

Cases and rulings

Country Code	Year	Reference details title	Reference details URL	Hate Bias motivation	Court / Body	Key facts of the case	Results (sanctions, outcome) and key consequences or implications of the case	Main reasoning / argumentation	Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case	Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details
Lithuania	2020	Lithuania / Supreme administrative court of Lithuania / Administrative case No. A-1437-662/2020	https://eteismai.lt/byla/190833160916047/A-1437-662/2020	Religion	The Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania (Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas)	A convicted person stated that the prison authorities had not provided food according to his religious beliefs. When the pork-based food is served in the prison canteen, the authorities offered a vegetarian option to the convict. However, the plaintiff stated that he is a Muslim, not a vegetarian, and meat is necessary to diet. The convicted also complained that he was denied his right to a Friday prayer together with other Muslims on several occasions .	Complaint was dismissed and the first instance court ruling was left in power.	The Court stated that the Lithuanian legislation does not require that convicted persons should be provided with the food prepared following Muslim diet. Therefore, if a plaintiff is guaranteed his right to a diet that basically meets his religious beliefs, it cannot be stated that the person was discriminated. Concerning the fact that the person 2 times was not allowed to pray with other Muslims on Friday, the Court agreed with the reasoning of the first instance court: 1) once it was a national holiday and, therefore, there were no possibilities to accompany the inmates to the prayer; 2) the group of people, who would express their wish to pray, was not formed. The Court noted that the plaintiff could pray in his own cell.	The court pointed out that the plaintiff is a person with a special legal status - he is serving a sentence in prison - therefore some restrictions of his personal freedoms are unavoidable. Therefore, if the plaintiff is guaranteed his right to a diet that basically meets his religious beliefs, it cannot be stated that the person was discriminated.	"Taigi, pareiškėjui užtikrinus teisę į mitybą, kuri iš esmės atitinka jo religinius įsitikinimus, negali būti konstatuojama, kad pareiškėjas buvo diskriminuojamas." "Therefore, if a plaintiff is guaranteed a right to a diet that basically meets his religious convictions, it cannot be stated that the plaintiff was discriminated."

DISCLAIMER The information presented here is collected under contract by the FRA's research network FRANET. The information and views contained do not necessarily reflect the views or the official position of the FRA.

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/databases/anti-muslim-hatred/>

Copyright © 2026 European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights