



Ketevan

TSINTSADZE

An independent inspector

CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL /
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND
IDENTIFIED TRAITS / BEHAVIOR

2

In 2009–2011 Ms. Ketevan Tsintsadze worked as a legal assistant to the judge of the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court of Georgia. In 2011–2017 – she was an assistant to the judge of the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court of Georgia. From 21 November 2017 Ketevan Tsintsadze was elected as an independent inspector by the High Council of Justice for the term of 5 years.

MISCONDUCT REVEALED IN
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
(DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS,
PROFESSIONAL ETHICS)

6

PROMOTIONS AND AWARDS /
SCHOLARSHIPS GRANTED FOR
PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

6

CONFLICT WITH LAW,
CONFLICT OF INTEREST

7

CANDIDATE'S PUBLIC ACTIVITIES /
POSITION AND BEHAVIOR

8

FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AND
INCOME OF THE CANDIDATE

13

1

CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL / ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND THE IDENTIFIED TRAITS / BEHAVIOR

1. CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

Candidate Ketevan Tsintsadze currently heads the Office of Independent Inspector within the system of the High Council of Justice – an independent inspector. The Office of Independent Inspector was established in 2017, within the framework of the legislative changes as a result of the judiciary reform, the so called “third wave”. Ketevan Tsintsadze started to exercise her powers on the mentioned position from 21 November 2017.¹

In respect of the candidate's performance, the first annual report (2017-2018) of the independent inspector became available for the authors of the document. Before starting to discuss particular matters, the general statistics of the performance of the independent inspector is worth mentioning.

In the period from 21 November 2017 to 31 December 2018, 499 (131 complaints in 2017, and 318 complaints in 2018) disciplinary complaints were submitted to the independent inspector for review. In the reporting period, the independent inspector prepared 173 opinions on 188 cases and submitted them to the High Council of Justice of Georgia. The High Council of Justice of Georgia approved the inspector's opinion in 160 cases, and did not approve in 13 cases. The High Council of Justice delivered 186 decisions on the suspension of disciplinary proceedings, and in the case of 33 decisions, the Council ruled to initiate disciplinary persecution and to take explanation from judges.²

Note: despite the number of judges mentioned in the disciplinary complaint, the independent inspector shall prepare a report per disciplinary complaint, in which he/she assesses the action of each judge individually, and shall submit the prepared opinion to the High Council of Justice of Georgia. The High Council of Justice of Georgia shall deliver a decision on the disciplinary misconduct of each judge individually. In view of the mentioned, the number of the submitted opinions and of the decisions delivered by the High Council of Justice of Georgia may vary.

During the reporting period, out of the said 33 cases, the High Council of Justice of Georgia reviewed 12 cases on the initiation of disciplinary proceedings against judges. The Council suspended disciplinary proceedings in 8 cases, and initiated disciplinary proceedings against judges in 4 cases. In accordance with the inspector's report, the cases involved improper performance of a judge's duties, the violation of judicial ethics, and unreasonable delay of hearing cases.³

¹ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017-2018, page 4, is available on the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

² The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017-2018, pages 14, 20-21, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

³ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017-2018, page 23, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

Legal issue: the improper performance of a judge's duties;

When assessing the fact of improper performance of a judge's duties, the independent inspector (candidate) takes into account the practice of the Disciplinary Chamber in the case №ds-sh/9-16.

In the said case:

- The Chamber differentiated the legal error and the disciplinary misconduct. According to the Disciplinary Chamber, the relevant provision of the law must be interpreted in accordance with the two most important principles, the principle of legality and the procedure for exercising discretionary powers of a judge. The principle of legality shall be based on the rule of law. It is a constitutional principle, according to which no one has the right to take any action that contravenes the requirements of the law. While exercising discretionary powers, a judge is obliged to exercise such authority within the limits established by law and shall not go beyond the scope of the law. The judiciary shall exercise discretionary powers vested by law within the limits of the law ". Thus, in accordance with the existing practice, a judge's wrongful act / omission shall be considered as disciplinary misconduct only if it goes beyond the scope granted to judges by law and if it violates the imperative requirements of the relevant law.⁴

