



**GLOBAL
DETENTION
PROJECT**



Human Rights
Monitoring Institute

LITHUANIA: FOLLOW-UP REPORT TO THE UN COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (CESCR)

ISSUES RELATED TO IMMIGRATION DETENTION AND WIDER MIGRANT AND ASYLUM SEEKER RIGHTS

SUBMITTED: JANUARY 2026

ABOUT THE GLOBAL DETENTION PROJECT (GDP)

The Global Detention Project (GDP) is committed to ending arbitrary and harmful migration-related detention practices around the world, and to ensuring respect for the fundamental human rights of all migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers. To achieve this, we seek to:

- Increase public knowledge and awareness of immigration detention policies.
- Expand coverage of immigration detention by human rights monitoring bodies and other international agencies.
- Expand partnerships with local and international civil society organisations working to end arbitrary and harmful immigration detention practices.
- Strategically target research and advocacy so that it effectively challenges arbitrary and harmful detention laws and policies.

ABOUT THE HUMAN RIGHTS MONITORING INSTITUTE (HRMI)

HRMI is a Lithuania-based non-governmental, not-for-profit human rights organization. Since its establishment in 2003, HRMI has been advocating for full compliance of national laws and policies with international human rights obligations and working to ensure that rights are effective in practice. HRMI conducts research, monitoring, evidence-based advocacy and awareness raising in various human rights areas, including the rights of migrants and asylum seekers.

LITHUANIA: FOLLOW-UP REPORT TO THE UN COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (CESCR)

ISSUES RELATED TO IMMIGRATION DETENTION AND WIDER MIGRANT AND ASYLUM SEEKER RIGHTS

The Global Detention Project (GDP) and Human Rights Monitoring Institute (HRMI) welcome the opportunity to submit this alternative follow-up report with regards to the recommendations and concerns contained in Paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Committee's 2023 Concluding Observations E/C.12/LTU/CO/3 on the third periodic report of Lithuania. In particular, this submission focuses on concerns regarding the State Party's treatment of migrants and asylum seekers, including its immigration detention practices.

1. FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION RELATING TO PARAGRAPHS 14(A) AND 15(A)

In the Committee's March 2023 Concluding Observations, the CESCR noted its concerns regarding the expulsion of asylum seekers and migrants without review, including pushbacks where asylum seekers and migrants (amongst them children and other vulnerable persons) had been abandoned near the border in dire conditions and without access to assistance) (Paragraph 14(a)). It issued the following recommendation:

“(a) Ensure that, by taking legislative and other measures, including the amendment to the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens, that all asylum-seekers, including those arriving in an irregular manner and in times of emergency, have access to information on asylum procedures and to legal aid, and have the right to apply for asylum and be assessed on an individual base, without discrimination.”

Since then, however, pushbacks have continued to be documented, and access to asylum has remained restricted. As the Lithuanian Red Cross noted in February 2025, “Lithuania continues to implement a pushback policy, and no improvements can be identified in this regard. Access to the asylum procedures was restricted even more.”¹

The State Border Guard Service (SBGS) provides daily statistics on the number of foreigners denied entry from Belarus who attempted to enter Lithuania irregularly. According to these statistics, in 2025 border guards prevented the arrival of 1,652 foreigners in unauthorised locations, compared to 1,002 in 2024.² There is no data available regarding the ages and nationalities behind these figures, nor how many of these were unique individuals and how many were instances of repeat attempts by the same individuals.

In 2024, there were several documented cases where the principle of non-refoulement was violated, with foreigners pushed back after irregular crossing. At least two of them—one Russian national and one Belarusian national—were subsequently detained by Belarusian

¹ Lithuanian Red Cross, “Input by Civil Society Organisations to the Asylum Report 2025,” *European Union Agency for Asylum*, February 2025, https://www.euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-02/35_lithuanian_red_cross_society.pdf

