



G. A. S. LIMITED

GENUINE ARBITRATION SERVICE

MOSCOW

ARBITRATION & TAX DISPUTES



VLADISLAV ZAYTSEV

Managing Partner



+7 (499) 550-05-07



vladislav.zaytsev@gaslimited.ru



<http://gaslimited.ru/en/about/team/vladislavzaytsev/>



Russian, English

Vladislav is a Managing Partner at Genuine Arbitration Service Ltd. He is the Head of the firm's [International Arbitration Practice](#) and of the [Civil Law Litigation one](#).

Vladislav has a vast experience in representing Russian and foreign companies in international commercial arbitrations (under the LCIA, ICC, SCC, ICAC rules, etc.) and before Russian courts. His first litigations in Russian courts go back to as far as 1999; his international arbitration practice started in 2002.

Vladislav's experience in international commercial arbitrations encompasses different types of disputes subjected to Russian, English and international private laws. Amongst them those related to international sale of goods play a major role which is not surprisingly given the predominance of trade disputes in international commercial arbitrations.

Alongside the representation of clients in international commercial arbitrations, Vladislav regularly appears before Russian courts in [a wide range of civil law litigations](#) (arising out of construction, sale, lease, financial contracts, provision of services, tort, unjust enrichment, invalidity of contracts, corporate disputes, etc.). His specialization however is not limited to civil law disputes only – an important part of his litigation experience represent [disputes against fiscal authorities](#). Thus, for instance Vladislav have represented for a number of years a large Russian petrochemical company in a sheer number of tax disputes against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers.

EDUCATION:

- 2001 г., Military University (former Military Academy of Economics, Finance and Law), Diploma in Civil and Military Laws, First Class Honours;
- 2011 г., University College London, University of London, Master of Laws (LL.M.), International Commercial Arbitration, International Law of Foreign Investment, Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals, International Trade Law.

MAJOR CAREER STAGES:

- ITERA Oil and Gas Company LLC;
- Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer;
- Genuine Arbitration Service Ltd.

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS:

- Represented a large Russian agricultural company in an arbitration under the Rules of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) with the seat in London against a Brazilian supplier of soya beans; the dispute was governed (substantive law) by the UN Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods with a subsidiary application of English law;
- Represented an oil trading company (claimant) in an arbitration under the Arbitration Rules of the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) with the seat in London against a Singaporean buyer; the dispute was governed (substantive law) by English law and related to the quality of oil products delivered to Mongolia. The tribunal found for the claimant;
- Advised a Russian company on English law issues and on an arbitration clause of the agreement for pipeline inspection surveys at a Russian dry section and shore approach (Nord Stream project);
- Advised a Russian company on several issues of arbitrations under the Arbitration Rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC);
- Advised a Russian company on issues of arbitrations under the Arbitration Rules of the Dubai International Arbitration Centre and under the DIFC-LCIA Arbitration Rules;
- Advised a large Russian developer and manufacturer of energy systems in a dispute subject to arbitration under the ICC Arbitration Rules, concerning the performance of a Finnish company of a contract of sale of energy equipment;

- Represented a Russian company (claimant) in arbitration administered by the International Commercial Arbitration Court at the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICAC) against a U.S. respondent on a contract on a geological and geophysical survey for the construction of the Black Sea Oil Export Terminal. The tribunal found for the claimant holding that the respondent is liable for the non-performance of the contract and ordering to pay to the claimant the full sum requested by the latter;
- Represented a Russian IT-company (respondent) in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation against a U.S. based company in a dispute related to a software development contract under which the software were to be created for Concern Tractor Plants (Russia). Instructions were taken from the respondent at the appellate stage after the client had lost the case in the first instance court. Having been upheld by the appellate instance, the decisions of the lower courts were then reversed by the cassation court which remitted the case for reconsideration. Following this judgement, both courts of the first and the appellate instances found for the respondent; no further appeal was advanced by the adversaries;
- Advised a large Russian food factory in a dispute subject to arbitration under the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration, against a Dutch company and its Italian subsidiary on a supply of equipment contract;
- Advised a large Russian construction group in a dispute subject to arbitration under the arbitration rules of the Vienna International Arbitral Centre, against an Italian company on a supply of building equipment contract;
- Represented a Russian company in Moscow district (commercial) court litigation against a reseller of a large Chinese engineering group on an alleged breach of a sales contract;
- Represented a Russian company in an ICAC arbitration against an Icelandic respondent related to a contract on navigation and geodesic services for the operation of an underwater vehicle in the Baltic Sea. In the course of arbitral proceedings the parties settled the dispute and the respondent paid the agreed sum;
- Represented a large German group (respondent) in an ICAC arbitration against a Russian claimant on the issuance of bank guarantees. The tribunal dismissed the claim;
- Advised an Italian company on several issues in ICC arbitration against a Russian factory on a supply of equipment contract;

- Advised a consortium of the largest Russian banks on a complex arbitration agreement (with consolidation and joinder provisions therein) between the banks, a borrower and the Russian Federation in connection with a PPP-project;
- Advised a large Russian construction company in a dispute subject to arbitration under the ICC Rules of Arbitration, against an international hotel group on the construction of a luxury hotel in Moscow;
- Advised a large Russian state company on the possible outcome of a litigation in Russian state (commercial) courts on the construction of Olympic buildings;
- Advised a Finnish logistics company in a dispute subject to Russian state (commercial) court litigation against one of the largest Russian insurers on an insurable event;
- Advised a large Russian company on a claim brought by a number of individuals before the High Court of Justice of England and Wales against an owner of the Russian company;
- Advised one of the leading Russian banks on the arbitration rules of a domestic arbitration institute, drafted proposals and amendments thereto;
- Represented a respondent (not affiliated with Gazprom) in arbitral proceedings administered by the Gazprom Arbitration Court against a claimant, Gazprom's subsidiary, which sought damages for the alleged non-performance of a contract on navigational and geodetic services. The arbitral tribunal dismissed the claim in its entirety and ordered the claimant to pay the sum requested by the respondent in its counterclaim;
- Represented a Russian oil-refining factory (respondent) in an ICAC arbitration against a German design company (claimant) which sought damages arising out of a design contract early termination. The respondent prevailed on major issues;
- Represented Gazprom neftekhim Salavat JSC in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decisions to set-off allegedly outstanding debts against a VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 159 million were declared invalid;
- Represented Gazprom neftekhim Salavat JSC in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to reimburse the claimant VAT to the amount of RUB 10.3 million and pay interest to the amount of RUB 18.9

million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;

- Represented Gazprom neftekhim Salavat JSC in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to reimburse the claimant VAT to the amount of over RUB 500 thousand and pay interest to the amount of RUB 4.1 million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a large Armenian gas company on several gas supply contracts. The main controversy stemmed from the mechanism which was used by the parties as an alternative to direct payments for the gas supplied (complex financial transactions involving third parties not privies to the contract). The respondent argued that the debt had been closed, however the tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$3.5 million;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Ukrainian respondent on a gas supply contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$1.9 million;
- Represented a Russian claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Swiss respondent on a gasoil supply contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$3.5 million;
- Represented a U.S. claimant in a SCC arbitration against a Ukrainian respondent on a gas supply contract. The case was subsequently settled by the parties;
- Represented a U.S. claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Ukrainian respondent on a gas supply contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay \$1.015 million;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a large Georgian factory related to a loan dispute. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$29 million;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Swedish respondent on a supply of food products agreement. The respondent paid the debt in the course of arbitration and the case was settled by the parties;
- Represented a charterer in arbitration under the auspices of the Maritime Arbitration Commission at the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry with regard to a charter-party dispute. The tribunal found for the charterer;

- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a BVI respondent on a gas supply contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$4.5 million;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Russian respondent on construction of looping and bypass pipelines contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$2.7 million;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a U.S. respondent on a gas supply contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$7.9 million;
- Represented a Russian respondent in an ICAC arbitration against a Swiss claimant on a supply of mazut contract. The claimant requested a tribunal to order a specific performance of the contract. The claim was dismissed in its entirety;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Ukrainian respondent on a gas supply contract. The case was subsequently settled by the parties;
- Represented a respondent in arbitration under the auspices of the Maritime Arbitration Commission at the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry against a claimant on a supply of grain by sea contract;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a respondent on a loan agreement. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over RUB 8 million;
- Represented a claimant in an ICAC arbitration against a Ukrainian respondent on a gas supply contract. The tribunal found for the claimant and ordered the respondent to pay over \$128 thousand;
- Represented a Russian respondent in an ICAC arbitration against a BVI claimant on a gasoil supply contract. A contentious issue concerned a subsequence of supplies and prices linked thereto;
- Represented an applicant in Moscow district (commercial) courts set-aside proceedings of an arbitral award rendered under the auspices of the Maritime Arbitration Commission at the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The award was set aside due to procedural irregularities in the course of arbitration;
- Represented ICAC claimants in Moscow district (commercial) courts set-aside proceedings on motions of ICAC award debtors from Ukraine (3), Switzerland (1),

Georgia (1). Debtors' applications were dismissed and ICAC awards survived;

- Represented arbitral awards creditors in the recognition proceeding before the respective state courts (singly or in cooperation with the local consultants). Two awards were recognized in Russia; one in the Texas, U.S. (in cooperation with a Texas based law firm) more than ten awards in Ukraine (in cooperation with a Ukrainian law firm), two in Kazakhstan (in cooperation with an independent Kazakh attorney), one in Georgia (in cooperation with a Georgian law firm); one in Moldova (in cooperation with a Moldavian law firm);
- Represented a company in numerous "corporate-war" litigations before the Russian (commercial) courts of Moscow, Central, Povolzhie, West Siberian and Ural districts on illegal capture (unfriendly takeover) of the company's assets (corporate disputes);
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT rebate dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decision to refuse the claimant's application for the VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 90 million was declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of an excise tax dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decision to hold the claimant responsible for the breach of excise laws and to collect excise/interest/fines from the claimant to the amount of over RUB 607 million was declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decisions to set-off allegedly outstanding debts against a VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 12.7 million were declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to pay interest to the amount of RUB 1.5 million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT rebate dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to reimburse the claimant VAT to the amount of RUB 25.43 million from the federal budget;

- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of an excise tax dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decision to hold the claimant responsible for the breach of excise laws and to collect excise/interest/fines from the claimant to the amount of over RUB 377 million was declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decisions to set-off allegedly outstanding debts against a VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 39 million were declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to pay interest to the amount of RUB 3.4 million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT rebate dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to reimburse the claimant VAT to the amount of over RUB 41 million from the federal budget;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of an excise tax dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decision to hold the claimant responsible for the breach of excise laws and to collect excise/interest/fines from the claimant to the amount of over RUB 647 million was declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decisions to set-off allegedly outstanding debts against a VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 10.3 million were declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to pay interest to the amount of RUB 12.4 million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT rebate dispute against Interregional Tax

Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to reimburse the claimant VAT to the amount of RUB 25.49 million from the federal budget;

- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of an excise tax dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decision to hold the claimant responsible for the breach of excise laws and to collect excise/interest/fines from the claimant to the amount of over RUB 429 million was declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decisions to set-off allegedly outstanding debts against a VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 2.8 million were declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to pay interest to the amount of RUB 43.1 million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of an excise tax dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decision to hold the claimant responsible for the breach of excise laws and to collect excise/interest/fines from the claimant to the amount of over RUB 337 million was declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office's decisions to set-off allegedly outstanding debts against a VAT rebate to the amount of over RUB 400 million were declared invalid;
- Represented a large Russian petrochemical company in Moscow district (commercial) courts litigation of a VAT related dispute against Interregional Tax Office No. 1 for the largest taxpayers. The tax office was ordered to pay interest to the amount of RUB 1.03 million for the delay in VAT reimbursement;
- Represented a respondent in a Moscow state (commercial) court litigation against the Moscow Government (claimant) on a lease agreement dispute. The court dismissed the claim.