



COMISIA DE EVALUARE A JUDECĂTORILOR
JUDICIAL VETTING COMMISSION
str. Alexei Mateevici 75, mun. Chișinău,
MD-2009, Republica Moldova
+373 22 820 882 | +373 60 246 352
secretariat@vettingmd.eu | www.vettingmd.eu

EVALUATION REPORT

approved according to Article 40

of the Rules of Organization and Functioning

ELEONORA BADAN-MELNIC

candidate for the Central Court of Appeal

subject of evaluation under Article 3 para. (1) Law No. 252/2023

12 June 2025

Contents

I. Introduction.....	3
II. Subject of the Evaluation.....	3
III. Evaluation Criteria.....	3
IV. Evaluation Procedure.....	6
V. Analysis.....	8
A. Potential inexplicable for 2013, 2014 and 2017	8
VI. Conclusion.....	15
VII. Further action and publication	16

Evaluation Panel B of the Commission (hereinafter the “Commission”) established by Law No. 65/2023 on the External Evaluation of Judges and Candidates for Judges of the Supreme Court of Justice and discharging the powers under Law No. 252/2023 on the external evaluation of judges and prosecutors and amending some normative acts (hereinafter “Law No. 252/2023”) deliberated on the matter on 9 June 2025 and approved the following report on 12 June 2025. The members participating in the approval of the report were:

1. Scott BALES
2. Willem BROUWER
3. Iurie GAȚCAN

The Commission prepared this evaluation report based on its work in collecting and reviewing the information, the subject’s explanations and its subsequent deliberations.

I. Introduction

1. This report concerns Mrs. Eleonora Badan-Melnic (hereinafter the “subject”), a candidate for the Central Court of Appeal.
2. The Commission conducted its evaluation pursuant to Law No. 252/2023 and the Commission’s Rules of Organization and Functioning (hereinafter “Rules”).
3. The Commission concluded that the subject meets the criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023.

II. Subject of the Evaluation

4. The subject has been a judge at Chișinău Central Court since 2015.
5. Between 2003 and 2015, the subject was a university lecturer at the Moldovan State University.
6. The subject received a bachelor’s degree in law in 2003 from the Moldova State University. In 2004, she received a master’s degree in law from the same university. Between 2010 and 2013, she pursued doctoral studies in law, and between 2012 and 2014, she was a student at the National Institute of Justice.

III. Evaluation Criteria

7. Under Article 11 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission evaluates the subject’s ethical and financial integrity.
8. Under Article 11 para. (2), a subject:

"[...] does not meet ethical integrity requirements if the Evaluation Commission has determined that:

- a) in the last 5 years, he/she seriously violated the rules of ethics and professional conduct of judges, or, as the case may be, prosecutors, as well as if they acted arbitrarily or issued arbitrary acts, over the last 10 years, contrary to the imperative rules of the law, and the European Court of Human Rights had established, before the adoption of the act, that a similar decision was contrary to the European Convention on Human Rights;
- b) in the last 10 years, has admitted in his/her work incompatibilities and conflicts of interest that affect the office held."

9. Under Article 11 para. (3), a subject:

"[...] does not meet the criterion for financial integrity if the Evaluation Commission has serious doubts determined by the fact that:

- a) the difference between assets, expenses and income for the last 12 years exceeds 20 average salaries per economy, in the amount set by the Government for the year 2023;
- b) in the last 10 years, admitted tax irregularities as a result of which the amount of unpaid tax exceeded, in total, 5 average salaries per economy, in the amount set by the Government for the year 2023."

10. The applicable rules of ethics and professional conduct for judges in the relevant period were regulated by the:

- a. Law No. 544 of 20 July 1995 on Status of Judge;
- b. Law No. 178 of 25 July 2014 on Disciplinary Liability of Judges;
- c. Judge's Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct No. 8 of 11 September 2015 approved by the Decision of the General Assembly of Judge;
- d. Judge's Code of Ethics approved by the decision of the Superior Council of Magistracy no. 366/15 of 29 November 2007;
- e. Guide on the integrity of judges No. 318/16 of 3 July 2018 approved by the Superior Council of Magistracy.

11. The average salary per economy for 2023 was 11,700 MDL. Thus, the threshold of 20 average salaries is 234,000 MDL, and the threshold of five average salaries is 58,500 MDL.

