

Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania  
Žygimantų street no. 2, Vilnius

Plaintiff (appellant):  
Grant Arthur Gochin  
date of birth: November 2, 1963  
Address: 10900 Winnetka Ave., Chatsworth, CA 91311  
United States of America

Plaintiff's representative (address for correspondence):  
Rokas Rudzinskas, attorney  
A. Mickevičiaus street no. 14-2, LT-08119 Vilnius  
telephone: 8 614 88303 e-mail: rokas@rlaw.lt

Institution whose decision is being appealed:  
state institution Center for the Study of the Genocide and Resistance of Residents of Lithuania  
Corporate code: 191428780  
Address: Didžioji street no. 17/1, Vilnius

**STATEMENT**  
**On disinformation concerning the court finding being appealed**  
February 2, 2002, Vilnius

We hereby inform you that the director of the defendant organization on December 27, 2019, during broadcast of the Lithuanian public radio and television radio program "Aktualijų studio" [Current Events Studio], made false statements regarding the court finding being appealed.

The director/defendant's statements of December 27, 2019, were published in writing in the news section of the Lithuanian public radio and television website in Lithuanian and English. The publication "Genocido centro vadovė: svarby ne istorinis išsilavinimas, o tikėti tyrimų rezultatais" [Genocide Center Director: History Education Not Important, but Trusting Results of Research Is] <sup>1</sup> states that (cit.):

According to her, "it has never happened in this way, that our (the Genocide Center's--LRT.lt) conclusions or findings were annulled." **"We know that suit was filed the finding on J. Noreika with the administrative court,' the director of the Center for the Study of the Genocide and Resistance of Residents of Lithuania said, 'but the Vilnius Administrative Court found the findings were made based on academic methodology.'"**

The English-language translation on the site stated that (cit.):

**"The Center's conclusions have never been dismissed,' said the Center's director. 'A [report] on Noreika was once taken to an administrative court [in Vilnius], but it ruled that the conclusions were made using scientific methodology.'"**

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/1128465/genocido-centro-vadove-svarbu-ne-instorinis-issilavinimas-o-tiketi-tyrimu-rezultatais> and <https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/1133937/lithuanian-officer-in-holocaust-controversy-saved-jews-does-evidence-stack-up>

**This is false information.** It's clear this is discussion about finding of the Vilnius District Administrative Court of March 27, 2019, in case no. el-534-281/2019 concerning the call for annulling the historical finding on Jonas Noreika which is now undergoing appeal.

**The court finding in the case has not come into legal force, it is under appeal with the request to return the case to the court for full reconsideration.** The call for annulment of the finding was rejected because of one technicality. The court felt the plaintiff contacted the Genocide Center with a request (rather than a complaint) on an administrative procedure, the provision of information, which was presented to the plaintiff in the Genocide Center's letter no. 14R-52 dated July 18, 2018.

**The court didn't consider the content of the Genocide Center's historical finding.** The court did not consider historical documents and arguments presented by the plaintiff which show the finding needs to be changed. The court made no statement regarding these matters because it didn't consider them. **The court never said or even hinted "that the historical findings were made based on academic methodology."** This information presented to the public is not in keeping with the truth.

This knowingly false statement was made via the state broadcaster with self-serving intent in order to defend their reputation, since for some time previously historians from Vilnius University and the Lithuanian History Institute had been openly criticizing in the media a new finding from the defendant about Jonas Noreika.

In these circumstances, the defendant/director in issuing a public reply and claiming that "the court found that the findings were made based on academic methodology" intentionally spread disinformation to mislead the public using the authority of the court for cover.

I hereby also inform you that the plaintiff has made written representation to the defendant and the state broadcaster for the retraction of this false information.

Respectfully,  
Rokas Radziniskas, attorney