



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

**PETRU TRIBOI**

Interim President of the Ungheni District Court

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

---

9 December 2025

**Contents**

<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Subject of the Evaluation.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Evaluation Criteria .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV. Evaluation Procedure.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V. Analysis.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A. Inexplicable wealth .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VI. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Further action and publication .....</b>	<b>23</b>

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 9 December 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. Petru Triboi (hereinafter the “subject”), the Interim President of the Ungheni District 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 does not meet the criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023 for financial integrity.

## **II. Subject of the Evaluation**

4. Since 2023, the subject has served as Interim President of the Ungheni District Court. He has held the position of Vice President of the same court since 2020.
5. From 2005 to 2017, the subject served as a judge at the Nisporeni District Court. He served as Vice President of that court from 2011 until his appointment as its President in 2014.
6. Prior to his appointment as a judge, the subject served as a criminal investigator within the law enforcement system.
7. The subject obtained a bachelor’s degree in law in 1999 from the “Ștefan cel Mare” Police Academy.

**III. Evaluation Criteria**

8. Under Article 11 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission evaluates the subject's ethical and financial integrity.
9. 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."
10. 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."
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 found 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 the information from the Superior Council of Magistracy under Article 12 para. (1) of Law No.

252/2023. The information included the subject as the Interim President of the Ungheni District Court and Vice President of the same 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 21 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. The subject was also informed of his right to request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of any panel member. On 20 August 2025, the subject was notified that the panel composed of the same members had been renamed Panel D.
21. Because the law sets different evaluation periods for the ethical and financial integrity criteria cited above, the Commission evaluated compliance with these criteria over the past five, ten and 12 years. Due to the end-of-the-year availability of the tax declarations and declarations on wealth and personal interests, the financial criteria evaluation period included 2013-2024 and 2015-2024. The evaluation period for the ethical criterion includes the past five or ten years calculated backward from the date of the notification.
22. In the last 12 years of the evaluation period, the subject had the obligation to submit declarations, both under Law No. 133/2016 on the Declaration of Wealth and Personal Interests and under Law No. 1264/2002 on the Declaration and Income and Property Control for persons with positions of Public Dignity, Judges, Prosecutors, Civil Servants, positions of Management.
23. The Commission sought and obtained information from numerous sources. No source advised the Commission of later developments or any corrections regarding the information provided.
24. 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, the General

Inspectorate of Border Police, banks (Eximbank JSC, Moldinconbank JSC, MAIB JSC, Victoriabank JSC, OTP Bank JSC, , Banca de Economii JSC, Unibank JSC), Office for Prevention and Fight Against Money Laundering, and the Public Service Agency (hereinafter “PSA”). Information was also obtained from other public institutions and private entities, open sources such as social media and investigative journalism reports. No complaints or information was received from civil society. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.

25. On 5 August 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 17 August 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “first round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
26. On 29 September 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 7 October 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “second round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
27. On 9 October 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 16 October 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the “third round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.
28. On 23 October 2025, the Commission notified the subject that it had identified some areas of doubt about the subject’s compliance with the financial criterion and invited him to attend a public hearing on 3 November 2025. The subject was also informed that the evaluation report may refer to other issues considered during the evaluation.
29. As provided in Article 39 para. (4) of the Rules, the subject sought and was provided access to all the materials in his evaluation file on 29 October 2025.
30. On 3 November 2025, the Commission held a hearing. At the hearing, the subject reaffirmed the accuracy of his answers in the five-year declaration and the ethics questionnaire. The subject also stated that he did not have any corrections to the answers previously provided to the Commission’s requests for information. The subject submitted additional documents, which the Commission considered and included in the evaluation file.

## V. Analysis

31. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Commission's conclusion.
32. Based on the information it collected, the Commission analyzed and requested further clarifications regarding the difference between the assets, expenses, and income (hereinafter "inexplicable wealth").

