Russian court imposes injunctions on Dutch company, its counsel and Dutch bailiff (Commercial Court of St Petersburg and the Leningrad Region)

by *Practical Law Arbitration*, with *Kulkov, Kolotilov & Pokryshkin*

Legal update: case report | Published on 11-Nov-2026 | Russian Federation

In *Case No A56-67016/2026*, the Commercial Court of St Petersburg and the Leningrad Region granted PJSC Gazprom's claim for an injunction against Gasunie Transport Services BV, its counsel and a Dutch bailiff, but rejected Gazprom's claim brought on behalf of its debtor and subsidiary.

Maxim Kulkov (Managing partner) and Maria Ivanova (Associate), Kulkov, Kolotilov & Pokryshkin

The Commercial Court of St Petersburg and the Leningrad Region (Court) has granted PJSC Gazprom's (Gazprom) claim for an injunction against Gasunie Transport Services BV (Gasunie), its counsel and a Dutch bailiff, but has rejected Gazprom's claim brought on behalf of its debtor and subsidiary, South Stream Transport BV (South Stream).

Gazprom issued a bond to secure the obligations of its Russian subsidiary to Gasunie. Following Gazprom's failure to pay, Gasunie obtained an ICC award in its favour. During the enforcement proceedings in the Netherlands, Gerechtsdeurwaarderskantoor Groot & Evers BV (GGE), acting as a bailiff, foreclosed on Gazprom's loan claims against South Stream. Gazprom applied to the Court seeking an injunction prohibiting both the enforcement of the ICC award and the initiation and continuation of any proceedings against Gazprom and South Stream related to the loan contract between them.

The Court partially granted Gazprom's application, refusing an injunction in favour of South Stream, and ruled that:

- GGE's assistance in enforcing the ICC award against Gazprom's assets constituted a valid ground to impose an injunction against it.
- Gazprom faces obstacles in accessing justice, as belongings necessary for participation in court proceedings (including laptops and mobile phones) could be seized from Gazprom's Russian employees and counsel under EU sanction restrictions (as clarified in EU Council Regulation No 833/2014).
- South Stream should itself apply to the Court for an injunction to be issued in its favour.

Here, the Court refused to issue an injunction in favour of South Stream even though Russian courts tend to grant claims in Russian companies' interests and proceedings against South Stream may lead to foreclosure of Gazprom's claims against South Stream as part of enforcement of the ICC award. Furthermore, although injunctions against counsel do occur in Russian practice, an injunction against a company acting as a bailiff is highly unusual. The court's reliance on the risk of seizure of Russian citizens' personal belongings is also notable and may strengthen Russian companies' position when seeking to establish obstacles in accessing justice.

© 2026 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Case: *Case No A56-67016/2026 (Commercial Court of St Petersburg and the Leningrad Region) (22 October 2026)* (in Russian language).

END OF DOCUMENT

Related Content

Topics

Interim Measures - Arbitration
Enforcement - Arbitration
Jurisdictional Issues - Arbitration
Conflicts of Law Issues - Arbitration

Practice notes

Impact of sanctions on arbitration • Maintained
Jurisdictional issues in international arbitration • Maintained

Articles

Cases involving Russian sanctioned parties: risks and ways to protect arbitration agreements • Published on 19-Dec-2023

Toolkit

Russia Sanctions and Related Considerations Toolkit • Maintained

© 2026 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.