

**“ȘTEFAN CEL MARE” ACADEMY OF THE MINISTRY OF INTERNAL  
AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL “CRIMINAL SCIENCES AND PUBLIC LAW”**

Manuscript  
C.Z.U: 343.352:343.98(043.2)=111

**ȘEVCIUC Eugeniu**

**METHODOLOGY FOR INVESTIGATING CORRUPTION  
OFFENCES COMMITTED BY PUBLIC OFFICIALS WITH  
SPECIAL STATUS**

**SUMMARY OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS IN LAW**

**Specialty: 554.04 – Criminalistics, Forensic Examination,  
Operative Investigations**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Author:</b>                | <b>ȘEVCIUC Eugeniu</b>  |
| <b>Doctoral supervisor:</b>   | <b>OSTAVCIUC Dinu,</b><br>Doctor Habilitated in Law,<br>University Professor  |
| <b>Supervisory Committee:</b> | <b>OSOIANU Tudor ,</b><br>PhD in Law, University Professor<br><b>ODAGIU Iurie,</b><br>PhD in Law, Associate Professor<br><b>RUSNAC Constantin,</b><br>PhD in Law, Associate Professor |

**CHIȘINĂU, 2026**

The thesis was developed within the Doctoral School „Criminal Sciences and Public Law” of the „Ștefan cel Mare” Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova.

**Author:**

**ȘEVCIUC Eugeniu**

**Doctoral Committee:**

**GLAVAN Boris, Chairman of the Committee**, Doctor Habilitated in Law, Associate Professor, Ștefan cel Mare Academy of the MIA

**OSTAVCIUC Dinu, Doctoral Supervisor**, Doctor Habilitated in Law, University Professor, Ștefan cel Mare Academy of the MIA

**DOLEA Igor, Official Reviewer**, Doctor Habilitated in Law, University Professor, Moldova State University

**OSOIANU Tudor, Official Reviewer**, PhD in Law, University Professor, Ștefan cel Mare Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs

**RUSU Vitalie, Official Reviewer**, PhD in Law, University Professor, Alecu Russo State University of Bălți

**Secretary of the Doctoral Committee:**

**PILAT Artiom**, PhD in Law, Associate Professor, Ștefan cel Mare Academy of the MIA.

The public defense will take place on 15 May 2026, at 10.00, at the Ștefan cel Mare Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, at the following address: Chișinău, 21 Gheorghe Asachi Street, administrative building, 2nd floor, Boardroom..

The abstract and the doctoral thesis may be consulted at the library of the Ștefan cel Mare Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova, on the webpage of the Doctoral School “Criminal Sciences and Public Law” (<https://www.academy.police.md/scoala-doctorala/sustinere-teze-de-doctorat/teze-de-doctorat>) and on the webpage of the National Agency for Quality Assurance in Education and Research ([www.cnaa.md](http://www.cnaa.md)).

The summary was sent to \_\_\_\_\_ 2026

**Author:**

\_\_\_\_\_ ȘEVCIUC Eugeniu

**Secretary**

**of the Doctoral Committee:**

\_\_\_\_\_ PILAT Artiom,  
PhD in Law,  
Associate Professor

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH.....                    | 4     |
| SUMMARY OF THE THESIS CHAPTERS.....                          | 14    |
| GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....                 | 25    |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY.....  | 37    |
| LIST OF THE AUTHOR'S PUBLICATIONS ON THE THESIS TOPIC.....   | 41    |
| ANNOTATION (in Romanian, English and Russian languages)..... | 43-45 |

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

**Relevance and importance of the topic, positioning within international, national, and regional concerns.** The methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status represents, in the current context, one of the most relevant directions of research in the field of criminalistics. Corruption, in its profound meaning, constitutes not only a criminal phenomenon, but also a destructive process affecting public order and the moral values underpinning the rule of law. The involvement of public officials with special status in corrupt activities produces a systemic effect, undermining the credibility of institutions and citizens' trust in justice.

The relevance of the topic derives from the necessity to improve the mechanisms for detecting, investigating, and preventing such acts, which, by the nature of both active and passive subjects, are characterized by a high degree of complexity and concealment. A public official with special status is a qualified subject, professionally trained in the application of the law, knowledgeable about procedures, the legal limits of procedural measures, and the vulnerabilities of the system. Under these conditions, the investigation of internal corruption becomes a major scientific and practical challenge, requiring a differentiated methodology capable of correlating criminalistic tactics and methodology, procedural safeguards, and modern digital evidence tools.

In the context of the Republic of Moldova, the research topic is particularly significant also in light of the European integration process and the commitments undertaken within international anti-corruption mechanisms. Government Decision No. 235/2021 on the Government Action Plan for 2021–2022 expressly emphasizes the strengthening of institutional capacities to combat corruption, particularly among officials within law enforcement and public order structures. Corruption in these areas generates domino effects: weakening of institutional discipline, distortion of evidentiary integrity, compromise of investigations, and ultimately, deterioration of the state's image before international partners.

From a criminalistic perspective, the investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status requires an integrated approach based on a specific criminalistic characteristic: the analysis of the offender's personality, the organizational context, psychological factors, and the particularities of the professional environment. These elements determine the *modus operandi*, the selection of evidentiary means, and the choice of appropriate investigative tactics.

At the international level, concern regarding the investigation of corruption among public officials, including those with special status, is

constant and supported by multiple normative frameworks. The United Nations Convention against Corruption (New York, 2003) represents the fundamental instrument obliging signatory states to adopt legislative and institutional measures for the prevention, investigation, and sanctioning of corruption. The Convention emphasizes the integrity of public officials and the establishment of specialized investigative bodies trained to identify and prove acts of corruption with professionalism and impartiality.

The Council of Europe, through the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), has highlighted in its recent reports the importance of strengthening the independence of anti-corruption institutions and international cooperation in cases of corruption committed by uniformed personnel or officials with special status. The European Union, through Directive (EU) 2017/1371 on the protection of the Union's financial interests and the European Anti-Corruption Pact 2021–2024, emphasizes the transnational nature of institutional corruption, recommending the use of modern technologies, digital evidence, and joint investigation teams.

Likewise, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (Paris, 1997), has extended the concept of criminal liability to the entire administrative network, demonstrating that the phenomenon of corruption cannot be limited to a single professional category, but requires an integrated approach at the global level.

In doctrine, authors such as Peter Stelfox<sup>1</sup> consider that “the investigation of internal corruption must combine the scientific methods of criminalistics with organizational psychology and the principles of professional ethics.” In Russian-language scholarship, it is emphasized that “the tactics of investigations into corruption among law enforcement officials must be based on the systemic analysis of hierarchical relations, internal pressures, and institutional loyalties.”

These trends are also reflected in the practice of the European Union, where “internal affairs” investigations are standardized, and criminalistic methodologies include clear procedures for the collection, preservation, and evaluation of evidence in cases involving persons with special status. The Republic of Moldova, as a candidate country for accession to the European Union, is required to harmonize its own investigative procedures with these international standards, while ensuring the protection of fundamental rights and the principle of evidentiary integrity.

In the Republic of Moldova, combating corruption committed by

---

<sup>1</sup> Stelfox, Peter, *Criminal Investigation: An Introduction to Principles and Practice*, 1st Edition, London, 2009, 256 p., ISBN 9781315880730

public officials with special status represents a strategic priority, both within domestic policies and in the context of European commitments. At the legislative level, the Criminal Code of the Republic of Moldova, the Code of Criminal Procedure, as well as special laws, establish the regulatory framework governing the criminal and disciplinary liability of these categories of persons.

At the institutional level, the National Anticorruption Center, the Anticorruption Prosecutor's Office, and the Intelligence and Security Service, based on Joint Order No. 53/405/83/307-O of 15 September 2020, have established mechanisms for inter-institutional cooperation in the investigation of corruption offences. However, the analysis of judicial practice reveals significant methodological shortcomings: the lack of standardized criminalistic models, inconsistent application of special investigative measures, and insufficient tactical training of criminal investigation officers.

In this regard, the study of the methodology for investigating these offences has not only theoretical value but also particular practical importance, contributing to the development of a scientific framework for professional training and for improving the tactics of conducting criminal investigation actions and prompt intervention activities. At the same time, the topic aligns with the regional concerns of Eastern European countries, where institutional corruption remains a vulnerability factor for political stability and national security. Regional initiatives—such as the Eastern Partnership and the GUAM Anti-Corruption Platform—promote the exchange of best practices and cooperation among member states in combating cross-border corruption.

In this context, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, and Ukraine are developing joint mechanisms for investigation, training, and information exchange, including on the basis of cooperation protocols with EUROPOL and FRONTEX. Thus, the investigation of corruption among public officials with special status goes beyond the internal dimension, becoming integrated into a regional network of legal security and operational cooperation.

By way of example, we refer to the following authors from the Republic of Moldova and other states who have addressed aspects of criminalistic methodology and tactics related to the forensic investigation of offences: Cușnir V., Osoianu T., Ostavciuc D., Odagiu Iu., Rusnac C., Glavan B., Gurin V., Cicala A., Vizdoagă I., Gheorghită M., Dolea I., Roman D., Rusu V., Cojocaru R., Golubenco Gh., Suciuc E., Stancu E., Ruiu M., Ciopraga Au., Jitariuc V., Popa L., A.-G. Necula, A.-C. Moise, C. Suciuc, R. Tocan, C.-E. Tolbaru, and others.

In conclusion, the relevance and importance of the topic arise from

the intersection of three major dimensions: international, national, and regional. At the international level, corruption among public officials with special status is treated as a threat to the rule of law and collective security. At the national level, the Republic of Moldova is strengthening its efforts to combat this phenomenon through institutional and legislative reforms. At the regional level, cooperation among states in the region, through common legal and operational mechanisms, provides the premises for an effective fight against systemic corruption. Therefore, the research on the methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status contributes to strengthening the theoretical and practical framework of modern criminalistics, ensuring better protection of constitutional values, public order, and the general interest.

**Description of the situation in the field of research and identification of research problems.** The study of the field of investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status reveals a complex and highly relevant issue, situated at the intersection of criminalistics, criminal law, criminal procedural law, and the ethics of public office. Corruption within institutions responsible for law enforcement represents one of the most dangerous forms of criminality, as it distorts the very mechanisms designed to combat it. In the Republic of Moldova, this phenomenon has acquired systemic dimensions, affecting public trust, the fairness of justice, and the efficiency of criminal investigation activities.

The doctrinal and practical analysis carried out within this research has highlighted that, although the general issue of corruption has been addressed in numerous scientific works, aspects concerning the methodology for investigating corruption committed by public officials with special status remain fragmented and insufficiently developed. Most existing studies, both in national and foreign literature, examine corruption from a general perspective, without thoroughly analyzing the behavioral, professional, and psychological specifics of officials holding special status, as well as the criminalistic particularities generated by such status.

From a legislative standpoint, the normative framework of the Republic of Moldova provides detailed regulation of the constituent elements of corruption offences and establishes the competencies of criminal investigation bodies. However, there is a lack of a unified criminalistic methodology for investigation, adapted to the professional status of these officials. Judicial practice demonstrates that the investigation of corruption cases involving public officials with special status faces major obstacles: concealment of evidence, issues related to the conclusiveness, relevance, and usefulness of evidence, manipulation of evidentiary means, and the perpetrators' advanced knowledge of operative tactics. These elements generate active resistance to investigation, thus requir-

ing a scientifically grounded strategy based on specific tactics and modern evidentiary techniques.

At the theoretical level, the research identifies a clear methodological gap in the specialized literature concerning institutional corruption involving public officials with special status. Although authors such as T. Osoianu, D. Ostavciuc, Iu. Odagiu, C. Rusnac, B. Glavan, M. Gheorghită, V. Gurin, V. Cușnir, M. Avram, A. Donciu, and others have developed important works in the field of interviewing tactics, crime scene investigation, and the application of special investigative measures, an integrated approach to these procedures within a methodology specifically dedicated to corruption among public officials with special status is lacking. This doctrinal deficiency limits the ability of criminal investigation bodies to act coherently, particularly in cases involving a high degree of hierarchy or inter-institutional involvement.

