**ENGLISH TRANSLATION - PUBLICATION / REFERENCE COPY**

# STATEMENT / REPORT OF A POSSIBLE CRIMINAL OFFENCE

Request to initiate a pre-trial investigation concerning the actions of Alfredas Rukšėnas and Arūnas Bubnys in connection with LGGRTC Historical-Archival Report No. 9R-598 (9.6E), under Article 170²(1) of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania

**Filed with the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Lithuania on 11 September 2026**

Grant Arthur Gochin - citizen of the Republic of Lithuania - filing submitted in his personal capacity

## Front-page references

**Original Lithuanian filing (signed PDF filename):** Pareiskimas_GP_Ruksenas_Bubnys_BK1702.pdf

**Primary challenged document:** LGGRTC, “On the Person of Kazys Škirpa (Historical-Archival Report),” 25 June 2024, No. 9R-598 (9.6E)

**Primary challenged document - official source:**
https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Titulinis/2024/20240808_skirpa_pazyma.pdf

**Criminal Code, Article 170²:** https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.111555/VNuiCTEqQL/

**Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 168:** https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.163482/JrmLbcVSan/

**Prosecutor’s Office statement on the Valdas Rakutis matter (22 Feb. 2021):** https://www.prokuraturos.lt/lt/atsisakyta-pradeti-ikiteismini-tyrima-del-seimo-nario-v.-rakucio-straipsnyje-paskelbtu-teiginiu/7383

**Supreme Court of Lithuania, criminal case No. 2K-173-1073/2025:**
https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=5be5da5c-15d4-4739-a2ff-fe5805fa4e9c

**Supreme Court of Lithuania, criminal case No. 2K-293-788/2018:**
https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=6cce3fcc-46f9-493d-b0aa-fd10b2e575a9

*Translation status: This is an unofficial English translation prepared from the Lithuanian filing for reference and publication. The Lithuanian filing submitted to the Prosecutor General is the controlling procedural text. URLs and source identifiers are reproduced from the filed document.*

## TO THE OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR GENERAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

Rinktinės g. 5A, Vilnius

**Applicant: Grant Arthur Gochin**

Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania; statement submitted in a personal capacity

Correspondence address: 10900 Winnetka Avenue, Chatsworth, CA 91311, USA

Email: ggochin@gmail.com

Tel.: +1 818 625 6513

# STATEMENT / REPORT OF A POSSIBLE CRIMINAL OFFENCE

**Request to initiate a pre-trial investigation concerning the actions of Alfredas Rukšėnas and Arūnas Bubnys in connection with LGGRTC Historical-Archival Report No. 9R-598 (9.6E) of 25 June 2024, under Article 170²(1) of the Criminal Code**

11 September 2026

## I. Essence of the Statement

1. I ask the Office of the Prosecutor General to assess whether the preparation, approval and public publication of the 25 June 2024 historical-archival report No. 9R-598 (9.6E) of the Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania (LGGRTC) displays the elements of the criminal offence set out in Article 170²(1) of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania and, where the statutory basis exists, to initiate a pre-trial investigation into the individual actions of Alfredas Rukšėnas and Arūnas Bubnys. [S2, S5]

2. I ask that the specific role of each person be established separately. The public LGGRTC entry and the document itself identify A. Rukšėnas as the historian who prepared the report; the end of the report also names the then Director General, Dr Arūnas Bubnys. The mere appearance of names in the document does not prove authorship of every formulation or direct intent. It is therefore for pre-trial investigative measures to establish who drafted, edited, coordinated, approved and decided to publish the specific formulations. [S5, S41, S42]

3. This statement is not a request to criminalise a historical dispute. I do not contend that disagreement with my historical interpretation is a crime. The question is narrower: whether an official state historical report, while knowing and itself reproducing documents setting out an antisemitic programme of collective deprivation of rights, expulsion and seizure of property, systematically separated and weighted them in a manner capable of grossly trivialising recognised crimes of Nazi Germany and the role of their local preconditions and participants; and, if so, whether this was done with direct intent and while the other conditions of Article 170²(1) were present. [S2, S5]

4. I also ask that the same criteria of direct intent, historical discussion, context and purpose that the Prosecutor's Office publicly applied in the 2021 Valdas Rakutis matter be applied, and that their relationship to the current application of Article 170²(1) in the Artur Fridman case No. 02-2-00512-24 be explained. The Fridman case is not a final precedent in the legal sense; it is a current factual and procedural comparator involving application of the same criminal provision. [S4, S23, S24]

## II. Procedural Characterisation: a New Factual Matter, Not a "Repeat" of Old Refusals

5. In 2018-2019 I submitted three separate statements under Article 170²(1) concerning earlier LGGRTC statements about Holocaust history. The first was received on 9 August 2018 (AP-21510; material No. M-2-02-00825-18) and rejected on 17 August 2018; the second was received on 19 October 2018 (AP-28340; material No. M-2-02-01123-18) and rejected on 12 November 2018; the third was received on 18 November 2019 (AP-31212; material No. M-2-02-01142-19) and rejected on 2 December 2019. [S43, S44, S14-S17]

6. I do not appeal those old decisions in this statement and do not ask for them to be reopened. The present factual object is the report No. 9R-598 issued on 25 June 2024, the specific actions of A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys, the new 2024 memorialisation procedure, institutional reactions in 2024-2026, newly consolidated methodological material authored by Rukšėnas himself, and the active application of Article 170² in the Fridman case in 2025-2026. [S5, S7, S19, S20, S23]

7. The 2018-2019 refusals are therefore relevant not as a procedural bar but as part of the earlier methodology applied by prosecutors and the State's knowledge. In the 2019 decision, the prosecutor himself recorded that the document on which LGGRTC based its assertion that Brazaitis had been rehabilitated and exonerated did not state either exoneration or rehabilitation, but declined to open an investigation because he did not find purposeful and intentional fulfilment of the Article 170² offence and treated dissemination as part of LGGRTC's statutory research functions. [S16, S17] None of the 2018-2019 decisions assessed the preparation of the report No. 9R-598 of 25 June 2024, its August 2024 publication, or the individual actions of A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys identified in this statement. The procedural finality of those earlier decisions therefore does not itself answer this new factual matter. If a contrary view is taken, I ask that the decision precisely identify the applicable point of Article 3(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the exact identity of the factual circumstances.

8. Article 168(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that commencement of a pre-trial investigation may be refused only where the reported information about a criminal offence is manifestly false or where the clear circumstances specified in Article 3(1) are present. At the same stage, the prosecutor may clarify the information by non-coercive measures, including requesting information or documents from state institutions. In this matter, the most important evidence concerning intent, source selection and the decision-making chain is contained in LGGRTC internal working documents that the applicant does not possess. [S3, S38]

9. Because the facts identified in this statement are based on documents published by a state institution itself, earlier prosecutorial decisions, final court interpretations and public academic publications, they cannot be considered “manifestly false” merely because resolving the question of direct intent requires LGGRTC internal documents. Article 168(1) specifically permits requesting such documents at the information-clarification stage. [S3, S38]

## III. Legal Test

10. Article 170²(1) covers publicly approving of, denying or grossly trivialising genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes recognised by laws of the Republic of Lithuania or the European Union or by final judgments of Lithuanian or international courts, as well as such crimes committed by Nazi Germany, where the act is committed in a threatening, abusive or insulting manner or where it has disturbed or could have disturbed public order. [S2]

11. On 22 February 2021, in the Valdas Rakutis matter, the Prosecutor’s Office publicly stated an additional subjective criterion: offences under Article 170(2) and Article 170²(1) can be committed only with direct intent. The Prosecutor’s Office assessed the historical facts cited by the author, his analysis of causes, opinion and aim of initiating discussion and, having found no direct intent, did not open an investigation. [S4]

12. On 9 December 2025, in criminal case No. 2K-173-1073/2025, the Supreme Court of Lithuania again emphasised that liability under Article 170²(1) arises only where the additional statutory condition is present - a threatening, abusive or insulting manner, or disturbance of public order. The Court also stated that, when assessing historical speech, the content and purpose of the statement, the social and political context, possible harmful consequences, and the rights of victims of crimes and their descendants are relevant; international crimes may be denied or trivialised not only through direct language but also through omissions, cautious formulations or hypotheses, and denial of significant and proven circumstances - for example, responsible persons, the scale of the crime or its consequences - may amount to denial. These interpretations make the source-selection and fragmentation issues in 9R-598 legally relevant, but do not remove the obligation separately to establish the additional manner/public-order element and direct intent. I am a descendant of a Lithuanian Jewish family; members of my family were murdered in 1941 in Šiauliai County, including in the destruction of the Žagarė ghetto. I mention this only as context for the rights of victims and descendants referred to in the Supreme Court interpretation, not as separate proof of procedural status or of an element of the offence. [S34]

13. Conversely, in case No. 2K-293-788/2018 the Supreme Court of Lithuania emphasised the protective boundary in the opposite direction: criminal liability for expression cannot be based on assumptions or an excessively broad interpretation of implied meaning; the objective and subjective elements of the offence must be established, and ambiguous or insufficiently informative content is not by itself enough. In that case the Court required concrete and unambiguous approval. 9R-598 differs from a short ambiguous internet comment because it is a multi-page official state report with identifiable sources, a drafting process and a working file; but here too every element of Article 170² must be proved, not presumed. [S35]

14. This statement asks that those standards be applied, not bypassed. The quotations from the report do not by themselves prove criminal intent. They do, however, show that the author had adverse material before him. When that knowledge is added to the same historian’s earlier methodology, unequal standards for evidentiary weight and the official purpose of the document in an active memorialisation process, a concrete and testable question arises whether the result was a good-faith historiographical conclusion or conscious gross trivialisation. At this stage I also do not contend that the threatening, abusive or insulting manner or public-order element has already been established. I ask that it be assessed separately in light of the specific formulations in 9R-598, the document’s official purpose, the circumstances of publication, the audience and actual impact. [S4, S5, S9-S13, S34, S35] Nor do I ask by this statement to narrow the protection of historical speech under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In Perinçek v. Switzerland (No. 27510/08, 15 October 2015), the Grand Chamber of the ECtHR found a violation of Article 10 in the specific circumstances of that case because of a criminal sanction. That case is not factually or legally identical to the Holocaust or Nazi-crimes context; I cite it only for the principle that criminal intervention in historical speech must be necessary, proportionate and based on clearly established elements. I ask that the same guarantees of expression and proportionality be applied equally, regardless of whether speech accords with the State’s historical narrative or challenges it. [S46]

15. Article 170²(2) provides for liability of a legal person, but Article 20 of the Criminal Code excludes the State and state institutions and agencies from criminal liability. I therefore do not ask that LGGRTC, as a state budgetary institution, be prosecuted as a legal person. The institutional context is supplied in order to establish the actions, knowledge and decision-making chain of natural persons. [S1, S5]

