

Distr.: General
18 March 2026

Original: English

Advance unedited version

Human Rights Committee

Decision adopted by the Committee under the Optional Protocol, concerning communication No. 3718/2020^{*,**}

<i>Communication submitted by:</i>	S.T. (not represented by counsel)
<i>Alleged victim:</i>	The author
<i>State Party:</i>	Lithuania
<i>Date of communication:</i>	20 January 2020 (initial submission)
<i>Document references:</i>	Decision taken pursuant to rule 92 of the Committee's rules of procedure, transmitted to the State party on 11 March 2020 (not issued in document form)
<i>Date of adoption of decision:</i>	16 March 2026
<i>Subject matter:</i>	Right to stand as candidate in election
<i>Procedural issues:</i>	Exhaustion of domestic remedies; level of substantiation of claims; victim status; abuse of the right of submission
<i>Substantive issues:</i>	Conditions of detention; right to fair trial; right to privacy; right to hold elected office; non-discrimination; right to an effective remedy
<i>Articles of the Covenant:</i>	2 (3) (a), 10 (1), 14 (1), 17, 25 (b) and 26
<i>Articles of the Optional Protocol:</i>	2, 3 and 5 (2) (b)

1. The author of the communication is S.T., a Lithuanian national born in 1983. The author claims to be the victim of violations by the State Party of articles 2 (3) (a), 10 (1), 14 (1), 17, 25 (b) and 26 of the Covenant. The Optional Protocol entered into force for the State party on 20 February 1992. The author is not represented by counsel.

* Adopted by the Committee at its 145th session (2-19 March 2026).

** The following members of the Committee participated in the examination of the communication: Tania María Abdo Rocholl, Wafaa Ashraf Moharram Bassim, Rodrigo A. Carazo, Yvonne Donders, Carlos Ramón Fernández Liesa, Laurence R. Helfer, Konstantin Korkelia, Bacre Waly Ndiaye, Hernan Quezada Cabrera, Akmal Kholmatovich Saidov, Ivan Šimonović, Changrok Soh, Koji Teraya, Hélène Tigroudja and Imeru Tamerat Yigezu. Pursuant to rule 108 (1) (a) of the Committee's rules of procedure, Dalia Leinarte did not participate in the examination of the present communication.

Facts as submitted by the author

2.1 The author is a lawyer. On 15 February 2019, he created a public election committee in order to run in the 2019 elections to the European Parliament in Lithuania. The election was set to take place on 26 May 2019. To run in the election, an election committee had to obtain at least 10,000 signatures prior to 11 April 2019. A portion of the signatures for the author's committee was collected in prisons.

2.2 On 20 March 2019, the author went to the Pravieniškės correctional facility to meet with prisoners and collect signatures. He claims that the deputy director of the correctional facility interrupted him and stated that prisoners did not have the right to collect signatures from other prisoners. The author claims that the director punched him and confiscated the signature sheets he had collected by physical force. The author also claims that the deputy director also confiscated election materials from prisoners and punished prisoners who distributed the election flyers by placing them in solitary confinement.

2.3 One of the requirements under domestic law to obtain valid signatures for the election committee was that signatories had to indicate their passport or identification number at the time of signature. The author notes, however, that prisoners in the State Party do not have the right to keep identification documents in their possession and he claims that the prison administration refused to provide the identification numbers upon request. As a result, the signatures obtained from prisoners for the election committee were invalid.

2.4 On 22 March 2019, the author filed a complaint with the Chief Electoral Commission and sent a copy of the complaint to the Pravieniškės Correctional Centre. The author sought to explain to the prison administration that the prisoners had a right to distribute election materials and to sign for the author's campaign.

2.5 On 27 March 2019, the author requested signatures from another facility, the Vilnius correctional facility. However, the prison administration refused to provide the prisoners' identification information to the author. The author claims that the Vilnius facility also confiscated 100 papers with signatures. On the same day, the author filed a complaint with the Chief Electoral Commission regarding the incident. On 30 March 2019, the author filed another complaint with the Chief Electoral Commission concerning the inability of prisoners without identity documentation due to, among other reasons, their poverty to participate in elections.

2.6 On 1 April 2019, the Pravieniškės correctional facility informed the author that they would not provide him with the prisoners' identification information. On 1 April 2019 the author also asked the Prison Hospital to provide the identification information of hospitalized prisoners, but his request was ignored. On 3 April 2019, the Siauliai Remand Prison refused the author's request for prisoners' identity document numbers. On 10 April 2019, the Kaunas Minors Remand Prison also refused the author's request.

