Template for input

(1) Information on developments and measures taken to implement each of the recommendations addressed to your Member State in the 2025 Rule of Law Report

In the below box, please describe relevant developments and the measures taken with a view to implement the recommendations, following the order of the recommendations as they were addressed to your Member State in the 2025 Rule of Law Report.

1. Take measures to ensure the adequate safeguards against undue political influence in the appointment procedure for Supreme Court judges, taking into account European standards on judicial appointments.

In response to the European Commission's 2025 Rule of Law recommendation regarding safeguards in judicial appointment procedures, the matter was examined at national level by the Judicial Council in the context of ongoing amendments to the Law "On the Judicial Power". The Commission recommended: "Take measures to ensure adequate safeguards against undue political influence in the appointment procedure for Supreme Court judges."

The matter was discussed at the preparatory meeting of the Judicial Council held on **9 January 2026,** where the **judge-led majority of the Council unanimously concluded** that the situation underlying the European Commission's recommendation does **not reveal a systemic problem** in Latvia's judicial appointment system.

Following the discussion, the prevailing view was that the situation which gave rise to the recommendation constituted an isolated incident rather than a systemic deficiency in the judicial appointment framework. The Judicial Council concluded that the existing constitutional framework already provides effective mechanisms to address potential consequences of political decision-making in judicial appointment procedures. In particular, under the Constitutional Court Law, political decisions adopted by the Saeima (Parliament) and other constitutional bodies may be subject to constitutional review, and the absence of a separate formal decision does not preclude such a political vote from being regarded as an act amenable to review by the Constitutional Court.

Furthermore, within the scope of its statutory competences, the Judicial Council has the right to submit an application to the Constitutional Court regarding the compliance of such acts with higher-ranking legal norms. Against this background, it was considered that the existing legal framework provides sufficient safeguards to protect judicial independence and that no immediate structural amendments were necessary at this stage.

The Judicial Council will continue to monitor the practical functioning of the appointment system and assess any emerging risks.

2. Ensure the effective implementation of the legislation on lobbying, including as regards the special interim lobby register.

According to the June 12, 2025 amendments to the Law on Transparency of Interest Representation, development of the Register of Interest Representation and the System for Declaring Interest Representation has been stopped due to potential changes in the European Union's regulation. The Enterprise Register will begin maintaining the Register of Interest Representation and the System for Declaring Interest Representation starting from September 1, 2028. In the meantime, starting from September 1, 2025, the Enterprise Register of the Republic of Latvia maintains a voluntary list of interest representatives available to the public, but information about interest representation activities are published on the websites of the institutions. The following information is included in the list of interest representatives: 1) about an interest representative — a legal person or partnership — legal form, name, registration number and country of registration; 2) about an interest representative — a natural person — first name, surname and personal identification number (if none, — date of birth, number and date of issue of the personal identification document, country and institution that issued the document).

Administrative liability will be assessed in Latvia after the implementation of the register and declaration system.

(2) Information on:

a. developments that are relevant for updating and following up on the assessment of the topics covered in the respective country chapter of the 2025 Report, including possible clarifications

- *In the boxes below, describe developments (updates or feedback) related to the topics covered in your country chapter of the 2025 Report (if not already covered under point (1)). You are invited to follow the order of topics as presented in the country chapter and insert direct references to the country chapter text, if convenient; and*

b. any other new developments not already covered under points (1) and (2)a. that you consider relevant

- *The list of topics provided in the Annex can provide guidance for this input.*

I. Justice Systems

A. Independence

1. Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)

On November 7, the Judicial Council heard the candidates for the position of Prosecutor General and decided to nominate the Chief Prosecutor of Riga Judicial Region Armins Meisters for appointment to this position. On November 20, 2025, the Saeima approved the appointment of Armins Meisters as the Prosecutor General. 88 Saeima members voted in favour of the appointment, with no members voting "against". Armins Meisters has more than 25 years of experience in the Prosecution Office. Since 2000, he has worked in various structural units of the Prosecution Office, including the Chief Prosecutor of the Riga Judicial Region Prosecution Office and the Chief Prosecutor of the Prosecution Office for the Investigation of Financial and Economic Crimes. The Prosecutor General is appointed by the Saeima for a five-year term upon the proposal of the Judicial Council. The same person may serve as Prosecutor General for no more than two consecutive terms.

In 2025 the Prosecution Office organized 3 rounds of application for positions of prosecutors. In the first round 7 applications were received (3 applicants exempted from the tests, 4 applicants failed the test). In the second round 13 applications were received (6 applicants exempted from the tests, 1 applicant failed the test). In the 3 round 17 applications were received (6 applicants exempted from the tests, 4 applicants failed the test). Outside of rounds of applications 12 applications were received. 31 applicants were appointed as prosecutors.

In 2022 the Constitutional Court adopted a judgment[1] in which it held that a blanket ban for persons, criminal proceedings against whom had been terminated on non-exonerating grounds, to become a candidate for the office of a judge was unconstitutional. Subsequently Article 55 the Law on Judicial Power[2] was amended to provide for an individual assessment of candidates for judicial office who have been tried for less serious crimes or criminal violations.[3] In 2025 Mr. Jānis Rozenbergs – the former head of the Latvian Bar Association – was appointed to be a judge of the Supreme Court.[4] According to publicly available information[5] he had been tried for having committed a criminal violation but the criminal proceedings had been discontinued when Mr. Rozenbergs and the victim

[1] Judgment of 15 December 2022 in case no. 2021-41-01, an English translation of the judgment is available: https://www.satv.tiesa.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/2021-41-01_Judgement.pdf
[2] Available in English translation: https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/62847-on-judicial-power
[3] See Article 55(2).
[4] See https://www.at.gov.lv/lv/jaunumi/par-notikumiem/senata-krimінallietu-departamenta-darbu-sak-senators-janis-rozenbergs-12780?year=2025&month=12.
[5] See, for example, https://www.lsm.lv/raksts/zinas/latvija/17.09.2025-ap-toposa-augstakas-tiesas-senatora-jana-rozenberga-reputaciju-krit-aizdomu-ena.a614785/.

concluded a settlement. After an individual assessment a special commission established by the Judicial Council nevertheless declared that Mr. Rozenbergs was well suited for the office of a judge.

2. *Irremovability of judges; including transfers (incl. as part of judicial map reform), dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)*

Currently the Parliament is deliberating a number of possible amendments to the Constitutional Court Law. The amending law has been adopted in two readings and currently the third and final reading is being scheduled. One of the proposed amendments concerns judges of the Constitutional Court who, prior to becoming judges, were public prosecutors. It is proposed[6] that, similarly as is already the case of Constitutional Court judges who prior to their appointment were civil servants or judges of ordinary courts or administrative courts,[7] such judges will be entitled to return to the prosecution service in a position equivalent to the one they held prior to the appointment to the Constitutional Court. The idea behind the "guarantee of return" is to strengthen the independence of judges of the Constitutional Court by excluding the theoretical possibility that their decision-making at the Constitutional Court might lead to negative repercussions after the end of their mandate at the Constitutional Court.

3. *Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)*

In 2025, twelve prosecutors were promoted. Ten prosecutors were re-appointed to the positions of Chief Prosecutors and Deputy Chief Prosecutors.

4. *Allocation of cases in courts*

Computerized case distribution is carried out through by the Court information system. Direct specialization, workload and absences are taken into account during allocation. Computerized distribution of cases ensures the principle of randomness of distribution of cases and avoids conflict of interests. In 2024 the work continued towards the implementation the case weighing model was continued. In order to ensure the use of the model for determining the degree of complexity of cases for workload analysis and monitoring in courts of first and second instance, the Court Administration had to carry out technical adjustment of statistical accounting tools. From January 2024, the technical adjustments ensured the collection of the results of the weighing of cases for the courts of first instance, but from July 1 also in regional (appeal instance) courts. Court presidents have access to current data on court performance indicators in accordance with the scope of the weighing project. Data is grouped (aggregated) by instance, so each instance has its own reports. In order to verify the compliance of workload points with the actual situation, to look for a solution for the possibility of synchronizing the workload between judges specializing in criminal and civil cases, two working groups are established. One for the first instance courts and the second one for the appeal instance courts.

In 2025, the principles governing the allocation of cases in courts did not undergo significant changes, and the automated case distribution system continued to operate by taking into account judges' specialization, workload, and absences. The principle of randomness was also maintained to avoid conflicts of interest and ensure a transparent allocation process.

In 2025, work continued on improving the case weighing model. In the autumn, the Court Administration presented an updated version of the model, developed on the basis of judicial practice, working group recommendations, and data analysis.

During the year, substantial changes were introduced to the weighting principles applied in regional courts, ensuring a more balanced workload between the Criminal and Civil Divisions. The revised model better reflects the actual complexity of cases and the workload of judges, thereby contributing

[6] See the proposal with respect to Article 7^1(41) of the Constitutional Court Law: https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS14/saeimalivs14.nsf/0/95D3753CD8A72CA7C2258D79003FF5FB?OpenDocument

[7] See Article 7^1(3) and (4) of the Constitutional Court Law; an English translation is available: https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/63354-constitutional-court-law.

to a fairer and more transparent distribution of judicial workload.

At the same time, in 2025 preparatory work was carried out for the inclusion of administrative cases in the case weighing model. The practical implementation of administrative case integration will begin in 2026, ensuring comprehensive coverage of all categories of cases and a unified approach to workload analysis across the judiciary.

5. *Independence (including composition and nomination and dismissal of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e.g. Council for the Judiciary)*

No new updates in 2025.

6. *Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal/civil (where applicable) liability of judges (incl. judicial review)*

In 2025, five cases were examined regarding the possible disciplinary liability of prosecutors, of which three resulted in a decision to hold the prosecutor disciplinarily liable by imposing a disciplinary penalty of 20 % of their monthly salary for 1, 3 and 5 months, and in one case it was proposed to hold the prosecutor accountable by applying a disciplinary penalty – demotion. In one case, consideration of the matter was postponed. One matter concerning possible violations of the Latvian Prosecutors' Code of Ethics was closed due to the prosecutor being dismissed from office.

7. *Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service*

No new updates in 2025.

8. *Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers*

The Constitutional Court has received at least two applications concerning the constitutionality of Article 17(2) of the Advocacy Law that provides for an automatic suspension of the status of a sworn attorneys against whom criminal proceedings have been initiated with respect to intentional crimes allegedly committed within the course of carrying out their professional duties or with respect to whom a security measure – the prohibition to carry out specific types of employment – has been imposed. One such application by the District Administrative Court has been declared inadmissible,[8] and the Constitutional Court has not yet ruled on the admissibility of the second application.

Please see the letter from Latvian Council of Sworn Advocates No. LZAP-6/17.

9. *Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary*

In line with the instructions of the Cabinet of Ministers, Ministry of Justice has drafted the necessary amendments to regulatory enactments intended to establish the right of a prosecutor, after the end of a Constitutional Court judge’s term of office, to return to an equivalent position within the Prosecutor’s Office and to retain eligibility for a prosecutor’s service pension. These amendments are currently being considered by the Parliament. Such regulation would guarantee continuity in these individuals’ professional careers and ensure that their previous knowledge and experience in the Prosecutor’s Office can be fully made use of, both at the Constitutional Court and, after the end of their term, back in the Prosecutor’s Office.

The draft law also includes several technical amendments, as well as changes aimed, for example, at improving the regulation of the institution of a judge’s separate opinion and the procedural stage of case examination, as well as clarifying the rules on judges’ disciplinary liability. The amendments also provide for the digitalisation of the Constitutional Court’s case management, establishing its integration into the e-Case system and ensuring that the Court’s procedures are incorporated into the judicial information environment.

[8] The inadmissibility decision of 28 August 2025 is available in Latvian: https://www.satv.tiesa.gov.lv/decisions/kolegijas-2025-gada-28-augusta-lemums-pieteikums-nr-142-2025/.

Another draft law is being reviewed by the Parliament as well with the aim to introduce changes to the existing service pension regulation for judges and prosecutors in order to establish a system of social guarantees that meets the standards of judicial independence, while simultaneously addressing the identified issues of cross-sector segmentation of service pensions, the increasing divergence from the state old-age pension system, the rapidly growing state budget expenditures, as well as the employment risks for service pension beneficiaries. The draft law provides for strengthening the independence of judges and prosecutors by guaranteeing their statutory right to adequate material security after leaving office, and to establish the procedure for granting, calculating and paying a special pension for judges and prosecutors. The regulation would not affect those persons who will have more than 15 years of service on 31 December 2026. For those officials, at the moment when the entitlement to the special pension becomes entitled, it will be granted, calculated and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Judges' Retirement Pensions Act and the Prosecutors' Retirement Pensions Act, which were in force until 31 December 2026. This will ensure that the new legal framework is introduced gradually, ensuring reasonable legitimate expectations while also ensuring timely preparation for the new legal order.

B. Quality of justice

10. Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)

As of 1 January 2025, amendments to the Law "On State Compensation to Victims" entered into force, introducing the right to receive State compensation for victims of criminal offences committed through negligence, where the consequences involve the death of a person or the infliction of moderate or serious bodily harm. In 2025, eight decisions were adopted in cases where the criminal offence had been committed through negligence.

The Ministry of Justice has also prepared a draft law providing for amendments to the State Ensured Legal Aid Law, aimed at expanding access to state-ensured legal aid in proceedings before the Constitutional Court by ensuring that such aid is available already at the stage of preparing an application, rather than only after a refusal by the Constitutional Court to initiate proceedings. The purpose of the amendments is to ensure more effective protection of the rights of socially vulnerable persons who require professional legal support in order to prepare a high-quality application.

Throughout 2025 the Constitutional Court, in collaboration with other state institutions, has worked on expanding the possibilities to obtain legal aid to improve the accessibility of the Constitutional Court. The existing system is procedurally cumbersome and in practice has meant that the legal aid for submitting applications to the Constitutional Court has been granted on average once or twice a year. The intention is to revamp the system by means of engaging sworn attorneys in the process from the very outset, by giving the attorneys the responsibility to carry out the initial analysis of the likelihood of a successful outcome of proceedings before the Constitutional Court. The relevant amendments of the applicable legal acts (first and foremost – the State Ensured Legal Aid Law[9]) are currently being prepared by the Government for submission to the Parliament.

11. Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material), remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year),

The number of available positions of the first and second (appellate) instance courts judges – 546 remains unchanged in 2024. In the spring of 2025, the Judicial Council determined the optimal number of judges for courts in Latvia. In accordance with Judicial Council Decision No. 20, the number of judicial positions to be filled in district (city) courts and regional courts may not exceed 516 positions in total. At the end of 2025, 456 judges were serving in the first and second instance courts, which is 60 judges fewer than the number established by the Judicial Council. This difference indicates that the judicial system has not yet reached the optimal staffing level set for 2025. While the number of serving judges remains below the recommended threshold, the situation highlights the ongoing need to strengthen judicial capacity through recruitment and resource planning.

[9] Available in English translation: https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/104831-state-ensured-legal-aid-law.

Regarding financing, an additional 925,406 euros have been allocated for 2025 year's court budget to strengthen the competitiveness of judicial assistants in the labour market and ensure competitive remuneration for court employees, in order to reduce employee turnover and promote work efficiency.

