



Challenges in Training Judicial Experts in Moldova

Olga Cataraga

Doctor of law, Director, judicial expert, National Center of Judicial Expertise, Kishinev, Republic of Moldova,
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4257-804>, e-mail: olga.cataraga@justice.gov.md

Victoria Prisacaru

Judicial expert, National Anticorruption Center, Kishinev, Republic of Moldova,
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4257-804>, e-mail: victoria.prisacaru@cna.md

Recent legislative changes in the Republic of Moldova attest to many problems related to the training process of judicial experts, which was not at all successful anyway. The authors of the changes made aimed to facilitate access to the profession of judicial expert, neglecting the aspect of their training. This article discusses the issues raised by the changes in the legislation and the related risks, deeply analyzing the obstacles and offering proposals for improving the situation. However, the success of justice directly depends on the quality of training of judicial experts.

Keywords: judicial expertise; professional training; Law No. 68/2016; special knowledge; internship; SIA GDEJ; Republic of Moldova.

Проблеми підготовки судових експертів у Молдові

Ольга Катарага, Вікторія Прісакару

Нещодавні законодавчі зміни в Республіці Молдова свідчать про низку проблем, пов'язаних із процесом підготовки судових експертів, який і без того не був успішним. Ініціатори цих змін прагнули спростити доступ до професії судового експерта, однак не врахували аспект їхньої підготовки. У цій статті розглядаються питання, пов'язані зі змінами в законодавстві, та висвітлюються супутні ризики; про- водиться глибокий аналіз перешкод та надаються пропозиції щодо покращення існуючої ситуації. Проте, важливо зазначити що ефективність правосуддя безпосередньо залежить від якості підготовки судових експертів.

Ключові слова: судова експертиза; професійна підготовка; Закон № 68/2016; спеціальні знання; стажування; SIA GDEJ; Республіка Молдова.

In the contemporary architecture of the Rule of Law, judicial expertise serves as the vital technical-scientific infrastructure of justice. It is the primary instrument through which raw, factual truth is meticulously transformed into legal truth through the rigor of scientific research. Consequently, the quality of judicial expert training is not merely an administrative detail but a fundamental prerequisite for the integrity of court decisions and the broader efficacy of the judicial system [1].

The following sections delineate the theoretical and practical framework required to elevate the profession from a technical service to a cornerstone of judicial credibility, beginning with the core competencies that define the modern expert.

To ensure the integrity of the judicial act, the evaluation of a judicial expert must transcend the simple verification of technical data. A holistic approach is required, viewing the profession

through five strategic „Architectural Pillars” that support the weight of judicial responsibility [1]:

The Knowledge Pillar: Representing the mastery of heuristic thinking and the capacity to model complex expert situations. This is not merely a collection of data but the ability to apply scientific logic to unique cases.

The Educative Pillar: Focuses on professional ethics and the expert's resistance to external interference, serving as the bedrock of independence.

The Architectonic Pillar: Defines the logical structuring of the expert report, ensuring the research is presented coherently and follows a rigorous internal methodology.

The Communicative Pillar: Involves the expert's ability to translate complex scientific phenomena into unambiguous language that a magistrate can utilize in a legal context.

The Organizational Pillar: Concerns the management of the expert's workflow and the in-

tegration of modern digital tools to ensure procedural efficiency.

While the Knowledge and Educative pillars form the core of professional integrity, the Architectonic and Communicative pillars provide the final research with its procedural value. Without a rigorous formation that integrates all five dimensions, judicial expertise risks devolving into a mere bureaucratic exercise, devoid of the scientific force required to uphold justice.

The danger of „Google-like expertise”—where the expert is viewed as a mere data operator—threatens the quality of justice. True expertise requires a „cultural” dimension involving specific biological and psychological properties, including visual memory, motor precision, and the heuristic ability to forecast investigation results based on accumulated experience [2].

