PROSECUTOR VETTING COMMISSION

Evaluation Report No. 43 of 17 July 2026
on Alexandr COREȚCHII, prosecutor in the Soroca Prosecutor's Office, subject of evaluation in his former capacity as prosecutor 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 30 June 2026 and approved this report on 17 July 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 Alexandr COREȚCHII, prosecutor in the Soroca Prosecutor's Office.

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 Alexandr COREȚCHII meets the ethical and financial integrity criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023.

II. Subject of the Evaluation

4. Alexandr COREȚCHII ("the subject") was appointed interim assistant prosecutor in the Soroca District Prosecutor's Office on 16 August 1999 and, subsequently, assistant prosecutor in the same office on 20 October 2000. From 2 March 2020 to 13 June 2021, he was delegated to the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office ("APO"). From 14 June 2021 to 9 May 2024, he was delegated to the General Prosecutor's Office ("GPO"), initially as a prosecutor in the Section for the Investigation of Fraud against the Environment and Public Interests within the Department for Policies, Reforms and Protection of Society's

Interests, and later as a prosecutor for special missions. On 1 April 2025, the subject was reconfirmed as a prosecutor in the Soroca 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

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

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.

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 defence, 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. Alexandr COREȚCHII 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 paras. (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 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 6 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 the subject by email that his evaluation file had been randomly assigned to Panel B consisting of the following members: Virginia MORARU (Chair of the Panel), Cornel LEBEDINSCHI, and Irmantas MIKELIONIS. The subject was informed that he may request, in writing and at the earliest possible time, the recusal of members from the evaluation. He did not submit any recusal request.

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, 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 21 January 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 29 January 2026 to clarify certain matters ("first round of written questions"). The subject requested an extension of the deadline until 2 February 2026, which was granted by the Panel. The subject provided his answers and supporting documents within the extended deadline – on 1 February 2026 and 2 February 2026.

27. On 25 February 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 4 March 2026 to clarify certain matters ("second round of written questions"). The subject provided his answers and supporting documents within the deadline – on 4 March 2026.

28. On 1 April 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 9 April 2026 to clarify certain matters ("third round of written questions"), and to provide certain supporting documents related to the second round of written questions. The subject provided his answers and supporting documents, including those related to the second round of written questions, within the deadline – on 9 April 2026.

29. On 18 June 2026, the Panel notified the subject that it had identified certain areas of doubt regarding his compliance with the integrity criteria and invited him to attend a public hearing on 30 June 2026, pursuant to art. 16 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023. The subject was informed of his rights under art. 16 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023, including the right to request access to the evaluation materials.

30. On 21 June 2026, the subject informed the Panel that he would not attend the proposed public hearing and requested that the evaluation proceed in accordance with the law, based on the materials and information in the evaluation file and taking into account his written opinion submitted on the same date.

31. Following the subject's request, on 24 June 2026, he was granted access to the evaluation materials in accordance with art. 16 para. (5) lit. c) of Law No. 252/2023.

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 analysed and, where necessary, sought further clarifications from the subject on the following matters:

- *Failure to disclose certain immovable assets in the process of applying for participation in a real estate project at a preferential price, coordinated by the Superior Council of Magistracy;*

- *Non-compliance with certain laws and regulations in the field of road safety, road use and fiscal obligations;*

- *Unjustified wealth for the year 2013.*

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. Failure to disclose certain immovable assets in the process of the subject's wife applying for participation in a real estate project at a preferential price, coordinated by the Superior Council of Magistracy

34. According to the information available to the Panel, the subject's family was included in the list of beneficiaries of a real estate project, coordinated by the Superior Council of Magistracy ("SCM") for employees of the judiciary system, that was to be developed at a preferential (below market) price on M street in the municipality of Chișinău ("real estate project on M street"). In November 2017, the subject's wife I.C. served as the head of the Secretariat at the Soroca Court and in this capacity on 6 November 2017 she submitted an application to participate in the aforementioned real estate project, along with the following supporting documents:

a) request to be allocated an apartment, specifying the number of rooms;
b) copy of ID card,
c) copy of workbook;
d) certificate issued by the employer, proving that the applicant works in a judicial court, and specifying position, tenure and overall length of employment in the judicial system;
e) certificate on family composition;
f) certificate regarding ownership of immovable assets (apartment, house and land plot for construction) on the territory of the Republic of Moldova, or lack thereof;

g) certificate from the Register of Immovable Assets regarding past ownership of immovable assets, alienated by the applicant;
h) certificate, if applicable, proving that the applicant rents accommodation or lives with the parents, specifying the surface area of the accommodation concerned and the number of residents.

