

The aim of the evaluation of the ethical and financial integrity of candidates for leadership positions in the Superior Council of Magistracy, the Superior Council of Prosecutors and their specialized bodies is to increase the integrity of future members of those bodies, as well as the society's trust in the activity of the self-administration bodies of judges and prosecutors and in the justice system overall (art. 8 para. (1) preamble to Law No. 26/2022). When candidates fail the evaluation because there are serious doubts about financial and/or ethical integrity issues, it demonstrates that candidates for leadership positions in the justice system have been scrupulously held to high standards of integrity, increasing the public's confidence in those candidates who pass and are eligible for election as members of the self-administration bodies. Especially considering the critical role of members of the self-administration bodies in the selection, promotion and discipline of their colleagues and in their administration of benefits such as preferential housing programs, it is imperative that the members themselves have demonstrated the highest level of financial and ethical integrity so that they can be expected as leaders to promote high standards for themselves and others.

According to art. 13 para. (1) of Law No. 26/2022, there are only two outcomes for the evaluation of candidates for leadership positions in the self-administration bodies: passing or failing the evaluation. No other measures are available to the Commission. According to the ECtHR, it is consistent with the vetting process to have a more limited scale of measures. (In Albania there were only two measures that could be imposed: dismissal from office or suspension with the obligation to attend a training program.)⁴⁸ For perspective in terms of the proportionality of a fail decision based upon reasonable doubt about a candidate's financial integrity, the ECtHR has repeatedly upheld confiscation orders issued by domestic authorities based only on a preponderance of evidence suggesting that the respondents' lawful incomes could not have sufficed for them to acquire the property in question. Confiscation orders have been upheld not only with respect to persons directly accused of offenses, but also in connection with their family members and other close relatives who had been presumed to possess and manage the "ill-gotten" property informally on behalf of the suspected offenders or who otherwise lacked the necessary *bona fide* status.⁴⁹ A failing decision in the context of the evaluation of candidates seeking to serve on self-administration bodies in the justice system is in no way comparable in magnitude to confiscation of property orders, which have been sustained by the ECtHR on the basis of similar standards of proof.

The SJC special panel suggested that the Commission could pass some candidates with perhaps minor integrity issues and provide a detailed description of those issues in the Commission's decisions so that the issues could be considered by those voting on the candidates for positions as members in the self-administration bodies. Commission evaluation decisions are public only with

⁴⁸ *Sevdari v. Albania*, no. 40662/19, para. 87, 13 December 2022.

⁴⁹ *Telbis and Viziteu v. Romania*, no. 47911/15, para. 68, 26 June 2018; *Gogitidze and Others v. Georgia*, no. 36862/05, para. 107, 12 May 2015; *Webb v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), no. 56054/00, 10 February 2004; *Morabito and Others v. Italy* (dec.), 58572/00, 7 June 2005; and *Saccoccia v. Austria*, no. 69917/01, paras. 87-91, 18 December 2008.

