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

# MIHAIL BUȘULEAC

former interim President of Cahul District Court

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

**21 January 2026**

## Contents

**I. Introduction** ..... **3**

**II. Subject of the Evaluation** ..... **3**

**III. Evaluation Criteria** ..... **3**

**IV. Evaluation Procedure** ..... **6**

**V. Analysis** ..... **9**

A. Potential ethical breaches in relation to the procedural delays ..... 10

B. Potential tax irregularities ..... 11

C. Compliance with the conflict-of-interest regime ..... 16

D. Inexplicable wealth ..... 25

**VI. Conclusion** ..... **65**

**VII. Further action and publication** ..... **66**

Evaluation Panel C 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 8 December 2025 and approved the following report on 21 January 2026. The members participating in the approval of the report were:

1. Andrei BIVOL
2. Willem BROUWER
3. Lavly PERLING

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. Mihail Bușuleac (hereinafter the "subject"), former interim President of the Cahul 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. The subject was appointed as a judge of the Cahul District Court in 2011. Between 2017 and 2021, he served as Vice President of the same court. From 2018 to 2021, he also held the position of the interim President of the court.

5. Prior to his appointment as a judge, the subject was a trainee attorney.

6. The subject obtained a bachelor's degree in law in 2008 from the University of European Studies of Moldova (USEM). In 2010, the subject received a master's degree in law from the same university.

## 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 the Status of the Judge;

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

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

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

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

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

12. Article 11 para. (4) of Law No. 252/2023 allows the Commission to verify various things in evaluating the subject's financial integrity, including

payment of taxes, compliance with the legal regime for declaring assets and personal interests, and the origins of the subject's wealth.

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

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

15. According to Article 11 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023 a subject shall be deemed not to meet the ethical integrity criteria 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 criteria 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

### A. General aspects

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 former interim President and Vice President of the Cahul District 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 22 May 2025.

20. On 30 May 2025, the Commission notified the subject that his evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel A, composed of Andrei Bivol, Willem Brouwer, and Lavly Perling. He 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 C.

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 twelve 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 twelve 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, and 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 (Energbank JSC, EuroCreditBank JSC, Eximbank JSC, Moldinconbank JSC, MAIB JSC, Procredit Bank 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. The Commission received three petitions, which were included in the evaluation file. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.

**B. Rounds of questions and answers**

25. On 13 August 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 28 August 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "first round of questions"). On 14 August 2025, the subject requested an extension, which the Commission granted. The subject provided answers and documents within the extended deadline.

26. On 10 October 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 20 October 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "second round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents on 21 October 2025. On 22 and 31 October 2025, the subject submitted additional documents and photographs.

27. On 10 November 2025, the Commission asked the subject to provide additional information by 17 November 2025 to clarify certain matters (hereinafter the "third round of questions"). On the same day, the subject submitted a request asking the Commission to initiate steps for his temporary release from judicial duties to allow him to respond, stating that the questionnaire consisted of 200 pages.

28. On 18 November 2025, the Commission informed the subject that he had failed to respond within the established deadline and requested an explanation for the delay. The Commission also clarified that it has no competence to request the suspension of a judge from their judicial duties. Furthermore, it clarified that the third round of questions consisted of 73 pages, not 200 as he had claimed, and that most of the questions related to issues previously addressed in the previous rounds.

29. On 19 November 2025, the subject answered the third round of questions. On 24 and 26 November 2025, the subject submitted additional documents.

### C. Statements, requests and conduct of the hearing

30. On 28 November 2025, the Commission notified the subject that it had identified doubts about the subject's compliance with the financial and ethical criteria. The Commission invited him to attend a public hearing on 8 December 2025. The subject was also informed that the evaluation report may refer to other issues considered during the evaluation.

31. 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 4 December 2025.

32. After receiving the notice regarding the public hearing on his evaluation, the subject submitted multiple statements and formulated several requests.

33. On 1 December 2025, following the notification, the subject submitted to the Commission four documents titled "motions" (*demersuri*). However, most of these submissions consisted of additional explanations concerning the doubts raised in the notice of hearing. The only two submissions that contained actual procedural requests were: (1) a request to hear the seller of a vehicle, and (2) a request to hear the participants who attended the christening event of his child, as potential witnesses regarding the financial support received on that occasion.

34. On the same date, the subject submitted four additional documents titled "requests" which also primarily consisted of explanations. The only procedural request contained therein was to hear the donor of the property and the previous owners who had transferred it to the donor.

35. On 3 December 2025, the Commission replied in writing that it would consider the explanations and documents provided. It informed the subject that it was not necessary to hear the individuals who had attended the christening event, as their general capacity to offer gifts on a ceremonial occasion was not questioned. Regarding the other persons whose hearing had been requested, the Commission informed the subject that it was prepared to hear them during the hearing, and that it was the subject's responsibility to ensure their presence.

36. On 4 December 2025, the subject submitted five documents titled "motions" which contained additional explanations. The only procedural request was to hear all parties involved in cases where a potential conflict of interest was identified with attorney G.C.

37. On 5 December 2025, the Commission responded by email. It stated that it would consider the explanations and documents provided. As for the request to hear the parties involved in the cases with attorney G.C., the Commission considered that such hearings were not necessary. It clarified that, under the relevant case law of the European Court of Human Rights (hereinafter "ECtHR"), the analysis of judicial impartiality is mainly based on an objective test, and the perceptions of the parties are not decisive for this analysis.

38. On 7 December 2025, the subject submitted other explanations and documents, which were attached to the evaluation file.

39. On 8 December 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 had no corrections or additions to the previously provided answers and explanations.

40. After the hearing, on 14 December 2025, the subject submitted additional explanations and evidence. He also filed a request proposing that either an on-site review of the accounting register of his wife's bailiff office be conducted by the Commission's secretariat or, alternatively, that his wife be invited to appear before the Commission in person to present and explain the register in detail. According to the subject, merely submitting scanned copies would be insufficient for a proper understanding of the financial data they contain. The Commission added the documents to the evaluation file. On 18 December 2025, the Commission replied that the specific nature of bailiff-related financial flows had been noted and that, if further clarifications are needed, he will be informed accordingly.

41. On 15 December 2025, 22 December 2025, and 6 January 2026, the subject sent further documents, explanations, and evidence, which were included in the evaluation file and considered in the analysis.

## V. Analysis

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

43. 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 breaches in relation to the repetitive procedural delays in minor offence cases;

b. potential tax irregularities;

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

d. difference between the assets, expenses, and income (hereinafter "unjustified or inexplicable wealth").

44. Only the matters under points c) and d) served as independent grounds for the Commission's proposal of non-promotion.

## A. Potential ethical breaches in relation to the repetitive procedural delays in minor offence cases

### 1. Factual circumstances

45. The complaints submitted to the Judicial Inspection against the subject presented a recurring pattern of procedural delays in a significant number of criminal and contravention cases adjudicated by the subject. These cases, although legally and factually of low or moderate complexity, were characterized by a disproportionate number of hearings and overall length, relative to the statutory limitation periods applicable.

46. One notable example is the case of I.G. charged with driving under the influence (Art. $264^1$ of the Criminal Code) and multiple counts of violation of a protection order related to domestic violence (Art. $320^1$ of the Criminal Code). The subject presided over proceedings from 2019 to 2023, with over 30 hearings scheduled. The case ended because of the death of the defendant, not a judgment on the merits.

47. In another set of cases (R.P., N.P., A.G., V.C.), all for driving under influence (Art. $264^1$ of the Criminal Code), the subject issued convictions at first instance. However, each of these proceedings extended over a period exceeding 20 months. The sentences were issued close to the expiry of the statutory limitation period. As a result, shortly after the defendants exercised their right to appeal, the limitation period expired, rendering it impossible for the Cahul Court of Appeal to uphold the sentence. In each case, the Cahul Court of Appeal was procedurally bound to discontinue the proceedings and release the defendants from criminal liability. The Cahul Court of Appeal issued interlocutory rulings and formally referred the recurring procedural pattern to the Judicial Inspection.

48. Similarly, in the case of V.P., charged for abuse of office under Art. 312 of the Contravention Code, the proceedings extended beyond the one-year

statutory limitation period. The case was ultimately discontinued due to the expiration of the limitation period, and the National Anticorruption Center formally notified the Judicial Inspection of the procedural failure.

49. In the case involving E.B. and others charged with hooliganism (Art. 287 para. (2) of the Criminal Code), the limitation period had expired by the time of sentencing in 2025, yet the subject applied amnesty rather than acknowledging the prescription of criminal liability.

**2. Subject's explanations**

50. In the second round of questions, the subject denied personal responsibility, invoking the absence of attorneys or witnesses, procedural requests from the parties, and an increased workload at the Cahul District Court. The subject submitted copies of requests sent to the SCM for additional staffing.

**3. Commission's assessment**

51. The cases reviewed were not complex and involved short limitation periods. While these deficiencies reflect a lack of procedural efficiency and case management, there was no evidence of personal benefit or deliberate misuse of judicial functions. The subject attributed the delays to external and contextual factors, including party absences, procedural requests, and a high workload at the Cahul District Court. These explanations are partially supported by objective factors but do not fully account for the systematic nature of the observed delays.

52. The subject's behavior is more indicative of professional error or competence issues than of a serious violation of ethical standards as required under art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. The assessment of judicial competence and professional conduct falls within the competence of the specialized bodies tasked with evaluating the professional performance of judges, including the application of proportionate disciplinary sanctions, where appropriate.

**B. Potential tax irregularities**

**1. Potential non-payment of taxes resulting from salary transfers to the subject's wife's private accounts**

**1.1 Factual circumstances**

53. Between 2017–2021 and 2023–2024, the subject's wife, a bailiff, declared a total income of 5,913,372 MDL, including professional earnings and income from rental contracts concluded between herself and her bailiff's office.

54. During the same period, 7,571,917 MDL were transferred from the professional accounts to her private MICB bank account, with most transactions described as "salary payments". Only seven transfers in 2017, totaling 162,347 MDL, were not described in the MICB bank statement, but given that they originated from her bailiff's office, the Commission presumed they were also salary-related. This resulted in a discrepancy of 1,658,545 MDL above the income reported to the tax authorities, raising concerns regarding the completeness and accuracy of declared earnings.

55. In 2023, a further 166,400 MDL was received on MICB account ***921 linked to the bailiff office. The transfers were labelled "transfer of honorariums to salary account". Given this labeling and the nature of the credited account's activity—primarily used for credit repayments, transfers to third parties, and retail expenditures—it appears to be used for private, not professional, purposes. Including this amount, the total discrepancy with the declared income is 1,824,945 MDL.

56. In 2022, the subject's wife declared more income than was received in her accounts. However, this may be due to part of the income being received in cash.

57. The table below presents a year-by-year comparison between the net income declared to the SFS by the subject's wife and the net amounts transferred to her private bank accounts, labeled as honorariums or salary payments. The Commission relied on net amounts, as it was established that taxes had already been paid directly from the professional accounts of the Bailiff office. In other words, the funds transferred to the private accounts reflect income after tax, making a direct comparison appropriate. Between 2017 and 2020, the subject's wife paid an effective tax rate of 18%[1], while between 2021 and 2024, the rate applied was 12%[2] of the income earned.

| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Salary receipt on acc. *4661 | 473,265 | 785,765 | 531,796 | 370,838 | 866,300 | 442,500 | 1,859,590 | 2,241,863 |
| Salary receipt on acc. *921 | | | | | | | 166,400 | |

[1] As per Chapter 10[1] of the Tax code (in force until 2020)

[2] As per art.15 lit. a) of the Tax code (in force from 2021)

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Net income per tax forms | 366,684 | 644,983 | 497,652 | 298,310 | 617,656 | 814,012 | 1,386,578 | 2,101,509 |
| Difference | -106,581 | -140,782 | -34,144 | -72,528 | -248,644 | n/a | -639,412 | -140,354 |
| Potential unpaid taxes | 19,184 | 25,340 | 6,145 | 13,055 | 29,837 | n/a | 76,729 | 16,842 |

58. Accordingly, per the above, the subject's wife most likely failed to pay 187,132 MDL in taxes.

59. As a measure of secondary verification, the Commission conducted a comprehensive analysis of the bank statements corresponding to the professional accounts of the subject's wife. According to the data from MICB accounts no. ***467, ***466, and ***222, the total amount of identifiable deductible expenses for the period 2017–2023 was 3,654,928 MDL. These expenses were exclusively related to business operations and included, among others, payments for taxes, employee salaries, insurance, fuel, office supplies, furniture, and fines issued in the wife's name (not connected to enforcement proceedings).

60. In contrast to the gross income of 7,393,629 MDL declared to the SFS by the subject's wife for her activity as a bailiff during the same period, the Commission calculated an actual income of 9,151,382 MDL, derived by adding the salary payments transferred to private accounts (5,496,454 MDL) to the business-related expenses paid from professional accounts (3,654,928 MDL). The resulting difference of 1,757,753 MDL suggests undeclared income and is notably close to the discrepancy of 1,824,945 MDL previously identified based solely on private account transfers. This reinforced the doubts regarding underreporting taxable income.

**1.2 Subject's explanations**

61. In both his oral statements during the hearing and in the written submission provided afterwards, the subject explained that many of the financial flows recorded in the bank accounts of his spouse did not represent her personal income but rather operational or third-party funds, such as bailiff-related procedural costs, deposits, payments for experts, court fines, unclaimed creditor funds, and sums received on behalf of the state or other bailiffs. According to the subject, the nature of these sums makes them difficult to decipher without proper contextualization, and a misinterpretation of such flows could lead to incorrect conclusions about undeclared income.

62. After the hearing, the subject submitted a certificate issued by SFS dated 9 December 2025, stating that his wife had no outstanding debts to the state budget.