² State Border Guard Service Under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania, “Neleistų neteisėtų migrantų statistika,” accessed 7 January 2026, <https://vsat.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos/neileistu-neteisetu-migrantu-statistika/>

border guards, and the Russian (an asylum seeker who was a soldier who had fled service) was transferred to Russia, where he was subsequently prosecuted.³ The EU Commissioner for Human Rights stated in 2025, “I observe that UNHCR has stated that asylum seekers returned to Belarus ‘could not and ought not to be generally presumed to have access to effective protection against the risk of *refoulement* and treatment prohibited under Article 3.’”⁴ Previously, in 2023, UNHCR commented on Lithuania’s proposed asylum law amendments by affirming that “non-refoulement cannot be derogated from even in times of emergency or in situations where a third country instrumentalizes irregular migratory flows.”⁵

Restrictions on access to asylum and pushback practices continue to encourage migrants and asylum seekers to take dangerous routes through forests and natural obstacles in an attempt to reach the country, exposing them to serious risk to life. In April 2025, the decomposed remains of three individuals were found in the Katra River at the Lithuania-Belarus border, in a remote and difficult to access part of the “Green Border” (stretches of Lithuania’s land border that are outside official border crossing points) with at least one body found on the Lithuanian side.⁶

Critically, the country’s pushback policy, in place since 2021, was legally authorised on 25 April 2023, when the Seimas passed amendments to the **Law on the State Border and its Protection**.⁷ Amongst various changes, these amendments permitted border officials to push back migrants at the border during times of State-level emergency, without giving them the possibility to claim asylum. (A State-level emergency was declared in 2021 due to the mass influx of foreigners from Belarus, and this essentially remains in effect as of January 2026.)⁸ Article 4(13) states that:

“In the event of a national emergency declared due to a mass influx of foreigners and with a view to ensuring public policy and national security of the Republic of Lithuania, the Government, on the proposal of the National Security Commission, may adopt a decision whereby foreigners who intend to cross, or who have crossed, the State border in places other than those designated for that purpose, or in places designated for that purpose but in violation of the procedure for the crossing of the State border, and who are in the frontier zone, shall be refused admission into the territory of the Republic of Lithuania.”

The same article further provides a fiction of non-entry, stating that:

³ Lithuanian Red Cross, “Input by Civil Society Organisations to the Asylum Report 2025,” *European Union Agency for Asylum*, February 2025, https://www.euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-02/35_lithuanian_red_cross_society.pdf

⁴ Commissioner for Human Rights, “Oral Intervention Before the Grand Chamber in the Case of C.O.C.G. and Others v. Lithuania,” 12 February 2025, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/commissioner/-/oral-intervention-before-the-grand-chamber-in-the-case-of-c.o.c.g.-and-others-v.-lithuania>

⁵ UNHCR, “UNHCR observations on the Draft Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Lithuania on Legal Status of Aliens (No XIVP-2385)1 and the Draft Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Lithuania on the State Border and its Protection (No XIVP-2383),” March 2023, <https://www.refworld.org/legal/natlegcomments/unhcr/2023/en/124239>

⁶ LRT, “*Baltarusijos pasienyje rasti apirę trijų žmonių kūnai, dėl dviejų aiškinasi baltarusiai*,” 30 April 2025, <https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/2550823/baltarusijos-pasienyje-rasti-apire-triju-zmoniu-kunai-del-dvieju-aiškinasi-baltarusiai?srstid=AfmBOOrGNRGsJWgL9yDI8lqE-N5OJ4ByxF2kNezh2OoR8c1hhZl2wZga>

⁷ Republic of Lithuania, “Law on the State Border and Guarding of the State Border,” <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/rs/legalact/TAD/895327028f0211f0b351ee31aa0a26b8/>

⁸ Although the formal state of emergency declared in 2021 was lifted in May 2023, Lithuania continues to operate under an emergency situation regime, and legislative measures adopted in the context of the emergency—including provisions enabling pushbacks—remain in force.

“The stay in the frontier zone of foreigners who have crossed the State border in places other than those designated for that purpose, or in places designated for that purpose but in violation of the procedure for the crossing of the State border, shall not be considered as their stay in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania.”

While this article foresees that decisions on refusal of entry are to be made individually, and that it is not to apply to persons who are fleeing armed conflicts (a list of which is to be established by the government), persecution within the meaning of the Refugee Convention, or for humanitarian reasons, observers have raised concerns regarding the adequacy and transparency of these safeguards.⁹ In 2024, the Lithuanian Red Cross documented several cases in which third-country nationals seeking international protection, amongst them children, were pushed back irregularly across the border.¹⁰

In 2025, Lithuania’s Supreme Administrative Court (LVAT) issued several important rulings, marking important steps towards justice. On 12 March, it confirmed the admissibility of a class action initiated by Amnesty International on behalf of 24 asylum seekers who were arbitrarily detained in Lithuania in 2021-2022, allowing others in similar situations to join.¹¹

On 30 December 2025, the LVAT also issued a landmark ruling in which it found that SBGS officers had acted unlawfully and violated the right of a Sri Lankan national to apply for asylum when they pushed him back into Belarus. The man was forcibly removed from Lithuania on 23 October 2023 without being given the opportunity to lodge a protection request. This was the first time that an administrative court of the highest instance explicitly ruled on pushbacks at the “Green Border.”¹²

International rights bodies have also continued to examine and condemn the country’s pushback operations. On 12 February 2025, the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights held a hearing on the case of *C.O.C.G. and Others v. Lithuania* (application no. 17764/22), which concerns four Cuban nationals and their repeated attempts in March and April 2022 to enter Lithuania by crossing the border with Belarus, only to be pushed back (allegedly at gunpoint) by Lithuanian border guards on multiple occasions. They eventually entered Lithuania on 13 April 2022 and were apprehended and detained, without individual assessments.¹³ The Commissioner for Human Rights also intervened in the hearing, urging the Court to “provide clear guidance on ensuring that non-refoulement obligations are honoured without exception.”¹⁴ As of January 2026, the case remains pending before the Grand Chamber.

⁹ Human Rights Monitoring Institute, “Lithuania’s Legalisation of Pushbacks is Incompatible with Democratic Principles,” 5 May 2023, <https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/lithuania-pushbacks-legalisation-violates-democratic-principles/44783>

¹⁰ Lithuanian Red Cross, “Monitoring Report 2024,” April 2025, <https://redcross.lt/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/MSA24-EN.pdf>

¹¹ Amnesty International, “Lithuania: Court’s Decision on Class Action Admissibility Marks a Step Towards Justice for Asylum Seekers Who Were Unlawfully Detained,” 2 April 2025, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur53/9212/2025/en/>

¹² Human Rights Monitoring Institute, “Supreme Administrative Court Ruling: Pushbacks at the so-Called “Green Border” Violate the Right to Asylum – An Important Precedent in Lithuania,” 6 January 2026, <https://hrmi.lt/en/supreme-administrative-court-ruling-pushbacks-at-the-the-so-called-green-border-violate-the-right-to-asylum-an-important-precedent-in-lithuania/>

¹³ European Court of Human Rights, “Grand Chamber Hearing Concerning Alleged “Pushbacks” at the Lithuanian-Belarusian Border,” 12 February 2025, [https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre-press%22itemid%22:\[%22003-8156398-11432818%22\]}](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre-press%22itemid%22:[%22003-8156398-11432818%22]})

¹⁴ Commissioner for Human Rights, “Oral Intervention Before the Grand Chamber in the Case of C.O.C.G. and Others v. Lithuania,” 12 February 2025, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/commissioner/-/oral-intervention-before-the-grand-chamber-in-the-case-of-c.o.c.g.-and-others-v.-lithuania>

In addition to this:

- In a December 2025 interview with the Baltic News Service (BNS), UNHCR's Representative for the Nordic and Baltic countries urged the country to review its legislation regarding pushbacks.¹⁵
- In July 2025 following a visit to Lithuania, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances noted the practice of pushbacks and urged the country to "review the legislation allowing pushbacks and stop the practice of pushbacks, as they effectively remove persons subjected to them from the protection of the law and expose them to heightened risk of disappearance."¹⁶
- In 2024, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child urged the country to "cease the practice of pushback operations at the border and ensure that children have access to information on asylum procedures and to legal aid, and have the right to apply for asylum and be assessed on an individual base, without discrimination."¹⁷

Recommendations

We encourage the Committee to issue these follow up recommendations:

- Given the continued documentation of pushbacks since 2023, urge Lithuania to immediately suspend pushback practices. The State Party should also be encouraged to explain how it conducts individualised assessments in practice.
- Amend the Law on the State Border and its Protection, particularly Article 4(13), to ensure that provisions authorising refusal of entry and pushbacks are removed, and to ensure that any border control measures are compatible with the principle of non-refoulement and the right to seek asylum, regardless of mode of entry.
- In response to the 30 December 2025 ruling of the Supreme Administrative Court, recommend that Lithuania take legislative and administrative measures to ensure that the Court's ruling is implemented systematically, and is not limited to individual cases. Effective remedies and compensation should also be afforded for individuals who have been unlawfully pushed back.
- Ensure independent monitoring of border practices by national human rights institutions, civil society, and international organisations.

2. FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION RELATING TO PARAGRAPHS 15(B)(C) AND (D) OF THE CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In 2023, the Committee issued the following recommendations:

"15(b) Recall that detention is only applied as a measure of last resort for asylum - seekers and undocumented migrants, following an individual assessment of its

¹⁵ LRT, "UNHCR Urges Lithuania to End Migrant Pushback Policy, Honour EU Refugee Commitments," 8 December 2025, <https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/2769152/unhcr-urges-lithuania-to-end-migrant-pushback-policy-honour-eu-refugee-commitments>

¹⁶ UN Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, "Visit to Lithuania: Report of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances," A/HRC/60/35/Add.1, 9 July 2025, <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/60/35/ADD.1>

¹⁷ UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, "Concluding Observations on the Combined Fifth and Sixth Periodic Reports of Lithuania," CRC/C/LTU/CO/5-6, 7 March 2024, <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/LTU/CO/5-6>

reasonableness, necessity and proportionality, and an examination of the alternatives;

(c) Take measures to ensure that undocumented migrants and asylum-seekers in accommodation sites have access to adequate food, clothes, other essential non-food items, health care, including psychosocial services, and information on asylum procedures and legal aid in a language that they understand;

(d) Take into account recommendations made in 2021 by the Committee against Torture in this regard.”¹⁸

At the time of the Committee’s examination of Lithuania, provisions in the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens provided that all persons who irregularly entered the country during times of State-level emergency were to be automatically detained for up to six months—with authorities referring to this as “temporary accommodation.”¹⁹

In June 2023, the Constitutional Court of Lithuania (Case No. KT53-A-N6/2023) ruled that this was unconstitutional, as it contradicted Article 20 of the Constitution which protects against arbitrary detention and arrest, and against unlawful restrictions on freedom of movement. In particular, the Court held that:

*“[T]he human right to liberty may be restricted if necessary; according to the Constitution, *inter alia* Article 20 thereof, personal liberty, in accordance with the conditions for restricting personal rights and freedoms arising from the Constitution, may be restricted *inter alia* in order to protect the constitutional order of the state, as well as for the purposes of ensuring public order, defence and security of the state; however, personal liberty guaranteed by Article 20 of the Constitution, in order to achieve the aforementioned purposes, may not be restricted or restricted on general grounds (such as on the sole basis that a state of emergency has been declared due to a threat to the constitutional order of the state or public order), without assessing the real threat posed by the person to the values protected by the Constitution, which would require restricting the person's liberty.”*

This ruling echoed the CJEU’s 2022 judgement in the case of *M.A v State Border Protection Service at the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania*, which stated that:

“[T]he threat to national security or public order can justify the detention of an applicant only on condition that his individual conduct represents a genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of society or the internal or external security of the Member State concerned.”²⁰

¹⁸ The CAT’s recommendations are included in Section 12 of the Committee’s Concluding Observations, and include taking measures to avoid unlawful or arbitrary detention; refraining from detaining families with children and vulnerable asylum seekers; and adopting measures to ensure appropriate conditions in accommodation sites. See: UN Committee against Torture, “Concluding Observations on the Fourth Periodic Report of Lithuania,” CAT/C/LTU/CO/4, 21 December 2021,

<https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=VAzMsf0HaokuUx1nqedEYySA8rqE%2FsWF7hYddZl5p6%2FAFCSkleackBpw2EyhCCcPKx8Ms6RCaas%2FrOaMzLpICQ%3D%3D>

¹⁹ Amnesty International, “Lithuania: Pushbacks, Illegal Detention, Deception and Abuses Against Refugees and Migrants,” 27 June 2022, <https://www.amnesty.eu/news/lithuania-pushbacks-illegal-detention-deception-and-abuses-against-refugees-and-migrants/>

²⁰ European Union Agency for Asylum, “M.A. v State Border Protection Service at the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania,” 30 June 2022, <https://caselaw.euaa.europa.eu/pages/viewcaselaw.aspx?CaseLawID=2597>

In the wake of this ruling, Lithuania's parliament adopted various amendments to the [Law on Aliens](#). Amongst these amendments have been changes to Article 140-8, which now provides for assessments of an asylum seeker's age, health condition, family situation, and other individual circumstances prior to their placement "in a temporary accommodation place....without granting him the right to move freely within the territory of the Republic of Lithuania." The maximum period for this restriction was also shortened, from six to five months.²¹ [Authorities continue to use the term "temporary accommodation," even though observers including the Seimas Ombudsman²² and Amnesty International²³ have previously challenged it, arguing that in reality it amounts to de facto detention.]

A new alternative to detention measure has also been introduced ("accommodate an alien in a temporary accommodation place, establishing an obligation not to leave the territory belonging to the temporary accommodation place without the permission of the manager of the temporary accommodation place or a person authorised by him") (Article 115(5)).

While Article 114 of the law requires a court order for detaining foreigners in the Aliens Registration Centre after an initial 48-hour period (Article 114), according to the International Human Rights Monitoring Institute, there is very little publicly available information about the extent of application of the 48-hour court-order requirement, which has raised concerns about the practical effectiveness and impact of this safeguard.

Additional concerns regarding the law remain, such as the fact that it does not protect children against detention. Article 114(3) states that "An alien who has not reached the age of 18 may be detained only as a last resort, taking into account his or her best interests." The detention of under-18s has been documented, both at border units and at the Pabradė Foreigners Reception Centre (FRC). In 2024, the Lithuanian Red Cross (LRC) documented the detention of a girl alongside her family.²⁴ In 2024, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child called on Lithuania to end the detention of asylum-seeking and migrant children.²⁵

The GDP and HRMI encourage the Committee to remind the State Party that detention is never in a child's best interests, and thus represents a child rights violation in every instance, with no exception, as affirmed by the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee on Migrant Workers' 2017 Joint General Comment (No.23/No.4)—"Any kind of child immigration detention should be forbidden by law and such prohibition should be fully implemented in practice."²⁶

²¹ Government of the Republic of Lithuania, "Vyriausybė pritarė patikslintoms įstatymo nuostatomams dėl migrantų sulaikymo ir apgyvendinimo," 30 August 2023, Vyriausybė pritarė patikslintoms įstatymo nuostatomams dėl migrantų sulaikymo ir apgyvendinimo

²² Parliamentary Ombudspersons of Lithuania, "For the first time in history, the Seimas Ombudspersons' Office presented a position to the European Court of Human Rights regarding the detention of migrants in Lithuania," 30 October 2023, <https://www.lrski.lt/en/naujienos/for-the-first-time-in-history-the-seimas-ombudspersons-office-presented-a-position-to-the-european-court-of-human-rights-regarding-the-detention-of-migrants-in-lithuania>

²³ Amnesty International, "Lithuania: Court of Justice of the EU rejects national law restricting the right to asylum and imposing automatic detention on asylum-seekers and migrants," 4 July 2022, <https://www.amnesty.eu/news/lithuania-court-of-justice-of-the-eu-rejects-national-law-restricting-the-right-to-asylum-and-imposing-automatic-detention-on-asylum-seekers-and-migrants/>

²⁴ Lithuanian Red Cross, "Monitoring Report 2024," April 2025, <https://redcross.lt/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/MSA24-EN.pdf>

²⁵ UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, "Concluding Observations on the Combined Fifth and Sixth Periodic Reports of Lithuania," CRC/C/LTU/CO/5-6, 7 March 2024, <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/LTU/CO/5-6>

²⁶ Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and Committee on the Rights of the Child, "Joint General Comment No. 4 (2017) of the committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and No.23 (2017) of the Committee on the Rights of the Child on State Obligations Regarding the Human Rights of Children in the Context of International

In 2025, Lithuania's Supreme Administrative Court issued an important ruling pertaining to removal and the best interests of the child—in a case involving the rejection of an asylum seeker's application and issuing of a removal order and re-entry ban, despite his sharing a son with a Lithuanian national and co-habiting as a family unit. Specifically, it held that the birth of a child and the creation of a family constitute grounds for re-assessing a foreign national's removal order and re-entry ban. The Court found that the Migration Department had acted unlawfully by failing to properly assess the best interests of the child. It emphasised that merely noting the existence of family ties is insufficient without a substantive and proportional evaluation of their impact.²⁷

As of January 2026, Lithuania operates one dedicated immigration detention centre—Pabradė Foreigners Reception Centre (FRC) (which partially functions as a non-secure accommodation facility)—as well as two rooms at Vilnius Airport (the Vilnius Airport Border Guard Station) and rooms in numerous border units. According to the Lithuanian Red Cross (LRC), irregular arrivals are typically initially detained in border units where they are accommodated in “container-type houses.” In 2024, the LRC found that most foreigners spent three to five days in these units (exceeding the 48-hour limit foreseen by the Law on Aliens), and some reported that conditions were poor, with no opportunity to wash and detainees prevented from using phones or contacting relatives. All were subsequently transferred to Pabradė FRC.

While conditions at Pabradė have been reported to be better than at border units (access to full sanitary facilities, provision of hygiene products, hot food available in the canteen), and appear to have significantly improved in recent years, the LRC has nevertheless flagged various concerns regarding the facility. These include lack of regular access to interpreters, with medical staff relying on Google Translate; lack of culturally appropriate food; and a ban on detainees taking food to their rooms. Of note, the LRC has expressed concerns regarding the practice of placing new arrivals in quarantine buildings, including children, which the organisation was not allowed to visit and where no legal safeguards are in place to prevent arbitrary or indefinite detention. In particular, the LRC states:

“It was noted that the practice of prolonged quarantine was applied to all foreigners arriving in Lithuania via Latvia who ended up in the FRC (while arrangements for their readmission were pending), which in essence allowed the restriction of freedom of movement without applying to the court for a detention order.”²⁸

As of January 2026, there is no official information indicating whether the quarantine practice has been formally discontinued.

Recommendations

The GDP and HRMI urge the committee to issue the following recommendations:

- Immigration detention of children is never in the best interests of a child and thus represent in all cases a child rights violation, according to the UN Committee on the

Migration in Countries of Origin, Transit, Destination and Return,” 16 November 2017, <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/GC/23>

²⁷ Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, “*Nutartis Lietuvos Respublikos Vardu*,” 6 August 2025, <https://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaiseska/tekstas.aspx?id=50959171-57b5-491e-b4c8-729a08e7fdb3>

²⁸ Lithuanian Red Cross, “Monitoring Report 2024,” April 2025, <https://redcross.lt/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/MSA24-EN.pdf>

Rights of the Child. Lithuania should urgently amend its legislation to explicitly prohibit the detention of children

- Authorities must ensure that any detained children and their families are immediately released and provided with safe, community-based reception and care arrangements that prioritise the best interests of the child.
- Clarify whether the quarantine practice remains in force, and whether it is applied to all non-nationals (both those who are accommodated and those who are detained).
- Ensure an end to the practice of prolonged quarantine without legal safeguards or court oversight, given the risks of arbitrary and indefinite detention.
- Ensure full transparency by permitting full independent monitoring of all areas of the Pabradé FRC, including its quarantine building.
- Ensure that conditions inside all detention facilities meet human rights standards, including adequate provision of culturally-appropriate food and hygiene products, access to sanitary facilities, and access to interpreters.