



Independent Evaluation Commission for assessing the integrity of candidates
for the position of member in the self-administration bodies of judges and prosecutors

Comisia independentă de evaluare a integrității candidaților la funcția
de membru în organele de autoadministrare ale judecătorilor și procurorilor

*Decision No. 24 of 10 March 2023 on the Candidacy of Tatiana CIAGLIC,
Candidate for the Superior Council of Magistracy*

The Independent Evaluation Commission for assessing the integrity of candidates for the position of member in the self-administration bodies of judges and prosecutors (“the Commission”) deliberated in private on 1 March 2023 and 10 March 2023. The members participating were:

1. Herman von HEBEL
2. Victoria HENLEY
3. Nadejda HRIPTIEVSCHI
4. Vitalie MIRON
5. Tatiana RĂDUCANU
6. Nona TSOTSORIA

The Commission delivers the following decision which was adopted on that date:

I. The procedure

Tatiana CIAGLIC, Head of the E-Training Section and Trainer at the Legal Information Center of the National Institute of Justice, was on the list of candidates submitted by the Parliament to the Commission on 9 June 2022 for evaluation for the position of member of the Superior Council of Magistracy.

The candidate held several positions in the Department of Judicial Administration of the Ministry of Justice between 2008 and 2013 and has since held the position of Head of the E-Training Section and Trainer within the Legal Information Center of the National Institute of Justice.

On 21 June 2022 the Commission sent an ethics questionnaire to the candidate to be filled in voluntarily and returned to the Commission by 5 July 2022. The candidate submitted the completed questionnaire to the Commission on 29 June 2022.

On 27 December 2022 the Commission sent a request to the candidate for completing and submitting by 3 January 2023 the Declaration of assets and personal interests for the past 5 years as required by art. 9 para. (2) of Law No. 26/2022 on certain measures relating to the selection of candidates for position as a member of the self-administration bodies of the judges and prosecutors (hereinafter “Law No. 26/2022”). The declaration also includes the list of close persons in the judiciary, prosecution and public service, as required by the same article. The candidate submitted a completed declaration to the Commission on 3 January 2023.

The Commission obtained information from numerous sources in order to assess the candidate’s financial and ethical integrity. The sources from which information was obtained concerning evaluated candidates generally included the National Integrity Authority, State Fiscal Service,

General Inspectorate of Border Police, financial institutions, public institutions, open sources such as social media and investigative journalism reports and reports from members of civil society. Not all sources produced information concerning each candidate and not all of the information produced by sources about a candidate was pertinent to the Commission's assessment. All information received was carefully screened for accuracy and relevance.

Written communication with candidate:

On 27 January 2023, the Commission sent to the candidate a request for clarifying information, containing one question, including one sub-question and one request for further documentation. The candidate replied within the requested time period on 27 January 2023 to this question and provided the requested documents.

On 31 January 2023, the Commission sent a second round of one question, including two sub-questions and two requests for further documentation, to clarify some issues that came out during the evaluation. The candidate replied within the requested time period on 2 February 2023 to all questions. The documents requested related to the income and property declarations and personal interest declarations over the period 2008-2013. The candidate stated that she submitted these statements for the relevant years, but that she was only able to provide evidence of the submission of these statements from 2011 onward, when a central register for the collection of these declarations was established.

The candidate did not request access to the evaluation materials according to art. 12 para. (4) lit. c) of Law No. 26/2022 and therefore did not receive the materials.

On 1 March 2023, the candidate took part in a public hearing of the Commission.

II. The law relating to the evaluation

The Commission's evaluation of candidates' integrity consists of verifying their ethical integrity and financial integrity (art. 8 para. (1) of Law No. 26/2022).

Art. 8 para. (2) of Law No. 26/2022 provides that a candidate is deemed to meet the criterion of *ethical integrity* if:

- a) he/she has not seriously violated the rules of ethics and professional conduct of judges, prosecutors or, where applicable, other professions, and has not committed, in his/her activity, any wrongful actions or inactions, which would be inexplicable from the point of view of a legal professional and an impartial observer;
- b) there are no reasonable suspicions that the candidate has committed corruption acts, acts related to corruption or corruptible acts, within the meaning of the Law on Integrity No. 82/2017;

- c) has not violated the legal regime of declaring personal assets and interests, conflicts of interest, incompatibilities, restrictions and/or limitations.

The *Public Servant's Code of Conduct*, Law No. 25/2008 regarding the public servant's Code of conduct, last amended by Law No. 305/2017, applied over the period of time covered by the evaluation.

In the absence of rules of ethics and conduct approved for the field in which the candidate works or has worked, it shall be verified whether or not the past conduct of the candidate gives rise to reasonable doubts as to his/her compliance with the ethical and conduct standards established for judges and prosecutors (art. 8 para. (3) of Law No. 26/2022).

Art. 8 para. (4) of Law No. 26/2022 provides that a candidate shall be deemed to meet the criterion of *financial integrity* if:

- a) the candidate's assets have been declared in the manner established by law;
- b) the Evaluation Commission finds that his/her wealth acquired in the last 15 years corresponds to the declared revenues.

Art. 2 para. (2) of Law No. 26/2022 provides that the evaluation of candidates includes a verification of the assets of persons close to candidates, as defined in Law No. 133/2016 on 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.

Art. 8 para. (5) of Law No. 26/2022 provides that in order to assess the applicant's financial integrity, the Commission is required to verify the following:

- a) compliance by the candidate with the tax regime in the part related to the payment of taxes when using the means and income derived from the property held, as well as taxable income and the payment of import duty and export duty;
- b) compliance by the candidate with the regime of declaring assets and personal interests;
- c) the method of acquiring the property owned or possessed by the candidate or persons referred to in art. 2 para. (2), as well as the expenses associated with the maintenance of such assets;
- d) the sources of income of the candidate and, where appropriate, of the persons referred to in art. 2 para. (2);
- e) existence or not of loan, credit, leasing, insurance or other contracts capable of providing financial benefits, in which the candidate, the person defined in art. 2 para. (2) thereof, or the legal entity in which they are beneficial owners, is a contracting party;
- f) whether or not donations exist, in which the candidate or the person established in art. 2 para. (2) has the status of donor or recipient of donation;
- g) other relevant aspects to clarify the origin and justification of the candidate's wealth.

In assessing and deciding upon the criteria related to financial and ethical integrity, the Commission is not to depend on the findings of other bodies competent in the field concerned. (art. 8 para. (6) of Law No. 26/2022). The Commission is required to assess the information gathered about candidates using its own judgment, formed as a result of multi-faceted, comprehensive and objective review of the information. None of the submitted materials has a predetermined probative value without being assessed by the Commission (art. 10 para. (9) of Law No. 26/2022).

A candidate shall be deemed not to meet the integrity criteria if serious doubts have been found as to the candidate's compliance with the above-listed requirements which have not been mitigated by the evaluated person (art. 13 para. (5) of Law No. 26/2022). As noted in the recent Venice Report on vetting in Kosovo, "In a system of prior integrity checks, the decision not to recruit a candidate 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 inexplicable wealth, even if it cannot be proven beyond doubt that this wealth does come from illegal sources." Also, "[I]n other investigations like wider integrity checking the burden of proof will be discharged on the balance of probability." Venice Commission, CDL-AD(2022)011-e, Kosovo - Opinion on the Concept Paper on the Vetting of Judges and Prosecutors and draft amendments to the Constitution, adopted by the Venice Commission at its 131st Plenary Session (Venice, 17-18 June 2022), §§10,9.

Shifting the burden of proof to the candidate, once the evaluating body has identified integrity issues, has been found permissible by the European Court of Human Rights, 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, §352, 31 May 2021 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."

Under art. 5 para. (1) of the Evaluation Rules of the Independent Evaluation Commission for assessing the integrity of candidates for the position of member in the self-administrative bodies of judges and prosecutors, pursuant to Law No.26/2022, of 2 May 2022 (hereinafter "Evaluation Rules"), only if a candidate fully meets all of the indicators set for the in art. 8 para. (2)-(5) of Law No.26/2022 does the candidate satisfy the criterion of "ethical and financial integrity."

III. Evaluation of the candidate

The Commission sent the candidate a limited number of questions relating to financial issues. The candidate responded in a timely fashion and provided the Commission with all required answers and relevant documentation. Based on the information provided by the candidate and all

other information available to the Commission, the Commission has no serious doubts about the compliance of the candidate with the criterion of financial integrity as per art. 8 para. (1) and (4) of Law No. 26/2022. In addition, the Commission has no serious doubts about the compliance of the candidate with the criterion of ethical integrity as per art. 8 para. (1) and (2) of Law No. 26/2022.

IV. Decision

Based on art. 8 para. (1), (2) and (4) and art. 13 para. (5) of Law No. 26/2022, the Commission decided that the candidate is compliant with the ethical and financial integrity criteria and thus passes the evaluation.

V. Appeal and publication of the decision

Pursuant to art. 14 para. (1) of Law No. 26/2022, the candidate is entitled to appeal this decision within 5 days from receiving the decision.

Pursuant to art. 13 para. (7) of Law No. 26/2022, this decision is sent by email to the candidate and to the institution responsible for organizing the election or competition, which in the present case is the Parliament. If within 48 hours of sending the decision, the candidate does not notify the Commission of her refusal to publish the decision, the decision shall be published on the website of the Parliament in a depersonalized form, except for the surname and first name of the candidate that remain public. The Commission will also publish the decision on its website if the candidate does not object to publication.

This decision was adopted unanimously by all participating members of the Commission.

Done in English and translated into Romanian.

Signature:



Herman von HEBEL
Chairman, Commission