35. By Decision No. 7/5 of 15 December 2017, the SCM Working Group set the following eligibility criteria for beneficiaries of the real estate project on M street:

   a) status of employee of the judicial system as of the date of application;
   b) lack of accommodation in the municipality of Chișinău;
   c) non-participation in prior real estate projects at preferential price for employees of the judicial system;
   d) minimum work experience of four years;
   e) other criteria considered relevant by the Working Group.

36. As of the date of application, the subject's family met the above criteria and accordingly, on 19 December 2017, the Working Group by Decision No. 9/6, accepted the application submitted by I.C.

37. Based on its Decision No. 13/9 of 16 February 2018, the Working Group requested that applicants submit the following additional information:
   a) certificate regarding ownership by the applicant's spouse of immovable assets (apartment, house and land plot for construction) on the territory of the Republic of Moldova, or lack thereof;
   b) certificate from the Register of Immovable Assets regarding past ownership of immovable assets, alienated by the applicant's spouse in the last five years.

38. On 13 March 2018, I.C. submitted to the Working Group a document entitled "Information from the central data bank of the real estate register" no. 7801/18/3934 of 26 February 2018, according to which "*as of 7 March 2018, in the name of Corețchii Alexandr […], no real estate located on the territory of the Republic of Moldova is registered with ownership rights*". This document was obtained by the subject upon him personally applying to the Soroca Branch of the Public Institution Cadastre of Immovable Assets ("Cadastre"). According to the information available to the Panel, the mentioned document contains untrue data, a fact later confirmed by the Cadastre in response to the Panel's inquiry. At the time of submission to the Working Group of the aforementioned information from Cadastre, the subject owned a plot of land for construction with cadastral no. 71xxx7, located on H street, N village, Rîșcani district. The subject's property right was registered on 23 May 2005 pursuant to a Title of Authentication of the Right of Landowner dated 20 December 2004. The Panel notes that the land plot in question has been included in the annual declarations on assets and personal interests submitted by the subject to the NIA in the years 2013 - 2023, i.e. the entire period covered by this evaluation. In its response to the Panel's inquiry, Cadastre confirmed that "*the information issued […] by the Soroca Territorial Cadastral Service […] was completed with errors. In reality, Corețchii A. owns the real estate with cadastral number [71xxx7].*

The registration of the ownership right in the name of Mr. Corețchii A. was carried out […] with incomplete data, the state identification code (IDNP) of the right holder not being specified".

39. On 18 November 2020, I.C. purchased an apartment located on B street in the municipality of Chișinău (cadastral number 01xxx7) and on 27 November 2020 registered the right of ownership in the Register of Immovable Assets. It appears *prima facie* that as of 27 November 2020, the subject's family no longer met a core substantive condition of eligibility, set by the Decision No. 7/5 of 15 December 2017, namely lack of accommodation in the municipality of Chișinău. However, neither the subject, nor his wife informed the Working Group on the change of this circumstance.

40. On 20 May 2021, the Working Group revised the lists of employees of the judicial system who were accepted in 2017 as beneficiaries of the real estate project on M street. Following such revision, the applicant I.C. was included in the updated list of employees who met the eligibility criteria and were therefore entitled to purchase apartments at a preferential price.

41. The Panel notes that the Working Group decided on the inclusion of the subject's family in the list of beneficiaries of the real estate project on M street without having access to complete and updated information on the scope of ownership rights of the subject's family, specifically the title over the apartment on B street, Chișinău municipality. According to the information presented to the Panel by the SCM, as a result of the revision, the Working Group excluded certain applicants from the updated list of beneficiaries, including for reasons of owning residential property in the municipality of Chișinău.

42. Under the Working Group Decision No. 18/18 of 30 June 2021 (as amended), the subject's family was allocated a two-bedroom apartment in the real estate project on M street.

43. On 18 April 2022, the subject's wife concluded with the development company B that built the real estate project on M street a sale-purchase agreement in respect of the apartment (cadastral no. 01xxx1) specified in the Working Group Decision No. 18/18 of 30 June 2021. The total price for the 64.1 sq. m. apartment was set at 27,174 EUR, which amounts to 420 EUR per square metre.

