

High Qualification
COMMISSION
of Judges of Ukraine



Вища кваліфікаційна
КОМІСІЯ
суддів України



Digest of the Practice of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine for the First Half of 2026

2026

List of Abbreviations

HQCJ – High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine

HCJ – High Council of Justice

PIC – Public Integrity Council

PCIE – Public Council of International Experts

Declarations of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government – asset declaration

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
I. General Information.....	5
II. Review of HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in Appellate General Courts	6
Summary of the Results of Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in Appellate General Courts	72
III. Review of HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in the High Anti-Corruption Court	74
IV. Review of HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in Specialised Administrative Courts	136
V. Information on HQCJ Decisions Concerning the Organisation of Procedures for the Selection of Judges to Local Courts	144
VI. HQCJ Decisions on the Qualification Assessment of Judges for Suitability for the Position Held.....	147
VII. HQCJ Decisions on Approval of Regulatory Legal Acts	154

INTRODUCTION

During the first half of 2026, the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine continued its systematic work in exercising its powers in the area of staffing the judicial system of Ukraine in accordance with the Constitution of Ukraine, the Law of Ukraine “On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges”, and other regulatory legal acts.

One of the measures envisaged by the Rule of Law Roadmap is publication by the Commission of regular digests of its adopted decisions. This measure is intended to enhance the Commission’s accountability in filling judicial vacancies and completing the qualification assessment of serving judges, and to improve the efficiency, accessibility, and quality of justice.

This edition of the Digest provides a concise review of HQCJ decisions adopted following consideration of the principal matters within its remit: the implementation of competitive procedures for filling vacant judicial positions in appellate general courts, the High Anti-Corruption Court, and specialised administrative courts; the qualification assessment of judges for compliance with the requirements for the position held; the organisation of the selection of judges to local courts; and other matters. Particular attention is devoted to decisions finding that candidates for vacant judicial positions failed to demonstrate their ability to administer justice in particular courts, together with a summary of the grounds for adopting such decisions.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. From January to June 2026, the HQCJ considered 590 matters, of which:

- 267 with the participation of authorised representatives of the PIC;
- 250 in plenary session, resulting in the adoption of **280 decisions**;
- 27 at a special joint session of the Commission and the PCIE, resulting in the adoption of **70 decisions**;
- 107 sitting in chambers, resulting in the adoption of **102 decisions**;
- 206 sitting in panels, resulting in the adoption of **373 decisions**.

In total, the HQCJ adopted **825 decisions**.

2. During the specified period, the Commission considered 73 matters concerning the secondment of judges, of which:

- the secondment of judges to other courts – 68;
- the early termination of judges' secondment/simultaneous secondment to other courts – 4;
- the transfer of judges to another court / without competition – 1.

II. Review of HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in Appellate General Courts.

1. General Information

Sitting in panels, the HQCJ considered matters concerning the examination of dossiers, the conduction of interviews, and the determination of qualification assessment results in respect of candidates for judgeship in appellate general courts, and adopted **230 decisions**, of which:

- **96 decisions** on finding that candidates had demonstrated their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court;
- **49 decisions** on finding that candidates had failed to demonstrate their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court;
- **1 decision** on suspension of the qualification assessment of a candidate for judgeship in an appellate general court and referring the matter to the High Council of Justice for determination as to whether to open disciplinary proceedings or refuse to open them;
- **3 decisions** on termination of participation in the competition;
- **81 decisions** referring to the Commission in plenary session the issue of whether a candidate for a judgeship had demonstrated the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

The HQCJ in **plenary session** adopted **66 decisions** (regarding candidates, the Public Integrity Council had submitted opinion finding that the candidate for judgeship did not comply with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity), including:

- **55 decisions** on finding that candidates had demonstrated their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court;
- **11 decisions** on finding that candidates had failed to demonstrate their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

In addition, the HQCJ in **plenary session** adopted:

- **8 decisions** on termination of candidates' participation in the competition;
- **2 decisions** on approval of the ranking of candidates for vacant judgeships in appellate general courts and determining the winners of the competition;
- **39 decisions** on recommending candidates for appointment as judges of an appellate court.

2. HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in Appellate General Courts

Decision dated 11.05.2026 No. 57/zp-26

On Approval of the Ranking of Candidates Based on the Qualification Assessment Results and Determination of the Winners of the Competition for Vacant Judgeships in the Mykolaiv Court of Appeal within the competition announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytingu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-4>)

Decisions dated 20.05.2026 Nos. 213-228/ac-26

On Recommending Candidates for Appointment as Judges of the Mykolaiv Court of Appeal.

Decision dated 27.05.2026 No. 63/zp-26

On Approval of the Ranking of Candidates Based on the Qualification Assessment Results and Determination of the Winners of the Competition for Vacant Judgeships in the Odesa Court of Appeal within the Competition Announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytingu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-5>)

Decisions dated 08.06.2026 Nos. 275 - 297/ac-26

On Recommending Candidates for Appointment as Judges of the Odesa Court of Appeal.

3. HQCJ Decisions on Finding That Candidates Failed to Demonstrate Their Ability to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court

3.1 HQCJ decisions on finding that candidates failed to demonstrate their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court due to non-compliance with the indicators of personal and social competence.

Decision dated 15.01.2026 No. 8/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Alla Sanduliak, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-198>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 30.67 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

The candidate's motivation letter and her responses to the Commission members' follow-up questions did not satisfy the panel as to the accuracy of her assertions or the explanation of their substance. For example, the Commission members gave conflicting assessments to the following statement in the candidate's letter: "If, through my work as a judge of an appellate court, at least one panel works honestly and incorruptibly, in accordance with the requirements of the law, this will be a small but significant step towards establishing the rule of law..." The candidate did not convincingly explain the substance of this statement. In the panel's view, the statement is contradictory and may undermine the authority of the judiciary because it calls into question the integrity of other judges. The Commission unanimously decided to assess this circumstance through the lens of personal responsibility, namely, the candidate's conscious ability to bear responsibility for her actions and statements.

Moreover, candidate Sanduliak A.V. systematically avoided answering direct questions concerning her professional activities.

Accordingly, Sanduliak A.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 15.01.2026 No. 11/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Viktoriia Stoliarenko, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-192>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 34 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

The candidate's responses during the interview were general and declarative and contained no specific examples of making difficult or unpopular decisions in her professional activities. When asked about the meaning of "responsibility" the candidate confined herself to general formulations – "high-quality performance of work", "compliance with deadlines", and "compliance with the law" – without providing examples of personal responsibility for difficult decisions and their consequences.

The candidate's assertion that experience as a defence lawyer and prosecutor is "fundamental" because it makes it possible to see the "shortcomings of the parties" indicates a focus on the errors of other participants in the proceedings rather than on her own responsibility for the ultimate outcome of the administration of justice.

In response to a question about changes in the judicial system and her role in them as a judge, the candidate effectively reduced those changes to the competitive selection process itself and an abstract increase in confidence in the courts, without articulating a clear personal position or a vision of specific actions by an appellate judge. She herself acknowledged that the ideas she proposed (summarising judicial practice) were not new, and they were not accompanied by an understanding of the mechanisms for their implementation.

In substantiating her intention to take up the position of an appellate judge immediately, the candidate relied primarily on subjective impressions and her personal "fascination" with observing the work of judicial panels in the past. In the Commission's view, such reasoning does not demonstrate that the candidate is prepared to make difficult, independent, and socially significant decisions, which are an integral part of the work of an appellate judge.

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 35.01 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate did not comply with the criterion of social competence.

As regards the indicator of effective communication, during the interview the candidate was unable to communicate her position clearly and consistently and did not provide a single specific example of effective communication from her professional practice, despite repeated follow-up questions from Commission members.

At the same time, the candidate effectively confirmed a practice of notifying judges in advance of an intention to file applications for searches by personally visiting their chambers before cases had been allocated through the automated system. She regarded

this practice as “normal” and did not view it as exceeding the boundaries of proper procedural communication. In the Commission’s view, this may indicate that the candidate lacks an understanding of judicial independence, the prohibition on extra-procedural influence, and the standards of judicial ethics, which is critically incompatible with the exercise of judicial powers.

Furthermore, the candidate’s use of the phrase “we are doing the same work” in relation to the court and prosecution authorities indicates an effective identification of the functions of the prosecution and the court. This approach demonstrates a failure to distinguish clearly between prosecutorial and judicial functions, is contrary to the principle of impartiality, and creates a risk of a biased, prosecution-oriented approach to decision-making.

The candidate’s responses concerning her reasons for seeking judicial office, her personal contribution to building a state governed by the rule of law, and professional challenges were general and superficial and did not reflect an understanding of the essence of judicial work. Stoliarenko V.M. was unable to explain clearly and convincingly what motivated her to seek the position of an appellate judge, confining herself to phrases about “performing work well” and general reflections about future study. This approach indicates a lack of clear awareness of the challenges and responsibilities of the judicial profession.

Accordingly, Stoliarenko V.M. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 22.01.2026 No. 22/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Serhii Diachuk, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-221>)

Taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 30 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

The Commission concluded that, by accepting blame for committing an administrative offence, the candidate had effectively helped the person who had in fact committed the administrative offence to evade the liability prescribed by law. In the Commission’s conviction, the conduct demonstrated by the candidate plainly does not evidence an ability to act responsibly and instead has the opposite effect.

Following review of the dossier and the interview, the candidate failed to demonstrate the requisite level of decisiveness and responsibility.

Accordingly, Diachuk S.I. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 22.01.2026 No. 23/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Iryna Teslenko, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-213>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 36 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not comply with the criterion of personal competence.

The following circumstance affected the panel members' voting under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator: it was established during the interview that the case (criminal proceedings NUMBER_1 dated 28 January 2019) had been assigned to the judge (candidate) pursuant to the automated case-allocation report; however, according to the candidate, certain persons manipulatively secured the reallocation of the case by obtaining the recusal of the judge (candidate) from hearing it.

The panel considers that this circumstance gave rise to a situation in which the fundamental principle of justice – the “tribunal established by law” – was violated.

In the panel's view, the judge (candidate) was legally obliged to appeal to the High Council of Justice with the notification of interference with the administration of justice. The candidate's failure to respond appropriately led the panel members to reduce the score under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator.

Thus, the information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate the requisite level of personal competence.

Accordingly, Teslenko I.O. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 05.02.2026 No. 37/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Svitlana Vzheshch, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-239>)

Following assessment of the written explanations and other materials included in the dossier and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by the members of the Commission sitting as a panel for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 35 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

Following the interview, the Commission concluded that the candidate had been unable to demonstrate appropriate professional self-development, namely, an established position regarding continuous development as a component of the personal competence of an appellate court judge.

Following the review of the rulings adopted by the judge, it was established that some of them may indicate a formalistic approach to submitting statements of self-recusal, without proper appreciation of circumstances that objectively preclude a judge's participation in hearing a particular case.

The Commission considers that the significant number of judicial decisions entered into the Unified State Register of Court Decisions out of time may indicate certain difficulties in the candidate's organisation of her work. Accordingly, Vzheshch S.I. was found **to have failed to confirm her ability** to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 05.02.2026 No. 40/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Yurii Tytarenko, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-219>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 35.67 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum

possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate had failed to demonstrate his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

Tytarenko Yu.O. explained that, in entering the competition for a prosecutor's position at the Office of the Prosecutor General, his objective was to study the Supreme Court's case-law, with which he, as a defence lawyer, was unfamiliar owing to the particular nature of his cases. However, after being appointed, Tytarenko Yu.O. resigned seven months later upon retirement, which demonstrates only to a certain extent the candidate's responsibility in making important decisions, his ability to maintain his commitment to working in that organisation, and his ability to make informed decisions.

The candidate's understanding of the collegiate consideration of cases by appellate courts appears contradictory: whether as an opportunity for a professional exchange of views and expert discussion in order to make well-reasoned decisions, or as an opportunity to 'share' responsibility.

The interview established that acquiring and improving knowledge of civil procedure was not a priority in the candidate's professional development, given the specialisation of his advocate activity, and that the 'systematic attendance of educational programmes on current issues of criminal and civil procedure' mentioned in his written explanations in fact concerned criminal law and criminal procedure. Tytarenko Yu.O. had not devoted sufficient attention to self-development in civil procedure or to fundamental issues concerning the organisation and operation of the judiciary. Thus, in answering the Commission members' questions, Tytarenko Yu.O. failed to demonstrate an understanding of such key concepts as the rule of law and judicial independence, or of the fundamental judgments of the European Court of Human Rights.

Accordingly, Tytarenko Yu.O. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 05.02.2026 No. 41/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Snizhana Stepanova, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-214>)

On the basis of its examination of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence was assessed at 31 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that Stepanova S.V. did not comply with the criterion of personal competence.

The candidate's repeated temporary secondments to administer justice without actually exercising judicial powers indicate the formal nature of Stepanova S.V.'s participation in the secondment procedure and a lack of a responsible attitude towards the performance of judicial duties. Such conduct is inconsistent with the substance of the responsibility indicator, which defines a judge's readiness to administer justice under difficult conditions, rather than to avoid performing the functions entrusted to the judge by remaining absent for an extended period from the court to which the judge was temporarily assigned.

Without entering into academic debate, the Commission considers it necessary to note that, since scholarly novelty in a dissertation is the author's original contribution to the relevant field of scholarship – that is, research findings not previously substantiated, formulated, or proven in the scholarly works of other researchers – proposals to amend legislation cannot be regarded as scholarly novelty.

In answering the Commission's questions, the candidate effectively equated scholarly novelty with results of a legislative drafting nature, whereas scholarly novelty primarily entails the development of legal doctrine, rather than merely formulating proposals to amend legislation. This approach indicates that the candidate does not distinguish between scholarly novelty, practical significance, and legislative initiatives.

The Commission concluded that, during the interview, the candidate had not demonstrated a clear understanding of the substance and criteria of scholarly novelty as a mandatory component of dissertation research; her answer was general and declarative and did not permit the identification of a specific original scholarly contribution.

Accordingly, Stepanova S.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 11.02.2026 No. 50/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Kostiantyn Baryla, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-249>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 32.33 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not comply with the criterion of personal competence.

Among the candidate's other statements and presentations of behavioural skills, the panel members' voting under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator was also affected by the candidate's violation of military-registration rules. In response to a Commission

member's question, the candidate confirmed that his place of work/residence was the city of Kyiv, while his registered place of residence was Lviv Region.

In the panel's view, the candidate's failure to comply with military-registration rules (not being registered at his place of residence), particularly under martial law, constituted grounds for reducing his score under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator.

Accordingly, Baryla K.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 18.02.2026 No. 55/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Vadym Oksiuta, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-238>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 34 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate did not comply with the criterion of social competence.

During the interview, the candidate stated that he had contemplated a judicial career since 2003 but had not participated in competitions for a long period, explaining this by the 'lack of openness' of the procedures. The assertion that the competitions were 'not open' is evaluative and unsupported by specific circumstances. At the same time, competitions were in fact held in 2011–2017 and resulted in the appointment of a significant number of judges. The candidate did not provide persuasive reasons why he had not attempted to pursue his aspiration during that period, which indicates a certain declarative quality in his motivation in previous years.

Despite statements about his desire to 'enhance the authority of justice', the candidate did not demonstrate a vision of his own contribution to the development of the judicial system and focused primarily on personal qualities.

As regards the emotional resilience indicator, during the interview the candidate repeatedly emphasised that he had 'developed self-control mechanisms' and was able to make decisions without being influenced by emotions. At the same time, his assertions concerning his composure were predominantly declarative.

The existence of administrative proceedings concerning domestic violence, notwithstanding their subsequent discontinuance, indicates a conflict in the sphere of family relations that became public and was considered by law-enforcement authorities

and a court. At the same time, the explanations provided focused primarily on the external circumstances of the conflict and shifted responsibility for it to others (the former wife, the police authority, and the court of first instance), without sufficiently disclosing the candidate's own assessment of his conduct or possible means of preventing similar situations in the future.

A judge must demonstrate not only confidence in his or her own resilience, but also an ability to acknowledge difficult moments, draw conclusions, and demonstrate growth through self-control. The candidate's responses did not properly reflect this level of awareness.

Having regard to all the foregoing circumstances, the Commission concluded that the candidate's explanations during the interview did not establish his compliance with the criterion of social competence.

Accordingly, Oksiuta V.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 25.02.2026 No. 58/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Qualification Assessment Results of Valeriia Barankevych, a Candidate for Judgeship in an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-242>)

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 34.33 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that Barankevych V.O. had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

Despite the examples given of working under difficult conditions, the candidate in fact focused on describing external circumstances (martial law, the lack of adequate logistical support for the court, and staff shortages), but did not provide persuasive examples of making difficult or unpopular decisions in situations of significance to the parties to proceedings. Her responses were general and contained no specific examples of decisiveness specifically in the administration of justice, which is central to assessing this indicator.

Regarding responsibility, the candidate gave no examples of making decisions while assessing their possible consequences, or of instances in which she assumed personal responsibility in difficult managerial or procedural situations.

As regards continuous development, the candidate confined herself to general statements concerning participation in professional-development activities at the National School of Judges of Ukraine and familiarisation with Supreme Court case-law. At the same time, she was unable to provide specific examples of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights or the Supreme Court that had led her to change her approaches to work; she did not identify her own areas for professional development, demonstrate an established self-improvement plan, or give examples of reflection on her own mistakes. The formal nature of her responses indicates compliance with mandatory requirements rather than conscious and systematic work on professional growth.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated a sufficient level of decisiveness, responsibility, and continuous development within the meaning of paragraphs 2.4–2.7 of Section 2 of the Regulation and therefore did not comply with the criterion of personal competence.

Following review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion was 36 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that Barankevych V.O. did not comply with the criterion of social competence.

As regards effective communication, the candidate's responses were emotionally charged, fragmentary, and insufficiently structured. She cited examples from practice (including the confrontational conduct of participants in proceedings and the pronouncement of a judgment in criminal proceedings), but her reasoning was descriptive rather than analytical. The candidate did not always articulate her position clearly and gave lengthy answers that departed from the substance of the questions, making her views difficult to follow. When discussing her son's employment at the court over which she presided, her answers were internally contradictory: on the one hand, she acknowledged that an outside observer might have doubts; on the other, she denied any ethical risks. Such inconsistency does not demonstrate an ability to substantiate her position persuasively and coherently.

As regards effective interaction, the candidate asserted that there were good relations within the team and no conflicts, but the examples provided were general and contained no specific analysis of managerial decisions in difficult situations. At the same time, the circumstances of her son's employment at the court while she served as president of that court objectively created a risk of doubts arising as to impartiality and compliance with ethical standards. Nevertheless, the candidate did not demonstrate proper sensitivity to reputational risks and standards of public confidence, which are an important component of a judge's social competence.

As regards sustained motivation and emotional resilience, the candidate confirmed a general desire to continue her judicial career, but her motivation to move to an appellate court was connected to a significant extent with personal and family circumstances rather than with a vision of the role of an appellate court or professional development. In describing ways of responding to stressful situations, the candidate confined herself to general formulations without specifying professional approaches to self-regulation. When

sensitive issues were discussed, her responses were predominantly general and did not contain sufficiently clear and consistent reasoning, which prevented a full assessment of her capacity for reflection and resilience.

The totality of the established circumstances provides grounds for finding that the candidate did not demonstrate an appropriate level of effective communication, interaction, stability of motivation, and emotional resilience within the meaning of clauses 2.8–2.12 of Section 2 of the Regulation and therefore does not meet the criterion of social competence.

Accordingly, V.O. Barankevych was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 03.03.2026 No. 64/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Oleksandr Obodovskyi, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-243>)

Based on the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion is 35.67 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that O.V. Obodovskyi had not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

The situations described, involving the independent performance of assignments on behalf of other lecturers or the performance of work under difficult living conditions, are indicative of individual conscientiousness rather than an ability to make timely managerial decisions and eliminate the causes of systemic violations. In practice, the candidate chose to perform the duties of others without demonstrating initiative in resolving problems at the organisational level or introducing mechanisms to prevent such situations from recurring, which indicates an avoidance of difficult managerial decisions.

The Commission also notes that, in his answers, the candidate did not demonstrate an adequate awareness of his own responsibility for the consequences of professional decisions. In particular, he stated that he had not informed management of instances of possible pressure from students and had not taken institutional response measures, confining himself to personal restraint. Such conduct indicates a tendency to resolve problematic situations individually, without properly documenting and responding to them under the established procedures, which is incompatible with the standards of judicial

responsibility requiring not only personal restraint but also an appropriate response to any manifestation of influence.

Furthermore, the written explanations show that the candidate systematically undertook assignments in circumstances involving breaches of established procedures (in particular, reviewing papers submitted after the deadline), thereby effectively tolerating other persons' non-compliance with the rules. This approach indicates a willingness to adapt to violations instead of ensuring compliance with the prescribed requirements, which is inconsistent with the ability expected of a judge to maintain procedural discipline and act within the established rules.

Having regard to all of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that during the interview the candidate did not demonstrate a sufficient degree of decisiveness in making difficult decisions or an appropriate level of responsibility within the meaning of the personal competence criteria. The explanations provided are predominantly descriptive, contain no proper self-reflection regarding his own managerial decisions, and do not demonstrate the candidate's ability to act as a holder of public authority who makes timely decisions and bears full personal responsibility for them. Accordingly, the Commission considers that O.A. Obodovskyi does not meet the criterion of personal competence under the indicator of decisiveness and responsibility.

Based on the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion is 36.33 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that O.V. Obodovskyi does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The written explanations and answers given during the interview show that the candidate predominantly chooses an individual persuasion-based model of interaction aimed at avoiding conflict through prolonged personal conversations or informal influence. In particular, contacting the parents of adult students as a means of influencing their conduct demonstrates the use of tools outside established procedures to achieve a result. This approach is inconsistent with the principles of institutional interaction, which require a judge to observe formalised procedures, maintain professional distance, and ensure equality among participants in legal relations. The candidate provided no examples of systematically resolving difficult interactions through prescribed organisational mechanisms.

As regards stability of motivation, the Commission took into account the candidate's assertion that he had aspired for many years to hold judicial office, his interest in the work of the judiciary, his scholarly publications, his participation in preparing proposals to improve judicial selection procedures, and his obtaining a certificate authorising him to practise law. At the same time, both the written explanations and the answers given during the interview indicate that these circumstances primarily characterise the candidate's professional interest in the legal field generally rather than demonstrate sustained and consistent motivation specifically to administer justice. The arguments advanced by the candidate are largely declarative and theoretical and are not accompanied by compelling

examples of professional situations demonstrating stable motivation amid a prolonged workload, professional uncertainty, or the need to make difficult and responsible decisions. The Commission also notes that the candidate's motivation is focused largely on his interest in the institution of the court and its operating procedures, whereas he did not demonstrate an adequate awareness of the practical challenges of administering justice or a willingness to bear the heightened responsibility associated with it.

Accordingly, O.V. Obodovskyi was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 05.03.2026 No. 69/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Olha Shevchenko, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-250>)

Based on the review of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence was assessed at 30.66 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that O.Yu. Shevchenko does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

In assessing the circumstances set out above and the candidate's explanations, the Commission notes their internal inconsistency. On the one hand, the candidate maintains that while she was outside Ukraine from 24 to 30 October 2013, no judicial decisions were in fact rendered and that their dates of issuance were mistakenly stated in the texts of the respective decisions. On the other hand, according to the candidate's explanations, the hearings in the cases scheduled for 28, 29, and 30 October were adjourned, the parties were notified of the rescheduling, and the cases were subsequently heard on 31 October 2013, her first day back at work. At the same time, the candidate confirmed that even where applications had been filed for cases to be heard in the parties' absence, the court was required to notify the participants in the proceedings in advance of the date, time, and place of the court hearing. In these circumstances, the candidate's explanations do not dispel doubts as to whether the parties could have been duly notified of the court hearings which, according to the candidate, were scheduled for 31 October 2013, given her absence from the workplace throughout the preceding week. Moreover, the candidate provided the Commission with no evidence that the cases concerned were heard on 31 October 2013.

The Commission also notes that, according to the candidate's explanations, before travelling she submitted an application for unpaid leave and agreed her intention with the president of the court. At the same time, the candidate confirmed that no order granting her leave had been issued. In these circumstances, the candidate should have ensured that her absence from work was properly documented and that the relevant decision

granting leave had been adopted in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law. Her failure to take such measures resulted in her actual absence from the workplace during the period concerned without proper documentary authorisation, while cases continued to be allocated to her through the automated case-allocation system.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the candidate's explanations do not dispel reasonable doubts as to the proper performance of her professional duties during the period concerned. The substantial number – 32, according to the candidate – of incorrect dates of issuance of judicial decisions, together with the inconsistency of the explanations provided regarding the circumstances in which the cases were heard, indicate an insufficient level of responsibility in the administration of justice. In these circumstances, the Commission considers that the candidate does not fully meet the criterion of personal competence under the “responsibility” indicator.

Accordingly, O.Yu. Shevchenko was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 10.03.2026 No. 72/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Serhii Maslo, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-284>)

Based on the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion following the assessment is 29 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible total score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

The Commission critically assessed the candidate's explanations concerning his exercise of the powers of president of the court for two months and the absence of adequate reasons for resigning as president at his own request, which indicates insufficient compliance with the criterion of personal competence, namely the candidate's inability to act decisively and his unwillingness to accept responsibility for the consequences of his own decisions.

The Commission also viewed critically the urgent preparation of draft judicial decisions while serving as a judge's assistant as evidence of the candidate's personal responsibility.

Furthermore, S.P. Maslo's explanations regarding his continuous development were found to be formalistic and unconvincing.

Accordingly, S.P. Maslo was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 11.03.2026 No. 73/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Oleksandra Tuntula, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-254>)

In assessing the candidate for judicial office under the indicator ‘compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life’, the Commission finds that O.S. Tuntula, while holding her previous positions as a scholar and academic staff member, made statements in the above-mentioned monograph (Kyrychenko A.A., Tuntula A.S. ‘Brilliant or Permeated by Outright Corruption and Manifest Unprofessionalism: The Worthless Results of the Competition to the Courts of Cassation, HACC and the HACC Appeals Chamber’. A Systemic Legal Study: monograph: 2nd ed. Kyiv: Publisher Nazarov O.A., 2019. 888 pp.) evidencing non-compliance with professional ethical standards and generally accepted moral rules of conduct, including the ethical requirements applicable to scholars, whose principal priorities are honesty, objectivity, social responsibility, and service to truth and society. The Commission critically assesses O.S. Tuntula’s denial of authorship, as it contradicts the facts established during the examination of the dossier and the interview.

In view of these circumstances, the members of the panel of the Commission unanimously found that there was reasonable doubt as to candidate O.S. Tuntula’s compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators ‘honesty’ and ‘compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life’, and assessed those indicators and, consequently, the criterion as a whole at 0 points.

Accordingly, O.S. Tuntula was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 18.03.2026 No. 75/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Yevhenii Bohdanov, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-261>)

Based on the review of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence was assessed at 31 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore unanimously considers that Ye.A. Bohdanov does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, Ye.A. Bohdanov did not provide compelling arguments demonstrating that he had developed the internal readiness to perform judicial functions under conditions of increased workload and case complexity. In particular, the candidate did not provide sufficiently substantiated answers regarding his resolve to act under pressure and gave no specific examples from his professional experience demonstrating an ability to make difficult and potentially unpopular decisions.

During the interview, Ye.A. Bohdanov did not provide sufficient examples of professional tools that he could use as an appellate court judge to reason and render decisions. Moreover, the candidate was unable to convince the Commission that he understood how such tools could be applied in judicial decision-making. It may therefore be concluded that the candidate lacks not only a practical but, above all, a theoretical understanding of the use of such tools.

The candidate did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the principles governing the application by national courts of the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. Furthermore, the candidate did not provide a clear explanation of the jurisdiction of the Court of Justice of the European Union, including the states subject to its jurisdiction and the categories of cases it hears.

Accordingly, Ye.A. Bohdanov was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 28.04.2026 No. 153/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Serhii Dunaiev, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-311>)

Based on the review of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence was assessed at 36 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore unanimously considers that S.O. Dunaiev does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

From the rulings of the Prydniprovskiy District Court of Cherkasy City that were examined, an outside observer could conclude that the judge's conduct displayed a tendency to use self-recusal as a means of avoiding the consideration of certain cases.

The systematic nature of the candidate's practice and the totality of such decisions may, in the eyes of an outside observer, give rise to doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator, which adversely affects his assessment under the relevant indicator.

The Commission finds that S.O. Dunaiev took certain steps for his own professional development. At the same time, given that his judicial powers ceased on 25 July 2018 upon expiry of the term for which he had been appointed, he had considerably more time and opportunities for systematic continuing training and professional growth. In the Commission's view, the lengthy period during which he lacked authority to administer justice created favourable conditions for more intensive and focused efforts to improve his professional level, but the candidate did not make full use of that opportunity.

Accordingly, S.O. Dunaiev was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 28.04.2026 No. 155/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Tamara Yaroshenko, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-315>)

Based on the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion is 32 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

In assessing the candidate's personal competence under the 'responsibility' indicator, the Commission noted the judge's frequent issuance of rulings correcting clerical errors in court decisions. Procedural law provides that a court may correct clerical errors (grammatical and technical errors) and arithmetical errors. Such corrections must not alter the substance of the decision.

At the same time, amending the operative part of a decision is not the correction of a clerical error but effectively the rendering of a new decision. Correction of a clerical error is permitted only in respect of technical errors; a court may not alter the content of a decision under the guise of making a correction. Furthermore, an erroneous conclusion by a court

is not a clerical error; such an error may be corrected on appeal. Accordingly, the panel of the Commission took into account, together with other matters, when assessing the 'responsibility' indicator under the criterion of personal competence, the repeated instances in which Judge T.O. Yaroshenko issued rulings correcting clerical errors in decisions concerning the amount of indebtedness, the incorrect identification of the parties to a case and their particulars, the method of calculating time limits, and other matters.

The explanations provided by T.O. Yaroshenko in clause 1.2, 'Information on the candidate for judicial office's compliance with the criterion of personal competence under the "continuous development" indicator', concern only activities that are mandatory for a judge by virtue of the duties imposed by the Law and do not fully demonstrate the candidate's compliance with the 'continuous development' indicator under the criterion of personal competence. In particular, when Commission members asked about her understanding of certain legal institutions, the candidate did not answer affirmatively and displayed uncertainty in her understanding of them.

Accordingly, T.O. Yaroshenko was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 26.05.2026 No. 240/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Halyna Litvinova, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-367>)

Based on the review of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence was assessed at 35.66 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore considers that H.M. Litvinova does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

The Commission members examined H.M. Litvinova's practice concerning the correction of clerical errors in decisions, including in the operative part and the parties' particulars. In some cases, the candidate refused to add a party's date of birth to a writ of execution, stating that a state or private enforcement officer could ascertain that information independently in the course of enforcing the decision, whereas in other similar cases she granted such an addition.

Having regard to the explanations received, the Commission notes that correcting the operative part of a decision under the guise of correcting a clerical error is impermissible.

