



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

IGOR BOTEZATU

Interim Vice President of Comrat first level Court

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

6 November 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 wealth (2017, 2018 and 2024)	8
B. Compliance with the wealth and personal interests declaration regime...	12
C. Potential ethical breaches related to the subject's actions	13
VI. Conclusion	16
VII. Further action and publication.....	16

Evaluation Panel D 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 3 November 2025 and approved the following report on 6 November 2025. The members participating in the approval of the report were:

1. Scott BALES
2. Lilian ENCIU
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 Mr. Igor Botezatu (hereinafter the “subject”), Interim Vice President of the Comrat Court.
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 held the position of Interim Vice President of the Comrat Court since 2021. He previously served as Vice President of the Comrat Court from 2017 to 2021.
5. In 2011, the subject was appointed as a judge at the Vulcănești Court.
6. The subject received a bachelor’s degree in law in 2003 from the Moldova State University. In 2004, the subject received a master’s degree in law from the same university. In 2010, the subject obtained the title of Doctor of Law.

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 15 April 2025, the Commission received from the Superior Council of Magistracy, under Article 12 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023, the list of judges who have exercised the office of President and/or Vice-President of the Judges, including those who have interim these positions for a term of more than one year. The list included the subject as Vice President of the Comrat Court.
19. On 2 May 2025, the Commission notified the subject and requested that he 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 17 May 2025.
20. On 30 May 2025, the Commission notified the subject that his evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel B with members Scott Bales, Lilian Enciu and Iurie Gațcan. He was also informed that subjects may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from their evaluation.
21. On 20 August 2025, the Commission notified the subject that the evaluation panel composed of members Scott Bales, Lilian Enciu and Iurie Gațcan has been renamed Panel D.
22. 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 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.
23. 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.
24. The Commission sought and obtained information from numerous sources. No source advised the Commission of later developments or any corrections regarding the information provided.
25. The sources asked to provide information on the subject included the General Prosecutor's Office, the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office, the Prosecutor's

Office for Combating Organized Crime and Special Cases, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the National Anticorruption Center, 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 (Energbank JSC, Eximbank JSC, Moldincombank JSC, MAIB JSC, Victoriabank JSC, OTP Bank JSC, Banca de Economii JSC, Unibank 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. Two petitions were received from individuals. These were included in the evaluation file. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.

26. On 30 June 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 10 July 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “first round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
27. On 4 August 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 14 August 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “second round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
28. On 11 September 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 21 September 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “third round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
29. On 15 October 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 21 October 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “fourth round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
30. On 23 October 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 his compliance with the financial or ethical integrity criteria. The subject was sent a written notice of a public 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.

31. As provided in Article 39 para. (4) of the Rules, the subject could have requested access to all the materials in his evaluation file at least seven days before the hearing. However, the subject decided not to exercise this right.
32. On 25 October 2025, the subject confirmed the accuracy and correctness of the information provided in the declarations, the ethics questionnaire and subsequent answers. He also provided a copy of his recently obtained Romanian citizenship certificate, and he declined to participate in a hearing regarding his evaluation.

V. Analysis

33. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Commission's conclusion.
34. 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 inexplicable wealth (2017, 2018 and 2024);
 - b. compliance with the wealth and personal interests declaration regime;
 - c. potential ethical breaches related to the subject's actions.

A. Potential inexplicable wealth (2017, 2018 and 2024)

35. In its analysis of the subject's household income and expenses, the Commission examined potential inexplicable wealth for 2017, 2018 and 2024.
36. For this purpose, the Commission analyzed the sources of funds for the subject's daughter apartment purchase in 2017, a 2018 loan from the subject's cousin to the subject's daughter, and a 2024 loan and donation from the subject's sister-in-law.

Sources of funds for the subject's daughter apartment purchase in 2017

37. The Commission found that the subject's eldest daughter purchased an apartment of 45,5 sq. m. in 2017 for 24,300 EUR (512,927 MDL). According to the confirmative documents presented by the subject, the first installment of 424,882 MDL was paid by his daughter on 10 January 2017, and the second installment of 88,045 MDL was paid on 25 May 2017.
38. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that the source of funds for this purchase was his eldest daughter's income for the period 2013 – 2017. He explained that while she was living with her parents in this period, his daughter did not use her personal income to contribute to the family's expenses.

