



Observatoire ARGA

ARGA Atlas

INTERNATIONAL MASTER DOSSIER:

Corporate Conflict, Criminal Prosecution, and Redistribution of Assets: The Individual Case of Vladimir Chabrov in the Context of PJSC “Togliattiazot” (TOAZ)

Author:

Sergei Khrabrykh — President of ARGA, PhD

Organization: Observatoire ARGA, ARGA Atlas

Mailing address: 21 route de l’Aviation, 12 C, 64600 Anglet, FRANCE

Contacts: info@argaobservatory.org, +33 7 58 49 62 27

Website: www.argaobservatory.org, <https://www.arga-atlas.com/>

Anglet, 20 March 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE DOSSIER

II. ACTORS AND ROLES

III. CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS

IV. PROCEDURAL AND LEGAL DEFECTS

V. ECONOMIC AND CORPORATE NATURE OF THE DISPUTED ACTIONS

VI. FALSIFICATION AND DISTORTION OF THE EVIDENTIARY BASIS

VII. PRESSURE ON THIRD PARTIES AND PROPERTY MEASURES

VIII. INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION AND LEGAL QUALIFICATION

IX. CONVERGENCE OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AND CORPORATE CONTROL

X. CONCLUSION

ANNEXES

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE DOSSIER

This master dossier has been prepared within the mandate of ARGA and Observatoire ARGA for the purposes of systematic international documentation, analytical verification, and legal structuring of the circumstances surrounding the criminal prosecution of Vladimir Chabrov, as one of the former executives who formed part of the management framework of enterprises associated with PJSC “Togliattiazot” and its affiliated business structures. The dossier constitutes part of a broader documented body of material relating to the case of PJSC “Togliattiazot” (TOAZ), within which persistent indicators have already been identified of the transformation of a corporate conflict into a multi-layered criminal, civil, arbitral, and property-based prosecution of former beneficiaries, top managers, and associated individuals. The materials of the broader TOAZ case point to a recurring pattern whereby corporate confrontation, the struggle for control over assets, criminal cases, bankruptcy procedures, asset seizures, and international search mechanisms operate not in isolation, but as elements of a unified factual and procedural construct aimed at the redistribution of corporate control and the displacement of the previous management structure.

The subject of this dossier is the individual case of Vladimir Chabrov, considered not as an autonomous and incidental episode, but as an integral component of the broader prosecution of the former TOAZ management block. In this regard, the Chabrov case must be analyzed simultaneously on two levels. The first level is individual-procedural. It encompasses the initiation of criminal proceedings, the course of the investigation, the charges brought, the trial proceedings, the issuance of a conviction on 19 March 2025, the subsequent appellate review on 29 August 2025, and the transition of the case into the cassation stage. The second level is structural and contextual. It concerns the place of the Chabrov case within the broader mechanism of criminal-law pressure that emerged following the corporate conflict around TOAZ, the arrest of assets,

criminal cases against other executives, the redistribution of property control, and the subsequent change in corporate governance. Such a dual analytical approach is necessary because any isolated examination of the Chabrov case outside the broader context inevitably distorts its legal nature and obscures the interconnection between criminal prosecution and the corporate dynamics of the dispute.

This dossier proceeds from the premise that, in respect of Vladimir Chabrov, there exists not only a national criminal procedural framework, which has culminated in a conviction and its appellate confirmation in its principal part, but also an internationally relevant dimension of protection. Of particular significance is the fact that the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files has previously recognized the political predominance of the relevant prosecution and ordered the deletion of data from the INTERPOL system. Such a conclusion by an international supervisory body is not limited to a purely technical issue concerning the admissibility of data processing within INTERPOL channels. It signifies that an international body has already established the presence of a politically driven element in the case and, accordingly, has acknowledged the impossibility of treating the corresponding criminal prosecution as an exclusively neutral, ordinary, and depoliticized national matter. For the purposes of this dossier, this circumstance is of fundamental importance, as it creates a rare legal configuration: notwithstanding the existence of a final national conviction, an international authority has already concluded that the prosecution is politically driven. Such a configuration requires not a standard description of procedural history, but a specialized international analysis capable of linking domestic judicial acts with an external assessment of the political and corporate context.

