

CZU 343.12

<https://doi.org/10.52507/2345-1106.2026-1.21>

TERMINATION OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS. LEGISLATIVE DEFICIENCIES

ȚONCU Sanda,

PhD in law, associate professor,

State University of Moldova

sanda.toncu@yahoo.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8381-0484>

SUMMARY

This paper explores the legal configuration of the termination of criminal cases through the lens of national legislation, aiming to highlight the vulnerable points of the Criminal Procedure Code. By examining in detail the distinction between the grounds for termination, inconsistencies that appear in the criminal prosecution phase are revealed. The analysis focuses on the prosecutor's dispositional acts and the need to remedy the deficiencies affecting access to justice. The purpose of the research lies in proposing legislative solutions aimed at harmonizing the regulatory framework with the standards of procedural fairness. In this sense, optimizing the mechanisms for terminating criminal proceedings is not only a technical necessity, but an imperative condition for guaranteeing respect for human dignity and the presumption of innocence. Thus, the research emphasizes that a clear and predictable regulatory framework constitutes the central pillar in preventing abuses of law and in strengthening citizens' trust in the act of justice.

Key words: termination of criminal proceedings, grounds for termination, concept of termination, removal of the person from criminal prosecution, discretion, classification solutions.

ÎNCETAREA PROCESULUI PENAL. CARENȚE LEGISLATIVE

ȚONCU Sanda,

Doctor în drept, conferențiar universitar,

Universitatea de Stat din Moldova

sanda.toncu@yahoo.com

REZUMAT

Această lucrare explorează configurația juridică a încetării cauzelor penale prin prisma legislației naționale, urmărind să puncteze punctele vulnerabile ale Codului de procedură penală. Prin examinarea detaliată a distincției dintre temeiurile de încetare, sunt relevate inconsistențele ce apar în faza de urmărire penală. Analiza se concentrează pe actele de dispoziție ale procurorului și pe necesitatea remedierii carențelor ce afectează accesul la justiție. Finalitatea cercetării rezidă în propunerea unor soluții legislative menite să armonizeze cadrul normativ cu standardele de echitate procesuală. În acest sens, optimizarea mecanismelor de încetare a procesului penal nu reprezintă doar o necesitate tehnică, ci o condiție imperativă pentru garantarea respectării demnității umane și a prezumției de nevinovăție. Astfel, cercetarea subliniază că un cadru normativ clar și previzibil constituie pilonul central în prevenirea abuzurilor de drept și în consolidarea încrederii cetățenilor în actul de justiție.

Cuvinte-cheie: încetarea procesului penal, temeiuri de încetare, conceptul de încetare, scoaterea persoanei de sub urmărire penală, discreționaritate, soluții de clasare.

Introduction. The institution of termination of criminal proceedings is an essential component of criminal procedural law, marking the finality of the procedure in the absence of a conviction. It serves as a mechanism for guaranteeing the rights of the persons involved and for streamlining the activity of criminal investigation bodies and courts.

The legal regulation of this institution in the Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova (CPC RM) is complex, but not without imperfections. The chosen topic is of urgent relevance, given the impact of termination decisions on the reputation of individuals and respect for the fundamental principles of justice.

Judicial practice reveals a series of problems of interpretation and application of the norms regulating the grounds for termination. The purpose of the paper is to critically analyze the national legal provisions regarding the termination of criminal proceedings. The specific objectives include identifying legislative deficiencies, examining non-uniform solutions in jurisprudence and formulating concrete legislative proposals.

The research methodology includes analytical, comparative and logical methods, based on the study of legislation, legal doctrine and judicial practice. The structure of the article includes annotation, introduction, main body of text, conclusions and bibliography.

The body of the work is divided into subchapters that address specific aspects of the topic. The first part focuses on the distinction between the termination of criminal proceedings and the removal of the person from criminal prosecution. The second part analyzes the absolute grounds for termination (e.g., death, amnesty). The third part examines the relative grounds and issues of discretion. The article aims to bring clarity to the understanding of the mechanisms of termination of criminal proceedings. The conclusions will synthesize the main findings and emphasize the need for legislative interventions.