It should be noted that the independent inspector (candidate) considered as an improper performance of a judge's duties the case:

- "When a judge made a decision based on an invalid provision that resulted in violation of a party's substantive right to a trial, in particular, the right to an oral hearing of the relevant application. Due to the possibility of correcting an error, the motive of the judge, his/her intentional attitude to an act, also the attitude excluding gross negligence, the fact of violation of the procedural rules was assessed by the High Council of Justice of Georgia as a legal error.⁵

The independent inspector (candidate) considered as disciplinary misconduct the cases, where:

- "The party was served upon the substantiated decision on the civil case about five months later; it was delayed by 8 months; it was delayed by 6 months. The fact of committing disciplinary misconduct was not established in the cases where a substantiated judgment was sent and served upon the respondent, two weeks after the sending of the judgment to the plaintiff; the decision was served upon the defendant on the 13th day after the address to a court (the deadline was violated by 10 days), although the party was not deprived of the right to appeal.⁶

The independent inspector (candidate) did not consider the improper performance of the duties of a judge established when the sending of a substantiated decision to the party was delayed by 9 months. The inspector focused on several circumstances:

⁴ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017-2018, page 31, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

⁵ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017-2018, page 31, (disciplinary case №202-17) is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

⁶ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017-2018, page 32, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

- The party has not been deprived of the right to appeal the decision; and
- The workload of the judge was quite high, in particular, the judge had 1674 civil cases pending by the period of the violation of the deadline, out of which 888 (53%) cases were completed.⁷

Legal issue: Violation of judicial ethics.

The independent inspector (candidate) deemed the judge’s loud address to an interpreter commanding to perform the duties assigned to him/her, as a violation of judicial ethics. The mentioned conclusion of the inspector was not approved by the High Council of Justice of Georgia and it suspended the disciplinary proceedings. The Council considered that **“the interpreter’s actions at the trial were intended to disrupt the process. The judge’s action served the purposes of the continuity of judicial review and the prompt administration of justice”**.⁸

The independent inspector did not deem as disciplinary misconduct the judgment of the judge concerning the personality and the lifestyle of the accused, in a ruling to impose preventive measures. While reviewing the matter related to preventive measures, the judge argued in the ruling on the personality of the accused, his/her family, activities, and the independent lifestyle of an adult accused.

According to the independent inspector’s assessment:

- **The judge’s argument served to substantiate the grounds for imposing preventive measures and was not intended to abuse the personality and the family of the accused.**⁴⁹

Legal Issue: Unjustified delay of the hearing of the case by a judge

It is specified in the report that the independent inspector (candidate) is guided by the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights during the review of the unjustified delay of the hearing of the case by a judge.¹⁰

During the review of the fact of alleged delay, the independent inspector (candidate) focuses on the complexity of the case, the actions taken by a judge and the parties to the case, the conducted sessions and different procedural measures, as well as the period of pending cases of a particular judge, the workload and individual responsibility of the judge.

According to the report, the mentioned includes:

- **“A civil/administrative case may be pending in a court for 2 years, although a particular judge against whom the claim is filed, may hear the case not for the entire duration of the proceedings, but for 3 or 4 months. For example, a civil case has been pending in the City Court for more than a year, although a judge has had the case pending for 4 months and 24 days, and the other judge – for 8 months and 23 days. Although the independent inspector (candidate) established the fact of general delay of the hearing of the case, during the violation of**

⁷ Ibid, page 33.

⁸ Ibid, page 34.

⁹ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017–2018, page 26, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

¹⁰ The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017–2018, page 31, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

the statutory deadlines for the hearing of the case, he/she gave arguments with respect to each judge individually.¹¹



The independent inspector (candidate) assessed and considered the delay of administrative proceedings by 2 years and 6 months as the fact of the alleged disciplinary misconduct, while no procedural action has been taken in the administrative case during a year and eight months.

