

**Evaluation Report No. 18 of 19 December 2025
on Vitalie CODREANU, prosecutor in the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office,
subject of evaluation under Law No. 252/2023**

Evaluation Panel A (“the Panel”) of the Prosecutor Vetting Commission (“the Commission”) established by Law No. 252/2023 on the external evaluation of judges and prosecutors and amending some normative acts (“Law No. 252/2023”), discharging the powers under the same Law, deliberated in private on 7 November 2025 and approved this report on 19 December 2025.

Due to a conflict of interest affecting one member of the initially assigned Panel, the members participating in the approval of the evaluation report were:

*Cornel LEBEDINSCHI
Christopher LEHMANN – Panel’s Chair
Saskia de VRIES*

Based on its work in collecting and reviewing the information, and subsequent deliberations, Panel A prepared the following evaluation report.

I. Introduction

1. This report concerns the subject of evaluation Vitalie CODREANU, prosecutor in the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office (“APO”).
2. The Panel evaluated the subject of evaluation (“the subject”) according to the procedure and criteria regulated by Law No. 252/2023, and according to the Rules of Procedure of the Prosecutor Vetting Commission (“the Commission Rules”) approved by the Commission pursuant to art. 5 para. (4) of Law No. 252/2023.
3. The Panel unanimously concluded that Vitalie CODREANU meets the ethical and financial integrity criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023.

II. Subject of the Evaluation

4. Vitalie CODREANU (“the subject”) was appointed as a prosecutor’s assistant in the Riscani Prosecutor’s Office of the Chisinau Municipality on 7 April 2003. On 6 May 2004, he was appointed as a prosecutor within the same office. Subsequently, on 19 July 2011, the subject was appointed as a prosecutor in the Division for Conducting and Leading Criminal Investigations of the General Prosecutor’s Office (“GPO”). Since 18 July 2016, he has served as a prosecutor in the APO.

III. Evaluation Criteria

5. Under art. 11 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission evaluates the subject's ethical and financial integrity.
6. Art. 11 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that a subject is deemed not to meet the requirements of ethical integrity if the Commission has determined that:
 - a) over the last 5 years, the subject has seriously violated the rules of ethics and professional conduct of judges or, as the case may be, of prosecutors, as well as if the subject acted arbitrarily or issued arbitrary acts, over the last 10 years, contrary to the imperative rules of law, and the European Court of Human Rights has established, before the adoption of the act, that a similar decision was contrary to the European Convention on Human Rights.
 - b) over the last 10 years, the subject has admitted in his/her activity incompatibilities and conflicts of interest that affect the position held.
7. Art. 11 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that the subject shall be deemed not to meet the criterion of financial integrity if the 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 as set by the Government for the year 2023.
 - b) over the last 10 years, the subject admitted tax irregularities as a result of which the amount of unpaid tax exceeded, in total, 5 average salaries per economy, in the amount as set by the Government for the year 2023.
8. The average salary per economy for 2023 was 11,700 MDL¹. Thus, the threshold of 20 average salaries is 234,000 MDL, and the threshold of five average salaries is 58,500 MDL.
9. Art. 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, the sources of funds of the subject's wealth.
10. Art. 11 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that in evaluating compliance with the criteria set out in para. (3) of this article, the Commission shall also take into account the wealth, expenses, and income of close persons, as defined in Law No. 133/2016 on the

¹ Government decision No. 936/2022 on the approval of the amount of the average monthly salary per economy, forecast for 2023.

declaration of assets and personal interests, as well as of the persons referred to in art. 33 para. (4) and (5) of Law No 132/2016 on the National Integrity Authority.