### A. Inexplicable wealth

33. In its analysis of the subject's household income and expenses, the Commission identified a difference between the incoming and outgoing financial flows (negative balance) for only one year: --405,384 MDL in 2021.
34. The Commission also examined several other issues, including a major loan contracted in 2020, the potential beneficial ownership of a vehicle, the acquisition and renovation of an apartment in Nisporeni, the deflated price declared for the purchase of a vehicle and the deflated price for the acquisition of an apartment in Chișinău. None of these issues contributed to the finding of inexplicable wealth. These are addressed below, followed by the issues that led to the finding of inexplicable wealth.
35. For clarity, the analysis is structured in two sections: (1) mitigated inexplicable wealth issues and (2) assessment of identified inexplicable wealth.

#### 1. Mitigated inexplicable wealth issues

##### 1.1 Loan from the subject's father-in-law

36. In the 2020 NIA declaration, the subject reported a loan of 15,000 EUR received from his father-in-law. According to the declaration, the loan was contracted in 2020, repayable over ten years, and interest-free.
37. In response to the first round of questions, the subject submitted a handwritten receipt dated 20 August 2020 signed by himself and his in-laws confirming the loan. The subject stated that the amount was received in cash and that the loan was repaid in 2024.
38. In the second round of questions, to confirm the financial capacity of the subject's in-laws, he submitted income data for his parents-in-law, who worked in Italy during the period 2000–2019. According to the subject, his

mother-in-law was continuously employed throughout this entire period, while his father-in-law worked between 2002 and 2019.

39. According to these records, the mother-in-law's cumulative net income for the period 2002–2017 was approximately 109,576.71 EUR, while the father-in-law's cumulative net income for the period 2016–2018 was approximately 11,418 EUR. The subject further stated that his in-laws worked in undeclared jobs in addition to their official employment and earned supplementary income, but no supporting documentation was provided. According to the subject, the only income they received in the Republic of Moldova was a pension.
40. The subject was also asked to provide information on bank accounts where his in-laws received their income abroad; accommodation-related expenses while living in Italy; ownership of movable or immovable property in Italy or elsewhere; and the method and timeline by which funds were transferred to the Republic of Moldova.
41. He explained that his in-laws did not have bank accounts, lived rent-free at their place of work in Rome, and did not purchase any property abroad. According to the subject, his in-laws brought the funds into the Republic of Moldova in cash, but they could not recall the exact amounts or timelines.
42. During the public hearing, the subject clarified that his mother-in-law went to Italy in October 2025 and submitted additional documentation. In particular, the subject provided a statement for a savings account held by his mother-in-law at *Poste Italiane*, an Italian postal service, provider, which showed that she withdrew more than 29,000 EUR in 2018. The subject further stated that the amount was withdrawn in 2018, kept in cash, and introduced into the Republic of Moldova later.
43. Considering the statement confirming the availability of cash, combined with the relatively short period (about 2 years) following the cash withdrawal and the lack of an identifiable acquisitions by the in-laws thereafter, the origin of the loan seems substantiated. Consequently, the amount of 15,000 EUR was included in the financial inflows for 2020, while the repayment made in 2024 was included in the financial outflows for that year.

