

**Evaluation Report No. 47 of 19 August 2026
on Ion URSU, delegated prosecutor to the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office,
subject of evaluation under Law No. 252/2023**

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 17 July 2026 and approved this report on 19 August 2026.

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

Virginia MORARU – the 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 Ion URSU, delegated prosecutor to the Anticorruption 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 Ion URSU meets the ethical and financial integrity criteria identified in Law No. 252/2023.

II. Subject of the Evaluation

4. Ion URSU ("the subject") was appointed as a prosecutor in the Chisinau Municipality Prosecutor's Office on 5 November 2018. From 2 September 2019 to 31 August 2021, as well as from 1 August 2025 to the day of this Evaluation Report, he was delegated to the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office ("APO").

III. Evaluation Criteria

5. Under art. 11 para. (1) of Law No. 252/2023, the Commission evaluates the subject's ethical and financial integrity.
6. Art. 11 para. (2) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that a subject is deemed not to meet the requirements of ethical integrity if the Commission has determined that:
 - a) over the last 5 years, the subject has seriously violated the rules of ethics and professional conduct of judges or, as the case may be, of prosecutors, as well as if the subject acted arbitrarily or issued arbitrary acts, over the last 10 years, contrary to the imperative rules of law, and the European Court of Human Rights has established, before the adoption of the act, that a similar decision was contrary to the European Convention on Human Rights.
 - b) over the last 10 years, the subject has admitted in his/her activity incompatibilities and conflicts of interest that affect the position held.
7. Art. 11 para. (3) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that the subject shall be deemed not to meet the criterion of financial integrity if the Commission has serious doubts determined by the fact that:
 - a) the difference between assets, expenses, and income, for the last 12 years, exceeds 20 average salaries per economy, in the amount as set by the Government for the year 2023.
 - b) over the last 10 years, the subject admitted tax irregularities as a result of which the amount of unpaid tax exceeded, in total, 5 average salaries per economy, in the amount as set by the Government for the year 2023.
8. The average salary per economy for 2023 was 11,700 MDL¹. Thus, the threshold of 20 average salaries is 234,000 MDL, and the threshold of five average salaries is 58,500 MDL.
9. Art. 11 para. (4) of Law No. 252/2023 allows the Commission to verify various things in evaluating the subject's financial integrity, including payment of taxes, compliance with the legal regime for declaring assets and personal interests, the sources of funds of the subject's wealth.
10. Art. 11 para. (5) of Law No. 252/2023 provides that in evaluating compliance with the criteria set out in para. (3) of this article, the Commission shall also take into account the wealth, expenses, and income of close persons, as defined in Law No. 133/2016 on the 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 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. Ion URSU 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 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 12 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, composed of Virginia MORARU (the Panel’s Chair), 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 26 May 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 8 June 2026 to clarify certain matters ("first round of written questions"). The subject provided his answers and supporting documents within the deadline – on 8 June 2026.
27. On 16 June 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 24 June 2026 to clarify certain matters ("second round of written questions"). The subject requested an extension of the deadline until 30 June 2026, which was granted by the Panel. The subject provided his answers and supporting documents within the extended deadline – on 29 June 2026.
28. On 6 July 2026, the Panel notified the subject that it had not identified in its evaluation any areas of doubt regarding his compliance with the integrity criteria and invited him to attend a public hearing on 17 July 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 13 July 2026, he was granted access to the evaluation materials in accordance with art. 16 para. (5) lit. c) of Law No. 252/2023.
30. On 17 July 2026, the subject participated in a public hearing before the Panel.
31. At the hearing, the subject reaffirmed the accuracy of his answers in the five-year declaration and ethics questionnaire and stated that he had no corrections or additions to the answers previously provided to the Panel's requests for information.
32. On 6 August 2026, the Panel asked the subject to provide additional information by 13 August 2026 to clarify certain matters ("post-hearing round of written questions"). The subject provided his answers within the deadline – on 13 August 2026.

V. Analysis

33. This section discusses the relevant facts and reasons for the Panel's conclusion.

34. Based on the information it collected, the Panel analyzed and, where necessary, sought further clarifications from the subject on the following matters:
- *Financial capacity of the subject's parents to make the claimed cash donations.*
 - *Indication of values below the estimated market value in an immovable-property exchange contract.*
 - *Omission to disclose financial liabilities in the declaration submitted to NIA.*
35. These issues were mitigated before the hearing.

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

Issue 1. Financial capacity of the subject's parents to make the claimed cash donations

36. To accurately assess the subject's financial situation during certain years of the evaluation period, the Panel considered it necessary to examine the financial capacity of the subject's parents. This examination was required because the subject claimed that, between 2012 and 2016, he received several cash donations from his parents, I.U. and M.U., amounting to 460,000 MDL in total.
37. In particular, the subject claimed that in 2015 he received a cash donation of 350,000 MDL from his parents. If this donation were not included in the subject's incoming financial flows for that year, his overall balance would be negative by 244,620 MDL, exceeding the statutory threshold provided for in art. 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.
38. The Panel therefore had to determine whether the subject's parents had sufficient financial means to make the claimed donation. According to the information obtained by the Panel from the STS and MConnect, in 2015 the parents' combined income amounted to 226,698.56 MDL. After deducting their household living expenses, estimated on the basis of the Consumption Expenditures for Population ("CEP")² at 47,577.60 MDL for two

² The 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 are 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. 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 are calculated based on NBS methodology and the method available on the NBS site. 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 family members and 12 calendar months.

adults, the parents' household was left with a positive balance of 179,120.96 MDL. This amount, however, was not sufficient to provide the subject with the claimed cash donation of 350,000 MDL. If said donation were included in the outgoing financial flow of the parents' household, it would generate a negative balance of 170,879 MDL.

39. In his responses to the second round of written questions (R2-Q9), the subject submitted documents confirming that in September 2015 his father obtained a bank loan of 295,000 MDL from B.C. "V" S.A. According to the subject, the loan was taken out to finance the claimed donation. Including the loan in the parents' incoming financial flows for 2015 increased their available funds to 521,698 MDL.
40. To assess their financial capacity accurately, the Panel recalculated the parents' balance by deducting the actual loan repayments made in 2015, including principal, interest, commissions, and penalties. After deducting their household living expenses of 47,577.60 MDL, loan repayments of 20,314 MDL, and the donation of 350,000 MDL, the parents retained a positive balance of 103,806 MDL.
41. The Panel did not identify any other substantial expenditures that might have been financed from the loan obtained by the subject's father. Moreover, the parents' balances remained positive in 2016 and 2017 after deducting the actual loan repayments made during those years. The Panel therefore finds that the subject's parents had sufficient financial capacity to make the claimed donation of 350,000 MDL in 2015.
42. Accordingly, as regards this issue, the Panel finds that the subject meets the financial integrity criterion provided for in art. 11 para. (3) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023.

Issue 2. Indication of values below the estimated market value in an immovable-property exchange contract

43. Based on the available information, the Panel established that, on 19 May 2014, the subject and his then wife concluded contract no. 5478 for the exchange of immovable property. Under that contract, they transferred a 44.3 sq. m apartment located on I. Street in Chisinau and acquired a 68.3 sq. m apartment located on C. Street in Chisinau. The subject submitted a copy of the exchange contract in response to the first round of written questions (R1-Q27).
44. The exchange contract indicates the cadastral value of the two immovable assets being exchanged. Thus, the value of the apartment on I. Street (transferred by the subject and his wife) was recorded by the Register of Immovable Assets at 228,090 MDL, and the value of the and the apartment on C. Street (acquired by the subject and his wife) was recorded at 402,634 MDL. However, the parties agreed to appraise, for the purpose of the contract concluded by them, the apartment on I. Street at 12,119 EUR (equivalent to 228,090 MDL), which is equal to the cadastral value, and the apartment on C. Street - at 32,119 EUR (equivalent to 604,494 MDL). The subject and his wife undertook to pay a balancing sum of 20,000 EUR within a period of twelve months, between 1 August 2014 and 1 August 2015. In his response to the first round of written questions (R1-Q29), the

subject provided clarifications regarding the values indicated in the contract for the assets being exchanged. The apartment acquired by the subject and his wife was larger, comprising three separate rooms (opposed to only two separate rooms in their old apartment), was fully furnished and equipped, and ready for moving in. The parties negotiated the aforementioned balancing sum and stipulated the values of the exchanged assets in the contract to accurately reflect said sum.

