



General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 January 2026

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fifty-second session
Geneva, 4–15 May 2026

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Latvia*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review and the outcome of the previous review.¹ It is a summary of 10 stakeholders' submissions² for the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. In 2018, the Ombudsperson sent a letter to the Parliamentary Human Rights and Public Affairs Committee and Legal Affairs Committee recommending amendments to the Constitution including a new chapter on the Ombudsperson. Consolidation of the Ombudsperson's institution in the Constitution would demonstrate the serious intention of political decision-makers to strengthen the fundamental rights of Latvian people and the state's responsibility towards its people, also strengthening the democratic state system.³ In 2025, the Ombudsperson was designated as the official "authority for the protection of fundamental rights" under Latvia's national implementation of the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act. This role granted the Ombudsperson oversight over how Artificial Intelligence systems were used, ensuring that they complied with key rights such as privacy, non-discrimination, fairness, and transparency. While the mandate was broad in scope, it was introduced without the allocation of additional funding or staff for the Ombudsperson's Office.⁴

3. On discrimination and mobbing, the Ombudsperson emphasised its 2024 campaign called "Spark your Empathy", an educational, acceptance-stimulating series of ten talks to raise awareness on discrimination topics such as mental disorders, nationality, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender, religion, and social status, as well as a campaign on patient rights. The Ombudsperson reported that it regularly provided trainings to different

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



institutions, companies and employers about mobbing as an unacceptable phenomenon in the workplace, pointing out to a safe working environment as an integral part of civil rights.⁵

4. On hate speech, in 2022, the Ombudsperson emphasised the need for administrative responsibility for hate speech. In January 2023, it drew the attention of the Members of the Parliament on the fact that the Latvian legislation established criminal liability for hate speech (for inciting national, ethnic and racial hatred, and for inciting social hatred and discord) but that very limited sanctions for harmful speech did not reach the threshold of criminally prosecutable hate speech. Thus far, this initiative had not been supported by the Parliament.⁶

5. In 2025, there were also developments in the Parliament to amend Section 11.1 of the Law on Administrative Penalties for Offences in the Field of Administration, Public Order, and Use of the Official Language to improve the application of the legal norm to combat harmful behaviour on online settings. However, so far, no legislative amendments had been confirmed. The Ombudsperson noted that hate speech and aggression online continued to be important issues which required a multidisciplinary action to address and tackle it.⁷

6. On prisons, the Ombudsperson raised the issue of informal prison hierarchy in Latvian prisons and found in 2019 that there was psychological and physical violence between prisoners. It had recommended to the prison administration to provide new infrastructure and effective supervision but noted that no effective action had been taken. In 2023, following a visit, the Ombudsperson established that self-governance and hierarchy between prisoners, resulting in a high risk of violence among convicted persons, continued in Jēkabpils prison. The Ombudsperson immediately informed the Prison Administration about a possible criminal offence against one convicted person committed by another convicted person. The Prison Administration initiated criminal proceedings. The Ministry of Justice then produced an information report including several measures to prevent criminal offence being committed between prisoners such as reducing the existence of the informal hierarchy of prisoners and strengthening the capacity of prison staff.⁸ In 2025, the building of the new prison in Liepāja was concluded and was expected for full start operation in 2026 after conclusion of procurement procedures. The Ombudsperson noted the importance of sufficient and adequately remunerated staff for the operation of the new prison.⁹

7. On minimum income and state social benefits, in 2022, the Ombudsperson had called on the government to improve the legal framework so that minimum income levels would change in line with socio-economic changes in the country.¹⁰ It also concluded that child-care benefits had not been reviewed for a long time and that, despite the fact that prices of goods and services, as well as the average wage, had increased significantly, benefits and allowances had not been reviewed. Consequently, the Ombudsperson called on the Cabinet of Ministers to improve the regulations for determining and reviewing the amount of state social benefits.¹¹

