

High Qualification
COMMISSION
of Judges of Ukraine



Вища кваліфікаційна
КОМІСІЯ
суддів України



**Digest of the High Qualification
Commission of Judges' Practice
2025**

List of Abbreviations

HQCJU – High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine

HCJ – High Council of Justice

PIC – Public Integrity Council

PCIE – Public Council of International Experts

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
I. Background Information.....	5
II. Review of HQCJU Decisions on the Results of Competitive Selection for Filling Vacant Judgeships in the General Courts of Appeal	6
III. Review of the HQCJU Decisions Based on the Results of Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in the Administrative Courts of Appeal	53
IV. Review of the HQCJU Decisions Based on the Results of Competitive Procedures to Fill Vacant Judgeships in the Commercial Courts of Appeal	78
SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR FILLING VACANT JUDGESHIPS IN THE COURTS OF APPEAL	100
V. Information on the HQCJU Decisions Regarding the Organisation of Procedures for Selecting Judges for Local Courts	102
VI. Information about the HQCJU Decisions Regarding the Organisation of Competitions for Positions in High Specialised Courts	106
VII. Decisions on the Qualification Assessment of Judges for Suitability for Their Positions	109
VIII. HQCJU Decisions of a Regulatory and Legal Nature	117

INTRODUCTION

Throughout 2025, the HQCJU continued to exercise its constitutional and statutory powers with a view to ensuring the staffing of the judiciary in Ukraine, in accordance with the Constitution of Ukraine, the Law of Ukraine “On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges”, and other relevant legal acts.

One of the measures set out in the Rule of Law Roadmap provides for the Commission to publish regular digests of its adopted decisions. This measure is intended to strengthen the Commission’s accountability in the processes for filling judicial vacancies and completing the qualification assessment of sitting judges, while also improving the efficiency, accessibility and quality of justice.

This edition of the Digest provides a brief overview of the decisions adopted by the HQCJU following its consideration of key matters falling within its remit. These include the conduct of competitive procedures for filling vacant judicial posts in administrative, commercial and general courts of appeal; the assessment of judges’ suitability to hold office; the organisation of the selection procedure for local court judges; and the competition for vacant judicial posts in the High Anti-Corruption Court, among other matters. Particular attention is given to decisions not confirming the capacity of candidates for vacant judicial posts to administer justice in specific courts, together with a summary of the grounds underlying those decisions.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

During 2025, the HQCJU adopted **2,538** decisions on matters falling within its remit under the law.

The HQCJU considered **1,134** cases, including **242** in which authorised representatives of civil society organisations participated.

A total of **594** matters were considered by the plenary session, resulting in the adoption of **802** decisions.

At a special joint meeting of the HQCJU and the PCIE, **2** issues were considered, resulting in the adoption of **7** decisions.

A total of **301** issues were examined by the chambers, resulting in the adoption of **405** decisions.

A total of **237** issues were reviewed by the panels, resulting in the adoption of **1,324** decisions.

During the specified period, the HQCJU considered **252** issues concerning the secondment of judges, of which:

- on the secondment of judges to other courts – **152**;
- on the early termination of judges' secondments/simultaneous secondment to other courts – **95**;
- transfer of judges without a competitive selection procedure – **5**.

Within the framework of competitive procedures for filling vacant judicial positions in appellate courts across all jurisdictions, the HQCJU adopted a total of **480** decisions, including:

- **228** decisions confirming that candidates had demonstrated their ability to administer justice in appellate courts;
- **96** decisions concluding that candidates had not demonstrated the requisite ability to administer justice at the appellate level.

II. Review of HQCJU Decisions on the Results of Competitive Selection for Filling Vacant Judgeships in the General Courts of Appeal

1. General Information

The panels of the HQCJU adopted **193** decisions following the review of candidates' dossiers, the conduct of interviews, and the evaluation of the results of qualification assessments for the position of judge of a general court of appeal. These included:

- **72** decisions confirming that candidates had demonstrated their ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal;
- **40** decisions determining that candidates had failed to demonstrate the requisite ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal;
- **2** decisions to suspend the qualification assessment of a candidate pending the results of a verification conducted by the National Agency on Corruption Prevention (NACP);
- **3** decisions on the termination of a candidate's qualification assessment and participation in the competition;
- **76** decisions to refer the issue to the Commission in plenary session for a final determination on the candidate's ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

In plenary session, the HQCJU adopted **65 decisions** regarding candidates in respect of whom the PIC had issued negative opinions on grounds of non-compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity. Of these decisions:

Sitting in **plenary session**, the HQCJU adopted **65 decisions** regarding candidates in respect of whom the PIC had issued an opinion stating that they did not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity. Of those decisions:

- **53** recognised candidates as having demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal;
- **11** recognised candidates as having failed to demonstrate such ability; and
- **1** terminated a candidate's participation in the competition.

2. Decisions of the HQCJU based on the results of competitive procedures for filling vacant judgeships in the general courts of appeal

Decision of 24.09.2025, No. 179/zp-25

On approval of the ranking of candidates based on the results of the qualification assessment and the determination of competition winners for vacant judgeships in the Sumy Court of Appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-0>)

Decisions of 29.09.2025, Nos 443–461/as-25

On the recommendation for appointment to the position of judge of the Sumy Court of Appeal

Decision of 19.09.2025, No. 172/zp-25

On approval of the ranking of candidates based on the results of the qualification assessment and the determination of winners of the competition for vacant judgeships in the Zhytomyr Court of Appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

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

Decisions of 29.09.2025, Nos 429–442/as-25

On the recommendation for appointment to the position of judge of the Zhytomyr Court of Appeal

Decision of 26.11.2025 No. 206/zp-25

On approval of the ranking of candidates based on the results of qualification assessment and the determination of winners of the competition for vacant judgeships in the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-1>)

Decision of 26.11.2025, No. 206/zp-25

On approval of the ranking of candidates based on the results of the qualification assessment and the determination of winners of the competition for vacant judgeships in the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-1>)

Decisions of 08.12.2025, Nos 606–615/as-25

On the recommendation for appointment to the position of judge of the Zakarpattia Court of Appeal

Decision of 10.12.2025, No. 213/zp-25

On approval of the ranking of candidates based on the results of the qualification assessment and the determination of winners of the competition for vacant judgeships in the Chernihiv Court of Appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-2>)

Decisions of 22.12.2025, Nos 638–659/as-25

On the recommendation for appointment to the position of judge of the Chernihiv Court of Appeal

Decision of 10.12.2025, No. 214/zp-25

On approval of the ranking of candidates based on the results of the qualification assessment and the determination of winners of the competition for vacant judgeships in the Zaporizhzhia Court of Appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-za-rezultatamy-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-3>)

Decisions of 22.12.2025, Nos 660–675/as-25

On the recommendation for appointment to the position of judge of the Zaporizhzhia Court of Appeal

3. Decisions of the HQCJU on non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal

3.1. Decisions of the HQCJU on the non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal on the grounds of non-compliance with personal and social competence criteria

Decision of 17.07.2025, No. 185/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-27>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Yuliia Sokolova, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, the Commission assessed the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence at 35.333 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore unanimously concluded that the candidate did not meet the criterion of personal competence.

The Commission concluded that Yu. Sokolova did not provide convincing examples demonstrating compliance with the "Decisiveness and Responsibility" indicator, which adversely affects her assessment under the personal competence criterion.

Upon examining the candidate's explanations regarding the knowledge acquired through training activities, the Commission determined that the examples cited pertained not to specialised or professionally novel insights but to information that is widely known, including among individuals who do not work in law enforcement. Given the candidate's level of experience, such knowledge should have been acquired earlier in the course of her professional training.

The Commission also notes that the five-year term of office of judge Yu. Sokolova expired on August 01, 2021. During this period, while not administering justice, the candidate had additional opportunities for professional development and for fulfilling her duty to continuously maintain and improve her level of qualification. The position of judge of the court of appeal requires a significantly higher level of knowledge and responsibility. Accordingly, the candidate was expected not only to maintain her previously acquired level of competence but also to actively expand her knowledge and skills in order to properly perform the duties of this post.

Following on the established circumstances, the Commission found that Yu. Sokolova had not taken sufficient steps toward professional development, which negatively affected her personal competence assessment.

Thus, Yu. Sokolova was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 24.07.2025, No. 212/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-14>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Volodymyr Orlov, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following its review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and considering the individual assessments of its members, the Commission determined that the candidate's score for personal competence was 37 out of 50, which is below the 75% threshold (37.5 points). Consequently, the Commission finds that the candidate has not demonstrated sufficient personal competence to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

During the interview, the Commission drew attention to the following issues. In the context of the relevant indicators for this criterion, the Commission discussed with V. Orlov his understanding of the need to take difficult or unpopular decisions, as well as his approach to the grounds for recusal.

One member of the Commission requested that the candidate present examples from his personal life demonstrating determination and a sense of responsibility. The candidate indicated that his significant professional workload afforded him limited opportunity for personal pursuits, and he was therefore unable to identify concrete examples.

When asked what motivates him in his professional activities, particularly in light of statistical data indicating a relatively low number of reconciliations between parties and the absence of acquittals in the cases in which he participated, V. Orlov stated that he derives moral satisfaction from his work as a lawyer, noting that his efforts had contributed to the reduction of sentences.

In light of the foregoing, the information presented by the candidate, both in writing and during the interview, was insufficient to confirm the necessary level of personal competence.

Thus, V. Orlov was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 29.07.2025, No. 227/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-20>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Dmytro Kuznietsov, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The questionnaire provided by the candidate in response to the Commission's request consists predominantly of general phrases and does not include concrete information or relevant examples.

The examples of determination and responsibility cited by the candidate during the interview lacked a clear indication of moral dilemmas or situations requiring difficult decision-making, thus failing to illustrate these qualities in demanding contexts. Furthermore, the candidate did not present any examples indicating engagement in additional overtime work. The situations he described correspond rather to the due fulfilment of his standard official responsibilities.

In seeking to substantiate his compliance with the "continuous development" indicator, the candidate asserted that he engages in ongoing professional development through detailed study of relevant Supreme Court practice, analysis of articles and commentaries by legal practitioners in various professional and thematic outlets, and regular review of judicial practice digests issued by the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, when questioned during the interview about the professional publications he consults, the candidate stated that he does not read any such publications.

In response to a Commission member's question regarding the specific professional events he had attended and the aspects he had found noteworthy, D. Kuznietsov was unable to identify the event by name. He stated merely that it took place in early June 2025 and addressed issues of criminal law.

Therefore, based on the results of the dossier review, the written explanations and the interview, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the personal competence criterion.

During the interview, the candidate responded to nearly all questions in a vague manner, providing very lengthy and largely irrelevant answers. This obliged the Commission members to interrupt him repeatedly and request that he provide specific rather than general responses.

Furthermore, the Commission members reiterated on several occasions that the "effective communication" indicator was being evaluated continuously during the interview rather than solely within the segment devoted to that indicator. Despite these reminders, the candidate's manner of communication did not change.

The Commission therefore found that the candidate is not fully able to understand others' views or to express his own position clearly and consistently.

With respect to the stability of motivation, D. Kuznietsov indicated that his participation in the competition was motivated by aspirations for self-realisation, the attainment of further professional accomplishments, and the prospect of receiving a higher judicial salary. During the interview, however, the candidate was unable to respond promptly to the question posed by the rapporteur concerning the principal purpose of his participation in the competition.

The information submitted by the candidate in his written explanations and during the interview did not attest to an adequate level of social competence.

Accordingly, considering the findings of the dossier review, the written explanations submitted and the interview, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not satisfy the criterion of social competence.

Thus, D. Kuznietsov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 29.07.2025, No. 228/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-29>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Valentyna Malinovska, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the information contained in the dossier and the interview, the candidate's compliance with the personal competence criterion was assessed at 37 points, which is less than 75 per cent of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore unanimously concludes that the candidate does not meet the personal competence criterion.

During the interview, V. Malinovska was unable to give a clear evaluation of the decision that had provoked considerable public reaction and had been the subject of examination by the HCJ. Such a position reflects an inadequate readiness to assume responsibility for the consequences of her own decisions. The candidate's reference to the possibility of an appeal does not negate the duty of a first-instance judge to act decisively and with due care, thoroughly examining the circumstances and rendering a balanced and fair decision.

At the same time, during the interview, the candidate sought to explain the controversial decision solely by reference to external factors and procedural appeal mechanisms, which demonstrates an insufficient willingness to assume personal responsibility in difficult situations.

Having regard to the established circumstances, the Commission determined that V. Malinovska did not sufficiently demonstrate the capacity to recognise her own errors or to take responsibility for the consequences of her decisions. This shortcoming has a negative impact on her assessment in respect of the personal competence criterion.

Thus, the Commission concluded that V. Malinovska was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 29.07.2025, No. 230/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-17>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Vladyslav Kostenko, candidate for

the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, the candidate's written explanations, and the interview, as well as considering the individual assessments of Commission members across the relevant indicators, the candidate received a total of 34 points out of a possible 50 for the criterion of social competence. As this score falls below the 75% threshold (i.e., 37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

During the interview, the Commission identified the following aspects as requiring clarification or raising potential concerns.

The candidate frequently avoided providing direct answers to questions posed by members of the Commission, instead reiterating pre-formulated statements and failing to respond substantively to follow-up inquiries.

The candidate's articulation of the purpose of holding the position of judge of the court of appeal was expressed in abstract terms, lacking specificity and clear reference to the functions and responsibilities inherent to the role.

During the interview, the candidate did not demonstrate the ability to communicate his position clearly and coherently; to justify his views with rational, comprehensive, and consistent arguments; to defend his position effectively or influence the perspectives of others; nor to speak with confidence and persuasiveness before an audience.

In the course of the dialogue with members of the Commission concerning the motives underlying his decision to participate in the competition, V. Kostenko did not demonstrate a sufficient level of self-awareness or clarity regarding his motivation to serve as a judge. In particular, the candidate did not provide a convincing explanation as to why the public objectives he aims to pursue through holding the position of judge of the court of appeal could not be effectively achieved within the framework of his current professional activities.

Decision of 11.08.2025, No. 272/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-31>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksandr Sopianenko, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the review of the dossier, written explanations and interview, and considering the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the candidate obtained 36 points out of a possible 50 for the criterion of social competence, which is

below the 75% threshold (37.5 points). Therefore, the Commission concluded that the candidate does not meet the social competence criterion.

Although the candidate demonstrated a general understanding of the role of effective communication in court proceedings, the Commission considers that he did not present his views in a sufficiently structured or concise manner. His responses were lengthy and contained an excess of details, some of which were not relevant to the questions posed, ultimately making it difficult to discern his main point.

While the candidate claimed to be able to use communication effectively as a tool for interaction, he did not convincingly demonstrate an ability to listen to and understand the views of others, nor to present his own position clearly and in a structured manner. In several cases, the candidate refrained from providing a direct response to questions regarding his capacity to present his views in a clear, logical and concise manner, which constitutes an integral aspect of effective communication. In addition, he did not exhibit persistence in upholding his position, point of view or personal beliefs.

The candidate correctly recognised effective communication as an element of openness and transparency within the judiciary. Nevertheless, his responses did not fully articulate its broader meaning as a two-way, deliberate interaction directed toward mutual understanding and the constructive resolution of issues.

Although the candidate declared in his written explanations a commitment to preventing conflicts among participants in judicial proceedings, his oral responses were largely formalistic. He relied on references to procedural mechanisms and did not articulate his own psychological approaches to addressing conflictual behaviour by participants.

In discussing the candidate's compliance with the social competence criterion in the area of "Effective Interaction", and considering both his professional experience and his likely responses in simulated situations, the Commission found that the candidate did not demonstrate the ability to take effective measures to resolve workplace disputes or to address interpersonal conflicts. Conversely, the candidate's remarks indicate that, when confronted with conflicts, his approach tends to be passive rather than proactive or solution-oriented, thereby limiting his effectiveness in addressing the specific problem.

The candidate's motivation for seeking the position of judge of the general court of appeal, despite his many years of service as a judge of the district administrative court, was formulated in a rather abstract manner. During the interview, the candidate was unable to articulate convincingly the specific goals he would pursue as a judge of the general court of appeal, although he acknowledged the current excessive workload of Ukraine's courts of appeal. Ultimately, during the discussion with Commission members regarding the motives for his participation in the competition, the candidate did not demonstrate motivation to serve as a judge of the court of appeal.

Thus, O. Sopianenko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 14.08.2025, No. 288/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-51>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Victoriia Yevtiushenkova, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Considering the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the candidate received a total of 37 points out of a possible 50 for the criterion of personal competence, which is below the 75% threshold (37.5 points). Therefore, the Commission concluded that the candidate did not demonstrate the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal with respect to the criterion of personal competence.

Based on the results of the dossier review and the interview, the candidate did not demonstrate the required level of determination and responsibility, nor evidence of continuous professional development.

Thus, V. Yevtiushenkova was found to have **failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal.

Decision of 02.10.2025, No. 471/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-79>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Andrii Lytvyn, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 16.5 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

In the questionnaire provided by the Commission, the candidate made only general statements, without providing any specific details or examples.

During the interview, when asked by a member of the Commission about the fundamental principles of the judicial system in Ukraine, the duties of a judge, and the case-law of the Supreme

Court concerning the termination of parental rights, in particular as regards the questioning of minors, the candidate was unable to provide clear answers.

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 34.5 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of social competence.

Thus, A. Lytvyn was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal.

Decision of 03.10.2025, No. 473/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-102>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Larysa Dubyna, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 29.25 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concludes that the candidate, L. Dubyna, has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

During the interview, the candidate was repeatedly asked to provide examples of determination and responsibility drawn from her personal or professional life. L. Dubyna failed to provide a convincing response.

During the interview with L. Dubyna, the members of the panel asked several questions to assess her knowledge of the material and procedural law relevant to the area of specialisation she had chosen for the post of judge at the general court of appeal. The candidate was unable to provide clear and comprehensive answers to some of those questions.

Despite attempts to pursue a career in related areas of legal practice, including work as a legal adviser and the acquisition of a licence to practise as a solicitor, the lack of experience in representing clients before the courts and the discontinuation of legal practice for personal reasons mean that this period cannot be regarded as constituting a full application of the principle of continuous professional development.

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 36.5 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concludes that the candidate, L. Dubyna, has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of social competence.

When asked by a member of the Commission whether further professional adaptation was necessary, given that the current caseload remains high or has even increased, new categories of cases have emerged, and legal practice has become more complex, the candidate failed to provide a clear and substantive response. Her only argument was a reference to her emotional and physical readiness for new challenges, as well as her many years of judicial experience. Such a response does not sufficiently demonstrate a sound understanding of the current realities of the judicial system or of the specific ways in which adaptation to those realities would be required. This is an important consideration in assessing the candidate's readiness to resume her duties as a judge in the court of appeal.

The Commission notes that the written explanations and the answers provided during the interview do not clearly justify the candidate's wish to exercise judicial functions specifically at the court of appeal. While the candidate elaborated in detail on her general desire to continue working in the judicial system and to pursue her professional development, she did not specify what motivated her to serve at the court of appeal or how she envisaged her professional development in that context. The absence of a clear demonstration of such motivation adversely affects the candidate's assessment under the criterion of social competence.

Thus, L. Dubyna was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 09.10.2025, No. 481/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-101>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Nataliia Nahorna, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its assessment of the written explanations and other materials included in the dossier, the interview with the candidate, and the individual assessments of the panel members against the relevant criteria, the Commission awarded a total score of 35.67 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concludes that the candidate has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

The candidate explained that, in her capacity as a lawyer, she had on several occasions witnessed informal discussions between a judge and a prosecutor aimed at coordinating their positions on sentencing and related matters. However, from her replies to the Commission's follow-up questions, it emerged that, despite having witnessed such interactions, the candidate did not consider it necessary to react in the manner prescribed by law.

Considering the circumstances established during the interview and the candidate's position in that regard, the Commission considers that N. Nahorna failed not only to demonstrate decisive and responsible action in response to the instances of alleged interference with judicial independence that she had reported, but also to demonstrate a theoretical understanding of the fundamental guarantees of judicial independence.

Moreover, notwithstanding the circumstances she described, the candidate did not demonstrate a readiness to respond to situations which, in her view, indicated interference with judicial independence. Nor did she provide examples of such action or demonstrate an understanding of the mechanisms for safeguarding judicial independence.

Furthermore, in response to a question from the panel concerning a hypothetical situation in which the candidate was already serving as a judge and one of the members of the judicial panel engaged in extra-procedural communication, in particular with a prosecutor, the candidate stated that she would consider the issue of that judge's impartiality. At the same time, she indicated that she would not intend to take any further action or submit any report, despite sitting alongside that judge in the collegial examination of the case.

In the light of the above, the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated a sufficient level of determination and responsibility. Although aware of potential breaches of the principle of judicial independence, she did not demonstrate a readiness to take timely decisions in response to such situations and appeared inclined to avoid taking personal responsibility for responding to identified breaches in the future.

