published in TAR on November 12, 2024 as No. 19686, and effective February 1, 2025. Until January 31, 2025, that limb covered Soviet or Nazi German genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes committed in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania or against its residents. From February 1, 2025, the consolidated text no longer contains that territorial/residency limitation for those Soviet or Nazi German genocide, crimes-against-humanity, and war-crime offenses. Each potentially relevant act of VLE publication or substantive editing must therefore be assessed under the version of Article 170² in force when that act occurred. As a factual matter, the publications concern local Jewish communities in Lithuania, so the territorial/residency nexus should also be established for any editorial act occurring before February 1, 2025.

B. Objective act: whether omission can constitute denial or gross trivialization

The central legal question is not whether the statute contains a separate verb meaning "omit." The Supreme Court of Lithuania's final and non-appealable ruling of December 9, 2025 in Criminal Case No. 2K-173-1073/2025, Judicial Process No. 1-01-1-39003-2022-4 (the Algirdas Paleckis case), resolved a genuine judicial disagreement about the reach of Article 170²: Kaunas District Court acquitted Paleckis under Article 170² on November 20, 2024; Kaunas Regional Court reversed and convicted him on March 13, 2025; the Supreme Court left the conviction in force.

At paragraph 16, relying on European Court of Human Rights authority, the Supreme Court stated that international crimes can be denied or minimized through "omissions" and through cautious formulations or hypotheses, and that denial of significant proven circumstances such as "the persons responsible for genocide, its scale and consequences" may in substance be equivalent to denial of genocide itself. The Court cited, among other authorities, Pastörs v. Germany, Le Pen v. France and Witzsch v. Germany, and applied the principles at paragraphs 18–19.

That interpretation prevents threshold dismissal merely because the general pages acknowledge that killings occurred and give victim numbers. The Prosecutor's Office must assess the whole mode of presentation: whether, where the same publisher possesses and elsewhere publishes information identifying local Lithuanian police, white-armbanders and the Ypatingasis būrys, repeated removal of those responsible persons from general public history reaches the statutory threshold of denial or gross trivialization under the Supreme Court's interpretation.

This submission does not assert that the threshold has already been legally established for every page. It asserts that, after the Supreme Court's 2025 ruling, the question must be examined under the statutory elements and cannot be rejected merely as an "incomplete" or abbreviated historical description.

C. Scope: this is not a request to criminalize scholarship

This submission is not directed against scholarly works, editions of primary sources, or the specialist VLE entries, which function here as corrective sources. In my public article of August 19, 2026, “Omission Can Be Denial. Lithuania Said So.,” I expressly opposed prosecution of the Thomas Remeikis volume or the institutions that published it because omission there did not supply the second Article 170² element; in the same article I asked why the Paleckis test is never applied diagnostically to the State's own historical account. This filing is precisely such an element-by-element request for examination, not a demand to criminalize scholarly publishing.

D. Threatening, abusive or insulting manner / public-order element

Article 170² §1 requires an additional manner or consequence element: the conduct must be threatening, abusive or insulting, or public order must have been or could have been disturbed. Paragraph 9 of the Paleckis ruling summarizes this element in shorter form (“public order was disturbed”); this submission applies the consolidated Criminal Code in force on the date of signature. The primary theory advanced here is that the insulting-manner element requires investigation; at this stage I do not rely on a speculative public-order-disturbance theory.

At paragraph 16 of the Paleckis ruling, relying on European Court of Human Rights authority, the Supreme Court required attention to the content, purpose, context, and concrete right or interest affected by the expression, and discussed the legal significance of insulting, degrading, or defamatory expression in the setting of denial or minimization of genocide and other international crimes. This submission does not mechanically transfer those conclusions to VLE; it asks for a reasoned examination of the additional manner element in Article 170² §1 in the concrete circumstances. I am a citizen of the Republic of Lithuania and a descendant of Lithuanian Jews; members of my family were murdered in Lithuania during the Holocaust in 1941. That fact is not an independent element of Article 170², but it explains why the question whether the presentation is insulting is not abstract in this submission.

