Last updated: July 2026

Latvia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1997

National Judge: Artūrs Kučs (3 September 2024 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Egils Levits (1995-2004), Ineta Ziemele (2005-2014), Mārtiņš Mits (2015-2024)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 312 applications concerning Latvia in 2025, of which 305 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered six judgments (concerning seven applications), five of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	170	220	128
Communicated to the Government	10	6	8
Applications decided:	333	312	124
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	105	288	116
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	212	15	8
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	3	2	0
- Decided by judgment	13	7	0

* from January to July 2026

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the ECHR internet site.
Statistics on interim measures can be found here.

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	124
Single Judge	60
Committee (3 Judges)	29
Chamber (7 Judges)	34
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

Latvia and ...

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **673** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Savickis and Others v. Latvia

09.06.2022

The case concerned the payment of employment pensions in Latvia to "permanently resident non-citizens", which had not taken into account periods worked in other Soviet Republics at the time of the occupation of Latvia by the USSR, as compared with those to Latvian citizens, which did.

No violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

(In *Savickis and Others* the Grand Chamber departed from its previous ruling in *Andrejeva v. Latvia*)

Jeronovičs v. Latvia

05.07.2016

The case primarily concerned the national authorities' refusal to reopen the criminal proceedings relating to Mr Jeronovičs's ill-treatment, following a unilateral declaration in which the Government had acknowledged, among other breaches, a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

Violation of Article 3

Avotiņš v. Latvia

23.05.2016

The case concerned a judgment given by a Cypriot court ordering the applicant to pay a debt he had contracted with a Cypriot company, and the order made by the Latvian courts for the enforcement of the Cypriot judgment in Latvia.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Vistiņš and Perepjolkins v. Latvia

25.10.2012[1]

The case concerned the expropriation of land in the 1990s in connection with the enlargement of the Free Port of Riga. The expropriation was based on a special law derogating from the normal rules of expropriation.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

X v. Latvia (no. 27853/09)

26.11.2013

The case concerned the procedure for the return of a child to Australia, her country of origin, which she had left with her mother at the age of three years and five months, in application of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and the mother's complaint that the Latvian courts' decision ordering that return had breached her right to respect for her family life within the meaning of Article 8 of the Convention.

Violation of Article 8

Kononov v. Latvia

17.05.2010

The applicant, who was convicted of war crimes perpetrated during the Second World War, alleged in particular that the acts of which he had been convicted had not, at the time of their commission, constituted an offence under either domestic or international law.

No violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Ždanoka v. Latvia

16.03.2006

The applicant was disqualified from standing for election to the national parliament on account of her former membership of the communist party, which had been declared unconstitutional.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No.1 (right to free elections)

Slivenko v. Latvia

09.10.2003

Concerned the deportation of the family of a former Soviet army officer in accordance with the inter-state treaty between Russia and Latvia on the withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvian territory.

Violation of Article 8

[1] In the same case, the Court delivered its Grand Chamber judgment on the question of just satisfaction on 25 March 2014.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Cases concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Jasinskis v. Latvia
21.12.2010
Concerned the authorities' failure to provide medical treatment to a deaf mute suffering from serious head injuries who died after spending 14 hours in police custody.
Violations of Article 2 for the death in itself and for the lack of an effective investigation

Cases concerning Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Hanovs v. Latvia (no. 40861/22)
18.07.2024
The case concerned a homophobic attack against Mr Hanovs in 2020 when he had been out walking with his partner.
Violation of Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life), taken in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

Ābele v. Latvia
05.10.2017
The case concerned the complaint by a deaf and mute prisoner who alleged that he had been held in overcrowded cells and that the authorities had failed to cater for his disability. That had led to his being isolated.

Čalovskis v. Latvia
24.07.2014

Savičs v. Latvia
27.11.2012

J.L. v. Latvia (no. 23893/06)
17.04.2012
This was the first time that the Court underlined that prisoners who have co-operated with the police by reporting criminal offences are particularly vulnerable and exposed to violence in prison.

Melnītis v. Latvia
28.02.2012

Bazjaks v. Latvia
19.10.2010

Jeronovics v. Latvia
01.12.2009

Kornakovs v. Latvia and Moisejevs v. Latvia
15.06.2006

Kadiķis v. Latvia (No. 2)
04.05.2006

Cases concerning the right to liberty and security (Article 5)

Rimšēvičs v. Latvia
10.11.2022
The case concerned the arrest and approximately 46-hour detention of Mr Rimšēvičs – a former Governor of the Central Bank of Latvia and former ECB Governing Council member – on corruption-related charges in connection with a Latvian bank.
No violation of Article 5 § 1

Mihailovs v. Latvia
22.01.2013
The case concerned the complaint of a man who had been divested of his legal capacity that he had been held against his will in a social care institution for more than ten years without possibility of release.
Violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of Mr Mihailovs being held in a social care institution between January 2002 and April 2010 and no violation of Article 5 § 1 on account of him being held in another institution from 1 April 2010 onwards
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to have the lawfulness of one's detention decided speedily by a court) on account of Mr Mihailovs' inability to obtain a review of the lawfulness of his placement in the social care institution between January 2002 and April 2010 and no violation of Article 5 § 4 from 1 April 2010 onwards