In assessing this information, the Commission is unable to dispel the doubt that the first-instance judge effectively exceeded her authority, since correcting errors of legal characterisation in the operative part of a decision is the prerogative of the appellate court and cannot serve as a basis for amending the operative part of a judicial decision by

correcting a 'clerical error' as a means of avoiding responsibility for erroneous legal conclusions. These circumstances adversely affect the candidate's assessment under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator.

The Commission members discussed with the candidate the issue of self-recusals in cases to which a close relative of a court employee, or a court employee personally, is a party. H.M. Litvinova explained that she had previously followed the practice of a colleague who recused himself in such cases in order to avoid even the slightest doubt as to impartiality, and had herself applied that practice in cases involving close relatives of her assistant. The candidate has now departed from that approach and does not consider it justified.

Although the candidate stated that she had changed her approach to considering similar cases, she provided no specific examples demonstrating such a change in practice, which prevents the Commission from properly assessing whether the stated changes in her approach are genuine. These circumstances adversely affect the candidate's assessment under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator.

Accordingly, H.M. Litvinova was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 28.05.2026 No. 249/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Yurii Rybalka, a candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-359>)

Based on the examination of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence was assessed at 30.67 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that Yu.V. Rybalka does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

The number of rulings correcting clerical errors issued by the candidate is very substantial. In many instances, moreover, the corrections concerned not only technical errors but also the operative parts of judicial decisions. In the Commission's view, such a number of corrections indicates an insufficient level of attentiveness and responsibility when preparing and reviewing draft judicial decisions before they are rendered. The candidate's references to an excessive workload and a substantial volume of work may explain the occurrence of individual errors but do not remove a judge's obligation to ensure that procedural documents are properly prepared.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission takes the established circumstances into account when assessing the candidate under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator.

The candidate's use of the institution of judicial self-recusal was also discussed during the interview. Thus, in the course of hearing a number of cases, the parties sought the recusal of Judge Yu.V. Rybalka, but those applications were refused. The candidate subsequently recused himself in those cases. When asked by the Commission about the reasons for those actions, the candidate replied that the applications for his recusal had been unfounded and there had therefore been no grounds for granting them. At the same time, given the parties' categorical lack of confidence in the court's actions and decisions, he considered it appropriate to recuse himself in order to eliminate any doubts as to the objectivity and impartiality of the proceedings. The candidate also stated that he had not thereby sought to remove himself from hearing the cases.

In the circumstances established, the candidate concluded that the applications for his recusal were unfounded, thereby effectively acknowledging the absence of statutory grounds for removing him from the cases. Nevertheless, he subsequently recused himself, relying primarily on the parties' expressed lack of confidence in the court.

In the Commission's view, this approach does not fully accord with the substance of the institution of self-recusal and indicates insufficient readiness to withstand procedural conduct by the participants in a case aimed at removing a judge from the case in the absence of proper legal grounds. A judge must be capable of consistently adhering to his or her procedural position and continuing to hear a case where there are no circumstances objectively precluding his or her participation in the proceedings.

The Commission took the foregoing circumstances into account when assessing Yu.V. Rybalka under the 'decisiveness and responsibility' indicator.

Based on the examination of the information contained in the dossier materials and the interview with the candidate, the Commission determined that Yu.V. Rybalka scored 32.99 points under the criterion of social competence, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The Commission takes into account the candidate's explanations regarding his introduction of certain organisational practices for interaction with the judge's assistant and the court hearing secretary, including regular working meetings and the use of internal mechanisms to verify that cases were ready for hearing. At the same time, the results of such interaction are not fully consistent with other circumstances established during the assessment. In particular, the Commission identified a substantial number of rulings correcting clerical errors, instances in which procedural documents were not sent to case participants in a timely manner, and numerous discrepancies in the dates of the candidate's judicial decisions entered in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions. In certain instances, the candidate became aware of the identified deficiencies only after staff members had left, and the case files had to be put in order. In the Commission's view, the foregoing demonstrates insufficiently effective interaction between the candidate and his judicial office.

The Commission takes into account, in their totality, the circumstances established during the interview relating to numerous instances in which judicial decisions dated during periods when the candidate was absent from the workplace were entered in the Unified

State Register of Court Decisions; the inadequate organisation of oversight over the preparation of procedural documents and their timely transmission to participants in proceedings; the substantial number of rulings correcting clerical errors, including errors concerning the operative parts of judicial decisions; and the candidate's use of self-recusal in the absence of objective grounds for removing him from cases.

In the Commission's view, the foregoing circumstances demonstrate systemic deficiencies in the candidate's organisation of the performance of his professional duties and supervision of procedural actions, which are components of the conscientiousness indicator. Taken together, the established facts cast doubt on the appropriate level of discipline, diligence, and responsibility displayed by the candidate in administering justice.

The Commission notes that the explanations provided by the candidate did not dispel those doubts. References to an excessive workload, staffing changes in the judicial office, and a desire to avoid conflict with participants in the proceedings do not refute the established circumstances or explain their systemic nature.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concluded that the candidate does not meet the 'conscientiousness' indicator under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Accordingly, Yu.V. Rybalka was found to have failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 11.06.2026 No. 307/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Ivan Soloviov, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-429>)

Based on the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion is 33.75 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that candidate I.M. Soloviov had not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, the candidate confined himself to general statements concerning his decisiveness and responsibility in the professional sphere and his understanding of judicial responsibility. He gave no specific examples of decisiveness and responsibility in his everyday personal life.

The Commission considers that, in his written explanations and during the interview, the candidate effectively stated that he complied with the requirements of Article 89 of the Law

concerning judicial training to maintain qualifications. The Commission took into account the candidate's assertions that he monitors legislative developments and case-law, but those activities are a mandatory element of maintaining the qualifications and appropriate level of knowledge of a judge of a local general court and do not demonstrate additional effort in the context of his continuous development as a candidate for judicial office at an appellate general court.

Furthermore, during the interview the candidate did not provide clear answers to the Commission's questions directly concerning the work of a judge of an appellate general court. When the Commission asked him to provide examples of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights addressing the issues covered in the Jean Monnet Module course 'Digital Transformation of Rights: the EU Experience', the candidate provided no answer. Nor did he answer the question as to which civil obligations are referred to in Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Furthermore, during the interview I.M. Soloviov did not demonstrate in-depth knowledge of the issue that was the subject of his dissertation research; he confined himself to generally known facts, did not explain the issues he had researched, and offered no clear practical proposals for resolving them.

The examples of professional, academic, and personal development provided by the candidate, and his answers to the Commission's questions during the interview, did not satisfy the Commission members that the candidate was pursuing continuous development at a level that would enable him to adapt to a change in his area of professional activity within a timeframe comparable to that of the other candidates (the competition winners).

Based on the examination of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores assigned by Commission members for the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion is 34.5 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that I.M. Soloviov, a candidate for judicial office at an appellate general court, does not meet the criterion of social competence.

During the interview, when discussing the indicators of the criterion of social competence, I.M. Soloviov confined himself to providing only the formal information stated in his questionnaire, without proper substantiation, self-reflection, or examples from his life that would clearly and convincingly demonstrate the candidate's compliance with this criterion.

I.M. Soloviov did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the concepts of 'effective communication' and 'effective interaction' or of the relationship between them. Most of the examples provided by the candidate to demonstrate compliance with these indicators concerned the performance of his professional duties as a judge and the conduct of judicial proceedings, as expressly prescribed by procedural law. In response to the Commission's questions, he was unable to provide sufficient examples of effective communication and effective interaction outside judicial proceedings that would conclusively demonstrate his compliance with those criteria in everyday life.

During the interview, the candidate did not demonstrate a sufficiently high level of motivation to hold judicial office at an appellate general court.

The candidate's explanations also gave rise to reasonable doubts on the part of the Commission as to his correct understanding of the concept of 'emotional resilience' and his compliance with this indicator.

The Commission notes that, overall, the candidate adopted a somewhat passive stance during the interview, confining himself to the information stated in his questionnaire. He answered follow-up questions in general terms without explaining in detail the substance of the matters under discussion.

Accordingly, I.M. Soloviov was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 16.06.2026 No. 313/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Liubomyr Vynar, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-410>)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, the written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by members of the Commission for the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under this criterion is 36.34 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore, the Commission concludes that the candidate has not demonstrated his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

The actions and conduct of Judge Vynar L.V. resulted in a failure to comply with reasonable time limits for the consideration of a significant number of cases, since delays in their allocation, caused by the impact on Judge Vynar L.V.'s judicial workload in the manner described above, meant that no procedural steps were taken in those cases for a prolonged period. Thus, in his capacity as president of the court, Judge Vynar L.V. allowed not only a disproportionate automated allocation of cases, but also a violation of the litigants' right to a fair trial.

The Commission considers that these circumstances indicate that Judge Vynar L.V. avoided full personal responsibility for his decisions and their consequences; when obstacles and complications arose in the form of a substantial workload, he sought and found a way to shift responsibility to others, thereby absolving himself of responsibility by invoking external circumstances.

Thus, Vynar M.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

3.2 Decisions of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQCJ) on finding that candidates failed to demonstrate their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court on the grounds of non-compliance with the indicators of integrity and professional ethics.

Decision dated 15.01.2026 No. 12/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Serhii Chubarov, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-203>)

The Commission critically assesses the candidate's explanations concerning income received while employed by Private Enterprise 'Universum Agency' and Private Enterprise 'Universum-M Agency', since information on the amount of such income is absent both from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers and from the documents submitted by the candidate. The mere fact that an employment relationship may have existed does not in itself confirm receipt of income in a specific amount.

In his explanations, the candidate refers to additional income accumulated by him and his wife through the sale of movable property that they owned; however, the candidate fails to take into account that the movable property in question was purchased by both the candidate and his wife with their own funds and was not gifted to them. Therefore, in the Commission's view, its sale does not create a new source of income, but merely changes the form of income that already existed but remains unsubstantiated.

The Commission notes that the explanations provided by the candidate concerning income received during his employment at private enterprises, as well as the accumulation of savings through the sale of movable property, are not supported by the relevant documents and do not make it possible to establish the actual amount of funds received. In the absence of information on its original cost and sale price, the sale of property purchased with the owners' own funds cannot be regarded as a substantiated source of additional income.

Thus, the spouses' aggregate officially substantiated income is disproportionate to the value of a 2019 BMW R1250 ADV motorcycle, taking into account the need to cover current living expenses, taxes, family maintenance, and the purchase and maintenance of other movable property, as well as the simultaneous purchase by the candidate's wife in 2019 of a 2008 INFINITI EX35 vehicle.

In view of the established circumstances, the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated that he had the lawful financial means to purchase the BMW R1250

ADV motorcycle, which indicates that his level of expenditure was inconsistent with his declared income.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concluded that the candidate and his wife objectively lacked the financial means to accumulate savings in that amount, and that the explanations and documents provided do not resolve the established discrepancy between their level of income, mandatory expenses, and declared monetary assets.

The totality of the established facts gives the Commission grounds for reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators of 'honesty' and 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of property, consistency of the standard of living of a judge (candidate for judicial office) or members of his family with declared income, and consistency of the lifestyle of a judge (candidate for judicial office) with his status', which, in turn, is sufficient to find that he does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, Chubarov S.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 03.02.2026 No. 34/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Nataliia Rodrihes, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-220>)

Based on an analysis of the declarations submitted, the candidate's explanations and her answers during the interview, as well as the documents provided in support of those explanations, the Commission established a set of circumstances indicating the candidate's failure to comply with the requirements of the Law of Ukraine 'On Prevention of Corruption', as well as with the principles of honesty and transparency enshrined in the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and the Code of Judicial Ethics.

The candidate's declarations for various reporting periods were found to contain numerous instances in which information was omitted or incorrectly reported concerning: real estate; vehicles; income; transactions exceeding the statutory threshold; bank accounts; membership in a professional organisation; instances of administrative liability; and visits to the Russian Federation and the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine.

The Commission identified instances of: failure to declare income received pursuant to a court decision; failure to report social benefits; failure to include information on the disposal of property in the section on transactions; and failure to report assistance from her mother and son when explaining the sources of her financial means.

In addition, in the declaration of integrity of a candidate for judicial office and the Candidate for Judicial Office Questionnaire, the candidate confirmed that she had not visited the

russian federation or the temporarily occupied territory after 2015 and 2014, respectively, which is contradicted by official data from the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine.

The totality of the established facts gives the Commission grounds for reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators of 'honesty' and 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of property, consistency of the standard of living of a judge (candidate for judicial office) or members of her family with declared income, and consistency of the lifestyle of a judge (candidate for judicial office) with her status', which, in turn, is sufficient to find that she does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, Rodrihes N.A. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 05.02.2026 No. 38/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Serhii Mediuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-233>)

The Commission had reasonable doubt as to whether sufficient funds were available for a member of the candidate's family to make payments totalling UAH 1,497,500 in December 2021 and to accumulate savings of UAH 862,790, as reported in the declaration for 2021.

The Commission established that the candidate had not provided sufficient and convincing explanations concerning the sources of the funds used by a family member to acquire real estate.

This provides grounds for reasonable doubt as to whether Mediuk S.O. meets the integrity criterion under the indicator of 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of rights to objects of civil rights'.

In view of the established circumstances, the candidate must be awarded 0 points under the integrity criterion, which constitutes grounds for finding that he has not demonstrated his ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating his qualification assessment.

Thus, Mediuk S.O. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 04.03.2026 No. 68/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Serhii Cherevko, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General

Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-252>)

The interview included an examination of the judge's compliance with the time limits for entering electronic copies of judicial decisions in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions (hereinafter, the USRCD).

During the period from 01 February 2018 to 17 October 2024, the judge submitted 8,066 electronic copies of judicial decisions to the USRCD after the applicable time limits had expired.

Based on the facts established during the examination of the dossier and the interview, the Commission finds that candidate Cherevko S.P. does not meet the requirements of the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator of 'conscientiousness'.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION; THE INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED IN CLOSED SESSION.

The Commission concludes that the circumstances ascertained during the examination of the dossier and the interview with the candidate, considered in their totality, give rise to reasonable doubt as to whether Cherevko S.P. meets the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator of 'honesty'.

Based on the results of the examination of the dossier, the written explanations and the interview with the candidate, as well as the results of voting during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under these criteria is 0 points; therefore, the Commission concludes that Cherevko S.P. does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, Cherevko S.P. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 18.03.2026 No. 81/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Tetiana Bezruk, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-263>)

The Public Integrity Council (PIC) states that candidate Bezruk T.V. does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator of 'compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life'.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION; THIS PART OF THE INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED IN CLOSED SESSION.

The judgment of the Grand Chamber of the Supreme Court dated 14 November 2024 in case No. 990/71/24 states that grounds for doubting a candidate's compliance with the integrity criteria must be objective, real, weighty (material), effective, and sufficiently adverse to call into question the candidate's compliance with the criterion of integrity or professional ethics, or must possess characteristics (features) capable of adversely affecting public confidence in the judiciary in connection with such an appointment. Such grounds may include any factors, phenomena, or events of objective reality containing features (characteristics) that characterise or distinguish a candidate for judicial office as a person who does not meet certain 'benchmark' criteria of integrity and professional ethics that a judge, as a holder of public authority, must meet; or, in other words, an informal, mental system, based on traditions (customs), of notions, norms, and assessments that regulates people's conduct in society, is approved by the majority of society at a collectively subconscious level, and whose practical implementation is ensured through public censure.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission, guided by paragraph 5.10 of the Regulations, concluded that candidate Bezruk T.V. does not meet the criterion of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator of 'Compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life'.

Thus, Bezruk T.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 19.03.2026 No. 85/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Tetiana Radkevych, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-282>)

In view of the established circumstances and the candidate's unconvincing explanations concerning the grounds and circumstances under which she acquired the real estate, the reasons why an unrelated person gifted valuable real estate to the candidate remained unclear.

The Commission also notes that, given the nature of the transaction, the identity of its participants, and the stated reasons for its conclusion, the circumstances in which the apartment was acquired under a gift agreement from a person who was neither a close associate nor a relative of the candidate may give rise to reasonable doubt as to whether the form of the transaction corresponded to its true substance.

This, in turn, gives rise to reasonable doubt not only as to the transparency and good faith of the relevant property transaction, but also as to the veracity of the candidate's explanations concerning the true substance of the contractual relationship.

On those grounds, the Commission concludes that there is reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the 'honesty' indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Radkevych V.M. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 19.03.2026 No. 89/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Andrii Soloviov, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-339>)

During the interview, the candidate stated that, as at 31 December in each of the years from 2012 to 2024, he had no real estate in Yarmolyntsi District that could be regarded as his actual place of residence.

First and foremost, the Commission draws attention not to the failure to declare in the years preceding the 2019 decision, but to what occurred after that decision was adopted. The panel notes that the Commission's 2019 decision sent the candidate an unequivocal signal as to the expected standard of conduct and declaration. Nevertheless, from 2019 to 2026, the candidate continued to administer justice in the settlement of Yarmolyntsi, Khmelnytskyi Region, without changing his practice: no real estate near his place of work was reported in his declarations for that period. The candidate took no steps to arrange his residence in a documented and transparent manner and did not formalise any lease relationship.

This raises concerns that the Commission's stated position was consciously disregarded. The panel of the Commission regards the absence of any change in the candidate's practice after 2019 as demonstrating that he lacks the capacity and willingness voluntarily to attain the expected standard in his conduct.

In assessing the written statements of PERSON_3 dated 16 February 2026 and PERSON_4 dated 18 February 2026, which the candidate added to the case file in March 2026, the panel of the Commission cannot accept them because they are not corroborated by any objective evidence: there are no records, loan-for-use or lease agreements, utility payment documents, bank account statements, or other documents capable of confirming the candidate's actual use of the apartments concerned.

Further doubt as to the candidate's integrity arises from the fact that, from the time of his appointment as a judge and throughout the entire period during which he administered

justice (2012–2026), he did not declare any residential real estate near his place of work in the settlement of Yarmolyntsi, Khmelnytskyi Region.

In this particular case, the Commission assesses the circumstances in question as a 'material non-compliance' by the candidate, resulting in an award of 0 points under the 'honesty' indicator, which constitutes grounds for finding that he has not demonstrated his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission reduces the scores in respect of other circumstances and facts established during the candidate's qualification assessment, since the candidate's material non-compliance with the 'honesty' indicator of the criterion of professional ethics and integrity is in itself grounds for awarding a score of 0 points.

Thus, Soloviov A.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 97/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Nelia Otchak, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-otchak-neli-yaroslavivny-zdiysnyuvaty>)

Even in the absence of doubts as to the lawfulness of the sources of funds of the candidate's family members, the candidate's systematic use of expensive property may create an impression in the mind of a reasonable outside observer that the candidate's lifestyle is inconsistent with the expected standards of restraint and transparency associated with the status of a judge. In view of the foregoing, the Commission concluded that the lifestyle demonstrated by the candidate is a material circumstance that diminishes confidence in the candidate's integrity and indicates a departure from the expected standards of judicial conduct.

During the closed deliberation, seven members of the Commission voted 'FOR' confirming the ability of candidate for judicial office Otchak N.Ya. to administer justice in an appellate general court, and seven members of the Commission voted 'AGAINST'.

Pursuant to part one of Article 88 of the Law, the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine adopts a reasoned decision confirming or declining to confirm the ability of a judge (candidate for judicial office) to administer justice in the relevant court. If the Public Integrity Council has determined in its opinion that a judge (candidate for judicial office) does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity, the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine may adopt a reasoned decision confirming the ability of that judge (candidate for judicial office) to administer justice in the relevant court only if that decision is supported by two-thirds of the appointed members of the Commission, but by no fewer than nine votes.

Accordingly, where sixteen members have been appointed to (are serving on) the Commission, a decision confirming the candidate's ability to administer justice in the relevant court is deemed adopted if it receives at least eleven votes 'IN FAVOR' (that is, two-thirds of the membership of the Commission).

Thus, Otchak N.Ya. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 98/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Pavlo Hutsal, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-gucala-pavla-ivanovycha-zdiysnyuvaty>)

The Commission was concerned that the judge had provided differing explanations concerning the construction of an unfinished building.

The Commission in plenary session proceeds on the basis that, in a qualification assessment to confirm the ability to administer justice in an appellate court, the assessment concerns not only the candidate's declaration-related conduct, but also the quality and truthfulness of the explanations provided to the Commission.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission in plenary session concludes that the established circumstances demonstrate reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the 'honesty' indicator of the criterion of integrity and professional ethics, which constitutes an independent ground for finding that the candidate has not demonstrated his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court, pursuant to paragraphs 5.10 and 5.12 of the Regulation on the Procedure and Methodology for Qualification Assessment.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, the written explanations and the interview with the candidate, as well as the results of voting during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the Commission in plenary session concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, Hutsal P.I. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 24.03.2026 No. 100/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Nataliia Korolchuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-267>)

The Commission considers that the candidate's actions in adjudicating the disputes in question (concerning the removal of a guardian of a legally incapacitated person and the appointment of a new guardian) during the war, within short time frames, in the absence from the hearing of the parties and representatives of the guardianship and trusteeship authority, without the relevant opinion of that authority, and without hearing the child's views, give rise to reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

In view of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 1–2, the members of the panel of the Commission unanimously found that the candidate had committed material violations in adjudicating cases of significant public interest and heightened corruption risk, and that the candidate therefore did not meet the indicators of 'compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life', 'honesty', and 'conscientiousness' under the criterion of integrity and professional ethics. The Commission assigns 0 points to these indicators and, accordingly, to the criterion as a whole.

In those circumstances, the Commission concluded that the candidate does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, Korolchuk N.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 30.03.2026 No. 105/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Olena Balzhyk, a Candidate for Judgeship, to administer justice in an appellate general court within the competition announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtvverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-balzhyk-oleny-ivanivny-zdiysnyuvaty>)

The Commission concluded that, in considering the cases in question (concerning deprivation of parental rights), the candidate had failed to ensure an appropriate level of reasoning in the judicial decisions or a comprehensive examination of the circumstances of the case. In particular, the judicial decisions frequently lack specific reasons for individual procedural decisions, while the use of generalised wording makes it impossible to establish the actual grounds on which they were adopted.

In addition, the consideration of individual cases within short time frames, in the absence of the parties and representatives of the guardianship and trusteeship authority and without ascertaining the child's views, indicates that the candidate failed to exercise the requisite degree of diligence and circumspection when considering cases directly concerning the rights and interests of children.

The Commission emphasises that, under martial law and amid heightened public attention to judicial decisions in disputes involving family relations, a judge must demonstrate a particularly high level of professional responsibility, well-reasoned decision-making, and transparency in the administration of justice. The established circumstances, however, indicate that the candidate's actions did not fully comply with those standards.

On 28 August 2025, by No. 1814/0/15-25, the High Council of Justice (HCJ) initiated measures aimed at protecting the authority of the judiciary, since 'statistics concerning the courts of Ukraine do indeed show an atypical increase in cases involving family relations. It is clear that not all of them are artificial or aimed at facilitating evasion of mobilisation, but such data give rise to reasonable doubts'.

The Commission considers that these circumstances demonstrate the candidate's breach of the standards of professional ethics and judicial conduct established by the Code of Judicial Ethics, as well as her failure to comply with a judge's duty to demonstrate conduct that ensures public confidence in the judiciary and upholds the authority of justice.

Thus, Balzhyk O.I. was **found to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 20.04.2026 No. 141/ac-26

On confirming the ability of Petro Zhovtan, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/3n-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-zhovtana-petra-valeriyovycha>)

In particular, the Commission critically assesses the explanations provided by the candidate concerning the sources used to finance the construction of a garden house with a total area of 707 sq. m, of which his wife is a co-owner, and considers that they do not dispel reasonable doubts concerning the lawful origin of the funds required to construct that property.

In particular, in his written explanations, the candidate stated that the principal construction costs had been borne by another co-owner of the property. At the same time, during the interview before the Commission in plenary session, the candidate stated that his wife had sufficient accumulated funds to construct the property, derived from savings from her salary and income earned by her mother from business activities. In addition, in 2020, his wife disposed of an apartment that she owned.

Those explanations are contradictory and are not supported by proper evidence. In particular, there is no documentary evidence of income earned by the mother of the candidate's wife from business activities before 2012. Moreover, the candidate's explanations contain no information that would make it possible to establish the actual amount invested by each co-owner, the arrangements for financing the construction, or the lawful origin of the funds used for that purpose. The candidate did not provide documents

demonstrating how expenses were apportioned among the co-owners, substantiating the sources of the funds, or otherwise making it possible to verify his assertions.

In addition, the Commission drew attention to the systematic increase in the savings of both the candidate and his family members, despite the absence of a stable income for the candidate's wife and the existence of expenses for maintaining their property and meeting the family's day-to-day needs.

At the same time, according to the information stated in the candidate's declarations, the candidate's wife acquired Nissan Leaf and Audi Q7 vehicles, a land plot with a total area of 599 sq. m, and an apartment with a total area of 37.7 sq. m, and also incurred expenses for the construction of a garden house with a total area of 707 sq. m. However, the Commission has no information regarding the amount spent on constructing that property.

In those circumstances, the explanations provided by the candidate are general in nature, are based primarily on his assertions, and are not supported by proper documents, making it impossible to verify their accuracy.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission in plenary session considers that there are reasonable doubts as to whether candidate Zhovtan P.V. meets the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of rights to objects of civil rights' and 'consistency of the standard of living with declared income'.

Thus, Zhovtan P.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 27.04.2026 No. 151/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Maksym Danylevskiy, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/3п-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtvverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-danylevskogo-maksyma-anatoliyovycha>)

During the interview before a panel of the Commission on 18.03.2026 and the consideration of the matter by the Commission in plenary session on 27.04.2026, the candidate provided explanations concerning the circumstances of the incident at the railway station on 24.01.2024 that were not fully consistent with one another and concerned key elements of the incident.

Separate discrepancies were also identified in the explanations concerning alcohol consumption: during the first interview, the candidate stated that he may have consumed 'a glass of beer' without showing signs of intoxication, whereas during the subsequent interview he clarified that, after meeting a friend at a bar near the station, he may have drunk 'a glass or two of beer', thereby expanding upon the information previously provided.

The explanations concerning USD 12,000 were likewise inconsistent: the candidate consistently stated that the funds had been received from a friend and kept in a bag, but the details of their disappearance and recovery differed – from an account in which they were found with the involvement of a law enforcement officer to an account involving suspicions of possible interference by law enforcement officers and the decisive role played by a call to the 102 emergency line.

The Commission considers that the discrepancies in the candidate's explanations provided at different stages of the interview cannot be regarded as minor clarifications of detail. They demonstrate a lack of consistency in his account of the factual circumstances of the incident.

In those circumstances, the Commission concluded that the candidate's provision of contradictory explanations concerning the same circumstances during interviews before different compositions of the Commission demonstrates that candidate Danylevskiy M.A. does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator of "honesty".

Thus, Danylevskiy M.A. was **found to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 06.05.2026 No. 175/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Dmytro Tishko, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/3п-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtvordzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-tishka-dmytra-anatoliyovycha>)

The Commission considers that the totality of the established circumstances, the candidate's explanations, and the documents he submitted does not provide grounds for a settled conviction that there is no reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics. Although certain facts may formally be capable of explanation, taken together those explanations are inconsistent and predominantly exculpatory in nature, are unsupported by documentary evidence in a number of instances, and do not dispel reasonable doubt as to the openness, good faith, and impeccability of the candidate's conduct.

In particular, the Commission notes that, pursuant to clause 3.4 of the agreement for the sale and purchase of the residential house and land plot dated 20 June 2024, the seller confirmed that the real estate corresponded to its actual characteristics and that it was free from defects, unauthorised alterations, conversions, reconstruction, or other changes capable of affecting the condition of the property. The buyer, for her part, certified that she had inspected the property and had identified no shortcomings or defects that would prevent its use or indicate reconstruction or alterations.

At the same time, during the interview, the candidate stated that the house was unfit for habitation and required major repairs, referring to a report on the technical condition of the principal load-bearing and enclosing structural elements of residential buildings. In the Commission's view, those explanations are inconsistent with the terms of the concluded sale and purchase agreement, in which the parties expressly confirmed the proper technical condition of the property and the absence of material defects.

These contradictions give rise to reasonable doubt as to the consistency and veracity of the candidate's explanations concerning the actual condition of the acquired property, as well as the reasons for determining the value of that property.

The Commission considers that the explanations provided are not sufficiently consistent or persuasive to dispel such doubt. In these circumstances, the Commission concludes that the candidate's conduct does not fully comply with the standards of integrity, openness, and impeccable reputation arising from the Code of Judicial Ethics and the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, and that the existing reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with those criteria has not been dispelled.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that there remains an un rebutted reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, and therefore the candidate does not comply with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, Tishko D.A. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 07.05.2026 No. 181/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Mykola Voinarivskyi, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-379>)

In the Commission's view, the candidate's actions taken as a whole – the disposal of an apartment in 2010 for UAH 21 940; his registration, without actually residing there, at a municipal institution, the Mykolaiv Regional Centre for the Registration of Homeless Citizens, whose principal activity is the provision of social assistance to low-income citizens; his placement on the housing register in 2011, after the sale of the apartment, as a person in need of improved housing conditions; and his return in 2020 to reside in the previously sold apartment – form a 'complete picture' of the candidate's conduct that is inconsistent with the expected standard of restraint, transparency, and irreproachability inherent in judges.

As is apparent from the footage recorded by the police officer's body camera, the conduct of Voinarivskyi M.M. on 27 September 2022, while communicating with patrol police

officers at a medical facility, cannot, from the perspective of a reasonable, law-abiding, and responsible person, be regarded as impeccable. Such conduct may cause an outside observer to question whether the judge's moral and ethical qualities meet the requirements imposed on a holder of judicial office and may also indicate non-compliance with the standards of judicial ethical conduct, in particular the standard of proper conduct outside the exercise of judicial powers, that is, in private life.

The refusal to undergo an examination for alcohol intoxication at the place where the vehicle was stopped, as well as evasion of such an examination at a healthcare facility, demonstrate a deliberate and conspicuous disregard for the lawful requirements of police officers and the procedure established by law. Such conduct cannot be regarded as a good-faith exercise of procedural rights; rather, it is objectively perceived as an attempt to evade liability for an offence characterised by an increased danger to society.

In the Candidate for Judicial Office Questionnaire, in response to the question in item 12, 'Have any separate rulings (orders) been issued in respect of you, what were the grounds for the relevant judicial decisions, and what information is available regarding appeals against them?', the candidate stated, 'No, none have been issued.' In sub-item 14.1 of item 14, 'Information on being held liable', concerning the provision of information on all instances of being held subject to any form of legal liability over the previous five years, Voinarivskyi M.M. also stated that no such information existed. In response to the question in item 1.8 of the letter of motivation, 'Provide information on circumstances and events in your life that may give rise to concern regarding your participation in the judicial career procedure and your compliance with the criteria of competence, integrity, and professional competence, and that require prompt rebuttal, explanation, or clarification', the candidate stated that no such information existed.

The candidate submitted documents to the Commission for participation in the competition on 28 December 2023. At the time the candidate submitted those documents, there existed Ethics Council Decision dated 23 June 2022 No. 12, 'On the Non-Compliance of Voinarivskyi M.M., a Candidate for the Position of Member of the High Council of Justice, with the Criteria of Professional Ethics and Integrity for Holding the Position of Member of the High Council of Justice'; and the ruling of the Central District Court of the City of Mykolaiv dated 16 January 2023 in case No. 490/4814/22.