A further, non-dispositive contextual comparator is the August 27, 1944 Soviet local-government commission report concerning Semeliškės, preserved in USHMM microfilm collection RG-22.002M, Fond 7021, Opis 94, File 438. It attributes the victims to “German fascist” perpetrators without identifying Lithuanian participants. This submission does not claim that VLE copied that report; it identifies a matching attribution structure. At paragraph 18 of Paleckis, the Supreme Court treated the fact that the characterization of partisans as criminals corresponded to the occupying power's own “bandits” framing as relevant to the abusive and insulting character of the speech. The requested inquiry is whether repetition of an occupier-era attribution structure, while omitting fuller perpetrator information possessed by VLE itself, has analogous relevance to the insulting-manner element. (Exhibit C3.)

The requested inquiry is therefore whether a public state encyclopedia presentation that retains murdered Jewish victims and Nazi German orders while removing local participants identified in the same publisher's fuller historical account can, in the concrete circumstances, amount to gross trivialization in an insulting manner. That element should be reasoned and investigated, not presumed either way.

E. Direct intent

In its public decision of February 24, 2021 concerning Valdas Rakutis's article, the Prosecutor's Office stated that an offense under Article 170² §1 can be committed only with direct intent. This submission accepts that standard.

Possible direct intent must be investigated through facts unavailable from the public webpages: who prepared and approved each general entry; when it was published and substantively edited; what source material and specialist VLE entries were available to the editor; whether an editorial rule existed concerning local perpetrators, police, white-armbanders, administrators or the Ypatingasis būrys; and whether the relevant editors reviewed the specialist entries.

The potentially relevant acts are specific acts of public publication, approval, or later substantive editing. Mere continued passive hosting of an old webpage is not pleaded here as a separate continuing offense.

F. Limitation periods (BK Article 95)

The public VLE pages do not always display the original publication and last-edit dates. Some content may derive from older print encyclopedia material. Limitation must therefore be determined by reference to each proven act of online publication or substantive editing and the version of Article 95 applicable to that act.

I request that the Prosecutor's Office obtain from the VLE content-management system the first-publication date, all material revision dates, and the last substantive edit date for each core episode. This submission does not assert that passive online hosting alone creates a new or continuing offense. The question is whether one or more provable publication or editorial acts falls within the applicable limitation period.

VI. FACTS RELEVANT TO POSSIBLE INTENT AND EDITORIAL SELECTION

- The specialist and general entries are published in the same VLE system and, since 2023, administered within the National Library structure.
- The specialist material identifies local Lithuanian police, white-armbanders, administrators and the Ypatingasis būrys, while six core general entries retain only the Nazi German order attribution.
- The Semeliškės general page, immediately after its Holocaust sentence, is capable of naming actors in other historical events, including a Lithuanian partisan unit led by A. Galinis; simple lack of space therefore does not fully explain the omission.
- The Kaišiadorys general page provides specific counts of Soviet deportees while its Holocaust sentence names no perpetrator. The page is contextual only, but it shows that the format permits selective detail in other repression episodes.
- VLE is a digital publication whose version history, author/editor assignments, content-management metadata and approval trail should be capable of preservation and examination.

VII. IHRA MATERIAL — CONTEXT ONLY

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) material is not a substitute for Article 170² and is not offered as a source of Lithuanian criminal law. It is included only as international historical-memory context. IHRA's 2023 Understanding Holocaust Distortion discusses, as an example, presenting the Holocaust merely as a Nazi German organized crime while ignoring the role of local collaborators. Criminal qualification must rest exclusively on Lithuanian law and Lithuanian judicial interpretation.

VIII. REQUESTED INVESTIGATIVE AND PRESERVATION MEASURES

1. **Immediately preserve** current and prior versions, revision histories, publication/edit dates, CMS metadata, and other electronic traces for the six core general entries and the corresponding specialist Holocaust entries.
2. Identify the author, editor, and person(s) who approved initial publication and material later updates for each core general entry.
3. Determine what sources and specialist VLE texts were available when each general entry was prepared and edited.
4. Obtain VLE/National Library editorial policies, methodological instructions, internal communications, or directives governing whether local participants, police, white-armbanders, administrators, and the Ypatingasis būrys are named in Holocaust descriptions.
5. For each of the six core episodes, separately assess the objective elements of Article 170² §1, including the Supreme Court's December 9, 2025 interpretation concerning omissions and responsible persons.
6. For each potentially responsible natural person, separately assess direct intent using internal editorial evidence.