39. Based on the information provided by the SFS, the subject's eldest daughter earned a net income of 376,361 MDL between 2013 and 2016. The installments were paid until May 2017, therefore the net income earned by the subject's daughter up to May 2017 in the amount of 33,500 MDL has also been taken into account.
40. In the third round of questions, the subject was asked to explain the difference between the income earned by his daughter and the installments she paid for the apartment purchased in 2017.
41. The subject provided the following sources for the two installments paid by his daughter, specifying each amount precisely as shown below.

First installment (424,882 MDL)		Second installment (88,045 MDL)	
Net salary income (2013-2016)	375,000 MDL	Net salary income (January – April 2017)	33,500 MDL
Study scholarship	17,000 MDL	Temporary support provided by her brother-in-law	54,545 MDL
Monetary gifts	30,000 MDL		
Personal savings	2,882 MDL		
Total	424,882 MDL	Total	88,045 MDL

42. The Commission determined that documents support the source of most of these funds. However, the subject did not provide any supporting evidence for the 30,000 MDL allegedly originating from monetary gifts or the 54,545 MDL allegedly received from her brother-in-law as temporary financial support.
43. Following an analysis of the subject's incoming and outgoing financial flows during the relevant period, the Commission found that in 2016 and 2017 the subject had a positive balance. Therefore, even if the Commission were to attribute the unverified amounts to the subject, they would be covered by the positive balance from those years.
44. Based on the above, the Commission's doubts concerning the funds used by the subject's daughter to purchase the apartment were dispelled.

2018 loan from the subject's cousin to the subject's daughter

45. The Commission identified that the subject's middle daughter purchased an apartment of 76,7 sq. m. under an investment contract concluded on 12 March 2018.
46. The first installment of 12,000 EUR was paid on 12 March 2018. The subject stated that 2,000 EUR came from his daughter's personal savings and 10,000 EUR from a loan provided by his cousin, V.B. The subject did not provide a loan agreement or any evidence confirming the actual transfer of the borrowed amount.
47. In the second round of questions, the subject explained that his cousin works in the information technology field. The subject stated the loan was offered from the savings of his cousin and his wife. They were living and working in the Russian Federation when the loan was made to his daughter.
48. The subject mentioned that the money was received by his daughter in cash. He also provided confirmative evidence that his cousin was in the Republic of Moldova at that time.
49. During the evaluation, the subject provided documents confirming that the income of V.B. and his wife for the period 2015 – 2018 amounted to the following sums:

V.B. 's income		Wife's income	
2015	670,000 RUB (est. 9,937 EUR)	2015	1,593,621 RUB (est. 23,637 EUR)
2016	718,000 RUB (est. 9,703 EUR)	2016	1,601,698 RUB (est. 21,065 EUR)
2017	755,000 RUB (est. 11,489 EUR)	2017	1,043,402 RUB (est. 15,550 EUR)
Total: 6,381,721 RUB (est. 91,381 EUR)			

50. Moreover, in the third round of questions, the subject provided a declaration signed by V.B. on 25 September 2025, confirming that on 1 December 2017 he granted a loan to the subject's middle daughter, for a period of five years, without interest. The declaration also stated that the loan was repaid in two installments: 5,000 EUR on 30 June 2021 and 5,000 EUR on 17 April 2022.
51. Although the subject's daughter was not employed during this period, her husband declared an income sufficient to repay the loan of EUR 10,000.

52. Following the analysis of the income and expenses of the subject's daughter family, the Commission concluded that even if the 10,000 EUR loan is not accepted, the negative balance of the subject's daughter's household would amount to - 66,928 MDL for 2018.
53. Therefore, even if the Commission were to attribute this amount to the subject, the negative balance would be below the threshold set out in Article 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law no. 252/2023.