Furthermore, during the interview, the candidate failed to demonstrate the necessary ability to take difficult and unpopular decisions, which constitutes an integral part of the criterion of decisiveness and responsibility.

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the panel members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 36 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75%

of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

During the interview with the candidate, the Commission discussed the decision of the PIC of September 30, 2025, to provide information to the Commission concerning grounds suggesting that the candidate may have benefited from unlawfully acquired property.

The matter under examination concerned the circumstances in which PERSON_1 had committed the offence of fraud. By judgment of the Koroliovskiy District Court of Zhytomyr of December 09, 2019, in Case No 296/336/12-k, PERSON_1 was found guilty of offences under the Criminal Code of Ukraine.

At the outset of the interview, while explaining the general circumstances set out in the court judgment, the applicant was unable to maintain her composure or control her emotions. As a result, the head of the panel was obliged to adjourn the proceedings to allow her to regain her composure.

Although the questions put to the candidate were neither difficult nor provocative and were asked in a polite and respectful manner, her reaction was excessively emotional, making it necessary to suspend the interview temporarily.

In the light of the above, the Commission considers that the candidate's conduct during the interview, in particular the inability to control their emotions in a stressful situation, indicates a failure to meet the criterion of social competence as regards emotional stability.

Thus, N. Nahorna was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 16.10.2025, No. 492/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-111>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Kostiantyn Dokiichuk, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and considering the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 31.67 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concludes that the candidate, K. Dokiichuk, has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

In the Commission's view, the examples of responsibility cited by the candidate reflect the routine performance of his duties as head of legal departments or as a solicitor prior to 2011, while the examples of decisiveness are described without clearly demonstrating the existence of an ethical dilemma or the need to take decisions in complex circumstances. Furthermore, the candidate did not provide examples illustrating situations in which he had made every effort to resolve issues.

In the context of continuous professional development, and following an examination of the case-law of the Supreme Court and the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, the members of the Commission asked the candidate to explain his understanding of the concept of judicial activism and to provide possible examples of its application. The candidate was unable to provide a clear answer.

Also, the candidate was unable to answer a question concerning amendments to the Law of Ukraine "On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges" and certain other legislative acts of Ukraine aimed at improving the procedures for the adoption and pronouncement of court decisions, in particular the abolition of the deliberation chamber in civil, commercial and administrative proceedings.

In the Commission's view, the information provided by the candidate during the interview does not demonstrate continuous professional development. It does not include examples of the systematic improvement of professional standards, the acquisition of new knowledge or skills, participation in training programmes, or other activities aimed at professional development. The information provided is predominantly general in nature and relates mainly to the candidate's past experience, which does not demonstrate adherence to the principle of continuous professional development.

Thus, K. Dokiichuk was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal.

Decision of 04.11.2025, No. 537/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-143>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Andrii Traiduk, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 32 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below

75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission considers that the candidate, A. Traiduk, does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

In the questionnaire provided by the Commission, the candidate has included only general statements, without providing any specific details or examples.

The candidate was unable to answer the Commission's question concerning the Engel criteria and their scope of application.

The candidate also failed to demonstrate knowledge of the relevant case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, which constitutes an essential element of the knowledge required of a judge at any level of jurisdiction.

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 32.25 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission considers that the candidate, A. Traiduk, does not meet the criterion of social competence.

In his written explanations and during the interview, the candidate did not demonstrate a sufficient level of social competence.

Thus, A. Traiduk was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal.

Decision of 20.11.2025, No. 577/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-167>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Nataliia Zubar, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and considering the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 35.5 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

In the Commission's view, the candidate's explanations reflect complete indifference to public reaction to court rulings and to the way in which such rulings are perceived by the public. Although a judge must take decisions in accordance with the law and their inner conviction, the candidate's expressed and principled indifference to public opinion may indicate a lack of awareness of the importance of public trust in the justice system as a key element of integrity and compliance with standards of judicial ethics.

Furthermore, the candidate consistently equates public opinion with negativity or smear campaigns, which may indicate a preconceived bias against the public. In the Commission's view, such an approach is incompatible with the requirements of judicial impartiality and with the role of a judge in upholding and strengthening public confidence in the judiciary.

The content of the candidate's explanations concerning the circumstances surrounding her failure to fulfil the obligation laid down in Article 89 of the Act indicates a lack of sufficient awareness of her responsibility to uphold professional standards.

In the light of the above, the Commission notes that the candidate has not demonstrated the requisite level of determination. On the basis of its review of the dossier, the written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and considering the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 35.67 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concluded that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

In response to a question concerning communication as a means of strengthening public confidence in the judiciary, the candidate stated that this was 'a matter for the legislature' and not her personal responsibility. The Commission emphasises that such a position may indicate an insufficient understanding of the professional role of a judge and of the personal responsibility for fostering public confidence in the justice system. A refusal to assume responsibility for communication and engagement with the public may contribute to weakening the authority of the judiciary and diminishing public trust.

She stated that she may react emotionally during court proceedings, including by crying during a hearing or expressing sympathy. She further explained that her restraint in the expression of emotions does not result from self-control or the use of specific techniques, but rather from gradual emotional exhaustion, which over time reduces her responsiveness to the problems of others. In addition, N. Zubar referred to instances in which her emotional reactions had led parties to the proceedings to lodge complaints, including motions for recusal submitted by victims. In the Commission's view, these circumstances may give rise to a risk that the judge's conduct could be perceived as biased on account of such displays of emotion.

In the light of the above circumstances, the Commission considers that the candidate's lack of emotional resilience constitutes a significant factor affecting her social competence, in particular

her ability to respond objectively and impartially to the participants in the proceedings, to prevent conflicts, and to ensure public confidence in the court.

Thus, N. Zubar was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 27.11.2025, No. 589/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-172>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Kseniia Batrak, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

On the basis of its review of the candidate's file, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members against the relevant indicators, the Commission awarded a total score of 34.67 out of a possible 50 for this criterion. As this is below 75% of the maximum possible score, namely 37.5 points, the Commission concludes that the candidate has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

The Commission established that a person engaged in self-employed professional activity had failed to declare the income received.

Thus, K. Batrak was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

3.2. Decisions of the HQCIU on the non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the general court of appeal on the grounds of non-compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics

Decision of 15.07.2025, No. 175/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyiperevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-4>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Viktor Mokretskyi, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission found that the value of the property acquired in 2024 by the candidate for judicial office and by members of his family did not correspond to their income. The candidate incurred expenses that were inconsistent with his declared income.

Having regard to the circumstances set out above, the Commission concludes that the candidate has not demonstrated compliance with the criteria relating to the legality of the sources of his property and that his standard of living is not commensurate with his declared income. For these reasons, he is awarded 0 points under the relevant criteria. As a result, the Commission finds that the candidate does not satisfy the integrity and professional ethics criteria.

Thus, V. Mokretskyi was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal based on the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Decision of 15.07.2025, No. 173/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyiperevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-6>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleh Rudenko, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

During the interview, the Commission asked the candidate to explain the economic rationale for the transaction by which his wife purchased an AUDI A6 for UAH 497,559.74 on May 13, 2022, and subsequently sold it for UAH 120,000.00 on December 23, 2022.

O. Rudenko clarified that neither he nor his wife had in fact purchased the AUDI A6 vehicle. He indicated that the transaction had been carried out by close relatives involved in commercial activities related to the purchase and sale of automobiles, who used their own funds to acquire and later sell the vehicle pursuant to a power of attorney issued by his wife.

In the Commission's view, the actions of third parties involving the candidate's spouse constituted not only a disregard of the general principles of civil law, such as freedom of contract and good

faith, but also a breach of tax legislation, which would have resulted in the State not receiving tax payments from transactions involving the sale and purchase of vehicles.

The candidate's explanations indicate that he was fully aware of the nature of the activities of the persons who proposed entering into a transaction bearing signs of a sham arrangement, as well as of the consequences of his spouse entering into such a transaction. The Commission considers that the candidate was also aware of the specific tax treatment applicable to vehicle sale and purchase transactions and, importantly, that the involvement of his spouse in the transaction enabled a third party to avoid the obligation to pay the relevant tax.

The candidate did not provide information regarding the systematic nature of such actions. However, the Commission notes that the vehicles "Fiat Freemont" and "MAZDA 3", as well as the vehicle "AUDI A6", were owned by the candidate and his spouse for less than one year during the same period. At the same time, the Commission established that the candidate and his spouse did not have sufficient funds to acquire these vehicles.

Taking into account the established circumstances and the conclusion that the candidate does not meet the criteria of the qualification assessment, the candidate is to be assigned a score of 0 points under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics. This constitutes grounds for finding that he has failed to demonstrate the ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating the qualification assessment.

Thus, O. Rudenko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Decision of 07.08.2025 No. 262/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-54>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Yurii Leshchenko, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Between 04.09.2020 and 09.06.2025, the candidate was held administratively liable on 22 occasions. An analysis of data from the Unified State Register of Vehicles suggests a pattern of administrative offences related to speeding and parking violations while driving a 2007 TOYOTA CAMRY. The totality of the established facts (22 incidents over nearly five years) indicates the recurring nature of such conduct rather than isolated or incidental violations. The Commission notes that, given the high public status of a judge, compliance with traffic rules has not only a legal but also an ethical dimension, as it reflects respect for the law, the safety of other road users, and public discipline.

The Commission, sitting as a panel, unanimously decided that the above circumstances indicate a significant breach of the indicator “compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life” within the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

The income declared by the candidate from the provision of legal services, when compared with the level of his expenses necessary to support his family’s living needs, raises reasonable doubts as to the accuracy of the information provided. Such discrepancies may indicate the possible existence of undeclared income or other sources of funding not reflected in the declarations.

For a judge, who must serve as an example of compliance with the law and moral standards, even isolated instances of lack of transparency in financial matters are capable of undermining public trust in the judiciary as a whole. In this regard, the Commission considers the above facts as constituting a substantial non-compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity, resulting in a score of 0 points under the indicator “compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life”. This constitutes an independent ground for finding that the candidate has failed to demonstrate the ability to administer justice in the relevant court.

Thus, Yu. Leshchenko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 07.08.2025 No. 265/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-50>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oksana Kosohor, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission emphasises that the obligation to submit a declaration is not merely of a formal nature but constitutes an element of the ethical conduct of a judge and a candidate, in particular demonstrating readiness to comply with the rules and procedures established by law and the Commission’s regulatory acts. The candidate’s reference to having “forgotten” to submit the declaration cannot be regarded as a circumstance relieving her of responsibility, as the timeliness and completeness of fulfilling such obligations constitute a basic manifestation of diligence and professional ethics.

At the same time, the Commission dismisses the candidate’s arguments as to why she “forgot” to submit the declaration.

On 30.04.2024, the candidate submitted the integrity declaration of a candidate for the position of judge for 2023. In statement No. 6 (“I have timely submitted the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government, which contains accurate information”), O. Kosohor marked “Confirmed”, which also indicates inaccurate declaration.

A judge (candidate for the position of judge) meets the indicator of honesty if, inter alia, he or she has provided accurate information known to him or her in the integrity declarations of a judge (integrity declarations of a candidate for the position of judge), declarations of family ties of a judge (declarations of family ties of a candidate for the position of judge), and declarations of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government, of which he or she should be aware. In this particular case, the Commission assesses the above circumstances as grounds for finding that the candidate has failed to demonstrate the ability to administer justice in the relevant court.

Thus, O. Kosohor was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 07.08.2025 No. 266/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-41>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Valerii Buran, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission takes into account that the High Council of Justice established that judge V. Buran committed violations of procedural law in the administration of justice, which prevented a party to the proceedings from exercising procedural rights and fulfilling procedural obligations. At the same time, his actions resulted in a number of other adverse consequences, including a breach of Ukraine’s obligations under the New York Convention and a negative impact on the assessment of the performance of judicial authorities by Ukraine’s international partners.

The statement of judge V. Buran that he made an error in adjudicating the case raises reasonable doubt. Such doubt is due that he had previously examined a similar application for establishing a legally significant fact in legal relations bearing the characteristics of commercial matters. The relevant decision of the candidate was set aside. Subsequently, the judge reconsidered a similar application and again adopted a decision which was later set aside and served as grounds for his disciplinary liability.

The Commission concluded that the nature of the case, the significant amount of property rights involved, the speed of consideration, the failure to involve all interested parties, and the judge’s awareness of the inadmissibility of examining such cases under separate proceedings indicate the seriousness of the violations committed by the candidate. Therefore, the Commission concluded that V. Buran does not meet the indicator of “diligence”.

Taking into account the established circumstances and the conclusion that the candidate does not meet the criteria of the qualification assessment, the candidate was assigned a score of 0 points under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics. This constitutes grounds for finding that he

has failed to demonstrate the ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating the qualification assessment.

Thus, V. Buran was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 12.08.2025 No. 282/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-57>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Halyna Panchenko, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission notes that H. Panchenko's visits to the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine, in the absence of urgent necessity, indicate a lack of a clear civic position as a judge (candidate for the position of judge) regarding the occupation by the Russian Federation of part of Ukraine, as well as a disregard for violations by the Russian Federation of the rights and freedoms of Ukrainian citizens in the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine, and, consequently, non-compliance with the requirements of the Code of Judicial Ethics and the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct.

Although such actions are not unlawful, they do not correspond to the status of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State. Compliance by a sitting judge with the rules and regulations imposed by the occupying power in the temporarily occupied territories may adversely affect the authority of the judiciary and public trust in justice.

Based on the candidate's explanations, no critical or urgent life circumstances requiring her personal presence in those territories, which could not have been addressed otherwise, were established. Therefore, the Commission concluded that H. Panchenko does not meet the integrity criterion under the indicator "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life".

Thus, H. Panchenko was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 17.09.2025 No. 408/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtvrdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-nikitchuka-igorya-ivanovycha>)

On confirming the ability of Ihor Nikitchuk, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The candidate did not indicate in his declarations income derived from legal practice.

The Commission considers that the candidate has not dispelled reasonable doubts regarding the provision of legal services free of charge. According to data from the State Tax Service, I. Nikitchuk received income over the past three years which, in the opinion of the Commission members, did not allow him to maintain a sufficient standard of living and cover basic household needs. The candidate stated that he often provided legal services pro bono to clients (namely, enterprises operating in the agricultural sector). In response to questions from the Commission regarding fees and other income, the candidate referred only to the following: salary as the head of a company providing legal services (without confirming the existence of contracts with counterparties) and the provision of legal services free of charge. When asked to clarify the purpose of such activities, the candidate explained that this constituted a guaranteed opportunity to obtain additional benefits from such companies in the future.

In the Commission's view, such arrangements may be regarded as transactions carried out without monetary consideration and without a defined value. Having assessed the above and other circumstances relating to the declaration of the candidate's income and the taxes paid thereon, the Commission expresses doubts as to the good faith of the candidate's income declarations, which does not allow it to consider him as meeting the integrity criteria under the indicators of "honesty" and "consistency between the standard of living of the candidate (or his family members) and the declared income".

Thus, I. Nikitchuk was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 20.10.2025 No. 507/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-golovka-myhayla-borysovycha-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of Mykhailo Holovko, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

According to data from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, during the period from 16.09.2014 to 22.09.2014, M. Holovko filed 14 claims with the Solomianskyi District Court of Kyiv against the Security Service of Ukraine (hereinafter - the SSU) with similar claims. Eleven of these claims were subsequently withdrawn by the claimant.

Having heard the candidate's explanations and examined the information available in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, the Commission, sitting in plenary, assesses the above circumstances in light of non-compliance with two indicators of the Unified Indicators for assessing the integrity and professional ethics of a judge (candidate for the position of judge), namely "honesty" and "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life".

The inconsistency and contradictory nature of the candidate's explanations regarding the withdrawal of the claims, as well as an apparent lack of interest in clarifying these circumstances, in the view of the Commission sitting in plenary, indicate non-compliance with the "honesty" indicator.

Furthermore, the identified facts of possible abuse of procedural rights, which may be associated with manipulation of the automated case allocation system among judges, indicate non-compliance with the indicator "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life".

Thus, M. Holovko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 20.10.2025 No. 504/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-olashyna-volodymyra-volodymyrovycha>)

On confirming the ability of Volodymyr Olashyn, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

During the period from 2009 to 2015, the candidate, acting as a lawyer, represented the interests of his clients (PERSON_1, PERSON_2, PERSON_3, PERSON_4, PERSON_5, PERSON_6 and PERSON_7) in courts, as indicated in his application for the position of judge. However, according to information from the State Register of Individuals – Taxpayers, the candidate did not receive any income during 2009–2015.

Having heard the explanations of V. Olashyn, the Commission, sitting in plenary, concluded that such conduct, from the perspective of a reasonable observer, may be perceived as lacking transparency and as potentially indicating the concealment of fees for legal services during a certain period.

In his asset declarations for the period 2016-2024, the candidate declared annual income significantly lower than the average level of expenditures in Zakarpattia region for the same period. V. Olashyn explained that during 2016-2024 he was financially supported by his parents and sister, as he lived with them as one household and therefore did not rely solely on his own income.

The Commission concludes that the information provided on the candidate's income, from the perspective of a reasonable observer, raises doubts as to its truthfulness, accuracy and completeness.

On 22.07.2020, the candidate purchased a 2009 Volkswagen Golf for UAH 206,000. The value of the vehicle exceeded the candidate's officially declared income for the previous ten years. According to the candidate's asset declarations and information from the State Register of

Individuals - Taxpayers, during the period from 2009 to the first half of 2020, the candidate officially earned UAH 183,381.7, which is less than the cost of the vehicle.

During the plenary session, the candidate explained that the vehicle had been purchased primarily with his savings and partly with funds provided by his parents. He also noted that, according to income certificates of his family, their total income during this period amounted to UAH 1,427,342.57 and, in his view, it was therefore possible to accumulate funds for the purchase of the vehicle.

The Commission concludes that such conduct, from the perspective of a reasonable observer, may be perceived as lacking transparency and as potentially indicating the concealment of fees for legal services during a certain period, as also reflected, inter alia, in the opinion of the Public Integrity Council.

Taking the above into account, the Commission, sitting in plenary, notes the existence of reasonable doubts regarding the information provided by the candidate on his financial situation. In addition, the deficiencies in the candidate's declarations indicate a degree of inattention, negligence and insufficient responsibility in the performance of legally significant obligations. Such conduct, even if committed in good faith, may be regarded as demonstrating a lack of internal discipline, accuracy and a tendency to underestimate formal requirements of accountability, which are essential qualities for a judge.

Thus, V. Olashyn was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Decision of 25.10.2025 No. 521/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-125>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleh Kimstachov, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission and the Public Council of International Experts (PCIE) assessed all the above circumstances and concluded that, in the past, the candidate's low level of organisation of judicial proceedings resulted in serious violations of the rights of the parties and adversely affected the authority of the judiciary. The explanations and assurances provided by the candidate regarding his ability to properly organise case management in the future did not convince the Commission and the PCIE. The Commission and the PCIE consider that the candidate's difficulties in organising his work were systemic and manifested in various forms (including missed procedural time limits and delays in preparing full texts of judicial decisions), which may indicate insufficient managerial skills and a risk of recurrence of similar shortcomings.

In view of the above, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the "diligence" indicator under the integrity criterion.

As a judge of the Uman City District Court of Cherkasy region, on 07.02.2017 the candidate adopted a decision on the merits in civil case No. 705/47/17, granting the claim in full. The claimant in that case was a person who, at the time of filing the claim, held the position of a judge of the same court. At the same time, pursuant to Article 108(1) of the Civil Procedure Code of Ukraine (as in force at the time), jurisdiction in civil cases where one of the parties is a court or a judge of that court is determined by a ruling of a judge of a higher-level court without summoning the parties. The candidate did not comply with this requirement.

Accordingly, the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the "impartiality" indicator under the integrity criterion.

In view of significant discrepancies between the information in the candidate's asset declaration for 2023 and his explanations regarding the source of a gift received in the form of cryptocurrency (stablecoin), the Commission and the PCIE have reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator under the integrity criterion.

The Commission notes that, during the special joint meetings of the Commission and the PCIE in 2019 and 2025, the candidate provided explanations regarding the reasons for his resignation from the position of judge of the Uman City District Court of Cherkasy region that differed in substance.

In view of the above, the Commission concludes that the actions of O. Kimstachov indicate non-compliance with the principles of honesty, transparency and openness, which form part of the integrity criterion for a judge.

Thus, O. Kimstachov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 11.11.2025 No. 549/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-155>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksii Starikov, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

A significant number of administrative cases closed due to the expiry of the time limits for imposing administrative penalties may be regarded as indicative of insufficient internal discipline, accuracy, and a tendency to underestimate the importance of formal requirements of accountability, which are essential qualities for a judge. Accordingly, the Commission, sitting as a panel, considers that there are grounds to reduce the candidate's score under the "diligence" indicator within the criteria of professional ethics and integrity by 15 points.

