

**Question for written answer E-009434/2012
to the Commission**
Rule 117
Adrian Severin (NI)

Subject: Request for clarification on the dismissal of Traian Băsescu, President of Romania - a parliamentary putsch?

On 10 October 2012, I received a so-called answer from the Justice Commissioner, Viviane Reding, to my written question E-007924/12 of 22 September 2012.

Her answer consists simply of forwarding the replies given to questions tabled by other MEPs (E-007112/2012 and E-007534/2012). Given that my question was quite different from theirs, the answer given to those questions does not provide any response to my own question.

The purpose of my question was to clarify the reasons that led Commissioner Reding to describe the dismissal of President Traian Băsescu as a 'parliamentary putsch' or a 'coup d'état'. Accordingly, I asked her to identify the conspirators involved in the putsch and say in what way they had acted violently. I also requested arguments and evidence, rather than rumours and preconceived ideas, on the basis of which it might be concluded that the procedure followed in connection with the Romanian President's dismissal was not legal.

Leaving aside the fact that she did not answer my questions, Commissioner Reding's reply contains an involuntary recognition of the abuse that occurred when the Commission called on the Romanian Prime Minister to annul acts that did not breach the *acquis communautaire* (the Commission has no competence in relation to the replacement of heads of institutions, the formation of a government and legislating by decree), prevent the country's president from carrying out constitutional duties (the Government had no right to ask the President to forego prerogatives in relation to pardons) and remedy errors that had not been committed (alleged failure to comply with decisions of the Constitutional Court).

I am therefore once again asking the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. Who were the conspirators in the 'coup d'état' in Romania (in the period July to August 2012), and what acts of violence would justify the use of the term 'putsch'?
2. What arguments are there to indicate that the procedure followed in connection with the Romanian President's dismissal was not legal?
3. How will Commissioner Reding take responsibility for unfounded accusations?