44. According to the information published by real estate agencies, during the relevant period the market price for comparable immovable assets, in the area where the real estate project on M street is located, started at 600 - 700 EUR/sq. m., while the development company B was selling during the same period comparable properties in the same area at prices between 750 - 1,000 EUR/sq. m. Therefore, participation in the SCM-coordinated real estate project at preferential price enabled the subject's family to acquire a newly built immovable asset at a considerable discount compared to prevailing market levels.

45. On 25 August 2022, the subject's wife sold the apartment on B street to her mother. However, in his answers to the first round of written questions (R1-Q37), the subject

indicated that his family continues to live in the apartment on B street, while the formal owner (i.e. the subject's mother-in-law) has never lived in the newly acquired property and continues to live abroad, where she has a settled status for many years.

46. In R2-Q17 of written questions, the subject was asked to explain two issues related to the process of acquisition of the apartment on M street in the framework of the SCM-coordinated real estate project:
    1) document submitted by the subject's wife to the Working Group, containing untrue information, referred to in para. 38 *supra*;
    2) failure to inform the Working Group on acquisition of the apartment on B street, while the subject's wife was included on the provisional list of beneficiaries.

47. Regarding the first issue, the subject claimed that the document according to which he did not own any immovable assets on the territory of the Republic of Moldova is irrelevant, because, in the subject's view, only ownership of immovable property located in Chișinău would have disqualified the subject's family from participation in the SCM-coordinated real estate project.

48. The Panel observes, firstly, that it was for the Working Group, which requested information concerning property owned by the applicants' spouses, to determine the relevance and weight of that information in the selection process. According to the SCM, the purpose of collecting the additional information was to assist the Working Group in prioritising applicants who were in greater need of housing. The subject could therefore not unilaterally determine that information concerning property situated outside Chișinău was irrelevant and could be disregarded. At the same time, the inaccurate document did not conceal ownership of residential property in Chișinău and, as discussed below, the accurate disclosure of the land plot in N village would not have affected his wife's eligibility. The issue is therefore that the subject accepted the submission of official information which he knew, or ought reasonably to have realised, did not accurately reflect his property holdings. Such conduct demonstrates insufficient attention to the standards of accuracy and transparency expected of a prosecutor.

49. As regards the second issue raised by the Panel, the subject claimed that it was not necessary for him or his wife to disclose to the Working Group the fact that their family purchased the apartment on B street, as the eligibility criteria set by the Working Group only applied to the situation as of December 2017, and not as of April 2022, when the agreement to purchase the apartment at a preferential price was concluded by his wife.

50. The Panel does not find this interpretation entirely persuasive. The preferential housing programme extended over a considerable period: I.C. applied in November 2017, the list of beneficiaries was revised in May 2021, the apartment was allocated in June 2021, and the sale-purchase agreement was concluded in April 2022. In the absence of an indication that eligibility was assessed only once and remained unaffected by subsequent significant changes, the substantive criteria cannot reasonably be regarded as having become irrelevant immediately after the initial acceptance of the application. Because the acquisition in November 2020 of the apartment on B street was not disclosed before the

approval of the revised list and the allocation of the preferential apartment in 2021, those decisions were taken without consideration of a circumstance directly related to the requirement that beneficiaries lack accommodation in Chișinău. Nevertheless, the Panel also takes into account that I.C. met the established criteria when she applied in 2017 and that the family's subsequent acquisition of the preferential apartment could still have responded to a genuine long-term housing need. These circumstances weaken any inference that the family entered the programme from the outset with the intention of improperly obtaining a benefit.

51. In answers provided in R1-Q34 and R2-Q17, the subject also insisted that he had no connection with the real estate project coordinated by the SCM and accordingly had no obligations in relation to said project.

52. It is not disputed that the subject's wife was the applicant before the SCM. The Panel notes, however, that the acquisition and disposal of residential property in Chișinău constitute major family financial decisions. Both under the Family Code of the Republic of Moldova and pursuant to the agreement for the purchase of the apartment on M street, the asset in question is common matrimonial property of the subject and his wife. The argument that the spouse bore the procedural duty of disclosure does not eliminate the subject's ethical exposure. The benefit obtained (a preferential price substantially below market levels) was material. The relevant question is therefore whether the subject was aware that the factual basis on which his family had originally been admitted to the programme had materially changed and nevertheless accepted that the process continue without clarification.

53. Finally, the Panel observes that the Supreme Court of Justice ("SCJ") in its Decision of 4 February 2025[2] issued in the context of external evaluation under Law No. 26/2022, stated in para. 212 that prosecutors have "*a positive obligation to be fully aware of [their] own interests and to be informed about the activities and interests of family members*". This principle supports examining the subject's conduct notwithstanding the fact that his wife was the formal applicant. It does not, however, establish that the subject was responsible for correcting every deficiency in a selection procedure administered by the SCM, particularly where the Working Group had not expressly imposed a continuing reporting obligation.

54. Under the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors, approved by the General Assembly of Prosecutors on 27 May 2016, the subject is expected to comply with the highest standards of integrity and responsibility to ensure society's trust in the prosecutor's office (art. 6.3.1) and shall not conceal or distort information regarding the assets held (art. $6.6^1.7$).

55. Considering the above, the Panel must consider whether the subject's conduct in the process of acquisition of an immovable asset at a preferential price raises an ethical issue in light of the provisions of the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Under the ethical integrity standard set in Law No. 252/2023, the Panel's analysis shall focus on transparency and good faith.

[2] https://jurisprudenta.csj.md/search_col_civil.php?id=77162

56. As regards the Cadastre document containing inaccurate information, the Panel notes that the issuing public entity acknowledged that the subject's ownership right over the land plot had originally been recorded using incomplete identification data, because the subject's IDNP had not been entered in the Register of Immovable Assets. Although the Panel was not provided with a satisfactory explanation for that defective registration, there is no indication that the subject caused it or acted in bad faith when registering his ownership right or obtaining the document later submitted to the Working Group. The Panel also finds no indication that the subject intended to conceal his ownership of the land plot in N village. In particular, he consistently declared that property in his annual declarations submitted to the NIA.

57. The subject nevertheless knew that he owned the land plot and should have recognised that the document stating that no immovable property was registered in his name was inaccurate. His apparent assumption that the land was irrelevant because it was situated outside Chișinău did not entitle him to disregard the accuracy of the information requested by the Working Group. This reflects a careless and unacceptable approach to an official selection process. However, the accurate disclosure of the land plot would not have altered the substantive assessment of his wife's eligibility, since the applicable criterion concerned the lack of accommodation in the municipality of Chișinău. The inaccuracy therefore had no demonstrated effect on the selection of beneficiaries.

58. A similar lack of attention to the continuing accuracy of the information available to the Working Group may also explain the failure of the subject and his wife to disclose the acquisition of the apartment on B street while I.C. remained on the provisional list of beneficiaries. Unlike the land plot, however, the apartment was directly relevant to one of the substantive eligibility criteria. This makes the omission more significant, although its seriousness must be assessed in light of the manner in which the programme was administered and the absence of a clearly formulated continuing disclosure obligation.

59. The Panel cannot determine with certainty what the outcome of the revision carried out in May 2021 would have been had the Working Group been informed that the subject's family owned the apartment on B street. The information provided by the SCM indicates that certain applicants were excluded during the revision because they owned residential property in Chișinău. At the same time, the Working Group did not request from I.C. or, apparently, from the other applicants updated certificates concerning property acquired after the initial application. The additional request made in February 2018 concerned property then owned by the applicants' spouses and property alienated during the preceding five years. Moreover, the Working Group did not expressly establish an obligation to report residential property acquired later while the programme remained pending. Given that the programme continued from 2017 until at least 2022, the Working Group could reasonably have introduced a mechanism for verifying that beneficiaries continued to satisfy the relevant criteria before revising the list and allocating the apartments.

60. Accordingly, even if the subject's, as well as his wife's, omission to disclose their ownership of the apartment on B street is debatable from an ethical point of view, it was not their duty to substitute a body charged by SCM with managing the process of selecting the beneficiaries of a preferential price real estate project.

61. Finally, the Panel did not identify any indications that the subject's conduct discussed above affected in any way the rights or legitimate interests of other applicants to the real estate project in question.

62. Consequently, while the Panel has issues with the subject's conduct, these issues do not rise to the level of a "serious violation" of the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors within the language of art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

63. In this context, the Panel also takes heed of the Constitutional Court's conclusion in Judgment No. 2 of 16 January 2025[3], at paras. 182 – 183, namely that while the ECtHR has held that it is consistent with the spirit of the vetting process for there to be a more limited scale of sanctions where a person does not meet one of the criteria established by the vetting law (*Xhoxhaj v. Albania*, para. 412), the proportionality of dismissal from office for failing the evaluation must be assessed in light of the conduct for which that measure is applied.

64. Accordingly, in respect of the issue presented by the failure to disclose certain immovable assets in the process of the subject's wife applying for participation in a real estate project at a preferential price, coordinated by the SCM, the Panel finds that the subject meets the criterion of ethical integrity.

Issue 2. Non-compliance with certain laws and regulations in the field of road safety, road use and fiscal obligations

65. In 2019, the subject imported into the Republic of Moldova a Renault Kadjar motor vehicle, y./m. 2016. It was customs cleared and registered with registration number plates Gxxxx7. In order to have the vehicle registered, a technical inspection was carried out, a motor third party liability insurance policy was procured, and the road tax for 2019 was paid.

66. According to the information available to the Panel, no mandatory insurance policies were procured for the periods 2020 – 2021, 2021 – 2022, 2022 – 2023 and 2023 – 2024; no periodic technical inspections of the vehicle were performed during the same period; and the road tax was not paid for the years 2020 – 2024.

67. Each of the three above procedures is mandatory for all vehicle owners/users. They are designed to ensure that: only roadworthy vehicles are used on public roads; pecuniary disputes arising out of road accidents are promptly settled by compensation for damages being paid by the insurers; all motor vehicle users contribute financially towards maintaining the public road network in a satisfactory condition.

[3] https://www.constcourt.md/public/ccdoc/hotariri/h_2_2025_282a_2023_rou.pdf

68. Moreover, driving on public roads a vehicle without a valid insurance policy is a contravention punishable with fine and penalty points. A separate contravention is driving a vehicle that did not undergo periodic technical inspection.

69. In the second round of written questions (R2-Q16), the subject was asked to provide copies of the motor liability insurance policies in respect of the vehicle Renault Kadjar, r/n Gxxxx7, for the relevant period 2020 - 2024, copies of the technical inspection reports, as well as copies of the receipts proving payment of the road tax, or to explain the lack thereof.

70. In his reply, the subject admitted that over the period 2020 - 2023, none of the above mandatory procedures have been undertaken in connection with the mentioned motor vehicle, but dismissed them as unimportant. The subject also claimed that periodic technical inspection was carried out in 2024 and the road tax was paid for the same year, but failed to present any proofs in support of his claims.

71. The Panel expressed concern that the subject's conduct amounted to non-compliance with certain laws and regulations in the fields of road safety, road use and fiscal obligations, namely:

i. Law on compulsory third party liability insurance for damage caused by vehicles, No. 106 of 21 April 2022, and Law No. 414 of 22 December 2006 replaced by the former;
ii. Law on road traffic safety, No. 131 of 7 June 2007;
iii. Road Transport Code, No. 150 of 17 July 2014;
iv. Code on Contraventions, No. 218 of 24 October 2008;
v. Tax Code, No. 1163 of 24 April 1997;
vi. Rules for the periodic technical inspection of motor vehicles and their trailers, Annex No. 3 to Government Decision No. 1047 of 8 November 1999.

72. The Panel must assess the subject's conduct in light of the provisions of the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors. Under the Code, a prosecutor shall "*respect national legislation*" (art. 6.1.1 - Principle of the Rule of Law), "*follow the highest standards of integrity and responsibility in order to ensure society's trust in the prosecutor's office*" (art. 6.3.1 - Principle of Integrity) and "*behave in the family and in society in accordance with the unanimously recognized norms of social coexistence in order to enjoy respect and not compromise the status of a prosecutor*" (art. 6.8.5 - Principle of Correctness).

73. The Panel finds that the subject did not provide any valid reason for his failure, as the owner or user of a motor vehicle, to comply with the above laws and regulations governing road use and road safety. The prolonged and repeated nature of the omissions demonstrates a contemptuous attitude towards legal obligations applicable to all vehicle owners. At the same time, the Panel notes that there is no indication that the vehicle was involved in an accident or that the subject's conduct caused concrete harm to the rights or

legitimate interests of other road users. This circumstance mitigates the consequences of the subject's conduct, without removing its negative ethical implications.

74. In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that, although the subject's conduct raises ethical concerns regarding his compliance with legal obligations outside his professional activity, its nature, consequences and overall gravity do not reach the level of a "serious violation" of the rules of ethics and professional conduct within the meaning of art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

75. The Panel observes also that the subject's failure to pay the road tax may raise an issue of financial integrity under art. 11 para. (3) lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023. A subject of the evaluation shall be deemed not to meet the criterion of financial integrity if, *inter alia*, the Panel has serious doubts determined by the fact that over the last ten years, the subject committed tax irregularities as a result of which the amount of unpaid tax exceeded, in total, five average wages per economy, as set by the Government for the year 2023.