## 1.2 Potential beneficial ownership of a Toyota Yaris, m/y 2019

44. On 22 March 2024, the subject's mother-in-law registered ownership over a Toyota Yaris, m/y 2019, acquired for 220,000 MDL. The national motor liability insurance (RCAI) was issued in the name of the subject's mother-in-law, with an unlimited number of authorized users. Additionally, two international motor insurance policies (RCAE) were issued in 2024 under the name of the subject's mother-in-law, also with an unlimited number of users.
45. According to border crossing records, throughout 2024, the only driver of this vehicle who crossed the border was the subject's daughter. The subject's mother-in-law was only recorded once as a passenger. The subject's daughter also committed a traffic offense in the same vehicle on 15 June 2024.
46. Fuel expense records on the subject's daughter's bank account show frequent purchases throughout 2024 at various gas stations, beginning shortly after the vehicle was acquired. This transaction pattern suggests regular use of the vehicle.
47. In the first round of questions, the subject was asked to clarify the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of the vehicle, including its condition at the time of purchase, odometer reading, real purchase price, and who incurred the related expenses. The subject stated that the vehicle was purchased by his mother-in-law and that he had no additional information.
48. In the second round of questions, the subject reiterated that his mother-in-law had purchased the car in February 2024 for 11,500 EUR as a second-hand vehicle and registered it in her name the following month. According to the subject, all expenses related to the purchase and maintenance were incurred by his mother-in-law and the funds used originated from the 15,000 EUR loan she had previously granted to the subject, which he repaid on 20 February 2024.
49. The subject also explained that, although the vehicle was used predominantly by his daughter, his mother-in-law remained the actual beneficiary and allowed his daughter to use the vehicle by mutual agreement, given the family relationship.
50. The Commission notes that, based on the subject's explanations and the supporting documentation, it is plausible that the funds used to purchase the vehicle originated from the repayment of the previously declared loan, which was allegedly made in February 2024. Furthermore, the Commission

considers it reasonable that a grandmother might choose to purchase a vehicle for her granddaughter's use, particularly in the context of a close family relationship and given that the subject's daughter was a university student at the time.

51. Even if, in the alternative, it were accepted that the subject's household was the effective beneficiary of the vehicle, the financial analysis for 2024 shows a positive balance of approximately 370,000 MDL. Therefore, the vehicle's acquisition would not result in the identification of inexplicable wealth for that year.

### **1.3 Acquisition and renovation of an apartment in Nisporeni**

52. According to information from PSA, the subject, his wife, and daughter registered their official residence at an apartment at Industrialia-Păcii Street, Nisporeni, in 2022. The subject's son has been registered at the same address since December 2020. The subject explained, however, that his entire family has been living at this address since 2009. In this context, the Commission notes that the subject began declaring the right of use over this apartment in his 2015 annual NIC declaration, expressly indicating that he had been using the apartment since 2009.
53. Cadastral data shows that the apartment was registered on the subject's sister-in-law between 2006 and 2018, when it was transferred to the subject's daughter through a sale-purchase contract dated 24 August 2018, at the identified price of 47,388 MDL. This amount coincides with the price reportedly paid by the subject's parents-in-law to initially acquire it in 2006.
54. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that the apartment had been purchased in 2006 by his parents-in-law for their daughter (his sister-in-law), who never lived in the apartment. The subject submitted two written explanations dated 12 August 2025 — one from his sister-in-law and another from his mother-in-law — both confirming that the apartment had been formally registered under the sister-in-law's name, but that after she left for university studies in Chişinău, the subject's family moved in following "some renovation works." According to the same explanations, the subject's parents-in-law decided in 2018 to offer the apartment to their granddaughter (the subject's daughter), and to that end, a sale-purchase contract was concluded between the sister-in-law and the subject's daughter, with the 47,388 MDL allegedly being paid again by the parents-in-law to their daughter (the seller).

55. According to the Public Institution “Real Estate Cadaster”, the price range for apartments sold in Nisporeni city in 2018 varied widely – from as low as 15,000 MDL for a 30.2 sq.m. apartment to as high as 417,244 MDL for an apartment of 60.3 sq.m. The real estate broker “LARA” estimated that the average market price during 2018 for the discussed apartment, ranged between 117,081 MDL and 156,769 MDL.
56. When asked why the apartment had been mortgaged in 2007 (then evaluated by the bank at 110,000 MDL), the subject responded that this amount represented renovation expenses he had personally incurred, funded through a loan secured by a mortgage on the apartment. Although the question was focused on the discrepancy between the sale price and the bank evaluation, the subject provided the renovation amount instead. While his answers did not clearly indicate the timing of these renovations, it appears that the works most likely occurred after the loan was issued in 2007 and before 2009, the year the subject’s family began residing in the apartment.
57. In the third round of questions and the hearing, the subject clarified that the repairs had been carried out between 2007 and 2009 using funds from the loan. The subject submitted the mortgage contract, which refers to a loan agreement in which his sister-in-law was the debtor, while the subject acted as her representative. The signature on the mortgage contract appears to belong to the subject, although he was not the formal debtor.
58. It is unclear why the subject claimed that he had spent 110,000 MDL on renovations between 2007 and 2009 using a loan contracted in his sister-in-law’s name, especially since she was the formal owner of the apartment and allegedly never lived in it. It is also unclear why the subject would represent his sister-in-law in securing a loan for renovations if he was not the effective beneficiary of the apartment. It is plausible, given these circumstances, that the subject’s household had effective control and use of the apartment since 2006, and that the sister-in-law acted merely as the nominal owner.
59. However, since the declared renovation expenses of 110,000 MDL most likely took place in the period 2007–2009, which falls outside the evaluation period, they were not attributed as financial outflows for the subject’s household. Additionally, considering the conclusion that the subject's household most likely had been the effective beneficiary of the apartment since 2006, the formal transaction of 2018 between the subject’s sister-in-law and his daughter cannot be treated as a genuine acquisition. Rather, the 2018

contract appears to have served as a legal instrument to formalize an existing ownership reality, rather than to effectuate a new transfer of value.

60. In the first round of questions, the Commission requested the subject to submit photographs of the apartment taken at the time of acquisition and in its current state. The subject refused to provide any images, citing ethical concerns about who might access the materials. As a result, the Commission was unable to verify the condition of the apartment either at the time of the 2018 transaction or at present. While it remains possible that additional renovation works were carried out after 2018, the lack of documentation or visual evidence precluded the Commission from confirming or quantifying such improvements.

#### **1.4 Deflated price for the purchase of a vehicle**

61. According to the subject's own declarations provided across three rounds of questions, in March 2018 he acquired a Mercedes E220 CDI, m/y 2006, for a declared price of 70,000 MDL. The vehicle was purchased from a legal entity owned by the subject's marriage godfather.
62. According to data provided by the Customs Service, several vehicles of the same model and comparable specifications (Mercedes E220 CDI) were imported in 2017, the year before the acquisition, at higher values. For example:
- a) a Mercedes E220 CDI, m/y 2008, had a declared value of 100,000 MDL and a total value including customs duties of 123,800 MDL.
  - b) a Mercedes E220 CDI, m/y 2006, had a declared value of 100,000 MDL and a total value including customs duties of 123,683 MDL.
  - c) notably, a Mercedes E220 CDI, m/y 2003 — three years older than the subject's vehicle — was imported with a declared value of 123,455 MDL and a total value including customs duties of 146,356 MDL.
  - d) a Mercedes E220 CDI, m/y 2001 — five years older than the subject's vehicle — was imported with a declared invoice value of 70,000 MDL and a total value including customs duties of 92,562 MDL.
63. This data raised doubts regarding the real acquisition price of the vehicle. In the second round of questions, the subject stated that the vehicle had a significant technical defect at the time of purchase, specifically that "the

engine was functioning on only three cylinders." He further claimed that the necessary repairs cost between 1,000–1,500 MDL.

64. Such a repair estimate appears disproportionately low given the nature of the defect described. If the engine defect was indeed significant, it would be reasonable to expect much higher repair costs. This inconsistency suggests either that (i) the subject understated the actual price paid for the vehicle, or (ii) additional repair expenses were incurred but not declared.
65. However, as explained in the analysis of the apartment acquisition and renovation (see Section 1.3), the declared purchase price and renovation costs of that property—originally attributed to the subject’s household in 2018—were ultimately not considered outgoing flows. As a result, even after including an average estimated value for the vehicle acquisition, based on comparable customs data, a positive financial balance of approximately 6,300 MDL was established for 2018.

### **1.5 Deflated price for the purchase of an apartment**

66. In September 2020, the subject and his wife signed a sale-purchase contract for a 76.9 sq.m apartment located on Liviu Deleanu Street, Chisinau municipality. The contractual price was 758,113 MDL. According to the subject’s explanations, 675,000 MDL was paid through a bank loan contracted by the subject’s wife under the “Prima Casa” state program, and the remaining 83,113 MDL was paid from personal savings.
67. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that the apartment was purchased in a repaired and partially furnished condition from his marriage godfather and cousin, who had allegedly carried out the repair and furnishing works at his own expense before the transaction.
68. However, the apartment had been officially handed over by the construction company to the seller on 29 July 2020. The real estate evaluation report, likely for the mortgage, issued on 19 August 2020, approximately one month before the transaction, indicated that the apartment was in “grey wall” condition (*i.e.* without interior finishes). The market value was assessed at 758,113 MDL, based on the comparative sales approach. This leaves a period of less than one month for the alleged repairs and furnishing to have been made before the sale.
69. In the first round of questions, the subject, as with the apartment in Nisporeni, declined to provide photos of at the time of purchase, citing

privacy concerns. However, the subject stated that starting from 2021, his daughter has been residing in the apartment, which implies that the apartment had been rendered habitable and confirms that repairs were indeed undertaken, either by the seller or by the subject.

70. In the second round of questions, the subject explained that when the contract was signed, the apartment was already undergoing repairs, carried out by his marriage godfather.
71. The Commission has reasonable doubts as to whether the declared purchase price reflects the real value of the transaction, or whether the apartment was purchased in unfinished condition and later repaired and furnished by the subject using undeclared funds. The fact that the declared price is identical to the market value of an unfinished apartment supports both scenarios.
72. Nonetheless, according to the Commission's financial analysis, the subject's household had a positive balance of 253,000 MDL for 2020. Although the actual cost of the repairs or the real purchase price remains unquantifiable, this positive balance could have reasonably covered such expenses to a significant extent.

## **2. Assessment of identified inexplicable wealth**

### **2.1 Alleged loan of 25,000 EUR concluded in 2021**

73. In the 2021 NIA declaration, the subject reported a loan of 25,000 EUR from I.T. In the first round of questions, the subject submitted a simple form written contract dated 13 September 2021, with no interest and a 10-year repayment term.
74. The subject stated that the money was handed over in cash on the same date. According to General Inspectorate of the Border Police information, I.T. was present in the Republic of Moldova between 2 and 14 September 2021. However, no customs declaration was submitted attesting to the introduction into the country of an amount of cash exceeding the legal threshold of 10,000 EUR.
75. Also in the first round, the subject presented a written explanation dated 8 August 2025 from the alleged creditor. The creditor stated that he had worked in Italy as a truck driver since 2002 and, being a close friend of the subject for almost 20 years, granted him a loan of 25,000 EUR. He also explained that since his children had chosen to remain in Republic of Moldova, he intended to help them purchase an apartment in Durlești. Based

on this, he asked the subject to repay the loan in the summer of 2022. The subject claims to have reimbursed 5,000 EUR on 26 September 2022 and the remaining 20,000 EUR on 16 March 2024, after selling an apartment.

76. The subject annexed an employment letter dated 1 June 2012, signed by I.T. and his employer in Italy, indicating a total monthly salary of 1,447.61 EUR.
77. In the second round, the subject was asked to provide details regarding the total period worked by I.T. in Italy and the total amount earned, to prove his financial capacity to grant such a loan. He was also asked to provide bank statements confirming salary transfers and cash-withdrawal, and to clarify whether I.T. had any other income in Italy or Moldova. The Commission further requested information on any immovable or movable assets purchased by I.T. and supporting documents.
78. In response, the subject submitted another written explanation dated 29 September 2025 from I.T., in which the latter claimed to earn 2,000–2,900 EUR monthly working as a truck driver in Italy. He stated that between 2010–2012 he received his salary in cash, and thereafter via bank transfers, but refused to submit any bank account statements, citing privacy concerns. He also expressly declined to provide information on the monthly cost of living in Italy, the amounts transferred to family members in Moldova, or any data regarding immovable or movable property held in Italy.
79. The alleged creditor stated that the 25,000 EUR loaned to the subject had been introduced into Moldova in cash by himself and his wife, over several years, and was personally handed to the subject. The Commission attempted to corroborate this claim by analyzing border crossing records. However, General Inspectorate of the Border Police data is only accessible for the past five years. Accordingly, for the period preceding the alleged loan in September 2021, the Commission could only identify one entry of I.T. into the Republic of Moldova on 26 June 2021 and one exit on 2 July 2021.
80. At the hearing, the subject noted that the Commission's independent questionnaire to the creditor was sent to an incorrect email address. He also submitted additional documents allegedly demonstrating the creditor's income in Italy.
81. On 3 November 2025, after the hearing, the Commission submitted a follow-up request to the creditor, seeking further clarification of his financial capacity, assets abroad, and supporting evidence (e.g. bank statements, withdrawal receipts, proof of transfers). On the same day, I.T. sent a written

