

**Evaluation Report No. 26 of 2 April 2026  
on Alexandru MORCOV,  
former delegated prosecutor to the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office,  
subject of evaluation under Law No. 252/2023**

Evaluation Panel F (“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 13 March 2026 and approved this report on 2 April 2026.

The members participating in the approval of the evaluation report were:

*Ion GRAUR  
Nadejda HRIPTIEVSCHI  
Laura ȘTEFAN*

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

### **I. Introduction**

1. This report concerns the subject of evaluation Alexandru MORCOV, prosecutor in the Straseni Prosecutor's Office and former delegated prosecutor to 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 Alexandru MORCOV meets the ethical and financial integrity criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023.

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

4. Alexandru MORCOV (“the subject”) was appointed as a prosecutor on 25 June 2018 within the Calarasi Prosecutor's Office. Between 27 May 2019 and 26 May 2021, the subject was delegated to the APO. As of 1 April 2025, he serves as a prosecutor within the Straseni Prosecutor's Office.

### 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 five 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 MDL.<sup>1</sup> 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 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.

---

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

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 Judgement 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. Alexandru MORCOV 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 the provisions of art. 3 para. (1) lit. e) of Law No. 252/2023.
19. On 24 May 2024, the Commission notified the subject of the initiation of his evaluation and requested that he complete and return 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 7 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, composed of Nadejda HRIPTIEVSCHI, Christopher LEHMANN, 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 the evaluation.
22. Subsequently, pursuant to the Commission’s decision of 5 November 2025, the subject was randomly reassigned for evaluation to Panel F, composed of Ion GRAUR, Nadejda HRIPTIEVSCHI, and Laura ȘTEFAN, and the subject was notified accordingly by email on 18 November 2025. The subject was informed that he may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from the evaluation.
23. 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 five, 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 the years 2012-2023 and the income earned up to 2012 by the subject’s parents-in-law, pursuant to his request. The evaluation period for the ethical criterion includes the past five or 10 years calculated as per art. 24 para. (3) lit. b) of the Commission Rules.

24. During the last 12 years of the evaluation period, the subject was required to file declarations under Law No. 133/2016 on the declaration of assets and personal interests (“Law No. 133/2016”).
25. 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.
26. To the extent that issues were raised by the subject’s five-year declaration, ethics questionnaire and collected information, those issues were raised in written questions to the subject.
27. On 20 November 2025, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 28 November 2025 to clarify certain matters (“first round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the set deadline, on 28 November 2025. On 27 January 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 3 February 2026 to clarify certain matters (“second round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the set deadline, on 3 February 2026. On 13 February 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 20 February 2026 to clarify certain matters (“third round of questions”). The subject provided answers and documents within the set deadline, on 19 February 2026.
28. On 2 March 2026, the Panel notified the subject that it had not identified in its evaluation any areas of doubt about the subject’s compliance with the integrity criteria and invited the subject to attend a public hearing on 13 March 2026 pursuant to art. 16 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023. The subject was also informed about his rights under art. 16 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 and that he could request access to the evaluation materials.
29. Following the subject’s request, on 6 March 2026, the subject was granted access to the evaluation materials according to art. 16 para. (5) lit. c) of Law No. 252/2023.
30. On 4 March 2026, the subject informed the Panel that he would not participate in the hearing scheduled for 13 March 2026, stating that the information previously provided in the five-year declarations, ethical integrity questionnaire, and his subsequent written replies to the Panel were accurate and complete.

## **V. Analysis**

31. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Panel's conclusion.
32. Based on the information it collected, the Panel analyzed and, where necessary, sought further clarifications from the subject on the following matter:
  - Unjustified wealth in 2017 and 2018.
33. This issue was mitigated before the hearing.