Beiere v. Latvia
29.11.2011
The case concerned the complaint by a woman about her unlawful detention in a psychiatric hospital, in the context of

criminal proceedings against her, for an assessment of her mental state.
Violation of Article 5 § 1

Longa Yonkeu v. Latvia
15.11.2011
The case concerned detention of an asylum seeker from Cameroon.
Violation of Article 5 § 1 concerning the applicant's detention from 20 May to 16 September 2009 and from 23 October to 2 November 2009, and on account of the arbitrariness of the applicant's detention during his deportation to Cameroon
No violation of Article 5 § 1 - concerning the applicant's detention from 23 December 2008 to 20 May 2009, from 16 September to 23 October 2009 and from 2 November 2009 to 9 January 2010

Svipsta v. Latvia
09.03.2006
Concerned the length and lawfulness of the applicant's pre-trial detention.
Violation of Article 5 § 1, 5 § 3 (length of pre-trial detention) and 5 § 4 (judicial review)
No violation of Article 6 § 1 (length of proceedings)

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Jemeljanovs v. Latvia
06.10.2016
The case concerned a complaint by a man accused of murder that he had not had legal assistance in the first-instance criminal proceedings against him.
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance of own choosing)

Baltiņš v. Latvia
08.01.2013
The case concerned the complaint of a man convicted of acquisition of drugs that he had been incited by an undercover police agent to commit this offence.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Kalēja v. Latvia
05.10.2017
The case concerned criminal proceedings for misappropriation of funds. The applicant, an accountant, essentially complained that she had been questioned in those proceedings as a witness (and therefore without a lawyer), long before the official charges had actually been brought against her.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 because the overall length, nine years and ten months, of the proceedings had been excessive
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to legal assistance of own choosing)

Presumption of innocence

Kangers v. Latvia
14.03.2019
The case concerned the applicant being found guilty of a repeat offence of driving while disqualified when his appeal against a first charge for the same crime was still ongoing.
Violation of Article 6 § 2

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Jansons v. Latvia
08.09.2022
The case concerned the applicant's complaint that he had been forced out of an apartment he had been living in in a residential building in Riga when his right to reside there had come into dispute.
Violation of Article 8
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 8.

Dupate v. Latvia
19.11.2020
The case concerned surreptitiously taken photos of the applicant leaving a maternity ward and their subsequent publication with an accompanying article.
Violation of Article 8

Meimanis v. Latvia
21.07.2015
The case concerned the interception of the applicant's telephone calls when he was working as an official in the Riga economic crime police.
Violation of Article 8
No violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Elberte v. Latvia
13.01.2015
The case concerned the removal of body tissue from Ms Elberte's deceased husband by forensic experts after his death, without her knowledge or consent. Unknown to Ms Elberte, pursuant to a State-approved agreement, tissue had been removed from her husband's body after her husband's autopsy and sent to a pharmaceutical company in Germany for the creation of bio-implants. She only learned about the course of events two years after her husband's death when a criminal investigation was launched in Latvia into allegations of wide-scale illegal removal of organs and tissues from cadavers. However, domestic authorities eventually did not establish any elements of crime.
Violation of Article 8
Violation of article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Petrova v. Latvia
24.06.2014
The case concerned Ms Petrova's complaint that a public hospital had removed her son's organs for transplantation purposes without her consent after he was involved in a road traffic accident and had died from his injuries.
Violation of Article 8

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Rungainis v. Latvia
14.06.2018
The case concerned the applicant's being found liable for defamation after implicating a banker-turned-politician in the misappropriation of bank funds.
No violation of Article 10

Petropavlovskis v. Latvia
13.01.2015
The case concerned an allegation by a political activist that he was refused Latvian citizenship through naturalisation as punishment for his views on education reform in Latvia.
The Court held that articles 10 (freedom of expression), 11 (freedom of association) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention were not applicable and that there was therefore no arguable complaint under the Convention.

Nagla v. Latvia
16.07.2013
The case concerned the search by the police of a well-known broadcast journalist's home, and their seizure of data storage devices.
Violation of Article 10

A/S Diena and Ozolinš v. Latvia
12.07.2007
Journalist and press organ convicted of defamation for allegedly casting aspersions on the integrity of the Minister for Economic Affairs at the time of privatisation of a major Latvian company.
Violation of Article 10

Freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Rodina and Borisova v. Latvia (nos. 2623/16 and 2299/16)
10.07.2025
The case concerned the banning of jingoistic Russian protests.
No violation of Article 11 read in the light of Article 10

Straume v. Latvia
02.06.2022
The case concerned an air-traffic controller's treatment by her employer and ultimately her being fired for statements made regarding flight safety.
Violation of Article 11
Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial).

