





































affected the “honour, professional probity and prestige of justice that affect trust in justice, committed in the exercise of their duties or outside them, which, according to their seriousness, cannot be qualified only as violations of the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct of Judges”, but amount to a disciplinary offense provided for under art. 4 para. (1) lit. p) of Law No. 178/2014 on the disciplinary responsibility of judges. The Plenary of the Disciplinary Board of Judges decided to give the candidate a warning as a disciplinary sanction. The candidate contested the Decision of the Disciplinary Board of Judges, the outcome of which is still pending.

In his written answers to the Commission, the candidate stated that, in making his statement, he had acted in defense of the entire judiciary and in full compliance with ethical rules. The candidate also stated that he did not file a complaint with the SCM concerning the “intimidation of judges” because, from his point of view, SCM’s constitutional mandate had expired and “its activity is contrary to the interests of justice.” The candidate also noted that he had lodged a complaint with the ISS against Eugeniu Rurac who had requested the initiation of the criminal case against him.

At the public hearing, as to his public statement of 19 January 2022, the candidate explained that he had not commented on the request of the ISS but on the request that was signed by Eugeniu Rurac, who had a personal interest in the case and who was not authorized to sign the request on behalf of the ISS. It should have been signed by the head of the ISS. The candidate further noted that this request, which was made public, contained severe accusations against him. The candidate appealed against the ISS report. The appeal is still pending.

Regarding “Mr. Rurac’s personal interest,” the candidate explained that when the Presidential Decree on annulling the appointment of Vladislav Clima to the position of the President of the Chisinau Court of Appeal was issued, Eugeniu Rurac was working as an adviser at the President’s Office. At the time of the examination by the court, Eugeniu Rurac was working at the ISS. He was the one who had applied to the prosecutor’s office with the request to initiate a criminal case against the candidate. Thus, Eugeniu Rurac had had a conflict of interest. When asked about the evidence confirming Eugeniu Rurac’s involvement in drafting the presidential decree, the candidate referred to statements made during a television program by then-chairperson of the Legal, Appointments and Immunities Committee, who, at the time of the decree, was an adviser to the President. According to the candidate, the chairperson of the Legal, Appointments and Immunities Committee mentioned that several people had worked on that Decree. When asked specifically whether Eugeniu Rurac had been involved in drafting the decree, the candidate explained that there was no need to specify that, because, according to public information confirmed during the TV program, the entire legal department had been working on the document. The interview of Olesia Stamate on the TV8 program “Cutia Neagră” was aired on January 20, 2022.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Asked if she participated in the drafting of the decree signed by the president of the country, Olesia Stamate answered that “to some extent, but the idea came after some discussions between colleagues.” According to the Olesia Stamate, the Supreme Court of Justice will further establish the competence of the Court of Appeal. “It was a discussion between colleagues where they discussed the way he was appointed, the conflicts of interest, certain









