PUBLICATION / EN

Yuriy Vyacheslavovich Degas. Who owns ‘Kaleton’ and why is Odessa taking legal action on Starosennaya Square?

Published 16.11.2026 · Updated 16.11.2026

Yuriy Vyacheslavovich Degas, ‘Kaleton’ beach and Starosennaya Square in Odessa. Court rulings, the dispute over a lease worth 2.49 million UAH and the role of Remonselia Holdings.



An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

An editorial collage made from two portraits provided. The monument to the Duke of Richelieu has been added to the illustrative background based on a photograph by Ismael Solaz (CC BY 3.0).

Odessa was involved in a legal dispute over a beach it wanted to refurbish for people with disabilities, whilst at the same time demanding rent for the market near the railway station. On the coast, its opponent was a company in which Yuriy Vyacheslavovich Degas is listed as the sole shareholder. On Starosennaya Street, there is a company in which he holds a 10 per cent stake, whilst 80 per cent is owned by the Cypriot firm Remonselia Holdings Ltd. In February 2026, StopCor linked these stories together in a single investigation. Since then, a new first-instance ruling has been issued regarding Starosennaya, whilst documents relating to ‘Kaleton’ make it possible to verify exactly what the city was attempting to reclaim and why a single plot of land had to be the subject of several separate legal proceedings.

‘Kaleton’. How Odessa attempted to terminate the lease

On 1 August 2017, Focus Logistics LLC, EDRPOU code 40801563, entered into contract No. 129/jur with the city administration. In the Supreme Court documents, the property is described as a coastal protection structure in the form of a section of the ‘Delfin’ artificial sandy beach between breakwaters No. 12 and 12-a. The ‘Caleton’ beach complex operates on this stretch of coastline. In the publicly available tenant profile, Degas is listed as a shareholder with a 100 per cent stake and as the ultimate beneficial owner; Oleg Shevchenko is listed as the director.

There is a significant discrepancy in the figures. StopCor cites 2,800 m² of coastal area. In the court document relating to contract No. 129/jur, the area of the coastal protection structure is **3,755.82 m²**. The figures may refer to different areas. For example, the area of the commercial site may have differed from the area of the entire structure. The materials found do not provide a survey plan that would allow the difference to be explained with certainty. Therefore, 2,800 m² cannot be presented as the lease area established by the court.

On 24 April 2025, the Executive Committee appointed the City Administration as the client for the design and reconstruction of this section of ‘Delfin’. Decision No. 411 provided for the provision of access facilities for people with disabilities and other groups with reduced mobility. The following day, the department issued a notice of termination of the contract. According to ‘Suspilne’, the city based its position on the contractual deadline for vacating the site and considered the lease to end on 30 May. Degas told the publication that the notice had only been received in mid-May and

disputed the calculation of the deadlines.

An adjacent inclusive beach was already operating in the city, which, according to ‘Suspilne’, is also linked to the tenant. It is therefore difficult to reduce the dispute to the slogan ‘paid beach versus accessible sea’. The documents require a distinction to be made between three things: the existing social project, the site of the commercial complex, and the new urban regeneration project. For each of these, it is being clarified separately who is responsible for access, utility networks, safety and paid services.

What the court decided. Three legal proceedings concerning ‘Kaleton’

In the case **№ 916/1952/25** The company contested the notice of termination, a clause in the contract and the executive committee’s decision on the redevelopment. In May 2025, the court partially granted the application for interim relief and prohibited actions that could deprive the tenant of the opportunity to use the disputed property pending the outcome of the case. The appeal court upheld the interim measures, and on 23 September 2025, the Supreme Court dismissed the city authorities’ appeals against them. This constitutes interim relief for the duration of the dispute. The question of whether the contract was lawfully terminated was not addressed on its merits in that cassation ruling.

On 15 January 2026, the Commercial Court closed part of the case after ‘Focus Logistics’ withdrew its claim against the Executive Committee to overturn Decision No. 411. It was this specific clause that concerned the appointment of the client for the redevelopment. It cannot be inferred from the January ruling that the court has definitively recognised the lease as valid or brought the entire dispute to a close. Public court documents reviewed for this article provided no confirmation of a final ruling on all claims, including those concerning termination and eviction.

In another case, **№ 916/2523/25**The subject of the dispute was the technical specifications for water supply and sewerage for the facility, designated in the documents as a social beach for people with disabilities. On 1 December 2025, the Commercial Court declared invalid the decision by the municipal enterprise ‘Service Centre’ to annul these specifications. It dismissed the remaining claims. This outcome relates to the connection document. It cannot be inferred from this that the facility has already been connected or that the purpose of the lease has changed as a result.