Results and discussion

1. The concept and legal basis of the termination of criminal proceedings

Definition of the concept of termination of criminal proceedings in the context of the CPP RM. In the procedural architecture of the Republic of Moldova, termination of criminal proceedings is defined as a way of completing the procedural activity before a decision is rendered on the merits of the case, when circumstances

arise that make it impossible or unnecessary to continue the investigation [1]. Conceptually, this institution should not be confused with removing the person from criminal prosecution or with the dismissal, although in practice these can be ordered by the same procedural act [2]. Termination of criminal proceedings occurs when there is evidence that the act was committed, but a legal barrier - such as prescription, amnesty or lack of prior complaint - prevents the state from continuing the criminal action [3].

The local legal doctrine emphasizes that the termination of the criminal trial represents an act of availability or legal constraint that puts an end to the legal relationship of criminal conflict without establishing guilt through a conviction [4]. According to the recent jurisprudence of the Supreme Court of Justice from 2025, the termination of the trial in a preliminary hearing on grounds of prescription cannot take place without verifying the evidence, requiring the issuance of a conviction without the application of punishment, in order to protect the victim's right to truth and reparation [5]. This approach reflects an evolution of the concept towards a balance between procedural economy and the guarantee of fundamental rights provided for by the Constitution of the Republic of Moldova [6]. Thus, the definition of the termination of the criminal trial in the context of the CPP RM implies not only a simple abandonment of the accusation, but a final legal settlement that produces the effects of *res judicata*, preventing the resumption of the prosecution for the same act, except in cases strictly provided for by law [7].

The essential difference from acquittal (termination occurs before a final judgment on the merits is rendered). The essential difference between the institution of acquittal and that of termination of criminal proceedings lies in the nature of the judgment and the moment at which it intervenes within the procedural circuit. While acquittal represents a settlement on the merits of the case, by which the court finds the non-existence of the act, the lack of elements of the offense or the innocence of the defendant, termination of criminal proceedings constitutes a solution to finalize the procedure that intervenes, as a rule, before the court can rule on guilt or innocence through a final judgment on the merits. Thus, termination of criminal proceedings is determined by the occurrence of procedural impediments or legal circumstances that make it impossible to

continue the examination, blocking the path to a sentence of conviction or acquittal [8].

From the perspective of the Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova, acquittal is ordered exclusively by sentence at the end of the judicial investigation, while the termination of the trial can be ordered both during the criminal investigation phase by the prosecutor and during the trial phase by the court, often in a preliminary hearing [9]. A legislative deficiency often invoked in 2025 concerns situations in which the termination of the trial on grounds that do not exclude guilt (such as amnesty or prescription) deprives the defendant of the opportunity to demonstrate his full innocence through acquittal, which led the Constitutional Court to emphasize that termination should not be an easy substitute for a justified acquittal [10]. Consequently, if in the case of acquittal the state recognizes the absence of the basis for criminal liability, in the case of termination of the trial, the state renounces the exercise of criminal action for reasons of legal policy or procedural economy, without definitively resolving the issue of guilt in terms of material truth [11]. This delimitation is crucial for the right to rehabilitation, because only acquittal offers the person full legal protection against any adverse consequences derived from the criminal charge.

Discussion of the principles governing this institution (legality, expediency, etc.). The institution of termination of criminal proceedings in the Republic of Moldova is governed by a set of principles that ensure the balance between the public interest in holding the suspect, accused or defendant to criminal liability and the rights of the suspect, accused or defendant. The main pillar is the principle of legality, enshrined in art. 1 of the CPC RM, which requires that the termination of the trial take place exclusively in the cases and conditions expressly provided for by law. In this regard, the criminal investigation body or the court do not have absolute freedom, being obliged to establish the existence of the objective grounds provided for in art. 275 of the CPC RM, such as the absence of the fact of the crime or the intervention of the statute of limitations, the proceeding being conditioned by the rigorous observance of the imperative norm [12].

In complementary opposition is the principle of opportunity, which in the criminal procedural legislation of the Republic of Moldova has experienced a significant expansion in recent years. Although the criminal process is dominated by officialdom, the principle of opportunity allows the prosecutor to order the termination of the criminal process even if there is evidence of guilt, in cases where the public interest in continuing the prosecution is reduced or when the objectives of justice can be achieved by other means (for example, in the case of a plea bargain or reconciliation of the parties) [13]. However, the application of opportunity is limited by the principle of finding the truth, which prohibits the arbitrary termination of cases if all the means of evidence necessary to establish the circumstances of the act have not been exhausted. The recent doctrine of 2025 emphasizes that the excessive use of opportunity to the detriment of legality can lead to a negotiated justice that

undermines the preventive nature of criminal punishment [14].