explanation similar to that provided in the first round of questions. On the next day, I.T. submitted several supporting documents. He did not, however, provide a bank statement allowing for clear confirmation of his financial capacity or identification of possible major expenses by him.

82. The documentation provided by the subject and the alleged creditor suggest the following income data:

<b>The creditor's income</b>	
<b>Date or period</b>	<b>Amount, EUR</b>
July 2018	2,446
01.01.2021-31.12.2021	24,724.23
May 2022	2,563
June 2023	2,751
September 2024	2,797
January 2025	2,790
01.01.2024 -31.12.2024	26,809.65
<b>The creditor's wife's income</b>	
<b>Date or period</b>	<b>Amount, EUR</b>
01.01.2021-31.12.2021	19,501.13
01.01.2024 -31.12.2024	22,801.49

83. In this context, if the Commission makes an estimate of supposed salaries received by the creditor and his wife by multiplying by 12 months (presuming that the salary was the same in months of said year), the estimated household income would be as follows.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Amount, EUR</b>
2018	29,352
2021	44,225.36
2022	30,756
2023	33,012

2024	49,611.14
2025	33,480

84. However, despite this reported income, the Commission retains doubts about the creditor's actual ability to provide a loan of 25,000 EUR in 2021, for several related reasons:

a) Most income-related documents presented refer to periods after 2021, offering little insight into the creditor's actual financial position when the loan was allegedly granted.

b) According to the Statistical Office of the European Union (EUROSTAT), the average monthly household consumption expenditure in Italy was as follows: (1) in 2019: 2,560 EUR per month, amounting to an annual expenditure of 30,720 EUR for a household of two adults; (2) in 2020: 2,328 EUR per month, amounting to 27,936 EUR annually; (3) in 2021: 2,437 EUR per month, amounting to 29,244 EUR annually. These values represent essential living expenses such as food, housing, transport, healthcare, and other recurring costs. When compared to the declared household income of the creditor's family for 2021 (*i.e.*, 44,225.36 EUR), it results that approximately 66% of their income would have been consumed by ordinary living expenses alone<sup>1</sup>. The creditor declared that he has owned a mortgaged apartment since 2010, for which he continues to pay monthly instalments. He did not, however, identify the amount.

c) The alleged creditor claimed to have sold an Audi A8 vehicle in 2021 for 10,000 EUR. However, he did not provide any supporting documentation such as a sales contract or payment confirmation. Nor did he submit any additional information regarding other vehicles or movable assets purchased or owned during the relevant period. This lack of documentation and detail undermines the credibility of the claim.

d) In the explanation provided on 4 November 2025, the alleged creditor stated: "I lent the money because I had some cash savings, accumulated over the years while working in Italy, together with my wife which we were

---

<sup>1</sup> See the official EU report of Household consumption expenditure for 2019 in Italy - <https://www.istat.it/it/files/2020/06/Household-consumption-expenditure-2019-1.pdf?utm>

See the official EU report of Household consumption expenditure for 2020-2021 in Italy - [https://www.istat.it/it/files/2022/06/REPORT\\_CONSUMI\\_2021\\_rev.pdf?utm](https://www.istat.it/it/files/2022/06/REPORT_CONSUMI_2021_rev.pdf?utm)

setting aside for any potential need.” This statement suggests that the creditor gave the subject his personal savings — savings which, by his own account, had been set aside for unspecified, general future needs. However, no justification was provided for why the funds were ultimately loaned to the subject, nor was any specific “need” identified at that time. Moreover, the loan contract concluded between the parties provided for a 10-year repayment term. Theoretically, under such terms, the subject could have declined any request for early repayment. According to the creditor’s own statements, he requested early repayment of the loan in 2022 because he needed funds to help his daughter purchase an apartment in Durlesti. Therefore, it remains unclear what the creditor's concrete motivation or need was for parting with his savings in favor of the subject, under such conditions.

e) The subject had already contracted other substantial debts prior to the alleged loan. In 2020, he reported receiving a loan of 15,000 EUR from his father-in-law, repayable over ten years and interest-free. While the source of these funds was ultimately supported by documentation, this constituted a substantial debt at the time. On 7 September 2020, the subject’s wife contracted a long-term housing loan of 675,000 MDL (approximately 35,000 EUR) from “MICB” JSC under the “Prima Casă” program, repayable over 235 months. s (*i.e.*, until 7 April 2040). One year later, in September 2021, the subject declared an additional 25,000 EUR loan from I.T., also interest-free and repayable over ten years. Taken together, this suggests that between 2020 and 2021, the subject undertook three large financial obligations, totaling over 75,000 EUR. The accumulation of significant debts in rapid succession raises the question of whether the transaction was genuinely intended as loan or served alternative purposes, such as justifying the origin of funds or concealing real sources of income.

85. In conclusion, based on the arguments outlined above, the Commission considers it highly probable that the alleged loan of 25,000 EUR did not, in fact, take place. Unlike the loan from the subject’s in-laws — which was supported by cash withdrawal evidence and could be reasonably explained by close family ties — the loan from I.T. lacks both documentary substantiation and economic rationale. Even setting aside the refusal to provide asset-related documentation acquired abroad, it remains clear that such a loan would have imposed an undue financial burden on the creditor’s household. Accordingly, the 25,000 EUR was not recognized as an incoming

flow for 2021, and the alleged repayments in 2022 and 2024 were similarly excluded from the subject's outgoing financial flows.

## 2.2 Inexplicable wealth for 2021

86. **Incoming financial flows.** Pursuant to the Annex of the Rules, savings (including cash) have a double nature. At the beginning of the period, they count as incoming cash-flow. At the end of the period, they count as outgoing cash-flow. The outgoing cash-flow of savings at the end of the year (or another period) equals the incoming cash-flow of savings at the beginning of the next year (or another period).
87. The subject stated during the first round of questions that at the end of 2020 he held approximately 5,000 EUR in cash (remaining from the loan received from his in-laws) and an additional amount of 15,000–20,000 MDL. The Commission attributed a median value of 17,500 MDL from the latter range, while the 5,000 EUR was converted to 98,718 MDL. Additionally, the Commission identified 2,611 MDL in bank savings on the subject's accounts at the end of 2020. These amounts together constitute 118,859 MDL in available savings at the start of 2021.
88. The subject earned 253,658 MDL as salary from Ungheni District Court, 900 MDL from the National Institute of Justice. The subject's wife earned 85,324 MDL as salary from the Nisporeni Health Center. The subject's wife also received 9,348 MDL as an allowance for temporary work incapacity.
89. The household also received 59 MDL as bank interest from MICB and 14 MDL interest from VICB.
90. The subject's daughter received a scholarship of 1,001 MDL from the State University of Medicine and Pharmacy, as well as income amounting to 46,968 MDL from seasonal employment in Romania.
91. The total inflow for the subject's household in 2021 amounted to 516,131 MDL
92. **Outgoing Financial Flows.** 638,750 MDL were paid for the purchase of an apartment on Mircea cel Bătrân Blvd., Chișinău.
93. The subject declared vacation expenditures of 28,500 MDL for a family trip to Antalya, Turkey; 1,100 MDL for a private visit to Iași, Romania; and 5,835 MDL for a five-day vacation in Moieciu de Sus, Romania, totaling 35,435 MDL for travel and leisure in 2021. According to the Consumption Expenditures for Population methodology (hereinafter "CEP") of the

National Bureau of Statistics, the consumption expenditure for recreation and culture for a household of the subject's composition in 2021 amounted to 6,619.2 MDL. The Commission therefore attributed only the amount exceeding this threshold—*i.e.*, 28,815 MDL—as a separate outgoing financial flow.