11. Art. 11 para. (6) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that in assessing compliance with the criteria set out in art. 11 paras (2) and (3), the legal provisions in force when the relevant acts occurred are applied. The documents or findings of other entities with competence in the areas concerned shall have no predetermined value for the Commission. Findings in final judgments shall be taken into account by the Commission, except for judgments that the Commission considers to be arbitrary or manifestly unreasonable. The Commission may rule only on breaches of the rules of ethics and professional conduct, without ruling on the legality of the decisions in question.
12. In applying art. 11 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023, 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.
13. Regarding the standard of “serious doubts” in the context of the vetting exercise, the Constitutional Court noted with reference to its previous decisions that the definition of standards of proof inevitably involves using flexible texts. The Court also said that the Superior Council of Prosecutors 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 Judgment No. 2 of 16 January 2025, §§ 99, 101).
14. The Commission notes that the Venice Commission underlined that in “a system of prior integrity checks, the decision not to recruit a subject can be justified in case of mere doubt, on the basis of a risk assessment. However, the decision to negatively assess a current post holder should be linked to an indication of impropriety, for instance unjustified wealth, even if it cannot be proven beyond doubt that this wealth does come from illegal sources” (Opinion No. 1064/2021 of 20 June 2022, CDL-AD (2022)011-e, para. 10; Joint Opinion of 14 March 2023, CDL-AD(2023)005, para. 69).
15. Shifting the burden of proof to the subject, once the evaluating body has identified integrity issues, has been found permissible by the European Court of Human Rights (“ECtHR”), even in the vetting of sitting judges who may lose their positions or otherwise be sanctioned as a consequence of the evaluation. In *Xhoxhaj v. Albania*, no. 15227/19, 31 May 2021, § 352, the Court stated that “it is not per se arbitrary, for the purposes of the ‘civil’ limb of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, that the burden of proof shifted onto the applicant in the vetting proceedings after the IQC [Independent Qualification Commission] had made available the preliminary findings resulting from the conclusion of the investigation and had given access to the evidence in the case file” (confirmed for the vetting of prosecutors in *Sevdari v. Albania*, no. 40662/19, 13 December 2022, § 130).

16. Once the Commission establishes substantiated doubts based on particular facts that could lead to failure of evaluation, the subject will be afforded the opportunity to oppose those findings and to submit arguments in defense, as provided by art. 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

17. Vitalie CODREANU was on the list of subjects submitted by the Superior Council of Prosecutors ("SCP") to the Commission on 23 May 2024 for evaluation, pursuant to art. 12 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023.
18. The subject was evaluated based on provisions of art. 3 para. (1) lit. e) of Law No. 252/2023.²
19. On 24 May 2024, the Commission notified the subject of its initiation of evaluation and requested that he completes and returns the declaration of assets and personal interests for the last five years ("five-year declaration"), which includes the list of close persons in the judiciary, prosecution and public service, and an ethics questionnaire within 20 days, as provided in art. 25 para. (3) of the Commission Rules, consistent with art. 12 para. (4) of Law No. 252/2023. The subject returned the completed five-year declaration and ethics questionnaire within the deadline, on 13 June 2024.
20. Pursuant to art. 15 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023 and art. 17 of the Commission Rules, the file in this matter was randomly assigned to Panel A.
21. On 16 August 2024, the Commission notified the subject by email that his evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel A. However, since one member of Panel A and one member of Panel B were recused from examining this file, Panel A member Nadejda HRIPTIEVSCHI was replaced by Panel B member Cornel LEBEDINSCHI. Accordingly, Panel A assigned to the subject's file was composed of Christopher LEHMANN, Cornel LEBEDINSCHI, and Saskia de VRIES. The subject was informed that he may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from their evaluation.

² The subject has been evaluated in 2023 by the Pre-Vetting Commission under Law No. 26/2022 on certain measures relating to the selection of candidates for position as a member of the self-administration bodies of the judges and prosecutors, because he had applied for a position in the Superior Council of Prosecutors. The subject failed the evaluation by the Pre-Vetting Commission on May 15, 2023. After an appeal of the subject to the Supreme Court of Justice, the decision of the Pre-Vetting was annulled and a reevaluation was ordered. After the reevaluation process, the candidate failed the evaluation by the Pre-Vetting Commission again on December 4, 2023. The subject challenged this decision before the Supreme Court of Justice, which rejected the appeal on 8 February 2024.

The subject failed both the evaluation and the reevaluation by the Pre-Vetting Commission on ethical integrity issues with regard to the purchase of an apartment in 2010. Since the present Commission is evaluating on the basis of Law 252/2023, which only allows evaluation on ethical integrity over the last 5 years, the Panel will not include or refer to the evaluation/revaluation by the Pre-Vetting Commission or the issue of the purchase of the apartment in 2010.