In 2025, the monthly salaries[10] of judges increased by 2,6% and the changes are indicated in the table below. Accordingly, the amount of seniority allowances, allowances for participation in self-governing institutions, vacation allowances have also increased.

Position of judge	Current year's monthly salary for 2025 (gross), *euro*	Current year's monthly salary for 2024 (gross), *euro*	Changes in 2025 compared to 2024, *euro*
District (city) court judge	3959	3858	101
Regional court (appeal instance) judge	4750	4630	120
Supreme court judge	6185	6029	156
Constitutional court judge	7125	6945	180

Compared to 2024, in 2025 the increase in the monthly salary for all the prosecutors was the same – 2,6 %. Responding to the state-wide priority to allocate budget resources to increase the defence spending, the Constitutional Court's budget for 2026 has been reduced by 5% in comparison to 2025 budget. This has necessitated the reduction of the auxiliary staff and the bonuses that may be paid to the staff of the Court.

12. Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

On 24 October 2024, the Parliament of the Republic of Latvia adopted the Law on the Judicial Academy, thereby defining the status of the Judicial Academy and setting out its tasks and rights. As of 1 January 2025, the newly established institution "Judicial Academy"[11] has officially commenced its operations. The Judicial Academy of Latvia plans, organises and implements training for judges and court staff, for prosecutors and prosecution office employees, who provide legal support in the execution of prosecutors' duties, as well as investigators on issues essential for the effective administration of justice.

To ensure the provision of training, ten training programmes have been developed to comprehensively address the needs of the target audiences. These programmes are based on the long-term development plans of the professions, the requirements set out in policy planning documents, as well as the expressed needs of the target groups themselves. The programmes include professional development for both initial training and continuous training, and serve as a foundation for the development of the annual training plan.

The Judicial Academy applies a comprehensive approach to the development of professional competencies within the judiciary, encompassing initial training, continuing professional development, and strengthening innovation, research, and international cooperation capacities. The Judicial Academy is responsible for identifying and assessing training needs, as well as for the effective and sustainable planning of training content. It also selects and supports lecturers and participates in various working groups on training-related issues.

In May 2025, the renovated premises of the Judicial Academy – specifically adapted for training

[10] In the third quarter of 2025, the average gross salary in Latvia was 1,835 euros, according to data from the Central Statistical Bureau (CSB). https://www.csp.gov.lv/lv/jaunums/videjais-atalgojums-pirms-nodoklu-nomaksas-1-835-eiro-0

[11] The Judicial Academy is a derived public person under the institutional supervision of the Cabinet of Ministers, exercised through the Minister of Justice. Its functional supervision is carried out by the Judicial Council.

purposes – were officially completed, and from mid-2025, the premises, including all necessary training equipment, were handled over for the Academy's use. On 11–12 June 2025, the Judicial Academy was admitted as a member of the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) during its General Assembly.

In 2025 year, a total of 8,444 participations (not unique participants) were recorded in Judicial Academy training activities, which have comprised 407 training events. The Judicial Academy was established with funding from the European Union Recovery Fund (NextGenerationEU). After the conclusion of the project on 1 July 2026, the Judicial Academy will continue to organise training activities and enhance the efficiency of the judicial system using state budget funds.

In 2025 prosecutors attended various training events: courses, seminars, and conferences organized in Latvia and abroad, as well as trainings organized by the Prosecution Office, other state institutions, international organizations and NGOs and the newly established Justice Academy that organises and implements training for judges and court staff, prosecutors and prosecution staff who provide legal support in the performance of prosecutorial duties, as well as for investigators on issues relevant to the effective administration of justice. In 2025 altogether 2306 prosecutors attended various training activities on topics such as: construction regulation, investigation of financial and economic crimes, cryptocurrencies and digital evidence, virtual assets, virtual assets and international cooperation, resolving complex procedural situations when examining applications for temporary protection against violence, qualification and issues in investigating cruelty and violence, proving the criminal origin of property in court, current issues in the application of the OECD Convention, minors as victims in criminal proceedings, application of European Union law and others. For many of the training activities Senior Prosecutor Assistants were in attendance to promote their knowledge on the various topics. The prosecutors also attended various conferences, such as international conference "Clean Money, Clean Environment: Environmental Crime and Money Laundering", ERA organized conference on White-collar crimes, as well as meetings organized in Eurojust to promote international cooperation. The topics of trainings offered to prosecutors were based on surveys of prosecutors organized by Prosecution Office, Justice Academy, as well as following the specific recommendations given by Prosecutors' Attestation Commission to those prosecutors that were being evaluated. The evaluation system introduced by the Prosecution Office in 2021 pays special attention to the identification of the specific training that is necessary for each prosecutor. In 2025 a specially designed leadership programme was provided for the Chief Prosecutors at the regional prosecution offices. Training focused on theoretical knowledge and practical application of theory. Based on the positive reviews the training will be continued.

In addition, the foreign language trainings were organized to strengthen the capacity of prosecutors to cooperate in cross border investigations. The trainings were organized to improve knowledge of English and French languages. Altogether 78 prosecutors attended language trainings. In 2025 prosecutors participated in various EJTN, CEPOL and ERA trainings and exchange visits. The trainings were organized online as well as in face-to-face setting. 107 prosecutors participated in trainings about topics such as judicial cooperation in criminal matters, specialized language courses, victim's rights, artificial intelligence in criminal proceeding etc.

13. Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, including electronic communication and AI tools, within the justice system and with court users, procedural rules, access to judgments online)

The E-case program is implemented in two stages. Stage 1 was from 2018 until 2021 and stage 2 started in 2022. The main goal is to continue the digitalization of other litigation processes including the investigation authorities. Also, completion of cooperation partners' integration and functionality development.

During 2025 advancements were made to enhance the functionality, accessibility, and efficiency of the E-case portal. Key achievements include:

- introduced a new calendar functionality that allows users to view all scheduled court hearings in a single place and access additional information about each hearing. By selecting a specific hearing entry, users can see detailed data, including the "Case Information" section with a direct link to the case file, as well as the "Course of Proceedings" section, which provides access to publicly available information on the progress of the case. The calendar is available to authorised users.

- introduced a new e-form titled "E-submission to the Prosecution Office," which enables users to complete and submit applications electronically to any structural unit of the Prosecution Office of the Republic of Latvia. This new functionality simplifies communication with the institution by providing a structured and standardised format for submitting information, allowing users to attach supporting documents and facilitating more efficient processing of received submissions.
- introduced a new online service – the "State Compensation Calculator." This tool allows victims of crime to obtain an indicative estimate of the amount of state compensation they may be eligible to receive if, as a result of a criminal offence, any of the conditions prescribed by law have occurred, such as the death of a person, serious or moderate bodily harm, violation of sexual integrity, being a victim of human trafficking, or infection with HIV, or hepatitis B or C.
- introduced a new e-form titled "Complaint in Administrative Proceedings," enabling users to electronically submit complaints against procedural decisions taken by public authorities within administrative proceedings. The new solution significantly streamlines the submission process, as it is accessible online at any time, provides a structured format for entering the required information, and delivers the complaint to the court immediately upon submission. Under the Administrative Procedure Law, such complaints are examined in a single instance and within a shortened time frame, and the resulting court decisions are not subject to appeal, thereby ensuring a more efficient mechanism for procedural review.
- introduced improvements in "Lawyers calendar" functionality – hearing address is available, as well as other improvements in all events review.

To ensure day-to-day work for judicial officers, courts have their own information system – the Court Information System. In 2025, a major development was introduced within the Court Information System (TIS2), as administrative cases were incorporated into the new platform. Until now, administrative cases — just like civil and criminal cases — had been processed in the first-generation Court Information System. Their transition to new IS therefore represents a substantial step in the broader technological migration towards a unified and modernised judicial information environment.

The Prosecution Office continued to participate in the implementation of the national e-case platform in which the information systems of the Courts, the Prosecution Office, the State Probation Service, and the Prison Administration are connected. The existing solutions have been updated as well as some new ones have been implemented. In 2025 the electronic tool for remote procedural actions – a secure solution with data verification that will allow communication with the prosecutor remotely, was designed. In 2026 it will be implemented and the training for the use of the tool will be carried out. To ensure further development of the translation service and efficient use of translation time resources, the Prosecution Office has acquired a speech recognition platform and a machine translation platform licensing service.

In 2025, the Constitutional Court initiated a pilot project to test the feasibility of using AI tools for drafting the parts of court rulings that do not contain legal conclusions of the Court (i.e., the facts and summaries of submissions of the parties and third persons). The results of the initial testing are expected in the first half of 2026. At the same time, the Constitutional Court, similarly as the Supreme Court, have adopted internal guidelines on the use of AI which strictly emphasise that under no circumstances can AI tools be employed in the actual decision-making by the Court.

In the second half of 2025 a conceptual decision was made that the Constitutional Court will join the e-Case system which is used by other courts of Latvia to digitalize court proceedings and making the relevant information digitally accessible to all the involved persons. For this reason, a respective amendment of the Constitutional Court Law[12] is, as previously mentioned, currently pending before the Parliament, and amendments to the Rules of the Constitutional Court and other normative legal

[12] See the proposed addition of Article 33(3): https://titania.saeima.lv/LIVS14/saeimalivs14.nsf/0/95D3753CD8A72CA7C2258D79003FF5FB?OpenDocument.

acts are being prepared.

14. Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems, including AI-based systems, for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

In 2025, also an anonymisation tool for document processing, incorporating artificial intelligence elements was developed to support the secure handling of documents containing personal data. The tool automatically identifies and anonymises personal information, significantly reducing the amount of manual work required from court staff and allowing them to devote more time to the preparation of legal documents. This solution not only accelerates the preparation of documents but also strengthens compliance with data protection requirements, ensuring that information can be shared securely while preserving confidentiality. Designed as a shared solution for public administration, the anonymisation tool is now used not only by courts but also by a number of other national authorities, including the Information Centre of the Ministry of the Interior, the Prosecution Office, the State Revenue Service, the Nature Conservation Agency, the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau, the Competition Council, the Insolvency Control Service, and, more recently, the State Language Centre.

In 2025, the judiciary introduced an enhanced audio–video recording and transcription tool designed to modernise and streamline the documentation of court hearings. The tool enables automatic data transfer from the case file, ensuring that hearing recordings are directly linked to the relevant case information. This enhancement improves the efficiency and accuracy of court record-keeping and reduces the manual workload involved in preparing hearing transcripts. By automating key elements of the protocol preparation process, the judiciary strengthens both the quality and accessibility of hearing documentation.

Regarding technical equipment in 2025, technical work was carried out to ensure the continuous operation and modernization of court infrastructure. As for the technical equipment in the courts, all judges and 90% of other employees have laptops with docking stations and can use a secure VPN for remote work. The court uses Office 365 tools (email, sharepoint, teams, OneDrive, Word, Excel, etc. All courtrooms (~325) are equipped with audio recording systems, 60% of courtrooms are equipped with videoconferencing systems (the number of videoconferencing calls increases by ~30% every year). The courtrooms are equipped with e-case monitors to display the case file during the hearing.

In 2025 the Working Group for Management of Time Limits for the Examination of Cases prepared report on “Progress report”[13] and it has been concluded that:

- The involvement of court presidents in case-processing time management should be strengthened, with particular attention to the supervision of long-pending cases, as well as by making more active use of the powers granted under the Law “On Judicial Power”.
- The registration and data analysis of long-pending cases is an appropriate tool for identifying problematic situations.
- Separate guidelines on time-management processes are not needed, however, additions should be incorporated into the existing guidelines that describe case-processing time standards.
- Discussions need to continue on the application of Section 28.[6], Paragraph 5.1 of the Law "On Judicial Power".
- In practice, courts should more actively exercise their discretion to replace an attorney who cannot ensure participation in a court hearing (Criminal Procedure Law, Section 466(1) and Section 468).

The procedure for developing and approving case-processing time standards should be reviewed, meaning that standards should be based on statistical data from the previous year rather than on the opinions of court presidents, and that a uniform standard should be established for all courts of similar jurisdiction (Section 27.[1] of the Law “On Judicial Power”).The Prosecution Office Information System (ProIS) includes several tools that assist prosecutors such as sample forms, reminders about deadlines, notifications about expiration of terms, etc. In addition, ProIS allows to monitor quality of

[13] https://www.tieslietupadome.lv/lv/media/9237/download?attachment

the implementation of criminal proceedings and uniform application of the Criminal Law. To ensure uniform criminal sentencing policy, ProIS allows to carry out daily monitoring of the adopted prosecutor's penal orders and concluded plea agreements. ProIS is also used to collect and analyse data about prosecutors' performance, both by assessing the workload of each structural unit as a whole and the individual workload of each prosecutor. This allows to introduce necessary adjustments to balance the workload.

Information regarding the use of assessment tools by the Prosecution Office was provided in answers submitted to the "DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE 2026 EU JUSTICE SCOREBOARD". All prosecution offices in Latvia use electronic Case Management System; are equipped with distance communication technology, in particular videoconferencing equipment. All prosecutors and staff of the Prosecution Office can fulfil their duties and work securely remotely. Secure electronic communication within the prosecution service (including with lawyers employed by the prosecution service) is available, as well as secure electronic communication between the prosecution service and courts; and detention facilities, investigating authorities, defence lawyers. Use of artificial intelligence applications in core activities takes place as well as use of artificial intelligence application for automating routine tasks (e.g. allocation of rooms, management of resources).

AI tools (based on Machine Learning algorithms) are used to:
1) anonymize prosecutor decisions and others case materials
2) transcribe video/audio materials (speech-to-text)
3) prepare draft translations for documents written in foreign languages.

15. Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions ("judicial map") and their specialisation, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases.

Please see replay to 16. question.

16. Specialisation (of judges/specific courts/chambers within courts) and training for the judiciary to deal with commercial cases, as well as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and mediation as regards commercial cases.

Although Latvia does not generally distinguish between such specialization of judges as specialization in commercial matters, since March 31, 2021, the Economic Court (hereinafter also, EC) has been operating in Latvia, whose competence includes, among other things, the following categories of cases related to commercial matters: claims arising from reinsurance contracts; claims arising from investment service or ancillary investment service agreements; claims of investors of European Union Member States against the State of Latvia for the protection of investments; claims arising from legal relationships of groups of companies; claims arising from mutual legal relationships of shareholders (stockholders) of a capital company; claims arising from financial collateral arrangements; claims arising from transactions of capital companies with related persons within the meaning of the Commercial Law and the Financial Instrument Market Law; requirements arising from the transition of undertakings and the reorganization of a company, except for the claims of employees; claims arising from contractual obligations between participants of a construction process, including with sub-contractors, in relation to the construction of such structure of the second and third groups for the implementation of which a construction permit is required, except for the construction of an individual single apartment or duplex residential house and structures functionally linked thereto; claims for the violations of competition law; claims for decisions of the meeting of shareholders (stockholders) of a capital company; applications for the liquidation or insolvency of credit institutions.

Considering the existing scope and capacity of the EC, it has been concluded that the issue of expanding the court's competence should be considered. The issue of additional competences is being further assessed in connection with an appropriate increase in the number of judges and the provision of appropriate infrastructure.