12. Article 11 para. (4) of Law No. 252/2023 allows the Commission to verify various things in evaluating the subject's financial integrity, including

payment of taxes, compliance with the legal regime for declaring assets and personal interests, and the origins of the subject's wealth.

13. In evaluating the subject's financial integrity, Article 11 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 directs the Commission also to consider the wealth, expenses, and income of close persons, as defined in Law No. 133/2016 on the declaration of wealth and personal interests, as well as of persons referred to in Article 33 paras. (4) and (5) of Law No. 132/2016 on the National Integrity Authority.
14. In assessing a subject's compliance with the ethical and financial integrity criteria, the Commission applies the rules and legal regime that were in effect when the relevant acts occurred.
15. According to Article 11 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023 a subject shall be deemed not to meet the ethical integrity criterion if the Commission has determined the existence of the situations provided for by that paragraph. Under Article 11 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission determines that a subject does not meet the financial integrity criterion if it establishes serious doubts determined by the facts considered breaches of the evaluation criteria. The Commission cannot apply the term "serious doubts" without considering the accompanying phrase "determined by the fact that". This phrase suggests that the Commission must identify as a "fact" that the specified conduct has occurred.
16. Regarding the standard of "serious doubts" in the context of the vetting exercise, the Constitutional Court noted concerning its previous decisions that the definition of standards of proof inevitably involves using flexible texts. The Court also said that the Superior Council of Magistracy can only decide not to promote a subject if the report examined contains "confirming evidence" regarding the non-compliance with the integrity criteria. The word "confirms" suggests a certainty that the subject does not meet the legal criteria. Thus, comparing the wording "serious doubts" with the text "confirming evidence", the Court considered that the former implies a high probability without rising to the level of certainty (Constitutional Court Judgement No. 2 of 16 January 2025, §§ 99, 101).
17. Once the Commission establishes substantiated doubts regarding particular facts that could lead to failure of evaluation, the subject will be given the opportunity to oppose those findings and to submit arguments in defense, as provided by Article 16 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023. After weighing all the evidence and information gathered during the proceedings, the Commission makes its determination.

IV. Evaluation Procedure

18. On 26 December 2024, the Commission received the information from the Superior Council of Magistracy under Article 12 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023. The information included the subject's candidacy for the Central Court of Appeal.
19. On 13 January 2025, the Commission notified the subject and requested that she complete and return an ethics questionnaire and the declarations as provided in Article 12 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023 within 10 days from the date of notification (hereinafter, these declarations are referred to as the "five-year declaration"). The subject returned the completed five-year declaration and questionnaire on 23 January 2025.
20. On 6 February 2025, the Commission notified the subject that her evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel B with members Scott Bales, Willem Brouwer and Iurie Gațcan. She was also informed that subjects may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from their evaluation.
21. Because the law sets out different evaluation periods for the ethical and financial integrity criteria cited above, the Commission evaluated compliance with these criteria over the past five, ten and twelve years. Due to the end-of-the-year availability of the tax declarations and declarations on wealth and personal interests, the financial criteria evaluation period included 2013-2024 and 2015-2024. The evaluation period for the ethical criterion includes the past five or ten years calculated backward from the date of the notification.
22. In the last ten years of the evaluation period, the subject had an obligation to submit declarations, both under Law No. 133/2016 on the Declaration of Wealth and Personal Interests and under Law No. 1264/2002 on the Declaration and Income and Property Control for persons with positions of Public Dignity, Judges, Prosecutors, Civil Servants, positions of Management.
23. The Commission sought and obtained information from numerous sources. No source advised the Commission of later developments or any corrections regarding the information provided. The sources that were asked to provide information on the subject included the General Prosecutor's Office, the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office (hereinafter "APO"), the Prosecutor's Office for Combating Organized Crime and Special Cases (hereinafter "PCCOCS"), the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the National Anticorruption

Center (hereinafter “NAC”), the National Integrity Authority (hereinafter “NIA”), the State Fiscal Service (hereinafter “SFS”), the National Office of Social Insurance (in Romanian: *Casa Națională de Asigurări Sociale*, hence hereinafter – “CNAS”), the General Inspectorate of Border Police, banks (EuroCreditBank JSC, Eximbank JSC, Moldinconbank JSC, MAIB JSC, Procredit Bank JSC, Victoriabank JSC, Banca de Finanțe și Comerț (FincomBank) JSC, OTP Bank JSC, Banca Socială JSC, Banca de Economii JSC), Office for Prevention and Fight Against Money Laundering (in Romanian: *Serviciul Prevenirea și Combaterea Spălării Banilor*, hence hereinafter – “SPCSB”), and the Public Service Agency (hereinafter “PSA”). Information was also obtained from other public institutions and private entities, open sources such as social media and investigative journalism reports. No complaints or information were received from civil society. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.