94. The subject repaid 59,840 MDL in 2021 under the “Prima Casă” program, based on a contract concluded in 2020.
95. Based on the National Bureau of Statistics methodology, the CEP for a household of four in 2021 amounted to 162,163 MDL ( $3,378.4 \times 12$  months  $\times$  4 persons), and this amount is included in the subject's outgoing financial flows<sup>2</sup>. Although the subject's daughter worked for three summer months in Romania, the CEP was not revised. Her income earned during that period was included in the household's total income, and she inevitably incurred personal consumption expenses during those months, which were not separately accounted for in the financial calculations.
96. In the first round of questions, the subject declared cash savings of approximately 20,000–30,000 MDL at the end of 2021. The Commission attributed a median value of 25,000 MDL. Additionally, bank account balances totaled 6,947 MDL. These amounts together constitute 31,947 MDL in savings at the end of 2021, which were included as outgoing financial flows.
97. Thus, the household's financial outflow for 2021 amounted to 921,515 MDL.
98. It follows that, in the same year, the financial outflow exceeded the financial inflow by 405,384 MDL.

---

<sup>2</sup> The CEP for any year between 2019-2023 is calculated based on NBS methodology, available on the NBS website here:

[https://statbank.statistica.md/PxWeb/pxweb/en/30%20Statistica%20sociala/30%20Statistica%20sociala\\_\\_04%20NIV\\_\\_NIV020/NIV020600.px/?rxid=b2ff27d7-0b96-43c9-934b-42e1a2a9a7740](https://statbank.statistica.md/PxWeb/pxweb/en/30%20Statistica%20sociala/30%20Statistica%20sociala__04%20NIV__NIV020/NIV020600.px/?rxid=b2ff27d7-0b96-43c9-934b-42e1a2a9a7740).

This link is reached from the home page of the NBS website following these steps (tabs): - *Statistics by theme – Society and social conditions - Living standard of population - Stat bank - Population expenditure - Consumption expenditures of population by purpose of expenditures, number of children in household and area, 2019-2023.*

On the above link, the following variables were selected: *Year - Consumption expenditures total – Area (Urban/Rural) – Number of children (if no children, without children is chosen) – Lei, average monthly per capita for one person.* The generated result was multiplied by the number of family members and then was further multiplied by 12 calendar months.

Table Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2021

Income, MDL		Expenses, MDL	
Cash and bank savings	118,859	Purchase of the Mircea cel Batran Blvd apartment	638,750
Salary (Ungheni District Court)	253,658	Vacation expenses (exceeding CEP)	28,815
Salary (National Institute of Justice)	900	Loan repayment	59,840
Bank accounts interest	73	CEP	162,163
Wife's salary	85,324	Cash and bank savings	31,947
Allowance for the temporary incapacity to work	9,348		
Daughter's scholarship (State University of Medicine and Pharmacy)	1,001		
Daughter's income from Romania	46,968		
<b>Total</b>	<b>+516,131</b>		<b>921,515</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-405,384</b>	

### 2.3 Conclusion regarding inexplicable wealth

99. The Commission has identified that the subject's household had a negative financial balance of 405,384 MDL for 2021, which is above the threshold of 20 average salaries (234,000 MDL) required by Article 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law 252/2023 to establish a subject's lack of financial integrity.

## **VI. Conclusion**

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

## **VII. Further action and publication**

101. 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.

102. 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.

103. 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.

104. This evaluation report was approved by a unanimous vote of the Panel members on 9 December 2025 and signed pursuant to Articles 33 para. (7) and 40 para. (5) of the Rules.

105. Done in English and Romanian.

Scott Bales

Chair of Panel D