Another essential aspect of the researched situation is the low level of uniformity in the application of criminalistic methodology. Practice demonstrates that, in the absence of generalized methodological guidelines, investigations are predominantly conducted based on the individual experience of the criminal investigation officer, without a scientific systematization of the steps to be followed. Thus, there are cases in which evidence is collected improperly and the chain of custody is not fully respected, leading to the exclusion of evidence by the courts.

In addition to technical-criminalistic deficiencies, the research has also identified institutional problems: fragmentation of competencies among law enforcement bodies, insufficient technical equipment, and the absence of coherent continuous training programs for anti-corruption investigators. Moreover, hierarchical and corporatist influences within the institutions in which public officials with special status operate may generate internal pressures on criminal proceedings, reducing the independence of investigators and affecting the impartiality of the evidentiary process.

At the international level, modern trends in combating institutional corruption focus on the use of digital evidence, surveillance of encrypted communications, financial analysis of flows, and real-time cross-border cooperation. These modern investigative tools, already well established in the member states of the European Union, are not yet fully implemented in the Republic of Moldova, which limits the effectiveness of investigations and hinders alignment with European standards of integrity and transparency. Therefore, the current situation in the field of research is characterized by an imbalance between the normative and operational dimensions, between doctrinal requirements and the practical realities of criminal investigation. The absence of a unified methodological sys-



tem results in a heterogeneous application of procedures and reduced efficiency in detecting corruption offences committed by public officials with special status.

The present work aims to contribute to remedying these shortcomings by formulating a criminalistic methodology for investigating corruption committed by public officials with special status, grounded in the principles of criminalistics, the lawful administration of evidence, the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and operational efficiency.

**The important scientific problem solved through this research consists** in the development and substantiation of a unified criminalistic methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status, integrating the principles of legality, evidentiary integrity, and tactical efficiency. The study identified and systematized the criminalistic particularities specific to this category of subjects, providing a theoretical and practical framework for the coherent conduct of criminal investigation actions. The research enabled the correlation of the theoretical elements of criminalistic methodology with procedural tactics and the application of special investigative measures, contributing to the standardization of practice and the enhancement of evidentiary quality. Thus, the scientific problem addressed materializes in the creation of an integrated criminalistic methodology, adapted to the status of public officials with special powers, offering investigators modern tools for the detection, documentation, and evidentiary substantiation of corruption offences, in full compliance with European standards and the principles of the rule of law.

**The aim of the study consists** in conducting a comprehensive scientific research, both theoretical and applied, focused on the development of a modern criminalistic methodology adapted to the particularities of the special status of public officials, intended for the effective investigation of corruption offences committed by this professional category. The research seeks to provide a coherent scientific framework for the proper application of criminalistic means and methods, in order to increase the efficiency of criminal investigation activities, the application of special investigative measures, and to ensure an evidentiary process conducted with integrity, in accordance with European standards of the rule of law.

In order to achieve the proposed aim, the following **main objectives** were formulated:

- identifying conceptual inconsistencies and methodological gaps demonstrating the current absence of a coherent, unified, and practically applicable criminalistic methodology for this category of cases;
- developing the criminalistic characteristics of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status;

- determining the circumstances that must be established and proven, as well as identifying typical criminal investigation situations in cases concerning corruption offences committed by public officials with special status;
- highlighting and determining the particularities of the use of special investigative measures applicable in the investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status;
- determining the tactical particularities of specific criminal investigation actions in corruption cases involving public officials with special status;
- identifying structural deficiencies, methodological gaps, and factors affecting the managerial-criminalistic efficiency of criminal investigation activities;
- formulating practical recommendations for criminal investigation bodies and special investigative bodies in order to investigate corruption offences committed by public officials with special status, and, where appropriate, advancing proposals *de lege ferenda*.

**The research hypothesis** is based on the premise that the development and application of a criminalistic methodology adapted to the particularities of public officials with special status will lead to a significant increase in the efficiency of the process of investigating corruption offences committed by this category of persons. It is assumed that an integrated scientific approach, correlating criminal investigation tactics with the psychological, professional, and organizational specifics of officials with special status, will enable the more rapid identification of criminal elements, the proper administration of evidence, and the strengthening of the credibility of evidence before the court of law.

At the same time, it is assumed that the effective use of modern criminalistic tools and special investigative measures, within the limits of the law, will contribute to dismantling institutional corruption mechanisms and reducing the level of impunity among officials with special status. The research also proceeds from the assumption that the existing gaps in the current methodology—such as the lack of a unified theoretical framework, fragmented approaches, and insufficient specialized tactical training—can be remedied through the development of clear methodological procedures and tactical-procedural recommendations, based on national scientific experience and European best practices.

In this regard, the confirmation of the hypothesis would imply demonstrating that a criminalistic methodology adapted to public officials with special status ensures not only a more efficient investigation but also enhanced protection of the legality of criminal proceedings, contributing to the establishment of a more transparent institutional

framework and one that is more resilient to corruption.

**The scientific novelty and originality** of this doctoral thesis derive from the fact that, for the first time in the criminalistic doctrine of the Republic of Moldova, a scientifically grounded methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status has been developed. The paper proposes an applied approach aimed at creating a coherent methodological framework for investigating corruption committed by public officials with special status. In this regard, the research goes beyond mere theoretical analysis, transforming doctrinal conclusions into operational tools applicable in the practice of criminal investigation bodies.

The scientific originality is expressed through: the determination of the criminalistic profile of the public official with special status, taking into account their professional, cognitive, and behavioral particularities; the formulation of a phased criminalistic investigation model, based on the correlation of special investigative measures with procedural actions and forensic examinations, carried out in a lawful, prompt, and efficient manner; the development of a criminalistic risk matrix applicable to the professional body with special status, enabling the anticipation and early identification of signs of corruption; the substantiation of an integrated methodology for the use of special investigative measures and digital evidence, in strict compliance with the principle of evidentiary integrity.

Through these contributions, the thesis adds value to national criminalistic science by providing an applicable and verifiable methodological model that can be used in the practical activity of anti-corruption bodies and in the professional training process of criminal investigation officers. The research not only fills existing gaps in the specialized literature but also proposes innovative and replicable solutions for enhancing the effectiveness of detecting, documenting, and proving corruption offences committed by public officials with special status.

**Summary of the research methodology and justification of the selected research methods.** The methodological basis of this research is constituted by the principles of the theory of knowledge, legal logic, and criminalistic science, complemented by the foundations of criminal law, criminal procedural law, and criminology. The research relies on a set of theoretical and empirical methods that enabled the conduct of a coherent and rigorous scientific analysis.

Among the theoretical methods, analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction, and comparison were employed to systematize the specialized doctrine and to identify the directions of evolution of criminalistic methodology concerning the investigation of corruption committed by public officials with special status. The comparative analysis method served

to relate the research to international doctrinal and normative models, while the logical-systemic method was used to structure the criminalistic characteristics of corruption offences.

At the empirical level, recourse was made to the analysis of judicial practice and criminal investigation materials, to the scientific observation of typical investigative situations, and to the modeling of the criminalistic investigation process. These methods enabled the theoretical and practical substantiation of a methodology applicable to the investigation of corruption committed by public officials with special status.

The selection of these methods is justified by the interdisciplinary nature of the research, which requires a complex approach integrating criminalistic science with the principles of criminal procedural law and evidentiary legality.

**Theoretical importance and practical value of the research.** The theoretical importance of this doctoral thesis lies in the development and consolidation of the doctrinal foundations of criminalistics through the elaboration of an integrated conceptual framework for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status. The research contributes to the scientific definition of the criminalistic characteristics of this category of offences, highlighting the features of the offender, the mechanism of commission, the material and behavioral traces, as well as the particularities of the institutional environment in which they occur. By correlating the principles of criminal law and criminal procedural law with the instruments of modern criminalistics, the paper substantiates an original scientific methodology of investigation, which may serve as a theoretical reference for further scientific research in the field of combating institutional corruption. At the same time, the obtained results contribute to the development of the concept of criminalistics applied to public officials with special status, strengthening modern research directions regarding evidence, interviewing tactics, and the application of special investigative measures. The practical value of the research is determined by the possibility of implementing the conclusions and recommendations formulated in the practical activity of criminal investigation bodies, prosecution authorities, and anti-corruption structures. The developed methodology can be used in the professional training process of criminal investigation officers, as well as in the continuous professional development of personnel in the anti-corruption field. The results of the research provide concrete tools for identifying, documenting, and proving corruption offences, strengthening inter-institutional cooperation and ensuring compliance with the principles of legality and evidentiary integrity. Furthermore, the formulated recommendations may be utilized in the development of public

policies and national anti-corruption strategies, as well as in the revision of the normative framework concerning criminal liability and the investigation procedures applicable to public officials with special status. From an educational perspective, the work has formative value, as it can be used as a scientific and methodological support in teaching the disciplines “Criminalistics,” “Special Investigative Activity,” and “Criminal Investigation Activity” within higher education institutions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and other specialized structures. Thus, the thesis combines theoretical significance with practical relevance, contributing simultaneously to the development of criminalistic doctrine and to the improvement of operational and evidentiary activities in corruption cases involving public officials with special status.

**Validation of the results.** The results obtained during the preparation of the thesis were presented and thoroughly analyzed within prestigious national and international scientific events, where they generated constructive debates and meaningful exchanges of ideas. At the same time, these results were disseminated through publications in accredited specialized journals, contributing to the development of the field’s literature and providing significant theoretical perspectives and practical applications for the research area addressed.

**Publications on the thesis topic:** 9 publications.

**Keywords:** corruption, public official with special status, criminalistic methodology, investigative tactics, evidence, special investigative measures, institutional integrity.

## SUMMARY OF THE THESIS CHAPTERS

The structure of the doctoral thesis is designed in accordance with the logic and requirements of a complex scientific research, being oriented towards achieving the proposed aim and objectives. The work consists of: annotations in Romanian, English, and Russian, a list of abbreviations, introduction, four chapters divided into sections, general conclusions and recommendations, followed by a bibliography, a declaration of responsibility, and the author's CV.

**The Introduction** establishes the importance and relevance of the topic, defines the aim, objectives, hypothesis, and scientific problem of the research, presents the methodology and the theoretical-normative basis, as well as the novelty, theoretical importance, and practical value of the obtained results.

**Chapter I – Analysis of the situation regarding the methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status.** The first chapter aims to establish the theoretical and practical foundations of the research through a comprehensive analysis of doctrinal sources, the normative framework, and relevant case law. The examination of these benchmarks allows the identification of the main directions for the development of criminalistic methodology, as well as the existing gaps in national doctrine regarding the investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status—a distinct category due to the nature of their duties, their level of access to confidential information, and their knowledge of internal law enforcement mechanisms.

The research begins with an extensive analysis of the specialized literature from the Republic of Moldova, which shows that the phenomenon of corruption has been addressed mainly from legal, criminological, and institutional perspectives, while the criminalistic dimension of investigating such offences remains insufficiently developed. Despite the existence of a solid theoretical framework concerning criminal investigation tactics, interviewing, searches, or crime scene investigation, national studies treat corruption in a general sense, without clearly distinguishing the particularities that characterize public officials with special status.

This situation reveals that, although progress has been made in doctrine and in the regulation of special investigative activities, there is still a lack of a unified methodological vision capable of integrating procedural and operative aspects into a coherent system. There is a need for a scientific framework that correlates investigative efficiency with the requirements of legality and the protection of fundamental rights, in accordance with the principles of the rule of law.

At the international level, specialized research highlights the tendency to unify criminal procedural law and criminalistics, aimed at strengthening the coherence between investigative tactics and evidentiary rigor. The literature increasingly emphasizes the need to capitalize on modern technologies—phonoscopic analysis, digital forensics, and cyber surveillance—in the process of documenting and proving corruption offences, especially in institutional environments characterized by a high degree of confidentiality and hierarchy.

