



**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

---

## **RE-EVALUATION REPORT**

approved according to Article 41  
of the Rules of Organization and Functioning

**OLGA COJOCARU**

judge of the Central Court of Appeal

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

---

**21 October 2025**

## Contents

<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Grounds for the resumed evaluation .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III. Resumed evaluation procedure .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V. Analysis in the resumed evaluation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. Potential ethical breaches in relation to the subject's decisions.....	6
B. Inexplicable wealth .....	11
<b>VII. Further action and publication.....</b>	<b>32</b>

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 16 September 2025 and approved the following report on 21 October 2025. The members participating in the approval of the report were:

1. Scott BALES
2. Andrei BIVOL
3. Willem BROUWER
4. Lilian ENCIU
5. Iurie GĂTCAN
6. Lavly PERLING
7. Iulian RUSU
8. Gerrit-Marc SPRENGER
9. Marcel van de WETERING

The Commission prepared this re-evaluation report, which is confined to the matters referred to by the Superior Council of Magistracy and shall be examined only in conjunction with the initial evaluation report.

## **I. Introduction**

1. On 15 April 2025, the Commission approved the report concerning Mrs. Olga Cojocaru (hereinafter the "subject") under Law No. 252/2023. It proposed that the subject promotes the external evaluation made according to the criteria set in Article 11 of Law No. 252/2023 (hereinafter the "initial evaluation report").
2. On 22 May 2025, the Superior Council of Magistracy (hereinafter the "SCM"), by decision No. 238/21, rejected the report and decided to resume the evaluation procedure (hereinafter the "SCM's decision").
3. The Commission conducted its resumed evaluation pursuant to Law No. 252/2023 and the Commission's Rules of Organization and Functioning (hereinafter the "Rules").
4. Following the re-evaluation, the Commission concluded that the subject does not meet the criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023 for financial

integrity as serious doubts determined by facts have been found as to the subject's compliance with this criterion.

## II. Grounds for the resumed evaluation

5. Under Article 18 para. (3) lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023:

"By a reasoned decision adopted no later than 30 days after receipt of the documents referred to in Article 17 para. (6), the Superior Council of Magistracy shall: [...] reject the evaluation report and decide, once only, that the evaluation procedure of the judge be reopened if it finds factual circumstances or procedural errors which could have led to the passing or, as the case may be, the failure to pass the evaluation. "

6. Under Article 20 of Law No. 252/2023:

"(2) When resuming the evaluation procedure, the Evaluation Commission shall examine the aspects indicated by the respective Council or, as the case may be, by the Supreme Court of Justice, as well as any additional information which, for objective reasons, could not be submitted previously. If the subject of the evaluation agrees, the Commission shall organize repeated hearings. The subject's agreement or, as the case may be, refusal, shall be communicated to the Evaluation Commission within 3 working days from the date of the Commission's request.

(3) The report on the re-evaluation of the subject shall be adopted by the Evaluation Commission in accordance with the rules set forth in Article 17."

7. The initial evaluation report identified four matters which, upon preliminary review, raised doubts as to compliance with the ethical and financial integrity criteria established by law.
8. The SCM concurred with the Commission's determination regarding the subject's involvement in cases examined by the European Court of Human Rights (hereinafter "ECtHR"). It did not overturn the Commission's conclusion on the compliance with the legal regime on the declaration of assets and personal interests but underlined that the established instances of non-declaration negatively affect the credibility of the subject's statements and that the subject cannot benefit from a "presumption of honesty". The SCM disagreed with the Commission's determination on the potential discrepancy between assets, expenses, and income (hereinafter "inexplicable wealth") and the potential ethical breaches related to the subject's judicial decisions.
9. The SCM did not identify the specific factual circumstances or procedural errors that could have led to the non-promotion of the evaluation. In its

reasoning, the SCM identified that the non-attribution of the vehicles used by the subject's son was not sufficiently persuasive and required a further analysis (§ 3.5.9 of the SCM's decision). The SCM also noted that the subject's judicial decisions (*Caravita* case) require clear determination given the Supreme Court's of Justice (hereinafter "SCJ") irrevocable decision (§ 3.7.4 of the SCM's decision) and likewise did the information from a journalistic investigation report, including a pending criminal case (§ 3.10 of the SCM's decision).

### **III. Resumed evaluation procedure**

10. On 28 May 2025, the Commission received the SCM's decision. The SCM did not send any additional information or documents.
11. On 24 June 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 6 July 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "first round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
12. On 22 July 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 28 July 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "second round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
13. During the resumed evaluation, three petitions were received from members of the civil society. These did not refer to the aspects mentioned in the SCM's decision but reflected dissatisfaction with the subject's decisions. The petitioners did not argue what objective circumstances prevented them from submitting the petitions in the initial evaluation, as required by Article 20 para. (2) of Law 252. The petitions were therefore not analyzed but only included in the evaluation file.
14. On 5 September 2025, the Commission notified the subject that, based on the information collected and reviewed during the resumed evaluation, it intended to discuss the matters referred to in the SCM's decision about the subject's compliance with the ethical and financial criteria and invited her to attend a public hearing on 16 September 2025.
15. On 12 and 15 September 2025, the subject submitted written explanations. The Commission analyzed and included them in the re-evaluation file.
16. As provided in Article 26 para. (4) of the Rules, the subject could have requested access to all the materials in her re-evaluation file. However, the subject decided not to exercise this right.

17. On 16 September 2025, the Commission held a public hearing with both in-person and remote participation via electronic means. At the hearing, the subject stated that she did not have any corrections or additions to the answers previously provided to the Commission's requests for information.

#### **V. Analysis in the resumed evaluation**

18. The Commission analyzed and, where necessary, requested further clarifications on the matters from the initial evaluation report, and with respect to which a disagreement is noted in the SCM's decision:
  - a. potential ethical breaches in relation to the subject's judicial decisions;
  - b. inexplicable wealth.

##### **A. Potential ethical breaches in relation to the subject's judicial decisions**

*Commission's findings (initial evaluation report, §§ 111-113, 117-118)*

19. The *Caravita* case concerned a dispute over the results of a judicial auction of 226 hectares of agricultural land held by a company undergoing insolvency. The auction results were contested by the company's founder, V.R., whose action was initially dismissed by the Anenii Noi District Court.
20. As the first court judgment was under appeal, a panel of the Court of Appeal, which included the subject, reclassified the appeal as one on points of law, reasoning that the case should have been resolved by a ruling rather than by a judgment. The reclassification led to the reassignment of the case to another panel of judges, including the subject. This panel ultimately annulled both the first-instance judgment and the auction results.
21. On 3 November 2021, the SCJ found that the reclassification was legally unjustified and amounted to an abuse of procedure, which denied the parties fair access to justice. It annulled the Court of Appeal's decisions and returned the case for re-examination. The re-examined appeal was dismissed, and the auction was upheld as lawful.
22. In its initial report, the Commission noted that although the decisions rendered by the subject raised concerns about procedural irregularities and disregard of legal provisions, these were more indicative of professional error or competence issues rather than of a serious ethical breach as required under Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. The Commission also referenced the Constitutional Court's interpretation of this provision, highlighting the high threshold for qualifying a conduct as a serious ethical violation.