In accordance with the report, the High Council of Justice of Georgia suspended the disciplinary proceedings in the case. In particular, **“nine members considered that a judge should have been subject to disciplinary persecution and that explanations should have been taken from the judge with respect to the facts stated in the complaint, while four members considered it appropriate to suspend the disciplinary proceedings against the judge. As long as there was no decision made by two-thirds of the votes, the disciplinary proceedings against the judge were suspended.”**¹²

Legal Issue: The legality of the judicial act

The annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector also touches upon the lawfulness of the act adopted by a court on disciplinary complaints.¹³ According to the report, despite the fact that it is prohibited by law to control the lawfulness of the act adopted by a judge within the disciplinary proceedings, the independent inspector was addressed to review many complaints having the said content. For example, in 2017, 13% of complaints, and in 2018, 24% of complaints submitted to the independent inspector concerned the claims with regard to the lawfulness of the act adopted by a judge.

In this case the independent inspector refers to the Constitution of Georgia and the Organic Law of Georgia on Common Courts, and states that the control of the lawfulness of the act / decision adopted by a judge is not his/her competence.

The independent inspector states:

- **“The decision of the court may be reversed or repealed only by the court and in the cases and manner provided for by law. Disciplinary proceedings do not entail the control of the substantiation and content of the decision delivered by a court. It should also be noted that the incorrect interpretation of the law, which is based on a judge’s inner conviction, is not the disciplinary misconduct and the disciplinary liability shall not be imposed on the judge for such action”.**¹⁴

Note: In accordance with Article 63 (1) of the Constitution of Georgia “no one shall have the right to demand an account concerning a particular case from a judge.” In addition, in accordance with Article 7(1) of the Organic Law of Georgia on Common Courts, a judge shall deliver a decision on the basis of both the legislation and his/her inner conviction. And in accordance with Article 75(3) of the same law, an incorrect interpretation of a law, which is based on a judge’s inner conviction, shall not be a disciplinary misconduct and disciplinary liability shall not be imposed on a judge for such act.

¹¹ **ibid**, page 27.

¹² The first annual report of the Office of Independent Inspector, 2017–2018, page 27–28, is available at the website <https://bit.ly/2kk8gzd> [last reviewed 14.09.2019]

¹³ **ibid**, pages 36–34.

¹⁴ **ibid**, page 37.

2. ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES / PUBLICATIONS

Ketevan Tsintsadze – the candidate for judge of the Supreme Court of Georgia discusses in one of her English-language articles the matters related to tort liability arising from harm to a fetus.¹⁵ The article represents a comparative overview of the case-law decisions of the national courts of common law countries and of the Court of Justice of the European Union, of the relevant legislative and medical aspects.

In conclusion, the candidate states:

- “Despite the rapid development of tort liability arising from harm to a fetus, the best outcome of justice cannot be achieved until the courts and legislators fully recognize that an individual has value merely because of his/her status as a human being. Courts and legislators should review the legal status of the fetus and the matters related to the identification of the extent of harm, in the case of the death or damage to the health of the fetus.”

¹⁵ Tsintsadze K. “Tort liability arising from harm to a fetus”, European Scientific Magazine, November 2014.

2.

MISCONDUCT REVEALED IN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS, PROFESSIONAL ETHICS)

1. DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS – EXISTING COMPLAINTS

- No disciplinary penalties or measures of influence have been applied against the candidate.

2. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

- No violation of ethics has been identified.

3.

PROMOTIONS AND AWARDS / SCHOLARSHIPS GRANTED FOR PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

1. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- From February to July 2009, Mrs. Ketevan Tsintsadze was an intern at the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court of Georgia. In 2009-2011, the candidate held the position of a legal assistant to a judge

of the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court. In 2011–2017 she was an assistant (including the assistant to **Mikheil Chinchaladze**) to a judge of the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court of Georgia, and from June to November 2017 she was the so called “writing” assistant.