2.7 On 11 April 2019, the author lodged 10,474 signatures with the Chief Electoral Commission in support of his campaign for office. The author notes that media sources however reported that his committee lacked the requisite number of signatures prior to him receiving any official news from the Commission to this effect. He claims that an employee of the Commission verified the signatures for his election committee in the absence of any witnesses. On 23 April 2019, the Commission found that the author had lodged only 9,985 signatures. The author claims that the commission employee destroyed signatures so that he would not be able to run as a candidate in the election. Furthermore, the author alleges that the employee committed forgery because the employee found that some of the signatures submitted by the author were in fact signatures collected for another candidate, K.J. On 23 April 2019, a police report against two individuals for allegedly stealing documents with signatures for the election campaign was filed. The author states that instead of making searches in the residences of the suspects, the police only informed that the complaint had been registered.

2.8 In response to the author's complaint of 22 March 2019, the Chief Electoral Commission responded on 25 April 2019 that it did not have the authority to require prisons to provide prisoners' identity document information. On the same date the Commission also

declined to register the author as a candidate in the elections. The author claims that the decisions were however not communicated to him until May 2019.

2.9 On 29 April 2019, the author filed a complaint with the Administrative Supreme Court in which he claimed that signatures had been destroyed and forged at the Chief Electoral Commission. In his complaint to the Court, the author also stated that the Chief Electoral Commission had failed to arrange for prisoners lacking access to their identity documents to sign for election candidates. The author also claimed that prisoners were unable to vote in secrecy due to the requirement that they needed to request their identity documentation information from prison administrations. The complaint was dismissed by the Court on 3 May 2019.

Complaint

3.1 The author claims that the obstacle of obtaining identity document information for prisoners who had signed in support of his election committee prevented him from getting a sufficient number of signatures in order to stand as a candidate in the 2019 elections, in violation of his rights under article 25 (b) of the Covenant. The author claims that in this connection he as a candidate was also discriminated against in violation of his rights under article 26 of the Covenant, as compared to other candidates who had not tried to collect signatures from prisoners. The author further argues that the concept of dignity under article 10 (1) of the Covenant includes the enjoyment of the right of prisoners to vote or to sign a list in support of an election committee. He submits that in the present case both the right of the prisoners to sign the list of candidates and his right to obtain signatures were breached in violation of article 10 (1) of the Covenant.

3.2 The author also claims that the State Party breached the rights of prisoners to sign a list in support of an election committee in secrecy, and that this in turn breached his right to obtain signatures in secrecy in violation of articles 10 (1), 25 (b), and 26 of the Covenant. He argues that requiring him to submit a request to obtain the prisoners' identity documentation information to validate their signatures violated his rights because he had to disclose the names of the prisoners wishing to sign for his campaign.

3.3 The author further claims that the State Party violated his rights under article 25 (b), read in conjunction with article 2 (3) of the Covenant by failing to conduct an investigation into the complaint he submitted regarding the confiscation of signatures collected by him on 20 March 2019 at the Pravieniškės correctional facility and by failing to conduct an investigation into the complaint filed on 23 April 2019 regarding the theft of signatures from the campaign by two individuals.

3.4 The author also claims that his rights under article 25 (b) of the Covenant were violated due to the destruction of signatures by the Chief Electoral Commission, or at least due to the absence of independent observers during the verification of signatures by the Commission. He claims that the State party failed to establish an objective procedure for counting signatures.

3.5 The author submits that the lack of response from the Administrative Supreme Court regarding his claims on the failure by the Chief Electoral Commission to arrange opportunities for prisoners whose identity documents were kept by the prison administration or who lacked identity documents to sign lists in support of election campaigns, constitute a breach of access a court proceeding and to an effective remedy under articles 14 (1) and article 2 (3) (a) of the Covenant.

State Party's observations on admissibility and the merits

4.1 On 11 November 2020, the State Party submitted its observations on the admissibility and merits of the communication. It submits that the complaint should be found inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies, for failure to substantiate the claims for purposes of admissibility, as an abuse of submission, as well as inadmissible under article 1 of the Optional Protocol for incompatibility *ratione personae* with the provisions of the Covenant.

4.2 The State Party notes that the public election committee established by the author was registered as an autonomous participant in the electoral campaign for the 2019 elections to the European Parliament. To be registered for the elections, the election committee had to

collect 10,000 signatures from voters and present the pages with signatures to the Chief Electoral Commission on 11 April 2019 at the latest.