**1.3 Commission's assessment**

63. In trying to address the identified mismatches, the subject relied on a general explanation and on an SFS certificate that does not fully explain the issue. The claim that the financial flows are too complex to interpret does not account for the clear discrepancies between the net income declared to the SFS, and the net amounts transferred to private accounts as salary or honorarium.

64. The SFS certificate does not clarify the mismatches either. In general, such certificates only reflect the information available to the tax authority at the time of issuance, and does not confirm that no legal violation occurred. Undeclared income could have been detected only through a targeted audit.

65. Although the subject and his spouse were married throughout the period and shared a joint household, this alone does not establish his personal responsibility. The financial integrity criterion set out in Article 11 para. (3) lit. (b) of Law No. 252/2023 implies a subjective element of responsibility. The legal text refers to cases where "the subject allowed tax irregularities," which presupposes at least a degree of awareness, acceptance, or failure to act in the face of such irregularities. Accordingly, the existence of unpaid taxes within the subject's household is not, on its own, sufficient to conclude a failure to meet the integrity standard. Rather, there must be serious doubts that the subject personally allowed, either actively or through omission, the fiscal irregularities in question.

66. In this case, there is no evidence that the subject had knowledge of, contributed to, or tolerated potential tax irregularities. The financial flows were thoroughly examined and, while concerns remain regarding the spouse's fiscal reporting, these cannot be attributed to the subject as a matter of conduct or culpable inaction. As a matter of fact, the subject was cooperative and invited verification of his wife's bailiff accounts.

67. Therefore, although the identified tax discrepancy exceeds the legal threshold set out in Article 11 para. (3) lit. (b) of Law No. 252/2023, the absence of evidence implicating the subject personally leads the Commission to conclude that he does not fail the financial integrity criterion on this basis.

**2. Potential non-payment of taxes arising from vehicle rental income**

**2.1 Factual circumstances**

68. In the NIA declarations for the period 2019–2024, the subject reported receiving 482,880 MDL from renting out a personal vehicle.

69. In the same period, the subject received 455,840 MDL in his MICB account *881 from his spouse, through transfers either explicitly labelled as rent payments for a Toyota or, more generally, marked as rent payments.

| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Declared to NIA | 36.000 | 51.200 | 96.000 | 87.680 | 96.000 | 116.000 |
| Received on MICB account no. *881 | 34,400 | 59,200 | 86,400 | 85,760 | 84,480 | 105,600 |

70. While the figures do not coincide exactly, the amounts received are broadly aligned with those declared to the NIA. However, this rental income was not reflected in the subject's tax declarations for the years 2019–2023, except for 112,000 MDL in 2024, which was reported and taxed.

**2.2 Subject's explanations**

71. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that income from the rental of his personal vehicle was taxed at the same rate as regular income, and therefore, no tax evasion could be imputed.

**2.3 Commission's assessment**

72. While the subject did not provide further clarification, it is possible that in his explanations, he was referring to Article $90^1$ para. (3) of the Tax Code, which provides that income obtained by individuals who are not engaged in entrepreneurial activity, from the lease of movable or immovable property, is subject to a 12% withholding tax at the source.

73. However, according to SFS tax forms obtained by the Commission, no taxes were reported or withheld on this rental income for the years 2019–2023. If the tax had indeed been withheld at source, this would have been reflected in the subject's personal tax filings for the relevant years.

74. After deducting 112,000 MDL declared and taxed in 2024, the remaining potentially untaxed rental income amounts to 370,880 MDL. Applying the 12% tax rate, the estimated unpaid tax amounts to 44,506 MDL. This figure

is below the threshold established under Article 11 para. (3) lit. (b) of Law No. 252/2023.

## C. Compliance with the conflict-of-interest regime

### 1. Legal principles

75. Under Article 11 para. (2) lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023, a subject does not meet the criteria of ethical integrity if the Commission has established that in the last 10 years, he/she has admitted conflicts of interest affecting judicial position.

76. As already noted in the Commission's previous reports (e.g., *Ursachi*, Report of 5 November 2024), in its Judgment No. 18 of 27 September 2022, the Constitutional Court emphasized that a distinction must be made between conflicts of interest arising in the administrative activity of judges (such as in the case of court presidents) and those emerging from their jurisdictional activity. In the latter case, conflicts of interest are resolved exclusively under the procedural codes, which require the judges to abstain from adjudicating cases where there may be doubts as to their objectivity.

77. Article 52 para. (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure and Article 34 para. (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure obliges the judge to refrain from examining the case when there are reasons affecting the judge's impartiality.

78. Under Article 4 para. (1) lit. a) of Law No. 178/2014 on disciplinary responsibility of judges, a disciplinary offense can be:

> "non-compliance by intention or gross negligence with the duty to abstain when the judge knew or should have known that circumstances provided by law requiring abstention existed […]."

79. According to Article 15 para. (1) lit. a) and d) of Law No. 544/1995 on the status of judges, a judge is obliged:

> a) to be impartial;
>
> d) to refrain from acts that compromise the honor and dignity of judges or that cause doubts about the judge's objectivity."

80. Under Article 4 para. (4) and (5) of the Code of Ethics:

> "The judge shall refrain from making decisions, when his/her interests, those related by blood, adoption, affinity, or other persons who have close ties with his/her family, could influence the correctness of decisions."
>
> "The family and social relations of the judge must not influence the court decisions he/she adopts in the performance of his/her professional duties."

81. According to the well-established case-law of the ECtHR, impartiality is evaluated based on: (1) a subjective test where regard must be had to the personal conviction and behavior of a particular judge, that is, whether the judge held any personal prejudice or bias in a given case: and also (2) an objective test, that is to say by ascertaining whether the tribunal itself and, among other aspects, its composition, offered sufficient guarantees to exclude any legitimate doubt in respect of its impartiality. As to the subjective test, the principle that a tribunal shall be presumed to be free of personal prejudice. Therefore, in most cases involving appearances of bias, the analysis focuses on the objective test, which requires the identification of verifiable facts that could raise doubts as to impartiality (*Micallef v. Malta* [GC], 15 October 2009, §§ 93–97; *Ramos Nunes de Carvalho e Sá v. Portugal*, [GC, 6 November 2018, § 146).

82. The objective test is functional in nature. It aims to identify professional, financial or personal connections between a judge and a participant that may give rise to objectively justifiable suspicions concerning the impartiality of the court (*BEG S.P.A. v. Italy*, 20 May 2021, § 131).

83. The ECtHR also stated that even appearances may be of a certain importance. What is at stake is the confidence which the courts in a democratic society must inspire in the public, including the accused (see *Tsulukidze and Rusulashvili v. Georgia, 29 august 2024*, § 47).

**2. Cases with the prosecutor that investigated the subject's wife**

**2.1 The facts**

84. By order of Prosecutor I.V. of the Cahul District Prosecutor's Office dated 18 September 2024, the subject's wife was removed from criminal prosecution, and the case was formally closed. The proceedings concerned a reasonable suspicion of forgery of public documents under Article 332 of the Criminal Code. The criminal investigation had been initiated by the National Anticorruption Center on 19 April 2023.

85. According to data from PIGD, following the issuance of the order, the subject was assigned to at least ten criminal and contravention cases in which I.V. acts as the case prosecutor:

a) Case No. 4-246/2025 – V.R. – Article 105 of the Contravention Code (Minor misappropriation of property);

b) Case No. 1-360/2025 – P.G. – Article 264[1] of the Criminal Code (Driving under the influence);

c) Case No. 4-225/2025 – V.T. – Article 312 of the Contravention Code (Negligence in service);

d) Case No. 4-224/2025 – S.A. – Article 312 of the Contravention Code (Negligence in service);

e) Case No. 1-353/2025 – A.B. – Article 325 of the Criminal Code (Active corruption);

f) Case No. 5r-234/2025 – O.B., M.B. – Challenge against a contravention agent's decision;

g) Case No. 1-266/2024 – A.O. – Article 325 of the Criminal Code (Active corruption);

h) Case No. 1-185/2024 – A.T.– Article 361 of the Criminal Code (Forgery of official documents);

i) Case No. 1-174/2024 – T.T. – Article 325 of the Criminal Code (Active corruption);

j) Case No. 1-78/2024 – S.S. – Article 361 of the Criminal Code (Forgery of official documents).

86. In the first five cases listed above, no hearings had taken place as of the date of the subject's hearing. However, the subject formally admitted the cases for examination and summoned prosecutor I.V. in her procedural capacity.

87. Of the remaining cases, only that of A.O. was finalized through a sentence. However, prosecutor I.V. did not appear in court during trial. She signed the indictment at the pre-trial phase, but a different prosecutor represented the state during the hearings.

88. The rest of the cases remain pending. Hearings have taken place, and I.V. has appeared before the subject in her capacity as case prosecutor.

**2.2 Subject's explanations**

89. During the hearing, the subject stated that he was not aware that I.V. previously handled the case concerning his wife.

90. After receiving the notice of hearing, the subject submitted self-recusal requests in all pending cases involving I.V. These requests were subsequently rejected by other judges.

**2.3 Commission's assessment**

91. The subject's assertion that he was unaware that prosecutor I.V. handled the case involving his wife appears implausible, given the reasonable expectation that such matters would have been discussed within a family of legal professionals. Criminal prosecution is not a common occurrence, and the involvement of a specific prosecutor is generally a matter of particular significance.

92. As a judge serving in the same district where the prosecution was conducted, the subject had to exercise diligence in identifying potential conflicts. Prosecutor I.V. had appeared before the subject in other cases prior to the case concerning the subject`s wife. In such circumstances, the subject was expected to verify whether there was any procedural connection between the prosecutor and his immediate family and to take appropriate steps to preserve impartiality.

93. The previous practice suggests that a prior adversarial relationship, where the subject was investigated as a suspect by a prosecutor who later appeared as a party before the subject, is sufficient to create an objective appearance of lack of impartiality, triggering a duty of recusal or disclosure, regardless of the outcome of the criminal proceedings (see *e.g. Marina Anton*, Report of 8 April 2025, § 91).

94. In this case, however, it wasn't the subject who had been prosecuted, but his wife. The subject did not deliver any judgment on the merits in the identified cases. In the only finalized case, prosecutor I.V. did not participate in the hearings before the court, but only in the pre-trial stage.

95. The subject further self-recused in all pending cases after having received the hearing notice. The flagging in the hearing notice of cases as raising a potential doubt should not have been a determining factor in a subject's decision to self-recuse. The Commission's hearing notice signals a need for scrutiny. However, judges must independently assess whether the criteria for recusal are met, regardless of the procedural elements of the evaluation, such as the timing of a hearing notice or the rounds of questions.

96. Therefore, although a fully consummated conflict of interest cannot be established under Article 11 para. (2) lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023, and the subject's conduct as such does not lead to the failure of the evaluation, it demonstrates a concerning lack of sensitivity to the appearance of impropriety. The fact that he failed to disclose or recuse himself in a timely manner contributes to the broader concerns identified in this report.

### 3. Cases involving an attorney to whom the subject's family had an outstanding financial obligation

#### 3.1 The facts

97. On 10 June 2021, the subject's wife concluded a sale-purchase contract with G.C., an attorney practicing in Cahul Municipality since 2001. The object of the transaction was half of a plot of land and half of a 115 sq.m building, located in a central area of Cahul. The purchase price was 385,658 MDL (approximately 18,430 EUR), equal to the property's cadastral value. However, according to market real estate data from 2025, the average price for property in central Cahul is approximately 1,150 EUR per sq.m, which would place the estimated market value of the purchased share at around 69,000 EUR, significantly higher than the amount actually paid[3].

98. The contract stipulated payment in cash, in several instalments, with the final instalment paid in March 2022. Although the subject was not a signatory to the contract, the acquired property was registered on 10 June 2021 under the names of both the subject and his wife and became part of their joint marital patrimony.

99. Between 10 June 2021 and 11 March 2022, while the instalment payments were still ongoing, the subject presided over at least six cases in which attorney G.C. acted as a party representative. According to data from PIGD, in all six cases, the decisions were in favor of the party represented by G.C. In none of these cases did the subject request self-recusal. The cases are:

a) *M.B. v. D.C.* – a divorce lawsuit. G.C. represented the claimant. By judgment of 19 July 2021, the court admitted the claim.

b) *M.G. v. N.G.* – a divorce lawsuit that also concerned the residence of a minor child. G.C. represented the claimant. By judgment of 12 August 2021, the claim was admitted and the residence of the minor was established with the claimant.

c) *I.B.* – a lawsuit on confirmation of inheritance. G.C. represented the petitioner. By judgment of 3 September 2021, the claim was admitted.

d) *A.G. v. V.G.* – a divorce lawsuit. G.C. represented the claimant. By judgment of 11 October 2021, the claim was admitted.

[3] https://nordevis.md/pretul-mediu-pe-1-mp-la-apartamente-in-cahul-2025/

e) *N.O.* – a lawsuit on confirmation of inheritance. G.C. represented the petitioner. By judgment of 1 November 2021, the claim was admitted.

f) *S.C.* – a lawsuit challenging a contravention fine (under art. 240 para. (1) of the Contravention Code). G.C. represented the petitioner. By judgment of 11 March 2022, the petition was admitted.

100. The circumstances described above were also examined during the pre-vetting process, as part of the subject's earlier candidacy for the Superior Council of Magistracy. In its initial evaluation, by Decision No. 13 of 5 January 2023, the Pre-Vetting Commission identified this matter as a ground for non-promotion.

101. On 1 August 2023, the Supreme Court of Justice annulled the decision and ordered a re-evaluation of the subject's candidacy.

102. Following the Pre-Vetting Commission's hearing notice in the re-evaluation process, the subject withdrew from the competition for the Superior Council of Magistracy.

103. The subject continued to adjudicate additional cases involving attorney, G.C., after the Pre-Vetting process. These include at least 14 additional cases, including criminal cases, paternity disputes, cases regarding the determination of the residence of the minor, and alimony disputes.

104. Following the notification of the hearing in the present evaluation, the subject submitted requests for self-recusal in the cases pending in which attorney G.C. appeared. However, the requests were rejected.

**3.2 The subject's explanations**

105. In the second round of questions, the subject referred to the Supreme Court of Justice Decision of 1 August 2023 and invoked the principle of *res judicata*.

106. However, during the hearing, the subject acknowledged that, given the circumstances, he would have recused himself in the cases involving attorney G.C. He also stated that the cases in question were adjudicated in the absence of the parties.

107. On 6 January 2026, the subject submitted additional explanations, arguing that his involvement in cases involving attorney G.C. differs from the cases of other subjects in which the Commission identified conflicts of interest leading to non-promotion. The subject contended that the transaction in question was not gratuitous, thereby suggesting the absence of any undue benefit or irregularity. He emphasized that he was not a direct party to the sale-purchase contract, that it was not established whether any

communication occurred between him and attorney G.C. prior to the transaction, and that none of his judgments in the relevant cases were appealed. Furthermore, the subject stated that it was not established whether the outcomes favored the parties represented by attorney G.C., nor was there any indication that the judgments had a negative impact on the rights of the other parties. The subject also claimed that his situation is comparable to that of subjects Ghenadie Liulca, Andrei Mironov, and Vitalie Movilă, in whose cases the examined potential circumstances of conflicts of interests did not lead to the failure of the evaluation.

**3.3 Commission's assessment**

108. The Commission notes that the subject's financial relationship with attorney G.C., established through the purchase of jointly owned immovable property during 2021–2022, created a situation that required heightened vigilance and transparency, in accordance with judicial ethics standards.

109. The ethical obligation arising from this situation is established in Article 5 para. (3) of the Judicial Code of Ethics:

> "A judge shall refrain from any financial transactions or business activities that could affect their impartiality, influence the performance of their duties, exploit their judicial office, or involve them in arrangements with lawyers or other persons who are participants in proceedings before the court in which the judge operates."

110. The contractual relationship was formally entered into by the subject's wife. However, once the property became jointly owned and part of the family patrimony, and while instalment payments remained due to attorney G.C., the subject had a personal and ongoing financial interest in the transaction. In such a context, the ethical duty to refrain from adjudicating cases involving the attorney became fully applicable.

111. The duty of recusal in such circumstances exists not only to prevent actual bias, but also to preserve public confidence in judicial impartiality. From the perspective of an outside observer, the situation where a judge is simultaneously debtor in an ongoing transaction with the representative of one of the parties may reasonably raise doubts as to the fairness and objectivity of the proceedings.

112. The subject attempted to rely on *res judicata*, invoking the Supreme Court of Justice Decision of 1 August 2023, which annulled the Pre-Vetting Commission's decision. However, this argument is not applicable because the subject withdrew from the pre-vetting procedure before a new decision

could be adopted. The conflict of interest was not reassessed and so it remained open.

113. The Supreme Court of Justice stated that the cases examined by the subject in which attorney G.C. appeared, did not involve a legal dispute and that no party could be considered advantaged or disadvantaged by the outcome. However, while some of the proceedings may have been of a non-adversarial nature, the potential for influence or appearance of bias remains, especially given the subject's financial obligation to this attorney appearing repeatedly before him.

114. Moreover, the Supreme Court of Justice referred to only three cases allegedly lacking contentious elements, whereas the Commission identified six cases during the period of the ongoing transaction. These included a case concerning the residence of a minor.

115. During the hearing, the subject argued that he did not recuse himself because the parties were not present in the hearings. This explanation, however, is not supported in full by the official court records. According to PIGD data:

    a) In *N.O.*, the General Directorate of Fiscal Administration South appeared as an interested party;

    b) In *M.G. v. N.G.*, involving the residence of a minor, the defendant's mother attended and informed the court that her son was incarcerated in Italy and that he acknowledged the claim.

116. In the remaining cases, only attorney G.C. was present. However, the presence or absence of the parties is irrelevant for the purposes of determining a conflict of interest. Even in proceedings where only the attorney G.C. appeared, the subject was ruling on matters while having an unsettled financial obligation toward that same attorney. Such conduct gives rise to justifiable concerns about impartiality and may reasonably be perceived as ethically inappropriate by the public.

117. The subject's argument that the judgments were not appealed is irrelevant in this context. The ethical obligation to avoid conflicts of interest does not depend on whether the parties choose to challenge the decisions, but on the judge's duty to preserve impartiality. According to the case law of the ECtHR, "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. Thus, any judge in respect of whom there is a legitimate reason to fear a lack of impartiality must withdraw (*Morice v. France* [GC], 23 April 2015, § 78).

118. Despite the subject's argument that the decisions did not benefit the parties represented by G.C., the data presented in § 99 shows that all six decisions during the period of the ongoing transaction were rendered in favor of the parties represented by G.C.

119. The subject argued that his situation is like the cases or other subjects where no finding of non-compliance was made. However, the subject's situation is materially distinct. In the case of Ghenadie Liulca, the transaction with the attorney involved the purchase of a vehicle at market price with no ongoing obligations. Andrei Mironov examined cases involving a large company where his wife held minor, non-managerial administrative roles, and was not involved in the proceedings. Vitalie Movilă presided over cases involving a bailiff who had enforced a judgment in his favor four years before the cases in question, and several of those rulings were unfavorable to the bailiff, indicating no personal or procedural impropriety. Aurelia Cazacliu, although not formally recusing herself, took consistent procedural measures to ensure that relevant cases were reassigned or joined with other proceedings, thus avoiding examination. Aliona Miron filed a self-recusal request in a case involving a party represented by an attorney from the law firm employing her son, but the request was rejected. Therefore, in a subsequent case involving the same law firm, she did not file a new recusal request.

120. In all the alleged comparable situations, the judges either acted diligently to avoid adjudicating the cases or had no ongoing financial link to the parties.

121. Additionally, after the Pre-Vetting Commission identified this situation in its evaluation, the subject continued to adjudicate cases involving attorney G.C., including criminal and family law proceedings, instead of adopting a more prudent and cautious approach. Even though the payment obligation was no longer pending at the time of some of these proceedings, doubts regarding the subject's impartiality persisted. As noted at § 97, the price paid for the immovable property appears significantly lower than the market value, and the payment structure — which allowed for instalments — may be interpreted as a financial advantage. These elements reinforced the perception of a continuing ethical concern that warranted a decision to disclose these circumstances to the parties or abstain from further involvement in cases involving the same attorney.

122. Although the subject acknowledged during the hearing that, in hindsight, he would have recused himself in such circumstances, this delayed awareness does not exclude the conflict of interest in his earlier conduct.

123. Following the receipt of the hearing notice, the subject submitted self-recusal requests in the pending cases involving attorney G.C. These requests were rejected by other judges. As noted above, the procedural elements of the evaluation, such as the timing of a hearing notice, should not normally influence the independent assessment of the judge on whether the criteria for recusal are met.

124. Considering the above, the subject's conduct amounted to conflicts of interest, incompatible with the duties of judicial office. Accordingly, the subject does not meet the ethical integrity criterion set out in Article 11 para. (2) lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023.

125. While the first episode involving prosecutor I.V. does not constitute a separate breach of ethical integrity, it reinforces the Commission's conclusion regarding the subject's inadequate approach to managing conflicts of interest.

### D. Inexplicable wealth

126. In its analysis of the subject's household income and expenses, the Commission identified negative financial balances in 2013, 2023, and 2024, as well as a potential discrepancy in 2016.

127. The Commission also examined several specific issues that significantly affect, or could have affected, the calculation of inexplicable wealth. These include:

(i) the payment timeline for an apartment, which appeared to diverge from the formal instalment schedule and may have had financial implications for 2019;

(ii) donations reportedly received on the occasion of the subject's son's christening celebration (*cumătrie*) in 2016;

(iii) declared cash savings; and

(iv) the circumstances surrounding the transfer of immovable property in Chișinău to the subject's household by an alleged donation.

128. The Commission will first address these matters individually. Thereafter, the report presents a year-by-year assessment of the subject's household income and expenses.

**1. Payment timeline for a property acquired by the subject's family**

129. As indicated in the hearing notice, the Commission initially calculated a negative financial balance of 144,737 MDL for 2019 in connection with an apartment acquired by the subject's family. This preliminary conclusion was based on a potential transaction of 601,298 MDL, which a construction company declared to the SFS on 23 October 2019, pursuant to its VAT reporting obligations.

130. In the third round of questions, the subject explained that the total contractual price of 35,904 EUR had been fully paid for by December 2018. According to the subject, the 601,298 MDL invoice issued in 2019 did not reflect a new payment. The document was most likely an internal accounting record prepared by the construction company, without the buyers' involvement or knowledge, and unaccompanied by any actual financial transaction.

131. According to the contract, the total price of 35,904 EUR was to be paid in full by 31 December 2017, in four instalments. However, in the third round of questions, the subject explained that the payments were made as follows: 10,700 EUR on 29 November 2016, 18,684 EUR throughout 2017, and the remaining 6,520 EUR in December 2018. Although the payments did not strictly follow the contractual due dates, the subject's explanation is corroborated by Handover Act No. 6784 of 21 August 2018, which referenced the outstanding amount of 6,520 EUR with a due date of 31 December 2018 — an amount the subject explained was settled in full within that timeframe.

132. Given these circumstances, the Commission finds no basis to attribute 601,298 MDL as a real payment made in 2019.

**2. Donation received on the christening of the subject's son and cash savings declared**

133. In the 2016 NIA declaration, the subject reported receiving 30,000 EUR in donations on his son's christening. In the same declaration, he disclosed another donation of 100,000 MDL (approximately 4,500 EUR) from his parents and having 21,000 EUR in cash savings at the time of submitting the declaration.

134. The christening allegedly took place on 2 September 2016 and, according to the subject, was attended by approximately 150 guests. He stated that the event was fully organized and paid for by his parents. In the first round of questions, he explained that no documentation could be provided, as both his parents had since passed away. He also indicated that his parents

contributed a significant portion of the declared donation, explaining their generosity by the fact that "they very much wanted this event, as the first boy was born in the Bușuleac family."

135. In the second round of questions, the subject confirmed that his parents contributed more than half of the 30,000 EUR donations. During the hearing, he stated that their contribution was approximately 20,000 EUR. He reiterated that they covered the full costs of the event — venue, catering, music, and other arrangements — and stated that all contracts were concluded directly between the parents and the service providers.

136. After the Commission's inquiry, the restaurant provided a written response confirming that it maintains a list of clients and identified the subject's mother as one of its customers.

137. The subject argued that the financial support provided by his parents did not require declaration to NIA, as it did not result in a direct transfer of funds, did not increase his or his son's patrimony, and constituted ordinary family support. He maintained that the law requires the declaration of income and goods, not third-party expenses.

138. However, according to Article 2 of Law No. 133/2016, the notion of "income" includes:

> "any financial benefit, regardless of the source, obtained by the declarant or by their family members or partner, whether in the country or abroad."

139. This definition is broad and captures both direct and indirect forms of material gain. In this case, the subject allegedly benefited from substantial event-related expenses paid by his parents—an advantage that effectively relieved him of a financial burden. Even if the support did not take the form of a direct monetary transfer, it falls within the statutory definition of income, as it resulted in a financial gain in the form of a cost saving. By analogy with art. 1389 of the Civil Code (in force in 2016) on unjust enrichment, a person is considered to have obtained a benefit not only by receiving a good or sum of money but also by realizing a saving at the expense of another.

140. An interpretation under which public officials—particularly judges—would not be required to declare payments made by third parties for their benefit would seriously undermine the purpose of the asset declaration regime. It would open the door to undeclared advantages or informal arrangements, defeating the principle of transparency.

141. Article 4 para (3) of Law No. 133/2016, in the version applicable at the time of the declaration, exempted from disclosure only those gifts or advantages from family members whose individual value did not exceed 10 average salaries. In 2016, the average monthly salary was 5,050 MDL, meaning that the exemption threshold was 50,500 MDL (approximately 2,300 EUR). This amount is most likely below the value of the event in question, which involved approximately 150 guests and multiple associated expenses. As such, the financial support received exceeded the statutory threshold and should have been declared.

142. MICB bank records show that the subject's father received 1,258,963 MDL on 4 July 2016 — approximately two months before the event— from a bailiff, with the transfer labelled as "repayment of debt according to executive title no. 2-1627/15 of 2 November 2015." The number indicated in the transaction description corresponds to the number of a civil case in which the subject's father obtained a judgment against his former employer, an insurance company, in a labor dispute. The court ordered the payment of a total amount of 1,293,458 MDL.

143. The timing, legal origin, and amount of this income — combined with the restaurant's confirmation identifying the subject's mother as a client — may support the plausibility that the subject's parents had the financial capacity to contribute both to the donation and the costs of the event.

144. Nonetheless, certain doubts remain. No documentation was provided to confirm whether the funds received by the subject's father were withdrawn or made available in cash before the event. Additionally, the explanation regarding the motivation for the parents' contribution — that it was the celebration of the "first boy" born in the family — is inconsistent with the fact that the subject's sister had given birth to a boy in 2010.

145. A further inconsistency in the subject's explanations relates to the parents' equal, or at least similar, financial contributions for each of the three siblings, including the subject. The subject declared his receipt of financial contributions from his parents in the period 2007 – 2016, amounting to approximately 60,000 EUR, from their alleged purchase of an apartment in the subject's name and donations. In addition to these, the parents allegedly paid for a wedding and a christening, both large events with many participants, entailing further significant expenses for the venue, menu, and entertainment. However, according to SFS and CNAS documents, the subject's parents had a total confirmed income of approximately 235,000 EUR in this same period. Accounting for the CEP incurred by the subject's

parents, their available income in this period amounted to 208,000 EUR, and this only if all available income was converted into EUR in the year in which it was received. Furthermore, unquantified but plausible expenses were identified for the purchase of two vehicles, six land plots, a house, a large industrial building, and expenses for the construction of three buildings. It follows that the subject would have had to receive inordinate financial assistance from his parents simply because they did not have the financial capacity to provide the same support to all three of their children and their families, while also covering their own expenditure.

146. The subject declared income of 30,000 EUR to NIA from the christening, 100,000 MDL (approximately 4,500 EUR) in additional donations from his parents and only 21,000 EUR as cash savings at the end of the year. The remaining 13,500 EUR was not accounted for. The subject hindered the Commission's attempts to clarify the contributions by providing only general statements in the rounds of questions and specifying only during the hearing that 20,000 EUR had allegedly come from his parents.

147. Although repeatedly asked to list attendees so the Commission could verify individual contributions, the subject refused to do so during the rounds of questions. A partial list of 45 guests was submitted shortly before the hearing, many of whom were children, and the rest grouped into around 16 families. While the subject requested the hearing of all those present, this cannot explain his refusal to delineate their contributions. The subject did not identify the amount of each contribution, nor did he provide the contact information of any of the individuals mentioned. The separate 100,000 MDL donation from his parents was not explained considering their already large contribution in 2016. Finally, the subject did not reasonably explain why he did not bear any of the expenses associated with the event. These costs could have been settled after the event.

148. In the absence of the declaration of the parents' contribution to the NIA and given the lack of documentation regarding the full scope of event-related expenses — which may have included not only the venue but also music, entertainment, photography, or other services — the overall volume of the parents' contribution cannot be reliably quantified.

149. Accordingly, the subject's declarations to NIA in 2016 were treated at face value for the purposes of the inexplicable wealth calculations. The subject was attributed 34,500 EUR in donations (30,000 EUR from the christening event and 4,500 EUR from a donation of the parents), as well as cash savings of 21,000 EUR. The difference between the sums declared received in

donations and cash savings (13,500 EUR), may have been possible expenses associated with the christening event by the subject himself. This is plausible, especially in the light of the subject's non-disclosure in the NIA declaration of the expenses associated with the christening event, which were allegedly covered by his parents. Such an amount may represent a reliable estimate of the expenses associated with a large event, reportedly with 150 guests. This possible scenario will be represented below for the year 2016.

150. However, since the subject's parents had the financial capacity to contribute both to the donations and to the event costs, the scenario will not serve as a basis for the final negative balance in financial flows, within the meaning of Art. 11 para. (3) let. (a) of Law no. 252/2023.

**3. Cash savings**

**3.1 Alleged cash savings prior to the evaluation period**

151. In the first round of questions, the subject was asked to estimate his cash savings at the end of each year during the evaluation period, except for the years in which such savings had already been declared in the NIA forms.

152. He did not provide any concrete numbers for the years 2012-2015, but responded that he had savings at both the beginning and end of each calendar year, but had not kept any notes or calculations, as he had no reason to anticipate being subject to this type of evaluation. He further stated that these savings came from legal sources accumulated over the years, including monetary gifts received at his wedding in 2008. Initially, these funds were partially stored in bank accounts, but due to what he described as banking instability, they were later converted and kept in cash.

153. In the second round of questions, the subject stated that he had received the equivalent of 30,000 EUR in various currencies (MDL, USD, EUR, and Ukrainian Hryvnia) as gifts at his wedding in October 2008. He noted that the event was organized by his parents. He further explained that until 2011, he continued living with them and benefited from their financial support. While part of the wedding funds had been used, the remaining amount—described as substantial—was reportedly preserved. According to the subject, "the most substantial expenses were related to the apartment on Valea Trandafirilor Street", suggesting that a large portion of the wedding funds was likely spent on renovation and furnishing works—an aspect that will be further detailed below.

154. The subject submitted documentation in the second round of questions, including confirmation letters from Energbank and Victoriabank, as well as

deposit contracts from MAIB. These records showed that on 23 September 2008, he held 20,000 MDL, 9,400 USD, and 12,700 EUR across multiple accounts. However, by 2010, the entirety of these deposits had been withdrawn.

155. In the third round of questions, the subject argued that the initial deposits in 2008 actually amounted to 14,400 USD, 16,700 EUR, and 20,000 MDL. Nonetheless, he had misattributed certain deposits. Specifically, deposits made on 27 March 2009 (5,000 USD and 4,000 EUR) through Energbank appeared to be mistakenly conflated with those made in 2008. Since the 2008 deposits were withdrawn on 23 March 2009, the Commission concluded that the 2009 deposits could not be linked to the original wedding gifts, rather, these seem to have been financed by the original deposits from 2008.

156. In December 2007 the subject concluded an investment agreement and paid 28,872 EUR for an apartment located on Valea Trandafirilor St., Chisinau. An additional 3,603 EUR was due upon the building's substantial completion by 30 October 2012. In both the first and second rounds of questions, the subject stated that this initial payment was made by his parents, though he did not specify whether the full amount was paid upfront or in instalments. During the hearing, he clarified that the entire amount of 28,872 EUR had been paid in 2007. Regarding this payment, the Commission maintains doubts that the subject's parents covered its purchase because the contract was concluded by the subject's wife eight months prior to the wedding. This is inconsistent with the notion that the subject's parents paid for the apartment, in which case it would be expected that the subject conclude the contract. As they were not wedded at the time of contract conclusion, this apartment was and remains the sole property of the subject's wife and not part of the common matrimonial patrimony.

157. The subject mentioned that the apartment was ready for occupancy by late 2010 or early 2011. According to him, the renovation work was performed free of charge by his brother-in-law, while construction materials were reportedly provided by his parents.

158. The photographs submitted by the subject showed a fully furnished and modernly renovated apartment, implying significant expenses. While the subject attributed the renovation labor and materials to family support, the visual evidence suggested costs that likely exceeded what could be reasonably assumed as informal, in-kind help. The Commission identified offers for renovations at approximately 100 EUR per sq. m. in 2010, excluding

materials and furnishings. This reinforces the conclusion that repair and furnishing works entailed substantial expenses for this property.

159. Also, the Commission considered the time lapse between the subject's wedding in 2008, the withdrawal of all reported deposits by 2010, and the beginning of the evaluation period in 2013. Given the modest income reported by the household during that time, it appeared likely that a significant portion of the savings would have been used for daily consumption or other expenses, raising doubts as to whether any of those funds remained available by the start of the evaluation period.

160. Finally, the subject provided payment receipts indicating that, between 8 June 2010 and 30 May 2012, he invested 20,160 EUR toward the construction of a property located on Calea Orheiului St., Chisinau, under an investment agreement concluded on 8 June 2010.

161. Considering the above, the Commission notes that although the subject demonstrated the existence of certain cash deposits in 2008, these deposits were fully withdrawn by 2010 and were followed by a series of significant expenditures. These include: (i) the outstanding payment of 3,603 EUR made in 2012 for the apartment on Valea Trandafirilor; (ii) substantial, though unquantified renovation and furnishing expenses carried out for that apartment; and (iii) investment of 20,160 EUR between 2010 and 2012 for the construction of another apartment. These expenses must also be assessed considering the household's relatively modest declared income during the same period, which corroborates the subject's own statement that a considerable part of the wedding-related funds had already been spent. Moreover, although the circumstances outlined above are sufficient to justify rejecting the alleged savings, the possibility remains that the subject paid for his wedding expenses. Finally, he may have reimbursed his parents for the payment of 28,872 EUR to the Valea Trandafirilor apartment that the subject's wife purchased in 2007.

162. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that no reliable cash savings can be considered to have been carried forward into the evaluation period, and no corresponding financial inflow can be included for the purposes of assessing the subject's financial integrity.

**3.2 Cash savings during the evaluation period**

163. 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). For brevity, in future years the Commission will no longer refer to the Annex to the Rules when dealing with the previous year's savings.

164. As noted in the preceding section, in response to the Commission's request, the subject did not provide any estimated amounts of cash savings held at the end of each calendar year within the evaluation period. Regarding the alleged wedding-related savings, the Commission has already concluded above (§§ 161, 162) that there are serious doubts as to their availability at the start of the evaluation period.

165. In the first round of questions, the subject was provided with a breakdown of the household's net income on a yearly basis throughout the evaluation period. In the second round, he was communicated the total amount of cash withdrawn by the household each year. Despite this detailed information, the subject did not offer any consistent or verifiable explanation regarding the existence or evolution of cash holdings during this timeframe.

166. As stated in other previous reports, the cash savings declared by subjects under evaluation constitute an important element of the financial analysis. Unlike other assets, cash savings cannot be independently verified through objective records, such as bank statements or official registries. As a result, the reliance rests mainly on the accuracy and internal consistency of the figures self-reported by the subject, assessed considering surrounding circumstances and corroborating financial data (see *e.g. Oxana Mironov*, Report of 8 July 2025, § 113).

167. In the present case, and given the absence of reliable supporting information, no cash savings were included in the subject's financial calculations for the evaluation period, except for the amounts explicitly declared in the subject's NIA asset disclosures and already assessed in detail in the preceding sections (see § 149).

**4. Acquisition and investment in a property on Timiș Street, Chișinău**

168. Based on a donation contract concluded on 27 January 2023, the subject's wife obtained the following immovable assets located on Timiș Street in Chișinău: (1) a 7/84 share of a 0.142 ha land plot; (2) a 7/84 share of a 178.2 sq.m building and (3) a 1/4 share of a 197.2 sq.m building. The donor was a person identified as O.E., who divided her ownership shares and transferred part of them to the subject's wife.

169. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that O.E. is a close family acquaintance (*"cumătră"*), whom the family has known for approximately 20 years. He explained that the property required urgent repairs and that his wife agreed to become a co-owner in exchange for an investment of 500,000 MDL in reparation works. According to the subject, the repair works were carried out by O.E., given that his wife does not reside in Chișinău. He further stated that no furnishing works were undertaken, that the repairs were not completed, and that the property has never been used.

170. However, the photographs of the property submitted during the second round of questions make it highly unlikely that ownership rights over land and residential buildings located in a premium area of Chișinău could be obtained in exchange for an investment of only 500,000 MDL.

171. Current real estate listings confirm the high value of land in this area. For example, recent advertisements for construction land on Timiș Street indicate prices of approximately 423,000 EUR for 10 ares, which corresponds to 42,300 EUR per are (1 are = 100 sq.m.).[4] The 7/84 share of the 0.142 ha land plot received by the subject's wife results in a proportional surface of approximately 1.18 ares. At a price of 42,300 EUR per are, the market value of the land share alone would be approximately 50,000 EUR, close to 1,000,000 MDL, without considering the value of the buildings.

172. At the time the subject's wife obtained her ownership shares and when O.E. herself obtained the ownership, the property was subject to legal restrictions. According to available documentation, O.E. had obtained the property through a donation contract concluded on 6 December 2022, that is one and a half months before O.E. herself donated to the subject's wife.

173. Th donation contract to O.E. contained inconsistent provisions. While clause 1 described the donation as unconditional, clause 6 introduced several conditions: (i) that the donor's creditor — a non-bank credit institution "Microinvest" — would accept the donation only if an amount of 678,610 MDL was transferred into its account; (ii) that the existing mortgage over the property would remain in place and that the new owner would assume the donor's obligations; and (iii) that the mortgage would be lifted if a legal entity affiliated with the donors paid 322,000 MDL to the creditor. According to the Registry of immovable assets, the mortgage was lifted on 15 December 2022, after the conclusion of the donation contract. Subsequently, on 29

[4] https://rnco.md/anunturi-imobiliare/terenuri-de-vanzare/chisinau/centru/teren-de-vanzare-centru-chisinau-pid-6238

December 2022, a lawsuit brought by co-owners was formally registered in the Registry of immovable assets. The claim concerned "the declaration of the donation contract as ineffective with respect to the co-owners". Accordingly, on 27 January 2023 — the date on which O.E. donated the property shares to the subject's wife — the assets were officially marked as being subject to litigation.

174. Notably, in August 2021, the same property was advertised for sale on a local online marketplace (www.999.md) for 180,000 EUR, with the contact telephone number linked to the household of the previous owners.

175. Earlier, in 2020, the property had been mortgaged by the previous owners for a loan of 985,000 MDL obtained from "Microinvest". In connection with that transaction, an independent valuation was carried out by a commercial valuation company. According to the valuation report dated 8 November 2019, the market value of one duplex unit (*i.e.* 1/2 of the 237 sq.m. building) together with a 7/42 share of the land was estimated at 139,900 EUR (approximately 2,735,050 MDL), with a liquidation value of 2,144,423 MDL, and a replacement value of 1,407,380 MDL.[5] Although the report refers to a 237 sq.m. building, it concerns the unit with the same cadastral number as the 197.2 sq.m. building from which the subject's wife ultimately received a 1/4 share. The report was issued before any renovation works had been carried out, as confirmed by the photographs included.

176. Based on this valuation, the market value of the share received by the subject's wife — namely, 1/4 of the building and 7/84 of the land plot — would amount to at least 1,367,525 MDL (*i.e.*, half of the total estimated value of 2,735,050 MDL). In addition, she also received a 7/84 share from a second building on the same land plot, which was not included in the valuation

[5] The report defines "liquidation value" based on Law 142/2008 on mortgages, as "the estimated sum for which a property can be alienated at the date of the assessment, between a decided buyer and a determined seller, in a transaction based on objective price, after sufficient market analysis, in which the parties acted intentionally, prudently and without any outside influence."

"Liquidation value" is defined as "the value of the immovable good in the event in which it is or will be alienated in a small period of time and in conditions of market exposure different to those necessary to obtain the best price on the market (in accordance with Government Decision no. 958 of 4.08.2003)".

