

<http://www.luju.ro/he-admits-to-it-but-does-not-remember-after-3-days-of-avoiding-the-topic-augustin-lazar-admits-that-he-is-the-prosecutor-exposed-by-lumea-justitiei-in-1985-1986-i-fulfilled-duties-pertaining-to-the-parole-board-of-the-aiud-penitentiary-considering-the-fac>



**HE ADMITS TO IT, BUT DOES NOT REMEMBER – After 3 days of avoiding the topic, Augustin Lazar admits that he is the prosecutor exposed by Lumea Justitiei: "In 1985 – 1986 I fulfilled duties pertaining to the Parole Board of the Aiud Penitentiary... Considering the fact that the events took place a long time ago and that I am unable to review any original documents, I cannot confirm concrete aspects referring to the person mentioned in the press articles"**

Scris de L.J. | Data: 08.04.2019 14:23



Fascinating! After avoiding to talk about the exposé of Lumea Justitiei and confirm whether or not he is prosecutor "Augustin Lazar" of the Aiud Penitentiary Parole Board, which denied the parole of political dissident Iulius Filip, Romania's Attorney General Augustin Lazar sealed his fate on Facebook. **In a post published on Monday afternoon - April 1st 2019 – on the page of the Public Ministry, Attorney General Augustin Lazar (pictured) acknowledged that, between 1985 and 1986, he acted as a prosecutor within Alba Iulia's Prosecutor's Office, during which time he also served as a member of the Parole Board of the Aiud Penitentiary, periodically.**

---

In other words, Romania's Attorney General mentioned that the "Augustin Lazar" referred to in the article entitled *"The tirant of the communist regime"* ([click here to read it](#)), who led the Parole Board that denied the parole of political dissident Iulius Filip is the very same person. Meaning, he finally admitted to what Lumea Justitiei had uncovered on Friday, March 29th 2019!

**Has Att.Gen. Lazar forgotten how he used to sign his name?**

However, in the end of the absolutely fascinating Facebook post, **Augustin Lazar comes up with the excuse that he does not remember what happened that far back, since a long time has passed since he denied dissident Iulius Filip the chance to leave prison.**

**We have one question for the attorney general who admits, but argues that he no longer remembers: does he recognize the signatures next to his name in the reports? If he cannot even remember the signature...**

**The comments made by the Public Ministry and Lazar on Facebook follow the same Attorney General's comments on Monday morning – April 1st 2019 – in front of the Attorney General's Office, claiming that the revelations made by Lumea Justitiei were “the manipulations of a website, dedicated to the campaign”.**

**Here is what Attorney General Augustin Lazar had to say:**

*"COMMENTS of the Attorney General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice, referring to the activity conducted as a prosecutor within the Prosecutor's Office attached to the Alba Iulia Courthouse.*

*Given the mass-media reports referring to the activity conducted by Mr. Augustin Lazar as a prosecutor and member of the Parole Board of the Aiud Penitentiary, as well as the mass media's requests to clarify certain aspects, the Attorney General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice has the following comments:*

***Between 1985 and 1986, I acted as a criminalist prosecutor within the Alba Iulia Prosecutor's Office, capacity in which I also periodically fulfilled duties related to the Parole Board of the Aiud Penitentiary, which reviewed the circumstances of convicts who had served the imprisonment quota which qualified them for parole.***

**Contrary to the statements made by certain press outlets, the role of this board was not to release convicts – that being the prerogative of the courts of law - but to verify whether the technical criteria provisioned by art. 59-60 of the 1969 Criminal Code were met:**

**- serving a minimal compulsory quota of the sentence and**

**- the absence of disciplinary sanction reports.**

*The prison sentences were served based on definitive court orders, and the reports of the Parole Board were sent to the competent court of law on the matter; the convicts could address the court regardless of the negative findings of the Board.*

***Considering how much time has passed since then, as well as the fact that I am unable to review original documents (particularly, the court decision rendered in the case) which would prove the circumstances that were evoked, I cannot confirm concrete aspects referring to the individual mentioned in the press articles.***

*The institution of parole is currently regulated in a similar manner (art. 99 and subsequent art. Of the Criminal Code and art. 587 of the Criminal Procedure Code)".*

**[\\* Read here the Romanian version of the article](#)**