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

In the administrative case **№ 420/19666/25** The same company was in dispute with the city authorities over a temporary structure measuring 24.26 m², the refusal to approve its installation, and orders to dismantle it. On 20 January 2026, the District Administrative Court dismissed the claim. This court ruling relates to a specific structure. It does not order the demolition of the entire beach complex.

In the summer of 2026, ‘Suspilne’ published a list of sites authorised to operate. ‘Kaleton’ and the inclusive ‘Bezmezh’ beach in the ‘Delfin’ district are listed as separate locations. The summer authorisation indicates that the beach was included in the list of approved areas. However, this does not in itself determine the outcome of the dispute over the lease or who has the right to manage the coastal protection structure for the coming season.

How to read the documents on ‘Kaleton’

Document	What was decided	What follows from the published document
Contract No. 129/jur, 1 August 2017	Subject of the lease	The plot of the ‘Delfin’ artificial beach, 3,755.82 m² as described in the court order
№ 916/1952/25, 23.09.2025	The city’s complaints regarding interim measures	The Supreme Court has upheld the interim measures
№ 916/1952/25, 15.01.2026	A claim to set aside the decision on the contractor for the redevelopment	This part of the case has been closed following the claimant’s withdrawal
№ 916/2523/25, 01.12.2025	Annulment of the technical specifications for the public beach	The court ruled that the annulment was invalid and dismissed the remaining claims
№ 420/19666/25, 20.01.2026	Approval of the temporary structure and the order to dismantle it	The court of first instance dismissed the claim

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



Area figures from court documents relating to two different properties.

Starosennaya. Why the city is demanding nearly 2.5 million UAH

Starosennaya is a different property, with a different tenant and lease agreement. Case No. 916/704/26 states that in August 2016, Edvansment LLC was granted a 25-year lease **2.3859 hectares** for the operation of the market and the improvement of the surrounding area. The court ruling cites cadastral number 5110137500:34:003:0024. It also describes transactions from 2016 through which the company acquired shares or rights to individual commercial buildings. This makes it possible to distinguish between the rights to the market's property and the lease of the land beneath it. The document records the lease of the land plot; therefore, the claim that the entire area has been transferred to the company's ownership requires separate verification.

StopCor's account of the origin of the assets was published in February 2026. On 27 February, the city filed a claim with the Commercial Court, demanding 2,495,194.49 UAH for the period from 1 August 2022 to 31 August 2024, including the principal debt, late payment penalties, interest and inflation-related losses. 'Advancement' sought to have the claim dismissed in its entirety and contested, in particular, the calculation of the rent and whether the relevant terms of the contract had changed.

On 24 September 2026, the Commercial Court of the Odessa Region partially upheld the claims. It ruled to recover **2,490,539.24 UAH**, including **2,194,022.68 UAH** of the principal debt. Legal costs are calculated separately. The ruling also states that in March 2026, the company's property

was seized as security for the claim, up to the amount of the claim. This is a dispute concerning the performance of a lease agreement. ‘Advancement’ lodged an appeal and requested that the claim be dismissed in its entirety. On 2 November, the Court of Appeal left the appeal pending due to the lack of proof of payment of the court fee. We were unable to find the final appeal ruling or confirmation of actual payment in the verified documents.

This was already the second dispute over payments under the same contract. In the case **№ 916/3369/22** In November 2023, the court partially upheld the city’s claims against ‘Advancement’, including the recovery of 1,135,203.75 UAH in principal debt. As is evident from the judgement in the new case, in March 2024 the appeal court upheld this judgement. The two cases have different calculation periods. To understand how much the budget ultimately received, data on the enforcement of each judgement and details of payments under the contract are required.

Cyprus-based Remonselia and the theory of links to Kolomoyskyi

The ‘Advancement’ corporate register provides a specific breakdown of shareholdings. Remonselia Holdings Ltd of Cyprus holds 80 per cent, Yuri Degas 10 per cent, and Aminat Musaeva 10 per cent. The Cypriot registration document shows a legal entity with the number HE 358633, registered in 2016. This information indicates the Cypriot company’s shareholding in the Ukrainian company. It is not possible to automatically attribute the remaining 80 per cent to the Ukrainian co-owner through this company, nor to determine who votes on behalf of Remonselia.