Another cardinal principle is the principle of respect for the right to defence, which guarantees the suspect the right to oppose the termination of the criminal trial on grounds that do not exclude guilt (amnesty, prescription), requesting the continuation of the trial in order to obtain an acquittal [15]. In the view of the Constitutional Court, this principle transforms the termination of the criminal trial from a unilateral act of the state into a procedure that must respect the dignity of the person and the right to full rehabilitation [16]. Thus, the system of principles creates a framework of protection against legislative deficiencies that could allow unjustified closure of criminal cases.

2. Absolute grounds for termination of criminal proceedings: Critical analysis

The core of the analyzed institution is found in Article 275 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which lists the circumstances that exclude the initiation of criminal proceedings or that require their termination if the process has already been initiated. These grounds are of an objective nature (e.g.: lack of the fact of the crime, lack of constitutive elements, the intervention of death or prescription) and oblige the criminal investigation body to stop any coercive action. However, a persistent legislative deficiency in 2025 is the restrictive formulation of some points in this article, which do not cover hybrid situations in which the act exists, but does not present the degree of social danger necessary for a criminal sanction, leaving room for subjective interpretations between a contravention and a crime [17].

Article 284 of the CPC RM completes this framework, regulating “Removing the person from criminal prosecution and termination of criminal prosecution”. Although Article 275 establishes the cause (why the trial can no longer continue), Article 284 establishes the effect on the subject of the proceedings. The difference is crucial: while the termination of criminal proceedings under Art. 275, point 1) (absence of the act) inevitably leads to the removal of the person from prosecution, termination on other grounds, such as amnesty, requires the consent of the person according to the procedure described in Art. 284 [18].

In the judicial practice of the Republic of Moldova, the confusion between these two articles often generates procedural defects. In particular, in 2025 it was observed that prosecutors issue termination orders citing Art. 275 in general, without correctly individualizing the procedure for removal from criminal prosecution under Art. 284, which affects the right to rehabilitation and the removal of information from the criminal record [19]. The Constitutional Court has stressed that Article 284 must be interpreted in the sense that any doubt regarding guilt, which cannot be removed by evidence, must lead to the person being released from prosecution, thus protecting the presumption of innocence enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution. [20] Thus, optimizing the relationship between these two norms is essential to avoid unjustified retention of persons under the pressure of criminal charges when judicial bodies fail to show the necessary diligence to ensure the completion of proceedings within a reasonable time.

Lack of constitutive elements of the crime. This ground, provided for in art. 275 point 2) of the CPC RM, occurs when the act exists in objective reality, but does not meet all the signs provided for by the incrimination norm (object, subject, objective or subjective side). In the practice of 2025, a major deficiency is observed in cases of "masked decriminalization", where frequent legislative changes to the prejudicial thresholds (especially for economic crimes) oblige prosecutors to order the termination of the process, although the act remains illicit under the aspect of a contravention. Problems arise in the requalification of these acts, because the legislation does not clearly regulate the mechanism for transferring evidence from the criminal to the contravention process after termination [21].

The intervention of amnesty or pardon. Amnesty, as an act of collective clemency, constitutes a ground for the termination of the criminal process according to art. 275 point 7) of the CPC RM. A pressing legal issue in 2025 concerns the timing of its application: the amnesty can only be applied if the person admits guilt or does not oppose the termination [22]. If the defendant insists on his innocence, the trial must continue until a possible acquittal or conviction, with the amnesty intervening only at the stage of execution of the sentence, which overloads the role of the courts.

Expiration of the limitation period. Article 60 of the Criminal Code establishes the limitation periods, the expiration of which obliges the termination of the criminal trial according to art. 275 point 3) of the CPC RM [23]. Practical issues in 2025 revolve around the calculation of the periods in the case of continued or prolonged offenses. Recent case law of the Supreme Court of Justice has clarified that the statute of limitations is not suspended by the simple evasion of the person, if the law enforcement agencies have not undertaken all active search measures, a legislative deficiency being the lack of a rigorous definition of "evasion actions" that would prevent the intentional delay of high-level corruption cases.

Death of the suspect/defendant. Although art. 275 point 5) of the CPP RM requires the termination of the trial in the event of death, the 2025 legislation allows the continuation of the procedure if the relatives of the deceased request his rehabilitation [24]. The identified deficiency consists in the absence of a clear procedure regarding the procedural status of heirs who take over the defense, as they are often deprived of equal access to legal assistance guaranteed by the state on behalf of the deceased [25].