The Commission notes that Voinarivskyi M.M. could not have failed to appreciate that disclosure of such information was important for assessing compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics. Since the candidate was aware of the existence of the Ethics Council decision and the judicial decision when submitting documents for participation in the competition, the Commission regards the candidate's failure to disclose the relevant information as an attempt to conceal it.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission developed a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the 'honesty' indicator under sub-item 3 of item 18 of Section III of the Unified Indicators, which provides that a judge (candidate for judicial office) complies with the honesty indicator if, inter alia but not exclusively, he or she: provided truthful oral and/or written information while participating in selection, a competition, qualification assessment, disciplinary proceedings, and other legal procedures in which

such judge (candidate for judicial office) participated and/or participates; and did not conceal such information where there were grounds to believe that it was known to him or her, except where the law permits refusal to provide information.

In view of the established circumstances, the candidate is to be awarded 0 points under the integrity criterion, which constitutes grounds for finding that he did not demonstrate the ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating his qualification assessment.

Thus, Voinarivskyi M.M. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 11.05.2026 No. 188/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Viktor Siianko, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-siyanka-viktora-mykolayovycha>)

The Commission in plenary session drew attention to civil case No. 604/648/22 concerning dissolution of marriage and determination of a child's place of residence, in which the candidate opened proceedings on 09.08.2022 and, as early as 18.08.2022, rendered a decision determining the child's place of residence with the father without involving the guardianship and custody authority in the case.

The Commission takes a critical view of the candidate's explanations concerning the failure to involve the guardianship and custody authority, since part four of Article 19 of the Family Code of Ukraine clearly provides that participation of the guardianship and custody authority, represented by the appropriate legal entity, is mandatory when a court considers disputes concerning the participation of one parent in raising a child, the child's place of residence, eviction of the child, deregistration of the child's place of residence, recognition that the child has lost the right to use residential premises, deprivation and restoration of parental rights, access to the child by a mother or father deprived of parental rights, removal of a child from a person who is keeping the child without a legal basis or court decision, parents' management of the child's property, revocation of adoption, and declaration of adoption as invalid.

Furthermore, the Commission considers that the expedited consideration of the case in the absence of the parties and representatives of the guardianship and custody authority demonstrates the candidate's failure to exercise the requisite degree of diligence and prudence when considering cases directly concerning a child's rights and interests.

The Commission emphasises that, under martial law and amid heightened public scrutiny of judicial decisions in disputes relating to family legal relations, a judge must demonstrate a particularly high degree of professional responsibility, well-reasoned decision-making, and transparency in the administration of justice. The established circumstances, however, indicate that the candidate's actions did not fully meet those standards.

The Commission considers that the specified circumstances demonstrate the candidate's breach of the standards of professional ethics and judicial conduct established by the Code of Judicial Ethics, as well as failure to comply with a judge's duty to demonstrate conduct that maintains public confidence in the judiciary and upholds the authority of justice.

Thus, Siianko V.M. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 20.05.2026 No. 230/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Olena Samoilenko, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/зп-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-samoylenko-oleny-anatoliyivny>)

During the meeting of the Commission in plenary session, Samoilenko O.A. acknowledged that a sham transaction had been entered into.

Furthermore, the explanations provided by Samoilenko O.A. show that the vehicle was in fact permanently used by her and that PERSON_4 paid no money to her mother when purchasing the vehicle in 2022. The parties did not intend to effect an actual sale of the vehicle or to achieve the legal consequences stipulated by the agreement, namely the transfer of title from the seller to the buyer for the corresponding consideration. Their actions were directed exclusively at creating a formal legal basis for re-registering the vehicle, whereas no actual transfer of the vehicle, payment of its price, or acquisition by the buyer (PERSON_4) of the powers of an owner took place.

The Commission does not have the vehicle sale and purchase agreement dated 15 May 2025 under which Samoilenko O.A. acquired the vehicle from PERSON_4. At the same time, according to the Unified State Register of Vehicles, the value of the vehicle upon its registration was UAH 50 000.

It follows from the explanations of Samoilenko O.A. that, when acquiring the vehicle from PERSON_4, she made no payment other than for services related to re-registration of the vehicle.

The failure to perform the buyer's principal obligation to pay for the property indicates that the parties had no genuine intention to effect an alienation of the vehicle for consideration under the terms of a sale and purchase agreement. The following circumstances indicate the sham nature of the agreement entered into: the parties took no action directed at performing the material term of the agreement concerning payment for the vehicle; the agreement was used by the parties not as an instrument for the actual alienation of property for consideration, but as a formal basis for the state re-registration of the vehicle.

The foregoing circumstances indicate that the parties lacked the genuine intention to achieve the legal consequences characteristic of a sale and purchase agreement, namely the transfer of title to the vehicle in exchange for payment of its price.

Thus, the parties did not intend to effect an actual sale and purchase of the vehicle giving rise to all consequences of such a transaction prescribed by law, but acted exclusively to create a formal legal basis for re-registering the vehicle to another person. The absence of actual settlement is a circumstance indicating that the transaction bears the hallmarks of a sham.

Having heard the candidate's explanations and examined the information contained in the candidate's dossier, the Commission in plenary session assesses the foregoing circumstances through the lens of non-compliance with two Unified Indicators – 'honesty' and 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of property'.

Thus, Samoilenko O.A. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 21.05.2026 No. 238/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Volodymyr Fihurskyi, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-390>)

The Commission establishes that the candidate failed to disclose in his 2022 asset declaration cash in the amount of USD 30 000 which, according to the candidate, had been lent to a third party and had not been repaid to him as of 31 December 2022. The Commission also establishes that the candidate failed to disclose in his 2023 asset declaration cash equivalent to USD 60 000 which, according to the candidate, had been gifted to his family by his wife's parents.

The candidate submitted his 2022 asset declaration on 30 December 2023 and his 2023 asset declaration on 03 April 2025 (and a corrected declaration for the same period on 30 April 2025). Thus, the candidate committed several violations of anti-corruption legislation. This warrants the conclusion that the candidate's non-compliance with the indicator is material.

The total amount of information not disclosed by the candidate in his 2023 asset declaration is UAH 2 384 269,45.

Failure to declare assets in an amount exceeding UAH 2 271 000 bears the hallmarks of a criminal offence. Clearly, the Commission makes no finding as to the presence or absence of elements of a criminal offence in the candidate's actions. The calculation referred to is provided solely by way of explanation; therefore, the Commission considers that the

candidate's failure to declare UAH 2 384 269,45 is a circumstance indicating that the candidate's non-compliance with the indicator is material.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concluded that the candidate did not comply with the criterion of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators 'consistency of standard of living with declared income' and 'honesty'.

In view of the established circumstances and the conclusion that the candidate does not comply with the qualification assessment criteria, the candidate is awarded 0 points under the criterion of integrity and professional ethics, which constitutes grounds for finding that he did not demonstrate the ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating the qualification assessment.

Thus, Fihurskyi V.M. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 21.05.2026 No. 239/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Halyna Bilosevych, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-364>)

In analysing the candidate's practice in cases concerning deprivation of parental rights, the Commission notes an evident systemic divergence in the judge's approaches to the conduct of proceedings. Thus, in cases No. 601/3411/24, No. 601/3198/24, and No. 601/1014/24, the proceedings were conducted in compliance with the procedural requirements of the law: the court requested opinions from the guardianship and custody authorities, the parties were afforded a meaningful period in which to exercise their procedural rights, and the consideration of the cases lasted from several months to six months. Such duration and thoroughness of consideration fully comply both with the requirements of national legislation and with the standards of Article 8 of the Convention concerning the need for an in-depth examination of the evolving family situation.

At the same time, the established circumstances surrounding the consideration of case No. 601/2423/23 demonstrate the opposite. The case, which concerned deprivation of parental rights in the context of martial law and mobilisation, was considered before the expiry of the period prescribed by law. Such proceedings would inevitably be perceived by an ordinary reasonable person sufficiently informed of the circumstances of the case as proceedings in which the court failed to ensure the transparency and procedural prudence necessary to maintain public confidence in justice.

In view of the specified circumstances, the members of the panel of the Commission unanimously found that the candidate had committed material violations when considering a case of significant public interest and heightened corruption risk; the candidate therefore

does not comply with the indicators 'observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life', 'honesty', and 'conscientiousness' under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, and the Commission accordingly awards 0 points for those indicators and, consequently, for the criterion as a whole.

Thus, Bilosevych H.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 26.05.2026 No. 243/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Nataliia Yermak, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-392>)

The Commission established that, even after the matter had been legally regulated and clarification had been received from the authorised state body, the candidate included in Section 11, 'Income, including gifts', of her declarations for 2023 and 2024 information that, by its nature, did not constitute income, which may indicate, although not exclusively, the creation of a false impression among an ordinary reasonable person and law-enforcement and regulatory authorities that additional (unsubstantiated) income exceeding UAH 630 thousand existed.

The Commission established that, beginning in 2023, Yermak N.V. failed to disclose in her declarations an item of immovable property situated on a land plot owned by her, thereby violating the requirements of anti-corruption legislation concerning the completeness and accuracy of declarations. Such conduct demonstrates a lack of good faith in the performance of the duties of a declarant.

The Commission concludes that the significant number of instances in which Yermak N.V. breached the statutory time limits for transmitting electronic copies of judicial decisions to the Unified State Register of Court Decisions indicates an insufficiently effective organisation of her work, since the candidate failed to take the measures necessary to ensure timely compliance with those requirements.

Yermak N.V. received an apartment as a gift, and the origin of the funds used to acquire it gives rise to concerns. The Commission considers the candidate's explanations regarding the acquisition of the apartment insufficiently persuasive and finds that they do not fully establish the transparency of the origin of the funds. Accordingly, reasonable doubts remain as to the lawfulness and transparency of the sources used to finance the acquisition of the immovable property.

The information examined established that Judge Yermak N.V. used different IP addresses whose geolocation was identified as the city of Lviv 2 328 times, the city of Kyiv 610 times, the city of Kalush 1 619 times, and the settlement of Rudne 693 times. Furthermore,

outside working hours, the judge searched for cases that were directly pending before her. In response to questions from members of the Commission concerning the use of IP addresses outside the Yaremche City Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Region, Yermak N.V. did not provide a reasoned answer. These circumstances may indicate that Yermak N.V. possibly resided on a systematic basis at properties that she did not disclose in her declarations.

The totality of the established facts provides the Commission with grounds for a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators 'honesty' and 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of property', which in turn is sufficient to regard her as not complying with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Accordingly, based on the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations, and interview with the candidate, as well as the votes during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the aggregate score awarded under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity is 0 points out of a possible 300, which is below 75% (225 points) of the maximum possible score.

In view of the circumstances set out above, the Commission unanimously decided to find that the candidate did not comply with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, Yermak N.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 01.06.2026 No. 253/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Hanna Vysotska, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtvverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-vysockoyi-ganny-volodymyrivny>)

The Commission considers that the candidate's privatisation of official housing that had been allocated to her mother-in-law, who was no longer entitled to privatise it, does not contribute to building public confidence in the judiciary as a whole; the actions of Vysotska H.V. do not fully comply with the requirements of the Code of Judicial Ethics, which imposes on a judge the duty to demonstrate high standards of conduct in order to strengthen confidence in the judiciary and uphold the authority of justice, or with item 17 of the Unified Indicators.

Accordingly, having discussed the matter, the Commission in plenary session concludes that the manner in which Vysotska H.V. acquired ownership of the official apartment may engender public distrust of the judiciary as a whole and adversely affects the authority of the judiciary, of which she is a representative.

The Commission also takes a critical view of the candidate's explanations concerning the failure to involve the guardianship and custody authority in cases concerning determination of a child's place of residence, since part four of Article 19 of the Family Code of Ukraine

provides that participation of the guardianship and custody authority, represented by the appropriate legal entity, is mandatory when a court considers disputes concerning the participation of one parent in raising a child, the child's place of residence, eviction of the child, deregistration of the child's place of residence, recognition that the child has lost the right to use residential premises, deprivation and restoration of parental rights, access to the child by a mother or father deprived of parental rights, removal of a child from a person who is keeping the child without a legal basis or court decision, parents' management of the child's property, revocation of adoption, and declaration of adoption as invalid.

Accordingly, that provision is mandatory and permits no procedural conduct by a judge other than involving the guardianship and custody authority in cases of the specified categories, which the candidate failed to do.

The Commission in plenary session considers that the candidate's actions when considering the specified disputes during the war, at a preparatory court hearing in the absence of the parties and representatives of the guardianship and custody authority and without the relevant opinion of that authority, demonstrate the existence of a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

During the interview, Vysotska H.V. did not provide clear and persuasive evidence capable of dispelling the reasonable doubts as to her non-compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity set out in items 1 and 3 of the PIC opinion.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission in plenary session concludes that the established circumstances demonstrate a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators 'honesty', 'independence', 'observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life', and 'conscientiousness' under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, which constitutes an independent ground for finding that the candidate did not demonstrate the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court, pursuant to item 5.10 of the Regulations on the Procedure and Methodology for Qualification Assessment.

Thus, Vysotska H.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 04.06.2026 No. 270/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Polina Koliadenko, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-369>)

The Commission notes that the interview revealed facts demonstrating instances of unconscientious conduct by the candidate, in particular: rendering decisions during periods when she was absent from the workplace, which was probably the result of numerous

clerical errors; using an apartment with a total area of 88,5 m², two parking spaces with areas of 18,85 m² and 20,17 m², and 2013 Honda CR-V and 2017 Honda Pilot vehicles owned by the candidate's mother-in-law, in the absence of confirmation of the source of funds used to acquire the relevant property; and a practice of altering the operative parts of judicial decisions by applying the procedure for correcting clerical errors.

Having examined the opinion, the candidate's written and oral explanations provided during the interview, other data obtained by the Commission, and the asset declarations submitted by the candidate, the Commission notes that the foregoing circumstances, taken together, may give rise to reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the criterion of 'integrity and professional ethics' under the 'conscientiousness' indicator, which Koliadenko P.L. failed to dispel.

The Commission concludes that the candidate does not comply with the criterion of 'integrity and professional ethics' under the 'conscientiousness' indicator.

Thus, Koliadenko P.L. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 04.06.2026 No. 272/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Nadiia Salamakha, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-415>)

The Commission establishes that the candidate's close persons lacked official income sufficient to purchase a 2020 'BMW X5' vehicle valued at UAH 2 002 512,53. The Commission also takes a critical view of the candidate's explanation that her husband's mother received USD 70 000 as a loan from relatives, in view of the absence of documentary evidence.

During the interview, the candidate did not provide information concerning the personal data of the relatives (surname, given name and patronymic, taxpayer registration number) who lent her husband's mother funds in the amount of USD 70 000. In these circumstances, the Commission was unable to establish the actual financial capacity of those persons to provide a loan in the relevant amount or to verify the lawfulness of the sources of origin of those funds.

In assessing the candidate's explanations as a whole, the Commission emphasises that each circumstance referred to in those explanations, viewed separately, might have allowed the benefit of the doubt to be afforded to the candidate. Taken together, however, they form a complete picture in which each successive element, rather than supplementing or clarifying the previous one, instead raises new questions. An explanation that consistently relies on voluntary transfers of funds without supporting documents does not,

when taken as a whole, attain even the minimum level of plausibility sufficient to dispel a reasonable doubt.

It follows from the foregoing that the acquisition by the candidate's husband of a 2020 'BMW X5' vehicle valued at UAH 2 002 512,53 gives rise to reasonable doubts as to the financial transparency of the candidate's assets. These circumstances create a 'grey area' in her conduct that is incompatible with the requirements applicable to a judge's reputation.

For a judge, who must set an example of compliance with the law and moral standards, even isolated instances of opacity in financial matters are capable of undermining public confidence in the judiciary as a whole. In view of this, the Commission finds that the foregoing facts constitute material non-compliance by the candidate with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity. This results in a score of 0 points under the indicator 'consistency between expenditure and income', which constitutes an independent ground for finding that the candidate did not demonstrate the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

The Commission rejects the candidate's explanations concerning the sufficiency of the candidate's and her husband's funds to acquire a 2022 'RIVIAN R1T' vehicle, in view of the previously established circumstances surrounding her husband's acquisition of a 2020 'BMW X5' vehicle valued at UAH 2 002 512,53 and the absence of confirmation of official sources of origin of the funds used to acquire it.

In her declaration for 2022, the candidate did not declare the value of the following vehicles: a 1997 'CITROEN C4 PICASSO' (acquired into ownership on 02 August 2019), a 2020 'BMW X5' (acquired into ownership on 07 June 2022), and a 2017 'NISSAN ROGUE SPORT' (acquired into ownership on 28 March 2023).

The Commission takes into account the explanations provided by the candidate, which confirm the absence of intent and demonstrate a willingness to comply with declaration requirements. However, those explanations do not refute the fact of systemic errors, which affects the assessment of conscientiousness.

Based on the review of the dossier, the written explanations, and the interview with the candidate, as well as the vote during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the aggregate score awarded under those criteria is 0 points out of a possible 300, which is below 75% (225 points); the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not comply with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, Salamakha N.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 08.06.2026 No. 300/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Tetiana Leonova, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/зп-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-leonovoyi-tetyany-oleksandrivny>)

The Commission in plenary session assesses the explanations of Leonova T.O. concerning the circumstances specified in item 1 of the PIC opinion, in particular the acquisition of vehicles whose value was significantly below market value at the time her husband acquired title to them, as incomplete, insufficient, and unpersuasive.

The Commission in plenary session endorses the conclusions of the panel of the Commission and concludes that, during the interview, the candidate failed to demonstrate that her family member had the financial capacity to acquire a vehicle in 2013 and failed to establish the lawfulness of the income received by that family member.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that there remains an un rebutted reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

The Commission in plenary session additionally notes that the burden of proving the actual receipt of the specified income, onus probandi, rests with the candidate, since all the circumstances and the nature of the financial transactions are known to her and the documents capable of confirming the existence (authenticity) of the financial transaction are retained by her (or her family members). That burden is attributable to an objective information asymmetry: the Commission is unable independently to verify circumstances that are exclusively within the actual control of the candidate and her family members, whereas the candidate can and should possess the relevant supporting evidence.

Having heard the candidate's explanations and examined the information contained in the candidate's dossier, the Commission in plenary session assesses the foregoing circumstances through the lens of non-compliance with the Unified Indicator 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of property'.

Based on the review of the dossier, the written explanations, and the interview with the candidate, and the votes during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the Commission in plenary session concludes that the candidate does not comply with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator 'lawfulness of the sources of origin of property; consistency of the standard of living of the judge (candidate for judicial office) or members of his or her family with declared income; consistency of the lifestyle of the judge (candidate for judicial office) with his or her status'.

Thus, Leonova T.O. was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 23.06.2026 No. 323/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Vlada Malykhina, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-407>)

The Commission takes into account the violations identified by the PIC, namely that 54 % of the sources listed by Malykhina V.V. in the bibliography of her dissertation are not cited in the text.

In addition, the Commission takes into account the violations identified by the Public Integrity Council (PIC), which concern different structural parts of the dissertation (the introduction, main text, conclusions, and bibliography), different authors and sources, and which are recurring in nature and were committed in various ways: verbatim copying of texts without citation, paraphrasing without proper attribution, reproduction of other authors' conclusions and proposals, copying text together with its system of references, modification of borrowed propositions by changing the particulars of legislation, and the artificial inclusion in the bibliography of sources that were not actually used in writing the work.

Taken together, these circumstances preclude treating the identified violations as isolated inadvertent errors or technical shortcomings and demonstrate the candidate's systemic failure to comply with the principles of academic integrity in preparing the dissertation.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission considers that there are reasonable doubts as to whether V.V. Malykhina meets the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

In her declarations of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government, beginning in 2020, V.V. Malykhina reported acquiring ownership of a residential house with an area of 153 sq. m and a declared value of UAH 130,025, as well as a land plot with an area of 0.04 ha and a value of UAH 35,018.

The actual purchase of a residential house with an area of 153 sq. m for an amount equivalent to several thousand US dollars appears unlikely, taking into account the average cost of construction materials, construction expenses, and market housing prices. This discrepancy between the declared and probable market value gives rise to reasonable doubts regarding the accuracy of the information, the sources of the funds, the actual expenses incurred in acquiring the real estate, and the possible understatement of the property's value with a view to distorting the true indicators of financial standing.

The Commission established that, pursuant to a vehicle lease agreement dated 31 October 2019, Lideralians LLC leased to V.V. Malykhina a 2019 Lexus RX 300 for a term of five years. By agreement of the parties, the rent was set at UAH 2,000 for each month of use of the vehicle.

The Commission critically assesses V.V. Malykhina's explanations regarding rent of UAH 2,000 for the use of a 2019 Lexus RX 300, since that amount is disproportionate to the cost of using a 2019 business-class vehicle and is inconsistent with the generally known market terms for leasing comparable vehicles. V.V. Malykhina's reference to the fact that the rent was not understated because she independently bore the costs of fuel, maintenance, insurance, and operation of the vehicle does not rebut the reasonable doubt regarding the substantial understatement of the rent itself, since such expenses are

ordinary expenses borne by a vehicle user and do not replace payment for the use of property.

Taken together, the foregoing circumstances give rise to a reasonable doubt on the part of the Commission that, when entering into the lease agreement for the 2019 Lexus RX 300 at substantially understated rent, V.V. Malykhina acted in accordance with the rules of professional ethics and other ethical standards and refrained from any actions capable of harming the authority of the judiciary.

In view of the established circumstances, the candidate is to be awarded 0 points under the integrity criterion, which constitutes grounds for finding that she has failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating her qualification assessment.

Accordingly, V.V. Malykhina was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 25.06.2026 No. 333/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Tetiana Marzhyna, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-399>)

The Commission notes that the period of almost twenty-three months between the candidate's receipt of the case file and the issuance of the ruling accepting the case for consideration and scheduling a preparatory hearing does not meet the reasonable-time standard either under the criteria of the Convention or under the requirements of national procedural law. Throughout that period, approximately 800 parties to the dispute were deprived of procedural capacity: they could not file applications for the preservation of evidence or interim relief, seek recusals, initiate the appointment of forensic examinations, or take other procedural steps.

The Commission acknowledges the objective complexity of the case: the substantial volume of materials, the large number of participants, and the need to resolve a number of procedural issues arising from deficiencies in the preceding proceedings. However, those circumstances cannot justify the exceptionally long period required by the candidate to issue a ruling accepting the case for consideration and scheduling a preparatory hearing.

At the same time, the Commission draws attention to the candidate's overall efficiency in administering justice: since 2017, she breached the time limits for sending electronic copies of decisions to the Unified State Register of Court Decisions in only 46 instances; the number of amended and quashed decisions remained stable despite an increase in the overall workload by more than 2.5 times during 2015–2025; and the number of

instances in which the time limits for considering cases were breached has not exceeded 22 since 2017.

It is precisely in view of this organisational discipline that the Commission concludes that the candidate could not have been unaware that the case had remained dormant and that the relevant ruling had to be issued. The absence of any procedural action for almost two years, combined with the candidate's overall work efficiency, precludes the possibility that the inaction was inadvertent or unconscious. In these circumstances, an outside observer may have reasonable doubts concerning, at a minimum, a conscious disregard of procedural duties.

The Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of "integrity and professional ethics" under the indicator of "conscientiousness".

Accordingly, T.V. Marzhyna was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 25.06.2026 No. 335/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Maksym Heits, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-430>)

The arithmetic balance of funds amounting to UAH 253,317.78, coupled with the candidate's acquisition of numerous items of movable and immovable property during 1998–2024, which required not only acquisition costs but also regular maintenance and servicing expenses, gives rise to a reasonable doubt on the part of the Commission as to the candidate's ability to meet even the minimum level of his own living needs over a period of 26 years.

The Commission assessed all the circumstances in their entirety, examined the candidate's explanations and evidence concerning the sources of the financial resources, noted the absence of documentary evidence of the candidate's brother's income during the period when the apartment was purchased, took into account the non-transparent manner in which title was registered, as well as the reasonable doubt regarding the impossibility of supporting himself for 26 years on the balance of UAH 253,317.78, and concluded that the circumstances cited by the PIC were sufficient to find that the candidate did not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" and "consistency of lifestyle with declared income".

In view of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that, in his written explanations and during the interview, the candidate failed to dispel the reasonable doubt as to whether he met the criteria of integrity and professional ethics with respect to paragraph 1 of the PIC's

conclusion under such indicators as "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" and "consistency of lifestyle with declared income".

Accordingly, M.V. Heits was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 29.06.2026 No. 343/ac-26

On Confirming the Ability of Serhii Stadnyk, a Candidate for Judgeship, to Administer Justice in an Appellate General Court within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-stadnyka-sergiya-ivanovycha-zdiysnyuvaty>)

The Commission in plenary session discussed in detail the circumstances in which the candidate and his wife purchased an apartment in the city of Vinnytsia.

The 2016 declaration submitted by S.I. Stadnyk in his capacity as a judge of the Lypovets District Court of Vinnytsia Oblast contains, in Section 3, "Real Estate", information about an apartment in the city of Vinnytsia at ADDRESS_1, with a total area of 112.3 m². The date on which title was acquired was 19 October 2016. It states that the apartment is jointly owned by S.I. Stadnyk (50%) and his wife, PERSON_3 (50%). The value of the apartment on the date of acquisition was UAH 50,000, and its value according to the latest appraisal was UAH 49,537.

According to the apartment sale and purchase agreement dated 19 October 2016, concluded between the sellers, PERSON_2 and PERSON_1, and the buyers, PERSON_3 and S.I. Stadnyk (contained in the judicial dossier), the parties agreed to sell the apartment for UAH 50,000. The agreement records that, according to the independent market valuation report dated 19 October 2016, the appraised value of the apartment was UAH 49,537.

Upon examining the materials contained in S.I. Stadnyk's judicial dossier, the Commission in plenary session found that the INFORMATION_1 spouses had acquired proprietary rights to the apartment in question in 2013 for UAH 421,360 (pursuant to the agreement for the sale and purchase of proprietary rights dated 25 June 2013 No. 08/40).

This circumstance gives rise to additional doubt regarding the actual value of the apartment purchased by the candidate and his wife and the circumstances in which that value was determined.

Furthermore, in his declaration for 2015 (the year preceding the acquisition of the real estate), S.I. Stadnyk reported aggregate family income of UAH 264,567 and stated that neither he nor his family members held any monetary assets.

In his declaration for 2016 (the year in which the real estate was acquired), S.I. Stadnyk declared aggregate family income of UAH 633,745 and stated that neither he nor his family members held any monetary assets.

Beginning in 2020, S.I. Stadnyk stated in his declarations that the value of this apartment according to the latest monetary appraisal was UAH 951,321 and identified his wife and daughter as co-owners.

In the opinion of the Commission in plenary session, the candidate failed to rebut the PIC's assertion that the foregoing circumstances, taken together, demonstrate that the parties artificially understated the contractual value of the real estate when entering into the apartment sale and purchase agreement in 2016. Moreover, it is not only the value of the apartment that gives rise to reasonable doubt on the part of an outside observer, but also the circumstances in which that value was determined.

Taken together, the foregoing gives rise to reasonable doubt as to the veracity of the explanations provided by S.I. Stadnyk.

The Commission in plenary session is satisfied that S.I. Stadnyk did not make adequate efforts to dispel the doubts set out in the PIC's conclusion as to whether he met the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

During the interview, S.I. Stadnyk did not provide clear and convincing evidence capable of dispelling doubts as to whether he and his family member had acquired the right to an object of civil rights under an agreement for consideration at a price that did not differ substantially from its market value. The foregoing also gives rise to reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with ethical standards in his private life.

Having examined the PIC's conclusion and the explanations provided by S.I. Stadnyk during the interview, the Commission in plenary session assesses the foregoing circumstances through the prism of non-compliance with such indicators as "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life" and "lawfulness of the sources of origin of property".

Accordingly, S.I. Stadnyk was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

3.3 Decisions of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQCJ) on finding that candidates failed to demonstrate their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court due to non-compliance with the aggregate indicators of personal and social competence, as well as integrity and professional ethics.

Decision dated 15.01.2026 No. 6/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Oleh Hrebin, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-197>)

On the basis of the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the personal competence criterion was assessed at 31.66 points, which is below 75 percent of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore considers that O.O. Hrebin does not meet the personal competence criterion.

O.O. Hrebin did not provide reasonable and sufficient explanations capable of convincing an outside observer that the candidate had taken appropriate and effective measures to prevent systematic breaches of the time limits for sending decisions for publication in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions. This adversely affects the candidate's assessment under the indicator of "decisiveness and responsibility".

O.O. Hrebin confined himself to meeting only the minimum statutory requirements for professional development, showed no initiative, and took no additional steps aimed at his own continuous professional development beyond the mandatory minimum. This adversely affects the candidate's assessment under the indicator of "continuous development".

On the basis of the information contained in the dossier materials and the interview with the candidate, the Commission determined that O.O. Hrebin scored 34.33 points under the social competence criterion, which is below 75 percent of the maximum possible score. The Commission concluded that the candidate does not meet the social competence criterion.

The Commission notes that the explanations provided by the candidate concerning compliance with the indicator of "sustainability of motivation" in his written explanations, letter of motivation, and during the interview are general in nature and do not demonstrate a conscious motivation to serve as a judge of an appellate court.

The Commission also notes that, although the candidate stated in his written explanations that he sought to deepen his knowledge and skills, in practice he took no steps beyond the minimum required to maintain and develop his knowledge, particularly with respect to training at the National School of Judges of Ukraine. The Commission emphasises that administering justice in a court of appeal requires candidates to undertake substantially more than the minimum development activities and to possess a conscious motivation to perform the professional duties of a judge over the long term.

Regarding the candidate's compliance with the criteria and indicators of integrity and professional ethics.

The Commission notes that, according to the explanations provided by the candidate, the relevant vehicle purchase agreements may give an outside observer the impression that they were sham transactions entered into by the parties to conceal other transactions that they had in fact concluded (Article 235 § 1 of the Civil Code of Ukraine). During the interview, O.O. Hrebin not only failed to dispel the doubts but confirmed them: he did not pay for the vehicles in question (or paid only insignificant amounts); he was merely the nominal owner; in order to obtain full ownership rights, he made additional payments for two vehicles that he already owned; and he transferred the proceeds from the sale of other vehicles to the "real" owner, his friend, but did not ensure that the relevant taxes were paid.

The Commission notes that this was not an isolated incident but involved at least four separate episodes, which, taken together, demonstrate the systemic nature of the actions concerned. During the interview, the candidate did not acknowledge any problematic aspects of those legal relationships, stating that he had not breached the law and that, when filing his declarations, he had relied on explanations provided by the National Agency on Corruption Prevention.

The Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of "integrity and professional ethics" under the indicators of "honesty" and "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life".

Accordingly, O.O. Hrebin was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 20.01.2026 No. 17/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Inna Khaidarova, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-199>)

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations, and interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total score under this criterion was 35.67 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the personal competence criterion.