Currently, the Parliament is considering a draft law "Amendments to the Civil Procedure Law" and a draft law "Amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law", which aim to expand the competence of the EC. The expansion of the EC's competence is part of the Ministry's targeted measures to strengthen Latvia's investment environment. It is planned to add new categories of civil cases to the EC's jurisdiction and to ensure that only criminal proceedings that are in line with the purpose of the court's establishment are heard by it. The changes will bring direct benefits to businesses – the litigation process will become more efficient, specialized and predictable, thereby strengthening the security of Latvia's investment environment and the stability of the legal environment. At the same time, expanding the court's jurisdiction is inextricably linked to strengthening and expanding the court's capacity, which means increasing the number of judges, providing professional support staff, and ensuring the court's material and technical resources, including provision of appropriate court premises. It should be noted that the Ministry is working purposefully within its competence to meet these needs of the EC. At the same time, it should also be noted that the process of selecting judges and determining the number of judges in each court is the competence of the Judicial Council.

Regarding alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, it should be noted that amendments to the Civil Procedure Law regarding the regulation of arbitration courts entered into force in 2024. They were developed in connection with ensuring the implementation of the Constitutional Court judgment in case No. 2022-03-01, including:

- amendments to Chapter 66 of Civil Procedure Law that ensure compliance of arbitration regulation with international standards, especially UNICTRAL model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. The amendments introduce the possibility of setting aside the arbitral award, as well as specify the grounds for refusal to issue a writ of execution for enforcement of arbitral award. It also allows to recognize and enforce all arbitral awards, not only the ones made by a permanent arbitration court;
- amendments to Civil Procedure Law that add a new Chapter 65.[1] on court assistance in arbitral proceedings. It is intended the courts in cases specified in Arbitration Law can decide on such matters: assisting the arbitral tribunal in taking evidence, issuing interim measures in relation to arbitration proceedings, decide whether the dispute is subject to arbitration, appoint an arbitrator, decide on a challenge of arbitrator, decide on the termination of the mandate of arbitrator.

In 2025, the Council of Certified Mediators in cooperation with the Ministry of Justice continued to implement the program "Mediation in Family Disputes", within the framework of which the state subsidizes the resolution of disputes involving a child through mediation.

This program could be applied for in various cases of disputes related to a child, for example, in matters of daily care, upbringing and education of a child, in the event of a divorce of parents, when there is a dispute about the child's place of residence, access rights and/or the amount of alimony. Moreover, it was possible both if the dispute had not yet reached court, and in the event of already initiated legal proceedings.

In order to foster a successful development of mediation services in Latvia it is essential to promote mediation culture - dispute resolution via collaboration and effective communication that enhance individual responsibility for their disputes as well as lasting solutions. It is essential to increase public awareness and understanding of the benefits of mediation as an alternative conflict resolution tool and the existing opportunities to use these services. Ministry of Justice is working in close collaboration with the Council of Certified Mediators vis a view to promote mediation services and availability.

Within the European Social Fund Plus project "Access to Justice", targeted training is being implemented for legal aid providers and other professionals whose work involves supporting vulnerable individuals, including social sector workers, representatives of the court system, and employees of law-enforcement institutions. The aim of the training is to strengthen understanding of mediation opportunities and their practical application, as well as to promote effective cooperation in cases where individuals require state-funded legal aid or state compensation for victims.

In 2025, two significant training programmes took place: "State-guaranteed Legal Aid in Civil Cases, Administrative Cases and Constitutional Court Proceedings. Mediation Opportunities. Challenges of Effective Cooperation", attended by 155 participants, and "Mediation for Professionals Involved in the Provision of Legal Support Services", which involved 129 participants. The training brought together professionals from various sectors, including legal aid providers, certified mediators, representatives of the court system and law-enforcement institutions, as well as other specialists whose daily work involves children, families, and socially vulnerable individuals. In 2026, the training cycle is planned to continue, expanding the range of participants and strengthening inter-institutional cooperation.

At the same time, the project also foresees an assessment of the possibilities for integrating mediation into the state-funded legal aid system, with the long-term goal of promoting more effective dispute resolution and improving service accessibility.

In addition to institutional measures, public awareness of mediation is further supported by the annual Mediation Days organised each spring by the Council of Certified Mediators, which serve as an important platform for promoting mediation in general.

Mediation in commercial cases is generally available within the scope of the mediation. It should be noted as well that in the scope of competence of the Ministry of Economics there are additional ADR mechanisms, for example, Consumer Dispute Resolution Commission deals with disputes between consumer and seller or service provider.

Additionally the Industrial Property Board of Appeal examines extrajudicial disputes arising from registration and post-registration procedures of industrial property, also at granting a patent; firstly, the Board of Appeal endeavours to reconcile the parties in a matter of opposition (the Law on Industrial Property Institutions and Procedures introduces regulation on functions and competences of the Latvian Patent Office and the Industrial Property Board of Appeal; procedures and rules for all registered Industrial Property rights for opposition proceedings and appeals filed with the Industrial Property Board of Appeal; and rules governing the rights and obligations of patent and trademark attorneys[14]).

C. Efficiency of the justice system:

E.g. Measures as regards length of proceedings, to address backlogs, …

Other – please specify

The average length of court proceedings in 2025[15] according to Judicial Work Data Portal was:

- 2,5 months in the first instance and 4,6 months in the appeal instance for civil cases (including warning procedures), 7,5 months in the first instance and 4,5 months in the appeal instance for civil cases without warning procedures.
- 8 months in the first instance and 6,5 months in the appeal instance for criminal cases.
- 7,1 months in the first instance and 8,6 months in the appeal instance for administrative cases.
- 3,9 months in the first instance and 3,2 months in the appeal instance for administrative offense cases.

Also, it should be noted that Judicial Council's working group in the report on the specialization of land registry cases in courts has concluded that aware of the expected reduction in the number of judges specializing in land registers, a redistribution of decision-making competencies should be implemented by creating a position of court lawyer (state official) in courts with competitive remuneration.[16]

By the end of 2025, the overall dynamics of pending cases across all jurisdictions show diverging trends: civil case backlogs continued to decline, criminal and administrative case volumes increased, while administrative offence cases recorded a significant reduction.

Number of pending civil cases (excluding debt recovery in summary proceedings) in first-instance

[14] Law on Industrial Property Institutions and Procedures https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/275049

[15] https://dati.ta.gov.lv:443/MicroStrategy/asp/Main.aspx?evt=3140&src=Main.aspx.3140&documentID=DFF52FAD4F71BFD3FDBC43A6A2E5DB6C&Server=TA-MSTR2-NEW&Project=TA%20Dati%20New&Port=0&connmode=8&ru=1&share=1

[16] https://www.tieslietupadome.lv/lv/media/9019/download?attachment

and second instance courts had decreased from 21,729 cases at the end of 2024 to 20,111 cases, representing a 7.4% reduction. In district and city courts, including the Economic Court, the backlog decreased by 7.6% (from 20,706 to 19,139 cases). In the regional courts, the total number of pending cases decreased by 5.0% (from 1,023 to 972 cases), though trends varied across regions. Overall, the civil case backlog continues to decline across the court system.

Total number of pending criminal cases across all courts increased from 5,081 cases at the end of 2024 to 5,232 cases, representing a 3% rise. In district and city courts, including the Economic Court, the number of pending cases grew slightly - from 4,137 to 4,194 - while trends varied by court. In regional courts, the total backlog increased from 944 to 1,038 cases.

Total number of pending administrative cases had increased from 1,522 cases at the end of 2024 to 1,747 cases, reflecting a growth of 15%. The Administrative District Court experienced a notable rise in its backlog, from 942 to 1,195 cases, while the Administrative Regional Court recorded a moderate decrease, from 580 to 552 cases. Overall, the upward trend in pending administrative cases in 2025 was primarily driven by the increasing volume of unresolved cases in the first-instance administrative court, indicating sustained workloads and continuing pressure on case processing capacity.

The overall 11% reduction in the number of pending administrative offence cases across both instances in 2025 was primarily driven by the significant decrease in the Riga Regional Court's backlog, where the number of unresolved cases fell sharply as a result of the reallocation of administrative offence appeals to other regional courts. In accordance with Decision No. 22 of the Judicial Council,[17] all administrative offence cases submitted for appellate review were, for a limited period, redirected to other regional courts, and none were assigned to the Riga Regional Court. This temporary measure was intended to reduce the workload of judges in the Criminal Law Division of the Riga Regional Court. Targeted redistribution of cases - implemented to balance workloads - allowed the Riga Regional Court to substantially reduce its existing backlog, independently of the volume of newly received appeals. Although several first-instance courts experienced increases in pending cases, the marked decline at the appellate level, particularly in Riga, was the decisive factor behind the overall reduction.

Please refer to the information included previously regarding use of the digital technologies; the tools available in the ProIS. All these mechanisms allow the Prosecution Office to work more efficiently and to implement the quality assurance in the criminal proceedings which is one of seven priorities included in the Operational Strategy of the Prosecution Office 2022–2027.

II. Anti-Corruption Framework

A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)

In January 2025, the **Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau (KNAB)** took over the investigative and criminal intelligence functions of the Internal Security Department (ISD) of the State Revenue Service (SRS). An assessment of the necessary resources and positions was carried out with the takeover of functions, and a decision was taken to change the structure and list of positions of KNAB, creating 10 positions (not 16 as mentioned in Rule of Law 2025) and allocating funding (reallocated) in the amount of EUR 621 549.

Due to the current geopolitical situation, limited State resources and government priorities, Latvian public administration institutions have been asked to consider improving efficiency and reducing costs.

Therefore, on 26 August 2025 the Cabinet of Ministers in its meeting[18] (53 § point 14) approved the reduction of expenditures of ministries and independent institutions in accordance with Annex 7 to

[17] Decision of the Judicial Council Nr.22 - Par Rīgas apgabaltiesas izņemšanu no administratīvo pārkāpumu lietu sadales

[18] https://tapportals.mk.gov.lv/meetings/protocols/fba1296e-4d5c-45f5-8edf-f843782a48fe (in Latvian)

the informative report "On the results of the review of the state budget and state special budget base and expenditure for 2026, 2027, 2028 and 2029" and additional proposals for expenditure reductions in accordance with the informative report. In order to ensure the continuity, expediency and efficiency of the functions specified in the regulations of the KNAB from 1 January 2026, the changes were made to the structure and list of positions of the KNAB and 7 staff positions were eliminated and funding in the budget of KNAB reduced by EUR 516 700. Having assessed KNAB activities, and in solidarity with other public administration institutions, it was decided that KNAB's functions would not be significantly affected by the reduced vacancies and budget resources.

On 3 December 2025, the national Parliament approved amendments to the Law on Service Pensions for Officials of the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau in the second – final – reading, which are part of the gradual changes planned by the State Chancellery and the government to the service pension system. They will come into force from 2027 and provide for changes in the conditions for granting pensions, calculation procedures and transitional mechanisms, while respecting the principle of legitimate expectations in relation to those KNAB officials who have already accumulated significant service experience. The changes will apply in full only to those officials whose work at KNAB will begin after 1 January 2027. The aim of the reform is to make the pension system more socially just. The reform is comprehensive and does not apply only to KNAB.

KNAB officials who will have acquired the right to a service pension, or will already be recipients of a service pension on 1 January 2027, will not be affected by the changes. In turn, for officials who will not have acquired the right to a retirement pension on 1 January 2027, but whose length of service will be more than 15 years, the last two months will not be taken into account in the formula for calculating the service pension. For officials who will have accumulated less than 15 years of service on 1 January 2027, in addition to the above, the length of service and age will be gradually increased (by six months each year) by five years. In turn, for those officials who will have accumulated less than 10 years of service on 1 January 2027, in addition to the above, the service pension will be calculated taking into account the salary received over a 120-month period, as well as the minimum and maximum amount of the service pension will be reduced by 10%, but by 5% if the person is dismissed from office.

Persons who will start working at KNAB after 1 January 2027, in addition to the above, will be able to include work experience in the private and public sectors in their service, but this will not exceed 20% of the total service, and the service pension will be paid until the general retirement age is reached, after which the payment of the service pension will be terminated and the person will receive an old-age pension calculated in accordance with the general procedure from the person's social insurance contributions.

Therefore, from now on, the right to receive a service pension will be for those KNAB officials who have reached the age of 55 and have accumulated at least 25 years of service, of which at least the last 10 years have been worked as a KNAB official, with this procedure also being applied to the position of the head of KNAB. In certain cases – due to health conditions or the liquidation of the position – a pension may be granted regardless of age, maintaining the requirement for 25 years of service.

According to the planned changes, service pensions will no longer apply to those positions of KNAB officials whose daily work is not associated with increased risk, health or life threat.

In 2025, staff changes took place in the **Office of the Prosecutor General**. The Chief Prosecutor of the Corruption Prevention Coordination Unit of the Criminal Justice Department of the Office of the Prosecutor General Ph.D. Māris Leja was appointed as the Judge of the Supreme Court. After almost 25 years of work in the Prosecution Office, Mr. Leja joined the ranks of senators in the Senate Criminal Justice Department.

This move was followed by the reorganization of the Corruption Prevention Coordination Unit of the Office of the Prosecutor General. As of 2 June 2025, four prosecutor positions of this Unit were transferred to the Pre-Trial Criminal Proceedings and Litigation Coordination Unit of the Criminal

Justice Department of the Office of the Prosecutor General. The Pre-Trial Criminal Proceedings and Litigation Coordination Unit took over the responsibility for the coordination of the prosecution of anti-corruption cases, as well as general oversight of the corruption prevention related matters. As a result of this reorganization only the position of the Chief Prosecutor was liquidated.

The focus on anti-corruption cases remains as one of the top priorities of the Office of the Prosecutor General. At the judicial region level Prosecution Office three prosecutors continue to act as higher-ranking prosecutors specialized in corruption cases. In addition, the capacity of the district level anti-corruption specialized prosecution office has been increased – in 2025 the Prosecution Office Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions had one additional Senior Assistant Prosecutor and one position of Assistant Prosecutor, consisting in total of 1 Chief Prosecutor, 11 prosecutors, 3 Senior Assistant Prosecutors and one Assistant Prosecutor.

Regarding the expansion of the competence of the **Internal Security Bureau (IDB)** as of 1 January 2025 in relation to the investigation and prevention of all types of criminal offences committed by officials and employees of the Prison Administration, the increased workload has not negatively affected the performance of the functions of the Internal Security Bureau.

In addition, it should be noted that on 1 January 2026 the Tax and Customs Police Law entered into force, pursuant to which the Tax and Customs Police Department of the State Revenue Service came under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior. As a result, the investigation of criminal offences committed by the employees and officials of this institution became the competence of the Internal Security Bureau. At the same time, it should be noted that criminal offences in the field of corruption committed by the Tax and Customs Police officers and amployees will be investigated by KNAB, until this function will be taken over by the Internal Security Bureau (not later than year 2029).

The corruption investigation function as regards the **State Border Guard** remained unchanged throughout 2025. In 2025, no changes were introduced with regard to safeguards for the functional independence of the State Border Guard as an institution tasked with the prevention and detection of corruption.

B. Prevention

20. Measures to enhance integrity in the public sector in particular as regards high-level officials (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics)

According Corruption Prevention and Combating Action Plan 2023-2025[19] action line No. 1.10. the **draft report on Cooling-off period for work in the public sector** has been completed by the State Chancellery, KNAB and the Ministry of Welfare in 2025.

It provides analysis of the current situation regarding the cooling period in the public administration, implementation thereof and compensatory mechanisms, in the light of international experience and by making proposals for the development of control mechanisms. The experience of other countries and legal frameworks has been studied and described as well.

In January 2026, KNAB has begun collecting information from institutions involved in the implementation of the Corruption Prevention and Combating Action Plan 2023–2025 on the implementation results of its measures throughout the implementation period. The collected information will be included in the informative report to the Cabinet of Ministers on the assessment of the plan's implementation, the submission deadline of which is 1 May 2026.

KNAB has also completed drafting the 2026–2027 Action Plan project. On 5 January 2026 the project was submitted for consideration at the State Secretaries' meeting, and will subsequently be forwarded to the Cabinet of Ministers for approval. The plan defines four action lines, 20 measures and 28 performance indicators.

In 2025, the Ex-post evaluation of values and ethical requirements in public administration was finalised. The final report analyses codes of ethics of public administration, including the norms of conduct they contain, the scope of codes of ethics, including whether they are binding for heads of

[19] https://www.knab.gov.lv/en/media/3900/download?attachment

institutions and political officials, the implementation mechanisms and the practice of implementation. The Ex-post evaluation is based on a review of 126 public administration institutions. The final report includes a summary and recommendations.

The Ex-post evaluation was commissioned by the State Chancellery through a procurement. It was carried out by the "Sabiedrība par atklātību – Delna"/Transparency International LATVIA (TI Latvia). The evaluation is publicly available in the Research and Publication database[20].

During 2025, the State Chancellery carried out **a survey "Building a values-based culture in public administration.** 87 institutions answered questions on whether the values, have been defined, their implementation, responsible persons, good practice and whether there is a trusted person for ethics.

In-person **workshop "Values and ethics in public administration"** took place at the State Chancellery on 28 February 2025 which was attended by 70 representatives from various public administration institutions. The agenda included a presentation and discussions on the Ex-post evaluation of values and ethical requirements in public administration – its results and recommendations; issues of integrity and ethics in public administration and government and Iceland's experience.

[20] https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/database/valsts-parvaldes-vertibu-un-etikas-prasibu-ex-post-izvertejums/

On 11-12 December, 2025 a **training workshop "Values ambassadors and trusted persons in ethical issues the public administration: How to effectively strengthen a value-based working environment?"** was organised by the Latvian School of Public Administration[21].

13 trainings on ethics and integrity, for example, on prevention of corruption, conflict of interest, lobbying, whistleblowing etc. has been provided by the Latvian School of Public Administration as part of EU Recovery Fund project "Towards an open, transparent, fair and accountable public administration". The total audience - 5 552 participants.

In 2025, KNAB conducted a total of 72 educational events, of which at least 65 included topics on the role of professional ethics in preventing conflict of interest situations and corruption, reaching an audience of 6368 people. It should be noted that the actual size of the audience reached is significantly higher, as increasingly more institutions are choosing the option to create video recording of the training, which are then placed in their respective internal networks and imposing an obligation on their employees to watch the training, and concluding it with a final test.

Furthermore, the audience reached by these events comprises public officials, persons employed in the public sector, as well as representatives of the private sector.

Furthermore, in exercising control over the implementation of restrictions, prohibitions and obligations set out in the Law on Prevention of Conflicts of Interest in the Activities of Public Officials, in 2025 KNAB examined 828 declarations of public officials based on the reports and complaints received regarding potential conflicts of interest.

Thus, 389 departmental investigations were initiated, completing 52 departmental investigations (which were initiated in 2024) and 346 departmental investigations that were initiated in 2025.

In 2025, 165 decisions were made in administrative violation cases and in 110 cases, public officials were fined a total of 17 630 EUR, while in 27 cases public officials were reprimanded, but in 28 cases the administrative violation process was terminated by establishing circumstances excluding administrative liability.

16 persons were ordered to repay the state for damages caused in the amount of 28 449.57 EUR, while 13 persons were released from the obligation to repay the damages caused to the state. 220 written and 1 218 oral (telephone consultations) explanations were provided on the application of the provisions of the Law on Prevention of Conflict of Interest in the Activities of Public Officials. In three cases, the materials were transferred to the Criminal Investigation Department of KNAB for the initiation of criminal proceedings.

21. Measures to enhance general transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying, asset and interest disclosure rules, gifts policy, transparency of political party financing).

Paragraph 34 of the Transitional Provisions of the Law on Financing Political Organizations (Parties) states that "In 2025, the State budget financing for the political organisation (party) shall be calculated and granted by taking into account the minimum monthly wage for 2024."

Therefore, state budget funding for political organizations (parties) has not been increased in 2026, and has been approved at the 2024 level, i.e., EUR 6 647 979.

23. Measures to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including their application (i.e. number of reports received, and the follow-up given).

In 2025, the **Annual Report 2024 on Whistleblowing and Whistleblower protection** was prepared. There were 409 submissions drawn up as a whistleblower's reports and out of them 121 were recognised to actually be whistleblower's reports compared to 394 submissions and 113 reports in 2023.

In 2025, independent **Assessment "Evaluation of The Latvian Whistleblowing Law"** by the Delna/ Transparency International LATVIA was carried out.

The **Ex-post Evaluation of the Implementation of the Whistleblowing Law**[22] carried out under the leadership of the State Chancellery was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 21 January 2025.

Thus, the Cabinet of Ministers approved the suggestion to transfer the Whistleblower contact point from the State Chancellery to the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau in 2026.

In 2025, the **amendments[23] to the Whistleblowing Law** were drafted and approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 16 September 2025. The amendments to the Whistleblowing Law were adopted by the Saeima in first and second readings in 2025. It is expected that in the beginning of 2026 the third reading in Saeima will take place.

The amendments to the Whistleblowing Law foresee the transfer of the Whistleblower contact point from the State Chancellery to the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau (provisionally as of 1 March 2026), as well as other amendments in view of transposing the DIRECTIVE (EU) 2019/1937 of 23 October 2019 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law, as well as to address the conclusions of the Ex-post evaluation and the independent Assessment by the NGO "Sabiedrība par atklātību – Delna" / Transparency International LATVIA. After evaluating the feasibility thereof and experience in reviewing whistleblower reports, in order to improve and streamline the process, KNAB was recognized as the most suitable and best transfer target for the contact point.

In 2025, the Latvian School of Public Administration and the State Chancellery (Contact point of whistleblowers) have developed an **e-course "Whistleblowing"** that has 4 modules: "Whistleblowing foundations" (introductory course); "Handling whistleblower reports" (advanced course, practical course); "Internal procedures for the application of the Whistleblowing Law" and the 4th module "How to submit a whistleblower report and whistleblower protection". The e-course is based on the Whistleblowing Law and the practice of its application, using comprehensive data collected by the State Chancellery. The e-course will be updated in the beginning of 2026 in order to reflect the amendments to the Whistleblowing Law which are awaiting the 3rd reading in the Saeima.

On 7 November 2025, an **international conference on whistleblowing** was organised in Latvia. It was also attended by a guest speaker from Ukraine and remotely by the European Commission.

Information from KNAB

In 2025, KNAB received a total of 80 submissions in the form of whistleblower reports, of which 27 were recognized as whistleblower reports, whereas 40 were not recognized as such. Additionally, 13 submissions were transferred to other institutions based on their competence.

Breakdown of topics in received submissions in the form of whistleblower reports	Number of reports
Violations of the Law on Prevention of Conflict of Interest in Activities of Public Officials	27
Using official position in bad faith	22
Violations of pre-election campaigning	7
Squandering	6
Violations in public procurements	5
Tax violations	3
Misappropriation	3
Fraud	2
Other	5

Breakdown of topics in reports recognized as whistleblower reports	Number of reports
Violations of the Law on Prevention of Conflict of Interest in Activities of Public Officials	13
Using official position in bad faith	5

[21] Trusted persons in ethical issues as a person appointed or elected by employees were introduced by the Cabinet Recommendation No. 1 "Values of State Administration and Fundamental Principles of Ethics" (adopted on 21 November 2018)
[22] https://www.mk.gov.lv/lv/media/21975/download?attachment
[23] https://tapportals.mk.gov.lv/legal_acts/bde199b7-cb31-4b3c-9dd4-f965180de770

Violations of pre-election campaigning	3
Squandering	3
Violations in public procurements	2
Fraud	1

24. Specific measures to enhance transparency, integrity and accountability in sectors with high risks of corruption, with a view to monitor and prevent corruption and conflict of interests, and where applicable measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups.

KNAB provides the following update for 2025:

- KNAB participated in the Public Procurement Reform Working Group, advocating for process transparency and public disclosure of procurement data. Additionally, KNAB conducted a strategic analysis of corruption risks in public procurement, the report of which was published online[24].
- KNAB published a strategic corruption risk analysis[25] on the transparency of sports funding, thereby contributing to the development of a new state budget funding model and the review of allocation criteria.
- KNAB published a strategic analysis[26] of corruption risks in the activities of building inspectors, thereby promoting the understanding of the responsible ministry about potential corruption risks and measures to mitigate them.
- KNAB organized two anti-corruption data hackathons on reducing corruption risks in public procurement using AI solutions[27] and solutions to mitigate corruption risks in the use of military funds[28]. The ideas developed were used as proposals for tasks for the National Anti-Corruption Action Plan[29].

The Central Finance and Contracting Agency (CFCA) provides the following updates on the activities implemented:

- An informational material has been prepared on conflict of interest risks in the implementation of European Union funds projects, providing technical information to public aid providers and others who oversee, control, or implement cohesion policy on how to apply European Union legislation in the field of conflicts of interest[30]. –
- Cooperation with the EPPO has been strengthened by ensuring rapid, informal communication with the responsible prosecutor to discuss risk indicators identified by the CFCA and further actions in each individual case;
- To reduce conflict of interest risks, amendments have been made to the CFCA's internal regulatory framework, stipulating that an official is prohibited from combining a position at the agency with a position whose duties include any activities related to submitting a project application on behalf of a legal entity in project selection procedures at the agency, or the preparation of documentation or management of projects under the agency's supervision;
- An internal order has been issued establishing conflict of interest checks for members of the CFLA procurement committee in procurements organized by the institution.

The Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs (PMLP)

The PMLP ensures implementation and development of state policy in the field of migration and asylum, determining the legal status of persons, population registration and documentation, as well as in issuing personal identification documents and travel documents, which are areas with a high risk of corruption in the public sector. Despite this, in 2025, no cases of corruption were detected in the Office in any of its areas (for example, in the field of migration, when requesting and receiving residence permits, or determining the legal status of persons, when obtaining Latvian citizenship through naturalization).

By the 1 January 2023 Order No. 32/2023 "On the Approval of the Anti-Corruption Measures Plan of the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs for 2023-2025", the Office's Anti-Corruption Measures Plan for 2023-2025 was approved, which included an assessment of corruption risks broken down by functions of the Office, as well as defined preventive measures to prevent corruption risks.

In order to continue the effective, legal and ethical activities of its employees in the public interest, the Office's 2026-2028 Anti-Corruption Measures Plan was approved by the Office's 5January 2026 Order No. 2/2026 "On Approval of the Anti-Corruption Measures Plan of the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs for 2026-2028". The Office carries out the identification, analysis and assessment of general risks in accordance with the assessment of conflict of interest and corruption risks of the positions of the Office approved by Order No. 1/2025 "On Assessment of Conflict of Interest and Corruption Risks of Positions of the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs ", in which the level of corruption risk is determined for each position, taking into account four main criteria: (1) Work with clients; (2) Preparing decisions; (3) Monthly wages; (4) Access to information.

Helthcare*:* It should be noted that, similarly to the previous year, subordinate institutions of Ministry of Health and state-owned hospitals reported that in 2025 they continued to implement corruption prevention and conflict of interest management measures in accordance with applicable external and internal legal and regulatory frameworks. These efforts focused on further strengthening internal control and governance systems and included the implementation of interconnected internal regulatory documents covering preventive measures, monitoring, reporting, and response procedures; the updating of internal culture and ethics codes; targeted initial training for employees in corruption risk–exposed positions, with a focus on preventing conflicts of interest and corruption; the consistent application of a zero-tolerance approach supported by effective whistleblowing mechanisms; and continued participation in the "Zero Tolerance Towards Corruption" initiative of the association "Transparency International Latvia – Delna".

C. Repression

27. Official data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments, and the application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by offence if possible). Please indicate whether the cases: involve legal persons; are related to the implementation of EU or national funds; involve high level corruption. Please indicate which data is publicly available and how policy-making is informed by the data.

In 2025 **KNAB** sent a total of 27 criminal proceedings against 38 natural persons and one legal person for prosecution. Of these, 7 were for fraud or attempted fraud, using official position in bad faith and forgery of documents; 7 – for giving or attempted giving of bribes, or accepting bribes; 6 – for disclosure of non-disclosable information; 3 – for violation of provisions regarding accounting and statistical information, theft, fraud, misappropriation on a small scale, misappropriation and forging documents, violation of restrictions imposed on a public official; 1 – for unlawful participation in property transactions; 2 – for exceeding official authority and forging official documents; 1 – for failure to act, using official position in bad faith and forging official documents.

[24] https://www.knab.gov.lv/lv/jaunums/knab-pasvaldibas-un-iestades-ir-neaizsargatakas-pret-korupcijas-riskiem-publiskajos-iepirkumos
[25] https://www.knab.gov.lv/lv/jaunums/knab-sporta-organizacijam-pieskirta-valsts-budzeta-finansejuma-kartiba-trukst-caurskatamibas
[26] https://www.knab.gov.lv/lv/jaunums/knab-analize-norada-uz-augstiem-korupcijas-riskiem-buvinspektoru-darbiba
[27] https://www.knab.gov.lv/en/article/hackathon-experts-offer-proposals-identify-or-mitigate-corruption-risks-public-procurements
[28] https://www.knab.gov.lv/en/article/experts-hackathon-working-solutions-mitigate-corruption-risks-use-military-funds
[29] https://www.knab.gov.lv/lv/jaunums/hakatona-eksperti-izstrada-risinajumus-korupcijas-risku-mazinasanai-aizsardzibas-resora
[30] https://www.cfla.gov.lv/lv/interesu-konflikta-riski-piemeri-atbildes-uz-jautajumiem

According to the information provided by **CFCA**, 34 projects under its supervision (28 criminal proceedings out of them) are currently under pre-trial investigation, prosecution or trial: The 2014–2020 programming period; 2 projects (3 criminal proceedings are ongoing):

- The 2014–2020 programming period: 2 projects (3 criminal proceedings);
- The 2021-2027 programming period: 0 projects (0 criminal proceedings);
- The Recovery and Resilience Facility: 0 projects (0 criminal proceedings).

According to the data of the prosecutors of the **Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions and the Prosecution Office Information System (ProIS),** the specialized prosecution office received 51 criminal proceedings for criminal prosecution in 2025 (for 100 criminal offences against 78 natural persons and 2 legal entities), which include one of the corruptive criminal offences (Sections 317 – 330 of the Criminal Law).

Overall statistics, including criminal proceedings without corrupt criminal offences (Sections 317-330 of the Criminal Law) – the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions received 57 criminal proceedings for criminal prosecution in 2025 (for 111 criminal offences against 85 natural persons and 4 legal persons). In 2025, the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions received 4 proceedings against legal persons for criminal prosecution.