22. Because the law sets different evaluation periods for the ethical and financial integrity criteria cited above, the Panel evaluated compliance with these criteria over the past 5, 10 and 12 years, respectively. Due to the end-of-the-year availability of the tax declarations and declarations on assets and personal interests, the financial criteria evaluation included 2012 - 2023 (*unjustified wealth*) and 2014 - 2023 (*tax irregularities*). The evaluation period for the ethical criterion includes the past 5 or 10 years calculated as per art. 24 para. (3) lit. b) of the Commission Rules.
23. During the last 12 years of the evaluation period, the subject was required to file declarations, both under Law No. 133/2016 on the declaration of assets and personal interests ("Law No. 133/2016"), and under the previous Law No. 1264/2002 on the declaration and control of income and property of persons with public dignity positions, judges, prosecutors, civil servants and some persons with managing positions ("Law No. 1264/2002").
24. As part of the evaluation of the ethical and financial integrity of the subject, the Commission obtained information from numerous sources. The sources generally included the GPO, specialized Prosecutor's Offices, Superior Council of Prosecutors ("SCP"), National Integrity Authority ("NIA"), National Anti-Corruption Center ("NAC"), Office for Prevention and Fight Against Money Laundering ("AML"), Ministry of Internal Affairs ("MIA"), Customs Service, State Tax Service ("STS"), General Inspectorate of Border Police, the National Office of Social Insurance ("CNAS"), Public Services Agency ("PSA"), Governmental Agent within the Ministry of Justice, banks, financial institutions etc. Information was also sought, and where applicable obtained, from other public and private entities, as well as open sources, such as social media and investigative journalism reports. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.
25. To the extent that issues were raised from the subject's five-year declaration, and ethics questionnaire and collected information, those issues were raised in written questions with the subject.
26. On 4 August 2025, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 18 August 2025 to clarify certain matters ("first round of questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the set deadline – on 18 August 2025. On 23 September 2025, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 30 September 2025 to clarify certain matters ("second round of questions"). The subject provided answers within the deadline – 30 September 2025.
27. On 27 October 2025, the Panel notified the subject that it had identified certain areas of doubt about his compliance with the integrity criteria and invited the subject to attend a public hearing on 7 November 2025 pursuant to art. 16 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023. The subject was informed about his rights under art. 16 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 and that he could request access to the evaluation materials.

28. Following the subject's request, on 31 October 2025, the subject was granted access to the evaluation materials according to art. 16 para. (5) lit. c) of Law No. 252/2023.
29. The subject sent additional information and documents on his own initiative on 6 November 2025.
30. On 7 November 2025, the subject took part in a public hearing of the Panel.
31. At the hearing, the subject reaffirmed the accuracy of his answers in the five-year declaration and ethics questionnaire and stated that he did not have any corrections or additions to the answers he had previously provided to the Commission's requests for information.

V. Analysis

32. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Panel's conclusion.
33. Based on the information it collected, the Panel analyzed and, where necessary, sought further clarifications from the subject on the following matters:
- Non-declaration of bank accounts.
 - Beneficial ownership of a 2005 Nissan Patrol.
 - Beneficial ownership of a 2013 Hyundai I20.
 - Violation of the provisions of Law No. 130/2012 on the regime of weapons and ammunition for civilian use ("Law No. 130/2012").
34. These issues were discussed at the hearing.

Issues that raised certain doubts during the evaluation but were either mitigated or do not lead to failure under the thresholds set by Law No. 252/2023:

Issue 1. Non-declaration of bank accounts

35. According to the information available to the Panel, the subject is the holder of bank accounts in Moldova, as well as a bank account denominated in RON, identified by IBAN code ROxxx001, opened on 8 December 2015 with BCR in Romania. The account was opened in the subject's name as a Romanian citizen to receive state allowances for his minor children.
36. As a result of its analysis of the annual declarations on assets and personal interests for 2019, 2020, and 2021 ("annual declarations"), the Panel found that the subject did not declare the Romanian bank account specified above in the declarations submitted to the NIA on 3 March 2020, 26 March 2021, and 31 March 2022, respectively. He likewise did not declare any other bank accounts held by him or his wife (a total of 10 accounts, listed in the table below). The subject only declared the deposit accounts opened in his daughter's name (in the annual declarations for 2020 and 2021).