24. Before approving its report, the Commission asked the General Prosecutor’s Office, APO, PCCOCS and NAC to confirm that there were no changes in their previous responses. PCCOCS, NAC and APO responded, but the Prosecutor’s General Office has not responded within the deadline provided by Law No. 252/2023.
25. On 17 March 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 27 March 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “first round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
26. On 10 April 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 22 April 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “second round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
27. On 30 May 2025, the Commission notified the subject that based on the information collected and reviewed, it had not identified in its evaluation any areas of doubt about her compliance with the financial criterion and had not established a non-compliance with the ethical integrity criterion. The subject was sent a written hearing notice. The notice stated that if the subject declined to participate, but confirmed the accuracy of the information previously provided, the Commission would, absent any new information or developments, approve a report on passing the evaluation. The subject was also informed that the evaluation report may refer to other issues considered during the evaluation.

28. As provided in Article 39 para. (4) of the Rules, the subject sought and was provided access to all the materials in her evaluation file on 3 June 2025.
29. On 5 June 2025, the subject submitted additional documents. The Commission included them in the evaluation file and considered them in its analysis.
30. On 5 June 2025 the subject confirmed the accuracy and correctness of the information provided in the declarations, the ethics questionnaire and subsequent answers, and declined participation in the hearing.

V. Analysis

31. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Commission's conclusion.
32. Based on the information it collected, the Commission analyzed and, where necessary, requested further clarifications on the potential difference between the assets, expenses, and income (hereinafter "unjustified or inexplicable wealth") for 2013, 2014 and 2017. This was the only issue that, upon initial review, raised preliminary doubts about the subject's compliance with the criteria established by law.

- **Potential difference between the assets, expenses, and income (hereinafter "unjustified or inexplicable wealth") for 2013, 2014 and 2017**

33. To assess the existence of inexplicable wealth, the Commission analyzed (i) the source of funds related to the declared cash savings in 2013, (ii) the loans received from several individuals in 2015, 2016 and 2018, (iii) a donation in 2018, (iv) the source of deposits opened by the subject's husband, and (v) the registration of a Renault Kadjar, m/y 2017, in the name of the subject's mother-in-law.
34. The loans and the donation were not declared by the subject in any of her asset declarations submitted to the NIA. The instances of non-declaration are addressed below. Preliminarily, it should be noted that all non-declarations fall outside the five-year limitation period established by Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

Source of funds related to the declared cash savings in 2013

35. The subject declared to the Commission that, at the end of 2013, she had approximately 70,000–80,000 MDL in cash savings. She explained that these savings largely came from monetary gifts received at her wedding in 2007. The savings were kept in EUR, and the amount fluctuated slightly over the

years. She occasionally supplemented these savings with income from her salary and with bonuses allegedly received in cash by her husband from the company where he was employed at the time. These bonuses were paid based on cash collection orders, which were not kept and cannot be verified or quantified.

36. Although the savings from salaries may be considered acceptable, even if not quantifiable, the alleged cash bonuses received by her husband cannot be accepted. According to Article 18 lit. c) of the Fiscal Code, bonuses are considered taxable income and are subject to proper declaration and taxation. Since the subject failed to present supporting documents and such income is not reflected in the tax records held in the SFS database, it cannot be accepted.
37. The subject further stated that until 2011 the family had rented various apartments; however, starting with 2011, they moved into a dormitory (*cămin*) of the Moldova State University, where she worked as a lecturer, to reduce expenses and save money for the purchase of an apartment, which they eventually acquired in 2015.
38. The Commission considered several elements when assessing the plausibility of the declared cash savings from monetary gifts received at her wedding in 2007. Firstly, the Commission notes that it has long been common in the Republic of Moldova for family and guests to provide monetary gifts to newlyweds, which can represent a significant cash inflow. Secondly, the family's decision to reside in a university dormitory for several years suggests a deliberate effort to minimize expenses to accumulate savings. Finally, no significant purchases were identified.
39. While the absence of supporting documentation limits the ability to fully verify the amount, the explanation provided is coherent, and the lifestyle supports the subject's narrative. However, in the present case, in view of the conclusion reached in § 74 of the report, the Commission does not consider it necessary to examine separately the acceptance of the alleged cash savings as an incoming financial flow.

