



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

**ELENA GRUMEZA**

judge of North Court of Appeal

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

---

12 June 2025

## Contents

<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Subject of the Evaluation.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Evaluation Criteria.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV. Evaluation Procedure.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>V. Analysis.....</b>	<b>8</b>
A. Potential inexplicable wealth for 2012, 2013.....	8
B. Tax irregularities .....	14
<b>VI. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VII. Further action and publication .....</b>	<b>15</b>

Evaluation Panel A 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 10 June 2025 and approved the following report on 12 June 2025. The members participating in the approval of the report were:

1. Andrei BIVOL
2. Lavly PERLING
3. Lilian ENCIU

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. Elena Grumeza (hereinafter the “subject”), a judge of the North 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 the North Court of Appeal since 2014. This court was known as the Bălți Court of Appeal until it was renamed on 27 December 2024.
5. In 2007, the subject was appointed by transfer as a judge at the Bălți Court. In 2005, she was appointed as a judge at the Sîngerei Court. Between 1998 and 2005, the subject was a legal adviser at “RED-NORD” JSC. Between 1996 and 1998, she worked as a Court clerk at the Bălți District Tribunal.
6. The subject received a bachelor’s degree in law in 1999 from the Alecu Russo State University of Bălți.

**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 18 October 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 as a North Court of Appeal judge.
19. On 7 November 2024, 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 20 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 27 November 2024.
20. On 13 December 2024, the Commission notified the subject that her evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel A, which includes members Andrei Bivol, Lilian Enciu, and Lavly Perling. 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 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 12 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 2012-2023 and 2014-2023. 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 12 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 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*), the General Inspectorate of Border Police, banks (Comerțbank JSC, Energbank JSC, EuroCreditBank JSC, Eximbank JSC, Moldinconbank JSC, MAIB JSC, Procredit Bank JSC, BCR Chișinău JSC, Victoriabank JSC, Banca de Finanțe și Comerț (FincomBank) JSC, OTP Bank JSC, Banca Socială JSC, Banca de Economii JSC, Unibank JSC), Office for Prevention and Fight Against Money Laundering (in Romanian: *Serviciul Prevenirea și Combaterea Spălării Banilor*), 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. 65/2023.
25. On 6 March 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 16 March 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "first round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
26. On 3 April 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 13 April 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "second round of questions"). On 9 April 2025, the subject requested an extension until 18 April 2025 to respond, which the Commission granted. The subject provided answers and documents within the extended 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 notice of the hearing. 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.

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 6 June 2025.
29. On 10 June 2025, the Commission held a public hearing. At the hearing, the subject reaffirmed the accuracy of her answers in the five-year declaration and the ethics questionnaire. She also stated that she did not have any corrections or additions to the answers previously provided to the Commission's requests for information.

## V. Analysis

30. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Commission's conclusion.
31. Based on the information it collected, the Commission analyzed and, where necessary, requested further clarifications on the matters which, upon initial review, raised doubts as to compliance with the criteria established by law:
  - a. potential difference between the assets, expenses, and income (hereinafter "unjustified or inexplicable wealth") for 2012, 2013;
  - b. tax irregularities.

### A. Potential inexplicable wealth for 2012, 2013

32. The Commission identified a potential inexplicable wealth for 2012 (-48,469 MDL) and 2013 (-12,125 MDL), which was due to the leasing payments and Consumption Expenditure for Population (hereinafter "CEP") applied to the subject's household. In 2010, the subject's then husband purchased in leasing a vehicle Opel Insignia m/y 2010. The annual payments constituted -60,000 MDL in 2012 and -50,000 MDL in 2013. The CEP for the subject's family constituted -69,080 MDL in 2012 and -69,509 MDL in 2013.
33. In the second round of questions, the subject provided to the Commission bank account statements of her ex-husband's company, which indicated that 150,000 MDL was extracted in cash in 2012 and 20,000 MDL in 2013. These amounts covered the negative imbalance for the corresponding years. Accordingly, the Commission did not request further explanations on this issue.
34. In ascertaining the inexplicable wealth, the Commission also analyzed the financial capacity of the subject, her then husband, and her parents to make a monetary donation to the subject's daughter. A preliminary analysis has also



raised doubts about the financial capacity of the subject's daughter concerning her assets. In addition, the Commission analyzed the potential purchase of vehicles at possibly deflated prices by the subject. The relevant circumstances concerning these issues will be described in the following sections.