## IV. Report No. 9R-598: an Official State Document and Its Purpose

16. The first page of Report No. 9R-598 states that, on 28 February 2024, the Interinstitutional Commission for Assessing the Compliance of Public Objects with the Prohibition on Promoting Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes and Their Ideologies considered a request from the Historical Memory Commission of Vilnius City Municipality concerning a planned memorial plaque to Kazys Škirpa and decided to request a historical-archival report from LGGRTC. This was not a private review but a document of a state institution prepared for an official public-memory procedure. [S5, S45] The procedure was conducted under the public-object assessment system established by Article 4 of Law No. XIV-1679 on the Prohibition of the Promotion of Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes and Their Ideologies; the Seimas had established the Commission by Resolution No. XIV-2030 of 1 June 2023. Accordingly, 9R-598 was commissioned not for general academic research but for a specific statutory assessment of a public object. [S45]

17. At the end of the report appear “Director General Dr Arūnas Bubnys” and “Dr Alfredas Rukšėnas.” Public LGGRTC descriptions identify A. Rukšėnas as the historian who prepared the report. These facts are sufficient to request investigation of

each person's role, but not sufficient, without investigation, to attribute every sentence to A. Bubnys or every final editorial decision to A. Rukšėnas. [S5, S41, S42]

18. On 19 September 2024 the interinstitutional commission did not reach a final decision on the proposed plaque. That procedural outcome neither confirms nor disproves the historical conclusion of the report. It confirms that the report was used in a real and socially contentious memorialisation process. [S42]

## V. Adverse Material Contained in the Report Itself and the Narrowing That Follows

19. The report itself reproduces a 19 March 1941 Berlin LAF communication telling Jews that their fate is clear, urging them to leave Lithuania, and directing that "at the decisive moment" their property be taken into one's own hands. [S5]

20. It also quotes the instructions of 24 March 1941, which speak of the need to "get rid of the Jews," to create such an atmosphere that Jews would not dare even think that in the new Lithuania they could have even minimal rights or means of subsistence, to force them to flee together with the Russians, and permanently to revoke the protection associated with Vytautas the Great. [S5]

21. The report also quotes the leaflet "Let Us Liberate Lithuania Forever from the Jewish Yoke," in which Jews are collectively demonised as agents of communism and of the occupiers' will. [S5]

22. After reproducing this material, the report writes that the antisemitic statements in Berlin LAF documents "suggest" that the so-called "Jewish problem" was proposed to be solved not by genocide but by expulsion from Lithuania, and emphasises that members of the Berlin LAF on the eve of war did not know of the Nazi plan to exterminate all Jews. [S5]

23. The report further formulates the dispute in ethnically separated terms: "Lithuanian historians reject the assertions of Jewish researchers that the LAF urged Lithuanians to kill Jews on the eve of the war." I do not present this sentence as criminal in itself. I ask that its significance be assessed together with the weighting of sources, the purpose of the document and the other elements of the text. [S5]

24. For a favourable assessment of Škirpa, the report relies on a 25 June 1941 item in the Lithuanian-American newspaper Draugas stating that "the latest reports from Berlin" allegedly said that Škirpa had prohibited persecution of Jews in Lithuania. The report does not provide the prohibition order itself, a telegram, a chain of transmission or an identified primary source. Yet it immediately asks why Škirpa prohibited persecution, thereby transforming a secondary report into a premise whose existence is no longer tested. [S5, S20, S26]

25. Finally, the report chooses a narrow definition of "collaborator" tied to service in the occupation administration and makes a categorical exculpatory conclusion: "Thus he was not a collaborator." Separately, it states that there is no information that Škirpa, who was in Berlin, had anything to do with the July 1941 murders of 3,020 Jews at the Seventh Fort. Škirpa's physical absence from Lithuania is a significant limit on direct operational participation; it does not by itself resolve distinct questions concerning organisational leadership, propaganda, collective deprivation of rights, expulsion or seizure of property. [S5]

26. I ask the Prosecutor's Office to assess not one sentence in isolation but the overall construction: the report knows and reproduces a programme of collective expulsion, deprivation of rights and seizure of property; demands stricter personal attribution for adverse organisational material; accepts a much more weakly attributed favourable Draugas report; and then offers a categorical exculpatory conclusion on collaboration. The question is whether this combination crossed the boundary of disputable historiography and became conscious gross trivialisation of recognised crimes. [S2, S5]

## VI. A. Rukšėnas's Earlier Methodology: Why the Question of Intent Is Concrete Rather Than Speculative

27. In a 2014 study of Kretinga, A. Rukšėnas counted approximately 731 persons who belonged to institutions of local self-government, public police, security police, criminal police and auxiliary police. He wrote that these 731 persons could be regarded as "perpetrators of genocide" because the Nazi regime imposed criminal functions on their institutions, and that all could be described at minimum as indirect participants in genocide, even though some likely carried out no specific anti-Jewish act. [S9]

28. In the same study, A. Rukšėnas distinguished direct killing from indirect participation: of 242 persons identified by name, 79 directly killed, while arrests, escorting, guarding places of confinement and administration of Jewish property fell within the category of indirect participation. This demonstrates a principle present in his own scholarly methodology: an individual shot is not the only threshold for participation in the genocidal process. [S9]

29. In his 2016 article on Noreika, A. Rukšėnas himself relied on Raul Hilberg's administrative-bureaucratic model of the Holocaust - definition of the victim, expropriation of property, concentration, killing. He recorded that on 22 August 1941 Noreika transmitted Hans Gewecke's order to move the Jews of Šiauliai County into the Žagarė ghetto, that municipalities were to inventory Jewish property, and that there was evidence Noreika "contributed" to the concentration of Jews; he also discussed Directive No. 1875 of 10 September 1941 concerning liquidation of Jewish movable property. [S10]

30. Despite those administrative acts, the conclusion of the 2016 article stated that the research essentially did not confirm a connection between Noreika and the Holocaust. This internal methodological tension matters because it shows that A. Rukšėnas knew a broader participation model that could later narrow when a specific figure of national memory was assessed. It does not prove criminal intent, but it is testable evidence of knowledge and methodological choice. [S9, S10]

31. The same Noreika article also contains an asymmetry of attribution. A favourable memoir phrase about "our captain," whose surname is not specified in that quotation, is linked by A. Rukšėnas to Noreika; yet in an opposing Pakalniškis quotation, where "Commandant Captain Noreika" is named immediately before the dialogue, A. Rukšėnas writes that the surname of the

commandant who ordered killing is not given. Witness reliability may be disputed, but the grammatical standard for identity must be the same. [S10]

32. A. Rukšėnas's 2017 study of Jewish property treated confiscation as part of the process of persecution. The 2024 report, by contrast, itself quotes an LAF instruction to seize Jewish property at the decisive moment, but directs the collective weight of that programme into the safer category of "expulsion, not genocide." [S11, S5]

33. In 2011 A. Rukšėnas separately studied the motives of members of Kaunas self-defence battalions who participated in the killing of Jews and other groups. This shows that in his methodology the fact of participation and the assessment of motives used to explain that participation are distinct analytical questions. This distinction matters when investigating whether criteria of leadership, administrative programme and organisational responsibility were narrowed in the 2024 assessment of Škirpa. [S40]

34. In the Papilė civil case, when assessing a publication by A. Rukšėnas and the publisher, the Supreme Court of Lithuania emphasised the need for a critical scholarly and legal approach to doubtful sources and comprehensive comparison of different sources before categorical publication. This is not a rule of criminal liability, but it is a source-criticism standard of the highest national court personally known to A. Rukšėnas. [S12, S13]

35. In a 2023 public discussion concerning the Juozas Krikštaponis memorial, A. Rukšėnas was quoted as saying that the views of political prisoners, partisans and deportees had to be considered so that their feelings would not be offended because Krikštaponis was dear to them; he represented the Centre in the discussion, in which A. Bubnys did not participate. The following year Rukšėnas prepared the Škirpa report, which bears A. Bubnys's name at the end. I ask that this circumstance be assessed not as "proof of motive" but as possible context concerning memorial purpose and audience to be tested against the internal working file. [S5, S9-S13]

36. Taken together, these methodological parallels allow the investigative question to be formulated without mind-reading: did Rukšėnas apply in the 2024 report the same criteria for participation, persecution, confiscation of property, source reliability and institutional role that he himself had applied elsewhere; if not, what explains the change, and was it consciously intended to trivialise the significance of recognised crimes? [S9-S13, S40]

## VII. A. Bubnys's Individual Role Must Be Established, Not Presumed

37. A. Bubnys headed the LGGRTC historical research division from 2009 until 2021 and became Director General in 2021. That fact alone does not prove that he wrote earlier disputed formulations. But the 2024 report No. 9R-598 is a different category of fact: his name and position appear at the end of the document itself. [S5]

38. I therefore ask that it be established whether A. Bubnys received and read the draft; whether he provided comments or amendments; whether he approved the source list, the use of the Draugas report, the definition of collaboration and the final conclusion; whether the earlier 2015-2018 Škirpa file and the Parliamentary Ombudsman's transparency finding were provided to him; whether he knew of the history of favourable but unpublished premises; and who made the final decision to issue and publish the document. [S5, S6, S20]

39. A. Bubnys's public assessment in 2021 in another Noreika matter was more cautious than earlier categorical LGGRTC claims: he stated that there was no documented evidence concerning Noreika's knowledge of rescue and that one version could not be asserted categorically. This fact does not prove intent in the Škirpa matter; it shows that the Director was familiar with the necessity of distinguishing hypothesis from documented fact. [S32]

40. In 2026 the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs acknowledged to U.S. Representative Brad Sherman that LGGRTC's earlier "complete exoneration" statement concerning Brazaitis was legally imprecise, even though that favourable statement had been identified in 2018 as one of the circumstances relevant to the assessment of Škirpa. In 2018 A. Bubnys headed the Centre's historical research division; in 2021 he became Director General. I do not ask that personal guilt be inferred automatically from this chronology; I ask that it be established what he did, as Director General, after the 2026 correction by a state ministry and whether the basis of the Škirpa decisions was reconsidered or rechecked. [S18, S20, S21]

41. A. Bubnys's own 2006 study, "The Lithuanian Police 1(13) Battalion and the Murder of Jews in 1941," is directly relevant to the methodology of 9R-598. In it, Bubnys states that the purpose of the study is to show the role of the Tautos darbo apsauga (TDA) battalion in the murder of Jews in 1941; he describes the 3rd Company of the 1st Police Battalion as the core of J. Hamann's mobile killing squad, attributes to the 1st Battalion the murder of at least 36,000 Jews together with German Gestapo and auxiliary police, and states that most of the battalion was in one way or another drawn into the Holocaust. [S28]

42. By contrast, 9R-598 states that the Kaunas TDA Battalion "cannot be associated" with the August-November 1941 mass-destruction operations organised by Jäger because its reorganisation into the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Auxiliary Police Battalions began in early August. A. Bubnys's 2006 study does not itself prove Škirpa's personal responsibility, but it makes the reorganisation boundary methodologically testable: I ask that it be established whether Bubnys, when approving 9R-598, reconciled this "separation" with his own publication and, if so, how he explained the differing analytical result. [S5, S28]