- From 21 November 2017, Mrs. Ketevan Tsintsadze was elected as an independent inspector for a 5-year term by the High Council of Justice.

2. AWARD / SCHOLARSHIP GRANTED

- In 2005–2009 the Presidential State Scholarship was granted to Ketevan Tsintsadze.

4

CONFLICT WITH LAW, CONFLICT OF INTEREST

1. CRIMINAL LIABILITY, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFENCES / PENALTIES, LITIGATIONS

- Candidate Ketevan Tsintsadze has never been convicted.
- No administrative penalties have been imposed on Ketevan Tsintsadze.
- Mrs. Ketevan Tsintsadze was the third person involved in the administrative dispute, where the subject of dispute was the annulment of the results of competition for the position of an independent inspector and the imposition of the obligation on the High Council of Justice of Georgia to conduct a repeated interview. The Tbilisi City Court dismissed the complaint (05.03.2018), which was upheld by the Tbilisi Court of Appeals (10.07.2018) and then by the Supreme Court of Georgia (21.03.2019).

2. PARTY AFFILIATION, CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH A MEMBER OF THE HIGH COUNCIL OF JUSTICE, LINKS WITH POLITICIANS / INFLUENTIAL PERSONS

- Ketevan Tsintsadze has never been a member of any political party.
- During her time working as an assistant to a judge in the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court of Georgia, Ketevan Tsintsadze acted as an assistant to various judges, including to **Mikheil Chinchaladze**.
- Vano Bolkvadze (**Mikheil Chinchaladze**, Chairperson of the Chamber of Administrative Cases), who is currently the Director of the High School of Justice, worked in the Chamber of Administrative Cases of the Supreme Court of Georgia with Ketevan Tsintsadze. Vano Bolkvadze’s wife, Khatia Javakhishvili is engaged as a consultant at the Office of Independent Inspector.
- The Coalition “For an Independent and Transparent Judiciary,” negatively assessed the process of the selection of an independent inspector and stated that the complete closure of information related to the process of the selection of an independent inspector raised doubts with regard to the unhealthy interest of the Council in the results of the competition and decreased the opportunity of the selected candidate to find confidence in the public.¹

¹ The Coalition negatively assesses the lack of transparency in the competition for the selection of an independent inspector, see <http://bit.ly/2ZofVLf>

- The monitoring report of the High Council of Justice indicates that the selection of an independent inspector was ambiguous in terms of transparency and non-publicity of the process; the report states that Ketevan Tsintsadze’s biography and non-transparency of the process of her selection cast doubt on the actual independence of the inspector.²
- According to Nazi Janezashvili, a non-judicial member of the High Council of Justice, in the process of the interview with candidates for judges of the Supreme Court, an independent inspector did not react on unethical statements against her from the side of the judicial members of the High Council of Justice, thus putting the judicial members of the Council in the privileged position.³

² The monitoring report N6 of the High Council of Justice, pages 65-66; see <http://bit.ly/2kITphT>

³ Nazi Janezashvili – Madi Chantladze is an experienced and high-level lawyer, but I do not know due to what merits Ketevan Tsintsadze has the motivation to become a judge of the Supreme Court, see <http://bit.ly/2Z9C5pn>

5. CANDIDATE’S PUBLIC ACTIVITIES / POSITION AND BEHAVIOR

1. OPINIONS RECORDED BY THE CANDIDATE IN SOCIAL MEDIA

Candidate Ketevan Tsintsadze’s personal account is registered in the social network called Facebook, although she does not express her opinion publicly. Her page contains activities having mainly personal and religious content.¹

2. PUBLIC STATEMENTS MADE BY CANDIDATE KETEVAN TSINTSADZE

2.1. STATEMENT ON COMPLAINTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE INDEPENDENT INSPECTOR

On 20 June 2018, Independent Inspector Ketevan Tsintsadze, summarizing the results of her six-month work, stated:

“ Three types of complaints have been identified, namely, delays in the hearing of cases, improper performance of the duties of a judge, and the lawfulness of acts adopted by a court. None of the complaints served as grounds for the dismissal of a judge. It is noteworthy that mainly the authors of complaints make the lawfulness of the decision disputable, although the Office of Independent Inspector cannot not assess the lawfulness of the court’s decision and this is the competence of the superior court.”²

¹ For example, see the following posts by Ketevan Tsintsadze: <https://drive.google.com/file/>, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/>.

