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

VALERIU CURICHERU

judge of Chișinău Court, previously appointed as a member of the specialized panels for corruption and corruption related cases

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

24 September 2026

Contents

I. Introduction **3**

II. Subject of the Evaluation **3**

III. Evaluation Criteria **4**

IV. Evaluation Procedure **6**

V. Analysis **8**

A. Potential ethical issues arising from the subject's judicial conduct **8**

B. Compliance with the wealth and personal interests declaration regime . **9**

C. Compliance with the conflict-of-interest regime **10**

VI. Conclusion **16**

VII. Further action and publication **16**

Evaluation Panel G 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 17 September 2026 and approved the following report on 24 September 2026. The members participating in the approval of the report were:

1. Willem BROUWER
2. Gerrit-Marc SPRENGER
3. Iulian RUSU

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. Valeriu Curicheru (hereinafter the "subject"), a judge of the Chișinău first level Court.

2. The Commission conducted its evaluation pursuant to Law No. 252/2023 and the Commission's Rules of Organization and Functioning (hereinafter "Rules").

3. The Commission concluded that the subject meets the criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023 for ethical and financial integrity.

II. Subject of the Evaluation

4. Since 1 December 2023 the subject has served as a judge at the Chișinău Court, Centru Office. On 1 January 2025 he was appointed as an investigative judge at the same Court, Ciocana Office. The subject became a judge in 2019 when he was appointed to the Cahul Court.

5. Between 2013-2019, the subject was a judicial assistant at the Chișinău Court, Buiucani Office). Between 2010-2013, he held various positions as a translator, head of the archives, consultant, and senior specialist at the Buiucani Court, Chișinău municipality.

6. The subject received a bachelor's degree in law in 2009 from the Moldova State University. In 2012 the subject received a master's degree in law from the Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Moldova.

III. Evaluation Criteria

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

8. Under Article 11 para. (2), a subject:

> "[…] does not meet ethical integrity requirements if the Evaluation Commission has determined that:
>
> a) in the last 5 years, he/she seriously violated the rules of ethics and professional conduct of judges, or, as the case may be, prosecutors, as well as if they acted arbitrarily or issued arbitrary acts, over the last 10 years, contrary to the imperative rules of the law, and the European Court of Human Rights had established, before the adoption of the act, that a similar decision was contrary to the European Convention on Human Rights;
>
> b) in the last 10 years, has admitted in his/her work incompatibilities and conflicts of interest that affect the office held."

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

> "[…] does not meet the criterion for financial integrity if the Evaluation Commission has serious doubts determined by the fact that:
>
> a) the difference between assets, expenses and income for the last 12 years exceeds 20 average salaries per economy, in the amount set by the Government for the year 2023;
>
> b) in the last 10 years, admitted tax irregularities as a result of which the amount of unpaid tax exceeded, in total, 5 average salaries per economy, in the amount set by the Government for the year 2023."

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

    a. Law No. 544 of 20 July 1995 on Status of Judge;

    b. Law No. 178 of 25 July 2014 on Disciplinary Liability of Judges;

    c. Judge's Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct No. 8 of 11 September 2015 approved by the Decision of the General Assembly of Judges;

    d. Judge's Code of Ethics approved by the decision of the Superior Council of Magistracy no. 366/15 of 29 November 2007;

    e. Guide on the integrity of judges No. 318/16 of 3 July 2018 approved by the Superior Council of Magistracy.

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

12. Article 11 para. (4) of Law No. 252/2023 allows the Commission to verify various things in evaluating the subject's financial integrity, including payment of taxes, compliance with the legal regime for declaring assets and personal interests, and the origins of the subject's wealth.

13. In evaluating the subject's financial integrity, Article 11 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 directs the Commission also to consider the wealth, expenses, and income of close persons, as defined in Law No. 133/2016 on the declaration of wealth and personal interests, as well as of persons referred to in Article 33 paras. (4) and (5) of Law No. 132/2016 on the National Integrity Authority.

14. In assessing a subject's compliance with the ethical and financial integrity criteria, the Commission applies the rules and legal regime that were in effect when the relevant acts occurred.

15. According to Article 11 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023 a subject shall be deemed not to meet the ethical integrity criterion if the Commission has determined the existence of the situations provided for by that paragraph. Under Article 11 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission determines that a subject does not meet the financial integrity criterion if it establishes serious doubts determined by the facts considered breaches of the evaluation criteria. The Commission cannot apply the term "serious doubts" without considering the accompanying phrase "determined by the fact that". This phrase suggests that the Commission must identify as a "fact" that the specified conduct has occurred.

16. Regarding the standard of "serious doubts" in the context of the vetting exercise, the Constitutional Court noted concerning its previous decisions that the definition of standards of proof inevitably involves using flexible texts. The Court also 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 4 February 2026, under Article 12 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission received from the Superior Council of Magistracy the list of judges of the Chișinău Court, who since 1 January 2017 have been and/or are member of specialized panels for the corruption and corruption related cases, for the purpose of their evaluation. The list included the subject.

19. On 5 February 2026, the Commission notified the subject and requested that he completes and returns 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 24 February 2026.

20. On 16 March 2026, the Commission notified the subject that his evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel G with members Willem Brouwer, Gerrit-Marc Sprenger and Iulian Rusu. He was also informed that subjects may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from their evaluation.

21. Because the law sets out different evaluation periods for the ethical and financial integrity criteria cited above, the Commission evaluated compliance with these criteria over the past five, ten and 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 2014-2025 and 2016-2025. The evaluation period for the ethical criterion includes the past five or ten years calculated backward from the date of the notification.

22. In the last 12 years of the evaluation period, the subject had an obligation to submit declarations, both under Law No. 133/2016 on the Declaration of Wealth and Personal Interests, and under Law No. 1264/2002 on the Declaration and Income and Property Control for persons with positions of Public Dignity, Judges, Prosecutors, Civil Servants, positions of Management.

23. The Commission sought and obtained information from numerous sources. No source advised the Commission of later developments or any corrections regarding the information provided.

24. The sources that were 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 National Integrity Authority (hereinafter "NIA"), the State Fiscal Service (hereinafter "SFS"), the General Inspectorate of Border Police, banks (Energbank JSC, Eximbank JSC, Moldinconbank JSC, MAIB JSC, Victoriabank JSC, Banca de Finanțe și Comerț (FincomBank) JSC, OTP Bank JSC, Banca Socială JSC, Banca de Economii JSC), the Office for Prevention and Fight Against Money Laundering (in Romanian: *Serviciul Prevenirea și Combaterea Spălării Banilor*, hence hereinafter – "SPCSB"), and the Public Service Agency (hereinafter "PSA"). Information was also obtained from other public institutions and private entities, open sources such as social media, and investigative journalism reports. Three petitions were received from individuals. These were included in the evaluation file. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.

25. On 4 May 2026, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 17 May 2026 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "first round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.

26. On 8 July 2026, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 20 July 2026 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "second round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the deadline.

27. On 2 August 2026 the subject provided additional documents related to the second round of questions. These were included in the evaluation file.

28. On 7 September 2026, the Commission notified the subject that it had preliminarily established a non-compliance of the subject with the ethical integrity criterion and invited him to attend a public hearing on 17 September 2026. 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 14 September 2026.

30. On 13 September 2026, the subject submitted a request to the Commission to hold the hearing in a closed session, mentioning that most of the cases

identified by the Commission were examined by him, in capacity as an investigative judge, in closed hearings. By decision of 14 September 2016, the Commission granted the request and determined to conduct the hearing in a closed session.

31. On 17 September 2026, 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. He also stated that he did not have any corrections or additions to the answers previously provided to the Commission's requests for information.

32. After the hearing, the subject submitted additional documents. The Commission included them in the evaluation file and considered them in its analysis.

V. Analysis

33. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Commission's conclusion.

34. Based on the information it collected, the Commission analyzed and, where necessary, requested further clarifications on the matters which, upon initial review, raised doubts as to compliance with the criteria established by law:

    a. potential ethical issues arising from the subject's judicial conduct;

    b. compliance with the wealth and personal interests declaration regime;

    c. compliance with the conflict-of-interest regime.

A. Potential ethical issues arising from the subject's judicial conduct

35. A total of 27 complaints and petitions relating to the subject were received from the Judicial Inspection, who noted that complaints or petitions and all related documents are kept for 3 years after they are finished being reviewed. In addition, three petitions were submitted to the Commission on 15, 16 and 27 September 2026.

36. Most of the petitions from the Judicial Inspection concerned allegations regarding procedural irregularities in observing the procedural deadlines, limitations of procedural rights, the scheduling of hearings, disagreement with the court decisions.