According to data submitted by the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau (KNAB) and the Internal Security Bureau (ISB), both institutions sent 49 cases against 64 natural persons and 1 legal person to the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions for criminal prosecution in 2025:

- KNAB sent 27 cases against 38 natural persons and 1 legal person for prosecution;
- Internal Security Bureau sent 22 cases against 26 natural persons, 0 legal persons for prosecution).

By identifying the qualification of the criminal offenses and the number of persons:

- 9 criminal proceedings under Section 317 of the Criminal Law against 9 natural persons have been received for prosecution;
- 8 criminal proceedings under Section 318 of the Criminal Law against 11 natural persons and 1 legal person;
- 3 criminal proceedings under Section 319 of the Criminal Law against 3 natural persons;
- 4 criminal proceedings under Section 320 of the Criminal Law against 4 natural persons;
- 1 criminal proceedings under Section 321 of the Criminal Law against 3 natural persons and 1 legal person;
- 9 criminal proceedings under Section 323 of the Criminal Law against 12 natural persons and 1 legal person;
- 1 criminal proceedings under Section 325 of the Criminal Law against 1 natural person;
- 1 criminal proceedings under Section 326.2 of the Criminal Law against 1 natural person;
- 9 criminal proceedings under Section 327 of the Criminal Law against 14 natural persons;
- 14 criminal proceedings under Section 329 of the Criminal Law against 16 natural persons.

The Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions has sent 3 criminal proceedings to court under the terms of a plea bargain for 5 criminal offences against 5 individuals – 2 for bribery, 1 – for fraud, 1 – for official forgery, 1 – for driving under the influence of alcohol. All three judgments have entered into force. In these cases, the court has imposed probation supervision for 3 years and 6 months on 2 individuals, with deprivation of the right to hold certain positions, probation supervision for 2 years on 1 individual, a fine in the amount of 20 minimum monthly wages (14 800 EUR), with deprivation of the right to hold certain positions for 3 years, probation supervision for 2 years on 1 individual, and deprivation of the right to drive for 7 months on 1 individual.

In 2025, 40 convictions (judgments or decisions that left the judgment of a lower court unchanged) were adopted within the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of

State Institutions, convicting 60 individuals and 3 legal entities. Of these, 20 judgments have entered into force; 20 have not entered into force.

In 2025, 8 acquittals were passed within the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions, acquitting 11 individuals and 2 legal entities. The court has made 1 acquittal for bribery against 1 individual, 3 acquittals for abuse of office and inaction of a public official, 1 acquittal for inaction of a public official, 1 judgement for disclosure of undisclosed information, but these judgements have not entered into force. Only one judgement has entered into force, which terminated the process for the application of coercive measure to the limited liability company.

The Senate has also adopted a decision that annuls the decision of the appellate court on the termination of the proceedings on the application of coercive measure to the limited liability company and sends the case to the appellate court for consideration.

The types and measures of punishment prescribed in cases of the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions:

- for abuse of official position – a fine of 24 - 35 minimum monthly wages, deprivation of the right to hold positions related to decision-making in state and local government institutions for 1 to 2 years, community service for 100 – 180 hours,
- for bribery - imprisonment from 2 to 4 years, with additional penalties - deprivation of the right to hold public office for 5 years, as well as fines in the amount of 8-10 minimum monthly wages, probation supervision from 3-5 years,
- for unlawful giving of a benefit – a fine in the amount of 15 minimum monthly wages,
- for forgery of official documents – community service from 140 to 160 hours, a fine of 11 minimum monthly wages, probation supervision for 2 years,
- for failure to provide information and providing false information about the ownership of funds and the true beneficiary – a fine in the amount of 10 minimum monthly salaries, as well as a measure of coercive influence for a legal entity – a ban on participating in state or municipal procurement procedures for 4 years. For bribery, a fine of 20 minimum monthly salaries was imposed on a legal entity,
- for bribery and embezzlement of a bribe – deprivation of liberty from 2 months to 1 year and 6 months, deprivation of the right to engage in all types of business for 1 year and 4 months, probation supervision from 3 years 6 months to 5 years, deprivation of the right to engage in the provision of legal services in matters related to customs procedures and customs clearance activities for 5 years, deprivation of the right to hold positions for 1 year and 6 months, community service for 70 – 240 hours,
- for disclosure of undisclosed information – community service 80 – 150 hours, for smuggling – probation supervision for 3 years, deprivation of the right to conduct certain types of commercial activities for 3 years,
- for exceeding official authority – imprisonment for 5 months, community service for 150 – 200 hours, deprivation of the right to hold certain positions for 2 - 3 years,
- for inaction of a public official – probation supervision for 3 years, deprivation of the right to hold certain positions for 3 years.

Prosecutors of the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions have drawn up prosecutorial orders in 8 criminal proceedings for a total of 12 criminal offenses against 8 individuals for exceeding official authority (2 criminal offenses), inaction of a public official, bribery (2 criminal offenses, official forgery, disclosure of undisclosed information (5 criminal offenses) and violation of accounting and statistical information regulations, in which such penalties as probation supervision for 3 years, community service from 70 to 280 hours, a fine from 4 to 11 minimum monthly wages, probation supervision for 2 years and 6 months, in some cases deprivation of the right to hold positions for a period of from 1 year and 6 months to 3 years were imposed.

Within the framework of the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions, in 2025, decisions were made in 6 criminal proceedings to release a person from criminal liability (for 9 criminal offenses against 6 natural persons) for disclosure of undisclosed information and forgery of a document.

The data from the ProIS shows that in 2025, in the country as a whole:

- 132 criminal proceedings have been initiated for corrupt criminal offenses. Of these, 15 criminal proceedings were initiated for exceeding official authority (Section 317 of the Criminal Law), 23 – for abuse of official position (Section 318 of the Criminal Law), 10 – for inaction of a public official (Section 319 of the Criminal Law), 13 – for taking a bribe (Section 320 of the Criminal Law), 1 – for embezzlement of a bribe (Section 321 of the Criminal Law), 39 – for giving a bribe (Section 323 of the Criminal Law), 2 – for accepting and demanding an unlawful benefit (Section 326.2 of the Criminal Law), 1 – for giving an unlawful benefit (Section 326.[3] of the Criminal Law), 10 – for official forgery (Section 327 of the Criminal Law) and 18 – for disclosing undisclosed information (Section 329 of the Criminal Law);
- 30 criminal proceedings have been terminated: 4 – for abuse of official position (Section 318 of the Criminal Law), 4 – for inaction of a public official (Section 319 of the Criminal Law), 6 – for bribery (Section 320 of the Criminal Law), 8 – for bribery (Section 323 of the Criminal Law), 1 – for accepting and demanding an unlawful benefit (Section 326.2 of the Criminal Law), 3 – for official forgery (Section 327 of the Criminal Law) and 4 – for disclosure of undisclosed information (Section 329 of the Criminal Law);
- 95 criminal proceedings have been transferred to the Prosecution Office for prosecution: 9 – for exceeding official authority (Section 317 of the Criminal Law), 12 – for abuse of official position (Section 318 of the Criminal Law), 4 – for inaction of a public official (Section 319 of the Criminal Law), 7 – for accepting a bribe (Section 320 of the Criminal Law), 2 – for embezzlement of a bribe (Section 321 of the Criminal Law), 31 – for giving a bribe (Section 323 of the Criminal Law), 1 – for violating the restrictions imposed on a public official (Section 325 of the Criminal Law), 1 – for accepting and demanding an unlawful benefit (Section 326.2 of the Criminal Law), 11 – for official forgery (Section 327 of the Criminal Law) and 17 – for disclosing undisclosed information (Section 329 of the Criminal Law);
- In 25 criminal proceedings, prosecutors' orders for punishment were drawn up against 25 natural persons. The natural persons were mainly charged with bribery (18 persons) and disclosure of undisclosed information (3 persons). The remaining persons were charged with exceeding official authority (2 persons), abuse of official position (1 person), inaction of a public official (1 person) and forgery of official authority (1 person). By prosecutors' orders for punishment, fines were imposed on 11 natural persons, probation supervision on 7 persons, and community service on 7 persons;
- 3 criminal proceedings for disclosure of confidential information have been terminated, with 4 individuals conditionally released from criminal liability;
- 1 criminal case was transferred to the court under the accelerated procedure against 1 natural person for bribery and driving under the influence of alcohol. A guilty judgement was rendered in the case and the person was sentenced to a short-term imprisonment of 2 (two) months and 15 (fifteen) days, with a driving license suspension for 5 (five) years;
- 37 criminal proceedings have been referred to court for consideration against 48 individuals: 3 criminal proceedings for inaction of a public official and embezzlement against 3 natural persons, 3 criminal proceedings against 3 natural persons for bribery, driving under the influence of alcohol, embezzlement of a bribe, evading the execution of a court decision, 5 – for exceeding official authority against 5 natural persons, 11 criminal proceedings against 18 natural persons for abuse of official position, official forgery, fraud, document forgery and smuggling, 3 criminal proceedings against 4 natural persons for bribery and disclosure of undisclosed information, 6 criminal proceedings against 9 natural persons for official forgery, petty theft, embezzlement, abuse of power and violation of official authority, disclosure of undisclosed information and 6 criminal proceedings against 6 natural persons for disclosure of undisclosed information;
- In total, 7 criminal proceedings have been transferred to the court by agreement: 1 criminal proceeding against 2 individuals for fraud and official forgery, 6 criminal proceedings against 7 individuals for bribery. 5 out of a total of 7 criminal proceedings have been examined in the court of first instance, but 1 – in the appellate instance,

- 110 criminal cases against 211 individuals were tried: 45 – in the appellate court, and 5 – in the cassation procedure. The cases examined in court mainly concerned bribery (34 criminal cases), abuse of official position (24 criminal cases), bribery (23 criminal cases), inaction of a public official (18 criminal cases), forgery in official documents (17 criminal cases), disclosure of undisclosed information (14 criminal cases) and abuse of official authority (13 criminal cases).

The types and measures of punishment prescribed in cases of other structural units of the Prosecution Office:

- for abuse of official position – a fine of 9–27 minimum monthly wages or EUR 6 660 to EUR 19 980, deprivation of the right to hold positions related to decision-making in state and local government institutions for 2 years, imprisonment for 6 months to 1 year and 6 months,
- for inaction of a public official – a fine in the amount of 4 minimum monthly wages, imprisonment for 1 year and 6 months, deprivation of the right to hold public official positions for 3 years,
- for exceeding official authority – community service from 100 to 160 hours,
- for bribery – temporary deprivation of liberty for 2 months, a fine in the amount of 10–15 minimum monthly wages, probation supervision from 1 year 6 months to 2 years, community service from 200–240 hours,
- for forgery of official documents – community service from 140 hours, a fine of 12 minimum monthly salaries with deprivation of the right to hold public office for 2 years and 6 months,
- for disclosing undisclosed information – 150 hours of community service, a fine in the amount of 10 minimum monthly wages.

According to information of the **State Border Guard**, in 2025, two criminal proceedings were initiated within the State Border Guard against two civilians in connection with the bribery of State Border Guard officials. With regard to bribery, it should be noted that, as in previous years, during the reporting period bribery cases were detected at border crossing points along the external land border. The methods of offering bribes remained unchanged: typically, the bribe was given by placing the relevant banknote(s) inside documents presented to a State Border Guard official during border checks. No new types of offences or new trends in bribery-related crime were identified in 2025.

In 2025, three criminal proceedings against three civilians were forwarded to the Prosecutor's Office for the initiation of criminal prosecution concerning bribery of State Border Guard officials, that is, for the presence of elements of crime provided in Section 323(1) (Giving of Bribes) of the Criminal Law.

In 2025, five criminal proceedings were initiated concerning possible corrupt actions by State Border Guard officials, namely:

- one criminal proceeding was initiated for an offence under Section 319(2) of the Criminal Law, namely, for the intentional failure to perform official duties, which was possibly committed for the purpose of obtaining undue advantages for another person;
- four criminal proceedings were initiated for possible offences under Section 318(2) of the Criminal Law, namely, for the using *official position in bad faith*, committed *for the purpose of acquiring property* (one criminal proceeding) or for the purpose of obtaining undue advantages for another person (three criminal proceedings). These proceedings were initiated against four State Border Guard officials.
- No legal entities or high-level officials were involved in these criminal proceedings.

In 2025, four criminal proceedings (initiated in 2024) were forwarded for the initiation of criminal prosecution against six State Border Guard officials, namely:

- one criminal proceeding for a possible offence under Section 318(2) of the Criminal Law against one official;
- one criminal proceeding for possible offences under Section 318(2) and 327(2) of the Criminal Law against one official. During the investigation, the use of state funds in the amount of EUR 864.01 was identified;
- one criminal case for a possible offence under Section 327(1) of the Criminal Law against two officials;

- one criminal case for possible offences under the Section 327(1), 371(2) and Section 318(2) of the Criminal Law against two State Border Guard officials. During the investigation, the use of state funds in the amount of EUR 47.19 was identified.
- No legal entities or high-level officials were involved in these criminal proceedings.

At the same time, it should be noted that the State Border Guard does not compile data on the outcomes of prosecutions or the penalties applied for corruption offences.

Factual summaries of the three most significant criminal proceedings forwarded for the initiation of criminal prosecution:

1. Within the framework of a criminal proceeding initiated in 2024, it was established that a State Border Guard official of a control point of a territorial board, while performing duties as a queue administrator for goods vehicles during border checks, registered goods vehicles and trailers without their physical presence. The official registered vehicles belonging to a logistics company where he himself informal worked in parallel with his work in the State Border Guard. As a result of such registration, these vehicles were able to cross the state border more quickly and deliver their cargo faster, generating profit, thereby providing the official with a personal advantage. During the investigation, no evidence was obtained regarding any monetary amount the official may have received for this unlawful activity. In 2025, the criminal proceeding was forwarded to the Prosecutor’s Office for the initiation of criminal prosecution.

2. Within the framework of a criminal proceeding initiated in 2024, it was established that a border guard, during the period from August 22, 2023 to January 18, 2024, intentionally and repeatedly misused a State Border Guard service vehicle for personal and family interests, for material gain, causing a financial loss of EUR 864.01. Furthermore, the border guard knowingly entered false information regarding the conditions of vehicle use in the mandatory vehicle operation documents, namely in travel permits and the associated route sheets. These false entries were submitted to a competent official of the relevant State Border Guard structural unit for further processing, while the border guard was fully aware that the information was falsified, in order to ensure the vehicle could be used for personal purposes. In 2025, the criminal proceeding was forwarded to the Prosecutor’s Office for the initiation of criminal prosecution.

3. In 2024, a criminal proceeding was initiated concerning potentially unlawful actions by two border guards, namely: for abuse of official position for material gain and forgery of official documents committed by one border guard, and for forgery of official documents committed by the other border guard. During the investigation, it was established that the first border guard, for material gain, intentionally and repeatedly misused a State Border Guard service vehicle for personal and family interests, which had been assigned to a specific structural unit of the State Border Guard for official duties, causing a financial loss of EUR 47.19. Furthermore, the first border guard knowingly entered false information regarding the conditions of vehicle use in the mandatory vehicle operation documents, namely in travel permits and associated route sheets, and submitted this information to a competent official of the relevant structural unit for further processing, fully aware that the information was falsified, in order to ensure the vehicle could be used for personal purposes. The second border guard knowingly entered false information regarding the conditions of vehicle use in the mandatory vehicle operation documents, namely in travel permits and associated route sheets. In 2025, the criminal proceeding was forwarded to the Prosecutor’s Office for the initiation of criminal prosecution.