8. On medical compensation, in 2023, the Ombudsperson identified an important legal gap within the individual medicine compensation mechanism, highlighting how a rigid interpretation of the rules prevented compensation in atypical cases. The Ombudsperson examined a case where a patient had a serious medical condition. The prescribed medication was essential for maintaining her life. However, although other reimbursable medicines were available for her diagnosis, none were effective or suitable for her specific physiological condition. According to the existing regulations, compensation could only be granted if no reimbursable medicines applied to that diagnosis. Since there were alternative reimbursable drugs (even if ineffective for the patient), the National Health Service (NVD) was legally barred from approving compensation for medication. The Ombudsperson emphasized the necessity of establishing exception clauses for medically justified, patient-specific cases where the listed reimbursable options were clinically unsuitable.¹²

9. On gender-based violence, the Ombudsperson pointed out that since 2025, there were developments in the Parliament to initiate denunciation of the Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention). The Ombudsperson strongly opposed such initiative.¹³

10. On the rights of persons with disabilities, in 2024, the Ombudsperson's Office completed a study on the respect for human rights in the process of determining compulsory

measures of medical nature (applicable to persons with intellectual and/or psychosocial disabilities, deemed unfit to stand trial/not criminally responsible). Based on the study, the Ombudsperson recommended to amend the Criminal Procedure Law, excluding the norm that determines that a person's participation in the process depended on the opinion of a forensic psychiatric expert, and to ensure that necessary adjustments are made to the court process so that persons with various types of disabilities can fully participate in the process.¹⁴

11. On Roma, in 2021–2022, the Ombudsperson's Office undertook a study in seven municipalities in Latvia on cooperation with the Roma community, education of Roma children, and housing and social assistance support. Following the publication of the study in 2023, the Ombudsperson recommended to further support cooperation with the Roma community, with the participation of Roma mediators; to encourage Roma families to give their children a formal education, to engage children in vocational training or activities to motivate them to acquire basic education; and local governments to provide Roma teaching assistants in schools attended by several Roma children as well as to ensure the functioning of after-school day centres, where children could receive study support.¹⁵

12. On asylum-seekers, in August 2021, Latvia declared a state of emergency in municipalities near a third country border (Order No. 518). Initially, this restricted all access to asylum in those areas, including border crossing points and the Daugavpils detention center. After court rulings, the Order was amended to allow asylum applications only at official border crossing points and the detention center. Requests for asylum outside official points were not enough to stay in Latvia. The Order expired on 11 August 2023. In summer 2023, Latvia amended the Law on the State Border to allow an "enhanced mode of operation" for border protection. This enhanced mode was declared in August 2023 (Order No. 514), ended in February 2024, and reintroduced in March 2024 (Order No. 184). These orders did not explicitly mention asylum access, but amendments to the State Border Guard Law gave border guards the right to prevent entry outside official points unless there were objective urgent circumstances. Preparatory materials indicated that requesting asylum alone did not guarantee entry. The Ombudsperson proposed clarifying the law to guarantee asylum seekers' entry, but Parliament rejected this.¹⁶

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with human rights mechanisms

13. JS1 and JS2 recommended that Latvia reject attempts to withdraw from the Istanbul Convention, continue efforts to fully implement all provisions of the Istanbul Convention, and undertake public awareness campaigns to dispel misconceptions about this treaty.¹⁷

14. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Latvia sign and ratify the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons as a matter of international urgency.¹⁸

B. National human rights framework

Institutional infrastructure and policy measures

15. JS2 recommended to establish an independent, dedicated and powerful oversight mechanism of the State Security Service, such as the Investigatory Powers Commissioner's Office in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.¹⁹

C. Promotion and protection of human rights

1. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

Equality and non-discrimination

16. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights/Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE-ODIHR) observed that Latvia had not reported information and statistics on hate crimes since 2016. It recommended that Latvia review its existing legal framework to ensure that bias motivation in law-enforcement officials, prosecutors and judges can be effectively acknowledged and appropriate penalties be imposed on perpetrators.²⁰

