

2026 Rule of Law Report - targeted stakeholder consultation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The annual Rule of Law Report lies at the centre of the Annual Rule of Law Cycle, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues. So far, six editions of the Rule of Law Report have been published since 2020.

As every year, the Commission would like to invite the stakeholders to provide contributions to the 2026 Rule of Law Report. On the basis of these contributions and on-going developments, further targeted questions may be shared at a later stage of preparation of the 2026 Rule of Law Report, in particular in the context of country visits, or bilateral contacts.

The Commission invites stakeholders to provide contributions which include:

(1) developments and measures taken in relation to the recommendations in the 2025 report,
(2) developments related to topics covered in the 2025 country chapters, as well as any other new developments related to the rule of law.

The input should consist of a short summary, if possible in English, covering the areas referred to below. Legislation or other documents may be referenced with a link. Contributions should focus on significant developments since the last Rule of Law Report both as regards the legal framework and its implementation in practice.

This questionnaire also integrates the separate questionnaire on the single market from last year. In addition to these specific questions, respondents to the questionnaire are invited to consider the Single Market dimension, including any relevant cross-border issues, in all their answers.

Where questions of particular relevance under the single market dimension, this is indicated before the relevant question.

[1] Unless the information was already submitted in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Type of information to be included:

Under each of the four pillars, the replies should include references to the following types of information:

A) Legislative developments

- Newly adopted legislation
- legislative drafts currently discussed in Parliament
- legislative plans envisaged by the Government

B) Policy developments

- Implementation and enforcement of legislation
- evaluations, impact assessment, surveys
- white papers/strategies/actions plans/consultation processes
- follow-up to reports/recommendations of Council of Europe bodies or other international organisations
- important administrative measures
- generalised practices

C) Developments related to the judiciary / independent authorities

- important case law by national courts
- important decision/opinions from independent bodies/authorities
- state of play on terms, nominations and expired mandates for high-level positions (e.g. Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Council for the Judiciary, Prosecutor General, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the request for input[2])

D) Any other relevant developments

- National authorities are free to add any further information, which they deem relevant; however, this should be short and to the point.

Where relevant, please also indicate whether the developments reported are linked to the implementation of reforms and investments under the national Recovery Resilience Plan. To simplify your answers to the questionnaire, if there are no developments, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the contributions for the previous Rule of Law Reports does not need not be repeated.

[2] Such as: media regulatory authorities and bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, ombudsman institutions, supreme audit institutions and, where they exist, transparency authorities.

* I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☒ Civil society organisation/NGO
- ☐ International organisation
- ☐ Judicial association or network
- ☐ Media organisation or association
- ☐ Public authority or network of public authorities
- ☐ Other

* Organisation name

250 character(s) maximum

Fundatia pentru Dezvoltarea Societatii Civile (FDSC)

Main Areas of Work

- ☐ Justice System
- ☐ Anti-corruption
- ☐ Media Pluralism and Freedom
- ☐ Checks and Balances
- ☒ Other

If "Other", please specify

civil society and democratic participation

Please insert an URL towards your organisation's main online presence or describe your organisation briefly:

500 character(s) maximum

www.fdsc.ro

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is in the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making

* Country of origin

Please indicate the country of origin of your organisation

- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☒ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden
- ☐ Other - please specify

First name

Simona

Surname

Constantinescu

Email Address of the organisation

office@fdsc.ro

* Publication of your contribution and privacy settings

You can choose whether you wish for your contribution to be published and whether you wish your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- ☐ Anonymous - Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. Organisation name, URL, transparency register number, first name and surname given above will not be published. **To maintain anonymity, please refrain from mentioning the name of your organisation and any details from which your organisation can be identified in the rest of your contribution as we will not be able to guarantee anonymisation of these elements.**
- ☒ Public - Your personal details (name, organisation name, transparency register number, country of origin will be published with your contribution).
- ☐ No publication - Your contribution will not be published. Elements of your contribution may be referred to anonymously in documents produced by the Commission based on this consultation.

☒ I agree with the personal data protection provisions.

[Specific privacy statement targeted stakeholder consultation 2026 rule of law report.pdf](#)

Questions on horizontal developments

In this section, you are invited to provide information on general horizontal developments or trends, both positive and negative, covering all or several Member States. In particular, you could mention issues that are common to several Member States, as well as best practices identified in one Member State that could be replicated. Moreover, you could refer to your activities in the area of the four pillars and sub-topics (an overview of all sub-topics can be found below), and, if you represent a Network of national organisations, to the support you might have provided to one of your national members.

Overview topics for contribution

[List of topics for contribution.docx](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

Questions for contribution

Under each pillar, you are invited to provide information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2025 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter of the 2025 Rule of Law Report and any other significant developments since January 2025 and up to the date of submission^[3]. Please always include a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents (in the national language and/or where available, in English). **Significant developments** can include challenges, positive developments and best practices, covering both legislative developments or implementation and practices.

Information provided in reply to the first question under each pillar, related to the follow-up to the recommendations, does not need to be repeated in subsequent parts of the questionnaire, but can be cross-referenced in the subsequent questions, where relevant. All other questions are not limited to the recommendations, but as in previous years, cover the entire scope of the Report.

^[3] Unless already covered in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Member State/enlargement country covered in contribution [only one choice possible]

If you wish to submit information concerning several Member States/enlargement countries, please fill in the questionnaire separately for each country. There is no limit to the number of contributions submitted by a single participant.