Following the interview, the Commission notes that the candidate's answers were general in nature and did not demonstrate a clearly formed, consistent, and independent position on the professional challenges of judicial work. The candidate was unable to provide specific answers to the questions concerning her personal competence. She was unable to give any specific examples from her professional activities demonstrating decisiveness on the part of a judge and a willingness to assume responsibility.

The candidate was unable to respond constructively to the question concerning her continuous development; the information provided regarding the maintenance and enhancement of professional knowledge does not demonstrate a systematic approach to improving a judge's professional skills. In her written explanations under this criterion, the candidate stated that, following the expiry of her five-year term of office, she had been seconded to the National School of Judges of Ukraine and assigned to the Administrative Court of Cassation within the Supreme Court to provide methodological assistance. At the same time, she was unable to explain the specific assignments she had performed, limiting her explanation to stating that she had prepared a summary and drafted a letter

concerning taxes. In the Commission's opinion, the candidate's answers to the question concerning the results of her dissertation research did not demonstrate an understanding of the specific features of the operation of the Administrative Court of Cassation within the Supreme Court.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations, and interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total score under this criterion was 35.67 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate did not meet the social competence criterion.

The Commission notes that a substantial proportion of the candidate's answers concerning effective communication and effective interaction were verbose and unsystematic, with frequent departures from the substance of the questions asked. The candidate focused primarily on general observations, avoiding clear answers. Furthermore, her answers were not always structured or logically complete, which made them difficult to comprehend.

During the interview, the candidate stated that she saw no difference between effective communication and effective interaction, but was unable to provide sufficient arguments in support of her position.

When describing an example of emotional resilience in court proceedings, the candidate referred only to explaining the parties' rights and obligations to them, while, according to the judge's explanations, sustainability of motivation consisted exclusively in her desire to be a judge of an appellate court.

Regarding the candidate's compliance with the criteria and indicators of integrity and professional ethics.

In the context of Article 8 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Commission takes into account the candidate's personal circumstances that led to her relocation to the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea in 2014. At the same time, those circumstances do not demonstrate an urgent need for the judge to remain in the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea for a fairly prolonged period (249 days). In view of the foregoing and pursuant to paragraph 5.10 of the Regulations, the Commission concluded that candidate I.O. Khaidarova did not meet the criterion of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator of "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life".

Accordingly, I.O. Khaidarova was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 25.02.2026 No. 61/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Daria Luniova, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General

Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-256>)

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations, and interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total assessment score under this criterion was 31 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points); the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not meet the personal competence criterion.

In assessing the "personal competence" criterion, the panel members' voting results under the indicator of "decisiveness and responsibility" were influenced by the candidate's personal attitude towards certain requirements generally applicable to public service positions. In particular, the candidate responded flippantly to questions about periodic training at the National School of Judges of Ukraine and regarded as unimportant certain circumstances that, in the view of an outside observer, are important. This concerned systematically combining working hours with travel to another locality and an arbitrary interpretation of the term "working hours".

The assessment under the indicator of "continuous development" was particularly affected by the fact that the candidate did not undergo periodic training for judges (candidates) in 2018–2023 and by her particular attitude towards that subject.

Thus, the information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of personal competence.

Taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total assessment score under this criterion was 36.66 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not meet the social competence criterion.

The information provided by the candidate and the social skills she demonstrated during the interview did not persuade the members of the panel of the Commission that she possessed an adequate level of social competence sufficient to meet the passing threshold.

Following the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations, interview with the candidate, and voting during the closed deliberation under the relevant indicators, the aggregate score obtained under the specified criteria was 210 points out of a possible 300, which is below 75% (225 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that D.Yu. Luniova did not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

It became necessary to ascertain why information concerning the real estate in which the candidate's daughters reside had not been disclosed in the asset declarations. In order to dispel reasonable doubts concerning the completeness and accuracy of the declarations submitted, this matter had to be examined during the qualification assessment by

obtaining the relevant explanations from the candidate. The candidate explained that she had not considered it necessary to declare the children's right to use the relevant residential premises.

D.Yu. Luniova explained that she used the apartment pursuant to an oral agreement. However, when asked about its use free of charge, she gave a contradictory answer. She explained that she used the apartment alternately with her former husband, who had entered into an agreement to lease the apartment. After the owner of the apartment went abroad, the lease agreement was extended. In response to a follow-up question from a PIC member as to whether the apartment lease agreement had been appended to her explanations, the candidate stated that there was no such agreement and that the apartment was leased pursuant to an oral agreement. The Commission accepts the explanations provided but does not consider them sufficient and exhaustive.

In her declarations of family ties for 2013–2017, the candidate stated that her mother temporarily resided with her and shared a common household with her. At the same time, the candidate stated that there were no mutual rights and/or obligations between her and her mother. At the same time, an analysis of the annual declarations submitted for 2015, 2016, and 2017 shows that the judge did not disclose information about her mother as a family member despite having declared that they resided together and shared a common household. In the context of mutual rights and/or obligations, it should be noted that the information disclosed in the declarations for 2016 and 2017 shows that the candidate and her mother jointly owned real estate – an apartment – which demonstrates the existence between them of mutual property rights and obligations characteristic of family relationships.

The declarations submitted by the candidate for 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 contain no information concerning her husband's corporate rights in DI TI KOMPANI Limited Liability Company, although such information was subject to disclosure as information concerning the property and corporate rights of a family member of the declarant.

In view of the existence of several violations, the Commission unanimously decided to reduce the candidate's score under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity by 90 points.

The Commission is satisfied that, having regard to the nature of the violations committed, the foregoing facts are sufficient to find that the candidate does not meet the integrity criterion.

Accordingly, D.Yu. Luniova was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 16.04.2026 No. 140/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Rostyslav Sopilnyk, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate

General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-292>)

To find that Rostyslav Liubomyrovych Sopilnyk failed to confirm his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court on the grounds that he failed to appear for the qualification assessment.

Decision dated 26.05.2026 No. 242/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Alla Tokmakova, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-426>)

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations, and interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total score under this criterion was 13.25 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the personal competence criterion.

Following the interview, the Commission notes that the candidate's answers were general in nature and did not demonstrate a clearly formed, consistent, and independent position on the professional challenges of judicial work. The candidate was unable to provide specific answers to the questions concerning her personal competence.

Furthermore, the Commission notes that, while relying primarily on the length of her professional experience and the substantial volume of cases considered, the candidate did not in fact demonstrate an adequate level of self-analysis, the ability to critically assess her own professional activities, or the ability to draw specific conclusions regarding the reasons for shortcomings in her work. The explanations provided did not contain convincing substantiation of circumstances demonstrating a responsible attitude towards the performance of judicial duties, in particular with regard to the timely transmission of court decisions to the Unified State Register of Court Decisions.

The Commission also takes into account that the candidate was unable to provide a proper explanation for the systemic deficiencies in the organisation of her work and did not identify specific measures taken to remedy them and prevent their recurrence. Such conduct does not demonstrate a sufficient level of responsibility, independence, or awareness of the importance of properly performing the duties of a judge of an appellate court.

When asked about her knowledge of the case-law of the Criminal Court of Cassation within the Supreme Court concerning whether a court is entitled, when approving a plea agreement between the prosecutor and the accused, to order special confiscation where this is not provided for by the terms of the agreement, the candidate gave an incorrect answer.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations, and interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total score under this criterion was 21.75 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the social competence criterion.

The Commission notes that a substantial proportion of the candidate's answers concerning effective communication and effective interaction were verbose and unsystematic, with frequent departures from the substance of the questions asked. The candidate focused primarily on general observations, avoiding clear answers. Furthermore, her answers were not always structured or logically complete, which made them difficult to comprehend.

The Commission also takes into account that the candidate did not provide convincing examples demonstrating her ability to use communication effectively as a means of achieving mutual understanding and appropriate professional interaction. The circumstances cited by the candidate primarily concerned a general description of her professional activities and individual court proceedings, but did not properly explain how those examples demonstrated compliance with specific indicators of social competence.

Furthermore, during the interview, the candidate did not demonstrate a sufficient level of clear and consistent communication skills, the ability to focus on the substance of the questions asked, or an adequate level of self-presentation and argumentation in support of her position. The candidate's answers were often declaratory, without proper specificity or a logical connection between the circumstances cited and the assessment criteria.

The Commission notes that the candidate experienced difficulty communicating during the interview. Virtually every question required a relatively long pause before she answered, and the nature of her answers indicated a lack of confidence and insufficient preparedness for professional communication.

The Commission also notes that the candidate was unable to substantiate properly how the examples from judicial practice that she cited demonstrated effective communication and effective interaction on her part, including why she had cited one of the two cases in this section, which indicates an insufficient understanding of the substance of the relevant indicators of social competence.

The candidate was also unable to explain clearly her personal motivation for promotion to the position of judge of an appellate court.

Regarding the candidate's compliance with the criteria and indicators of integrity and professional ethics.

In the Commission's opinion, the conduct of PERSON_1 following the road traffic accident, in particular providing assistance to the victims and facilitating the necessary procedural steps, merits a positive assessment. At the same time, the nature of the candidate's explanations in this regard does not demonstrate an adequate level of self-criticism or awareness of the heightened standards of conduct that society reasonably expects of a judge.

The Commission accepts the candidate's explanation that the penalty imposed was consistent with the purpose of administrative punishment and the principle of individualisation of liability; however, it takes into account that the constitutional disciplinary body vested with the relevant powers, notwithstanding the most lenient penalty imposed on the candidate, stated the following in assessing the violation committed. In administering justice in case No. 615/330/20, Tokmakova A.P. grossly violated the requirements of Articles 1, 245 and 280 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, thereby impeding the State's fulfilment of the principal objectives for which that Code was adopted: educating a person who has committed such an offence in a spirit of compliance with the laws of Ukraine and respect for the rules of community life, and preventing the commission of new offences both by the offender and by other persons.

Accordingly, the violation in question demonstrates the candidate's failure to meet the 'conscientiousness' indicator.

The fact that the judge had previously worked with an attorney who subsequently participated regularly in cases before her, as well as the circumstances in which attorneys PERSON_2 and PERSON_3 represented the candidate's personal interests in her capacity as an individual, could objectively give rise, in the mind of an outside observer, to doubts as to the judge's impartiality and lack of bias when considering the relevant cases.

The Commission concludes that these circumstances reflect negatively on the candidate in terms of compliance with standards of professional ethics and ensuring public confidence in the administration of justice, specifically with regard to the 'impartiality' indicator.

The Commission critically assesses the candidate's explanations concerning her failure to disclose the apartment as a construction-in-progress asset in her declarations for 2022 and 2023. The Commission concluded that the candidate's explanations do not refute the established circumstances of her failure to disclose, in the declarations for 2021 and 2022, information concerning the construction-in-progress asset and the related property rights, which gives rise to reasonable doubt as to the candidate's proper compliance with financial-control requirements and integrity standards under the 'conscientiousness' indicator.

The substantial difference between the proportion of proceedings closed by the candidate (34%) and the corresponding indicators for other judges of that court (25%, 21% and 5%) cannot be fully explained solely by shortcomings in the work of law-enforcement bodies. The statistical data cited objectively demonstrate material differences in approaches to the assessment of evidence and the application of legal provisions in cases of this category. The Commission concluded that the candidate's explanations do not dispel the doubts arising from the significant discrepancy between the candidate's rate of closing proceedings in cases of this category and that of the other judges of the relevant court.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the totality of the facts established by the Commission, their materiality and their number demonstrate that the candidate fails to meet, or give rise to reasonable doubt as to whether she meets, all the above indicators of the criteria of integrity and professional ethics. Accordingly, Tokmakova A.P. wholly fails to meet those criteria of integrity and professional ethics, resulting in a score of 0 points under this criterion and the simultaneous finding that the candidate failed to demonstrate her ability to administer justice in an appellate court.

Thus, Tokmakova A.P. was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

Decision dated 29.05.2026 No. 251/ac-26

On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Mykyta Senatorov, a Candidate for Judgeship at an Appellate General Court, within the Competition Announced by Decision of the Commission dated 14 September 2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-414>)

Following the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total score under this criterion is 14 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of personal competence.

The Commission notes that, during the interview, the candidate was unable to properly substantiate what supported his stated assessment of the state of the judiciary in Ukraine and in Kharkiv Oblast; nor did he provide specific examples of decisive and responsible action that he had taken during his professional career to improve the administration of justice or could take as an appellate judge to raise the level of public confidence in the court in his region of residence and in Ukraine generally.

The Commission established that the candidate was unable to provide constructive answers to questions concerning his continuous development; the information provided concerning the maintenance and enhancement of his professional knowledge does not demonstrate a systematic approach to improving his professional skills.

Furthermore, during the interview, in response to a question from a Commission member, the candidate also failed to demonstrate a sufficient level of knowledge concerning the application of criminal procedure law.

Following the review of the dossier and written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual scores awarded by Commission members under the relevant indicators, the candidate's total score under this criterion is 22

out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore concluded that the candidate had failed to demonstrate his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court under the criterion of social competence.

Having regard to the candidate's written explanations and his answers during the interview, the Commission established that Senatorov M.V. had not demonstrated an appropriate level of social competence.

The Commission notes that the candidate's explanations during the interview concerning effective communication and effective interaction were framed in general descriptive terms, without specific examples of their application in particular professional and personal situations.

As regards the sustainability of his motivation, in particular the candidate's decision to apply directly to an appellate court, which may reassess evidence, without experience of its initial assessment at first instance, Senatorov M.V. focused primarily on the fact that this was permitted by the legislature and made general references to his experience in academic and legal practice.

Concerning the candidate's compliance with the indicators of the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

The Commission established that, according to information on the results of the special vetting of information concerning a person's fulfilment of military duty, provided at the Commission's request by the Kharkiv Oblast Territorial Recruitment and Social Support Centre on 14 August 2025 under No. 1024/BOO3, Senatorov M.V. was registered in the general military register at the Kyivskyi District Territorial Recruitment and Social Support Centre in the city of Kharkiv (INFORMATION_2) and, according to the available registration data, had violated the military-registration rules (failure to update personal data within the period prescribed by Ukrainian law and failure to undergo a military medical examination).

Furthermore, according to the letter "On the Provision of Information" from the Department of Information and Analytical Support of the National Police of Ukraine dated 08 April 2026, NPU No. 51000-2026, provided in response to the Commission's request dated 08 May 2026, Senatorov M.V., pursuant to the referral of the Kyivskyi District Territorial Recruitment and Social Support Centre in the city of Kharkiv dated 27 August 2025, was deemed to have violated mobilisation legislation and committed an administrative offence under Articles 210 and 210-1 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences.

Pursuant to the above requirements of the Law of Ukraine "On Amendments to Certain Laws of Ukraine Concerning the Provision of Social Protection Rights to Military Personnel and Police Officers" dated 21 March 2024 No. 3621-IX (hereinafter, Law No. 3621-IX), Senatorov M.V. was required to undergo a repeat military medical examination by 05 June 2025, but in fact did so only on 08 January 2026, that is, seven months late.

The candidate presented no sufficient and convincing evidence that he had been unable to undergo the military medical examination in a timely manner before the expiry of the

statutory deadline or that such a lengthy period of seven months after its expiry had been necessary to comply with Law No. 3621-IX.

During the meeting, the candidate also effectively admitted that he had violated the military-registration rules established by Law No. 3621-IX and had not undergone the military medical examination in a timely manner.

The candidate presented no sufficient and convincing evidence that, after 19 January 2026, he had been unable to appear pursuant to a summons at the Territorial Recruitment and Social Support Centre before 20 May 2026, and during the interview he provided no reasoned explanation for such a prolonged failure to appear.

The Commission concludes that, on two consecutive occasions, the candidate essentially and knowingly disregarded the requirements of military legislation and the military authorities concerning the timely repetition of the military medical examination and his appearance pursuant to a summons to clarify registration data, thereby demonstrating a dismissive attitude towards compliance with the Constitution and the military laws of Ukraine during such a difficult period for the State.

The Commission regards the candidate's conduct as undermining confidence in him as a candidate for judicial office in the State of Ukraine, moreover for a position at appellate instance.

The Commission concludes that the explanations provided by the candidate concerning the facts established by the Commission are not convincing, sufficient or acceptable to dispel the reasonable doubt as to his failure to meet the indicators of 'honesty' and 'consistency of lifestyle with declared income' throughout the disputed period from 2008 to 2024, both as regards compliance with legal requirements for the full and objective declaration of income, including for tax purposes, and the objective possibility of subsisting on the income actually declared by the candidate. Accordingly, the candidate wholly fails to meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, which in itself also results in a score of 0 points under this criterion and the simultaneous finding that the candidate failed to demonstrate his ability to administer justice in an appellate court.

The Commission concluded that Senatorov M.V. should be awarded 0 points under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, that is, that he does not meet those criteria, which constitutes grounds for finding that he failed to demonstrate his ability to administer justice in the relevant court.

Thus, Senatorov M.V. was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in an appellate general court.

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR FILLING VACANT JUDGESHIPS IN APPELLATE GENERAL COURTS.

As a result of the activities of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQCJ) in the first half of 2026, within the competition for vacant judicial positions in appellate general courts:

- 151 candidates were found to have confirmed their ability to administer justice in appellate general courts;
- 60 candidates were found to have failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in appellate general courts. Of these, 59 were so found on the basis of failure to meet the indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence, as well as integrity and professional ethics. One candidate was so found due to failure to appear at a Commission meeting.

The absolute majority – 30 candidates (50%) – failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in appellate general courts on the grounds of failure to meet the indicators of integrity and professional ethics.

Five candidates (8%) failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in an appellate general court on the grounds of failure to meet the combined indicators of personal and social competence, as well as integrity and professional ethics.

Twenty-one candidates (35%) failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in appellate general courts on the grounds of failure to meet the indicators of personal and social competence.

Of the candidates who failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in appellate general courts, 39 candidates (65%) are judges and 21 candidates (35%) are members of other legal professions, including 12 (20%) attorneys, 4 (7%) academics and 2 (3%) prosecutors.

Analysis of the specific reasons for finding that candidates failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in the relevant courts in the context of the indicators of personal and social competence reveals, for the most part, a formalistic approach by candidates to preparing for the interview, an insufficient understanding of the substance and importance of individual indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence, and a lack of commitment to self-improvement.

III. Review of HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in the High Anti-Corruption Court.

1. General information

Following special joint sessions of the HQCJ and the Public Council of International Experts (PCIE), 66 decisions were adopted.

Panels adopted 22 decisions finding that candidates had confirmed their ability to administer justice in the High Anti-Corruption Court.

The Commission in plenary session adopted 30 decisions, of which:

- **1 decision** on approval of the overall results of the first stage of the qualification assessment, “Qualification Exam”, and admission of candidates to the second stage, “Dossier Review and Interview”;
- **7 decisions** on termination of participation in the competition;
- **1 decision** on approval of the ranking of candidates for vacant judgeships in the High Anti-Corruption Court;
- **1 decision** on establishing the ranking of participants and determining the winners of the competition for vacant judgeships in the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court;
- **1 decision** on establishing the ranking of participants and determining the winners of the competition for vacant judicial positions in the High Anti-Corruption Court;
- **7 decisions** on recommending candidates for appointment as judges of the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court;
- **12 decisions** on recommending candidates for appointment as judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court.

2. HQCJ decisions following competitive procedures for filling vacant judgeships in the High Anti-Corruption Court.

Decision dated 08.06.2026 No. 70/zp-26

On Approval of the Ranking of Candidates for Vacant Judgeships in the High Anti-Corruption Court Based on the Results of the Qualification Assessment within the Competition Announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 03 June 2025 No. 112/zp-25 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytingu-kandydativ-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-u-vyshchomu-0>)

Decision dated 22.06.2026 No. 81/zp-26

On Determining the Winners of the Competition for Vacant Judgeships in the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 03 June 2025 No. 112/zp-25 (as amended).

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vyznachennya-peremozhciv-konkursu-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-v-apelyacyniy-palati>)

Decisions dated 22.06.2026 Nos. 215/vs-26–221/vs-26

On Recommending Candidates for Appointment as Judges of the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 03 June 2025 No. 112/zp-25 (as amended).

Decisions dated 22.06.2026 Nos. 222/vs-26–233/vs-26

On Recommending Candidates for Appointment as Judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court within the Competition Announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 03 June 2025 No. 112/zp-25 (as amended).

3. HQCJ decisions on candidates' failure to meet the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 130/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Ihor Makaryk, Candidate for Judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Prescribed by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-38>)

During the interview, the PCIE and the Commission discussed with the candidate his experience as an attorney and the declaration of income received from legal practice.

When asked by the Commission how the candidate’s assertion that he provided all assistance on a pro bono basis could be reconciled with information in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions concerning reimbursement of the costs of his professional legal assistance, the candidate replied that all his legal assistance had been provided free of charge and that, at the time of the interview, he could not provide a more detailed answer.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate’s explanations. A court decision ordering reimbursement of the costs of professional legal assistance may indicate either that funds for legal assistance were recovered from a party to the litigation without grounds for the benefit of the candidate, or that the candidate in fact received funds for the legal services he provided. In the absence of factual information capable of indicating that the recovery of those funds was unfounded, the Commission and the PCIE have doubts as to the truthfulness of the candidate’s answers that he provided services exclusively on a pro bono basis.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the ‘honesty’ indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Makaryk I.V., candidate for judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 131/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of whether Iryna Kuzina, Candidate for Judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Prescribed by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-40>)

According to data from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers (hereinafter, the SRIT), throughout almost her entire professional career the candidate declared low income from professional activities (see Table 1). This concerns both the initial stage of her career and the period when the candidate was already an experienced attorney and worked at the law firm “Illyashev & Partners”, which, according to publicly available information, ranked fourth in the “50 Leading Law Firms of Ukraine 2017”, as well as the period when the candidate worked and earned income at the law association bearing her name.

In view of the official information concerning the candidate's income and the information obtained from her written explanations concerning expenses incurred, including for the purchase, renovation and furnishing of a 127.3 sq. m house in the city of Irpin, Kyiv Oblast, the PCIE and the Commission had doubts as to whether the candidate's lifestyle was consistent with her declared income.

The candidate also stated that she had a negative attitude towards so-called 'under-the-table wages' ('grey wages'), although she acknowledged having previously received them. The candidate emphasised that this phenomenon had been widespread in the legal market and acknowledged that, as such, it was contrary to Ukrainian law. In the candidate's view, however, responsibility for it lay with the employer, who thereby infringed employees' rights.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate's assertion that responsibility for 'grey wages' lies solely with the employer. Although an employee is indeed in a more vulnerable position than an employer, such a situation has never been without a way out or an alternative. The candidate is an experienced lawyer and was well aware both of the unlawfulness of the very practice of paying remuneration illegally and of the adverse social consequences of such conduct. Accordingly, by voluntarily agreeing to such arrangements over an extended period, the candidate should have been aware of the reputational risks posed by such conduct in view of possible participation in competitive procedures for public office.

The candidate's refusal, during the closed part of the special joint session, to disclose information concerning the income actually received on account of the terms of a non-disclosure agreement means that the Commission and the PCIE cannot reach a conclusion as to whether her lifestyle is consistent with her declared income. Consequently, the Commission and the PCIE can take into account only the candidate's income recorded in the SRIT, which in certain years was less than, or only slightly exceeded, the annual subsistence minimum for an able-bodied person.

Furthermore, the Commission and the PCIE continue to have doubts as to the veracity of the data concerning income from professional activities, which are highly atypical for an experienced professional attorney.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the 'honesty' and 'consistency of lifestyle with declared income' indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Kuzina I.V., candidate for judicial office in the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found not to meet the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine 'On the High Anti-Corruption Court'.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 132/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Dmytro Ostapenko, Candidate for Judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria

Prescribed by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-44>)

During 2022–2023, Ostapenko D.M. was a member of the selection commission for the selection of a candidate for the position of Head of the National Agency of Ukraine for Finding, Tracing and Management of Assets Derived from Corruption and Other Crimes (hereinafter, the selection commission and ARMA). On 28 June 2023, following the selection commission’s vote, PERSON_1 was declared the winner of the competition. Ostapenko D.M. also cast his vote for her candidacy. However, on 29 June 2023, he published a post on the social network ‘Facebook’ withdrawing his vote for PERSON_1 because, at the time of voting, he had not possessed complete information concerning her that was decisive and had ‘shocked’ him, and because the voting procedure had been violated.

During the special joint session, when asked whether the candidate had been prepared to consider the candidacies in that competition, he replied in the affirmative – “very, very much so”.

The Commission and the PCIE note the inconsistency of the candidate’s explanations concerning his preparation to consider candidates for the position of Head of ARMA, his participation in the voting and the circumstances surrounding the withdrawal of his vote, which gives rise to doubts as to the truthfulness of the information provided by the candidate concerning those circumstances.

The Commission and the PCIE consider that the candidate’s explanations demonstrate that he did not display an appropriate level of conscientiousness in the performance of his duties as a member of the selection commission. Ostapenko D.M.’s statement withdrawing his vote after completion of the voting procedure in response to public criticism was not only inconsistent with the selection commission’s rules and therefore incapable of producing any legal consequences, but also created the impression that the candidate had yielded to public pressure in making it public, which calls into question his ability to comply with the requirements of independence.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the ‘conscientiousness’, ‘independence’ and ‘honesty’ indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Ostapenko D.M., candidate for judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 133/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Nazar Hryn, Candidate for Judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Prescribed by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-43>)

In his asset declarations for 2021–2024, Hryn N.H. stated that he, his wife and his son had the right to use a 59 sq. m apartment located in the city of Kryvyi Rih and owned by his mother-in-law, PERSON_2. At the same time, in his asset declarations for 2021–2023, the candidate did not disclose the value of that apartment, selecting the option ‘not applicable’.

The Commission and the PCIE take into account the candidate’s explanations, but note that he systematically failed to declare information known to him concerning the value of the apartment.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the ‘honesty’ indicator of the integrity criterion.

According to Hryn N.H.’s asset declarations for 2015–2024, since 27 October 2010 he has had the right to use a 63 sq. m service apartment in the city of Poltava.

According to a copy of his employment record book, on 01 February 2013 Hryn N.H. resigned from the Poltava Oblast Prosecutor’s Office of his own volition. After leaving the prosecution service, however, Hryn N.H. continued to use the service apartment in question, contrary to the requirements of Article 124 of the Housing Code of the Ukrainian SSR and occupancy warrant No. 50 dated 27 October 2010 for that apartment.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE had reasonable doubt as to the existence of lawful grounds for the candidate’s use of the service apartment in the city of Poltava for 13 years after leaving the prosecution service.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the ‘lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originate’ indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Hryn N.H., candidate for judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 134/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Vita Matolych, Candidate for Judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Prescribed by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-45>)

In section 3, ‘Real Estate’, of her declarations as a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government for 2020–2023 (hereinafter, the asset declarations), the candidate did not declare any real estate owned or used near her principal place of work, the Nadvirna District Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast. In the asset

declarations, the candidate identified the city of Lviv as her actual place of residence. The distance between the cities of Lviv and Nadvirna is approximately 180 km. The journey takes approximately three hours each way. Only in her asset declaration for 2024 did the candidate declare for the first time the right to use a 49.1 sq. m apartment in the city of Nadvirna owned by PERSON_1 (a former judge of the Nadvirna District Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast).

Her explanation that she lived in the city of Lviv every day while simultaneously administering justice in the city of Nadvirna for approximately four years gives rise, for the Commission and the PCIE, to reasonable doubt as to the truthfulness of her answers. Daily travel alone would have taken approximately 6–7 hours per day, in addition to her postgraduate studies from 2019 and preparation of a dissertation, which she defended in 2023. The candidate could have dispelled this doubt by providing documentary confirmation of those explanations (in particular, travel tickets, documents concerning hotel accommodation and/or bank statements), but she did not do so.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the 'honesty' indicator of the integrity criterion.

According to the candidate's asset declarations for 2016–2024, on 30 January 2014 she acquired title to a 47.1 sq. m apartment in the city of Lviv valued at UAH 395,377 (equivalent to USD 49,465.41 at the exchange rate of the National Bank of Ukraine as at 30 January 2014). At the same time, according to the State Register of Individual Taxpayers, the candidate's aggregate income for the period from 2008 through the first quarter of 2014 amounted to UAH 98,980.16 (before tax).

In response to the PCIE's request, the candidate confirmed the income information recorded in the State Register of Individual Taxpayers, stating that she had had no unofficial income during the period in question. As regards the sources of the funds used to purchase the apartment, the candidate confined herself to explaining that the apartment had been purchased partly with her own funds derived from her salary and partly with her husband's savings, savings of her parents and her husband's parents, and funds given as wedding gifts. At the same time, the candidate did not specify any amounts or provide any supporting documents.

Only in response to a repeated request from the PCIE and during the special joint session did the candidate clarify that her and her husband's combined savings amounted to approximately USD 15,000 and that their parents contributed the remainder in equal shares. The candidate provided no documentary confirmation of the origin of any of the stated sources of funds.

The Commission and the PCIE note that the explanations provided do not make it possible to determine the specific amount of the candidate's contribution to the purchase of the apartment in relation to her official income. Information concerning the lawfulness of the sources of the funds of other persons who allegedly contributed to the purchase of the apartment likewise remains unsubstantiated. The candidate took no steps to obtain and provide the relevant documentary confirmation, confining herself to general explanations.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the ‘honesty’ and ‘lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originate’ indicators of the integrity criterion.

According to full-access log data from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions (hereinafter, the Register), provided by the State Enterprise ‘Information Judicial Systems’ at the Commission’s request, in 2018 the candidate, while serving as an assistant to a judge of the Mykolaiv District Court of Lviv Oblast, conducted searches using the surnames and telephone numbers of individuals.

In response to the PCIE’s request and during the special joint session, the candidate stated that she did not remember the purpose of those queries and that the telephone numbers used for the searches belonged to members of her family. In her view, the searches had most likely been conducted to obtain public information available to any person through general access to the Register. As regards searches by telephone number, the candidate noted that such a search could not produce any results.

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess those explanations. Under paragraph 1 of part one of Article 7 of the Law of Ukraine ‘On Access to Court Decisions’, the texts of court decisions open to general access may not disclose information concerning individuals’ telephone numbers. This means that conducting searches by telephone number using full access to the Register demonstrates an intention to locate court decisions by means of a criterion that cannot be used in the publicly accessible version of the Register. In those circumstances, the candidate’s explanation that such a search could not have produced results is contradictory. If the candidate maintains that she searched exclusively for publicly available information obtainable from other sources, the use of full-access rights to the Register for personal purposes was unjustified and exceeded their intended purpose.

At the same time, those search queries were conducted using the ‘Criminal’ filter for the form of proceedings, which further calls into question the candidate’s explanations concerning the purpose of those queries.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the ‘compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life’ indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Matolych V.V., candidate for judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 135/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleksii Zaitsev, Candidate for Judgeship in the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Prescribed by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-47>)

Zaitsev O.V. participated in the competition for a judgeship at a court of appeal, announced by Commission Decision No. 94/зп-23 dated 14.09.2023. According to the Commission's decision of 26.11.2025 approving the ranking of candidates for vacant judgeships at the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal based on the results of the qualification assessment, Zaitsev O.V. was not recommended for appointment to the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal based on the competition results.

During the interview, Zaitsev O.V. explained that his motivation for submitting documents to participate in the competition for the HACC was his desire to become a judge. At the same time, in response to the Commission's follow-up questions regarding the priority of the competitions, the candidate repeatedly emphasised that his priority was the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal and that, if he successfully completed the competition, he would choose that particular court. The candidate described the competition for the HACC as an alternative option so that the "resources expended ... would not be fruitless" in the event that the competition for the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal was delayed or cancelled.

During the special joint session, the candidate was asked additional questions regarding his motivation to take up a judgeship at the HACC. The candidate noted that, "as of 18.02.2026, I am focused exclusively on the procedure in which I am currently participating", explaining his participation in the two competitions by their identical specialisation – criminal justice.

According to the candidate, "the choice of priority resolved itself", in view of the results of the previous competition. At the same time, Zaitsev O.V. avoided giving an unequivocal answer to the question of whether he might participate in other competitions for courts of appeal if they were announced before the completion of the competition for the HACC. Ultimately, the candidate acknowledged that, as a "realist and pragmatist", he could see that the HACC competition had a clear timeframe and would be completed sooner than a new competition for a general court of appeal would be announced.

The Commission and the PCIE draw attention to the contradictory nature of the candidate's answers regarding his motivation for participating in different competition procedures. The answers provided during the interview with the Commission on 16 October 2025 and during the special joint session provide grounds for believing that the candidate's decisive motivation is to obtain a judicial position regardless of the particular court. Participation in the competition for the HACC became a priority only after he received an adverse result in the competition for a judicial position at a court of appeal.

In view of the candidate's contradictory answers during the interview concerning the competition for a judgeship at a court of appeal and during the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE have doubts as to the candidate's high level of motivation to take up a judgeship at the HACC.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

The Commission's decision of 16.10.2025 establishing the results of the special check, review of the dossier, conduct of the interview, and determination of the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksii Zaitsev, a candidate for judgeship at a general court of

appeal, within the competition announced by Commission Decision No. 94/zp-23 dated 14.09.2023 (hereinafter, the “Decision of 16.10.2025”) sets out circumstances indicating that the candidate’s income was not duly substantiated. The Commission and the PCIE re-examined these circumstances, taking into account the candidate’s additional explanations and the additional documents provided.

The PCIE agrees with the Commission’s conclusion in the Decision of 16.10.2025 that the documents provided do not make it possible to establish the sources from which the candidate received income of UAH 179,101 in 2009. The documents provided do not contain proper confirmation that notarial activities were carried out.

The candidate provided additional documents concerning bank deposits made, which had not been attached to his explanations in October 2025. The Commission and the PCIE note the complexity and lack of clarity of the candidate’s explanations concerning the deposits made and the interest income received from them.

The Commission and the PCIE consider that the doubts concerning financial transparency and the accuracy of the declared assets have not been fully dispelled; consequently, there is a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “consistency of lifestyle with declared income” indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Zaitsev O.V., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision No. 136/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Ivan Posokhov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-50>)

During the competition (on 16 March 2025), the Security Service of Ukraine and the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine published information concerning the detention of PERSON_1 due to suspicion of inciting an attorney to provide USD 30,000 to a judge of the Solomianskyi District Court of Kyiv City in exchange for rendering a judgment of acquittal in criminal proceedings. On the basis of the evidence collected, PERSON_1 was notified of suspicion under part four of Article 27 and part three of Article 369 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine (incitement to provide an unlawful benefit to an official holding a position of responsibility for the performance by such official, in the interests of the person providing such benefit, of actions using the authority vested in the official).

These circumstances attracted significant public attention and, in particular, were covered in official communications from law enforcement authorities and leading Ukrainian media outlets.

The circumstances set out in the notice of suspicion, the fact that a preventive measure was imposed on PERSON_1, and the significant public resonance generated by these events, taken together with the candidate's statements during the special joint session regarding "zero tolerance" for corruption, constitute sufficient and convincing factual information that would give an ordinarily prudent person a rise to a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the integrity criteria.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Posokhov I.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 137/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleksandr Ostrohliad, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-46>)

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess the candidate's explanations regarding the possibility of spending approximately 30% of annual income on living expenses, given the amount of the candidate's and his wife's income and the composition of his family, which comprises five persons, including (INFORMATION_2) children.

Such expenditures by the candidate's family in 2016–2017 were several times lower than the subsistence minimum in Ukraine.

During the special joint session, Ostrohliad O.V. confirmed that it was precisely this allocation of income (30% for living expenses and 70% for savings and other expenses) that enabled his family to accumulate the relevant savings and acquire property.

During the special session, the candidate acknowledged that, in the table concerning his family's income, expenses, and savings provided at the PCIE's request, he had failed to take into account that the income amounts were stated before tax withholding. This means that the family's actual income was lower and also calls into question the candidate's calculations of his family's expenses and savings and, accordingly, the lawfulness of the sources of the funds used to accumulate the declared monetary assets and acquire the listed property.

In view of the candidate's explanation that he and his family members lived in 2016 and 2017 on funds whose aggregate amount was substantially lower than the subsistence minimum for a family of five in those years, the Commission and the PCIE also have

doubts as to the veracity of the information provided by the candidate in his explanations in response to the PCIE's request and during the special joint session.

Having assessed all the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" and "honesty" indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Ostrohliad O.V., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 138/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Yevhen Kapitonov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-51>)

In section 2.1 of his asset declarations for 2015–2019, the candidate stated that his actual place of residence (or postal address for correspondence with the National Agency on Corruption Prevention) was in the city of Vilniansk, Zaporizhzhia District, Zaporizhzhia Region.

At the same time, section 3, "Real Estate", of the asset declarations for 2015–2019 contains no information concerning any residential real estate in the city of Vilniansk that was owned or used by the candidate.

In section 11, "Income, Including Gifts", of the asset declaration for 2015, the candidate identified himself as the source of income from the disposal of a 1988 Mercedes-Benz 300 E vehicle, without identifying the purchaser.

Section 14, "Expenditures and Transactions of the Declarant", of the asset declaration for 2015 does not disclose the transaction pursuant to which ownership of the said vehicle was terminated.

In his asset declarations for 2015–2016, the candidate declared ownership of a 2005 Dacia Logan vehicle (acquired on 19 May 2015) but did not state its value as of the acquisition date.

In section 6, "Valuable Movable Property – Vehicles", of the asset declaration for 2018, the candidate reported acquiring ownership of a 2008 Mitsubishi Outlander vehicle on 04 September 2018. The candidate did not disclose the transaction pursuant to which ownership of this vehicle arose in section 14, "Expenditures and Transactions of the Declarant".

In view of the established facts, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" and "conscientiousness" indicators of the integrity criterion.

In the asset declaration for 2022, the candidate stated that on 23 August 2022 his wife had acquired a 2011 Toyota Land Cruiser Prado 150 vehicle for UAH 250,000, which, at the official exchange rate of the National Bank of Ukraine as of the vehicle's acquisition date, was equivalent to USD 6,837. According to information from open sources, the average market value of a vehicle of this make, model, and year of manufacture in 2022 was at least three times higher than the value declared by the candidate.

In his written explanations in response to the PCIE's request, the candidate asserted that the vehicle's price was consistent with the market, taking into account martial law, preferential customs clearance, the proximity of the place of sale (the city of Kryvyi Rih) to the front line, the urgency, and significant technical defects in the vehicle.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate's explanations because he did not provide any documents substantiating his explanations regarding the vehicle's technical defects or other circumstances that would account for such a low value of the vehicle. In particular, the introduction of preferential customs clearance for importing vehicles into Ukraine does not objectively affect the market price of used vehicles already registered domestically. Given that the declared value was at least three times lower than the market value of comparable models in 2022, the arguments provided do not dispel the doubt as to its accuracy.

Having assessed the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" and "honesty" indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Kapitonov Ye.M., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 139/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Andrii Dudikov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-52>)

According to the logs of full access to the Unified State Register of Court Decisions (hereinafter, the Register), provided by the State Enterprise "Information Judicial Systems" at the Commission's request, the candidate made a series of search queries using the surnames and telephone numbers of individuals, legal entities, addresses, and vehicle registration numbers, and viewed decisions found through those queries, including decisions in criminal proceedings. In total, there were more than 200 such queries.

Having assessed all the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that the candidate used full access to the Register in his personal interests and in the interests of persons associated with him, and also provided unclear and inconsistent explanations concerning these circumstances. In this connection, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life" and "honesty" indicators of the integrity criterion.

In the declaration of a person authorised to perform state or local self-government functions (hereinafter, the asset declaration) for 2016, the candidate declared in section 6, "Valuable Movable Property – Vehicles", a 2007 Volkswagen Passat passenger vehicle that became the property of his wife, PERSON_3, on 11 March 2016. At the same time, in the relevant field, "Value as of the Date of Acquisition into Ownership, Possession, or Use", the judge stated "Unknown".

In his explanations in response to the PCIE's request and during the special joint session, the candidate stated that he had asked his wife about the value of the property, but she informed him that the original vehicle sale and purchase agreement had been transferred to the territorial service centre of the Ministry of Internal Affairs during the registration process, that her copy of the agreement had not been retained, and that she did not remember the exact value. To avoid reporting inaccurate information regarding the vehicle's value, he selected "Unknown" in the relevant field of section 6 of the annual declaration.

The Commission and the PCIE question these explanations.

The candidate used this vehicle for more than four years and, by virtue of the position he held, was required to submit annual asset declarations and to declare the vehicle's value. However, throughout that entire period, the candidate took no steps to ascertain the value of this property and declare it properly.

In view of the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE consider that the candidate did not take sufficient steps to ascertain the requested information. Given these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Dudikov A.V., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 140/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleh Kimstachov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-53>)

In Decision No. 2/vs-25 dated 17.02. 2025, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's integrity due to inconsistent explanations concerning the circumstances in which he received a gift of cryptocurrency from his mother.

Specifically, in his declaration of a person authorised to perform state or local self-government functions for 2023, the candidate declared receipt from his mother of a non-monetary gift valued at UAH 549,156.

In his explanations in response to the PCIE's questions dated 02 January 2025, the candidate stated that he had received a gift from his mother in the cryptocurrency (stablecoin) Tether (USDT), in a total amount of 15,000 units.

The PCIE additionally requested that the candidate provide information concerning his mother's income, as well as information concerning cryptocurrency transactions that would confirm her ability to make this valuable gift.

In his explanations dated 03 February 2025, the candidate stated that his mother had never personally purchased (received) cryptocurrency and had not made any transactions to his crypto wallet. Nor was she personally a user of a crypto wallet or cryptocurrency exchange. Instead, all the cryptocurrency received by the candidate as a gift had in fact been transferred from crypto addresses belonging to his brother. The candidate also explained that he had declared his mother as the source of the gift because she had transferred her savings to the candidate's brother for investment in cryptocurrency (he provided no documents confirming this). In 2022, the mother informed the brother that she wished the funds invested by him to be given to the candidate. The brother transferred the cryptocurrency to Kimstachov O.S.

Having assessed all the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that the candidate had not been consistent in his written explanations and had effectively changed them.

Having examined the circumstances set out in paragraphs 3.1-3.3, the Commission and the PCIE note that the candidate did not provide, and the Commission and the PCIE did not identify, any new or additional information of material significance for rebutting the conclusions set out in Decision No. 2/vs-25 dated 17 February 2025, adopted following the special joint session concerning whether Kimstachov O.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, met the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court". The explanations provided by the candidate do not alter the substance of the established circumstances and do not dispel the reasonable doubts as to his compliance with the "conscientiousness", "impartiality", and "honesty" indicators of the integrity criterion.

In view of the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness", "impartiality", and "honesty" indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Kimstachov O.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 141/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Dmytro Kravets, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-54>)

According to information from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers (hereinafter, the SRIT), the aggregate income of the candidate’s family for 2016–2024 was lower than the actual subsistence minimum calculated pursuant to Article 5 of the Law of Ukraine “On the Subsistence Minimum”.

During the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE drew attention to the discrepancy between the candidate’s declared level of income from the practice of law and the actual scope of his professional practice.

The Commission and the PCIE take into account that the explanations provided by the candidate do not, in themselves, dispel the established discrepancy between the family’s declared level of income, which for an extended period was lower than the actual subsistence minimum, and the scope of the candidate’s professional activities as an attorney.

The explanations provided concerning the family’s frugal lifestyle, receipt of food from relatives, and the internal allocation of funds within the law office are general in nature and do not explain the actual sources of the funds used to meet the needs of the candidate’s family.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

According to the candidate’s asset declaration for 2024, on 08 November 2021 he acquired ownership of an apartment measuring 75.5 sq. m in the village of Sofiivska Borshchahivka, Kyiv Region, valued at UAH 1,427,400.

The Commission and the PCIE concluded that the candidate had not provided sufficient and convincing evidence of the lawfulness of the sources of the funds used to invest in an apartment measuring 74.1 sq. m in 2021, the subsequent assignment of the claim to which became the source of funds for the acquisition of an apartment measuring 75.5 sq. m in 2024.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated” indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Kravets D.M., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found

not to meet the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision No. 142/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Viktor Maslov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-56>)

In case No. 757/7845/19-к, a panel of judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court that included Judge Maslov V.V. rendered a judgment on 05 April 2024, which was appealed.

By a ruling of the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court dated 20 May 2025, the said judgment was set aside and a new trial of the criminal proceedings before the court of first instance was ordered. One of the grounds for setting aside the judgment was that the judges in that case had repeatedly interrupted their deliberations without justification, for reasons that were not based on the requirements of criminal procedure law and were not dictated by the needs of the case, which indisputably demonstrates a violation of the principle of continuity of judicial proceedings and, accordingly, of the secrecy of the deliberation room.

It was established that, while in the deliberation room, Judge Maslov V.V. participated in a meeting of judges as the chair and also attended training with other judges, which was not dictated by the needs of the particular criminal proceedings. The appellate court found that such actions violated the principle of continuity of judicial proceedings and the secrecy of the deliberation room.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE consider that the aforementioned actions demonstrate the judge’s failure to comply with the requirements governing the organisation of his activities when rendering a judicial decision and with standards of conduct intended to ensure confidence in the court.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life” indicator of the integrity criterion.

In section 13, “Financial Liabilities”, of the declarations of a person authorised to perform state or local self-government functions (hereinafter, the declaration) for 2020–2021, the candidate reported receiving a loan of UAH 400,000 from his father on 24 November 2020. According to the notice of significant changes in financial status dated 03 October 2021, the candidate reported repayment on 02 October 2021 of a loan in the amount of UAH 780,550. In addition, according to the notice of significant changes in financial status dated 03 October 2021, the candidate received a gift of UAH 1,530,550 from his father on 02 October 2021.

In the opinion of the Commission and the PCIE, receipt of the loan in instalments in amounts not subject to declaration (the candidate declared only the portion that exceeded the threshold (UAH 400,000)) may be perceived as a means of avoiding full disclosure of financial liabilities in the declaration, which adversely affects the perception of the transparency of the candidate's financial transactions.

The manner in which, according to the candidate, the debt under the loan agreement was repaid while a substantially larger gift was simultaneously received from his father creates a non-transparent structure of financial transactions that makes it difficult to establish their actual economic substance, which in turn gives rise to a reasonable doubt as to whether the legal nature of the transactions effected corresponded to the parties' true intentions.

Taken together, the candidate's aforementioned actions give rise to reasonable doubts regarding the completeness, transparency, and consistency of the disclosure of the candidate's financial transactions.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

By Decision No. 1325/1дп/15-25 of the First Disciplinary Chamber of the High Council of Justice dated 23.06.2025, judge Maslov V.V. was held disciplinarily liable and the disciplinary sanction of a warning was imposed on him.

That decision found that, by prohibiting the suspect from communicating with an unlimited and unspecified group of persons, judge Maslov V.V. committed a material violation of procedural law, namely, he failed to comply with the provisions of part five of Article 194 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine by failing to satisfy the statutory requirement to identify the person or persons with whom the suspect was prohibited from communicating, which affected the exercise of the suspect's right to defence. Taking into account that the judge's said violation was not systemic, the HCJ found that these actions had been committed as a result of negligence.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Maslov V.V., a candidate for judgeship at the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 143/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oksana Yevlakh, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-55>)

In section 11, “Income, Including Gifts”, of the declaration of a person authorised to perform state or local self-government functions for 2022, as well as in the notice of significant changes in financial status dated 06 July 2022, the candidate stated that on 01 July 2022 she had received a non-monetary gift from PERSON_1 – a residential house in the city of Romny, Sumy Region, with a total area of 129.9 sq. m and a declared value of UAH 370,646.

At the same time, according to the State Register of Proprietary Rights to Immovable Property, both the residential house measuring 129.9 sq. m and the land plot measuring 0.0992 ha, located in the city of Romny, Sumy Region, were initially acquired by PERSON_1 on 23 July 2021 for UAH 515,800.

In the notice of significant changes in financial status dated 25 September 2022, the candidate declared the gift (disposal) of immovable property on 17 September 2022, stating a value of UAH 370,866.

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess the candidate’s explanations concerning the nature and circumstances of the said transactions. The candidate’s assertion that she did not regard the property received as a “gift to a judge”, but merely as implementation of the arrangements between her and her former husband, does not negate the obligation to comply with the anti-corruption restrictions established for a person holding the status of judge, both in professional activities and in personal life.

Having assessed all the aforementioned circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct” and “lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated” indicators of the integrity criterion.

In section 2.1, “Information About the Declarant”, of the asset declarations for 2015, 2016, and 2017, Yevlakh O.O. stated the address of her actual place of residence as a house in the village of Ovlashi, Romny District, Sumy Region, title to which had been acquired on 13 June 2015 by the candidate’s daughter, PERSON_4, who at that time was (INFORMATION_1). At the same time, the candidate did not disclose her right to use this house in section 3, “Real Estate”.

In section 6, “Valuable Movable Property – Vehicles”, of the asset declarations for 2015, 2016, and 2017, the candidate listed a 2004 Toyota Avensis vehicle, stating the acquisition date as 02 August 2014, but did not report the value of that vehicle, even though the price of such property had been known to her since its acquisition.

In section 3, “Real Estate”, of the asset declaration for 2018, Yevlakh O.O. reported the acquisition of a land plot measuring 743 sq. m in the city of Nizhyn, Chernihiv Region, with a value as of the acquisition date of UAH 15,000. At the same time, the value of the property according to the latest appraisal was stated as UAH 49,928.

In the asset declarations for 2019–2024, the candidate reported the value of this property as “not applicable”, despite possessing precise information concerning the actual purchase price and the official appraisal.

In assessing the candidate's explanations concerning the reasons for failing to declare the value of the aforementioned property, the Commission and the PCIE note that the prolonged and repeated failure to disclose in asset declarations information concerning the value of property known to the candidate is inconsistent with the obligation to complete asset declarations carefully and conscientiously.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Yevlakh O.O., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria stipulated by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision No. 144/vs-26 dated 20.03.2026

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleksandr Ivasyn, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-58>)

According to the Commission's decision "On Establishing the Results of the Special Check, Reviewing the Dossier, Conduct of the Interview, and Determination of the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Ivasyn O.R., a Candidate for Judgeship at a General Court of Appeal, within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 94/zp-23 dated 14.09.2023 (as amended)", on his Facebook page and during a lecture at the Sixth Administrative Court of Appeal, the candidate publicly advised declaring property belonging to the declarant as having been gifted by another person, despite the fact that such information was inaccurate.

The Commission and the PCIE proceed from the premise that a person seeking judicial office must not only personally comply with the requirements of anti-corruption legislation, but must also foster among others a correct understanding of its substance and purpose, particularly in their public communications. Wording or recommendations by a candidate that are open to more than one interpretation or may be perceived as a means of "circumventing" statutory requirements create a risk that others will acquire a distorted understanding of such requirements, may encourage practices lacking integrity, and undermine confidence in the asset declaration system.

In particular, recommendations whereby information in a declaration is proposed to be corrected by changing the legal nature of property (for example, by indicating it as a gift in the absence of the relevant factual circumstances) may create an impression that manipulation of the substance of information entered in a declaration is permissible.

Accordingly, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the indicator of "compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life" under the integrity criterion.

Thus, O.R. Ivasyn, a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 145/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Petro Romanenko, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-59>)

During the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE noted the candidate’s limited experience in dealing with corruption-related and associated criminal offences.

In his explanations in response to the PCIE’s written questions, the candidate stated that throughout his professional career he had handled only one case involving a corruption-related offence. During the special joint session, the candidate acknowledged that he had limited experience in criminal law and procedure. In response to a follow-up question as to whether he possessed sufficient qualifications to administer justice at the HACC, the candidate replied that he could not say “whether I am sufficiently qualified or whether I will be able to perform the duties of a judge”, but expressed confidence that he would be able to learn.

P.V. Romanenko was unable to provide clear and complete answers to questions from members of the Commission concerning the subject-matter jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court, evidence in criminal proceedings, and asset declaration rules.

The Commission and the PCIE also take into account the candidate’s level of motivation. Concurrently with the competition for the HACC, the candidate is participating in the competition (selection) for a position as a judge of a local court announced by Commission Decision No. 366/зп-24 dated 11.12.2024. In response to a follow-up question regarding his motivation to become a HACC judge, the candidate replied that he “would find it interesting to work in this field”. When prioritising between serving as a judge of the HACC and serving as a judge of a local court of first instance, the candidate initially noted that a commercial specialisation would be more interesting to him, but then added that serving as a HACC judge would offer better prospects for professional development. Ultimately, he noted that he was equally interested in serving as a judge at either of those courts. The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of these answers, as they do not demonstrate a high level of professional motivation to hold office as a HACC judge.

Having regard to the information collected and the candidate’s answers, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the criterion of possessing sufficient knowledge and practical skills to adjudicate cases falling within the jurisdiction of the HACC, as well as the “conscientiousness” indicator under the integrity criterion.

Thus, P.V. Romanenko, a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 146/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Serhii Kovalchuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-61>)

The candidate provided neither a detailed breakdown of his living expenses nor any payment documents for 2018, making it impossible to verify the accuracy of the level of expenditure he reported.

The totality of these circumstances, including the reported level of living expenses corresponding to the subsistence minimum while foreign-currency savings were increasing, the significant discrepancy between the reported expenses and the averages for the candidate’s region of residence, the absence of documentary evidence of expenses, and the objectively insufficient balance of funds to maintain a minimum standard of living, gives grounds to doubt the veracity of the candidate’s explanations.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “honesty” indicator under the integrity criterion.

According to the information contained in the candidate’s asset declarations for 2017–2019 and 2021, the candidate was registered and actually resided in an apartment with a total area of 106.2 sq. m in the city of Ivano-Frankivsk, jointly owned in shares by his brother and mother.

At the same time, the candidate did not disclose information about his mother in item 4, “Family Members of the Declarant,” of section 1, “General Information,” of his declarations for the relevant years.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate’s explanation that there were no grounds for treating his mother as a family member within the meaning of anti-corruption legislation.

The totality of the established circumstances, including the registration of the candidate’s and his mother’s places of residence at the same address, the candidate’s use of housing owned by his mother, and his mother’s having a separate room containing her personal belongings in that apartment, indicates that they lived together.

Furthermore, the systematic provision to her of financial assistance in the amount of UAH 3,000 – 4,000 per month, and the payment by the mother, using those funds, of utility bills and other expenses related to maintaining the dwelling in which the candidate

resided, indicate a shared household and mutual rights and obligations between the candidate and his mother.

The failure to identify the mother as a family member in the declarations resulted in an incomplete disclosure of the candidate's financial position, particularly as regards his mother's income and property. The candidate's declarations contain no information about an apartment with an area of 67 sq. m in the village of Chaiky, Kyiv Region, or a 2014 Nissan Qashqai vehicle, both owned by his mother.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the "honesty" indicator under the integrity criterion.

The totality of the circumstances, including the substantial discrepancy between the level of income and the amount of savings reported for the purchase of a Toyota Corolla, the absence of documentary evidence of the sale of a Ford Sierra, the unconvincing explanations regarding the accumulation of savings in the amount of USD 14,000, and the absence of documentary evidence of a loan in the amount of UAH 130,000, raises doubts as to the candidate's financial capacity to purchase the vehicles concerned.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the "honesty" and "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originate" indicators under the integrity criterion.

Thus, S.O. Kovalchuk, a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 147/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Viktoriia Bazeliuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-57>)

During the special joint session, V.V. Bazeliuk acknowledged that she had mistakenly failed to disclose information about this vehicle in her 2024 asset declaration because she did not consider herself obliged to do so, as she had not actually used the vehicle for more than 183 days of the reporting period. The candidate added that the power of attorney had been issued to her not for permanent use of the vehicle, but so that, if the situation in the country deteriorated, she could leave by car with her child, including travel abroad.

Pursuant to the third paragraph of part two of Article 46 of the Law of Ukraine "On Prevention of Corruption," information about a declarable asset possessed or used by the declarant or members of the declarant's family shall be included in the declaration if such asset was possessed or used as at the last day of the reporting period (provided that the

declarant acquired the right of possession or use at least 30 calendar days before the last day of the reporting period) or for at least half of the days of the reporting period.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that V.V. Bazeliuk should have disclosed in her 2024 asset declaration information about the right to use a 2014 CHEVROLET VOLT vehicle under a power of attorney dated 17 May 2024, since she simultaneously held the right to use it for more than half the days of the reporting period (more than 183 days) and as at the last day of the reporting period.

Having assessed these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “honesty” indicator under the integrity criterion.

In her written answers to the PCIE’s questions as to whether the driver was intoxicated at the time of the road traffic accident on 22 June 2017, the candidate replied that the event had occurred approximately nine years earlier and that she therefore did not remember some details, but knew for certain that “if he had been drinking at all, it was very little”.

During the special joint session, PCIE member John J. O’Sullivan asked V.V. Bazeliuk whether the driver had been intoxicated at the time of the road traffic accident on 22 June 2017. The candidate denied this and added that he had not consumed alcoholic beverages because a case concerning the revocation of his driving privileges was to be heard the following day. V.V. Bazeliuk added that she considered driving while intoxicated to be a socially dangerous act and therefore had never entered a car with an intoxicated driver. The candidate added that in her written explanations she had meant that PERSON_1 might have consumed non-alcoholic beer.

The Commission and the PCIE noted that V.V. Bazeliuk had not been consistent in her written and oral answers to the question of whether the driver had been intoxicated at the time of the road traffic accident. In her written explanations, the candidate did not deny that the driver, PERSON_1, might have consumed alcoholic beverages shortly before the road traffic accident on 22 June 2017. During the special joint session, however, the candidate categorically denied that possibility.

At the special joint session, V.V. Bazeliuk confirmed that, during the consideration by the Kominternivskyi District Court of the city of Kharkiv of case No. 641/4198/17, the court established that, at the time of the road traffic accident on 22 June 2017, the vehicle had been driven by a man whom she allegedly did not know very well – “a man named Yurii with whom she was barely acquainted”. However, in her written explanations and during the special joint session, the candidate stated that she had lived with PERSON_1 from 2013 to 2023, meaning that as at 22 June 2017 they had lived together for approximately four years. Thus, the candidate may have provided false information to the court during the consideration of case No. 641/4198/17.

Having assessed these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “honesty” indicator under the integrity criterion.

During the special joint session, Commission member Yaroslav Dukh asked the candidate why it had been necessary to visit the Russian Federation systematically in 2018–2020.

The candidate explained that there had been no statutory prohibition on visiting the territory of the Russian Federation during that period. She could not adequately explain to a close associate why she could not travel to assist his relatives.

In view of the explanations provided, the Commission and the PCIE consider that the candidate made systematic visits to the territory of the aggressor state without an urgent need.

On the basis of the information collected and the candidate's answers, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the indicator of "compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life" under the integrity criterion.

Thus, V.V. Bazeliuk, a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 148/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleh Batiuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-63>)

In section 3, "Real Estate," of his declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2019, the candidate declared that on 04 July 2019 he had acquired the right to use free of charge an apartment in the city of Kyiv with a total area of 61.2 sq. m and a value of UAH 1,185,038. That real estate was acquired on 04 July 2019 by the candidate's mother, PERSON_1, under a sale and purchase agreement. In 2017, the candidate's mother purchased a two-room apartment in the city of Mariupol worth UAH 85,000, in which the candidate and his family also resided free of charge for one and a half years.

According to the State Register of Individual Taxpayers (hereinafter, the SRIT), the official income of PERSON_1, who has been a pensioner since 2003, for the period from 1998 to December 2025 amounted to UAH 186,505.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate's explanations regarding the sources of his mother's funds, as he provided no documentary evidence of income sufficient to acquire ownership of an apartment in the city of Kyiv. The candidate's mother's income recorded in the SRIT was plainly insufficient to purchase real estate in the city of Kyiv worth UAH 1,185,038, even taking into account the income from the disposal of the apartment in the city of Mariupol. Thus, the candidate provided no confirmation of the lawfulness of the sources of his mother's funds used to purchase the apartment in the city of Kyiv with an area of 61.2 sq. m.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originate” indicator under the integrity criterion.

In section 11, “Income, Including Gifts,” of his 2019 asset declaration, the candidate reported aggregate family income of UAH 33,710, of which his personal income amounted to only UAH 9,710 for the year (UAH 5,000 – income from independent professional activity, and UAH 4,710 – fees). At the same time, according to information from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, in 2019 the candidate participated as a representative in approximately 30 court cases.

In his written explanations in response to the PCIE’s request, the candidate stated that he had handled some cases in 2019 free of charge or had received advance payment for them in previous years. In addition, in the questionnaire for a candidate for judicial office, in response to the question concerning work performed without formalised employment relations, the candidate answered “sometimes,” explaining this by reference to small payments (UAH 200–500) received for consultations.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the explanations provided, since the candidate’s asset declarations for 2016, 2017 and 2018 contain no information whatsoever regarding income in the form of payments for independent professional activity or fees received.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the possibility of supporting a family of four in the city of Kyiv at a level of expenditure below the actual subsistence minimum, particularly in view of the candidate’s relocation from the city of Mariupol to the city of Kyiv in July 2019.

Having regard to these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “honesty” indicator under the integrity criterion.

By judgment of the Obolonskyi District Court of Kyiv City dated 31.03.2021 in case No. 263/429/19, the claim brought by the Mariupol City Employment Centre against the candidate for recovery of unemployment benefits and the cost of social services received without legal grounds was granted. The court established that, when applying for unemployed status in July 2018, the candidate had failed to disclose that he held a valid certificate of indefinite duration authorising him to practise law, a fact of which the employment authority became aware only in November 2018.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the explanations provided by the candidate. The assertion that a public authority should have independently checked public registers does not relieve the candidate of the obligation to act honestly and provide complete information concerning circumstances relevant to the receipt of state payments.

The existence of a final court judgment ordering recovery from the candidate of funds acquired without sufficient legal grounds as a result of his failure to disclose information relevant to the award of the respective payments raises doubts as to the candidate’s ability to comply with high standards of professional ethics.

Having assessed these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the indicators of “compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct” and “honesty” under the integrity criterion.

In section 3, “Real Estate,” of his asset declarations for 2016–2019, the candidate declared the right to lease an agricultural land plot with an area of 42,199 m² in Kherson Region. However, section 11, “Income, Including Gifts,” of those declarations contains no information regarding any income received from the use of that property.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the explanations provided. The systematic failure, over four years, to declare income recorded in the SRIT demonstrates disregard for, or a negligent attitude towards, the performance of obligations established by anti-corruption legislation.

Having assessed the prolonged nature of the failure to declare income, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “conscientiousness” indicator under the integrity criterion.

Thus, O.O. Batiuk, a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 149/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Ihor Omelian, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-64>)

Thus, in his questionnaire for a candidate for judgeship, I.V. Omelian stated that he had been the head of DR CONSULTING LLC, KRESS CONSULTING LLC, CLARITY CONSULTING LLC, WOODPECKER CONSULTANCY LLC, and the subsidiary Arconia. In addition, the Commission and the PCIE established that the candidate had also served as head of LINKS CONSULTING LLC (from 29 January 2021 to 28 March 2021) and VIKTOR FTV LLC (from 21 July 2021 to 23 September 2021), but had not disclosed that information in the questionnaire.

All of those companies were registered between 2020 and 2021 at the same address, which coincided with the registered address of the candidate’s law office. At the same time, the founders (ultimate beneficial owners) of those legal entities were foreign nationals, while, according to open-source information, the companies either had not filed financial statements in recent years or had reported zero or negative financial results, indicating the absence of genuine business activity.

The candidate confirmed that those legal entities had been established with foreign founders in order to enable the latter to obtain temporary residence permits in Ukraine. At the same time, he stated that he considered this practice lawful.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the above circumstances. Even if the candidate's actions complied with statutory requirements, the use of legal entities that conduct no genuine business activity and serve exclusively as an instrument for achieving a formal legal result – the acquisition by foreign nationals of the right to temporary residence in Ukraine – not only indicates the use of legal mechanisms for purposes other than those for which they were intended, but also bears the hallmarks of an abuse of rights. Such actions are incompatible with the standards of impeccable conduct that may reasonably be expected of a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the indicator of “compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life” under the integrity criterion.

Following an analysis of the information contained in the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government filed by the candidate for 2024, open sources, and the explanations provided, the Commission and the PCIE established that the candidate had been a member of two companies whose charter capital had been formed through intellectual property rights in the form of “know-how”.

In response to the PCIE's request and during the special joint session, the candidate confirmed that the charter capital of both companies had been formed exclusively through intellectual property rights in the form of “know-how.” At the same time, he was unable to explain clearly and consistently the economic substance of that “know-how,” its authorship, the period of its creation, the method of legal protection, or the approaches to its valuation that resulted in charter capital being formed in substantial amounts. The candidate stated that the formation of charter capital does not in itself give rise to tax consequences in the absence of actual business activity.

According to the candidate's explanations, on 25 December 2025 he ceased to be a member of those companies, and the charter capital of each was reduced by the amount of his share. In his notices of withdrawal from the companies, the candidate stated that he had no property claims against them.

In addition, the candidate explained that those companies either had not actually conducted business activities or had ceased doing so.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate's explanations for the following reasons.

First, the formation of the companies' charter capital in the amounts of UAH 4,200,000,000 and UAH 560,000,000 exclusively through intellectual property rights in the form of “know-how,” in the absence of any actual business activity by those companies, is inconsistent with a reasonable business purpose for establishing legal entities. The contribution of substantial intangible assets to charter capital is intended to facilitate the use of those assets in business activities, which, in this case and having regard to the candidate's explanations, was not established.

Furthermore, the candidate's inability to specify the substance of the “know-how,” its authorship, the period of its creation, the method of legal protection, and the approaches to

its valuation raises doubts as to the actual value and proper monetary valuation of those intangible assets.

The declared lack of any intention to enforce a property claim of such substantial value, in the absence of convincing explanations regarding the reasons for such conduct, is atypical and raises additional doubts as to the accuracy of the declared value of those assets.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “honesty” indicator under the integrity criterion.

Following an analysis of the information contained in the candidate’s dossier and the explanations provided by him, the Commission and the PCIE established that on 13 May 2024 the candidate resigned from his position as managing partner of the OMELIAN LAWYERS Law Office as his principal place of employment, and as early as 14 May 2024 he was hired full-time by the Private Higher Education Institution “International European University” (hereinafter, the University) as his principal place of employment. At the same time, the candidate continued working part-time at the law office.

During the special joint session, the candidate stated that he taught in the Department of Management, Finance and Business Administration and taught courses to students enrolled in the “Marketing” educational programme, including “Customs,” “Quality Management,” “European Integration,” “Procurement Marketing,” and “Sustainability of Public Finances and Financial Monitoring.”

Regarding the circumstances relating to military registration, the candidate stated that on 18 May 2024 he updated his military registration details, underwent a military medical examination on his own initiative in June–July 2024, and obtained a deferment from mobilisation on 02 August 2024. At the same time, the candidate indicated that he had been registered with the same Territorial Recruitment Centre since 2000 and, according to him, had not previously considered it necessary to update his military registration details.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate’s explanations, since the candidate’s diploma specialisation is “Law,” whereas he was employed by the Department of Management, Finance and Business Administration. At the same time, the candidate did not provide convincing explanations as to how his professional experience and education were relevant to the content of the courses he taught.

In addition, the Commission and the PCIE draw attention to the chronological sequence of events: the change of his principal place of employment to a higher education institution (14 May 2024), the update of his military registration details (18 May 2024), the military medical examination (June–July 2024), and the receipt of a deferment from mobilisation (02 August 2024). The sequence and temporal correlation of those events give rise to a doubt that the change of his principal place of employment to a higher education institution was intended to create grounds for obtaining a deferment from mobilisation, rather than being motivated by a genuine intention to engage in academic teaching.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the “honesty” indicator under the integrity criterion.

Thus, I.V. Omelian, a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found not to meet the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 152/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleksii Yevtushenko, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated by Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-60>)

The Commission and the PCIE examined the circumstances in which the candidate obtained and privatised an apartment in the city of Kharkiv, as well as his use of official housing in the city of Kryvyi Rih.

According to the minutes of meeting No. 12 of the Municipal Public Housing Commission dated 14 October 2011, the commission members considered the issue of registering the candidate, at his place of residence, with the executive committee of the city council as a person in need of improved housing conditions. The application was considered under No. 1.1.23.

The minutes indicate that the members of the Public Housing Commission proposed, “as an exception,” registering the candidate in the general queue of persons in need of improved housing conditions. Accordingly, on 14 October 2011 the candidate was placed on the housing register. As early as 30 November 2011 (less than two months after he was registered), the executive committee adopted a decision to provide the candidate with an apartment, and on 09 December 2011 an occupancy warrant was issued. At the time the relevant decision was adopted, the candidate held the position of chief of staff of the court of appeal.

It was also established that, when the apartment was privatised in 2012–2013, the candidate already owned a share of an apartment in the city of Chernihiv measuring 17.7 sq. m, which should have been taken into account when determining whether to provide him with housing.

On 16 August 2017, the candidate and members of his family acquired the right to use an official apartment in the city of Kryvyi Rih with a total area of 43.7 sq. m. On 15 September 2017, the candidate entered into a lease agreement for that real property with the Executive Committee of the Metallurgical District Council in the city. In 2020, the dwelling was reconstructed, increasing the apartment’s area from 43.7 sq. m to 54 sq. m. The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate’s explanations.

The decision to provide the candidate with an apartment in the city of Kharkiv was adopted less than two months after he was placed on the housing register. At the same time, the minutes of the meeting of the Public Housing Commission indicate that the candidate was registered “as an exception,” that is, under a special procedure rather than the general

procedure. The candidate did not explain the legal grounds for applying such an exception and provided no documentary evidence of circumstances that would justify providing him with housing outside the ordinary queue. In addition, the candidate did not provide convincing explanations as to how, when the issue of providing him with housing was determined, account was taken of the fact that he owned a share of an apartment in the city of Chernihiv measuring 17.7 sq. m.

The reconstruction of the official housing in the city of Kryvyi Rih, as a result of which the apartment's area increased from 43.7 sq. m to 54 sq. m, that is, by 10.3 sq. m, is inconsistent with the terms of the lease agreement, which, according to the candidate's explanations, prohibits compromising the structural integrity or destroying structures of the residential premises and altering utility systems. The candidate did not provide clear and convincing explanations concerning the legal grounds for reconstructing the official housing so as to increase its actual area, or concerning the proper approval of changes to the technical characteristics of this municipally owned property.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate meets the "honesty" indicator under the integrity criterion.

An analysis of the information contained in the ruling of the First Disciplinary Chamber of the High Council of Justice dated 25 March 2024 No. 875/1дп/15-24, "On Instituting Disciplinary Proceedings Against Judge N.H. Kovtun of the Saksahanskyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City, and in the candidate's dossier established that, at the end of February 2022, the candidate ceased reporting for work at the Saksahanskyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City. The reasons for his absence were recorded as "unknown" in the timesheet.

The Commission and the PCIE take into account the candidate's explanations and the circumstances (INFORMATION_8). At the same time, even under such conditions, a judge must comply with standards of official discipline, including by duly informing the court's management of the reasons for his absence and taking measures to arrange the consideration of cases pending before him.

The circumstances examined indicate that the candidate had been absent from his workplace at the court since at least 08 March 2022 and did not take those measures. The reasons for the candidate's absence were recorded as "unknown" in the timesheet.

The candidate sent a letter to the president of the court concerning the reasons for his absence only on 18 April 2022, that is, one month after leaving his workplace and after the order of the president of the court dated 06 April 2022 (INFORMATION_9).

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Yevtushenko O.I., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Nataliia Makhno, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-6>)

In her declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2017, Makhno N.V. stated that on 24 March 2017 she had purchased a 2008 Hyundai Accent for UAH 48,744 (equivalent to USD 1,832). However, according to information from open sources, in 2017 the price of vehicles of the same make, model and year of manufacture was approximately USD 7,500–8,300.

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess the candidate's explanation that the price of the vehicle in question was attributable to the date on which title to it was acquired (24 March 2017), since open sources contain information on the sale in 2017 of vehicles of the same make, model and year of manufacture at a price more than three times higher than that declared by the candidate. Furthermore, the candidate did not provide convincing explanations regarding the need to incur significant expenditure on repairs to the vehicle immediately after its purchase that could explain why its value on the date title was acquired was substantially below the market value. At the same time, the approximate repair expenditure of UAH 150,000 stated by the candidate covers the entire period of use of the vehicle, which is about nine years. Moreover, the documents provided by the candidate as evidence of the vehicle repairs show that most of the expenditure (UAH 116,354) was incurred after 2021, that is, after she had used the vehicle for more than four years.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators “lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated” and “honesty” under the integrity criterion.

On 19 January 2022, Makhno N.V. defended her dissertation entitled “Legal Regime of Water Bodies Classified as Therapeutic” and obtained a Doctor of Philosophy degree from Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University.

In her written explanations in response to the PCIE's questions, Makhno N.V. stated that she had undertaken postgraduate studies from 01 October 2016 to 30 September 2020 at Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Ivano-Frankivsk), during which time she completed the educational and research programme for training Doctors of Philosophy. She was able to combine this with her work at the court because she studied part-time.

The candidate added that she had chosen Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University (Kharkiv) to defend her dissertation because it was impossible to establish a one-time specialised academic council for the defence of the dissertation at Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, since the university scholars who could have served on it as reviewers did not have relevant publications in the field of research of the dissertation.

Candidate of Legal Sciences and Professor Kobetska N.R. was initially appointed as the academic supervisor of the dissertation research, but the academic supervisor was later changed to Candidate of Legal Sciences and Associate Professor Petliuk Yu.S.

During the special joint session, Commission member Mykhailo Bohonis asked Makhno N.V. whether there had been any instances in which her reports on the results of her postgraduate studies at Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University had been approved with adverse comments or findings. The candidate denied this and added that all results had always been positive and that she had fully completed her individual work plan. The candidate also asserted that the opinion of her former academic supervisor, Kobetska N.R., concerning the dissertation contained no negative assessment and merely indicated that the work required revision.

According to the opinion of academic supervisor Kobetska N.R. concerning the preparation of the dissertation and completion of the individual research plan and individual study plan, which was provided by Vasyl Stefanyk Carpathian National University at the PCIE's request, postgraduate student Makhno N.V., citing her workload at her principal place of employment, repeatedly failed to meet the prescribed deadlines and performed her assignments without due diligence. The opinion states that, following the second year of study, during reporting to the department, the academic supervisor raised the issue of expelling the postgraduate student because she was seriously behind her individual work plan. The academic supervisor also drew attention to Makhno N.V.'s breaches of the principles of academic integrity while writing her dissertation research. Section 1 of the work, which was submitted to the academic supervisor for review in October 2019, was found to contain approximately 50% text copied from academic articles without references. The academic supervisor concluded that Makhno N.V. had not prepared dissertation research of an appropriate academic standard and that the material submitted did not, either in form or substance, meet the requirements applicable to work of that kind.

In view of this opinion of the candidate's academic supervisor, the Commission and the PCIE had doubts as to the truthfulness of Makhno N.V.'s answers that there had been no negative assessment of the results of her research activity or of the status of completion of her individual research plan when she completed her postgraduate studies at Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Makhno N.V., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 154/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleksandr Vernyhora, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria

Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-10>)

The candidate has more than 20 years of overall professional experience, including more than 12 years in positions within the state tax service authorities. The candidate stated that his experience in the field of law after obtaining the relevant higher education was approximately 10 years, of which for the past 7 years he had practised law independently, specialising primarily in administrative (tax and pension), commercial and civil cases. In this connection, during the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE noted that the candidate’s experience in dealing with corruption and related criminal offences was limited.

During the special joint session, the candidate stated that in criminal cases he had participated only as a representative of victims or witnesses and had also been involved in certain investigative actions (searches and interviews). In particular, the candidate stated that he had handled only one case under Article 191 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine that potentially fell within the jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court, in which he represented the interests of a legal entity that was the victim, but only at the pre-trial investigation stage. According to the candidate, once the case was referred to court, the legal assistance agreement with that client was not renewed.

During the special joint session, the candidate was also unable to provide clear and comprehensive answers to Commission members’ questions concerning the exclusive jurisdiction of the HACC in cases involving the imposition of sanctions provided for by the Law of Ukraine “On Sanctions”. In particular, when answering questions on the procedural aspects of considering such cases, the candidate demonstrated uncertainty in identifying the persons entitled to apply to the court and was also unable to answer questions concerning the statutory time limits for filing such applications.

In view of the information gathered and the candidate’s answers, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the criterion of possessing sufficient knowledge and practical skills to consider cases falling within the jurisdiction of the HACC, as well as with the “conscientiousness” indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Vernyhora O.V., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 155/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Ihor Nikitchuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-13>)

According to information from the Unified State Register of Vehicles, on 19 August 2008 the candidate acquired ownership of a 2008 Toyota Avensis valued at UAH 168,344.

In his written explanations provided at the PCIE's request, the candidate stated that the vehicle in question had been purchased using savings of UAH 83,000 accumulated by him and his former wife between 2002 and 2008, as well as a bank loan dated 20 August 2008. The candidate also stated that he did not repay the loan during the period from 2008 to 2015 and provided a bank certificate dated 04 November 2015 confirming full performance of the loan agreement.

According to information from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers (hereinafter, the SRIT) for 2002–2008, in certain years the candidate's income was below the actual subsistence minimum calculated pursuant to Article 5 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Subsistence Minimum".

The Commission and the PCIE take into account that those amounts were determined without regard to family expenses not covered by the subsistence minimum, including expenditure on medical treatment, maintenance of movable and immovable property, and unforeseen expenses. Although in certain years the official income of the candidate's family formally exceeded the actual subsistence minimum, the aggregate funds remaining during 2002–2008 after deduction of the actual subsistence minimum and personal income tax, which ranged from 10% to 15% in different years, were less than the UAH 83,000 that the candidate claimed to have saved for the purchase of the vehicle.

Furthermore, the bank certificate dated 04 November 2015 provided by the candidate contains no clear explanation of the amount of the loan, its repayment terms, the monthly payments or the specific sources of funds used to service the loan. This makes it impossible to determine whether the value of the vehicle acquired was commensurate with the candidate's income from lawful sources during the period preceding its acquisition.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators "honesty" and "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" under the integrity criterion.

Accordingly, Nikitchuk I.I., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 156/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Kostiantyn Kharakoz, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-62>)

In his declaration of integrity of a candidate for judicial office for 2024, he stated that after 01 January 2015 he had visited the territory of the Russian Federation or the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine. In particular, the candidate informed the PCIE of three short trips in 2014–2015: to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (approximately 9 days in 2014 and approximately 3 days in 2015) and to the city of Donetsk (approximately 3 days in 2015).

During the special joint session held as part of this competition, in response to a Commission member's question as to whether he had understood the status of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea as occupied territory as of the summer of 2014, the candidate replied that he had not understood it as such and had regarded the situation as "temporary" and, in his view, one that "was to end soon".

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess these explanations by the candidate. In view of the well-known circumstances of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation and the occupation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea in 2014, the candidate's assertion that he was unaware of the fact of occupation does not appear convincing.

The candidate cited no circumstances demonstrating an urgent need to visit the temporarily occupied territory, and the purpose of the trip, namely to use a tourist voucher, cannot be regarded as a critical or urgent necessity of life.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator "adherence to ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life" under the integrity criterion.

Following the special joint session with the candidate, the Commission and the PCIE draw attention to circumstances giving rise to a reasonable doubt as to whether he possesses sufficient knowledge and practical skills to consider cases falling within the jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court. The candidate confirmed that, for a considerable period, his professional activities had related primarily to commercial and corporate law, including legal support for business operations, corporate governance matters and the protection of property rights.

The candidate also stated that his experience in criminal law was limited. In particular, he had participated only in isolated procedural actions, as well as in several cases concerning the application of compulsory medical measures and in individual instances of representing victims.

The candidate confirmed that neither while practising law nor while serving as a judge had he considered cases concerning corruption-related criminal offences.

Thus, the candidate has effectively no practical experience of considering or participating in cases falling within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criterion of possessing

sufficient knowledge and practical skills to consider cases falling within the jurisdiction of the HACC.

Thus, Kharakoz K.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found

not to meet the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 157/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Volodymyr Bubleinyk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-15>)

In section 3, “Real Estate”, of his declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2024, the candidate declared, among other real estate, nine residential houses located in the village of Chernechchyna, Samar District, Dnipropetrovsk Region, and two residential houses located in the village of Znamenivske, Synelnykove District, Dnipropetrovsk Region. All those residential houses were acquired by the candidate during 2019 or in early 2020.

In his asset declaration for 2024, the candidate declared income of UAH 4,897,699 from the sale of electricity under the feed-in tariff to Dnipro Energy Services LLC. According to data from the State Tax Service of Ukraine, the candidate’s total income from Dnipro Energy Services LLC for the period from 2019 to 2025 was UAH 20,401,761.

In the written explanations provided at the PCIE’s request and during the special joint session, the candidate stated that solar panel systems had been installed on the land plots on which the residential houses in question were located.

Although solar power plants are expensive equipment, they were not disclosed in section 5, “Valuable Movable Property”, of the declaration for 2024. The candidate explained that he could not assess their value because he had installed them himself and lacked primary documents confirming their value. He also expressed the view that, at the time of declaration, the assets could not be valued because of depreciation and the limited term of the “feed-in tariff” until 2029.

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess the explanations provided. Despite the candidate’s assertion that the solar power plants were constructed by his own efforts and that the equipment was purchased from private individuals without formal documentation, those explanations do not relieve him of the obligation to declare valuable property and confirm the lawfulness of the sources of the funds used to acquire it.

Given that the candidate's solar generation facilities yielded income exceeding UAH 20 million in 2019–2025, the assertion that it is impossible to assess the value of such installations appears unconvincing.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" and "honesty" under the integrity criterion.

According to the Unified Register of Powers of Attorney, in 2021 and 2024 the candidate issued powers of attorney relating to the management and disposal of immovable property located in Batumi, Georgia.

At the same time, the asset declaration for 2024 contains no information whatsoever about immovable property located in Georgia.

In his written explanations in response to the PCIE's request and during the special joint session, the candidate stated that, in approximately 2018, he had decided to invest in hotel complex construction projects in Batumi. According to the candidate, however, the investment was unsuccessful because the investment fund did not fully perform its obligations. The candidate explained that the powers of attorney in question had been issued in order to bring the investment fund's documents into compliance with Georgian law and to recover the invested funds.

The candidate asserts that during 2024 he succeeded in disposing of those investment assets and recovering the funds invested, without receiving any income. The candidate explained the absence of information in his declaration for 2024 by stating that, as of 31 December 2024, he no longer owned any assets in Georgia and that, after the project ended, he disposed of all the relevant documents.

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess the explanations provided. The candidate provided no documentary evidence of the amount invested, the sources of the funds used for that investment, or the fact, date and amount of the repayment of funds in 2024.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" and "honesty" under the integrity criterion.

Thus, Bubleinyk V.A., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 158/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Serhii Syvokin, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-65>)

According to the information provided by Syvokin S.S. in his declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2024, since 27 August 2021 his wife, PERSON_1, has rented office premises measuring 13 sq. m in the city of Cherkasy. However, the asset declarations for 2021–2024 contain no information on income received by the candidate's wife from entrepreneurial or other professional activities. In his questionnaire as a candidate for judicial office, Syvokin S.S. stated that his wife had no place of employment.

In his written responses to the PCIE's questions, Syvokin S.S. explained that his wife had rented office premises in the city of Cherkasy from August 2021 to June 2025 in order to start her own business. However, this was initially prevented by the quarantine and later by the full-scale invasion of the Russian Federation. The candidate added that they used the office premises to store some of their belongings because they lived in a one-room apartment in the city of Cherkasy with a total area of 40.8 sq. m, where there was insufficient space. Under the office lease agreement, the monthly rent was UAH 2,500; from January 2025, the rent increased to UAH 3,640.

The Commission and the PCIE critically assess the candidate's explanation that his wife rented the office premises for four years in order to start her own business, which she ultimately failed to do.

In view of the answers provided by Syvokin S.S., the Commission and the PCIE consider that, during his participation in the competition, the candidate provided false oral and written information concerning his wife's activities and her purpose in renting the office premises.

Having assessed the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Syvokin S.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 150/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Viktoriia Kytsiuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-66>)

In 2017, Kytsiuk V.S. was detained by a patrol police officer in connection with an alleged violation of traffic regulations (reference to published excerpts from the patrol officer's

body-camera footage). These circumstances attracted considerable public attention, were considered by a court and judicial self-governance bodies, and gave rise to a public conflict between authorised representatives of the patrol police and representatives of the judiciary.

In response to the PCIE's written question as to whether her conduct could be regarded as provocative, Kytsiuk V.S. agreed that, based on the published video, her conduct could indeed be characterised as provocative, but stated that this impression arose because only an excerpt had been published. The candidate also suggested that the conflict could have been "defused", but that she may have lacked the life experience to do so in circumstances involving unlawful conduct by a public authority.

The Commission and the PCIE analysed Kytsiuk V.S.'s written explanations and her answers during the interview and consider that they give rise to serious concerns and cast doubt on the candidate's ability to acknowledge her mistakes.

First, Kytsiuk V.S. continues to insist that her refusal to produce a driving licence on the ground that she was not the driver was an attempt to defuse the conflict. The Commission and the PCIE consider it obvious that, in the circumstances described above, suggesting that the police officer ask the driver to produce the licence could in no way have defused the conflict; on the contrary, it was an act that provoked it. Furthermore, this ex post facto interpretation contradicts the candidate's own explanation that the court found that she, as the driver, had not violated the Traffic Regulations. Thus, the candidate simultaneously denies her status as the driver as a basis for producing documents and acknowledges that status when the issue is whether the Traffic Regulations were violated. Second, although the candidate acknowledged that her conduct might appear provocative, she attributed this exclusively to external factors: the incompleteness of the video, the police officer's unlawful conduct and the presence of passers-by who had gathered around.

Having regard to the video materials examined, the candidate's written explanations and her explanations during the interview, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator "adherence to ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life" under the integrity criterion.

On 23 January 2019, the Commission and the PCIE adopted Decision No. 80/vs-19 "On Whether Viktoriia Zhovnovatiuk (Kytsiuk), a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, meets the criteria provided for in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court", as a result of which the candidate was found to have ceased participating in the competition. The content of the decision indicates that the judge breached the rules of judicial ethics when she posted on the social network "Facebook" "links to articles (with her own additional comments) concerning the ongoing consideration of criminal proceedings in which, during the pre-trial investigation, she had made procedural decisions as an investigating judge of the Solomianskyi District Court of Kyiv City. In particular, the articles criticised the role of NABU in preparing the relevant case for trial and criticised the concept of establishing an anti-corruption court in view of the criminal proceedings in question".

Having examined the relevant circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE note that the explanations provided by the candidate do not, in themselves, alter the substance of the established circumstances and contain no new or additional information of material significance capable of rebutting the findings set out in Decision No. 80/vs-19 of the Commission and the PCIE dated 23.01.2019.

In view of the above circumstances, in particular the material procedural violations in the case involving a NABU detective and the posting of comments critical of NABU while exercising judicial oversight in a case involving NABU, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicators "impartiality" and "conscientiousness" under the integrity criterion.

According to the data in her declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2024, Kytsiuk V.S. declared real estate in the village of Bilohorodka, Kyiv Region.

The PCIE asked the candidate to provide detailed information on the sources of funds used to acquire/construct the real estate in question. The PCIE also asked the candidate in which years the construction took place, whether she had spent personal funds and, if so, in what amount.

The Commission and the PCIE consider that Kytsiuk V.S. did not demonstrate an appropriate level of cooperation, including by failing to provide detailed answers to the PCIE's questions concerning the origin of the funds used to acquire and construct the real estate.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" under the integrity criterion.

Thus, Kytsiuk V.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 151/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Vitalii Dubas, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-67>)

In April and May 2025, acting as an investigating judge, Dubas V.M. issued two rulings (dated 23.04.2025 in case No. 991/3616/25 and dated 29.05.2025 in case No. 991/4887/25) returning to an investigator of the State Bureau of Investigation applications to extend the period of detention in the same criminal proceedings (No. NUMBER_1). Both rulings were set aside by the HACC Appeals Chamber on the grounds of non-compliance with the requirements of legality and restriction of the participants in the

criminal proceedings' access to justice. When issuing the second ruling (dated 29.05.2025 in case No. 991/4887/25), the candidate was aware of the HACC Appeals Chamber's decision setting aside his first ruling (dated 23.04.2025 in case No. 991/3616/25), as well as the appellate court's reasoning. Thus, the candidate deliberately disregarded the legal position of the HACC Appeals Chamber and knowingly issued a ruling contrary to that legal position.

During the special joint session, Dubas V.M. stated that he disagreed with the decisions of the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court in the criminal proceedings in question, "but had to comply". The candidate acknowledged that the conclusions of the Appeals Chamber in a particular case were binding when considering that case. At the same time, he did not deny that he had issued judicial decisions contrary to the legal conclusions of the HACC Appeals Chamber, stating that there were many such proceedings in the HACC.

The Commission and the PCIE noted that the candidate agreed that the conclusions of the HACC Appeals Chamber were binding on the HACC as a court of first instance. Nevertheless, he issued a second ruling that was contrary to the legal position of the HACC Appeals Chamber expressed in the ruling dated 23.04.2025 in case No. 991/3616/25 concerning consideration of an application with similar content in the same criminal proceedings.

In the opinion of the Commission and the PCIE, the second ruling issued on the same grounds and in respect of the same circumstances does not constitute a reasoned departure from a legal position, but rather excessive insistence on the candidate's own interpretation of legal provisions, which had been rejected by the appellate court. Such insistence could have been justified had relevant legislative amendments been made, had the case-law of higher courts developed appreciably, or had new, previously unknown circumstances relevant to the interpretation of legal provisions been identified. However, between 23.04.2025, when the first ruling was issued, and 29.05.2025, when the second ruling was issued, there were no changes in legislation or case-law, nor were any new circumstances identified that would have justified departing from the legal position set out in the judicial decision of the HACC Appeals Chamber.

Having assessed all the above circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Dubas V.M., a candidate for judgeship in the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 159/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Olena Roik, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-68>)

According to Roik O.O.'s asset declaration for 2023, from 01.09.2022 she owned a 2015 TESLA MODEL S whose value on the date title was acquired was UAH 1,490,000 (equivalent to USD 40,700). The candidate did not disclose that vehicle in her asset declaration for 2024. According to an extract from the Unified State Register of Vehicles, on 04.05.2024 the candidate disposed of the vehicle.

According to her asset declaration for 2024, since 06.10.2020 Roik O.O. has had the right to use a 2020 LAND ROVER RANGE ROVER EVOQUE owned by her mother. She did not disclose its value in her asset declarations for 2023 and 2024.

According to the information provided by Roik O.O. in the candidate for judicial office questionnaire completed on 03.08.2025, she had been held administratively liable three times during the preceding five years.

However, according to an extract from the Unified State Register of Vehicles, the candidate, as the owner of a Tesla MODEL S, was held administratively liable for traffic violations 12 times during 2022–2024.

Having assessed all the foregoing circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Roik O.O., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 160/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Tetiana Kryklyva, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-70>)

The Commission and the PCIE thoroughly analysed all the information collected that could be relevant for the purposes of the qualification assessment of the candidate's compliance with the integrity criteria, as well as whether the candidate possessed the knowledge and practical skills required to adjudicate cases falling within the jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court. In particular, the Commission and the PCIE examined the following circumstances.

3.1. THIS PART OF THE INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED IN CLOSED SESSION

Thus, Kryklyva T.H., a candidate for judgeship at the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 161/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Ivan Kravchenko, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-18>)

According to the Unified Register of Advocates of Ukraine, the candidate obtained Certificate No. 000534 authorising him to practise law on 25.07.2018 and practises at the “Andrii Pietukhov” Law Office and the “YURRAIT” Law Firm. According to the website of the educational institution where the candidate works, he has practised law since 2018 and, from 2020 to the present, has worked as an advocate and senior partner at the “YURRAIT” Law Firm.

In addition, in his declaration as a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government for 2024, the candidate declared corporate rights in “YURRAIT” LLC (a 29% interest in the charter capital) and the “YURRAIT” Law Firm (a 33.3% interest in the charter capital), which he has held since 2020. The candidate co-founded both legal entities with PERSON_1.

At the same time, according to the State Register of Individual Taxpayers (hereinafter, the SRIT), the candidate’s income from the practice of law was recorded exclusively as having been received from the “Andrii Pietukhov” Law Office. The candidate’s aggregate income for 2020–2022 amounted to UAH 13,485.78 (before tax).

The Commission and the PCIE assess the candidate’s explanations critically. From the perspective of an ordinary reasonable person, the status of senior partner of a law firm, the ownership of corporate rights in two legal entities operating in the legal sector, and the actual representation of clients in court cases indicate the active practice of law, which is inconsistent with the candidate’s explanations that his legal practice pursued non-profit and educational objectives related, according to him, to personal development and enhancing his image as a lecturer and the image of the faculty at which he teaches.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

In section 3, “Real Estate”, of his asset declarations for 2018 and 2024, the candidate provided no information about any real estate owned or used by him or members of his family. At the same time, in section 2.1 of those declarations, the candidate identified an

apartment at the following address as his registered and actual place of residence: Sumy, ADDRESS_1.