17. Latvian Centre for Human Rights (LCHR) further recommended to a) establish an interinstitutional working group tasked with monitoring hate speech and hate crime (which would include representatives of the relevant authorities, civil society organisations and the Ombudsperson); b) include sexual orientation and gender identity among hate motives in the Criminal Law; c) ensure that all police officers receive basic training on hate crimes; d) establish a dedicated national unit to coordinate the investigation of hate crimes; e) enhance hate crime data collection by including cases where a hate motive was applied as an aggravating circumstance; and f) support civil society efforts in monitoring online hate.²¹

Right to life, liberty and security of person, and freedom from torture

18. The Council of Europe (CoE) and the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) highlighted the issue of informal prisoner hierarchy in prisons and how it enabled access to illicit drugs. The CPT recommended taking resolute action to eradicate the informal prisoner hierarchy; strengthening recording, reporting, and investigation of inter-prisoner violence; and increasing custodial staff presence in detention areas. It also recommended improving healthcare provision and staffing; extending reintegration programs; and providing adequate support for drug-related problems.²²

19. The CPT recommended that measures be taken to reinforce that any use of excessive force by the police is illegal and punishable, and to provide further practical training to law enforcement officers on proportionate use of force and control/restraint techniques.²³

20. On psychiatric hospitals, the CPT recommended ensuring full legal safeguards for involuntary placement in psychiatric facilities, increasing patient participation in therapeutic and occupational activities, and improving the therapeutic environment of patients' rooms and common areas.²⁴

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

21. On access to justice for women, JS1 recommended to ensure judges, prosecutors and the police complete ongoing training on domestic violence, led by or in consultation with Non-Governmental Organizations service providers. In particular, the police should be regularly trained on domestic violence and risk assessment, given their new authorities under the Law on Police to conduct a risk assessment and separate the offender and victim, even without a formal victim request.²⁵

22. JS1 recommended to expand the mandate of all law enforcement and government ministries that routinely address gender-based violence to record, investigate, and prosecute all perpetrators of violence against Roma women and girls; and to conduct targeted campaigns encouraging Roma women to report experiences of violence to relevant authorities.²⁶

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life

23. On religious rights, the European Association of Jehovah's Witnesses (EAJW) requested the government of Latvia to a) withdraw the threat issued by the General Prosecutor to ban the religious community of Jehovah's Witnesses; b) ensure that religious hate speech and hate crimes are promptly investigated and prosecuted; c) ensure that religious ministers

of Jehovah's Witnesses are able to register marriages, to visit prison inmates and to conduct confidential pastoral conversations on the same terms as ministers of so-called traditional religious denominations; and d) abide by its commitment to uphold the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of Latvia, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights, and the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners ("the Nelson Mandela Rules").²⁷

24. On conscientious objection to military service, Connection e.V recommended to a) implement the Human Rights Committee's recommendations concerning conscientious objectors to military service; and b) amend Latvian legislation in order to fully recognise the right to conscientious objection to military service, in line with international human rights law and standards by introducing a genuinely civilian alternative service, and placing the assessment of applications for conscientious objector status under the full control of civilian authorities. It further recommended to explicitly recognise the right to conscientious objection in the domestic legislation for professional members of the armed forces, and to abolish legislation providing for forced conscription by the Military Police of persons who did not appear for military service.²⁸

25. JS2 emphasised that a high number of complaints against pro-Palestine protests, and slogans heard during such protests had been made to the police, resulting in a high number of prosecutions. JS2 described this method as a form of lawfare against the "For a free Palestine" civil society organization, as the number of prosecutions was too important for the organization to be able to appeal the administrative fines imposed by the courts, considering its limited resources. JS2 recommended that courts critically evaluate the balance of interests at stake and ensure prosecutions were not used to censor freedom of speech.²⁹

26. On the right of assembly and peaceful protest, JS2 recommended to amend the Law On Meetings, Processions, and Pickets, the Protection Zone Law and the Regulation on Restrictions on Activities in Protective Zones Around National Defence Objects to acknowledge and fully protect the right to hold spontaneous demonstrations, including in front of the Parliament, the Council of Ministers and the residence of the President, in line with General comment No. 37 (2020) on the right of peaceful assembly (article 21) of the Human Rights Committee and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.³⁰

