DOSSIER / EN

Rustam Yusufovich Gilfanov

Published 20.11.2026 · Updated 20.11.2026

Rustam Gilfanov: Lucky Labs, a civil dispute with Maxim Polyakov in the BVI, Phoenix Holdings and restrictions on withdrawals under interim measures.



Rustam Gilfanov. Portrait from a signed biographical profile on LB.ua; original image 200 × 200 pixels.

Status: IT investor; party to a civil dispute

Other names: Rustam Gilfanov; Rustam Yusufovich Gilfanov; Rustam Gilfanov; Rustam Gilfanov

Rustam Yusufovich Gilfanov is an IT entrepreneur and investor, publicly linked to the history of Lucky Labs and his partnership with Sergey Tokarev. One of the most revealing documents regarding his business career is the judgement of the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court in the dispute with Maxim Polyakov. This is a civil corporate proceeding; the claims described therein should not be misconstrued as a criminal conviction.

Biography and transition to the IT sector

The LB.ua profile states that Gilfanov was born in 1983 in the Perm Krai, studied law and worked in the legal sector. This information constitutes a published biography rather than a personally investigated file. Its significance for the dossier lies in the ability to match the individual with the

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

same full name in corporate and court documents. [3]

In public statements regarding Lucky Labs, Gilfanov described the company as a software developer and distinguished this role from the operation of casinos. This distinction is significant: the technology provider, the advertising entity and the gambling operator may be separate legal entities and bear different liabilities. Establishing specific roles requires contracts and a control structure. [4]

Phoenix Holdings and Together Networks

In case BVIHCMAP2016/0009, Gilfanov and Tokarev acted as claimants in a dispute with Maxim Valeryevich Polyakov, Valery Polyakov and associated entities. Phoenix Holdings and the Together Networks business feature in the background to the case. The court documents describe agreements regarding participation in the business and disagreements over their implementation. [1]

The documents refer to liabilities amounting to millions of dollars and claims relating to shares. However, the presentation of the party's arguments in the background section does not in itself mean that the court has accepted every argument as proven. Moreover, it does not automatically allow the entire turnover of dating websites to be characterised as criminal proceeds.

What exactly did the court decide?

The 2017 ruling concerns interim measures: the limits on the freezing of assets and the grounds for extending such measures. It considered an interim sum of up to $10 million; the reinstatement of the worldwide freeze was not the outcome of the appeal. The document does not constitute a conviction of Gilfanov, Tokarev or Polyakov for fraud, nor does it amount to a final order for the recovery of all the sums claimed. [1][2]

This distinction affects the meaning of the whole story. The existence of a civil dispute confirms a serious conflict between the partners and the existence of formal claims. It does not establish the criminality of every company mentioned in the contractual chain. The subject matter and outcome of any subsequent proceedings must be examined separately.

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

Lucky Labs and the issue of succession

In 2021, DOU published an analysis of the Lucky Labs story, including a response from Tokarev, who spoke of the sale of the brand in 2017 and drew a distinction between the former and the new businesses. This is a statement by a party involved in the story, not universal proof of the absence of any overlap. At the same time, it does not allow us to unequivocally conclude that the current AI projects are run by the same operators who featured in earlier publications. [5]

To verify continuity, one needs the list of owners, agreements transferring rights, staff details and payment records for specific dates. A recurring investor's name is grounds to investigate connections, but does not provide a definitive answer as to the route taken by the funds.

The dossier brings together three corroborated strands: a public biography, a position on the technological business model, and a documented corporate conflict. Based on the materials reviewed, no official criminal status has been established for Gilfanov. The key foreign document is valuable precisely because it allows for a discussion of the parties' actual claims without turning the interim relief proceedings into a fictitious verdict.

Related articles

Casinos, AI and high-level connections. Tokarev, Fedorov, Polyakov and the story of Lucky Labs

File updated: 20 November 2026.

Sources

1. Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court: Gilfanov v Polakov, 2017 judgement
   https://www.eccourts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/BVI-Gilfanov-v-Polakov.pdf
2. Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court: review of the appeal session, July 2016
   https://cms.eccourts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/TVI-CoA-Sitting-Digest-July-2016-FINAL-APPROVED.pdf
3. LB.ua: biographical profile of Rustam Yusufovich Gilfanov
   https://lb.ua/file/person/4550_gilfanov_rustam_yusufovich.html
4. RBC: Lucky Labs and the stance of the business stakeholders, 2018
   https://www.rbc.ru/magazine/2018/07/5b3f96df9a79475e9f9f5045
5. DOU: the story of Lucky Labs and Tokarev's commentary, 6 April 2021
   https://dou.ua/lenta/articles/what-happened-to-lucky-labs/

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

Use of materials

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

Original publication

https://kartel-khimprom.com/en/dossier/rustam-yusufovich-gilfanov/