Loan received from the subject's mother in 2015

40. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that she received a loan of 34,000 MDL from her mother in 2015. She did not report this loan in her 2015 annual declaration to the NIA.

41. The subject explained that the funds originated from her mother's long-term savings, accumulated through a modest lifestyle and the absence of major expenditures. According to the subject, her mother regularly saved money to support her children. The 34,000 MDL was transferred in two instalments in 2015, without a written agreement, fixed repayment schedule, or interest. The arrangement was informal and based on mutual family support, with the understanding that the children would assist the mother when necessary. The subject and her family reportedly provide regular support to her mother in lieu of repayment. She explained that she can't calculate the repayments because the support wasn't a formal loan, but part of her broader duty to care for her elderly mother that needed care.
42. The stated purpose of the funds was to cover initial payments for an apartment purchased in 2015. The subject claimed she did not report the loan because she did not perceive it as a formal financial obligation, but rather as intra-family assistance.
43. The subject did not provide documentary evidence to support the existence of the loan. However, financial data obtained from Banca de Economii JSC indicate that her mother had a deposit account that was closed in 2015. Between 1 January 2013 and 11 October 2015, the account was credited with 250,771 MDL and debited with 261,512 MDL, both in numerous small transactions. In 2015 alone, 79,800 MDL was credited, and 79,853 MDL was withdrawn. Although the subject's mother declared a modest income of 51,114 MDL for 2012–2014 according to the SFS, the deposit activity indicates additional previously accumulated savings.
44. Considering the transaction history of the deposit account, the consistent saving pattern, and the absence of other significant expenditures, the Commission concludes that the subject's mother likely had the financial capacity to provide the 34,000 MDL and accepts it as an incoming financial flow for 2015.

Loan received from N.M. and V.M. in 2015

45. In the first round of questions, the subject declared that she had received a loan of 5,000 EUR in 2016 from family friends, N.M. and V.M., intended to cover one of the instalments for their apartment on Cașu street. This loan was not reflected in her annual asset declaration submitted to the NIA.

46. The subject stated that she repaid 3,000 EUR at the beginning of 2017 and the remaining 2,000 EUR in 2018. Regarding the source of the funds, the subject stated that N.M. and V.M. had been residing in the United Kingdom since 2011. V.M. was employed as Delivery Director for an international IT company, "E.", and the loan was provided from his salary.
47. With respect to the failure to declare the loan, the subject explained that at the time she submitted her 2016 declaration (17 March 2017), she had already reimbursed 3,000 EUR, and the remaining balance of 2,000 EUR was below the reporting threshold of 10 average salaries, as provided by Article 4 para. (1), lit e) of Law No. 133/2016.
48. Open-source information confirms that V.M. holds a senior managerial position in a multinational IT company with a substantial financial capacity, which supports the claim that he had sufficient funds to offer such a loan. In addition, the personal relationship between the subject and N.M., the spouse of V.M., as described by the subject, lends credibility to the informal nature of the financial arrangement.
49. Based on the financial analysis for the year 2016, the subject's income would have been sufficient to ensure a positive balance even without this loan. This indicates that the loan was not essential to justify the subject's financial situation in that year. Additionally, the subject declared the reimbursement of the loan in 2017 and 2018 and the Commission included the payments as outgoing financial flows for the respective years. Based on the information reviewed, the Commission concludes that the loan is credible and accepts it as a plausible incoming financial flow for 2016.