StopCor links Remonselia to the inner circle of Ihor Kolomoyskyi and Ihor Surkis through overlapping senior management and other companies. This is a lead regarding business connections. To confirm current control over Remonselia or ‘Advancement’, one needs to trace the chain of ownership by dates and examine the documents that grant the ultimate owner the right to dispose of the shares. In the verified materials, we have no such confirmation for Kolomoyskyi, Surkis or for the assertion that Degas solely controls the market via Cyprus.

‘Advancement’ also has a history of criminal proceedings. StopCor points to an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the transfer of municipal property in Odessa between 2015 and 2017. Documents from 2017 mention the company’s properties on Starosennaya Square and the issue of interim injunctions restricting dealings with them. A court order regarding such measures makes it possible to determine which properties were of interest to the investigation. The criminal classification set out in the application requires verification against the final court ruling. We have

not found a published conviction against Degas in relation to this episode. Commercial decisions regarding the rent arrears address a different issue and do not, in themselves, provide an answer to this question.

Property outside Starosennaya. ‘Planeta Development’ and ‘Greenwich Park’

According to the current registration details for Planeta Development LLC (41410941), Degas owns 100 per cent of the company, with Oleg Shevchenko listed as the director. The same director is listed at ‘Focus Logistics’. A separate legal entity exists for the ‘Greenwich Park’ project: a housing and construction co-operative with the code 44164573. In its registration details, Degas is listed amongst the founders and beneficiaries. Documents, contracts with investors and court rulings must be searched for using the specific registration code. The name of the residential complex does not replace the details of the client commissioning the construction.

The Pecherskyi District Court of Kyiv heard case No. 757/20553/23-k in May 2023. According to its ruling, ‘Planeta Development’ was awarded the right to joint development following a tender, and on 20 October 2020, a joint venture agreement was concluded. The judge considered a motion to lift the seizure of a 0.5-hectare plot of land. He lifted the seizure and noted that the prosecution had not provided sufficient evidence to consider the plot as material evidence in case No. 12021000000000749. As of the date of that ruling, according to its text, the company’s officials had not been informed of the suspicion. StopCor links the case to possible irregularities in the construction permit process. The court ruling shows the grounds on which the seizure of the plot was justified and the objection to it that the court accepted.

Another useful cross-check: the hotel company ‘Crocus’ LLC (31677378). A StopCor publication mentions a 49% stake, whilst the company profile for this LLC shows Degas holding 50.5%. The link next to the figure in the publication leads to the profile of another company, ‘Crocus Invest Group’ (40254385). There are several similar names within the group, so it is risky to transfer the percentage between them. For the same reason, Degas Group LLC (43861490), in which Degas is listed as holding 100 per cent, cannot be regarded as the direct owner of all the companies in which he is personally listed as a founder.

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

How Degas explained the conflict with the city council

Degas was born on 1 January 1987 in Mykolaiv, according to his biographical profile on ‘Dumskaya’. He publicly presented projects under the name Degas Group and was involved in the development of an inclusive beach at ‘Delfin’.

In an interview with ‘Suspilne’, Degas contested the city’s actions regarding ‘Kaleton’ and referred to the notice periods. In the autumn of 2025, he publicly spoke out about searches, the seizure of documents and criminal prosecution, which he linked to political pressure from the Odessa authorities. His statements were reported by the publication ‘GORDON’. This is Degas’s own position. It is not possible to determine from this the nature of the alleged offence, the procedural status in each case, or the outcome of the investigation into his allegations against the city council.

In the dispute over ‘Kaleton’ itself, the city justified its decision on the grounds of ensuring the coast’s accessibility for people with reduced mobility. The tenant raised objections regarding both the contract and the notice. A key question for both parties is what has changed for visitors following the 2026 open season. To answer this, we will need the final status of the contract, a map of the public access route and the areas served, the design and completion certificates for the refurbishment works, as well as the conditions under which people actually use the access ramp to the sea and the facilities.

What the reconciliation revealed

A lease agreement has been established for the beach, and judgements have been handed down in three separate cases. Regarding Starosennaya, the contractual terms of the plot have been published, along with a first-instance ruling ordering the company to pay nearly 2.5 million UAH. A direct stake held by Remonselia has been identified within the Cypriot structure, whilst conclusions regarding its ultimate owners remain based on a source’s account. These questions may be answered by new court rulings, payment documents relating to the market transaction, and the disclosure of the Cypriot company’s ownership structure. A separate question remains as to whether the figure of 2,800 m² refers to a part of the property, which is described in court as a plot with an area of 3,755.82 m².