76. As mentioned in para. 70 *supra*, it is undisputed that the subject has not paid the road tax in respect of his motor vehicle Renault Kadjar, r./n. Gxxxx7, for the years 2020 - 2023. Although the subject claims to have paid the road tax for the year 2024, he did not present any proof of such payment. Accordingly, the subject's failure to pay the road tax occurred within the last ten years, i.e. inside the evaluation period.

77. The road tax is calculated, according to art. 366 of the Tax Code, based on the vehicle's engine displacement. Hence, for a Renault Kadjar (y./m. 2016) with an engine displacement of 1,461 cubic centimetres, the annual road tax amounts to 876.60 MDL. It follows that the total amount of the road tax that was not paid by the subject for the years 2020 - 2024 equals 4,383 MDL. This amount does not reach the threshold of five average wages per economy, as set by the Government for the year 2023, and referred to in para. 8 *supra*, i.e. 58,500 MDL.

78. Accordingly, in respect of the failure to pay the road tax during the period 2020 – 2024, the Panel finds that the subject meets the criterion of financial integrity. The failure to undergo periodic technical inspection and to procure mandatory insurance policies was assessed separately under the ethical integrity criterion in paras. 72 – 74 *supra*.

Issue 3. Unjustified wealth for the year 2013

79. Before proceeding to analyze the financial situation of the subject's family, the Panel considers it necessary to clarify certain aspects related to the financial capacity of the subject's mother-in-law G.Z. This is necessary given that the subject stated that his family had benefited from interest-free loans provided by G.Z. over several years included in the evaluation period, including in the year discussed below, for which the Panel found a negative balance of the subject's household financial flows.

80. According to the subject's response to R1-Q17, the proceeds of the loans provided by G.Z. have been used by the subject's family during the evaluation period to: purchase

three apartments, two land plots and one car; pay for vacation trips; open interest-bearing deposits (and keep the interest earned, which per the subject's explanations to the mentioned written question, was a form of financial assistance provided by G.Z. to her daughter).

81. Overall, between 2012 and 2023, the subject included in his annual declarations submitted to the NIA the following loans provided by G.Z.:

Table No. 1. Interest-free loans included in the subject's annual declarations to NIA

Year of declaration	Currency	Amount
2012	EUR	15,900
2013	EUR	8,000
	EUR	15,900
	EUR	19,000
2014	EUR	8,000
	MDL	39,860
2015	EUR	8,000
2016	EUR	15,900
2017	MDL	300,000
2018	EUR	20,000

82. As can be noted, some of the loans granted by G.Z. to the subject's family seem to be "revolving", such as those for the amounts of 15,900 EUR and 8,000 EUR. The Panel observes that the subject's annual declarations for the years 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016 submitted to the NIA do not mention the due date of the declared loans, although such information was mandatory. In spite of the Panel inquiries, the subject failed to provide accurate information on the exact date of reimbursement of said loans. Consequently, the Panel concludes that in the absence of any written documents to formalise the loans, the subject's family used to reimburse the money borrowed from G.Z. based on ad-hoc agreements, rather than on certain dates agreed when the transactions had been concluded.

83. According to the explanations provided consistently by the subject in the three rounds of written questions (R1-Q46, R2-Q18, R3-Q12), G.Z. has worked in Italy since 2000 in the field of elderly care, and had both formal and informal incomes. Additionally, given the nature of her work, her living expenses were usually covered by the employers, who occasionally would also grant her bonuses, gifts that have not been officially recorded. After retiring in 2013, G.Z. continued to live in Italy with her partner, who is a farmer and covers her current living expenses. While travelling home to the Republic of Moldova, G.Z. would bring cash, in amounts of less than 10,000 EUR, in respect of which she did not have the obligation to declare during customs control. As the subject explained in his response to R1-Q17, various portions of the cash thus brought into the country were later:

i. deposited in interest-bearing savings accounts opened by G.Z. herself;

ii. kept in a metallic safe box at the subject's residence;
iii. granted as interest-free loans to the subject's family.

84. When asked to provide documents confirming the income accumulated by his mother-in-law, the subject, in his replies to R1-Q37 and R2-Q18, submitted the following:
   a) a statement from G.Z.'s Italian social security account, issued by the Istituto Nazionale di Previdenza Sociale ("INPS"), which shows that between 2002 – 2013, G.Z. earned an overall salary of 59,583 EUR;
   b) a bank statement issued by Poste Italiane COO/SBO, confirming that during the period 2017 - 2023, G.Z. received in Italy a retirement pension in the amount of 47,097 EUR.

