

VALIULLINA and Others v. LATVIA
(Applications Nos. 56928/19, 7306/20 and 11937/20)

REQUEST FOR REFERRAL OF A CASE
TO THE GRAND CHAMBER

LHRC, December 08, 2023



Protest in front of the Parliament against the elimination of education in the Russian language

VALIULLINA and Others v. LATVIA
(Applications Nos. 56928/19, 7306/20 and 11937/20)

REQUEST FOR REFERRAL OF A CASE
TO THE GRAND CHAMBER

December 08, 2023

Contents

<i>I. Introduction</i>	2
<i>II. Development of relevant international law and practice, as well as the Court's case law</i>	3
<i>II.1. Progress in the approach to minority education in the mother tongue</i>	3
<i>II.2 Evolution of the Court's case-law</i>	7
<i>III. Grounds for referral to the Grand Chamber</i>	9
<i>III.1 The main deviations from the case-law consistency made by the Chamber</i>	9
<i>III.2 Failure to take into account progress made in the approach to minority education in the mother tongue</i>	12
<i>III.3 Possible consequences of a Chamber's departure from the case-law consistency</i>	18
<i>III.4. Case concerning “new” issues</i>	20
<i>III.5 Resonance case with significant repercussions</i>	22
<i>IV. Certain other deviations from Court's case-law that affected the outcome of the case</i>	24
<i>V. Conclusion</i>	27
<i>Annexes</i>	
<i>I. A brief description of the history of the education system of Latvian national minorities and current attempts to dismantle it.</i>	

2. *List of application numbers submitted to the Court in relation to the 2018 reform*
3. *Procedure for consideration of applications in the Court (including main documents submitted by the parties).*
4. *Volume of arguments taken into account and not taken into account by the Chamber*

I. Introduction

1. On 14 September 2023, the Chamber established by the Fifth Section of the Court (hereinafter - Chamber) proclaimed the Judgment in the joint case of Valiullina and Others v. Latvia¹ (no. 56928/19) - hereinafter Valiullina Judgment.

The applicants challenged the drastic reduction in the use of the mother tongue in Latvia's national minority education system caused by various regulatory acts adopted by the Latvian Parliament and Government in 2018 (hereinafter- the 2018 reform). Already during the pendency of the applications before the Court, the Latvian Parliament adopted new legislative acts aimed at the complete abolition of the minority language education system (hereinafter- the 2022 reform).

A brief description of the history of Latvia's national minority education system, as well as a characterisation of the 2018 and 2022 reforms is provided by the applicants in annex 1.

2. 2018 reform has generated many applications to the Court. The applicants' representative is aware of 227 such registered applications filed between 16/10/2019 and 31/01/2022 (annex 2).

15/03/2021 The Section decided to select a part (8 applications from 10 families) of the applications available to it at the time, so that the joint case (joint case Dina Valiullina and 7 other applications v. Latvia, hereinafter– first joint case) would cover all levels

¹ Cases nos. 56928/19, 7306/20 and 11937/20

(from pre-school to secondary school) and forms (public and private) of education and communicated them to the Government.

All stages of communication are described in detail in annex 3. The list and abbreviations of the titles of the documents submitted by the applicants and the government, used below in the references given in the main text, are also given there.

At the end of all stages of communication, the Chamber decided to separate from the first joint case those three applications which related only to education in public schools, to consider them jointly (hereinafter - the second joint case) and adopted the contested judgement on them.

The respective applications were lodged with the Court between 22/10/2019 and 13/02/2020 and related to a violation of Articles 8, 14 and Article 2 of Protocol 1 of the Convention.

The Chamber found the arguments in the second joint case under Article 8² and separately under Article 2 of Protocol 1³ inadmissible, examined the merits of the part of the complaint alleging a violation of Article 14 together with Article 2 of Protocol 1 and, unreasonably in the applicants' view, found no violation of the Convention here either.

II. Development of relevant international law and practice, as well as the Court's case law

II.1. Progress in the approach to minority education in the mother tongue

3. In the 73 years since the adoption of the Convention, significant progress has been made in understanding the importance of mother-tongue education for minorities and in developing related practices.

² Valiullina Judgment, §110

³ Ibid, §136

4. There is a wealth of United Nations research that clearly confirms the benefits of mother-tongue instruction, especially for pre-school and school-age children. There is a direct correlation between the extent to which the mother tongue is used in instruction and the effectiveness of the education received, including the provision of knowledge of the State language⁴.

5. The UN findings on the relationship between the use of mother tongue in education and the quality of education are conceptualised in the report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues at the forty-third session of the UN Human Rights Council (2020), which states the following.

Children thus stay in school longer, obtain on average better grades, and obtain on average a higher degree of fluency in both the official language and their own language. Put differently, minority students taught only in the official language will on average repeat grades more often, drop out of school more frequently, receive worse results, end up later in life with the lowest paying jobs and highest unemployment rates, and learn the official language less well than students who were taught in their own language. If persons belonging to linguistic minorities have a responsibility to integrate into the wider society, then it would seem that this can be best achieved through effectively teaching them in their own language because of generally better outcomes from education in one's language, even in acquiring fluency in the official language⁵.

The report also provides a detailed characterisation of these studies and related documents⁶.

⁴ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §17; see also Supplement, §§5e, 5f

⁵ Education, language and the human rights of minorities. Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, A/HRC/43/47, 09.01.2020, §53

⁶ Ibid, footnote 16 on document 'Excerpts of International and regional documents on education, language and the human rights of minorities'

6. On the basis of these studies and independent monitoring testifying to the deterioration of the quality of education of national minorities as a result of the previous stages of replacing the mother tongue in education with Latvian, the applicants concluded about undermining of the competitiveness of Russian-speaking pupils⁷.

7. The identified dependence of the quality of education on the extent to which the mother tongue is used in teaching has been reflected in the documents of interregional and regional international organisations of which Latvia is a member.

The OSCE⁸ and the European Parliament⁹ have enshrined the benefits of mother-tongue instruction for national minorities in a number of advisory documents, and the Council of Europe¹⁰ in binding documents.

8. In 1960, UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education¹¹ was adopted. Article 2b of the Convention provides that the following situation shall not be deemed to constitute discrimination that the establishment or maintenance, for [...] linguistic reasons, of separate educational systems or institutions offering an education which is in keeping with the wishes of the pupil's parents [...], if participation in such systems [...] is optional and if the education provided conforms to such standards as may be laid down [...] by the competent authorities. The conditions for the admissibility of separate minority language schools are also set out in Article 5.1 of the Convention (items b and c).

⁷ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§ 32-36. See also annex 4 to the main text, §7

⁸ the 1996 Hague Recommendations regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities

⁹ Resolution of 11 September 2013 on endangered European languages and linguistic diversity in the European Union (2013/2007(INI)); Resolution of 13 November 2018 on Minimum Standards for Minorities in the EU

¹⁰ The 1992 European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (not signed by Latvia); The 1995 Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (mandatory for Latvia).

¹¹ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §15

The Latvian education system for national minorities (taking into account the voluntariness of its choice) before the 2018 reform fully fulfils these conditions, as well as the conditions of acceptability of separate education¹².

9. Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) guarantees the right to education. There is a strong presumption of impermissibility of any retrogressive measures taken in relation to the right to education¹³.

10. UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)¹⁴ stipulates, inter alia, that the main purpose of education is the development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential (Article 29.1a) and protects the right of children from national minorities to use their mother tongue (Article 30).

Under the influence of this Convention, the Court recognised that there is a broad consensus, including in international law, in support of the idea that in all decisions concerning children, their best interests are of paramount importance¹⁵. In cases concerning discrimination in education (see §14 below), the Court has also noted that for minor children, the right to education is of paramount importance¹⁶.

11. The issue of mother-tongue education for national minorities is relevant for all Council of Europe countries with ethnic and linguistic minorities. This practice is

¹² See also Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§ 37-44

¹³ UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. General Comment no.13 (right to education), §45

¹⁴ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §14

¹⁵ Jansen v. Norway, no. 2822/16, 6 September 2018, §91

¹⁶ D.H. and others v. Czech Republic, [GC], no. 57325/00, 13 November 2007, §182

common in at least 13 EU countries¹⁷, in areas adjacent to the Danish-German border¹⁸, and in at least 8 other Council of Europe countries¹⁹.

Latvia's educational policy (see in details annex 1) before the loss of independence was fully, and during the annexation period partially (for the largest Russian national minority) in line with the documents mentioned in §§ 5, 7-10 above and not yet adopted at that time. In the period after the restoration of independence and until the 2018 reform, Latvia's educational system for national minorities was also largely in line with the above documents and established European practice.

II.2 Evolution of the Court's case-law

12. The rights of national minorities, in particular their specific rights of access to education, are not explicitly enshrined in the Convention.

Nevertheless, there are examples in case-law where restriction of access to education in the mother tongue or unequal treatment of minorities in access to quality education has been recognised as a violation of the Convention.

13. The restriction of the right to receive education in one's mother tongue has been found to be a violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 in those regions of Cyprus²⁰ and Moldova²¹, which were not under the control of the central authorities, and (in

¹⁷ See e.g. for 13 EU countries Research for CULT Committee – Minority languages and education: best practices and pitfalls. European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education. European Union, 2017

¹⁸ The German-Danish Minority Model in the borderland. German commission for UNESCO: <https://www.unesco.de/en/culture-and-nature/intangible-cultural-heritage/national-register-good-safeguarding-practices-1>

¹⁹ See conclusions of the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (ACFC) in relation to 8 more Council of Europe countries as Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Estonia, Georgia, Serbia, Sweden and Ukraine.

²⁰ Cyprus v. Turkey [GC], no. 25781/94, 10 May 2001

²¹ Catan and others v. Moldova and Russia [GC], nos. 43370/04, 8252/05 and 18454/06, 9 October 2012; Iovcev and Other v. Moldova and Russia, no. 40942/14, 17 September 2019

conjunction with Article 14) in certain regions of Belgium²². In all these cases, the mother tongue of the victims was the official language of the State, but differed from the de facto (in Belgium, de jure) official language in the place of residence of the victims, which was the cause of the conflict.

14. Discrimination has repeatedly been recognised by the Court under Article 14, read in conjunction with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 or Article 1 of Protocol No. 12, as unequal treatment between the majority of pupils and one²³ or more²⁴ ethnic groups of pupils with regard to the provision of quality education.

In the present case, where the inevitability of a deterioration in the quality of education due to the replacement of the mother tongue by the State language in the education programmes of national minorities appears to be proven (see §§ 4-6 above) and the quality of education remains unchanged for the majority of pupils, the Court's practice in these precedents is applicable.