Table No. 1. List of bank accounts in the Republic of Moldova that were not declared by the subject and his wife in the annual declarations for 2019, 2020 and 2021

Bank	Account No. / IBAN code	Type of account	Currency	Date of opening	Date of closing
Subject					
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx236	Current account	MDL	5 December 2019	Active
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx163	Current account	MDL	7 February 2020	4 February 2025
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx310	Current account	MDL	7 March 2022	Active
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx038	Current account	MDL	8 July 2022	Active
Subject's wife					
OTP Bank SA	MDxxx100	Current account	USD	9 August 2011	Active
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx692	Current account	MDL	25 July 2013	21 January 2021
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx770	Current account	MDL	4 September 2014	16 February 2025
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx773	Current account	EUR	25 November 2014	19 January 2021
BC MAIB SA	MDxxx917	Current account	MDL	7 September 2015	Active
BC MICB SA	MDxxx361	Current account	MDL	11 October 2021	Active

37. According to art. 4 para. (1) lit. d) of Law no. 133/2016, bank accounts held by the declarant and his family members must be declared if their total value exceeds the equivalent of 15 national average monthly salaries.

38. The total value of the bank accounts held by the subject and his family members as of 3 March 2020, 26 March 2021, and 31 March 2022, respectively, in relation to the applicable threshold of 15 national average monthly salaries, can be represented as follows:

Table No. 2. Total value of the bank accounts held by the subject and his family members as of the dates of submitting the annual declarations, in relation to the statutory threshold

Date of submitting the annual declaration	BCR account balance on the date of submitting the annual declaration		Total balance on all bank accounts (subject, wife and daughter) (in MDL)	Declaration threshold (in MDL)	Calculation basis for the declaration threshold (amount of average monthly salary per economy) (in MDL)
	in RON	in MDL			

3 March 2020	2,004	8,178	154,617	119,295	7,953 (Government Decision No. 678/2019)
26 March 2021	4,222	17,958	210,121	130,740	8,716 (Government Decision No. 923/2020)
31 March 2022	6,781	27,364	174,632	148,500	9,900 (Government Decision No. 458/2021)

39. Thus, the Panel notes that, in each of the three reference years, the total value of the bank accounts held by the subject and his family members exceeded the statutory threshold of 15 national average monthly salaries.
40. In his written answers in the second round of questions (R2, Q6), as well as during the hearing, the subject stated that the balance of the Romanian bank account in question (representing allowances granted by the Romanian state for the benefit of his minor children) had in fact been declared in the relevant annual declarations, but had been erroneously included in the income section rather than in the section relating to bank accounts. The subject maintained that this omission was unintentional and that such discrepancies would be avoided in the future.
41. The same considerations apply to the bank accounts held by the subject and his wife in the Republic of Moldova. The Panel has established that although the accounts listed in Table No. 1 were omitted from the subject's annual declarations, the funds deposited therein derive from legitimate and easily verifiable sources, namely the subject's salary as a prosecutor, his wife's professional income as an attorney, and social allowances for their child, which were duly indicated in the annual declarations for 2019, 2020 and 2021. The available information does not suggest any intention to conceal assets; rather, the omission appears to be the result of insufficient attention to the formal requirements of completing the declarations.
42. Under Law No. 252/2023, failures to declare assets to the NIA are not automatically attributable to the criterion of financial integrity. However, such infractions may raise questions about a subject's adherence to honesty and rectitude in financial matters. The Panel is also required to verify whether any undeclared assets give rise to concerns related to inexplicable wealth.
43. Failure to declare assets to the NIA may constitute, in itself, an ethical violation. Pursuant to art. 6.6¹.7 of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics, prosecutors have a duty to refrain from concealing or distorting information regarding the assets they hold and must ensure full disclosure of such information.
44. One of the purposes of Law No. 133/2016 is to foster transparency among public officials; another is to prevent and sanction financial impropriety, including the acquisition of assets from obscure or illicit sources.

45. Under art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023, only serious ethical violations may be attributed to the criterion of ethical integrity, and such violations must be clearly established by the Commission. Not every instance of non-compliance with asset declaration requirements justifies dismissal from office (*Nikëhasani v. Albania*, 13 December 2022, § 117; *Sevdari v. Albania*, 13 December 2022, § 85; *Thanza v. Albania*, 4 July 2023, § 153).
46. In the present case, the Panel has no doubts that the funds held by the subject and his family members in their bank accounts (both the Romanian and Moldovan bank accounts) were of legitimate origin, and that no practical motive existed for concealing this information. Moreover, the funds themselves were duly reported in the annual declarations for 2019, 2020, and 2021. This demonstrates that the omission related strictly to the technical listing of the bank accounts, rather than to the disclosure of the financial means available to the subject's household.
47. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the subject's non-compliance in 2020, 2021, and 2022 with the asset declaration regime established by Law No. 133/2016, although questionable under art. 6.6¹.7 of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics, constitutes an error that does not meet the high threshold of a serious ethical violation warranting dismissal from office and other adverse consequences.
48. Nevertheless, the subject has violated the legal regime for declaring personal assets and interests by filling his declaration 2019, 2020 and 2021 without reporting 11 bank accounts.
49. The legal obligation of public officials to file asset declarations in a timely and complete manner, is an obligation which the Panel takes very seriously, since it is a crucial standard of an effective anti-corruption policy. For this reason, the Panel uses its right according to art. 17 para. (7) of Law No. 252/2023 to send the information with regard to the undeclared bank accounts mentioned above, to the competent state body (NIA).