Loan received from C.M. in 2018

50. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that she had received a loan of 2,000 EUR in 2018 from C.M., a colleague and friend of her husband. This loan was not declared in her annual asset declaration to the NIA. She explained that the agreement was made verbally, and she submitted a written declaration signed by C.M. confirming both the existence of the loan and its full reimbursement.
51. Regarding the failure to declare the loan, the subject stated that the amount was below the reporting threshold of 10 average salaries, as stipulated by Article 4 para. (1), lit. e) of Law No. 133/2016.

52. According to the information available to the Commission, C.M. is the founder of the LLC "L.", where the subject's husband is employed as a manager. The data from the National Bureau of Statistics show that the company registered a net profit of 328,300 MDL in 2017 and 106,000 MDL in 2018. These figures indicate that C.M. had sufficient financial capacity to grant a loan of 2,000 EUR in 2018. The subject also provided a signed declaration from C.M. attesting to the loan and its reimbursement in 2020. Moreover, the subject declared the reimbursement of the loan in 2020 which was calculated as an outgoing financial flow. Based on above, the Commission accepts the loan of 2,000 EUR as an incoming financial flow for 2018.

Donation received from the subject's mother in 2018

53. In the first round of questions, the subject declared a donation of 11,000 MDL received from her mother in 2018. In response to the Commission's questions regarding the failure to declare the donation, the subject stated that, according to Article 4 para. (3) of Law No. 133/2016, the donation was exempt from declaration because it was a gift from her parents and its value did not exceed the legal threshold of 10 average salaries, which was 61,500 MDL in 2018. The subject further explained that the donation was intended for installing doors in their purchased appartement.
54. Taking into account the relatively low value of the donation and the family context in which it was granted, the Commission considers the explanation credible and accepts the 11,000 MDL as a justified incoming financial flow for 2018.
55. Regarding the failure to declare the above sources of income, the Commission notes that, under Law No. 252/2023, the non-declaration of assets and personal interests is not, in itself, a reason to fail the evaluation. Article 11 para. (4) lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that, in the process of verifying financial integrity, the Commission may verify whether the subject has complied with the legal regime for declaring assets and personal interests.
56. According to Article 11 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023, a judge does not meet the ethical integrity criterion if the Evaluation Commission has established that in the past five years, he/she seriously violated the rules of ethics and professional conduct of judges.

57. In the present case, all five instances of non-declaration identified by the Commission occurred outside the five-year timeframe established under Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. Consequently, while the Commission considered these omissions from an ethical perspective, they do not fall within the legally relevant reference period for the purpose of integrity evaluation.

Source of funds for the deposits opened by the subject's husband

58. In 2014, the subject's husband opened two deposit accounts in his name. The first, in EUR, was opened in December 2014 and funded with 13,050 EUR (approximately 245,970 MDL). No further deposits were made, and the total amount, 258,097 MDL, including accrued interest and exchange rate gains, was withdrawn in cash on 13 March 2015.
59. The second deposit account, in MDL, was opened in November 2014 and funded with 364,000 MDL (approximately 19,200 EUR). This account was closed in August 2015, with the entire sum withdrawn in cash.
60. The subject explained that both amounts were provided by her husband's aunt, A.C., for temporary safekeeping during her divorce. A.C. allegedly wanted to avoid the inclusion of these funds in any property division. The deposits were made under the husband's name, and the funds were fully returned to A.C. in 2015. The only income retained by the household was 12,500 MDL in interest, which the subject reported in her 2015 declaration.
61. When asked why A.C. did not entrust the funds to her adult children, the subject explained that they were residing in Italy and maintained good relations with their father.
62. The subject submitted two signed receipts. The first, from January 2015, confirms that her husband received and deposited the funds, which did not belong to him. The second, dated August 2015, confirms that A.C. received the full amount back.
63. Regarding the source of the funds, the subject submitted A.C.'s employment records in Italy, including labor contracts, tax payment evidence, a residence permit, and bank account statements showing prior deposits and withdrawals in Moldova. A.C. reportedly used the returned funds to purchase agricultural land in 2015, and the subject provided cadastral excerpts as supporting evidence.

64. The documentation demonstrates that A.C. had a legitimate income in Italy before transferring the funds to the subject's husband. Her financial capacity is further supported by her previous deposits: 265,000 MDL at Moldinconbank JSC and 13,000 EUR at Victoriabank JSC in November 2013, both withdrawn in November 2014. These records confirm that the funds later passed to the subject's husband had a traceable and credible source.
65. No significant expenditures were identified in the subject's household after 2015, aside from the apartment purchase, which was financed through multiple loans. Neither the subject nor her husband held a public position prior to 2015. Therefore, the Commission considers the issue as mitigated.

