

**Evaluation Report No. 37 of 20 May 2026
on Inna VÎHODEȚ, prosecutor in the Cahul Prosecutor’s Office,
subject of evaluation under Law No. 252/2023 as a prosecutor formerly delegated to the
Anti-Corruption Prosecutor’s Office**

Evaluation Panel B (“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 3 April 2026 and approved this report on 20 May 2026.

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

*Virginia MORARU – Panel’s Chair
Cornel LEBEDINSCHI
Irmantas MIKELIONIS*

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

I. Introduction

1. This report concerns the subject of evaluation Inna VÎHODEȚ, prosecutor in the Cahul 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 Inna VÎHODEȚ meets the ethical and financial integrity criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023.

II. Subject of the Evaluation

4. Inna VÎHODEȚ (“the subject”) was appointed as a prosecutor on 1 October 2014 within the Cahul District Prosecutor’s Office. Between 3 January 2022 and 2 January 2024, the subject was delegated to the APO. As of 1 April 2025, she serves as a prosecutor within the Cahul 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 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 MDL.¹ 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.

¹ 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. Inna VÎHODEȚ 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) and (3) of Law no. 252/2023.
19. On 24 May 2024, the Commission notified the subject of its initiation of evaluation and requested that she 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 B.
21. On 16 August 2024, the Commission notified by email the subject that her evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel B, composed of Virginia MORARU (Panel’s Chair), Cornel LEBEDINSCHI, and Irmantas MIKELIONIS. The subject was informed that she may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from the evaluation.
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 by the subject's five-year declaration, and ethics questionnaire and collected information, those issues were raised in written questions with the subject.
26. On 6 February 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 13 February 2026 to clarify certain matters ("round of written questions"). The subject provided answers and documents within the set deadline, on 13 February 2026.
27. On 23 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 3 April 2026 pursuant to art. 16 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023. The subject was also informed about her rights under art. 16 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 and that she could request access to the evaluation materials.
28. On 24 March 2026, the subject informed the Panel that she would not participate in the hearing scheduled for 3 April 2026, stating that the information previously provided in the five-year declarations, ethical integrity questionnaire, and her subsequent written replies to the Panel were accurate and complete.

V. Analysis

29. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Panel's conclusion.
30. 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 stock ownership.*
 - *The source of funds for the purchase of an apartment.*
 - *A disciplinary proceeding against the subject.*
31. These issues were mitigated before the scheduled 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 stock ownership

32. According to the subject's annual declarations of income and property for 2014, 2015, and annual declaration of assets and personal interests 2016 (annual declarations) submitted to the NIA, the subject declared ownership of 80 shares in SA "D.H.", identified as type 2 shares without voting rights, with a total nominal value of 80 MDL, i.e. 1 MDL per share. According to the available information, these shares represented approximately 0.00011% of the company's share capital.
33. However, the subject did not declare these shares in her annual declarations for 2017 and the following years. This period included the declarations submitted within the five-year period relevant for the assessment of ethical integrity under Law No. 252/2023, namely the declarations for 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023. Accordingly, the Panel examined whether the non-declaration of these shares during the relevant evaluation period is relevant for the subject's compliance with the criterion of ethical integrity under art. 11 of Law No. 252/2023.
34. The Panel notes that pursuant to art. 6.6¹.7 of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics, approved by Decision of the General Assembly of Prosecutors No. 4 of 27 May 2016 ("2016 Prosecutors' Code of Ethics"), prosecutors must refrain from concealing or distorting information regarding assets they hold and must ensure full disclosure. Therefore, failure to declare assets to the NIA may, in itself, constitute an ethical violation. At the same time, art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023 limits the assessment of violations of rules of ethics and professional conduct to the five-year period preceding the evaluation. Pursuant to art. 24 para. (3) lit. b) of the Commission Rules, this period runs from 1 May 2019 to 30 April 2024. Therefore, the Panel's assessment focused on whether the continued non-declaration of the shares within this period, in particular in the declarations for 2019 – 2023, amounted to a serious ethical violation.
35. In the round of written questions, the Panel asked the subject to explain the origin of these shares and to provide any supporting documents. The Panel also asked the subject to clarify what happened to the shares after 2016 and to provide any confirmatory documents in this respect (R1Q14).
36. In response, the subject stated that, on 4 January 1996, her parents and her brother received certificates of SA "D.H.". She submitted copies of the certificates held by her parents and brother. The subject stated that she did not possess information concerning the origin of these certificates.
37. As regards her own shares, the subject explained that, according to her parents, she had also held 80 shares in SA "D.H.". However, she stated that after 2016, the relevant certificate was lost and that, at present, she does not have any information concerning her shares in this company (R1Q14).
38. The Panel also considers the broader context in which such shares were commonly acquired in the Republic of Moldova in the 1990s, including through mass privatization or related

