

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	2024	Lithuania / District Court of Vilnius City (2024) Decision in criminal case No. 1-313-1133/2024, 8 February 2024.		Religion	District Court of Vilnius City	The case concerns incitement to hatred and public humiliation of a group of people based on their origin, religion, and gender. On April 18, 2023, T. M. made offensive and degrading statements in a public place, in the presence of others, targeting Muslims, women, and people of a certain nationality. His remarks were directed at the victim, K. M., who, along with her spouse, was engaged in trade and competing with the accused. Some examples of the statements: "Do you want me to show you your place, do you know where?", "Under the bed of a churban", "Because churbans, you know, are considered as animals", "You know that churbans don't take you women for human beings, don't you know that?", "Did you make a Catholic, maybe? You made a Muslim a Catholic for a Churban?", "Maybe you're a Muslim yourself?", "Fuck you, you, with your faith, you Muslim dude. ", "You Muslims are the only ones in the world, terrorists, everything else, you all need to be exterminated, everybody knows it, the lachudra and the two children, four others are in the children's home." The accused considered the victim to be of Muslim faith because of her Asian origin and previous conversations with her.	T. M. was sentenced for crime indicated in Article 170(2) (Incitement against Any National, Racial, Ethnic, Religious or Other Group of Persons) to one year of restricted liberty without intensive supervision. He was required to complete a behavioral correction program, stay employed or register with the Employment Service if unemployed, and avoid any contact with the victim, K. M.	The statements of the accused were evaluated by specialist of the Office of the inspector of journalist ethics who provides conclusions on designation of information as inciting hatred, as well as by the Lithuanian law expertise centre. The district court, after evaluating the experts' conclusions, ruled that the defendants' statements were unambiguous, and that the specific words and statements were considered to be publicly insulting to Muslims and their spouses or Muslim women, which constituted a crime under Article 170 (2) of the Criminal Code of Lithuania ("Anyone who publicly ridicules, despises, incites hatred or incites discrimination against a group of people or a person belonging to such a group on the grounds of age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, race, colour, nationality, language, descent, origin, ethnic origin, social status, faith, religion, or beliefs or opinions, shall be punishable by community service or a fine or restriction of liberty or arrest or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.")	The key issue was whether the insulting words addressed at the victim amounted to contempt of a particular religious group, not only of the victim.	"Teismas, įvertinęs baudžiamojoje byloje surinktus ir teisme ištirtus įrodymus bei jų pagrindu nustatytas faktines aplinkybes, sprendžia, kad byloje įrodyta, kad kaltinamasis T. M. kaltinime nurodytu laiku ir viešojoje vietoje, viešai, girdint kitiems asmenims, sakydamas kaltinime nurodytas frazes, teiginius, viešai niekino žmonių grupę dėl jų kilmės, tikėjimo, lyties, dėl jų priklausymo kitoms tautoms dėl jų religijos (dėl buvimo musulmonais, išpažįstančiais islamą) bei viešai niekino nukentėjusiąją K. M. dėl to, kad ji yra moteris ir musulmonė." "The Court, having assessed the evidence collected in the criminal case and examined in court, and the facts established on the basis of the evidence, decides that the case proves that the accused, T. M. at the time and in a public place specified in the indictment, publicly, in the hearing of other persons, by uttering the phrases and statements specified in the indictment, publicly disparaged a group of people on the grounds of their origin, religion, sex, membership of other nations, their religion (for being Muslims, practising Islam) and publicly disparaged the victim, K.M., on the grounds of being a woman and a Muslim."

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