**Issue that raised certain doubts during the evaluation but was mitigated and does not lead to failure under the thresholds set by Law No. 252/2023:**

*Issue 1. Unjustified wealth in 2017 and 2018*

34. **Unjustified wealth in 2017.** According to information available to the Panel, the total incoming financial flow of the subject for 2017 amounted to 115,828 MDL, while the total outgoing financial flow amounted to 121,405 MDL, resulting in a negative balance of 5,577 MDL.
35. The subject's incoming financial flows in the 2017 calendar year included the following sources of income: cash savings at the beginning of the year in the amount of 45,000 MDL; a scholarship from the National Institute of Justice in the amount of 14,566 MDL; the subject's net salary from the Prosecutor's Office in the amount of 35,875 MDL, according to bank account data reviewed by the Panel; a donation of 20,000 MDL from his mother; and interest and other returned amounts totaling 387 MDL.
36. The Panel examined the plausibility of the donation by reference to the supporting documents submitted by the subject, including bank statements of his mother, and found no indication that the amount lacked a lawful source or that it was fictitious.
37. The outgoing financial flow consisted of the CEP<sup>2</sup>, calculated for an adult living in an urban area, in the amount of 35,374 MDL, as well as cash savings of 65,000 MDL and bank savings of 21,031 MDL held at the end of 2017.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Consumption Expenditures for Population (CEP) are determined and published on annual basis by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). The exact amount per subject of evaluation is calculated by the Commission using the NBS data, taking into account the number of family members, residence area (rural or urban). The CEP for any year between 2006 - 2018 is calculated based on NBS methodology applied for the period of 2006 - 2018 (on the basis of "stable population" in the „discontinued series") and the method available on the NBS site (ENG). In this case, the indicator of Consumption expenditures by population according to purpose of expenditures, number of children and area 2006-2018 is chosen with the following variables: 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 is multiplied by the number of family members and 12 calendar months.

The CEP for any year between 2019 - 2023 is calculated based on NBS methodology and the method available on the NBS site (ENG). In this case, the indicator of Consumption expenditures by population according to purpose of expenditures, number of children and area 2019 - 2022 is chosen with the following variables: 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 is multiplied by the number of

38. The subject informed the Panel in written communication (R1Q29) that the CEP applicable to his household should be reduced, since from September 2016 to 29 May 2017 he was living with his parents that lived outside Chisinau while he was attending the initial professional training program at the National Institute of Justice and sharing a common household with them.
39. The Panel analyzed the subject's explanations regarding the CEP and concluded that there are no sufficiently justified grounds to reduce the CEP for the subject's household. The Panel notes that CEP represents a statistical estimate of average household consumption developed by the National Bureau of Statistics. While individual circumstances may vary, deviations from the CEP benchmark are generally accepted only where there is evidence of significantly different living conditions or proof that actual expenses were materially lower than the statistical estimate. CEP is designed to balance multiple categories of consumption expenditure and therefore provides a fair approximation of the expenses of an average individual. The methodology already reflects shared household arrangements and economies of scale, including situations where individuals live together with family members.
40. Even accepting that the subject temporarily resided with his parents during the relevant period, such circumstance does not automatically justify a proportional reduction of personal consumption expenditure. Cohabitation within a family household does not eliminate individual living costs; rather, it redistributes them within the household structure.
41. In addition, during the period September 2016 – 29 May 2017, the subject was enrolled in the initial professional training program at the National Institute of Justice, which inherently involved recurring personal expenses, including transportation to and from training and internships, as well as other costs related to participation in professional training activities.
42. In these circumstances, the Panel considers that it is more likely that the subject incurred consumption expenses at least at the level reflected by the CEP benchmark.
43. It follows that for the calendar year 2017, the subject's outgoing financial flow was 121,405 MDL, consisting of 35,374 MDL in CEP expenditures, 65,000 MDL representing cash savings held at the end of 2017, and 21,031 MDL representing bank savings held at the end of 2017.
44. Considering all the above, the total negative difference between wealth, expenses and income (unjustified wealth) in 2017 amounted to 5,577 MDL.

---

family members and 12 calendar months.