27. JS2 further recommended to a) delete Paragraph 5 of Section 4 of the law On Meetings, Processions, and Pickets to prevent the use of warnings and administrative fines as a means of infringing upon the right to assembly, and b) ensure that training programmes for law enforcement officials at all levels include mandatory training on human rights, including on the freedom of assembly, the freedom of expression and its application to demonstrations.³¹

28. JS2 recommended to cease prosecution and other forms of legal reprisals against human rights defenders, as well as to review existing laws to determine if they comply with the principles and rights laid out in the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders and the rights affirmed therein, and to make amendments to laws that do not.³²

29. JS2 recommended to investigate the role of opinion-based bias in both the banning of demonstrations and the actions taken by the police towards activists.³³

30. JS2 recommended to examine laws and regulations related to the use of the flag of Latvia and their compliance with human rights obligations, as LGBTQ+ activists had been reportedly intimidated or investigated by the police for sewing a Latvian flag together with a transgender pride flag, which was considered to have been potentially in breach of the Law on the National Flag of Latvia or the Procedures for the Application of the Law on the National Flag of Latvia.³⁴

31. On the right to information, LCHR reported that Latvian journalists continued to work in a free and safe environment, but access to reliable and pluralistic information, especially for the Russian-speaking population, remained a challenge. LCHR recommended ensuring that representatives of national minorities have access to credible and fact-checked information through public media, including content in Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian.³⁵

32. After observing the 2022 parliamentary elections in Latvia, OSCE-ODIHR recommended a) to ensure the operational independence and efficiency of the Central Election Commission with adequate financial and human resources allocated in a timely manner; b) that the Central Election Commission be provided with sufficient resources to prepare and implement comprehensive and timely voter education programs; and c) that the electoral legislation provide the possibility for independent candidates to participate in elections.³⁶

Prohibition of all forms of slavery, including trafficking in persons

33. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) recommended that Latvia immediately adopt and implement its Action Plan for the Prevention of Human Trafficking for 2025-2027 as it is focused on procedures allowing authorities to identify victims of human trafficking and quickly refer them for protection and support services; and that it strengthen procedures regarding investigations and prosecutions of traffickers.³⁷

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

34. On the right to a fair remuneration and gender equality, the European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR) recommended to promote job classification and evaluation systems and that they rely on criteria that are gender-neutral and do not result in indirect discrimination.³⁸

Right to social security

35. In relation to recommendation 132.166 from the third cycle (“Strengthen measures to combat social exclusion of elderly persons, in particular in relation to the social assistance and pensions provided”), ECSR concluded that the situation in Latvia was not in conformity with Article 12§1 of the European Social Charter for the following reasons. a) the minimum levels of unemployment benefits, old-age pensions, and disability benefits were too low; and b) These benefits did not meet adequacy standards, meaning they were insufficient to prevent poverty or social exclusion.³⁹

Right to an adequate standard of living

36. JS1 reported that in the third cycle, Latvia received five recommendations to eliminate discrimination and remove barriers against the Roma population. Latvia noted recommendation calling for legislative and administrative measures to eliminate discrimination against ethnic minorities, including Roma descent. While Latvia accepted the other four recommendations on improving the Roma population’s access to education, employment, and other services, they did not explicitly recognize the discrimination faced by Romani women and girls. JS1 recommended to modify the legal framework of the public work, education, and health system to ensure Roma women and girls fully enjoy their rights in this regard without discrimination, ensuring specific interventions focused on improving their access to employment, education, and health.⁴⁰

Right to health

37. Noting that public spending on healthcare remained low while out-of-pocket payments appeared to remain among the highest in Europe, ECSR considered that insufficient measures had been taken to effectively guarantee the right of access to healthcare, particularly measures pertaining to the reduction of maternal mortality.⁴¹

38. On breast cancer, JS1 recommended to coordinate among hospitals, research institutes, universities, patient organizations and networks of women organizations (e.g. organizations of breast cancer survivors) and expand treatments; implement efficiency in record-keeping and strengthen interdisciplinary cooperation to reduce delays in treatment and increase access to services.⁴²