- ☐ Albania
- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark

- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Montenegro
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ North Macedonia
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Serbia
- ☐ Slovakia
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden

I. Justice System

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

A. Independence

Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)

(The reference to 'judges' concerns judges at all level and types of courts as well as judges at constitutional courts)

5000 character(s) maximum

Irremovability of judges, including transfers, (incl. as part of judicial map reform), dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Allocation of cases in courts

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence (including composition and nomination and dismissal of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e. g. Council for the Judiciary)

5000 character(s) maximum

Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal/civil (where applicable) liability of judges (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers

5000 character(s) maximum

Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary

5000 character(s) maximum

By the end of 2025, Romania's justice system entered a period of acute tension in which freedom of expression of magistrates became a central fault line between institutional authority and democratic accountability. Publication of the independent media outlet Recorder investigation "Justiție Capturată" (Captured Justice) prompted unprecedented public reactions from judges and prosecutors. While no final disciplinary sanctions for their reactions had yet materialised, the Judicial Inspection initiated preliminary disciplinary checks. The Romanian Judges' Forum, Movement for the Defence of Prosecutors' Status, and Initiative for Justice issued public statements demanding an end to disciplinary pressure on magistrates exercising their right to free speech (<https://www.forumuljudecatorilor.ro/index.php/archives/6958>; <https://www.facebook.com/masp.amasp/posts/pfbid0r8mSnFWHyuiFm7bAWDCu7QKnk3E5ka2ZB7RSTJuGqFbWajg7YUi3MUBV2jNnREuAl>). The letter states that it is essential to have clear rules in place that allow judges and prosecutors to act as whistleblowers without fear of retaliation.

The initiation of these checks, despite collective and publicly articulated concerns, was widely perceived within the magistracy as disciplinary pressure rather than neutral oversight. This perception was reinforced by the rapid mobilisation of over 800 magistrates and by strong public statements from professional associations which explicitly framed disciplinary mechanisms as tools capable of silencing legitimate dissent (<https://tvrinfo.ro/adevarul-si-integritatea-nu-trebuie-sanctionate-peste-800-de-magistrati-au-semnat-scrisoarea-de-solidaritate-cu-judecatorii-laurentiu-besu-si-raluca-morosanu-numarul-semnatarilor/>).

Civil society, investigative journalists, and international judicial organisations interpreted the situation as emblematic of broader shrinking civic space, in which legal and administrative instruments are used to discourage public criticism. The concern is not limited to whether sanctions are ultimately imposed, but to the deterring effect of investigations themselves, which can lead to self-censorship and erode public trust.

In this context, the Romanian case illustrates how disciplinary measures, even when formally lawful, can exert disproportionate pressure on freedom of expression if deployed reactively. The long-term risk is systemic: when magistrates are discouraged from speaking openly, society loses an essential early-warning mechanism for democratic backsliding and civic space becomes more restricted.

A survey on trust in the justice system in Romania published very recent (January 2026, INSCOP Research - <https://www.inscop.ro/ianuarie-2026-barometrul-informat-ro-inscop-research-editia-a-vii-a-capitolul-1-perceptia-romanilor-cu-privire-la-sistemul-de-justitie/>) shows significant lack of confidence among the public: over 70 % of respondents declared they have very little, little, or no trust at all in the judiciary, a large majority (over 67 %) believe the justice system is not independent of political influences, around 80 % believe the law is not applied equally to all citizens. The results have been widely reported by Romanian media and interpreted as evidence of a trust crisis in the judiciary.

B. Quality of justice

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined in the introduction)

[single market relevance] Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)

5000 character(s) maximum

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material), remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year)

(Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities. Financial resources include salaries of staff in courts and prosecution offices.)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

5000 character(s) maximum

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, including electronic communication and AI tools, within the justice system and with court users, procedural rules, access to judgments online)

5000 character(s) maximum

Based on the experience related to the judicial procedure of setting up an association or foundation, although this possibility is not explicitly mentioned in any law, some courts accept the necessary documents by email and issue a decision without requiring physical presence. However, one cannot safely assume that the procedure can be completed solely by electronic means in all courts in Romania; therefore, it is necessary to check in advance whether the competent court allows it.

Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems, including AI-based systems, for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

5000 character(s) maximum

Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions (“judicial map”) and their specialisation, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases.

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Specialisation (of judges/specific courts/chambers within courts) and training for the judiciary to deal with commercial cases, as well as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and mediation as regards commercial cases.

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Efficiency of the justice system

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined in the introduction)

[single market relevance] Developments related to efforts to improve the efficiency of the justice system (e.g. as regards length of proceedings, to address backlogs)

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the justice system - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

II. Anti-Corruption Framework

Where previous specific reports, published in the framework of the review under the UN Convention against Corruption, of GRECO, and of the OECD address the issues below, please make a reference to the points you wish to bring to the Commission’s attention in these documents, indicating any relevant updates, changes or measures introduced that have occurred since these documents were published.

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable):

5000 character(s) maximum

A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)

List any **changes** as regards relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption and the resources allocated to each of these authorities (the human, financial, legal, and technical/specialised resources as relevant), including the cooperation among domestic and with foreign authorities. Indicate any relevant measures taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards for the functional independence of the authorities tasked with the prevention and detection of corruption

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on the implementation of measures foreseen in the strategic anti-corruption framework (if applicable). If available, please provide relevant objectives and indicators

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Prevention

Measures to enhance integrity in the public sector in particular as regards high-level officials (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to enhance general transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying, asset and interest disclosure rules, gifts policy, transparency of political party, financing)

In May 2025, the Romanian Constitutional Court ruled that the legal provisions requiring public officials to provide unrestricted access to their asset declarations and to publish declarations of assets and interests is unconstitutional. To prevent the resulting gap in transparency, Parliament needed to proactively revise the legal framework in a way that would ensure compliance with constitutional standards on privacy and proportionality while maintaining public access to key data relevant to public integrity, and remain aligned to EU law and international anti-corruption commitments. No significant corrective legislative action was taken in 2025 and neither Parliament nor the Government adopted corrective legislation.