*Donation to the subject's daughter*

35. On 27 May 2015, the subject donated 241,286 MDL to her daughter. Since they were financially separated as of the end of 2013, her then husband made an equal donation separately. Therefore, the daughter received 482,572 MDL from her parents in 2015. Both parents made this donation for their daughter to purchase an apartment in Romania, where she settled with her family in 2014. The donation was notarized and reported to SFS.
36. In response to the first and second rounds of questions, the subject stated that her parents contributed to this donation by donating 5,000 EUR to their granddaughter in 2012 as a 20th anniversary gift. The money was kept until 2015. The subject mentioned that the donation of 5,000 EUR was exclusively from her parents and destined for the purchase of an apartment for their granddaughter.
37. According to the donation contract from 27 May 2015, the grandparents are not mentioned as donors, only the subject and her then-husband are. The subject explained that the contract was drawn up on behalf of her and her then-husband, as the grandparents were at a sanatorium and unable to appear before the notary on that day.
38. When asked about the sources of the donated funds, the subject responded that her part was obtained over the years from savings and gifts received on birthdays and other occasions. Her ex-husband was an entrepreneur, and he had available cash from his professional activity. Besides his written statement, the subject provided confirmatory documents regarding a copy of an 80,000 MDL (est. 3,935 EUR) loan his company granted to him in 2015 (an LLC whose field of activity is manufacturing machinery, tools, and equipment). In his written statement, the subject's ex-husband declared that he obtained another 3,000 EUR offered by his mother C.N., who sold a villa at that time, and used the income obtained in the Republic of Kazakhstan (4,000 EUR).
39. According to information obtained by the Commission, on 12 June 2014, the subject's then-husband received 6,000 USD from the Republic of Kazakhstan through wire transfer. As explained by the subject, this was her then-

husband's payment for the assembly and installation of technical equipment exported by his company, which he converted into EUR.

40. In response to the second round of questions, the subject detailed her parents' source of funds for their part of the donation. Based on her explanations, the primary sources of income included: her mother's earnings from giving in lease her private dental office and her dentist activity within her individual enterprise; her father's income as a school principal, teacher, his pension, unofficial occasional earnings from private tutoring, income from renting agricultural land and a household farm; as well as family savings from the properties sold.
41. To confirm the financial capacity of her parents, the subject attached a written statement indicating that they had leased the dental office during the period 2007–2012, earning a total of 600,000 MDL. These claims were supported by written statements from one of the tenants, B.V. and an employee R.C., which were submitted to the Commission.
42. The subject provided the SFS statements regarding the individual enterprise of her mother, with the following income:

Reporting year	Profit up to taxation	Reporting year	Profit up to taxation
2007	3,372 MDL	2012	22,886 MDL
2008	9,504 MDL	2013	37,198 MDL
2009	3,406 MDL	2014	25,206 MDL
2010	19,528 MDL	2015	51,582 MDL
2011	18,708 MDL		

43. According to CNAS, for the period 2007-2011, the subject's parents earned the following amount as social payments:

Year	Subject's father		Subject's mother
	Annual pension	Monthly state allowance for outstanding merits	Annual pension
2007	11,453 MDL	300 MDL	6,466 MDL
2008	17,217 MDL	300 MDL	7,617 MDL
2009	20,546 MDL	300 MDL	9,090 MDL
2010	22,131 MDL	300 MDL	9,791 MDL

2011	23,670 MDL	300 MDL	10,472 MDL
------	------------	---------	------------

44. Considering the subject explanations, the written statements and the confirmatory documents provided, the Commission considered the sources of donation to be justified.
45. Noting the subject's donation to her daughter used to acquire a property in Romania, the Commission requested official confirmation that the subject herself owns no real estate there. The subject complied, and Romanian authorities confirmed she holds no property in the country.