37. The petitions submitted to the Commission concerned matters relating to the subject's professional competence and case management. The first one related to matters which require exclusively the assessment of the subject's

professionalism, namely the issuance of several rulings authorizing special investigative measures and ordering preventive measures. Under the law, these matters are not within the Commission's mandate. The third petition, was, in fact, a copy of the criminal complaint submitted to the prosecution by the same individual. It reported on the facts already notified to the Commission. It did not disclose new circumstances that would bring the matters complained of within the scope of the ethical integrity criteria under Law No. 252/2023.

38. The second petition related to the subject's failure to issue judicial acts in time and to perform some procedural actions in a case. Similar complaints had been examined by the Judicial Inspection, which accepted the subject's explanations that the delays resulted from a heavy workload, priority cases, annual leave, and occasional lack of support staff.

39. In the absence of any evidence submitted by the petitioner indicating a serious violation of ethical standards by the subject, and no such evidence having been independently identified by the Commission, no further inquiry was undertaken.

B. Compliance with the wealth and personal interests declaration regime

40. The Commission identified two instances of non-declarations that could have constituted potential breaches of the NIA declaration regime.

The first instance of non-declaration

41. In the first round of questions (Question 22), the subject indicated that between 2014 - June 2018 his household resided in a room dormitory of the Academy of Public Administration located in Chișinău.

42. In the second round of questions (Question 6), the subject explained that he lived in the dormitory as a student during his master studies at the Academy of Public Administration. After graduation (2012), he continued to live there based on a lease contract until June 2018.

43. Although he was a subject of declaration under Law No. 1264/2002 and Law No. 133/2016, he did not declare the right of use over this dormitory room in his annual declaration for 2014-2017.

The second instance of non-declaration

44. In the annual NIA declarations for 2022-2024, the subject declared that he had a right of habitation for an apartment located in Cahul. In the 5-year

declaration, the subject mentioned that he was offered this right for the period 2020-2024.

45. In the first round (Question 20) and second round of questions (Question 3), the subject explained that the apartment was made available to him free of charge by the parents of the owner, V.D., who was residing abroad during the relevant period. According to the subject, the D. family are close friends of his father-in-law, and the apartment was provided to be looked after and to cover the utility bills.

46. The subject did not declare the right of habitation over this apartment in his annual declaration for 2020 and 2021 but did so in the later years. The subject acknowledged this failure and described it as an omission.

The Commission's findings

47. The Commission notes that only the second non-declaration falls within the 5-year term provided by Article 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. The Commission will consider it from an ethical perspective.

48. According to Article 4 para. (1) lit. b) of Law No. 133/2016, the subject was obliged to declare any real estate held under a right of use or habitation.

49. Although the subject's omission to declare the habitation right of the apartment could formally constitute an infringement of the declaration regime, there is no evidence that he sought to conceal this fact or other reasons to doubt his integrity related to this matter. This is reinforced by the fact that the subject declared in his later NIA declarations for 2022-2024 this right and disclosed the full period of habitation to the Commission in the 5-year declaration.

C. Compliance with the conflict-of-interest regime

50. In 2023, the subject crossed the state border together with the C. family (I. and S.) on four round trips, the first being in March 2023 and the last later that year. Of these, one trip was made by the subject with only the husband of attorney S.C. and their daughter.

51. Regarding the last trip, the subject mentioned in the first round of questions (Question 33) that they were supposed to go to Bolgrad to do some grocery shopping, but because of a power outage they did not cross the border into Ukraine and turned back. These crossings were carried out both with the subject's vehicle (Toyota Corolla, m/y 2006) and with C. family's vehicle (Opel Corsa, m/y 2014).

Border crossings		
Vehicle	**leaving**	**entering**
Opel, m/y 2014 (C. family's vehicle)	11 March 2023 (I.C., S.C., subject and his wife)	11 March 2023 (I.C., S.C., subject and his wife)
Opel, m/y 2014 (C.'s family vehicle)	17 June 2023 (I.C., S.C., subject and his wife)	17 June 2023 (I.C., S.C., subject and his wife)
Opel, m/y 2014 (C. family's vehicle)	8 July 2023 (I.C., A.C., subject)	8 July 2023 (I.C., subject)
Toyota Corolla, m/y 2006 (Subject family's vehicle)	18 November 2023 (I.C., S.C., subject and his wife)	18 November 2023 (I.C., S.C., subject and his wife)

52. The joint travels raised doubts concerning the existence of close personal ties between the subject and C. family, in particular attorney at law S.C.

Relationship with the C. family

53. I.C. is a former judge of the Cahul Court and was a colleague of the subject until 20 May 2022. According to the subject's answer from the second round of questions (Question 7, c), he consulted with I.C. on professional matters as judge C. had more experience. During the hearing, the subject mentioned that the communication with I.C. was no different in nature from those with other judges and that there was no special or privileged communication.

54. On 28 May 2021, the Disciplinary Board of SCM examined the disciplinary case regarding the actions of judge I.C., initiated based on a complaint submitted by the Prosecutor General, and decided on his dismissal from office. On 20 May 2022, I.C. was dismissed from the office.

55. His wife, S.C., is an attorney at law since 17 June 2016. She works in a law office (*cabinetul avocatului*) in Cahul. She participated as an attorney in multiple cases during the period when the subject was serving as a judge at the Cahul Court.

56. According to PIGD data, starting December 2019, when the subject was appointed as a judge at the Cahul Court, until 2024, when he was transferred

to Chișinău, the subject examined at least 41 cases in which S.C. participated as an attorney. The subject did not submit self-recusal from any of the cases involving S.C.

Subject's explanations

57. In the first round of questions (Question 33), the subject was asked to provide details of his relationship with the C. family. He stated that his family is in a friendly relationship with the C. family. He became acquainted with I.C. in December 2019 while working together at the Cahul Court. The subject explained that the families occasionally traveled together for shopping purposes. He also added that they have not participated in common family events. The Commission did not establish any indications in that direction.

58. In the second round of questions (Question 7), the subject was requested to provide additional clarifications regarding the relationship between their families, and if he recused himself or informed the participants about the relationship when examining cases with S.C.'s participation.

59. The subject answered that he knows S.C. since 2020, from the court proceedings. In the period December 2019 – November 2023 they communicated only within the court hearings. The friendly family relationship was formed after his transfer from the Cahul Court to the Chișinău Court in December 2023. Since his wife and children remained in Cahul, they began more frequently to communicate with the C. family. In the period of common border crossings, they had only a collegial relationship. The subject claimed that his family and the C. family did not spend time together, did not go jointly on vacations and did not participate in common family events.

60. He mentioned that when they travelled together the expenses for the fuel were shared equally between them. Also, for the trips to Romania the C. family's vehicle was used because it had Romanian registration plates, which helped them save the costs for the international liability insurance policy. In the hearing, the subject specified that their families did not travel together on any other trips within the country.

61. The subject stated that he did not self-recuse in the cases with the participation of the attorney S.C. as there was no ground to do so. According to him, there were no grounds to inform the parties as between him and S.C. existed only a professional relationship. He mentioned that according to the practice at that time, declarations of self-recusal were rejected even in situations where one of the parties or their representative was in a godparent (Romanian: "cumetri")

relationship with the children of a judge. He provided copies of ten rulings issued by the judges of Cahul Court (two of which were issued by the subject himself) in the period 2021-2023. According to these rulings, several declarations of self-recusal submitted by two judges D.B. and A.S. disclosing a godparent relationship with a bailiff were dismissed.

62. He also notes about a working meeting within the Cahul Court in 2021 where the attention was drawn to the excessive number of self-recusals by judges and that this could have led to a situation where there was no one left to examine the cases. Accordingly, it was agreed not to self-recuse over insignificant matters, such as the godparent relationships, not to mention collegial relationships with attorneys who are married to fellow judges.

63. The subject mentioned that for those working meetings no minutes were drafted and he could not provide confirmative documents. Nevertheless, he provided a signed statement of a former judge of Cahul Court, E.B., who confirmed those stated by the subject. E.B. also added that, as a result, a practice was established according to which almost all the self-recusals related to godparent, collegial, friendship relationships were dismissed. However, he specified, that the self-recusals related to godparent-godson relationship (Romanian: "naș-fin") were accepted.

Explanations of the attorney S.C.

64. After the second round of questions addressed to the subject, the Commission asked S.C. about the nature of her relationship with the subject and the common border crossing in 2023. In her response, she confirmed the subject's account, including the professional nature of their relationship (since 2020), her personal relationship with his wife (after the subject's transfer), and that the common border crossings were for shopping purposes.

Examination by the subject of 41 cases involving the attorney S.C.

65. According to data from PIGD and that provided by the Cahul Court, between 2019 and 2023, the subject examined 41 cases with the involvement of the attorney S.C. In 14 cases the subject acted as an investigating judge, exercising judicial oversight at the stage of criminal investigation.

66. According to the information provided by the Chișinău Court the subject did not examine any cases with involvement of the attorney S.C. in the period of his activity at this Court.

67. Out of 41 examined cases in 15 cases the subject adopted decision in favor of the attorney's clients. In 26 cases – he adopted decisions by dismissing the

attorney's claims, declining his competence in favor of the general jurisdiction court, or by dismissing the prosecutor's requests, by the case.

68. In 5 cases out of 41 the subject issued rulings in the period when he crossed the border with C. family's members, including S.C. In all 5 cases – the subject dismissed the complaints, requests of the clients represented by the attorney S.C.

69. In majority of the cases, S.C. acted as an attorney appointed by the territorial office of the National Council for State-Guaranteed Legal Aid. Thus, she provided free legal assistance guaranteed by the state.

Compliance with legal Principles

70. As noted in other previous reports, judges have an obligation to perform their functional duties impartially and objectively. Art. 52 para. (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, Art. 33 para. (2) p. 6) and Art. 34 para. (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, Art. 202 para. (1) of the Administrative Code, Art. 4 para. (4) and (5) of the Code of Ethics require the judge to self-recuse from examining the case when there are circumstances giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his impartiality.

71. According to the ECtHR's settled case-law, the existence of impartiality must be determined according to a subjective test (personal conviction and behavior of a particular judge) and an objective test (impartiality from the point of view of the external observer). As to the subjective test, the principle is that a "tribunal" must be presumed to be free of personal prejudice or partiality until there is proof to the contrary. As to the objective test, it should be determined whether, apart from the judge's conduct, there are ascertainable facts which may raise doubts as to his or her impartiality. In this connection even appearances may be of a certain importance or, in other words, "justice must not only be done, it must also be seen to be done". What is at stake is the confidence which the courts in a democratic society must inspire in the public (*Morice v. France* [GC], no. 29369/10, 23 April 2015, §§ 74, 76, 78).

72. The Bangalore Principles and their Commentary require judges to avoid both actual bias and situations that may reasonably create an appearance of partiality, including through close personal or recurrent social relationships with lawyers or other persons involved in proceedings before them; the relevant test is whether a fully informed, disinterested observer could reasonably doubt the judge's impartiality or the proper administration of justice (Bangalore Principles, paras. 2.5 and 4.3; Commentary, paras. 90(b) and 120).

Commission's findings

73. Travelling abroad in the same vehicle with an attorney involved in cases examined by the subject, necessarily can give rise to concerns in the context of judicial ethics. Such travel entails at least some logistical arrangements, including agreement on the place and time of departure and the possible allocation of fuel costs.

74. The relevant circumstances of the case, weaken however any inference of an improper relationship. The three border crossings were family trips rather than private journeys involving the judge and the attorney alone, as was in *Ciobanu* (Report of 14 May 2024, § 128). The judge travelled primarily in the company of his former work colleague, who happened to be married to an attorney. During the journeys to acquire goods in a nearby town in Romania, common for border cities from the Republic of Moldova, the judge sat in front of the vehicle and conversed with his former colleague, while the attorney sat in the rear with the judge's wife.

75. As noted above (§ 59), the subject explained that a friendly relationship between the two families developed following his transfer to the Chișinău Court in December 2023. This relationship continued to the present day, although the contact appears to have remained limited, with occasional telephone conversations between his wife and S.C.

76. In most of the relevant proceedings, S.C. did not act as privately retained counsel whose remuneration depended upon a particular client or outcome, but as counsel appointed by the state to provide free legal representation. Against that background, occasional social proximity resulting from the spouses' respective relationships cannot reasonably be equated, without additional evidence, with a financial, personal, or professional interest capable of influencing judicial decisions.

77. It would nevertheless have been preferable, in relation to the 5 cases examined after the first common border crossing and in the interests of transparency, to disclose these circumstances to the parties and allow them to raise any concerns. The absence of such disclosure may therefore be open to criticism from the standpoint of judicial prudence. However, that omission remains different from actual bias, favoritism or concealment of an improper relationship. The existence of three family border crossings, even coupled with a failure to disclose them, cannot by itself bear the weight of the most severe professional consequences.

78. In these circumstances, the Commission concludes that the common border crossings of the subject and attorney S.C. followed by the subject's examination of the cases involving the attorney do not lead to a conflict of interest affecting his position as a judge and warranting the consequences provided by Law No. 252/2023.

VI. Conclusion

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

VII. Further action and publication

80. 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.

81. 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.

82. 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.

83. This evaluation report was approved by a unanimous vote of the Panel members on 24 September 2026 and signed pursuant to Articles 33 para. (2) and 40 para. (5) of the Rules

84. Done in English and Romanian.

Willem Brouwer

Chair of Panel G