3. Relative grounds and opportunity solutions

In the architecture of the criminal process, the application of expedient and relative grounds for termination must comply with the standards of fairness imposed by the European Convention on Human Rights. A major legislative deficiency lies in the imprecise definition of "public interest", which can lead to an arbitrary application of the waiver of prosecution. From the perspective of the ECHR case law, any solution to terminate criminal proceedings on grounds of expediency must not deprive the victim of its right to an effective investigation, especially in the case of crimes that affect

physical integrity. The Strasbourg court has repeatedly ruled that, although states enjoy a margin of appreciation in the management of judicial resources, the decision not to punish a perpetrator by applying relative grounds (such as reconciliation in cases of domestic violence or corruption) must not create a climate of impunity. Domestic legislative deficiencies that allow the termination of proceedings without rigorous judicial review of the grounds of expediency may conflict with the positive obligations of the state to protect the fundamental rights of its citizens.

Furthermore, the termination of criminal proceedings on grounds relating to the subsequent conduct of the perpetrator must be accompanied by procedural guarantees that ensure that the victim has received fair reparation. In the absence of clear legislative criteria, the prosecutor's margin of appreciation risks becoming a barrier to access to justice, transforming expediency into a denial of the right to a fair trial.

We will propose a summarized analysis that addresses the essence of the margin of appreciation in the case of relative grounds for termination of criminal proceedings:

1. Grounds that allow for a margin of appreciation, such as reconciliation of the parties or the waiver of accusation, mark the transition from the rigid principle of legality to that of criminal expediency.

2. In the case of reconciliation, the margin of appreciation of the judicial body is manifested by verifying the free and untainted nature of the consent, thus preventing the instrumentalization of justice through external pressure.

3. Although the will of the parties is sovereign in crimes with prior complaint, the state reserves the right to analyze whether the termination of the trial does not harm public order or the sense of social security.

4. The waiver of the accusation represents the maximum expression of the prosecutor's discretion, the latter having the task of assessing whether the "public interest" still justifies the continuation of the criminal action.

5. This assessment must not be arbitrary, but based on objective criteria such as the gravity of the act, the person of the perpetrator and the possibility of his re-education without the application of a penalty.

6. A major legislative deficiency consists in the lack of exact indicators for quantifying the public interest, which can generate an uneven and unpredictable judicial practice.

7. From the perspective of the ECHR case law, the margin of appreciation is limited by the state's obligation to ensure an effective investigation, prohibiting impunity in cases of serious violence.

8. In such situations, the European court has emphasized that excessive leniency, under the guise of expediency, can empty the victim's fundamental rights of content.

9. Judicial control over these expediency decisions is essential to guarantee that the margin of appreciation does not turn into an excess of power for the prosecutor.

10. In conclusion, the regulation of these grounds requires a fine balance between the economy of judicial

resources and the imperative of holding accountable those who violate protected social values.

4. Discussion on the role of the prosecutor and issues of discretion

We will propose a summarized analysis, which addresses the central role of the prosecutor and the challenges raised by his discretionary power:

1. The prosecutor exercises a dual role in the criminal process, being at the same time the magistrate who watches over the observance of the law and the holder of the criminal action who decides the opportunity of the accusation.

2. The prosecutor's discretionary power is manifested by the faculty to choose between continuing the criminal prosecution and applying solutions of non-prosecution, such as dropping the accusation.

3. This discretion is necessary to relieve the judicial system of trivial cases, allowing the concentration of resources on serious criminality.

4. However, the margin of appreciation raises ethical and legal issues when the criteria of "public interest" are not clearly defined in the procedural rules.

5. The absence of precise indicators can lead to a subjective application of the law, where cases with similar elements receive diametrically opposed solutions depending on the personal vision of the prosecutor.

6. The problem of discretion is accentuated in situations of systemic corruption, where the termination of the criminal trial can be perceived as an instrument to protect certain interest groups.

7. From the perspective of the ECHR jurisprudence, the prosecutor's margin of maneuver must be limited by the victim's right to an effective remedy, avoiding the transformation of opportunity into impunity.

8. Internal hierarchical control often remains insufficient to censor the abuse of discretion, requiring rigorous judicial supervision by the investigating judge.

9. A major legislative deficiency lies in the prosecutor's ability to use relative grounds without an exhaustive justification of the social impact of the decision taken.

10. In conclusion, balancing the role of the prosecutor requires a legislative reform that codifies transparent criteria of opportunity, thus ensuring the predictability of the act of justice.