Measures to prevent conflicts of interest in the public sector. Please specify the features and scope of their application (e.g. categories of officials concerned, types of checks and corrective measures depending on the category of officials concerned)

5000 character(s) maximum

Law 197/2025 amended Article 12 of Law 96/2006 (Statute of Deputies and Senators) aiming at operationalise a transparency instrument designed to reduce hidden influence and related conflict-of-interest risks. A Single Register of Transparency of Interests in Parliament (RUTI) will be created (possible use the same as the Government) and MPs' meetings with third parties should be disclosed at least 48 hours in advance, or within 48 hours after if unplanned. Although a step forward, the law remain limited in scope (it targets meetings linked to legislative initiatives "in parliamentary procedure" and mainly those where third parties "manifest interest" while informal channels of influence (events, indirect intermediaries, social settings) may remain outside the register's reach), its effectiveness depends heavily on MPs' compliance and on the capacity/willingness of parliamentary administrations to enforce rules consistently, and has weak sanctions (a written warning, which may not be sufficiently dissuasive for repeated non-compliance). RUTI may improve transparency of some contacts, but it does not by itself replace robust asset/interest disclosure and effective ANI/disciplinary follow-up mechanisms (which remain essential).

--> For the three previous points, **please also provide information and figures on their application/enforcement if available to you**, such as number of detected breaches/irregularities of the various rules in place and the follow-up given (investigations, sanctions, etc.)

Measures to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including their application (i.e. number of reports received, and the follow-up given)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Specific measures to enhance transparency, integrity and accountability in sectors with high risks of corruption, with a view to monitor and prevent corruption and conflict of interests, and where applicable measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups.

- *Such high-risk sectors could include: public procurement, including construction, transport/infrastructure, defence, cohesion, agriculture, environment, healthcare, investor residence schemes, large-scale investments of national interest and the spending of EU funds, urban planning.*
- *In particular, measures to mitigate high risks of corruption in the area of public procurement, such as enhancing transparency and oversight (for example through digital technologies) and promoting fair competition and accountability in public procurement (e.g. targeted actions to address the high share of single bids) and measures to guarantee the effective and independent functioning of the public procurement review bodies.*

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Measures for the prevention of corruption in relation to the issuing of official permits (e.g. related to environment, energy, service provision and various types of construction)

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Repression

The legal framework on the criminalisation and sanctions for corruption and related offences, including foreign bribery

5000 character(s) maximum

Official data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments and the application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by offence if possible). Please indicate whether the cases: involve legal persons; are related to the implementation of EU or national funds; involve high level corruption. Please indicate which data is publicly available and how policy-making is informed by the data

5000 character(s) maximum

Potential obstacles identified in law or in practice to the investigation and prosecution of high-level and complex corruption cases (e.g. political immunity regulation, procedural rules, statute of limitations, cross-border cooperation, pardoning)

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on effectiveness of criminal and non-criminal measures and of sanctions (e.g. recovery measures and administrative sanctions) on both public and private offenders

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the anti-corruption framework - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

III. Media pluralism and media freedom

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding media pluralism and media freedom (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

Freedom of expression has been increasingly challenged in Romania over the past years, particularly as a result of the progressive political capture of parts of the media sector (<https://romania.europalibera.org/a/cum-a-crescut-in-zece-ani-subventia-pentru-partide-de-la-bugetul-statului-de-la-8-la-386-de-milioane-de-lei/33302932.html>). Civil society organisations and international stakeholders, including the European Commission in its annual Rule of Law Reports, have consistently warned about opaque media financing, notably through public funds channelled by political parties, as well as about persistent risks to the independence of the national media regulator and the public service media (<https://www.stareademocratiei.ro/2025/06/11/raport/>; <https://cji.ro/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Starea-mass-media-din-Romania-in-pragul-anului-super-electoral-2024-1.pdf>; <https://activewatch.ro/search/#p=publication>; <https://ipi.media/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/ROMANIA-Media-Capture-Monitoring-Report-Overview-5.pdf>; <https://www.stareademocratiei.ro/2025/07/10/reactiile-organizatiilor-neguvernementale-in-urma-publicarii-raportului-comisiei-europene-privind-statul-de-drept-in-romania/>). These factors, along with market pressure, continue to undermine the reliability of information and public trust in the media. The concentration of financial resources in politically aligned media outlets, combined with the lack of transparent and predictable public support mechanisms for independent journalism, further weakens media pluralism and limits the reach of public-interest reporting.

In 2025, parties received 232 million lei (approx. 46,400,000 EUR) in public subsidies, of which 112 million lei (about 50%) was spent on press and propaganda in the first eleven months (<https://expertforum.ro/subventii-partide-precampanie-noiembrie-2025/>). This sustained flow of public money into media and related activities continues to raise concerns about editorial independence and media pluralism.

In addition to annual state subsidies, Romanian political parties also receive substantial public funds through the reimbursement of electoral campaign expenses, which significantly increase in electoral years. In 2024, a super-electoral year, cumulative reimbursed campaign spending and regular subsidies exceeded one billion lei (<https://expertforum.ro/subventia-partidelor-politice-in-2024>), while additional millions were spent and reimbursed during the 2025 presidential elections.