The comparative analysis of doctrinal sources and practical experience leads to a clear conclusion: in the Republic of Moldova there is a lack of a unified criminalistic methodology specifically designed for investigating corruption committed by public officials with special status. This finding justifies the need for dedicated research aimed at developing a scientifically grounded methodology capable of combining the principles of legality with modern technical-criminalistic tools, while also providing a practical model for application in the activity of criminal investigation bodies.

The national normative framework regulates in detail the general aspects of the phenomenon of corruption, establishing the principles, competencies, and responsibilities of the institutions empowered to prevent and combat this type of criminality. However, the analysis of existing legal provisions reveals that there are no specific norms addressing the methodological particularities of investigating corruption committed by public officials with special status. Current regulations focus mainly on the punitive and administrative dimensions of criminal liability, without offering a distinct approach regarding the mechanisms for applying criminalistic and tactical methods adapted to the professional specificity of these officials.

Consequently, the investigation of institutional corruption is carried out based on general procedural rules and the practical experience of criminal investigation bodies, in the absence of a uniform national methodological framework ensuring coherence and efficiency in the application of criminalistic tools. This deficiency justifies the need to develop a specialized methodology tailored to the professional, hierarchical, and institutional particularities of public officials with special status.

From a procedural perspective, the Code of Criminal Procedure establishes the principles and limits of criminal investigation activity; however, the concrete manner of applying procedural actions and special investigative measures in cases involving officials from law enforcement systems remains insufficiently regulated. This gap requires the development of a national criminalistic methodology to ensure uniformity and efficiency in the application of investigative tools, in compliance with the

principle of legality and international anti-corruption standards.

The examination of judicial practice demonstrates that corruption offences committed by public officials with special status are characterized by a high degree of latency, sophistication, and evidentiary concealment. In numerous cases, acts of corruption are disguised as administrative favors, “consultancy” commissions, or informal services, and identifying the causal link between the benefit and the exercise of official duties requires meticulous evidentiary substantiation.

The analysis of resolved cases reveals deficiencies in evidence documentation, in the application of special investigative measures, and in correlating operative information with procedural actions. In some cases, evidence obtained through interceptions or flagrant operations is challenged due to non-compliance with the principle of evidentiary integrity. This situation confirms the need to improve criminalistic methodology and to enhance the professional training of investigation officers and criminal investigation officers dealing with institutional corruption.

The doctrinal, legislative, and practical analysis conducted in this chapter has made it possible to identify the main directions for improving investigative methodology. Among these are: the development of a unified national methodology adapted to the specifics of public officials with special status; the integration of modern technologies into the evidentiary process; strengthening procedural control over the use of special investigative measures to ensure evidentiary integrity; creating an inter-institutional cooperation mechanism between operative structures, criminal investigation bodies, and prosecution authorities; and promoting continuous training for investigators and prosecutors specialized in institutional corruption.

In conclusion, Chapter I demonstrates that the current approach to investigating corruption among public officials with special status is insufficiently standardized and only partially adapted to institutional realities. Therefore, the present research aims to address these needs by formulating a unified criminalistic methodology capable of correlating theoretical requirements with the practical needs of criminal investigation bodies and contributing to strengthening institutional integrity in the Republic of Moldova.

**Chapter II – Criminalistic characteristics of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status.** The criminalistic characteristics of corruption offences represent one of the essential pillars of investigative methodology, as they constitute the basis for planning and conducting criminal investigation actions. In the case of corruption committed by public officials with special status, these characteristics acquire particular features determined by the professional status of the



perpetrators, their level of legal training, and their knowledge of the internal mechanisms of the law enforcement system. The criminalistic characteristic provides the investigator with the possibility to construct a systemic vision of the offence by identifying the relationships between its constituent elements—namely the subject, object, modus operandi, traces, temporal and spatial circumstances, and post-offence behavior.

In cases involving public officials with special status, the analysis of these elements allows for a deeper understanding of how criminal activity is conceived, concealed, and protected through internal institutional mechanisms. In such situations, the criminalistic characteristic must be adapted to the particularities of the professional environment, as the investigated official possesses advanced technical and legal knowledge, access to confidential information, and direct familiarity with operative procedures and investigative tactics. These elements determine a higher degree of latency of the offence and require the use of complex investigative methods based on correlating direct and indirect evidence and on the rigorous application of special investigative measures. Consequently, the effectiveness of criminal investigation depends on the ability of investigative bodies to identify and exploit these interdependencies while ensuring compliance with the principles of legality and evidentiary integrity.

The active subject of corruption offences is a person vested with public authority; however, in the case of officials with special status, complexity increases due to their dual affiliation—both to law enforcement structures and to the administrative system of the state. These officials, such as police officers, customs officers, intelligence service officers, military personnel, and penitentiary staff, are trained in operative techniques, which provides them with an enhanced ability to conceal traces of criminal activity.

Research shows that these individuals exhibit greater psychological and tactical resistance during criminal investigations, as well as a pronounced tendency toward professional solidarity, which complicates the process of obtaining evidence. Officials with special status generally possess a high degree of internal loyalty and legal knowledge that allows them to anticipate investigative actions and exploit potential procedural deficiencies. Therefore, the investigation of offences committed by such individuals requires a higher level of criminalistic training of criminal investigation bodies and the use of specific tactics based on the element of surprise, operational discretion, and meticulous documentation of internal decision-making processes.

The analysis of corruption cases from judicial practice and procedural materials demonstrates that the criminal mechanism often follows a phased structure: establishing contact between the official and the

bribe giver, negotiating sums or advantages, accepting the benefit, and concealing its origin. In the case of officials with special status, the initial contact is usually disguised through legitimate service actions, such as inspections, verifications, authorizations, or administrative interventions. Moreover, the circumstances of commission may be influenced by the hierarchical environment—pressure from superiors, an institutional culture tolerant of misconduct, and internal protection mechanisms. In many situations, acts of corruption manifest as “reciprocal services” between colleagues or departments, without immediate material form, but with long-term effects on institutional integrity.

Corruption committed by officials with special status leaves complex, predominantly indirect traces, manifested in administrative documents, electronic communications, concealed financial transfers, or seemingly lawful institutional decisions. In this context, forensic and digital expertise acquire increased importance.

The use of special investigative measures becomes indispensable for establishing the causal link between the corrupt act and the involved individual. At the same time, modern doctrine emphasizes compliance with the principle of evidentiary integrity, according to which evidence must be obtained lawfully, without provocation, manipulation, or exceeding operative powers. In investigative practice, the application of technical-scientific expertise ensures an objective basis for confirming facts, especially when direct evidence is lacking.

The phenomenon of corruption among officials with special status is determined by a combination of professional, institutional, and psychological factors. Among the most frequent are: an organizational culture based on hierarchy and corporate loyalty; the absence of effective internal control; the erroneous perception of power as a privilege; insufficient ethical and legal training; and the lack of effective mechanisms for protecting whistleblowers. These conditions generate informal tolerance toward corrupt behavior, and corruption becomes, in some cases, a “tacit practice” accepted within the professional environment.

The conducted analysis demonstrates that corruption offences committed by public officials with special status are distinguished by their own criminalistic characteristics, determined by the level of training of the subjects, the specificity of the institutional environment, and the high degree of evidentiary concealment. From a theoretical perspective, this category of offences requires a differentiated approach within general criminalistic methodology, while from a practical perspective, it requires the adaptation of investigative tactics and technical-scientific means to the psychological and operational particularities of the offender.

The criminalistic characteristic formulated in this chapter consti-

tutes the conceptual basis for the development of the actual investigative methodology presented in the subsequent chapters. It guides the activity of criminal investigation bodies toward a more efficient, more lawful, and more adaptable investigation in line with the realities of contemporary institutional corruption.

**Chapter III – Particularities of organizing and conducting criminal investigation in corruption cases involving public officials with special status.** The conduct of criminal investigation in corruption cases involving public officials with special status presents a series of essential particularities, determined by the professional and institutional specificity of the subjects involved, the complexity of hierarchical relationships, their high level of legal training, and the subtle manner in which criminal activities are concealed. In such cases, the success of the investigation depends directly on the proper organization of the criminal investigation process, the clear establishment of the circumstances to be proven, the coordinated use of criminalistic means and special investigative measures, as well as the ensuring of legality and evidentiary integrity.

Criminal investigation in corruption cases committed by public officials with special status generally unfolds in three stages: the preliminary stage, in which operative information is collected, reports are verified, and reasonable indications of the offence are assessed; the initial stage of criminal investigation, in which urgent actions are carried out, such as flagrant apprehension, application of special investigative measures, preservation of material evidence, and questioning of witnesses; and the complex stage of criminal investigation, dedicated to consolidating the evidentiary material, correlating expert findings, and preparing the case for referral to court.

Within this dynamic, the investigator must consider that officials with special status, due to their professional training, often anticipate investigative actions, and any superficial documentation may compromise the entire case. Therefore, investigative planning must be based on multiple, verifiable hypotheses and on a logical sequence of tactical actions, ensuring that the element of surprise is maintained until the completion of the flagrant operation or other evidentiary procedures.

During the criminal investigation process, the investigative body must establish a set of circumstances defining both the act and its criminal context. Among the most important are: the time, place, and manner of manifestation of corruption acts; the identity, function, and precise duties of the public official with special status involved; the relationships between the perpetrator and the persons who offered or intermediated undue advantages; the value and nature of the benefits received; the means of concealing their origin (financial transfers, false supporting

documents, seemingly lawful intermediaries); and the causal link between the exercise of official duties and the obtaining of the benefit. In addition, the psychological and motivational circumstances of the offence must be established, including intent, the subject's attitude toward professional conduct norms, and possible involvement of other individuals within the institution.

The analysis of judicial practice reveals several typical situations requiring differentiated tactical approaches: the flagrant apprehension of a public official with special status, which requires rigorous prior documentation and perfect synchronization between operative bodies and the case prosecutor; the investigation of corruption mediated through intermediaries, where criminal communication is masked through apparently uninvolved third parties; cases of institutionalized corruption, characterized by the involvement of multiple persons within the same structure, with role distribution and mutual protection; passive corruption cases, where the official does not directly solicit a bribe but creates favorable conditions for its offering; and corruption offences combined with other service-related crimes, such as abuse of office, negligence, forgery of official documents, or disclosure of state secrets. In all these situations, the investigator must maintain a balance between confidentiality, legality, and efficiency, applying precise tactics and avoiding any form of unlawful provocation.

Special investigative measures represent the central element in documenting corruption offences committed by public officials with special status. These include visual surveillance, interception of communications, audio-video recordings, controlled deliveries, and professional integrity tests. The research emphasizes that the effectiveness of such measures depends on perfect coordination between operative structures and criminal investigation bodies, as well as on ensuring judicial control over their proportionality and legality. In the practice of the Republic of Moldova, discrepancies between operative and procedural activities have sometimes led to the exclusion of evidence due to the lack of evidentiary integrity. To avoid such situations, it is necessary to implement an integrated mechanism for the use of the results of special investigative measures, including: preliminary verification of the legality of authorization; objective analysis of the obtained information and its transformation into procedural evidence; and maintaining confidentiality regarding sources of information and persons involved in documentation. Thus, the thesis argues that special investigative measures should not be regarded as an end in themselves, but as complementary criminalistic tools that support criminal investigation, allowing the transition from the informational level to the evidentiary level in a lawful and

transparent manner.

An essential aspect of organizing criminal investigation is cooperation between authorities involved in combating corruption. In cases involving officials with special status, such cooperation must be based on operative exchange of information, clear delimitation of competencies, and respect for the principle of procedural independence.

The analysis of practical materials reveals a number of recurring problems: the lack of a unified methodology for documenting flagrant offences and managing electronic evidence; insufficient specialized training of criminal investigation officers and investigators in the field of institutional corruption; inefficient application of forensic expertise; and deficiencies in communication between operative and procedural structures. To overcome these obstacles, the thesis proposes: the development of a unified methodological framework for corruption cases involving public officials with special status; the introduction of continuous interdisciplinary training for investigators, criminal investigation officers, and prosecutors, focused on cooperation and ethical standards; the digitalization of the evidentiary process through integrated systems for the storage, analysis, and presentation of electronic evidence; and the expansion of the role of forensic expertise, including psychological and financial expertise, in substantiating investigative hypotheses.