43. In the conclusions approved in 2005 by Lithuania's own International Commission, the Dieckmann-Sužiedėlis research found that local cooperation considerably facilitated the persecution, ghettoisation and mass murder of Jews. The Commission's archival research examines mechanisms of Lithuanian participation. The public source apparatus of 9R-598 does not refer to those Commission conclusions or to Dieckmann and Sužiedėlis; nor does it refer to Hilberg or Arad. This does not prove that those works were consciously concealed or were not read. I therefore ask that the working file be used to establish whether they were considered and, if so, why the public document does not show how its conclusions regarding the LAF/TDA and organisational responsibility were reconciled with them. [S29, S30] The International Commission is an official Lithuanian state commission established by Presidential Decree of Valdas Adamkus on 7 September 1998; its approved conclusions are not legally binding on LGGRTC, but they are an official source of Lithuanian state institutional historical expertise. [S48]

## VIII. The 2015-2018 Škirpa File: State Institutions Had Already Documented a Transparency Problem

44. The 2015 LGGRTC Škirpa report had already acknowledged antisemitism in the Berlin LAF, reproduced significant anti-Jewish material, and then limited its significance by distinguishing expulsion from physical extermination, by the claimed lack of knowledge of the final Nazi plan, and by Škirpa's physical absence from Lithuania. This architecture is essentially repeated in the 2024 report. [S6, S5, S20]

45. On 2 February 2018 the Parliamentary Ombudsman, in Report No. 4D-2017/1-1558/3D-317, recorded that LGGRTC's conclusion on Škirpa had also relied on circumstances not stated in the published assessment, found a violation of the principle of transparency, and declared the complaint well founded. This is a procedural finding of a Lithuanian state supervisory institution, not my interpretation of a hidden motive. [S20]

46. LGGRTC's letter No. 55R-21 of 26 February 2018 identified as examples of such unpublished favourable circumstances the claim that Brazaitis had been completely exonerated in the United States and the fact that Škirpa had lived in the United States for decades without being charged. [S20, S21]

47. In letter No. 14R-51 of 11 July 2018 LGGRTC again used the assertion of Brazaitis's "complete exoneration" and in the same document reproduced U.S. language concerning removal from the active list and deactivation of investigations. In the same reply the Centre also raised a hypothesis that antisemitic material might have been inserted or falsified later, but did not publicly provide a complete provenance chain, parallel copy, forensic comparison or document-by-document source history that would allow a third party to replicate that hypothesis. [S20, S21]

48. This 2018 transparency and source problem is directly relevant to the 2024 report because it shows that six years earlier the Centre had already been officially warned about unpublished favourable premises and a non-replicable assessment. It is necessary to establish in the investigation whether the 2024 authors received this file and how they became acquainted with it. [S20]

## IX. Continuity of External and Internal State Warnings / Corrections

49. On the LGGRTC public page "On the Provision of Information" (Centre page No. 2969), published in July 2018 and still publicly accessible in August 2026, the context of independent Holocaust research is described using language about possible violations of the Constitution and the Criminal Code, and the assertion that Brazaitis had been "rehabilitated" by the U.S. Department of Justice is repeated. I present this as context showing the persistence of an institutional position and criminal-law rhetoric through 2026, not as a new 2026 publication or independent proof of a crime. [S25]

50. In a high-level public statement posted on the IHRA website in 2019 and signed by IHRA leadership and current and former chairs of expert committees and working groups, "grave concern" was expressed about LGGRTC's treatment of Noreika, and the Centre's publication was described as one of the attempts to rehabilitate his reputation. This statement is not a finding about Škirpa or 9R-598; its significance here is that, before 2024, the Centre had already received an international institutional warning concerning its treatment of Noreika and the direction of reputational rehabilitation. [S8]

51. On 23 August 2024 the Council of the Lithuanian Jewish (Litvak) Community, representing 32 Lithuanian and foreign Jewish organisations, categorically rejected Report No. 9R-598 itself; it described the broader situation of Škirpa memorialisation as an instance of Holocaust revisionism. This position is not a legal finding of a criminal offence, but it is a material public and institutional notice to the Centre concerning the report's impact and its perceived trivialising character. [S7]

52. On 12 May 2026 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs acknowledged to U.S. Representative Brad Sherman that the "complete exoneration" formulation concerning Brazaitis was legally imprecise and that administrative closure of an investigation is not a formal judicial acquittal. This statement is relevant to the Škirpa matter only because LGGRTC itself had identified Brazaitis's purported U.S. exoneration in 2018 as part of the argument favourable to Škirpa. [S18, S20, S21]

53. No publicly reissued Škirpa report has been identified that, after the Ministry correction, clearly explains whether and to what extent the earlier Brazaitis premise was removed from the assessment of Škirpa. This proves neither intent nor error in the conclusion; it leaves unresolved the question of replicability and correction that I ask be checked in the working file. [S20, S21]

54. On 17 July 2026 the Centre received a broader formal correction demand concerning earlier LGGRTC texts and public statements that remained online, and on 20 July 2026 a separate demand concerning correction of Report No. 9R-598, the working file, source provenance and preservation of documents. On 19 August 2026 the Škirpa material was transmitted to IHRA addressees as separate supplemental material. This later chronology matters primarily because it allows identification of the specific criticism that the Centre and its leadership received after publication of 9R-598 and the corrective action they did or did not take. [S19, S20, S22]

55. On 20 August 2026 IHRA Secretary General Michaela Küchler confirmed receipt of my approach and expressly explained: "There is no process for external submission of petitions." She also stated that the agendas of working groups and committees are set by their chairs and that, as a membership-based organisation, IHRA does not disclose detailed internal procedures externally. I therefore rely on the May and August 2026 documents as evidence of documented transmission, receipt and institutional knowledge, not as evidence of an external petition process initiated or considered by IHRA. [S36]

56. Chronologically after the supplemental material sent to IHRA addressees on 19 August 2026, the Centre marked one correction to a Brazaitis formulation on its public page on 26 August 2026: a sentence was changed from "rehabilitated" to "removed from the list of suspects" and marked "corrected 2026 08 26." Yet the same public page retained the earlier stronger formulation that Brazaitis had been "rehabilitated by the U.S. Department of Justice." I do not contend that the 19 August transmission caused the 26 August correction; I record only the chronology. I present this partial correction not as proof of intent by A. Rukšėnas or A. Bubnys, but as a fact showing that LGGRTC can in practice alter historical text after criticism, and that the scope and propagation of corrections can be tested. [S31, S36]

## X. Earlier Prosecutorial Decisions and the Valdas Rakutis Standard

57. In the first 2018 refusal, the Prosecutor's Office assessed my complaint against LGGRTC and its then Director General Birutė Burauskaitė, described the historical dispute as multifaceted and complex, noted the different positions of the applicant and the Centre's historians, and found no elements of Article 170². [S43, S44]

58. The second 2018 refusal essentially carried the earlier assessment into the repeated and expanded statement, relying on the procedural finality of the earlier decision and the absence of new circumstances changing the earlier criminal-law assessment. [S14, S15]

59. The 2019 refusal is particularly important to the current question of direct intent. The prosecutor recorded that the 1975 letter of a U.S. Congressman on which LGGRTC relied in disseminating the assertion of Brazaitis's rehabilitation and exoneration stated neither rehabilitation nor exoneration. Nevertheless, the prosecutor found no objective evidence that the Centre had intentionally and purposefully disseminated the disputed information for a purpose prohibited by Article 170² and treated it as the result of the Centre's statutory research functions. [S16, S17]

60. The Prosecutor's Office has therefore already recognised a situation in which a favourable historical-meaning claim by a state historical institution did not match the source itself, yet the criminal threshold was not crossed because of the assessment of intent and the institutional research function. In the present statement I ask that this earlier logic not be ignored but applied transparently: what additional information beyond textual mismatch is required to establish direct intent, and can the author's own earlier methodology, knowledge and internal working file provide such information here? [S16, S17]

61. The 2021 Rakutis matter stated the rule still more clearly: direct intent, presentation of historical fact, analysis of causes, opinion and the aim of discussion. I ask that the same rule be applied to the actions of A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys and that the reasoned decision show how each criterion was applied. [S4]

## XI. The Fridman Case: a Current Comparator for Application of Article 170²

62. Criminal case No. 02-2-00512-24 shows that Article 170²(1) is not a merely declaratory or unused provision. On 30 October 2025 Artur Fridman was charged under Article 170²(1), together with Article 313(2), concerning a Facebook post of 9 May 2024 in which he criticised the state-honoured Adolfas Ramanauskas-Vanagas and the memory of Lithuanian partisans. The formal indictment is a separate document; the publicly preserved pre-trial investigation file comprises approximately 220 pages and is not itself a copy of the indictment. [S23, S24]

63. On 8 January 2025 Fridman was placed under a written undertaking not to leave. On 5 March 2026 the court began hearing the case on the merits and questioned experts; another hearing took place on 26 August 2026; afterward it was publicly reported that the case remained pending and the next hearing was set for 26 October 2026. I present these facts not to comment on his guilt or to request interference in the pending case, but to show the actual level of procedural intensity the Lithuanian State can apply to historical speech under the same Article 170²(1). [S23, S24, S33]

64. The Fridman case is not a final legal precedent; the proceedings have not concluded and the facts differ. It is nevertheless a relevant comparator for equal application of the law: when a private individual challenges a state-honoured national figure, the State can open an investigation, collect expert evidence, impose a procedural measure and bring charges. Therefore, when the same article is invoked concerning an official state historical publication, a refusal decision must specifically explain why analysis of direct intent, historical dispute and the additional manner/public-order element leads to a different result. [S2, S4, S23, S34, S35]

## XII. Chain of Knowledge and Response of State Institutions

The purpose of this section is procedural: to prevent the 2024 report from being treated as an isolated and unknown error of a single historian. I do not contend that all institutions or officials listed below formed a common criminal agreement, shared one intent, or were accomplices to a criminal offence. The chronology shows that the dispute, specific sources, methodological issues and correction problems were presented for many years to different Lithuanian state institutions and that those institutions responded in different institutional ways.

65. The Office of the President received the Škirpa and Noreika issues in 2017-2018 and explained the limits of competence and referral to state institutions; some approaches were referred to / connected with LGGRTC. [S20]

66. In 2018 the Parliamentary Ombudsman did not merely receive a complaint but specifically found a transparency problem in the Škirpa conclusion and declared the complaint well founded. [S20]

67. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded to the Škirpa issue in 2018 and in 2026, after repeated approaches by U.S. Representative Brad Sherman, officially acknowledged the legally imprecise "complete exoneration" formulation concerning Brazaitis that LGGRTC had used in the context of assessing Škirpa. [S18, S20, S21]

68. In its 2018 replies LGGRTC disclosed unpublished premises favourable to Škirpa, defended them, raised alternative hypotheses about the provenance of sources and used criminal-law rhetoric toward independent Holocaust research in its July 2018 public reply; in 2024 the Centre published the new report 9R-598. [S5, S20, S25]

69. In 2024 the Interinstitutional Commission on Public Objects requested precisely such a report from the Centre for the Škirpa memorialisation process and later did not reach a final decision on the plaque. [S5, S20]

70. In 2018-2019 the Prosecutor's Office assessed three of my Article 170² statements concerning claims by the state historical institution and did not open investigations; in the 2021 Rakutis matter it publicly formulated the direct-intent and historical-discussion standard; in 2025 it used the same article in the criminal prosecution of Fridman. [S4, S43, S44, S14-S17, S23]

71. On 11 September 2026 the Ministry of Justice, responding to my 7-8 September UPR proposals, expressly stated: “The particularities, criteria, practical challenges and assessments relating to application of Article 170² of the Criminal Code fall within the competence of the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Lithuania.” This statement is therefore submitted precisely to the institution identified by the Ministry of Justice as competent. Its subject cannot be dismissed simply as a historical or academic dispute outside criminal-law competence without assessing the elements of Article 170² within the competence assigned to the Prosecutor’s Office. [S37]

This chain may support a broader institutional conclusion about a state-tolerated or state-protected direction of historical memory only to the extent supported by specific documents and decisions. In the criminal matter I do not ask for a finding of “guilt of the entire State,” but for examination of the specific elements of the actions of A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys and a reasoned explanation of how this long background of state knowledge bears on the analysis of direct intent and equal application of Article 170².