(a) The Court found in all cases that the singling out of the allegedly discriminated group had an ethnic ground.

(b) In a number of cases, this conclusion was reached on the basis of the interpretation of statistical data²⁵. In the one case where the statistical criterion of proving an ethnic ground did not work, and it seemed more likely that the group being sent to special classes was singled out on the ground of insufficient knowledge of the official language, the judges were split almost in half as to whether discrimination had occurred²⁶. Several judges noted in their dissenting opinion that, in addition, the majority

²² Case “relating to certain aspects of the laws on the use of languages in education in Belgium” (merits), 23 July 1968

²³ D.H. and others v. Czech Republic, [GC], no. 57325/00, 13 November 2007; Sampanis and others v. Greece, no. 32526/05, 5 June 2008; Oršuš and others v. Croatia, [GC], no. 15766/03, 16 March 2010; Lavida and others v. Greece, no. 7973/10, 30 May 2013; Horváth and Kiss v. Hungary, no. 11146/11, 29 January 2013

²⁴ X and others v. Albania, nos. 73548/17 and 45521/19, 31 May 2022

²⁵ D.H. and others v. Czech Republic, §§187-192; Horváth and Kiss v. Hungary, §§7,8, 110; X and others v. Albania, §74

²⁶ Oršuš and others v. Croatia, §152

has not taken into consideration at all that one of the rights of a minority consists in “preserving diversity” [...] and that separation is therefore not always considered to be harmful [...]²⁷.

(c) In these proceedings, the Court has always taken into account the country-specific recommendations made by international human rights institutions²⁸.

15. Finally, the Court has recognised the particular importance of minorities receiving education in their mother tongue, without regard to specific countries and situations²⁹. In the Court's view, there is a consensus in this respect among Council of Europe countries³⁰, at least among those who, like Latvia, have ratified the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (hereinafter - Framework Convention).

III. Grounds for referral to the Grand Chamber

III.1 The main deviations from the case-law consistency made by the Chamber

16. The Chamber in the present case allowed serious deviations from case-law described above in §§ 12-15.

17. The Chamber first of all reconsidered the Court's findings (see §15 above) that there was a consensus with respect to minorities' rights in the field of education among the Council of Europe countries, at least those which had ratified binding instruments for

²⁷ Joint partly dissenting opinion of judges Jungwiert, Vajič, Kovler, Gyulumyan, Jaeger, Myjer, Berro-Lefevre and Vučnić, §17

²⁸ X and others v. Albania, §§43, 86

²⁹ Adam and others v. Romania, §94

³⁰ See also Sampanis and others v. Greece, §72

the protection of minority rights³¹. In reassessing the Court's 2008 and 2020 precedents, the Chamber relied on a 2005 judgment of the Latvian Constitutional Court.

In reviewing the 2020 precedent most unpalatable to the Chamber, the Chamber questioned the applicants' right to rely on cases concerning complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 12, which Latvia had not signed³². Nevertheless, the Court has previously found that the methodology for dealing with Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 and Article 14 cases is substantially the same and, accordingly, may rely on the same case-law³³. In addition, the Chamber itself is guided by the methodology set out in the request received under Protocol No. 16, which Latvia has also not signed³⁴.

18. The Chamber rejected, without detailed justification, the applicants' proposal to examine the issue of unequal treatment compared to ethnically Latvian pupils, including on the basis of belonging to a national minority (i.e., on an ethnic ground)³⁵, deciding to analyse the existence of discrimination solely on the ground of language³⁶. In doing so, the Chamber disregarded the statistical analysis of the ethnic composition of the comparative groups submitted by the applicants in full compliance with the case-law (see §14b above) and, accordingly, deviated from the case-law which considers unequal treatment in the provision of quality education on ethnic grounds (see §14a above).

Accordingly, the Chamber unjustifiably exaggerated the limits of the State's margin of appreciation, which in the case of differential treatment on ethnic grounds is very small³⁷.

³¹ Valiullina Judgment, §210

³² *ibid*, §133. In this case, this is primarily case Adam and others v. Romania and also case X and others v. Albania.

³³ Adam and others v. Romania, §§82-84

³⁴ Valiullina Judgment, §182

³⁵ *Ibid*, §156

³⁶ *Ibid*, §190

³⁷ D.H. and others v. Czech Republic, §§ 176,196; Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina [GC], nos. 27996/06 and 34836/06, 22 December 2009, §44; Timishev v. Russia, nos. 55762/00 and 55974/00, 13 December 2005, § 58

19. The Chamber also rejected the established case-law in such cases to take into account country-specific recommendations made by international human rights institutions (see §14c above).

The opinion of all international institutions (with the exception of the Venice Commission) on the 2018 reform in public schools³⁸ was unequivocally negative. In all opinions, it was noted that it is precisely about restricting the rights of national minorities. The UN Committees and Special Rapporteurs explicitly referred to possible discrimination against national minorities, and of the several such opinions submitted by the applicants³⁹, only one is referenced in the appealed judgment of the Chamber⁴⁰. The Venice Commission, which recognised the 2018 reform of public schools as permissible (but condemned the reform of pre-schools and private schools), by default refused to address the issue of discrimination against children from national minorities compared to ethnic Latvian schoolchildren, which is the main point of contention in this case.

20. With regard to the precedents cited in §13 above, the Chamber excluded them because, firstly, the restrictions concerned the official language of the country⁴¹ and, secondly, the restrictions took place (with the exception of Belgium) in territories outside the control of the official authorities⁴².

However, since the subject matter of the dispute, as in the present case, is still restrictions on the use of the mother tongue in education, in order to assess the proportionality of the restrictions it would be appropriate to take into account the applicants' comparison of the Latvian case with these precedents⁴³. This comparison

³⁸ The conclusions of the European structures are reflected by the Chamber in Valiullina Judgment, §§89-93

³⁹ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §16

⁴⁰ Valiullina Judgment, §84

⁴¹ Ibid, §132

⁴² Ibid, §§130-131

⁴³ Supplement, §8

shows that the degree of exclusion of the mother tongue from the educational process in cases where the Court has found a violation of the Convention is substantially less than that caused by the 2018 reform.

With regard to the statement in one of these precedents of the need to preserve the right to mother-tongue instruction when a child transitions from basic to secondary education, see also §26 below.

III.2 Failure to take into account progress made in the approach to minority education in the mother tongue

21. The Court's case-law has established that Convention is a living instrument which [...] must be interpreted in the light of present-day conditions⁴⁴. In interpreting and applying [Article 2 of Protocol No. 1], account must also be taken of any relevant rules and principles of international law applicable in relations between the Contracting Parties and the Convention should so far as possible be interpreted in harmony with other rules of international law of which it forms part⁴⁵.

However, the Chamber has not demonstrated consideration of the evolving understanding of the benefits of mother tongue education in international law and related practice (described in §§ 3-11 above).

22. The UN studies proving a direct link between the degree of use of the mother tongue in teaching and the effectiveness of the education received, and the applicants' corresponding conclusion that the 2018 reform reduced the competitiveness of Russian-speaking pupils (see §§ 4-6 above), the Chamber treated as presumed intentions or mere suppositions⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ *Tyler v. the United Kingdom*, no. 5856/72, 25 April 1978, §31; *Leyla Şahin v. Turkey* [GC], no. 44774/98, 10 November 2005, § 136

⁴⁵ *Catan and others v. Moldova and Russia* [GC], §136

⁴⁶ *Valiullina Judgment*, §193

Although the decline in the quality of education due to the 2018 reform, noted by the applicants and expected also by international organisations⁴⁷, is a crucial argument both in terms of the application of a number of the Court's case-law (see §14 above) and in assessing the proportionality of the different treatment in dispute.

The subject of the dispute in this case is not "the right to access educational institutions in a language of their choice"⁴⁸, but the right to be taught in one's mother tongue, which is closely linked to the effectiveness of education. While one may agree with the Chamber's conclusion that the right as first formulated is not protected by Article 2 of Protocol 1⁴⁹, the right to effective education falls within the protection of the Convention⁵⁰.

The restrictions, such as 2018 reform, that are imposed curtail the right in question to such an extent as to impair its very essence and deprive it of its effectiveness⁵¹

23. With regard to the UN documents describing the benefits of mother-tongue education, as well as the OSCE, European Parliament and Council of Europe documents relating to the rights of minorities to mother-tongue education (see §§ 4-7 above), the Chamber simply listed some of them, stating that the applicants referred to particular non-binding international material⁵².

24. The OSCE Hague Recommendations, which the applicants used for comparison with the 2018 reform provisions⁵³, have been given a little more attention: the recommendations are referenced in the judgment⁵⁴, but the Chamber used only the part

⁴⁷ Of those referred to by the Chamber. Valiullina Judgment, §92 (ECRI, §62); §93 (Venice Commission, §101)

⁴⁸ Valiullina judgment, §§130-134, 146

⁴⁹ Ibid, §136

⁵⁰ Case "relating to certain aspects of the laws on the use of languages in education in Belgium" (merits), 23 July 1968, §1B4

⁵¹ Leyla Şahin v. Turkey [GC], no. 44774/98, 10 November 2005, §154

⁵² Valiullina Judgment, §163

⁵³ Ibid, §166; see also Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §36

⁵⁴ Valiullina Judgment §95

of them that indicates the need for sufficient knowledge of the state language for integration into society⁵⁵.

25. The provisions of the Framework Convention binding on Latvia and the conclusions on the basis of the Framework Convention of the Advisory Committee and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe condemning the 2018 reform are included in the text of the appealed judgement⁵⁶. However, the Chamber disagreed with the conclusions of these organisations, upholding a narrowed interpretation of the Framework Convention borrowed from the 2005 and 2019 judgments of the Latvian Constitutional Court⁵⁷. This interpretation diverges significantly from the Court's view expressed in the 2020 judgment as follows: the rights of persons belonging to national minorities to use their mother tongue and receive education in this language, as well as the State's corresponding obligation to protect and encourage the development of minority languages, are among the principles safeguarded by the international instruments on the matter, to which the respondent State is a party⁵⁸.

26. The opinion of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of impermissibility of any retrogressive measures taken in relation to the right to education (see §9 above) was cited by the Chamber only in the narrative part of the judgment⁵⁹, without drawing any conclusions from the opinion. Although the entire practice preceding the 2018 reform, as well as the 2018 and 2022 reforms themselves, are clear examples of such retrogressive measures.

The Chamber in particular ignored the Court's finding that a retrograde measure such as changing the language of education when a child moves from basic to secondary

⁵⁵ Ibid, §210

⁵⁶ Ibid, §§85-90

⁵⁷ Ibid, §§134,210,211

⁵⁸ Adam and Others v. Romania, §94

⁵⁹ Valiullina Judgment, §83

school as a result of the elimination of previously available secondary education in the mother tongue, which is also present in the 2018 reform, is inadmissible⁶⁰.