Chapter III demonstrates that investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status requires a strategic organization of criminal investigation based on inter-institutional coordination, legality, and scientific rigor. The research confirms that only through harmonizing operative and procedural activities, properly utilizing the results of special investigative measures, and applying criminalistic tactics adapted to the status of the official, can a complete, reliable, and effective evidentiary framework be achieved.

**Chapter IV – Tactical particularities of conducting certain criminal investigation actions in cases of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status.** Chapter IV holds decisive importance within the structure of the proposed criminalistic methodology, as it translates the theoretical concepts formulated in the previous chapters into a concrete operational-tactical framework, adapted to the specific nature of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status. In such cases, evidentiary activity must combine procedural rigor with tactical subtlety, since the investigated subjects possess professional experience in law enforcement and have detailed knowledge of criminal investigation procedures. Consequently, any error in planning or conducting investigative actions may be exploited by the offender, and the integrity of the evidence may easily be challenged. For this reason, the tactics of

investigating institutional corruption are based on precision, discretion, and strict compliance with the principles of legality and proportionality.

*Flagrant apprehension* constitutes one of the most effective, yet also one of the most risky, criminal investigation actions in corruption cases. It provides the opportunity to catch the offender in the act, ensuring the acquisition of direct and indisputable evidence. In the case of public officials with special status, the preparation of a flagrant operation requires a high level of professionalism, inter-institutional cooperation, and prior judicial control. The apprehension must be based on thorough prior documentation: monitoring the official's behavior, identifying the moment of handing over or receiving the bribe, using audio-video equipment, and preparing the operative team. At the same time, it is essential to avoid any form of provocation, in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights<sup>2</sup>, which sanctions situations where investigative bodies actively induce criminal intent. The success of this action depends on perfect synchronization between the operative and procedural phases, as well as on the immediate preservation of evidence: documents, marked money, digital or biological traces. It is also important that excessive use of physical force be avoided during apprehension, as otherwise there is a risk of violating rights guaranteed under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights<sup>3</sup>. Following the flagrant operation, a prompt hearing phase ensues, aimed at exploiting the psychological effect of surprise.

*Crime scene investigation* in corruption cases involving officials with special status has distinct particularities compared to other types of offences. Since the corrupt act usually occurs in official spaces (offices, service vehicles, residences), the intervention must respect both procedural norms and the specifics of the institutional environment. The investigation aims to identify material traces (money, documents, packaging, electronic devices), discover biological or fingerprint traces on relevant objects, and thoroughly document the conditions under which the corrupt act occurred (furniture arrangement, access routes, lighting, movement paths). A particular feature lies in the fact that officials with special status may influence the evidentiary environment—they possess knowledge regarding trace preservation and, in some cases, have direct access to the crime scene after the act. Therefore, the investigator must

---

<sup>2</sup> Judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Pareniciu v. the Republic of Moldova*, 1 October 2014 (§§ 33–36). Available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%7B%22itemid%22:%5B%22001-154853%22%5D%7D> [accessed on: 02.11.2024].

<sup>3</sup> Judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Savičchi v. the Republic of Moldova*, 17 June 2008 (§§ 4–5). Available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%7B%22itemid%22:%5B%22001-127978%22%5D%7D> [accessed on: 18.07.2024]

act promptly, secure the perimeter, and cooperate with a forensic specialist to ensure the integrity of traces.

*Searches* constitute one of the most sensitive procedural actions in cases of institutional corruption, as they target officials with special status who have access to classified information and benefit from hierarchical protection. The tactics of searches must combine the element of surprise with absolute procedural legality. It is recommended that, prior to conducting a search, precise data be collected regarding locations, the official's schedule, the technical means used, and possible hiding places. In practice, the search must be conducted in the presence of witnesses, with full video recording, and all seized evidence must be immediately labeled and sealed. Additionally, in cases involving officials with special status, investigators must pay particular attention to internal documents, electronic devices, storage media, and service phones, as these may contain essential evidentiary data (encrypted communications, unauthorized transfers, photographs, recordings).

*Interviewing* represents one of the most complex criminalistic actions in corruption cases. In the case of public officials with special status, interrogation must take into account their high level of legal knowledge and psychological control capacity. The investigator must combine classical interrogation methods with modern behavioral and psychological analysis techniques. According to the methodology proposed by the author, interviewing should be conducted in stages: establishing psychological contact by creating an atmosphere of apparent neutrality; obtaining spontaneous information that can later be compared with objective evidence; exploiting contradictions in the statements of the interviewed person; and using confrontation between the accused official and relevant witnesses to clarify contradictory aspects. At the same time, the interviewing of witnesses and whistleblowers must be conducted with caution, in order to protect their identity and prevent potential pressure or retaliation.

*Forensic expertise* represents the means through which criminal activity is scientifically confirmed. In corruption cases, phonoscopic, graphoscopic, forensic, accounting, psychological, and digital expert examinations are frequently used to strengthen the evidentiary framework. The particularity lies in correlating technical-scientific evidence with indirect evidence in order to demonstrate not only the material act but also the corrupt intent of the official. At the same time, expert examinations must be ordered in a timely manner, before the evidentiary value of material or electronic traces is lost. A special role is played by examinations of electronic devices, which allow the analysis of encrypted communications and data stored on mobile devices. Psychological

expertise may also be used to identify behavioral patterns specific to corruption-related situations.

In addition to the actions analyzed above, the thesis highlights the importance of other procedural activities, such as identification by distinctive features, presentation for identification, seizure of objects and documents, digital cross-verification of evidence, and on-site verification of statements. These actions must be planned in strict correlation with the case file data and adapted to the level of training of the involved official. The author also emphasizes the application of tactics aimed at countering institutional influence, as individuals with special status may resort to hierarchical, political, or collegial relationships to compromise criminal proceedings. In such situations, investigators must act under the supervision of the prosecutor, with strict measures of confidentiality and information security.

The analysis of procedural and tactical actions has demonstrated that the investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status requires a differentiated tactical approach, based on strategic planning, procedural discipline, and inter-institutional cooperation. Flagrant apprehension, crime scene investigation, searches, interviewing, and forensic expertise must not be viewed as isolated actions, but as interdependent elements of a coherent methodological system. Only through their integrated application can a complete, lawful, and credible evidentiary framework be ensured.

Overall, this chapter completes the criminalistic model developed within the thesis, providing a practical tool for specialized investigators and prosecutors, aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of detecting, documenting, and preventing corruption among public officials with special status.



## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The scientific results obtained as a result of the doctoral research consist of:

a) Determining the level of investigation of institutional corruption offences. The research revealed the complexity of the phenomenon of corruption among public officials with special status, highlighting doctrinal deficiencies and the lack of a unified investigative methodology. Through the analysis of judicial practice, the causes of the latency of the phenomenon and the methodological gaps affecting the efficiency of criminal investigation activities were identified;

b) Scientific substantiation of the criminalistic characteristics of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status. The study established the defining elements of this category of offences—namely the active subject, the mechanism of commission, material and behavioral traces, the circumstances of time and place, as well as the specific psychological features of officials with special status;

c) Establishing the circumstances forming the basis of reasonable suspicion of corruption. Objective indicators and characteristic signs of institutional corruption acts were identified, enabling the formulation of investigative hypotheses and the lawful initiation of criminal proceedings;

d) Identification of typical criminal investigation situations. Distinct typologies of investigative situations were outlined, such as flagrant apprehension, corruption intermediaries, hierarchical involvement, and team-based corruption, for which differentiated tactics of documentation and evidentiary substantiation were proposed;

e) Development of an integrated methodological algorithm for criminalistic investigation. The thesis proposes a phased framework correlating operative-intelligence activities, procedural actions, and forensic expertise, ensuring coherence, legality, and evidentiary validity;

f) Improvement of the use of special investigative measures. The importance of the integrated use of special measures (technical surveillance, interception of communications, digital expertise, financial monitoring) under judicial control was substantiated, in order to transform operative information into procedural evidence;

g) Enhancement of inter-institutional cooperation mechanisms. The research demonstrated the need to strengthen cooperation between anti-corruption authorities through the standardization of information exchange and the development of joint investigative teams;

h) Formulation of practical recommendations for increasing the efficiency of the investigation process. The study provides solutions for

improving the normative framework, unifying investigative methodology, and enhancing the professional training of investigators in cases of institutional corruption.

The scientific results obtained as a result of this research constitute a substantial contribution to the development of criminalistic theory and practice in the Republic of Moldova. They provide a modern theoretical and applied framework aimed at significantly improving the process of investigating corruption offences among public officials with special status and at supporting law enforcement bodies in combating this complex, deeply institutionalized phenomenon with a high degree of latency. As a result of the research, general conclusions and fundamental recommendations were formulated for improving the criminalistic methodology applicable to such cases. The study provides investigators with a unified tool capable of ensuring a balance between legality, evidentiary integrity, and the tactical efficiency of procedural actions.

The results highlight the importance of developing a phased criminalistic model based on correlating special investigative measures with technical-scientific evidence, as well as the necessity of continuous professional development of criminal investigation officers and investigative officers, in order to adapt to new forms of corruption generated by institutional and technological developments. Through its theoretical contributions and the practical nature of the proposed methodology, the research provides a solid foundation for modernizing anti-corruption activities, strengthening the role of criminalistics in achieving an efficient, fair, and European standards-compliant criminal process in terms of institutional integrity and transparency.

Thus, the main **general conclusions** are as follows:

- 1) The normative framework, specialized doctrine, and judicial practice have consistently and convergently highlighted the existence of major conceptual inconsistencies and methodological gaps that hinder the formation of a criminalistic methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status. The disparities between definitions and delimitations established by legislation, doctrine, and practice, the absence of uniform tactical benchmarks, the lack of standardized criminalistic tools, and the lack of correlation between the theoretical, procedural, and operational dimensions of investigation demonstrate that, at the current stage, an integrated, coherent, and practically applicable methodology for this category of cases cannot be identified. This finding confirms the necessity of the thesis objective: the scientific substantiation of a modern criminalistic methodology capable of unifying concepts, eliminating existing gaps, and providing criminal investigation bodies with a predictable, reproducible, and oper-

ational framework adapted to the complexity of contemporary forms of corruption committed by public officials with special status.

2) The defining elements of the criminalistic characteristics demonstrate that this category of cases presents distinct criminal features, differing both from ordinary forms of corruption and from other service-related offences. Despite the complex and often latent nature of these criminal acts, the synthesis of the identified structural and functional factors has enabled the formulation of a specific criminalistic characteristic that explains the internal logic of unlawful conduct, outlines the limits of manifestation of criminal behavior, and highlights the essential indicators guiding the investigation.

3) The circumstances that must be established and proven in cases concerning corruption committed by public officials with special status require a complex approach that goes beyond the traditional framework of service-related offences. The particularities of the exercised duties, the special legal regime, the increased level of access to sensitive information, and the existence of rigid hierarchical structures determine a distinct set of circumstances relevant to the investigation, whose correct identification conditions the success of the entire evidentiary process. Establishing the nature and content of the corrupt act, the position of the official within the institutional mechanism, the pursued purpose, the advantage requested or received, and the direct link between official duties and unlawful conduct constitute indispensable benchmarks for substantiating tactical and evidentiary actions.

4) The typical investigative situations in corruption cases involving public officials with special status reveal the existence of recurrent patterns of criminal conduct that decisively influence both the dynamics of the acts and the orientation of investigative tactics. These situations are marked by a high degree of clandestinity, the use of institutional concealment mechanisms, and the involvement of intermediaries, aspects that confer corruption acts a fragmented structure that is difficult to detect in the early stages of investigation. At the same time, typical situations include the exploitation of hierarchical position, access to restricted information, the use of unofficial or encrypted communication channels, as well as the interference of personal interests with official duties, all of which generate complex and often volatile evidentiary contexts.