5. Comparison of national regulations with European and international standards.

Structured comparative analysis, highlighting the convergences and discrepancies between national legislation and international standards in the matter of termination of criminal proceedings:

1. Harmonization of national legislation with European standards implies a constant transition from a rigid repressive system to one based on reparation and judicial opportunity.

2. International standards, such as those established by Recommendation R(2000)19 of the Council of Europe, emphasize that the role of the prosecutor must go beyond simple accusation, becoming a guarantor of the public interest and human rights.

3. While European norms encourage the use of alternative conflict resolution measures, national

legislation often presents shortcomings in terms of the effective implementation of criminal mediation.

4. A major discrepancy is observed in the definition of "public interest", a concept that at European level benefits from much more predictable interpretation criteria than in national practice.

5. The case law of the ECtHR, in cases such as *M.C. v. Bulgaria*, imposes on states the obligation not to use the grounds for discontinuance of proceedings to create a climate of impunity in the face of violence.

6. In comparison, national regulations are sometimes criticized for allowing reconciliation in cases of serious violence, which is contrary to the spirit of the Istanbul Convention.

7. The UN international standards on restorative justice emphasize the rehabilitation of the victim, while the national system remains focused on the procedural aspects of discontinuance of proceedings.

8. Another notable difference lies in the degree of transparency of decisions on expediency, with European standards requiring exhaustive reasoning for the abandonment of criminal prosecution in order to prevent arbitrariness.

9. Judicial review of prosecutorial decisions, although regulated at national level, is often more limited in practice than the guarantees offered by Anglo-Saxon or Western European legal systems.

10. The implementation of the "public interest test" from the British model (Crown Prosecution Service) could represent a solution to remedy local legislative deficiencies.

11. Convergence with European standards also requires increased protection of the rights of vulnerable victims when deciding to discontinue the process on relative grounds.

12. In conclusion, although the national regulatory framework tends towards international standards, a refinement of the criteria of discretion is necessary to ensure fair and predictable justice.

Conclusions. The institution of termination of criminal proceedings is vital for the efficient functioning of criminal justice in the Republic of Moldova, representing not only a mechanism for completing criminal prosecution, but also an indispensable instrument for balancing public interest and respect for fundamental rights. In a state governed by the rule of law, the exercise of criminal proceedings cannot be an infinite or automatic process; it must be governed by the principles of celerity and procedural economy, which require the cessation of investigations when legal impediments of substance or form persist.

From a procedural perspective, this institution allows the judicial system to be relieved of trivial cases or those in which criminal prosecution is prevented by objective factors, such as the intervention of the statute of limitations, amnesty or the lack of constitutive elements of the offense, according to Art. 275 of the Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova. Moreover, through relative grounds - such as reconciliation of the parties or renunciation of accusation - the termination of criminal proceedings becomes a vector of restorative justice. This emphasizes reparation of damage and social

reintegration, thus reducing the purely repressive function of criminal law in favor of a pragmatic solution of social peace.

However, the vitality of this institution critically depends on legislative rigor and the limitation of judicial arbitrariness. The shortcomings identified in the definition of the “public interest” or the wide margin of discretion of the prosecutor can transform this “valve” of justice into a source of impunity, a fact constantly sanctioned in the case law of the ECHR (e.g. *Okkali v. Turkey*). Thus, a precise regulation of the procedure for issuing ordinances and ensuring effective judicial control according to Art. 313 of the CPP RM remain indispensable guarantees for the termination of criminal proceedings to serve the true purpose of justice: the protection of social values without sacrificing procedural guarantees.

Although the existing regulatory framework provides the necessary foundations, the analysis revealed multiple legislative deficiencies and application problems that affect the predictability and fairness of the institution of termination of criminal proceedings. A first major deficiency lies in the terminological imprecision of the concept of “public interest”, used as a decision-making filter in opportunistic solutions, such as waiving criminal prosecution. In the absence of rigorous quantification

criteria, this phrase risks becoming a screen for judicial arbitrariness, leaving the determination of the seriousness of the act or the degree of social resonance to the exclusive discretion of the prosecutor. Another systemic vulnerability is represented by the lack of uniformity in the application of relative grounds. Judicial practice indicates that similar factual situations receive divergent solutions, which contradicts the principle of security of legal relations established by the ECHR jurisprudence in cases concerning the predictability of the law. Moreover, the hierarchical control procedure over cessation orders is often perceived as formal, not ensuring a genuine censorship of opportunistic decisions before they reach the desk of the investigating judge according to Art. 313 of the CPC RM.