85. In addition, the subject claimed in his responses to R2-Q18b and R3-Q12, that G.Z. also had income during the period 2000 - 2002, but this is not reflected in the above statement issued by the INPS, because the employers did not pay the relevant social security contributions. The subject also argued that, while according to the above INPS statement, the average gross income earned by G.Z. over the stated period was 458 EUR per month, in reality G.Z. had an average net income of 950 EUR per month, the difference being explained by the informal payments mentioned in para. 83 *supra*. Overall, the subject estimated, in his reply to R3-Q12, that at the beginning of 2012, i.e. right before the beginning of the evaluation period, G.Z. held 75,000 EUR in savings[4] (both in cash and in bank accounts). This figure, as well as all other estimates of G.Z. savings, as provided by the subject, are important for the evaluation of the subject household's financial flows for the year 2013 as described below.

86. Given the resident status of G.Z. in Italy, the Panel shall use EUR as the baseline currency to reconstruct her financial flows for the period of interest. The subject estimated (in R3-Q12) that at the beginning of 2013, his mother-in-law held 64,800 EUR in savings (both in cash and in bank accounts). This amount is included in the incoming financial flow of G.Z. for the year 2013, along with the following amounts:
   i. salary in the amount of 1,250 EUR reported to INPS Italy;
   ii. retirement pension in the amount of 7,086 MDL (converted to 423 EUR[5] for the purpose of this reconstruction) paid by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova;
   iii. the amount of 15,900 EUR, which represents the repayment of a loan granted to the subject's wife in order to purchase an apartment in Soroca town. The subject's family later sold another apartment in Soroca town and deposited the proceeds in 2012 into a bank savings account in the name of the subject's wife, then withdrew the money at maturity in 2013 and reimbursed it to G.Z. in the same year.

87. Accordingly, the Panel determined that the total incoming financial flow of G.Z. in 2013 amounted to 82,373 EUR.

[4] According to the European Court of Human Rights, savings (both cash and bank savings) have a dual nature: at the beginning of the year, they are considered inflows of funds, and at the end of the year, they are considered outflows of funds. Outflows of savings at the end of the previous period are equal to inflows of savings at the beginning of the following period (*Case Xhoxhaj v. Albania, No. 15227/19, February 2021, § 31*).
[5] All currency conversions are made at the annual average exchange rate of the National Bank of Moldova, unless otherwise specified.

88. G.Z.'s outgoing financial flow for 2013 includes the following amounts:
    i. a deposit opened by G.Z. on 19 December 2013 at B.C. "M" S.A. in the amount of 19,000 EUR;
    ii. savings estimated by the subject (R3-Q12) at 67,000 EUR.

89. The Panel accepted the subject's explanations provided consistently in the three rounds of written questions and did not include here any amounts as living expenses (accommodation, food etc.), as these were covered by G.Z.'s employers. On this basis, the Panel determined that the total outgoing financial flow of G.Z. in 2013 equalled 86,000 EUR, exceeding the available income by 3,627 EUR.

90. It follows that, after accounting for the savings and deposit attributed to her at the end of 2013, G.Z. did not have demonstrated available resources from which she could additionally provide the subject's family with the claimed loan of 8,000 EUR.

91. Based on the information available in the evaluation file and taking into account the conclusion set out in the previous paragraph, the Panel determined that the total incoming financial flow of the subject's household for 2013 amounted to 602,028 MDL, while the total outgoing financial flow amounted to 653,563 MDL, resulting in a negative balance of 51,535 MDL.

92. The incoming financial flow includes cash savings in the amount of 25,000 MDL carried over from the end of 2012, as stated in the response to R1-Q6, as well as 3,143 MDL representing balances on the bank accounts opened by the subject and his wife.

93. In 2013, the subject received a net salary of 65,887 MDL from the Soroca Prosecutor's Office, according to information obtained by the Panel from the STS, a net salary of 11,559 MDL from the Soroca Penitentiary No. 6 (according to the STS), a severance pay from the Soroca Prosecutor's Office in the amount of 95,490 MDL (transferred to a bank account opened at B.C. "BE" S.A.), and 507 MDL as bank interest calculated on the positive account balance, according to the payroll card statements.