The principle of impermissibility of any retrogressive measures should also apply to the guarantees for the education of national minorities given by the Framework Convention, which entered into force in respect of Latvia on 1 October 2005. It should be noted that when Latvia ratified the Framework Convention, article 14 of the Convention, which guarantees the right to education for national minorities, was accepted by Latvia without reservation⁶¹.

27. The Chamber's judgement makes no mention at all of the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education or the applicants' other arguments that there is no impermissible segregation in the Latvian educational system (see § 8 above).

It seems obvious that the entire "segregation" of the Latvian school system consists only in the fact that pupils from national minorities are taught according to programmes for national minorities, which differ from those for the majority exclusively in the language of instruction, and do not differ from them in the teaching of non-language subjects and in the monitoring of learning outcomes (see also annex 1, §8). Such "segregation" is characteristic of all the European systems of education for national minorities mentioned in §11 above and of the Latvian education system in the period before annexation.

Nevertheless, the Chamber uncritically borrowed from the government⁶² both the very term "segregation" as the main characterisation of Latvia's Soviet and post-Soviet educational system, and the struggle to restore the already existing unity of the educational system (see annex 1, §8), as one of the two main legitimate aims of the reform 2018⁶³.

⁶⁰ Cyprus v. Turkey [GC], §278

⁶¹ Valiullina Judgment, §86

⁶² Ibid, §§ 11, 48, 170

⁶³ Ibid, §§193, 201, 203

28. The Chamber also uses Russification⁶⁴, which did occur during the Soviet era, to support its findings of segregation. However, it is important to assess Russification not in general, but in the context of the subject matter of the dispute, which relates solely to the choice of the language of education.

Namely, ethnic Latvian schoolchildren before the annexation, during the annexation period and after the restoration of independence were taught exclusively in their native Latvian language.

The only evidence of the Russification of the Latvian school reflected in the contested judgement - Russification was achieved by paying special attention to teaching Russian in schools which had Latvian as the language of instruction⁶⁵ – simply means that Russian was taught in Latvian schools for majority as a separate compulsory subject⁶⁶. Such consequences of Russification as "significant changes in the ethnic composition of Latvian inhabitants"⁶⁷ in the school-age group have already been completely overcome: share of children belonging to national minorities now is in the range of 26-28%, in 1935 (those, during the period of maximum predominance of ethnic Latvians in the population in the last century), the share of national minorities among school-age persons was 26%⁶⁸.

The consequences of Russification in terms of the population's knowledge of the state language have also been overcome: in 2014, 91% of the population knew Latvian, while in 1930 only 84% of the population knew it ⁶⁹.

As for the Russification of non-Russian ethnic groups⁷⁰, a comparative analysis of population censuses shows that their adoption of Russian as a family language took

⁶⁴ Ibid, §§ 11, 170, 179, 210

⁶⁵ Ibid, §11

⁶⁶ See also an example of positive discrimination against the ethnically Latvian part of schoolchildren during the period of annexation in order to ensure their competitiveness in any profession anywhere in the USSR in Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §44

⁶⁷ Valiullina Judgment, §210

⁶⁸ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, §4; Supplement, §12.2

⁶⁹ Supplement, §12.1. See also annex 4 to main text, §6

⁷⁰ Valiullina Judgment, §§ 93 (Venice commission, §13), 179

place after the restoration of independence: according to the results of the 1979, 1989 and 2000 censuses, the proportion of non-Russian ethnic minorities who used mainly their mother tongue was 44, 41 and 25%, respectively⁷¹ (see also annex1, §14). In the context of the dependence of the quality of education on the level of mother tongue use in education, all school pupil -applicants are equally victims of the 2018 reform, irrespective of their parents' membership of three different ethnic minorities noted by the Chamber⁷².

In addition, the Chamber erroneously emphasises that the 2018 reform only affects the rights of Russian-speaking pupils⁷³. Reform 2018, with a few exceptions⁷⁴ that are not significant in practice, equally restricts the use of the mother tongue in other educational programmes of national minorities.

The 227 registered applications known to the complainants include applications from parents and pupils of national Jewish (no. 11170/20), Belarusian (no. 53698/20) and Polish (no. 19/21) public educational institutions.

29. To justify the restriction of the rights to be taught in the mother tongue of minor children born in the twenty-first century, the Chamber applies an interpretation of events that occurred several decades before the birth of these children⁷⁵.

The applicants consider that this is contrary to the principle of the best interests of the child recognised by the pan-European consensus (see § 10 above). The Convention establishing this principle was not even mentioned by the Chamber in the judgment, and no trace of the application of the Convention was found in the Chamber's findings by the applicants.

⁷¹ Supplement, §4

⁷² Valiullina Judgment, §§32-34, 190

⁷³ *ibid.*, §§ 190, 191, 193, 194, 208, 212

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, §§ 49, 50, 137.

⁷⁵ See for example *ibid.*, §210

30. With regard to the prevalence of mother-tongue education of minorities (see §11 above), the Chamber, following the Government, argues that principle of instruction in one's mother tongue, which the applicants referred to, is far from being the rule among the member States of the Council of Europe. The Government emphasised that such a practice existed in only a handful of other member States⁷⁶.

III.3 Possible consequences of a Chamber's departure from the case-law consistency

31. The Latvian system of education of pupils of national minorities in national minority education programmes designed for them, with predominantly mother-tongue instruction and in-depth study of the state language as a separate subject, which imposes the same requirements for the study of non-linguistic subjects as the main curricula and uniform means of verification in examinations, and which is chosen voluntarily by the pupils' parents, is in essence no different from any such programme implemented by other Council of Europe countries (see §11 above for a list of countries, see also conclusions from §§ 11, 27, 28 above).

Therefore, the Chamber's conclusion that there is unacceptable segregation and support for the dismantling of Latvia's system of education for national minorities applies without exception to any such system in any State.

This applies in particular to the Chamber's conclusion that if pupils from national minorities have a good knowledge of the state language, there is no harm in refusing to provide instruction in their mother tongue, but if not, they should be forced to be taught in the state language⁷⁷.

The Chamber, however, refers to the uniqueness of Latvia, which has survived long occupation and Russification⁷⁸.

⁷⁶ Ibid, §§181, 210

⁷⁷ Ibid, § 208

⁷⁸ See for example *ibid*, §210

Yet the whole history of Europe is full of occupations and annexations leaving minorities living in "foreign" territory.

For example, the long tensions and territorial disputes between Germany and Denmark (which was occupied by Germany in the same 1940), accompanied by dramatic referendums (1920), did not prevent the introduction of a separate from the general (i.e., segregated!) system of education entirely in the native language of the national minority in places of compact settlement of the respective minorities on the territory of the other state.

In 1920 Poland occupied and annexed for a long period of time (until 1939) a significant part of the territory of Lithuania, including its capital Vilnius. The demographic composition of the population in the annexed territory was significantly changed and Lithuanian schools were abolished⁷⁹.

However, this does not prevent Lithuania from maintaining a network of Polish schools, which survived the annexation of Lithuania by the USSR (1940-1990)⁸⁰.

32. Thus the Chamber, by deviating from the Court's case-law, has set a precedent which may adversely affect the established system of education for national minorities in any of the European countries mentioned in § 11 above⁸¹.

All the more so because in the last few years there have been alarming tendencies recorded by international human rights institutions to abandon the principle of teaching members of national minorities in their native language, including in those countries where the availability of resources to maintain such education has been confirmed by previous long-standing practice.

⁷⁹ See for example Polish annexation of Eastern Lithuania in 1920–1939. Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania: <http://www.genocid.lt/centras/en/2394/a/>

⁸⁰ See annex 1, §14 and Research for CULT Committee (op. cit.), p.83-86

⁸¹ Practice followed by the panel of the Grand Chamber when deciding on requests for referral under Article 43 of the Convention. Note prepared by the Grand Chamber Registry 2 June 2021, Section IV (a); Explanatory Report to Protocol No. 11 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, restructuring the control machinery established thereby. Strasbourg, 11.V.1994, §100

These problems are particularly characteristic of countries such as Estonia⁸², Latvia, Lithuania⁸³ and Ukraine⁸⁴, where the rights of other traditional European minorities (e.g., Poles in all four countries or Hungarians and Romanians in Ukraine) are affected alongside the rights of the traditional Russian-speaking minority in these countries.

III.4. Case concerning “new” issues

33. It should be noted that the case in question differs in certain respects from those cases involving Article 14 of the Convention referred to in §14 above.

In those cases, certain groups of national minorities were placed in a separate education system of a known inferior quality, and there were doubts as to the voluntariness of the choice of this inferior system.

In the present case, before the contested reform 2018, the education systems for the majority and for ethnic minorities were virtually identical in quality. The subject of the dispute is the inevitable deterioration of the quality of education in the programs of national minorities as their mother tongue is replaced by the state language in education.

The choice of education system for national minorities is completely voluntary and there are no obstacles for them to choose the majority education system and enjoy all the advantages of this system declared by the government in terms of mastering the state language and full integration into society. However, national minorities overwhelmingly refuse such a "favourable choice". The State responds to this challenge by gradually dismantling the education system for national minorities.

In addition, for the first time the Court had to consider the issue of discrimination against minor children belonging to several ethnic groups at once, i.e., practically all

⁸² See for example ACFC. Fifth opinion of Estonia, 02/02/2022, §§7,16,104.184-186

⁸³ ACFC. Fourth Opinion on Lithuania, 30/05/2018, §§93,94,98-100, 114

⁸⁴ Venice Commission. Opinion on Ukraine, 2017 (CDL-AD(2017)030)

such persons whose ethnic origin does not coincide with the ethnic origin of the majority of the nation.

34. The novelty of the case also lies in the fact that in the present case, the Chamber was not able to make full use of the principle of subsidiarity and was forced to substitute the Constitutional Court of Latvia in assessing whether and to what extent differences in similar situations justify different treatment.

The Latvian Constitutional Court, in all three 2018 reform proceedings, refused to consider the merits of the question of possible discrimination put to it by the plaintiffs, citing that persons who study in the state language are in a deliberately unequal position to those whose language of instruction has no official status⁸⁵.

The Venice Commission, to which the 2018 reform was referred by the PACE Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination⁸⁶, was aware of the proceedings before the Constitutional Court, two of which had concluded by the time the Commission's Opinion was prepared, and the judgement in the third trial was published the day after the publication of the Opinion⁸⁷. Nevertheless, the Venice Commission, without any explanation (by default), avoided discussing the issue, limiting itself to assessing only minor differences in the treatment of minority pupils depending on whether the language of instruction is an EU language or protected by an international treaty.