² “Ketevan Tsintsadze – of the complaints lodged for review by the independent inspector, none has served as the grounds for the dismissal of a judge.” 20.06.2018, available at: <https://bit.ly/2mklATP>

On the question what was meant by improper performance of duties by a judge in respect of the case, Ketevan Tsintsadze stated that it meant that the constitutional right of the party was violated during the exercise of the authority by a judge,

“ which was done by the judge deliberately and it was a gross violation of the constitutional right.”³

3. INTERVIEW OF CANDIDATE KETEVAN TSINTSADZE GIVEN AT THE HIGH COUNCIL OF JUSTICE



Question to the candidate by LEVAN GZIRISHVILI, a member of the Council: “How would you interpret the rule of law?”

The candidate’s answer:

“ The rule of law in general is a fundamental principle of a democratic state, the law and justice are the driving force for all three branches of the state in general, and especially for courts. Thus, the obedience to the law and the enforcement of the law is a primary goal of the branches of the government and, above all, of judges ...whatever decision a judge may take, whether lawful or just; I recall one of interesting words by Kant, saying that the law does not bring justice, but justice brings the law itself and what is the law in itself, from the prospect of the public, it is the echo of people, and the echo of justice. I also recall a very interesting article by Gustav Radbruch, who spoke about supracanonical justice and illegal justice and supracanonical injustice. When the question stands that justice and expediency are no longer compatible with law, then law must give way to justice, this is my answer with regard to lawfulness and justice.”



The member of the Council, IRAKLI BONDARENKO asked the candidate about her opinion with regard to freedom of expression in relation to judges.

Ketevan Tsintsadze’s answer:

“ There are two very interesting contexts of freedom of expression in general, the freedom of expression in relation to a judge, and the freedom of expression from the side of a judge. We know that in accordance with both the Law of Georgia on Freedom of Speech and Expression, and the European Convention, the subject of protection is the freedom of expression and there is one limitation, in accordance with our legislation, there are independence and impartiality of the judiciary, and there are authority and impartiality of the judiciary under the European Convention. With regard to the mentioned there are several cases that I recall, including Scalka v. Poland, Oberschlick v. Austria, Prager v. Austria, Morris v. France, etc., where there was a discussion around the value judgement, on the one hand, and when it came to the expression of opinion as a result of the value judgment on summary concepts and not on individuals in general, in such case the restriction of freedom of expression was not considered proportionate. But in the second case, when we talk about the facts, I recall the case Peru v. Italy, the case Vintgenter v. Germany, where there was judgment on the particular facts, addressed towards a particular judge, that he/she, for example, explicitly violated ethical standards, deliberately violated the law to make such decision, and even more, I recall the recent decision delivered in relation to the case Rustavi 2, where the subject of judgment is the criticism of the judiciary that goes far beyond the limits. Thus, if such criticism leads to the open restriction of authority and impartiality of a judge and the judiciary at the same time, it is natural that to limit the freedom of expression in such case becomes permitted.”

³ Ibid.



Question to the candidate by NAZI JANEZASHVILI, a member of the Council: “What is your attitude to Article 366 of the Criminal Code (contempt of court). We have the term in this article – “to abuse”, how you think it can be explained and what do you think about this article in general, do you know the court decisions, including the Supreme Court decisions.”