On 26.03.2025, the Third Disciplinary Chamber of the High Council of Justice initiated disciplinary proceedings against the judge on the grounds of indications of a disciplinary offence under paragraph 2 of part one of Article 106 of the Law (unjustified delays or failure by a judge to take measures to examine an application, complaint or case within the time limits established by law, delays in preparing a reasoned judicial decision, and untimely provision of a copy of a judicial decision for its inclusion in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions). By decision of the Third Disciplinary Chamber of the High Council of Justice dated 03.09.2025, O. Starikov was held disciplinarily liable and sanctioned with a warning. Accordingly, the Commission, sitting as a panel, considers that there are grounds to reduce the candidate's score under the "diligence" indicator by 15 points.

The Commission concluded that the deficiencies in the candidate's declarations are not incompatible with holding the office of a judge; however, they indicate insufficient diligence in complying with anti-corruption legislation. Accordingly, these deficiencies affect the candidate's score under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity, namely under the "diligence" indicator. Therefore, the Commission, sitting as a panel, decided to reduce the score under this indicator by 15 points.

In providing explanations, Judge Starikov demonstrated, *inter alia*, an insufficient level of knowledge of the legislation governing his professional duties as a judge. Furthermore, by shifting responsibility for the consequences of failing to fulfil his judicial duty to sign the electronic version of a decision onto his assistant, the judge demonstrated an inability to assume responsibility for his own actions. Such conduct, from the perspective of a reasonable observer, may be perceived as irresponsible and as undermining the authority of the judiciary. Therefore, the Commission, sitting as a panel, considers that there are grounds to reduce the candidate's score under the indicator "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life" by 30 points.

Given that the candidate failed to provide, apart from receipts for the purchase of car parts, supporting documents to dispel the reasonable doubts expressed by the Public Integrity Council regarding the lawfulness of the source of funds used to acquire the vehicle, the Commission agrees with the opinion of the Public Integrity Council in this respect. Such conduct, from the perspective of a reasonable observer, may be perceived as lacking transparency and as potentially indicating concealment of the actual value of the property. Accordingly, the Commission, sitting as a panel, decided to reduce the candidate's score under the indicator "lawfulness of the origin of rights to civil law objects" by 15 points.

As a result of the assessment of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, as well as voting during the closed deliberations on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under these criteria amounted to 210 out of a possible 300 points, which is below 75% (225 points) of the maximum score.

In view of the above, the Commission concludes that O. Starikov does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of "honesty", "diligence", "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life", and "lawfulness of the origin of assets".

Thus, O. Starikov was found **to have failed to confirm his ability** to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 11.11.2025 No. 548/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-140>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksandr Kutsenko, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Taken together, the circumstances established by the Commission, including the repeated transfer by the candidate and his family members of vehicles through powers of attorney instead of concluding proper transactions, the submission of inaccurate or incomplete information in declarations over different years, discrepancies between actual data and the income amounts declared, and the absence of documentary evidence confirming the origin of significant funds used for disposal or gifting, indicate patterns of non-compliance with the requirements of anti-corruption legislation of Ukraine.

In view of the above, the Commission concludes that the actions of O. Kutsenko indicate non-compliance with the principles of honesty, transparency and openness, which form part of the integrity criterion for a judge.

The totality of the established facts provides the Commission with reasonable grounds to doubt the candidate's compliance with the "honesty" indicator, which in turn is sufficient to consider him as not meeting the criteria of integrity and professional ethics. Accordingly, following the assessment of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, as well as voting during the closed deliberations on the relevant indicator, the total score obtained under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity amounts to 0 out of a possible 300 points.

Thus, O. Kutsenko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 24.11.2025 No. 579/as-25

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

On confirming the ability of Ruslan Uliyanov, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The candidate used offensive language towards other persons and did not adhere to standards of ethical communication. R.Ulianov repeatedly posted comments of an inappropriate nature on the social network “Facebook” and demonstrated a hostile attitude towards representatives of the journalistic community. In addition, while exercising his powers as a deputy of the Kremenchuk City Council, he used statements in public discussions that may be regarded as having elements of sexism.

The candidate’s acknowledgment of the inappropriateness of his public conduct, as well as his reference to having significantly changed his views regarding public statements and communication on social media, may be regarded as a positive development in his behaviour. At the same time, the explanations provided by R. Ulianov do not refute the circumstances set out in the opinion of the Public Integrity Council, which indicate that the candidate’s conduct did not comply with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics in the context of strict adherence to professional ethical standards and generally accepted moral norms of behaviour (indicator “compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life”).

Thus, R. Ulianov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 24.11.2025 No. 582/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-kolomiyec-nataliyi-volodymyrivny>)

On confirming the ability of Nataliia Kolomiets, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

N. Kolomiets did not provide convincing evidence to substantiate her explanations regarding the origin of funds used for the acquisition of three apartments and two vehicles during the period 2020-2024.

The above circumstances give rise to reasonable doubts as to the candidate’s compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator “lawfulness of the origin of rights to civil law objects”, in particular as regards whether the value of the assets acquired by the judge (candidate for the position of judge) and/or her family members corresponds to the amount of income received from lawful sources in the periods preceding the acquisition of such assets (subparagraph 2, paragraph 21 of the Unified Indicators).

Thus, N. Kolomiets was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 26.11.2025 No. 587/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-mashkinoyi-natali-vasylivny-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of Nataliia Mashkina, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The materials of the judicial dossier contain information that, during the period from 2015 to 2017, N. Mashkina repeatedly crossed the line of contact with the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine, namely the city of Donetsk. In particular, she made 14 trips in 2015, 23 trips in 2016, and 14 trips in 2017. It was also established that N. Mashkina crossed the administrative boundary with the temporarily occupied territories in the capacity of a driver.

In light of the explanations provided by the candidate, the Commission, sitting in plenary, considers that N. Mashkina's visits to the city of Donetsk were not of an urgent nature and were not due to critical or unavoidable life circumstances requiring her personal presence in the temporarily occupied territory. The Commission further notes that there were realistic and available alternative means of resolving the matters referred to by the candidate, and that the frequency (approximately twice per month) and total number of trips (51) do not correspond to the nature of urgent or exceptional situations.

Accordingly, the circumstances invoked by N. Mashkina to justify the need to visit the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine, in the view of the Commission sitting in plenary, do not meet the above criteria.

Having examined the opinion of the Public Integrity Council, the written explanations and the explanations provided by N. Mashkina during the interview, the Commission, sitting in plenary, concluded that the candidate has not dispelled reasonable doubts regarding her compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity under the indicator "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life", in connection with her visits to the temporarily occupied territory of the city of Donetsk on the grounds set out in the decision.

Thus, N. Mashkina was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 27.11.2025 No. 590/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-165>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Liudmyla Krasnopolska, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission established that the value of assets acquired by L. Krasnopolska, taking into account income from the sale of a land plot (UAH 98,108) and the transfer of a 2023 TOYOTA YARIS CROSS vehicle to a car dealership (UAH 810,000), exceeds the income received from lawful sources by UAH 800,000.

The Commission has reasonable doubts as to whether the standard of living of L. Krasnopolska corresponds to her declared income.

Given that L. Krasnopolska did not provide convincing explanations regarding the consistency of her standard of living with her declared income, the Commission concluded that there are reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator "lawfulness of the origin of assets, consistency between the standard of living of the judge (candidate for the position of judge) or their family members and the declared income, and consistency of the judge's lifestyle with their status".

Thus, L. Krasnopolska was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 01.12.2025 No. 598/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-yacuna-oleksandra-sergiyovycha>)

On confirming the ability of Oleksandr Yatsun, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission, sitting in plenary and having deliberated on the matter, concludes that the manner in which O. Yatsun acquired the apartment gives rise to public distrust in the judiciary as a whole. The candidate's conduct is considered by the Commission to indicate a lack of integrity and the use of the judicial position for personal interests.

The candidate does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of "diligence" and "honesty" (subparagraphs 3 and 4 of paragraph 19, subparagraph 6 of paragraph 18 of the Unified Indicators).

Based on the analysis of data from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, using the search queries "child", "guardianship", and "parental", for the period from 01.03.2022, it was established that O. Yatsun adopted 263 judicial decisions in categories of cases of significant public importance. A selective analysis of decisions in these categories indicates that, in a number of cases, O. Yatsun did not fully perform his duties with due diligence and competence.

Without assessing the substance of judicial decisions, the Commission established, inter alia, that the decisions do not demonstrate that O. Yatsun took all necessary measures to ensure a comprehensive and thorough examination of the factual circumstances.

Thus, O. Yatsun was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 01.12.2025 No. 599/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-cebryka-lyubomyra-vasylovycha>)

On confirming the ability of Liubomyr Tsebryk, candidate for the position of judge, to administer justice in a general court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The candidate did not dispel reasonable doubts regarding the sufficiency of financial resources of himself and his family members (parents) for the construction of a residential building with a total area of 319.3 sq. m. During the plenary session, the candidate provided somewhat inconsistent information: initially stating that the house had been built using joint funds of himself and his parents, and subsequently indicating that the construction had been fully financed by him personally.

In support of his ability to finance the construction, the candidate referred to income amounts indicated in the reports of a small business entity - an individual taxpayer - for the period 2009-2011. However, he did not clarify the actual income received, as the tax reports reflect only gross revenue from the sale of goods (works, services), which cannot be equated with net income. The candidate also failed to provide information on the contractual basis under which he received significant income during certain periods included in the tax reporting, or on the clients of his services. His explanations regarding the sharp decrease in income after 2011 were not found to be convincing.

Thus, L. Tsebryk was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

3.3 Decisions of the HQCJ on non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal due to non-compliance with the aggregate indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence, as well as integrity and professional ethics

Decision of 31.07.2025 No. 240/as-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-18>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Serhii Lukianchuk, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The example provided by the candidate to demonstrate his decisiveness and responsibility is described without a clear indication of a moral dilemma or the need to take decisions in challenging circumstances. The candidate did not provide examples of additional or above-standard efforts undertaken by him. The example cited relates exclusively to his own property interests which, in the Commission's view, in the absence of other examples, cannot confirm his compliance with the criterion of personal competence. Furthermore, the candidate did not substantiate why this decision should be considered complex or unpopular, as the protection of one's own property interests is a natural course of action and does not necessarily involve internal conflict. The candidate's reference to the possible imposition of penalties is also not regarded by the Commission as evidence of responsibility, as it again relates to his personal interests and the avoidance of negative consequences for himself.

In paragraph 2.5 of section 2 "Education" of the candidate's application form, S. Lukianchuk indicated that he had not participated in professional development activities. During the interview, in response to a question from a member of the Commission, he was unable to provide a clear explanation for not completing this section, stating only that it was his oversight and that he could not explain the reasons for it.

In the context of the candidate's references to administrative court claims mentioned in his questionnaire with regard to the indicators of "determination" and "responsibility", he was unable to answer a question posed by the reporting member of the Commission concerning a judgment of the European Court of Human Rights illustrating the concept of good governance. Accordingly, during the interview the Commission had reasonable doubts as to the candidate's sufficient compliance with the "continuous development" indicator.

During the interview, it was established that the candidate had been employed on a part-time basis as an agronomy technologist at Fastiv Agro LLC. The candidate confirmed that he did not have an educational background in agronomy, did not perform agronomist functions, and was formally employed as such due to the absence of a legal counsel position in the company's staffing structure. At the same time, his salary for 2024 in the amount of UAH 3,851 indicates that he did not perform legal counsel functions either, as this amount clearly does not correspond to the remuneration level for such a position. When asked by members of the Commission what his actual duties at Fastiv Agro LLC were, the candidate did not provide convincing explanations.

These circumstances indicate that S. Lukianchuk effectively entered into an employment arrangement without a genuine intention to perform duties thereunder, as evidenced by his income, the absence of the relevant qualifications, and his own explanations.

Entering into such an arrangement without the intention to perform the corresponding duties is considered by the Commission to indicate non-compliance with the “honesty” indicator. In view of the above, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the “honesty” indicator.

Thus, S. Lukianchuk was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 07.10.2025 No. 477/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-86>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Vira Husarova, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the review of the candidate’s dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 36.63 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

Given that V. Husarova served as a judge until 2024, her stated motivation for applying for the position of a judge of a general court of appeal was formulated in rather abstract terms. During the interview, the candidate was unable to provide a convincing response regarding her vision of the role of an appellate court judge and did not demonstrate sufficient awareness of her motivation for assuming such a position.

Examples from the candidate’s professional activity, taken together with the explanations provided, did not convince the Commission members that she meets the expected minimum characteristics demonstrating a conscious and well-founded decision to become a judge of an appellate court.

The candidate has devoted sufficient attention to building a positive professional image as a judge of a local court and to professional training in order to be prepared to effectively perform the duties of an appellate court judge.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations and interview, and the results of voting during the closed deliberations, the total score obtained under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics amounted to 210 out of a possible 300 points, which is below 75% (225 points)

of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

V. Husarova demonstrated a pattern of incomplete or inaccurate declaration of information. Therefore, the Commission considered reducing her score under the “diligence” indicator in light of the cumulative minor deficiencies. During the closed deliberations, the Commission, sitting as a panel, unanimously decided to reduce the score under the “diligence” indicator by 15 points.

Having assessed the explanations, the Commission considers that the identified circumstances do not give rise to reasonable doubts regarding the accuracy of declarations or the candidate’s integrity. At the same time, V. Husarova demonstrated insufficient diligence, honesty and thoroughness when completing declarations and should have taken additional measures to ensure proper declaration of immovable property, the timing of its acquisition, and other relevant characteristics, as well as to verify the accuracy of the information provided. Although these shortcomings do not indicate intentional concealment of information or an attempt to mislead, they demonstrate insufficient honesty on the part of the candidate in relation to the declaration of her immovable property and the consistency of her standard of living with declared income.

Accordingly, the Commission, sitting as a panel, unanimously decided to reduce the candidate’s score under the indicators “honesty” and “consistency between the standard of living and declared income” by 15 points each.

Repeated summons of a person subject to administrative liability, aimed at ensuring their right to be heard, cannot in themselves be regarded as ineffective administration of justice. However, situations where such actions result in the release of a person from administrative liability due to the expiry of limitation periods should be assessed by the Commission in the context of compliance with the criteria of professional ethics, taking into account the systematic nature of such actions, the judge’s workload, the financial and technical capacity of the court to ensure proper notification, and the procedural conduct of the person concerned (or their representative).

Unjustified granting of unsubstantiated motions leading to repeated adjournments and failure to take measures to prevent abusive procedural conduct may indicate shortcomings in the organisation of judicial proceedings and an insufficient level of diligence in the performance of judicial duties.

The Commission analysed the grounds for termination of proceedings in the relevant cases and established that hearings were repeatedly adjourned due to the absence of parties and, in certain instances, due to military service of those parties.

Accordingly, the Commission, sitting as a panel, unanimously decided to reduce the candidate’s score under the “impartiality” indicator by 15 points.

During the assessment of the candidate’s professional activity and the interview, instances of disciplinary liability were identified. Repeated disciplinary violations may adversely affect public trust in the judiciary and may be inconsistent with the standards of irreproachable professional conduct.

In view of the above, the Commission notes that these violations indicate non-compliance with the ethical standards set out in the Code of Judicial Ethics.

The Commission, sitting as a panel, unanimously decided to reduce the candidate's score under the indicator "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life" by 15 points.

Thus, V. Husarova was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 09.10.2025 No. 484/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-121>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Iryna Rohava, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 32.75 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

The candidate did not demonstrate knowledge of relevant case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, which constitutes an essential component of the knowledge required of a judge at any level, given that, under the Law of Ukraine "On the Ratification of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 1950" of 17.07.1997 No. 475/97-VR, Ukraine has fully recognised the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights in all matters concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention.

During the interview, the candidate was unable to answer questions posed by members of the Commission regarding the content of Article 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights and its application, as well as the legal regulation of judicial recusal in criminal proceedings. The candidate was also unable to provide clear answers regarding basic legal concepts such as "law" and "legislation" and their correlation.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 34.75 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

In response to a question from the Commission as to which of the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct contains the most requirements in the field of communication, the candidate was unable to provide a clear answer.

The information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of social competence.

During the interview, the candidate did not provide complete and transparent information regarding the circumstances of acquiring movable property for business purposes, did not confirm financial capacity for such acquisition, and did not demonstrate the financial capacity of a family member for the purchase of a vehicle in 2019.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations and interview, and the results of voting during the closed deliberations, the total score obtained under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity amounted to 210 out of a possible 300 points, which is below 75% (225 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, I. Rohava was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 14.10.2025 No. 487/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-113>)

On establishing the results of the special check, determining the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Yuliia Sizintsova, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 31.25 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

In response to a question from a member of the Commission regarding the difference between the decisiveness of a judge of a first-instance court and that of an appellate court judge, as well as the differences in their respective responsibilities as provided for by law, the candidate was unable to provide clear answers.

The candidate was also unable to provide clear answers to questions concerning the main tasks and functions of a first-instance court, the concepts of "law" and "legislation", and their correlation.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 36.25 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of social competence.

Following the review of the dossier, written explanations and interview, and the results of voting during the closed deliberations, the total score obtained under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity amounted to 210 out of a possible 300 points, which is below 75% (225 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

During the interview, the Commission established that the candidate had unjustifiably failed to declare complete information subject to declaration. Discrepancies and errors were identified in the declarations. The Commission notes that the candidate did not demonstrate knowledge of anti-corruption legislation, in particular regarding the requirements for completing declarations.

The Commission takes a critical view of the candidate's explanations regarding the sources of funds used for the construction of a house and concludes that the income of her husband's relatives, which is not supported by documentary evidence, raises doubts as to the possibility of financing such construction. The Commission further notes that the assessment of the above facts and circumstances gives rise to reasonable doubt, from the perspective of a reasonable observer, as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator "lawfulness of the origin of rights to civil law objects".

The Commission also established that Yu. Sizintsova submitted an integrity declaration of a candidate for the position of judge, in which she marked as "Confirmed" statement No. 5 ("I have taken reasonable measures to ascertain the financial status of persons whose information I am required to disclose in the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government"). In the Commission's view, this information is inaccurate, as it was established that the candidate had not taken reasonable measures to ascertain the financial status of her family members indicated in the declaration.

Thus, Yu. Sizintsova was found to **have failed** to confirm her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 16.10.2025 No. 500/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-104>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oksana Sofilkanych, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 36 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission concluded that the candidate failed to confirm her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, it was established that the judicial decisions which, in the candidate's view, demonstrated her decisiveness and responsibility had been overturned by an appellate court. At the same time, the candidate stated that she remains convinced of the lawfulness of those decisions, notwithstanding the violations identified by the appellate court, and indicated that, in the event of a rehearing, she would adopt identical decisions.

According to the opinion of the Public Integrity Council, the candidate does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, as, while serving as a judge, she repeatedly engaged in conduct that led to significant procedural violations and attracted considerable public attention, which adversely affected the authority of the judiciary and public trust in the courts. In substantiating its conclusion, the Public Integrity Council placed particular emphasis on the candidate's handling of high-profile cases No. 936/285/22 (concerning group violence against a minor girl in August 2021) and No. 936/108/21 (an acquittal of the head of the Volovets community accused of receiving undue advantage).

The Commission emphasises that a judge should not render decisions based solely on public opinion; however, an entirely indifferent attitude to the views of those to whom the judge has sworn to administer justice objectively, impartially, independently, fairly and professionally may undermine the authority of the judiciary. Evidence that the decision of judge O. Sofilkanych in case No. 936/285/22 was not perceived by society as just and fair, and that it gave rise to significant public attention, is reflected in numerous publications.

In view of the above, the Commission concludes that O. Sofilkanych does not meet the criterion of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator "compliance with ethical standards and irreproachable conduct in professional activity and personal life".

Thus, O. Sofilkanych was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 28.10.2025 No. 526/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnovi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-144>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Viktoriia Kaliuzhna, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 37 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the candidate failed to confirm her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

The Commission notes that the information provided by the candidate in her written explanations and during the interview did not demonstrate a sufficient level of decisiveness, responsibility, or continuous professional development.

When issuing the ruling of 22.12.2021 on the seizure of property, judge V. Kaliuzhna did not provide reasoning substantiating the legal grounds for applying such a measure, did not assess the consequences of this measure for the property owners, and did not ensure compliance with the requirements of reasonableness and proportionality of interference with property rights as provided for in Article 173 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine.

Having assessed the submitted materials, the candidate's explanations, and the content of decisions of the High Council of Justice and the appellate court, the Commission considers that the explanations provided are general in nature and do not dispel doubts regarding the proper organisation of her work and her ability to ensure compliance with procedural standards.

