Criminal justice response to corruption at sub-national level

Anca Jurma Romania

Corruption at sub-national level

Sub-national governments, in OECD countries, account for (in average):

- 40% of total public expenditure
- 55% of total public investment
- 60% of public staff expenditure

(worldwide – 34,7% of public staff expenditure)

Most frequent corruption typologies at sub-national level

- Corruption in public procurement (contracts, projects funded by local budgets)
- Bribery / fraud with EU funds (EU financing for local projects)
- Corruption related to employment of staff in local administration
- Corruption related to granting licenses, authorizations, permits
- Corruption in financing of political campaigns of local elections
- Infringing conflict of interests and incompatibility rules
- Etc...

Responsible for the corruption offenses

- Mayors, vice-mayors
- Presidents, vice-presidents of regional / local councils
- Members of the regional, local councils
- Civil servants with decision power in the city/town halls, local governments
- Other persons involved in the corruption scheme (natural persons or companies paying the bribe, representatives of locally owned enterprises, natural persons or companies acting as intermediaries, as money launderers, etc.)

Examples of corruption cases at subnational level (Romania) I

Mayor of S – traffic of influence and money laundering

- Received a bribe of 1,25 million Euro to influence the winning by the briber of three public contracts with the municipally owned Water Company, in value of 15 million Euro
- Searches found stashes of money, gold bars hidden in a stable and 125 valuable paintings under a false wall
- Mayor convicted to 6 years imprisonment prohibition of holding public office and confiscation of the bribe

Examples of corruption cases at subnational level (Romania) II

President of the County Council T – abuse of office

- He was also president of the regional branch of the biggest political party, later become the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies in Parliament – very influential
- 2 people worked full time for the regional branch of the political party
- The President put pressure on the director of the Regional Directorate for Child Protection to fictitiously employ the 2 persons
- The 2 people received salaries for 1 year from the RDCP, while in fact working for the political party regional branch
- He was convicted to 3 years and 6 months in prison for abuse of office; other persons have also been convicted in the case

Examples of corruption cases at subnational level (Romania) III

Mayor of commune VM – abuse of office

- Scandal around employments based on political affiliations in public institutions at local level
- Case happened at a regional branch (ABA) of the National Administration "Romanian Waters"
- General Director of the regional ABA ("I am a political animal and will become a minister
 one day") colluded with the mayor of the commune VM to fictitiously employ a person with
 no professional qualifications at the townhall, to then second her at the ABA
- The superior of the seconded person became a whistleblower; talked to the press and filed a complaint with the prosecution; he got dismissed from his position; filed a law suit and won
- The mayor, the general director and other persons have been indicted for abuse of office

Main categories of issues:

- Capacity to detect and investigate corruption at sub-national level
- ✓ Independence of the investigating and prosecuting authorities and courts
- ✓ Procedure impediments
- ✓ Practice

Capacity to detect and investigate corruption

- The use of all detection means, including:
 - reporting by citizens / public officials / media / whistleblowers
 - use of audit reports
- How the whistleblower reports are used in detection / investigation of corruption; the follow up given to them; means of protection used
- The internal organization of the prosecution office and LEAs units; division of competencies between central and local level
- Resources human, technical, financial
- Specialized training of the LEAs officials, of the prosecutors

II. Independence of the investigating and prosecuting authorities

- Whether there have been any changes from the previous evaluation rounds
- Whether the local LEAs, prosecutors and courts are not captures by the political powers at local level; if safeguards are in place to avoid this risk
- Whether LEAs or prosecutors have excessive reporting obligations at local politically level

III. Procedure

- inviolability or immunity of jurisdiction,
- special procedures,
- special competencies,
- special jurisdiction

IV. Practice

- Are there cases opened, investigated, concluded by court decisions? If not, what are the obstacles?
- Statistics and examples of cases
- Results of investigations and statistics are made public
- Type and level of sanctions applied

Thank you for your attention!

Anca Jurma