processes, often resulting in individuals holding very small share packages of limited practical or economic significance. This context does not remove the obligation to declare assets where they are still held, but it is relevant in assessing the gravity of the omission and whether it reveals concealment, bad faith, or a serious disregard of declaration obligations.

39. According to the available public information from open sources, it appears that SA “D.H.” did not declare dividends for payment during the period 2009 – 2023. The Panel also notes that the shares had a very low nominal value, represented an insignificant percentage of the company’s share capital, and had been disclosed by the subject in her annual declarations for three consecutive years before the omissions occurred.
40. In these circumstances, although the shares were not declared within the relevant five-year period, the Panel notes that the omission concerned a very small number of non-voting shares with a total nominal value of 80 MDL, representing approximately 0.00011% of the company’s share capital. There is no indication that the shares generated dividends or other income, and the subject provided a plausible explanation that the relevant certificate had been lost and that she no longer had information concerning the status of the shares. The Panel also took into account that the shares had previously been declared, which reduces the likelihood that the later omission reflected an intention to conceal the assets.
41. Accordingly, the Panel considers the issue mitigated and concludes that, in relation to the non-declaration of stock ownership after 2016, namely during the relevant five-year period, the subject meets the criterion of ethical integrity under art. 11 of Law No. 252/2023.

Issue 2. The source of funds for the purchase of an apartment

42. According to the information available to the Panel from the Register of Immovable Property, the subject owns a 45.4 sq.m. apartment in Cahul municipality, registered in the Register of Immovable Property on 30 May 2018 and acquired under sale-purchase agreement no. 4034 of 31 March 2018. In her annual declaration for 2018, the subject declared the acquisition of the apartment on 31 March 2018, indicating a value of 439,348 MDL.
43. In the round of written questions, the Panel asked the subject to provide a copy of the sale-purchase agreement, to clarify the real price paid for the apartment, and to identify the source of funds used for its acquisition, with supporting documents (R1Q21). The Panel also asked the subject to clarify the condition of the apartment at the time of acquisition, the subsequent renovation expenses, and the date from which she began living in the apartment (R1Q25).
44. In response to R1Q21, the subject confirmed that she acquired the apartment under sale-purchase agreement no. 4034 of 31 March 2018, which she provided to the Panel. She explained that the real price paid for the apartment was 22,500 EUR. The subject further stated that the acquisition was financed from two sources: first, funds obtained under a mortgage loan agreement concluded in 2018 with BC “M” SA for the period 2018 – 2033;

and second, funds provided by her father in the amount of 8,316 USD, withdrawn from his account at BC “M” SA (R1Q21).