45. In his responses to the first round of written questions (R1-Q29), the subject explained that payment of the balancing sum was conditional upon the other contracting party, P.S., settling certain pre-existing utility debts by 1 August 2015. As P.S. did not settle those debts within the agreed period, allegedly because of ongoing judicial proceedings, the parties agreed that the subject and his wife would pay 16,000 EUR and retain the remaining 4,000 EUR as security until the utility debts were settled.
46. The subject further explained that, following their divorce in 2018, he and his former wife agreed that the apartment would remain in their common ownership and that, once one of their minor children reached the age of majority, the subject would donate his share in the apartment to that child. They also agreed to pay the outstanding 4,000 EUR of the balancing sum in equal shares, each contributing 2,000 EUR. According to the subject, the outstanding amount was paid in 2021 and 2023, through payments totalling 1,000 EUR and 3,000 EUR, respectively. This explanation was confirmed by a statement from the subject's former wife submitted in response to the second round of written questions (R2-Q7). The initial agreement and the subsequent arrangement are also supported by the exchange contract and by a statement signed by P.S. and submitted by the subject to the Panel (R1-Q29).
47. The Panel observes that the values assigned to the apartments in the exchange contract were lower than the estimated market values of comparable immovable properties. According to information obtained by the Panel from real-estate agencies, the market value of the apartment transferred by the subject was estimated to have ranged between 24,000 EUR and 30,000 EUR, while the market value of the larger apartment acquired by the subject was estimated to have ranged between 40,000 EUR and 50,000 EUR during the relevant period.
48. For the purposes of assessing the subject's financial integrity, however, the relevant consideration is not the market value of each property viewed in isolation, but the actual financial obligation assumed and discharged by the subject as part of the exchange. The contractual balancing sum of 20,000 EUR falls within the range of 10,000 EUR to 26,000 EUR, representing the possible difference between the estimated market values of the two properties. Thus, even if the parties had indicated the prevailing market value of each property in the contract, the agreed balancing sum would still have represented a reasonable arm's-length difference between their respective values. Accordingly, the lower contractual valuation of the two properties does not give rise to an unjustified wealth imbalance in the subject's financial flows.
49. The Panel further notes that the apartment on I. Street (transferred by the subject and his wife pursuant to the exchange contract no. 5478) was previously acquired by them under

the sale and purchase contract no. 6710 of 6 October 2010. According to the subject's explanations provided in the post-hearing round of written questions, the acquisition of the asset in question was negotiated and fully paid for by the subject's father, who was a close friend with the former owner. The subject further explained that he was in his first year of employment as a public official, while his wife was on maternity leave with their first child, and their family did not possess financial resources to purchase an apartment. In these circumstances, his parents decided to step in and help the young family, on the occasion of having welcomed their first grandchild. The subject and his wife's involvement in the transaction was limited to signing the notarial deed. The apartment purchased was small, located on the last floor of an old building and in poor condition. It needed serious renovation works, both inside the apartment and on the roof of the building. Such works were carried out later by the subject and his father.

50. The sale and purchase contract no. 6710 of 6 October 2010 specifies that while the cadastral value of the apartment is 228,090 MDL (equivalent to 13,900 EUR), the price at which it was being sold is only 15,598 MDL (equivalent to 950 EUR). The Panel finds such a sale price to be highly improbable and shall address this issue in para. 53 *infra*.
51. The Panel observes also that the subject transferred the apartment in question under the exchange contract of 19 May 2014 discussed in paras. 42 and 43 *supra*. Consequently, the Panel had to assess whether the subject had the obligation to pay income tax on the potential capital gain generated by the two transactions, as the exchange contract was concluded (and potential capital gain generated) inside the evaluation period. The failure to pay the income 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.
52. In a first scenario, for the purpose of determining the potential income tax due, the Panel used the values indicated in the two contracts. Under this scenario, the subject would have had the obligation to pay income tax in the amount of 13,724,28 MDL³. 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.
53. However, as mentioned above, the Panel finds the sale price of 15,598 MDL mentioned in the sale and purchase contract no. 6710 of 6 October 2010 to be unrealistic. According to the information obtained by the Panel from real estate agencies, the average price in 2010 of an apartment of that size in the relevant area was around 537,000 MDL (equivalent to 32,750 EUR). According to the explanations provided by the subject in the post-hearing round of written questions, the price negotiated and effectively paid in cash by the subject's father was, according to the latter's recollection, close to the cadastral value indicated in the contract, i.e. 228,000 MDL. Taking into consideration the poor

³ The amount of income tax due in the described scenario was calculated pursuant to the provisions of the Tax Code, as in force in 2014: $((228,090 - 15,598) / 2 - 30,000) * 18\% = 13,724.28$ MDL.

condition of the property and its location on the fifth floor of an old building with no elevator, the Panel finds it plausible that the subject's father paid a diminished price, as claimed. The former owner of the apartment in question has since passed away and there are no other ways to corroborate the claims made by the subject's father regarding the price paid.

54. The Panel also takes note of the fact that in the framework of the exchange contract discussed above, the subject and his wife agreed to transfer the property in question at the same cadastral value, even though they improved the apartment's condition. According to the information provided by real estate agencies, in 2014 the average price of a comparable apartment in the relevant area was around 481,500 MDL (equivalent to 25,850 EUR), i.e. lower than the 2010 market price. The drop in price of immovable assets in Chişinău during the relevant period can explain the final arrangement included in the exchange contract, whereby the subject and his wife agreed to appraise their property at the cadastral value.
55. In the more realistic scenario where the subject in 2010 acquired the apartment on I. street at a price equal to the one at which the asset in question was transferred in 2014, the Panel finds that the subject could not have acquired, as a result of the two transactions, any capital gain on which income tax was due.
56. The Panel further notes that the exchange contract was concluded in 2014, outside the period relevant to the assessment of the subject's ethical integrity under art. 11 para. (2) lit. a) of Law No. 252/2023. It is therefore unnecessary to make a separate finding concerning the indication of the contractual values from the perspective of violating the rules of ethics and professional conduct.
57. Accordingly, as regards this issue, the Panel finds that the subject meets the financial integrity criterion provided for in art. 11 para. (3) lit. a) and lit. b) of Law No. 252/2023.

Issue 3. Omission to disclose financial liabilities in the declaration submitted to NIA

58. Under art. 11 para. (4) lit. b) and e) of Law No. 252/2023, when assessing a subject's financial integrity, the Panel may verify whether the subject complied with the legal regime governing the declaration of assets and personal interests. It may also verify the existence of any loan, credit, leasing, insurance, or other contracts capable of generating financial benefits to which the subject, a person referred to in para. (5), or a legal entity in which any of them is a beneficial owner is a party.
59. Under art. 4 para. (1) lit. e) of Law No. 133/2016, a subject of declaration must disclose personal liabilities and those of his or her family members or cohabiting partner, including loans, pledges, mortgages, and guarantees issued in favour of third parties, where their value exceeds ten average monthly salaries.
60. Moreover, under the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors, approved by the General Assembly of Prosecutors on 27 May 2016, prosecutors are required to comply with national legislation (art. 6.1.1), to observe the highest standards of integrity and responsibility in

order to maintain society's trust in the prosecution service (art. 6.3.1), and not to conceal or distort information concerning their assets or conflicts of interest that must be made public by virtue of their office (art. 6.6¹.7).

61. During the assessment of the subject's financial integrity, the information initially available to the Panel indicated that, on the date on which he submitted his declaration of assets and personal interests for 2019 ("2019 annual declaration") to the NIA, i.e. 30 March 2020, the subject may have had financial liabilities amounting in total to 92,465 MDL. This amount exceeded the statutory reporting threshold of ten average monthly salaries, which in 2020 amounted to 79,530 MDL⁴. The subject did not disclose these liabilities in his 2019 annual declaration.
62. The Panel therefore had to first determine whether the subject was legally required to disclose those liabilities.
63. To establish the value of the liabilities existing on the date of submission of the 2019 annual declaration, the Panel examined the dates on which the relevant obligations arose, the repayment dates and the corresponding official records.
64. Based on the information initially available, it appeared *prima facie* that, on the date of submission of the 2019 annual declaration, the subject had the following liabilities, amounting in total to 92,465 MDL:
 - a) a loan obtained from "M" S.R.L. on 26 April 2019 in the original amount of 13,499 MDL, which remained active on the date of submission of the 2019 annual declaration; and
 - b) a liability of 4,000 EUR (equivalent to 78,966 MDL), representing the unpaid portion of the balancing sum under the immovable-property exchange contract discussed at Issue 2.
65. As set out in para. 45 *supra*, following the subject's divorce in 2018, he and his former wife agreed to pay the outstanding balancing sum of 4,000 EUR in equal shares. Accordingly, only 2,000 EUR (equivalent to 39,483 MDL) represented the subject's own liability, while the remaining half was payable by his former wife.
66. Consequently, on 30 March 2020, the subject's existing financial liabilities amounted in total to 52,982 MDL, comprising 13,499 MDL under the loan agreement with "M" S.R.L. and 39,483 MDL under the immovable property exchange contract. This amount was below the statutory reporting threshold provided for by Law No. 133/2016. The subject was therefore not legally required to disclose those liabilities in his 2019 annual declaration.
67. Having accepted the subject's explanations concerning the payment of the balancing sum, which were supported by the documents submitted to the Panel, the Panel further

⁴ Government Decision No. 678/2019 on the approval of the amount of the average monthly salary per economy, forecasted for 2020.

established that the aggregate value of the subject's existing financial liabilities did not exceed the statutory reporting threshold in any subsequent year before the balancing sum was fully paid.

68. In light of the above, the Panel finds that the subject's non-disclosure of the financial liabilities examined in this section did not constitute a breach of the legal regime governing the declaration of assets and personal interests or of the relevant provisions of the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors. Accordingly, in respect of this issue, the subject meets the ethical integrity criterion provided for in 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 Ion URSU passes the external evaluation made according to the criteria set out 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 19 August 2026 and signed by the Vice-Chairperson of the Prosecutor Vetting Commission.
74. Done in English and Romanian.

Signature:

Virginia MORARU
Vice-Chairperson
Prosecutor Vetting Commission

Digitally signed by Moraru Virginia
Date: 2026.08.20 16:43:33 EEST
Reason: MoldSign Signature
Location: Moldova
MOLDOVA EUROPEANĂ