Candidate’s answer:



As you know, it is very interesting here to draw a distinguishing line between the crime, on the one hand, and the action during civil and criminal proceedings, on the other hand. We know that we have the possibility, and a judge has the possibility to impose penalties, apply expulsion and other leverage during the proceedings, if a party expresses contempt to the court, or does not obey the court. But the criminal offence is on the other side. The provision we are talking about is about the trial participant, which naturally includes a judge, as well as the parties, a lawyer, a prosecutor, and any party involved in the proceedings. To abuse, to put it in several forms, is, to my opinion, the verbal abuse, or the physical abuse that is exercised and is directly related to the case, as I imagine (...). My personal opinion is that the provision involves that there is dispute in relation to a particular case which is being heard, has already been heard, or is to be heard. And not that we have to hypothetically differentiate between the judicial function and the non-judicial function in general, when outside of us, a judge becomes merely abused by somebody in the ordinary circumstances, I don’t think that could be the basis for its being qualified under this provision. This is when we directly abuse the judge as a judge and we know that he/she is the judge, who will hear the case, has heard the case or the case is being heard by him/her.”



LEVAN GZIRISHVILI’s question to the candidate: Is the abuse of religious sentiments punishable and should it be punished, and is the right endangered?

Candidate’s answer:



Abuse of religious sentiments is not directly punishable under our law, however, as I remember, there is a provision in the Criminal Code that speaks of the obstruction to enforcement, which may, at the same time, be accompanied by the abuse of religious sentiments. There are actually two circumstances here, there are religious sentiments, religious freedom on the one side, and the freedom of expression on the other side, and in such cases we know the practice of the Strasbourg Court, including when in some cases the issue is about the level of abuse, the kind of speeches that actually abuse not just a particular religion, but also evokes aggression, incitement towards a particular religion, in this case I recall Norwood v. The United Kingdom, when there was judgment on the United Kingdom without Islam, and accordingly , there is a very clear margin to be drawn on the part of the state in order not to have religious sentiments abused by the freedom of expression, on the one hand, and on the other hand, not to have the fundamental human rights violated as a result of the abuse of religious sentiments.”

- The candidate was additionally asked about this issue: “Do you remember the fact of hanging a pig head on the door of an educational institution in Kobuleti, and there were other facts too. Would we consider it as violence? Do you think such abuse of religious sentiments shall be punishable?”

Ketevan Tsintsadze’s answer:



To my opinion, the cases where we have some elements of violence, shall be punishable. However, if we are talking about, for example, elements of expression, when a particular person expresses his /her attitude by a wrong formulation, which does not contain the elements of violence, in such case, as I think, there should be no interference by the state. “



Question by ANA DOLIDZE, a member of the Council: “In the system of our common courts, there is an absolute minority of women represented as chairpersons, only in one or two cases. Would you agree that such high position as a chairperson of the court is mainly occupied by men? How would you describe this situation? How the situation would be described by you as a lawyer and as a researcher?”

Candidate’s answer:



As I watch these conferences, the judges do not even raise this issue. Personally, I believe that a woman as a chairperson can really be a very good manager, and I am very much in favor of having as many women on the position of a manager as possible. So, I think that there is a problem not in the legislation, but in its essence, it is the problem of assessment of what we prefer. We prefer to administer judicial powers and not to become overloaded. Conditionally, to allocate time differently, devote more time to academic activities rather than to the role of a chairperson.”



ANA DOLIDZE’s question to the candidate: “Please draw a line between the opposite discrimination and the positive discrimination. Where does the positive discrimination end, and at what stage does it start what we call the opposite discrimination?”

Candidate Ketevan Tsintsadze’s answer:



Positive discrimination means the taking of particular measures to eliminate the existing discrimination. And we have opposite discrimination when people in a certain minority actually occupy the place of majority and actually have the opposite effect. In reality, when our goal is actual equality, conditional equality in quotas, in such case we are led to the situation where a certain category in the majority appear in the minority, and accordingly, there is a need to apply positive discrimination against them.”



NAZI JANEZASHVILI’s question to the candidate: “Do you know who the director of the High School of Justice is?”

Ketevan Tsintsadze’s answer:



Yes, I do, Vano Bolkvadze”.