As a result, the Venice Commission, the only international body whose opinion the Chamber took into account in condemning aspects of the 2018 reform such as the removal of minority mother tongues from pre-school education and private schools, found it acceptable to impose the state language on minorities as the language of instruction in public schools.

⁸⁵ Judgment of 23 April 2019 in case No. 2018-12-01, §21.1; Judgment of 13 November 2019 in case No. 2018-22-01, §23.1; Judgment of 19 June 2020 in case No.2019-20-03, §21

⁸⁶ AS/Ega (2019) CB 08 6 December 2019

⁸⁷ Venice Commission. Opinion on Latvia, 18 June 2020, CDL-AD(2020)012; see also Valiullina Judgment, §93

All other international institutions that have given recommendations to Latvia regarding the 2018 reform have perceived it extremely negatively, and some of them have recorded possible discrimination of national minorities on ethnic grounds.

35. In view of the foregoing in §§33-34, as well as the previously mentioned in §§17-30 deviations of the Chamber from the Court's case-law The case in question has a certain novelty and can be categorised as one of the cases which are suitable for clarifying the principles set forth in the case-law or cases in which the Grand Chamber may be called upon to re-examine a development in the case-law endorsed by the Chamber⁸⁸.

III.5 Resonance case with significant repercussions

36. Attempts to restrict the possibility for national minorities to receive education in their native language have invariably provoked discussion in Latvia's traditionally multi-ethnic society, periodically culminating in protests that have reached national proportions: street marches with tens of thousands of participants, mass hunger strike by parents, the collection of tens of thousands of protest signatures⁸⁹, lawsuits filed by opposition MPs and individuals with the Constitutional Court and subsequent mass applications to the Court.

37. Let us compare the Latvian case with several high-profile precedents that necessitated the intervention of the Grand Chamber⁹⁰. In almost all the precedents cited (except the last one), the Court applied the pilot judgement procedure.

⁸⁸ Practice followed by the panel.. Section IV (c,d); Explanatory Report., §100

⁸⁹ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§13-23

⁹⁰ Sources of the statistics below: Ukraine: *Burmych and Others v Ukraine* [GC], nos. 46852/13, 47786/13, 54125/13, 56605/13, and 3653/14, 12 Oktober 2017, §44; Poland: *Hutten-Czapska v Poland* (2006), [GC], no. 35014/97, 19 June 2006, §19; Yugoslavia; *Ališić and Others v Bosnia and Herzegovina and Others* [GC], no. 60642/08, 16 July 2014, §144; Slovenia; *Kurić and Others v. Slovenia*, [GC], no.

In Latvia, the 2018 reform affected 73,251 children enrolled in national minority education programmes (as of 2019, 19,207 preschoolers and 54,044 schoolchildren)⁹¹. Together with parents (based on an approximate calculation of 3 persons per family), the 2018 reform affected about 220 thousand people. At least 227 applications filed between 16/10/2019 and 31/01/2022 have been registered with the Court, i.e., in 2 years and three months: approximately 100 applications per year.

With Latvia's population (as of 2019) of 1,919,968, the proportion of people affected by the reform was 11.4% of the population, including 3.8% children.

The number of residents per one application to the Court was: 8458 (over the year - 19,200).

In Ukraine, with a population of 45 million people (2017), 29,000 similar applications (refusal to enforce court judgements to recover unpaid wages from state-owned enterprises) were filed with the Court between 1999 and 2017, i.e., 1,611 complaints per year.

The number of residents of the country per one complaint was: 1,552 (for the year - 27,933).

In Poland, with a population of 38 million (2006), the maximum number of people affected by a forced rent freeze appealed to the Court was 1 million (100,000 landlords and 900,000 tenants), or 2.63 per cent of the population.

In Yugoslavia, with a population of 23.5 million (1991), 8,000 applicants who were denied compensation for their foreign currency deposits filed 1,850 similar applications with the Court. The number of inhabitants of the country for whom one application was lodged was 12,703

In Slovenia, with a population of 2 million, 25,671 inhabitants, i.e., 1.3% of the population, became stateless and without permanent residence registration.

26828/06, 26 June 2012, §69; Czech Republic; D.H. and others v. Czech Republic, [GC], no. 57325/00, 13 November 2007, §15.

⁹¹ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, tables 3 and 4

Finally, in the Czech Republic (1988, then part of Czechoslovakia), 16 million people lived in the country, and 59,301 children (including Roma children) attended special schools. These children accounted for 0.37% of the country's population.

The number of people affected by the 2018 reform and in particular the proportion of these people in the population of the country is quite comparable to that in cases where referrals to the Grand Chamber were triggered by the existence, in the Contracting State concerned, of a structural or systemic problem or other dysfunction necessitating a substantial change to domestic law⁹².

Thus, the subject of the dispute in the present case is socially and politically sensitive, and has significant repercussions for Latvia⁹³

IV. Certain other deviations from Court's case-law that affected the outcome of the case

38. The Chamber in the present case departed from the Court's jurisprudence on the exhaustion of domestic remedies, which allowed for some flexibility taking into account the human rights context⁹⁴. In particular, the Chamber did not follow the Court's case-law to the effect, that the last stage of domestic remedies may be reached after the application has been lodged but before its admissibility has been determined⁹⁵. This departure from established jurisprudence is expressed in the fact that the Chamber “taking into account the principle of subsidiarity and the requirement to exhaust domestic remedies as enshrined in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention, in the present case, the Court can examine only those issues which were raised before and examined by the Latvian Constitutional Court (see paragraphs 45-54 above)”⁹⁶. In doing so, the

⁹² Practice followed by the panel.. Section IV (e); Explanatory Report., §101

⁹³ Practice followed by the panel.. Section IV (h); Explanatory Report., §102

⁹⁴ *Ringeisen v. Austria*, no. 2614/65, 16 July 1971, § 89; *Gherghina v. Romania (dec.)* [GC], no. 42219/07, 9 July 2015, § 87.

⁹⁵ *Karoussiotis v. Portugal*, no. 23205/08, 1 February 2011, §57; *Molla Sali v. Greece*, no. 20452/14, 19 December 2018, § 90

⁹⁶ *Valiullina Judgment*, §99

Chamber referred only to the first of three proceedings before the Constitutional Court relating to the 2018 reform.

Part of the applicants' arguments, which they had submitted to the Court in their initial complaints, was submitted to the Constitutional Court in a third proceeding, initiated before the applicants' application to the Court and concluded before communication with the Government began (see in details annex 3). These arguments, which could decisively influence the outcome of the case, were not considered by the Chamber (see in details annex 4).

39. The Chamber also departed from the Court's jurisprudence in relation to the handling of cases brought for an alleged violation of Article 14 of the Convention. The Chamber proclaimed⁹⁷ that it was guided by the principles formulated by the Grand Chamber in Advisory Opinion on the difference in treatment between landowner associations “having a recognised existence on the date of the creation of an approved municipal hunters’ association” and landowners’ associations set up after that date (Request no. P16-2021-002, French Conseil d’État, §§ 64-71, 13 July 2022).

In particular, the elements which characterise different situations, and determine their comparability, must be assessed in light of the subject-matter, objective of the impugned provision and the context in which the alleged discrimination is occurring. The assessment of the question of whether or not two persons or groups are in a comparable situation for the purposes of an analysis of differential treatment and discrimination is both specific and contextual; it can only be based on objective and verifiable elements, and the comparable situations must be considered as a whole, avoiding isolated or marginal aspects which would make the entire analysis artificial. The Chamber, however, misjudged the subject-matter and context of discussion.

⁹⁷ Ibid, §182

The Chamber incorrectly assumed that the 2018 reform enrolled in **all public schools** with the aim of **restoring** the use of Latvian as the language of instruction and the unity of the educational system in Latvia⁹⁸.

In fact, the 2018 reform relates exclusively to schools that implemented minority programmes, as is clear from the text of the legislative amendments themselves, and the contrary has not been argued by any of the parties in the case. The 2018 reform did not affect schools that provide educational programmes for the majority⁹⁹, (i.e., predominantly ethnic Latvians), where 100 per cent of non-language subjects have been taught in the native Latvian language for the last 100 years.

Therefore, it is also incorrect for the Chamber to conclude that the State had to take steps to correct factual inequalities so that Latvian-speaking individuals could regain their right to use Latvian in all spheres [...], including their right to an education in the official language of the State¹⁰⁰.

It should also be taken into account that the teaching of non-linguistic subjects in educational programmes for the majority and national minorities was subject to the same requirements, and in this respect the educational system in Latvia has always been unified.

If the unity of the educational system is understood as the mere elimination of educational programmes for national minorities in secondary schools (reform 2018) and at lower educational levels (reform 2022), then there is no question of restoring unity or restoring historical justice, because there has never been such "unity" in the Latvian educational system.

⁹⁸ Ibid, §193, see also §21

⁹⁹ As of the 2016/17 school year, out of 759 schools, 602 schools were running programmes for the majority of pupils in which teaching takes place exclusively in Latvian. Only in 159 school's minority education programmes were available, including 100 schools that implemented only these programmes (of which 94 in Russian, 6 in other minority languages), and 59 schools had minority education programmes in some classes and programmes for the majority of pupils in the remaining classes. Data source: LHRC alternative report for the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 2017, §44, table 10:
http://lhrc.lv/arxiv/Shadow_report_FCNM_LV2017.docx

¹⁰⁰ Valiullina Judgment, §204

40. Finally, the Chamber incorrectly applied to the present case the principle of preserving the State's constitutional identity¹⁰¹, borrowed from a Grand Chamber judgement concerning pensions for Latvian non-citizens¹⁰².

In the mentioned judgment of the Grand Chamber, this principle is based on the principle of state continuity, i.e., the restoration of the legal framework that existed in Latvia before its annexation. However, during this period Latvia strictly adhered to the principle of educating members of national minorities in the language of the family (annex 1, §2), in direct contrast to the goal pursued by the 2018 and 2022 reforms of creating a unified education system with education exclusively in Latvian.

With regard to additional features of preserving the State's constitutional identity, such as “to avoid retrospective approbation of the consequences of the immigration policy practised during the period of unlawful occupation and annexation”¹⁰³, then, with regard to school education, these effects have already been overcome, both in terms of the Latvian language proficiency of school leavers from national minority programmes and the proportion of school-age persons in the population (see §28 above).

The application of this principle to the second family (case no. 7306/20), in which several generations before the annexation, during the annexation period and after the restoration of independence up to the reform of 2018 were educated in Russian in Latvia, looks particularly strange.