In view of the above, the Commission has reasonable doubts as to V. Kaliuzhna's compliance with the integrity criterion under the indicator "diligence".

Taking into account the established circumstances and the conclusions regarding the candidate's non-compliance with the qualification assessment criteria, the candidate is assigned a score of 0 under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, which constitutes grounds for finding that she has failed to confirm her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal and for terminating the qualification assessment.

Thus, V. Kaliuzhna was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 30.10.2025 No. 531/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-136>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksandr Korolenko, candidate for the position of judge of a general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the assessment, explanations and other materials included in the dossier, the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members, sitting as a panel, under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounted to 15 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum score. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

As an example of continuous professional development, O. Korolenko referred to his involvement in the preparation of criminal law dissertations for other individuals.

In his oral explanations, the candidate stated that he had not faced any moral dilemmas in this regard, which indicates that he was unaware of the seriousness of the breach committed and of his own responsibility for such actions.

The aforementioned actions and the candidate's own retrospective view of their nature and consequences indicate not only a lack of proper awareness of the consequences of his own actions and an unwillingness to take full personal responsibility for them (which is inconsistent with the "Responsibility" criterion), but also of a lack of awareness of the impact of such behaviour on the authority of the judiciary as a whole.

Having summarised the circumstances examined during the interview with O. Korolenko, the Commission notes that the candidate has admitted to committing acts that constitute breaches of ethical rules and standards, namely:

- writing dissertations for others in return for payment (O.Vashchuk, who holds the position of judge at the Kotovsk City and District Court of Odesa Oblast; thesis topic: "The Auditor as a Specific Subject of a Criminal Offence under Ukrainian Law"; O. Morozovska, who holds the position of judge at the Myrhorod City and District Court of Poltava Oblast, thesis topic: "Criminal liability for the deliberate placing on the Ukrainian market of dangerous products"). This indicates that the candidate ceded authorship of the research work he had carried out to another person, which is unacceptable under the Code of Ethics;
- deliberate failure to declare income received, citing an agreement with the aforementioned individuals;
- communication with academic supervisors (while being aware of the unlawfulness of his conduct): sending draft versions of dissertations written for other individuals for the purpose of making corrections to the texts;
- during the interview, O. Korolenko demonstrated full awareness of the negative consequences of his actions (he acknowledged that he understood his violation of the provisions of the Code of Ethics, as well as the provisions of other acts regulating the relevant legal relations; he explained that he was aware of payments made to judges from

the State Budget of Ukraine as supplements to judicial remuneration for academic degrees, etc.). At the same time, whilst retrospectively analysing his behaviour and understanding his deviation from the norms and rules established in society, the candidate did not consider it unacceptable. Moreover, in his written explanations, he referred to his activity of writing academic papers for third parties in return for monetary remuneration, considering it to be something that should be viewed positively. This demonstrates O. Korolenko's complete lack of understanding of the social context of his actions.

The Commission therefore considers that the candidate's conduct constitutes a serious breach of professional ethics and, consequently, provides grounds for finding that he fails to meet the criterion of integrity regarding "Observance of ethical standards and impeccable behaviour in professional and personal life".

The income reported by O. Korolenko during the interview was not disclosed by him in any declaration submitted to the Unified State Register of Declarations.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, as well as the results of the voting during the closed discussion on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for these criteria is 0 points; therefore, the Commission concludes that O. Korolenko does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, O. Korolenko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 18.11.2025 No. 570/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-158>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Yanina Haidai, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 36 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, therefore the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

In the Commission's view, the lack of information regarding the candidate's professional qualification upgrades in 2021 and 2024 indicates that the candidate has failed to adequately meet the requirements for continuous professional development.

The Commission notes that the candidate has not demonstrated an adequate level of determination, responsibility and continuous development.

Based on the analysis of the submitted declarations, the candidate's explanations and her responses during the interview, as well as the documents provided to substantiate the explanations, the Commission has established a set of circumstances indicating the candidate's failure to comply with the requirements of the Law of Ukraine "On the Prevention of Corruption", as well as the principles of integrity and transparency set out in the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and the Code of Judicial Ethics.

The declarations for 2018 and 2022 contain no information regarding savings held by her or her husband, nor the amount of financial support provided by her son.

The Commission notes that the candidate provided contradictory and inconsistent explanations regarding the period during which her son lived with them as part of the same household.

Ya. Haidai provided contradictory explanations regarding the circumstances surrounding her husband's purchase of an off-plan property – an apartment in 2018.

Discrepancies and a lack of proportionality between the duration of her professional activity and the income actually declared may indicate possible concealment or improper declaration of income.

The candidate has failed to comply with the conditions of the Competition, namely by failing to submit declarations of integrity for 2023 and declarations of family ties for 2019–2023.

The totality of the established facts gives the Commission grounds for reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of "honesty" and "lawful origins of property, correspondence of the standard of living of the judge (judicial candidate) or his/her family members to the declared income, correspondence of the lifestyle of the judge (judicial candidate) to his/her status", which in turn is sufficient to consider the candidate as failing to meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Consequently, based on the results of the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, as well as the votes cast during the deliberations on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity is 0 points.

Thus, Ya. Haidai was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

Decision of 20.11.2025 No. 573/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vstanovlennya-rezultativ-specialnoyi-perevirky-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-175>)

On establishing the results of the special check, reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Volodymyr Krasnopol'skyi, candidate for the position of judge of the general court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023, No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

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

As can be seen from the information provided by V. Krasnopol'skyi in section 1.2 "Information regarding the candidate's compliance with the criterion of personal competence under the indicator "Continuous development", he associates his systematic professional development with professional development activities in which he participated as a lawyer.

The Commission takes a critical view of such statements by the candidate, since, in accordance with paragraph 4 of Part 1 of Article 21 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Bar and the Practice of Law", it is a lawyer's professional duty, whilst practicing law, to enhance their professional competence. Therefore, the candidate's reference, as a lawyer, to the formal performance of his duties as a sign of continuous development, which would give him an advantage in the competitive procedure compared to other candidates, appears unconvincing.

In view of the above, the Commission notes that the candidate has not demonstrated sufficient conscious and consistent efforts aimed at professional self-development, which could give him an advantage in this respect.

Regarding participation in two seminars in 2018 and completion of a one-month English language course from December 2015 to January 2016, the Commission considers that information regarding activities that took place in the distant past (7–10 years ago) is not sufficiently relevant to confirm the candidate's appropriate level of professional development and to assess it as sufficient at the time of this competition.

The Commission notes that the sale by V. Krasnopol'skyi of a residential property and a plot of land just over a month after their purchase, at a price UAH 360,000 lower than the purchase price, gives rise to reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criterion "Consistency of standard of living with declared income" under the Unified Indicators.

The Commission concludes that the level of income of the candidate and his family members, and the expenditure incurred by them, gives rise to reasonable doubt as to the legality of the sources of funds used to purchase, in 2015, a residential building and a plot of land in the city of Lviv worth UAH 960,000.

Thus, V. Krasnopolskyi was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in a general court of appeal.

III. Review of the HCJCU Decisions Based on the Results of Competitive Procedures for Filling Vacant Judgeships in the Administrative Courts of Appeal

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

The HCJCU, **sitting in chambers**, adopted **67 decisions** following the consideration of matters concerning the review of dossiers, the conduct of interviews and the determination of the results of the qualification assessment of candidates for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, of which:

recognising candidates as having confirmed the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal – **18** decisions;

recognising candidates as having failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal – **16** decisions;

referring to the Commission in plenary session the issue of confirming a candidate's ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal – **33** decisions.

The HCJCU, sitting in plenary, adopted 33 decisions (concerning candidates in respect of whom the Public Integrity Council had issued an opinion stating that the candidate for the position of judge did not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity), of which:

25 decisions recognising candidates as having confirmed their ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal;

8 decisions recognising candidates as having failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

2. Decisions of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine following the results of competitive procedures for filling vacant judgeships in administrative courts of appeal

Decision of 11.08.2025 No. 150/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-v-apelyaciyh>)

On the approval of the ranking of candidates for filling vacant judgeships in the administrative courts of appeal based on the results of the qualification assessment within the competition announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23

Decision of 15.08.2025 No. 157/zp-25

On the determination of the winners of the competition for filling vacant judgeships in the administrative courts of appeal within the competition announced by Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

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

Decision of 15.08.2025 Nos 295/as-25 – 336/as-25

On recommending candidates for appointment to the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal

3. Decisions of the HQCJU on the non-confirmation of the candidates' ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal

3.1 Decisions of the HQCJU on the non-confirmation of the candidates' ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal on the grounds of non-compliance with the criteria for personal and social competence

Decision of 06.05.2025 No. 7/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-98>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Zhanna Hrushko, within the competition announced by Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 36.25 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 confirmed her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

The examples of her decisiveness cited by the candidate are described without clearly demonstrating a moral dilemma or the need to make decisions under difficult circumstances. Nor has the candidate provided any examples of going the extra effort.

Zh. Hrushko claimed (as confirmed by video footage) to have had 9 years of legal practice as of August 2024 (although her licence was issued in December 2018). She initially denied this fact (stating that she "does not recall" such claims), and then described it as a misstatement during a live broadcast. Thus, in the Commission's view, the candidate demonstrated an attempt to evade responsibility for her own words.

The motivation letter states that the candidate "shapes students' ethical guidelines", yet during the interview she was unable to specify exactly how this takes place. Only after follow-up questions did she explain that this refers to optional extra-curricular activities. Such generalisations, in the Commission's view, may indicate a tendency towards empty rhetoric without substantive content.

Thus, Zhanna Hrushko was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 08.05.2025 No. 12/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-98>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Yuri Vanivskyi, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 33 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission concluded that the candidate has not confirmed his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, the candidate stated that he meets the criterion of "continuous development", as he regularly undertakes training and participates in workshops and seminars at the National School of Judges of Ukraine. He also noted that, in addition to seminars and regular training sessions, he regularly reads publications on the Telegram channel and social media. At the same time, the candidate was unable to provide a detailed and convincing explanation of the significance of participating in training sessions, seminars or other professional development activities for his own professional development, which, in the Commission's view, may indicate an insufficient understanding of the role of continuous learning and a formalistic approach on the part of the candidate to undertaking training.

Furthermore, Yu. Vanivskyi stated that he independently monitors changes in legislation, summarises case law, and familiarises himself with the opinions of the Consultative Council of European Judges. However, during the interview, he was unable to name a single opinion of the Consultative Council of European Judges that he had read.

Taking into account the candidate's written explanations and his answers provided during the interview, the Commission established that the candidate had not demonstrated an adequate level of compliance with the criterion of continuous professional development.

Thus, Yuri Vanivskyi was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

Decision of 13.05.2025 No. 21/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidytav-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciy-nogo-102>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Maryna Bilonozhenko, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the Commission members

according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion following the assessment by Commission members sitting as a chamber is 32.75 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 confirmed his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, the Commission raised doubts as to whether the candidate met the criteria of decisiveness and responsibility, in particular given the circumstances surrounding the candidate's administrative prosecution for a traffic offence and the candidate's subsequent actions in appealing against the decision to impose an administrative penalty.

During the interview, the Commission raised doubts regarding the candidate's compliance with the criterion of continuous development.

The information provided by the candidate in written explanations and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of personal competence.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion following the Commission's assessment as a panel is 37.25 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 confirmed his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal in terms of the criterion of social competence.

In the opinion of the Commission of the First Chamber, the information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of social competence.

Thus, the candidate **has not confirmed** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal in accordance with the criteria of personal and social competence.

Decision of 13.05.2025 No. 23/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-110>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Andrii Babaiev, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion following the assessment by the Commission sitting as a chamber is 30.33 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. The Commission concludes that the candidate has not

confirmed his ability to administer justice in an administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

In his written explanations, the candidate provided formal examples of his compliance with the indicators, specifically noting that he had imposed a fine for failure to comply with a decision. However, during the interview, it emerged that this referred to a single recent incident during his entire period of work.

In his letter to the Commission, the candidate interpreted the concepts of “pressure” and “legal uncertainty” rather loosely. He cited “psychological pressure” and “legal uncertainty” as challenges which he successfully overcomes. However, during the interview it became clear that by “psychological pressure” he meant a normal workload, and by “legal uncertainty” – jurisdictional disputes which he considered obvious.

Contrary to his own written statements, the candidate was unable to convincingly demonstrate, through examples, the effective analysis of court decisions he had carried out.

Although the candidate refers to a “systematic analysis of ECHR case law”, during the interview he was unable to explain exactly how he analyses this case law, did not provide examples of thematic generalisations, nor did he cite specific cases in which he had taken ECHR case law into account. In response to follow-up questions, he stated that he uses the “LIGA ZAKON” legal information system and the website of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine; however, his answers were confused and, in the Commission’s view, he failed to convince the Commission of his ability to utilise these resources.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members, the total score obtained for this criterion is 35 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points), therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The candidate’s letter states that he is able to adapt his communication style to suit the situation – whether it be a court hearing, an official meeting, a judges’ assembly, or discussions regarding the development of case law. As an example of adapting his communication style, the candidate mentioned only the avoidance of professional abbreviations (e.g., court hearing – c/h) or professional terminology, rather than genuinely adapting his communication depending on the emotional atmosphere. He did not demonstrate an adequate level of awareness in resolving conflict situations.

Regarding the indicator of effective interaction, the candidate stated that during court hearings he ensures that no disrespect towards individuals is shown, including on the grounds of race, gender, nationality, religion, political views, socio-economic status, physical disabilities, or aggressive behaviour by the parties. The only incident cited was a derogatory remark about a ‘woman’ made by a party to the case. In the Commission’s view, this is an isolated incident, not representative for assessing the skill of effective interaction.

Furthermore, the candidate failed to clearly distinguish between the concepts of “effective communication” and “effective interaction”, presenting them as an outcome and a tool, but without any practical substance or analytical depth.

Thus, A. Babaiev was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 20.05.2025 No. 34/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-104>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Olena Tsarikova, within the competition announced by Decision of the Commission of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 27.67 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission unanimously concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

Since O. Tsarikova has not yet taken effective measures to adjust her approach to organising her work and to rectify shortcomings that have a significant impact on the rights of the parties, the Commission concludes that the candidate did not fully realise her personal responsibility for her decisions and their consequences. This affects her assessment under the criterion of personal competence.

Based on an examination of the information contained in the dossier materials and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 30 points, which is below 75 per cent of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

During the interview, the candidate failed to confirm the ability to convey her position clearly and in a structured manner, to justify her decisions with rational, coherent and consistent arguments, to defend her position and influence the opinions of others, or to speak confidently and persuasively in front of an audience.

Thus, O. Tsarikova **has not confirmed** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-148>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Yurii Nazar, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of personal competence is 36.50 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 confirmed his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, the examples of the candidate's decisiveness are described without clearly demonstrating a moral dilemma or the need to make decisions in challenging circumstances. The candidate has not provided examples of going the extra effort.

The circumstances cited by the candidate relate to his professional activities and are not directly linked to the field of justice. The candidate's professional experience, in particular the positions he has held and currently holds, and his current officer rank, led the Commission members to have significantly higher expectations regarding the circumstances cited by the candidate during the interview concerning his direct participation in the defence of Ukraine against the Russian Federation's attack since 2014, as well as the organisational measures implemented by him as head of the institution after 24.02.2024. The candidate did not provide any evidence of active civic engagement as a member of civil society organisations.

The information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of decisiveness on his part.

The examples provided of professional, academic and personal development did not convince the members of the Commission that the candidate is committed to continuous development, which would enable him to adapt quickly to changes in his professional field.

Based on the results of the review of the candidate's dossier, written explanations and interview, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of social competence is 34.75 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 the ability to administer justice in the Administrative Court of Appeal in terms of social competence.

During the interview, the candidate did not sufficiently demonstrate a high level of motivation to take up the post of judge of the administrative court of appeal. Furthermore, Yu. Nazar failed to demonstrate to the Commission that he had adequately prepared himself as a candidate for the position of judge. The candidate's answers to the Commission members' questions regarding his participation in court cases, as well as regarding the jurisdictional competence of cases concerning

legal relationships that were the subject of his academic research, convinced the Commission members otherwise.

Thus, Yu. Nazar **has not confirmed** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 27.05.2025 No. 52/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-130>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Olena Patratii, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 33.50 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

According to the materials in the judicial dossier, judge O. Patratii heard 2,543 cases and files between 2012 and 2021; of these, 979 cases and files were heard in breach of the statutory time limits, representing 38.5%. During the interview, the candidate explained that the examination of cases in breach of the time limits established by law was due to a reduction in the time allowed for case examination and the actions of her assistant, who, after a case had been examined, filled in statistical forms in the programme and marked the cases as having been examined within the prescribed time limit.

In the Commission's view, these circumstances indicate the candidate's unwillingness to recognise the consequences of her actions and demonstrate a tendency to shift responsibility onto others in order to avoid personal accountability, citing external circumstances.

The fact that the judge did not undergo the relevant training at the National School of Judges of Ukraine to maintain her qualifications is not in itself an absolute ground for finding that she does not meet the criteria for qualification assessment (the indicator of continuous development). At the same time, the candidate's explanations regarding the circumstances of her failure to fulfil the duty provided for in Article 89 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges" indicate a lack of an adequate level of awareness of her responsibility to maintain her professional standards.

Taking into account the candidate's written explanations and her responses during the interview, the Commission concluded that the candidate had not demonstrated an adequate level of compliance with the criteria of decisiveness and responsibility; continuous development.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the Commission members on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 35.50 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission concluded that the candidate had not confirmed the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal in terms of social competence.

The explanations provided by the candidate, O. Patratii, indicate a negligent attitude towards the duty to declare assets and a failure to make sufficient efforts to be informed about the financial interests of her family members.

In the Commission's view, although the aforementioned facts indicate improper performance by O. Patratii of the duties provided for by the Law of Ukraine "On the Prevention of Corruption", taken separately, they do not constitute a material breach. At the same time, taken together, these breaches indicate a lack of due diligence in the performance of the duties prescribed by Ukraine's anti-corruption legislation.

Despite the fact that no criminal intent or gross negligence on the part of the judge was established during the disciplinary proceedings, the fact that her decisions were repeatedly overturned by the Court of Appeal on grounds relating to the exceeding of powers and disregard for the doctrine of res judicata, in the Commission's view, raises reasonable doubt as to the candidate's compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, in particular the standard of conscientiousness.

Thus, Olena Patratii was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 29.05.2025 No. 59/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-150>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Oksana Andrusenko, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of personal competence is 36.75 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 the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

In her written explanations, the candidate provided formal examples of her compliance with the indicators of "decisiveness" and "responsibility". She noted that, thanks to more than 20 years'

experience in the judiciary, her knowledge of procedural and substantive law, and continuous professional development, she is able to quickly analyse circumstances, assess evidence and resolve cases promptly and judiciously, regardless of the complexity of such cases and under conditions of excessive workload. During the interview, she did not provide any more substantive examples.

When asked by a member of the Commission about her stance, viewed through the prism of responsibility, on the public call for a debate regarding the application of financial monitoring measures to public officials after their term of office has ended, the candidate did not provide a clear answer, which may indicate a reluctance to take responsibility for articulating her own position.

During the discussion of the issue of the candidate's husband's property acquisition, the candidate remarked: "I don't know, perhaps he paid a bit more... You see, he has his own finances, as it were, and I have mine. I have no influence over these matters." Such a stance may indicate the candidate's inability to take responsibility for decisions and their consequences. The Commission is left with the impression that, should obstacles arise, the candidate is inclined to shift responsibility onto others or absolve herself of it, citing external circumstances.

Thus, O. Andrusenko **has not confirmed** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 11.06.2025 No. 90/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidytava-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-177>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Iryna Shevchenko, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the review of the information contained in the dossier and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 35 points, which is below 75 per cent of the maximum possible score; the Commission therefore concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The Commission notes that the assessment of a candidate based on the criterion of social competence is carried out with the candidate's active participation in demonstrating their compliance with the established indicators of the criterion. A passive position or the provision of merely formal information, without proper justification, self-reflection and professional substance, may negatively affect the Commission's assessment of the relevant criterion. At the same time, during the interview, the candidate failed to demonstrate the ability to convey her position clearly and in a structured manner, to justify her decisions with rational, coherent and consistent arguments, to defend her position and influence the opinions of others, or to speak confidently and persuasively before an audience.

Thus, Iryna Shevchenko was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 12.06.2025 No. 95/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-165>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Oleh Kyrylchuk, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 34.75 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate has not confirmed his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal in terms of personal competence.

The candidate openly disagrees with the decision of the High Council of Justice and the Supreme Court regarding his disciplinary liability, citing the “eight dissenting opinions” of the Supreme Court judges. Whilst such a stance may demonstrate the candidate's principled nature, constant denial also indicates a lack of self-reflection and the ability to acknowledge one's own mistakes and take them into account in future practice.