The cases prosecuted that have received public attention:
1) Most significant case in from the Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau in the Prosecution Office for Investigating Criminal Offenses in the Service of State Institutions – for the attempted offer and preparation of a bribe of a large amount – 100 000 EUR – to a public official in an organized group, namely when two citizens of the Republic of Latvia and two citizens of the Russian Federation attempted to offer a bribe of a large amount to a high-ranking public official of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The aim was to achieve that the public official, using his official position, would make a decision to lift the ban on entry into the Republic of Latvia of a citizen of the Russian Federation.

2) An official of Ltd "Rīgas Austrumu klīniskā universitātes slimnīca" (state-owned company) and the head of a structural unit of a capital company and his deputy are being charged with abuse of office for the purpose of acquiring property. In this criminal case, it could be considered that the level of corruption is quite high, because the official, who held a fairly high, managerial position in the capital company, used the advantages of his position, as well as his role in procurement procedures and the status he had in relation to the companies under his control, to illegally demand material benefits from third parties – officials and representatives of the companies. In addition, another head of a structural unit of the same state-owned capital company (who himself has even held and fulfilled the duties of a member of the board and chairman of the board of this capital company at some point) with the support of his deputy prepared a forged document, with the help of which he illegally obtained funds from a foundation by fraud.

3) A State Police official and a certified detective were accused of abuse of official position for the purpose of acquiring property, including the process of applying a means of coercion to a detective company. The corrupt activities took place over a long period of time, at least a period of about a month, when the State Police official, without coordinating and informing any of the officials conducting the criminal proceedings, but acting on the detective's instructions to obtain information necessary for detective work, abused his status as a State Police official and deceived several private individuals and representatives of legal entities about his authorization to perform procedural actions to obtain evidence in the specific criminal proceedings. The State Police official transferred the information obtained from the individuals to the detective, who further used the information obtained in his detective work within the framework of the execution of the contract.

4) A case for supporting the import of goods subject to customs clearance, specifically cigarettes, into the customs territory of the Republic of Latvia from the Republic of Belarus, bypassing customs control or concealing them from such control, committed by a group of persons after prior agreement (the official of the State Police organized a "green corridor").

The convictions made in the cases which involved high-level corruption:

1) One of the two largest bribery cases of the Terekhova Customs Control Point, in which a total of 20 customs officials have been accused of systematically accepting bribes from a group of persons by prior agreement, using their official position, from 24 December 2020 to 8 April 2021. In this case, 7 persons were convicted under Section 320(3) of the Criminal Law and the court sentenced them to imprisonment for a term of 3 years 6 months to 5 years, with deprivation of the right to hold a public official position for 5 years. The ruling of the cassation court left the judgment of the Economic Court unchanged. Riga Regional Court has left the judgment of the Economic Court unchanged, but the judgment of the appellate court has not yet entered into force. In this case, too, the court imposed a sentence of imprisonment for 3 to 4 years, simultaneously imposing a fine of 6 200 EUR and depriving the person of the right to hold a public official position for 5 years.

2) In 2025, a conviction was made in criminal proceedings in which the former official of the National Armed Forces was accused of committing crimes under Sections 341(2), 275(2) and 177(3) of the Criminal Law. The former official has been sentenced to 4 years of imprisonment, with probation supervision for 1 year and the car confiscated), the judgment has not yet entered into force.

3) A natural person and an official of the State Joint Stock Company "Latvijas dzelzceļš" ("Latvian Railway") are accused of having both agreed that the private individual would hand over, and the public official would accept, a bribe of 800 000 EUR, so that the official of State Joint Stock Company "Latvijas dzelzceļš" would facilitate the private individual's represented joint-stock company "Skinest Rail" to obtain the right to sell four diesel locomotives to a subsidiary of the State Joint Stock Company "Latvijas dzelzceļš". Later, both agreed to reduce the amount of the bribe to 500 000 EUR. After which the provincial governor handed over a bribe of 499 500 EUR to an official of the State Joint Stock Company "Latvijas dzelzceļš". The Riga Regional Court found the official of the State Joint Stock Company "Latvijas dzelzceļš" guilty of committing a criminal offense provided for in Section Section 320(3) of the Criminal Law, punishing him with imprisonment for three years, applying Section Section $49.^{1}(1).1$ of the Criminal Law, mitigated the sentence of imprisonment for two years and six months, with partial confiscation of property. A private individual

was found guilty of committing a criminal offence provided for in Section 323(2) of the Criminal Law, sentenced to imprisonment for two years and ten months, applying Section 49.[1](1).3 of the Criminal Law, a lighter sentence was imposed than that provided for in Section 323(2) of the Criminal Law – a fine in the amount of 205 minimum monthly wages established in the Republic of Latvia, i.e., EUR 151 700, and a ban was imposed on him from participating in public procurements organized by the state and local governments and their enterprises in any capacity for three years. The judgment of the Riga Regional Court has not entered into force.

On 28 October 2025, the Prosecution Office transferred to the Riga City Court for consideration a criminal case regarding the use of special contract flights or charter flights during foreign business trips of former Prime Minister A. K. Kariņš. In the criminal case, the former Director of the State Chancellery has been charged with failure to fulfil the duties of a public official, which caused serious consequences, pursuant to Section 319, Part Three of the Criminal Law, as a result of whose inaction the Republic of Latvia suffered losses in the amount of 89 382.90 EUR. The pre-trial criminal proceedings assessed the possible liability of the former Prime Minister, several officials and employees of the State Chancellery and its structural unit – the Prime Minister's Office, concluding that it was the Director of the State Chancellery, as the head of the institution, who was responsible for the legality and efficiency of the use of state budget funds in the procurement of services related to the Prime Minister's foreign business trips. It was concluded that during the Prime Minister's four foreign business trips, the State Chancellery illegally ordered and paid for five special charter flights, despite the opportunity to purchase regular commercial flight tickets for members of the Prime Minister's delegation in time.

In 2025, **the Internal Security Bureau** initiated a total of 52 criminal investigations, of which 24 were related to crimes committed on duty by the officials from the institutions subordinated to the Ministry of Interior and Municipal police (including 9 criminal investigations related to corruption).

20 criminal cases related to crimes committed on duty by the officials from the institutions subordinated to the Ministry of Interior and Municipal police, including 9 criminal cases related to corruption, were sent to the Prosecutor's Office for prosecution.

A total of 24 officials from institutions subordinated to the Ministry of interior, Municipal police, 12 private individuals and 1 legal entity were convicted for various crimes. In out of all convictions 13 officials and 5 private individuals were convicted for crimes committed in the line of duty – 6 of 13 officials and 1 of 5 private individuals were sentenced to imprisonment.

The **Court Administration of the Republic of Latvia** provides the following information: between 2022 and 2025, a total of 234 corruption-related criminal cases[31] were examined in the first instance, while 69 cases were reviewed by the appellate courts or the Supreme Court. These proceedings involved 214 persons at the first-instance level and 68 persons at the appellate or cassation level. It is important to note that the Court Information System (TIS) does not register or store data on judgments by the categories "conviction" or "acquittal" at the case level, because a single case may involve multiple defendants, and each person may receive a different final outcome. Therefore, the system records outcomes per individual, not per case, which results in more accurate person-level statistics but does not allow for direct aggregation of "convicted cases" versus "acquitted cases."

The largest number of cases and involved persons are associated with the more prevalent and severe forms of corruption-related offences, specifically Section 320 (Accepting Bribes) and Section 323 (Giving of Bribes) of the Criminal Law. Under Section 323, a total of 107 first-instance cases were recorded, corresponding to 107 persons, and an additional 10 cases (10 persons) were reviewed in the appellate or Supreme Court. Section 320 accounted for 54 first-instance cases and 27 cases in higher courts, similarly matching the number of individuals involved. Together, these two criminal provisions constitute the clear majority of corruption cases during the reporting period.

[31] Data on corruption cases are compiled according to the statistical classification section, based on the most severe sanction applied in the case.

Other corruption-related provisions appear less frequently but consistently, reflecting a broader spectrum of misconduct within public administration. For instance, Section 317 (Exceeding Official Authority) accounted for 10 first-instance cases and 5 cases in appellate courts. Section 318 (Using Official Position in Bad Faith) resulted in 12 first-instance cases, with a small number escalating to higher courts. A similar pattern is observed for Section 319 (Failure to Act by a Public Official), with 7 first-instance cases and 4 appellate cases registered across the four-year period.

Certain years show minor fluctuations in case volume, which is typical for specific provisions. In 2024, there was a noticeable increase in the number of cases under Section 320, while Sections 318 and 327 (Forging Official Documents) showed steady activity, indicating the persistent presence of these types of offences.

Regarding the distribution of outcomes, first-instance proceedings most frequently result in final convictions, while appellate and cassation courts also predominantly confirm final convictions, with smaller numbers of acquittals or other procedural outcomes. However, the interpretation of these figures is significantly influenced by the technical features of TIS, as mentioned above — because the system records individual outcomes, not case-level verdict categories, the resulting statistics cannot be directly compared with traditional counts of "convicted cases" or "acquitted cases."

Overall, the data demonstrates that the structure, frequency and outcome patterns of corruption cases in Latvia remain stable throughout the reporting period. Bribery-related offences (Sections 320 and 323) dominate the caseload, while other corruption-linked offences, such as abuse of office or failure to perform official duties, appear regularly and consistently. This distribution reflects the general profile of corruption-related criminal conduct in Latvia and indicates a consistent judicial practice in the adjudication of such offences.

Between 2022 and 2025, custodial sentences in corruption-related criminal cases were imposed on 146 convicted persons. Of these, 83 individuals received actual imprisonment, while 63 persons were sentenced to suspended imprisonment. The total length of imprisonment assigned during this period amounted to 301.76 years, corresponding to an overall average of 2.07 years per convicted person.

The majority of convictions were concentrated in cases classified under Section 320 (Accepting Bribes) of the Criminal Law, which accounted for 42.5% of all individuals sentenced to custodial penalties. The second most common provision was Section 323 (Giving of Bribes), representing 31.5% of all cases. Other Criminal Law provisions collectively constituted a significantly smaller share of the total, each with comparatively lower numbers of convicted persons.

Between 2022 and 2025, several corruption-related criminal cases were examined in first-instance courts in which a legal person on whose behalf the accused acted participated in the proceedings. During this period, four such cases were registered, classified under Section 320 of the Criminal Law (accepting bribes) and Section 323 (giving of bribes). In each of these cases, the court applied a basic coercive measure to the legal person.

The cases are distributed across the years as follows: one case in 2022, two cases in 2023, and one case in 2024. Each proceeding involved one legal person, consistent with the procedural framework for imposing coercive measures on legal entities.

At the end of 2025, a total of 167 corruption-related criminal cases remained pending in the courts, classified according to the Statistical Section Number of the Criminal Law. Of these, 108 cases were pending before first-instance courts, 43 cases were under review in the appeal courts, and 16 cases were pending before the Supreme Court.

The distribution of pending cases varies across different provisions of the Criminal Law. The highest number of pending cases was recorded under Section 318 (Using Official Position in Bad Faith), with 28 cases, followed by Section 327 (Forging Official Documents), with 25 cases. Under Section 320 (Accepting Bribes), 23 cases remained pending, while Section 323 (Giving of Bribes) accounted for 22 pending cases. In turn, 21 cases were registered under Section 329 (Disclosure of Non-disclosable Information). These provisions represent the largest groups of pending corruption-related cases at the end of the reporting period.

Table - Pending cases at the end of 2025[32]

Statistical Section Number	Title of Criminal Law section	Pending cases at the end of 2025		
		First instance courts	Appeal courts	Supreme Court
317	Exceeding Official Authority	11	6	3
318	Using Official Position in Bad Faith	17	9	2
319	Failure to Act by a Public Official	11	7	1
320	Accepting Bribes	12	7	4
321	Misappropriation of a Bribe	3		
322	Intermediation in Bribery	2		
323	Giving of Bribes	13	8	1
326-2	Unlawful Requesting and Receiving of Benefits	2		1
326-3	Unlawful Giving of Benefits	1		
327	Forging Official Documents	19	4	2
329	Disclosure of Non-disclosable Information	17	2	2
		108	**43**	**16**

The **Public Officials' Data Administration Unit of the State Revenue Service** provides the following information:

for refusal to initiate administrative offence proceedings (oral reprimand)	119
imposing an administrative penalty	182
on the termination of administrative offence proceedings	9

III. Media Pluralism and Media Freedom

A. Media authorities and bodies

30. Measures taken to ensure the independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources (financial, human and technical) of media regulatory authorities and bodies.

To ensure the effective implementation of the European Media Freedom Act (EMFA) in Latvia, the Ministry of Culture, in cooperation with the Ministry of Justice, the Register of Enterprises, the National Electronic Mass Media Council (NEPLP), and other competent institutions, has prepared amendments to the Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media" (Press Law) and the Electronic Mass Media Law (EPLL). The draft amendments were submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers for consideration on 17 December 2025 and are expected to be approved by the Parliament in 2026.

Under the proposed amendments to the Press Law, NEPLP is designated as the authority responsible for assessing media market concentration (EMFA Article 22(1)) and as the national regulatory authority referred to in EMFA Article 25(3). NEPLP will oversee and report annually on the funding allocated to media service providers for state advertising.

In view of the additional functions arising from the application of EMFA requirements, NEPLP will be allocated resources to establish two new positions.

31. Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies.

No new updates in 2025.

[32] Data on the number pending cases, number of convicted persons and the penalties imposed are publicly available and published on the Court Administration's Data Portal at https://dati.ta.gov.lv.

32. Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies.

On 11 January 2025, amendments to the Copyright Law entered into force, granting the National Electronic Mass Media Council (the audiovisual media regulator) new powers – the right to restrict access to websites where copyright or related rights objects are unlawfully published.

B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership

33. Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising

To ensure Latvia's legal framework compliance with EMFA Article 25 (Allocation of public funds for state advertising and supply or service contracts), the proposed amendments to the Press Law introduce an obligation for media service providers to provide updated information on the total annual amount of public funding allocated to them for state advertising easily and directly accessible. Additionally, public authorities and entities will be required to compile and publish annually their public expenditures allocated to media service providers for the provision of state advertising. The amendments are scheduled for approval by the Parliament in 2026.

34. Safeguards against state / political interference, in particular:

- *safeguards to ensure editorial independence of media (private and public)*
- *specific safeguards for the independence of heads of management and members of the governing boards of public service media (e.g. related to appointment, dismissal), safeguards for their financial and operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions*
- *information on specific legal provisions and procedures applying to media service providers, including as regards granting/renewal/termination of licences, company operation, capital entry requirements, concentration, and corporate governance*

No new updates in 2025.

35. Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners

To ensure the implementation of the requirements set out in EMFA Article 6(1) in Latvia's legal framework, the proposed amendments to the Press Law establish an obligation for media service providers to make updated information easily and directly accessible regarding their legal name, contact details, direct and indirect owners, ultimate beneficial owners, and the total annual amount of public funding allocated to them for state advertising.

At the beginning of 2026, explanatory guidelines on obligations related to the EMFA will be made available to media service providers.

C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents

36. Rules and practices guaranteeing journalist's independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications, referring also, if applicable, to follow-up given to alerts lodged with the Council of Europe's Platform to promote the protection of journalism and safety of journalists.

The Ministry of Culture, in close collaboration with various state institutions and media organisations, developed the Safety of Journalists and Other Media Professionals Action Plan, which was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 11 November 2025.

At the end of September 2025, the Ministry of Culture commissioned a study on public perceptions of the role of media and journalists in society and democracy. The purpose of the study was to analyse the public perceptions of Latvia regarding the role of media and journalists in a democratic society, as well as to assess the level of trust and understanding regarding the safety of journalists. The results show that there is moderate confidence in the media in Latvian society, with a strong polarisation. Social media is most highly regarded, while social networks and alternative sources cause scepticism.

The main differences are between generations and language groups: Latvians and seniors are more likely to trust traditional media, while Russian-speaking residents and young people are more critical or focused on digital channels. Focus groups reveal that reasons for mistrust range from advanced media literacy to cynicism about media political addiction. The study concluded that trust in the media is closely related to trust in public institutions, and recommendations were made to strengthen public media literacy and journalists' security.

Second tender for the National Focal Point of the "Journalists Matter" Campaign was won by the Latvian Journalists' Association (Latvijas Žurnālistu Asociācija – LŽA), and a three-year cooperation agreement was signed with the Ministry of Culture on 17 October 2025.

The Ministry of Culture cooperates closely with the Focal Point. For example, on 7 May 2025, with the support of the Ministry of Culture, the Focal Point held a conference "Challenges to the safety of journalists" which took place in Riga[33]. The seminar was organised to discuss problems in the industry and their solutions concerning hate speech and threats to journalists' security. Aggressive verbal attacks have become a daily reality, not only threatening journalists' emotional and physical security, but also promoting self-censorship, polarisation and a loss of public trust in independent journalism. The latest results of the World Press Freedom Index – global, regional and Latvian trends and the situation, a panel discussion with law enforcement authorities, representatives of public administration and journalists on the role of journalists in modern society, the public attitude towards representatives of the profession, as well as focusing on practical safety and psychological resilience training to help journalists better prepare for risk situations, manage aggressive behaviour, and protect themselves online – these were themes covered by the conference. Among the guest speakers were Pierre Dagard (France) from "Reporters Without Borders" and Peter der Velde from the Netherlands, representing the organisation PersVeilig – a joint initiative between the media, police and the prosecutor's office aimed at improving the safety of journalists in the Netherlands.

On 29 October and 5 November 2025, the Focal Point organised online training lessons "The rights and obligations of a journalist from a legal point of view"[34].

37. Law enforcement capacity, including during protests and demonstrations, to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists.

As a part of the co-operation agreement between the Ministry of Culture and the non-governmental organisation "Latvian Media Ethics Council", a seminar "When a journalist comes under the scrutiny of the person directing the process" was held on 25 April 2025. The seminar was aimed at public authorities, in particular representatives of law enforcement agencies – State Police, prosecutors and investigative judges in association with investigating journalists' cases, so that they better understand the special role and rights of the media.

In mid-December 2025, the non-governmental organisation "Media Hub Riga", with the support of the Ministry of Culture, prepared an informative booklet "Action in the event of a threat to a journalist" on how law enforcement officers can recognise threats to journalists and other media professionals to ensure their protection, also during protests and demonstrations.

At the end of January 2025, the Ministry of Culture held a meeting with the Ministry of Justice, the Judicial Academy, and Media Hub Riga to discuss establishing a training course for the judiciary on SLAPPs. This was followed by a meeting on 29 April 2025 with the director of the Judicial Academy regarding the inclusion of journalist safety in the training program for judges and prosecutors. One potential solution was to provide a universal course on journalist safety, including SLAPPs, available on the State Administration School website as easily accessible recordings.

38. Access to information and public documents by public at large and journalists (incl. transparency authorities where they exist, procedures, costs/fees, timeframes, administrative/judicial review of decisions, execution of decisions by public authorities,

[33] Konferencē Rīgā spriedīs par izaicinājumiem žurnālistu drošībai | Latvijas žurnālistu asociācija
[34] Tiešsaistes nodarbības žurnālistiem "Žurnālista tiesības un pienākumi no juridiskā skatpunkta" | Latvijas žurnālistu asociācija

possible obstacles related to the classification of information).

No new updates in 2025.

39. *Lawsuits (incl. SLAPPs - strategic lawsuits against public participation) and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and measures taken to safeguard against manifestly unfounded and abusive lawsuits.*

The approved Safety of Journalists and other Media Professionals Action Plan includes an action line to envisage the transposition of the Anti-SLAPP Directive. To complete the task, the Ministry of Justice, as the lead institution, developed the Law on the Protection of Persons Involved in Public Interests, and on 22 December 2025, it was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers and forwarded to the Parliament. The purpose of the law is to protect persons against whom a manifestly unfounded claim or claim for malicious purposes has been brought in court, in connection with these persons' actions in the public interest. The Law will enter into force on 7 May 2026.

Other – please specify

On 7 October 2025, the Latvian Cabinet of Ministers approved the Media Policy Guidelines Implementation Plan for 2025-2027, developed by the Ministry of Culture in close collaboration with media industry professionals. The Plan aims to ensure the implementation of the tasks set out in the Guidelines, in accordance with the four action lines.

On 12 December 2025, amendments to the Electronic Mass Media Law entered into force, which facilitate the procedure for placing audiovisual commercial communications in radio programmes and clarify the order in which programme distribution service providers must arrange the television programmes they provide to their customers.

IV. Other institutional issues related to check and balances

A. The process for preparing, enacting and implementing laws

40. *Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders'/public consultations (including rules and practices on the transparent participation of civil society to policy development and decision-making processes, and transparency and quality of the legislative process in the preparatory, the parliamentary and implementation phase (including guidance on how to implement legislation).*

The Public Administration Modernisation Plan 2023 – 2027[35] provides a framework for strengthening policy quality, including the evidence-based policy-making system and improving impact assessment in policy-making in Latvia. Latvia is focusing on professionalising the interface between science and policy, while also strengthening its internal government analytical capacity. The School of Public Administration (an in-service training institution for public servants; a public administration institution subordinated to the State Chancellery) provides a number of courses to improve the analytical skills necessary for policy planning, policy and programme implementation, and evaluation. A team of policy planners from the Ministry of Justice participates in a training module designed to develop essential policy-making skills for evidence-based approach, such as problem analysis, alternative formulation, forecasting and evaluation.

The State Chancellery oversees the quality of regulatory impact assessments for major regulations and is at present developing a systemic approach to ex-post evaluations. The Ministry of Justice is one of the ministries taking a proactive approach to making ex-post evaluations a systematic part of the policy cycle.

The State Chancellery strongly maintains that opportunities for public participation must be ensured in all cases where this is necessary. Decisions of public significance that affect a wider community must be discussed with the relevant target groups in an appropriate manner. The urgency or

[35] Valsts pārvaldes modernizācijas plāns | Ministru kabinets

complexity of an issue is not a justification for proceeding without ensuring opportunities for public participation.

Recently new regulation on public participation was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers. It is the Cabinet Regulation No. 639 of 15 October 2024, *Procedures for the Public Participation in the Development Planning Process*.[36] The new regulation for public participation is based on international standards and recent trends. It supports use of innovative and modern methods to ensure more inclusive and meaningful public participation.

The new Cabinet regulation not only provides the necessary legal framework, but further motivates public authorities to use a variety of tools and methods to engage the public, in particular by reaching out to the groups affected by the particular matter. It provides for a number of significant improvements to the opportunities for civil society representatives to participate in state and local government development planning processes. The regulation will extend the forms of public participation, enabling not only the use of well-known methods of participation, but also the possibility to practise modern engagement forms. The regulation highlights the importance of targeted communication with social groups concerned by the regulation in order to inform them early about the opportunities to participate in decision-making that directly concerns them.

Opportunities for participation will be provided not only in development planning and drafting of legislation, but also in other initiatives of public interest, including planning of reforms and public funding. It is essential that public administrations take the societal needs into account as far as possible when organising participation. For instance, information on the issues to be discussed should be provided in a user-friendly manner, remote participation should be made possible, consultations should be organised closer to the target groups and those who lack digital skills should be assisted. In addition, it is required to provide a response in situations where public participation is not required. In this case, the authority should provide a publicly accessible explanation.

TAP portal has the main role in implementation of public participation opportunities in the direct public administration. This is the main platform for drafting of all development planning documents, draft laws and regulations, as well as to conduct participation activities in these projects. Mainly are conducted public consultations with stakeholders, but the form can also be meeting/discussion or survey.

After representatives of the public have expressed their opinions, where possible, while balancing the interests of various stakeholders, these opinions should be taken into account or a justification shall be provided.

The methods used for public participation and the results achieved shall be reflected in the initial impact assessment report (for legal acts) or in the text of the document (for policy planning documents), ensuring that decision-makers and the public are aware of consultations carried out. The institutions have to provide citizens with feedback on the proposals they have made, as already stated, but also to provide information on further opportunities for involvement and updating information on the results of the participation process at each stage of the project.

The public has the opportunity to participate more actively in the advisory and supervisory councils of the public administration institutions, transparency regarding the composition and operation of these councils is to be improved with the new Cabinet regulation (information to be published as of 2026).

The State Chancellery, in cooperation with the Latvian School of Public Administration, organises regular training on public participation – on regulatory framework and practical aspects of ensuring opportunities for public participation.

The State Chancellery also oversees draft legal acts and policy planning documents submitted by ministries, ensuring that opportunities for public participation have been provided during the drafting stages, responds to complaints from representatives of the public regarding opportunities to engage,

[36] https://likumi.lv/ta/id/355632-sabiedribas-lidzdalibas-kartiba-attistibas-planosanas-procesa

and, where necessary, requests that shortcomings be remedied.

To ensure the continuous involvement of civil society organisations in decision-making processes, it is planned to further strengthen civic dialogue, which is currently implemented by the Council for the Implementation of the Memorandum of Cooperation between Non-Governmental Organisations and the Cabinet of Ministers (half of the Council's members are representatives of CSOs – associations and foundations – elected by the organisations themselves, while the other half consists of the Director of the State Chancellery, State Secretaries of ministries, and a representative of the Prime Minister's Office). The Council of the Memorandum addresses issues of relevance to civil society.

The Ministry of Culture cooperates closely with NGOs. Civil society has been involved in the drafting of amendments to the Cabinet of Ministers regulations directly affecting NGOs. Representatives from NGOs have been part of working groups that draft amendments to the "Regulations on the criteria and procedure for selecting non-governmental organizations to work in the Council of the Society Integration Fund, and remuneration for members of the Council of the Society Integration Fund who are representatives of non-governmental organizations"(Cabinet Regulation No.205 of 7 April 2021) and amendments to "Procedures for making changes in appropriations specified in the Annual State budget Law" (Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No. 421 of 17 July 2018), The purpose of the Regulation No. 421 is to provide for a systemic framework in which associations and foundations may engage in projects and measures co-financed by the European Union policy instruments and other foreign financial assistance and apply for pre-financing of the State budget, if the implementation of such financial instruments is not regulated by other regulatory enactments.

Department of EU Coordination and Policy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Latvia regularly organises consultations with NGOs before developing positions on EU issues. The society "Women's NGOs Cooperation Network" nominated the Department for Civil dialogue award 2025 in the category "national administrations involving civil society in EU policy making". The award aims to assess good practice and initiatives for meaningful involvement of civil society organisations in EU policy making. Enduring serious competition, the Foreign Office's EU Department of Coordination and Policy entered the three finalists, where it finished second.

41. *Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency/urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)*

Both parliamentary decision-making and decision-making within the Cabinet of Ministers may be altered by certain fast-track procedures. However, these procedures are strictly regulated and are considered exceptions to the ordinary process. For example, Section 114(1) of the Rules of Order of the Saeima provides that a draft law shall be deemed adopted and shall enter into force if it has been considered in three readings, or, in the cases provided for in the following paragraph of the same section, in two readings. These cases include draft laws that have been recognised as urgent, the State Budget Law, and draft laws providing for the approval of international treaties. Pursuant to Section 92(1), a reasoned motion must be submitted, and the Parliament must decide to recognise a draft law as urgent.

Decision-making within the Cabinet of Ministers is governed by Cabinet Regulation No. 606 of 7 September 2021, *Rules of Procedure of the Cabinet*. Article 121 provides that a member of the Cabinet may request the Prime Minister to consider a draft at a Cabinet sitting under urgency procedures if an issue requires immediate resolution in order to prevent unfavourable consequences for the State that affect significant public interests or the international financial, economic, or security interests of the State. The use of urgency must be substantiated on the merits, specifying the concrete unfavourable consequences. Application of the urgency procedure shortens the deadline for submitting the draft legal act to the State Chancellery for inclusion on the agenda of a Cabinet sitting to no later than three working days before a Cabinet sitting.

In practice, urgency clauses are applied frequently; however, there are no indications that their use has substantially restricted stakeholder engagement or undermined the legitimacy of decision-making. Moreover, fast-track procedures are rarely used where the subject matter requires complex balancing of interests and prompts active public debate. There are no publicly available recent statistics on the use of fast-track procedures.

42. Safeguards to ensure legal certainty, the stability of the legal framework and non-discrimination.

In the Latvian legal system, the principle of legal certainty derives from Article 1 of the Satversme (the Constitution), which establishes Latvia as a democratic state governed by the rule of law, and from Article 90, which guarantees the right of individuals to be informed about legal regulation. The main instruments for achieving legal certainty and stability of the legal framework are a unified and predictable legal drafting process, the publication of legal acts and explanatory materials, the prohibition of retroactivity, and the application of the principle of legitimate expectations.

In its case law, the Constitutional Court of Latvia *(Satversmes tiesa)* has held that a legal norm must be sufficiently clear and predictable, meaning that it must be interpretable. A legal norm is considered unclear if its true meaning cannot be determined using recognised methods of interpretation. Accordingly, it is a constitutional obligation of the legislator to ensure the clarity of legal norms.

To achieve these objectives, both the Parliament and the Cabinet of Ministers have established internal bodies responsible for the legal and editorial review of draft legal acts. In addition, Cabinet Regulation No. 108 of 13 February 2009, *Rules for the Preparation of Draft Regulatory Enactments*, sets out detailed requirements for legal drafting. It provides, inter alia, that the text of a draft legal act shall be written concisely, in accordance with the literary and grammatical norms of the State language, legal terminology, and spelling requirements, and in a uniform style consistent with regulatory enactments, using standardised wording and a logical structure. Furthermore, publicly available guidelines, the *Manual for Drafting Regulatory Enactments*, supplement these requirements, and the State Administration School provides legal drafting courses for civil servants. This wide range of regulatory and non-regulatory instruments demonstrates that legal clarity continues to be regarded as an essential element of legal certainty.