4.3 On 14 March 2019 the author sent an email to the administration of the Pravieniškės correctional facility with a request to allow the election committee to meet with the prisoners in the facility between 18 and 22 March 2019. On 20 March 2019, the author together with a member of the electoral office of the election committee arrived at the facility. The author and his colleague met with the prisoners. The author was not prevented from meetings with prisoners; he was only informed that the prisoners were not allowed to distribute manuscripts and other publications without the authorisation by the administration of the correctional facility. The author was also informed by the deputy director of the facility that the fact that a prisoner provided their signature in support of the election committee's campaign did not mean that the administration of the correctional facility had an obligation to provide personal information about the prisoners to the candidate, the prisoners had to provide said information to the campaign. No pages with signatures were confiscated from the author, he in fact took the signatures with him when he left the facility, which is confirmed by video recordings. Also, contrary to the author's statements, the deputy director never touched the author or raised his voice, which is again confirmed by video recordings. It was in fact the author who raised his voice at the deputy director and told the latter to "shut up". The claim that electoral leaflets were taken from prisoners and that those distributing electoral material were threatened with solitary confinement are claims not based on any evidence, no prisoners were punished nor is solitary confinement allowed for under domestic law.

4.4 Based on its information above the State party submits that the author's claims should be found inadmissible as an abuse of submission for providing misleading and false information to the Committee. It notes that the author has been prohibited by the European Court of Human Rights from representing, or otherwise assisting, applicants both in pending applications as well as in any future cases brought before the Court. It further notes that in 2016 the author was excluded from the list of assistant advocates of Lithuania for gross violations of professional ethics and that in the same year he was likewise removed from the chamber of Andorran advocates.

4.5 On 22 March 2019, the author wrote a complaint to the Pravieniškės correctional facility. He claimed that the meeting with the prisoners on 20 March 2019 was interrupted by the deputy director and that 50 empty pages for signatures were confiscated. He also claimed that the deputy director had ordered all leaflets to be confiscated and that prisoners who distributed the leaflets were threatened with solitary confinement. The author also claimed that the deputy director pushed him. To ascertain the circumstances raised by the author in his complaint, an investigation commission was set up on 28 March 2019 by the director of the Pravieniškės correctional facility. On 9 April 2019 the deputy director provided the investigation commission with the video recordings from the facility, on which the conversation between him and the author was recorded. It was clear from the recording that the deputy director spoke in a respectful tone and explained to the author that the written request from every prisoner to provide them with the number of their identity document was necessary to provide said information. On 2 May 2019, the investigation commission concluded that the claims made by the author were untrue and recommended the investigation to be closed. A copy of the investigation findings was sent the author on 20 May 2019 by email. The author did not appeal the decision to close the investigation within the 30 days deadline as stipulated in the Law on Public Administration and the Law on Administrative Proceedings.

4.6 On 28 March 2019 the author sent an email to the Pravieniškės correctional facility, in which he requested to be provided with the identity document information of prisoners' who he stated had supported his campaign. The Pravieniškės correctional facility responded on 1 April 2019 and stated that in accordance with decision No. Sp-148 of the Chief Electoral Commission of 27 November 2018, a voter had to enter all personal data, their signature and the date of signature themselves, when filling out a document in support of an election committee. He was also informed that identity document information was personal data and that the written consent by prisoners was therefore necessary for such information to be released. In this connection the State Party states that during the relevant period no requests

were received from the prisoners at the Pravieniškės correctional facility, for such information to be provided.

4.7 Regarding the author's claims of problems with collecting signatures at other prison facilities the State Party notes that: a) no prisoners asked the administration of the Kaunas juvenile remand prison to provide them with numbers of their identity documents. In addition, the author's statement that pages with signatures were confiscated at the facility is not based on any evidence and should be considered as false; b) as for the author's request for identity document information to be provided by the Prison Hospital, one request of one convicted person was attached to the author's request. However, said person was not at the Prison hospital during the relevant period and the request was therefore declined; c) no prisoners asked the administration of the Vilnius correctional facility to provide them with numbers of their identity documents. In addition, the author's statement that pages with signatures were confiscated at the facility is not based on any evidence and should be considered as false; and d) the statement that pages with signatures were confiscated at the Šiauliai remand prison is false. On 25 March 2019 and 1 April 2019, the Šiauliai remand prison received the author's requests to provide him with the numbers of identity documents of specific prisoners he stated had signed for his election committee. He was informed that the request was rejected as it did not comply with domestic law requirements and as the author had not substantiated that he was authorised to represent the persons whose identity document information he sought to receive.