Registration of a Renault Kadjar, m/y 2017, after the subject's mother-in-law

66. The subject's mother-in-law was the owner of a Renault Kadjar, m/y 2017, with a personalized registration number between 3 August and 11 September 2020. Regarding the source of funds for the purchase of the vehicle, the subject clarified that the actual owner was M.C., her husband's friend and business partner.
67. M.C. had purchased the personalized registration number shortly after such numbers were made available at special sale prices, in April 2015. Although he already owned a personalized number, he wanted another one. He bought it and temporarily gave it to the subject's husband, who used it on their Skoda Octavia. When her husband wanted to sell the Skoda in July 2020, he intended to return the number to M.C. However, under the legal provisions in force at the time, a personalized number could only be transferred to a first-degree relative. As a result, the number was formally donated to his mother.
68. M.C. signed a sale-purchase agreement for the Renault Kadjar he already owned with the subject's mother-in-law on 3 August 2020. After she registered the vehicle with the personalized number, on 11 September 2020, she formally "sold" back the vehicle, along with the personalized number.
69. The subject emphasized that no actual sale or resale occurred and that no supporting documents have been kept. The vehicle remained in M.C.'s possession throughout; it was never used by the subject, her husband, or her mother-in-law. Her mother-in-law neither paid for the vehicle nor received proceeds from its resale. The subject also submitted a declaration signed by M.C., confirming her statements.

70. According to the PSA, M.C. owned the 2017 Renault Kadjar under one registration number from 2018 to 2020, and starting with 2020, he owned it with the personalized registration number in question. After selling the Renault Kadjar, M.C. registered another vehicle using the same special registration number.
71. Therefore, based on the circumstances of the case—namely: (i) the absence of any indicators that the vehicle was actually used by the subject, her husband, or her mother-in-law; (ii) the brief period during which the vehicle was formally registered in the name of the subject's mother-in-law; and (iii) the fact that the special registration number is currently still used by M.C., the Commission considers the explanation to be plausible and the initial doubt removed.

Conclusion on the potential inexplicable wealth

72. Following the detailed analysis of the subject's financial situation and the explanations of the subject during two rounds of questions, the Commission identified inexplicable wealth for 2013, 2014 and 2017. According to the Commission's calculations, the difference (negative balance) between the income and expenses in these years was -17,575 MDL, -9,081 MDL and -54,026 MDL, respectively, thus forming a total inexplicable wealth of -80,682 MDL.
73. Even if the negative balance for these years were treated as inexplicable wealth, it would not exceed the threshold of 234,000 MDL under Article 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.
74. The Commission further notes that, even if the above-mentioned sources of income (see §§ 35-54) were excluded from the incoming financial flow, the subject's negative balance, approximately -130,000 MDL, would still not exceed the 234,000 MDL threshold provided under Article 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. Accordingly, the Commission did not request further explanations on this issue.

VI. Conclusion

75. Based on the information it obtained and the subject's explanations, the Commission proposes that the subject promotes the external evaluation made according to the criteria set in Article 11 of Law No. 252/2023.

VII. Further action and publication

76. As provided in Article 40 para. (4) of the Rules, this evaluation report will be sent by e-mail to the subject and the Superior Council of Magistracy. The Commission will publish the evaluation's result on its official website on the same day.
77. No later than three days after the approval, a printed paper copy of the electronically signed report will be submitted to the Superior Council of Magistracy, along with the original electronic copy of the evaluation file containing all the evaluation materials gathered by the Commission.
78. This report will be published on the Commission's official website, with appropriate precautions to protect the privacy of the subject and other persons, within three days after the expiry of the appeal period against the decision of the Superior Council of Magistracy or after the Supreme Court of Justice issues its decision rejecting the appeal or ordering the promotion or non-promotion of the evaluation.
79. This evaluation report was approved by a unanimous vote of the Panel members on 12 June 2025 and signed pursuant to Articles 33 para. (2) and 40 para. (5) of the Rules.
80. Done in English and Romanian.

Scott Bales

Chairperson of the Commission

Chair of Panel B