The results of the study highlighted five fundamental types of investigative situations, defined by the specificity of the moment of notification, the criminal mechanism, and the possibilities of evidence: *Flagrant based on a report (complaint)* – represents the most favorable situation for the criminal investigation body, as it allows real-time documentation of the offence. Prompt reporting and the cooperation of the whistleblower

create the premises for an effective controlled operation, based on the monitored transfer of money, interception of communications, and visual recording of the corrupt act. In this context, the role of the criminal investigation body is to coordinate the tactics of the flagrant operation, ensure the integrity of evidence, and prevent unlawful provocation. *Post-factum report* – occurs when the offence becomes known after its completion. The retrospective nature of this situation requires a logical reconstruction of events and a thorough corroboration of indirect evidence: statements, documents, financial flows, and digital traces. The criminal investigation body must make use of modern investigative technologies and forensic expertise to accurately reconstruct the moment of the offence and to confirm the credibility of the report. *Extortion situation* – reflects a form of passive corruption involving coercion, where the public official conditions the exercise of their duties on the receipt of undue benefits. This situation involves increased evidentiary difficulty, as it is necessary to prove not only the material act of receiving goods but also the psychological mechanism of pressure exerted on the victim. Therefore, the criminal investigation focuses on the detailed interviewing of the complainant, confrontations, interception of communications and images revealing the threatening tone of the dialogue, and the analysis of official acts abusively issued by the official. *Complex situation* – concerns cases of systemic or participatory corruption, where several public officials with special status act in a coordinated or repetitive manner. In such cases, criminal investigation acquires an extended dimension, based on simultaneous special investigative measures, multiple searches, prolonged interceptions, and parallel expert examinations, all aimed at highlighting the continuity of the acts and the role of each participant in the criminal chain. This situation requires an advanced level of inter-institutional coordination and rigorous planning to ensure effective control of the evidentiary flow. Apprehension of the active and/or passive bribe giver (in the absence of a report) – constitutes an exceptional situation, determined by ex officio notification of criminal investigation bodies or the incidental discovery of corruption acts within other investigations. The particularity of this situation lies in the lack of cooperation from the involved parties, which obliges the criminal investigation body to rely on objective elements: financial traces, technical-scientific evidence, official documents, and contradictions in statements.

5) Special investigative measures applicable in corruption cases involving public officials with special status demonstrate that the effectiveness of investigating this type of offence is inseparably linked to the use of advanced operative tools capable of capturing deeply concealed criminal acts that are inaccessible to traditional evidentiary methods.

The latent nature of such acts, the high level of professionalization of the involved subjects, their access to sensitive information, and their ability to evade institutional control necessitate the use of interception and recording of communications and/or images, technical surveillance, controlled delivery of money, visual tracking, undercover investigations, home searches, the use and/or installation of devices ensuring photographic, audio, and video recording, as well as information gathering. The assessment of the applicability of these measures reveals that, although the normative framework provides a sufficiently diversified investigative arsenal, the lack of a unified investigative methodology, divergent interpretations by criminal investigation bodies, and insufficient correlation with typical manifestations of corruption within structures with special status reduce the evidentiary potential of these instruments. Nevertheless, the systematic identification of appropriate special investigative measures and their correlation with the typology of the analysed offences confirm their indispensable role in detecting, documenting, and proving corrupt behavior.

1) The investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status is significantly affected by structural and methodological deficiencies that undermine the managerial-criminalistic efficiency of criminal proceedings. The lack of a clear delineation of the official's competencies, the unlawful establishment of the investigative team, the improper ordering and execution of special investigative measures, the use of evidence obtained under non-procedural conditions, as well as the defective organization of flagrant operations and other procedural actions have repeatedly led to the exclusion of evidence and acquittal decisions. These shortcomings, amplified by the absence of coherent investigative planning and the lack of correlation between operative activities, special investigative measures, and criminalistic actions, reveal the non-existence of a unified and practically applicable methodology for this category of cases.

2) The determination of the tactical particularities of criminal investigation actions in cases of corruption committed by public officials with special status confirms that such investigations require a specific adaptation based on rigor, planning, and comprehensive documentation. The level of professional training of these officials, their access to sensitive information, and their capacity for concealment necessitate different tactics compared to ordinary cases, both in interviewing and confrontation, as well as in flagrant operations, searches, and special investigative measures. The identified particularities constitute indispensable benchmarks for an effective criminalistic methodology and for building a solid and admissible evidentiary framework, as follows:

a) *Flagrant apprehension* of a public official with special status represents one of the most complex and sensitive tactical-procedural actions in the investigation of institutional corruption, as it involves the simultaneous integration of special investigative measures, procedural activities, and perfect inter-institutional coordination. This action entails three essential tactical stages: preparation, execution, and documentation of results. *The preparation stage* requires a thorough analysis of initial information, verification of the complaint, and identification of the optimal moment and location for intervention, ensuring complete and secure documentation. The roles of all participants are planned, legal authorizations are obtained, banknotes are marked and recorded, audio-video equipment is installed, and the protection of the whistleblower's identity is ensured. Confidentiality and the element of surprise are decisive, given the advanced level of training and anticipatory capacity of the targeted official. *The execution stage* is based on precise synchronization between the prosecutor, the criminal investigation body, investigative officers, and specialists, in order to fully document the moment of transferring illicit benefits and to intervene immediately after the completion of the corrupt act. Certified technical means for surveillance and interception are used, while the operation coordinator simultaneously manages the apprehension, the protection of the whistleblower, and the preservation of evidence, avoiding any form of unlawful provocation. *The documentation stage* involves the rigorous formalization of the entire operation: drafting detailed reports, seizing and sealing marked banknotes, conducting personal searches and, where appropriate, searches of premises, recording the statements of participants, correlating audio-video recordings, and ordering the necessary technical-scientific expert examinations to confirm the authenticity of the evidence. From a criminalistic perspective, the success of a flagrant apprehension depends on strict compliance with legality, tactical professionalism, continuity of documentation, and impeccable coordination among the involved institutions. Thus, the flagrant operation becomes an integrated process of capturing and consolidating evidence, ensuring both the evidentiary strength of material means and the credibility of state action in combating institutional corruption.

b) *Crime scene investigation* in cases of corruption committed by public officials with special status presents tactical particularities generated by the professionalized and concealed environment in which such acts are carried out. In these cases, the investigation does not aim solely at identifying material traces, but also at the logical reconstruction of the corruption mechanism, in relation to the space, objects, and actions of the persons involved. *The preparation stage* requires rigorous planning, delimitation

itation of the area to be examined, verification of authorizations, and the presence of forensic specialists. Risks of evidence alteration are assessed, the method of access to administrative premises is established, and appropriate technical-scientific equipment is selected (light sources, UV detection, video recording devices). Ensuring confidentiality and preparing the chain of custody are essential. *The execution stage* consists of the direct perception of the scene, the discovery, identification, and collection of material traces. In institutional corruption cases, these include not only obvious objects—envelopes, marked banknotes, documents, electronic devices—but also fluorescent traces or other indicators confirming the transfer of undue benefits. The activity is documented through photographs, video recordings, sketches, and detailed records, carried out with maximum professionalism to avoid compromising the evidentiary value. *The documentation stage* transforms criminalistic findings into procedural evidence: drafting the report in accordance with Article 118 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, packaging and sealing the collected objects, numbering and accurately describing them, as well as ordering the necessary expert examinations (dactyloscopic, physico-chemical, biological, or digital). In cases involving officials with special status, this stage may include additional measures, such as collecting biological traces from banknotes or identifying fingerprints on packaging. Overall, crime scene investigation in such cases represents an integrated criminalistic operation aimed at confirming the materiality of the corrupt act and providing a solid, coherent, and credible evidentiary framework. The success of this activity depends on technical-scientific rigor, compliance with legality, and the continuity of documentation—elements indispensable for the legitimacy of the act of justice.

c) *Search* in cases of corruption committed by public officials with special status represents a criminalistic operation of paramount importance, through which essential evidence regarding the illicit mechanism is discovered and documented—documents, money, objects, electronic devices, or digital traces. The particularities of this action derive from the controlled institutional context and the high degree of concealment that characterize such offences. *The preparation stage* requires the analysis of operative information, the establishment of the concrete purpose of the intervention, the identification of probable locations where evidence may be found, and obtaining the necessary legal authorization. A specialized team is formed, responsibilities are assigned, technical-scientific means are selected (seals, video cameras, fingerprint and chemical detection kits), and possible reactions of the official are anticipated, given their level of legal training. *The execution stage* is conducted in a tactical and synchronized manner, often in parallel with other actions (flagrant

apprehension, seizure of documents, crime scene investigations), in order to prevent the destruction of evidence. The office, residence, vehicle, electronic devices, and accounting documents are systematically examined, with a focus on identifying assets derived from the offence, envelopes used for transferring bribes, supporting documents, and digital traces. Full video recording of the search and respect for the dignity of the person are essential requirements, considering the public status of the targeted official. *The documentation stage* transforms criminalistic findings into valid procedural evidence: detailed reports are drafted, objects are photographed, described, packaged, and sealed, indicating the position in which they were found. This is followed by the ordering of graphoscopic, digital, chemical, or traceological expert examinations necessary to establish authenticity and to correlate the evidence with other elements of the case.

d) *Interviewing and confrontation* in cases of corruption committed by public officials with special status represent tactical-procedural actions of major importance, due to the psychological complexity of the involved subjects and their central role in structuring the evidentiary framework. These actions require a differentiated approach, adapted to the professional status and experience of the official, characterized by methodological rigor and psychological balance. *The preparation stage* consists of analyzing the personality of the person to be interviewed (official, witness, whistleblower), establishing the objectives of the discussion, formulating questions in a logical sequence, and selecting a neutral environment conducive to communication. The investigator must anticipate the defense strategies of the official with special status, adapt the tone and pace of the dialogue to their psychological profile, and, in the case of witnesses or whistleblowers, ensure the protection of identity and the integrity of statements. *The execution stage* requires compliance with the principles of clarity, voluntariness, and respect for dignity. Officials with legal expertise may employ concealment techniques; therefore, the investigator must combine control questions with detailed inquiries, exploit contradictions, and introduce, at the appropriate moment, the element of surprise by presenting partial evidence (documents, audio-video recordings, digital data). Observing non-verbal reactions—gestures, hesitations, changes in tone—constitutes an additional tool for assessing credibility. Interviewing witnesses and whistleblowers requires promptness, a climate of trust, and tactics adapted to the risks of influence or intimidation, especially within the institutional environment in which the suspects operate. *The documentation stage* involves the accurate recording of statements, documenting the circumstances of the interview, and, in complex cases, full audio-video recording to



prevent subsequent challenges to the evidentiary value. *Confrontation* serves the purpose of verifying the truthfulness of statements and eliminating contradictions. *Its preparation* includes selecting the participants, determining the appropriate moment, and choosing relevant evidence. *During its conduct*, the criminal investigation officer must maintain psychological balance between participants, prevent intimidation or mutual influence, and capitalize on spontaneous reactions as additional indicators of sincerity. *Documentation* is carried out through a detailed report recording statements, behaviors, and any admissions made.

e) *Ordering forensic expert examinations* in cases of corruption committed by public officials with special status represents an essential tactical activity through which operative indications are transformed into verifiable scientific evidence. Thus, expert examination becomes a decisive instrument for confirming facts, establishing the authenticity of evidentiary materials, and strengthening the credibility of criminal proceedings. *The preparation stage* involves determining the appropriate moment for ordering the expert examination, correctly defining its object, and formulating clear and relevant questions for the expert, depending on the type of collected evidence—documents, banknotes, electronic devices, audio-video recordings, or biological traces. The competent institution and specialist are selected, and the evidence is prepared for submission in compliance with the chain of custody and sealing rules. *The execution stage* consists of cooperation between the criminal investigation body and the expert, through the provision of the legal context and the necessary materials. In such cases, frequently used expert examinations include technical document analysis, biological, financial-accounting, digital-forensic, chemical, graphoscopic, dactyloscopic, phono- and videographic expertise, as well as psychological expertise when assessment of the official's behavior is required. The choice of the type of expertise depends on the nature of the evidence, the criminal scheme, and the need to correlate it with other evidentiary means. *The documentation stage* includes the analysis of the expert report, the integration of its conclusions into the overall evidentiary framework, and the verification of methodological coherence. In complex cases, comprehensive expert examinations may be ordered to obtain a complete picture of the criminal mechanism.