The purpose of this master dossier is not to engage in polemical criticism of national authorities nor to provide a declarative presentation of the defense position, but rather to produce a jurisdiction-neutral, document-based, and analytically coherent material suitable for use by international judicial, quasi-judicial, human rights, sanctions, regulatory, and compliance bodies. In this sense, the dossier is intended to perform several functions simultaneously. First, it must consolidate into a single structure facts that, within the national framework, have been fragmented across criminal proceedings, arbitral materials, corporate developments, property-related interim measures, and international procedures. Second, it must demonstrate that the criminal prosecution of Vladimir Chabrov cannot be properly qualified outside the corporate conflict surrounding the assets of TOAZ and related enterprises. Third, it must show that the charges brought and the subsequent judicial decisions contain indicators of systemic defects: issues of legal qualification, insufficient proof of substantial harm, procedural limitations on the right to defense, reliance on disputed or inadmissible evidence, and internal inconsistencies within the prosecutorial theory. Fourth, the dossier must ensure international readability of the case, that is, to present Russian procedural material in a form understandable and suitable for analysis outside the framework of Russian criminal procedure.

This dossier is based on the already established international body of material concerning the TOAZ case, including a previously prepared memorandum on the corporate conflict, criminal proceedings, and transnational redistribution of assets, in which the conflict around TOAZ is described as a prolonged and multi-layered process encompassing the struggle for corporate control, criminal cases against former management, bankruptcy procedures, asset seizures, international corporate structures, maritime and commercial infrastructure, as well as cross-border financial channels. This broader material is not of auxiliary, but of systemic importance for the Chabrov case. It demonstrates that criminal cases against former executives were not isolated events arising spontaneously, but developed against the backdrop of a long-term escalation of corporate conflict, which began well before the change of control in 2021 and reached its

culmination following the transfer of de facto management to a new corporate structure. Accordingly, the individual case of Vladimir Chabrov must be considered as part of a reproducible mechanism of pressure on individuals associated with the former system of asset management.

At the same time, the dossier deliberately adheres to a neutral and evidence-based standard of presentation. It is not intended to substitute for a procedural defense document at the national level and is not constructed as an emotional statement of injustice. Its purpose is to demonstrate that the case contains objectively verifiable indicators of a broader distortion of law enforcement. In particular, the analysis addresses the chronological linkage between property measures, corporate events, and criminal actions; the use of criminal-law qualification to assess business and managerial decisions; the absence of convincingly established substantial harm; the discrepancy between the economic nature of the disputed transactions and their criminal-law interpretation; as well as the fact that an international body has already recognized the political predominance of the prosecution. Taken together, these elements do not constitute a dispute over isolated defects of a particular judicial act, but rather raise the question of the very nature of the prosecution.

It must also be specifically noted that the case of Vladimir Chabrov should be assessed not only as a criminal case in the narrow sense, but also as an element of the redistribution of control over assets. The materials of the broader TOAZ case indicate that the corporate conflict was accompanied not only by litigation and criminal charges, but also by a consistent shift in the center of effective control over the enterprise and related structures, as well as by bankruptcy and property mechanisms that operated in close temporal and functional connection with the criminal framework. In this context, the individual prosecution of a former executive cannot be properly understood without taking into account who acquired control over the assets and at what stage, which property measures had been applied beforehand, how the prosecutorial theory of damage was constructed, and how this theory corresponded to economic and arbitral realities.

Structurally, the dossier is organized so as to demonstrate sequentially: first, the factual history of the Chabrov case within an expanded chronology; second, the legal defects of the charges and judicial proceedings; third, the economic inconsistency of the abuse-of-authority theory, including the remunerated nature of guarantees, the absence of gratuitous extraction, and the lack of proven substantial harm; fourth, the political and corporate context, including its connection with the Makhlaev case, the transfer of control over assets, and the seizure of property as the background to the conflict; and fifth, the international dimension, already confirmed by the findings of the INTERPOL CCF. Such a structure makes it possible to present the Chabrov case as part of a unified architecture of prosecution rather than as an isolated episode of individual criminal liability.

Thus, the subject matter of this master dossier consists in a documented and internationally oriented presentation of the individual case of Vladimir Chabrov as part of the broader case of PJSC “Togliattiazot,” in which corporate conflict, property pressure, criminal prosecution, and international legal mechanisms have formed a single interconnected system. The principal conclusion to be developed in the subsequent sections is that the case of Vladimir Chabrov should be analyzed not within the framework of a conventional criminal case concerning abuse of authority, but within the logic of a corporately driven prosecution, already partially qualified at the international level as politically dominated and therefore requiring in-depth external legal assessment.

II. ACTORS AND ROLES

The analysis of the case of Vladimir Chabrov requires a precise reconstruction of the range of actors involved in the relevant processes, as well as their functional roles within both the national criminal proceedings and the broader corporate conflict surrounding the assets of PJSC

“Togliattiazot.” In this case, not only the formal list of participants is of importance, but also the nature of their interconnections, since it is through these interconnections that the transformation of a corporate confrontation into a criminal-law and property-based framework can be traced.