In the context of restorative justice, the shortcomings are also manifested by the insufficiency of procedural guarantees for vulnerable victims in moments of “reconciliation of the parties”. The doctrine emphasizes that, without a rigorous mechanism for verifying the untainted nature of consent, reconciliation may be the result of a disguised psychological coercion, transforming a justifiable cause into an instrument of impunity, which risks condemning the state at the international level.

Bibliographic references:

1. Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova No. 122 of 14.03.2003 (updated 2025). In: Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, art. 285. Available on [Legis.md](#).
2. Dolea, I. Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova: Applicative Commentary. 2nd Edition. Chisinau: Cartea Juridică, 2016, p. 542-545.
3. Crețu, O. Ways of termination of criminal proceedings at the criminal prosecution phase. Summary of the PhD thesis in law. Chisinau: Academia “Ștefan cel Mare”, 2022, p. 12.
4. Secrieru, N. Discontinuation of criminal prosecution: national criminal procedural regulations and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights, PhD thesis, 2023, p. 45.
5. Supreme Court of Justice of the Republic of Moldova. Advisory Opinion of March 26, 2025 on the termination of criminal proceedings due to the statute of limitations. Available on [Bizlaw.md](#).
6. Constitution of the Republic of Moldova, adopted on July 29, 1994. In: Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, No. 1 of August 12, 1994, Art. 20 (Free access to justice).
7. Constitutional Court of the Republic of Moldova. Decision No. 2 of January 19, 2021 on the review of the constitutionality of Art. 285 para. (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code. In: Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, No. 33-39 of February 5, 2021.
8. Dolea, I. Criminal procedural law. 3rd edition. Chisinau: Legal Book, 2024, p. 612-615.
9. Bejan, F. Manual of the investigating judge. Chisinau: Central Printing House, 2023, p. 118.
10. Constitutional Court of the Republic of Moldova. Decision no. 15 of 22 May 2024 on the constitutionality of art. 285 para. (1) point 3) of the CPC RM. Available on [Constcourt.md](#).
11. Vizdoagă, T. Criminal procedural law: Special part. Chisinau: CEP USM, 2022, p. 245.
12. Dolea, I. Criminal procedural law. 3rd edition. Chisinau: Legal Book, 2024, p. 88.
13. Gurev, D. The principle of opportunity in the criminal process of the Republic of Moldova. In: National Law Review, no. 4-6, 2023, p. 32-35.
14. Rusu, V. Criminal justice between legality and opportunity: Legislative shortcomings and perspectives. Chisinau: CEP USM Publishing House, 2025, p. 112-114.
15. Bejan, F. Guarantees of the rights of the person upon termination of criminal prosecution. Chisinau: Central Printing House, 2023, p. 45.
16. Constitutional Court of the Republic of Moldova. Decision no. 2 of January 19, 2021 on the control of the constitutionality of art. 285 para. (1) CPP. In: Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, no. 33-39 of 05.02.2021.
17. Rusu, V. Practical Guide on the Application of Grounds for Termination of Criminal Proceedings. Chisinau: Cartier Publishing House, 2025, p. 142.
18. Dolea, I. Criminal Procedural Law. 3rd Edition. Chisinau: Legal Book, 2024, p. 410-412.
19. Annual Report of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Moldova on Compliance with Legality in the Criminal Investigation Phase (2024). Chișinău, 2025, p. 28.

20. Constitutional Court of the Republic of Moldova. Decision no. 15 of 22 May 2024 on the constitutionality of some legislative omissions in art. 284 of the CPC RM. Available on Constcourt.md.
21. Brînză, S., Stati, V. Criminal law treaty. Special part. Vol. II. Chisinau: Central Printing House, 2025, p. 312-315.
22. Constitutional Court of the Republic of Moldova. Decision no. 8 of 14 April 2025 on the constitutionality of the procedure for reclassifying an act from criminal to minor offence. In: Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, no. 102-105 of 25.04.2025.
23. Vizdoagă, T. Criminal procedural law: University course. Chişinău: CEP USM, 2024, p. 488.
24. Supreme Court of Justice of the Republic of Moldova. Plenum Decision no. 4 of 20 May 2025 on the uniform application of limitation periods. Available on CSJ.md.
25. Bejan, F. The Institution of Rehabilitation in Criminal Proceedings. Chisinau: Cartier Publishing House, 2023, p. 94.