In section 11 of the same asset declarations, the candidate did not declare the income of his wife, PERSON_2. According to the SRIT, she received income of UAH 3,000 in 2018 and UAH 7,740 in 2024.

In section 12.1 of his asset declaration for 2024, the candidate did not declare his wife's bank accounts.

In addition, the candidate declared no information in section 16 concerning membership in organisations and their governing bodies. On 25 July 2018, the candidate obtained a certificate authorising him to practise law and therefore, pursuant to part six of Article 45 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Bar and Practice of Law", became a member of the Ukrainian National Bar Association, which was required to be disclosed in the declarations.

The Commission and the PCIE note that the identified undeclared information concerns different categories and spans several reporting periods; it therefore cannot be regarded as isolated technical errors and indicates a systemic pattern of providing incomplete information when completing declarations.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

In the candidate for judicial office questionnaire, he stated that he had served as an opponent during the defence of PERSON_1's dissertation, "Administrative and Legal Framework for Interaction between Government and Business in Ukraine". The dissertation was defended in 2021.

At the same time, according to the Unified State Register of Legal Entities, Individual Entrepreneurs and Public Organisations, the candidate and PERSON_1 have been co-founders of "YURRAIT" LLC (EDRPOU code 43683400) and the "YURRAIT" Law Firm (EDRPOU code 43621674) since 2020. In addition, according to the Unified Register of Advocates of Ukraine, the candidate practises law at the "Andrii Pietukhov" Law Office and, according to the SRIT, received income from it during 2020–2022.

Thus, at the time of the dissertation defence in 2021, the candidate and PERSON_1 had business relations that included joint participation in legal entities and the candidate's receipt of income from the law office founded by the dissertation candidate.

The existence of financial and business ties between the candidate and the dissertation candidate, including the receipt of income from a law office associated with the latter and their joint participation in legal entities, gives rise to a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's impartiality. The explanations provided by the candidate do not dispel this doubt.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Kravchenko I.O., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 162/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Snizhana Kolesnyk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-21>)

In the candidate for judicial office declaration of integrity for 2024, the candidate did not select any response in paragraph 28, “I have not committed any acts that resulted in my being held legally liable”.

In the candidate for judicial office questionnaire, the candidate did not provide information concerning her employment history, all instances in which she had been held legally liable in any form during the preceding five years, or enforcement proceedings.

At the same time, according to the Register of Vehicles, on 10 August 2022 and 17 January 2024 the candidate was held administratively liable under part one of Article 122 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences (hereinafter, the CUA AO) (exceeding the prescribed speed limit by more than twenty kilometres per hour). According to the Register of Enforcement Proceedings, enforcement proceeding No. 70630425 dated 23 January 2023 was also opened against the candidate. In addition, according to information provided by the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, a report was drawn up against the candidate under part one of Article 122 of the CUA AO on 21 June 2025.

The Commission and the PCIE assess critically the candidate’s explanations concerning the offences committed on 10 August 2022 and 17 January 2024. Irrespective of who was driving the vehicle, it was the candidate who was held administratively liable. Those decisions were not set aside and were therefore required to be disclosed in the declaration of integrity and the documents she submitted to participate in the competition. Moreover, at the time of submitting the documents, she was aware of the violation she had committed on 21 June 2025 and of the enforcement proceeding, but she did not disclose this information either.

The candidate’s failure to provide information about having been held administratively liable and the existence of an enforcement proceeding, combined with the absence of any selection in the declaration of integrity, cannot be regarded as an isolated technical error and demonstrates that the information submitted was incomplete.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

In her declarations as a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government for 2015–2018, the candidate stated that on 19 November 2015 she acquired title to a land plot with a total area of 495 sq. m in Zaporizhzhia, valued at UAH 7,200 on the acquisition date. She also stated that on 23 August 2006 her husband acquired title to a residential building with a total area of 75 sq. m in Zaporizhzhia, valued at UAH 59,000 on the acquisition date.

At the same time, the asset declarations for 2022–2024 state that the value of the same land plot on the acquisition date was UAH 8,000 and that the value of the building was UAH 225,000. Thus, the candidate's declarations contain material discrepancies concerning the value of the same property.

In addition, in her asset declarations for 2016–2018 and 2022–2024, the candidate did not state the cadastral number of the land plot, although she had disclosed that information in the declaration for 2015.

The candidate also declared no information in section 16 of her asset declarations for 2018 and 2022–2024 concerning membership in organisations and their governing bodies. At the same time, on 31 August 2018, the candidate obtained a certificate authorising her to practise law and therefore, pursuant to part six of Article 45 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Bar and Practice of Law", became a member of the Ukrainian National Bar Association, which was required to be disclosed in the declarations.

The Commission and the PCIE note that the identified errors concern different categories of information and span several reporting periods; they therefore cannot be regarded as isolated technical errors and indicate a systemic pattern of providing incomplete information when completing declarations.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Since 2017, the candidate has been retired from her position as a judge of the Leninskyi District Court of Zaporizhzhia City following the submission of her application for retirement. After retiring, the candidate did not engage in professional legal activity for a considerable period. In this connection, during the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE noted that the candidate's experience with corruption-related and associated criminal offences was limited.

The candidate explained that she maintained her professional competence by independently studying legal literature, reviewing case-law and discussing legislative amendments with her husband, who works in the prosecution authorities. The candidate also stated that she had obtained a certificate authorising her to practise law but had not actually practised, as a result of which the certificate had been suspended.

During the special joint session, the candidate was unable to provide examples of current case-law in criminal proceedings concerning corruption and corruption-related criminal offences. In addition, the candidate was unable to provide clear and complete answers to questions from Commission members concerning the particular features of special criminal

proceedings and the distinction between certain forms of the actus reus of offences involving an undue advantage.

On the basis of the information collected and the candidate's answers, the Commission and the PCIE had a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion and whether she possessed sufficient knowledge and practical skills to adjudicate cases falling within the jurisdiction of the HACC.

Thus, Kolesnyk S.H., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 163/vs-26

On Consideration, at a Special Joint Session, of Whether Oleksandr Zavhorodnii, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-22>)

According to the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government for 2024, Zavhorodnii O.S.'s actual place of residence is located at: Dnipro, ADDRESS_1. The same actual place of residence is stated in the candidate's asset declaration for 2016 and in the candidate for judicial office questionnaire completed on 05 August 2025.

However, section 3, "Real Estate", of the candidate's asset declarations for 2016 and 2024 (all the asset declarations submitted by him) does not disclose any real estate located in Dnipro; instead, only properties in Donetsk and Donetsk Oblast are stated.

During the special joint session, Zavhorodnii O.S. explained that since 2015 his family had lived in Dnipro at the above address with relatives of his mother-in-law. The candidate added that they had not entered into any written transactions concerning the use of this dwelling, and for that reason he had not disclosed it in his asset declarations.

Thus, contrary to the law, the candidate did not declare the real estate in Dnipro that he and members of his family had the right to use in his asset declarations for 2016 and 2024.

In the candidate for judicial office questionnaire, Zavhorodnii O.S. stated that he had worked continuously as a lawyer since 2000. In particular, from 21 July 2003 to 10 January 2017, the candidate worked as a lawyer at "JUSTICE" Law Firm LLC in Donetsk, and he has also practised law from 11 July 2007 to the present.

Nevertheless, according to a certificate from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers concerning income paid and taxes withheld, the candidate's entire income for the period from 2000 to 2025 amounted to UAH 853,539, which included, inter alia, income from the

sale of property. The candidate received no income in 2014–2017 or 2020–2021. The candidate also failed to disclose his income in his asset declaration for 2016.

Regarding the absence of income in 2020–2021, Zavhorodnii O.S. explained that during that period he had worked at the “Legal Consulting” law firm, which paid him income. However, he did not recall the amount of that income. The Commission drew Zavhorodnii O.S.’s attention to the fact that the candidate had not provided this information in the employment history section of the candidate for judicial office questionnaire. According to the copy of the candidate’s employment record book provided, he worked as a lawyer at the “Legal Consulting” law firm from 18 July 2000 to 27 March 2001, while the most recent entry in the candidate’s employment record book concerns his work as a senior legal counsel at FIDOBANK PJSC from 12 November 2018 to 18 October 2019.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that the candidate had repeatedly provided false information concerning his income during the special joint session.

Paragraph 14 of the candidate for judicial office questionnaire requires information concerning all instances in which the candidate has been held legally liable during the preceding five years. Zavhorodnii O.S. did not disclose in this paragraph of the candidate for judicial office questionnaire any instance in which he had been held administratively liable.

However, according to the Unified State Register of Vehicles, Zavhorodnii O.S., as the owner of a VOLKSVAGEN GOLF that he declared in 2024, was held administratively liable twice for traffic violations, namely for violating standing rules on 21 August 2024 and for violating vehicle parking rules on 16 July 2025.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Zavhorodnii O.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found not to meet the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 164/vs-26

On Consideration, at a Special Joint Session, of Whether Oleksandr Prokhorov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated In Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-71>)

According to information from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers for 2014–2018 and information from the candidate’s declarations as a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government for 2016–2017, the candidate’s income was

below the actual subsistence minimum calculated pursuant to Article 5 of the Law of Ukraine “On the Subsistence Minimum”.

The Commission and the PCIE assess the candidate’s explanations critically in view of the following circumstances.

The aggregate annual income of the candidate and his family in 2014–2018 was significantly below the actual subsistence minimum. The discrepancy is so substantial that the candidate’s explanations that they were supported by his parents and provided accommodation free of charge by his parents’ acquaintances do not explain how the candidate’s family of three met all of its basic needs over an extended period with that level of income. Even if the candidate saved his 2020 dividend income of UAH 118,000, which, according to him, he spent in full on the purchase of a car in 2021, the candidate’s aggregate family income for the year was also significantly below the actual subsistence minimum. The Commission and the PCIE also note that the candidate did not provide any documents confirming that his parents had provided financial support sufficient to cover basic needs. In particular, his asset declarations for 2016 and 2017 contain no information about any income originating from his parents.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

According to information from the candidate’s asset declaration for 2016, on 09 August 2012 he acquired title to a residential building with a total area of 50 sq. m and a land plot with an area of 2,500 sq. m, located in the village of Liubymivka, Sofiivka District, Dnipropetrovsk Region. The aggregate declared value of these properties was UAH 48,399. At the same time, according to the SRIT, the candidate’s aggregate income for the period from 2002 to 2012 amounted to UAH 142,046. The aggregate income of the candidate’s wife for the period from 2009 to 2012, when they were married, amounted to UAH 1,560.

The aggregate actual subsistence minimum for the candidate and members of his family for the period from 2002 to 2011, calculated on the basis of monthly figures and taking into account changes in family composition, INFORMATION_6, amounted to UAH 125,451.23.

In his responses to the PCIE’s requests and during the special joint session, the candidate was unable to explain the origin of the UAH 48,399 used to purchase the residential building and land plot in 2012, nor did he provide any documentary evidence of relevant savings, credit obligations or other sources of financing from which those funds could have been accumulated.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that the aggregate income of the candidate and members of his family for the period from 2002 to 2012 was insufficient to cover the minimum necessary expenditure required to meet the basic needs of the candidate and members of his family and to purchase the residential building and land plot with an aggregate value of UAH 48,399.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” and “lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originate” indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Prokhorov O.O., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 165/vs-26

On consideration, at a Special Joint Session, of Whether Oleksandr Leonov, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated In Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-23>)

According to full-access log data from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions provided by the State Enterprise “Information Judicial Systems” at the Commission’s request, the candidate performed a series of searches using individuals’ surnames, first names and telephone numbers and vehicle registration numbers, and viewed decisions found through those searches, including decisions in criminal proceedings.

According to the log data, using full access, the candidate searched for the personal data of his wife (PERSON_1), mother (PERSON_2) and brother (PERSON_3), including by applying the “Criminal” filter for the form of proceedings, and for the number of a criminal proceeding concerning his brother (NUMBER_1). In addition, repeated searches concerning other individuals were performed using the candidate’s credentials in the Register system, including PERSON_4, in respect of whom more than 1,000 such searches were performed.

The Commission and the PCIE assess the candidate’s explanations critically in view of the following.

First, the candidate was inconsistent in his explanations because he disclosed information about his use of full access to the Register only gradually: initially he entirely denied any use for personal purposes, then admitted searches concerning his wife and, subsequently, his mother and brother.

The candidate also stated that he did not know PERSON_4 and had not adjudicated cases involving her. At the same time, the Register contains case No. 521/13267/19, in which the notary PERSON_4 was a party to the case pending before the candidate.

Having assessed the relevant circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that the candidate used full access to the Register in his personal interests and in the interests of persons associated with him and provided unclear and inconsistent explanations concerning those circumstances. In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional and personal life” and “honesty” indicators of the integrity criterion.

In his declarations as a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government for 2016–2019, the candidate declared the right to use a 34.1 sq. m apartment in Odesa owned by his mother. The date on which the right was acquired was 09 February 2016. The value of the apartment on the acquisition date was UAH 225,550.

In addition, according to the State Register of Rights to Immovable Property, since August 2022 the candidate's mother has owned a residential building with an area of 243.3 sq. m in the village of Fontanka, Odesa Oblast. The candidate's mother purchased the 0.08 ha land plot for the construction of this building on 22 August 2015 for UAH 84,100.

The candidate also stated in his asset declaration for 2021 that he had acquired title to a 2017 Kia Sportage under a gift agreement dated 16 July 2021. The value of the vehicle on the acquisition date was UAH 160,000. According to the Register of Vehicles, the candidate's mother registered the vehicle on 16 July 2021 as a vehicle imported from abroad, and it was re-registered in the candidate's name on the same day.

The Commission and the PCIE assess the candidate's explanations critically in view of the following.

The candidate provided no documentary evidence that it was his brother, PERSON_5, who financed the purchase of the apartment and vehicle and the construction of the house.

In addition, the Commission and the PCIE do not take into account the tax forms provided by the candidate's brother because they cover the period from 2023 to 2025, whereas the investments in the property under assessment were made during 2013–2022 and, accordingly, do not confirm that he had sufficient income during the period when the property was acquired.

The Commission and the PCIE also note that, according to the candidate's explanations, the sole principal investor in the purchase of the apartment and vehicle and the construction of the house was his brother, PERSON_5, while the property in question was registered in the name of the candidate's mother and was subsequently distributed among various family members.

Having assessed all the foregoing circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" and "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originate" indicators of the integrity criterion.

According to the Unified Register of Advocates of Ukraine, on 30 November 2011 the candidate's wife obtained Certificate No. NUMBER_2 authorising her to practise law.

According to the official "Judiciary of Ukraine" web portal and the Register, the candidate's wife is identified as a representative in a number of court cases. This indicates that she was actively practising law. At the same time, her official income from the practice of law during those periods was negligible or non-existent.

The Commission and the PCIE assess the candidate's explanations critically in view of the following.

The candidate provided no documentary evidence concerning income received by his wife in the specific court cases in which she is identified in the Register as an advocate (or their 'pro bono' nature), citing document retention periods and legal professional privilege.

At the same time, the candidate provided his wife's application to accede to the Public Agreement on Comprehensive Banking Services for Individuals of "Bank Alliance" JSC and for the provision of the "Alliance Loan for Goods" banking service dated 03 August 2025

No. NUMBER_3, which states that his wife's average monthly income was UAH 30,000. This information materially contradicts the candidate's explanations that his wife's income from the practice of law was minimal or non-existent. During the special joint session, the candidate was unable to explain this discrepancy convincingly, stating only that he had not known that this amount was specified in the loan agreement and that he and his wife were not married when the agreement was concluded (they remarried on 08 August 2025 and resumed cohabitation in February 2025).

From the perspective of an ordinary reasonable person, the identified circumstances are inconsistent with the candidate's explanations concerning his wife's "pro bono" legal practice.

Having assessed all the foregoing circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

By Decision No. 1106/1дп/15-18 of the First Disciplinary Chamber of the High Council of Justice dated 13.04.2018, the candidate was subjected to disciplinary liability for committing the disciplinary offence provided for in subparagraph "a" of paragraph 1 of part one of Article 106 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges". By Decision No. 2293/0/15-18 of the High Council of Justice dated 17.04.2018, this decision of the First Chamber of the HCJ was upheld.

The Commission and the PCIE take into account that the candidate acknowledged the mistakes he had made in his professional activity; however, they consider the violations of procedural law sufficiently serious to give rise to a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, Leonov O.S., a candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, was found **not to meet** the criteria set out in part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 166/vs-26

On Consideration, at a Special Joint Session, of Whether Oleh Marchuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court, Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-24>)

According to information provided at the Commission's request by the Vasylkiv City District Court of Kyiv Oblast concerning the adjudication by Marchuk O.L. of cases under Article 130 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences (driving while intoxicated), the candidate adjudicated 391 such cases, in 118 of which he terminated the proceedings because the time limit for imposing an administrative penalty had expired, representing approximately 30% of the cases. In particular, in 2019 the candidate adjudicated 101 such cases, in 41 of which he terminated the proceedings on that ground, that is, in 40% of the cases; in 2020, the candidate adjudicated 145 such cases, in 57 of which he terminated the proceedings on that ground, that is, in 39% of the cases.

At the same time, in most of the cases referred to, the candidate had more than two months after receipt of the case to adjudicate it within the time limits for imposing an administrative penalty.

The Commission and the PCIE note that, in a number of court decisions, the candidate did not provide reasons as to why it had been impossible to adjudicate those cases within the time limit for imposing an administrative penalty.

Under the version of Article 38 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences in force at the time those cases were adjudicated, an administrative penalty could be imposed no later than three months from the date on which the offence was committed.

Thus, in the cases cited, the candidate had more than 2.5 months to consider them within the time limits for imposing an administrative penalty. At the same time, those court decisions do not refer to any motions by the parties or other grounds for adjourning consideration of the cases, nor do they provide any justification for the impossibility of considering the cases within the time limits for imposing an administrative penalty. Notably, the candidate closed the proceedings in these cases within several days after the time limits for imposing an administrative penalty had expired.

Having assessed the foregoing circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" indicator of the integrity criterion.

In Section 14 of the questionnaire of a candidate for judicial office concerning liability, Marchuk O.L. stated that he had been held administratively liable 21 times for traffic violations over the preceding five years, including 11 times in 2020, five times in 2021, and three times in 2022 for exceeding the prescribed speed limit. In addition, in 2020 the candidate was held administratively liable for violating parking rules, and in 2023 for failing to maintain a safe following distance.

Having assessed the foregoing circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Marchuk O.L., shall be found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 167/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Yana Kinakh, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-26>)

According to the candidate's declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2023, she declared cash savings of USD 40,000. However, according to the State Register of Individual Taxpayers, this amount exceeds all of the candidate's official income from 1999 to 2023, which totals approximately UAH 530,000 (approximately USD 30,000 calculated at the average annual exchange rate for the year in which the income was received).

In addition, according to the State Register of Individual Taxpayers and the candidate's asset declaration for 2023, she owns the following vehicles: a 2008 Renault Koleos acquired in 2018 and valued at UAH 62,254; a 2007 DAEWOO MATIZ acquired in 2013 (value unknown); and a 2015 AUDI Q5 acquired in 2021 (value unknown).

In her asset declaration for 2024, the candidate declared cash savings of USD 60,000, which was USD 20,000 more than the savings declared in 2023. In addition, the candidate declared that, as of 30 January 2024, she owned a 2018 AUDI Q5 valued at UAH 720,000.

At the same time, the declared income of the candidate and her family members for 2024 amounted to UAH 360,282 (approximately USD 8,974 at the official exchange rate of the National Bank of Ukraine as of the last day of the reporting period). The candidate also declared her father's pension income but did not indicate its amount, stating that the family member had not provided that information.

Because the candidate did not provide convincing, documentary evidence concerning the lawful receipt of cash after her father's death, and did not provide information on the sources of funds used to accumulate substantial cash savings from 1999 to 2024, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the “lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated” indicator of the integrity criterion.

On 02 April 2021, the Lutsk City District Court of Volyn Oblast delivered an acquittal in case No. 161/16712/19. PERSON_1 is the victim in this case.

When examining the evidence in the criminal proceedings, the court established, inter alia, the following circumstances. According to the victim's testimony, “as a result of the criminal offence committed against him, he became INFORMATION_1. Thus, for a certain period, together with “Lviv partners”, he was engaged in selling “oil” from Europe and also illegally transported cigarettes”.

PERSON_2 also testified in this case. According to her testimony in court, “PERSON_1 had a business in the city of Lviv for a certain period; his partners were PERSON_40 and PERSON_43, together with whom they transported goods within Europe, while PERSON_2 assisted with legal matters”.

In view of the circumstances established by the court, the PCIE sent the candidate a written request asking her to comment on whether she had known about the illegal transportation of goods undertaken by PERSON_1 with his partners, which he had disclosed to the court during the consideration of case No. 161/16712/19, and what measures she had taken in connection with the information known to her.

The Commission and the PCIE note that, according to information in the candidate’s dossier, PERSON_1’s aggregate income from 2018 to 2024 (six years) amounted to UAH 95,171. The sole source of these funds was social benefits from the Social Protection Department of the Kivertsy District State Administration and the Social and Veterans Policy Department of the Lutsk District State Administration of Volyn Oblast. In 2019, PERSON_1 purchased a 2009 SKODA OCTAVIA.

The Commission and the PCIE also take into account that PERSON_1 was not registered as an individual entrepreneur and was not a member of any legal entities established for profit-making purposes. Accordingly, PERSON_2’s testimony in court that she assisted PERSON_1’s business with legal matters is unclear because, “legally”, the candidate’s PERSON_1 had no business at all.

In addition, the text of the court decision indicates that PERSON_2 personally testified that, in recent years, relations between PERSON_1 and his partners had been strained because a portion of the funds had been lost.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Kinakh Ya.V., was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 168/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Anton Baida, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-27>)

Since 25 August 2021, Baida A.O. has held a certificate conferring the right to practise law. In his application to participate in the competition for judgeship at the HACC, the candidate provided a list of six court cases in which he acted as an attorney, while acknowledging at the special joint session that there may have been more such cases.

In the motivation letter submitted in this competition, Baida A.O. stated as follows: “I have been a practising attorney since 2021 and have always observed high standards of legal ethics and integrity in my professional activities; this concerned both the payment of fees and the organisation of my legal practice in general (I always honestly informed the client of the possible prospects of a particular case, did not seek to artificially “slow down” proceedings in order to obtain a higher fee, etc.). I provided free legal aid to service members of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and members of their families”.

At the same time, in his declarations of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2022–2024, Baida A.O. did not declare any income from practising law.

The Commission and the PCIE take a critical view of the candidate's assertions and note that they are contradictory.

In the motivation letter submitted for participation in the competition for judgeship at the HACC, the candidate emphasises his observance of high standards of legal ethics, noting in particular that he did not take actions aimed at artificially delaying the consideration of cases in order to obtain a higher fee. This assertion implies that receiving remuneration for legal aid provided in compliance with ethical standards is normal and acceptable practice for the candidate. At the same time, he claims that he had no “moral right” to demand payment for legal services and practised exclusively free of charge. This position contradicts the candidate's previous assertions because it effectively denies the very possibility of receiving remuneration for practising law as such, rather than merely improper practices aimed at increasing such remuneration. Moreover, the fact that practising law was ancillary to the candidate's principal occupation does not mean that it could be provided exclusively free of charge.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

In his asset declarations for 2017, 2018, and 2022–2024, the candidate identified his mother, PERSON_1, as a family member, but in 2022–2023 the candidate did not declare any of her income or monetary assets.

The Commission and the PCIE consider the candidate's explanations for failing to declare his mother's income and monetary assets because he had no “moral right” to obtain the relevant information to be unfounded. Since the candidate's mother was a member of his family, he was under an obligation to disclose the relevant information concerning her in his asset declarations.

Thus, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that Baida A.O. had no grounds for failing to declare information concerning his mother's income and monetary assets in his asset declarations for 2017, 2018, and 2022–2023.

In Section 2.2, “Information on Family Members of the Declarant”, of the asset declarations for 2024 submitted on 01 and 13 March 2025, the candidate declared PERSON_2 as a person with whom he cohabited but was not married.

When asked by the PCIE from what point PERSON_2 was considered a member of his family, Baida A.O. replied, “approximately since 2019”. At the same time, Baida A.O. did not disclose information concerning PERSON_2 in his asset declarations for 2022–2023.

The Commission and the PCIE consider that the candidate did not provide a substantiated explanation as to why information concerning PERSON_2 was absent from the declarations for 2022–2023, given that he himself had acknowledged PERSON_2 as a family member since 2019.

The Commission and the PCIE consider that the candidate had no grounds for failing to disclose information concerning INFORMATION_3 son, as well as INFORMATION_11, in his asset declarations for 2017, 2018, 2022, and 2023.

In his asset declarations for 2022–2023, the candidate did not declare any bank accounts in Section 12.1, “Banks and Other Financial Institutions, Including Abroad, in Which the Declarant or Members of His Family Have Accounts or in Which Funds or Other Property Are Held”.

Furthermore, unlike in the asset declarations for 2017, 2018, and 2024, the candidate did not indicate in the declarations for 2022–2023 any information about an apartment in the city of Berdiansk with a total area of 43.7 sq. m, which had been owned since 02 February 2017 by the candidate’s mother, whom he declared as a family member.

In addition, the candidate did not declare any information in Section 16, “Membership of the Declarant in Organisations and Their Governing Bodies”, of the asset declarations for 2022–2023. At the same time, on 25 August 2021, the candidate obtained a certificate conferring the right to practise law pursuant to part six of Article 45 of the Law of Ukraine “On the Bar and Practice of Law”. He became a member of the Ukrainian National Bar Association, which was required to be disclosed in the asset declarations.

The Commission and the PCIE note that the errors identified concern different categories of information and span several reporting periods; therefore, they cannot be regarded as isolated technical errors but demonstrate a systemic pattern of providing incomplete and inaccurate information when completing declarations.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” indicator of the integrity criterion.

In his asset declaration for 2022, the candidate did not declare any vehicle that he owned or had the right to use.

At the same time, the materials of court case No. 953/7650/22 and the information contained in the dossier of the candidate for judicial office show that the candidate used a BMW 135 I in 2022.

Given that the candidate had the right to use the BMW 135 I as of the last day of the 2022 reporting period, had informed the National Police of Ukraine that he was its owner, and had paid for it, the Commission and the PCIE doubt that the candidate provided truthful information concerning his lack of property rights in this vehicle and that he was not required to declare it in his asset declaration for 2022.

The Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" and "consistency of lifestyle with declared income" indicators of the integrity criterion.

According to the asset declaration for 2022, the candidate received "payments to internally displaced persons" totalling UAH 18,000 from Poltava City Council. In his asset declaration for 2023, the candidate declared receipt of UAH 24,000 on the same basis. At the same time, in his asset declarations for 2022–2023, the candidate indicated that his actual place of residence was in the city of Kharkiv. He did not declare any property rights in real estate in the city of Poltava or Poltava Region.

Having assessed the relevant circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there were no grounds for the candidate to receive payments as an internally displaced person after returning to the city of Kharkiv in 2022, and raised concerns as to the completeness and veracity of the explanations provided. In view of the foregoing, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Baida A.O., was found not to meet the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 169/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Iryna Tokarska, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-29>)

In her declarations of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2015–2025, as well as in her declarations of property, income, expenditures, and financial obligations for 2012–2015, Tokarska I.S. stated that she owned a 1995 Ford Escort acquired by the candidate on 11 December 2008. In her asset declarations for 2015–2022 and paper declarations for 2013–2015, Tokarska I.S. stated that she owned a 2006 Honda Jazz acquired by the candidate on 06 July 2013. In her asset declarations for 2017–2021, the candidate also indicated that her former husband owned a 2002 BMW X5 acquired on 15 September 2017.

At the same time, the candidate did not declare the value of the vehicles in those declarations.

The Commission and the PCIE concluded that Tokarska I.S. had no grounds for failing to disclose the value of the following vehicles: the 1995 Ford Escort in the paper declarations for 2012–2015 and the asset declarations for 2015–2025; the 2006 Honda Jazz in the paper declarations for 2013–2015 and the asset declarations for 2015–2022; and the 2002 BMW X5 in the asset declarations for 2017–2021.

The Commission and the PCIE concluded that the candidate did not provide accurate information known to her concerning the value of the 1995 Ford Escort, the 2006 Honda Jazz, and the 2002 BMW X5, and also failed to declare the right to use an apartment with a total area of 45.8 sq. m in the relevant paper declarations for 2012–2015 and asset declarations for 2015–2025.

Having assessed all the foregoing circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

According to information from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, the candidate closed proceedings in cases concerning administrative liability under Article 130 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences due to the expiry of the time limits for imposing an administrative penalty. During 2017–2025, the candidate issued at least 75 decisions closing proceedings on this ground.

The judicial practice analysed may indicate the candidate's intentional or unintentional lack of conscientiousness in organising and considering cases involving the operation of vehicles while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

Having assessed all the foregoing circumstances and the number of court proceedings closed due to the expiry of the time limits for imposing administrative liability, as a result of which the offenders escaped liability, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "conscientiousness" and "observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and personal life" indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Tokarska I.S., was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 170/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Vadym Khodko, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-31>)

According to his declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2017, Khodko V.M. did not declare any monetary assets.

In his asset declaration for 2018, the candidate declared aggregate income of himself and his family members amounting to UAH 344,703, or approximately UAH 294,000 after tax. At the same time, in 2018 the candidate declared monetary assets of UAH 227,503 and a loan of UAH 47,675. Thus, the candidate's aggregate expenditure on accumulating savings and repaying the loan amounted to UAH 275,178.

It follows from the foregoing that, in 2018, the amount available to cover the candidate's everyday living expenses was UAH 19,423 per year, or UAH 1,619 (equivalent to USD 59) per month for a family of four. Given that these funds were insufficient for living expenses, the Commission and the PCIE requested the candidate to provide relevant explanations.

Because the candidate did not corroborate the information that he had sufficient income to accumulate monetary assets of UAH 227,503, which he declared in 2018, and did not establish the lawfulness of the sources of those monetary assets, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" and "lawfulness of the sources from which rights to objects of civil rights originated" indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Khodko V.M., was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 171/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Mykhailo Hrabynskyi, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-33>)

Following the special joint session with the candidate, the Commission and the PCIE draw attention to circumstances giving rise to a reasonable doubt as to whether he possesses sufficient knowledge and practical skills to consider cases falling within the jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC).

In particular, the candidate explained that he had no practical experience of participating in criminal proceedings before a court as defence counsel. His professional activities had focused primarily on civil, commercial, and employment law.

In addition, during the session, the candidate demonstrated an insufficient level of theoretical knowledge of fundamental issues of criminal law and procedure. In particular, he was unable to explain what constitutes a formally defined offence.

The candidate also failed to provide a clear answer concerning the statutory regulation of the institution of whistleblowers; in particular, he was unable to confirm the existence of provisions in criminal procedural legislation concerning the payment of remuneration to a whistleblower, stating that his relevant knowledge came solely from media publications.