In his responses, the candidate did not provide examples of the knowledge acquired or how this knowledge had been integrated into his practice.

The information provided by the candidate in his written explanations and during the interview demonstrated an inadequate level of determination, responsibility and continuous development on the part of the candidate.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the Commission members on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 29.75 out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points), therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The candidate demonstrated a commitment to his convictions, particularly regarding the unacceptability of military personnel evading responsibility; however, he pursued this through disciplinary complaints and the publication of other judges' rulings.

The candidate demonstrated limited variety in his communication strategies. In fact, he failed to demonstrate skills in soft communication, dialogue and persuasion.

The candidate demonstrated excessively low effectiveness in the tools for effective interaction that he introduced and applied.

The candidate was unable to clearly outline his long-term motivations specifically regarding judicial activity: he did not provide examples of professional tasks he sets for himself as an appeal court judge; he did not demonstrate a vision of his mission within the justice system; he did not formulate specific goals for professional development within the judicial system.

Consequently, the information provided and the candidate's performance during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of social competence.

Thus, Oleh Kyrlychuk was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 17.06.2025 No. 101/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-174>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Ruslana Dmytryshena, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 35.67 out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission has concluded that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

Despite recognising the importance of communication in the court's work, the candidate failed to articulate her position in a sufficiently structured and concise manner. Her answers were verbose and contained excessive detail, which did not always directly address the substance of the questions asked and made it difficult to grasp the main point. Furthermore, the members of the Commission repeatedly drew attention to the need for more concise answers.

R. Dmytryshena avoided giving a direct answer to the question of whether she is able to present her position clearly, logically and concisely, which is a component of effective communication (in her written explanations, the candidate had previously identified this as a key component).

The candidate correctly understands effective communication in terms of the openness and transparency of the judicial system; however, her answers do not always fully reveal it as a process of two-way, purposeful interaction aimed at achieving mutual understanding and constructive problem-solving.

Regarding the resolution of disputes involving a judge, the candidate limited herself to stating that meetings are held, without elaborating on the principles of conducting effective dialogue, reaching agreements or resolving conflicts.

Regarding interaction with colleagues and the legal community, the answers are superficial, lacking specific examples or guiding principles.

The examples given of professional interaction (participation in training sessions, mentoring and public events) are largely descriptive in nature, without specifying the level of personal involvement or the outcomes of such interaction.

Despite the candidate's stated understanding of the importance of restraint and emotional balance, their answers are largely formal, referring to procedural measures, without sufficiently elaborating on their own psychological strategies for responding to the confrontational behaviour of parties to the proceedings.

Although the candidate emphasises the moral principles that underpin judicial activity, the content of her explanations and answers reveals a lack of specific professional goals for the future position. The answers provided regarding the role of an appeal court judge are predominantly formal in nature.

Thus, Ruslana Dmytryshena was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 17.06.2025 No. 100/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-188>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Iryna Buriak, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments by the members of the Commission on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 34.67 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 confirmed the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal in terms of social competence.

The circumstances cited by the candidate during the assessment of social competence criteria ("effective communication", "effective interaction", "sustained motivation"), taken together with the information examined during the assessment of the candidate's compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity, failed to convince the members of the Commission that the candidate had taken active and consistent measures aimed at achieving the objective – namely, for

the members of the Commission to recognise the candidate as a person who has confirmed their ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Thus, I. Buriak was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 30.06.2025 No. 136/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-201>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Oleksandr Karmazin, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The candidate attempted to present decisions in “clear language”, explaining complex legal constructs. However, in the documents submitted to the Commission, the candidate presents information about himself sometimes in the first person and sometimes in the third person. In the Commission's view, this may indicate a lack of communicative flexibility or overly formalised thinking.

Judge Karmazin emphasises the development of well-coordinated teamwork with his assistants and secretary, which allowed them to work “automatically and autonomously”.

The candidate frequently avoided answering direct questions from the Commission members, repeating prepared talking points without adequately addressing follow-up questions.

The objective of holding the position of an appeal court judge is formulated in rather abstract terms.

The candidate provided examples of stressful situations and demonstrated an ability to maintain a balanced behaviour. However, based on the candidate's examples, it can be concluded that he did not always effectively prevent the internal negative consequences of such situations.

Based on the results of the review of the dossier, written explanations and the interview with the candidate, and taking into account the individual assessments of the chamber members on the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for this criterion is 34.67 points, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score; therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

Thus, O. Karmazin was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 16.07.2025 No. 176/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-208>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Yurii Badiukov, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

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 32.33 points, which is below 75% of the maximum possible score; therefore, the Commission concludes that Yu. Badiukov does not meet the criterion of personal competence.

Although the candidate paid maintenance for his minor child, his failure to fulfil the obligations imposed by Law No. 606-XIV resulted in arrears in maintenance payments, a warrant being issued for his arrest, and the termination of his parental rights. In view of the above, the Commission considers that Yu. Badiukov, amongst other things, has not fully taken personal responsibility for his decisions and their consequences in his private life, which has been taken into account by reducing the number of points awarded following the assessment of the candidate against the criterion of personal competence.

Thus, Yu. Badiukov **has not confirmed** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

3.2 Decisions of the HQCJ on the non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal due to non-compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics

Decision of 02.06.2025 No. 62/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtvrdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-gudkova-sergiya-oleksiyovycha>)

On confirming the ability of candidate for the position of judge, Serhii Hudkov, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission, sitting in plenary session, agrees that, from the perspective of an outside observer, the reliability of information regarding the candidate's income from 2014 to 2021 raises reasonable doubt, and at the same time draws attention to the correlation between the candidate's standard of living and the declared income.

During the interview with the candidate, the Commission discussed, in particular, the absence of official income (in 2015, 2017, 2020, and 2021), the circumstances of obtaining loans (in 2018 and

2021), the acquisition of property rights to real estate (2021), the sources of loan repayment (2022–2023), and the increase in monetary assets (2023).

The Commission remained unconvinced as to how a person with minimal income, and in certain years no income at all, undertakes the purchase of real estate, obtains loans that significantly exceed previously received income, and at the same time has the resources to repay such loans, maintain the family's standard of living, develop entrepreneurial activity, provide legal services free of charge, and accumulate substantial funds in bank accounts and in cash.

Thus, S. Hudkov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 02.06.2025 No. 64/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-apelyaciynogo-administratyvnogo-sudu>)

On confirming the ability of candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Anzhelika Babych, to administer justice in the relevant court within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the review of the dossier, 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, sitting in plenary session, concludes that the candidate does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

The judge was unable to provide documentary evidence of other sources of funds for the purchase of a vehicle, referring only to her father's "personal savings" and the "impossibility of documentary confirmation."

The Commission in plenary session also takes into account that judge A. Babych obtained a driver's license in 2014, and the 2013 Audi Q5 was purchased in the same year. The judge's father, being a pensioner, made a purchase that significantly differs from his previous acquisitions.

Thus, Anzhelika Babych was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 09.06.2025 No. 83/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-shevyakova-igorya-sergiyovycha>)

On confirming the ability of candidate for the position of judge, Ihor Sheviakov, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission, sitting in plenary session, concluded that there are reasonable doubts regarding the candidate's compliance with the indicators of "honesty" and "legality of the sources of origin of rights to civil law objects" under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

The candidate exercised the right to free privatisation of agricultural land not for the purpose of conducting personal farming, as provided by law, but to obtain personal economic benefit by subsequently using such land for purposes unrelated to agriculture. This approach indicates a deliberate exploitation of gaps in legal regulation and circumvention of established procedures intended for obtaining land plots for industrial activities. Such conduct demonstrates not only a formal but also a substantive disregard for the essence and values of legal norms, undermining trust in legal mechanisms and contradicting societal expectations.

When concluding a transaction for the alienation of a vehicle, no actual sale took place; the candidate merely formalized the transfer of ownership that had occurred long before. Such actions violate the principles of transparency, good faith, and honesty, which must be observed by a person applying for a judicial position and being assessed under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

The candidate provided inconsistent explanations regarding the declaration of funds in the amount of UAH 350,000, which indicates the absence of a clear and consistent position and, in the Commission's view, reflects non-compliance with the principle of honesty and a breach of the requirements for accurate and complete declaration. The established circumstances demonstrate the candidate's inadequate understanding of anti-corruption legislation and responsibility for the accuracy of submitted information.

Thus, I. Sheviakov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 09.06.2025 No. 82/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-gergeliynyka-vyacheslava-oleksandrovycha>)

On confirming the ability of the candidate for the position of judge, Viacheslav Herheliinyk, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission's doubt that the candidate for the position of judge makes sufficient efforts to ensure that, in the opinion of a reasonable, law-abiding and informed person, his conduct is impeccable has not been dispelled.

The Commission in plenary composition agrees with the conclusion of the Commission sitting as a chamber that visiting the territory of the aggressor state during the full-scale war of russia against Ukraine is permissible only in exceptional circumstances or in cases of vital necessity. At the same time, the Commission in plenary composition draws attention to the totality of facts and

circumstances set out in the conclusion of the Public Integrity Council, which connect V. Herheliinyk and his close persons with the aggressor state.

This indicates non-compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicator “observance of ethical standards and impeccable conduct in professional activity and personal life”.

Thus, V. Herheliinyk was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 16.06.2025 No. 99/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-balas-tetyany-pavlivny-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of the candidate for the position of judge, Tetiana Balas, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

In the opinion of the Commission, visiting the territory of the aggressor state or the territories occupied by it during the aggression of russia against Ukraine is permissible only in cases of urgent necessity, when such necessity outweighs all the risks associated with visiting the said territories.

Urgent necessity is characterised by its immediacy; its satisfaction cannot be postponed due to the irreversibility and critical nature of the consequences for the individual.

The circumstances indicated by T. Balas that determined her need to visit the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine, in the opinion of the Commission, do not meet the above criteria.

In view of the above, the Commission in plenary composition notes that T. Balas’s visit to the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine without urgent necessity indicates the absence of a clear civic position as a judge (candidate for the position of judge) regarding the occupation by the russian federation of part of Ukraine, her disregard for violations by russia of the rights and freedoms of citizens of Ukraine in the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine, and therefore non-compliance with the requirements of the Code of Judicial Ethics and the Bangalore Principles.

Thus, having examined the conclusion of the Public Integrity Council, the written explanations and the explanations provided by T. Balas during the interview, the Commission in plenary composition concluded that the candidate has not dispelled the well-founded doubt regarding her compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity in connection with her visit to the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea on the grounds set out in paragraphs 110–142 of this Decision.

Thus, T. Balas was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 23.07.2025 No. 205/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-potapchuk-ganny-vyacheslavivny>)

On confirming the ability of the candidate for the position of judge, Hanna Potapchuk, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the totality of established circumstances, namely: the candidate's acquisition of an apartment, its actual value at the time of donation, its subsequent sale, and the absence of convincing explanations regarding the legality and good faith of these actions, the Commission considers that the stated facts may be deemed sufficient to conclude that the candidate does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Taking the above into account, the Commission in plenary composition has reached the conclusion that there exists a well-founded doubt regarding the candidate's compliance with the indicators of "honesty" and "legality of sources of origin of rights to civil law objects" within the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

With regard to other circumstances indicated in the conclusion of the Public Integrity Council, the Commission in plenary composition supports the decision of the Commission sitting as the First Chamber.

Following the review of the dossier, the conclusion of the Public Integrity Council, the written explanations and the interview with the candidate, as well as the results of the voting, the Commission in plenary composition, during a closed deliberation, concluded that the candidate H. Potapchuk does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, H. Potapchuk was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 28.07.2025 No. 218/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-dudar-oksany-myhaylivny-zdiyusnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of candidate for the position of a judge, Oksana Dudar, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

The Commission emphasises that a judge, within the scope of their authority, must ensure compliance with objective, impartial, unbiased, independent, and fair adjudication of cases and the constitutional principles of judicial proceedings. However, in rendering the judicial decisions mentioned in the PIC's opinion (the decision to ban peaceful assemblies) during a period of acute social conflict, when society particularly needed the court to demonstrate the highest standards of

impartiality and independence, O.Dudar failed to demonstrate an adequate level of internal independence.

Thus, O. Dudar was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

Decision of 06.08.2025 No. 260/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-adamova-asena-semenovycha-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of candidate for the position of a judge, Asen Adamov, to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal within the competition announced by Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

The Commission notes the candidate's commitment to resolving cases concerning the deprivation of parental rights without undue delay, which is also consistent with the position of the European Court of Human Rights regarding the speed of proceedings in this category of cases. However, the cases were examined in the absence of the parties and representatives of the guardianship and custody authorities from the court hearings, on the basis of written evidence, which almost entirely precluded the possibility of an in-depth examination of the full family situation prevailing in each family; consequently, the candidate did not fully comply with the requirement for a thorough examination of all circumstances.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission, sitting in plenary session, finds that A. Adamov's consideration of the aforementioned cases under wartime conditions within a single month and in the absence of the parties to the case at the very least creates the impression of a formal and mechanical approach, which is unacceptable when resolving issues concerning fundamental human rights and indicates a significant failure on the part of the candidate to meet the criterion of 'integrity'.

Consequently, having examined the conclusion of the Public Council, the written explanations and the explanations provided by A. Adamov during the interview, the Commission, sitting in plenary session, considers that the circumstances set out in paragraphs 75–88 of this decision indicate the candidate's failure to meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, A. Adamov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

3.3 Decisions of the HQCJ on non-confirmation of the candidates' ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal due to non-compliance with an aggregate of indicators of criteria of personal and social competence as well as integrity and professional ethics

Decision of 03.06.2025 No. 71/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-134>)

On the dossier review, the conduct of the interview and the determination of the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the administrative court of appeal, Taras Zaiets, within the competition announced by Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interviews with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under the criterion of personal competence is 29.25 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in an administrative court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, the candidate did not provide specific examples of determination and responsibility in his professional and personal life, limiting himself to general phrases about understanding and perceiving these concepts. The only exception to demonstrating determination in this context is the example of the candidate's participation in court proceedings as a party defending his rights.

The candidate did not provide information regarding participation in educational or other events, regarding mastery of modern tools and educational platforms aimed at his continuous development as a judge and as a person.

A clear example of certain gaps in understanding basic concepts that should obviously be within the scope of a lawyer's understanding in general is T. Zaiet's lack of knowledge of the concepts used to describe the difference between legal norms and principles of "hard law" and "soft law" which was demonstrated during the interview.

During the interview, although the judge repeatedly stated that he follows the practice of the European Court of Human Rights, he did not demonstrate (or avoided demonstrating) sufficient knowledge of the relevant practice of that international court, in particular the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights on administrative practice (with the exception of the decision of the international court in the case of "Volkov v. Ukraine", which in fact concerns only one segment of public service – the judicial career, and not a wide range of legal relations).

When asked by a member of the Commission about a clearly formulated development plan, T. Zaiets limited himself to commonly used generalised phrases and did not outline any points of

the plan, nor did he give examples of points of the plan that had already been implemented, which could have convinced the members of the Commission of its feasibility.

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of social competence is 26.25 points out of a possible 50, which is not equal to 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

Contrary to the above facts, which indicate ineffective (insufficient) communication, during the interview, the candidate was repeatedly asked to provide examples of effective (successful) communication from his personal or professional life, to which T. Zaiets did not respond.

The circumstances cited by the candidate during the assessment of the criterion of sustainability of motivation did not convince the members of the Commission that they were directly relevant and indicated that the candidate had taken active and consistent actions aimed at achieving the goal – recognition of the candidate as a person who has proven their ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

By joint decision of the Commission and the PCIE of January 18, 2019, № 49/vs-19, it was established that the candidate demonstrated a significantly low level of prudence, restraint and unprofessional behaviour. The candidate confirmed these qualities during the interview on June 03, 2025.

The criteria of integrity and professional ethics were assessed at 0 points.

The judge (candidate for the position of judge) unjustifiably failed to declare all information subject to declaration, as required by law.

In the annual declarations of a person authorised to perform state or local self-government functions for 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, the candidate for the position of judge did not declare his wife's income and information about her cash assets. The 2020 declaration also does not indicate the banking institution where the judge's wife has an account.

The judge made court decisions while not at work (he was abroad, studying, in a temporarily occupied territory, etc.).

Numerous facts give grounds to conclude that the candidate does not meet the integrity criterion.

By joint decision of the Commission and the PCIE of January 18, 2019, № 49/vs-19, it was established that the candidate did not refute reasonable doubts regarding compliance with the criteria set forth in Part Four of Article 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On the High Anti-Corruption Court”: integrity (morality, honesty, incorruptibility), namely in terms of lawfulness of the origin of sources of the candidate’s property, correspondence of the standard of living of the candidate or his or her family members with the declared income, correspondence of the candidate’s lifestyle to his or her status, knowledge and practical skills that the candidate possesses for the consideration of cases within the jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court.

This indicates a significantly low level of prudence, restraint and unprofessional behaviour on the part of the candidate, which raises reasonable doubts about the candidate’s professional qualities necessary for considering cases falling within the jurisdiction of the High Anti-Corruption Court.

The candidate demonstrated similar qualities during the interview, failing to refute the Commission members’ reasonable doubts about his compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, T. Zaiets was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the administrative court of appeal.

IV. Review of the HQCJU Decisions Based on the Results of Competitive Procedures to Fill Vacant Judgeships in the Commercial Courts of Appeal

1. General Information

The HQCJ, **sitting in chambers**, adopted **82 decisions** based on the consideration of issues related to the review of dossiers, conducting interviews, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of candidates for the position of judge of commercial court, including:

37 decisions recognising candidates as having confirmed their ability to administer justice in the commercial courts of appeal;

16 decisions recognising candidates as having failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal;

1 decision on terminating the qualification assessment and participation in the competition;

28 decisions to submit to the Commission in plenary session the issue of confirming a candidate's ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

The HQCJ, **in plenary session**, adopted **28 decisions** (regarding candidates for whom an opinion was received from the PIC on non-compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity), including:

23 decisions recognising candidates as having confirmed their ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal;

5 decisions recognising candidates as having failed to confirm their ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

2. Decisions of the HQCJU following the conduction of competitive procedures for filling vacant judgeships in the commercial courts of appeal

Decision of 13.08.2025 No. 153/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-reytyngu-kandydativ-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-v-apelyacinyh-0>)

On the approval of the ranking of candidates for filling vacant judgeships in the commercial courts of appeal based on the results of the qualification assessment within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23

Decision of 15.08.2025 No. 158/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vyznachennya-peremozhciv-konkursu-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-v-apelyacinyh-0>)

On the determination of the winners of the competition for filling vacant judgeships in the commercial courts of appeal within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Decision of 15.08.2025 Nos 338/as-25 – 392/as-25

On recommending candidates for appointment to the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal

3. Decisions of the HQCJU on non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal

3.1 Decisions of the HQCJU on non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal due to non-compliance with indicators of personal and social competence

Decision of 20.05.2025 No. 35/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-105>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Yevhen Ivashin, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interviews with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of personal competence is 33.25 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concluded that the candidate did not confirm his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal according to the criterion of personal competence.

The candidate did not provide convincing information about his compliance with the established indicators, nor did he explain how the facts mentioned testify to his compliance with the indicators of determination and responsibility.

Regarding compliance with the indicator of continuous development, Ye. Ivashin noted that, in addition to his main job, he is engaged in scientific research on bankruptcy procedures. At the same time, the candidate did not provide any other facts of compliance with the indicator of continuous development. The Commission noted that the publications referred to by the candidate were published in 2010 and 2012, which cannot testify to the candidate's continuous development.

Considering the candidate's written explanations and his answers provided during the interview, the Commission found that the candidate did not demonstrate an adequate level of compliance with the indicators of determination and responsibility; continuous development.

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of social competence is 28.5 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concluded that the candidate did not confirm his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal according to the criterion of social competence.

During court hearings, the candidate (Ye. Ivashin), acting as a representative, together with members of the public audience, exerted psychological pressure on the panel of judges in an attempt to influence the course of the case. The panel concluded that such circumstances could cast doubt on the fairness of the proceedings and the adoption of judicial decisions. The Commission considers that such conduct does not meet the indicator of effective interaction, as it raises doubts about the candidate's ability to build constructive relationships with other representatives of the professional community based on professional goals and values.

Taking into account the candidate's written explanations and responses during the interview, the Commission determined that the candidate demonstrated an insufficient level of social competence.

Thus, Ye. Ivashin was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 22.05.2025 No. 38/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-112>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Tetiana Popovych, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interviews with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of social competence is 34.75 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

The Commission takes into account the candidate's explanations and behaviour, in particular the steadfastness of their convictions and confidence in the correctness of their position and qualifications in relation to the relevant issues, despite the lack of adequate objective evidence and logically consistent legal reasoning in their conclusions. The shortcomings and errors in the declaration, which were pointed out by the Ethics Council in its decision, were not fully analysed and reconsidered by the candidate, as evidenced, in particular, in the fact that even after indicating a change in the situation with the place of residence and rights to use real estate owned by family members in 2023–2024, T. Popovych did not reflect this information in her declarations for 2023 and 2024, as required by anti-corruption legislation.

