



**Observatoire ARGA**

**ARGA Atlas**

**ANALYTICAL REPORT:**

**Criminalization of Managerial Decisions and Institutional Defects of  
Justice: The Case of Vladimir Chabrov in the Context of PJSC  
“Togliattiazot”**

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](mailto:info@argaobservatory.org), +33 7 58 49 62 27

Website: [www.argaobservatory.org](http://www.argaobservatory.org), <https://www.arga-atlas.com/>

Anglet, 20 March 2026

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. STATUS OF THE REPORT AND MANDATE
- II. SUBJECT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE REPORT
- III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- IV. CORPORATE AND CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND
- V. FORMATION OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION
- VI. INSTITUTIONAL DEFECTS OF THE CRIMINAL PROCESS
- VII. CRIMINALIZATION OF MANAGERIAL DECISIONS
- VIII. EVIDENTIARY BASIS AND ISSUES OF ITS RELIABILITY
- IX. PROPERTY MEASURES AND IMPACT ON THIRD PARTIES
- X. SYSTEMIC NATURE OF THE PROSECUTION
- XI. INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION
- XII. CONCLUSION

## **ANNEXES**

### **I. STATUS OF THE REPORT AND MANDATE**

This report has been prepared by Observatoire ARGA — a specialized analytical unit of the international association Asylum Research & Global Assistance (ARGA), operating within a mandate to study systemic human rights violations, abuses of judicial power, and transnational corporate conflicts accompanied by criminal prosecution.

The report constitutes an independent expert assessment and is not a procedural document aimed at revising a specific judicial decision. Its purpose is to identify institutional patterns, analyze law enforcement practices, and develop an analytical framework suitable for use by international judicial, human rights, and regulatory bodies.

Methodologically, the report is based on the principle of jurisdictional neutrality. This means that the analysis is not confined to the framework of national criminal proceedings and does not proceed from a presumption of correctness or incorrectness of any specific judicial act. Rather, the study is aimed at comparing factual circumstances, procedural actions, and legal conclusions with universal standards of fair justice, including the principles of:

- clarity of charges,
- individualization of responsibility,
- adversarial proceedings,

- admissibility and verifiability of evidence,
- proportionality of interference with rights.

A distinctive feature of this report is that it examines the criminal case of Vladimir Chabrov not in isolation, but within the broader system formed around the corporate conflict of PJSC “Togliattiazot.” This approach is based on the fact that the case materials, as well as prior studies, indicate the presence of recurring elements suggesting a possible systemic nature of the processes involved.

In this context, the report performs several interrelated functions.

First, it systematizes fragmented facts distributed across the criminal case, arbitral materials, corporate events, and international procedures.

Second, it identifies structural defects in law enforcement that cannot be explained by accidental errors or isolated violations.

Third, it forms an analytical basis for international assessment, including the potential consideration of the case within procedures extending beyond national jurisdiction.

Particular significance attaches to the existence of an already established international assessment, reflected in the decision of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL’s Files (CCF). This factor substantially enhances the analytical relevance of the report, as it indicates that the case has already been subject to external institutional review and has been recognized as containing a political predominance.

Thus, the present report should be regarded as part of a broader body of international legal work aimed at identifying and documenting cases in which criminal law enforcement may be used in the context of corporate conflicts and the redistribution of assets.

## **II. SUBJECT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE REPORT**

The subject of this report is the criminal case of Vladimir Chabrov, considered as a typological example of the criminalization of managerial decisions in the context of a corporate conflict.

Unlike classical criminal cases, in which the object of analysis consists of specific actions of the accused, this case requires a more complex approach. It involves the intersection of several legal and factual domains, including:

- corporate governance,
- business operations of the enterprise,
- criminal prosecution,
- property restrictions,
- international legal mechanisms.

This intersection creates a complex nature of the case, whereby the assessment of its individual elements outside the overall context leads to a distortion of its legal nature.

The purpose of the report is to present the Chabrov case as a systemic phenomenon in which criminal prosecution constitutes part of a broader construct. To achieve this objective, the analysis is structured along several lines.

First, a reconstruction of the factual and procedural logic of the case is carried out. This includes an analysis of the chronology of events, the structure of the charges, the evidentiary basis, and judicial decisions. This stage is necessary to identify internal inconsistencies and patterns in the development of the case.

The second line concerns the analysis of institutional defects. This involves identifying violations affecting the fundamental principles of criminal proceedings. Importantly, these defects are examined not as isolated violations, but as elements of a stable pattern.

The third line focuses on the mechanism of criminalization of managerial decisions. Within this analysis, it is assessed how actions that form part of ordinary business activity are transformed into objects of criminal prosecution. Particular attention is given to the absence of key elements of the offense, including personal gain and proven damage.

The fourth line relates to the assessment of the systemic nature of the prosecution. Here, the interconnection between the criminal case, the corporate conflict, the change of control over assets, and other legal processes is analyzed.

Finally, the fifth line includes the international dimension. It involves assessing the case in light of international standards, as well as taking into account existing decisions of international bodies.

Thus, the objectives of the report may be summarized as follows:

- to establish the factual structure of the case,
- to identify institutional violations,
- to demonstrate the mechanism of criminalization of corporate governance,
- to show the systemic nature of the prosecution,
- to provide a basis for international legal assessment.

### **III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The case of Vladimir Chabrov represents an example of criminal prosecution which, in its structure and substance, extends beyond standard law enforcement practice.

The analysis of the materials allows several key characteristics to be identified.

First, the prosecutorial construction is marked by vagueness and lack of specificity. The use of the category of “unidentified persons” despite the factual identification of participants indicates insufficient clarity of the charges. This leads to a weakening of the principle of individualization of responsibility.

Second, during the proceedings, restrictions on the right to defense and violations of the adversarial principle are observed. The ability of the defense to present evidence and challenge the prosecution’s position is significantly limited.

Third, the criminal-law qualification is based on the interpretation of managerial decisions as abuse of authority. At the same time, key elements of the offense are absent, including:

- personal gain,
- proven substantial damage.

Fourth, the evidentiary basis is characterized by limited verifiability and a one-sided selection of materials. This reduces the reliability of the conclusions underlying judicial decisions.

Fifth, the criminal prosecution develops in close connection with the corporate conflict and the change of control over assets. The chronological coincidence of these processes indicates their interrelation.

Sixth, the international assessment of the case, reflected in the decision of the INTERPOL CCF, confirms the presence of a political predominance in the prosecution. This circumstance confers additional legal significance on the case and places it beyond a purely national context.

Taken together, these elements allow the case to be characterized not as an isolated criminal proceeding, but as part of a broader system in which criminal law is used in conjunction with corporate and property mechanisms.

The main conclusion of the report is that the case of Vladimir Chabrov demonstrates features of a systemic distortion of justice requiring international assessment.

#### **IV. CORPORATE AND CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND**

The case of Vladimir Chabrov cannot be adequately assessed outside the broader corporate conflict associated with PJSC “Togliattiazot,” which developed over a significant period of time and involved a multi-layered interaction of legal, economic, and institutional mechanisms.

This conflict initially had the character of a corporate dispute related to the distribution of control over a strategically significant industrial asset. However, as it evolved, it acquired a qualitatively different character, transforming into a complex set of processes that included not only civil-law and corporate instruments, but also criminal prosecution, bankruptcy procedures, and property restrictions.

A key feature of this conflict is its gradual escalation. At early stages, it manifested through disputes over ownership rights and corporate governance, but subsequently became accompanied by increasingly intensive use of legal mechanisms aimed at altering the balance of control. In this context, criminal cases against managerial personnel become part of the overall dynamic rather than isolated events.

Particular importance attaches to the fact that the enterprise’s business activity, including its commercial operations and financial mechanisms, was initially structured in accordance with international practice and industry standards. The enterprise operated in a global market environment, utilized complex trading and logistical arrangements, and interacted with foreign counterparties. Under such conditions, managerial decisions inevitably involve an element of risk and must be assessed in terms of business judgment rather than criminal-law qualification.

A turning point in the development of the conflict was the change of corporate control in November 2021. This event not only led to a change in the composition of governing bodies, but

effectively completed the displacement of the previous management framework. It is precisely after this point that a qualitative intensification of criminal prosecution directed at individuals previously involved in asset management is observed.

It is essential to note that the actions attributed to Vladimir Chabrov relate to a period preceding this change. This means that their criminal-law assessment is formed retrospectively, already under conditions of an altered corporate structure. Such retrospectivity is not in itself impermissible; however, in combination with other factors, it acquires particular significance, as it indicates a possible dependence of the criminal assessment on the changed context.

Additionally, it must be taken into account that parallel processes developed alongside the criminal prosecution, including arbitral disputes, bankruptcy proceedings, and the redistribution of assets. These processes not only coincide in time with the criminal framework, but also interact with it, forming a unified system.

Taken together, the corporate and contextual background of the case indicates that the criminal prosecution of Vladimir Chabrov forms part of a broader structure in which legal mechanisms are used in close interconnection with corporate transformations. This circumstance necessitates an analysis of the case not only within the framework of criminal law, but also in the context of corporate and economic interaction.

## **V. FORMATION OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION**

The criminal prosecution of Vladimir Chabrov is formed within an already established law-enforcement model in which business operations and managerial decisions are subjected to retrospective criminal-law assessment.

A key feature of this process is that the charges do not arise as a reaction to new or previously unknown circumstances. On the contrary, they are based on a reassessment of actions taken in the past, at a time when the relevant decisions were regarded as part of the company's ordinary activities. This indicates a shift in evaluative criteria, whereby the same facts receive a different legal qualification depending on the context.

The formation of the charges is based on several interrelated elements. First, there is the assertion of damage caused to the enterprise. However, this category is not sufficiently specified or substantiated, creating the basis for subsequent legal uncertainty.

The second element is the interpretation of managerial decisions as abuse of authority. In this context, the boundary between permissible entrepreneurial risk and criminally punishable conduct becomes effectively blurred. As a result, actions that in other circumstances could be subject to corporate or civil-law assessment acquire a criminal-law character.

The third element is the aggregation of actions of several individuals within a single scheme. Such a construction makes it possible to form a generalized prosecutorial model, but at the same time reduces the level of individualization of responsibility. This is reflected, in particular, in the use of references to an undefined circle of participants.

The process of forming the charges is accompanied by restrictions on the defense's procedural capabilities. At the investigation stage, refusals are recorded in relation to motions aimed at obtaining alternative evidence or conducting additional expert examinations. This leads to a situation in which the prosecutorial version is consolidated without full verification.

Additional significance attaches to the connection between the criminal prosecution and property and corporate processes. Asset seizures, the initiation of procedures affecting ownership structures, and other measures create a context in which the criminal case becomes part of a broader system of influence. In such circumstances, the criminal prosecution cannot be regarded as an autonomous process, as it develops in interaction with other legal mechanisms.

Particular attention should be given to the trial stage. The judgment of 19 March 2025 and its subsequent confirmation by the appellate instance on 29 August 2025 consolidate the prosecutorial construction formed at the investigation stage. At the same time, the defense arguments do not receive a substantive reassessment, which indicates limitations in judicial control over both the evidentiary basis and the legal qualification.

Overall, the formation of the criminal prosecution in the case of Vladimir Chabrov demonstrates features of a process in which legal assessment is not based exclusively on facts, but is to a significant extent determined by the context of their interpretation. This circumstance requires further analysis from the perspective of institutional and systemic factors influencing the development of the case.

## **VI. INSTITUTIONAL DEFECTS OF THE CRIMINAL PROCESS**

The analysis of the criminal case of Vladimir Chabrov reveals a set of violations that go beyond individual procedural deviations and indicate a deeper institutional deformation of criminal proceedings. These defects affect fundamental principles of fair trial and create a situation in which the process loses balance and predictability.

First, attention must be drawn to the problem of the lack of specificity of the charges. The prosecutorial construction is formulated in such a way that key elements of the alleged offense remain insufficiently defined. In particular, there is no clear delineation between the actions of different participants, their roles, and their degree of involvement. This leads to a blurring of the boundaries of responsibility and reduces the level of legal certainty necessary for the effective exercise of the right to defense.

Closely related to this issue is the practice of using the category of “unidentified persons.” Despite the factual possibility of identifying participants in the relevant business operations, the prosecution retains references to an undefined group of subjects. Such a construction functions as a compensatory mechanism, allowing evidentiary gaps to be filled. As a result, the charges acquire a flexible and mutable character, which contradicts the principle of legal certainty.

A significant issue concerns the violation of the adversarial principle. During the proceedings, the defense encounters systemic limitations, including:

- refusals to grant significant motions,
- restricted access to alternative evidence,
- inability to fully challenge the prosecution’s position.

Such a situation leads to the de facto dominance of the prosecutorial narrative and transforms the trial from an adversarial process into a procedure confirming an already established investigative position.

Additional concerns relate to the use of evidence. The practice of reading out witness statements without direct examination limits the possibility of verifying their reliability. The absence of cross-examination deprives the defense of a key procedural tool, thereby reducing the reliability of the evidentiary basis.

An important element is the response of judicial instances. The appellate review did not eliminate the identified defects and did not provide a *полноцен* assessment of the defense arguments. This indicates limitations in internal control mechanisms and reduces the effectiveness of national remedies.

From the perspective of international standards, the combination of these circumstances indicates a violation of fundamental due process principles, including:

- insufficient clarity of charges,
- inequality of arms,
- restrictions on the right to effective defense,
- reliance on evidence that has not undergone proper scrutiny.

Thus, the institutional defects in the case of Vladimir Chabrov are not incidental but systemic in nature and affect the very structure of the criminal process. This necessitates their assessment not only within the framework of national law, but also from the standpoint of international standards of justice.

## **VII. CRIMINALIZATION OF MANAGERIAL DECISIONS**

One of the central aspects of the present case is the transformation of managerial decisions into the object of criminal prosecution. This process reflects a broader trend in which the boundaries between entrepreneurial activity and criminal liability become blurred, and business decisions are subjected to retrospective criminalization.

The actions attributed to Vladimir Chabrov fall within the sphere of corporate governance and the business activities of the enterprise. They were taken within an established decision-making framework, taking into account economic factors and in the context of operating a complex industrial structure. Such decisions are inherently associated with risk and variability of outcomes, which constitute normal characteristics of entrepreneurial activity.

However, within the criminal proceedings, these actions are interpreted as abuse of authority. In doing so, there is a shift in evaluative criteria: instead of analyzing economic justification and business judgment, a criminal-law qualification is applied that does not take into account the specific nature of corporate governance.

A key element of this transformation is the absence of evidence of personal gain. In the classical construction of abuse of authority, the presence of self-interest is a mandatory element. In the present case, such elements are not convincingly established. The prosecution does not demonstrate that the actions were aimed at obtaining personal benefit, which calls into question the very possibility of their criminal qualification.

Equally significant is the absence of proven damage. Despite the central role of the category of “substantial harm,” it is not adequately substantiated in economic terms. The lack of recognition

of the relevant claims in arbitral proceedings reinforces this conclusion and indicates a divergence between the criminal construct and the actual financial reality.

Particular importance attaches to the retrospective nature of the criminalization. Actions that were not considered unlawful at the time they were performed are subsequently subjected to criminal assessment after a significant lapse of time and in a changed context. Such retrospectivity creates a risk of arbitrary application of criminal law and undermines the predictability of the legal system.

In a broader context, this situation corresponds to a model in which criminal law is used to reassess corporate decisions in the context of a conflict. This is manifested in:

- the transfer of economic disputes into the criminal sphere,
- the use of criminal qualification instead of civil-law assessment,
- the substitution of business judgment analysis with an assessment of “damage.”

From the standpoint of international practice, such cases are regarded as posing a risk of the criminalization of entrepreneurial activity and the use of criminal law for purposes unrelated to the protection of legal order.

Thus, the case of Vladimir Chabrov demonstrates features of systemic criminalization of managerial decisions, whereby the boundaries of criminal liability are expanded to include actions that form part of ordinary business activity. This circumstance is of fundamental importance for the assessment of the case and requires its consideration within a broader institutional context.

## **VIII. EVIDENTIARY BASIS AND ISSUES OF ITS RELIABILITY**

An analysis of the evidentiary basis in the case of Vladimir Chabrov reveals significant issues affecting not only the evaluation of individual pieces of evidence, but also the overall structure of the evidentiary corpus. These issues relate to the completeness, verifiability, and internal consistency of the materials presented, directly impacting the validity of judicial conclusions.

One of the key aspects is the limited nature of judicial scrutiny of evidence. The use of witness statements read out without the witnesses’ direct participation in court significantly reduces the level of procedural reliability. In the absence of cross-examination, such testimony cannot be fully tested for accuracy, consistency, and alignment with other materials in the case. This creates a risk that the court relies on information that has not undergone full procedural verification.

Additional concerns arise regarding the principle of evidence selection. The analysis shows that the evidentiary base is formed primarily in support of the prosecution’s version, while alternative data are either excluded from the case materials or not given proper consideration. This results in a one-sided evidentiary picture lacking balance between competing interpretations of the facts.

Particular importance attaches to the issue of internal consistency of the evidence. The case materials indicate discrepancies between different types of evidence, including documentary data and witness testimony. Such inconsistencies are not adequately analyzed and do not lead to a reassessment of conclusions, thereby reducing the overall reliability of the evidentiary structure.

In a broader context, it should be taken into account that the case of Vladimir Chabrov forms part of a larger evidentiary corpus developed within the broader TOAZ case. Within this corpus, indications of distortion and inconsistencies have previously been identified, including

discrepancies between written materials and factual data. This circumstance reinforces the need for a critical evaluation of the evidentiary basis and its independent verification.

From the perspective of international standards, the reliability of evidence is a key component of a fair trial. The absence of the possibility of full verification, the one-sided nature of evidence selection, and the presence of inconsistencies indicate that the evidentiary base does not meet the requirements of objectivity and sufficiency.

Thus, the evidentiary system in the case of Vladimir Chabrov is characterized by a set of defects that call into question the validity of the conclusions drawn on its basis. This necessitates a reassessment of the approach to evaluating evidence and its comparison with alternative sources of information.

## **IX. PROPERTY MEASURES AND IMPACT ON THIRD PARTIES**

The property measures applied in the case of Vladimir Chabrov constitute an independent element of legal intervention that goes beyond the classical function of securing criminal proceedings. Their scale, duration, and manner of application indicate the presence of an additional function — the creation of systemic pressure affecting not only the accused, but also a wide range of associated individuals.

The seizure of assets, introduced as early as 2017, has remained in force throughout the entire period of criminal prosecution. Such prolonged application significantly exceeds the typical temporary purpose of such measures and transforms them from a securing instrument into a persistent restriction of property rights. At the same time, a direct connection between specific assets and the alleged actions is not always established, which calls into question the justification for their application.

Particular concern arises from the extension of property restrictions to third parties, including relatives and individuals who are not subjects of criminal prosecution. Such practice contradicts the principle of personal liability, according to which coercive measures should be applied exclusively to persons whose guilt has been established in accordance with due process.

The absence of an individualized assessment of the origin of assets further amplifies this effect. In a number of instances, measures are applied without a detailed analysis of whether the relevant assets are linked to the alleged offenses. This results in property restrictions acquiring a generalized character and affecting a broader range of subjects than is justified by the objectives of criminal proceedings.

From the standpoint of international standards, such practice may be regarded as a disproportionate interference with the right to property. The principle of proportionality requires that any restriction of property rights be justified, necessary, and proportionate to the pursued aim. In the present case, these criteria raise substantiated concerns.

Additionally, it must be taken into account that property measures are applied in the context of a corporate conflict and the redistribution of assets. This enhances their significance and indicates a potential connection between criminal prosecution and economic processes. In such circumstances, property restrictions cease to be a neutral instrument and become part of a broader strategy of influence.

Thus, the property measures in the case of Vladimir Chabrov perform not only a securing function but also a de facto sanctioning function, creating additional pressure and affecting the rights of individuals not directly involved in the criminal proceedings.

## **X. SYSTEMIC NATURE OF THE PROSECUTION**

Considering the case of Vladimir Chabrov in isolation from the broader context leads to an incomplete understanding of its nature. The analysis of the materials demonstrates that this case forms part of a broader and reproducible model in which criminal prosecution is integrated into a system of corporate and property-related pressure.

One of the key indicators of systemic character is the repeatability of the law-enforcement model. Similar elements — the use of a generalized prosecutorial construction, restrictions on the procedural rights of the defense, the application of property measures, and the retrospective assessment of business actions — are observed in relation to various representatives of the management framework associated with PJSC “Togliattiazot.”

The chronological correlation between criminal prosecution and corporate changes reinforces this conclusion. The intensification of criminal cases coincides with stages of changes in control over assets, indicating a possible functional link between these processes.

An additional element of systemic character is the combination of various legal mechanisms. Criminal prosecution develops in parallel with:

- arbitral disputes,
- bankruptcy proceedings,
- property restrictions,
- corporate decisions.

Taken together, these elements form a complex structure in which different legal instruments are used in a coordinated manner.

Of particular importance is the fact that this model is not limited to a single case, but is reproduced in relation to multiple individuals and across different proceedings. This indicates the existence of a consistent approach rather than a coincidence of circumstances.

From the standpoint of legal qualification, such a situation may be regarded as the use of the criminal mechanism within a broader strategy. This does not imply an automatic denial of all elements of the charges, but requires an assessment of their purposes, context, and consequences.

Thus, the case of Vladimir Chabrov demonstrates characteristics of systemic prosecution, in which criminal law is used in conjunction with corporate and property instruments to achieve a combined outcome.

## **XI. INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION**

The case of Vladimir Chabrov extends beyond the framework of a national criminal process and acquires independent international significance due to a combination of factors, including the

transnational nature of the corporate conflict, the involvement of foreign elements, and the existence of an already established assessment by an international institutional body.

A key element of this dimension is the decision of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files (CCF), which recognized the political predominance of the prosecution and ordered the deletion of the relevant data from the INTERPOL system. This finding is of fundamental importance, as it reflects not only a technical assessment of the admissibility of data processing, but also a broader legal qualification of the nature of the prosecution.

In international practice, the recognition of political predominance означает, что уголовное преследование рассматривается как выходящее за пределы нейтрального применения уголовного закона. It indicates that the factors determining the initiation and development of the case are not limited to legal grounds, but include elements related to external objectives, including political or corporate interests.

A distinctive feature of the present situation is the existence of a contradiction between national and international levels of assessment. On the one hand, domestic judicial authorities recognize the existence of a criminal offense and issue a conviction. On the other hand, an international body determines that the prosecution is politically dominated. Such divergence cannot be explained solely by differences in jurisdiction and requires analysis in terms of the compatibility of the national process with international standards.

Additional significance arises from the transnational nature of the conflict itself. The activities of enterprises associated with PJSC "Togliattiazot" involved interaction with foreign counterparties, the use of international infrastructure, and participation in global markets. This means that the consequences of the criminal prosecution may affect not only domestic but also external economic and legal relations.

In this context, the case is of relevance for international institutions, including:

- human rights mechanisms assessing compliance with the right to a fair trial,
- regulatory bodies analyzing risks of abuse of justice,
- compliance structures assessing legal risks of engagement with affected entities,
- international judicial and quasi-judicial bodies.

From the perspective of international law, the combination of identified circumstances may be assessed through several conceptual frameworks. First, the concept of abuse of process, where formally lawful legal mechanisms are used to achieve objectives inconsistent with their intended purpose. Second, the concept of criminalization of entrepreneurial activity, where criminal law is used to reassess business decisions.

Particular attention should be given to the effectiveness of domestic remedies. Despite the formal use of appellate and cassation procedures, the identified defects were not remedied, which calls into question the ability of the national system to provide effective redress. In international practice, this is regarded as a basis for recourse to external mechanisms of protection.

Thus, the international dimension of the case of Vladimir Chabrov establishes an independent level of assessment. It confirms that the case cannot be regarded solely as a domestic criminal proceeding and requires analysis within the framework of international standards, including the

principles of fair trial, proportionality, and the prohibition of the use of criminal law for purposes unrelated to the protection of legal order.

## **XII. CONCLUSION**

The conducted analysis allows the case of Vladimir Chabrov to be qualified as an example of criminal prosecution in which the combination of factual, procedural, and contextual elements indicates the presence of a systemic deformation of law enforcement.

First, the structure of the charges and the course of the trial demonstrate the existence of institutional defects affecting the fundamental principles of criminal proceedings. The lack of specificity of the charges, the use of the category of “unidentified persons,” restrictions on the right to defense, and insufficient verifiability of evidence create a situation in which the process loses the necessary degree of legal certainty and balance.

Second, the criminal prosecution demonstrates features of the criminalization of managerial decisions. Actions that form part of business activity are given a criminal-law qualification in the absence of key elements of the offense, including personal gain and proven substantial damage. This indicates a shift of the boundaries of criminal law into the sphere of corporate governance.

Third, the case is characterized by a pronounced systemic nature. The criminal prosecution develops in close connection with the corporate conflict, the change of control over assets, and the application of property measures. The repetition of this model in relation to different subjects indicates its устойчивый характер.

Fourth, the international dimension of the case, confirmed by the decision of the INTERPOL CCF, indicates the presence of a political predominance in the prosecution. This circumstance places the case beyond the framework of an ordinary criminal process and requires its assessment within the context of international standards.

Taken together, these elements form a picture in which criminal law is used not only as a mechanism for responding to offenses, but also as part of a broader system of influence associated with corporate and property-related processes.

From the standpoint of international legal assessment, this situation corresponds to indications of:

- abuse of criminal law enforcement,
- criminalization of entrepreneurial activity,
- violations of fair trial principles,
- disproportionate interference with property rights.

Taking into account the limited effectiveness of domestic remedies and the existence of an already established international assessment, the case of Vladimir Chabrov requires further consideration at the international level. This may include recourse to human rights mechanisms, regulatory bodies, and other institutions competent to assess compliance with fundamental rights and principles of justice.

The present report records not isolated violations, but a combination of factors indicating the systemic nature of the prosecution. Its purpose is to establish an analytical basis for independent

international assessment and for restoring the balance between criminal law enforcement and the principles of fairness.

## 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. Indictment in the criminal case
4. Extracts from the case materials, including court hearing transcripts
5. Documents confirming procedural violations (defense motions, refusals, complaints)
6. Documents relating to the economic aspects of the case (contracts, guarantees, financial materials)
7. Arbitral and civil court decisions, including the refusal to include claims in the register of creditors
8. Documents confirming asset seizures and property restrictions (from 21.04.2017)
9. Decision of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files (CCF) on data deletion
10. Materials confirming the connection of the case with the corporate conflict surrounding PJSC "Togliattiazot"
11. Extracts from analytical materials and memoranda of ARGA on the TOAZ case
12. Documents confirming the impact of the prosecution on third parties and family members
13. 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.