*SCM findings regarding Caravita case (SCM's decision, § 3.7.4.)*

23. The SCM referred to Article 123 para. (2) of the Code of Civil Procedure (“binding nature of facts established by a final court decision”) and highlighted the Supreme Court of Justice's findings in its Decision of 3 November 2021 which overturned the decision issued with the participation of the subject:

“[...] although the Chisinau Court of Appeal admitted V.R.'s appeal for consideration on 24 February 2021, it requalified it as an appeal on points of law, without legal basis on 25 May 2021.

[...] the Supreme Court of Justice found this procedural requalification as abusive since there was no legal basis for changing the way of appealing (*calea de atac*) and since none of the parties had requested this change.

[...] the Supreme Court of Justice held that the Chisinau Court of Appeal did not justify, by indicating the relevant legal provision, its assertion that the court of first instance should have settled the case by a ruling and not by a judgement.

“[...] in view of these major procedural shortcomings, the Supreme Court of Justice concluded that the 1 July 2021 decision of the Chisinau Court of Appeal is flawed and was adopted as a result of the abusive requalification of the way of appealing carried out by the 25 May 2021 ruling.”

24. With reference to Article 11 para. (6) of Law 252/2023, the SCM noted that it is unclear from the initial report whether the Commission examined the Supreme Court of Justice's findings concerning the subject's decision as being “arbitrary” or “manifestly ill-founded”. According to the SCM, upon resuming its assessment, the Commission shall either refute or confirm all doubts, considering the existence of the SCJ final decision of 3 November 2021.

*Subject's explanations in the resumed evaluation*

25. In the second round of questions, the subject stated that at the time, the legal provisions did not expressly regulate the procedure for contesting the auction report in insolvency proceedings, and the subject, together with the panel members, concluded, by analogy, that the applicable rules were those governing enforcement or insolvency cases. The decision to reclassify was discussed with the court's management, which supported the panel's view.

26. The subject acknowledged that the parties were not consulted before the procedure was changed but considered that this did not affect their

fundamental rights. She also stated that the procedural error was not admitted in bad faith, but rather due to the lack of clear legislative provisions and the incorrect registration of the case as an appeal by the court's secretariat. The subject expressed agreement with the Commission's prior conclusion that the issue reflected a professional error rather than a serious ethical breach, as defined by Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

*Commission's assessment in the resumed evaluation*

27. The Commission acknowledges that the SCJ described the procedural reclassification performed by the panel, including the subject, as lacking legal basis and amounting to an abuse of procedure. However, the Commission notes that this finding was made in the context of assessing the legality of the decision, not the ethical integrity of the judges involved.
28. According to Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023, a subject fails to meet the criterion of ethical integrity where the Commission finds arbitrary acts contrary to imperative legal norms, and where the ECtHR had previously found that a similar decision was incompatible with the Convention. In its Judgment No. 2 of 16 January 2025, the Constitutional Court confirmed the cumulative nature of these elements. The criterion of arbitrariness under the cited provision is not met because the law expressly requires that the ECtHR must have previously ruled that a similar decision violated the Convention before the issuance of the act. In this case, the Commission did not identify any judgments in which the ECtHR found that similar conduct violated the Convention.
29. Moreover, as noted in its previous practice, *Andrei Mironov* (Report of 12 June 2025), failing to meet the "arbitrary behavior and arbitrary acts" criterion under Article 11 para. (2) lit. (a) of Law No. 252/2023 does not entail an automatic reclassification of the conduct into the separate category of "serious ethical breach" under the same article. These are distinct legal grounds, each subject to independent evidentiary and normative thresholds.
30. A serious ethical breach implies conduct that, while not amounting to arbitrariness, still reflects a serious violation of ethical standards, such as impartiality, integrity, or independence, with significant impact on public confidence in the judiciary. In its Judgment No. 2 of 16 January 2025, the Constitutional Court has clarified that the term "seriously violated" sets a high threshold for establishing breaches of ethical and professional rules applicable to judges. Additionally, the Court has noted that the Commission may rule only on violations of ethical and professional conduct rules,

without making any determination regarding the legality of the respective judgments (§§ 154, 185).

31. Consequently, as in its initial report, the Commission considers that the subject's decisions are more indicative of professional error or competence issues than of a serious violation of ethical standards as required under Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. Therefore, it falls within the competence of the specialized bodies tasked with assessing judicial professionalism to determine the nature and gravity of the actions in question and, where appropriate, to apply proportionate sanctions.

*SCM findings regarding the information from a journalistic investigation report (SCM's decision, § 3.10)*

32. Although § 110 of the initial evaluation report indicates that the Commission examined an independent journalistic investigation report, the SCM stated that relevant information regarding ethical and financial integrity, including a pending criminal case since 2013, were not properly assessed<sup>1</sup>.
33. In its decision, the SCM did not explicitly identify the case in question. However, *Gacikevici* is the only criminal case referenced in the journalistic investigation. This case is currently pending before the subject at the Chișinău District Court. It was initially assigned to the subject in 2013 and has remained under the subject's jurisdiction following the promotion to the Central Court of Appeal in 2018. Given the unusually long period the case has remained pending under the subject's jurisdiction, the Commission analyzed the subject's involvement from the perspective of ethical integrity.
34. Regarding the other cases mentioned in the journalistic report:
  - In the *Halk Support LP v. State Road Administration* case, the journalistic report suggested that subject delivered a dissenting opinion in favor of admitting an appeal against a ruling that had returned a lawsuit on the grounds of missing valid powers of attorney. This reasoning diverged from that applied in other similar cases and was interpreted as potentially indicative of a non-uniform approach to the acceptance of legal representation;

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ipre.md/2024/10/30/raport-de-investigatie-jurnalistica-independenta-judecator-olga-cojocaru/>

- – In the *Basconlux v. Benfatto-Plast SRL* case, the panel in which the subject participated ruled on aspects that the claimant had already withdrawn; this judgment was subsequently quashed;
- The journalistic report described a case concerning the restitution of agricultural land associated with Vlad Filat, which in fact is the *Caravita* case already examined by the Commission during both the initial evaluation and the re-evaluation.