During the dialogue with the members of the Commission regarding the motives that prompted her to participate in the competition, T. Popovych did not demonstrate sufficient awareness of her motivation to work as a judge. In particular, the candidate failed to convincingly explain why the

public goals she seeks to achieve by taking up the position of judge of the court of appeal cannot be achieved within the scope of her current activities.

Thus, T. Popovych was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 27.05.2025 No. 49/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidytav-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-121>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Oleksandr Rybchenko, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of personal competence is 30.3 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concludes that candidate O. Rybchenko has not confirmed his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal according to the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview with O. Rybchenko, certain facts cited by the candidate were discussed. In particular, parking violations, forced opening of doors for three hours without the presence of the owner and authorised persons in connection with the flooding of apartments in the building (the management company of this building was his client), which are interpreted by O. Rybchenko as necessary, and the latter example as a manifestation of determination. The examples given by the candidate and their justification raise doubts about the candidate's proper understanding of legal and, in general, social responsibility towards other people and society.

During the interview, the candidate confirmed that he did not participate in educational events, round tables, trainings, or seminars, citing lack of time and excessive workload.

The Facebook page "Law Enforcement Practice of the Supreme Court of Ukraine" run by O. Rybchenko, only shares posts from certain legal websites (protocol.ua, sud.ua) without any analysis or comments from the author.

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of social competence is 35.7 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. Therefore, the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the social competence criterion.

It should be pointed out that the candidate tends to make unsubstantiated statements that are not backed up by specific facts and evidence.

The Commission expresses doubt about the candidate's ability to build constructive relationships with representatives of the professional judicial community based on common goals and values, especially in the process of collegial consideration of cases, which is the main form of justice in courts of appeal.

The Commission also takes into account the contradictory nature of O. Rybchenko's motivation. The candidate's arguments in justifying his motives for taking up the position of judge raise doubts about his sincerity, namely: professional burnout, currently using only 20-30% of his potential, and the uniformity and predictability of the cases he handles as a lawyer. However, the list of cases in which O. Rybchenko has participated since 2007, attached to the application, on the contrary, indicates the diversity of his specialisation and the categories of cases.

Thus, O. Rybchenko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 29.05.2025 No. 55/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-136>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Nataliia Vedmid, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results the dossier review, written explanations and interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of personal competence is 19 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. Therefore, the Commission concludes that candidate N. Vedmid has not demonstrated the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal based on the criterion of personal competence.

The examples of determination provided by the candidate are described without a clear demonstration of a moral dilemma or the necessity of making decisions in complex conditions, nor are there examples of applying additional, above-standard efforts.

The Commission expressed doubts regarding the candidate's compliance with the indicator of continuous development, in particular because the candidate, intending to become a judge of an appellate commercial court, did not demonstrate consistent efforts toward professional self-development in the field of commercial jurisdiction and did not define priorities for her own development. The candidate stated that she had not undertaken any training aimed at updating knowledge in commercial law specialisation, considering it related to civil procedure, from which she regularly attended professional development events.

N.Vedmid was also unable to answer the Commission's questions regarding recent legislative changes, in particular the abolition of the Commercial Code of Ukraine and the further regulation

of commercial relations. According to the candidate, the legislator intends to abolish the Commercial Code of Ukraine and adopt it in a new version.

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations and interviews with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score obtained for the criterion of social competence is 34.25 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score, and therefore the Commission concludes that the candidate does not meet the criterion of social competence.

During the dialogue with the members of the Commission regarding the motives that prompted her to participate in the competition, N. Vedmid did not demonstrate sufficient awareness of her motivation to work as a judge of the commercial court of appeal.

The examples of emotional stability cited by the candidate, such as being guided in decision-making solely by the rules of law and internal convictions formed on the basis of a comprehensive, complete and objective examination of the circumstances of the case, are general requirements that every judge must follow when considering cases and making decisions.

In addition, during the interview, the candidate did not demonstrate the ability to clearly and structurally convey her position, justify her decisions with rational, coherent and consistent arguments, defend her position and influence the opinions of others, or speak confidently and convincingly in front of an audience.

Thus, N. Vedmid was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 15.07.2025 No.170/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-207>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Yevhen Yakymenko, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of dossier review, written explanations, and the interview with a candidate, as well as having regard to the individual assessments by the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score received under the criterion of personal competence amounts to 33 out of 50 possible points, which is lower than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. Therefore, the Commission concluded that the candidate has failed to confirm his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

When asked by Commission members about current activities demonstrating compliance with the indicator of "determination and responsibility", Ye. Yakymenko stated that he currently represents clients in a limited number of commercial cases. During the Commission session, he provided an

example of a case in which, in 2024, he prepared a claim for a client to a commercial court seeking to invalidate a decision of a gardening association. At present, Ye. Yakymenko provides legal assistance to approximately 10 clients. In addition, he works with the Bar Council of the Dnipropetrovsk Oblast, where he is involved in preparing administrative materials for drafting administrative protocols concerning failure to respond to lawyer requests.

However, the candidate did not provide convincing information regarding his compliance with the established indicators and did not explain how these facts demonstrate his compliance with the indicators of “determination and responsibility.”

To confirm compliance with the criterion of personal competence under the indicator of “continuous development,” the candidate submitted a copy of the publication “Dedicated to Owners and Lessors” in the newspaper Advocate of the Accountant (March 2002), a copy of a 2013 certificate of professional development for lawyers, and an extract from the Unified Register of Advocates of Ukraine. However, the candidate did not provide any other evidence of continuous development. The Commission noted that the referenced publication dates back to 2002, which cannot be considered evidence of continuous development.

Taking into account the candidate’s written explanations and responses provided during the interview, the Commission determined that the candidate did not demonstrate an adequate level of compliance with the indicators of determination and responsibility and continuous development.

Thus, Ye. Yakymenko was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 16.07.2025 No. 178/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidytav-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-220>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Olena Pohorelova, within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of dossier review, written explanations, and the interview with a candidate, as well as having regard to the individual assessments by the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score received under the criterion of personal competence amounts to 33.5 out of 50 possible points, which is lower than 75% (37.5 points) of the maximum possible score. Therefore, the Commission concludes that the candidate, O. Pohorelova, has failed to confirm her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

To demonstrate compliance with the indicator of “continuous development,” O. Pohorelova stated in her candidate questionnaire that she constantly develops herself, remains objective and up to

date in her role as a judge, continuously improves her professional qualifications, participates in training activities, reads professional literature, follows changes in legislation, and engages in discussions of complex legal issues within the professional community. However, during the interview, when asked by a Commission member (rapporteur) about specific events she had attended and topics of interest, the candidate was unable to name any events, including those organised by the National School of Judges of Ukraine. She stated that over the past year she had focused on participating in the competition for appointment to the appellate court and had not taken part in training activities.

When asked about her interest in the decisions of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the candidate responded that she was aware of this court but noted that its case law was not relevant to the categories of cases she adjudicates. Given her limited time, studying its decisions was not a priority for her.

The candidate was also unable to answer questions related to the application of legal principles in judicial practice, including the classical principle “Jura novit curia” (“The court knows the law”), which is fundamental to judicial activity and entails the court’s obligation to correctly apply the law regardless of the parties’ positions.

During the interview, the Commission developed doubts regarding the candidate’s compliance with the continuous development indicator.

The information provided by the candidate in writing and during the interview did not demonstrate an adequate level of determination, responsibility, and continuous development.

Thus, O. Pohorelova was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

Decision of 01.08.2025 No. 242/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-245>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Vitalii Stambula, within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier review, written explanations, and the interview with a candidate, as well as having regard to the individual assessments by the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score received under the personal competence criterion amounts to 30 points out of a possible 50, which is less than 75% of the maximum possible score. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the candidate, V. Stambula, has failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the personal competence criterion.

In assessing the candidate's personal competence, the Commission considered a number of circumstances that affected the assessment under this criterion.

In particular, the Commission noted repeated violations by V. Stambula of the Traffic Rules of Ukraine, specifically exceeding the established speed limits. The candidate explained that he spends a significant amount of time driving and indicated that, since submitting his documents for the competition, he has changed his approach to driving and now uses a navigation system that alerts him when he exceeds the permitted speed, so such incidents are now rare. Exceeding the speed limit can lead to a loss of control over the vehicle and result in serious adverse consequences. Awareness of this and understanding the importance of adhering to the established rules is crucial for ensuring road safety.

Additionally, during the session, the issue of the candidate's fulfilment of military service obligations was discussed in detail. It was established that, as of December 23, 2023, the candidate was employed as Chief Legal Counsel at the farming enterprise "HORSTA" with which he had previously cooperated on a contractual basis. V. Stambula explained the necessity to formalise employment relations as the farming enterprise's need to perform a broader scope of legal work as well as the additional opportunities it would provide him for business communication and participation in the client's business processes. At the same time, as appears from the dossier, since 2015 the candidate had not worked under a formal employment contract conditions with any client.

Following his employment at the farming enterprise, V. Stambula received a deferral from military conscription, which was repeatedly renewed during the period from August 13, 2024 to June 18, 2026. The Commission does not in any way dispute the lawfulness of his official employment during the period of the announced mobilisation or the issuance of the deferral. At the same time, in assessing these circumstances, the Commission, sitting in the Second Chamber, relies on the obvious facts which, taken together, raise a reasonable doubt regarding the good faith of candidate's actions and the level of his social responsibility.

Discountenance by the Commission is caused by deliberate actions of V. Stambula, aimed at creating and registering a legal entity – the Limited Liability Company "HENICHESKI LANY" – for the purpose of buyout of corporate rights of another legal entity – the Private Enterprise "Chongar Private Lease Enterprise" – without the intention of conducting any commercial activity.

In the context of the candidate's compliance with the continuous development indicator, it was established that he participated annually in training at the Higher School of Advocacy, as confirmed by the relevant certificates. However, V. Stambula did not provide examples of attending training sessions, courses, or professional conferences neither in his questionnaire, nor in his written response to the Commission's request, or during the interview, explaining that due to a lack of time he mostly watches recordings of professional events broadcast on the Internet. Regarding courses and webinars of a commercial orientation, V. Stambula noted that he plans to focus intensively on these matters after appointment to the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal.

The candidate maintains his own YouTube channel, “Advocate Stambula Vitalii,” dedicated to current issues of military registration and service. The channel was created in May 2022, has over 63,000 subscribers, and more than 9,000,000 views. Given the current reality, the channel is undeniably popular. However, this information cannot serve as evidence of V. Stambula’s professional self-development as a candidate for the vacant position of judge of the commercial court of appeal.

Thus, V. Stambula was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

3.2 Decisions of the HQCJU on the non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal due to non-compliance with the indicators of integrity and professional ethics criteria

Decision of 03.06.2025 No. 70/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-142>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Roman Romaniuk, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended).

During the qualification assessment of R. Romaniuk, information from the Unified State Register of Court Decisions was analysed, in particular the court decisions in case No 756/11050/21-c.

It has been established from those decisions, that in May 2018 the candidate received a loan in the amount of UAH 1,043,200, which is equivalent to USD 40,000 at the official exchange rate of the National Bank of Ukraine. The Commission established that, despite clear and convincing factual data, the candidate denied having incurred a financial obligation. In his declarations for 2018–2020, he did not disclose information about the loan of UAH 1,043,200 and did not submit a notification of significant changes in his property status in connection with making a one-time expenditure exceeding 50 subsistence minimums of citizens' incomes due to repayment of this loan.

R. Romaniuk stated that he had been unaware of the civil case, did not know the plaintiff, had not entered into a loan agreement, and had not received the funds that were the subject of the transaction. He further claimed that during the consideration of the civil case he had never been notified about the date and place of the court hearings and had not participated in them.

However, given the reviewed factual circumstances, the Commission developed a reasonable doubt regarding the credibility of R. Romaniuk's explanations and the information provided by him, as the candidate appears to be attempting to avoid negative consequences in the qualification assessment procedure.

This gave rise to a reasonable doubt regarding R. Romaniuk's compliance with the integrity criterion under the indicator "Compliance of the standard of living with the declared income".

Thus, R. Romaniuk was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

The Commission decided to inform the National Agency on Corruption Prevention of the circumstances that may indicate a violation by Roman Romaniuk, a candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal and currently a judge of the Commercial Court of Rivne Oblast, of the legislation on the prevention of corruption.

Decision of 12.06.2025 No. 91/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-144>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Oksana Bezhenaru, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of dossier review, written explanations, the interview with a candidate, and the voting during the closed deliberation regarding the relevant indicators, the total score received under the criteria of professional ethics and integrity amounts to 0 out of 300 possible points. Therefore, the Commission concluded that the candidate does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

During the qualification assessment, it was established that since 2016 the candidate has been an accused person in criminal proceedings under Part Five of Article 191 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine – misuse of official position to wrongfully obtain or convert property of another, in an amount deemed extraordinarily substantial. The consideration of proceedings concerning a systemic conflict related to the distribution of agricultural land has not been completed. The proceedings are accompanied by public resonance, media publications, and statements of political influence, which indicates a potential loss of public trust in the judiciary in case of candidate's appointment as a judge.

In addition, the candidate's actions related to the alienation of real and movable property for the benefit of close relatives during the pre-trial investigation may be perceived as a sign of non-transparent conduct, which contradicts the expected standard of openness and impeccability for a person, applying for a judicial position.

Based on the totality of the established circumstances – namely: the candidate's status as an accused person in criminal proceedings on charges of misuse of official position to wrongfully obtain or convert property of another, in an amount deemed extraordinarily substantial, inconsistencies in property transactions with close relatives, and the absence of convincing explanations regarding the legality and good faith of these actions – the Commission considers the above-mentioned facts to be sufficient to conclude that the candidate does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

Thus, O. Bezhenaru was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 07.07.2025 No. 148/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-shchotkina-olega-vitaliyovycha>)

On confirming the ability of a candidate for the position of judge, Oleh Shchotkin, to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

When examining the circumstances of the candidate's acquisition of ownership of an apartment with an area of 116 sq. m in Kyiv, O. Shchotkin explained that the apartment, which belongs to him by right of private ownership and where he resides together with his wife and children, was purchased by his father in 2007. Part of the funds for the purchase, namely USD 350,000, was borrowed by his father from a friend, and the remainder, USD 110,000, came from his father's personal savings.

The Commission in plenary composition notes the absence of objective evidence confirming the fact that the candidate's father received a loan of USD 350,000.

According to O. Shchotkin's explanations, his father obtained the aforementioned sum from a friend. Similar information was also contained in the written explanations of the father, which were submitted to the Commission by the candidate. However, no documents (agreement or receipt of the funds) have been provided as evidence supporting the aforementioned circumstances. The candidate repeatedly emphasised that the borrowed funds have not been fully repaid and that repayments are being made by his father periodically, depending on his financial capacity. The candidate does not have information regarding the remaining amount that his father is obliged to repay under the debt obligation, nor regarding the terms of its fulfilment.

The candidate has not confirmed the legality of the sources of the origin of the property he owns and uses. These circumstances indicate a significant non-compliance of the candidate with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, O. Shchotkin was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 15.07.2025 No. 167/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidytta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-212>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Oleksandr Arkhipov, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

During the interview, the candidate provided contradictory explanations regarding the circumstances of acquiring ownership of an apartment and its value: initially, he referred to an oral loan secured by the sale of apartment owned by PERSON_1; subsequently, he stated that USD 15,000 was transferred by PERSON_1 as a gift; and later he claimed that the total expenditure amounted to approximately USD 20,000, of which USD 4,700 was officially paid to the seller under the contract, and the remainder was transferred in cash by PERSON_1 through the candidate's former wife.

The candidate failed to provide a clear answer in response to the Commission's clarifying question regarding the legal nature of the transaction he had executed.

The Commission critically assesses the candidate's explanations due to their contradictions and emphasises that, according to the title document – the contract of sale dated 01.07.2022 – the apartment was sold for UAH 140,000 (Clause 3 of the contract). Accordingly, O. Arkhipov's arguments raise reasonable doubts and cannot be considered by the Commission.

The Commission notes that the established circumstances regarding the acquisition of the apartment in Kyiv and the reflection of its understated value in the declaration of a person authorised to exercise the functions of the state or local self-government for 2022 indicate the existence of sufficient factual data, which are persuasive to an ordinary reasonable person, that the candidate for the position of judge does not meet the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of "Honesty" and "Lawful origin of rights to objects of civil rights" in connection with these circumstances.

The Commission established that during the period of mobilisation restrictions, the candidate took trips outside the territory of Ukraine. The candidate indicated that the basis for these trips was participation in volunteer activities and sports competitions. However, the explanations and supporting documents provided by O. Arkhipov give rise to reasonable doubts of the Commission. The confirmation letter from the Public Organisation "Centre for Promoting International Cooperation" dated 17.04.2025 No. 02/04, contains only general statements regarding the candidate's participation in the delivery of equipment and vehicles, without specifying the scope, nature, or personal contribution.

In response to the Commission's clarifying question regarding the departure from and entry into the country using the same vehicle, the candidate provided contradictory explanations, stating that he travelled abroad to search for vehicles on foreign sales platforms.

Participation in international sports events was also not confirmed by official documents. According to the Commission, the absence of specific official confirmations of candidate's participation in international competitions raises reasonable doubts regarding the veracity of the stated purpose of his travel abroad, which results in the candidate not meeting the criteria of integrity and professional ethics under the indicators of "Honesty" and "Adherence to ethical standards".

The Commission notes that between 2012 and 2024, the candidate was repeatedly held administratively liable for violations of traffic regulations, which may give rise to reasonable doubts concerning his integrity.

The Commission further observes that, despite receiving a summons to clarify registration data, the candidate failed to appear within the prescribed timeframe, limiting himself to sending a notice of inability to attend. At the same time, he did not take sufficient measures for voluntary personal appearance after the reasons preventing his attendance upon summons were resolved and was in fact delivered to the Hološivskiy Regional Territorial Centre for Recruitment and Social Support. Such behaviour gives rise to reasonable doubts regarding the proper fulfilment of military registration obligations, whereas a candidate for the position of judge is expected to serve as an example of law-abiding conduct.

Considering the above circumstances, the Commission concluded that there was a reasonable doubt regarding O. Arkhipov's compliance with the integrity criterion under the indicator "Adherence to ethical standards and impeccable behaviour in professional activities and personal life".

In view of the established circumstances and the conclusions regarding O. Arkhipov's noncompliance with the qualification assessment criteria, the candidate is assigned 0 points under the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, which constitutes grounds for recognising him as not having confirmed his ability to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating the qualification assessment.

Thus, O. Arkhipov was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 21.07.2025 No. 192/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-golovka-oleksiya-igorovycha-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of a candidate for the position of judge, Oleksii Holovko, to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission retained an unrefuted doubt as to whether the candidate for the position of a judge undertakes adequate efforts to ensure that, in the eyes of a reasonable, law-abiding, and well-informed person, his conduct would be considered impeccable.

The candidate failed to confirm the legality of the sources of property origin, that he owns and uses. The mentioned circumstances indicate the candidate's non-compliance with the indicators of professional ethics and integrity.

Thus, O. Holovko was found **to have failed to confirm** his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 21.07.2025 No. 193/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-kravchyk-marty-bogdanivny-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of a candidate for the position of judge, Marta Kravchyk, to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

In the candidate's declarations for 2022–2024, no information was provided regarding her right to use an apartment. The Commission in plenary composition agrees with the conclusion of the Second Chamber of the Commission regarding the candidate's failure to fulfil the obligation to declare real estate object.

The submitted declaration also did not include information about the candidate's husband, who, according to his own declarations published in the Unified State Register of Declarations, held the position of prosecutor. The Commission in plenary composition agrees with the conclusions of the Second Chamber of the Commission regarding violations of the rules on declaring information in the declaration of family ties of a candidate for the position of a judge.

Having examined the opinion of the Public Integrity Council, written explanations, and the explanations provided by M. Kravchyk during the interview, the Commission in plenary composition concluded that the candidate failed to refute the reasonable doubt regarding her compliance with the criteria of professional ethics and integrity in light of the circumstances outlined above.

Thus, M. Kravchyk was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 04.08.2025 No. 249/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-sokolovoyi-ruslany-igorivny-zdiysnyuvaty>)

On confirming the ability of a candidate for the position of judge, Ruslana Sokolova, to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission retained an unrefuted doubt as to whether the candidate for the position of a judge undertakes adequate efforts to ensure that, in the eyes of a reasonable, law-abiding, and well-informed person, her conduct would be considered impeccable.