Pursuant to Section 4(1) of the Law on Official Publications and Legal Information, a law shall be proclaimed within the time period specified in the Constitution by publishing it in the official gazette. Similarly, under Section 7(1) of the same law, Cabinet regulations, instructions, and recommendations shall also be proclaimed through publication in the official gazette. The official gazette, *Latvijas Vēstnesis* (vestnesis.lv), is publicly accessible online and contains not only legal acts adopted by the Parliament or the Cabinet of Ministers, but also acts issued by other public authorities, such as municipal regulations, notices relating to inheritance matters, notifications from the Commercial Register, and revocations of powers of attorney. In addition, the State maintains the website lvportals.lv, which provides explanations of ongoing and significant developments in the legal framework.

Section 9(4) of the Law on Official Publications and Legal Information expressly provides that a regulatory enactment, or part thereof, shall not have retroactive effect, except in cases expressly provided for by law. In practice, some enactments with retroactive effect have been adopted; however, in such cases the legislator is obliged to provide a substantiated justification based on a constitutional balancing test and to ensure that the public interest outweighs the individual interests affected and the legitimate expectations on which individuals reasonably relied. The Constitutional Court has also emphasised that transitional provisions constitute an important element of legal certainty and the protection of legitimate expectations. Accordingly, the legislator has a constitutional obligation to assess the impact of the proposed legal solution on both societal interests and the individual rights of those whose fundamental rights are restricted. As a result, the legislator is expected to provide a proportionate time frame for adaptation to regulatory changes.

43. Rules and application of states of emergency (or analogous regimes), including judicial review and parliamentary oversight.

The policy regarding state of emergency is primarily determined by the Ministry of Defence. The

Law On Emergency situation and State of Exception[37] establishes the procedure by which a special legal regime — a state of emergency or a state of exception — is declared and revoked, as well as the rights of state institutions and local government institutions, natural and legal persons, the restrictions on those rights, special obligations, and the safeguarding of legality during the period in which these legal regimes are in force. The basis for this is a decision of the Cabinet of Ministers declaring a state of emergency or a state of exception.

The Parliament has the competence to decide on the justification for declaring a state of emergency or a state of exception. It must immediately include the relevant Cabinet decision on its agenda and has the authority to reject it — in such a case, the decision loses its force.

It should also be noted that the Law on Military Courts[38] provides that, if a state of war has arisen or if the Cabinet of Ministers, in accordance with the procedures laid down in regulatory enactments, has decided to initiate the operation of military courts when declaring a state of exception, the Minister of Justice must immediately issue an order determining the deployment of military courts, their territorial jurisdiction, and their composition. The Law on Military Courts regulates issues of court jurisdiction, establishes the legal framework for the operation of military courts, and their functioning.

The Law on Military Courts also provides for the training of military court judges, prosecutors, and advocates. Training is conducted in accordance with a programme developed by the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Justice, using the material and technical resources of the National Defence Academy of Latvia. Each institution and council maintain a register of persons who have been trained and have agreed to serve as a military court judge, prosecutor, or advocate. The law also regulates procedural matters of military courts and the termination of their activities.

44. Regime for constitutional review of laws

We will provide information as soon as possible.

B. Independent authorities

45. Independence, resources, capacity and powers (including effective access to relevant data) of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions

Amendments to the Ombudsman Law were adopted on 6 March 2025 and entered into force on 2 April 2025. The amendments include two main issues: including the function of the National Preventive Mechanisms in the Ombudsman Law and formalizing the procedure of accessing information and data included in the Court Information System, particularly regarding rights and obligations for data security for the employees of the Ombudsman's Office.

On 18 March 2025 the President of the Republic of Latvia submitted to the Parliament a draft law on the amendments to the Ombudsman Law providing that the President nominates a candidate for the position of the Ombudsman. After the 4 June 2025 sitting the Parliamentary Legal Committee drafted amendments to the Ombudsman Law providing that both members of the Parliament (not less than 10) and the State President could nominate candidates for the position of the Ombudsman. The draft law on amendments (No 981/Lp14) has been submitted for third reading of the Parliament.

Draft law on amendments to the Ombudsman Law (No 1071/Lp14) that provide for additional mandate to the Ombudsman according to the Artificial Intelligence Act will be viewed in the third reading of the Parliament on 15 January 2026. Considering the difficult financial situation in the country the Ombudsperson did not request additional funding for AI mandate for 2026; however, the Ombudsperson reserved the right to request additional funding in the future

[37] The law On Emergency Situation and state of Exception and its English translation (29.05.2025. amendments are not included in the translation) available on: https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/255713-on-emergency-situation-and-state-of-exception

[38] The law On Military Courts and its English translation is available on: https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/104829-law-on-military-courts

In November 2025 the Ombudsman's Office was reaccredited with A status in the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI), confirming the compliance of the Ombudsman's Office of the Republic of Latvia with the Paris Principles, the functioning of the institution and the related national regulation.

Due to overall austerity measures in the state-funded institutions, the Ombudsman's Office revised its budget and reduced planned expenses for research, training and travel. Within the existing budget, resources were re-assessed and funding reallocated for two additional positions to perform the functions of the national fundamental rights protection authority arising from the Artificial Intelligence Act.

In October and November of 2025, the Ombudsperson met with the non-governmental institutions that represent people with disabilities and advocate for their rights. The NGOs were informed about the possibility to submit their reports to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and that the Ombudsman's Office is ready to facilitate their submissions. Also, the Ombudsperson has invited the NGOs to participate in the Advisory Council on Disability Matters, and its first online meeting will take place on 22 January 2026.

46. *Statistics/reports concerning the follow-up to recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies, and supreme audit institutions in the past year.*

According to Section 15 (1) of the Ombudsman Law, the Ombudsman shall, once a year, provide the Parliament and the State President with a written report regarding the activities of the Ombudsman's Office. According to Section 15 (2) of the Law, the Ombudsman has the right to provide the Parliament, its committees, the President, the Cabinet, the State administration institutions and international organisations with reports in respect of specific issues.

The practice is that the Ombudsman's Office compiles and sends the Annual Report to the Parliament and the Presidents until the beginning of March and reports to the Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights and Public Affairs and afterwards to the Parliament in the end of March.

The 2024 Annual Report is publicly available on the Ombudsperson's website.[39] In 2025, the Ombudsperson published several research reports on topics like sexual harassment, on the availability and quality of municipal housing, situation on discrimination in Latvia, accessibility of online surveys and media accessibility, as well as Ombudsperson's alternative reports to the United nations on the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in Latvia[40] and for the 4th cycle of the Universal Periodic Review[41].

47. *Safeguards to ensure the effective independence of supervisory and regulatory authorities with a direct impact on economic operators such as national economic oversight, enforcement and competition authorities,*

The Competition Council of Latvia[42]: The amendments allowing the Minister of Economics to appoint an interim Chairperson and Council members until permanent appointments are made were submitted to the Saeima in September 2025.

C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

48. *Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and respect of the good administration principle (including the obligation of the administration to give reasons for decisions)*

---

[39] 2024 Ombudsman's Annual Report

[40] Alternative Report of the Ombudsman's Office of the Republic of Latvia on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights regarding List of issues in relation to the fourth periodic report of Latvia

[41] Alternative Report of the Ombudsperson of the Republic of Latvia to the Human Rights Council for the 4th cycle of the Universal Periodic Review

[42] Sākumlapa en | Konkurences padome

No new updates in 2025.

49. Judicial review of administrative decisions: short description of the general regime (in particular competent court, scope, suspensive effect, interim measures, and any applicable specific rules or derogations from the general regime of judicial review).

In accordance with Article 7 of the Law "On Judicial Power", in administrative cases, courts shall exercise control over an activity of the executive power which relates to the lawfulness and validity of a specific public law relation (an administrative act or the actual actions of an institution), and also establishes the public legal obligations or rights of a person. Pursuant to Article 35 of the Law, an appeal court - the Administrative Regional Court has been established.

The total number of judges in the Administrative District Court is determined by the Saeima upon the proposal of the Judicial Council. The number of judges in each court is determined by the Judicial Council upon the proposal of the Minister of Justice. The total number of judges in the Administrative Regional Court is determined by the Saeima upon the proposal of the Judicial Council.

According to the Administrative Procedure Law, an administrative case shall be examined on the merits by a court of first instance but following a complaint of a participant to the administrative proceedings regarding a judgment of this court - also by a court of second instance in accordance with the appeal procedures, except for the cases specified in law. A participant to the administrative proceedings may appeal a judgment of a court of second instance in accordance with the cassation procedures, except for the cases specified in law.

50. Safeguards (other than judicial review) regarding decisions or inaction of administrative authorities, including remedies (e.g. administrative review)

No new updates in 2025.

51. Rules and practices related to the application by all courts, including constitutional jurisdictions, of the preliminary ruling procedure (Art. 267 TFEU)

We will provide information as soon as possible.

52. Implementation of final judgments by the public administration and State institutions and follow-up given to supranational judgments, including decisions from the European Court of Human Rights, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation

We will provide information as soon as possible.

53. Oversight, including by courts, of the use of intrusive surveillance software by national authorities

We will provide information as soon as possible.

D. The enabling framework for civil society

54. Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. legal framework and its application in practice incl. registration, transparency and dissolution rules)

In 2025 Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Latvia allocated 250 000 euro to "NGO Fund" program for projects in 2026 that will strengthen NGO capacity and support for NGO civil society activities.

On 15 September 2025 working group within the framework of the Council for the Implementation of the Memorandum of Cooperation between Non-governmental Organisations and the Cabinet organised a forum "Civil Society Development Strategy – What Do We Want?", which started to discuss the potential thematic framework of the National strategy for Civil Society Development.

In the supervisory board for the implementation of the guidelines for the development of a cohesive and civically active society on 10 September 2025, 6 NGO's were involved in a discussion about the national proposal for the 'AgoraEU' programme.

55. Rules and practices having an impact on the effective operation and safety of civil society organisations and human rights defenders. This includes measures to protect them from attacks – verbal, physical or on-line –, intimidation, legal threats incl. SLAPPs, negative narratives or smear campaigns, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc. It also includes measures to monitor threats or attacks and dedicated support services, as well as available remedies.

Concerning SLAPP – a work has been started regarding transposition of the Directive (EU) 2024/1069 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 on protecting persons who engage in public participation from manifestly unfounded claims or abusive court proceedings ('Strategic lawsuits against public participation').

56. Organisation of financial support for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. framework to ensure access to funding, and for financial viability, taxation/incentive/donation systems, measures to ensure a fair distribution of funding)

It is planned to continue state support programmes for civil society organisations, the most significant of which is the national programme *NGO Fund*.

In addition, with the support of various sources of foreign funding, including EU funds for the period 2021–2027, assistance is being provided for the growth of civil society organisations by strengthening participation in public administration decision-making processes (State Chancellery) and by promoting public self-organisation and expanding cooperation and co-creation skills and opportunities (Ministry of Culture).

Latvia provides targeted financial support to civil society organisations (CSOs), including organisations engaged in public interest advocacy and human rights protection, primarily through EU-funded programmes coordinated by the State Chancellery under the EU Cohesion Policy Programme 2021–2027 and the Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF). Under the Cohesion Policy Programme, dedicated measures support CSO capacity-building and participation in public decision-making, including involvement in policy planning, legislative processes and dialogue with public authorities at national and regional levels. In parallel, under the RRF, investment measure 6.3.1.4.i provides financial support to CSOs engaged in public interest monitoring and the representation of vulnerable societal groups, strengthening transparency, accountability and civic oversight. Grants are awarded and implemented through competitive procedures and subject to monitoring and public reporting requirements. These funding instruments ensure open access, fair distribution of funding and accountability, while contributing to the financial viability and institutional capacity of civil society organisations in Latvia.

Measure 4.3.4.5 "Support for the growth of civil society organisations by strengthening participation in public administration decision-making processes". Measure 4.3.4.5, coordinated by the State Chancellery and implemented by the Society Integration Foundation (SIF), is a flagship initiative of *Latvia's 2021–2027 EU Cohesion Policy programme*.

This initiative aims to reinforce the capacity of civil society organisations (CSOs) and foster structured civil dialogue with public authorities, thereby increasing public trust and transparency in decision-making. With a total budget of €1.74 million (85% ESF+ 15% state budget co-financing), the measure provides targeted support to CSOs – associations and foundations – across Latvia. Activities include: (1) the creation of four regional CSO incubators; (2) professional training for CSO leaders and members, and (3) systematic monitoring of draft legislation and policy documents.

The project period is 2024–2028. Over this time CSOs will receive legal and methodological assistance to improve the quality of their input into policy-making, supported by information made accessible in plain language and widely disseminated.

By the year 2028, this initiative aims to support 250 CSOs and ensure that at least 50 organisations submit structured opinions on policy and legal proposals. These outcomes will contribute to more inclusive governance, strengthen the role of CSOs as partners in policy development, and address capacity gaps, particularly in regions outside Riga. Strategically, the measure advances Latvia's commitments under the Open Government Partnership and the EU Recommendation on promoting civic engagement (2023/2836). It provides a structured framework to empower civil society, reduce fragmentation of participation practices, and build a sustainable enabling environment for NGOs nationwide.

In 2025, the State Chancellery financed dialogues on *the Future of Latvia in 2050*. Dialogues are a series of events gathering citizens to jointly discuss issues of societal importance – this time Latvia in 2050 – and to share their views and experiences. It is an innovative civic engagement form first practiced in 2023 and inspired by similar practice in Finland. Summary of Dialogues on *the Future of Latvia in 2050* (in English).[43]

E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

This can include developments related to initiatives to foster a rule of law culture, please specify which, (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, contributions from civil society, education initiatives, etc.): …

Other – please specify

Please see activities included in replays to 20., 36. and 37. questions.

Cross-pillar elements: cross-border rule of law issues related to the Single Market

If you are aware of any significant challenges concerning the Single Market faced by businesses or citizens from your Member State in a cross-border context relating to any of the four pillars of the report, including for example issues with market access and the conditions for economic activities, please highlight them in the box below.

Ministry of Economics:

To protect the rights of citizens and businesses in European Union (hereinafter – EU) and to ensure the correct application of EU law by public authorities, the SOLVIT network was established. SOLVIT is an informal problem-solving mechanism, which works only with cases in which no court proceedings have been initiated.

In 2025, the Latvian SOLVIT centre received 38 complaints from Latvian citizens concerning misapplication of the EU law by public authorities in other Member States, and 24 complaints from EU citizens regarding problems with Latvian public authorities. These cases included clarification cases, in which authorities provided justification for their decisions and correct application of EU laws, and individual misapplications. However, no evidence of systematic problems or repetitive EU law misapplications by Latvian public authorities was identified

In addition to individual misapplications, Latvian experience through SOLVIT highlights a number of horizontal challenges affecting the cross-border exercise of Single Market rights. These include differences in national administrative practices, procedural complexity, limited administrative capacity, language barriers, insufficient access to clear and user-friendly information, as well as difficulties in recognition of professional qualifications that may hinder market access and the provision of cross-border services.

Furthermore, the lack of interoperability between national IT systems and uneven levels of digitalisation across Member States continue to create obstacles to the effective application of EU law in cross-border situations.

SOLVIT therefore remains a key preventive and early-warning mechanism, contributing to the identification of emerging risks and helping to ensure legal certainty and trust in the functioning of

[43] https://www.mk.gov.lv/lv/media/24611/download?attachment

the Single Market.

As regards the publication of your written input, please indicate whether you:

☐ Consent

☐ Do not consent