V. Conclusion.

41. There are therefore several prerequisites for referral to the Grand Chamber of the Court under Article 44 § 2 (b) of the Convention ¹⁰⁴.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. §§195, 208

¹⁰² Savickis and Others v. Latvia,[GC], no. 49270/11, 9 June 2022, §§ 176, 196, 198

¹⁰³ Valiullina Judgment, §195

¹⁰⁴ Practice followed by the panel..., Section IV, §§ a,c,d,e,h; Explanatory Report..., §§100-102

 Deniss Gorba,
representative of the applicants

Annexes

1. A brief description of the history of the education system of Latvian national minorities and current attempts to dismantle it.
2. List of application numbers submitted to the Court in relation to the 2018 reform
3. Procedure for consideration of applications in the Court (including main documents submitted by the parties).
4. Volume of arguments taken into account and not taken into account by the Chamber

A brief description of the history of the education system of Latvian national minorities and current attempts to dismantle it

1. The 2018 and 2022 reforms interrupted the tradition of education in the family language¹, which had existed in Latvia for almost 100 years and which originally corresponded to international standards of education for national minorities adopted much later (see §§ 3-10 in the main text).

I. Historical excursion

(a) the education system before the annexation of Latvia by the USSR²

2. The rule of teaching children in the language of the family was introduced by law in 1919 (one year after the declaration of independence) and was fully enforced by the creation of a network of schools teaching either in Latvian or in one of the languages of the largest minorities.

(b) the education system during the annexation period³

3. Education at all levels entirely in the Latvian language, with in-depth study of the Russian language as a separate subject in Latvian ethnic schools, was developed throughout entire annexation period.

¹ The description has been compiled by systematising the data set out in the Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021

² Ibid, §§ 4,5

³ Ibid, §6

The former practice of developing education in minority languages has been reduced to maintaining the education system only in Russian, the language of the largest minority which was the largest national minority and in the period prior to annexation. On the disappearance of schools of other minorities, see also below in § 14.

Latvian remained a compulsory subject in Russian schools.

The choice for a family of one of the two education systems was completely free.

(c) Education system after restoration of independence

4. After the restoration of independence, the education system entirely in Latvian continued to be dominant.

According to the statistical data submitted to the Court by the applicants, the overwhelming majority of ethnic Latvian schoolchildren are taught using general education programmes entirely in the Latvian language, and the overwhelming majority of ethnic minority children are taught using programmes for national minorities⁴.

5. In addition to the system of education in Russian, the state began to support public education in other minority languages, which was not in popular demand⁵ due to the fact that Russian, as a family language among other minorities, became dominant during this period. Latvian continued to be a compulsory subject in the education system of national minorities.

6. Russian has become a subject of choice in Latvian ethnic schools, and over the last decades it has been chosen by about 50 per cent of pupils.

⁴ Ibid, §26 and annex 1, §§1-5

⁵ In 2019, 27.1% of students received school education under national minority programs, including 1.4% in languages other than Russian: Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, table 3

According to the data provided by the applicants, the level of knowledge of the state language of minority representatives in the age group 17-25, (i.e., for graduates who received education under programmes for national minorities) is so high that 80 per cent of them do not experience any problems with integration into the majority society⁶.

7. Alongside the public schools, a relatively small network of private schools⁷ has also emerged, where the choice of the language of instruction was free before the 2018 reform, but afterwards subject to exactly the same restrictions as in public schools.

8. The unity of the education system, as in the annexation period, is ensured by a single state standard for public pre-school and school education, according to which the same requirements are imposed on the teaching of all non-linguistic subjects, irrespective of the language of instruction, and by a single system of control for public and private educational institutions, including compulsory state examinations, in particular the Latvian language examinations⁸.

9. Since 1995, contrary to the traditions established over the last century, there have been persistent attempts by legislators to include Latvian as a language of instruction in national minority education programmes in varying proportions⁹, with the prospective goal of completely eliminating minority languages from the education system¹⁰. The above-mentioned reforms of 2018 and 2022 are part of such attempts.

⁶ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, §§11-15; see also annex 4 to main text, §6

⁷ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, §9

⁸ All the requirements for subject mastery and related monitoring included in the standards are common to both minority and majority programmes, as can be seen directly from the structure of the standard. See, for example, the basic education standard (Regulation No. 468) in force before the 2018 reform: <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/268342>

⁹ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§7-12

¹⁰ Observation by applicants of 06/01/2023, §9

10. In particular, the following attempts to deform the existing system of education of national minorities, undertaken even before the introduction of the contested reform 2018, provoked protests from international organisations:

- the disproportionate and increasing use of the state language in the education programmes of national minorities¹¹;
- studying the Latvian language and literature according to a common curriculum with ethnic Latvian schoolchildren and passing the corresponding unified centralized exam in secondary school¹²;
- abolition of the choice of national minority language in state inspections and examinations¹³.

II.2018 and 2022 Reform

11. 2018 Reform, implemented between 01/09/2019 and 01/09/2021, affected those public and private pre-school and school education institutions that provided education programmes for national minorities, as well as private higher education institutions¹⁴.

12. The case before the Constitutional Court against restrictions on the use of the mother tongue in private higher education institutions was won¹⁵.

¹¹ See Valiullina Judgment, §§15-20; compare with Adam and Others v. Romania, no. 81114/17, 13 October 2020, §5

¹² ACFC Third Opinion on Latvia adopted on 23 February 2018 (ACFC/OP/III(2018)001), §149; compare with Adam and others v. Romania, §95. See also Valiullina Judgment, §166

¹³ ACFC/OP/III(2018)001, §150; compare with Adam and others v. Romania, §11: In [primary and secondary] education, pupils may sit the entrance and final exams in the language in which they were taught the relevant subjects

¹⁴ Valiullina Judgment, §§21-30

¹⁵ Ibid, §§75-77

As for the three proceedings before the Constitutional Court concerning public¹⁶ and private¹⁷ schools, as well as pre-schools¹⁸, all of them were lost by the plaintiffs¹⁹ and, accordingly, all domestic remedies within the meaning of Article 35.1 of the Convention have been exhausted, both for the litigants and for other victims of the 2018 reform.

13. 2018 Reform in respect of pre-school and school education programmes for national minorities was expressed as follows.

(a) In pre-school and school educational programmes for national minorities (the subject of the dispute in the first joint case), there has been an intensive replacement of the native language with Latvian in the study of non-language subjects.

In pre-school programmes the state (Latvian) language has become the main language of communication with children, in school programmes from 1st to 6th grade - at least 50%, from 7th to 9th grade - at least 80%, in secondary schools and private higher education institutions - in all 100% of teaching time the native language of teaching has been replaced by the state language.

(b) For the first time in the last 100 years, the number of hours of mother tongue instruction has been approximately halved in programmes for national minorities. In

¹⁶ Judgment of 23 April 2019 in case No. 2018-12-01 see also Valiullina Judgment, §§44-54. The case was initiated on July 25, 2018 based on a complaint from 20 members of parliament

¹⁷ Judgment of 13 November 2019 in case No. 2018-22-01, see also Valiullina Judgment, §73. The case was separated from case No. 2018-12-01 with the addition of claims from individuals

¹⁸ Judgment of 19 June 2020 in case No.2019-20-03, see also Valiullina Judgment, §74. The case was initiated on September 25, 2019 based on a complaint from a group of individuals

¹⁹ The Constitutional Court rejected the conclusions of international institutions criticizing the 2018 reform- Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§64,65

addition, the mother tongue of national minorities has become an optional subject in secondary schools²⁰.

(c) On 29/09/2022, i.e., after communication with the Government on the first joint case, the Latvian Parliament adopted new legislative amendments (2022 reform), according to which also pre-school and basic school education programmes for national minorities are abolished from 01/09/2023 to 01/09/2025. In particular, as of 01/09/2023, all pre-school institutions and schoolchildren in grades 1, 4 and 7 switched exclusively to the Latvian language of instruction. The study of the mother tongue was offered to national minorities as an elective taught outside the standard school timetable²¹.

III. The disappearance of non-Russian minority schools before and during the annexation period

14. The elimination of the schools of the most developed minorities - German and Jewish - is linked to the disappearance of these minorities themselves. Germans were resettled in Germany by bilateral agreement mostly before the annexation (1939). The Jews were exterminated in the Holocaust (1941-1945).

The liquidation of schools of other non-Russian ethnic groups mentioned in the appealed judgment during the annexation period was apparently not a directive from Moscow, but an initiative of the local administration, which had considerable autonomy in terms of regulating the education system. In any case, the government of neighbouring Lithuania maintained during the annexation period a system of Polish

²⁰ Restrictions on studying the native language were introduced by government Regulations No. 747 (for basic education) and No. 416 (for secondary education). See description of this Regulations in Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §§9, 10

²¹ Valiullina Judgment, §§31,56. Full description of 2022 reform see in Observation by applicants of 06/01/2023

schools with instruction entirely in the Polish language²²: in 1980 there were 16,400 school students instructed in Polish. Their number declined to 11,400 in 1990. In independent Lithuania between 1990 and 2001, the number of Polish mother tongue children attending schools with Polish as the language of instruction doubled to over 22,300, then gradually decreased to 18,392 in 2005²³.