Cases concerning discrimination (Article 14)

Djeri and Others v. Latvia **(nos. 50942/20 and 2022/21)**

18.07.2024

The case concerned 2018 amendments to the law whereby the use of Latvian – the national language – was increased in all pre-schools in Latvia, both public or private, and the use of Russian was consequently reduced.

No violation of Article 14 taken together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Valiullina and Others v. Latvia
(nos. 56928/19 and 2 others)
Džibuti and Others v. Latvia

16.11.2023

The cases concerned changes to the law in 2018 which had increased the number of subjects that had to be taught through Latvian – the national language – in public and private schools, resulting in a decrease in teaching time through Russian.

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

The Court found that increased instruction through Latvian in schools did not discriminate against Russian-speakers.

Ēcis v. Latvia

10.01.2019

The case concerned a male prison inmate who complained that he had not been allowed to attend his father's funeral under a law regulating prison regimes which discriminated in favour of women.

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Protection of property cases (Article 1 of Protocol no. 1)

SIA AKKA/LAA v. Latvia **(no. 562/05)**

12.07.2016

The case concerned a complaint about the restriction on the copyright of authors' musical work.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to fair hearing)

Cases concerning the right to free elections (Article 3 of Protocol No. 1)

Ždanoka v. Latvia (no. 2) **(no. 42221/18)**

25.07.2024

The case concerned the removal of Ms Ždanoka, a former MEP, from the candidate list for the 2018 parliamentary elections, owing to her active membership of the Communist Party of Latvia during the post-independence struggles against the Soviet Union.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Ādamsons v. Latvia

24.06.2008

Concerned the applicant's disqualification from standing for election on account of his previous service in the Border Guard Service, an armed corps placed under the supervision of the KGB.

Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Podkolzina v. Latvia

09.04.2002

Concerned the disqualification of a minority Russian-speaking candidate for parliamentary elections on the ground that she had an inadequate command of the official language.

Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Mirolubovs and Others v. Latvia

15.09.2009

Concerned a complaint about the authorities' unwarranted intervention in an internal dispute within the Old Orthodox religious community.

Violation of Article 9 (freedom of religion)

Kornakovs v. Latvia

15.06.2006

Concerned, among other issues, the authorities' interception of a prisoner's letter to the European Court of Human Rights and his being reprimanded for communicating with the Court.

In particular, two violations of Article 34 (right of individual application)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Gaponenko c. Lettonie

15.06.2023

The case concerned the arrest in 2018 and subsequent detention of Mr Gaponenko for various alleged criminal offences related to actions directed against national independence and incitement to hatred.

Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

Guravska v. Latvia

10.09.2020

The application concerned a complaint by the applicant about the excessive length of civil proceedings in a property ownership dispute.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

Vecbaštika and Others v. Latvia

12.12.2019

The applicants are 19 individuals, who live in Dunika parish and who opposed the construction of wind power stations close to their home.

Applications declared inadmissible

Larionovs v. Latvia and Tess v. Latvia

25.11.2014

The applicants in both cases complained that the criminal law had been retroactively applied in the proceedings against them in connection with their acts during the mass deportation of Latvian inhabitants to remote places of the USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) in March 1949.

Applications declared inadmissible (non-exhaustion of domestic remedies)

Kovaļkovs v. Latvia

31.01. 2012

The applicant complained in particular of repeated violations of his freedom of religion in prison. He relied on Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion).

Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

Liepajnieks v. Latvia

02.11.2010

Concerned applicant's complaint that, following the restoration of Latvia's independence in 1990, he gradually lost his right to the lease – without compensation – of an apartment to which he had been entitled since 1969.

Application declared inadmissible (lack of victim status)

Noteworthy pending cases

H.M.M. and Others v. Latvia (no. 42165/21)

The case concerns alleged "pushbacks" in the vicinity of the Latvian-Belarusian border starting from 10 August 2021.

Case communicated to the parties on 3 May 2022

The Chamber relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber on 2 July February 2024.

A Grand Chamber hearing took place on 12 February 2025.

Two other cases concerning alleged "push backs" were notified to the Latvian Government in 2023:

M.A. and Others v. Latvia (no. 1134/23) and **S.S. v. Latvia (no. 15408/23)**

SIA TVNET GRUPA v. Latvia (no. 20099/24)
O.C. v. Latvia (no. 30007/23)
Gaponenko v. Latvia (no. 39755/22)
Šaripovs v. Latvia and Gončarovs v. Latvia (nos. 14589/18 and 22381/18)

Cases concerning freedom of expression (Article 10) and/or freedom of assembly (Article 11).

A, B and X v. Latvia (no. 14318/23 and 2 others)
Veiss v. Latvia (no. 2) (no. 49326/21)

Cases concerning contact rights with children.

Rucki and Others (nos. 37284/23 and 5 others)

Notified to the Government on 4 April 2024
Concerns Covid-19 related restrictions.

ECHR Press Unit Contact:
++33 (0)3 90 21 42 08