"Replacement value" is defined as "amount of spending necessary for the construction of a building or a similar construction to the object of valuation, calculated based on the price for materials at the moment of valuation, accounting for the use of the building (in accordance with Government Decision no. 958 of 04.08.2003)."

report and whose value remains unquantified. A comparison between the photographs submitted by the subject and those contained in the 2019 valuation report indicates that significant renovation works have since been carried out on the property.

177. The market data and real estate comparisons clearly demonstrate that the market value of the received property shares far exceeds the alleged investment.

178. The Commission also highlights the fact that the property was under mortgage at the time when O.E. acquired it, and that it was the object of a registered lawsuit at the time when the subject's wife obtained her ownership shares from O.E. The chain of transactions — donation from former owners to O.E., an attorney, then from the attorney to the family of a judge and a bailiff — raises serious concerns regarding the genuineness of the donation. According to Article 1154 of the Civil Code, judges, prosecutors, bailiffs, and attorneys are prohibited from obtaining litigious rights, under penalty of absolute nullity.

179. The Commission notes that the cited provision uses the verb "to obtain", which may suggest a broader scope of application. A commentary to a prior version of the Civil Code (before its republication in 2019) interpreted a similar provision as prohibiting members of legal professions from acquiring litigious rights in any form — whether for consideration or gratuitously. However, in the current version, Article 1154 of the Civil Code is in Chapter Sale-Purchase, within the section titled "Sale of litigious rights". A systematic interpretation of this structure supports the view that the prohibition under Article 1154 applies exclusively to sale-purchase contracts and not to gratuitous transfers such as donations.

180. Given that the property was subject to a legal dispute, the asset qualifies as a litigious right under Article 1153:

> "A right is litigious if it is uncertain, contested or contestable by the debtor, or if a legal action has been filed or it can be presumed that such an action will be necessary".

181. Although the transaction was structured as a donation, the circumstances — including the relationship between the parties, the encumbrances and legal dispute affecting the property, and the discrepancy between the asset's market value and the alleged investment — strongly suggest a simulated legal act. Under Article 1089 paras. (1) and (3) of the Civil Code:

> "(1) The simulation of a contract may be absolute or relative.

> (3) The simulation is relative when the parties conclude the contract with the intention that its apparent legal effects differ from the effects they truly intend (secret contract)."

182. In the present case, the available data support the conclusion that the parties most likely used the form of a donation to conceal a transaction of a different legal and economic nature, which may have involved elements characteristic of a sale or another form of mutual arrangement not disclosed in the formal contract.

183. Accordingly, the Commission applied the estimated market value, and not the alleged investment, for the purpose of its financial analysis. While the property had certain legal imperfections, these do not significantly affect the economic value, especially given the additional 7/84 share in the second building, which was not appraised in the 2019 report. For these reasons, the Commission will include in its financial analysis the estimated market value of at least 1,367,525 MDL for the property share received by the subject's wife, while also recognizing that the total benefit is likely even higher due to the unvalued share in the second residential unit.

184. Although the subject claimed that the transfer occurred in exchange for renovation works valued at 500,000 MDL, that amount was recorded as a separate declared expense, without treating it as the actual acquisition cost of the property rights. Given the visible improvements captured in the photographs, the Commission concludes that the financial analysis must reflect both the declared investment of 500,000 MDL and the estimated market value of at least 1,367,525 MDL.

185. On 7 December 2025, the subject submitted explanations, stating that his wife and O.E. had agreed to terminate (*rezoluționeze*) the donation contract of 27 January 2023, with an obligation for O.E. to reimburse the 500,000 MDL. On 5 December 2025, both parties appeared before a notary to formalize the termination. However, the notary refused to authenticate the act due to existing restrictions recorded in the immovable property register, including a seizure over the property. Consequently, the subject submitted a court request to have the seizure partially lifted for the sole purpose of executing the termination agreement. These claims were reiterated during the hearing.

186. Even assuming that the termination agreement was to be finalized and registered, such an act would not alter the Commission's assessment. The financial analysis is based on the economic advantage effectively obtained by the subject's household at the time of the transaction — namely, the acquisition of valuable property rights through a legal act whose declared

form (donation) does not correspond to its likely substance (a simulated transfer circumventing legal restrictions). Accordingly, any later developments cannot affect the Commission's appraisal of circumstances at the acquisition of the property.

**5. Yearly assessment of inexplicable wealth**

**5.1 Inexplicable wealth for 2013**

*Incoming financial flows*

187. For the reasons outlined in §§ 163-167, the Commission did not include any cash savings at the beginning of 2013 in the financial analysis. However, the Commission identified bank savings of 3,451 MDL held in MAIB account no. ***878 at the end of 2012. This amount was therefore included in the calculation as available financial means for the year 2013.

188. In the third round of questions, the subject referred to a MAIB deposit account allegedly containing 44,000 MDL in 2013. However, the subject did not provide any supporting evidence, nor was the Commission able to corroborate the existence of such a deposit.

189. According to the data provided by the SFS, in 2013, the subject received 67,578 MDL in net income from the Cahul District Court and 2,616 MDL from the "Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu" State University of Cahul.

190. In 2013, the subject also benefitted from two revolving credit lines on MAIB accounts ***953 and ***747. As confirmed by the subject in the first round of questions, these accounts were used for expenditures categorized as Consumption Expenditures for Population (hereinafter "CEP"). In the second round of questions, the subject further clarified that the cash withdrawn from these credit lines was used for household needs. As a result, the cash withdrawn was spent, and the funds deposited afterward were used to repay the outstanding balance. Accordingly, all debit transactions on these accounts — with minor exceptions noted below — are considered incoming financial flows, while credit transactions represent outgoing flows, as they were used to repay debt.

191. In 2013, the subject used 44,545 MDL from the credit line on MAIB account no. ***953: 13,329 MDL for retail expenditures and 31,216 MDL as cash withdrawn.

192. The subject also used 22,700 MDL from the credit line on MAIB account no. ***747: 17,920 MDL for retail transactions; 100 MDL as a transfer to another

account and 4,250 MDL as cash withdrawn. This account was additionally debited with 83 MDL in commissions and 500 MDL in overdraft fees in 2013. Only these two amounts were excluded from the calculation of incoming financial flow, as they did not contribute to household resources but rather increased the repayment obligation.

193. The subject declared receipt of 500 MDL declared by the subject to the National Integrity Commission as a prize from MAIB, confirmed to have been received in MAIB account no. ***747. However, these funds were used to service the existing negative balance on this account and therefore cannot be considered incoming financial flow.

194. Based on the foregoing, the Commission calculated the total incoming financial flow for the subject's household in 2013 to be 140,460 MDL.

*Outgoing financial flow*

195. In the subject's NIA Declaration for 2016, he stated that his daughter had acquired a property located on Calea Orheiului in Chișinău, which had not yet been commissioned, based on a contract concluded in 2010. In the first round of questions, the subject also submitted an investment in construction agreement dated 8 June 2010, along with its payment schedule and receipts of payments made. One receipt, dated 15 June 2013, confirms a payment of 1,300 EUR or 21,473 MDL. Accordingly, this amount was included as outgoing financial flow for 2013.

196. As explained above, credit transactions on the credit line accounts are treated as outgoing financial flows, as they reflect repayments of outstanding debt.

197. At the beginning of 2013, the subject's MAIB account no. ***953 had an outstanding debt of 18,481 MDL. The account was closed by year-end with a zero balance. During 2013, the subject deposited 63,027 MDL into this account, covering both new and previous debts. This full amount is therefore recorded as an outgoing financial flow for loan repayments.

198. The subject's wife deposited 4,287 MDL into MAIB account no. ***747, while the subject transferred an additional 17,345 MDL from MAIB account no. ***878. The account also received 500 MDL as cashback/bonus, which is not counted as an outgoing flow, as mentioned at § 193. Accordingly, 21,632 MDL is recorded as outgoing financial flow for this account.

199. In estimating a subject's expenses related to daily maintenance, as per point 3.5 of the Annex to the Rules, the Commission employs the National Bureau of Statistics' (hereinafter "NBS") estimations of CEP to quantify expenditures

for daily (non-declared) expenses. The CEP accounts for expenses such as rent/property, utilities, clothing, transportation, food, medication, household appliances, etc.[6] The CEP was selected particularly due to the NBS' reliance on surveys of real expenses incurred by randomly selected individuals surveyed. Accordingly, the CEP communicates reliable data as to daily expenses incurred depending on demographic background, size of the household, and geographic location (urban/rural). The CEP for a household composed of two adults and one child amounted to 73,606 MDL in 2013 (calculated as 2,045 MDL × 3 persons × 12 months).

200. In the explanations submitted before the hearing, the subject argued that the CEP is partially accounted for twice in his repayments of revolving credits because the funds taken as part of the revolving credits were used for CEP expenditures. However, expenses paid for via revolving credits acted, in effect, as temporary loans. The funds received were immediately spent, figuratively speaking, either for retail purchases or cash withdrawals. These funds were attributed to the subject's incoming financial flow, as stipulated at § 190. Accordingly, no double accounting of expenses can occur due to attribution to incoming financial flows of said funds.

201. As previously explained, the Commission did not include any cash savings in the financial analysis. No bank savings were identified for this year.

[6] The CEP for any year between 2006-2018 is calculated based on National Bureau of Statistics (hereinafter "NBS") methodology, available on the NBS website here. 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 – Discontinued series - Household expenditures (2006-2018, based on resident population) - Consumption expenditures of population by purpose of expenditures, number of children in household and area, 2006-2018*.

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.

The CEP for any year between 2019-2024 is calculated based on NBS methodology, available on the NBS website here. 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.

202. Based on the information outlined above, the subject's total outgoing financial flows for 2013 amounted to 179,738 MDL.

203. Accordingly, the Commission identified a negative financial balance of 39,278 MDL.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2013*

| **Incoming financial flows MDL** | | **Outgoing financial flows MDL** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bank savings at the beginning of the year | 3,451 | Payment for apartment (Calea Orheiului) | 21,473 |
| Salary, Cahul District Court | 67,578 | Revolving credit repayment (MAIB ***953) | 63,027 |
| Salary, BP Hasdeu University | 2,616 | Revolving credit repayment (MAIB ***747) | 21,632 |
| Revolving credit (MAIB ***747) | 22,270 | CEP | 73,606 |
| Revolving credit (MAIB ***953) | 44,545 | | |
| **Total** | **+140,460** | | **-179,738** |
| **Difference** | **-39,278** | | |

### 5.1 Inexplicable wealth for 2016

204. Considering the reasoning set out in § 150, the reference to the year 2016 is made for contextual purposes only.

*Incoming financial flows*

205. For the reasons outlined in §§ 163-167, the Commission did not include any cash savings potentially derived from the previous year. However, the Commission identified bank savings of 790 MDL held in MICB account no. ***5022 at the end of 2015.

206. According to the data provided by the SFS, in 2016 the subject received 130,338 MDL in net income from the Cahul District Court and 21,212 MDL from the "Bogdan Petriceicu Hașdeu" State University of Cahul. The subject also received 8,299 MDL in social security payments. His wife received an additional 68,537 MDL in social security.

207. In 2016 NIA Declaration, the subject reported 50,324 MDL as income received by his wife from her professional activity. This was reiterated during the third round of questions. However, both the wife's personal tax forms and those of her professional office indicate that no income was recorded in this category for 2016. Prior to the hearing, the subject presented SFS confirmation that his wife did indeed received 47,689 MDL in net income in 2016, which was attributed to incoming financial flows.

208. In his 2016 NIA Declaration, the subject also reported a donation of 100,000 MDL from his parents. The Commission has verified the parents' financial capacity to carry out such a donation in 2016 and determined sufficiency of funds.

209. In 2016 NIA Declaration, the subject reported receiving 30,000 EUR in ceremonial donations on the occasion of his son's christening. Both this amount and the donation in the preceding paragraph are attributable to incoming financial flow, per the reasoning at §§ 133-150, but with the reflection of concerns noted therein and attribution of plausible expenses for the event.

210. The subject further declared the receipt of 4,070 MDL by his wife as a Master's study grant. In the third round of questions, he provided confirmation of this grant, and the Commission accepted the amount as incoming financial flow.

211. In 2016, the subject also received 93,352 MDL through a revolving credit line associated with MAIB account no. ***4645. Of this, 25,000 MDL was withdrawn in cash, and 68,352 MDL was used for retail expenses. An additional 475 MDL in commissions was debited from this account, but was excluded from the incoming flow, as it constituted a financial charge rather than income.

212. Accordingly, the subject's household had incoming financial flows of 1,135,997 MDL in 2016.

*Outgoing financial flow*

213. According to investment in construction agreement of 29 November 2016, the subject spent 10,700 EUR upon signing the contract for the acquisition of a property located on Prospectul Republicii Street, Cahul. In the first round of questions, he confirmed having made this payment.

214. On 30 June 2016, the subject registered ownership over vehicle model Toyota Prius m/y 2008. In the 2016 NIA Declaration, he declared the acquisition price as 90,000 MDL.

215. Similar vehicles of the same model year are currently offered for sale at up to 7,000 EUR (~137,000 MDL) on the national commercial platforms. According to the Customs Service, this very vehicle was imported into the Republic of Moldova a month prior with a customs value of 100,000 MDL and taxes of 21,476 MDL paid upon import — totaling 121,476 MDL.

216. In the first round of questions, the subject could not explain the discrepancy between the declared price and the customs value. In the third round of questions the subject objected to the inclusion of the customs value of this vehicle instead of the official sales price, remarking that import value is not necessarily the actual value of this vehicle. On 1 December 2025, the subject requested that the Commission hear the vehicle's seller to clarify the discrepancy. The Commission accepted this procedural request and informed the subject that he must ensure the seller's attendance at the hearing. However, the subject later stated that he was unable to facilitate the seller's participation because he no longer had access to the individual's contact details.