45. In response to R1Q25, the subject mentioned that the mortgage agreement had been concluded for the amount of 384,000 MDL.
46. As to the funds provided by her father, the subject explained that her father had received a pension from the MIA, initially into an account opened with BC “B.E.” from 2003, and that after the withdrawal of the bank’s license to conduct financial activity, the accumulated financial resources were deposited into an account at BC “M” SA. The bank information reviewed by the Panel confirms the existence of the relevant account history and the withdrawal of the funds from the father’s account.
47. The subject further explained that the amount provided by her father also included 3,800 EUR representing her own savings from a scholarship received in 2011 – 2012, when she participated, as a master’s student in the Erasmus Academic Mobility Program in Poland. According to the subject, the scholarship amounted to 1,000 EUR per month, and part of these funds had been saved and later included in the amount held by her father (R1Q21).
48. In this context, the Panel also notes that the subject did not declare the donation received from her father in her annual declaration for 2018, submitted on 30 March 2019. This omission could, in principle, raise concerns under the ethical integrity criterion, in light of the obligation of prosecutors to act with integrity and transparency, as reflected in art. 6.6¹.7 of the 2016 Prosecutors’ Code of Ethics, and in view of the objectives of Law No. 133/2016 to ensure transparency of assets and to prevent financial impropriety. However, under art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023, violations of ethical rules may be assessed only if they occurred within the five years preceding the initiation of the evaluation. Since the annual declaration for 2018 was submitted outside that limitation period, as noted in para. 34 above, the Panel cannot examine this omission under the ethical integrity criterion and cannot establish a violation of ethical rules on that basis.
49. The Panel also examined the subject’s explanations concerning the condition of the apartment and subsequent renovation works. In response to R1Q25, the subject stated that she began living in the apartment immediately after its acquisition, in April 2018. She further indicated that only cosmetic repair works were carried out later, in 2023, with the assistance of relatives and acquaintances, allegedly for symbolic payments. According to the subject, the total amount spent on construction materials and furniture was approximately 200,000 MDL. She stated that she had not preserved invoices or receipts for the construction materials and furniture, but provided salary-card bank extracts showing payments for construction materials, as well as photographs of the apartment before and after the repair works.
50. After examining the explanations and documents provided by the subject, the Panel considers that the source of funds for the acquisition of the apartment is sufficiently explained. Accordingly, the Panel considers that this issue is mitigated.

Issue 3. A disciplinary proceeding against the subject

51. The Panel examined whether a disciplinary sanction applied to the subject in 2019 for repeated and unjustified delays in criminal investigations is relevant for the subject's compliance with the criterion of ethical integrity under art. 11 of Law No. 252/2023.
52. In assessing this issue, the Panel had regard to the 2016 Prosecutors' Code of Ethics, in particular art. 6.1, concerning respect for the rule of law, and art. 6.5, concerning professionalism.
53. According to the information available to the Panel, on 9 July 2019 a complaint concerning the subject was registered with the SCP. The complaint was submitted by a GPO prosecutor and was based on information reported by the Interim Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Cahul District Prosecutor's Office. The complaint concerned repeated and unjustified delays allegedly admitted by the subject in seven criminal cases prosecuted or coordinated by her.
54. On 15 July 2019, the Prosecutor Inspection issued a decision finding grounds for disciplinary liability and proposing the application of a disciplinary sanction. Subsequently, by decision of 18 October 2019, the Discipline and Ethics Board of the SCP applied to the subject the disciplinary sanction of warning.
55. The disciplinary body found that the subject had admitted repeated and unjustified delays in seven criminal cases. The subject did not dispute the delays as such. She accepted the claims indicated in the disciplinary proceedings, while explaining that the delays were caused by the complexity of the criminal cases and by her workload.
56. The Panel notes that the disciplinary proceeding did not concern allegations of corruption, abuse of office for personal benefit, improper communication with parties, intentional concealment of information, conflict of interest, selective treatment of parties, or conduct suggesting a lack of honesty or bad faith. The issue concerned the manner in which the subject managed several criminal investigations, in particular the timely performance of investigative activity.
57. The available materials show that the disciplinary proceeding concerned seven criminal cases, several of which were complex economic or customs-related cases. The cases included, *inter alia*, allegations of money laundering on an especially large scale under art. 243 para. (3) of the Criminal Code, tax evasion under art. 244 of the Criminal Code, and smuggling committed by two or more persons in respect of goods of significant value under art. 248 para. (5) of the Criminal Code. The cases had been initiated between 2012 and 2017 and were attributed to the subject mainly in late 2018 or early 2019. The subject issued multiple orders extending the duration of criminal investigations, including several orders falling within the relevant five-year period considered by the Panel, namely from 1 May 2019 to 30 April 2024.
58. In particular, criminal case no. 20139782204, initiated on 20 November 2013 and concerning alleged money laundering on an especially large scale, was attributed to the

subject on 30 January 2019. The subject issued orders extending the criminal investigation on 18 February 2019, 29 March 2019, 26 April 2019, and 28 June 2019. The materials also indicate that the subject undertook investigative or procedural steps, including requests for judicial authorization to obtain banking records from four Moldovan banks, requests to the South Customs Office for customs declarations and related documents, an application to the Cahul District Court concerning administrative acts, and a request to the PSA for company incorporation documents.