## XIII. Matrix for Application of the Elements of Article 170²(1)

| Element | Current evidentiary level | What the existing record shows | What is requested to be investigated |
|---|---|---|---|
| Publicity | Strongly supported | 9R-598 is an official LGGRTC report prepared for an interinstitutional commission and published on the LGGRTC website on 8 August 2024. [S5, S41] | Publication decision, target audience and dissemination; internal coordination and approval. |
| Protected crimes | Strongly supported | The report addresses the Holocaust context, the LAF anti-Jewish programme, deprivation of Jewish rights and mass murder at the Seventh Fort. | The precise legal connection between the disputed formulations and the crimes protected by Article 170². |
| Approval / denial / gross trivialisation | Disputed; requires legal assessment | The theory is not that the report denies the killings, but that while itself knowing the programme of collective persecution it fragments and narrows it and applies asymmetric evidentiary weight. Supreme Court 2K-173-1073/2025 recognises that trivialisation may occur through omissions, cautious formulations or hypotheses. [S34] | Whether the whole objectively reaches the threshold of “gross trivialisation” rather than remaining permissible historiographical interpretation; which significant circumstances were omitted or had their weight altered. |
| Threatening / abusive / insulting manner or public-order criterion | Weaker / open - requires independent assessment | Supreme Court 2K-173-1073/2025 expressly repeated that denial or trivialisation alone is insufficient: a threatening, abusive or insulting manner or the public-order condition is required. Social/political context, possible harmful consequences, and the rights of victims and descendants are also assessed. [S34, S35] | Whether the specific formulations in 9R-598, the document’s official purpose, active memorialisation conflict, audience and actual impact satisfy at least one additional statutory condition. If not, this element is not proved and there is no offence. |
| Direct intent | Not proved; there are indicators justifying investigation | Rukšėnas himself quotes adverse texts; his earlier methodology shows a broader understanding of indirect participation, persecution and confiscation; narrower criteria are applied in 2024. Supreme Court practice in 2018 and 2025 prohibits inferring intent from assumptions alone. [S34, S35] | Internal drafts, email, revisions, comments, source-selection notes, memorialisation purpose, reaction to earlier criticism and corrections. |
| Individual role of A. Rukšėnas | Supported, but not in detail | Publicly identified as the author of the report; his name appears in the document. | Who wrote each material part, what he knew and what result he sought to achieve. |
| Individual role of A. Bubnys | Supported by the official document; content unclear | His name and position as Director General appear at the end of the document. | Whether he read, edited, coordinated, approved and authorised publication; what material he received and what decisions he made. |

## XIV. Specific Requested Verification and Investigative Steps

72. Register this document as a statement / report of a possible criminal offence and inform me of the registration and investigation / material number.

73. Use the information-clarification possibility under Article 168(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and, before making a procedural decision, request from LGGRTC a minimum set of the principal working documents for 9R-598: the instruction or assignment to prepare the report; the list of sources used; surviving draft versions and version history; coordination and approval records; the publication decision; correspondence exchanged with the interinstitutional commission; working notes concerning the 25 June 1941 Draugas item and the provenance of the LAF texts; and documents allowing a preliminary

determination of the roles of A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys. If a pre-trial investigation is opened, request the remainder of the complete working file connected with the preparation, editing, approval and publication of 9R-598. [S3, S38]

74. Establish separately the roles of A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys: who wrote, edited, coordinated, approved and authorised each material part of the report and its final conclusion.

75. Establish who selected the 25 June 1941 Draugas item, what primary source or chain of transmission LGGRTC had for it, whether a primary document attributable to Škirpa prohibiting persecution of Jews exists and, if not, why the secondary report was converted into a factual premise of the report.

76. Establish what original-version / source-provenance verification the authors performed concerning the LAF texts of 19 March and 24 March 1941, which had already been the subject of a formal dispute in 2017-2018. In the complete index of LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, item LVIII clearly identifies “Instructions for the Liberation of Lithuania,” an LAF leadership document of 24 March 1941, folios 188-199. That index contains no separate entry identifiable solely by title and date as the 19 March 1941 proclamation; this is only an index-level negative finding and does not prove that such a document did not exist or is not included under another title. I separately ask that the exact archival source, fond, inventory, file, folios, version and provenance of the 19 March 1941 text used in the report be established and its relationship to the collection LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582 explained. [S39]

77. Establish whether the authors were provided with the 2015 Škirpa report, the 2018 Parliamentary Ombudsman transparency finding, letters No. 55R-21, 14R-51 and 14R-82, and the applicant’s earlier submissions; if so, how they were assessed in the 2024 working file.

78. Establish whether the authors checked entry 18 in the document register / printed pp. 165-167 of K. Škirpa’s 1973 book, which the 2015 and 2024 reports do not cite; if checked, how it was assessed; if not checked, why, given that the same book is cited elsewhere in the reports. Raising this question does not itself amount to an assertion that this material was consciously concealed. [S27]

79. Establish whether A. Rukšėnas’s 2014 Kretinga, 2016 Noreika, 2017 property and earlier battalion studies were known / considered as methodological context in preparing 9R-598; if not, whether and why a different threshold of institutional and indirect participation was used in 2024. [S9-S11, S40]

80. Establish whether the August 2024 statement of the Lithuanian Jewish Community and the September 2024 public criticism by historians led to an internal review of 9R-598; obtain all related documents.

81. Establish what actions LGGRTC and specifically A. Bubnys and A. Rukšėnas took after the Ministry of Foreign Affairs acknowledgement of 12 May 2026 concerning the “complete exoneration” formulation regarding Brazaitis, given that this premise had earlier been identified as part of the assessment of Škirpa.

82. Establish whether, after the Ministry of Foreign Affairs correction of 12 May 2026 and the correction demands of 17-20 July 2026, LGGRTC leadership reviewed the 2018 public page No. 2969 and other public texts that retained the assertion of Brazaitis’s U.S. “rehabilitation”; obtain documents connected with the decision to leave, correct or not correct the text to the extent they exist. [S18, S19, S25, S31] Separately, obtain the internal instruction, version history or other document by which the change to page No. 3058 was made on 26 August 2026, and documents, if any, explaining why the parallel stronger DOJ “rehabilitation” formulation remaining on the same page was or was not corrected. [S31]

83. If a pre-trial investigation is opened, separately question A. Rukšėnas and A. Bubnys, in accordance with the prescribed procedure and with their procedural status determined under the Code of Criminal Procedure, about their actual roles, knowledge, rules for weighting sources, knowledge of the 2018 transparency finding, the purpose of the 2024 report and approval of the final conclusion. [S38]

84. In applying Article 170²(1), separately and with reasons assess each objective element and direct intent under the standard publicly articulated in the 2021 Rakutis decision, together with the interpretations of the Supreme Court of Lithuania: criminal case No. 2K-173-1073/2025, explaining that denial or trivialisation may be effected through omissions, cautious formulations or hypotheses and that content, purpose, context, consequences and the rights of victims and their descendants are assessed; and the protective boundary in criminal case No. 2K-293-788/2018 prohibiting liability based on assumptions or implied meaning. [S4, S34, S35]

85. As context for equal application of the law, assess the 2018-2019 refusals concerning my statements, the 2021 Rakutis refusal and the active 2025-2026 application of Article 170² in the Fridman case, without suggesting that the facts of those matters are identical.

86. Immediately take lawful steps to ensure that LGGRTC is informed of the need not to delete, alter or destroy electronic or paper documents, email, messages, revisions, cloud history, metadata, source copies and approval records connected with 9R-598; if a pre-trial investigation is opened, where necessary use the evidence-preservation and acquisition measures provided by the Code of Criminal Procedure. [S3, S38]

87. If commencement of a pre-trial investigation is refused, issue a detailed reasoned decision separately addressing: publicity; protected crimes; approval / denial / gross trivialisation; the threatening / abusive / insulting manner or public-order condition; direct intent; A. Rukšėnas’s role; A. Bubnys’s role; the Rakutis standard; Supreme Court cases No. 2K-173-1073/2025 and No. 2K-293-788/2018; the 2018-2019 refusals; the Fridman comparator; and the reasons why requesting the working files is considered necessary or unnecessary. The decision should also identify precisely the ground for refusal under Article 168(1) relied upon and explain why the document-supported information in this statement is considered “manifestly false” or why circumstances under Article 3(1) are present, particularly if the principal LGGRTC working documents for 9R-598 were not requested before the decision. [S3, S38]

88. In the event of refusal, explain the appeal procedure under Article 168, including the seven-day period from receipt of a copy of the decision or ruling; if the decision is made by a prosecutor, it is appealable to the pre-trial investigation judge. [S3] A ruling of the pre-trial investigation judge may, in accordance with the Code, be further appealed to a higher court.

## XV. Limits of the Request and Presumption of Innocence

89. Nowhere in this statement do I ask that A. Rukšėnas or A. Bubnys be regarded as guilty before investigation. The methodological comparisons I provide are evidence justifying the question and the request for documents; they are not a final conclusion about their internal state of mind.

90. I do not ask the Prosecutor's Office to find that Kazys Škirpa personally directed killings in Lithuania, and I do not contend that he personally wrote every antisemitic LAF text. This matter concerns the manner in which the 2024 state report was prepared and published, not a criminal process against a deceased historical figure.

91. Nor do I contend that all Lithuanian state institutions or officials acted with a common criminal purpose. The institutional chronology is presented because of knowledge, notices, corrections, standards applied and the scale of institutional response. Any broader conclusion must be drawn from documents, not from a political or moral assumption.