A dominant share of both subsidies and reimbursed campaign funds was allocated to media, advertising, online promotion, and propaganda, reinforcing the economic dependence of many media outlets on political actors.

This dual public-funding mechanism contributes to structural media capture, undermines editorial independence, and places independent public-interest journalism at a severe competitive disadvantage.

In this extraordinary context, marked by two consecutive years of electoral contests, the European Media Freedom Act (EMFA) became fully applicable across the European Union in August 2025. The EMFA introduces transparency obligations regarding media ownership and public funding of the press, as well as rules aimed at protecting journalists from abusive surveillance and intimidation. However, national implementing legislation has not yet been adopted, and the working group announced by the Ministry of Culture has, to date, operated without transparency). According to the 2025 Media Capture Monitoring Report (<https://ipi.media/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/ROMANIA-Media-Capture-Monitoring-Report-Overview-5.pdf>), which reviews developments related to media capture in Romania in 2025 and assesses the country's compliance with the EMFA, Romania is not fully compliant with any of the standards analysed. The report records a "No" assessment in particular with regard to the use of state funds to influence media content and to the transparency of media ownership. The report sets out a detailed list of findings and recommendations in this regard.

A. Media authorities and bodies

(Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808)

Measures taken to ensure the independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources (financial, human and technical) of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership

[single market relevance] Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards against state / political interference, in particular:

- safeguards to ensure editorial independence of media (private and public)
- specific safeguards for the independence of heads of management and members of the governing boards of public service media (e.g. related to appointment, dismissal), safeguards for their financial and operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions
- **[single market relevance]** information on specific legal provisions and procedures applying to media service providers, including as regards granting /renewal/termination of licenses, company operation, capital entry requirements, concentration and corporate governance

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalists' independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications, referring also, if applicable, to follow-up given to alerts lodged with the Council of Europe's Platform to promote the protection of journalism and safety of journalists

Law enforcement capacity, including during protests and demonstrations, to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

In case of journalists' protection, Romania does not have a dedicated national protection mechanism (e.g., specialised prosecutors, rapid response units, hotlines, or risk-assessment protocols). Threats, harassment, and attacks against journalists are addressed only through general criminal law.

In 2025, multiple serious press freedom violations were documented. In the first six months of the year, Mapping Media Freedom recorded 24 press freedom violations affecting 46 media professionals or media-related entities, amidst the political turmoil following the controversial presidential election.

Particularly relevant cases include:

- death threats against journalists (<https://activewatch.ro/articole/jurnali%C8%99tii-pressone-amenin%C8%9Ba%C8%9Bi-cu-moartea/>);
- searches and seizures of journalists' materials (<https://activewatch.ro/articole/perchezi%C8%9Biile-jurnali%C8%99tilor-care-documenteaz%C4%83-subiecte-de-interes-public-reprezint%C4%83-o-limitare-abuziv%C4%83-a-libert%C4%83%C8%9Bii-presei/>);
- technical surveillance warrants targeting journalists, confirmed and maintained even after the authorities were aware of their professional status (<https://activewatch.ro/articole/scrisoare-deschis%C4%83-mandatele-de-supraveghere-care-vizeaz%C4%83-jurnali%C8%99ti-periculoase-pentru-democra%C8%9Bie/>);
- threats against NGOs in traditional media and on social media (<https://activewatch.ro/articole/suntem-solidari-cu-asocia%C8%9Biile-funky-citizens-%C8%99i-declie/> ; <https://activewatch.ro/articole/organiza%C8%9Biile-vizate-de-postarea-lui-elon-musk-ong-urile-%C3%AEncerc%C4%83-s%C4%83-distrug%C4%83-democra%C8%9Bia-reac%C8%9Bioneaz%C4%83-public/>);

A severe institutional backlash followed Recorder's investigative reporting on the justice system. Senior judicial figures publicly accused journalists of orchestrating campaigns against the judiciary (The President of the Bucharest Court of Appeal, during the press conference 11 December 2025, following the broadcast and publication of the Recorder documentary, mentioned the press investigation was part of a "campaign to destabilise the judicial power", describing it as "public incitement against the constitutional order."

<https://agerpres.ro/2025/12/11/conducerea-cab-se-apara-in-fata-acuzatiilor-din-documentarul-recorder-asistam-la-o-campanie-de-linsa--1511074>). The Superior Council of Magistracy reacted defensively, with actions perceived as intimidatory. In response, at the initiative of a recently established journalists association, A Patra Putere/ The Fourth Estate (<https://apatraputere.ro/>), over 1,000 journalists, editors, and civil society representatives signed an open letter expressing solidarity with Recorder and warning that some of the gravest attacks on press freedom were coming from within the judicial authority itself (<https://pressone.ro/peste-1-000-de-jurnalisti-si-persoane-din-societatea-civila-solidari-cu-recorder-situatia-este-cu-atat-mai-ingrijoratoare-cu-cat-unele-dintre-cele-mai-grave-atacuri-vin-chiar-din-interiorul>). In addition to the institutional attacks, part of the offensive against Recorder is also being carried out by the "same sources of falsehoods and disinformation" that the National Audiovisual Council (CNA) has been sanctioning for years. Consequently, the signatories call on the CNA to fulfil its role as a guarantor of the public interest and to act ex officio in cases of programmes containing disinformation that targeted journalists. CNA replied in a press release that it would analyse this possibility.

Access to information and public documents by public at large and journalists (incl. transparency authorities where they exist, procedures, costs/fees, timeframes, administrative/judicial review of decisions, execution of decisions by public authorities, possible obstacles related to the classification of information)

5000 character(s) maximum

Several legislative initiatives to modify FOIA law with impact on both journalists and CSOs (including journalists functioning as CSOs) were registered in 2025:

- Drastic limitation to access to public interest information (FOIA law) may also occur in case of the adoption of the draft Administrative Procedure Code (also noted as an alert in the 2025 RoL report). If adopted in this form, it will impose requirements that many NGOs, including NGOs media outlets are not structurally prepared for and creates ambiguity around who it applies to and may disproportionately affect smaller organisations with limited resources. Details at: Early Warning and Alert Mechanism - <https://www.fdsc.ro/en/romania-draft-law-risks-turning-csos-into-public-bodies/>. Although the draft had not been adopted by the end of 2025, the proposal moved to interinstitutional consultation which is the final stage before adoption by the government and subsequent submission to Parliament. The language of the bill has remained unchanged and the criticisms and concerns, therefore, remain.
- A draft initiative to amend the FOIA law was reported as restricting access and/or adding burdensome requirements; the initiative was withdrawn following criticism from civil society (<https://www.news.ro/cultura-media/proiectul-modificare-legii-nr-544-2001-privind-liberul-acces-informatiile-interes-public-initiat-deputati-pnl-retras-15-ong-uri-au-reclamat-tradeaza-dispret-profund-fata-cetateni-nesocoteste-1922402319312025111222242973>).
- A legislative initiative that reached the second chamber of Parliament in December 2025 mentions that individuals who request public information verbally must comply with the working hours of the authority /institution and display behaviour that does not disrupt the activity of its staff. Failure to comply would allow staff to remove the person concerned from the premises. The text is ambiguous and lacks clarity and predictability, particularly when referring to "behaviour" (<https://www.cdep.ro/proiecte/2025/500/30/1/se678.pdf>; <https://context.ro/legea-544-2001-este-principalul-instrument-in-baza-caruia-cetatenii-pot-solicita-informatii-de-interes-public-de-la-institutii-si-autoritati-legea-este-folosita-in-special-de-jurnalisti-in-documenta/>).

Lawsuits (incl. SLAPPs - strategic lawsuits against public participation) and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and measures taken to safeguard against manifestly unfounded and abusive lawsuits

5000 character(s) maximum

See below

Any other developments related to media pluralism and freedom - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the system of checks and balances (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

Not directly related to 2025 RoL Report, but very relevant to the system of checks and balance and visibly relevant in the context of the justice independence topic on the Romanian public agenda is the selection, role and activity of the two so-called representatives of civil society in the Superior Council of Magistrates. The current eligibility criteria and selection procedure should be revised: civil society representatives are appointed by the Senate, which introduces a high risk of political bargaining, there is no robust mechanism to screen candidates for past or ongoing political ties, and there are no requirements to have a previous experience, connection, activity within civil society. This disconnect weakens the legitimacy of the representatives as authentic voices of civil society. The role and activity of the representatives of the civils society are purely decorative, clarification of their mandate and accountability is strongly needed.

A. The process for preparing, enacting and implementing laws

[single market relevance] Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders'*/public consultations (including rules and practices on the transparent participation of civil society to policy development and decision-making processes), and transparency and quality of the legislative process in the preparatory, the parliamentary and implementation phase (including guidance on how to implement legislation)

* This includes also the consultation of social partners

5000 character(s) maximum

Across these 2025 cases, several recurring deficiencies can be identified:

1. Overuse of emergency procedures, which effectively circumvent public consultation (94 Emergency Ordinances in 2025 while the number of laws debated and enacted by the Parliament was 247 laws enacted by the Parliament)
2. Late-stage consultation, when policy choices are already fixed or short consultation periods
Consultations are conducted too late in the policy cycle, usually on already drafted IPMs or draft legislation (<https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099120425080537862/pdf/P179784-2be8ff73-2b2a-40d4-b957-1923ba75eaaa.pdf>). At present, relevant stakeholders are not engaged in the early stages of the process despite the quality of the texts is directly influenced by timely collection of relevant feedback and integrate it during drafting process.

In early 2025, the Romanian Government adopted Emergency Ordinance No. 1/2025, regulating political advertising and online political content during the electoral period. The ordinance was adopted without prior public consultation and without a transparent decision-making process (<https://www.stareademocratiei.ro/2025/01/16/modificarea-legii-electorale-trebuie-facuta-transparent-si-fara-a-afecta-drepturile-fundamentale-ale-cetatenilor/>; <https://expertforum.ro/en/political-advertising-in-the-2025-elections/>). Several CSOs, including Expert Forum, ActiveWatch, APTI and CeRe, publicly criticised the ordinance, arguing that no meaningful consultation with civil society or digital rights experts took place before adoption, the ordinance introduced vague and overly broad definitions that could affect freedom of expression, the use of an emergency ordinance bypassed the safeguards of Law no. 52/2003 on decisional transparency. NGOs also warned that the

ordinance risked conflicting with EU law, particularly the Digital Services Act (DSA), and that the lack of consultation undermined the legitimacy and quality of the regulation.

This case illustrates a recurring structural problem: the systematic use of emergency legislation to avoid public consultation, even in areas with significant impact on fundamental rights and democratic processes.

The business sector publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the quality and transparency of policy and legislative processes in 2025, highlighting deficiencies in stakeholder consultation. According to AmCham Romania's 2025 business climate survey, only 21% of companies assessed Romania's investment climate as good or very good, citing uncertainty around public policies and lack of predictability in legislative and fiscal measures, in part reflecting insufficient engagement with stakeholders (<https://www.amcham.ro/communication/amcham-press-releases/results-of-the-amcham-survey-on-romania's-investment-and-business-climate-in-2025---7th-edition>).