Issue 2. Beneficial ownership of a 2005 Nissan Patrol

50. According to the information available to the Panel, from February 2013 to the present, the subject has been using a 2005 Nissan Patrol. Between 8 February 2013 and 13 May 2025, the vehicle was registered in the name of the subject's father.
51. Shortly after the vehicle's acquisition (in the same month), the subject registered a right of use over it. In his annual declarations for 2013–2023, the subject declared this right of use. A value of 10,500 EUR was indicated for the years 2017–2023, whereas no value was declared for the period 2013–2016.
52. According to the available information, the subject's father passed away on 18 June 2022. Nevertheless, official records, accessed on 19 March 2025, continued to show the father as the registered owner of the vehicle, while the subject continued to use it.

53. The subject's continuous use of the vehicle is supported by the following circumstances:
- the subject was the primary insured under the mandatory RCA insurance policies from March 2014 to May 2017 and from April 2018 to the present; the father only appears as co-insured between March 2014 and May 2017. In his written answers to the first round of questions (R1, Q39), the subject confirmed paying the insurance policies for 2015 and 2018–2023.
 - mandatory external civil liability insurance policies were issued solely in the subject's name for 2013–2023.
 - four traffic sanctions were recorded against the subject while driving the vehicle, whereas none were recorded against his father.
 - fuel payments reflected in the subject's bank statements indicate continuous use of the vehicle between 2013 and 2023.
 - neither the subject nor his wife owned any other vehicle during the evaluated period.
 - the license plate appears personalized, as it corresponds to the subject's initials.
54. In light of the above, the Panel developed doubts regarding the beneficial ownership of the vehicle from the time of its acquisition, necessitating further clarification.
55. In both his written answers (R1, Q39; R2, Q8) and during the hearings, the subject asserted that the vehicle belonged to his father, who had purchased it for use in his beekeeping business and had indeed used it for that purpose. The subject also maintained that he only used the vehicle occasionally.
56. The subject stated that his father granted him the right to use the vehicle because they lived in the same household and maintained a good father-son relationship. At the hearings, the subject reiterated that he used the vehicle only with his father's permission. As an example, he explained that between 2017 and 2018, due to a disagreement, his father prohibited him from using the vehicle, and he complied. He also referenced an instance in which a traffic sanction relating to the vehicle was issued in the name of a third party unknown to him, which, in his view, demonstrates that the father used the vehicle as he considered appropriate and that the subject was not its sole user.
57. With respect to the insurance policies, the subject explained that he arranged these because a friend working in the insurance sector could provide him with favorable terms. His father did not reimburse him for these expenses, as their close relationship did not require a formal or accounting-based approach. The subject also emphasized that he did not insure the vehicle during the 2017–2018 period, when his father prohibited him from using the vehicle.
58. Concerning the personalized license plates, the subject stated in his written answers in the first round of questions (R1, Q38) that he was unaware of this detail and noted that the initials also matched those of his father.
59. Regarding the origin of funds for the vehicle's acquisition, the subject stated during the hearings that his father possessed sufficient resources, deriving both from his employment as a lawyer with a major Moldovan insurance company and from extensive beekeeping

activities. The subject additionally submitted written notes and calculations to substantiate the asserted scale and revenue of the apiculture business.

60. After examining the totality of the information collected, including documentary records, insurance data, fuel-related payments, traffic sanctions, and the subject's explanations, the Panel retains certain doubts regarding the credibility of the subject's account. If, as he maintains, he used the vehicle only occasionally, there appears to have been no practical need to register a right of use in his name or to place the insurance policy under his name rather than his father's.
61. Regarding the financial aspects of the purchase, the subject provided an explanation of his father's capacity to acquire the vehicle, referring to the latter's professional income and the scale of his apiculture activities.
62. In any event, the Panel considers that there is no issue concerning the source of funds used for the acquisition. Moreover, even if the vehicle were to be attributed to the subject as its beneficial owner, the resulting increase in assets would still not place him above the statutory threshold of unjustified wealth under Law No. 252/2023.

Issue 3. Beneficial ownership of a 2013 Hyundai I20

63. In his annual declarations for 2015–2023, the subject declared a right of use over a second vehicle registered in his father's name, namely a 2013 Hyundai I20. A value of EUR 7,200 was indicated for the years 2017–2023, whereas no value was declared for the period 2015–2016.
64. As with the first vehicle referenced above, the Hyundai I20 continued to be used by the subject following the death of his father on 18 June 2022.
65. Similar doubts regarding the vehicle's effective ownership arose in respect of this second vehicle, based on the following indicators:
 - the father appeared as insured only at the time of acquisition; thereafter, the subject and/or his wife were listed as primary insured.
 - mandatory external civil liability insurance policies were issued exclusively in the subject's name; five traffic sanctions were issued to the subject while using the vehicle, and none to his father.
 - fuel payments recorded in the subject's bank statements indicate regular use of the vehicle between 2013 and 2023.
 - the subject's wife also held a right of use over the vehicle, with no duration registered; furthermore, in the subject's annual declarations for 2021, 2022, and 2023, it is indicated that the beneficial owner of the vehicle was the Attorney's Office "C.E.", whose founder and administrator is the subject's wife.
66. As the Hyundai I20 was the third vehicle acquired by the subject's father, the Panel requested clarification regarding both the need for an additional car and the source of funds used for its acquisition.

67. In his written answers in the second round of questions (R2, Q9), the subject stated that his father had intended to sell one of the vehicles in his possession, namely a 1997 Land Rover Defender, which he had owned since 2013. According to available information, no sale ultimately took place. The subject admitted during the hearing that Land Rover is still in possession of a family member.
68. During the hearing, the subject reiterated explanations similar to those provided in connection with the Nissan vehicle. He stated that use of the Hyundai was shared between his father, himself, and, in this case, also his wife, while the father remained the owner and controlled the use of the vehicle according to his needs and preferences. As with the first vehicle, the subject explained this shared use by reference to the close familial relationship, and reiterated the same arguments regarding the insurance arrangements.
69. Regarding the source of funds for the purchase of the Hyundai I20, the subject stated during the hearings that his father possessed sufficient lawful income, derived from both his beekeeping activity and his employment as a lawyer with an insurance company, and submitted supporting documents in this regard.
70. To clarify the broader context of the vehicles owned by the subject's father and used regularly by the subject (and more occasionally by his wife), the Panel also sought information regarding a third vehicle owned by the father since 2013. The subject explained that the acquisition of this vehicle had long been his father's wish and that, being an off-road vehicle, it was suitable for both his father's apiculture business and his hunting hobby.
71. In view of the clarifications provided, the documentary evidence submitted, and the familial context described, the Panel considers that the circumstances surrounding the Hyundai I20 largely mirror those of the first vehicle.
72. The subject also demonstrated that his father had had access to legitimate revenues, including salary income. The documents submitted support the credibility of these statements.
73. Against this background, the Panel concludes that the evidence does indicate the subject's and/or his wife's beneficial ownership of the Hyundai I20 during the evaluated period. But even if the vehicle were to be attributed to the subject as its beneficial owner, the resulting increase in assets would still not place him above the statutory threshold of unjustified wealth under Law No. 252/2023.

Issue 4. Violation of the provisions of Law No. 130/2012

74. According to the information available to the Panel, on 8 May 2025 the subject inherited from his father, who had passed away on 18 June 2022, three firearms: two smooth-barreled long guns "IJ-27," cal. 12×70 mm, each valued at 8,000 MDL (hunting weapons); and one gas pistol "ME-9" cal. 9 mm, valued at 2,000 MDL (self-defense weapon).