4.8 On 11 April 2019 the election committee presented a list with 10,474 signatures to the Chief Electoral Commission. However, while verifying the signatures the Commission found that among the list of signatures for the election committee, there were also some pages with signatures collected for the candidate for the Presidential elections K.J. On 23 April 2019, the Commission issued an act of verification of the list of signatures presented by the election committee and stated that because there were pages with signatures collected for K.J, the election committee had only collected 9,985 signatures in total. On 25 April 2019, the Commission issued a decision by which it refused to register the candidates of the election committee for the elections to the European Parliament. On 29 April 2019 K.J and the author filed a complaint against the decision to the Supreme Administrative Court. On 3 May 2019 the Supreme Administrative Court adopted a decision finding that after the verification of pages with signatures there were also pages with signatures collected in favour of K.J. and that the requirement provided by law for the submission of 10,000 signatures to the Chief Electoral Commission had not been met.

4.9 On 23 April 2019 the Prosecutor General received a complaint by K.J., against two individuals for the "purposeful failure to implement the law on elections and destruction of democratic order". On 3 May 2019 a decision to not initiate a pre-trial investigation was adopted. K.J. was informed that in accordance with article 168 (5) of the Code on Criminal Procedure he could appeal the decision to the prosecutor within seven days from receipt of the decision. No such appeal was made by K.J.

4.10 Regarding the author's claims under article 10 of the Covenant, the State Party notes that it is the author who claims that the dignity of prisoners was breached and not the prisoners themselves. The State Party submits that the author thus lacks victim status, and that the claims under article 10 (1) should be found inadmissible *ratione personae* in accordance with article 1 of the Optional Protocol.

4.11 Regarding the author's claims of alleged discrimination under articles 25 (b) and 26 of the Covenant, the State Party firstly notes that the author received a reply to his request to provide him with the numbers of prisoners' identity documents from the Pravieniškės correctional facility and that he could have filed a complaint against the decision, which he failed to do. Additionally, he received a reply on 2 May 2019 to the complaint he submitted to the Pravieniškės correctional facility about the alleged interrupted meeting and confiscation of signatures at the facility, in which he was informed about the possibility of appealing the decision to close the investigation. However, the author failed to submit an appeal. The State Party submits that the author's claims of alleged discrimination under articles 25 (b) and 26 of the Covenant should therefore be found inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies under article 5 (2) (b) of the Optional Protocol.

4.12 Regarding the author's claim that the Chief Electoral Commission destroyed valid signatures the State Party argues that the claim is not based on any evidence. It notes that on 25 April 2019 the Chief Electoral Commission adopted a decision not to register the candidates of the election committee as the requirement for registration had not been met. If the author thought that an offence had been committed, he should have submitted a complaint to the relevant police authorities, which he failed to do. The State Party submits that these claims should therefore also be found inadmissible for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

4.13 As to the author's claims that the authorities failed to investigate the alleged theft by two individuals of some pages with signatures for the election committee, the State Party notes that on 3 May 2019 the Kaunas Region Chief Police Office decided to not open a pre-trial investigation into the matter. The decision was transmitted to the complainant, K.J., who was informed that he could submit a complaint against that decision. No appeal was however submitted. The State Party submit that these claims should therefore also be found inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

4.14 As to the merits of the author's claims, the State Party notes that the Law on Enforcement of Pre-Trial Detention and the Code for the Execution of Sentences does not limit the right of prisoners to participate in elections. However, the collection of votes from prisoners must be coordinated with the prison administration. The Chief Electoral Commission has issued recommendations to the administrations of prisons and correctional facilities to not directly transmit the personal data of arrested or convicted persons to candidates and candidate lists, but only directly to the prisoners themselves. In the author's case, this recommendation was followed by the relevant officers of prisons and correctional facilities. The State Party further notes that under article 37 § 4 of the Law on Election to the European Parliament, a person who supports a list of candidates, has to personally enter the data (surname and name, the number of an identity document, passport or a residence permit, date of birth, place of residence, signature and date) on the document. In the author's case it would thus have been contrary to domestic legislation if he entered the identity document numbers of prisoners on pages with their signatures.