In the view of the Commission sitting in plenary, the candidate did not provide reasonable explanations regarding the circumstances set out in the PIC's opinion. The presence of errors in her declarations and the failure to take appropriate measures to submit complete and accurate information call into question the candidate's compliance with the integrity criterion, and her

conduct indicates negligent performance of the obligation to declare information specified in Article 46 of the Law of Ukraine “On Prevention of Corruption”.

Based on the results of dossier review, written explanations, the interview with a candidate, and the voting during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the Commission in its plenary composition concludes that the candidate does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity under the indicators of “Diligence” and “Adherence to Ethical Standards and Impeccable Behaviour in Professional Activities and Personal Life”.

Thus, R. Sokolova was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 04.08.2025 No. 246/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pidtverdzhennya-zdatnosti-kandydata-na-posadu-suddi-shevchenko-daryi-stanislavivny>)

On confirming the ability of a candidate for the position of judge, Dariia Shevchenko, to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal within the competition announced by the Commission’s Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

The Commission retained an unrefuted doubt as to whether the candidate for the position of judge undertakes adequate efforts to ensure that, in the eyes of a reasonable, law-abiding, and well-informed person, her conduct would be considered impeccable.

The candidate failed to confirm the legality of origin of the income she received. These circumstances indicate a significant non-compliance of the candidate with the indicators of professional ethics and integrity.

Based on the dossier review, written explanations, the interview with a candidate, and voting during the closed deliberation on the relevant indicators, the Commission in its plenary composition concludes that the candidate does not meet the criteria of professional ethics and integrity under the indicator “Legality of the sources of property origin, compliance of the standard of living of the judge (judicial candidate) or his/her family members with the declared income, compliance of the lifestyle of the judge (judicial candidate) with his/her status”.

Thus, D. Shevchenko was found **to have failed to confirm** her ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

3.3 Decisions of the HQCJU on the non-confirmation of candidates' ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal due to non-compliance with the aggregate indicators of the criteria for personal and social competence as well as integrity and professional ethics

Decision of 05.06.2025 No. 76/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-156>)

On the dossier review, conducting an interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of the candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal, Denys Prymich, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of dossier review, written explanations, and the interview with a candidate, as well as having regard to the individual assessments by the Commission members according to the relevant indicators, the total score received under the criterion of personal competence amounts to 36.00 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, D. Prymich, has failed to confirm his ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

During the interview, the candidate did not provide specific examples demonstrating determination and responsibility in his professional or personal life, limiting himself to general statements regarding his own determination and responsibility in the professional sphere, as well as his understanding of a judge's responsibilities.

During consideration of the continuous development aspect, the candidate essentially stated that he fulfilled the requirements of paragraph 4 of Part 1 of Article 21 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Bar and Legal Practice" concerning a lawyer's obligation to improve his professional level. The candidate's arguments that he monitored court practice and analysed large volumes of information when preparing cases were also considered by the Commission. However, such activities constitute mandatory elements of maintaining an advocate's qualification and fulfilling professional duties and cannot demonstrate additional efforts in the context of continuous professional development as a candidate for the position of judge of the commercial court of appeal. Furthermore, when asked by the Commission, the candidate failed to cite recent legal positions of the Commercial Cassation Court regarding the squeeze-out procedure.

The Commission assessed the criteria of integrity and professional ethics at 0 points.

During the interview, the Commission established that the candidate for the position of a judge, D. Prymich, unreasonably failed to declare complete information required for declaration by law.

The Commission also determined that while serving as director of several commercial companies, D. Prymich did not reflect that information in the declarations, including for 2016 and 2018. The candidate explained that he did not indicate this information because those commercial companies were inactive at that time, companies generated no income and that work was unpaid.

The Commission does not accept this explanation, as it does not comply with the requirements of anti-corruption legislation.

In view of the above, the members of the Commission expressed reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator of "Honesty".

The Commission notes that, during the interview, the candidate failed to demonstrate knowledge of anti-corruption legislation, in particular with regard to the requirements for completing the declaration of a person authorised to perform the functions of the State or local self-government. Furthermore, during the interview, Prymich D.V. failed to demonstrate a sufficient understanding of the concept of "conflict of interest", as well as competence in taking measures to prevent the occurrence of a conflict of interest, which currently forms part of his professional duties.

These circumstances also gave rise to reasonable doubts among the members of the Commission as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator of "Diligence".

In his written explanations and during the interview, the candidate failed to dispel reasonable doubts regarding his compliance with the criteria of integrity and professional ethics, in particular in terms of honesty, diligence, and impartiality.

Thus, D. Prymich was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 10.06.2025 No. 85/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-163>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Mykola Shelest, a candidate for the position of judge of a commercial court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Following the review of the dossier, the written explanations, and the interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Commission's members under the relevant indicators, the total score obtained under this criterion amounts to 36,25 points out of a possible 50, which is below 75% (37,5 points) of the maximum possible score. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the candidate M. Shelest has failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal under the criterion of personal competence.

The example provided by the candidate to demonstrate his decisiveness – namely, his enrolment in and completion of postgraduate studies in 2010 at the Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs without defending a dissertation for the award of a scientific degree, allegedly due to the inactivity of his academic supervisor (who was undertaking doctoral studies) – is described by M. Shelest without clearly demonstrating the necessity of taking a decision regarding the defence of the dissertation in challenging circumstances. Furthermore, the candidate has not demonstrated examples of applying additional effort to achieve the relevant final result.

In response to questions posed during the interview, M. Shelest stated that the performance of a prosecutor's professional duties, in particular ensuring participation in a court hearing during the consideration of a case, is of greater significance than compliance with the requirements of traffic regulations. The example provided by the candidate and the reasoning offered give rise to doubts as to whether the candidate properly appreciates the legal, as well as broader social, responsibility owed to other individuals and to society. A person who places their own assessment of expediency above the law demonstrates an irresponsible approach, namely that "it is permissible to breach the law if there is a legitimate objective".

The Commission notes that the professional activities of a prosecutor must be carried out within the limits and in the manner prescribed by law. Even where a "need for urgency" arises in the course of performing official duties, this does not confer any right to breach traffic regulations, which form part of the national legislation of Ukraine. Such justification of the candidate's conduct indicates a shift in emphasis from legal principles to considerations of personal expediency.

Analysing the deliberate actions and explanations provided by the candidate regarding the alleged necessity of breaching traffic regulations in order to perform the professional duties of a prosecutor, the Commission finds that, in such circumstances, M. Shelest not only committed a violation of traffic regulations but also does not regard this as problematic, which in turn indicates a lack of critical reflection on his own conduct.

Accordingly, the Commission considers that the candidate demonstrates an attempt to evade responsibility by referring to external circumstances (namely, the need to perform the professional duties of a prosecutor).

The conduct of the candidate, who systematically breaches traffic regulations, cannot be regarded as irreproachable within the meaning of the law and the ethical and moral standards applicable to a candidate for the position of judge. Such actions demonstrate a lack of respect for the law and a disregard for established rules.

The Commission notes that the candidate has provided inconsistent explanations regarding the purpose of the acquisition of apartments by his son in the city of Vyshneve, Kyiv Oblast. In his written explanations and at the beginning of the interview, M. Shelest stated that the apartments had been acquired by his son as the sole heir; however, he subsequently asserted that the apartments had been purchased for the residence of his mother and his spouse's parents. In response to follow-up questions during the interview, the candidate indicated that, as part of the division of property between former spouses, his son had gifted him an apartment with a total area of 38,4 sq.m. According to the division of property between him and his former wife, each of them has been provided with housing. Such inconsistent explanations by M. Shelest may indicate an attempt to conceal the true purpose of the acquisition of the property and raise doubts as to the candidate's candour and integrity.

The candidate has failed to provide comprehensive information and supporting documentation regarding the sources of funds by which a family member – his (former) spouse – was able to accumulate the relevant amount for a contribution in 2017 to the authorised capital of "ADDO SPIRITS" LLC in the amount of UAH 500,000, as well as for granting a loan to that company in 2019

in the amount of UAH 481,728, which significantly exceeded the candidate's family income during the relevant period. The Commission has reasonable doubts as to the candidate's compliance with the indicator of "lawfulness of the origin of rights to objects of civil rights" under the integrity criterion.

The Commission concludes that the receipt of a housing subsidy by individuals who are capable of independently covering the full cost of housing and utility services does not comply with the high standards of ethical conduct expected of persons seeking appointment to the position of judge.

Thus, M. Shelest was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

Decision of 10.07.2025 No. 155/as-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-219>)

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Viktor Syzonenko, a candidate for the position of judge of a commercial court of appeal, within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 14.09.2023 No. 94/zp-23 (as amended)

Based on the results of the dossier's review, the written explanations, and the interview with the candidate, as well as taking into account the individual assessments of the Chamber's members under the relevant indicators, the total score awarded under this criterion amounts to 35 out of a possible 50 points, which is below 75% (37,5 points) of the maximum possible score. The Commission therefore concludes that the candidate failed to meet the criterion of social competence.

The Commission has received a submission from the PIC, indicating that the candidate for the position of judge, V. Syzonenko, attempted to communicate with a member of the PIC in an extra-procedural manner. The subject of this communication concerned his qualification assessment, as a result of which the said member of the PIC declared a recusal from considering matters relating to the candidate. The submission includes excerpts from written messages exchanged via the WhatsApp messenger dated 02.05.2025. It is also noted that, in the course of clarifying the circumstances, it was established that the PIC member had long been acquainted with the candidate, was a member of the Aspen Institute Kyiv community together with him, and maintained regular communication with him.

With regard to the content of the written communication between the candidate and the PIC member (excerpts of which are set out in the PIC's submission of 24.06.2025 and in the written explanations of V. Syzonenko of 03.07.2025), it should be noted that the relationship between V. Syzonenko and the PIC member may have been determined by other social connections, which is not disputed by the PIC co-coordinator, who refers to their joint participation in the Aspen Institute Kyiv community and their regular communication. However, insofar as the communication concerned matters related to the qualification assessment procedure – such as the

commencement of the PIC’s review of information about the candidate, the publication of an article concerning the candidate, and the PIC member’s perception of that publication – V. Syzonenko ought to have refrained from referring to such matters in the course of private messaging. As a legal professional, V. Syzonenko could not have been unaware of which forms of interaction with the PIC are considered appropriate within the qualification assessment procedure, nor that engaging in communication on such matters with a PIC member could, at the very least from an external perspective, create the impression that the procedure for his qualification assessment lacks objectivity and that, in comparison with other candidates, he enjoys certain privileges.

The aforementioned factual circumstances are assessed by the Commission as a negative indicator relevant to the assessment of the candidate’s compliance with the criterion of social competence under the indicator of “effective interaction”.

By demonstrating dissatisfaction with the course of the judicial proceedings, V. Syzonenko displayed a lack of respect for the procedural role of the court, which bore the hallmarks of a distinct procedural offence, thereby provoking, during the court hearing, the emergence of a specific type of conflictual legal relationship. Such conduct on the part of the representative gave rise to the adoption of a court decision imposing a sanction and therefore cannot be regarded as a means of effective interaction.

In view of the above, and taking into account the circumstances established by the ruling of the Commercial Court of Odesa Oblast and the decision of the Pivdenno-Zakhidnyi Commercial Court of Appeal of 19.06.2023 in case No. 916/697/21, the Commission considers that the actions of V. Syzonenko, which were qualified by the court as an abuse of procedural rights, failure to comply with procedural obligations, and a breach of the procedure for conducting court hearings as established by Article 200 of the Commercial and Procedural Code of Ukraine (including obstruction of the consideration of the case in the manner determined by the judge, a manifest lack of respect for the court, and persistent, gross and contemptuous insistence on the judge taking certain procedural steps), indicate a substantial non-compliance with the indicator of “observance of ethical standards and impeccable behaviour in professional and personal life”.

In light of the above, the candidate is to be awarded 0 points under the indicator of “observance of ethical standards and impeccable behaviour in professional and personal life” within the integrity criterion, which constitutes grounds for finding that he has failed to demonstrate the capacity to administer justice in the relevant court and for terminating the qualification assessment.

Thus, V. Syzonenko was found **to have failed to confirm** the ability to administer justice in the commercial court of appeal.

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

HQCJ in 2025:

- The ranking has been determined and 42 candidates have been recommended for appointment as judges of administrative courts of appeal. The competitive procedures have been completed.
- The ranking has been determined and 55 candidates have been recommended for appointment as judges of commercial courts of appeal. The competitive procedures have been completed.
- The ranking has been determined and 81 candidates have been recommended for appointment as judges of general courts of appeal.

Based on the results of the activities of the HQCJ in 2025, within the framework of the competition for vacant positions in courts of appeal of all jurisdictions, 96 candidates were found to have failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the respective courts. Of these, 94 were so found on the grounds of non-compliance with the indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence, as well as integrity and professional ethics. 3 candidates were found to have failed to confirm such ability due to their failure to appear at the Commission session.

The absolute majority – 38 candidates (36%) – failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the respective courts due to non-compliance with the indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence; of these, 15 candidates (14%) failed to meet the indicators of both types of competence, 11 (10%) – only the indicators of personal competence, and 8 (8%) – only the indicators of social competence.

A total of 33 candidates (31%) failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the respective courts due to non-compliance with the indicators of the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

7 candidates (7%) failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the respective courts due to combined non-compliance with the indicators of the criteria of personal competence and integrity and professional ethics.

2 candidates (2%) failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the respective courts due to combined non-compliance with the indicators of the criteria of social competence and integrity and professional ethics.

2 candidates (2%) failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in the respective court due to combined non-compliance with the indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence, as well as integrity and professional ethics.

Among the candidates who failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in courts of appeal, 42 candidates (44%) were judges, while 54 candidates (56%) were representatives of other legal professions, including 31 (32%) attorneys, 4 (4%) academics, and 19 (20%) with combined professional experience.

Among the candidates who failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in administrative courts of appeal, the absolute majority – 16 (67%) – did not meet the indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence.

Among the candidates who failed to confirm the ability to administer justice in commercial courts of appeal, the absolute majority – 11 (55%) – did not meet the indicators of the criteria of integrity and professional ethics.

An analysis of the specific reasons for finding candidates not to have confirmed the ability to administer justice in the respective courts, in the context of the indicators of personal and social competence, indicates a formalistic approach by candidates to interview preparation, an insufficient understanding of the substance and importance of certain indicators of the criteria of personal and social competence, and a lack of commitment to self-improvement.

Out of the total number of candidates who participated in the qualification assessment procedure with the aim of demonstrating the ability to administer justice in courts of appeal, 48 candidates obtained the maximum score (300 points) under the indicators of integrity and professional ethics. In respect of the remaining candidates, the HQCJ applied score reductions under the indicators of integrity and professional ethics.

An analysis of the grounds for decisions to reduce the number of points awarded to candidates in assessing their compliance with the indicators of integrity and professional ethics demonstrates that the most common deficiencies relate to the indicators of “diligence” and “honesty”.

The grounds for reducing scores under the indicator of “diligence”, in addition to instances of ineffective performance of official duties – such as adopting court decisions while on leave (secondment or training), failure to submit court decisions to the Unified State Register of Court Decisions in a timely manner, or the imposition of disciplinary liability on a judge – also included violations related to the improper fulfilment of obligations concerning asset declarations by persons authorised to perform the functions of the state or local self-government, as well as the completion and submission of integrity declarations and declarations of family ties.

Similarly, as with the indicator of “diligence”, the overwhelming majority of grounds for reducing scores under the indicator of “honesty” are related to various forms of declaration and consist predominantly in the deliberate omission of relevant information from declarations, its misrepresentation, or concealment.

The third most frequently cited indicator, non-compliance with which served as a basis for score reduction, is “observance of ethical standards and impeccable behaviour in professional and personal life”. In this regard, the most common grounds for reducing scores were instances of candidates being held administratively liable for violations of traffic regulations, as well as visits to the territory of the aggressor state during the period of the full-scale war of Russia against Ukraine without urgent necessity. Other violations are, in most cases, of an individual nature.

Scores were least frequently reduced for non-compliance with such indicators as “impartiality” and “independence”.

No instances of score reduction were recorded under the indicator of “incorruptibility”.

V. Information on the HQCJU Decisions Regarding the Organisation of Procedures for Selecting Judges for Local Courts

Decision of 30.04.2025 No. 96/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-metodychnyh-vkazivok-z-ocinyuvannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-vykonanogo-pid>)

On the approval of methodological guidelines for the assessment of the practical assignment completed during the qualification exam by candidates for the position of judge of a local court and by judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court

Decision of 06.05.2025 No. 18/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 07.05.2025 No. 109/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-0>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 08.05.2025 No. 297/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-1>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 09.05.2025 No. 368/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-pytannya-shchodo-dopusku-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 09.05.2025 No. 494/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://www.vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-pytannya-shchodo-dopusku-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-0>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 21.05.2025 No. 602/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-2>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 21.05.2025 No. 622/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-5>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 26.05.2025 No. 657/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-6>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 26.05.2025 No. 743/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-4>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 26.05.2025 No. 638/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-osib-do-uchasti-v-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-miscevogo-sudu-ogoloshenomurishennyam-3>)

On the admission of persons to participation in the selection for the position of judge of a local court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 11.12.2024 No. 366/zp-24

Decision of 26.05.2025 No. 740/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-do-skladannya-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-suddiv-yaki-mayut-namir-buty-perevedenymy-do-0>)

On the admission of judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court to complete the qualification exam

Decision of 26.05.2025 No. 655/ds-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-dopusk-do-skladannya-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-suddiv-yaki-mayut-namir-buty-perevedenymy-do-1>)

On the admission of judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court to complete the qualification exam

Decision of 09.07.2025 No. 135/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-form-dokumentiv-neobhidnyh-dlya-provedennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-dlya>)

On the approval of document templates required for conducting the qualification exam for candidates for the position of judge of a local court and for judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court

Decision of 01.10.2025 No. 183/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zdiysnennya-organizaciynyh-zahodiv-shchodo-provedennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-kandydativ-1>)

On the implementation of organisational measures for conducting the qualification exam of candidates for the position of judge of a local court and of judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court

Decision of 24.11.2025 No. 205/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zdiysnennya-organizaciyh-zahodiv-shchodo-provedennya-perevirky-ta-ocinyuvannya-praktychnyh>)

On the implementation of organisational measures for the review and assessment of practical assignments completed during the qualification exam by candidates for the position of judge of a local court and by judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court

VI. Information about the HQCJU Decisions Regarding the Organisation of Competitions for Positions in High Specialised Courts

Decision of 19.03.2025 No. 54/zp-25

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

On the approval of the ranking of candidates for vacant judgeships at the High Anti-Corruption Court based on the results of the qualification assessment and the determination of the winners of the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 23.11.2023 No. 145/zp-23 (as amended)

Decision of 03.06.2025 No. 112/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-ogoloshennya-konkursu-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-vyshchogo-antikorupciynogo-sudu-0>)

On the announcement of a competition for vacant positions of judges at the High Anti-Corruption Court

To announce a competition for 23 vacant positions of judges at the High Anti-Corruption Court, of which:

- 10 vacant positions of judges at the Appeals Chamber of the High Anti-Corruption Court;
 - 13 vacant positions of other judges at the High Anti-Corruption Court.
-

Decision of 04.07.2025 No. 131/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-program-etapiv-ispytu-ta-taksonomichnyh-harakterystyk-anonimnyh-testuvan-dlya>)

On the approval of the exam stage programmes and the taxonomic characteristics of anonymous testing for the conduct of the qualification exam within the qualification assessment of candidates for the position of judge of the High Anti-Corruption Court, including its Appeals Chamber, within the competition announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 03.06.2025 No. 112/zp-25

Decision of 27.08.2025 No. 163/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-oprylyudnennya-pereliku-pytan-anonimnogo-testuvannya-z-istoriyi-ukrayinskoyi-derzhavnosti>)

On the publication of the list of questions for anonymous testing on the history of Ukrainian statehood for the conduct of the qualification exam of candidates for the position of judge of the High Anti-Corruption Court, including its Appeals Chamber, within the competition announced on 03.06.2025

Decision of 08.09.2025 No. 165/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-oprylyudnennya-pereliku-pytan-anonimnogo-testuvannya-iz-zagalnyh-znan-u-sferi-prava-ta>)

On the publication of the list of questions for anonymous testing on general knowledge in the field of law and the specialisation of the High Anti-Corruption Court, including its Appeals Chamber, for the conduct of the qualification exam of candidates for the position of judge within the competition announced on 03.06.2025

Decision of 18.09.2025 No. 56/vs-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-pytannya-dopusku-kandydativ-do-prohodzhennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-ta-2>)

On the consideration of the issue of admitting candidates to undergo the qualification assessment and to participate in the competition for vacant judgeships at the High Anti-Corruption Court, announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 03.06.2025 No. 112/zp-25

Decision of 19.09.2025 No. 174/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya-v-mezhah-konkursu-na-zavnyattya-vakantnyh-posad>)

On the scheduling of the qualification assessment within the competition for vacant judgeships at the High Anti-Corruption Court, announced by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 03.06.2025 No. 112/zp-25

Decision of 19.09.2025 No. 175/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-pryznachennya-kvalifikaciynogo-ispytu-u-mezhah-ogoloshenogo-rishennyam-komisiyi-vid-03>)

On the scheduling of the qualification exam within the competition for vacant judgeships at the High Anti-Corruption Court, announced by the Commission's Decision of 03.06.2025 No. 112/zp-25

Decision of 29.10.2025 No. 193/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-ogoloshennya-konkursu-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-u-specializovanomu-okruzhnomu>)

On the announcement of a competition for vacant judgeships at the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court

Decision of 29.10.2025 No. 194/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-ogoloshennya-konkursu-na-zaynyattya-vakantnyh-posad-suddiv-u-specializovanomu-apelyaciynomu>)

On the announcement of a competition for vacant judgeships at the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal

Decision of 01.12.2025 No. 207/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-program-ispytu-etapiv-ta-taksonomichnyh-harakterystyk-anonimnyh-testuvan-dlya>)

On the approval of the exam programmes (stages) and the taxonomic characteristics of anonymous testing for the conduct of qualification exams within the qualification assessment of candidates for the positions of judges of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal, within the competitions announced by the Commission's Decisions of 29.10.2025 No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25

VII. Decisions on the Qualification Assessment of Judges for Suitability for Their Positions

1. General information

In 2025, the HCJ considered 102 issues within the framework of procedures for the qualification assessment of judges for suitability for the positions held. Based on the consideration of these issues:

The HCJ, **sitting in panels**, took **51 decisions**, including:

- **20** decisions declaring judges to be suitable for the positions held;
- **8** decisions declaring judges to be unsuitable for the positions held;
- **1** decision on the suspension of the qualification assessment;
- **4** decisions on the termination of the qualification assessment;
- **18** decisions to refer to the Commission in plenary session the issue of judges' suitability for the positions held.