75. In his written answers to the second round of questions (R2, Q11), the subject indicated that he does not hold a weapon permit and that the firearms inherited from his father were handed over to the Ciocana Police Inspectorate. He provided a copy of the minutes documenting the temporary surrender of the weapons, dated 27 September 2024. The Panel notes that, according to the subject, the testamentary inheritance documents were prepared on 8 May 2025; however, the Panel was unable to examine these documents, as the subject declined to submit them on the grounds that they fall outside the evaluated period (2012–2023).
76. Art. 4 para. (7) of Law No. 130/2012 provides that relatives or persons who live together with an individual who legally owns firearms or ammunition are obliged, in the event the owner dies or is declared missing, to deposit the respective firearms and ammunition at the nearest police authority within 15 days from the date of death for safekeeping, until the heir is determined. Hence, the Panel sought additional clarification regarding compliance with this provision.
77. The Panel notes that three adults shared the flat with the deceased: his wife, the subject, and the subject's wife. Hence, they had the joint obligation to surrender the weapons to the nearest police station by 3 July 2022.
78. During the hearings, the subject explained that the firearms were not kept at the apartment serving as the joint domicile of the subject, his family, and his father, but rather at a different property – a house in Colonita village owned by the subject's sister. He stated that, after the father's death, his sister could not locate the keys to the safe in which the firearms were stored, which delayed their surrender. The subject also argued that, in his view, the legal obligation to deposit the firearms within 15 days did not apply to him personally, as he was not the owner of the premises where they were stored. Finally, he noted that no fines or sanctions were imposed by the police upon the eventual handing over of the firearms.
79. The Panel observes, however, that while art. 4 para. (10) of Law No. 130/2012 allows firearms to be stored at a location other than the owner's domicile, this is permitted only with the written consent of the police. Moreover, the obligation under art. 4 para. (7) to deposit the firearms within 15 days is not transferred to the owner or manager of the alternative storage location; it remains with the relatives or persons living together with the deceased owner. Failure to comply with this obligation is subject to the sanctions provided by law.
80. The only responsibilities of the person designated to manage the storage location, with respect to firearms lawfully kept there, are to secure a second set of keys and to lock the access door, as provided in point 6 of Annex No. 3 to the same Law.
81. In light of the above-cited legal provisions and considering the subject's line of work, the Panel finds that the subject failed to comply with the mandatory legal requirements regulating the handling and temporary deposit of firearms upon the death of their legal owner.

82. This failure constitutes an ethical violation. Pursuant to art. 6.1.1 of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics, prosecutors have a duty to abide by the rule of law in all its aspects.
83. However, as noted in Issue 1, art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that only serious ethical violations may be attributed to the criterion of ethical integrity, and such violations must be clearly and convincingly established by the Commission.
84. In the present case, the Panel observes that the non-compliance occurred within a shared family responsibility, given that the firearms were stored at premises owned and managed by the subject's sister.
85. The omission was not deliberate, stemmed from practical difficulties (including lack of access to the safe), and resulted in no harm, incident, or misuse of the firearms. The weapons were ultimately surrendered to the police, and no sanctions were applied.
86. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the subject's failure to comply with the surrender requirements under Law No. 130/2012, although questionable under art. 6.1.1 of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics, constitutes an error that does not reach the high threshold of a serious ethical violation warranting dismissal from office and other adverse consequences.

VI. Conclusion

87. Based on the information it obtained and that was presented by the subject, the Panel proposes that Vitalie CODREANU passes the external evaluation made according to the criteria set in art. 11 of Law No. 252/2023.

VII. Further Action and Publication

88. According to art. 17 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023, this evaluation report shall be sent by e-mail to the subject and the SCP within three days of its approval, and on the same day the Commission will publish on its official website the information on the result of the evaluation.
89. Under art. 17 para. (6) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission will submit to the SCP, within three days of approval of the evaluation report, a hard copy of that evaluation report, along with an electronic copy of the evaluation file of the subject.
90. Under art. 17 para. (8) of Law No. 252/2023 the evaluation report, in full, will be published on the Commission's official website, with appropriate precautions to protect the privacy of the subject and other people, within three days from the expiry of the deadline for appealing the SCP's decision (pursuant to art. 18 para. (3) lit. a) and c) of Law No. 252/2023) or from the date of issuance of the Supreme Court of Justice's decision (pursuant to art. 19 para. (5) point 1) and point 2) lit. c) of Law No. 252/2023).

91. Pursuant to art. 17 para (2) of Law No. 252/2023, this evaluation report was approved unanimously by the evaluation panel on 19 December 2025 and signed by the Chairperson of the Commission.

92. Done in English and Romanian.

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Ch. Lehmann', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Christopher LEHMANN
Chairperson
Prosecutor Vetting Commission