²² See memories of the Soviet era by an ethnic Pole and member of the European Parliament from Lithuania - Томашевский: я не просоветский человек, но в советское время поляки учились на польском [Tomashevsky: I'm not a pro-Soviet person, but in Soviet times Poles studied in Polish], Delfi, 02/03/2011: <https://www.delfi.lt/ru/news/live/tomashevskiy-ya-ne-prosovetskiy-chelovek-no-v-sovetskoe-vremya-polyaki-uchilis-na-polskom-42642337>

²³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poles_in_Lithuania

Annex 2

List of application numbers submitted to the Court in relation to the 2018 reform

56928/19; 56942/19; 56951/19; 56957/19; 56963/19; 56964/19; 56965/19; 56967/19;
56995/19; 56996/19; 57093/19; 57096/19; 57106/19; 58911/19; 61320/19; 61322/19;
61330/19; 61340/19;
61903/19; 61917/19; 62346/19; 62355/19; 62785/19; 64168/19; 64172/19; 64975/19;
225/20;
1382/20; 1392/20; 1418/20; 2934/20; 5100/20; 5669/20; 6010/20; 7306/20;
7309/20; 8345/20; 9774/20; 9797/20; 9921/20; 10434/20; 10440/20; 11069/20;
11109/20; 11115/20;
11124/20; 11131/20; 11143/20; 11170/20; 11360/20; 11362/20; 11632/20; 11637/20;
11642/20;
11646/20; 11651/20; 11659/20; 11679/20; 11787/20; 11792/20; 11805/20; 11809/20;
11816/20;
11818/20; 11842/20; 11847/20; 11925/20; 11937/20; 11960/20; 12017/20; 12033/20;
12087/20;
12117/20; 12129/20; 12328/20; 12384/20; 12384/20; 12394/20; 12400/20; 12447/20;
12450/20;
12465/20; 12559/20; 12567/20; 12604/20; 12632/20; 12662/20; 12666/20; 12679/20;
12690/20;
12703/20; 12707/20; 12717/20; 12732/20; 12739/20; 12757/20; 12760/20; 12813/20;
12818/20;
12826/20; 12829/20; 12833/20; 12838/20; 12844/20; 12847/20; 12871/20; 12899/20;
12902/20;
12907/20; 12909/20; 12915/20; 12916/20; 12924/20; 12932/20; 12933/20; 12949/20;
12951/20;
12992/20; 12998/20; 13006/20; 13009/20; 13014/20; 13018/20; 13027/20; 13293/20;
18153/20;

18160/20; 18164/20; 18171/20; 20842/20; 21692/20; 21815/20; 22107/20; 43123/20;
50942/20;
50951/20; 51110/20; 51236/20; 51239/20; 51713/20; 51714/20; 51715/20; 53373/20;
53376/20;
53456/20; 53460/20; 53463/20; 53466/20; 53471/20; 53641/20; 53698/20; 53728/20;
53757/20;
53759/20; 53763/20; 53765/20; 55075/20; 55096/20; 19/21; 258/21; 292/21;
297/21;
319/21; 629/21; 636/21; 641/21; 815/21; 865/21; 891/21; 1711/21;
1716/21;
1717/21; 1721/21; 2019/21; 2022/21; 4839/21; 4845/21; 11538/21; 12108/21;
13090/21;
13113/21; 13124/21; 13170/21; 13177/21; 13191/21; 13196/21; 13202/21; 13919/21;
13926/21;
13933/21; 13943/21; 13946/21; 13952/21; 13956/21; 13959/21; 13962/21; 13966/21;
14106/21;
14377/21; 60221/21; 61252/21; 61270/21; 61289/21; 61803/21; 1867/22; 1878/22;
1957/22;
2268/22; 2277/22; 3725/22; 4005/22; 4846/22; 5187/22; 6141/22; 7163/22;
7168/22;
7177/22; 7550/22; 8474/22; 8477/22; 8481/22; 8629/22; 8634/22; 8636/22;
8639/22;
8641/22; 8816/22

Annex 3

**Procedure for consideration of applications in the Court
(including main documents submitted by the parties)**

1. The judgement under appeal concerns three applications from families whose children were attending public schools at the time of application: Valiullina and Trruši v. Latvia (no. 56928/19), Neronovas v. Latvia (no. 7306/20), Raizere-Rubcova and Others v. Latvia (no. 11937/20), filed on 22/10/2019, 28/01/2020 and 13/02/2020, respectively.

By that time, the Constitutional Court had already completed its examination of the part of the application filed by 20 members of Parliament against the 2018 reform, which related to public schools¹, and the interference with the applicants' rights began on 01/09/2019.

2. According to the data available to the applicants' representative, there are over 200 further registered applications from Latvia pending before the Court relating to the 2018 reform. They were lodged between 16 October 2019 and 31 January 2022 and include complaints by persons whose children (or themselves) were enrolled in public and private schools and/or pre-school institutions at the time of lodging the application. During the pendency of the applications, assessments by international human rights institutions on the 2018 reform continued to emerge, some of which are reflected and used extensively in the appealed ruling : for example, the opinion issued by the Venice Commission entitled “On the recent amendments to the legislation on education in minority languages in Latvia” (CDL-AD(2020)012, 18 June 2020) or Resolution CM/ResCMN(2021)9 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the

¹ Judgment of 23 April 2019 in case No. 2018-12-01. The case was initiated on July 25, 2018, that is, even before the implementation of the 2018 reform began (September 1, 2019)

Protection of National Minorities by Latvia. Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 3 March 2021.

The next two (out of three) 2018 reform-related proceedings before the Constitutional Court - concerning private schools² and pre-schools³ - have also been finalised.

The deadlines for lodging applications (Article 35 of the Convention) were counted either from the date of the Constitutional Court's ruling on a particular type of complaint (see line above) or from the date when the infringement of Convention-protected rights began (1 September of the year in which the 2018 reform came into force for a particular child⁴). The reasoning behind the applications has improved over time in light of the new information described above.

3. The above-mentioned second and third proceedings before the Constitutional Court were initiated before the applicants filed their applications with the Court. The process concerning private schools was separated from the lawsuit of 20 deputies (case No. 2018-12-01) and merged with several lawsuits from private individuals⁵. The pre-school case was initiated on 25/09/2019.

Thus, the applicants' reasoning in those cases before the Constitutional Court was already known and used by the applicants in the present case, and the opportunity before submitting applications to the Court to ascertain whether the Constitutional Court would reject that reasoning was limited by the time limits set by Article 35 of the Convention.

4. 15/03/2021 The Section decided to select, from the several hundred complaints at its disposal, 8 complaints from 10 families concerning all levels and forms of education (first joint case) and forwarded them for communication to the Government. At this

² Judgment of 13 November 2019 in case No. 2018-22-01, see also Valiullina Judgment, §73.

³ Judgment of 19 June 2020 in case No.2019-20-03, see also Valiullina Judgment, §74.

⁴ Valiullina Judgment, §59 [§66 of Transitional Provisions]

⁵ case No. 2018-22-01, §§2-4

point, all the Constitutional Court judgements and international recommendations mentioned therein were already known to the Court.

After all stages of communication (see §§6-8 below) had been completed, three applications concerning all those families whose children had been educated in public schools - Valiullina and Truši v. Latvia (no. 56928/19), Neronovas v. Latvia (no. 7306/20), Raizere-Rubcova and Others v. Latvia (no. 7306/20), were separated from the general list, heard jointly (second joint case) and the judgement under appeal was adopted on 14/09/2023.

5. All three families whose applications were considered in the appealed judgment were represented by the same lawyer (after communication with the government and until his premature death by the lawyer of the Latvian Human Rights Committee - LHRC - Aleksandrs Kuzmins, then by the lawyer of the LHRC Denis Gorba). The same lawyer represents four families whose children are enrolled in pre-schools:

- Djeri and Others v. Latvia, case no. 50942/20 - three families represented before the Constitutional Court and before communication with the Government by LHRC co-chairman Vladimirs Buzajevs;

- Gomajunova and Livdāne v. Latvia, case no. 2022/21 - another family whose child is enrolled in a private pre-school.

The applications of the remaining three families (case nos. 225/20, 11642/20 and 21815/20) concern parents and/or children from private schools and are represented by sworn lawyer Inese Nikuļceva. The relevant documents are not available to the applicants' representative in the present case.

6. On 08/07/2021 the Government submitted to the Court an explanation of the first joint case in one document (hereinafter - Government Memorial of 08/07/2021).

Each of the two applicants' representatives submitted a separate comment to the Court on that document.

In particular, the representative of the seven applicant families (including the three applicant families in the present case) submitted two documents to the Court - a partially alternative description of facts to the Government's communication (hereinafter - Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021)⁶ and observations on the Government's arguments (hereinafter - Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021)⁷.

Both documents consolidated and systematised the facts and arguments presented by the applicants in their individual applications. In doing so, the condition of presenting only those legal arguments related to the original applications or specific aspects of those applications was respected⁸.

On 14/10/2021, the Government filed a reply supplemental comment (hereinafter - Government Memorial of 14/10/2021)⁹. In the covering letter addressed to the applicants' representative¹⁰, was indicated: You are requested not to reply to these submissions. Any unsolicited submissions will normally not be included in the case file for the consideration of the Court except where they contain important new factual information (Rule 38 § 1).

7. On 06/01/2023 the applicants submitted to the Court Observations under Rule 47 §7 and Rule 39 §1 of the Rules of Court in the case no. 56928/19 (hereinafter - Observation by applicants of 06/01/2023). The applicants described in detail the 2022 reform (see also §3b3 of the main text) and its detrimental effect on the applicants (Rule 47 §7). The applicants also requested the Court to take interim measures in respect of the 2022 reform before the end of the proceedings (Rule 39 §1). The court, by letter dated

⁶ Valiullina and Others v. Latvia Applications no. 56928/19, 7306/20, 11937/20, 50942/20, and 2022/21. Statement of facts by applicants. Reply (challenges) of the applicants to the relevant part of the Memorial of the government of the Republic of Latvia

⁷ Observations in reply to Government by applicants in the case Valiullina and Truši v. Latvia and 4 Others (applications. Nos. 56928/19, 7306/20, 11937/20, 50942/20, 2022/21)

⁸ Fábíán v. Hungary, no. 78117/13, 05/09/2017, §94

⁹ Valiullina and Others v. Latvia. (applications nos.56928/19, 225/20, 7306/20, 11642/20, 11937/20, 21815/20, 50942/20, and 2022/21). Additional observations of the Government of the Republic of Latvia and comments concerning just satisfaction

¹⁰ ECHR-LE4.6R 100 mod DCE/ag, 3 November 2021 by V. Soloveytchik Section Registrar

11/01/2023¹¹, stated that on 10 January 2023, the Court (the duty judge) decided that your request for an interim measure falls outside the scope of Rule 39. Therefore, the Court will not request the Government to suspend entry into force of the 29 September 2022 amendments to the Education Law.

The Court then, by letter dated 16/01/2023¹², stated that these submissions were not asked for by the Court. However, it has been exceptionally decided, pursuant to Rule 38 § 1 of the Rules of Court, that the submissions shall be included in the case file for the consideration of the Court. They have been transmitted to the Government for information or comments, if they so wish.

On 10/02/2023 the Government submitted their comment on the applicants' communication.

8. The applicants' communication about a fundamental change in the "rules of the game" by one of the parties to the case, which occurred during the proceedings before the Court (see § 7 above), was mentioned twice in the narrative part of the Chamber's judgment¹³ but had no impact on the examination of the case.

9. The information included in the applicants' documents described above (see §§6, 7 above) concerning the general characterisation of the 2018 Reform (e.g., its objectives or the identification of groups treated differently), the impact of the 2018 Reform on schooling, and, in particular, directly concerning the three families against whom the appealed judgment is made, must also be taken into account in the present case.

The comparative numbering of the families and individual applicants in the present case and in the former consolidated case (see §4 above) is therefore set out below.