*Subject's daughter assets*

46. In 2009, the subject's then-husband donated to their daughter a 69 sq.m. apartment in Bălți city. According to the sale-purchase contract in 2022, the apartment was sold for 183,500 MDL. The subject represented the daughter, by acting on a power of attorney.
47. The Commission sought clarification on the real beneficiary of the money obtained from the apartment's sale. In response to the first round of questions, the subject stated that the donation was made on the condition that her daughter's grandparents would continue to live in it. After the death of the last of her grandparents in 2022, her daughter decided immediately to sell the apartment. This decision was justified because she intended to stay in Romania, not in the Republic of Moldova. The subject transferred the money to her daughter when the latter came to visit.
48. On 28 May 2015, the subject's daughter purchased a 36 sq.m. apartment in Ploiești district, Romania, for 24,500 EUR. On 6 March 2019, she sold it for 129,525 RON (27,258 EUR). The Commission was provided with a copy of the sale-purchase contracts.
49. In 2018, the subject's daughter purchased an Audi A4, m/y 2008, for 23,500 RON (4,809 EUR). In 2021, according to the copy of the sale-purchase contract, she sold it for the same price. Subsequently, according to the subject statements, she purchased a BMW, m/y 2015, for 50,000 RON (10,155 EUR). No confirmatory documents related to the purchase of this vehicle were provided. The Commission did not identify any vehicles registered in her name in the Republic of Moldova.
50. On 11 March 2022, the subject's daughter purchased another 82 sq.m. apartment for 96,000 EUR as a mortgagor in Ilfov district, Romania. Her personal contribution was 14,465 EUR, while 81,535 EUR was credited from the banking institution.

51. To justify the financial capacity of her daughter, the subject provided confirmatory documents of income from Romania. On 16 April 2019, the subject's daughter signed an employment contract with an LLC. According to a salary statement issued by the LLC, she had the following annual income:

Year	Gross income	Net income	Average annual rate EUR/RON	Converted to EUR
2019	53,373 RON	31,224 RON	4.7452	6,580
2020	83,879 RON	49,068 RON	4.8371	10,144
2021	96,691 RON	56,564 RON	4.9204	11,496
2022	107,118 RON	62,663 RON	4.9315	12,707
2023	86,913 RON	50,844 RON	4.9499	10,272
<b>Total</b>	<b>427,974 RON</b>	<b>250,363 RON</b>	-	<b>51,198 EUR</b>

52. Considering that the financial capacity of the subject's daughter was proved, therefore no further clarification was sought.

*Transactions with vehicles at possibly deflated prices*

*Toyota Auris, m/y 2011*

53. On 15 February 2017, the subject registered the ownership right over a vehicle Toyota Auris, m/y 2011. This vehicle was imported to the Republic of Moldova in 2016 with an import value and taxes of 85,936 MDL.
54. In the 2017-2019 annual declarations submitted to NIA, the subject declared the vehicle's value at 20,000 MDL. That seemed an underrated price. In her annual declaration for 2020, the subject indicated that she sold this vehicle for 80,000 MDL. Based on depreciation and market data, the estimated fair value of the vehicle in early 2017 was at least 4,000–6,000 EUR. The Commission asked the subject to clarify the difference between the purchase and sale prices and whether these were the actual prices.
55. Responding to the first and second rounds of questions, the subject confirmed the purchase and sale prices. She explained that the vehicle was purchased at a reduced price of 20,000 MDL due to several defects related to the gearbox, engine, and rust, having been brought from a flooded area in Europe. The seller was in financial need. She was advised by an experienced person who considered buying a vehicle with known defects safer than one without a clear history. Being her first vehicle, it was not worth purchasing an expensive one.

56. According to the subject, she incurred repair expenses related to this vehicle in 2017. She submitted corresponding documents indicating repair expenses of 37,350 MDL.
57. The Commission could not access the sale-purchase contract or other documents verifying the vehicle's declared purchase price, as these are only kept for six years, according to a PSA letter.
58. The vehicle was sold in 2020 for 80,000 MDL to a person who, as the subject stated, was aware of its condition. This amount is not confirmed by any document except the subject's annual declaration for 2020. She issued a power of attorney for G.S. on 27 November 2020, who, in turn, issued another power of attorney in the name of M.B. on 17 December 2020, authorizing the latter to sell the vehicle.
59. Therefore, when analyzing this aspect, the Commission based its decision on the declarations submitted to NIA and the subject's explanations. In absence of any evidence indicating otherwise, the Commission accepted the subject's declarations regarding the purchase and sale price for Toyota Auris, m/y 2011.