Law no. 68/2016 serves as the primary normative pillar for the profession, establishing criteria such as citizenship, higher education, and integrity [3]. However, its implementation revealed a critical lesson in quality management known as „The Error of 2016.”

Originally, Art. 40 para. (5) exempted PhDs and Academicians from the mandatory professional internship and qualification exam. This was based on the fallacious premise that academic excellence automatically translates to expert competence. In reality, a renowned scholar can be an incompetent judicial expert if they lack mastery over trace research methodologies, procedural regulations, and forensic deontology [2, p. 62]. Rectifying this error by

mandating training for all categories was a strategic victory for system integrity.

Currently, professional entry is managed by the Qualification Commission (Art. 43), a collegial body of five members with a four-year mandate, and the Ministry of Justice, which maintains the *State Register of Judicial Experts* (Art. 49). These bodies ensure that the transition from academic achievement to a genuine „expert culture” is verified before a license is granted.

The internship stage (Art. 41 and 42) is the link most vulnerable to administrative formalism. Currently, there is a systemic risk where the „Individual Internship Plan” becomes a box-ticking exercise. A significant structural flaw identified in Art. 42 para. (3) is that while interns draft reports, they bear no legal liability for them. This creates an environment for „ghost-writing,” where interns mimic templates without assimilating the heuristic process of research.

To remedy this, we propose a „*Bridge of Responsibility*.” Policy reform should target Art. 42 to move from a state of intern impunity toward a regime of *subsidiary liability* for mentors. Mentors must shift from passive supervisors to methodological guarantors who assume legal responsibility for the projects signed by the intern. This ensures the internship is a rigorous process of professional assimilation rather than a bureaucratic hurdle.

To eliminate discrepancies between various authorized training institutions under Art. 54, the implementation of a modular, unified curriculum (Art. 42 para. 4¹) is an imperative.

Table 1

**Architecture of the Judicial Expert
Training Process**

Training Module	Targeted Competencies/Stages	Responsible Institution (Examples)
Preparatory Stage Methodology	Examining the disposition act, material verification, strategic planning.	INJ / CNEJ
Separate Research Techniques	Individual analysis of objects and traces; characteristic identification.	Acad. / CNEJ
Comparative and Heuristic Analysis	Establishing coincidences via situational modeling and intuitive thinking.	INJ / USMF
Synthesis and Typology of Conclusions and digitalization in forensic expertise	Formulation of conclusions (categorical, probability, or impossibility). Implementation of the information system for managing expert reports	INJ / CNEJ



Conclusions. The reform of judicial expert training is a fundamental pillar for the Moldovan Rule of Law. To ensure that the expert remains a credible guarantor of scientific truth, the following strategic directions are proposed:

1. *Standardization of Internship Monitoring:* Approval of a unified regulation and a *unified monitoring mechanism* between the Ministry of Justice and training institutions to evaluate practical skills and eliminate „ghost” internships.
2. *Institutionalization of the Unified Curriculum:* Mandatory implementation of heuristic and synthesis modules across all authorized training institutions to ensure methodological uniformity.
3. *Integrated Digitalization:* Completing the implementation of SIA GDEJ and correlating it with the State Register for real-time performance and integrity monitoring.

Investing in the rigorous preparation of judicial experts is an investment in the credibility of the judicial act. The expert must remain the guarantor of scientific truth to ensure the stability of the legal order.

References

1. The problem of the judicial expertise system in the Republic of Moldova. Information note to the Minister of Justice, 2025 Scientific. Chisinau : Ministry of Justice, 2025. 24 p.
2. Kataraga O. Preparations of forensic personnel training in modern conditions. *Archives of Criminology and Forensic Sciences*. 2020. T. 1. P. 61–72. DOI: 10.32353/acfs.1.2020.04 (date accessed: 12.04.2026).
3. Law no. 68 of 14.04.2016 on judicial expertise and the status of the judicial expert / Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, 2026. Nr. 409–412. Art. 551 (Law 191 from 10.07.2025).