Second joint case	First joint case
-------------------	------------------

¹¹ ECHR-LE2.1aR (mod) LLI/msh, 11 January 2023 by K. Ryngielewicz Head of the Filtering Section

¹² ECHR-LE0.1bR mod. LLI/jj, 16 January 2023 by V. Soloveytkhik Section Registrar

¹³ Valiullina Judgment, §§ 31 and 56

Family	Applicants	Family	Applicants
1	1-4	1	1-4
2	5-7	3	8-10
3	8-10	5	12-14

10. The basic facts and arguments of the present case are summarised in each individual application form (hereinafter - AF) and more fully in the Supplement to application in accordance with paragraph 2(b) of Rule 47 of the Rules of Court (hereinafter - Supplement).

The content of both documents is a standardised blueprint that also includes unique family-specific information (AF, Section "E" §§3-5). The standard set of arguments and facts offered to each family, prepared by the LHRC, changed somewhat over time. We therefore further refer to the documents of the most recent application (no. 21815/20), which already described the Constitutional Court's judgment on private schools of 13/11/2019 (AF, Section "E", §7) and reported on the decision of the PACE Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination of 04/12/2019 to request, in relation to the 2018 reform, the opinion of the Venice Commission (Supplement, §5(b3)).

Volume of arguments taken into account and not taken into account by the Chamber

1. The Section initially decided to identify 8 complaints covering all levels of education out of the several hundred 2018 reform complaints at its disposal, consolidated them into a first joint case and conducted all stages of communication with the Government (see in detail annex 3). The Chamber then singled out of these 8 complaints only the 3 where the applicant children were in public schools at the time of application, consolidated them into a second joint case and issued the appealed judgement.

The Chamber defined the scope of the second joint case as follows: taking into account the principle of subsidiarity and the requirement to exhaust domestic remedies as enshrined in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention, in the present case, the Court can examine only those issues which were raised before and examined by the Latvian Constitutional Court (see paragraphs 45-54 above)¹. In other words, the Chamber decided to consider only those arguments of the applicants that were raised and verified by the Constitutional Court in Case No. 2018-12-01, the first of three cases (see §3a of the main text) dealing with the 2018 reform.

In doing so, the Chamber excluded many of the applicants' substantive arguments from the second joint case, arguments also presented to the national authorities, but not in the first, but in the last of the three proceedings before the Constitutional Court (case no. 2019-20-03) and then in the first joint case, which together with those arguments had gone through all stages of communication with the Government.

¹ Valiullina Judgment, §99. The paragraphs referred to by the Chamber relate solely to the description of the Constitutional Court's judgement in Case No. 2018-12-01

2 While each of the three proceedings before the Constitutional Court focused on specific aspects of the 2018 reform (public schools, private schools, pre-schools), they also raised general issues. As a consequence, the applicants' arguments in the later proceedings were improved by taking into account the Constitutional Court's views on the arguments of their predecessors.

In particular, in the latest proceedings (case no. 2019-20-03, in this case the applicants' children were preschoolers), which started before the applications were submitted to the Court (on 25/09/2019 and 22/10/2019 respectively), other applicants from the first joint case raised a number of such new arguments of a general nature, independent of the level of education (e.g. the lack of a legitimate aim of the 2018 reform, the lack of inadmissible segregation in the education of Latvian national minorities, possible discrimination on ethnic grounds etc.) and quite relevant also to school education. These arguments concerned the interpretation of those articles of the Constitution that the Constitutional Court had already applied in Case No. 2018-12-01 and recognised that the 2018 reform in the aspect of public schools complied with those articles.

The applicants in the second joint case included these arguments in their applications to the Court. They could not appeal to the Constitutional Court on their own, as the Court had already recognised the 2018 reform of public schools as being in line with the Constitution. Nor could they passively wait for the decision of the Constitutional Court in Case No. 2019-20-03: the six-month period from the start of the interference with their rights expired on 01/03/2020, the court only delivered its judgement on 19/06/2020, and even a win by the applicants in that case would not have overturned the court's decision in Case No. 2018-12-01 on schooling.

In Case No. 2019-20-03, the Constitutional Court, which had also found all the plaintiffs' restrictions to be constitutionally compliant, had ample opportunity to consider the merits of these new arguments, but generally limited itself to referring to the consideration of the relevant issues in the two previous proceedings.

By the time the first joint case was referred to the Government for communication (15/03/2021), the principle of subsidiarity for these arguments had already been

fulfilled and they were further discussed by the parties at all stages of communication. The fact that the arguments were considered by the Constitutional Court in a process in which the applicants from the second joint case were not directly involved does not constitute an obstacle to their use².

The applicants submitted these arguments to the Court prematurely, i.e., they had not fulfilled the condition of having previously passed through all the domestic instances at the time of their applications. However, in similar cases the Court has found that the objection as to non-exhaustion has in any case lost its relevance, because in any event it accepts that the last stage of domestic remedies may be reached after the application has been lodged but before its admissibility has been determined³.

It should also be borne in mind that the Court has registered numerous applications regarding the application of the 2018 Reform to school education, filed after the judgement in Case 2019-20-03. The applicants in those cases are in exactly the same position as the applicants in the present case and have raised similar arguments. If the arguments under discussion are taken into account in their review, it would be difficult to find objective and reasonable justification for the difference in treatment, which are based on a temporal criterion⁴.

It should be added that the applicants have already raised similar considerations about the need to take into account not one but all three judgments of the Constitutional Court in their cases⁵. In the present case, it was a question of going through the domestic instances in respect of those parts of the applications which relate to Article 8 of the Convention.

The Chamber's judgment does not reflect these considerations, and even states that “the applicants did not provide more details as to the Government’s argument...”

² Ibid, §§ 140, 143, 148, 149

³ Karoussiotis v. Portugal, no. 23205/08, 1 February 2011, §57; Molla Sali v. Greece, no. 20452/14, 19 December 2018, § 90

⁴ See Request no. P16-2021-002, French Conseil d’État, 13 July 2022, § 60

⁵ Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§16,17

[concerning the applicability of Article 8 of the Convention]⁶. Accordingly, the judgment declared this part of the complaints inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies, which is not subject to appeal to the Grand Chamber⁷.

3. The applicants in the present case have raised a number of arguments not raised by the applicant deputies in case 2018-12-01 but presented to the Constitutional Court in the last case of 2019-20-03 and systematically set out in the communication process with the government in the first joint case.

The text of the complaint to the Constitutional Court in Case No. 2019-20-03 (hereinafter - CCC) is submitted to the Court in the annex to Case No. 50942/20 and is included in the materials of the first joint case.

The main arguments raised for the first time before the Constitutional Court in only the third case and included in the applicants' complaints:

(1) the absence of signs of inadmissible segregation in the Latvian educational system and as a consequence, the lack of such (in the opinion of the Chamber) legitimate purpose of the 2018 reform as ensuring the unity of the education system: CCC [6.4.2], [6.5.5], [6.5.7]; AF Section “E”, §2, “F”, §§3-4; Supplement, §§1,4,8,13,14; Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §44; Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§4-6, 26-28, 37-44, 50;

(2) the obsolescence of such (in the opinion of the Chamber) legitimate objective of the 2018 reform as strengthening the use of the state language: CCC [6.4], [6.5.5]; AF Section “F”, §3; Supplement, §§11-14; Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§37-43, 48; Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§29-31;

⁶ Valiullina Judgment, §103

⁷ Ibid, §110

- (3) a way of singling out groups to whom the 2018 reform establishes unequal treatment: CCC [1,2], [7.1]; AF Section “F”, §7; Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§61, 62;
- (4) the existence among the grounds for alleged discrimination of applicants not only of their mother tongue but also of their ethnic origin: CCC [1.2], [1.3], [6.3.1], [7.2], [7.3]; AF Section “F”, §7; Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §60(1);
- (5) the consequences of perceived discrimination, such as an inevitable deterioration in the quality of education: CCC [2.5] (1), [3.3] (3) and (5), [3.4], [4.2], [4.6], [5.6] (1), [6.5.2]; AF Section “E”, §8; Supplement, §§4,5,13,14,15; Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §§32-36;
- (6) the inadmissibility of upsetting the existing balance between the two groups, in particular during the pendency of the Court's examination of the applications: CCC [6.5.1], [7.4], [7.5]; AF Section “F”, §7; Supplement, §16; Observation by applicants of 01/09/2021, §56; Observations by applicants of 06/01/2023.

The fact that these arguments were mostly not considered by the Chamber and, as a rule, were not even cited in the narrative part of the appealed judgment⁸, in the applicants' view, had a significant impact on the final outcome of their cases.

4. The above arguments of the applicants are based on facts, including relevant findings of international organisations and statistical data, directly or through comparative processing, obtained from official statistics. These facts, together with the arguments, were partly presented to the Constitutional Court in case 2019-20-03, included in the statements in the present case and systematised in the Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021.

The Government had every opportunity to verify the facts submitted by the applicants and availed themselves of those opportunities in Government Memorial of 14/10/2021 (§§3-9).

⁸Ibid, §§111, 118-121, 137, 142-144, 155-167

The Government made the following observations on the facts submitted by the applicants concerning school education (full list).

- (1) the Government effectively accepted the argument that minority language schools had been established prior to the annexation of Latvia in 1940⁹ (§4);
- (2) in the opinion of the government, the process of faster reduction in the number of Russian schools compared to Latvian ethnic schools (the government did not doubt the fact) is caused by reasons independent of the language of instruction (§5)¹⁰;
- (3) the Government once again listed the transitional support measures for educators and pupils previously submitted to the Court (§7)¹¹;
- (4) the Government once again stated that it regularly monitors the quality of education, again without presenting any clear results of this monitoring in the context of replacing pupils' mother tongue with the state language in teaching (§8)¹²;
- (5) the Government questioned the objectivity of the applicants' representatives (§9).

That is, the Government did not question any particular figure or conclusion from the Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, nor did it provide alternative statistics on the issues raised therein¹³.

5. The Government's last observation (§4(5) above) in the applicants' view deserves a separate reply.

The Government's last observation is expressed in full as follows: Finally, the Government submits that there are doubts as to the credibility of certain evidence referred to by the applicants. In several instances throughout their arguments and in their statistics that allegedly support their arguments, some of the applicants rely on the findings in the LHRC alternative report for the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, (2017). However, the

⁹ See Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §2 of annex 1 to the main text

¹⁰ See Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §10

¹¹ Ibid, §§ 66-68

¹² Ibid, §§ 32-36

¹³ Compare with *D.H. and Others v. the Czech Republic* [GC], no. 57325/00, 13/11/2007, §191

Government draws the Court's attention to the fact that the authors of the alternative report are also the representatives of some of the applicants in the present proceedings, and the alternative report has been prepared shortly before lodging a complaint before the Court. This, in turn, casts doubts as to the objectivity of the alternative report, and therefore the Government invites the Court to disregard it.