59. Criminal case no. 2015978073, initiated on 12 May 2015 and concerning alleged tax evasion by two companies, was attributed to the subject on 18 October 2018. The subject issued several orders extending the investigation, including on 30 May 2019 and 28 June 2019. According to the materials available to the Panel, the subject requested the STS to provide documents concerning control activities and sanctions applied in relation to the companies for the period 2010 – 2017, and those documents were collected on 14 March 2019.
60. Criminal case no. 2012156056, initiated on 6 July 2012 and concerning alleged tax evasion on an especially large scale by a company, was attributed to the subject on 31 October 2018. The subject issued repeated orders extending the criminal investigation, including on 30 May 2019 and 28 June 2019. The materials indicate that the subject requested the STS to provide documents regarding control activities and sanctions.
61. Criminal case no. 2017150960, initiated on 6 November 2017 and concerning alleged tax evasion, was attributed to the subject on 29 March 2019. The subject issued orders extending the criminal investigation on 3 May 2019 and 28 June 2019. The materials indicate that two fiscal inspectors were heard in that case.
62. Criminal case no. 2016150788, initiated on 24 June 2016 and concerning alleged tax evasion, was attributed to the subject on 29 April 2019. The subject issued orders extending the criminal investigation on 16 May 2019 and 28 June 2019. The materials indicate that the STS was requested to provide documents concerning control activities and sanctions, and that a fiscal inspector was heard.
63. Criminal case no. 2017869089, initiated on 2 June 2017 and concerning alleged smuggling committed by two or more persons in respect of goods of significant value, was attributed to the subject on 22 October 2018. The subject issued repeated orders extending the criminal investigation, including on 30 May 2019 and 28 June 2019. The materials indicate that requests were made to the cadastral institution and to the vehicle registration department concerning property owned by the accused persons.
64. Criminal case no. 2017869098, initiated on 26 June 2017 and also concerning alleged smuggling committed by two or more persons in respect of goods of significant value, was attributed to the subject on 22 October 2018. The subject issued several orders extending the investigation, including on 30 May 2019 and 28 June 2019. The materials indicate that a customs inspector was heard in that case.

65. Repeated and unjustified delay in several criminal cases may affect the effectiveness of criminal proceedings, the rights of parties, and public confidence in the prosecution service. Moreover, the fact that several extensions were issued during May – June 2019 places part of the conduct within the relevant five-year period assessed by the Panel.
66. However, several mitigating elements are relevant. First, the disciplinary sanction applied was the least severe sanction of warning. The disciplinary body did not find circumstances requiring a more serious sanction. Second, the conduct examined was connected to case-management deficiencies and delay, rather than to dishonesty, abuse of prosecutorial authority for private interest, corruption-related conduct, or intentional violation of ethical obligations. Third, the subject acknowledged the delays and provided an explanation based on the complexity of the cases and workload. Fourth, the available materials also show that, despite the deficiencies identified in the orders extending the criminal investigations, the subject did perform certain investigative or procedural acts in the relevant cases, including requests for banking, tax, customs, cadastral, vehicle-registration, and company-registration information, as well as hearings of fiscal or customs inspectors.
67. The Panel also considered that the disciplinary proceeding dates from 2019 and that the materials available to the Panel do not establish, by themselves, that the same type of conduct continued as a persistent pattern during the subsequent relevant five-year period. The Panel has no indication, on the basis of the materials reviewed, that after the warning the subject was again sanctioned for similar delays or that the 2019 disciplinary matter formed part of a broader pattern of ethical misconduct.
68. Accordingly, the Panel considers the issue mitigated and concludes that, in relation to the disciplinary proceeding, the subject meets the criterion of ethical integrity under art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

VI. Conclusion

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

VII. Further Action and Publication

70. 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.
71. 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.

72. 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).
73. Pursuant to art. 17 para (2) of Law No. 252/2023, this evaluation report was approved unanimously by the evaluation panel on 20 May 2026 and signed by the Vice-Chairperson of the Commission.
74. Done in English and Romanian.

Signature:

Virginia MORARU
Vice-Chairperson
Prosecutor Vetting Commission