92. At the same time, state institutions cannot receive automatic immunity from criminal law because disputed text was prepared "in the performance of research functions" if private historical speech can trigger an intensive criminal process under the same article. The research function is context, not an answer to the question of direct intent. [S4, S17, S23]

## XVI. Index of Annexes and Principal Evidence

| Annex | Document / purpose | Reference / ID | Form of submission / file / extent |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | LGGRTC Report No. 9R-598 (9.6E), 25 Jun. 2024 - principal disputed document. | S5 | Priedas_A_LGGRTC_9R-598_2024-06-25.pdf - 7 pp. Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_A_LGGRTC_9R-598_2024-06-25.pdf |
| B | LGGRTC 2015 Škirpa report - earlier methodological version. | S6 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required under source register. |
| C | Parliamentary Ombudsman report No. 4D-2017/1-1558/3D-317, 2 Feb. 2018 - transparency violation / well-founded complaint. | LAC-D00100 | Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/4D-2017-1-1558-3D-317-2018-02-02.pdf |
| D | LGGRTC letter No. 55R-21, 26 Feb. 2018 - unpublished favourable circumstances. | LAC-D00101 | Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Gonocide-Reply-2018-02-26-Holocaust-interpretation.pdf |
| E | LGGRTC letter No. 14R-51, 11 Jul. 2018 - Brazaitis premise, U.S. text and alternative provenance hypothesis. | LAC-D00105 | Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/GC_reply_Skirpa_20180711-1.pdf |
| F | LGGRTC letter No. 14R-82, 11 Oct. 2018 - further Škirpa/Brazaitis reply. | LAC-D00109 | Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/4.-2018-10-11-Lietuvos-gyventoju-genocido-ir-rezistencijos-tyrimo-centro-rastas-Nr.-14R-82.pdf |
| G | 2018-2019 Article 170² statements and prosecutorial refusals: AP-21510 / M-2-02-00825-18; AP-28340 / M-2-02-01123-18; AP-31212 / M-2-02-01142-19. | S43-S44, S14-S17 | Prosecutor's Office holds originals under the stated registration / material numbers; public copies are in source register. |
| H | Prosecutor's Office public statement of 22 Feb. 2021 concerning V. Rakutis - direct-intent test. | S4 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| I | IHRA 2019 expert statement concerning LGGRTC and J. Noreika. | S8 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| J | Lithuanian Jewish Community statement of 23/26 Aug. 2024 concerning 9R-598. | S7 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| K | Ministry of Foreign Affairs reply to U.S. Rep. Brad Sherman and attachments, 12 May 2026 - correction of legal formulation concerning Brazaitis. | S18 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| L | Open letter / demand for working files, correction and preservation concerning 9R-598, 20 Jul. 2026. | S19 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| M | Supplemental material transmitted to IHRA addressees on 19 Aug. 2026 concerning the Škirpa determination (historical document title retained in annex). | S20 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| N | Supplemental material transmitted to IHRA addressees on 19 Aug. 2026 concerning attribution of Brazaitis U.S. "exoneration / rehabilitation." | S21 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| O | A. Rukšėnas academic publications of 2014, 2016 and 2017 and Supreme Court decisions of 2011/2012. | S9-S13 | Provided through public links. |
| P | Fridman case No. 02-2-00512-24 pre-trial material and defence memorandum; indictment identified as separate procedural document of 30 Oct. 2025. | S23-S24 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| Q | Ministry of Justice reply of 11 Sep. 2026 concerning UPR proposals of 7-8 Sep., identifying Prosecutor General | S37 | Priedas_Q_TM_2026-09-11_UPR_atsakymas.pdf - 2 pp. Public copy: |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | competence for Article 170² criteria. | | https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_Q_TM_2026-09-11_UPR_atsakymas.pdf |
| R | Document transmitted to IHRA addressees on 28 May 2026 and historically titled a formal petition, and later transmission chain; procedural status limited by IHRA Secretary General reply of 20 Aug. 2026 that there is no external petition-submission process. | S22, S36 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| S | Arūnas Bubnys 2006 study concerning TDA / 1(13) Police Battalion and murder of Jews. | S28 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| T | International Commission approved conclusions of 2005 and Dieckmann-Sužiedėlis study concerning persecution and mass murder of Lithuanian Jews. | S29-S30 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| U | LGGRTC page recording partial correction of Brazaitis wording on 26 Aug. 2026 and the remaining DOJ "rehabilitation" wording on same page. | S31 | Public link / source identifier; separate copy available if required. |
| V | Email of IHRA Secretary General Michaela Küchler, 20 Aug. 2026: acknowledgement of receipt and explanation that IHRA has no external petition-submission process. | S36 | Priedas_V_IHRA_Kuchler_2026-08-20.pdf - 1 p. Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_V_IHRA_Kuchler_2026-08-20.pdf |
| W | Unofficial Lithuanian translations of targeted English-language excerpts (IHRA 2019; MFA 2026; International Commission 2005; Küchler 2026). | S8, S18, S29, S36, S47 | Priedas_W_Tiksliniu_anglu_kalbos_istrauku_vertimai_2026-09-11.pdf - 1 p. Public copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_W_Tiksliniu_anglu_kalbos_istrauku_vertimai_2026-09-11.pdf |

Language and form of annexes. Criminal proceedings in the Republic of Lithuania are conducted in the state language (Article 8 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). Some sources identified in this index are in English. To make the specific excerpts relied upon in this statement easier for participants in the proceedings to use, Annex W provides unofficial targeted translations into Lithuanian; if meaning is disputed, the original controls. Not all documents identified in the index are physically attached: where a document is publicly and stably accessible or already in the possession of the Prosecutor's Office under a specific case number, an exact link / identifier is provided. Copies of Annexes A, Q, V and W are physically submitted together. Public copies of Annexes A, Q, V and W are also identified in the table so that the identity of the submitted files can be checked. In the case of Annex A, the official LGGRTC PDF identified at S5 is the source original; the physically submitted TOI public preservation copy is a text-preservation derivative, and no assertion is made that it is byte-for-byte identical to the official LGGRTC PDF. [S47]

## XVII. Source Register


**S1.** Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania, Article 20 (criminal liability of a legal person; exception for the State and state institutions). https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.111555/zaLfzBNenL/

**S2.** Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania, Article 170² (current version). https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.111555/VNuiCTEqQL/

**S3.** Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania, Article 168 (refusal to commence pre-trial investigation; clarification of information; appeal). https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.163482/JrmLbcVSan/

**S4.** Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Lithuania, 22 Feb. 2021 statement concerning Valdas Rakutis: direct intent and historical-discussion criteria. https://www.prokuraturos.lt/lt/atsisakyta-pradeti-ikiteismini-tyrima-del-seimo-nario-v.-rakucio-straipsnyje-paskelbtu-teiginiu/7383

**S5.** LGGRTC, "On the Person of Kazys Škirpa (Historical-Archival Report)," 25 Jun. 2024, No. 9R-598 (9.6E). https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Titulinis/2024/20240808_skirpa_pazyma.pdf

**S6.** LGGRTC, "On the Activities of Kazys Škirpa during the Second World War" (2015 report). https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Pazymos/201510_skirpa_pazyma01.pdf

**S7.** Council of the Lithuanian Jewish (Litvak) Community statement concerning LGGRTC Report No. 9R-598, 23 Aug. 2024 / English 26 Aug. 2024. https://www.lzb.lt/en/2024/08/26/lithuanian-jewish-community-statement-on-genocide-centers-newest-report-on-kazys-skirpa/

**S8.** 2019 statement of IHRA expert chairs and former chairs concerning LGGRTC and Jonas Noreika. https://holocaustremembrance.com/statements/statement-center-study-genocide-resistance-lithuania

**S9.** Alfredas Rukšėnas, "The Destruction of the Jewish Community of Kretinga District in the Summer and Autumn of 1941," Genocidas ir rezistencija 2(36) (2014), esp. pp. 37-38, 47. https://etalpykla.lituanistika.lt/object/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2014~1484852912784/J.04~2014~1484852912784.pdf

**S10.** Alfredas Rukšėnas, "Controversies in the Biography of Jonas Noreika-General Vėtra," Genocidas ir rezistencija 1(39) (2016), esp. pp. 39, 50-59. https://www.journals.vu.lt/gr/lt/article/view/35731

**S11.** Alfredas Rukšėnas, "Features of the History of Jewish Property in the Districts of Kaunas County during the Nazi Occupation (1941-1944): Confiscation and Administration of Real Property," Genocidas ir rezistencija 2(42) (2017). https://www.journals.vu.lt/gr/lt/article/view/35646

**S12.** Supreme Court of Lithuania, civil case No. 3K-3-347/2011, 9 Sep. 2011, esp. public Liteko text lines 243-251; lines 245-248 require critical assessment of doubtful sources, and line 246 emphasises comprehensive comparison of various sources. https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=76b5b2dd-1fce-4431-81e9-961672f922a6

**S13.** Supreme Court of Lithuania, civil case No. 3K-3-222/2012, 16 May 2012; public Liteko text lines 78-100 define the two disputed publication circumstances, lines 180-181 give their final assessment, and around line 210 the final disposition and LTL 3,000 non-pecuniary damages. https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=4e8d546a-c795-4cc3-923d-c92d964ce43c

**S14.** A. Gochin, repeated Article 170²(1) statement of 26 Sep. 2018 (public archival copy). https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/request-to-start-criminal-action-Holocaust-denial-BK-170-2-GG-2018-09-26.pdf

**S15.** Prosecutor's refusal of 12 Nov. 2018, AP-28340 / M-2-02-01123-18. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/Prosecutor_refusal2.pdf