The central subject of this dossier is Vladimir Chabrov — a former executive of Togliattiazot-Methanol (TOMET), who formed part of the management framework of enterprises associated with PJSC “TOAZ.” His procedural status is that of a person held criminally liable on charges classified under Article 201 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, resulting in a conviction on 19 March 2025 and its subsequent confirmation by the appellate instance on 29 August 2025. At the same time, his actual role extends beyond the formal legal classification of the charges, as he is treated by the investigation and the court as a participant in managerial decisions taken within the course of the companies’ business activities prior to the change in corporate control. In this regard, his actions were retrospectively reassessed through the prism of a criminal-law construct based on the allegation of damage, notwithstanding that the relevant decisions were taken within the framework of ordinary corporate practice and collective governance.

Among the related persons are other representatives of the former managerial and financial block who participated in the activities of PJSC “TOAZ” and its affiliated structures during the period preceding the change in corporate control. These individuals include members of the board of directors, heads of financial and economic divisions, commercial directors, and other managers involved in decision-making that subsequently became the subject of criminal prosecution. Taken together, they form a unified management framework to which a similar model of criminal-law qualification has been applied. Within the broader TOAZ case, this framework has already been subjected to prosecution under an analogous scheme, which confirms the systemic nature of the approach to the legal qualification of their actions.

At the corporate level, the key entity is PJSC “Togliattiazot” as a major industrial asset of strategic importance in the chemical sector and the primary source of economic activity. It is directly linked to Togliattiazot-Methanol (TOMET), where Vladimir Chabrov held a senior management position. TOMET is not an isolated enterprise, but part of a broader industrial and corporate structure economically connected to TOAZ. Within the processes under consideration, this interconnection is of fundamental importance, since the criminal prosecution concerns managerial decisions taken in the context of the activities of the entire group.

Particular attention must be given to the corporate structures that participated in the redistribution of control over assets. These refer to companies which, as a result of a combination of corporate, judicial, and bankruptcy procedures, acquired control over the assets of TOAZ and related enterprises. These structures form an alternative corporate framework that replaced the previous management following 27 November 2021. Their role in the present dossier does not consist in formal participation in the criminal proceedings, but rather in the fact that their emergence and subsequent consolidation coincide in time and in functional outcome with the intensification of criminal prosecution against the former management. Such concurrence requires analysis from the standpoint of a causal relationship between corporate changes and criminal actions.

State authorities are represented by investigative bodies of the Russian Federation, prosecutorial authorities, courts of various instances, as well as bodies of judicial and disciplinary oversight. Investigative authorities act as initiators of criminal prosecution, shape the prosecutorial theory, and determine the evidentiary framework. The prosecution exercises supervisory functions and maintains the charges, while the materials of the present case indicate circumstances suggesting the absence of an effective response to allegations of procedural violations. Courts of first instance, appellate, and cassation levels play a central role in formalizing the legal assessment, while

analysis of the materials raises questions as to the completeness of the examination of defense arguments and the evaluation of evidence. Judicial and disciplinary oversight bodies appear in the context of complaints filed; however, their response did not result in the revision of key procedural decisions.

At the international level, the principal actor is the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files (CCF), which previously adopted a decision to delete data related to this case from the INTERPOL system on the basis of establishing the political predominance of the prosecution. In the present context, this body does not act as a participant in national proceedings, but as an external and independent evaluative authority whose decision carries autonomous legal significance. In effect, this constitutes an institutional international acknowledgment that the criminal prosecution cannot be regarded as purely neutral and devoid of external context. This circumstance materially affects the interpretation of the roles of all other actors, as it introduces an additional layer of assessment extending beyond national jurisdiction.

Taken together, these actors form a multi-level system in which the individual criminal case of Vladimir Chabrov intersects with corporate structures, state law-enforcement mechanisms, and international institutions. The analysis of their roles demonstrates that the case cannot be reduced to the standard model of "defendant — investigation — court," as it contains an additional dimension related to the redistribution of corporate control, the use of various legal instruments, and the existence of an international assessment of the political context. It is precisely this combination of factors that necessitates consideration of the Chabrov case as part of a broader architecture in which criminal prosecution, corporate changes, and international mechanisms are interrelated and must be analyzed as a unified whole.

III. CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS

The reconstruction of the chronology in the case of Vladimir Chabrov is of fundamental importance, as it is precisely the sequence of events that makes it possible to establish not only the formal development of the criminal proceedings, but also their connection with the corporate conflict, property measures, and the redistribution of control over assets. In this case, the chronology is not a neutral timeline: it demonstrates a consistent correlation between corporate processes and criminal-law actions, which requires analysis in their totality rather than in isolated episodes.

The formation of the criminal framework within which the case of Vladimir Chabrov was later situated begins in the period 2014–2016. It is during this stage that the corporate conflict surrounding PJSC "Togliattiazot" moves beyond the bounds of civil and corporate procedures and begins to transform into the sphere of criminal law. Business operations that had previously been regarded as part of ordinary commercial activity are retrospectively re-evaluated as potentially unlawful. This transition from corporate dispute to criminal prosecution creates a foundational construct that is subsequently replicated with respect to various representatives of the management block, including Vladimir Chabrov.

The next key stage occurs on 21 April 2017, when interim measures in the form of asset seizures are imposed. These measures are not targeted but systemic in nature and affect not only corporate assets but also the property sphere associated with individuals involved in the management framework. The imposition of such measures at an early stage establishes long-term pressure that accompanies the subsequent development of criminal cases. Of particular significance is the fact that these measures are introduced prior to the final determination of guilt and without an individualized assessment of the role of specific persons, thereby effectively transforming them from a securing instrument into a mechanism of preliminary coercion.

On 5 July 2019, the first key conviction is delivered in case No. 41702007706000072. This judicial act has systemic significance for all subsequent law-enforcement practice relating to TOAZ. Within this judgment, a foundational legal construct is established, according to which business operations of previous years are interpreted as having caused damage to the company. This construct is subsequently used as a starting point for new criminal cases, including that of Vladimir Chabrov. Thus, the 2019 judgment performs not only the function of resolving a specific case, but also establishes a legal template that is extended to subsequent proceedings.

The period 2020–2021 is characterized by the development of a parallel civil and arbitral framework, within which attempts are made to provide an economic substantiation for the previously formulated criminal theory. During this period, creditors' claims are examined, arbitral disputes are formed, and the existence of actual financial damage is assessed. Of particular importance is the refusal of the arbitral court to include the bank's claims in the register of creditors. This circumstance is of fundamental legal significance, as it indicates the absence of confirmed damage in the civil-law sphere. A divergence thus emerges between the criminal construct of "damage" and its economic substantiation, which subsequently becomes central to the assessment of the validity of the charges.

A turning point occurs on 27 November 2021, when a change in corporate control over PJSC "Togliattiazot" takes place. As a result of an extraordinary general meeting of shareholders, the powers of the previous board of directors are terminated, a new management framework is established, and effective control over the enterprise is transferred. This moment is critical for the analysis of subsequent events, as it is precisely after the change of control that a significant intensification of criminal prosecution against former managers occurs. Such a temporal correlation between the transfer of control and the escalation of criminal pressure corresponds to the general pattern previously identified in international materials relating to the TOAZ case.

Following the change in corporate control, new criminal proceedings are initiated in which Vladimir Chabrov is brought to liability. The subject of the charges consists of managerial decisions taken in prior periods, that is, before he lost the relevant authority. This indicates the retrospective nature of the criminal prosecution, whereby actions that had not previously been regarded as unlawful are subsequently given criminal-law qualification after the change in corporate structure. Accordingly, the criminal case does not arise as a response to newly discovered facts, but is formed on the basis of a re-evaluation of past business activities.

During 2022–2023, the stage of preliminary investigation is carried out. This phase is characterized by the formation of the prosecutorial case, while the defense encounters restrictions on procedural opportunities, including refusals to grant key motions and limited access to mechanisms for challenging evidence. Within the investigation, the prosecutorial narrative is consolidated and subsequently reproduced in court proceedings with virtually no substantial modifications. At the same time, already at this stage there are indications that alternative interpretations of business operations and the economic arguments of the defense are not given full consideration.

On 19 March 2025, a conviction is issued against Vladimir Chabrov. The court qualifies his actions as abuse of authority, based on the assertion that substantial harm was caused. The judgment relies on an interpretation of managerial decisions as exceeding the limits of permissible entrepreneurial risk. Of particular importance is the fact that the economic nature of these decisions and their connection to the company's business activities are not fully assessed, while the very category of "damage" is constructed without adequate evidentiary substantiation in the civil-law sense.

