

bought in 2011 for the declared purchase price of 6,700 EUR, are listed for sale today at around 6,500 EUR.³ Thus, similar cars are now selling for the price that the candidate claims to have paid 11 years ago. Therefore, the Commission has serious doubts in respect to the declared purchase price of this car.

The Commission also noted that the candidate had had the right of usufruct over a BMW m/y 2004 car for over 2 years. It is unclear what the economic benefit was to the candidate's relative in providing the latter with the right of usufruct of such an expensive car. Furthermore, from 2006 to 2008, the candidate held the right of usufruct for another BMW m/y 1999, owned by the same relative. The sub-evaluated market value of the 2004 BMW 7 series 730i car model combined with the long period of time during which the candidate used it for free, raises serious doubts regarding the beneficial ownership of the candidate over this car from the moment of its purchase. Even more so, the candidate did not pay the capital increase of 40,000 MDL in accordance with the provision of art. 15 and 37 of the Fiscal Code ($40,000/50\%*18\% = 8,600$ MDL) likely due to the fact that the sales price was erroneously declared as being 247,000 MDL.

The Commission also had doubts as to the real purchase price of the second car, a BMW m/y 2008, which the candidate had bought in 2013 and sold for 36,000 MDL more than the declared purchase price three years later. Nine years later, in 2022, such cars are on sale for the price of 277,760 MDL (equivalent to 14,000 EUR.)⁴, still more than the purchase price declared by the candidate. These circumstances raise serious doubts regarding the declared value of this car. The candidate could not provide convincing explanations or supportive documents that could mitigate the Commission's doubts concerning the sub-evaluated purchase price of this car.

The Commission observed a pattern whereby the candidate used expensive cars for free from the same relative and then purchased them at an underestimated price. In light of above circumstances, the Commission has serious doubts (art. 13 para. (5), Law No. 26/2022) about the compliance of the candidate with the criterion of financial integrity as per art. 8 para. (4) lit. a) and para. (5) lit. a), b), c) and g) of Law No. 26/2022 and ethical integrity as per art. 8 para. (2) lit. c) of Law No. 26/2022 with respect to the sub-estimated value of the cars acquired by the candidate, declaration of assets and interests in the manner prescribed by law and failure to pay capital increase tax following the sale of one of these cars, which have not been mitigated by the candidate.

4. Failure to disclose donations and contributions made by the candidate and his wife to their son in 2017 and 2018 in the manner prescribed by law

4.1. The facts

(I) In his 2019 declaration of assets and personal interests (hereinafter "annual declaration"), the candidate's son declared 60,000 EUR and 21,208 USD as donations received as wedding gifts, and 40,000 EUR received as gifts for the christening of his child. The candidate stated that he had

³ Medium sale prices calculated on platform 999.md, makler.md, interauto.md.

⁴ Medium sale prices calculated on platform 999.md, makler.md, interauto.md