39. JS1 further recommended to a) create a national quality control system by establishing a centralized authority to oversee quality assurance and audit screening facilities, including a centralized national breast cancer screening registry; b) allocate funds to establish a national strategy that ensures mandatory, ongoing training and capacity building of screening

providers; c) implement a call-recall system to ensure clients undergo follow-up procedures following their screening results; and d) prepare a public communication strategy to raise awareness on the importance of regular screenings for breast cancer.⁴³

2. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

40. JS1 reported that Latvia noted all previous cycle recommendations to amend its domestic legal framework or expand existing mandates with the aim to improve gender-based violence prevention and gender equality. JS1 reported the inadequate political will and resourcing to proactively prioritize women's rights on the policy agenda in the first place and to engage diverse partners, especially women's working on violence against women and supporting victims, in helping overcome barriers to prosecution of perpetrators. JS1 recommended to prioritize adequate resourcing in terms of personnel, ongoing public education campaigns, and budgeting for gender equality and violence against women policies and activities, with a focus on intersectionality to address women's issues.⁴⁴

41. JS1 also recommended to amend Latvia's Plan for the Prevention and Combating of Violence against Women and Domestic Violence for 2024–2029 to include protection against discrimination based on ethnicity, gender and multiple discrimination, including an effective remedy in cases of discrimination and violence against Roma women and girls.⁴⁵

42. JS1 recommended to a) guarantee accessibility of shelters and support services for victims of gender-based violence, particularly women with disabilities while ensuring that councils throughout the country receive adequate funding for such services; and b) allocate sustainable state funding to civil society organizations, particularly organizations representing disadvantaged groups of women and women's organizational networks, and reduce reliance on external donors.⁴⁶

43. JS1 also recommended to improve university curricula for journalists on understanding gender stereotypes and responsible gender reporting and to include ongoing training on gender equality for media representatives and personalities to reduce persistent gender stereotypes in the media.⁴⁷

Children

44. Connection e.V recalled that the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) noted that children from the age of 10 may participate in the voluntary "Youth Guard" movement that functioned under the auspices of the Ministry of Defence, with the purpose of educating youth about national defence. The Committee was deeply concerned that the "Youth Guard" programme included the participation of children in activities involving weapons and military training. CRC was also concerned that there was no explicit reference in the Criminal Law that criminal liability applied also to non-State armed groups. Connection e.V recommended to a) ban military training involving the use of weapons for individuals under the age of 18 years, in general, and in the Youth Guard and the National Defence Course, in particular, and b) explicitly criminalize the recruitment, use, involvement and participation in hostilities of children (under the age of 18 years) by the armed forces and by non-State armed groups.⁴⁸

45. LCHR highlighted that in 2016–2017, Romani students accounted for 22.4% in learning difficulty programmes and 39% in special education programmes designed for children with intellectual disabilities, which was reportedly confirmed by the Ombudsperson in 2022.⁴⁹ It recommended to collect anonymised and disaggregated data on Roma educational attainment (ensuring data protection) to better assess disparities and develop targeted policies.⁵⁰

Persons with disabilities

46. JS1 recommended to a) strengthen national policies and strategies on gender-based violence to explicitly address the intersection of gender and disability, recognizing women with disabilities as a distinct target group; b) embed disability competence into victim support services by requiring specialized training for law enforcement, social workers, counsellors, and shelter staff to identify and address risks specific to women with disabilities; c) reform

disability assessment and welfare procedures to remove bureaucratic barriers that prevent women with disabilities from accessing social protection and victim support in cases of violence; and d) ensure proactive outreach and accessible information on available services in formats accessible to women with different disabilities (Easy-to-Read, sign language, Braille, plain language websites).⁵¹

47. JS1 recommended to a) introduce targeted budget lines within gender equality and disability inclusion policies for measures that address violence against women with disabilities; and b) establish regular consultation mechanisms with organizations of women with disabilities to co-design policies, monitoring systems, and service provision standards.⁵²