NAZI JANEZASHVILI’s question to the candidate: “Does his wife work with you?”

Candidate Ketevan Tsintsadze’s answer:



Yes, she does, she is Mrs. Khatia Javakhishvili.”



NAZI JANEZASHVILI’s question to the candidate: “How did you recruit her?”

Ketevan Tsintsadze’s answer:



On the basis of the competition”.



NAZI JANEZASHVILI’s question to the candidate: “Did Vano Bolkvadze, the director of the High School of Justice, work with you in the Supreme Court and how long? Please specify years.”

Ketevan Tsintsadze's answer:



I don't remember how many years exactly, but Mr. Vano Bolkvadze worked at the Supreme Court. Vano and I have worked together at the Chamber of Administrative Cases for years."



NAZI JANEZASHVILI's question to the candidate: "Did you work during the period when Mikheil Chinchaladze was a member of the Supreme Court? And did you have any official relation with him?"

The candidate's answer:



Yes, I worked at the Supreme Court from 2009 until 2017. During the period I have been an assistant to various judges of the Chamber of Administrative Cases, including to Mr. Mikhail Chinchaladze."



NAZI JANEZASHVILI's question to the candidate:



What is your, as an independent inspector's opinion, who has been working in the system for a long time and who knows the person well. Is Mikheil Chinchaladze a person of influence in the judiciary system? "

Ketevan Tsintsadze's answer:



Mr. Mikheil Chinchaladze is the Chairperson of the Court of Appeal and was the Chairperson of the Chamber of Administrative Cases. Accordingly, he holds a managerial position. What do you imply under a person of influence? No judge and no chairperson has the right to exercise influence over another judge, and it is obviously illegal. And the fact that he occupies a particular managerial position is natural and obvious. This is my answer."



ANA DOLIDZE's question to the candidate: "What procedure did you take to occupy the first position in the Supreme Court?"

The candidate's answer:



In December 2008 the internship competition was announced in the Supreme Court, I participated in the competition and was selected as an intern. After completing my 6-month internship, I was appointed a legal assistant"

6.

FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AND INCOME OF THE CANDIDATE

1. REAL ESTATE



2016
AN APARTMENT
IN TBILISI,
GEL 84 660
69 SQ.M



2004
AN APARTMENT
IN TBILISI
GEL 27 300
46 SQ.M

2. FINANCES

Ketevan Tsintsadze worked as an independent inspector in 2018 and gained GEL 55,640 as remuneration. Along with her professional activities, the candidate pursues academic activities from which she earned GEL 3,240 last year.

As for her husband, Archil Maisuradze, he is employed by the insurance company called Unison as a sales manager, from which his annual income comprised GEL 10,452. Archil Maisuradze is also a private entrepreneur, however, his entrepreneurial activities are currently suspended.

Ketevan Tsintsadze has two current bank liabilities at TBC Bank. In 2019, the candidate took a consumer loan to repay the consumer loan at the Bank of Georgia. Also, in 2016, Ketevan Tsintsadze took a mortgage loan in the amount of USD 34,000 at TBC Bank, and bought an apartment at N 59 Anna Politkovskaia Street, Tbilisi. The mortgage loan service commissions of the candidate costs USD 421 per month.



Authors: EDUARD MARIKASHVILI, ANA NATSVLISHVILI, GIORGI BERAIA, IRAKLI GVARAMADZE, ZAZA ABASHIDZE

Editors: DAVIT PAICHADZE, GIORGI CHITIDZE, SOPHIO ASATIANI, INA GRIGALISHVILI Designer: BESIK DANELIA

Open Society foundation would like to than following individuals for their contribution:

SALOME KVIRIKASHVILI, MARIAM ORZHONIA, LASHA JUGHELI, TINATIN CHACHUKASHVILI, GVANTSA KAKHIDZE,
TEONA BABUTSIDZE, KHATIA NIKOLAISHVILI, SHOTA KOBALIA

PREPARED BY THE OPEN SOCIETY GEORGIA FOUNDATION