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

Sources

1. StopCor — original investigation dated 17 February 2026
   https://www.stopcor.org/section-suspilstvo/news-vid-starosinnoi-do-2800-kv-m-uzberezhzhya-yak-yurij-degas-kontrolyue-odesku-neruhomist-cherez-ofshor-z-orbiti-kolomojskogo-17-02-2026.html
2. Suspilne Odesa — the conflict over the ‘Kaleton’ lease, the positions of Degas and the city
   https://suspilne.media/odesa/1022503-konflikt-navkolo-plazu-v-odesi-rozirvanna-dogovoru-ta-dola-kaletonu/
3. The Commercial Cassation Court of the Supreme Court — ruling of 23 September 2025 in case No. 916/1952/25
   https://iplex.com.ua/doc.php?regnum=130409509
4. Odessa Regional Commercial Court — partial closure of proceedings No. 916/1952/25 dated 15 January 2026
   https://youcontrol.com.ua/catalog/court-document/133318293/
5. Odessa Regional Commercial Court — ruling of 1 December 2025 on technical specifications, No. 916/2523/25
   https://youcontrol.com.ua/catalog/court-document/132551870/
6. Odessa District Administrative Court — ruling on a temporary structure, No. 420/19666/25
   https://youcontrol.com.ua/catalog/court-document/133425806/
7. Suspilne Odesa — ‘Kaleton’ and ‘Bezmezh’ on the list of beach areas for the 2026 season
   https://suspilne.media/odesa/1334834-v-odesi-vidkrili-27-bezpecnih-plaznih-dilanok-perelik-lokacij/
8. Odessa Regional Commercial Court — ruling on the rent for Starosennaya dated 24 September 2026, No. 916/704/26
   https://youcontrol.com.ua/ru/catalog/court-document/140275183/
9. South-Western Commercial Court of Appeal — ruling of 2 November 2026 on the appeal lodged by ‘Advancement’
   https://opendatabot.ua/court/141143315-7167ca0b331c4f3d8bfa0b14cd560dee
10. Odessa Regional Commercial Court — an earlier ruling on the rent arrears, No. 916/3369/22
    https://youcontrol.com.ua/catalog/court-document/115517626/
11. The Unified State Register of Court Decisions — 2017 case files relating to properties on Starosennaya Square
    https://www.reyestr.court.gov.ua/Review/70844698
12. OpenDataBot — ‘Advancement’ (39348773) and the distribution of shares
    https://opendatabot.ua/c/39348773
13. CompaniesRegistry.cy — corporate profile of Remonselia Holdings Ltd (HE 358633)
    https://companiesregistry.cy/company-details/remonselia-holdings-ltd-358633/

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

14. OpenDataBot — ‘Focus Logistics’ (40801563)
https://opendatabot.ua/c/40801563

15. OpenDataBot — ‘Planeta Development’ (41410941)
https://opendatabot.ua/c/41410941

16. OpenDataBot — ‘Greenwich Park’ Housing Co-operative (44164573)
https://opendatabot.ua/c/44164573

17. Kyiv’s Pecherskyi District Court — lifting of the seizure order on the ‘Planeta Development’ plot, Case No. 757/20553/23-k
https://youcontrol.com.ua/en/catalog/court-document/112519353/

18. OpenDataBot — Crocus LLC (31677378)
https://opendatabot.ua/c/31677378

19. YouControl — ‘Crocus Invest Group’ (40254385)
https://youcontrol.com.ua/catalog/company_details/40254385/

20. OpenDataBot — Degas Group LLC (43861490)
https://opendatabot.ua/c/43861490

21. ‘Dumskaya’ – a biographical profile of Yuri Degas
https://new.dumskaya.net/wiki/yyriy-degas/

22. Ismael Solaz / Wikimedia Commons — photo of the monument to the Duke of Richelieu, adapted for a collage, CC BY 3.0
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Duque_de_Richelieu_Odessa.jpg

23. Creative Commons — CC BY 3.0 licence
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/

24. ‘GORDON’ — Degas’s statement on the searches and the conflict with the Odessa authorities
https://gordonua.com/amp/news/society/osnovatel-initsiativy-za-odessu-dehas-zajavil-ob-uholovnom-presledovanii-so-storony-mestnykh-vlastej-1756359.html

Use of materials

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

Original publication

https://kartel-khimprom.com/en/article/yuriy-vyacheslavovich-degas-who-owns-kaleton-and-why-is-odessa-taking-legal-action-on-starosennaya-square/