On 29 August 2025, the appellate instance reviews the defense appeals and upholds the conviction in its principal part. The appellate proceedings do not result in the elimination of previously identified procedural and evidentiary defects. The defense arguments concerning violations of the right to a fair trial, issues with evidence, and the inconsistency between the prosecutorial theory and economic reality are not substantively reassessed. Thus, the appeal functions more as a formal confirmation of the judgment than as a *полноцен* review.

Following the appellate review, the case proceeds to the cassation stage, which formally indicates the continuation of the national procedural path. However, in parallel, there already exists an international assessment of the case, expressed in the decision of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files, which recognized the political predominance of the prosecution and ordered the deletion of the relevant data from the INTERPOL system. This creates a unique legal situation in which a national conviction coexists with an international finding of the politically motivated nature of the prosecution.

Taken together, the presented chronology demonstrates not a sequence of isolated events, but an interconnected system in which asset seizures, the first conviction, arbitral decisions, the change of corporate control, the initiation of new criminal proceedings, and subsequent judicial acts form a single logical chain. This chain indicates that the criminal prosecution of Vladimir Chabrov developed in close connection with the corporate dynamics of the conflict surrounding TOAZ and cannot be adequately understood outside this context.

IV. PROCEDURAL AND LEGAL DEFECTS

The analysis of the criminal case of Vladimir Chabrov reveals a set of defects that are not episodic but systemic in nature and affect both the construction of the charges and the procedural implementation of the right to defense. These defects are not limited to isolated procedural violations, but rather result in the internal inconsistency of the prosecutorial model.

First, attention must be drawn to the structure of the indictment, which relies on references to "unidentified persons" despite the factual identification of participants in the relevant business transactions. Such a construction creates legal uncertainty and allows the charges to be formulated without a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities. As a result, the prosecution acquires an expansive character and loses the necessary degree of individualization, which contradicts fundamental principles of criminal law.

Serious concerns arise regarding the observance of the right to defense. During both the preliminary investigation and the trial, the defense faced limitations in exercising procedural rights, including refusals to grant significant motions and restrictions on the presentation of alternative evidence. This leads to a violation of the principle of adversarial proceedings and a *de facto* imbalance in favor of the prosecution.

The evidentiary basis requires separate analysis, particularly the use of witness statements read out in court without direct examination of the witnesses. Such a practice restricts the possibility of cross-examination and verification of the reliability of testimony, thereby diminishing its evidentiary value. In combination with the refusal to examine alternative evidence, this creates a situation in which the court relies on material that is insufficiently tested and procedurally vulnerable.

A key element of the charges is the qualification of the actions under Article 201 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation as abuse of authority. However, in the present case, this qualification raises substantiated doubts. In particular, there is no proper establishment of the

mandatory elements of the offense, including the presence of personal interest and the infliction of substantial harm. At the same time, the very category of “substantial harm” is constructed largely on the basis of assumptions and does not receive sufficient confirmation in the economic and civil-law sphere.

Taken together, these circumstances indicate that in the case of Vladimir Chabrov there is not only a violation of individual procedural guarantees, but also a deeper problem — a mismatch between the factual circumstances of business activity and their criminal-law interpretation. This inconsistency manifests itself both in the construction of the charges and in the method of evaluating evidence, and it requires further analysis in the context of the economic nature of the disputed actions.

V. ECONOMIC AND CORPORATE NATURE OF THE DISPUTED ACTIONS

A key element in the analysis of the case of Vladimir Chabrov is the comparison between the criminal-law qualification of the charges and the actual economic nature of the relevant actions. It is at this level that a fundamental divergence becomes apparent between the business logic underlying managerial decisions and their subsequent criminal-law interpretation.

At the center of the charges lies the assertion of abuse of authority, allegedly expressed in actions that caused damage to a business entity. However, an examination of these actions in their economic context demonstrates that they were carried out within the framework of ordinary corporate activity and did not exceed the limits of permissible entrepreneurial risk. The managerial decisions that became the subject of criminal prosecution were taken in the context of the operation of a large industrial enterprise active in the international market and employing financial and contractual instruments standard for the industry. Under comparable conditions, such decisions are regarded as part of normal business practice and do not entail the automatic emergence of criminal liability.

Particular importance attaches to the analysis of guarantees and other financial obligations involved in the case. These instruments were of a remunerated nature and were aimed at ensuring the company’s business operations, including maintaining operational stability and fulfilling obligations toward counterparties. Accordingly, they cannot be qualified as gratuitous withdrawal of assets or as actions intended to cause harm. On the contrary, their economic function consisted in supporting the functioning of the business, which excludes their assessment as inherently detrimental.