The HCJ, **sitting in plenary composition**, took **60 decisions**, including:

- **23** decisions declaring judges to be suitable for the positions held;
- **5** decisions declaring judges to be unsuitable for the positions held;
- **2** decisions establishing the fact of judges' refusal to undergo the qualification assessment for suitability for the positions held;
- **30** decisions on the termination of the qualification assessment of 665 judges for suitability for the positions held.

2. Overview of the HQCJ decisions declaring judges to be unsuitable for the position held following qualification assessment for suitability for the position held.

Decision of 09.01.2025 No. 2/ko-25

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksandr Yuriev, a judge of the Mezhova District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast regarding his suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-70>)

The delegation by a judge of certain powers to his assistant, such as the submission of court decisions to the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, is not provided for under current legislation and is also contrary to the fundamental principles governing the organisation of the judiciary in Ukraine.

The conduct demonstrated by the judge does not meet the criterion of professional ethics.

Based on the results of the review of the judicial dossier and the interview conducted, judge O. Yuriev obtained a total score of 654,75 points, which is less than 67 per cent of the maximum possible score under all criteria of the qualification assessment, and is therefore found to be unsuitable for the position held.

Thus, Oleksandr Yuriev, a judge of the Mezhova District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast, was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

Decision of 23.01.2025 No. 9/ko-25

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Vitalii Kutsarov, a judge of the Ochakiv City and District Court of Mykolaiv Oblast regarding his suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-72>)

Judge V. Kutsarov failed to provide the Commission with explanations regarding his failure, as an individual taxpayer, to submit a tax declaration of property status and income for 2016, reflecting income received as an additional benefit.

During the discussion of the grounds for the annulment and amendment by V. Kutsarov of court decisions, the Commission concluded that there had been a negligent attitude towards judicial duties in the administration of justice, without a proper understanding of the requirements of criminal procedural law and without the ability to analyse errors in order to prevent their

recurrence. This demonstrates the judge's inability to apply legal knowledge, as evidenced by the grounds for the annulment of court decisions.

Based on the results of the review of the judicial dossier and the interview conducted, judge V. Kutsarov obtained a total score of 635,75 points, which is less than 67 per cent of the maximum possible score under all criteria of the qualification assessment, and is therefore found not to comply with the position held.

Thus, Vitalii Kutsarov, a judge of the Ochakiv City and District Court of Mykolaiv Oblast, was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

Decision of 29.04.2025 No. 52/ko-25

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Pavlo Skutelnyk, a judge of the Commercial Court of Kyiv Oblast regarding his suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-91>)

The Commission has established that, at the time of the qualification assessment, the candidate is a person in respect of whom criminal proceedings are ongoing, the consideration of which has not been completed and no final decision has been adopted.

On 16.12.2024, a prosecutor of the Prosecutor General's Office provided copies of the requested documents and granted permission for the Commission to disclose and use, in full, the information and materials of the proceedings during the qualification assessment of Skutelnyk P.F.

In particular, from the content of the extra-procedural dialogues between the candidate and PERSON_5, it is evident that the interlocutors clearly identified the subject of discussion (namely, the issue of removing an insolvency practitioner in a case pending before the judge); PERSON_5, during the conversation, presented himself as a person seeking, in an extra-procedural manner, to persuade the judge of the need to adopt a specific decision; the judge accepted such discussion, facilitated it, and articulated the conditions under which a decision favourable to one of the parties could be adopted; during the conversation, the judge demonstrated awareness of methods of concealment to prevent the unlawful arrangement from being exposed; and the interlocutors discussed the wording of the operative part of the decision, as well as the methods of its adoption and obtaining a copy of the court decision.

Furthermore, the events concerning the judge received widespread media coverage, and the activities of the Commercial Court of Kyiv Oblast were viewed negatively by the public in terms of the judges' integrity and incorruptibility; this undoubtedly brings the office of judge into disrepute and has undermined the authority not only of this court but of the judicial system as a whole.

The circumstances established by the Commission indicate that the actions of Skutelnyk P.F. can be classified as a deliberate violation of the principles of judicial independence (being bound by improper ties when deciding the case), impartiality (extra-procedural relations with other persons

with the aim of facilitating the consideration of the matter concerning the arbitration manager), honesty, incorruptibility, deliberate disregard for standards of conduct that ensure public trust in the court, as well as engaging in conduct that discredits the office of judge and undermines the authority of justice.

Based on the results of the review of the judge's dossier and the interview conducted, judge Skutelnyk P.F. scored a total of 434,75 points, which constitutes less than 67 per cent of the maximum possible points based on the results of the qualification assessment of all criteria.

Thus, Pavlo Skutelnyk, a judge of the Commercial Court of Kyiv Oblast was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

Decision of 29.04.2025 No. 57/ko-25

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Petro Burda, a judge of the Petropavlivka District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast regarding his suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidy-ta-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-84>)

Following the review of the dossier, the information provided by the PIC, other available data, and the conduct of the interview, the Commission has reached the following conclusions.

Judge P. Burda has failed to dispel reasonable doubts regarding the provision of false information during selection procedures, qualification assessment, or other processes related to professional activity or career advancement, with the aim of obtaining a favourable outcome. The Commission has established that P. Burda provided inaccurate information in the Candidate Questionnaire submitted within the competition for the position of judge of the Criminal Cassation Court of the Supreme Court. At the same time, in the Questionnaire he confirmed the accuracy, completeness, and reliability of all information contained therein.

Judge P. Burda has also failed to dispel reasonable doubts regarding the negligent preparation of documents. Statistical data on decisions rendered by judge P. Burda over the period 2013–2023 indicate that approximately one in three cases was considered beyond the time limits established by law, and in every fourth case the full court decision was prepared in breach of the procedural time limits prescribed by law.

Judge P. Burda has further failed to dispel reasonable doubts regarding the adoption of decisions during periods of temporary incapacity for work. The Commission's analysis demonstrates that such decisions were adopted at different times, indicating a recurring pattern of errors and, consequently, a possible systemic nature of the violations. This allows the Commission to conclude that either the judge rendered decisions during periods of absence from work, or regularly failed to take the necessary steps to ensure the proper formalisation of court decisions.

Thus, Petro Burda, a judge of the Petropavlivka District Court of the Dnipropetrovsk Oblast was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

Decision of 25.09.2025 No. 92/ko-25

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Liubov Marulina, a judge of the Circuit Administrative Court of Kyiv regarding her suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-250>)

Commission notes that the decisions adopted by L. Marulina in cases concerning restrictions on the right to peaceful assembly created, in the eyes of an objective observer, the impression of being politically motivated and not compliant with the principle of proportionality between the interference with the right and the legitimate aim, as is evidenced, inter alia, by the opinion of the PIC. The explanations provided by the judge did not fully dispel the Commission's doubts in this regard.

In assessing the judge's compliance with the integrity criterion in accordance with the indicators set out in paragraph 9 of Chapter 2 of Section II of the Regulation, the Commission identified doubts as to the transparency of the disclosure to the public of all assets, as well as the lawfulness of the sources of funds used for the acquisition of the property referred to in the opinion of the PIC and in this decision. L. Marulina failed to dispel these doubts of the members of the Commission.

Commission notes the absence of convincing information regarding the sources of origin of liquid assets and benefits received by the judge's nephews and sister (which were, inter alia, used by L. Marulina), and/or the legality of the income, which formed the basis for the opinion of the Public Integrity Council. The explanations provided by the judge did not dispel the reasonable doubts on this issue.

Having analysed the judge's explanations regarding the failure to indicate, in the declarations for 2019–2023, membership in the Ukrainian National Bar Association, the Commission observes that although such an omission does not indicate deliberate concealment of information or an intention to mislead, it nevertheless demonstrates a degree of inattention, negligence, and insufficient responsibility in the performance of legally significant duties.

Following the review of the judicial dossier and the interview conducted, judge L. Marulina obtained a total score of 612,875 points, which is less than 67 per cent of the maximum possible score based on the results of the qualification assessment across all criteria.

Thus, L. Marulina, a judge of the Circuit Administrative Court of Kyiv was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Maryna Boiaryntseva, a judge of the Circuit Administrative Court of Kyiv regarding her suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-253>)

The facts presented by the PIC regarding the coordination by M. Boiaryntseva of her actions with the head of the court in the course of administering justice, as well as discussions with court staff concerning the status of case consideration and plans for adopting specific decisions in cases, indicate that the judge failed to comply with the provisions set out in the Law of Ukraine “On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges” and the Code of Judicial Ethics concerning the maintenance of high standards of judicial conduct, strict observance of the law, the judicial oath, and high standards of behaviour aimed at strengthening public confidence in the honesty, independence, impartiality, and fairness of the judiciary. These findings are fully supported by materials of criminal proceedings provided, upon the Commission’s request, by the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, as well as by media publications prepared on their basis.

The actions of a judge who becomes dependent on instructions from another person create the appearance of certain predispositions and, in the view of a reasonable observer, give rise to doubts as to the judge’s adherence to ethical principles and standards of judicial conduct, as they form a perception of the possibility of undue influence on judicial decision-making in the administration of justice.

Having assessed the circumstances recorded in the materials provided by the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine and described in media publications concerning these events, in conjunction with the explanations of M. Boiaryntseva, the Commission concludes that there are grounds for reasonable doubts as to the sufficient level of independence in the judge’s conduct and her ability to resist external influence.

The Commission concludes that, during the interview, M. Boiaryntseva failed to dispel reasonable doubts regarding her proper observance of the principle of judicial independence, compliance with judicial ethics, and adherence to standards of conduct that ensure public confidence in the judiciary.

In assessing the judge’s compliance with the integrity criterion in accordance with the indicators set out in paragraph 9 of Chapter 2 of Section II of the Regulation, the Commission identified doubts as to the transparency of the disclosure to the public of all assets, as well as the lawfulness of the sources of funds used for the acquisition of the property referred to in the opinion of the PIC and in this decision. M. Boiaryntseva failed to dispel these doubts of the members of the Commission.

Following the review of the judicial dossier and the interview conducted, judge M. Boiaryntseva obtained a total score of 659,25 points, which is less than 67 per cent of the maximum possible score based on the results of the qualification assessment across all criteria.

Thus, M. Boiaryntseva, a judge of the Circuit Administrative Court of Kyiv was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

Decision of 03.12.2025 No. 108/ko-25

On the consideration of the issue regarding the suitability of Ilarion Rudyk, a judge of the Holoziivskiy District Court of Kyiv City, for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-rozglyad-pytannya-shchodo-vidpovidnosti-suddi-golosiyivskogo-rayonnogo-sudu-mista-kyyyeva>)

Commission, in plenary composition, agrees with the conclusions of the Commission sitting in a panel that, in view of the expenditures of the parents of PERSON_1, the explanations provided by I.Rudyk that their funds constituted the source of PERSON_1's funds used for the acquisition of immovable property and for the provision of loans to third parties appear unconvincing.

The judge's declarations for 2019–2021 contain no information regarding income received by PERSON_1 from his parents which could subsequently have been used for the acquisition of immovable property or for the provision of loans to third parties.

Notwithstanding the explanations and documents provided by the judge, the fact of receipt by the family member, PERSON_1, of funds from his parents that could have served as the source of funds for the acquisition of immovable property and the provision of loans has not been documented by I. Rudyk.

The Commission, in plenary composition, concurs with the conclusions of the Commission sitting in a panel that the identified information regarding the involvement of the parents of PERSON_1 in mortgage legal relations calls into question the explanations provided by the judge as to the sufficiency of their funds, as the income documents submitted by the judge do not fully confirm their financial capacity.

These circumstances indicate insufficient efforts on the part of the judge to properly ascertain and substantiate the sources of the funds of the parents of his family member (taking into account their expenditures).

At the same time, the failure of the judge to submit documents demonstrating the lawfulness of the sources of income of his family member, which were subsequently used for the acquisition of immovable property and the provision of loans, is regarded by the Commission, in plenary composition, as a breach of the judge's duty to confirm the lawfulness of the sources of property.

Thus, I.Rudyk, a judge of the Holoziivskiy District Court of Kyiv City, was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

Decision of 04.12.2025 No. 109/ko-25

On the reviewing the dossier, conducting the interview, and determining the results of the qualification assessment of Oleksandr Hutsaliuk, a judge of the Kherson City Court of Kherson Oblast regarding his suitability for the position held

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-doslidzhennya-dosye-provedennya-spivbesidya-vyznachennya-rezultativ-kvalifikaciynogo-257>)

O. Hutsaliuk has been held administratively liable for a corruption-related administrative offence as provided for under Part 1 of Article 172-6 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences.

Judge O. Hutsaliuk provided inconsistent information. In particular, in his written explanations he stated that a land plot with a total area of 792,00 sq. m located in the settlement of Oleshky in the Kherson Oblast, on which a residential house is situated, has belonged to him since 2007, whereas during the interview he indicated that he does not recall the exact date from which he has owned this property. He also explained that in his asset, income, expenditure, and financial obligations declarations for 2012–2013 the land plot was not declared separately, but as an integral part of the household property.

In the Commission’s view, the acquisition by a member of the judge’s family of the right to use a vehicle encumbered (under arrest) on the basis of a power of attorney indicates the selection of a mechanism aimed at avoiding encumbrances on property, which, in the opinion of an informed and reasonable observer, may give rise to doubts as to the judge’s integrity.

During the interview, O. Hutsaliuk failed to provide clear and convincing explanations regarding the reasons for his non-enforcement of court decisions, in particular the recovery of debt for gas supply services, as well as the reasons for the enforcement of obligations through compulsory measures.

Following the review of the judicial dossier and the interview conducted, O.Hutsaliuk, a judge of the Kherson City Court of the Kherson Oblast obtained a total score of 628 points, which is less than 67 per cent of the maximum possible score based on the results of the qualification assessment across all criteria.

Thus, O.Hutsaliuk, a judge of the Kherson City Court of Kherson Oblast, was found **unsuitable** for the position held.

VIII. HQCJU Decisions of a Regulatory and Legal Nature

Decision of 08.01.2025 No. 3/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-struktury-ta-shtatnogo-rozpysu-vyshchoyi-kvalifikaciynoyi-komisiyi-suddiv-0>)

On approval of the structure and staffing table of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine for 2025

Decision of 15.01.2025 No. 13/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-formy-i-zmistu-zayavy-pro-uchast-u-dobori-na-posadu-suddi-ta-vnesennya-zmin>)

On the approval of the form and content of the application for participation in the selection for the position of judge and on amendments to the content of the candidate questionnaire for the position of judge

Decision of 22.01.2025 No. 20/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-polozhennya-pro-poryadok-ta-metodologiyu-kvalifikaciynogo-ocinyuvannya>)

On the approval of the Regulation on the Procedure and Methodology of Qualification Evaluation, Indicators of Compliance with the Qualification Evaluation Criteria, and Means of their Establishment

This Regulation has been developed in accordance with the Law of Ukraine “On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges” and defines the procedure and methodology for the qualification assessment of a judge in connection with the imposition of a disciplinary sanction, or the qualification assessment of a candidate for the position of judge within a competition for a vacant position of judge in the court of appeal, the high specialised court, or the Supreme Court, as well as the indicators of compliance with the qualification assessment criteria and the means of their establishment.

Decision of 30.04.2025 No. 96/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-metodychnyh-vkazivok-z-ocinyuvannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-vykonanogo-pid>)

On the approval of methodological guidelines for the assessment of the practical assignment completed during the qualification exam by candidates for the positions of judges of local courts and by judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court

The methodological guidelines define the elements of the practical assignment subject to assessment, establish the maximum scores for each assessment element, and set out the list of assessment indicators for the reasoning and operative parts of a court decision, as well as compliance with the stylistic requirements of court decisions and the rules of spelling and punctuation. These elements and indicators are determined for the assessment of practical assignments in administrative, commercial, and civil specialisations, and separately for criminal specialisation.

Decision of 09.07.2025 No. 135/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-form-dokumentiv-neobhidnyh-dlya-provedennya-kvalifikaciyogo-ispytu-dlya>)

On the approval of the forms of documents required for conducting the qualification exam for candidates for the position of judge of local court and for judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court

This act defines and approves the forms of documents required for conducting the qualification exam for candidates for the position of judge of a local court and for judges who have expressed their intention to be transferred to another local court, namely: the individual exam record card; the attendance sheet (for the stages of the qualification exam, including the test on knowledge of the history of Ukrainian statehood and the test on general knowledge in the field of law and knowledge of the specialisation of the relevant court); the protocol for recording violations; the report on an extraordinary situation; and the report on refusal to sit the qualification exam.

Decision of 17.09.2025 No. 169/zp-25

On amendments to the Procedure for Initial Training of Judges at the National School of Judges of Ukraine, approved by the Decision of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine of 10.07.2024 No. 219/zp-24 (as amended), and on the approval of initial training programmes for judges of courts of appeal in the relevant specialisations

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-vnesennya-zmin-do-poryadku-prohodzhennya-pochatkovoyi-pidgotovky-suddi-v-nacionalniy-0>)

Decision of 29.09.2025 No. 181/zp-25

On the approval of the Regulation on the Regular Assessment of a Judge

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-polozhennya-pro-regulyarne-ocinyuvannya-suddi>)

This Regulation has been developed in accordance with the Law of Ukraine “On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges” and defines the procedure and methodology for the assessment and self-

assessment of judges as regular processes within a judicial career. In particular, the Regulation sets out the procedure for the assessment of a judge by instructors (trainers) of the National School of Judges of Ukraine, the procedure for assessment by other judges, the procedure for the judge's self-assessment, and the procedure for the assessment of a judge by public associations.

Decision of 01.10.2025 No. 182/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-poryadku-obmezhennya-zagalnogo-dostupu-do-informaciyi-materialiv-na-period>)

On the approval of the Procedure for Restricting General Access to Information (Materials) During the Period of Martial Law in Ukraine in accordance with paragraph 91 of Section XII "Final and Transitional Provisions" of the Law of Ukraine "On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges"

Decision of 22.10.2025 No. 191/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-metodychnyh-vkazivok-z-ocinyuvannya-praktychnogo-zavdannya-vykonanogo-1>)

On the approval of methodological guidelines for the assessment of the practical assignment completed by candidates for the positions of judges of the High Anti-Corruption Court, including its Appeals Chamber, during the qualification exam within the competition announced by the Commission's Decision of 03.06.2025 No. 112/zp-25

Decision of 01.12.2025 No. 207/zp-25

(full text available at - <https://vkksu.gov.ua/doc/pro-zatverdzhennya-program-ispytu-etapiv-taksonomichnyh-harakterystyk-anonimnyh-testuvan-dlya>)

On the approval of exam programmes (stages) and taxonomic characteristics of anonymous testing for the conduct of qualification exams during the qualification assessment of candidates for the positions of judges of the Specialised Circuit Administrative Court and the Specialised Administrative Court of Appeal within the competitions announced by the Commission's Decisions of 29.10.2025 No. 193/zp-25 and No. 194/zp-25