4.15 As to requirement for prisoners to request their identification documentation from the prison administration, the State Party notes that in accordance with regulation, convicted persons and those placed in the pre-trial detention cannot have with them, among other items, their identity cards, however they can upon request receive copies of any document in their file, and they are not required to state the reason why said information is needed.

4.16 Regarding the author's claim that his rights under article 14 of the Covenant were violated as the Supreme Administrative Court did not respond to all the arguments raised by him, the State Party notes the Committee's jurisprudence that while article 14 (1) may be interpreted as obliging courts to give reasons for their decisions, it cannot be interpreted as requiring a detailed answer to every argument advanced by a complainant.¹ In the present case the State Party argues that the Supreme Administrative Court issued a reasoned decision to the claims raised by the author and that he has failed to substantiate that the decision was insufficiently reasoned.

Author's comments on the State Party's observations on admissibility and the merits

5.1 On 2 January 2021, the author submitted his comments on the State Party's observations. He maintains that the communication is admissible, and he reiterates his claims as presented in his initial complaint.

5.2 The author notes the State Party's argument that his claim that the deputy director of the Pravieniškės correctional facility punched him and that signatures were confiscated at the facility is disproven by video recordings. He states that the confiscation and altercation at the facility were not captured on the recording, as the person who recorded the video had left the room before the altercation took place. He further claims that the video recording was illegal and a breach of his rights under article 17 of the Covenant, as well as a breach of the prisoner's right to sign election documents in secrecy and his right to gather votes in secrecy.

¹ The State Party refers to *Verlinden v. Netherlands* (CCPR/C/88/D/1187/2003), para. 7.7.

5.3 As to his claims under article 10 (1) of the Covenant, the author argues that the very fact that prisoners do not have identity documents in their possession is an attack against their dignity. He submits that he is “an incidental victim” as the violation of the prisoners’ rights under article 10 (1) prevented him from obtaining signatures of prisoners, thus also amounting to a violation of his rights under articles 25 (b) and 26 of the Covenant.

5.4 As to the facts of the complaint, the author reiterates his claims that he had the written authorization from prisoners to obtain their identity document information from the correctional facility administrations in question. He also reiterates his assertion that prisoners at the Pravieniškės correctional facility, the Kaunas Juvenile Remand Prison, the Prison Hospital, the Vilnius Correctional Facility, and the Siauliai Remand Prison requested the administrations at those facilities to provide their identity document information.

5.5 Regarding the State Party’s submission that he failed to exhaust domestic remedies by not appealing the decision of 2 May 2019 of the Pravieniškės correctional facility about the alleged altercation at meeting and confiscation of signatures at the facility, the author claims that he was not in receipt of said decision. He likewise states that K.J. was not in receipt of the decision by the Kaunas Region Chief Police Office to decline to open a pre-trial investigation into K.J.’s complaint of alleged theft of signed electoral documents.

State Party’s further submission

6.1 On 5 November 2021, the State Party submitted its further observations on the communication. It reiterates its submission that the communication should be found inadmissible for the reasons outlined in its initial observations.

6.2 As to the author’s claim that the video recording at the Pravieniškės correctional facility was illegal, the State Party notes that Order no. V-522 by the Prisons Department, under the Ministry of Justice, dated 5 December 2017 stipulates that video recordings are authorized for the protection of persons visiting a place of detention. Thus, the video recording of the author’s visit to the facility was in accordance with domestic law and contrary to the author’s assertion it proves that no signatures were confiscated during the author’s visit to the facility.

6.3 As to the author’s assertion that he did not receive the decision of 20 May 2019 from the Pravieniškės correctional facility on the complaint submitted by him, the State Party reiterates its argument that a copy of the decision was sent to the author, who did not appeal the decision. It additionally states that he did not make any inquiries into the complaint, nor did he raise any complaint regarding the alleged incident before any domestic court. The State Party argues that the author was thus fully aware of the findings of the Pravieniškės investigation commission. It likewise reiterates its argument that the author did not appeal the decisions by the respective prison administrations to not provide him with the requested identity document information of prisoners. Finally, the State Party emphasizes that as the author chose to collect election signatures in prisons, it was his obligation to follow the clear rules on the collection of signatures in such facilities. He however failed to do so, preventing him from collecting the right number of signatures within the stipulated timeframe.

Issues and proceedings before the Committee

Consideration of admissibility

7.1 Before considering any claims contained in a communication, the Committee must decide, in accordance with rule 97 of its rules of procedure, whether the communication is admissible under the Optional Protocol.