**S16.** A. Gochin, Article 170²(1) statement of 15 Nov. 2019 concerning assertions of Brazaitis “exoneration / rehabilitation.” https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/complaint-to-public-prosecutor-english.pdf
**S17.** Prosecutor’s refusal of 2 Dec. 2019, AP-31212 / M-2-02-01142-19. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/2020-05-20_035122-Decision.pdf
**S18.** Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania reply of 12 May 2026 to U.S. Representative Brad Sherman (Ref. (19.2.3)3-2806) and U.S. document packet. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/06/Letter-to-Rep.-Sherman.pdf
**S19.** Open letter concerning LGGRTC Report No. 9R-598, 20 Jul. 2026, with requests concerning sources, working files, correction and preservation. https://grantgochin.substack.com/p/the-skirpa-report-cannot-stand
**S20.** Supplemental material transmitted to IHRA addressees on 19 Aug. 2026 concerning the Škirpa determination (historical filename: IHRA Supplemental Submission). https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/IHRA_Supplemental_Submission_Skirpa_Determination_2026-08-19.pdf
**S21.** Supplemental material transmitted to IHRA addressees on 19 Aug. 2026 concerning attribution of Juozas Ambrazevičius-Brazaitis U.S. “exoneration / rehabilitation.” https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/08/IHRA_Supplemental_Submission_Brazaitis_2026-08-19.pdf
**S22.** Document transmitted to IHRA addressees on 28 May 2026, historically titled “Formal Petition,” concerning Lithuania’s state institutional Holocaust-memory practices; on 20 Aug. 2026 IHRA Secretary General explained that there is no external petition-submission process. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/IHRA-Petition-Gochin-5-28-26.pdf
**S23.** Pre-trial investigation material in Artur Fridman case No. 02-2-00512-24 (approx. 220 pp.; not the 30 Oct. 2025 indictment itself). https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/ikiteisminio-tyrimo-medziaga-02-2-00512-24.pdf
**S24.** Fridman defence memorandum, 25 Apr. 2026. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/Fridman-Defense-Memorandum-for-Counsel-of-Record.pdf
**S25.** LGGRTC July 2018 public text “On the Provision of Information,” Centre page No. 2969. As of Aug. 2026 the page remained publicly accessible; recorded as persistence of the 2018 text, not a new 2026 publication. https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/2969/a/
**S26.** LRT, 15 Sep. 2024, public historical discussion and criticism concerning the sources and conclusions of the Škirpa report. https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/2357594/tikrasis-skirpos-veidas-didvyris-ar-antisemitizmui-pasidaves-kolaborantas
**S27.** Kazys Škirpa, Sukilimas Lietuvos suverenumui atstatyti: dokumentinė apžvalga (Washington, 1973) - a source cited by the 2015 and 2024 LGGRTC reports; in this statement entry 18 of the document register / pp. 165-167 is used only as an investigative question, not a final conclusion. https://grantgochin.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/Sukilimas-Lietuvos-suverenumu-atstatyti-Kazys-Skirpa.pdf
**S28.** Arūnas Bubnys, “The Lithuanian Police 1(13) Battalion and the Murder of Jews in 1941,” Genocidas ir rezistencija 2(20) (2006), pp. 31-52, DOI 10.61903/GR.2006.202. https://www.journals.vu.lt/gr/lt/article/view/38790
**S29.** International Commission conclusions concerning “The Persecution and Mass Murder of Lithuanian Jews during Summer and Fall of 1941: Sources and Analysis,” approved 20 Apr. 2005 (official English copy). https://www.komisija.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Approved-Conclusions_Persecution-and-Mass-Murder-of-Lithuanian-Jews.pdf
**S30.** Christoph Dieckmann and Saulius Sužiedėlis, “The Persecution and Mass Murder of Lithuanian Jews during Summer and Fall of 1941: Sources and Analysis” - public research copy of the Commission. https://www.komisija.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/S.SuziedelisC.Dieckmann_Mass-Killings_United-version.pdf
**S31.** LGGRTC public page “The Genocide Research Centre Will Not Yield to Vulgar Pressure,” marked “corrected 2026 08 26,” with another DOJ “rehabilitation” formulation remaining on the same page. https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/3058/a/
**S32.** LRT, 25 May 2021 interview with Arūnas Bubnys concerning Noreika and the limits of documentary proof. https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/1408141/prie-lggrtc-vairo-stojes-bubnys-apie-birzelio-sukilimo-sasajas-su-holokaustu-noreikos-asmenybe-ir-istorine-tiesa
**S33.** Grant Arthur Gochin, “Six A.M. on Rosh Hashanah,” 30 Aug. 2026, publicly recording the status of the Fridman case after the 26 Aug. 2026 hearing. https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/six-a-m-on-rosh-hashanah/
**S34.** Supreme Court of Lithuania, criminal case No. 2K-173-1073/2025, 9 Dec. 2025 - interpretation of Article 170², additional manner/public-order element, historical-speech context, significance of omissions and cautious formulations. https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=5be5da5c-15d4-4739-a2ff-fe5805fa4e9c
**S35.** Supreme Court of Lithuania, criminal case No. 2K-293-788/2018 - freedom of expression, proof of objective and subjective elements, avoidance of assumptions and requirement of sufficiently concrete content. https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.aspx?id=6cce3fcc-46f9-493d-b0aa-fd10b2e575a9
**S36.** Email of IHRA Secretary General Michaela Küchler to applicant, 20 Aug. 2026: acknowledgement of receipt and explanation “There is no process for external submission of petitions.” Gmail message ID 1a01e4963fdc3bc1. Annex V. Public copy. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_V_IHRA_Kuchler_2026-08-20.pdf
**S37.** Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania reply to applicant, 11 Sep. 2026, concerning UPR proposals of 7 and 8 Sep. 2026; it assigns the particularities, criteria, practical challenges and assessment of Article 170² application to the competence of the Office of the Prosecutor General. Gmail message ID 1a08f1c134636335. Annex Q. Public copy. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_Q_TM_2026-09-11_UPR_atsakymas.pdf
**S38.** Recommendations of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Lithuania concerning commencement and registration of pre-trial investigations; at the clarification stage, permits the non-coercive actions identified in Article 168(1), including requesting documents from state institutions, and prohibits coercive procedural measures. https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.325977/augaEyeyiv/
**S39.** Complete index transcription of LCVA f. 648, ap. 2, b. 582, received from Evaldas Balčiūnas on 1 Sep. 2026 (LAC-D00329). The index contains 110 principal Roman-numbered entries I-CX; LVIII is “Instructions for the Liberation of Lithuania,” LAF leadership, 24 Mar. 1941, folios 188-199. The full index contains no separate entry clearly identifiable solely by title and date as the 19 Mar. 1941 proclamation; this index-level finding does not prove absence of the document. Public digital copy of full file b. 582. https://grantgochin.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/skirpapastangospriedai_lcva_f648_a2_b582-1000px.pdf
**S40.** Alfredas Rukšėnas, “Motives of Members of the Kaunas Self-Defence Battalions for Participating in the Killing of Jews and Other Groups during the German Occupation (1941-1944),” Genocidas ir rezistencija 2(30) (2011), pp. 40-61, DOI 10.61903/GR.2011.202. https://www.journals.vu.lt/gr/lt/article/view/37742
**S41.** LGGRTC official publication entry of 8 Aug. 2024, “ON THE PERSON OF KAZYS ŠKIRPA (historical-archival report),” recording public publication of Report No. 9R-598. https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/4517/a/print_version/
**S42.** LGGRTC / Interinstitutional Commission public record of meeting result, 19 Sep. 2024: concerning Kazys Škirpa plaque, “NO DECISION ADOPTED”; the same page identifies the report as “author Dr Alfredas Rukšėnas.” https://www.genocid.lt/centras/lt/4443/a/print_version/
**S43.** Applicant’s first Article 170²(1) statement to the Vilnius Prosecutor’s Office, 24 Jul. 2018, naming LGGRTC and Director General Teresė Birutė Burauskaitė; prosecutorial register AP-21510 / material No. M-2-02-00825-18. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/05/burauskaite-public-prosecutor.pdf

**S44.** Vilnius Prosecutor's Office decision refusing to commence a pre-trial investigation, 17 Aug. 2018, AP-21510 / material No. M-2-02-00825-18. https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/04/17-August-2018.pdf

**S45.** Law of the Republic of Lithuania on the Prohibition of the Promotion of Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes and Their Ideologies, No. XIV-1679, especially Article 4, and Seimas Resolution No. XIV-2030 of 1 Jun. 2023 establishing the Interinstitutional Commission. https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/b80056227d3211edbdcebd68a7a0df7e/kZvAiiyZkg/format/ISO_PDF/ ; https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/7eeb4530044011eebc0bd16e3a4d3b97/PELbvTcfGp/

**S46.** European Court of Human Rights, Grand Chamber, Perinçek v. Switzerland, application No. 27510/08, 15 Oct. 2015. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-158235

**S47.** Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania, Article 8: criminal proceedings are conducted in the state language; participants who do not know Lithuanian are guaranteed the right to use an interpreter as provided by law. https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/actualedition/TAIS.163482/iiGbdCgWtW/format/ISO_PDF/

**S48.** International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania, official "About the Commission" page: Commission established by decree of President Valdas Adamkus on 7 Sep. 1998; approved conclusions are used here as a source of official state institutional historical expertise, not as legally binding acts upon LGGRTC. https://www.komisija.lt/apie-komisija/

## XVIII. Submission and Signature

On 31 August 2026 the Office of the Prosecutor General informed me in writing that a simple unsigned email would not be registered unless it was signed with a qualified electronic signature or created by electronic means ensuring the integrity and immutability of the text. The final PDF version of this statement was therefore signed with a qualified electronic signature using the Evrotrust application on my phone and only then submitted to the Prosecutor's Office. The final PDF version was signed with an Evrotrust qualified electronic signature (PAdES PDF signature format) and checked before submission in an eIDAS-compatible qualified electronic-signature validator. Annexes A, Q, V and W were included in the same PDF signed with the qualified electronic signature after the statement text so that the signature covered them as well. Separate annex files and a ZIP archive were not submitted unless requested by the Office of the Prosecutor General.

I request that all procedural correspondence and decisions be provided electronically using the contact details specified in the electronic submission. I also request confirmation by return email that the statement has been registered and that the registration / material number be provided.

**Grant Arthur Gochin**

Citizen of the Republic of Lithuania

11 September 2026

*Qualified electronic signature*

## ANNEX A - SUBMISSION / SOURCE CONTROL SHEET

Attached copy: Priedas_A_LGGRTC_9R-598_2024-06-25.pdf (7 pp.).

Status: public TOI preservation copy / text-preservation derivative. It is not submitted as proof of byte-for-byte identity with the original LGGRTC PDF.

Official source original (S5): https://www.genocid.lt/UserFiles/File/Titulinis/2024/20240808_skirpa_pazyma.pdf

Public preservation copy: https://static-cdn.toi-media.com/blogs/uploads/2026/09/Priedas_A_LGGRTC_9R-598_2024-06-25.pdf

If wording, display or technical identity is disputed, the official LGGRTC PDF identified at S5 controls.

Prepared 11 September 2026

## ANNEX A - Unofficial English Translation of LGGRTC Report No. 9R-598 (9.6E)

**GENOCIDE AND RESISTANCE RESEARCH CENTRE OF LITHUANIA**

**ON THE PERSON OF KAZYS ŠKIRPA (historical-archival report)**

25 June 2024 No. 9R-598 (9.6E) - Vilnius

On 28 February 2024, the Interinstitutional Commission for Assessing the Compliance of Public Objects with the Prohibition on Promoting Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes and Their Ideologies considered a request of the Historical Memory Commission of Vilnius City Municipal Council to assess whether the text of a newly proposed public object - a memorial plaque to Kazys Škirpa on the building at Gedimino pr. 40, Vilnius - complied with Article 3 of the Law. The planned inscription was: “IN THIS BUILDING IN 1918 WORKED THE FIRST VOLUNTEER OF THE LITHUANIAN ARMY, MEMBER OF THE CONSTITUENT SEIMAS, DIPLOMAT, ORGANISER OF THE JUNE 1941 UPRISING, COLONEL KAZYS ŠKIRPA.” During the consideration, it was decided to request the Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania to prepare a historical-archival report concerning the personality and activities of Kazys Škirpa.

Accordingly, we inform you that Kazys Škirpa, as a historical figure, is not assessed uniformly in society. Some consider him a participant in the freedom struggle and a patriot whose activities were beyond reproach. Others consider him a participant in the freedom struggle whose activities also had a darker side, including antisemitism and cooperation with Nazi Germany. There are also those who assess K. Škirpa only negatively.

Kazys Škirpa was born on 18 February 1895 in the village of Namajūnai, Saločiai district, Biržai county. In 1915 he graduated from a real school and then studied at the Commercial Institute in Petrograd. In 1916 he was mobilised into the army of the Russian Empire, graduated from the Peterhof ensign school, and served as a junior officer in the 37th Siberian Reserve Rifle Regiment in Omsk. That same year, after returning to Petrograd, he began organising Lithuanian military units within the Russian Empire and was the representative of the Lithuanian Soldiers’ Union to the Ukrainian government in Kyiv. After the Bolsheviks destroyed that union in 1918, K. Škirpa participated in the secret Supreme Committee of Lithuanian Soldiers and belonged to the Lithuanian National Council in Soviet Russia.