*Nissan Juke, m/y 2015*

60. On 11 December 2020, the subject registered the ownership right over a vehicle Nissan Juke, m/y 2015. This vehicle was imported to the Republic of Moldova by "DAAC-Autosport" LLC in 2015 with an import value and taxes related to it of 289,516 MDL.
61. In the 2020 annual declaration submitted to NIA, the subject declared a value of 100,000 MDL, that corresponds to the price indicated in the sale-purchase contract from 11 December 2020. However, in her annual declaration for 2021, the subject indicated that the value of vehicle was 200,000 MDL.
62. According to the subject's annual declaration for 2022, she obtained 200,000 MDL from the sale of this vehicle. The price corresponds to the one indicated in the sale-purchase contract from 28 April 2022.
63. Pursuant to the copy of the sale-purchase contract from 29 November 2019, the seller from whom the subject purchased the vehicle acquired it for 230,343 MDL. Therefore, it seemed suspicious for the Commission that the former owner sold this car to the subject for 100,000 MDL.
64. The Commission asked the subject to explain the low purchase price and why the sale price was significantly higher. Also, she was asked to clarify the difference between the value of the vehicle declared in 2020 and the one declared in 2021.

65. In response to the first and second rounds of questions, the subject confirmed the purchase and sale prices of 100,000 MDL and 200,000 MDL. She stated that the vehicle had a cracked windshield, both left doors were scratched, the tires were worn, and the interior mats were replaced. The vehicle was extremely unkept, the seats were stained, and chemical cleaning was being carried out. She spent about 20,000 MDL over the year to fix these defects.
66. According to the subject, these investments have improved the condition of the vehicle, giving it a more favorable commercial appearance. She estimated that its market value could correspond to the price of 200,000 MDL.
67. At the first opportunity, she sold this vehicle for 200,000 MDL because she didn't like it at all, considering its fuel consumption and low comfort level.
68. The Commission believes it unlikely that the purchase of a Nissan Juke, m/y 2015, was the one declared by the subject and identified in the contract. However, even if the Commission had considered a market price paid for a Nissan Juke vehicle m/y 2015, the subject would have had sufficient financial capacity for such an acquisition in 2020.
69. Given the above circumstances related to purchasing the mentioned vehicles, the Commission did not identify an infringement that could be serious enough to lead to failure under Law No. 252/2023.

**B. Tax irregularities**

70. During the evaluation period, the subject sold two vehicles (Toyota Auris, m/y 2011 and Nissan Juke, m/y 2015) at a higher price than was paid for their purchase §§ 54-55, 61-62.
71. In the case of Toyota Auris, m/y 2011, the subject obtained a capital increase of 60,000 MDL, and in the case of Nissan Juke, m/y 2015, a capital increase of 100,000 MDL.
72. In response to the second round of questions, when asked about the payment of the capital gains tax, the subject stated that after the sale of Toyota Auris, m/y 2011, she went to submit the corresponding fiscal declaration. Nevertheless, she was told that a declaration in this regard can be submitted only after the vehicle will be sold through a sale-purchase contract. The subject "sold" it through a power of attorney. At the same time, she was told that when a person sells an asset and, with the money obtained, buys another one from the same category (vehicle), the obtained income is not considered capital increase. Respectively, she was not issued the fiscal declaration.

73. In the case of Nissan Juke, m/y 2015, the subject contended that according to SFS explanations, she did not have a capital increase by substituting an asset with another one, which is more expensive. However, in this case, she insisted on submitting the fiscal declaration and was issued a receipt confirming it.
74. The Commission examined the subject's fiscal declaration (CET 18) for 2022 and concluded that she did not declare any income resulting from the increase in capital. The corresponding fields from the declaration were not filled with any information.
75. According to Article 39 para. (1) lit. b) of the Fiscal Code, private property (vehicle) not used in entrepreneurial activity, is considered a capital asset. Pursuant to Article 40 para. (1), the amount of the capital increase or decrease resulting from the sale, exchange of capital assets is equal to the difference between the amount received (the income received) and the value basis of these assets.
76. As stated in a letter from SFS, the value base of the vehicle shall be determined based on the documents confirming its purchase. In the absence of confirming documents, the value base shall be zero. The capital increase will be determined as the difference between the amount received (income earned) and the value base of these assets.
77. The amount of capital increase in the fiscal period is equal to 50% of the excess amount of recognized capital increase over the amount of any capital losses incurred during the fiscal period. Therefore, considering the capital increase obtained by the subject (§ 71), the Commission identified a potential non-payment of capital increase tax of 9,600 MDL. This is below the threshold identified by Article 11 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023. Thus, this breach does not lead to the subject's non-promotion, according to Law No. 252/2023.

## **VI. Conclusion**

78. 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**

79. 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.

80. 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.
81. 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.
82. 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.
83. Done in English and Romanian.

Andrei Bivol

Vice-chairperson of the Commission

Chair of Panel A