Following the general conclusions and the conducted research, we formulate **the following recommendations addressed** to the prosecutor, criminal investigation bodies, and structures carrying out special investigative activities, as well as a set of **de lege ferenda proposals** aimed at optimizing the normative framework and investigative practices in corruption cases involving public officials with special status:

- In order to ensure an accurate legal classification of acts imputed to public officials with special status, the prosecutor, the criminal investigation body, and special investigative structures must verify, from the outset of the case, the appointment act, job description, and specific professional regulations, including the provisions of special laws and professional statutes. This analysis allows a clear delineation of actual duties and identification of the legal basis of each examined action. It is also recommended to use a “competence matrix of the public official with special status,” correlating the investigated act with legal prerogatives, thereby eliminating classification errors and strengthening the accuracy of the evidentiary process;

- In cases concerning corruption committed by public officials with special status, the investigative team should be established exclusively by a reasoned ordinance of the prosecutor, explicitly indicating the duties of each member. Only the team leader should have the competence to order and direct procedural activities, while other members execute strictly the acts provided in the ordinance, without the possibility of initiating or authorizing measures or procedural actions. In this context, the practice of using investigative officers as criminal investigation officers should be excluded, and a mechanism for periodic control of the legality of the team’s composition should be instituted;

- To ensure the authenticity and integrity of evidence, criminal investigation bodies and investigative structures must preserve original media resulting from special measures—audio-video files, metadata, logs—indicating explicitly the procedures of packaging, labeling, and sealing;

- It is necessary to develop an instruction regulating the handling of material evidence—especially audio-video recordings, marked money, and other evidentiary means—covering the entire evidentiary chain: from seizure, packaging, labeling, and sealing, to examination, transfer, storage, presentation before the court, and preservation until the judgment becomes final;

- It is recommended to develop an instruction regarding the procedure for examining, sealing, and unsealing seized items, explicitly regulating the technical-procedural stages, storage conditions, transfer for expert examination, and the participation of procedural subjects in these operations;

- The tactics of flagrant operations must be standardized by introducing uniform procedures ensuring the integrity and authenticity of evidence. Continuous video recording, without interruption, of essential stages—marking banknotes, handing them over to the whistleblower, the moment of transfer, and the seizure of evidence—represents a

fundamental guarantee of evidentiary integrity. The chain of custody must be ensured from the moment the money is handed to the whistleblower, with documentation of each subsequent operation. It is also recommended to consistently use fluorescent substances, UV tests, identification through serial marking, and sealed packaging to strengthen identification, preservation, and verification of the integrity of material evidence obtained during the flagrant operation;

- In situations where there are well-founded indications that a witness may leave the territory of the Republic of Moldova and not return within a foreseeable period, or where there is a reasonable suspicion confirming such a risk, it is recommended that the hearing be conducted urgently, under special conditions, by the investigating judge;

- Considering the existence of situations where whistleblowers act in bad faith, it is recommended that the filing of the complaint and the initial hearing be carried out with video recording, in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Criminal Procedure. This measure contributes to preventing distortion of statements, subsequent influence on their content, and possible allegations of provocation, while strengthening the integrity and credibility of the evidentiary process;

- To protect evidentiary integrity and the fairness of criminal proceedings, it is necessary to further detail the legal concept of provocation, by clearly establishing the threshold between permissible documentation actions and any form of instigation that alters the natural conduct of the official. At the same time, legislation should expressly prohibit the use of repeat whistleblowers or individuals repeatedly involved in similar cases, as they generate increased risks of manipulation and affect the credibility of the evidentiary framework. The implementation of these rules constitutes an essential guarantee for maintaining the integrity of investigations and compliance with European standards regarding the prohibition of entrapment;

- Based on the analysis of national judicial practice and existing issues, it is proposed to amend and supplement Article 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, so as to regulate that in the case of flagrant apprehension, the procedure must be documented through mandatory video recording. The introduction of this obligation would strengthen evidentiary integrity, enhance the protection of individual rights, and significantly reduce acquittals caused by lack of evidentiary continuity;

- Another proposal for amending and supplementing the Code of Criminal Procedure concerns Article 118, by introducing an explicit regulation for situations where a person refuses the conduct of a crime scene investigation at their residence or interrupts it during its execution. In such cases, it is proposed that the continuation or resumption of the

crime scene investigation may be ordered by ordinance of the criminal investigation body or the prosecutor, subject to legality control by the investigating judge within no more than 24 hours after its completion. Practice and part of the doctrine support the ordering of a search in such situations; however, this solution cannot be accepted, as crime scene investigation and search have distinct purposes, respond to different procedural objectives, and cannot substitute each other.

**The important scientific problem solved through this research** consists in the development and substantiation of a unified criminalistic methodology for investigating corruption offences committed by public officials with special status, integrating the principles of legality, evidentiary integrity, and tactical efficiency. The study identified and systematized the criminalistic particularities specific to this category of subjects, providing a theoretical and practical framework for the coherent conduct of criminal investigation actions. The research enabled the correlation of the theoretical elements of criminalistic methodology with procedural tactics and the application of special investigative measures, contributing to the standardization of practice and the enhancement of evidentiary quality. Thus, the scientific problem addressed materializes in the creation of an integrated criminalistic methodology, adapted to the status of public officials with special powers, offering investigators modern tools for the detection, documentation, and evidentiary substantiation of corruption offences, in full compliance with European standards and the principles of the rule of law.

**Suggestions for potential future research directions:** analysis of the impact of the digitalization of public administration on the forms and mechanisms of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status; the use of artificial intelligence and data analysis tools in identifying criminal patterns and supporting the evidentiary process in corruption cases; further study of the effectiveness and limits of special investigative measures in relation to the guarantees of fundamental rights of the persons concerned; development of models of inter-institutional and international cooperation in investigating corruption offences with cross-border elements; evaluation of the role of organizational culture and internal integrity mechanisms in preventing and early detecting acts of corruption.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Aionițoiaie Constantin, Bercheșan Vasile, Sandu Ion-Eugen, *Treatise on Criminalistic Tactics*, Carpați Publishing House, 1992, pp. 293–294. 328 p. ISBN 9739528368.
2. Alecu Gheorghe, Boloș Petru, *Methodology of Investigating and Examining Corruption Offences*. In: *Criminalistica*, no. 1-2023 (133), March 2023, VOL. XXIV, p. 71, pp. 67–72. Available at: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/67-72\\_Ro.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/67-72_Ro.pdf) [accessed: 04.05.2024].
3. Andruș Cătălin, Șevciuc Eugeniu, *Traces of Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status*. In: *Scientific Annals of the Academy*, 2025, pp. 170–192.
4. Avram Mihail, Gurin Vasile, Donciu Anatol. Coordinator: Valeriu Zubco, *Detection, Investigation and Legal Qualification of Corruption Offences*, Agency for the Support of Legal Education and Law Enforcement Bodies “EX LEGE”, ARC Publishing House, Chișinău, 2005, 360 p. ISBN 9975-61-397-7.
5. Bejan Octavian, *The Criminal Framework of Corruption under the Criminal Code of the Republic of Moldova*, *Journal of Criminology, Criminal Law and Criminalistics*, no. 3–4, 2006, p. 15, pp. 15–21. Available at: <https://old.criminology.md/index.php/ro/articole/159-cadrul-penal-al-corupiei-dup-codul-penal-al-republicii-moldova> [accessed: 03.04.2022].
6. Chirtoacă Ilie, Gribincea Vladislav, Brighidin Oxana, Goinic Daniel, *Sanctioning Corruption – Analysis of Judicial Practice*, Legal Resources Centre from Moldova, Chișinău, 2022. Available at: [https://crjm.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Sanctionarea-coruptiei\\_2022-RO.pdf](https://crjm.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Sanctionarea-coruptiei_2022-RO.pdf) [accessed: 21.10.2024].
7. Chupakhin Roman Vladimirovich, *Investigation of Bribery: Theoretical and Applied Aspects*, PhD Thesis, Moscow, 2006, 194 p.
8. Coman Vasile, *Corruption Offences and Related Offences, Vol. I: Bribe Taking, Bribe Giving. Commented Case Law*, Hamangiu Publishing House, Bucharest, 2019, p. 79. 546 p. ISBN 978-606-27-1321-8.
9. Coman Vasile, *Corruption Offences and Related Offences, Vol. II: Influence Peddling, Buying Influence, Related Offences. Commented Case Law*, Hamangiu Publishing House, 2019, p. 158. 558 p. ISBN 978-606-27-1322-5.
10. Cușnir Valeriu, Cojocari Ion, *Sanctions Provided for Offences Related to Corruption Acts*. In: *Legal Studies and Research*, Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Moldova, Institute of Legal, Political and Sociological Research, Chișinău, 2024, pp. 135–156. Available at: [https://icjp.asm.md/sites/default/files/publicatii/studii\\_si\\_cercetari\\_juridice.\\_parte\\_7-8.\\_2024.pdf](https://icjp.asm.md/sites/default/files/publicatii/studii_si_cercetari_juridice._parte_7-8._2024.pdf) [accessed: 13.02.2025].
11. Cușnir Valeriu, *Criminalization of Corruption in the Criminal Legislation of the Republic of Moldova*, Habilitated Doctoral Thesis in

Law, Chişinău, 2005.

12. Cuşnir Valeriu, *Modern Technical-Scientific Methods for Preventing and Combating Corruption Acts*, Chişinău, 2004.

13. Cuşnir Valeriu, Sterschi Florena Esther, *Impact of Corruption and Organized Crime on National and International Security*. In: *Journal of Legal Studies and Research*, no. 1-2/2014, Chişinău, 2014, pp. 98-115.

14. Cuşnir Valeriu, *The Offence of Influence Peddling (Art. 326 Criminal Code of RM) in the Light of the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption*. In: *Journal of Legal Studies and Research*, no. 1-2/2011, Chişinău, 2011, pp. 87-103.

15. Cuşnir Valeriu, *The Phenomenon of Corruption: Between Perception and Social Reaction*, Akademos, no. 4, Chişinău, 2015, pp. 97-105.

16. Diaconescu Horia, *Corruption Offences and Related Offences*, All Beck Publishing House, Bucharest, 2004. 592 p. ISBN 973-655-568-2.

17. Dolea Igor, *Applied Commentary on the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Moldova*, Central Printing House, Chişinău, 2022.

18. Doraş Simion, *Criminalistics*, Cartea Juridică Publishing House, Chişinău, 2011. ISBN 978-9975-53-015-6.

19. Frolova Elena, *Methodology for Investigating Corruption Activity in Law Enforcement and Judicial Bodies*, PhD Thesis, Krasnodar, 2005, pp. 54-58.

20. Gheorghişă Mihai, *Criminalistic Characteristic and Model of Offences*. In: *Ombudsman*, no. 1-2, 2012, pp. 11-14.

21. Gheorghişă Mihail, *Treatise on Criminalistic Methodology*, State University of Moldova, Chişinău, 2015, 532 p. ISBN 978-9975-71-606-2.

22. Gherman Marin, Botnari Ilie, *Criteria for Classifying Special Investigative Measures*. In: *Legea și Viața*, January-March 2023, pp. 74-79.

23. Glavan Boris, *Conceptual Approaches to Special Investigative Activity under the Rule of Law*, Habilitated Doctoral Thesis, Chişinău, 2024. Available at: <https://anacec.md/files/Glavan-tezaDH.pdf> [accessed: 14.04.2025].

