



Judgment of the General Court in Case T-358/25 | Abramovich v Council

Press release No 124/26

Luxembourg, 9 September 2026

War in Ukraine: the General Court dismisses the action brought by Mr Roman Arkadyevich Abramovich, thereby upholding the restrictive measures taken against him

Mr Roman Arkadyevich Abramovich is a businessperson of Russian, Israeli and Portuguese nationalities. He is, in particular, the majority shareholder in the parent company Evraz, one of the leading Russian groups in the steel and mining sectors.

Following the attack launched by Russia against Ukraine on 24 February 2022, the Council, *inter alia*, froze the funds of, and prohibited entry into or transit through the European Union to, leading businesspersons who engage in activities in economic sectors regarded as a substantial source of revenue to the Russian Government. ¹

Mr Abramovich brought actions before the General Court of the European Union challenging the inclusion and maintenance of his name on the lists of persons and entities subject to those measures. By its judgments of 20 December 2023 and 10 September 2025, the General Court dismissed those actions. ²

After receiving the observations submitted by Mr Abramovich, the Council adopted new acts extending the restrictive measures taken against him, thus prolonging the period of application of those measures, first, to 15 September 2025, ³ then to 15 March 2026, respectively. ⁴

As a consequence, Mr Abramovich brought then adapted an action seeking (i) annulment of the latter acts, and (ii) compensation in respect of the non-material harm that he claims to have suffered as a result of the adoption thereof.

In its judgment delivered today, **the General Court dismisses Mr Abramovich's action and upholds the acts adopted by the Council.**

The General Court rejects the argument that the measures at issue were adopted de facto by the working parties of the Council which is tasked with carrying out the *travaux préparatoires*. In actual fact, **the Council simply relied on those travaux in order to decide whether to adopt the contested measures**; the fact that those working parties were involved in reviewing the restrictive measures, with the aim of simplifying the taking, by the Council, of a final decision, does not mean that the latter relinquishes its decision-making power or delegates it to one of its preparatory bodies.

Furthermore, the **designation criteria** for applying those measures, which come under the **broad discretion** afforded to the Council, are objective, sufficiently **precise** and **proportionate**: first, they **specifically** target **leading businesspersons** operating in **Russia**, in a context where the **main economic operators** have close **ties to the State**; second, they target those acting in **sectors which generate** significant **revenues** for the **Russian Government**, by clearly referring to **activities of non-negligible importance**, which are sources of funding for that government's actions and policies. ⁵

It is the **application of those criteria**, having regard to the importance of Mr Abramovich's capital holdings, **which led to the adoption of restrictive measures against him** and not, as he maintains, a desire to exploit him on account of his public notoriety.

He is, in fact, **the majority shareholder in Evraz**, which is the parent company of **one of the leading Russian groups** in the **steel and mining sectors**. He also owns **shares in Norilsk Nickel**, one of **the world's leading producers of palladium** and a key operator in the market for **refined nickel**. Those activities, which form part of the steel and mining

industries, represent, moreover, a **substantial source of revenue** for the Russian Government.⁶

Finally, the measures **comply with the conditions laid down under EU law, and in particular the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, with regard to restrictions on the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms, such as the freedom of movement of EU citizens**, since those restrictions are founded on a legislative basis which clearly and precisely defines the scope of those restrictions; the measures respect the 'essence' of the right of the applicant to move freely on the territory of the Member States, inasmuch as they provide for derogations and periodic reviews; and they are proportionate and appropriate to the objective of promoting a peaceful settlement of the crisis in Ukraine.

NOTE: An action for annulment seeks the annulment of acts of the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the European Union that are contrary to EU 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 presentation of the facts and legal context refers to the material time and is based on the information before the General Court.

The full [text and, as the case may be, an abstract](#) of the judgment is published on the CURIA website on the day of delivery.

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

Images of the delivery of the judgment are available on the [European Broadcasting Service](#) ☎ (+32) 2 2964106.

Stay Connected!



¹ That wording of the criteria for applying restrictive measures was introduced by [Council Decision \(CFSP\) 2023/1094](#) of 5 June 2023, amending Decision 2014/145/PESC concerning restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine; and by [Council Regulation \(EU\) 2023/1089](#) of 5 June 2023, amending Regulation (EU) No 269/2014 concerning restrictive measures in respect of actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine.

² See judgments of the General Court in *Abramovich v Council*, Cases [T-313/22](#) (see also Press Release [No 195/23](#)) and [T-1105/23](#).

³ [Council Decision \(CFSP\) 2025/528](#) of 14 March 2025 amending Decision 2014/145/CFSP; [Council Implementing Regulation \(EU\) 2025/527](#) of 14 March 2025 implementing Regulation (EU) No 269/2014.

⁴ [Council Decision \(CFSP\) 2025/1895](#) of 12 September 2025 amending Decision 2014/145/CFSP; [Council Implementing Regulation \(EU\) 2025/1894](#) of 12 September 2025 implementing Regulation (EU) No 269/2014.

⁵ The proportionality of the measures adopted and of the criteria for applying those measures is also based on the confirmation thereof during the periodic review, since the initial factual context remains unchanged. Moreover, the applicant has failed to propose any less restrictive alternatives which may be used in order to achieve the objectives pursued.

⁶ According to the Evraz annual report for 2021, revenues from steel represent 66.3% of the group's annual revenue. Moreover, the General Court holds that the applicant has failed to establish that it was impossible to sell his shares in Evraz.