7.2 The Committee has ascertained, as required under article 5 (2) (a) of the Optional Protocol, that the same matter is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

7.3 The Committee notes the State Party’s submission that the author has failed to exhaust domestic remedies concerning some of his claims. It notes that on 2 May 2019 the author received a reply to the complaint he submitted to the Pravieniškės correctional facility about the alleged altercation and confiscation of signatures at the facility, in which he was informed about the possibility of appealing the decision to close the investigation. It notes the State

Party's information that no such appeal was filed by the author. The Committee notes the author's argument that he was not in receipt of the decision of 2 May 2019, it however observes the State Party's information that the author did not make any inquiries into the filed complaint nor raise any complaint regarding the alleged incident before any domestic court, and that similarly he did not file any complaint about the alleged confiscation of signatures at any other facility. In light of the above, and in the absence of any further specific information or argumentation by the author, the Committee finds the author's claims regarding the alleged altercation and confiscation of signatures at the Pravieniškės correctional facility, as well as the alleged confiscation at other correctional facilities, to be inadmissible under article 5 (2) (b) of the Optional Protocol.

7.4 As to the author's claims that the authorities failed to investigate the alleged theft by two individuals of some pages with signatures for the election committee, the Committee notes the State Party's information that the author did not file a complaint into the matter, and that the person, K.J., who filed the complaint, failed to appeal the decision by the Kaunas Region Chief Police Office to not open a pre-trial investigation into the matter. The Committee thus finds the author's claim in this regard inadmissible under article 5 (2) (b) of the Optional Protocol.

7.5 The Committee notes the author's claims that the requirement for prisoners to request their identity document information from prison administrations violate their rights to dignity and to vote in secrecy, and that he himself is "an incidental victim" of said violation as the requirement for identity document information prevented him from obtaining signatures of prisoners. The Committee notes the State Party's argument that the author was not prevented from collecting election signatures in prisons, only under the obligation to follow the clear rules on the collection of signatures in such facilities. In light of the above, the Committee finds his claims under article 10 of the Covenant to be insufficiently substantiated for the purposes of admissibility and inadmissible under article 2 of the Optional Protocol.

7.6 The Committee notes the author's remaining claims that the obstacle of obtaining prisoners' identity document information and the alleged destruction of signatures by the Chief Electoral Commission violated his rights under article 25 (b) of the Covenant. It further notes the author's claims that he as a candidate was discriminated against in violation of his rights under article 26 of the Covenant, as compared to other candidates who did not try to collect signatures from prisoners. The Committee notes the State Party's submission that these claims should be found inadmissible for failure to substantiate the claims for purposes of admissibility. In this connection the Committee notes the State Party's information that the author's claim that the Chief Electoral Commission destroyed or forged signatures is not based on any evidence and its argument that the author was repeatedly informed by various prison administrations that requests for prisoners' identity document information had to be requested by the prisoners themselves in order to protect personal data, and that he likewise was informed of the requirement in domestic law that prisoners need to enter said information themselves on election campaign lists, but that he failed to comply with said regulations. The Committee notes that the author has not provided any further specific information or argumentation in support of his claims, and it therefore finds his claims under articles 25 (b) and 26 of the Covenant to be insufficiently substantiated for the purposes of admissibility and inadmissible under article 2 of the Optional Protocol.

7.7 The Committee further notes the author's claim that his rights under article 14 (1), read in conjunction with article 2 (3) of the Covenant were violated as the Supreme Administrative Court did not respond to all the arguments raised by him in his complaint. It also notes his claim that the video recording at the Pravieniškės correctional facility was illegal and in violation of his rights under article 17 of the Covenant. The Committee notes the State Party's argument that the Supreme Administrative Court issued a reasoned decision to the claims raised by the author and its information that Order no. V-522 by the Prisons Department, under the Ministry of Justice, dated 5 December 2017 stipulates that video recordings are authorized for the protection of persons visiting a place of detention. In the absence of any further specific information or argumentation by the author in support of his claims, the Committee finds his claims under articles 14 (1), read in conjunction with article 2 (3) as well as his claim under article 17 of the Covenant to be insufficiently substantiated for the purposes of admissibility and inadmissible under article 2 of the Optional Protocol.

8. The Committee therefore decides:
- (a) That the communication is inadmissible under articles 2 and 5 (2) (b) of the Optional Protocol;
 - (b) That the present decision shall be communicated to the State Party and to the author.
-