24. Glavan Boris, *Grounds and Conditions for Conducting Special Investigative Measures*. In: *Intelectus*, no. 1-2, 2021, pp. 165-173.

25. Gurin Vasile et al., *Corruption. Studies on Various Aspects of Corruption in the Republic of Moldova*, ARC Publishing House, Chişinău, 2000, 382 p.

26. Gurschi Constantin, Gurin Vasile, Cuşnir Valeriu, Avram Mihai, *Case Law on Corruption Offences. Theoretical and Practical Aspects*, Ulysse Publishing House, Chişinău, 2003, 260 p. ISBN 9975-9663-5-7.

27. Hans Gross, *Handbook for Investigating Judges as a System of Criminalistics*, Graz, 1893; later republished as *Handbook of Criminalistics*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 10th ed., 1970; *Criminal Investigation: A Practical Handbook for Magistrates, Police Officers and Lawyers* (English translation, 1924, Sweet & Maxwell, London), pp. 15-27, 145-152.

28. Judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in *Pareniciu v. the Republic of Moldova*, 1 October 2014 (§§ 33–36). Available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-154853> [accessed: 02.11.2024].
29. Judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in *Savițchi v. the Republic of Moldova*, 17 June 2008 (§§ 4–5). Available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-127978> [accessed: 18.07.2024].
30. Khachatryan Tigran Borisovich, *Detection and Investigation of Bribery in Executive Authorities*, PhD Thesis.
31. Khalikov Aslyam Nailevich, *Particularities of Investigating Bribe-Taking by Law Enforcement Officials*, PhD Thesis, Ufa, 2005, 238 p.
32. Luchin Lilian, Rusnac Constantin, *Some Aspects Regarding the Search of Means of Transport*. In: *Scientific Annals of the “Ștefan cel Mare” Academy of the MIA of RM, Chișinău*, 2009, pp. 132–134.
33. Lyamin Mikhail Viktorovich, *Use of Criminalistic Methods in Investigating Bribery within Law Enforcement Bodies*, PhD Thesis, Saratov, 2003, 231 p.
34. Masterkov A.A., *Criminal-Law and Criminological Aspects of Provocative Activity*, PhD Thesis, Vladivostok, 2000, 184 p.
35. Năstase O., *Methodology of Investigating Bribery Offences*. In: *Guide for Criminal Prosecutors, Vol. II*, Helicon Publishing House, Timișoara, 1994, 247 p.
36. Odagiu Iurie, Nestor Sergiu, *Criminalistics*, Printing House of the “Ștefan cel Mare” Academy, Chișinău, 2011, 140 p.
37. Osipov A.B., *Corruption Activity in Internal Affairs Bodies*, PhD Abstract, St. Petersburg, 2005.
38. Osoianu Tudor, Odagiu Iurie, Ostavciuc Dinu, Rusnac Constantin, *Tactics of Criminal Investigation Actions*, Cartea Militară Publishing House, Chișinău, 2020, 338 p.
39. Osoianu Tudor, Ostavciuc Dinu, *Criminal Investigation*, Chișinău, 2021, 494 p.
40. Osoianu Tudor, Ostavciuc Dinu, *Procedure of Hearing Witnesses and Victims under Special Conditions at the Pre-Trial Stage*. In: *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae. Legal Sciences*, 2023, pp. 138–153.
41. Ostavciuc Dinu, *Circumstances to be Established and Proven in Cases of Child Trafficking*. In: *Scientific Annals of the “Ștefan cel Mare” Academy*, 2013.
42. Ostavciuc Dinu, *Notification of the Criminal Investigation Body*, Cartea Militară Publishing House, Chișinău, 2020, 206 p.
43. Ostavciuc Dinu, Odagiu Iurie, *Investigation of Organized Crime Offences. Methodological Guide for Criminal Investigation Officers*, Cartea Militară Publishing House, Chișinău, 2020, 92 p.
44. Ostavciuc Dinu, Odagiu Iurie, *Tactics of Conducting Crime Scene Investigation*, Cartea Militară Publishing House, Chișinău, 2020, 38 p.
45. Ostavciuc Dinu, Odagiu Iurie, *Tactics of Conducting Interviews*.

Methodological Guide for Criminal Investigation Officers, Cartea Militară Publishing House, Chişinău, 2020, 70 p.

46. Ostavciuc Dinu, Principles of Criminal Procedure, Print-Caro Publishing House, Chişinău, 2022, 719 p.

47. Ostavciuc Dinu, Procedural-Criminal Aspects and Criminalistic Tactics in Investigating Child Trafficking, Pro Universitaria Publishing House, Bucharest, 2023, 250 p.

48. Ostavciuc Dinu, Rusnac Constantin, Features of Planning the Investigation of Crimes Committed by Organized Criminal Groups. In: Bulletin of Luhansk State University of Internal Affairs, 2021, p. 297.

49. Ostavciuc Dinu, Rusnac Constantin, Forensic Assistance in the Investigation of Crimes Committed by Organized Criminal Groups. In: Socio-Legal Studies, 2021, p. 111.

50. Ostavciuc Dinu, Şevciuc Eugeniu, Mechanism of Corruption Crime Committed by Civil Servants with Special Status. In: Supremăția Dreptului, 2025, pp. 10–25.

51. Ostavciuc Dinu, Şevciuc Eugeniu, The Issue of Organising the Investigation of Corruption Offences. In: Agora International Journal of Juridical Sciences, 2025, pp. 253–264.

52. Peter Stelfox, Criminal Investigation: An Introduction to Principles and Practice, Routledge, London/New York, 2013, pp. 72–79, 115–121.

53. Popov Ruslan, Scientific Research on the Subject of Offences Provided in Chapters XV and XVI of the Special Part of the Criminal Code. In: Studia Universitatis Moldaviae, 2015, no. 8 (88), pp. 129–143.

54. Şevciuc Eugeniu, Circumstances of Committing Corruption Offences by Public Officials with Special Status. In: Legea și Viața, 2025, pp. 244–260.

55. Şevciuc Eugeniu, Osoianu Viorica, Establishing Psychological Contact in the Process of Hearing a Public Official with Special Status. In: Proceedings of the II International Scientific Conference, Vinnytsia, 2025, pp. 257–266.

56. Şevciuc Eugeniu, Osoianu Viorica, Preparation for the Interrogation of a Public Official with Special Status. In: International Scientific Conference Proceedings, Chişinău, 2025, pp. 450–456.

57. Şevciuc Eugeniu, The Criminological Characteristic of Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status. In: Legea și Viața, special edition, 2024, pp. 339–344.

58. Şevciuc Eugeniu, The Features of the Public Official with Special Status as a Defining Element of Criminalistic Characteristics. In: Legea și Viața, special edition, 2023, pp. 225–237.

59. Stancu Emilian, Ciobanu Petruț, Criminalistics. Criminalistic Methodology, Universul Juridic Publishing House, Bucharest, 2018, 336 p.



## LIST OF THE AUTHOR'S PUBLICATIONS ON THE THESIS TOPIC

### Articles in national and international scientific journals:

- 1) Şevciuc Eugeniu, *The Features of the Public Official with Special Status as a Defining Element of Criminalistic Characteristics in the Investigation of Corruption Offences*. In: Proceedings of the Interuniversity Scientific Conference with International Participation "Prevention and Combating of Crime: Problems, Solutions and Perspectives", 5th edition, Chişinău, 18 May 2023. Scientific-practical publication *Legea și Viața*, special edition, "Ștefan cel Mare" Academy of the MIA, 2023, pp. 225–237. ISSN 2587-4365 / E-ISSN 2587-4373. Type C.
- 2) Şevciuc Eugeniu, *The Criminological Characteristic of Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status*. In: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference "Prevention and Combating of Crime: Problems, Solutions and Perspectives", 6th edition, Chişinău, 25 April 2024. Scientific-practical publication *Legea și Viața*, special edition, "Ștefan cel Mare" Academy of the MIA, 2024, pp. 339–344. ISSN 2587-4365 / E-ISSN 2587-4373. Type C.
- 3) Şevciuc Eugeniu, Osoianu Viorica, *Establishing Psychological Contact in the Process of Hearing a Public Official with Special Status as Suspected or Accused of Committing Acts of Corruption*. In: Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference "Crime and Its Counteraction in Wartime and Post-War Perspective: An Interdisciplinary Panorama" (Vinnytsia, 16 April 2025), Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine; National Police of Ukraine; Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs; Criminological Association of Ukraine. Vinnytsia: KhNUVS, 2025, pp. 257–266.
- 4) Şevciuc Eugeniu, Osoianu Viorica, *Preparation for the Interrogation of a Public Official with Special Status as a Suspect or Accused in Corruption Offences as a Mandatory Step for Ensuring Tactical Success*. In: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference "Prevention and Combating of Crime: Problems, Solutions and Perspectives", 7th edition, Chişinău, 10 April 2025, pp. 450–456. ISSN 2587-4365 / E-ISSN 2587-4373. Type B.
- 5) Şevciuc Eugeniu, *Circumstances of Committing Corruption Offences by Public Officials with Special Status*. In: Scientific-practical publication *Legea și Viața*, issue 2, "Ștefan cel Mare" Academy of the MIA, Chişinău, 2025, pp. 244–260. ISSN 2587-4365 / E-ISSN 2587-4373. Type B.
- 6) Andruș Cătălin, Şevciuc Eugeniu, *Traces of Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status*. In: *Scientific Annals of the "Ștefan cel Mare" Academy of the MIA*, issue 21, Chişinău, 2025, pp.

170–192. ISSN 1857-0976 / E-ISSN 2953-6898. Type B.

7) Ostavciuc Dinu, Șevciuc Eugeniu, *Mechanism of Corruption Crime Committed by Civil Servants with Special Status*. In: *International Scientific Journal Supremăția Dreptului*, “Constantin Stere” University of European Political and Economic Studies, No. 1, 2025, pp. 10–25. ISSN 2345-1971 / E-ISSN 2587-4128. Type B.

8) Ostavciuc Dinu, Șevciuc Eugeniu, *The Issue of Organising the Investigation of Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status Based on the Practice of the Republic of Moldova*. In: *Agora International Journal of Juridical Sciences*, Agora University of Oradea, Vol. 19, No. 2 (2025), pp. 253–264. ISSN 1843-570X / E-ISSN 2067-7677. Category B+.

9) Șevciuc Eugeniu, *Use of the Results of Special Investigative Measures in the Process of Investigating Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status*. In: Scientific-practical publication *Legea și Viața*, issue 4, “Ștefan cel Mare” Academy of the MIA, Chișinău, 2025. ISSN 2587-4365 / E-ISSN 2587-4373. Type B.

**Participation in national and international scientific conferences:**

1) Interuniversity Scientific Conference with international participation “Prevention and Combating of Crime: Problems, Solutions and Perspectives”, 5th edition, Chișinău, 18 May 2023.

2) International Scientific Conference “Prevention and Combating of Crime: Problems, Solutions and Perspectives”, 6th edition, Chișinău, 25 April 2024.

3) International Scientific Conference “Prevention and Combating of Crime: Problems, Solutions and Perspectives”, 7th edition, Chișinău, 10 April 2025.

4) II International Scientific and Practical Conference “Crime and Its Counteraction in Wartime and Post-War Perspective: An Interdisciplinary Panorama” (Vinnytsia, 16 April 2025), Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine; National Police of Ukraine; Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs; Criminological Association of Ukraine. Vinnytsia: KhNUVS.

## ADNOTARE

Eugeniu ȘEVCIUC. „Metodica cercetării infracțiunilor de corupție comise de funcționarii publici cu statut special.” Teză de doctor în drept. Chișinău, 2026.

**Structura tezei:** text de bază – 322 pagini; adnotare în limbile română, engleză și rusă; lista abrevierilor; introducere; patru capitole structurate în subcapitole; concluzii generale și recomandări; bibliografie din 409 surse. Rezultatele științifice ale cercetării au fost diseminate prin 9 publicații științifice și comunicări la conferințe naționale și internaționale.