[single market relevance] Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency /urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards to ensure legal certainty, the stability of the legal framework and non-discrimination.

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and application of states of emergency (or analogous regimes), including judicial review and parliamentary oversight

5000 character(s) maximum

Regime for constitutional review of laws

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Independent authorities

Independence, resources, capacity and powers (including effective access to relevant data) of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman

institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions

(Cf. the website of the European Court of Auditors: <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/SupremeAuditInstitutions.aspx#>)

5000 character(s) maximum

At the EU level, the 2025 EU Civil Society Strategy recognises the need to support and protect civil society actors and HRDs, but it does not impose binding obligations on Member States to establish national protection mechanisms. In Romania, this gap is particularly visible given the absence of a National Human Rights Institution accredited under the UN Paris Principles and the fragility of existing bodies, such as the Ombudsman (Avocatul Poporului) and the National Council for Combating Discrimination (CNCD); that is one of the recurring recommendations in the European Commission Rule of Law Reports for Romania.

The tendency towards weaker human rights protections is reflected by the proposal launched by the governing coalition to merge the CNCD with the Ombudsman (<https://hotnews.ro/un-elefant-se-uneste-cu-o-furnica-iar-furnicii-i-se-taie-4-picioare-acuze-ca-cineva-incearca-sa-l-prosteasca-pe-premier-in-procesul-de-restructurare-2016368>). In response, civil society organisations called on the government and the presidency to abandon this proposal. More than 100 members of the Anti-Discrimination Coalition and the RESPECT Platform for Rights and Freedoms warned that such a merger would drastically weaken prevention of discrimination; it could contravene EU directives on equality bodies; and victims of discrimination could lose effective access to remedies (<https://www.digi24.ro/stiri/actualitate/societatea-civila-cere-protejarea-cncd-comasarea-cu-avocatul-poporului-ar-slabi-lupta-impotriva-discriminarii-3337601>). No concrete action had been taken to date.

The lack of interest on the part of public institutions to strengthen the protection of those who defend human rights is illustrated by a recent example (December 2025) and comes from a professional category that is among the best placed both to understand and to act in this field, namely the magistrates.

Statistics/reports concerning the follow-up to recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies and supreme audit institutions in the past year

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards to ensure the effective independence of supervisory and regulatory authorities with a direct impact on economic operators such as national economic oversight, enforcement and competition authorities

C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

[single market relevance] Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and respect of the good administration principle (including the obligation of the administration to give reasons for decisions)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Judicial review of administrative decisions: short description of the general regime (in particular competent court, scope, suspensive effect, interim measures, and any applicable specific rules or derogations from the general regime of judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards (other than judicial review) regarding decisions or inaction of administrative authorities, including remedies (e.g. administrative review)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Rules and practices related to the application by all courts, including constitutional jurisdictions, of the preliminary ruling procedure (Art. 267 TFEU)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Implementation of final judgments by the public administration and State institutions and follow-up given to supranational judgments, including decisions from the European Court of Human Rights, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation

5000 character(s) maximum

No progress on this side, see the example below.

Despite the fact that Article 369 of the Criminal Code criminalises incitement to hatred, violence, and discrimination, and although Romania is monitored by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe for failing to implement related ECtHR judgments (European Court of Human Rights, M.C. and A.C. v. Romania (Application no. 12060/12) and ACCEPT and others v. Romania (Application no. 19237/16), national

authorities are not taking concrete measures to combat hate speech. Key problems include the lack of a unified methodology for identifying and investigating bias motivation, the routine failure to examine hate indicators ex officio, and the systematic avoidance of applying aggravating circumstances related to hate speech. The situation is made worse by the absence of specialised victim support mechanisms.

A further critical deficiency concerns the lack of comprehensive and disaggregated data on hate speech and hate crime. The Council of Europe and OSCE/ODIHR (<https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-commission-against-racism-and-intolerance/romania>; <https://hatecrime.osce.org/reporting/romania/2024>) have repeatedly stressed that Romania lacks reliable statistics on reported incidents, investigations, prosecutions, convictions, and bias motivation. Without such data, it is impossible to assess trends, measure the effectiveness of legal responses or design evidence-based policies.

Oversight, including by courts, of the use of intrusive surveillance software by national authorities

5000 character(s) maximum

According to Civicus Monitor, Romania has relatively narrowed civic space (<https://monitor.civicus.org/country/romania/>), with a growing trend of intimidation targeting civic actors, especially organisations working in sensitive areas such as minority rights, environmental protection, and anti-corruption. However, no unauthorised interference with the privacy or communications of CSOs or associated individuals or cases of authorities breaking into CSO offices or accessing CSO documents without due judicial authorisation have been reported.

In case of journalists, there is a significant dangerous precedent (<https://activewatch.ro/articole/scrisoare-deschis%C4%83-mandatele-de-supraveghere-care-vizeaz%C4%83-jurnali%C8%99ti-periculoase-pentru-democra%C8%9Bie/>) reported publicly in March 2025, about the National Anticorruption Directorate (DNA) in Iași, who previously placed two investigative journalists under surveillance, after publishing an investigation into possible corruption. According to information released in the press, they were wiretapped for two months, physically followed, and extensively monitored, with no public information to date about the initiation of an internal investigation to verify whether the measures taken were legal and proportionate to their stated purpose. Although the surveillance took place in 2023, it was made known in 2025.

D. The enabling framework for civil society

Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. legal framework and its application in practice incl. registration, transparency and dissolution rules)

5000 character(s) maximum

The current framework law for CSOs has been subject to a comprehensive revision initiated by the government, through the Ministry of Justice, in 2023. The draft law was developed in consultation with civil society organisations and, despite completing the necessary stages, is currently stalled in Parliament, awaiting plenary debate following the issuance of all required opinions by the parliamentary committees.