In view of the information collected and the candidate's answers, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criterion of possessing sufficient knowledge and practical skills to consider cases falling within the jurisdiction of the HACC.

Following an analysis of the dossier materials and the candidate's explanations provided during the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE identified circumstances giving rise to a reasonable doubt as to the completeness and accuracy of the candidate's disclosure of income in the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government.

In particular, the candidate confirmed that in 2023–2024 he had received funds under legal aid agreements concluded with a state-owned enterprise by which he was concurrently employed. According to his explanations, the total funds received included UAH 27,792 under a 2023 agreement (partially received in 2024) and UAH 18,300 under a 2024 agreement.

At the same time, the candidate stated that he had not disclosed those receipts in his asset declaration for 2024, explaining that his legal practice had operated at a loss and that the expenses incurred exceeded the income received.

The mere fact that the candidate received funds under legal aid agreements demonstrates the existence of income that was required to be disclosed in the asset declaration, irrespective of whether the activity operated at a loss.

In these circumstances, the Commission and the PCIE concluded that there was a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Hrabynskyi M.I., was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 172/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Vitalii Kryklyvyi, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine "On the High Anti-Corruption Court".

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-69>)

During preparations for the special joint session, it was established that, in his declarations of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2018–2021, the candidate declared information concerning a person with whom he cohabited but was not married, namely PERSON_1.

In March 2018, the candidate and PERSON_1, who at that time served as a judge of the Novosanzharskyi District Court of Poltava Oblast.

PERSON_1 was appointed as a judge of the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC) by Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 128/2019 dated 11.04.2019.

High Anti-Corruption Court judges Kryklyvyi V.V. and PERSON_1 were included on the list of persons in need of improved housing conditions.

PERSON_1, with whom the candidate was at that time in a de facto marital relationship, chaired the Housing and Amenities Commission of the High Anti-Corruption Court and considered matters concerning the provision of official housing (she was elected by Decision No. 2 of the Meeting of Judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court dated 03 September 2019).

By Decision No. 2 of the Meeting of Judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court dated 28 November 2019, it was resolved to provide Kryklyvyi V.V., a judge of that court, with official housing, namely a four-room apartment for a family of 4 (four) persons. As to the composition of the family, the candidate listed himself, PERSON_1, and two daughters.

On 15 January 2020, the candidate submitted an application to suspend the procedure for providing him with an apartment and reduced the composition of his family from 4 (four) persons to 2 (two). Two months later, PERSON_1 increased the composition of her family (herself, her daughter, and both of her parents).

Pursuant to Decision No. 4 of the Meeting of Judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court dated

19.03.2020, PERSON_1, a judge of that court, was provided with official housing for a family of 4 persons (herself, her daughter, her mother, and her father), namely the four-room apartment that the candidate had previously declined.

In view of the foregoing, a number of circumstances discussed during the special joint session, as well as the candidate's explanations concerning the circumstances in which housing was provided to him and PERSON_1, give rise to a reasonable doubt as to the candidate's honesty.

Following an analysis of the candidate's oral and written explanations concerning the issues raised during the special joint session, as well as those that arose during the review of the candidate's dossier and the determination of his compliance with the qualification assessment criteria, the Commission and the PCIE find that the candidate does not meet the integrity and professional ethics criteria under the "honesty" indicator.

During the special joint session, the Commission and the PCIE also discussed the circumstances of the candidate's failure to disclose in his declarations for 2017–2019 information concerning INFORMATION_4 daughter PERSON_2, born in ____.

In addition, during the special joint session, the circumstances of the candidate's failure to disclose in his 2017 declaration information concerning close persons, including persons with whom he shared a household and mutual rights and obligations, were discussed. This information was also omitted from the candidate's declaration of family relationships for 2013–2017. At the same time, it was established that, in March 2018, the candidate and PERSON_1 INFORMATION_7.

In addition, during the special joint session it was established that, according to the notification of material changes in financial status dated 09 August 2019, on 08 August 2019 the candidate acquired ownership of a land plot measuring 1,000 sq. m, located in

the city of Horishni Plavni, Poltava Region, and valued at UAH 274,166. In his annual declaration for 2019, he disclosed UAH 274,166 as income from the privatisation of the land plot.

In Section 14, “Expenditures and Transactions of the Declarant”, of the declaration for 2020, the candidate disclosed a transaction dated 17 March 2020, namely the lease of an apartment. At the same time, Section 3, “Real Estate”, of the same declaration contains no information concerning the relevant real estate.

The Commission and the PCIE take into account the explanations provided by the candidate, which confirm the absence of intent when the declaration errors or inaccuracies were made; at the same time, those explanations do not refute the fact that they were systemic and demonstrate insufficient conscientiousness on the candidate’s part when completing the declarations.

Accordingly, the candidate did not make sufficient efforts to dispel fully the public’s doubts as to his complete compliance with the integrity and professional ethics criteria.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court, Kryklyvyi V.V., was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

Decision dated 20.03.2026 No. 173/vs-26

On Consideration at a Special Joint Session of Whether Oleh Kostiuk, a Candidate for Judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Meets the Criteria Stipulated In Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-u-specialnomu-spilnomu-zasidanni-pytannya-pro-vidpovidnist-kandydata-na-posadu-36>)

According to data from the State Register of Individual Taxpayers, the candidate’s total income from 1999 to 2011 amounted to approximately UAH 230,526, while the income of his wife, PERSON_1, amounted to UAH 18,711.

In addition, according to the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government for 2024, as of 31 December 2024 the aggregate savings of the candidate and his family members amounted to EUR 17,000, USD 3,000, and UAH 30,000.

In view of the absence of documentary evidence concerning the amount of income and financial assistance received, as well as the internal inconsistency of the candidate’s testimony, the Commission and the PCIE have a reasonable doubt as to the candidate’s compliance with the “honesty” and “consistency of lifestyle with declared income” indicators of the integrity criterion.

Thus, the candidate for judgeship at the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), Kostiuk O.P., was found **not to meet** the criteria established by part four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”.

IV. Review of HQCJ Decisions Following Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in Specialised Administrative Courts.

1. General Information

The Commission, **sitting in Panels**, adopted **86 decisions** on admission to qualification assessment and participation in the competition.

The Commission **in plenary session** adopted **35 decisions**, of which:

- **7 decisions** on reviewing decisions adopted by panels of the Commission on admitting candidates to qualification assessment and participation in the competition;
- **4 decisions** on scheduling candidates' qualification assessment;
- **11 decisions** on scheduling stages of the qualification exam and determining their results;
- **19 decisions** on terminating candidates' participation in the competition.

2. Decisions of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQCJ) following competitive selection procedures for vacant judgeships in specialised administrative courts

Decision dated 05.02.2026 No. 1/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court, announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-5>)

Decision dated 05.02.2026 No. 6/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-6>)

Decision dated 09.02.2026 No. 11/zp-26

On Publication of the List of Questions for Anonymous Testing on the History of Ukrainian Statehood for the Qualification Exams of Candidates for Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal within the Competitions Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-oprylyudnennya-pereliku-pytan-anonimnogo-testuvannya-z-istoriyi-ukrayinskoyi-derzhavnosti-0>)

Decision dated 11.02.2026 No. 11/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-7>)

Decision dated 11.02.2026 No. 24/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-8>)

Decision dated 12.02.2026 No. 28/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-9>)

Decision dated 12.02.2026 No. 38/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-10>)

Decision dated 12.02.2026 No. 43/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court, announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-11>)

Decision dated 12.02.2026 No. 65/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-12>)

Decision dated 20.02.2026 No. 75/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court, announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-13>)

Decision dated 20.02.2026 No. 84/vs-26

On Admitting Candidates to Qualification Assessment and Participation in the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-uchasti-v-konkursi-na-14>)

Decision dated 25.02.2026 No. 16/zp-26

On Scheduling the Qualification Assessment and Qualification Exam within the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court, announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-v-mezhah-konkursu-na>)

Decision dated 25.02.2026 No. 17/zp-26

On Scheduling the Qualification Assessment and Qualification Exam within the Competition for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-v-mezhah-konkursu-0>)

Decision dated 25.02.2026 No. 18/zp-26

On Determining the Specific Features of the Procedure for Cognitive Ability Testing and the Methodology for Evaluating Its Results During the Qualification Assessment of Candidates for Judgeship Within the Competitions for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vyznachennya-osoblyvostey-poryadku-provedennya-testuvannya-kognityvnyh-zdibnostey-ta-1>)

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 30/zp-26

On Scheduling the Test of Knowledge of the History of Ukrainian Statehood and the Cognitive Ability Test Within the Competitions for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-testuvannya-znan-z-istoriyi-ukrayinskoyi-derzhavnosti-ta-testuvannya>)

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 31/zp-26

On Publishing the Lists of Questions for Anonymous Testing of General Knowledge in the Field of Law and Knowledge of the Specialisation of the Relevant Court for Conducting Qualification Exams of Candidates for Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal Within the Competitions Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-oprylyudnennya-perelikiv-pytan-anonimnogo-testuvannya-iz-zagalnyh-znan-u-sferi-prava-ta-zi>)

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 27/zp-26

On Scheduling the Qualification Assessment of Candidates for Judgeship at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court within the Competition Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-stosovno-kandydativ-na-posadu-suddi>)

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 28/zp-26

On Scheduling the Qualification Assessment of Candidates for Judgeship at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal Within the Competition Announced by the Decision of the HQCJ No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-stosovno-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi>)

Decision dated 15.04.2026 No. 42/zp-26

On Scheduling the Test of General Knowledge in the Field of Law and Knowledge of the Specialisation of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court Within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-testuvannya-zagalnyh-znan-u-sferi-prava-ta-znan-zi-specializaciyi>)

Decision dated 15.04.2026 No. 43/zp-26

On Scheduling the Test of General Knowledge in the Field of Law and Knowledge of the Specialisation of the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal Within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-testuvannya-zagalnyh-znan-u-sferi-prava-ta-znan-zi-specializaciyi-0>)

Decision dated 08.04.2026 No. 40/zp-26

On Approving the Coded and Decoded Results of the Test of Knowledge of the History of Ukrainian Statehood Within the Competitions for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-ta-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-testuvannya-znan-z-istoriyi-1>)

Decision dated 15.04.2026 No. 41/zp-26

On Approving the Coded and Decoded Results of the Cognitive Ability Test Within the Competitions for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-ta-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-testuvannya-kognityvnyh-zdibnostey-v>)

Decision dated 29.04.2026 No. 51/zp-26

On Approving the Coded and Decoded Results of the Test of General Knowledge in the Field of Law and Knowledge of the Specialisation of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court Within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-ta-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-testuvannya-zagalnyh-znan-u-sferi-prava-8>)

Decision dated 29.04.2026 No. 52/zp-26

On Approving the Coded and Decoded Results of the Test of General Knowledge in the Field of Law and Knowledge of the Specialisation of the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal Within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-ta-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-testuvannya-zagalnyh-znan-u-sferi-prava-9>)

Decision dated 06.05.2026 No. 54/zp-26

On Scheduling the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam (Completion of a Practical Assignment in the Specialisation of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court) Within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-chetvertogo-etapu-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi>)

Decision dated 06.05.2026 No. 55/zp-26

On Scheduling the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam (Completion of a Practical Assignment in the Specialisation of the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal) within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-chetvertogo-etapu-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-0>)

Decision dated 06.05.2026 No. 56/zp-26

On Approving the Composition of Examination Commissions for Reviewing and Evaluating Practical Assignments Completed During the Qualification Exam by Candidates for Judgeship at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal Within the Competitions Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-skladiv-ekzamenaciyh-komisiy-dlya-perevirky-ta-ocinyuvannya-praktychnyh-0>)

Decision dated 15.06.2026 No. 72/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam (Completion of a Practical Assignment in the Specialisation of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court) within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-chetvertogo-etapu-kvalifikaciyhogo-ispytu-vykonannya-0>)

Decision dated 15.06.2026 No. 73/zp-26

On Approving the Decoded Results of the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam (Completion of a Practical Assignment in the Specialisation of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court) within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 193/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-chetvertogo-etapu-kvalifikaciyhogo-ispytu-vykonannya-0>)

Decision dated 22.06.2026 No. 80/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam (Completion of a Practical Assignment in the Specialisation of the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal) within the Competition Announced by Commission Decision No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-chetvertogo-etapu-kvalifikaciyhogo-ispytu-vykonannya-1>)

Decision dated 22.06.2026 No. 83/zp-26

On Approving the Decoded Results of the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam (Completion of a Practical Assignment in the Specialisation of the Specialised

Administrative Court of Appeal) within the Competition announced by Commission Decision No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-chetvertogo-etapu-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-vykonannya-1>)

V. Information on HQCJ Decisions Concerning the Organisation of Procedures for the Selection of Judges to Local Courts

1. General information

The Commission in plenary session adopted **13 decisions**, including:

- **1 decision** on approving the results of the fourth stage of the qualification exam – the completion of a practical assignment – and the overall results of the qualification exam in the specialisation of a local administrative court;
- **1 decision** on approving the results of the fourth stage of the qualification exam – the completion of a practical assignment in the specialisation of a local commercial court;
- **6 decisions** on approving the coded results of the completion of a practical assignment in the specialisation of a local general court (the fourth stage of the qualification exam);
- **5 decisions** on terminating participation in the selection (transfer) procedure.

2. HQCJ decisions adopted following procedures for selecting candidates for judgeships and transferring judges to another local court

Decision dated 11.03.2026 No. 22/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local General Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by Separate Groups of Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi>)

Decision dated 30.03.2026 No. 33/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local General Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by a Separate Group of Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention to be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-0>)

Decision dated 01.04.2026 No. 36/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local Administrative Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed

by Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-1>)

Decision dated 01.04.2026 No. 37/zp-26

On Approving the Overall Results of the Qualification Exam in the Specialisation of a Local Administrative Court Taken by Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-zagalnyh-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-zi-specializaciyi-miscevogo>)

Decision dated 13.05.2026 No. 58/zp-26

On Approving, in New Versions, Exam Programs, Taxonomic Specifications for Anonymous Written Testing, and Test Questions for Exams Within the Qualification Assessment of Judges of Local and Appellate Courts.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-u-novyh-redakciyah-program-ispytiv-taksonomichnyh-harakterystyk-anonimnogo>)

Decision dated 27.05.2026 No. 64/zp-26

On Approving Banks of Practical Assignments for Exams Within the Qualification Assessment of Local Court Judges.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-baz-praktychnyh-zavdan-dlya-provedennya-ispytiv-u-mezhah-kvalifikaciynogo>)

Decision dated 27.05.2026 No. 62/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local General Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by Separate Groups of Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-2>)

Decision dated 03.06.2026 No. 69/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local General Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by a

Separate Group of Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-3>)

Decision dated 10.06.2026 No. 71/zp-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local General Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by Separate Groups of Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed An Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-4>)

Decision dated 17.06.2026 No. 74/zp-26

On Approving The Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local Commercial Court (The Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed By Candidates For Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-6>)

Decision dated 17.06.2026 No. 77/зп-26

On Approving the Coded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local General Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by a Separate Group of Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-kodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi-5>)

Decision dated 17.06.2026 No. 78/zp-26

On Approving the Decoded Results of Practical Assignments in the Specialisation of a Local Commercial Court (the Fourth Stage of the Qualification Exam) Completed by Candidates for Judgeship at a Local Court and Judges Who Expressed an Intention To Be Transferred to Another Local Court.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-dekodovanyh-rezultativ-vykonannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-zi-specializaciyi>)

VI. HQCJ Decisions on the Qualification Assessment of Judges for Suitability for the Position Held

1. General information

The Commission, **sitting in Panels**, adopted **13 decisions**, including:

- **7 decisions** on recognising judges as suitable for the position held;
- **2 decisions** on recognising judges as not suitable for the position held;
- **2 decisions** on terminating qualification assessments for suitability for the position held;
- **2 decisions** on referring the issue of judges' suitability for the positions held to the Commission in plenary session.

The Commission **in plenary session** adopted **20 decisions**, including:

- **2 decisions** on recognising judges as suitable for the position held;
- **3 decisions** on recognising judges as not suitable for the position held;
- **15 decisions** on terminating the qualification assessment of 93 judges for suitability for the position held (initial qualification assessment and qualification assessment in connection with the imposition of a disciplinary sanction).

2. Overview of HQCJ decisions on recognising judges as not suitable for the positions held, based on the results of qualification assessments for suitability for the position held.

Decision dated 09.02.2026 No. 11/ko-26

On Consideration of Suitability of Serhii Nahorianskyi, judge of the Kyiv District Administrative Court, for the Position held.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-pytannya-shchodo-vidpovidnosti-suddi-okruzhnogo-administratyvnogo-sudu-mista-0>)

Having heard the explanations of judge Nahorianskyi S.I., the Commission notes that a judge's receipt of official housing constitutes the exercise of a social guarantee expressly provided for by law and therefore cannot indicate a lack of integrity or unethical conduct.

At the same time, the Commission applies the criteria of integrity and professional ethics not to the fact of receiving housing, but to the lawfulness of the grounds and procedure for receiving it, as well as to the judge's conduct in exercising this right. In particular, the Commission is concerned about the possible provision of inaccurate information concerning the absence of housing (or rights thereto), as well as the failure to disclose the existence of grounds for registering title to inherited property after accepting the inheritance of his parents' apartment.

The Commission takes into account the explanations provided by the judge, including his having been on the waiting list for permanent housing for many years and the insufficiency of living space per family member at the time he applied for official housing. At the same

time, the Commission considers Nahorianskyi S.I.'s failure to register title to the apartment after accepting the inheritance, failure to disclose this information, and failure to remove himself from the Kyiv Garrison housing register after receiving the warrant for official housing to be indicative of non-compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Assessing the above facts, circumstances, and the judge's conduct in their totality, the Commission concluded that they give rise to reasonable doubt as to whether Nahorianskyi S.I. meets the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, since they adversely affect public confidence in and the authority of the judiciary.

Thus, Judge Nahorianskyi S.I. of the Kyiv District Administrative Court was found **not suitable** for the position held.

Decision dated 30.03.2026 No. 18/ko-26

On Suitability of Serhii Stupak, judge of the Metalurhiynyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City, for the position held.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vidpovidnist-suddi-metallurgiyynogo-rayonnogo-sudu-mista-kryvogo-rogu-dnipropetrovskoyi>)

The Commission finds that, in the absence of clear legal grounds, the judge issued a significant number of rulings returning administrative-offence reports to the authorities that had drawn them up for revision and proper completion. Some rulings contained the judge's findings that police officers had failed to bring the offender before the court and that the submitted materials therefore had to be returned so that the police authorities could discharge their duty to ensure the offender's access to justice by bringing that person before the court.

In the Commission's opinion, returning administrative-offence reports for proper completion and revision on grounds not provided for by law indicates that the judge had no intention of considering cases in this category and points to violations of the rights of the persons against whom the administrative-offence reports had been drawn up, the victims, and the authorities (officials) that had drawn up the relevant reports. As a result of such conduct by the judge, the time limits for considering administrative-offence cases were breached, and the persons against whom the reports had been drawn up escaped the liability prescribed by law.

The judge was afforded an opportunity, both in communications with the PIC and during the interview, to provide detailed explanations concerning the circumstances that, in each individual case, prevented a final decision from being rendered. The judge did not avail himself of that opportunity, insisting solely that he had been guided by the applicable provisions of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences and by the general practice of judges of other courts in considering cases of this category.

The Commission finds that, during the interview and in his written explanations, the judge failed to provide reasoned and convincing explanations showing that, when considering cases in the above category, he had conscientiously followed the relevant provisions of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences.

The totality of the circumstances established during the interview and review of the dossier concerning the numerous instances in which Judge Stupak S.V. closed proceedings in cases under Article 130 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences indicates that his actions did not meet society's high expectations regarding conscientiousness and the proper performance of a judge's procedural duties, facilitated offenders' avoidance of liability, and could be perceived as the deliberate use of procedural opportunities contrary to the objectives of justice. The Commission agrees with the PIC's assertion that such conduct by a judge undermines confidence in the judiciary and causes substantial harm to its authority.

The Commission further notes that the administrative offence under Article 130 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences poses a greater danger to society than other offences established by that Code; the unjustified release of offenders from liability has extremely adverse consequences; and the consideration of this category of cases is socially significant and attracts considerable public interest.

In view of the circumstances established, the Commission concludes that the judge's actions, examined during the assessment, when considering cases under Article 130 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences were not fully consistent with the objectives of administrative-offence proceedings (Article 245 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences), resulting in persons avoiding liability under that Code.

The Commission agrees with the PIC's opinion that the judge failed to ensure the effective administration of justice in administrative-offence cases.

The Commission took the judge's excessively formalistic actions in considering administrative-offence cases under Article 130 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences into account as adversely affecting the assessment of the judge's compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

The judge provided the Commission with explanations in which he confirmed that he had used the apartments free of charge. The Commission takes the judge's explanations in this regard into account, but also considers the circumstances established during the interview concerning his free use of those apartments. The judge did not provide exhaustive information about the circumstances in which persons who are not his close relatives allowed him to use the apartments free of charge, nor did he submit any supporting documents with his explanations. The Commission considers that this circumstance, taken alone, is insufficient to conclude that the judge does not meet the requirements for the position held; however, together with the other facts established and discussed during the interview with the judge, it gives rise to reasonable doubt as to whether the judge meets the criterion of integrity.

Having verified the circumstances set out in the PIC opinion, taking into account the explanations provided by the judge and its review of the judicial dossier, the Commission concluded that the judge does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of “compliance with ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activities and private life,” as well as “honesty” and “conscientiousness”.

Thus, Stupak S.V., judge of the Metalurhiyni District Court of Kryvyi Rih City, was found **not suitable** for the position held.

Decision dated 16.04.2026 No. 21/ko-26

On Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment for Suitability for the Position Held of Vitalii Nikushyn, judge of the Kyiv-Sviatoshyn District Court of Kyiv Oblast.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-na-vidpovidnist-zaymaniy-posadi-58>)

The Commission established that Judge Nikushyn V.V. of the Kyiv-Sviatoshyn District Court of Kyiv Oblast failed to appear three times for the “Taking the Exam” stage of the qualification assessment; accordingly, the Commission finds that Judge Nikushyn V.V. of the Kyiv-Sviatoshyn District Court of Kyiv Oblast did not pass the qualification exam within the qualification assessment for suitability for the position held.

Since Nikushyn V.V. did not demonstrate his professional competence at the exam stage, he may not be admitted to the next stage of the qualification assessment.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission decided to recognise Nikushyn V.V. as not suitable for the position held under the criterion of professional competence and to recommend that the High Council of Justice (HCJ) consider dismissing him from the position of Judge of the Kyiv-Sviatoshyn District Court of Kyiv Oblast.

Thus, Nikushyn V.V., judge of the Kyiv-Sviatoshyn District Court of Kyiv Oblast was found **not suitable** for the position held.

Decision dated 20.04.2026 No. 22/ko-26

On Consideration of Suitability of Nataliia Dobrivska, judge of the Kyiv District Administrative Court, for the position held.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-pytannya-shchodo-vidpovidnosti-suddi-okruzhnogo-administratyvnogo-sudu-mista-1>)

Judge Dobrivska N.A. failed to appear twice – on 17 April and 21 May 2019 – for the exam scheduled by the Commission within the qualification assessment of judges for suitability for the position held.

At the same time, Commission Decisions No. 67/zp-19 dated 8.05.2019 and No.174/zp-19 dated 27.09.2019 show that the failure of judges of the Kyiv District Administrative Court to appear for the exams on 17 April and 21 May 2019 was widespread (only 7 and 3 judges of that court, respectively, appeared for the exams). Most judges failed to appear because of temporary incapacity for work, even though most judges of that court had been at work on the day preceding each exam date.

In light of the NABU recordings of conversations from the office of PERSON_1, the President of the Kyiv District Administrative Court, which were made public in July 2019, the widespread failure of judges of that court, including Judge Dobrivska N.A., to appear for the qualification assessment on 17 April and 21 May 2019 due to temporary incapacity for work quite reasonably creates the impression, for an outside observer and society as a whole, that such actions were coordinated. The facts set out in the PIC opinion concerning simultaneous mass leave and temporary incapacity for work among judges of the Kyiv District Administrative Court raise legitimate doubts that those circumstances coincided by chance.

Such actions by judges of the Kyiv District Administrative Court – including the simultaneous failure of most of them to complete stages of the qualification assessment, which is a mandatory statutory requirement for confirming suitability for the position held – amid agreements and coordination among individual judges, caused substantial harm to the authority of justice, given the considerable public interest and adverse social assessment. This resulted in the liquidation of the court and had adverse consequences both for court employees and for society.

Separate attention should also be paid to the circumstances in which judges of the Kyiv District Administrative Court considered cases brought by third parties against Commission members seeking to have acts or omissions of the bodies appointing (electing) Commission members, members of the High Council of Justice (HCJ), and officials of the relevant competition commissions declared unlawful.

On 15 February 2019, Judge Dobrivska N.A. issued a ruling in Case No. 640/2574/19 opening proceedings in an administrative case brought by PERSON_2 against the Chairman of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine and PERSON_4, a member of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine, with the Bar Council of Ukraine and the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQCJ) as third parties, seeking to have actions declared unlawful, to have the absence of authority recognised, and to compel the defendants to refrain from exercising authority; determining that the case would be considered under the rules of general claim proceedings; and scheduling a preparatory hearing for 18 March 2019 at 13:40.

The Commission in plenary session critically assessed Judge Dobrivska N.A.'s explanations that the case had been accepted for proceedings within the time limits prescribed by procedural law, as well as her explanations concerning the need to schedule it for consideration under the rules of general claim proceedings.

Judge Dobrivska N.A.'s communications with PERSON_1, President of the Kyiv District Administrative Court, as recorded in the NABU materials, demonstrate that Judge Dobrivska N.A. was aware of the destructive and manipulative processes initiated by the court president.

The foregoing indicates that Judge Dobrivska N.A. breached the rules of judicial ethics and standards of conduct that ensure public confidence in the court, thereby bringing the office of judge into disrepute and undermining the authority of justice.

At the same time, the Commission in plenary session endorsed the conclusions of the panel of the Commission set out in Decision No. 14/ko-26 dated 11 February 2026 regarding the absence of clear and convincing evidence supporting the circumstances concerning the discrepancy in the value of the declared real property acquired by the judge's father in 2019.

Following verification of the circumstances set out in the PIC opinion, taking into account the explanations provided by Judge Dobrivska N.A., and having reviewed the judicial dossier and other materials obtained during the judge's qualification assessment, the Commission in plenary session established facts that may indicate that Judge Dobrivska N.A. of the Kyiv District Administrative Court does not meet the criterion of professional ethics under the indicator "observance of conduct that ensures confidence in the judicial office and the authority of justice".

Thus, Dobrivska N.A., judge of the Kyiv District Administrative Court was found **not suitable** for the position held.

Decision dated 14.05.2026 No. 27/ko-26

On Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment for Suitability for the Position Held of Ihor Shtulman, Judge of the Sixth Administrative Court of Appeal.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-na-vidpovidnist-zaymaniy-posadi-59>)

The Commission established that Shtulman I.V., judge of the Sixth Administrative Court of Appeal, repeatedly failed to appear for the "Taking the Exam" stage of the qualification assessment; accordingly, the Commission finds that Shtulman I.V., judge of the Sixth Administrative Court of Appeal did not pass the qualification exam within the qualification assessment for suitability for the position held.

Since Shtulman I.V. did not demonstrate his professional competence at the exam stage, he may not be admitted to the next stage of the qualification assessment.

Thus, Shtulman I.V., judge of the Sixth Administrative Court of Appeal was found **not suitable** for the position held.

Decision dated 30.06.2026 No. 34/ko-26

On Reviewing the Dossier, Conducting the Interview, and Determining the Results of the Qualification Assessment of Ihor Smolii, Judge of the Kyiv District Administrative Court, for Suitability for the Position Held.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-269>)

At the time he submitted written explanations to the Commission on 03.06.2019 and during the interviews on 02.04.2026 and 30.06.2026, the judge was aware that his wife possessed the necessary set of documents (a power of attorney and the consent of the owner's husband) to exercise the right to dispose of Apartment 1, including by selling or renting it out. However, the judge refused to acknowledge that his wife held such rights.

The Commission has reasonable doubt as to whether the parties intended to create the legal consequences that should arise from the apartment sale and purchase agreement. In the Commission's opinion, the agreement bears the hallmarks of a sham transaction.

Thus, the Commission has reasonable doubt as to the completeness and truthfulness of the explanations provided by the judge to the Commission concerning the above circumstances. This conclusion by the Commission warrants a reduction in the scores for the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Based on the results of the qualification assessment, Smolii I.V., judge of the Kyiv District Administrative Court scored 637.625 points, which is less than 67 percent of the aggregate maximum possible score in the qualification assessment of all criteria; accordingly, the Commission concluded that Judge Smolii I.V. of the Kyiv District Administrative Court does not meet the requirements for the position held.

Thus, Smolii I.V., judge of the Kyiv District Administrative Court was found **not suitable** for the position held.

VII. HQCJ Decisions On Approval of Regulatory Legal Acts

Decision dated 23.03.2026 No. 29/zp-26

On Approving the Forms of Documents Required for Qualification Exams During the Qualification Assessment Within the Competitions for Vacant Judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-form-dokumentiv-neobhidnyh-dlya-provedennya-kvalifikaciyh-ispytiv-pid-chas>)

Decision dated 06.04.2026 No. 39/zp-26

On Approving the Initial Training Program for Judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC), including its Appeals Chamber.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-programy-pochatkovoyi-pidgotovky-suddiv-vyshchogo-antikorupciynogo-sudu>)

Decision dated 06.05.2026 No. 53/zp-26

On Approving Methodological Guidelines for Evaluating Practical Assignments Completed by Candidates for Judgeship at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal During the Qualification Exam Within the Competitions Announced by Commission Decisions No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25 dated 29.10.2025.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-metodychnyh-vkazivok-z-ocinyuvannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-vykonanogo-2>)

Decision dated 13.05.2026 No. 58/zp-26

On Approving, in New Versions, Examination Programs, Taxonomic Specifications for Anonymous Written Testing, and Test Questions for Exams Within the Qualification Assessment of Judges of Local and Appellate Courts.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-u-novyh-redakciyah-program-ispytiv-taksonomichnyh-harakterystyk-anonimnogo>)

Decision dated 25.05.2026 No. 61/zp-26

On Amending the Procedure for Conducting Special Background Check In Respect of Candidates for the Position of a Judge and the Procedure for Obtaining Information Regarding a Judge (Candidate for the Position of a Judge) and Members of His/Her Family or Close Persons By Means Of Searching And Collecting Data (Information) In Automated Information And Reference Systems, Registers And Databases Maintained (Administered) By State Authorities, Other State Bodies Or Local Self-Government Bodies, approved by Decision No. 35/zp-26 of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine dated 30.03.2026.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vnesennya-zmin-do-poryadku-provedennya-specialnoyi-perevirky-stosovno-kandydativ-na-posadu>)

Decision dated 27.05.2026 No. 64/zp-26

On Approving Banks of Practical Assignments for Conduction of Exams Within the Qualification Assessment of Local Court Judges.

(Full text available at: <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-baz-praktychnyh-zavdan-dlya-provedennya-ispytiv-u-mezhah-kvalifikaciynogo>)