**Cuvinte-cheie:** corupție, funcționar public cu statut special, metodică criminalistică, tactici investigative, probe, măsuri speciale de investigație, integritate instituțională.

**Domeniul cercetării:** criminalistică, expertiză judiciară, investigații operative.

**Scopul și obiectivele lucrării:** Scopul tezei constă în realizarea unei cercetări științifice complexe și aplicative în domeniul criminalisticii, orientate spre elaborarea unei metodici unitare și adaptate specificului profesional al funcționarilor publici cu statut special, destinată investigării eficiente a infracțiunilor de corupție comise de această categorie de persoane. Obiectivele cercetării includ: analiza cadrului doctrinar, legislativ și practic privind combaterea corupției; definirea caracteristicii criminalistice a acestor infracțiuni; stabilirea circumstanțelor ce urmează a fi probate; identificarea situațiilor tipice de urmărire penală și elaborarea recomandărilor tactice; valorificarea rezultatelor măsurilor speciale de investigație; propunerea unui model metodic integrat care să coreleze tactica procesuală cu activitatea operativă și să asigure loialitatea probatoriului; formularea de recomandări pentru perfecționarea cadrului normativ și a cooperării interinstituționale.

**Noutatea și originalitatea științifică:** este determinată de elaborarea pentru prima dată în doctrina națională a unei metodici criminalistice destinate investigării corupției comise de funcționarii publici cu statut special, categorie profesională care prezintă particularități juridice, psihologice și instituționale distincte. Originalitatea rezultă din abordarea sistemică a corupției prin identificarea și analiza detaliată a aspectelor specifice ale investigării infracțiunii respective, precum și prin propunerea unor soluții metodice inovatoare, bazate pe utilizarea probelor digitale, expertizelor tehnico-științifice și tacticilor investigative moderne, adaptate cerințelor statului de drept și standardelor europene.

**Semnificația teoretică a tezei:** Cercetarea contribuie la dezvoltarea teoriei criminalistice moderne prin formularea unei concepții științifice unitare privind investigarea corupției comise de funcționarii publici cu statut special. Lucrarea extinde dimensiunea metodică a criminalisticii prin corelarea activităților tactice, procesuale cu cele operative și prin sistematizarea criteriilor de definire a caracteristicii criminalistice a acestor infracțiuni. Rezultatele obținute pot servi drept suport pentru cercetări științifice ulterioare în domeniul combaterii corupției și al perfecționării tacticilor de investigare penală.

**Valoarea aplicativă a tezei:** Lucrarea are o valoare practică pronunțată, oferind un instrumentar criminalistic modern pentru organele de urmărire penală, procurori și structuri anti-corupție. Recomandările formulate pot fi aplicate în activitatea de descoperire, documentare și probare a faptelor de corupție comise de funcționarii publici cu statut special, contribuind la sporirea eficienței investigațiilor și la asigurarea loialității probatoriului. Totodată, rezultatele pot fi utilizate în procesul de formare profesională a studenților, masteranzilor, doctoranzilor și ofițerilor din cadrul PA, MAI, CNA, SPIA, în cadrul cursurilor de „Criminalistică”, „Activitate de urmărire penală”, „Expertize judiciare” și „Activitate specială de investigații”.

**Implementarea rezultatelor științifice:** Rezultatele obținute contribuie la modernizarea cadrului metodic al investigațiilor criminalistice, prin aplicarea unui model integrat de cercetare a corupției instituționale, care îmbină analiza teoretică cu soluțiile tactice. Concluziile formulate pot fi implementate în practica organelor de urmărire penală și a procuraturii, în vederea eficientizării procesului de probare și a consolidării legalității procedurale. De asemenea, cercetarea servește drept suport pentru perfecționarea programelor educaționale din domeniul criminalisticii și pentru elaborarea strategiilor instituționale de prevenire și combatere a corupției.

## ANNOTATION

Eugeniu ȘEVCIUC. "The Forensic Methodology of Investigating Corruption Offences Committed by Public Officials with Special Status." Doctoral Thesis in Law. Chișinău, 2026.

**Structure of the thesis:** main text – 322 pages; annotation in Romanian, English, and Russian; list of abbreviations; introduction; four chapters divided into subchapters; general conclusions and recommendations; bibliography comprising 409 sources. The scientific results of the research have been disseminated through 9 scientific publications and presentations at national and international conferences.

**Keywords:** corruption, public official with special status, forensic methodology, investigative tactics, evidence, special investigative measures, institutional integrity.

**Field of research:** forensics, judicial expertise, operative investigations.

**Purpose and objectives of the thesis:** The purpose of the thesis is to conduct a complex and applied scientific study in the field of forensic science, aimed at developing a unified methodology adapted to the professional specificities of public officials with special status, designed to ensure the effective investigation of corruption offences committed by this category of persons.

**The objectives of the research include:** analyzing the doctrinal, legislative, and practical framework concerning the fight against corruption; defining the forensic characteristics of such offences; establishing the circumstances that must be proven; identifying typical situations encountered during criminal proceedings and formulating tactical recommendations; capitalizing on the results of special investigative measures; proposing an integrated methodological model that correlates procedural tactics with operative activity and ensures the loyalty of evidence; and formulating recommendations for improving the normative framework and inter-institutional cooperation.

**Scientific novelty and originality:** The novelty of the thesis lies in the elaboration, for the first time in national doctrine, of a forensic methodology dedicated to the investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status – a professional category characterized by distinct legal, psychological, and institutional features. The originality derives from the systemic and interdisciplinary approach to corruption, through the identification and detailed analysis of the specific aspects of investigating such offences, as well as through the proposal of innovative methodological solutions based on the use of digital evidence, technical-scientific expertise, and modern investigative tactics adapted to the requirements of the rule of law and European standards.

**Theoretical significance of the thesis:** The research contributes to the development of modern forensic theory by formulating a unified scientific concept on the investigation of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status. The work expands the methodological dimension of forensics by correlating tactical and procedural activities with operative ones and by systematizing the criteria for defining the forensic characteristics of these offences. The results obtained can serve as a foundation for future scientific studies in the field of combating corruption and improving criminal investigation tactics.

**Practical value of the thesis:** The thesis has a pronounced practical value, providing a modern forensic toolkit for criminal investigation bodies, prosecutors, and anti-corruption structures. The recommendations formulated can be applied in the detection, documentation, and proof of corruption offences committed by public officials with special status, contributing to greater efficiency in investigations and ensuring the loyalty of evidence. Furthermore, the results can be used in the professional training of students, master's and doctoral candidates, and officers within the institutions of the Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office, Ministry of Internal Affairs, the National Anticorruption Center, and the Internal Protection and Anti-Corruption Service, within courses such as Forensics, Criminal Investigation Activity, Judicial Expertise, and Special Investigative Activity.

**Implementation of scientific results:** The results obtained contribute to the modernization of the methodological framework of forensic investigations, by applying an integrated model for studying institutional corruption that combines theoretical analysis with tactical solutions. The conclusions formulated can be implemented in the practice of criminal investigation bodies and prosecution offices to improve the efficiency of evidence collection and strengthen procedural legality. Additionally, the research serves as a basis for enhancing educational programs in forensic science and for the development of institutional strategies for preventing and combating corruption.

## АДНОТАЦИЯ

**Евгений ШЕВЧУК. «Методика расследования коррупционных преступлений, совершаемых публичными служащими со специальным статусом». Диссертация на соискание учёной степени доктора юридических наук. Кишинёв, 2026.**

**Структура диссертации:** основной текст – 322 страниц; аннотация на румынском, английском и русском языках; список сокращений; введение; четыре главы, разделённые на параграфы; общие выводы и рекомендации; библиография, включающая 409 источников. Научные результаты исследования были представлены в 9 научных публикациях и сообщениях на национальных и международных конференциях. Ключевые слова: коррупция, публичный служащий со специальным статусом, криминалистическая методика, тактика расследования, доказательства, специальные следственные мероприятия, институциональная интегритетность. Область исследования: криминалистика, судебная экспертиза, оперативно-розыскная деятельность.

**Цель и задачи исследования:** Цель диссертации состоит в проведении комплексного и прикладного научного исследования в области криминалистики, направленного на разработку единой методики, адаптированной к профессиональной специфике публичных служащих со специальным статусом, с целью обеспечения эффективного расследования коррупционных преступлений, совершаемых данной категорией лиц. Задачи исследования включают: анализ доктринальной, законодательной и практической базы противодействия коррупции; определение криминалистической характеристики указанных преступлений; установление подлежащих доказыванию обстоятельств; выявление типичных ситуаций следствия и разработку тактических рекомендаций; использование результатов специальных следственных мероприятий; предложение интегрированной методической модели, сочетающей процессуальную тактику с оперативной деятельностью и обеспечивающей лояльность доказательств; формулирование предложений по совершенствованию нормативно-правовой базы и межведомственного взаимодействия.

**Научная новизна и оригинальность:** Новизна исследования определяется тем, что впервые в национальной доктрине разработана криминалистическая методика расследования коррупции, совершаемой публичными служащими со специальным статусом – профессиональной категорией, обладающей специфическими юридическими, психологическими и институциональными особенностями. Оригинальность работы заключается в системном и междисциплинарном подходе к изучению коррупции посредством идентификации и детального анализа особенностей расследования данных преступлений, а также в предложении инновационных методических решений, основанных на использовании цифровых доказательств, технико-научных экспертиз и современных тактик расследования, адаптированных к требованиям правового государства и европейским стандартам.

**Теоретическая значимость диссертации:** Исследование способствует развитию современной криминалистической теории, формируя единую научную концепцию расследования коррупционных преступлений, совершаемых публичными служащими со специальным статусом. Работа расширяет методологическую основу криминалистики за счёт соотнесения тактических, процессуальных и оперативных аспектов и систематизации критериев определения криминалистической характеристики этих преступлений. Полученные результаты могут служить основой для дальнейших научных исследований в области противодействия коррупции и совершенствования методов уголовного расследования.

**Практическая ценность диссертации:** Работа обладает выраженной практической направленностью, предлагая современный криминалистический инструментарий для следственных органов, прокуратуры и антикоррупционных структур. Разработанные рекомендации могут быть применены при выявлении, документировании и доказывании коррупционных преступлений, совершаемых публичными служащими со специальным статусом, способствуя повышению эффективности расследований и обеспечению допустимости и добросовестности доказательств. Результаты исследования могут быть использованы в процессе профессиональной подготовки студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и сотрудников Антикоррупционной прокуратуры, МВД, НЦБК, Службы внутренней защиты и борьбы с коррупцией, в рамках курсов «Криминалистика», «Деятельность по уголовному преследованию», «Судебные экспертизы» и «Оперативно-розыскная деятельность».

**Внедрение научных результатов:** Полученные результаты способствуют модернизации методической базы криминалистических исследований путём применения интегрированной модели изучения институциональной коррупции, сочетающей теоретический анализ с практическими тактическими решениями. Сформулированные выводы могут быть внедрены в практику следственных органов и прокуратуры с целью повышения эффективности доказывания и укрепления процессуальной законности. Кроме того, исследование служит основой для совершенствования образовательных программ в области криминалистики и разработки институциональных стратегий предупреждения и противодействия коррупции.

**ȘEVCIUC Eugeniu**

**METHODOLOGY FOR INVESTIGATING CORRUPTION OFFENCES  
COMMITTED BY PUBLIC OFFICIALS WITH SPECIAL STATUS**

**Specialty: 554.04 – Criminalistics, forensic expertise,  
operative investigations**

**SUMMARY OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS IN LAW**

Approved for printing: 08.04.2026  
Offset paper. Offset printing  
Pattern sheets: 3.75.

Paper format 60×90/16  
Edition 10 ex.  
Order no. 242.

Printed at the Printing House  
of the Editorial and Polygraphic Department  
of the “Ștefan cel Mare” Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs  
Chișinău municipality, 21 Gheorghe Asachi Street,  
MD-2009, Republic of Moldova