If adopted, the draft (https://www.cdep.ro/pls/proiecte/upl_pck2015.proiect?cam=2&idp=21379) would introduce several important amendments to the existing legislation, including reducing bureaucratic requirements, simplifying judicial procedures related to the establishment and governance of NGOs, and further digitising existing processes. These reforms include the modernisation of the National Register of Non-Profit Legal Entities maintained by the Ministry of Justice, as well as the unification of NGO registers.

Despite additional efforts by several NGOs to explain the necessity of adopting the draft law, it has not yet been

placed on the agenda of the Chamber of Deputies and has therefore not been debated. There is growing concern that the current wave of extremism represented by the parties in Parliament may either leave the draft dormant or introduce new amendments that, at this stage, could negatively affect the proposed reforms. Moreover, the adoption of the law is necessary as several of its provisions are linked to the digital reform of court registries under the EUs National Programme for Recovery and Resilience (NRRP).

Rules and practices having an impact on the effective operation and safety of civil society organisations and human rights defenders. This includes measures to protect them from attacks – verbal, physical or on-line –, intimidation, legal threats incl. SLAPPs, negative narratives or smear campaigns, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc. It also includes measures to monitor threats or attacks and dedicated support services, as well as available remedies

5000 character(s) maximum

Operation (see also in previous sections)

A public debate on the upcoming mechanism for supervising the activity of associations and foundations to further the implementation of the anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing law was organised in August 2025. Several CSOs highlighted the areas of improvement and most of their comments were taken into consideration (<https://www.fdsc.ro/opinie-fdsc-mecanismul-de-supraveghere-a-activitatii-asociatiilor-si-fundatiilor/>; <https://acdd.ro/2025/09/02/finantarea-terorismului-si-sectorul-non-profit/>; <https://apador.org/observatiile-apador-ch-cu-privire-la-proiectul-de-ordin-privind-supravegherea-ong-urilor/>). However, the text adopted in September 2025 (<https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliuDocument/302390>) includes additional administrative burdens for CSOs: the CSO's board of directors has to adopt an internal procedure to prevent terrorist financing and to verify annually, when approving the financial statements, that this procedure has been implemented. This creates a recurring verification obligation (linked to the annual approval of financial statements) and may require documentation, internal audit or review processes that many NGOs may not currently have the capacity to implement.

Safety

There is no permanent, dedicated national protection mechanism in Romania for HRDs or civic activists. HRDs and CSOs are treated as ordinary citizens or legal persons when facing threats, harassment, or violence, despite the specific risks associated with their public interest work. The institutional response is lengthy and often without concrete results. The lack of firm reactions and condemnation from the authorities could lead to an increasingly hostile and unpredictable environment for CSOs and HRDs.

The year 2025 was marked by heightened social polarisation, amplified by electoral campaigns and the populist rhetoric of certain political actors, which fuelled media and online campaigns against NGOs, journalists, and civic activists. In recent years, hostile rhetoric directed at CSOs has intensified, with organisations labelled in the public sphere as “foreign agents”, “ideological activists” or “organisations funded from external sources”. In 2025, several public lists were circulated online targeting NGO members, who were labelled as “Soros-funded” (<https://www.gandul.ro/actualitate/marile-surpriza-ale-retelei-soros-in-romania-pe-lista-se-afla-si-nicusor-dan-calin-georgescu-gabriel-liceanu-lucian-mindruta-sau-victor-rebengiuc-20628119>; <https://activewatch.ro/publicatii/soros-ad-portas-again-freeex-digest-no-10/>), and which were produced and distributed by extremist groups (https://www.disinfo.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/20251103_Disinfo-landscape-in-Romania-V2.pdf). These smear campaigns aimed to undermine public trust in civil society, and they intensified in the context of the 2025 electoral campaigns, when extremist political parties, as well as certain media actors and influencers promoted narratives meant to discredit civic activists and to cast doubt on Romania's international commitment to democratic values.

Although the National Audiovisual Council (CNA) imposed sanctions for the broadcasting of hate-inciting messages and disinformation, the impact of these measures remains limited, both because the fines are relatively small and because such violations are repeated; some media outlets have budgets specifically allocated for paying such penalties.

Members of an NGO advocating for Roma rights received direct threats, including images of firearms and legionary symbols (<https://www.digi24.ro/stiri/actualitate/ancheta-dupa-ce-membrii-unui-ong-pentru-drepturile-romilor-au-primit-amenintari-si-imagini-cu-arme-de-foc-si-simboluri-legionare-3036237>), and several LGBTQI+ organisations were targeted with threats against their offices and members (<https://buletin.de/bucuresti/asociatia-mozaiq-reclama-indemnuri-la-distrugetea-sediului-din-bucuresti-difuzate-online-proiect-de-lege-anti-lgbtq-depus-de-un-parlamentar-din-ilfov/>). Although the Romanian police announced an investigation, there has been no publicly available information about the status or investigation into both cases.

Moreover, discriminatory discourse is not limited to the online environment or extremist groups; representatives of the state also spread it. In 2025, a member of the Parliamentary Group of National Minorities, made discriminatory statements targeting the LGBTQI+ community and the NGOs promoting such rights, claiming that “in Roma communities, campaigns promoting homosexuality have been launched by Romanian NGOs funded by billionaire George Soros” (<https://ziare.com/nicolae-paun/deputat-reclamat-cncd-comentarii-ong-tineri-romi-1966966>). Such rhetoric coming from a public official fuels intolerance and legitimises hate speech, threatening the space for CSOs to operate.