35. The Commission concluded that, aside from the *Gacikevici* case, the other cases referred to in the journalistic report did not raise serious doubts concerning the subject's integrity and appeared to relate rather to matters of judicial practice.

*Subject's explanations regarding the Gacikevici case*

36. In the first round of questions, the subject stated:

"The reasons for which this criminal case is still pending before the court cannot be attributed to me. On the contrary, the prolonged examination of the case is due exclusively to the conduct of the parties involved in the proceedings."

37. The subject also submitted an informative note. According to the explanations provided:

- a. The case is of extraordinary complexity, comprising 71 alleged criminal episodes, 54 volumes of judicial material (13,500 pages), and 130 credit dossiers as evidentiary files;
- b. Over the course of the proceedings, 15 witnesses were heard, and numerous procedural delays were caused by the absence or procedural conduct of the injured party's representatives, prosecutors, defense lawyers, defendants, and other parties;
- c. The case has also involved multiple procedural interruptions due to health issues, repeated requests for adjournment, reassessments of prosecutors and representatives of the parties, the COVID-19 pandemic, among other factors;
- d. The subject affirmed that the court exercised due diligence throughout the proceedings, scheduling hearings within the available dates and advancing the case as permitted by the availability of the parties and procedural constraints.

*Commission's assessment in the resumed evaluation*

38. While the Commission acknowledges the detailed information provided in the informative note and the procedural history of the case, certain doubts remain regarding judicial case management and the overall efficiency of the proceedings.
39. Following the review of the above information, the Commission found that these circumstances do not meet the criteria established under Article 11 para. (2) lit. (a) of Law No. 252/2023. Specifically, there is no indication that the subject engaged in arbitrary conduct or seriously violated ethical standards.

**B. Inexplicable wealth**

- 1. Commission's findings (Report of 15 April 2025, §§ 75–86)**
  40. The initial evaluation report did not include in the calculation of the subject's inexplicable wealth the purchase and sale prices of three vehicles owned and used by the subject's son (Skoda Superb, m/y 2018; BMW X5, m/y 2014; Mercedes-Benz E-Class, m/y 2017). This was because the subject's son was an adult and no longer a legal dependent. In the absence of evidence that the subject paid for these vehicles or had any beneficial ownership, the financial choices and difficulties of the son were not attributed to her.
  41. The subject's role in these transactions was apparently limited to occasional support, such as a 2021 insurance premium payment. The records of border crossings and compulsory civil liability insurance policies listed only the son as the driver and insured person. The subject did not cross the border in these vehicles as a driver or passenger, nor was she included in the relevant insurance policies.
  42. All transactions concerning the three vehicles—leasing and sale and purchase agreements—were carried out by the son. He was the sole signatory of the contracts. Although the subject acted as a surety in the leasing contract, no payments from her bank accounts for the acquisition of the vehicles were identified.
- 2. SCM's findings (Decision of 22 May 2025, § 3.5.9)**
  43. The SCM's decision noted that the conclusion regarding the non-inclusion of the vehicles in the calculation of inexplicable wealth was not sufficiently supported by facts and did not meet the "standard for an integrated analysis" of the subject's income, expenses, and lifestyle.

44. Although the Commission identified elements of financial support from relatives and mentioned the possibility of unofficial income of the subject's son, the SCM considered that these factors were "speculative and insufficiently substantiated" to justify excluding the expenses related to the son's "luxury" vehicles from the calculation, especially considering that the subject and her son lived together and the son lacked certain and sustainable income.
45. The Commission raised doubts regarding the contractual purchase price of the BMW X5, m/y 2014, and the Mercedes-Benz E-Class, m/y 2017, but failed to provide evidence or clarify the circumstances that justified such doubts being dismissed. The Commission's reference in § 84 to post-COVID vehicle market fluctuations was deemed vague.
46. Given that the subject's son lived with the subject between 2020 and 2023 and was provided for in terms of daily needs (food, laundry), an aggregate analysis of the household's income and expenses is warranted. In the absence of asset separation or conclusive evidence that the subject neither financed the vehicles nor benefited from their use, it cannot be ruled out that she financed them directly or indirectly or derived benefit from them. Therefore, these elements should have been included in the calculation of inexplicable wealth.

### **3. Commission's assessment in the resumed evaluation**

47. This section addresses two separate issues. The first concerns several income sources accepted in the initial evaluation, which the SCM noted were partly speculative or insufficiently supported, such as family assistance or unofficial income. The second relates to the vehicle transactions involving the subject's son, including the SCM's concerns about the declared purchase price of the vehicles. A yearly assessment of the subject's inexplicable wealth is presented after these two issues are addressed.

#### **3.1 Income sources accepted in the initial evaluation**

##### *3.1.1 Alleged gifts received in 2015*

48. In the first and third rounds of questions in the initial evaluation, as well as during the hearing in the initial evaluation, the subject declared having received 30,000 MDL in 2015 as monetary contributions from her mother and her relatives at her 40<sup>th</sup> birthday and her son's 15<sup>th</sup> birthday.

49. None of these amounts was declared as income in the subject's annual asset and interest declarations submitted to the National Integrity Commission (NIC). The Commission notes the following.
  - a. Under Law No. 1264/2002, the subject had an explicit obligation to declare all income. The term "income," as defined by the law, included any increase, addition to, or growth in assets—regardless of source—expressed as pecuniary rights or any other patrimonial benefit obtained by the subject or members of his family. Thus, the origin of the funds—whether employment, inheritance, donation, or family assistance—was irrelevant for declaration purposes;
  - b. Law No. 1264/2002 did not provide for any exemptions from declaration requirements, such as gifts from close relatives;
  - c. The official declaration form included specific sections for "income from donations" and "other income." Therefore, regardless of the subject's legal interpretation or personal belief, any financial benefit received should have been declared accordingly.
50. Additionally, in the case of ceremonial gifts, it would distort the financial assessment to accept such sources of income at face value while disregarding the customary expenses typically associated with such ceremonial events (*e.g.* venue costs, catering, etc.), including potential reciprocal gifts provided by the subject on similar occasions. The intrinsically unverifiable nature of such transactions renders them unreliable as financial inflows and precludes their use in explaining the subject's negative balance.
51. Moreover, the Commission analyzed the financial capacity of the subject's mother for the period relevant to the alleged gift in 2015, and finds that she most likely did not have sufficient financial resources to provide substantial monetary gifts. As is detailed later in § 65 in relation to her income between 2012 and 2021, the subject's mother received a modest income primarily from pension payments. In the absence of clear and documented sources of income, the subject's statements regarding the origin of these funds remain uncorroborated.
52. The initial evaluation report found the subject's explanations "credible". On reconsideration, the Commission concludes, as did the SCM ( (§ 44 above) that these explanations were not sufficiently supported. Accordingly, the alleged monetary gifts have been excluded from the income calculations used in the resumed evaluation.

3.1.2 *Regarding several sources of income declared as received in 2021 and 2022*

53. In the 2021 and 2022 NIA annual declarations, the subject reported receiving “material assistance” of 35,000 MDL and 36,000 MDL respectively from her mother.
54. During the resumed evaluation, the Commission analyzed the financial situation of the subject’s mother and found that her total pension income amounted to 44,325 MDL in 2021 and 52,383 MDL in 2022. No other sources of income were identified. The estimated CEP level for a single person living in an urban area was approximately 64,000 MDL in 2021 and 69,732 MDL in 2022. Based on this data, her pension income appeared insufficient to cover her own subsistence needs, which could raise doubts as to her capacity to provide financial assistance.
55. In response to the first round of questions during the initial evaluation, the subject explained that her mother had lived with her since 2019 and incurred no personal expenses. Although the mother owns an apartment on Albișoara Street, the subject clarified that no one resides there permanently and that her mother only uses it occasionally.
56. Considering the subject’s declarations submitted to the NIA, the plausible cohabitation of the subject’s mother with the subject, and the fact that the household expenses identified by the Commission—based on bank card transactions and cash outflows—significantly exceeded the national average (as will be reflected in the annual financial tables). Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the subject’s mother could also have benefited from those shared household expenditures. Accordingly, the Commission considered the declared material assistance of 35,000 MDL for 2021 and 36,000 MDL for 2022 to be plausible and accepted it as a source of income in the calculation of the subject’s financial flows for the respective years.
57. In the annual declaration submitted to the NIA for 2021 and 2022, the subject reported receiving 12,000 MDL per year in child support payments from her former husband. A court decision established the obligation to pay this amount (1000 MDL per month). Although the former husband does not appear to have had any official income during the relevant period, the modest amount involved, the existence of a binding court decision and the absence of any enforcement proceedings—either reported by the subject or identified by the Commission—suggest that the payments were most likely made voluntarily. In view of these circumstances, the Commission accepted

the declared child support payments as a plausible source of income in the calculation of the subject's financial flows for 2021 and 2022.

58. According to §§ 50–51 of the initial evaluation report, the Commission accepted the following sources of income for 2021 as legitimate for inclusion in the financial assessment:
  - a. 16,669 MDL, representing the difference between the subject's son's declared income and the retail expenses identified on his bank account for the relevant year (63,251 MDL – 46,582 MDL = 16,669 MDL);
  - b. a donation of 50,000 MDL from the subject's former husband (S.C.) to their son; and
  - c. 4,000 EUR (approximately 83,680 MDL), allegedly donated by the subject's mother in 2021 as proceeds from the sale of a Renault Megane (m/y 2011), which she had previously promised to her grandson.
59. However, upon repeated verification during the resumed evaluation, the Commission found that the amount listed under point (a) reflected a double counting of income. Specifically, the sum of 63,251 MDL received by the subject's son from the bailiff's office was already included in the income inflows. The same amount was then indirectly recounted by treating the difference between that income and the identified retail expenses (16,669 MDL) as an additional, separate source of income. To correct this, the Commission retained the full amount of 63,251 MDL in the income category and excluded the 16,669 MDL from the financial inflows. At the same time, 46,582 MDL was maintained in the expenditure category, corresponding to the retail payments identified in the son's bank transactions.
60. The son's income and expenses were considered exclusively due to the inclusion, within the household's overall expenditures, of the costs of the vehicles acquired by the son, for the reasons detailed below at §§ 69–102.
61. Regarding the alleged donation of 50,000 MDL from S.C., the only supporting document provided was a handwritten statement dated 16 February 2025 and signed by this person, claiming to have donated the amount in question and indicating that the funds originated from the donor's mother (*i.e.* the subject's son's paternal grandmother). However, as a result of further verification during the resumed evaluation, the Commission established that, according to information obtained from the SFS, the donor's mother, L.C., had no registered official income in the years preceding the alleged donation. Additional information reviewed by the

Commission indicates that, between 2012 and 2023, she received only a monthly pension ranging between 900 and 2,300 MDL. On the balance of probabilities, and in the absence of any verifiable financial capacity on the part of the donor's mother, the Commission considers that the donation most likely did not occur. Consequently, this amount was no longer accepted as a legitimate income source for the purposes of this evaluation.

62. Regarding the alleged donation of 4,000 EUR, the Commission notes the following. In 2018, the subject's mother purchased a Renault Megane (m/y 2011) for a contractually declared price of 10,000 MDL. In 2021, the same vehicle was sold for the same declared contractual price of 10,000 MDL. However, according to the subject, the vehicle was in fact sold for 4,000 EUR, which was subsequently donated to the subject's son. The subject also stated that the car had originally been purchased for her son as a gift for his 18th birthday. Therefore, when the vehicle was sold, the proceeds were transferred to him by his maternal grandmother.
63. As a result of further verification during the resumed evaluation, the Commission notes that no documentary evidence was presented to confirm either the actual sale price of the vehicle or the alleged transfer of 4,000 EUR to the subject's son.
64. A review of RCAI insurance records indicates that, although the subject's son was registered as a secondary beneficiary of the insurance policy between 14 April 2019 and 24 March 2021, so was the subject's cohabitant during the same period, while the primary beneficiary remained the subject's mother. In the first year of ownership, the insurance policy was issued for an unlimited number of users. These circumstances cast doubt on the claim that the vehicle was purchased specifically for the subject's son on his 18th birthday.
65. The Commission analyzed the income and expenditure data of the subject's mother and her household to assess her financial capacity in both 2018 and 2021. The verified annual income consists mainly of pension payments, which gradually increased from approximately 27,000 MDL in 2012 to just over 44,000 MDL in 2021. No salary income was declared for the subject's mother after 2012. Her husband (now deceased) had reported employment income before 2011. While in 2014 the subject's mother reported income from the sale of a garage, a plot of land, and an apartment, these proceeds were immediately absorbed by the purchase of a new apartment in the same year, the price of which exceeded the combined value of the three transactions.

66. At the same time, her household's annual expenditures regularly exceeded declared income. In 2018, the reported income deficit was over 7,000 MDL, and in 2021 the deficit exceeded 19,000 MDL. These figures reflect only ordinary expenses and do not consider the alleged acquisition of the Renault Megane vehicle in 2018. If the indicative value of 4,000 EUR is considered for that transaction, the actual financial imbalance for that year would have been substantially greater. These findings demonstrate a pattern of precarious financial standing, which makes it unlikely that the subject's mother would have had the independent means to purchase a vehicle in 2018.
67. If the 4,000 EUR figure is to be treated as the actual market value, at least the same indicative value would have to be applied retroactively to the 2018 acquisition. In that case, considering the subject's mother's lack of sufficient income to justify such a purchase, combined with the fact that the vehicle was used by members of the subject's household (her cohabitant and her son), a potential beneficial ownership by the subject's household could be inferred. Under these circumstances, applying an indicative acquisition value of 4,000 EUR, could have created a misbalance of wealth for the subject's family in 2018 (*i.e.* year of the acquisition).
68. On the balance of probabilities, and in the absence of verifiable proof regarding the acquisition, sale price, and alleged donation, the Commission did not include the 4,000 EUR in the income calculations of the subject's financial flows.

### **3.2 Financial implications arising from vehicle transactions**

#### *3.2.1 Preliminary remarks*

69. In the context of this reevaluation, the Commission adopted a revised analytical approach regarding the vehicle transactions carried out by the subject's son. Rather than focusing solely on the question of whether the subject directly benefited from the use of these vehicles, the Commission will assess the broader financial implications of these transactions.
70. The Commission notes that although the subject's son was of legal age and not formally a dependent, the absence of credible or documented income capable of justifying the acquisition and use of high-value vehicles raises serious doubts. In the absence of financial independence, and in the context of shared living arrangements, it is reasonable to assess household expenditures in aggregate.

71. Furthermore, the subject's decision to act as a surety (*fidejussor*) in the leasing contract for one of these vehicles (Skoda Superb m/y 2018) – knowing that her son had no sustainable or documented income at the time – serves to reinforce these doubts. The assumption of personal financial risk in such a context may indicate at least an indirect involvement or tacit endorsement of a financial arrangement that exceeded her son's means
72. Consequently, the Commission will consider the financial implications of the following transactions in its overall assessment of inexplicable wealth.

*3.2.2 Regarding the Skoda Superb, m/y 2018*

73. Between 2020 and 2022, the subject's son had possession and use of this vehicle under a financial leasing contract concluded with a financial services company<sup>2</sup>. The contract, dated 29 July 2020, had a total value of EUR 18,141 (including interest). On the same date, the leasing company also concluded a suretyship contract with the subject, under which she expressly undertook the obligation to be jointly liable for her son's payment obligations under the leasing contract. The contract also stipulated that, in the event of non-performance by the debtor, the creditor could claim from the surety the outstanding amounts, including penalties and interest, as well as judicial expenses incurred in the recovery process.
74. On 7 March 2022, the son transferred his rights and obligations under the leasing agreement to a third party (A.S.). According to the assignment contract, the son had paid EUR 9,377 in principal and EUR 2,174 in interest. The remaining EUR 6,277 was assumed by A.S. As per the payment schedule, the son paid 19 out of 30 equal installments.
75. The Commission notes with concern the subject's decision to act as a guarantor in a transaction for a vehicle whose cost significantly exceeded the son's annual income. Given his precarious financial situation, recent formal employment, and lack of stable income, it was reasonably foreseeable that he would struggle to meet the payment obligations. These circumstances cast doubt on the true source of funds used for the transaction.
76. The fact that in the following years (2022 and 2023), the subject's son reportedly travelled abroad for short-term, unqualified work further

---

<sup>2</sup> Financial leasing is a transaction where a leasing company (the lessor) purchases an asset at the lessee's request and then grants the lessee the right to use it for a specific period in exchange for regular payments. At the end of the lease term, ownership of the asset is typically transferred to the lessee.

supports the conclusion that he did not have stable or official sources of income. Although these activities took place after the suretyship undertaken by the subject, they reinforce the assessment that the son lacked the financial independence required to justify entering into such a financial commitment in 2020.

### 3.2.3 *Regarding the BMW X5, m/y 2014*

77. On 21 January 2022, the subject's son purchased a BMW X5 for a contractual price of MDL 290,000. This purchase occurred prior to the official assignment of the Skoda leasing contract, which took place on 7 March 2022.
78. The subject claimed that the funds used for the BMW were obtained through the assignment of the Skoda leasing contract (stated value: MDL 300,000). She submitted a receipt signed by her son and A.S., dated 20 January 2022.
79. The declared contractual price of the vehicle was 290,000 MDL. However, during both the initial and resumed evaluation, the Commission identified several circumstances that raise reasonable doubts as to the accuracy of this declared purchase price.
80. According to the National Transport Agency (ANTA), a technical inspection conducted on 13 May 2021—prior to the acquisition—indicated that the vehicle had a total mileage of 110,000 km. A subsequent inspection dated 8 June 2022, before the vehicle was sold on 20 March 2023, showed a mileage of 132,025 km. Neither report identified any technical deficiencies.
81. According to the data provided by the Customs Service, the average customs value in 2022 for ten imported BMW X5 vehicles, m/y 2014, was 483,374 MDL.
82. In addition, the Commission reviewed public listings for BMW X5 vehicles on the 999.md platform. The lowest price listed for the same model (m/y 2014) was 18,341 EUR (~353,445 MDL), and the highest was 49,499 EUR (~953,884 MDL). Based on a sample of 67 listings, the average asking price for such a vehicle was 27,412 EUR (~528,250 MDL).
83. Further investigation revealed that the subject's son had an active user account on 999.md, linked to his personal phone number. On 19 September 2022, he posted a listing for a white BMW X5—the same color as reported in the ANTA and PSA documents—at a price of 33,000 EUR (~660,000 MDL), which is more than twice the value declared in the sale contract.

84. The Commission acknowledges that the listing price on a digital platform does not necessarily reflect the actual sale or purchase price. Nevertheless, the listing indicates an intention to receive approximately 33,000 EUR for the vehicle, suggesting that its market value substantially exceeded the declared contractual amount.
85. Considering this information, the Commission finds that the contractual price is most likely understated and that the vehicle was acquired for a significantly higher amount. The Commission applied the average market price for 10 similar BMW X5 vehicles in 2022—calculated from Customs Service data—as a proxy to estimate the vehicle's fair market value. Consequently, for the purpose of the financial analysis, the acquisition value of the BMW X5 was set at 483,374 MDL. To ensure a consistent and balanced approach, the Commission applied the same indicative value—483,374 MDL—as the vehicle's sale price in 2023, even though the contractual sale price appeared to be significantly below the market average.

*3.2.4 Regarding the Mercedes-Benz E-Class, m/y 2017*

86. On 30 May 2023, the subject's son purchased a Mercedes-Benz E-Class for a declared price of MDL 250,000.
87. The subject stated that the vehicle was purchased using the proceeds from the sale of the BMW X5.
88. Nevertheless, the present report does not include the financial flows for 2023, as no unexplained wealth was identified for that year. This is due in particular to the fact that the amount received from the sale of the BMW X5 was attributed as an inflow in 2023, based on an estimated market value rather than the contractual sale price, as explained in §§ 79-85 above. Even assuming that the Mercedes-Benz E-Class was purchased at a price higher than the declared amount, no negative balance is established for 2023, and therefore no indication of unexplained wealth arises.

*3.2.5 Regarding the alleged sources of income of the subject's son to pay for the vehicles*

89. In the first round of questions during the resumed evaluation, the subject informed the Commission that no additional documentation could be provided to substantiate further income earned by her son in 2021, beyond what had already been submitted during the initial evaluation.
90. The subject explained that her son was formally employed at a bailiff's office throughout 2021, which, in her view, made it implausible for him to engage

in undeclared or informal income-generating activities during the same period.

91. The subject further stated that her son had been financially dependent on her between 2018 and 2020, during which time he worked informally as a waiter and a bodyguard. However, according to the subject, he became financially independent starting in 2021, earning a regular salary which allowed him to cover his own daily expenses, including clothing.
92. To substantiate this prior employment history, the subject noted that her son had attempted, in July 2025, to contact former colleagues. Most of these individuals were reportedly abroad and unavailable, and only one individual—a restaurant cook—was willing to provide a written statement confirming the subject's son's past employment.
93. The subject also reiterated claims made during the initial evaluation that, in 2019–2020, her son engaged in purchasing and repairing defective mobile phones for resale. Although no documentation had been available at the time of the initial assessment, the subject later submitted a declaration dated 2 July 2025 from I.P., the administrator of a limited liability company, allegedly confirming that her son purchased spare parts and utilized the company's diagnostic services during that period.
94. Despite these additional explanations, the Commission considers that the son's financial capacity in 2021 remains insufficiently substantiated. The income allegedly earned through informal activities and prior employment is not supported by verifiable, contemporaneous, and corroborated evidence. The declaration provided by a former cook and the statement from a spare-parts supplier are not sufficient to reliably demonstrate the financial solvency required to cover his 2021 expenses, particularly the substantial leasing payments.
95. In the responses provided during the reevaluation, the subject stated that she was unable to provide any additional information or documentation confirming her son's income in 2022, beyond what had already been submitted during the initial evaluation.
96. The subject explained that, in 2022, her son worked informally in France, allegedly earning approximately 1,800 EUR per month. According to her statements, he spent about six months abroad and covered his own living expenses from this income. Upon returning to the Republic of Moldova, he allegedly continued to rely on the funds earned during his stay in France.

97. The subject acknowledged that she could not present bank records, salary slips, or any official proof of her son's employment abroad. However, she submitted a signed declaration from an individual identified as V.M., who she claimed had worked with her son during the same period in France.
98. Upon verifying the border crossing data received from the General Inspectorate of Border Police, the Commission found that, contrary to the subject's statement, her son was abroad for less than six months in total. Specifically, except for a few short trips, the subject's son was outside the territory of the Republic of Moldova only during the following two periods: from 9 March to 2 June 2022 and from 11 June to 1 August 2022. Thus, the total time spent abroad was approximately 4.5 months, not six as claimed.
99. In this regard, the Commission refers to the reasoning adopted by the Supreme Court of Justice in its decision of 4 March 2025 (*Andrian Ciobanu v. SCM*, § 82), where it emphasized that even when a person claims to have received a substantial monthly salary while abroad, such an assertion cannot be accepted at face value. The Court underscored that it is unlikely a person would work uninterruptedly during the entire period spent outside the country, and that various unavoidable costs—such as transportation, food, communications, and other personal expenses—must be reasonably deducted when assessing the true financial benefit derived from work abroad.
100. The period spent abroad by the subject's son, although possibly associated with undeclared employment, does not permit a reliable estimation of the net earnings, given the absence of supporting documentation and the inherent uncertainty of the income and expenditure involved, as emphasized by the SCJ. Even if the subject's son may have earned income abroad during his limited stay, he would have inevitably incurred living and travel expenses that substantially reduced the net amount available for savings or large purchases. These unavoidable expenditures further reduce the plausibility of the claim that he accumulated sufficient funds to independently purchase a high-value vehicle such as the BMW X5.
101. In addition, the Commission notes that, shortly after returning from France, the subject's son departed the Republic of Moldova on 10 August 2022 via a flight to Antalya, returning on 18 August 2022. According to the Commission's findings, he spent 28,536 MDL on this vacation. This suggests that a considerable portion of the income allegedly earned abroad may have been spent on this trip.

102. Accordingly, in the absence of verifiable supporting documentation and given the inconsistencies regarding the duration of the stay abroad and the associated living costs, the Commission finds that the subject has not sufficiently substantiated her claim that her son had the independent financial means to support the vehicle acquisition.

### **3.3 Per year analysis of inexplicable wealth**

#### *3.3.1 Inexplicable wealth in 2015*

##### *Incoming financial flows*

103. According to SFS data, in 2015, the subject earned net salary income of 120,043 MDL from the Buiucani District Court and 389 MDL from the National Institute of Justice, resulting in a total of 120,432 MDL.
104. The subject also reported cash savings of 10,000 MDL at the end of 2014, as indicated in her response to the first round of questions. In accordance with the Annex to the Rules, this amount is considered incoming cash flow for 2015, as prior-year savings.
105. Therefore, the subject's total incoming financial flow for 2015 amounted to 130,432 MDL.

##### *Outgoing financial flows*

106. The Commission identified total ATM cash withdrawals amounting to 103,634 MDL. Considering that the subject's declared cash savings increased from 10,000 MDL to 25,000 MDL by the end of the year, the Commission calculated that approximately 88,634 MDL could be effectively spent in cash during 2015. This amount is considered the pool of available liquid funds used for household expenses during the relevant year. This figure exceeds the estimated Consumption Expenditure per Population (hereinafter "CEP") by approximately 11%, indicating that the subject's household had sufficient liquid resources to cover basic consumption needs during the year.
107. In response to the second round of questions during the initial evaluation, when asked about the use of cash withdrawn in 2015, the subject stated that it "was used to cover the family's current expenses throughout the year." As no other significant cash expenses were identified beyond a loan repayment, the Commission treated this amount as covering CEP-related costs, without resulting in duplication.
108. Additionally, retail expenses from the subject's checking accounts (excluding loan payments and peer-to-peer transfers) were calculated at 16,773 MDL.

109. The Commission also included loan repayments totaling 19,400 MDL to Mobiasbanca as part of the outgoing flow.

110. The subject reported cash savings of 25,000 MDL as held at the end of 2015. In line with the Commission's evaluation methodology, this amount is treated as an outgoing flow for 2015, since it will be carried over as incoming flow in the 2016 calculation.

111. Accordingly, the subject's total outgoing financial flow for 2015 amounted to 149,807 MDL.

112. It follows that, for the year 2015, the subject's household registered a negative financial balance of 19,375 MDL, with outgoing financial flows exceeding the incoming flows.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2015*

Income, MDL		Expenses, MDL	
Salary, Buiucani District Court	120,043	Cash expenses from ATM withdrawals	88,634
Salary, National Institute Justice	398	Retail Expenses identified on bank accounts	16,773
Cash and bank savings at the beginning of the year	10,000	Loan Repayment (30,000 MDL)	19,400
		Cash savings at the end of the year	25,000
<b>Total, MDL</b>	<b>130,441</b>		<b>149,807</b>
<b>Difference, MDL</b>	<b>-19,366 MDL</b>		

*3.3.2 Inexplicable wealth in 2021*

*Incoming financial flows*

113. According to SFS information, in 2021, the subject received a net salary income of 247,666 MDL from the Chișinău Court of Appeal, along with a temporary unemployment allowance of 10,206 MDL. The subject's cohabitant earned net salary income of 104,351 MDL from Chișinău-Gaz

SRL. In the same year, the subject's son received a net income of 63,251 MDL as salary from the office of a bailiff. Consequently, the total recorded income for the household in 2021 amounted to 425,474 MDL.

114. In addition, the Commission considered the sale of a Peugeot 208 (m/y 2013) for a declared price of 75,000 MDL as part of the incoming cash flow for 2021.
115. The Commission also included cash and bank savings amounting to 103,680 MDL, as declared by the subject at the end of 2020, which are carried over into the 2021 analysis in accordance with the Commission's evaluation rules.
116. The incoming financial flows included 12,000 MDL in child support payments from the subject's former husband.
117. The subject also took a loan of 104,600 MDL (equivalent to 5,000 EUR) from D.T.
118. Based on the reasoning set out at §§ 53-56, the Commission accepted the declared material assistance in the amount of 35,000 MDL from the subject's mother as a plausible source of income and included it in the subject's financial flows for that year.
119. Accordingly, the total incoming financial flow for 2021 was 755,754 MDL.

*Outgoing financial flows*

120. According to the data verified, total ATM cash withdrawals made by the subject in 2021 amounted to 16,000 MDL. Additionally, the subject's declared cash savings decreased from 100,000 MDL in 2020 to 55,000 MDL at the end of 2021, indicating that an additional 45,000 MDL was spent in cash. Therefore, the total effective cash expenditure for the year was 61,000 MDL.
121. In the second round of questions during the initial evaluation, the subject explained that the withdrawn cash was used for "current household maintenance expenses throughout 2021." The subject also mentioned that, in that year, her partner purchased a Nissan Qashqai, the family went on vacation together, and the kitchen was renovated.
122. Given the subject's explanation that cash was used for other types of expenses—such as renovations and vehicle-related costs—these cash outflows were not counted separately to avoid double-counting.
123. However, the Commission considered that the retail transactions from the subject's checking accounts exceeded the CEP and thus were attributed to the household's basic consumption needs. The retail expenses identified on

the subject's checking (non-savings) bank accounts totaled 360,024 MDL. In calculating this figure, the Commission excluded all peer-to-peer payments and focused strictly on checking accounts used for everyday expenditures.

124. The subject declared having used the loan received from D.T. (in the amount of 5,000 EUR) to finance kitchen renovation. Supporting documentation confirmed that renovation costs amounted to 114,676 MDL, which was accepted by the Commission as a standalone cash outflow for 2021.
125. The subject also submitted that her vehicle, a Peugeot 208 m/y 2013, was repaired in 2021 at a cost of approximately 2,700 EUR (56,502 MDL). The repairs were reportedly carried out in the Transnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova and paid for by her cohabitant. The Commission considered this amount as an additional cash outflow.
126. On 10 July 2021, the subject's cohabitant purchased a Nissan Qashqai m/y 2015 for a contractual price of 150,000 MDL, which was also included in the outflow calculation.
127. The subject declared that a 1,000 EUR loan (approx. 19,741 MDL) was repaid in 2021. The Commission accepted this repayment as a verified outgoing flow.
128. The subject's son allegedly made leasing payments amounting to 174,575 MDL in connection with the Skoda Superb m/y 2018. Per the reasoning set out in §§ 69-102, this amount was included in the subject's family outflows for 2021 due to the Commission's decision to treat vehicle acquisition costs as household expenses.
129. Additionally, retail expenditures from the subject's son's bank accounts, totaling 46,582 MDL, were included in the family's outgoing cash flow.
130. Upon verification with a travel agency, the Commission confirmed that the subject's cohabitant reserved two vacation trips together with the subject and her daughter, and paid in cash the total amount of 55,653 MDL. These payments were not reflected in the bank accounts previously analyzed and were therefore included separately.
131. Likewise, the subject's son booked two trips together and paid 46,577 MDL in cash. These transactions also fell outside the reviewed bank flows and were included separately.
132. The subject also declared cash savings of 55,000 MDL at the end of 2021. Additionally, the Commission identified 1,679 MDL in the subject's bank

accounts as of 31 December 2021. Accordingly, the total cash and bank savings carried into the next year amounted to 56,679 MDL.

133. Based on these elements, the total outgoing financial flow for 2021 was calculated to be 1,081,009 MDL.
134. It follows that, for the year 2021, the subject's household registered a negative financial balance of 325,255 MDL, with outgoing financial flows exceeding the incoming flows.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2021*

Income, MDL		Expenses, MDL	
Chisinau Court of Appeal salary	247,666	Total retail expenses identified on the subject's bank accounts	360,024
Temporary unemployment allowance	10,206	Kitchen repair works	114,676
Salary, Chisinau Gaz SRL	104,351	Repair works on Peugeot 208	56,502
Sale of Peugeot 208	75,000	Acquisition of Nissan Qashqai	150,000
Alimony from the former husband	12,000	Payments for the leasing contract	174,575
Loan from T.D (5,000 EUR)	104,600	Repayment of the 1000 EUR loan	19,741
Bailiff office (salary)	63,251	Retail expenses identified on the son's bank accounts	46,582

Cash and bank savings at the beginning of the year	103,680	Cash payments for trips reserved by the cohabitant	55,653
Donation from the subject's mother	35,000	Cash payments for trips reserved by the son	46,577
		Cash savings at the end of the year	56,679
<b>Total, MDL</b>	<b>755,754</b>		<b>1,081,009</b>
<b>Difference, MDL</b>			<b>-325,255</b>

### 3.3.3 Inexplicable wealth in 2022

#### *Incoming financial flows*

135. According to SFS data, in 2022, the subject received net salary income from the Chișinău Court of Appeal in the amount of 246,455 MDL. The subject's cohabitant received net salary income from Chișinău-Gaz L.L.C. and another L.L.C. in the amounts of 112,896 MDL and 4,770 MDL, respectively. The subject's son received a net income of 14,063 MDL. The total salary-based income for the household thus amounted to 378,184 MDL.
136. The subject also declared to the Commission that in 2022 her son sold the Skoda Superb, m/y 2018, for a contractual price of 300,000 MDL. This amount was considered as incoming flow for 2022.
137. The incoming financial flows also include 12,000 MDL in child support payments received from the subject's former husband.
138. Additionally, cash and bank savings held at the end of 2021, totaling 56,679 MDL, were carried over as part of the 2022 incoming financial flows.
139. Based on the reasoning set out at § 53-56, the Commission accepted the declared material assistance in the amount of 36,000 MDL from the subject's mother as a plausible source of income and included it in the subject's financial flows for that year.

140. As a result, the total incoming financial flows for 2022 amounted to 782,863 MDL.

*Outgoing financial flow*

141. Total cash withdrawals from ATMs in 2022 amounted to 24,800 MDL. Given that the subject's declared cash savings decreased from 55,000 MDL at the end of 2021 to 50,000 MDL at the end of 2022, this indicates that an additional 5,000 MDL was expended. Accordingly, total cash expenditures for the year are estimated at 29,800 MDL.

142. In the second round of questions during the initial evaluation, the subject explained that the cash withdrawn during 2022 "was used to cover the family's current expenses throughout the year." Considering this explanation, and in the absence of any specific overlapping cash-based expenses, the Commission attributed the above amount as part of the household's ordinary consumption, without resulting in any duplication of recorded outflows.

143. Retail transactions and repayments of loans recorded on the subject's checking bank accounts (including salary and other current accounts) amounted to 357,964 MDL.

144. In line with the reasoning outlined in §§ 69-102, the outgoing financial flow for 2022 includes all leasing payments allegedly made by the subject's son in relation to the Skoda Superb, m/y 2018, in the amount of 50,018 MDL.

145. Additionally, as detailed in §§ 69-102, the Commission included in the financial outflows the indicative value of 483,374 MDL, established as the fair market value for the acquisition of the BMW X5, m/y 2014, by the subject's son. This amount was used instead of the declared contractual price, which the Commission found to be significantly below market value.

146. Further, based on information received from a travel agency, the Commission identified that the subject's cohabitant reserved a vacation trip for himself, the subject, and her daughter, for which he paid in cash a total of 38,603 MDL. After repeated verification of the subject's and her cohabitant's bank accounts, it was confirmed that this payment was not made through any of the bank accounts considered in calculating retail expenses. Accordingly, the full amount was added as a separate cash outflow.

147. Similarly, based on information from the same travel agency, the Commission established that the subject's son reserved a vacation trip and

paid for it in cash, amounting to 28,536 MDL. However, considering the information outlined above in § 101 regarding his alleged work abroad, the Commission did not include this amount under the declared expenses.

148. At the end of 2022, the subject declared cash savings of 50,000 MDL, with an additional total end-of-year bank account balance of 1,616 MDL, resulting in 51,616 MDL in total savings. This amount is considered an outgoing financial flow for 2022, as it is carried forward as an incoming flow for the following year.
149. Consequently, the total outgoing financial flow for 2022 amounted to 1,011,375 MDL.
150. It follows that, for the year 2022, the household's total outgoing financial flow exceeded its total incoming financial flow by 228,512 MDL.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2022*

Income, MDL		Expenses, MDL	
Chisinau Court of Appeal salary	246,455	Total Cash spent calculated by the Commission	29,800
Salary, Chisinau Gaz LLC	112,896	Total retail expenses identified on the subject's bank accounts	357,964
Salary from another LLC	4,770	Purchase of BMW X5	483,374
Alimony from the former husband	12,000	Payments for the leasing contract	50,018
Bailiff office (salary)	14,063	Cash payments for trips reserved by the cohabitant	38,603

Sale of Skoda Superb	300,000	Cash and bank savings at the end of the year	51,616
Cash and bank savings at the beginning of the year	56,679		
Donation from the subject's mother	36,000		
<b>Total</b>	782,863		1,011,375
<b>Difference, MDL</b>	<b>-228,512 MDL</b>		

### 3.3.4 Conclusion regarding inexplicable wealth

151. The Commission has identified that the subject's household accumulated a negative financial balance 573,133 MDL which is above the threshold of 20 average salaries (234,000 MDL) required by Article 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023 to establish a subject's lack of financial integrity.

Year	Inexplicable wealth per year
2015	-19,366 MDL
2021	-325,255 MDL
2022	-228,512 MDL
<b>Total</b>	<b>-573,133 MDL</b>

## VI. Conclusion of the resumed evaluation

152. Based on the information it obtained and that presented by the subject, the Commission proposes that the subject does not promote the external evaluation on the grounds of non-compliance with the criteria set in Article 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

## VII. Further action and publication

153. As provided in Article 25 para. (3) of the Rules, this re-evaluation report will be sent by e-mail to the subject and the Superior Council of Magistracy. The Commission will publish the re-evaluation's result on its official website on the same day.
154. No later than three days after the approval, a printed paper copy of the report, electronically signed by the Chairperson, will be submitted to the Superior Council of Magistracy, along with the original electronic copy of the re-evaluation file containing all the evaluation materials gathered by the Commission.
155. 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.
156. This re-evaluation report was approved by a majority of the participating members on 21 October 2025 and signed pursuant to Article 8 para. (1) and (2) of Law No. 252/2023.
157. Done in English and Romanian.

Scott Bales

Chairperson of the Commission