2024 loan and donation from the subject's sister-in-law

54. In the 2024 declaration submitted to NIA, the subject reported receiving a donation of 3,000 EUR from his sister-in-law, C.B. The donation was allegedly made to the subject's youngest daughter upon her high school graduation.
55. In the same year, the subject also declared a loan of 5,000 EUR contracted by his wife from the same sister-in-law, for a five-year term and at a zero interest rate.
56. In the first round of questions, the subject presented a handwritten receipt signed on 10 August 2024 by his wife and sister-in-law confirming the loan of 5,000 EUR.
57. During the evaluation, the subject mentioned that his sister-in-law is a New Zealand citizen, living and working there since 2010. He provided confirmatory documents.
58. Moreover, the subject presented a document dated 12 September 2017, confirming that during the period 2012-2017, his sister-in-law was employed under an individual employment contract with an annual salary of 95,000 USD per year. Starting with 1 October 2017, the salary increased to 115,000 USD per year.
59. Apart from this document issued in 2017, the subject did not provide any documents confirming the availability of funds when the donation and the loan were made.
60. According to the information received from the Border Police, C.B. travelled to Bucharest on 26 July 2024 and returned to Chisinau on the same day. She travelled again to Bucharest on 10 August 2024, the same day she signed the receipt.
61. In the light of the circumstances mentioned above, the Commission considers it plausible that the subject's sister-in-law made the donation and offered the loan in 2024.

62. However, even if the Commission did not include these two financial contributions for 2024, the subject would have a positive balance of +336,600 MDL at the end of this year. Therefore, the Commission considers that its doubts have been removed.

B. Compliance with the wealth and personal interests declaration regime

First instance

63. According to the tax statements (CET form) submitted to SFS for 2019, the subject reported an income of 4,522.7 MDL from a legal entity. However, this income was not reflected in the 2019 declaration submitted to NIA. Starting from 2020, the subject has declared annual income from the same company.
64. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that this income originated from the lease of agricultural land plots. In the 2019 NIA declaration, under the section „Land”, he indicated three agricultural plots acquired through inheritance in June 2019 but omitted to declare the income obtained from leasing these plots.

Second instance

65. Starting with 2022, the subject declared to NIA the right of habitation for a 38 sq. m. apartment in Vulcănești. According to the declarations, the right of habitation was acquired in 2013. However, in the period 2013 – 2021, the subject did not declare this right.
66. In the first round of questions, the subject explained that the owner of this apartment is the City Council of Vulcănești. He provided confirmatory documents that it was allocated to him as a service accommodation in 2013.
67. The subject claims that the failure to declare the right of habitation in this apartment was an oversight, which was subsequently corrected.

The Commission's assessment

68. The first non-declaration occurred more than five years ago, which is outside the period for the ethical criterion.
69. Regarding the second instance of non-declaration, the Commission notes that under the provisions of Article 4 para. 1 lit. b) of Law No. 133/2016, the subject had the duty to declare the right to possess and to use of real estate, regardless of the title (usufruct, habitation, superficies, possession based on mandate, commission or trust agreements, as well as based on other translatative agreements of possession and use).

70. The Commission acknowledges that although the subject's omission to declare the use of the apartment could formally constitute an infringement of the legal regime for declaring personal assets and interests, there is no evidence that he sought to conceal this fact or that there are other reasons to doubt his integrity related to this matter.
71. The aim of Law No. 133/2016 is to establish measures to prevent and combat unjustified enrichment, conflicts of interest, incompatibilities, and violations of the legal regime of restrictions and limitations. The Commission does not see how the non-disclosure in question would infringe the purpose of the law or otherwise endanger the public interest.
72. It would be a formalistic or even a superficial exercise to simply equate a potential non-declaration of assets (*lato sensu* – which includes the use of assets) with a lack of integrity.

C. Potential ethical breaches related to the subject's actions

73. The Commission found that, according to the Integrated Case Management System (PIGD), the subject was excluded from random case assignment between 16 November 2020 and 31 March 2021.
74. According to the Comrat Court, the subject as Vice President issued two orders—on 13 November 2020 and 1 February 2021—personally excluding himself from case distribution for a total of four and a half months.
75. According to the orders, the monitoring of judges' workloads revealed that the subject had the highest number of cases under examination. It was also mentioned that he had been performing the duties of Court President since January 2017 and, in accordance with the Decision of the Superior Council of Magistracy No. 394/38 of 27 December 2016, the President of the Comrat Court is to be assigned cases at a 50% workload rate.
76. Furthermore, in the Order of 13 November 2020, he referred to a criminal case under his examination which required exceptional intellectual, psychological, and moral effort. Accordingly, in order to optimize and redistribute the caseload and incoming materials, the subject blocked himself from random case assignment during the specified periods.
77. During the evaluation, the subject was asked to explain the blocking from random case assignment. In the explanations provided, the subject presented the following arguments:

- In October 2020, the Comrat Court had five judges in office, which represented only 50% of the total number of judicial positions approved for that court;
 - From 27 January 2017 (the date of the Decree appointing the subject as Vice President of the Comrat Court) until 28 December 2021, the position of President of the Comrat Court remained vacant, with all its duties being carried out by the Vice President of the court;
 - During the period 1 January 2017 – 27 December 2024, the subject worked at the Vulcănești branch of the Comrat Court, being the only judge there, except for the period October 2020 – January 2021, when one more judge also worked there;
 - During the same period, eight judges of the Comrat Court were released from office, transferred, suspended, or seconded, with their cases being reassigned to the sitting judges, without following the 50% allocation share for the President of the court.
78. The Commission requested the Superior Council of Magistracy (hereinafter „SCM”) to confirm the factual circumstances described by the subject regarding this situation. The Commission also requested information on how other judges acted in similar situations.
79. The SCM confirmed that during the period 3 February 2017 – 28 December 2021, the subject, while serving as Vice President of the Comrat Court, also exercised the functions of the President. The SCM further noted that during the period 1 April 2017 – 1 October 2024, the subject was the only judge at the Vulcănești branch of the Comrat Court.
80. Moreover, the SCM confirmed that during the period 1 January 2017 – 27 December 2024, at the Comrat Court, 4 judges were released from office, 3 judges were suspended, 3 judges were transferred, 2 judges were promoted to higher-level courts, and one judge’s mandate expired before being reappointed, upon reaching the age limit.
81. With regard to how other judges acted in similar situations, the SCM stated that it does not have such information.
82. According to Article 5 of the Regulation on the Procedure for Random Case Assignment in Courts, approved by SCM Decision No. 110/5 of 5 February 2013:
- „The Integrated Case Management System (PIGD) takes into account whether specialized panels exist for the relevant category of cases and calculates judges’ workload based on predefined complexity levels for each case category. Other

factors considered in random distribution include the case type (civil, criminal, contraventional), the examination procedure (order procedure, administrative litigation, appeal, cassation), and the judge's full or partial workload (with the reduced workload percentages set by SCM decisions for court presidents, vice presidents, and members of disciplinary, selection, and evaluation boards)."

83. Article 8 of the same Regulation provides the circumstances under which judges may be blocked from random assignment of cases, as follows:

„If a judge is temporarily transferred to another court or suspended from office, the president shall issue a reasoned order to block the judge from case assignment for the duration of the transfer or suspension.

If the judge takes annual leave for a period exceeding half of the total annual leave entitlement for the current year, the court president shall issue a reasoned order to block (mark) the judge five calendar days before the start of the leave. The judge will be unblocked from the day of returning to work, except in the case of the Supreme Court of Justice.

If a legal or constitutional basis arises for the dismissal of the judge, the president shall issue a reasoned order to block (mark) the judge from case assignment in the system two months prior to the occurrence of this event.

The court president may also temporarily block (mark) a judge in other justified cases, by issuing a reasoned order."

84. The Commission notes that, under the Regulation cited above, the court president has the right to block a judge from random case assignment in any justified case, by issuing a reasoned order. Considering that, at that time, the Comrat Court did not have a designated president, these responsibilities were exercised by the subject in his capacity as vice president.
85. Law No. 514/1995 on the Judicial Organization and the Regulation on the Procedure for Random Case Assignment in Courts do not provide any special rules on excluding the president or vice-president of the court from the random distribution of cases. Accordingly, the general rules cited above were applicable.
86. Moreover, since the president and vice-president of a court continue to perform judicial duties, albeit to a lesser extent, there is a clear distinction between their administrative and judicial roles. Consequently, the Commission finds no grounds to conclude that the subject lacked the right to temporarily exclude himself from the random distribution of cases.
87. Based on the arguments provided by the subject and the SCM, the Commission considers the blocking orders preventing him from random case assignment

during the periods 16 November 2020 – 31 January 2021 and 1 February 2021 – 31 March 2021 to be justified.

88. In light of the above, the Commission did not find serious ethical breaches that would lead to the subject's non-promotion under Law No. 252/2023.

VI. Conclusion

89. 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

90. 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.
91. 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.
92. 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.
93. This evaluation report was approved by a unanimous vote of the Panel members on 6 November 2025 and signed pursuant to Articles 33 para. (2) and 40 para. (5) of the Rules.
94. Done in English and Romanian.

Scott Bales

Chairperson of the Commission

Chair of Panel D