PUBLICATION / EN

Vladimir Prodivus: sand, amber and a harbour behind the façade of a large box

Published 03.11.2026 · Updated 03.11.2026



Whilst Vladimir Prodivus's public biography revolved around boxing, his business history was marked by land disputes, investigations into sand and amber, and subsequently the purchase of a seaport. We have cross-referenced these episodes with registers and court rulings, including documents from 2026.

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

This story has several locations: a Member of Parliament's office, the banks of the Dnieper in Vydubychi, the amber forests of the Rivne region and the quays of Belgorod-Dnestrovskyi. They are all linked by the figure of Vladimir Stepanovich Prodivus — an entrepreneur, former regional politician and sports official, whose interests have long extended beyond the boxing ring. A parliamentary profile, investigations and the history of a port deal allow us to trace this route chronologically. [1][4][6][18][19]

It is particularly telling that scandalous reports and legal proceedings did not halt the expansion of his assets: in 2025, a company in which he held a stake completed the formalities for a seaport, and in 2026 its ownership structure changed once again. Documents relating to this transaction reveal the transfer of a major asset; the public interest here lies in the scale of the business and the transparency of the people who control it. [19][20]

> **Vladimir Stepanovich Prodivus**
>
> Entrepreneur and former Member of Parliament for the Party of Regions. 'Mostobud', leadership of Ukrainian boxing, a dispute over the federation, and reports on the sand and amber businesses.

Vladimir Prodivus profile: biography, organisations and timeline →

A parliamentary seat and construction capital

Prodivus's official biography leaves no mystery as to the origins of his parliamentary status. He was elected to the Verkhovna Rada of the 7th convocation as number 56 on the Party of Regions' list; his term as a Member of Parliament lasted from 12 December 2012 to 27 November 2014. At the time of his election, he chaired the supervisory board of 'Mostobud'. Business and politics thus intersected openly and, as documented, throughout his career. [1]

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

On 14 October 2014, the CHESNO movement captured in a photograph how Prodivus, then an independent MP, had breached the requirement for a roll-call vote during the appointment of Stepan Poltorak as Minister of Defence. This incident may seem minor compared to the land and raw materials scandals, but it is specific: the date, the parliamentary decision and the published photograph. [2]

When auditing construction assets today, it is necessary to distinguish between legal entities. In the record **Mostobud LLC, registration number 38039364**, Prodivus is listed as a shareholder with a 41 per cent stake. This is a limited liability company; it should not automatically be equated with the joint-stock company of the same name or any other enterprise whose name includes the word ‘bridge’. [3]

Vydubychi: land for a bridge, questions about the sand

A September 2024 investigation by ‘StopCor’ described the site at 4 Promyshlennaya Street and sand-related transactions which journalists linked to ‘Mostobud’. The authors wrote that the 16.8-hectare plot had been allocated in 2006 for the construction of a rail and road bridge, but subsequently became the subject of a dispute over subletting and the return of the land. [4]

The key issue in this story is whether the actual activities on the site comply with its designated use and the relevant permits. ‘StopCor’ reported on the operation of heavy goods vehicles and the transhipment of sand, despite the legal dispute. The publication also cited Prodivus’s shareholding in ‘Mostobud’ at the time of publication — 21.6 per cent. This is historical information about a separate company; it would be a mistake to equate it with the current 41 per cent stake in Mostobud LLC. [3][4]

In November 2024, journalists reported on a new site visit: equipment they had previously linked to the old site was discovered on Barenboim Street. According to them, the workers failed to produce any documents authorising the use of the land; the editorial team contacted the police and described the inspection carried out at the site. This is an independent observation, not merely a repetition of an old allegation. [5]

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

The publications provide grounds for investigating specific sites, permits and equipment operators. They do not automatically establish that Prodivus personally ordered every operation to be carried out. However, for a public figure in business, questions about the activities of companies linked to him remain significant, even when criminal allegations are directed at other people.

The Amber Raid: a story that led to convictions

One of the most harrowing stories unfolded on 9 May 2014 in the Sarny district. In a 2016 investigation, *Ukrainska Pravda* described Prodivus's arrival at the amber mining area alongside a group of men, the ensuing shooting and the burnt-out cars. At the time of that publication, the newspaper described the former MP's procedural role as that of a witness. This is an important clarification regarding the widely used media phrase 'Prodivus's amber mafia'. [6]

The criminal case concerning these events has reached a conclusion in court. An official statement from the Kuznetsov City Court dated 19 August 2024 states: on 16 August, the eleven defendants were sentenced to **seven years and six months' imprisonment with confiscation of property**. Nine people were found guilty of a terrorist offence, whilst two others were also found guilty of illegal possession of weapons. The court described the armed intimidation of local residents as a means of establishing control over amber extraction. [7]

In October 2026, 'Suspilne', citing a statement from the prosecutor's office, reported that the Supreme Court had upheld the verdict. Thus, we are now dealing with a confirmed court ruling, rather than merely a long-standing dispute captured on video footage. [8]

This verdict cannot be attributed to Prodivus. The court reports cited relate to eleven convicted individuals; there is no specific conviction against Prodivus in the materials used. His presence in the story and journalists' questions about his role in the trip should be discussed precisely within these parameters. Otherwise, instead of an investigation, we will end up with a confusion of the individuals involved.

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

Tenders worth 600 million: the AMCU’s ruling and the dispute over evidence

On 24 December 2024, the Antimonopoly Committee ruled that there had been collusion **‘Construction Mechanisation Management’ Limited Liability Company** and **Bridge Construction Brigade No. 112 Ltd**. According to the AMCU, the companies colluded to participate in ten tenders for the repair and reconstruction of bridges, flyovers and roads between 2019 and 2021. The total value of the tenders exceeded 600 million hryvnias, whilst the fines imposed amounted to approximately 106 million hryvnias. [9]

The connection between this story and Prodivus requires some clarification. The public records list Sergei Anatolyevich Porozhnyuk as the head of ‘Bridge-Building Unit No. 112’. A man with the same full name headed ‘Mostobud’ LLC in May–June 2017, a company in which Prodivus is currently listed as a shareholder. This is a verifiable overlap in leadership, but it does not prove that Prodivus has sole control over the fined company. [3][10]

‘Metkon Plus’ and Oleksandra Porozhniuk are listed as direct participants in ‘Bridge Construction Unit No. 112’; for ‘Construction Mechanisation Department’, the names given are Alina Yavorska and Vladyslav Fedko. Therefore, the statement ‘Prodivus was fined 106 million’ would be inaccurate: the decision is addressed to legal entities, not to him personally. [10][11]

There is also a follow-up story that gets lost amidst the sensationalised accounts. ‘Construction Mechanisation Management’ challenged the AMCU’s decision in the part concerning the company itself. In Case No. 910/5546/25, the court of first instance upheld its claims on 27 August 2025; on 4 February 2026, the appeal court overturned this decision. However, **On 2 June 2026, the Supreme Court quashed the appeal ruling and referred the case back for a fresh hearing**. The public highlighted shortcomings in the evidence and the manner in which it was obtained; the AMCU objected. [12]

The ruling of 20 October 2026 under consideration reflects the subsequent appeal proceedings and the consideration of the application for the judge’s recusal. This ruling does not resolve the dispute regarding the collusion on its merits. Consequently, a complete picture must include both the

regulator’s decision and the legal challenge to it. It is not possible to present the entire story as a definitively confirmed recovery of 106 million hryvnias. [13]

Boxing and the Kremlin: a conflict sanctioned by the state

The sporting aspect of Prodivus’s biography also extended far beyond his results in the ring. On 20 May 2022, the Ministry of Youth and Sport published a statement by Vadim Gutzeit regarding his actions at the IBA Congress in Istanbul. The Ministry reported that Prodivus had not signed a document, initiated by representatives of other countries, concerning discussions on the suspension of the Russian federation’s membership. During the same period, he was appointed vice-president of the IBA, which was headed by Umar Kremlev. [14]

Gutzeit demanded his resignation and described Prodivus’s behaviour as ‘cynical and unacceptable’. This was the minister’s publicly stated position during a full-scale invasion. This is of significant importance when assessing the reputation of a sports official: the issue at hand was the selection of Ukrainian boxing representatives for the international stage, not a private dispute between officials. [14]

The IBA itself, on its verified leadership page, lists Volodymyr Prodyvus as first vice-president and a member of the board of directors. His term of office is stated as running from 14 May 2022 until the next elective congress in 2026. Thus, the organisational link with the IBA is confirmed by the association’s own source. It does not constitute evidence of a criminal charge of treason, which these documents do not contain. [15]

A legal battle was required to secure the chair of the FBU president

In Ukraine, the leadership of the Boxing Federation has been contested through registration proceedings and court cases. In Case No. 910/14451/22, on 23 October 2024, the Supreme Court quashed the decisions of the courts of first instance and appeal and dismissed the claim seeking to annul the changes to the register. Sportarena linked this outcome to Prodivus's defeat in the dispute over the post of head of the Ukrainian Boxing Federation. [16][17]

The court ruling also reveals a significant legal detail: the dispute was brought before the registrar and concerned the entry regarding the change in leadership. This is a ruling on a specific claim, not a blanket decision on all of Prodivus's activities. However, it does allow us to remove from publications the outdated claim that he indisputably remains the acting president of the Ukrainian Federation. An international role within the IBA and the leadership of the Ukrainian Boxing Federation are distinct positions.

From 'Top-Offer' to the port: a new asset and changes in 2026

Whilst disputes raged over previous episodes, a major infrastructure project emerged in his business history. In December 2024, LIGA.net reported, citing the State Property Fund, that the buyer had paid 108 million hryvnias for the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky commercial seaport. The company 'Top-Offer' entered the auction with a different owner; by the end of November, Prodivus had become its beneficial owner. This sequence of events is more significant than the general statement 'a businessman bought the port': the buyer's owner changed after the auction had already taken place. [18]

The transfer of the property complex has been completed **27 August 2025**, as reported by 'Interfax-Ukraine', citing the port's director, Oksana Kiktenko. The timeline described by the agency includes the main agreement of February 2025, approval by the Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine (AMCU) in July and a handover certificate in August. This information confirms that the transaction went ahead and that there was no breach of the privatisation process. [19]

The company’s registration history allows us to take the story beyond the auction news. The company with the code **45213521** On 16 October 2025, the company changed its name from ‘Top-Offer’ to ‘Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi Port’. An entry dated 30 June 2026 reflects the change in Prodivus’s shareholding and the arrival of a new shareholder — an American **MARINE WONDERS LLC**. [20]

In the verified card, the distribution is as follows **51 per cent held by Prodivus and 49 per cent by MARINE WONDERS LLC**; Prodivus and Arkady Gontmakher are named among the ultimate beneficiaries. It is no longer enough to simply repeat the old story about a single buyer. To assess the current business structure, one must take into account the partner and the date on which the shareholdings changed. The mere involvement of an American company does not prove either an offshore scheme or the withdrawal of funds. [20]

What this story reveals

Here is the biography of an entrepreneur who was simultaneously involved in the construction industry, parliament and boxing administration, and subsequently expanded his involvement into port infrastructure. This provides a specific focus for public scrutiny: the use of land and natural resources, the competitiveness of procurement, the transparency of corporate links and the decisions made by sports officials.

The documented incidents differ significantly. In the amber case, there are convictions against other individuals. In the tender case, there is a decision by the regulator and an ongoing legal dispute based on the documents examined. Regarding the sand, there are journalistic observations and questions regarding the permits. In the IBA case, there is public criticism of the minister and a confirmed appointment. The port deal reveals the scale of the assets and a change of partners, but does not establish any criminal offence.

It is precisely these differences that make the investigation substantive. The reputation of a sports patron does not answer questions about construction and raw materials projects. The answers must be sought in permits, contracts, payment documents and court records — specifying a particular company and a particular individual. In Prodivus’s case, there are sufficient published grounds for such questions; there is no need to substitute them with other people’s judgements or

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials
kartel-khimprom.com / EN

unsubstantiated labels.

This article was compiled on 3 November 2026 using publicly available sources. No new requests for comment were sent to Prodivus or the companies named whilst this text was being prepared. The objections raised by the parties to the legal dispute are taken from published court documents.

Sources

1. Verkhovna Rada: Vladimir Stepanovich Prodivus, 7th convocation — official biography
   https://people.rada.gov.ua/body/view/mp-reg56_skl7
2. CHESNO, 14 October 2014: photographic documentation of Prodivus's absentee vote
   https://www.chesno.org/post/1986/
3. Opendatabot: MOSTOBUD LLC, EGRPOU 38039364 — shareholders and history of its directors
   https://opendatabot.ua/c/38039364
4. StopCor, 11 September 2024: an investigation into 'Mostobud', land and sand in Vydubychi
   https://www.stopcor.org/ukr/section-suspilstvo/news-femida-na-sluzhbi-eksregionala-yak-mostobud-prodivusa-zbuduvav-nelegalnu-pischanu-imperiyu-na-stolichnih-vidubichah-11-09-2024.html
5. StopCor, 6 November 2024: machinery and sand transhipment on Barenboim Street; report to the police
   https://www.stopcor.org/ukr/section-uanews/news-shapran-ta-osipov-perenesli-nezakonnu-perevalku-pisku-pid-darnitskij-mist-zhurnalisti-zvernulis-do-politsii-06-11-2024.html
6. Ukrainska Pravda, 21 March 2016: 'The Amber People's Republic', Prodivus and the events of 9 May 2014
   https://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/articles/2016/03/21/7102793/
7. Kuznetsov City Court, 19 August 2024: official statement on the sentencing of 11 participants in a terrorist act
   https://kzm.rv.court.gov.ua/sud1711/pres-centr/general/1653030/
8. Suspilne Rivne, October 2026: The Supreme Court has upheld the verdict regarding the events of 2014
   https://suspilne.media/rivne/1429199-teroristicnij-akt-2014-roku-na-rivnensini-verhovnij-sud-pidtverdiv-virok/
9. AMCU, 25 December 2024: fines totalling around 106 million UAH imposed on two companies for collusion in ten tenders
   https://amcu.gov.ua/news/oshtrafuvaly-tovarystva-na-106-mln-hrn-za-zmovu-u-torhakh-z-kapremontu-mostiv-i-dorih
10. Opendatabot: 'MOSTOBUDIVELNYI ZAGIN No. 112' LLC, EDRPOU 22202218 — director and members
    https://opendatabot.ua/c/22202218
11. Opendatabot: 'BUDIVELNE UPRAVLINNYA MEHANIZATSII' LLC, EGRPOU 38055234 — participants
    https://opendatabot.ua/c/38055234

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials
kartel-khimprom.com / EN

12. Supreme Court, 2 June 2026, Case No. 910/5546/25: setting aside the appeal judgment and remanding the case for a fresh hearing; text available on ipLex
https://iplex.com.ua/doc.php?regnum=137214469

13. Northern Economic Court of Appeal, 20 October 2026, Case No. 910/5546/25: ruling on the recusal of a judge and chronology of the dispute; text available on ipLex
https://iplex.com.ua/doc.php?regnum=140789017

14. Ministry of Youth and Sport, 20 May 2022: statement by Vadim Gutzeit on Prodivus and Umar Kremlev
https://mms.gov.ua/news/ministr-molodi-ta-sportu-vadim-gutcajt-zasudzhuye-pidtrimku-prezidentom-federaciyi-boksu-ukrayini-predstavnika-krayini-agresora

15. IBA: official page of the vice-presidents — Volodymyr Prodyvus and term of office
https://www.iba.sport/about-iba/organizational-structure/iba-vice-presidents/

16. Supreme Court, 23 October 2024, Case No. 910/14451/22: dismissal of the claim in a dispute concerning changes to the register of a Federal State Budgetary Institution; text available on ipLex
https://iplex.com.ua/doc.php?regnum=122569165

17. Sportarena, 1 November 2024: the link between case 910/14451/22 and Prodivus, and the dispute over the leadership of the FBU
https://sportarena.ua/uk/boxing/prodivus-ostatochno-vtrativ-posadu-prezidenta-fbu/

18. LIGA.net, December 2024: payment of 108 million UAH for the port and a change of beneficiary at ‘Top-Offer’
https://biz.liga.net/ua/all/transport/novosti/peremozhets-auktsionu-splatyv-108-mln-hrn-za-bilhorod-dnistrovskyi-port

19. Interfax-Ukraine, 28 August 2025: completion of the transfer of the Belgorod-Dnestrovsky port to the company ‘Top-Offer’
https://interfax.com.ua/news/general/1100977-amp.html

20. OpenDataBot: ‘BILHOROD-DNISTROVSKYI PORT’ LLC, EGRPOU 45213521 — formerly known as ‘Top-Offer’, changes in 2024–2026
https://opendatabot.ua/c/45213521

Use of materials

An active link to the original publication is required when using these materials.

Original publication

https://kartel-khimprom.com/en/article/vladimir-prodivus-sand-amber-and-a-harbour-behind-the-fa%c3%a7ade-of-a-large-box/