In February 1918 he visited Vilnius and urged immediate organisation of the Lithuanian army. On 25 April 1918 he submitted to the Presidium of the Council of Lithuania a memorandum “On the Question of the Lithuanian Army.” After the Lithuanian army was established by Order No. 1 of 23 November 1918, K. Škirpa joined the work of rebuilding it. He organised the Vilnius commandant battalion from volunteers and participated in raising the Lithuanian tricolour on Gediminas Castle Tower on 1 January 1919. From January 1919 he served as commandant of Vilnius city and later Kaunas city and county. During 1918-1920 he participated in the struggles for Lithuanian independence against Bolsheviks, Poles and Bermontians. He studied military science at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, attended higher officers’ courses in Kaunas, and graduated from the Belgian Military Academy in Brussels in 1925.

After returning from Belgium in 1926 he was appointed head of Section II (Information) of the Supreme Army Staff and from 22 June to 24 December 1926 served as Chief of the Supreme Army Staff. On 16 February 1928 he was granted the rank of General Staff colonel. He opposed the coup of 17 December 1926 and was removed from the General Staff. In July 1937, at his own request and by act of the President of the Republic, General Staff Colonel K. Škirpa was released into the infantry officers’ reserve. For bravery he was awarded the 5th class Order of the Cross of Vytis on 25 October 1919, the Volunteer Medal on 7 February 1930, and the 3rd class Order of Vytautas the Great on 8 September 1935.

Alongside military service, he was active in politics. In 1920-1921 he was a member of the Constituent Seimas. He belonged to the faction of the Lithuanian Socialist Popular Democratic Party within the bloc of that party and the Lithuanian Peasant Union. On 14 December 1927 he was transferred to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, serving as head of the consular division of the Lithuanian mission in Berlin. On 13 March 1928 he was appointed military attaché in Germany. From 1937 he was Lithuania’s permanent representative to the League of Nations in Geneva, with the rank of envoy and minister plenipotentiary. In 1938 he was appointed Lithuania’s first envoy and minister plenipotentiary to Poland and, at the end of 1938, transferred to Berlin as Lithuania’s envoy and minister plenipotentiary to Germany (Juozas Jankauskas, 1941 m. Birželio sukilimas Lietuvoje, Vilnius, 2010, pp. 17-19).

After the Soviet Union occupied and annexed Lithuania in the summer of 1940, K. Škirpa from the first days became an active resister interested in restoring an independent Lithuanian state. On 25 June 1940, reacting to a coded telegram from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he travelled from Berlin to Kaunas. There he met with several military and resistance figures and discussed possible resistance to the Soviets and its forms. On 27 June he presented Minister Vincas Krėvė-Mickevičius with a report on the German attitude toward the Baltic states. On 28 June, sensing danger from Soviet Lithuanian security, he hurried back to Berlin and was there by 30 June. After the elections to the People’s Seimas on 14-15 July 1940 he protested its decisions. In a protest of 22 July addressed to Reich Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop he declared the People’s Seimas

incompetent to express the nation's will and its decisions on introducing the Soviet system and incorporating Lithuania into the Soviet Union unlawful. In the first half of August 1940, as Lithuanian minister in Germany, he resisted transfer of the mission and its property to the Soviet embassy in Berlin. On 14 August 1940 a government decree signed by Prof. V. Krėvė-Mickevičius deprived K. Škirpa and seven other diplomats of Lithuanian citizenship, prohibited their return to Lithuania and confiscated all their property.

In September 1940, as the anti-Soviet movement in Lithuania expanded, there arose a need to organise the resistance underground so that it would function in an organised, planned and unified manner. Resistance centres were needed. The beginning of a unified underground is dated to 9 October 1940, when Adolfas Damušis, Leonas Prapuolenis, Jonas Senauskas and others established the Kaunas-sector Lithuanian activist headquarters. A similar centre began to be organised in Vilnius around 10 October 1940; one of its organisers and leaders was General Staff Major Vytautas Bulvičius. The establishment of the Kaunas and Vilnius centres on 9 and 10 October may be regarded as the beginning of the formation of a unified resistance underground.

The third resistance centre - the Lithuanian Activist Front (LAF) - was established in Berlin on 17 November 1940 at K. Škirpa's initiative in his apartment. Twenty-eight people assembled. At the meeting, chaired by E. Galvanauskas, a founding act was signed. K. Škirpa was unanimously entrusted with leadership of the LAF. Twenty commissions were formed, including finance, foreign affairs and national defence. Berlin LAF couriers established contact with underground organisations, groups and individuals in western and central Lithuania. Around the end of December 1940 the resistance centres established in Kaunas and Vilnius also adopted the LAF name. LAF organisations in Lithuania and Berlin expected to restore independence through an uprising at the outbreak of war between Germany and the USSR. Preparations included producing and distributing anti-Soviet literature, recruiting members and seeking weapons necessary to form armed forces that, during the uprising, would fight to expel Red Army soldiers and Soviet activists and protect vital installations.

Under K. Škirpa's plan for restoration of Lithuania, the nuclei of fighters were to be the Tautos darbo apsauga (TDA), established on 30 March 1941 as part of the LAF. TDA units were to be organised in Lithuania in schools, institutions, youth organisations, farmers' associations, the Lithuanian corps of the Red Army and elsewhere. Members could be persons consciously prepared to sacrifice themselves for restoration of the state and with anti-Soviet views; persons accused of criminal offences were not to be admitted. TDA detachments were to emerge immediately before the German-Soviet war so that Soviet security organs would not have time to expose them. During the uprising TDA members were instructed to wear a white armband on the left arm bearing the letters TDA so Germans could distinguish them from local civilians and communists. (K. Škirpa, Sukilimas Lietuvos suverenumui atstatyti, Washington, 1973, pp. 149-150, 184, 189-191, 299, 301; V. Brandišauskas, Siekiai atkurti Lietuvos valstybingumą (1940 06-1941 09), Vilnius, 1996, p. 40; P. Narutis, Tautos sukilimas 1941, Oak Lawn, USA, 1994, part 1, p. 149; Juozas Jankauskas, 1941 m. Birželio sukilimas Lietuvoje, Vilnius, 2010, pp. 22-26; A. Bubnys, S. Jegelevičius, S. Knezys, A. Rukšėnas, Lietuvių tautos sukilimas 1941 m. birželio 22-28 d., Vilnius, 2011, pp. 92, 107-108, 161-162).

Some people assess K. Škirpa critically because the Berlin LAF organisation under his leadership displayed manifestations of antisemitism. The organisation included a propaganda commission whose principal task was to prepare leaflets and distribute them in Lithuania. It was headed by Bronys Raila, a former member of the "Third Front" movement and a representative of the radical wing of the Nationalist Union. He wrote the brochure "What the Activists Fight For," which stated that "the new independent Lithuanian state can only be and will have to be national," and that the LAF, in rebuilding a new Lithuania, "is determined completely to separate the Jews from the Lithuanian state and national body and gradually to carry out the removal of Jews from Lithuanian soil altogether."

On 19 March 1941 the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Berlin issued a communication addressed to compatriots in occupied Lithuania. Point 6 stated: "Already now 'inform' the Jews that their fate is clear, therefore whoever can should already today get out of Lithuania, so that there are no unnecessary victims. At the decisive moment take their property into your own hands so that nothing is lost in vain." The "Instructions for the Liberation of Lithuania" of 24 March 1941 stated that, when driving out the Red Army, it was very important to get rid of the Jews, that such a stifling atmosphere should be created in the country that not a single Jew would dare even think that in the new Lithuania he could have even minimal rights or any means of subsistence, and that Jews should be forced to flee together with the Russians. "The more of them leave Lithuania on this occasion, the easier it will be later to finish getting rid of the Jews. The protection once granted to Jews in Lithuania by Vytautas the Great is revoked forever because of their constantly repeated betrayal of the Lithuanian nation to its oppressors."

The spring 1941 leaflet "Let Us Liberate Lithuania Forever from the Jewish Yoke" stated: "We are all convinced that the greatest helper of this enemy was the Jew. The Jew belongs to no national community. He has no homeland or state. Everywhere and always he is only a Jew. The Russian Jew was and remained the most active engine of communism. Along with the occupation army, hordes of Jews swarmed into Lithuania as commissars, Chekists, political officers, etc. Likewise the Lithuanian Jew was and until the last moment remained the most stubborn servant of Russian Bolshevism, the most slavish executor of the will of foreign occupiers, the most disgusting strangler and parasite the Lithuanian nation has ever felt upon its neck." Historical literature, relying on historical sources, states that proclamations of the LAF organisation's centre reached Lithuania and its inhabitants. Lithuanian historians reject the assertions of Jewish researchers that the LAF urged Lithuanians to kill Jews on the eve of the war.

The antisemitic statements found in the texts of the Berlin LAF organisation's documents suggest that the "Jewish problem" was proposed to be solved not by genocide but by expulsion from Lithuania. In the opinion of historian L. Truska, LAF leaflets were one of the reasons why in the summer of 1941 some Lithuanians participated in carrying out Nazi criminal orders. It should be noted that on the eve of the war members of the Berlin LAF had no information that the Nazis planned to exterminate all Jews (L. Truska, V. Vareikis, Holokausto prielaidos: antisemitizmas Lietuvoje, Vilnius, 2004, pp. 86-92, 255, 264-265, 267; Lietuva 1940-1990. Okupuotos Lietuvos istorija, Vilnius, 2007, p. 157; LYA, f. K-1, ap. 58, b. P-2255, l. 129).

Although antisemitic content is observed in the documents of the Berlin LAF organisation, there is also controversial information of another kind. The 25 June 1941 issue of the Lithuanian-American newspaper Draugas contains an article, “Škirpa Appointed Leader.” It states in substance that Kaunas Radio reported Lithuanian insurgents fighting Russians in the streets of Kaunas; that Lithuania had been proclaimed free and independent and a new government formed with Colonel Kazys Škirpa at its head, then in Berlin; and that “the latest reports from Berlin say that Col. Škirpa has prohibited persecution of Jews in Lithuania.” Thus the following question remains uninvestigated: Why did K. Škirpa prohibit persecution of Jews in Lithuania when manifestations of antisemitism are observed in the activities of the Berlin LAF organisation under his leadership?

Some individuals have expressed the opinion that K. Škirpa was a Nazi collaborator. Historian Vytautas Tininis states that a collaborator is an assistant to the occupier, a traitor to the homeland, an official, civil servant or employee of the central or local government (administration) of an occupied state who carries out the instructions (policy) of the occupation authorities and compels fellow citizens by force to submit to the occupiers’ will. Collaborators are people who, most often because of political and ideological convictions, betrayed the homeland and its independence and voluntarily began to cooperate with the occupiers. K. Škirpa’s activities do not fit this definition. He did not betray the independent Lithuanian State but sought ways to restore independence and eliminate the consequences of the Soviet Union’s occupation and annexation in the summer of 1940. Moreover, he was not an official of local government institutions in Nazi-occupied Lithuania. Thus, he was not a collaborator.

