

Question for written answer E-004563/2018
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Rule 130
Dobromir Sośnierz (NI)

Subject: VP/HR - Applying European Parliament Resolution of 4 July 2018 on the political crisis in Moldova

Having regard to the adoption of European Parliament Resolution of 4 July 2018 on the political crisis in Moldova following the invalidation of the mayoral elections in Chisinau (2018/2783(RSP)), I would like to ask how the High Representative will put the recommendations contained therein into practice, considering that:

1. The Resolution urges the Moldovan government to break the law by calling for the acknowledgement of the results of the elections in Chisinau, contrary to the final court judgment (paragraph 8).
2. The Moldovan government is being given recommendations that are the exact opposite of those given to the Polish government. Poland is being told to respect court judgments and is prohibited from exerting political influence over the administration of justice, and especially replacing or removing judges for political reasons. Meanwhile, Moldova has been recommended to not respect court judgments (the aforementioned paragraph 8) and to replace judges to force through changes in case law (paragraph 10). Moreover, by means of threats to withhold financial aid, Moldova is attempting to exert political pressure on the court whose verdict the European Parliament does not agree with (paragraphs 6 and 7).
3. The Resolution contains internal contradictions between paragraph 4 (the recommended rule of law and tripartite division of power) on the one hand, and paragraphs 8 (ignoring court judgments) and 10 (executive interference with the judiciary by replacing judges) on the other hand.

Which of the conflicting recommendations will be transmitted to the Moldovan side as the EU's official position and how will the High Representative explain to the Moldovan and Polish sides the contradictory recommendations issued to their governments?