7. Separately and expressly assess the insulting-manner element; this submission does not ask the Prosecutor's Office to rely on an unproven public-order theory.
8. Determine the date of each publication/revision and apply the appropriate Article 95 limitation regime without treating passive online hosting alone as a continuing offense.
9. If additional facts are needed before a commencement decision, use the Article 168(1) clarification process and obtain the specified records and electronic data from the National Library.
10. **If commencement is refused, issue a reasoned decision addressing each Article 170² §1 element, Supreme Court Case No. 2K-173-1073/2025, direct intent, the insulting-manner element, and limitation, and stating the applicable appeal procedure and deadline.**

IX. EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY THE SIGNED FILING

1. **A1-A6. Verified September 17, 2026 excerpts and public URLs for the six core general VLE pages: Semeliškės, Trakai, Vievis, Onuškis, Žasliai, Žiežmariai.**
2. **B1-B2. Verified September 17, 2026 excerpts and public URLs for the specialist VLE entries Trakų apskrities getai and Ypatingasis būrys.**
3. **C1-C2. Verified September 17, 2026 excerpts and public URLs for the contextual Aukštadvaris and Kaišiadorys general VLE pages.**

3A. C3. Archival locator for the August 27, 1944 Semeliškės commission report, USHMM RG-22.002M, 7021-94/438, plus a public Yahad-In Unum reproduction/transcription link (contextual attribution comparator only).

4. **D. Locators and relevant excerpts from the Supreme Court of Lithuania ruling of December 9, 2025 in the Algirdas Paleckis case, Criminal Case No. 2K-173-1073/2025, Judicial Process No. 1-01-1-39003-2022-4, especially paragraphs 9, 16, 18 and 19.**
5. **E1-E3. Current consolidated BK Articles 20, 95 and 170²; Law No. XIV-3060 of November 7, 2024 (TAR 2024-19686; effective February 1, 2025); locator for the pre-amendment Article 170² territorial/residency wording.**
6. **F. Current locators for BPK Articles 166 and 168, including Article 168(1)'s ten-day clarification period and Article 168(5)'s seven-day appeal period.**
7. **G. Prosecutor's Office public notice of February 22, 2021 concerning V. Rakutis (direct-intent standard).**
8. **H. Official MELC reorganization instrument confirming integration into the National Library from January 1, 2023.**
9. **I. IHRA, Understanding Holocaust Distortion (2023), for contextual use only and not as a source of criminal law.**
10. **J. Identification list and public locators for the 2018-2019 Article 170² submissions and prosecutorial decisions solely to establish that the present matter is new rather than repetitive.**

X. CONCLUSION

The proposition presented is narrow and documentable. VLE's specialist Holocaust entries identify local Lithuanian participants, while six general civic-history entries publicly present the same crimes by preserving Nazi German orders and removing local participants identified in the specialist material.

The Supreme Court's December 9, 2025 ruling expressly requires consideration of whether international crimes can be denied or minimized through omissions, including removal of significant proven circumstances concerning responsible persons. That does not create automatic criminal liability. It does mean that this report cannot properly be dismissed merely because the general pages acknowledge that the killings occurred.

I request commencement of a pre-trial investigation or, before any refusal, the factual clarification permitted by Article 168(1), preservation of VLE's electronic editorial trail, identification of the responsible natural persons, and an element-by-element assessment under Article 170² §1 and the Supreme Court's interpretation, and, if commencement is refused, a decision clearly stating the appeal procedure and deadline.

Grant Arthur Gochin
Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania
The operative Lithuanian filing is to be signed with a qualified electronic signature (Evrotrust).
September 17, 2026