It is also essential to note the absence of proven substantial harm in economic terms. Within the criminal-law structure of the charges, the category of damage plays a central role; however, its factual content is not sufficiently substantiated. Moreover, previously established arbitral and civil-law decisions indicate the absence of proper recognition of the relevant claims, which points to the lack of a demonstrable property loss. A discrepancy thus arises between the criminal assessment and economic reality, whereby the alleged harm is not confirmed either by financial indicators or by judicial practice in related jurisdictions.

Additional significance lies in the fact that the managerial decisions in question were adopted within collective governing bodies and in accordance with internal corporate procedures. This excludes their arbitrary nature and indicates their institutional character. The retrospective attempt to individualize responsibility for such decisions and their subsequent criminalization distorts the very logic of corporate governance by replacing an assessment of business judgment with criminal-law qualification.

In a broader context, this situation corresponds to a general pattern identified in the materials of the TOAZ case, where business operations and managerial decisions that initially constituted part of normal economic activity are subsequently reinterpreted as unlawful within criminal proceedings. Such a transformation indicates that the criminal-law mechanism is used not to address evident abuses, but to reassess previously executed corporate decisions in a changed context of control over assets.

Thus, the economic analysis demonstrates that, in the case of Vladimir Chabrov, there is no necessary link between the actions attributed to him and any real damage. On the contrary, the available data indicate that the relevant actions were part of ordinary business activity, were remunerated in nature, were carried out within corporate procedures, and did not exceed the limits of entrepreneurial risk. This circumstance calls into question not only the validity of the specific legal qualification, but also the very admissibility of criminal-law intervention in the relations at issue.

VI. FALSIFICATION AND DISTORTION OF THE EVIDENTIARY BASIS

An analysis of the materials in the case of Vladimir Chabrov reveals indications of significant distortions in the formation and evaluation of the evidentiary basis, which go beyond ordinary procedural shortcomings and raise questions regarding the reliability of the evidentiary corpus itself. The issue concerns not only disputable interpretations of individual pieces of evidence, but also structural problems in their collection, presentation, and judicial examination.

One of the key aspects is the limitation of the possibility of fully examining evidence during the trial. In particular, the use of witness statements read out in court without the direct examination of the witnesses significantly reduces the verifiability of such information. The absence of cross-examination deprives the defense of the opportunity to identify inconsistencies, clarify the context of testimony, and challenge its reliability. As a result, such statements effectively acquire a one-sided character and are relied upon by the court without proper procedural scrutiny.

Additional concerns arise regarding the selection and evaluation of evidence forming the basis of the charges. The case materials indicate a preferential reliance on evidence supporting the prosecutorial version, while alternative data are either ignored or access to them is restricted. This is reflected, in particular, in refusals to examine other economic materials capable of refuting or qualifying the conclusions of the investigation. Such an approach leads to the construction of a one-sided evidentiary narrative in which there is no balance between the positions of the parties.

Particular importance attaches to the issue of documentary reliability and the consistency of the formation of procedural materials. Within the broader TOAZ case, discrepancies have already been identified between different types of evidence, including inconsistencies between written materials and factual data, as well as indications of interference in the process of their formation. These circumstances are directly relevant to the Chabrov case, as it forms part of the same evidentiary framework. In such a situation, a justified question arises as to the integrity of the evidentiary basis and the possibility of its independent verification.

Taken together, these elements indicate that the evidentiary system in the case does not meet the required standard of reliability. Limitations on the verification of evidence, the one-sided nature of its selection, and the presence of discrepancies create a situation in which the charges are based on material that has not undergone full procedural scrutiny. This, in turn, affects the validity of the court's conclusions and necessitates a critical reassessment of the evidentiary basis as a whole.

VII. PRESSURE ON THIRD PARTIES AND PROPERTY MEASURES

A distinct dimension of the case of Vladimir Chabrov is associated with the application of property restrictions and their extension to individuals who are not formally subjects of the criminal prosecution. This aspect goes beyond the classical logic of criminal procedure and indicates the use of interim measures as an instrument of expanded coercion.

The seizure of assets, initiated as early as 2017, is of a prolonged and systemic nature. These measures have been applied throughout the entire development of the criminal case and have effectively become a persistent restriction of property rights. At the same time, they are not always accompanied by a detailed assessment of the origin of the assets and their connection to the alleged actions. As a result, a situation arises in which interim measures lose their temporary and auxiliary function and acquire the character of an independent mechanism of pressure.