**Table 1. Income and expenses table for 2017**

Incoming financial flows (MDL)		Outgoing financial flows (MDL)	
Description	Amount	Description	Amount
Cash savings (at the beginning of the year)	45,000	Consumption expenditures (CEP, urban average)	35,374
Scholarship from National Institute of Justice	14,566	Cash savings	65,000
Salary from the Prosecutor's Office	35,875	Bank savings	21,031
Donation	20,000		
Interest and other returned amounts	387		
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>115,828</b>	<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>121,405</b>
		<b>Balance: -5,577 MDL</b>	

45. **Unjustified wealth in 2018.** According to information available to the Panel, the total incoming financial flow of the subject for the year 2018 amounted to 242,426 MDL, while the total outgoing financial flow amounted to 258,111 MDL, resulting in a negative balance of 15,685 MDL.
46. The incoming financial flow of the subject included the following: cash savings carried over from the previous year in the amount of 65,000 MDL; bank savings carried over from the previous year in the amount of 21,031 MDL; the subject's net salary from the Prosecutor's Office in the amount of 123,928 MDL, according to bank account data available to the Panel; a donation of 30,000 MDL from his mother; and interest and other returned amounts totaling 2,467 MDL.
47. The outgoing financial flow of the subject for 2018 included the following: retail expenses totaling 18,540 MDL; the purchase price of a vehicle (a 2014 Škoda Fabia) in the amount of 118,620 MDL; vehicle insurance in the amount of 391 MDL; cash expenditures in the amount of 51,167 MDL, identified by the Panel based on the analysis of ATM withdrawals and cash payments; cash savings held at the end of 2018 in the amount of 30,000 MDL; and bank savings held at the end of 2018 in the amount of 39,393 MDL. The Panel attributed the household's retail expenses and available cash to outgoing financial flows, as a reflection of the subject's living expenses. This stems from net available cash exceeding the calculated CEP for the same year, indicating its likely use for daily expenses.
48. The subject argued that the amount of 53,000 MDL, representing savings originating from 2017, should be excluded from the cash balance used in 2018 (R2Q18). The Panel does not accept this approach. Even if originating from 2017, this amount represents funds carried forward and available to the subject in 2018. Moreover, the amount formed part of the payment made for the purchase of the Škoda Fabia. Excluding this amount from the

available cash would therefore be inconsistent with the fact that it was included in the outgoing financial flow corresponding to the purchase of the vehicle.

49. Considering all the above, the total negative difference between wealth, expenses and income (unjustified wealth) in 2018 amounted to 15,685 MDL.

**Table 2. Income and expenses table for 2018**

Incoming financial flows (MDL)		Outgoing financial flows (MDL)	
Description	Amount	Description	Amount
Cash savings (at the beginning of the year)	65,000	Retail expenses	18,540
Bank savings (at the beginning of the year)	21,031	Purchase of Škoda Fabia (2014)	118,620
Salary from the Prosecutor's Office	123,928	Vehicle insurance	391
Donation	30,000	Cash expenses (not included in CEP)	51,167
Interest and other returned amounts	2,467	Cash savings	30,000
		Bank savings	39,393
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>242,426</b>	<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>258,111</b>
		<b>Balance: -15,685 MDL</b>	

50. Based on the above analysis, the Panel concludes that for the years 2017 and 2018 the subject registered negative balances of 5,577 MDL and 15,685 MDL respectively, resulting in a cumulative amount of 21,262 MDL representing unjustified wealth.
51. In light of the above, the Panel concludes that, given that the amount is below the statutory threshold of 234,000 MDL established under art. 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023, the subject meets the criterion of financial integrity.

## VI. Conclusion

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

## VII. Further Action and Publication

53. 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.

54. 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.
55. 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).
56. Pursuant to art. 17 para (2) of Law No. 252/2023, this evaluation report was approved unanimously by the evaluation panel on 2 April 2026 and signed by the Chair of the Panel.
57. Done in English and Romanian.

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Nadejda Hriptievschi', written in a cursive style.

Nadejda HRIPTIEVSCHI

Chair of Panel F, designated to sign the evaluation report by the Chairperson of the Prosecutor Vetting Commission, by email, pursuant to art. 29 para. (6) of the Commission Rules