Persons previously critical of K. Škirpa have expressed the opinion that he established the Kaunas Tautinio darbo apsauga battalion and was responsible for its participation in shooting Jews at the Seventh Fort on 6, 9 and 19 July 1941. Such an assessment is considered doubtful for the following reasons. After war began between Nazi Germany and the Bolshevik Soviet Union on 22 June 1941, participants in the Lithuanian resistance movement moved from underground activity to open resistance against the Soviet regime - the June 1941 Uprising. At 9:28 a.m. on 23 June in Kaunas, L. Prapuolenis announced on behalf of the LAF Supreme Headquarters that the newly reborn Provisional Government of Lithuania declared restoration of the free and independent Lithuanian state. A list of members of the Provisional Government was announced and Kazys Škirpa was designated Prime Minister. But K. Škirpa could not perform those duties because Berlin police placed him under house arrest and required daily registration. Although the arrest was lifted after three weeks, he was not permitted to travel to Lithuania, and the prime minister’s duties were temporarily transferred to Juozas Ambrazevičius.

On 24 June in Berlin K. Škirpa sent State Secretary E. von Weizsäcker of the Foreign Ministry a letter informing him of the uprising in Lithuania, the proclamation of restored independent statehood and the formation of a national government that had in fact taken control of the country. On 23 July 1941 K. Škirpa distributed to representatives in Berlin of eight states allied with Germany a memorandum concerning restoration of Lithuanian independence (Arūnas Bubnys, Vokiečių okupuota Lietuva (1941-1944), Vilnius, 1998, pp. 34-35; V. Brandišauskas, Siekiai atkurti Lietuvos valstybingumą (1940 06-1941 09), Vilnius, 1996, pp. 92-93; K. Škirpa, Sukilimas Lietuvos suverenumui atstatyti, Washington, 1973, pp. 459-463).

The Provisional Government included a Minister of National Defence, a post assigned to General Stasys Raštikis, who had arrived from Berlin. One task of the Provisional Government was to restore the organisational structure of the Lithuanian army as it had existed before summer 1940. Commandant offices were first re-established. Another step was restoration of armed forces. However, the German occupation authorities allowed only self-defence units (police battalions) to be formed. This permission was used in the hope that the battalions could later become part of the armed forces of sovereign Lithuania. The Provisional Government also decided to organise an Apsaugos battalion on military lines. By Order No. 9 of 28 June 1941 the Kaunas Military Commandant, Colonel Jurgis Bobelis, declared that insurgent units were being reorganised into a regular formation and that their weapons permits were invalid. Shortly afterward the commandant announced that a Tautinio darbo apsauga (TDA) battalion was being formed at the Kaunas Military Commandant’s Office and invited Lithuanians wishing to serve to register there.

The name of K. Škirpa’s organisation established on 30 March 1941 - Tautos darbo apsauga - was used in naming the battalion. But Škirpa himself, because he was prohibited from coming to Lithuania, was not the founder or commander of this battalion. The commander of the Kaunas TDA battalion was former independent-Lithuanian officer Colonel Andrius Butkūnas (after the Voldemaras supporters’ coup on 24 July 1941, Major Kazys Šimkus took over). In August 1941 the Kaunas TDA battalion was reorganised into three separate 1st, 2nd and 3rd Auxiliary Police Service Battalions. Until the end of July the Kaunas TDA battalion was subordinated to the German military administration, the German Security Police and SD in Lithuania under SS-Standartenführer Karl Jäger, and the Kaunas city and county commandant’s office.

By K. Jäger’s order and direction, extermination operations carried out at the Kaunas Seventh Fort on 4, 6, 9 and 19 July 1941 killed 3,027 persons (including 3,020 Jews). There is no information that Colonel Kazys Škirpa, then living in Berlin, had anything to do with these killings. The Kaunas TDA battalion cannot be associated with the mass-extermination operations organised by K. Jäger from August to November 1941 at the Fourth and Ninth Forts in Kaunas and in provincial localities because, at the beginning of August 1941, its reorganisation into the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Auxiliary Police Battalions had begun (sources cited in the original report).

We consider that the wording of the planned plaque reflects correct information about the life of K. Škirpa. On the other hand, it gives the impression that it was formulated with too little regard to the history of the building. The Constituent Seimas did not meet in this building, and K. Škirpa did not organise the uprising from this building. The building is connected only with events in K. Škirpa’s biography in 1918-1919, when in the difficult conditions of the Lithuanian War of Independence he contributed to the work of creating the army. A plaque commemorating the Vilnius Military Commandant’s Office that operated here, in which K. Škirpa and others worked and which contributed to the creation of the army, would be more appropriate at this site.

**Director General Dr Arūnas Bubnys**

**Dr Alfredas Rukšėnas**

alfredas.ruksenas@genocid.lt

## ANNEX Q - Ministry of Justice Reply of 11 September 2026 - English Translation

From: Danielė Giedraitytė <daniele.giedraityte@tm.lt>

To: Grant Arthur Gochin <ggochin@gmail.com>

Cc: Ministry of Justice <rastine@tm.lt>

Subject: Reply concerning proposals received on 7-8 September during the UPR public consultation

Gmail message ID: 1a08f1c134636335

Date: 11 September 2026

Dear Mr Grant Arthur Gochin,

Thank you for your letters sent on 7 and 8 September 2026. We inform you that, having carefully assessed them, we provide you with the following response.

The Lithuanian report being prepared is intended to inform the United Nations Human Rights Council about Lithuania's progress following the recommendations received during the previous cycle. This means that the information in Lithuania's report covers 2022-2026. It is also important to note that, due to the continuing financial crisis affecting the United Nations and relevant cost-saving measures adopted by the United Nations Office at Geneva, the word limit for the main body of national reports has been set at 9,530 words, including paragraph numbers. Accordingly, in preparing Lithuania's report, the aim is to present essential concise information directly responding to received and accepted recommendations concerning Lithuania's progress during that period.

In assessing the submitted proposals, we took the circumstances stated above into account and decided, on the basis of your proposals, to prepare broader information in advance of consideration of Lithuania's report on 20 January 2027 in Geneva, Switzerland.

Responding to your comment concerning correction of factual historical inaccuracies, we inform you that within the competence of the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport the quality assurance of the content of general-education textbooks and teaching/learning materials is regulated. Under Article 40(3) of the Education Law and Order No. V-184 of the Minister of Education, Science and Sport of 15 February 2024, a procedure has been approved governing assessment of compliance with legal acts and provision of printed and virtual textbooks and teaching/learning materials of varying levels of interactivity. The procedure establishes general and special requirements, assessment, quality assurance and responsibilities. The current regulation also provides for responses to factual or subject-matter errors in textbooks or non-compliance with the procedure. The National Agency for Education has been assigned functions, within its competence, related to ensuring content quality and responding to information concerning deficiencies.

In assessing your additional comments concerning equal application of Article 170²(1) of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania, within the scope of preparation of Lithuania's report we consider it inappropriate to include criteria for application of Article 170². It should be noted that the particularities, criteria, practical challenges and assessments relating to application of Article 170² fall within the competence of the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Lithuania.

In assessing the proposals concerning EU standards on genocide denial, historical revisionism and glorification, we inform you that within the scope of Lithuania's report we do not consider it appropriate to specify particular criteria and assessment mechanisms applied to state awards, memorialisation and state-published historical information, because this would not directly respond to the recommendations received by Lithuania. Questions concerning the granting and review of state awards are regulated by the Law on State Awards of the Republic of Lithuania, while procedures for assessing public memorial signs and objects are established by the Law on the Prohibition of the Promotion of Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes and Their Ideologies.

Thank you for your insights and the time you devoted.

Respectfully,

Danielė Giedraitytė
International Cooperation and Human Rights Policy Group
Adviser

Note: This is a textual copy of the email prepared for the procedural file. The original electronic email and its technical header data are preserved in the applicant's Gmail account under the message ID stated above.

## ANNEX V - Email of IHRA Secretary General Michaela Küchler, 20 August 2026

From: IHRA Info <info@holocaustremembrance.com> / Michaela Küchler

To: Grant Arthur Gochin <ggochin@gmail.com>

Subject: AW: Formal Petition to IHRA - Republic of Lithuania - Request for acknowledgment and procedural clarification

Gmail message ID: 1a01e4963fdc3bc1

Date: 20 August 2026

Dear Mr Gochin,

Thank you for your interest in the IHRA. We can confirm receipt of your request.

There is no process for external submission of petitions. The independence of our working groups and committees is very important to the way we work. The individual chairs are responsible for setting their agendas, in line with our organizational priorities.

As the IHRA is a membership-based organization, and our meetings are closed to the public, it is not possible for us to share in-depth procedural details externally.

We appreciate your interest in our work.

Kind regards

Michaela Küchler

Note: This is a textual copy of the email prepared for the procedural file. The original electronic email and its technical header data are preserved in the applicant’s Gmail account under the message ID stated above.

## ANNEX W - Targeted English-Language Excerpts (English Edition)

Prepared 11 September 2026

*STATUS. In the Lithuanian filing, Annex W supplied unofficial Lithuanian translations of targeted English-language passages to assist participants in the proceedings. In this English edition, the original English passages are reproduced, together with the explanatory limitations stated in the Lithuanian filing. If meaning is disputed, the original language and original document control.*

### I. IHRA 2019 statement (S8 / Annex I)

Source: IHRA, Statement on Center for the Study of the Genocide and Resistance of Lithuania (2019). Original excerpt: “express our grave concern” … “attempts to rehabilitate the reputation of Noreika”. Explanation: In the statement these phrases are used only to show the context of an earlier international institutional warning and LGGRTC’s treatment of Noreika; they are not a conclusion concerning Škirpa or 9R-598.

### II. Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs reply to Brad Sherman, 12 May 2026 (S18 / Annex K)

Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, Vice-Minister Vidmantas Verbickas, Ref. (19.2.3)3-2806, 12 May 2026. Original excerpt: “complete exoneration” … “legally imprecise”. Explanation: The statement also relies on the Ministry’s explanation that administrative closure of a U.S. investigation is not a formal judicial acquittal under U.S. law. In the Lithuanian Annex W this was provided as a source-based Lithuanian summary rather than an additional verbatim quotation.

### III. International Commission approved conclusions, 2005 (S29 / Annex T)

Source: International Commission for the Evaluation of the Crimes of the Nazi and Soviet Occupation Regimes in Lithuania, approved conclusions, 2005. Original excerpt: “Indigenous cooperation considerably facilitated the persecution, ghettoization and mass murder of the Jews.”

### IV. Michaela Küchler email, 20 August 2026 (S36 / Annex V)

Source: Michaela Küchler, IHRA Secretary General, email to Grant Arthur Gochin, 20 August 2026. Original excerpt: “There is no process for external submission of petitions.” Explanation: This limits the procedural meaning: the earlier documents are treated as transmitted and received material, not as an external petition process initiated by IHRA.