Indigenous Peoples and minorities

48. On Roma women, JS1 recommended to strengthen efforts to enhance the systematic collection, dissemination and analysis of data related to women's rights, disaggregated by sex, age, ethnicity, religion, geographical location, disability and socioeconomic context, in all spheres. It recommended to create and fund a legal framework for collecting data disaggregated by gender and ethnicity in fields relevant to the human rights of Roma women and girls and to evaluate the impact of government policies on this group as it suffered double marginalization based on both ethnicity and gender.⁵³

49. LCHR recommended to implement measures specifically aimed at improving Roma employment and educational opportunities and to allocate state funding for Roma mediators in municipalities with significant Roma populations.⁵⁴

50. JS1 recommended to a) ensure that policies and plans related to the Roma integrate a specific focus on Roma women and girls' rights, including a focus on gender-based violence; b) enhance state-funded integration and public activities into more sustainable and consistent activities to include Roma women and girls as relevant stakeholders in Latvian society; and c) regularly conduct anti-discrimination and gender equality training for public sector employees.⁵⁵

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

51. JS2 stressed that, while LGBTQIA+ rights had improved in 2023, with legal amendments being adopted to establish same-sex civil partnerships, there had been significant backsliding since then, with legislative proposals brought up in Parliament on restricting pride parades, or gender-affirming care for minors and on the use of pride flags with the flag of Latvia. JS2 urged Latvia to explore areas where LGBTQIA+ persons remain insufficiently protected based on the existing partnership law and ways to address these shortcomings, as well as to ensure that discriminatory legislation targeting sexual and gender minorities is not passed.⁵⁶

Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

52. The Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights (COE-Commissioner) recognised the challenge of instrumentalised migration pressure posed by actions by a third country and stressed that such actions might exploit migrants and asylum seekers and put them in a situation of particular vulnerability or even in a human rights emergency, which only corroborated the need to fully protect their rights. Therefore, it reminded that efforts to address the practice of instrumentalization should be without prejudice to States' obligations under Article 2 and Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and the obligation to ensure genuine and effective access to a possibility to apply for protection.⁵⁷

53. The CPT reported allegations of severe ill-treatment of migrants at the border with a third country in 2021–2022 and emphasised the urgent need for training on lawful and proportionate use of force at the border and regular reinforcement that excessive force is illegal and punishable.⁵⁸

54. JS2 recommended to a) end the practice of illegal pushbacks at the border by providing access to asylum claims processes to those who request it; b) thoroughly investigate all allegations of unlawful acts by State Border Guard and other state institutions towards people on the border, especially paying attention to acts that may constitute torture,

inhuman and degrading treatment; c) and allow access to the border for the press, independent monitors and humanitarian volunteers.⁵⁹ LCHR recommended to the Ombudsperson's Office to strengthen the monitoring of human rights compliance at the border, with particular emphasis on preventing risks of ill-treatment.⁶⁰

55. LCHR recommended to a) ensure that foreign nationals have effective access to an asylum procedure which includes an individual assessment of the risk of ill-treatment if returned to their country of origin; b) decriminalise humanitarian aid to asylum seekers at the border and protect providers of essential assistance legal sanctions; c) ensure legal frameworks clearly distinguish aid from irregular migration activities; and d) implement the European Migration and Asylum Pact by increasing the number of legal aid providers and providing relevant training.⁶¹

56. The CPT recommended that, in immigration detention centres, detained persons be offered purposeful activities, and that the detention of migrant children be avoided, in particular unaccompanied minors.⁶²

57. Connection e.V urged Latvia to grant asylum to conscientious objectors to military service who are at risk of persecution in their country of origin owing to their refusal to perform military service when there is no provision, or no adequate provision, for conscientious objection to military service.⁶³

Notes

¹ A/HRC/48/15, A/HRC/48/15/Add.1/Corr.1, and A/HRC/48/2.

