

**Question for written answer E-000426/2015
to the Commission**
Rule 130
Traian Ungureanu (PPE)

Subject: The Romanian Ombudsman

In the summer of 2012, the Commission made it very clear to the Romanian Government that the appointment of the national Ombudsman should be the result of a political consensus. Ignoring the Commission's request, the Romanian Government proceeded to nominate, and its parliamentary majority to confirm, an Ombudsman who has thus far served not the people but only the government.

The clearest proof of this is the refusal of the Ombudsman to challenge on constitutional grounds an emergency ordinance giving the green light to mayors wishing to change their political affiliation. As a result, according to the Expert Forum website, 540 mayors out of 3 140 have changed party. The Constitutional Court ruled against the ordinance, but the effects were already in place.

More recently, the Government has issued another emergency ordinance aimed at protecting the incumbent Prime Minister from the consequences of a case of blatant plagiarism related to his doctoral degree.

The Ombudsman, as the only authority empowered to question the constitutionality of this ordinance, has again failed to do his duty.

What is the position of the Commission with regard to the Ombudsman as an institution in Romania and the way the present Ombudsman understands the notion of serving the people?

Does the Commission intend to take any concrete actions in support of an essential institution which is being poorly served by the current holder of the post?