Organisation of financial support for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. framework to ensure access to funding, and for financial viability, taxation/incentive/donation systems, measures to ensure a fair distribution of funding)

5000 character(s) maximum

No progress since the previous report

E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

If there have been developments related to initiatives to foster a rule of law culture, please specify, which (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, contributions from civil society, education initiatives, etc.)

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the system of checks and balances - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

The SLAPP phenomenon, understood in its broader sense rather than the restrictive definition contained in the EU Directive, appears to be on the rise in Romania. However, at present there is no comprehensive inventory of cases that could meet the criteria for classification as SLAPPs, whether under the narrow or the broader definition. Such an inventory would ensure that Romania’s mandatory transposition of the Anti-SLAPP Directive is conducted not only to comply with EU requirements, but also in response to concrete needs on the ground in

Romania.

Although the Directive establishes only a minimum standard of protection, limited to civil and commercial proceedings with a cross-border element, nothing prevents Member States from extending these protections to criminal and administrative proceedings, as well as to purely domestic cases without a cross-border element, including situations in which the NGO, activist or journalist is also the party bringing the claim in response to a power imbalance.

A group of CSOs, including journalists, supports the need for this broader approach in the drafting of the national legislation transposing the Directive. Despite calls from civil society (<https://activewatch.ro/articole/proiectul-de-lege-anti-slapp-scrisoare-c%C4%83tre-ministerul-justi%C8%9Biei/>; <https://apador.org/ministerul-justitiei-promite-o-protectie-mai-buna-a-vocilor-incomode-din-societate-prin-viitoarea-lege-anti-slapp/>; more legal analysis for the draft law https://baciupartners.ro/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Articol-SLAPP-02.05.2025_.pdf.pdf) to extend the scope of the transposition law to domestic civil cases as well as to the administrative and criminal fields, the Ministry of Justice has refused to adopt the full extension requested by CSOs and agreed only to extend the scope of the Directive to national civil cases. At the time of answering to this questionnaire, the final version of the draft law has not been published.

The Romanian Institute for Human Rights (IRDO) has been designated as the national SLAPP focal point since 2023 and is supposed to conduct research, awareness-raising, and coordination on SLAPP issues. However, its capacity is constrained by limited resources and institutional gaps, and it does not currently function as a dedicated protective mechanism with enforcement authority. IRDO is not accredited as an independent NHRI under the UN Paris Principles. Without NHRI-level independence, IRDO is structurally ill-equipped to confront SLAPPs that involve state or politically connected plaintiffs. Moreover, According to ENNHRI, the Romanian Institute for Human Rights reported a staff deficit of approximately 60% in 2023, caused by low salaries and the loss of personnel, and warned that additional tasks would further strain its limited capacity. According to the latest information available in 2025 on ENNHRI website, IRDO “does not have adequate resources to carry out the full breath of its mandate” and the EC 2025 Rule of Law Report mentions that “there is a real risk that the RIRH ceases its functioning in the coming months”.

Following discussions between a group of CSOs and the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman expressed its intention to be designated as a focal point under the Directive, responsible for the centralisation of information, publication of final court decisions, dissemination of available resources, and the provision of guarantees for potential SLAPP targets. However, it must be noted that the Ombudsman is facing legitimacy issues, as the mandate expired in June 2024 and Parliament had not begun the procedure to appoint a new Ombudsman, despite concerns raised by civil society on this matter (https://www.stareademocratiei.ro/2024/12/11/viitorul-avocat-al-poporului-trebuie-sa-fie-un-garant-real-al-protejarii-drepturilor-fundamentale/?fbclid=IwY2xjawPJ8s9leHRuA2FibQlXMAbicmlkETBGS0c1ZzRJSUNaUHYzRjFmc3J0YwZhchBfaWQQMjlyMDM5MTc4ODlwMDg5MgABHq8T8S0XXY2uJzOZLEjB_OCXWI1SYKNrWpKjm8DFaJBS8R75T3QqnJ1_7IA_aem_CDkUF9PZaESuMC1eQNctWw; https://www.facebook.com/stiri.org/posts/pfbid02SyUz9vcxmrmV9JDwyojTZ3GiLUnQXJ56m94F6Kbenq2ep1ErHwC7kTgW31trjMVI).

Meanwhile, lawsuits with potential to intimidate activists and journalists continue. A relevant example is the case filed by the state-owned company Romgaz against Greenpeace Romania, an organisation publicly opposing the Black Sea gas extraction project (Neptun Deep). Romgaz requested the dissolution of Greenpeace Romania based on unfounded allegations of insolvency, an action perceived by civil society as a SLAPP type attempt. Although the Minister of Energy at the time supported the Romgaz request, the company later withdrew its complaint and was ordered to pay legal costs to Greenpeace (<https://www.greenpeace.org/romania/articol/10798/romgaz-bahamas-renunta-la-dizolvarea-greenpeace-si-au-dat-seama-ca-pierd/>).

Cross-pillar elements: cross-border rule of law issues related to the Single Market

If there are any significant challenges concerning the Single Market you have been facing in a cross-border context relating to any of the four pillars of the report, including for example issues with market access and the conditions for economic activities, that you would like to highlight, please do so here.

Given the cross-cutting nature of this question, it is included as a separate section in the questionnaire. Information collected under this question will however be integrated under the relevant existing pillar(s) of the Report.

5000 character(s) maximum

Supporting document upload

If you would like to submit any supporting document(s) to your contribution, please upload your file(s) here

Contact

rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu