



PRESS RELEASE No 43/23

Luxembourg, 8 March 2023

Judgment of the General Court in Case T-212/22 | Prigozhina v Council

The General Court annuls the restrictive measures applied to Ms Violetta Prigozhina, mother of Mr Yevgeniy Prigozhin, in the context of Russia's war against Ukraine

Even if the latter is responsible for actions undermining the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine, the link between Ms Prigozhina and her son established at the time of the adoption of the contested acts is based solely on their family relationship and is therefore not sufficient to justify her inclusion on the contested lists

In order to respond to the illegal annexation of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol by Russia in March 2014 and to Russia's destabilising actions in eastern Ukraine, the Council of the European Union adopted, on **17 March 2014**, a series of restrictive measures.¹ It provided, inter alia, for restrictions to prevent the entry into, or transit through, the territories of the Member States of certain persons responsible, inter alia, for actions or policies which undermine or threaten the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine. In addition, the Council froze their funds and their economic resources. Likewise, it imposed similar penalties on the persons, entities or bodies associated with them.

Since the beginning of Russia's war against Ukraine in February 2022, the Council has, in its acts of **23 February 2022**,² inter alia added members of the government, banks, businesspersons and Members of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly to the lists of those subject to restrictive measures. In that context, it added the name of Ms Violetta Prigozhina, the mother of Mr Yevgeniy Prigozhin, responsible for the deployment of Wagner Group mercenaries in Ukraine and for benefitting from large public contracts with the Russian Ministry of Defence following the illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia and occupation of eastern Ukraine by Russia-backed separatists. According to the Council, Ms Prigozhina is the owner of Concord Management and Consulting LLC, which belongs to the Concord group, founded and owned until 2019 by her son. She is also the owner of other undertakings with links to her son. In the Council's view, she has therefore supported actions and policies which undermine the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine.

¹ Council Decision 2014/145/CFSP of 17 March 2014 concerning restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine (OJ 2014 L 78, p. 16) and Council Regulation (EU) No 269/2014 of 17 March 2014 concerning restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine (OJ 2014 L 78, p. 6).

² Council Decision (CFSP) 2022/265 of 23 February 2022 amending Decision 2014/145/CFSP concerning restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine (OJ 2022 L 421, p. 98), and Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/260 of 23 February 2022 implementing Regulation (EU) No 269/2014 concerning restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine (OJ 2022 L 421, p. 3).

In that context, she has requested that the General Court annul the contested acts in so far as they concern her.

In its judgment delivered today, **the General Court grants her request**. It observes, inter alia, that it is apparent from the case file that Ms Prigozhina has no longer been the owner of Concord Management and Consulting since 2017, even though she had held shares in that undertaking. In addition, the Council fails to demonstrate that she owned other undertakings with links to her son on the date of the adoption of the contested acts.

Consequently, **the link that would amount to an association between the two persons** established at the time of the adoption of the contested acts and upon which the Council relied on that date **is based solely on their family relationship, which, in view of the criterion applied by the Council in the present case, the statement of reasons on which the contested acts are based and the case-law of the Court of Justice, is not sufficient to justify her inclusion on the contested lists**.

NOTE: An action for annulment seeks the annulment of acts of the institutions of the European Union that are contrary to European Union law. The Member States, the European institutions and individuals may, under certain conditions, bring an action for annulment before the Court of Justice or the General Court. If the action is well founded, the act is annulled. The institution concerned must fill any legal vacuum created by the annulment of the act.

NOTE: An appeal, limited to points of law only, may be brought before the Court of Justice against the decision of the General Court within two months and ten days of notification of the decision.

Unofficial document for media use, not binding on the General Court.

The [full text](#) of the judgment is published on the CURIA website on the day of delivery.

Press contact: Jacques René Zammit ☎(+352) 4303 3355

Stay Connected!