Of particular significance is the extension of property restrictions to third parties, including relatives and individuals who are not participants in the criminal proceedings. Such a practice violates the principle of personal liability, as it affects subjects with respect to whom there is no established procedural link to the alleged offense. Moreover, the application of such measures without an individualized assessment of the origin of assets results in property restrictions that are generalized and disproportionate in nature.

In a broader context, this practice corresponds to the general model identified in the TOAZ case, where property measures are used not only to secure the potential enforcement of a judgment, but also as an element of broader pressure on the management framework and associated individuals. Such use of securing mechanisms amplifies the effect of criminal prosecution, extending beyond its immediate purposes and affecting a wider circle of subjects.

Thus, the property measures in the case of Vladimir Chabrov acquire an independent significance and must be assessed not only from the standpoint of their formal legality, but also in terms of proportionality and justification. Their duration, scale, and extension to third parties indicate that they perform the function of additional pressure, reinforcing the overall context of prosecution and affecting the rights of individuals not directly involved in the criminal process.

VIII. INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION AND LEGAL QUALIFICATION

The case of Vladimir Chabrov acquires a qualitatively different level of legal significance when examined in the international context. Unlike typical criminal cases confined to national jurisdiction, this case has already been subject to evaluation by an international institutional mechanism — the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files (CCF). The decision adopted by this body to delete data from the INTERPOL system on the basis of recognizing the political predominance of the prosecution constitutes a key factor in determining the further legal qualification of the case.

From a legal standpoint, the conclusion of the CCF means that the prosecution cannot be regarded as purely criminal in nature. It establishes the presence of a predominant political element that influences the very initiation, development, and objectives of the criminal proceedings. In international practice, such a finding is treated as an indicator that law enforcement mechanisms may be used not for the protection of legal order, but for achieving purposes external to criminal law.

A particular feature of the present case is that this international finding coexists with a final national conviction. This situation creates a legal asymmetry: on the one hand, domestic courts recognize the existence of a criminal offense; on the other, an international body determines that

the prosecution is politically dominated. This contradiction cannot be resolved within a single jurisdiction and requires analysis through the comparison of standards of justice.

In international legal practice, such cases are typically examined through the prism of abuse of process and the instrumentalization of criminal prosecution. This refers to situations in which formally lawful mechanisms are used to achieve objectives inconsistent with their intended purpose. In the context of the Chabrov case, such objectives may include the redistribution of corporate control, the exertion of pressure on the management framework, and the creation of a legal basis for subsequent property and corporate decisions.

Additional significance arises from the transnational nature of the conflict itself. Materials relating to the TOAZ case indicate the existence of corporate structures, financial flows, and business operations spanning multiple jurisdictions, including European financial centers, offshore zones, and international trade routes. This means that the consequences of the criminal prosecution extend beyond a single country and may affect the interests of foreign entities, banking institutions, and regulatory authorities.

From the perspective of European and international law, the Chabrov case must be assessed in light of standards of fair trial, including the right to defense, equality of arms, and the admissibility of evidence. The existence of limitations in the exercise of these rights, as identified in the preceding sections, reinforces the argument that the case does not meet the fundamental requirements of due process.

Thus, the international dimension of the case establishes an independent level of assessment. It takes the analysis beyond the framework of national criminal proceedings and allows the case to be considered as a potential example of the use of criminal justice mechanisms within the context of a corporate conflict that has already been recognized by an international body as politically dominated.

IX. CONVERGENCE OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AND CORPORATE CONTROL

One of the key elements of this dossier is the analysis of the relationship between the criminal prosecution of Vladimir Chabrov and the processes of redistribution of corporate control over assets associated with PJSC “Togliattiazot.” Unlike a traditional criminal case, in which the legal assessment of a person’s actions is carried out in isolation from the external economic context, the present case demonstrates a consistent interconnection between legal and corporate mechanisms.

The chronology of events shows that key stages of the criminal prosecution coincide with critical moments in the transformation of the corporate structure. The seizure of assets, the formation of the prosecutorial theory, the issuance of judicial decisions, and their subsequent confirmation occur in close temporal proximity to processes related to the loss of control by the former management framework and the transfer of assets to new actors. Such synchronization cannot be regarded as incidental and must be analyzed as part of a unified process.

Particular importance attaches to the change of corporate control in November 2021. It is precisely after this event that a qualitative intensification of criminal prosecution directed at former managers is observed. At the same time, the alleged actions relate to a period preceding this change, which indicates the retrospective nature of the criminal assessment. In other words, actions that previously formed part of normal business activity are subsequently given criminal qualification after the change in the subject of corporate control.