217. No evidence or reasonable explanation was presented to support the fact that the vehicle possible had sustained damage after import or that it had technical defects requiring investment. The Commission considers it unlikely that an importer would willingly accept a significant financial loss by selling the vehicle for 90,000 MDL just one month after incurring import costs totaling at least 121,476 MDL. Accordingly, the Commission retains the sum of 121,476 MDL as the minimum outgoing financial flow attributable to the acquisition of this vehicle.

218. Per the reasoning at §§ 146-150, 298,513 MDL (approximately 13,500 EUR) is attributable to the subject's outgoing financial flow as a reflection of potential Christening event expenses. The figure was reached by subtracting the cash savings declared by the subject from the cumulative amount of donations received in 2016.

219. The Commission identified 91,158 MDL in transfers from the subject's other accounts to his MAIB account no. ***645, used to repay the active credit line. In the explanations submitted before the hearing, the subject argued that these expenses were accounted for twice. However, as the funds received in 2016 were attributed to incoming financial flows, no double accounting can occur in this instance.

220. The CEP for a household composed of two adults and one child for the first seven months of the year, and two children for the remaining five months, amounted to 93,288 MDL in 2016.

221. As noted in § 133, the subject declared cash savings of 21,000 EUR (463,197 MDL) at the end of 2016. Given that the Commission accepted this amount as plausibly derived from the subject's parents, it is included in the financial analysis as part of the outgoing financial flows for 2016.

222. Accordingly, the total outgoing financial flow for 2016 amounted to 1,277,507 MDL.

223. This results in a possible negative balance between incoming and outgoing financial flows of 141,510 MDL.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2016*

| Incoming financial flows MDL | | Outgoing financial flows MDL | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bank savings at beginning of year | 790 | Payment for property on Prospectul Republicii St. | 209,875 |
| Salary – Cahul District Court | 130,338 | Acquisition of Toyota Prius | 121,476 |
| Salary – State University of Cahul | 21,212 | Revolving credit | 91,158 |
| Salary – Wife (Bailiff's Office) | 47,689 | CEP | 93,288 |
| Social security | 8,299 | Potential Christening event expenses | 298,513 MDL |
| Donation from parents and son's Christening | 761,710 | End-of-year cash savings | 463,197 |
| Revolving credit | 93,352 | | |
| Social security (wife) | 68,537 | | |
| Master's study grant (wife) | 4,070 | | |
| **Total** | **+1,135,997** | | **-1,277,507** |
| **Difference** | **-141,510** | | |

### 5.2 Inexplicable wealth for 2023

*Incoming financial flows*

224. In the subject's NIA Declaration for 2022, submitted on 31 March 2023, he declared cash savings amounting to 400,000 MDL and 4,500 EUR (approximately 85,500 MDL). In the same declaration, the subject also reported bank savings totaling 380,740 MDL (3,785 EUR and 338,517 MDL). However, the Commission established that the bank accounts on which these amounts were previously held—MICB accounts no. ***817 and ***815 belonging to the subject's wife—were both closed on 26 November 2022. Consequently, the corresponding funds could not have been available at the start of 2023 and are therefore not considered incoming financial flows for that year.

225. The Commission identified a remaining bank balance of 5,751 MDL across the household's accounts as of 31 December 2022, which is attributable to 2023 incoming financial flows.

226. In the third round of questions, the subject confirmed that, at the beginning of 2023, he held the declared amount of 400,000 MDL and 4,500 EUR in cash, explaining that the money originated "primarily" from the closure of the above-mentioned bank deposits.

227. Based on these clarifications, the Commission attributes to the household a total of 491,251 MDL as incoming financial flows at the beginning of 2023, consisting of 485,500 MDL in cash savings and 5,751 MDL in bank savings.

228. According to the SFS, in 2023 the subject received 254,664 MDL in net income from the Cahul District Court and 102,623 MDL in social security benefits. The subject's wife received 1,217,618 MDL in net income from her professional activity as a bailiff, as reported in her SFS tax forms.

229. The subject's wife also reported receiving 168,960 MDL as rental income in 2023, based on an agreement concluded between her bailiff's office and herself, for the rental of a property located on Prospectul Republicii Street, Cahul. In previous years, the rent paid under this arrangement ranged between 4,000 MDL and 8,000 MDL per month, whereas in 2023, the reported amount increased significantly to 16,000 MDL per month. During the same period, offices in the same property were also leased to an individual and a legal entity at 1,000 MDL and approximately 4,700 MDL per month, respectively. This discrepancy raises concerns that the rent payments made by the wife's professional office were overvalued.

Nevertheless, as the income was declared and taxed, 168,960 MDL was included in the incoming financial flow for 2023.

230. As mentioned in §§ 68,69, the subject declared 96,000 MDL as rental income in his 2023 NIA declaration. During the rounds of questions, he explained that this amount came from leasing a Toyota Prius to his wife's bailiff's office. The Commission did not find evidence that taxes were paid on this income. However, it confirmed that 84,480 MDL was transferred from the subject's wife to his MICB account (*881). Therefore, his amount is counted as incoming financial flow for 2023.

231. On 21 July 2023, the subject sold a property located on Alexandru cel Bun Street in Ungheni for 300,000 MDL. He had inherited this from his mother and by receiving the shares of co-heirs (his siblings) via donation, with ownership formally registered on 23 June 2023. Accordingly, the amount of 300,000 MDL is included in the incoming financial flow for 2023.

232. According to PSA data, on 25 October 2023, the subject allegedly sold a Skoda Octavia m/y 2011 to his brother for 30,000 MDL. However, the vehicle's RCAI insurance history shows that the brother was already the primary user of the vehicle well before the reported sale. Furthermore, the subject's brother had recently donated to the subject his share of inheritance. These circumstances raised questions about the financial context of the transaction.

233. In response to questions raised during the first and third rounds, the subject stated that his brother had paid the full purchase price for the vehicle, despite having recently made substantial donations of property shares to the subject — including rights over an inherited immovable asset that was sold at a profit in 2023. The subject also submitted a declaration signed by his brother allegedly confirming this account.

234. The declared sale price appears deflated. Current listings for similar Skoda Octavia vehicles range between 3,000 and 8,000 EUR, suggesting that the market value of the vehicle at the time of the transaction was higher than the declared price of approximately 1,500 EUR. Given that the subject's brother had recently donated to him, unconditionally, his share of an inherited immovable asset, the Commission does not exclude the possibility that the vehicle sale at a modest price served as a form of informal compensation for the earlier donation. The declared amount was included in the household's income for 2023.

235. In his 2023 NIA declaration, the subject reported receiving 52,993 MDL in social security benefits from Romanian authorities. According to the bank statement for the account in which these benefits were transferred, the equivalent of 62,714 MDL was used to purchase shares on the Romanian Stock Exchange and are therefore attributable to the subject's incoming financial flows.

236. In to the explanations submitted before the hearing, the subject requested the inclusion of income from dividends from stock options held in Romania. However, available documents seem to confirm that any dividends received were reinvested for the purchase of additional stock options, which the Commission did not account for. Accordingly, this income cannot be considered as it seems to have remained on the Romanian Stock Exchange and did not influence the financial flows of the subject's household.

237. In 2023, the subject's wife contracted six loans from MICB, totaling 2,777,000 MDL. These were disbursed to various accounts and withdrawn shortly after disbursement, as follows:

a) 197,000 MDL credited to MICB account no. ***245 and withdrawn on the same day (16 March 2023);

b) 200,000 MDL credited to MICB account no. ***248 and withdrawn the following day (20–21 March 2023);

c) 400,000 MDL credited to MICB account no. ***947 and withdrawn on the same day (14 September 2023);

d) 400,000 MDL credited to MICB account no. ***517 and withdrawn the same day (17 November 2023);

e) 580,000 MDL credited to MICB account no. ***413 and withdrawn on 7 December 2023;

f) 1,000,000 MDL credited to MICB account no. ***414 and also withdrawn on 7 December 2023.

238. In his 2023 NIA Declaration, the subject reported having received a loan of 96,265 MDL (equivalent to 5,000 EUR) from his brother-in-law, S.V., with no interest. The Commission confirmed that on 6 November 2023, the subject's wife received 5,000 EUR from S.V. via a non-client MoneyGram transfer from Germany. The subject also submitted documentation demonstrating that S.V. had earned over 100,000 EUR in 2023. Accordingly, the amount of 96,265 MDL is attributed to the subject's incoming financial flow for the year 2023.

239. In the 2023 NIA Declaration, the subject indicated having received a loan of 289,600 MDL from his sister, L.B., with no interest. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that the loan was granted without a defined repayment term and did not clarify whether any amount had been reimbursed. The Commission initially expressed doubts as to whether the transfer constituted an actual loan. These doubts stemmed basically from the following circumstances:

a) The loan was interest-free, had no repayment terms, and had not yet been reimbursed

b) No UK-produced documentation was provided to confirm the sister's ability to lend this amount, especially considering her declared annual income of only 12,177 GBP.

c) The subject's household had a significant income and was actively engaged in leveraging assets for large real estate investments, making the necessity of such a loan questionable.

240. In the third round of questions and at the hearing, the subject explained that the loan of 289,600 MDL received from his sister originated directly from the 300,000 MDL she had received in April 2023 from the subject himself, as payment for her share of an apartment located on Independentei Street. According to the subject, his sister took the money in cash to the United Kingdom after the sale, carrying part of it upon her departure from Moldova, and the rest during a visit between 18–30 August 2023. The cash was subsequently transferred to his wife.

241. On 22 December 2025, the subject submitted passport stamps and explanations to support this narrative. On 15 December, he also submitted screenshots from the MICB banking application, confirming that his wife received the following transfers:

a) Two transfers of 4,160.99 GBP (approx. 90,000 MDL each) on 5 October 2023,

b) One transfer of 554.91 GBP (approx. 12,000 MDL) on 6 October 2023,

c) One transfer of 3,581 GBP (approx. 78,000 MDL) on 15 November 2023,

d) One transfer of 913.91 GBP (approx. 19,600 MDL) on 16 November 2023.

242. These transfers amount to 289,600 MDL and partially match the transactions previously identified by the Commission for which the sender was initially unknown.

243. The subject stated that the purpose of the loan was to repay an earlier bank loan and thus improve his credit rating to secure a larger loan later in the year — which he successfully did, as evidenced by the 1,000,000 MDL loan contracted by his wife at the end of 2023.

244. The subject further explained that his sister did not urgently need the money and intended to use it later to cover her son's university expenses.

245. While the Commission retains some doubts regarding the decision to withdraw cash abroad and subsequently transfer it electronically—despite the possibility of agreeing on a deferred payment arrangement at the time of sale—the overall sequence of events lends some plausibility to the subject's account. Specifically, the sale of the sister's property share took place in April 2023; the funds were allegedly withdrawn in two instalments—one shortly after the sale and another during a visit to Moldova in August 2023—and the corresponding international transfers to the subject's wife occurred only in October and November 2023. Considering this timeline and based on supporting documentation, the Commission accepts the sister's transfer as a loan and attributes 289,600 MDL to the subject's incoming financial flow for 2023.

246. In the 2023 NIA Declaration, the subject declared the receipt of 200,669 MDL in rental income in 2023, presumably from immovable property. By cross-referencing rental income reported by legal entities (as reflected in the subject's wife's tax forms) and tenancy agreements obtained from the SFS, the Commission confirmed that the household received the following income from third-party property rentals:

a. 21,560 MDL (net) from an LLC for the rental of the property on Prospectul Republicii St., Cahul (period not specified);

b. 43,268 MDL (net) from an LLC for the rental of the property on Victoriei Blvd., Cahul (period not specified);

c. 9,000 MDL (gross) from an individual for the rental of an apartment on Valea Trandafirilor St., Chișinău, for January–March 2023 (3,000 MDL/month);

d. 18,000 MDL (gross) from an individual for the rental of an apartment on Calea Orheiului St., Chișinău, for January–June 2023 (3,000 MDL/month);

e. 6,000 MDL (gross) from an individual for the rental of the property on Prospectul Republicii St., Cahul, for January–June 2023 (1,000 MDL/month).

247. According to SFS information, the subject's wife paid 3,200 MDL in taxes on rent received from individuals. Therefore, the household's total confirmed rental income from third parties in 2023 amounts to 94,628 MDL (*i.e.*, 21,560 + 43,268 + 9,000 + 18,000 + 6,000 – 3,200).

248. The subject also declared receiving 3,000 MDL in court-ordered damages. As he provided confirmation during the previous rounds of questions, this amount is attributed to the incoming financial flows.

249. The Commission also identified the following third-party transfers in 2023: 21,000 MDL, 11,107 MDL, and 1,500 MDL. In his explanations submitted on 15 December 2025, the subject stated that the latter two transfers were related to enforcement proceedings. As their connection to household income has not been proven, they are excluded from the incoming financial flow. As regards the transfer of 21,000 MDL, the subject explained that these amounted to restitution of funds used by an individual (D.R.) from the revolving credit on the relevant account. Such use would amount, in effect, to a loan granted by the subject's household. The subject did not indicate any such loan in the first round of questions. The subject did not provide any additional information or proof in this regard. Accordingly, the Commission is required to disregard this source of income.

250. It follows from the foregoing that, in 2023, the subject's household had total incoming financial flows of 5,972,803 MDL.

*Outgoing financial flows*

251. According to the sale-purchase contract dated 30 November 2023, the subject's wife acquired the land plot and two houses located on Ștefan cel Mare St., Cahul, along with the adjoining land plot at 17 Nicolae Bălcescu St., for 2,351,904 MDL (equivalent to 120,000 EUR). This amount is attributed to the outgoing financial flow.

