

Question for written answer E-001254/2025
to the Commission
Rule 144
Chloé Ridet (S&D)

Subject: Huawei corruption case: European Anti-Fraud Office's failure to take action

Citizens' trust in the institutions has once again been put to the test with the Huawei case. MEPs reportedly received thousands of euros to defend the interests of the Chinese telecoms leader by signing letters or supporting amendments in its favour.

The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), which is supposed to investigate allegations of corruption involving members of the institutions, did not react when made aware of the situation, however.

In December 2022, just four days after Qatargate made the headlines, Transparency International alerted OLAF to possible acts of corruption involving several MEPs who may have defended Chinese interests in the deployment of 5G in Europe. Yet, in 2023, OLAF decided not to pursue the case, saying the grounds were insufficient.

1. Why did OLAF decide not to pursue such a huge corruption case, supported by irrefutable evidence?
2. Why did it not forward the case to the European Public Prosecutor's Office or to the Belgian intelligence services?
3. When will the Commission present the proposal for a revision of the regulation on the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) that will allow it to deal with corruption cases?

Submitted: 26.3.2025