In fact, the applicants make no secret of the fact that they actively use both the statistical data collected by the LHRC¹⁴ and the representation of the organisation's lawyers¹⁵.

As for the alternative report itself, it does not contain data specifically on 2018 reform, for it was prepared on 31/07/2017, and the plans for 2018 reform were only announced in October 2017¹⁶. Nevertheless, the report contains a detailed description of the previous stages of introducing the state language instead of the mother tongue in the educational programmes of national minorities, replacing the non-existent government monitoring.

Statistical data provided to the Advisory Committee were reflected in the Committee's conclusions on Latvia (2018), supported later by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2021)¹⁷, i.e., internationally certified.

6. The Chamber mostly did not mention these statistics at all or used them very selectively. This can be seen, for example, in the use of the table on minorities' knowledge of the State language according to age¹⁸, reproduced in full below.

Table 6

¹⁴ See annex 3, §3

¹⁵ Ibid, §5

¹⁶ See for example «Коалиция поддержала постепенный переход на образование на латышском языке». [The Coalition supported the gradual transition to Latvian-language education] Delfi, 09/10/2017: <https://www.delfi.lv/57860/latvia/49319733/koaliciya-podderzhala-postepennyy-perehod-na-obrazovanie-na-latyshskom-yazyke>

¹⁷ Valiullina Judgment, §§89-90

¹⁸ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, §12, table 6

The level of knowledge of the Latvian language by representatives of different age groups in % of the number of respondents (2014 SKDS survey)

answer/age	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
all	20,7	27,6	27,5	18,8	4,2	1,2
18-24	38,9	38,4	20,3	1,1	0	1,2
25-34	31,2	31,9	28,1	8,2	0,6	0
35-44	22,4	32,0	25,2	14,8	4,1	1,5
45-54	15,8	32,0	27,8	23,2	0	1,2
55-64	19,0	24,4	33,2	18,9	4,4	0
65+	10,8	16,4	26,3	32,0	11,1	2,8

The following answer options were offered:

- a. I know the language very well (I understand everything, I can read freely, I speak, I write);
- b. I know the language well (in general, I understand, read, speak and write well, although sometimes there are mistakes);
- c. I have a satisfactory knowledge of the language (ability to communicate, speak and write, although there are difficulties and mistakes);
- d. I know the language poorly (I understand the basics, I can communicate in very familiar situations, but there are great difficulties);
- e. I know almost no language at all
- f. Hard to say

The table shows that it is primarily the representatives of older generations who need to improve their knowledge of the state language. As for the generation closest in age to schoolchildren, almost 80% of them have a sufficient level of Latvian to be able to

participate in the life of a democratic society¹⁹. The remaining 20% had problems, but their level of language proficiency was high enough not to interfere with the right of persons belonging to the State nation (valstsnācija) “to freely use the Latvian language in any sphere of life within the whole territory of Latvia”²⁰.

The Chamber referred to this argument of the applicants without referring to the statistics presented by them at all²¹, but did cite the first line of the table (language proficiency of national minorities of all ages) in the overview part of the judgment²². As to the second line of the table on the knowledge of the Latvian language by young people, which is directly relevant to the issue under discussion, the Chamber did not cite it at all, simply stating: as to the applicants’ allegation that the younger generation of Russian-speaking pupils had a sufficient level of Latvian and that there had been no need to improve that knowledge within the education system, the Court has not been provided with sufficiently reliable statistical data²³.

The government did not make any comments on this part of the statistics, as well as on statistics in general (see summary in §4 above). Moreover, although the survey was carried out by a private company SKDS²⁴, it was commissioned by the government (as well as many other surveys), as it is reported on the government portal²⁵.

Surveys of this kind are extremely rare, but new data have emerged while the case was before the Court. A 2019 survey by the same SKDS commissioned by the government's State Language Agency in the 18-34 age group showed similar results to the table under discussion: 26% of respondents whose native language is not Latvian rated their

¹⁹ Valiullina Judgment, §198

²⁰ Official Language Law, Section 1, item 3. See also Valiullina Judgment, §204

²¹ Valiullina Judgment, §160

²² Ibid, §10

²³ Ibid, §208

²⁴ SKDS, the best-known private opinion polling centre in Latvia: <https://www.skds.lv/?langs=2053>

²⁵ Edīte Brikmane “Mazākumtautību piederības sajūta Latvijai. Pētījums atklāj interesantu ainu” [The feeling of belonging of minorities to Latvia. The study reveals an interesting picture], LV portāls, 19/09/2014: <https://lvportals.lv/norises/265478-mazakumtautibu-piederibas-sajuta-latvijai-petijums-atklaj-interesantu-ainu-2014>

knowledge as excellent, 35% as good, 22% as average, 8% as poor, and 5% as very poor or nil²⁶.

State portal data for 2022 also confirms that the state language in this age group is known by 92-93% of those for whom it is not their first language²⁷.

7. The Chamber also advances the following consideration²⁸: If, indeed, Russian-speaking pupils had such a good knowledge of Latvian, as was alleged by the applicants, then the Court does not see any grounds for the applicants' argument that they had been seriously affected by the increase in the use of Latvian as the language of instruction.

In this regard, it should be realised that knowledge of a non-native language and learning in a non-native language are fundamentally different things. The latter has a significant negative impact on the vast majority of pupils (with the exception of individual congenital bilinguals). The applicants have submitted to the Court relevant UN studies²⁹ and independent observations on Latvia³⁰. All this information is reflected in the appealed judgment in one line³¹: the applicants referred to particular non-binding international material: [...] the 2017 Practical Guide for Implementation, Language Rights of Linguistic Minorities, by the UN Special Rapporteur on minority issues [and] views expressed by UNESCO in various position and policy papers.

8. It would be possible to doubt the facts set out in the second line of the table (see § 6 above) if the applicants did not provide evidence that the overwhelming majority of the

²⁶ Valsts valodas politikas pamatnostādnes 2021.-2027. gadam, 15. attēls [National Language Policy Guidelines 2021-2027, Figure 15]: <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/325679>

²⁷ PIA74. Foreign language skills by language, sex, age, educational attainment and labour status in 2022 (aged 25-64/per cent of population in the respective age group) – Language and Socio-demographic indicator: https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/en/OSP_OD/OSP_OD__apsekojumi__pieaug_izgl/PIA74.px/

²⁸ Valiullina Judgment, §208

²⁹ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §17

³⁰ Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, §35

³¹ Valiullina Judgment, §163

representatives of the youth group concerned were graduates of schools providing educational programmes for national minorities and not graduates of schools with Latvian language of instruction. However, the evidence that the overwhelming majority of children of national minorities are enrolled in the programmes of education of national minorities - the object of the reform 2018 - is provided by the applicants³², although it is not even mentioned in the appealed judgment.

9. The applicants particularly emphasised that the new Basic Education Standard (Regulations Regarding the State Basic Education Standard and Model Basic Education Programmes, adopted on 27/11/2018 - hereinafter Regulations no.747³³), which came into effect in 2020, also provided for approximately halving (from 5 to 3) the number of hours of teaching of mother tongue and literature, which had remained unchanged for the last century³⁴. At the same time, the number of hours of mother tongue and literature in ethnic Latvian schools remained the same - 6 hours per week³⁵, i.e., this is the optimum amount of teaching of mother tongue accepted by the government. This circumstance is visible to the naked eye as evidence of the different attitude towards the selected groups, an attitude that has neither a legitimate purpose³⁶ nor any other reasonable explanation.

Although Regulations no.747 were not included in the applicants' complaints in any of the three 2018 reform proceedings before the Constitutional Court and were not yet in force at the time the complaints were filed with the Court, this, as shown below, is not at all an obstacle to considering the difference in treatment introduced by Regulations no.747 precisely in the second joint case under discussion.

³² Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 1, §§ 3-4

³³ Full text available in document CDL-AD(2020)012-e, 975/2020 [related documents]

³⁴ AF Section "E", §1; Supplement, §§3, 17; Statement of facts by applicants of 01/09/2021, annex 2, §§7, 9

³⁵ See annex 11 to the Regulations no. 747.

³⁶ At any rate, from the list of legitimate purposes established by the Chamber (Valiullina Judgment, §§195-201)

The lawsuits related to school education were filed with the Constitutional Court before the adoption of the rules (27/11/2018), so the plaintiffs did not raise them in their complaints. However, the Constitutional Court examined the Rules No. 747 on its own initiative, recognising them as an integral part of the 2018 reform, contributing to the integration of society and protecting the interests of national minorities³⁷. Thus, the principle of subsidiarity has been fulfilled.

Moreover, attempts to separately challenge Regulation 747 after the Constitutional Court had found the 2018 reform as a whole and that part of it to be constitutionally compliant could reasonably be regarded as deliberately ineffective³⁸. Some of the applicants in the first joint case attempted to test this conclusion in practice by filing a constitutional complaint on 24/02/2022, but on 25/04/2022 the court refused to initiate proceedings, mainly on the grounds that the 2018 reform had previously been found to be constitutionally³⁹.

At the time the applications were lodged with the Court, Regulations no. 747 were not yet in force.

However, in respect of the second, third and fourth applicants from the first family and the seventh applicant from the second family⁴⁰, the Rules came into force from 01.09.2020, i.e., before communication with the Government (15/03/2021).

Thus, at the time of filing the applications, all the conditions were fulfilled to consider the applicants as potential victims of Regulations no.747 with reasonable probability⁴¹. The Government in their submissions to the Court did not comment in any way on the applicants' observations on the restriction of the right to study the mother tongue, mentioning Regulations no.747 only once, and in the context that they were an integral

³⁷ Judgment of 23 April 2019 in case No. 2018-12-01, §24.3; Judgment of 13 November 2019 in case No. 2018-22-01, §14

³⁸ Valiullina Judgment, §149

³⁹ Observation by applicants of 06/01/2023, §5 and annex 2

⁴⁰ Compare Valiullina Judgment, §§ 35,38 and Regulation No. 747, §§26-28

⁴¹ See for example *Modinos v. Cyprus*, no. 15070/89, 22 April 1993 or *Halford v. the United Kingdom*, no. 20605/92, 25 June 1997, §48

part of the 2018 reforms⁴². In turn, the Chamber emphasises that preserving the possibility for child applicants to study their mother tongue is a sign of proportionality of the restrictions⁴³, without noting that this possibility has been substantially reduced.

⁴² Government Memorial of 14/10/2021, §27

⁴³ Valiullina Judgment, §§210, 212