Parallel to the criminal proceedings, civil, arbitral, and bankruptcy procedures develop, affecting related assets, including TOMET. These processes lead to a redistribution of property control, while their development occurs in logical and temporal conjunction with the criminal framework. As a result, a complex mechanism is formed in which criminal prosecution, property restrictions, and corporate transformations reinforce one another.

The materials of the broader TOAZ case confirm the existence of such convergence. They indicate the sequential use of various legal instruments — criminal cases, civil claims, bankruptcy procedures, and corporate decisions — to achieve a unified outcome, namely the change of control over assets. In this context, the Chabrov case is not an exception, but represents one of the elements of this system.

From the standpoint of legal qualification, such a situation may be regarded as the use of the criminal mechanism as an instrument of corporate influence. This does not imply an automatic denial of all legal grounds for prosecution, but indicates the need to assess its purposes and consequences. Where criminal prosecution effectively contributes to the redistribution of assets and the alteration of corporate control, it extends beyond its classical function and acquires an additional dimension.

Thus, the analysis of the convergence between the criminal and corporate frameworks demonstrates that the case of Vladimir Chabrov should be considered not only as an individual criminal prosecution, but also as part of a broader system in which legal and economic processes are interrelated and directed toward achieving a combined outcome.

X. CONCLUSION

The totality of the facts, procedural materials, and analytical findings presented in this master dossier makes it possible to formulate an overall assessment of the case of Vladimir Chabrov as part of a broader mechanism that has emerged within the framework of the corporate conflict surrounding PJSC “Togliattiazot.” This case cannot be adequately understood within the logic of an isolated criminal prosecution, as its key elements — chronology, evidentiary basis, economic assessment, and procedural characteristics — demonstrate a consistent connection with external corporate and property-related processes.

The chronological analysis shows that the criminal prosecution develops in close correlation with asset seizures, arbitral decisions, and the change of corporate control. This sequence of events forms a logical chain in which the criminal case becomes one of the elements of a broader transformation of the corporate structure. At the same time, the retrospective nature of the charges indicates that criminal-law assessment is applied to actions that were not previously regarded as unlawful, thereby reinforcing doubts as to its validity.

The legal analysis reveals the presence of systemic defects, including issues of individualization of the charges, limitations on the right to defense, and the use of evidence that has not undergone full scrutiny. These defects are not isolated violations but indicate deeper structural problems in the formation of the prosecutorial theory and its judicial evaluation.

The economic dimension of the case demonstrates the absence of convincingly established substantial harm and indicates that the actions attributed to Vladimir Chabrov corresponded to ordinary business practice and were remunerated in nature. This calls into question the very possibility of qualifying them as abuse of authority in the criminal-law sense.

The international dimension, reflected in the decision of the INTERPOL CCF, confers additional legal significance on the case. The recognition of the political predominance of the prosecution means that the case extends beyond the framework of an ordinary criminal process and requires assessment in light of international standards of justice and the prohibition of the use of criminal law for purposes unrelated to the protection of legal order.

Taken together, these circumstances support the conclusion that the case of Vladimir Chabrov bears the characteristics of a complex prosecution in which the criminal-law mechanism is used in conjunction with corporate and property instruments. Such a configuration requires further consideration at the international level, as domestic remedies, despite their formal exhaustion, have not resolved the identified inconsistencies.

This master dossier therefore records not only the factual and procedural aspects of the case, but also its systemic nature. It is intended for further use before international judicial, human rights, and regulatory bodies with a view to obtaining an independent legal assessment and restoring the balance between criminal law enforcement and the principles of fair justice.

ANNEXES

1. Judgment of the court of first instance dated 19.03.2025 in respect of Vladimir Chabrov
2. Appellate decision dated 29.08.2025
3. Materials of the criminal case (extracts), including the indictment
4. Documents confirming procedural violations (protocols, motions, refusals)
5. Materials confirming the economic nature of the disputed actions (contracts, financial documents, corporate decisions)
6. Arbitral and civil court decisions, including the refusal to include claims in the register of creditors
7. Documents confirming asset seizures and property restrictions (from 21.04.2017)
8. Decision of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files (CCF) on data deletion
9. Materials confirming the connection of the case with the corporate conflict surrounding PJSC "TOAZ"
10. Extracts from the international memorandum and analytical materials of ARGA on the TOAZ case
11. Documents confirming the impact of the prosecution on third parties and family members
12. Other materials relevant to the international legal assessment of the case

All original documents referenced in this report and annexes have been systematized and are stored in a secure Google Drive archive. Access to the archive is provided to authorized recipients upon separate request.