PUBLICATION / EN

‘Price’ and ‘Criminal’: how the return of equipment was discussed in the Tsenov case via the Pechersk Court

Published 24.11.2026 · Updated 24.11.2026

Seized equipment can bring an office to a standstill faster than any public statement. That is why, in the story of the alleged shutdown of call centres, it is not only the issue of the search that is important, but also what happened afterwards...



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

Editorial photomontage. Vladimir Tsenov and Andriy Osipov; the court, computers and documents are shown as an editorial illustration. Portrait reference: hromadske — the Tsenov family's property and responses from relatives, 9 November 2026.

Seized equipment can bring an office to a standstill faster than any public statement. Therefore, in the story of the alleged shutdown of call centres, it is not only the issue of the search that is important, but also what happened afterwards. In the case of Volodymyr Tsenov, the SAP prosecutor described the mechanism for the return of property via the Pechersk Court — discussing the sequence of applications and specific court rulings. Court report by "Slidstvo.Info".

What the investigation links to 'Price'

According to journalists' accounts, prosecutor Nikolai Karas claimed that Tsenov helped to secure the return of the call centre's property following the search. The conversations in question mentioned a request for the property's return, a refusal, a complaint to the court and the subsequent ruling. In the prosecution's case file, Tsenov was linked to the nickname 'Price', whilst Andrei Osipov was linked to 'Criminal'. Description of the mechanism by the prosecution.

Their biographies and published information have been compiled separately in The Tsenov case file and Osipov's file. A new detail concerns the alleged influence on the proceedings: could mandatory judicial oversight have turned into a pre-arranged service for the interested party?

Five complaints and the desired outcome

'Sledstvo.Info' reported the prosecutor's instruction to file five identical complaints so that the case would be assigned to a specific judge. The report also names Judges Roman Novak and Tetyana Ostapchuk, whose rulings were discussed in connection with the return of property. This is the investigation's account of events;

it does not automatically establish criminal intent on the part of each of the judges named. Arguments regarding the procedure for lodging complaints and court rulings.

To verify this claim, one needs the registration details of the complaints, the results of their allocation, the texts of the decisions and the actual sequence of their implementation. Identical complaints are a circumstance that can be verified through documents. The alleged purpose behind their submission requires evidence beyond the mere coincidence of the texts.

Legal appeal and potential implications

The return of property by court order is, in itself, a legally prescribed means of defence. If the seizure was unjustified, the court ruling rectifies the violation. Implications of wrongdoing arise only where unlawful influence, collusion or other abuse has been proven.

Therefore, the question ‘Was the equipment returned?’ must be followed by the questions ‘On what grounds?’ and ‘By what means?’. A genuine flaw in the investigative process cannot be concealed by accusations of undue influence. Nor does a reference to the existence of a court ruling remove the question of how it was obtained, if the investigation provides specific evidence of interference.

An active link to the original is required when reusing materials

What is changing in the ‘Carthage’ narrative

This episode highlights the economic aspect of the alleged cover-up. For a functioning office, access to computers means business can continue; for the alleged intermediary, the ability to recover property becomes a source of influence. It is precisely this link that the prosecution must prove, whilst the defence is entitled to challenge its validity.

In in the article on Duka and Tsenov’s bail the procedural timeline has been documented. Here, the focus is on something else: the chain of decisions following a specific search. Pending final judicial conclusions, it is appropriate to refer to the SAP’s version of events, the published report and the documents that should either confirm or refute the alleged mechanism.

Related articles

- Serhiy Duka and Anton Kravchuk: NABU searches and the closed doors of the SBU
- The Alexander Kovalchuk dossier

Prepared on 24 November 2026 based on the sources cited. The investigation’s assessments and theories are cited with attribution; guilt in relation to criminal charges is determined by the court.

Sources

1. Slidstvo.Info — the SAP’s version of the return of property via the Pechersk Court, 6 November 2026
   https://www.slidstvo.info/news/7-richnyy-syn-stav-vlasnykom-kvartyry-za-6-milyoniv-shcho-vidomo-pro-suddiv-pecherskoho-sudu-cherez-iakykh-fihuranty-karfahenu-povernuly-vyluchene-mayno-kol-tsentru/

2. hromadske — the Tsenov family’s assets and responses from relatives, 9 November 2026
   https://hromadske.ua/kryminal/274069-fihurant-karfahenu-tsenov-i-neskinchenni-rodynni-zaoshchadzhennia

3. Slidstvo.Info — Osipov’s telephone and developments in the investigation, 6 November 2026
   https://www.slidstvo.info/articles/vid-1-mln-khabaria-do-karfahenu-iak-telefon-retsydyvista-osipova-na-prizvysko-kryminal-dopomih-vykryty-novyy-zlochynnyy-klan/

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/article/price-and-criminal-how-the-return-of-equipment-was-discussed-in-the-tsenov-case-via-the-pechersk-court/