² The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org (one asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with A status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

Connection	Connection e.V., Offenbach (Germany);
EAIW	European Association Of Jehovah's Witnesses, 1950 Kraainem (Belgium);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, The, Strasbourg (France);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
LCHR	Latvian Centre for Human Rights, Riga (Latvia).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America); Women's NGOs Cooperation Network of Latvia/ Latvijas Sieviešu nevalstisko organizāciju sadarbības tīkls;
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: Coalition of NGO's for Latviaa, Riga (Latvia); "Protests""Par brīvu Palestīnu""Maiznīca""Incredible Terra""Latvijas Transpersonu apvienība 'Transformācija""I Want to Help Refugees" ("Gribu palīdzēt bēgļiem").

National human rights institution:

Ombudsperson Office	Ombudsperson Office, Riga (Latvia).
---------------------	-------------------------------------

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	Council of Europe, 67075 Strasbourg Cedex (France);
OSCE-ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights/Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw (Poland).

³ Ombudsperson, p. 2.

⁴ Ombudsperson, p. 2.

⁵ Ombudsperson, p. 8.

⁶ Ombudsperson, p. 5.

⁷ Ombudsperson, p. 5.

⁸ Ombudsperson, p. 6. See also Report to the HRC, 2025, p. 3.

- ⁹ Ombudsperson, p.6.
 - ¹⁰ Ombudsperson, p. 4.
 - ¹¹ Ombudsperson, p. 4.
 - ¹² Ombudsperson, p. 4.
 - ¹³ Ombudsperson, p.7.
 - ¹⁴ Ombudsperson, p. 3.
 - ¹⁵ Ombudsperson, p. 3.
 - ¹⁶ Ombudsperson, p.7. See also Report to the HRC, 2025, pp. 7–8.
 - ¹⁷ JS1, paras. 6 and 42, and JS2, pp. 11–12.
 - ¹⁸ ICAN, p. 1.
 - ¹⁹ JS2, p. 10.
 - ²⁰ OSCE-ODIHR, paras. 8–9.
 - ²¹ LCHR, p. 4.
 - ²² CoE, paras. 5 and 12–13.
 - ²³ CoE, para. 9.
 - ²⁴ CoE, para. 14.
 - ²⁵ JS1, paras. 10, 12 and 42.
 - ²⁶ JS1, paras. 17–19 and 42.
 - ²⁷ EAJW, para. 30.
 - ²⁸ Connection e.V, para. 26.
 - ²⁹ JS2, pp. 7 and 9.
 - ³⁰ JS2, pp. 5–6.
 - ³¹ JS2, pp. 6–7.
 - ³² JS2, p. 9.
 - ³³ JS2, pp. 6–7.
 - ³⁴ JS2, pp. 8–9.
 - ³⁵ LCHR, pp. 7–8.
 - ³⁶ OSCE-ODIHR, para. 7.
 - ³⁷ ECLJ, paras. 14–15.
 - ³⁸ CoE, para. 20.
 - ³⁹ CoE, para. 17.
 - ⁴⁰ JS1, para. 42.
 - ⁴¹ CoE, para. 19.
 - ⁴² JS1, para. 42.
 - ⁴³ JS1, paras. 37–40 and 42.
 - ⁴⁴ JS1, paras. 2–5 and 42.
 - ⁴⁵ JS1, paras. 18 and 42.
 - ⁴⁶ JS1, paras. 21–23 and 42.
 - ⁴⁷ JS1, paras. 7–8 and 42.
 - ⁴⁸ Connection e.V, paras. 23–26.
 - ⁴⁹ LCHR, p. 5.
 - ⁵⁰ LCHR, p. 6.
 - ⁵¹ JS1, paras. 21–23 and 42.
 - ⁵² JS1, paras. 23–24 and 42.
 - ⁵³ JS1, paras. 14–15 and 42.
 - ⁵⁴ LCHR, p. 6.
 - ⁵⁵ JS1, paras. 17–19 and 42.
 - ⁵⁶ JS2, pp. 11–12.
 - ⁵⁷ CoE, paras. 2–3.
 - ⁵⁸ CoE, para. 11.
 - ⁵⁹ JS2, p. 11.
 - ⁶⁰ LCHR, p. 7.
 - ⁶¹ LCHR, p. 7.
 - ⁶² CoE, para. 10.
 - ⁶³ Connection e.V, para. 26.
-