94. The subject's wife earned a salary of 70,830 MDL (according to the STS), as well as interest on bank deposits in the amount of 707.16 EUR (equivalent to 11,841 MDL), according to bank accounts opened at B.C. "M" S.A., where each amount was converted on the date the interest on the deposit was paid, and the amount of 13 MDL in bank interest calculated on the positive account balance.

95. Included in the financial inflow is the amount 19,000 EUR (equivalent to 317,758 MDL) received upon the maturity of a series of consecutive deposits opened in 2012 and 2013 at B.C. "M." S.A., per the subject's response to R1-Q17 and R3-Q5.

96. For the reasons set out in paras. 89 and 90 *supra*, the Panel did not include in the household's incoming financial flow the alleged loan of 8,000 EUR (equivalent to 133,792 MDL) from G.Z.

97. On this basis, the Panel determined that the incoming financial flow available to the subject's household in 2013 amounted to 602,028 MDL.

98. The outgoing financial flow reflects the use of this income. It includes, first, the household's living expenses, estimated on the basis of Consumption Expenditures for Population ("CEP")[6] in the amount of 73,606 MDL, calculated for two adults and one child. The Panel uses CEP as a proxy for baseline daily consumption (such as food, utilities, and routine household expenses) which are not fully traceable through documentary evidence. The Panel further notes that CEP is applied in a complementary manner and does not duplicate specific expenditures identified separately in the file.

99. The subject's family paid 37,000 MDL for renovation works in an apartment located in Soroca, according to the subject's response to R2-Q3.

100. In 2013, the subject's wife reimbursed the amount of 15,900 EUR (equivalent to 265,913 MDL) to her mother G.Z. which, according to the subject's response to R1-Q17d, was borrowed in 2012 to purchase the apartment mentioned in the previous paragraph.

101. Outgoing financial flow also includes a deposit opened by the subject's wife at B.C. "M" S.A. in the amount of 8,000 EUR /(equivalent to 133,793 MDL), as well as the amount of 3,000 EUR (equivalent to 50,172 MDL) used by the subject's wife to replenish a different deposit opened earlier at the same bank.

102. According to the subject's response to R1-Q6, at the end of 2013, the household had cash savings estimated at 90,000 MDL. Additionally, based on an analysis of the bank accounts held by the subject and his wife, the Panel identified bank savings/year-end balances totalling 3,079 MDL.

103. It follows that, in 2013, the total outgoing financial flow of the subject's household amounted to 653,563 MDL. The resulting negative balance of 51,535 MDL, reflects a structural imbalance between the available incoming financial flow and the expenditures incurred during the year.

[6] 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 - 2023 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.

Table No. 2. Financial flows of the subject's household for 2013

Incoming financial flow	Amount (MDL)	Outgoing financial flow	Amount (MDL)
Cash savings at the beginning of the year	25,000	CEP (two adults and one child, urban area)	73,606
Bank savings at the beginning of the year	3,143	Loan repayment to G.Z.	265,913
Subject's salary from the Soroca Prosecutor's Office	65,887	Bank deposit	133,793
Subject's salary from Penitentiary No. 6	11,559	Renovation works in apartment	37,000
Severance pay upon dismissal from the prosecutor's office	95,490	Replenishment of the bank deposit account	50,172
Subject's wife's salary	70,830	Cash savings at the end of the year	90,000
Bank interest on account balances	520	Bank savings at the end of the year	3,079
Proceeds from closing a deposit	317,758		
Interest on bank deposit	11,841		
TOTAL INCOME	**602,028**	**TOTAL EXPENSES**	**653,563**
BALANCE: -51,535			

104. The Panel notes that the negative balance of 51,535 MDL identified for 2013 remains substantially below the statutory threshold of 234,000 MDL referred to in para. 8 *supra*. Accordingly, in relation to the issue of unjustified wealth for 2013, the Panel finds that the subject meets the criterion of financial integrity under art. 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

VI. Conclusion

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

VII. Further Action and Publication

106. 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.

107. 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.

108. 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).

109. Pursuant to art. 17 para (2) of Law No. 252/2023, this evaluation report was approved unanimously by the evaluation panel on 17 July 2026 and signed by the Vice-Chairperson of the Prosecutor Vetting Commission.

110. Done in English and Romanian.

Signature:

Digitally signed by Moraru Virginia
Date: 2026.07.20 14:18:48 EEST
Reason: MoldSign Signature
Location: Moldova
MOLDOVA EUROPEANĂ

Virginia MORARU
Vice-Chairperson
Prosecutor Vetting Commission