252. In connection with this property, the subject indicated in the NIA declarations for 2023, 2024, and the rectified 2024 version an acquisition value of 2,351,904 MDL and a market value of 2,851,904 MDL, citing "repairs to the property" as the reason for the difference. According to Law No. 133/2016 and the guidance provided in the declaration form, the market value should reflect the price at which similar properties were sold on the date of acquisition, with justification for any discrepancy. It appears the subject misunderstood this requirement and instead declared the market value as of the date of the declaration, which was higher than at the time of acquisition.

253. In his written explanations of 7 December 2025, the subject stated that he believed he was required to declare the market value and that he added 200,000 MDL to the valuer's estimate for minor improvements. However, the valuation reports submitted assessed the market value at 2,568,000 MDL (1,658,000 MDL for Ștefan cel Mare and 910,000 MDL for Nicolae Bălcescu). This means the declared value of 2,851,904 MDL exceeds the expert valuation by approximately 284,000 MDL—not 200,000—contradicting the subject's explanation. Moreover, the valuation report for the Nicolae Bălcescu property was only issued in 2025, two years after the market value was declared to the NIA, further weakening the argument.

254. Given the inconsistencies between the declared figures, the valuations, and the subject's own explanations, the Commission retains the full amount of 500,000 MDL as a declared expense attributed to property improvements.

255. For the reasons set out in §§ 168-186, the Commission attributed the amount of 500,000 MDL as declared investment in renovation works for the property on Timiș Street. In addition, the amount of 1,367,525 MDL was attributed as the market value of the ownership shares acquired in the same property.

256. On 21 April 2023, the subject purchased 2/5 of the apartment located on Independenței Street, Chișinău, from his siblings for a total price of 600,000 MDL.

257. On 8 September 2023, the subject's wife purchased a Toyota RAV4, model year 2020, for 580,000 MDL from O.E., the same individual who had previously donated the Timiș property. Accordingly, this amount is attributed to the household's outgoing financial flow for 2023.

258. The Commission also identified 57,433 MDL in utility expenses. Of these, 11,523 MDL were verified through bank payments made by the subject and his wife. An amount of 40,896 MDL was already accounted for within the CEP category and was therefore excluded to avoid double-counting. Additionally, 3,026 MDL represented utility payments for properties that were rented out in 2023 and thus not attributable to household consumption. Accordingly, 1,988 MDL (57,433 – 11,523 – (681.6 x 12 months x 5 persons) – 3,026) was attributed to the household's outgoing financial flow for 2023 as expenses exceeding the CEP utility category.

259. Based on the brokerage account submitted by the subject during the second round of questions, and cross-referenced with the Romanian bank account where he received social payments, the Commission identified cash-in

deposits totaling 62,714 MDL (16,100 RON), which are attributed to the outgoing financial flow for 2023.

260. The Commission further identified loan repayment expenses totaling 840,995 MDL in 2023, made either through MICB account no. ***236 or ***517:

a) 205,575 MDL as repayment of the 197,000 MDL loan credited from MICB on 16.03.2023;

b) 210,373 MDL as repayment of the 200,000 MDL loan credited from MICB on 20.03.2023;

c) 402,532 MDL as repayment of the 400,000 MDL loan credited from MICB on 14.09.2023;

d) 8,616 MDL as partial repayment of the 400,000 MDL loan credited from MICB on 17.11.2023;

e) 3,133 MDL as partial repayment of the 580,000 MDL loan credited from MICB on 28.11.2023;

f) 10,586 MDL as partial repayment of the 1,000,000 MDL loan credited from MICB on 28.11.2023.

261. The Commission identified total transfers amounting to 138,843 MDL debited from the bank accounts of the subject and his wife in 2023, which were initially treated as outgoing financial flows. In his written submissions of 15 December 2025, the subject provided additional information and supporting screenshots confirming that two of the largest transactions — specifically, 119,390 MDL transferred on 31 October 2023 from MICB account no. ***792, and 9,393 MDL transferred on 7 August 2023 from MICB account no. ***661 — represented internal transfers between accounts held by the subject and his wife. These amounts were therefore excluded from the calculation of outgoing financial flow. The remaining transfers, including several P2P payments and transfers to the subject's brother, totaled 10,060 MDL and remain attributable to outgoing financial flows.

262. Given the high number of real estate acquisitions carried out by the subject's household over the evaluation period, the Commission reviewed the associated notarial fees and state taxes and included the total amount of 23,069 MDL in the household's outgoing financial flows. This approach may differ from the treatment of other subjects, whose property acquisitions were isolated and infrequent, and for whom such expenses were not included,

either due to their low cumulative value or limited relevance for the financial assessment.

a) 11,760 MDL in state taxes and 7,362 MDL in notarial fees related to the acquisition of the property on Ștefan cel Mare Street, Cahul, as stipulated in Article 18 of the corresponding contract;

b) 2,500 MDL in state taxes and 1,447 MDL in notarial fees for the acquisition of the property on Timiș Street, Chisinau, as stipulated in Article 9 of the respective contract.

263. On 7 December 2025, before the hearing, the subject submitted the completed table of vacation expenses. He identified vacation expenses of 40,360 MDL in 2023, in addition to those expenses identified on the household's bank accounts. The "Recreation and Culture" CEP category includes expenses for social and cultural purposes, for leisure and sports including payments for various cultural activities and tourism services[7]. In 2023, this category amounted to 17,560 MDL for the subject's household. Therefore, the Commission attributed the excess amount of 22,800 MDL as a separate outgoing financial flow for 2023.

264. The CEP in a household of two adults and three children amounted to 283,812 MDL (4,730 MDL x 12 months x 5 persons).

265. Bank savings in the amount of 72,161 MDL were identified at year-end, primarily in the wife's MICB accounts (nos. ***517 and ***044).

266. As previously mentioned, the subject did not declare any cash savings at the end of 2023.

267. It follows from the foregoing that in 2023, the household's total outgoing financial flows amounted to 7,217,028 MDL.

268. Consequently, the Commission identified a negative balance between incoming and outgoing financial flows of at least 1,244,225 for the year 2023.

269. As noted in the hearing notice, the Commission also identified additional expenses — including insurance payments, fines, telecommunications services, and VAT-reported transactions with, for example, home improvement stores — which could have been treated as potential additional outflows. However, given the possibility that these were related to the wife's

[7] https://statistica.gov.md/files/files/Metadate/CBGC.pdf

professional activity and were paid from her gross income, they were not included in the analysis of inexplicable wealth.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2023*

| **Incoming financial flows MDL** | | **Outgoing financial flows MDL** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cash and bank savings at the beginning of the year | 491,251 | Purchase of property – Ştefan cel Mare/Nicolae Balcescu St., Cahul and declared repairs | 2,851,904 |
| Salary – Cahul Court | 254,664 | Market value of Timis property | 1,367,525 |
| Social security | 102,623 | Investment in Timis St., Chisinau property | 500,000 |
| Sale of property – Alexandru cel Bun St., Ungheni | 300,000 | Purchase of property – apartment Independentei St., Chisinau | 600,000 |
| Rent of vehicle | 84,480 | Purchase of Toyota RAV 4 m/y 2020 | 580,000 |
| Loan of 14.09.2023 | 400,000 | Utilities (exceeding CEP) | 1,988 |
| Loan of 17.11.2023 | 400,000 | Acquisition of shares (Romanian brokerage) | 62,714 |
| Loan of 28.11.2023 | 580,000 | Loan repayments | 840,995 |
| Loan of 28.11.2023 | 1,000,000 | Transfers to third parties | 10,060 |
| Loan of 16.03.2023 | 197,000 | Notarial and state fees | 23,069 |
| Loan of 20.03.2023 | 200,000 | Vacation expenses (exceeding CEP) | 22,800 |
| Income – Wife (Bailiff Office) | 1,217,618 | CEP | 283,812 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Income – Sale of Skoda Octavia | 30,000 | Bank savings at year-end | 72,161 |
| Romanian social security | 62,714 | | |
| Rent paid by Judicial Bailiff to herself | 168,960 | | |
| Rent from third parties (net, confirmed) | 94.628 | | |
| Court-ordered damages | 3,000 | | |
| Loan from Brother-in-law | 96,265 | | |
| Loan from sister | 289,600 | | |
| **Total** | **+5,972,803** | | **-7,217,028** |
| **Difference** | **-1,244,225** | | |

### 5.3 Inexplicable wealth for 2024

*Incoming financial flows*

270. The Commission identified bank savings of 72,161 MDL held in MAIB bank accounts at the end of 2023.

271. According to the SFS, in 2024, the subject received net income of 284,884 MDL from the Cahul District Court, 601 MDL from the National Institute of Justice, and 76,073 MDL in social security. The subject's wife received 2,002,949 MDL in net income from her professional activity as a bailiff, as reflected in the SFS tax forms. Additionally, the subject's wife received 73 MDL as bank interest.

272. The subject's wife received 98,560 MDL in rental income from her bailiff's office.

273. In the subject's NIA Declaration for 2024, he declared receiving 116,000 MDL in rental income, which he later clarified referring to renting out of the Toyota Prius to his wife's bailiff office. According to SFS tax records, the subject received 112,000 MDL in gross rental income, resulting in a net income of 98,560 MDL. Separately, 105,600 MDL was confirmed as received

into the subject's MICB account no. ***881. In the third round of questions, the subject argued that 105,600 MDL should be fully attributed to the incoming financial flow, as this amount was identified on his account. However, this argument cannot be accepted. The amount transferred to the subject's account is lower than the gross amount in rent income declared to the SFS. Accordingly, the amount received on the subject's bank account could be interpreted as part of the gross amount from which taxes were paid after transfer.

274. In 2024, the subject's wife contracted a loan of 400,000 MDL, which was credited to her MICB account no. ***155 under a contract of 3 May 2024. This amount is attributed to the household's incoming financial flow.

275. The Commission also identified third-party transfers totaling 12,757 MDL received in 2024 on the subject's wife's MICB account no. ***661. In his 15 December explanations, the subject stated that these were related to enforcement proceedings. As their connection to household income has not been proven, they are excluded from the incoming financial flow.

276. According to SFS tax forms, the subject's wife received 134,067 MDL in rent income in 2024:

a) 63,360 MDL (net) from a legal entity for the rental of a property (gross: 72,000 MDL);

b) 42,567 MDL (net) from a legal entity for the rental of a property (gross: 48,372 MDL);

c) 28,140 MDL (net) from a legal entity for the rental of a property (gross: 31,977 MDL);

d) 21,000 MDL (gross) from an individual for the rental of the apartment located at 6/1 Valea Trandafirilor St., Chișinău, for the period June–December 2024 (3,000 MDL/month).

277. According to SFS data, the subject's wife paid 2,600 MDL in taxes on rental income received from individuals. Therefore, the household's total confirmed rental income from third parties in 2024 amounted to 152,467 MDL (*i.e.*, 63,360 + 42,567 + 28,140 + 21,000 – 2,600).

278. According to the bank account statement for the Romanian bank account in which the subject received social security, provided in the second round of questions, he received 40,266 MDL but used only 36,652 MDL to pay for the acquisition of shares. Accordingly, the latter sum is attributable to the

incoming financial flow for 2024, with the remainder of these funds being either used in Romania or remaining on said account.

279. In submissions prior to the hearing, the subject requested the inclusion of income from dividends from stock options held in Romania. However, available documents confirm that all dividends were reinvested for the purchase of additional stock options, which the Commission did not account for. Accordingly, this income cannot be considered as it seems to have remained on the Romanian Stock Exchange and did not influence the financial flows of the subject's household.

280. In the 2024 NIA Declaration, the subject declared receipt of a total of 9,329 MDL in court-ordered damages. In the first round of questions, he confirmed his receipt of only 3,000 MDL in 2024, attributed to the incoming financial flow for 2024.

281. The subject also declared that his wife received 5,850 MDL from the Central Electoral Commission. Although this payment could not initially be confirmed, the subject later submitted a supporting document on 1 December 2025. Accordingly, the amount is included in the household's incoming financial flow for 2024.

282. It follows from the foregoing that the household had total incoming financial flows of 3,231,757 MDL in 2024.

*Outgoing financial flows*

283. On 3 June 2024, the subject's wife acquired a 0.02 ha land plot and a 95.6 m² commercial building in Roșu Village, Cahul, for 940,776 MDL (49,000 EUR). The contract specified that 20,000 EUR was to be paid upon signing, and the remaining 29,000 EUR by 31 December 2024.

284. In the first round of questions, the subject stated that the remainder was paid on 6 January 2025. This statement is corroborated by the cadastral excerpt, which shows that the ownership was initially registered subject to full payment (*rezerva proprietății*). The same excerpt shows that on 27 January 2025, the previous owner's right was formally removed based on a "declaration of full payment dated 6 January 2025."

285. In the second round of questions, the subject confirmed that the second instalment had been covered using savings and income from 2024. In the third round of questions, he stated that part of the amount required for the second instalment was withdrawn from bank accounts in 2025, without specifying the exact amount.

286. To clarify this aspect, the Commission inquired the commercial banks where the subject and his wife held accounts, requesting information on withdrawals made before 6 January 2025. Based on the information received, the Commission identified relevant cash withdrawals from two accounts:

– MAIB account no. ***878 registered 8,000 MDL on 2 January 2025, another 8,000 MDL on the same day, and 9,100 MDL on 6 January 2025, totaling 25,100 MDL;

– MICB account no. ***881, held by the subject's wife, registered a withdrawal of 24,620 MDL on 3 January 2025.

287. Because the first instalment of 20,000 EUR (383,990 MDL) was paid upon signing the contract in 2024 it will be recorded in the financial table as payment for the acquisition of the property.

288. As for the second instalment of 29,000 EUR (556,786 MDL), 49,720 MDL (25,100 MDL + 24,620 MDL) was deducted, based on the subject's statement regarding cash withdrawals in early 2025. According to the Commission's methodology, year-end bank savings are treated as outgoing financial flows for the year of evaluation. To ensure that outgoing flows are not counted twice — first as bank savings at the end of the year, and again as expenditures from same savings in the following year — only the remaining 507,066 MDL was considered as savings accumulated in 2024 and transferred in early 2025 for the completion of the payment obligation.

289. In accordance with the brokerage account submitted by the subject during the second round of questions and cross-referenced with the Romanian bank account statement through which he received Romanian social payments, the Commission identified cash-in deposits totaling 36,652 MDL (9,507 RON). This sum is attributed to the outgoing financial flow for 2024, reflecting investment activity.

290. The Commission identified fuel expenses of 25,902 MDL associated with the use of vehicle model Toyota RAV 4 m/y 2020:

a) According to the National Agency for Auto Transport (ANTA), on 22 August 2023 this vehicle's prior owner conducted the mandatory yearly testing, registering odometer data at 30,370 km. On 21 August 2024, the subject conducted this vehicle's yearly mandatory testing, registering odometer data at 47,856 km. On 16 August 2025, the subject again conducted this vehicle's mandatory testing, registering odometer data at 69,697 km. It follows that between 22 August 2023 and 21 August 2024, this vehicle travelled an average monthly distance of 1,457 km ((47,856 – 30,370)/12

months). In the period between 21 August 2024 and 16 August 2025, this vehicle travelled an average monthly distance of 1,820 km ((69,697 – 47,856)/12 months),

b) According to open access data, the average consumption of vehicles model Toyota RAV 4 m/y 2020 are conservatively estimated at 5.7l/100km. This is a very modest estimate for vehicles of this type, lending credence to the reliability of the following figures. In the third round of questions (question 19), the subject insisted that his vehicle's average consumption is 5.6 l/100km but provided no proof in this regard. Accordingly, given that the figure already employed was identified to be a bare minimum level of consumption, these assertions were rejected.

c) According to ANRE's annual Report for 2024, monthly average fuel prices in 2024 ranged from 22.81 MDL/l to 26.11 MDL/l.

d) Therefore, the Commission can reliably estimate that the subject incurred roughly 25,902 MDL in fuel expenses in 2024.[8]

e) In addition to this, the Commission also identified 7,936 MDL in expenses related to RCAI and RCAE policies, as well as expenses related to the annual mandatory testing.

f) Nevertheless, the Commission recognizes that the CEP category for transportation amounted to 14,190 MDL in 2024 (236.6 MDL x 12 month x 5 persons). Accordingly, the Commission attributed only fuel expenses and other vehicle-related expenses that exceeded the CEP category expenses, resulting in expenses of 19,658 MDL.

g) The subject stated that this vehicle was used for long-distance travel in professional circumstances for which he was compensated. It remains unclear why the subject would use his personal vehicle for professional purposes rather than a service vehicle. Even if such use occurred, supporting documentation — such as accounting records or reimbursement statements — would have been readily available and could have been submitted. No such documents were provided.

291. The Commission further identified loan repayment expenses of 1,315,334 MDL, mostly via MICB account no. ***517:

[8] The estimate for monthly expense is calculated according to the following formula: [average monthly distance travelled] x 12 months x 5.7 l/100 km x monthly price point for fuel; all monthly estimates are then added together.

a) 405,417 MDL as repayment of a 400,000 MDL loan granted in 2023 on MICB account no. *517 (Contract dated 17.11.2023);

b) 430,758 MDL as repayment of a 580,000 MDL loan granted in 2023 on MICB account no. *0413 (Contract No. IND31955 dated 28.11.2023). In this regard, the hearing notice referred to repayments of only 391,108 MDL. However, this latter sum represented only payments on the principal. The bank account statement for MICB account no. ***517 confirms payment of the total former sum associated with this loan agreement, alongside a minor payment of 1,332 MDL from MICB account no. ***4661.

c) 280,760 MDL as repayment of a 1,000,000 MDL loan granted in 2023 on MICB account no. ***0414(Contract dated 28.11.2023);

d) 198,399 MDL as repayment of a 400,000 MDL loan granted in 2024 on MICB account no. ***155 517 (Contract dated 03.05.2024).

292. The Commission identified transfers to third parties. In the explanations submitted on 15 December 2025, the subject stated that a transfer of 35,700 MDL on 6 June 2024 from account no. ***452, represented the repayment of the loan received from his brother-in-law in 2023. The same explanation was provided for a second transfer of 61,500 MDL on 11 June 2024. The subject argued that these amounts should not be attributed, claiming that they would duplicate the loan repayment expenses already accounted for. This assertion is incorrect. The loan repayments referenced in the previous paragraph concern bank loans, whereas the identified transfers refer to repayments of a private loan and constitute distinct expenditures.

293. As for the remaining third-party transfers noted in the hearing notice, the Commission accepts that these either represent internal transfers between the subject's own accounts or have already been separately attributed as specific expenses.

294. The Commission identified 9,336 MDL in notarial service expenses attributable to the household's outgoing financial flow for 2024, as the relevant contract expressly stipulates that they were borne by the subject's wife. These include 4,704 MDL in state taxes and 4,632 MDL in notarial fees for the acquisition of the property in Roșu Village, as specified under Article 6 of the underlying contract.

295. On 7 December 2025, before the hearing, the subject declared vacation expenses of 28,872 MDL in 2024. In 2023, the "Recreation and Culture" CEP category for the subject's household amounted to 14,520 MDL. Therefore, the

Commission attributed the excess amount of 14,352 MDL as a separate outgoing financial flow for 2023.

296. The CEP in a household of two adults and three children amounted to 217,818 MDL (3,630 MDL x 12 months x 5 persons).

297. The Commission identified additional retail payments of 158,985 MDL in 2024:

a) 30,619 MDL on MAIB account no. ***878;

b) 5,725 MDL on MAIB account no. ***113;

c) 124 MDL on MICB account no. ***881;

d) 96,917 MDL on MICB account no. ***661 (wife);

e) 1,903 MDL on MICB account no. ***2006 (wife);

f) 1,200 MDL on MICB account no. ***14517 (wife);

g) 913 MDL on MICB account no. ***4422 (wife);

h) 9,256 MDL on MICB account no. ***0441 (wife);

i) 12,328 MDL on MICB account no. ***7921 (wife).

298. These expenses were attributed in addition to the CEP, among others, because the household's declared regular income in 2024 — consisting of salaries and confirmed rent — amounted to 2,689,282 MDL, which is 1,198% higher than the national average income of 224,448 MDL. The significant surplus income available to the household makes it reasonable to assume a higher consumption level than that of an average household.

299. Of the above, 6,028 MDL were payments at petrol stations, identified on accounts ***878, ***113, ***661, and ***2006, and deducted from retail expenses to avoid overlap with separately attributed fuel costs and were therefore excluded from outgoing financial flows.

300. In the third round of questions, the subject objected to attributing additional retail expenses on the grounds of potential double accounting. However, this argument is unconvincing. The Commission has already excluded several categories of potential overlap (*e.g.*, utilities, fuel), and the subject did not identify any specific components of the CEP that would be duplicated by the additional expenses or to what extent. Given the subject's high income, it is implausible to treat his household as having operated at the baseline subsistence level reflected by the CEP alone.

301. The subject's household had ample cash available in 2024. Below is a representation of all the identified potential cash income and expenses.

| **Incoming cash financial flows** | |
|---|---|
| Cash withdrawn from personal accounts | +1,684,668 |
| Cash withdrawn as loans | +400,000 |
| Other cash sources (rent, damages) | +21,400 |
| **Outgoing cash financial flows** | |
| Real estate purchase | -940,776 |
| Cash deposited on bank accounts | -223,907 |
| Cash deposited on MICB account no. ***517 for repayments of loans | -194,550 |
| CEP | -217,818 |
| Notary payments | -9,336 |
| Building insurance | -7,936 |
| Fuel expenses | -5,964 |
| Vacation expenses | -14,352 |
| **Difference** | **+491,429** |

302. This surplus demonstrates that the household could have easily covered the CEP and additional expenses, eliminating the risk of double counting.

303. The subject declared no cash savings at the end of 2024, neither to the Commission nor in the NIA declaration. It is therefore reasonable to presume that this surplus was spent during the same year rather than carried over into 2025. If this presumption were applied in full, the household's negative financial balance for 2024 would increase by 491,429 MDL, far exceeding the amount currently identified in the present analysis.

304. As subsidiary confirmation of the above, in the first months of 2025, the Commission identified on a preliminary basis that the subject's household may have incurred a negative balance between financial flows of 746,381 MDL due to insufficient documented income to cover loan repayments, a

property acquisition, and other expenditures. However, this figure was reached based on income until 3 May 2025, when the evaluation was initiated and expenses until 29 May 2025, when the last major repayments of loans taken out during the evaluation period occurred. As the income until 29 May 2025 could not be accounted for, the Commission could not reach any definitive conclusions in this regard. Notwithstanding, this preliminary investigation upholds the previous findings and may point to cash savings from 2024 contributing to expenses in 2025.

305. Nevertheless, the Commission limited attribution to verifiable transactions carried out through bank accounts, which were not already counted under other expense categories (such as utilities or loan repayments). These were treated as additional to the statistical CEP indicator, which — consistent with prior practice — reflects a baseline of spendings, not significantly different from the minimum standard of living (see *Irina Iacub*, Report of 2 April 2024, §§ 77, 78). In this context, the attribution of a limited set of confirmed additional retail expenses is both reasonable and conservative.

306. At the end of 2024, the Commission identified a total of 602,482 MDL in bank savings held by the subject's household, distributed as follows:

a) 500,000 MDL on the wife's MICB deposit account no. ***001;

b) 25,115 MDL on the subject's MAIB account no. ***878;

c) 24,640 MDL on the subject's MICB account no. ***881;

d) 52,607 MDL on the wife's MICB account no. ***661;

e) 120 MDL across the wife's other MICB accounts.

307. It follows from the foregoing that in 2024, the household's outgoing financial flows amounted to 3,355,662 MDL, resulting in a negative balance of 123,905 MDL between incoming and outgoing financial flows.

308. As noted in the hearing notice, the Commission also identified additional expenses — including insurance payments, fines, telecommunications services, and VAT-reported transactions with, for example, home improvement stores — which could have been treated as potential additional outflows. However, given the possibility that these were related to the wife's professional activity and were paid from her gross income, they were not included in the analysis of inexplicable wealth.

*Incoming and outgoing financial flows for 2024*

| **Incoming financial flows MDL** | | **Outgoing financial flows MDL** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bank savings at the beginning of the year | 72,161 | First installment for real estate in Roșu Village, Cahul | 383,990 MDL |
| Salary – Cahul Court | 284,884 | Acquisition of shares | 36,652 |
| National Institute of Justice | 601 | Fuel expenses | 13,360 |
| Social security | 76,073 | Loan repayments | 1,315,334 |
| Rent of vehicle | 98,560 | Third party transfers (loan repayment to brother-in-law) | 97,200 |
| Loan of 03.05.2024 | 400,000 | Notarial fees | 9,336 |
| Income – wife (Bailiff Office) | 2,002,949 | Vacation expenses (exceeding CEP) | 14,352 |
| Rent from wife's office to herself | 98,560 | CEP | 217,818 |
| Social security Romania | 36,652 | Retail transactions (exceeding CEP) | 158,072 |
| Rent from third parties | 152,467 | Transfer of savings for second instalment (property Roșu, Cahul) | 507,066 |
| Court-ordered damages | 3,000 | Bank savings at year-end | 602,482 |
| Payment from Central Electoral Commission | 5,850 | | |
| **Total** | **3,231,757** | | **-3,355,662** |
| **Difference** | **-123,905** | | |

### 5.4 Conclusion regarding inexplicable wealth

309. The subject's household has accumulated a negative financial balance of **1,407,408 MDL**, which exceeds 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 | Amount of inexplicable wealth |
|---|---|
| 2013 | **39,278** |
| 2023 | **1,244,225** |
| 2024 | **123,905** |
| **Total** | **-1,407,408** |

310. As noted in § 150, for the purposes of this report, it is accepted that the subject's parents may have covered all expenses related to the christening event and the likelihood of the full 30,000 EUR donation from the christening event guests. With the acceptance of this — or at least 20,000 EUR originating from the parents, the negative balance for 2016 would be eliminated.

311. If, however, the expenses associated with the 2016 christening event were attributed to the subject's household, rather than to the parents as claimed, this would generate a negative balance for that year, increasing the total potentially unexplained wealth to approximately -1,548,918 MDL.

312. If the full amount of unspent cash surplus identified in § 303 as additional expenditures for 2024 is attributed as expenses — on the presumption that these funds were not carried over into 2025 — the household's negative financial balance for this year would increase by 491,429 MDL.

313. For the reasons outlined in this report, the Commission proposes to the Superior Council of Magistracy that the subject does not promote the evaluation based on the approach according to which the subject's household accumulated a negative balance between financial flows of 1,407,408 MDL.

## VI. Conclusion

314. 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 criteria set in Article 11 para. (2) lit. b) and para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

315. The Commission found two separate grounds for finding non-compliance with the criteria in Article 11 of Law No. 252/2023. Under Article 17 of Law No. 252/2023, a subject will be deemed not to have passed the evaluation if one or more grounds for non-compliance are found to exist. The Commission would have issued its recommendation of non-promotion based on any one of the identified grounds.

## VII. Further action and publication

316. 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.

317. 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.

318. 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.

319. This evaluation report was approved by a unanimous vote of the Panel members on 21 January 2026 and signed pursuant to Articles 33 para. (2) and 40 para. (5) of the Rules.

320. Done in English and Romanian.

Andrei Bivol

Chairperson of the Commission

Chair of Panel C