

1 **ALESSANDRO G. ASSANTI, ESQ. (State Bar No. 181368)**
2 **A.G. ASSANTI & ASSOCIATES, PC**
3 **9841 Irvine Center Dr Suite 100,**
4 **Irvine, CA 92618**
5 **v. (949) 540-0439 f. (949) 540-0439**
6 **email: aassanti@assantilaw.com**

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Yuri Vanetik

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**

30-2021-01204453-CU-BT-CJC

10 Yuri Vanetik, an individual,

) CASE NO.:

) Judge Martha K. Gooding

11)
12) Plaintiff

) **COMPLAINT FOR:**

) **1) VIOLATION OF THE RACKETEER**

) **INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT**

) **ORGANIZATIONS ACT, (RICO);**

) **2) DEFAMATION;**

) **3) UNJUST ENRICHMENT;**

) **4) TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH**

) **PERSPECTIVE ECONOMIC**

) **ADVANTAGE;**

) **5) CIVIL CONSPIRACY;**

) **6) BREACH OF CONTRACT;**

) **7) FRAUD;**

) **8) INTENTIONAL INFLECTION OF**

) **EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;**

13 vs.

14)
15 Pavel Fuks, aka Pavlo Fuks, aka Pavel Fuchs,)
16 aka the Mercenary, BEM Global Corporation,)
17 Andrei Telezhenko, daily.rbc.ua, tlg.today,)
18 2000.ua, uainfo.org, and DOES 1-50,)
19 inclusive,)

20 Defendants.

) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiff Yuri Vanetik (“Vanetik” or “Plaintiff Vanetik”) brings its Complaint against the
2 Defendants listed below and alleges as follows:

- 3
4 1. Plaintiff Yuri Vanetik is an American attorney, political activist and businessman who
5 has served as California Lottery Commissioner and Criminal Justice Commissioner,
6 appointed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. Vanetik resides in the County of
7 Orange, state of California.
- 8 2. The Defendant, Pavel Fuks, aka Pavlo Fuks, aka Pavlo Fuchs, aka Pavel Fuchs, aka
9 “Mercenary”, aka “Funtik”, hereinafter identified as “Fuks” or “Defendant Fuks” is an
10 international resident, who regularly transacts business in the United States, and has done
11 so within the County of Orange.
- 12 3. Defendant Fuks is a resident and national of multiple countries.
- 13 4. Defendant BEM Global Corporation hereinafter identified as “BEM” or “Defendant
14 BEM” is a British Virgin Islands corporate entity that is located at 24 D Castro Street,
15 Road Town, Tortola, British Virgin Islands. Defendant BEM is associated with Fuks.
- 16 5. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks is a notorious criminal,
17 specializing in transnational money laundering, fraudulent schemes, and extortion.
- 18 6. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks is a fugitive from justice
19 and a reputed associate and “earner” of Russian, Ukrainian, and Kazakhstan based
20 criminal syndicates, other dangerous fugitives, many of whom are under sanctions in
21 Europe and Asia, and in U.S. by the U.S. State Department and the Office of Foreign
22 Asset Control (“OFAC”) of the U.S. Department of Treasury and/or U.S. State
23 Department.
- 24 7. Defendant Fuks is presently hiding out in the cities of Kharkiv and Kyiv, Ukraine.
- 25 8. Fuks’ criminal background, money laundering operations, and extortion and racketeering
26 schemes have been widely reported on in the Western and East European press and are
27 subject of multiple ongoing investigations. For example, Fuks’ transnational criminal
28

1 activities are being highlighted in the press as follows:

2 [https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/01/oligarch-threat-trump-inauguration-](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/01/oligarch-threat-trump-inauguration-190114134730841.html)
3 [190114134730841.html](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/01/oligarch-threat-trump-inauguration-190114134730841.html) . Another recent story regarding Fuks appeared in Forbes,
4 [https://www.forbes.ru/milliardery/409565-kak-razbogatel-pavel-fuks-developer-iz-](https://www.forbes.ru/milliardery/409565-kak-razbogatel-pavel-fuks-developer-iz-rassledovaniya-ob-utechke-iz-finrazvedki)
5 [rassledovaniya-ob-utechke-iz-finrazvedki](https://www.forbes.ru/milliardery/409565-kak-razbogatel-pavel-fuks-developer-iz-rassledovaniya-ob-utechke-iz-finrazvedki); additional relevant examples out of literally
6 hundreds available in open source searches include the following:

7 [https://www.thedailybeast.com/federal-investigators-eye-rudy-giulianis-security-firm-as-](https://www.thedailybeast.com/federal-investigators-eye-rudy-giulianis-security-firm-as-probe-ramps-up)
8 [probe-ramps-up](https://www.thedailybeast.com/federal-investigators-eye-rudy-giulianis-security-firm-as-probe-ramps-up); [https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/30/us/politics/ukraine-giuliani-](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/30/us/politics/ukraine-giuliani-foreign-work.html)
9 [foreign-work.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/30/us/politics/ukraine-giuliani-foreign-work.html);

10 [https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2019/01/ukrainian-oligarch-pavel-fuks-](https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2019/01/ukrainian-oligarch-pavel-fuks-scrutinized-by-robert-mueller-was-rudy-giuliani-client/)
11 [scrutinized-by-robert-mueller-was-rudy-giuliani-client/](https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2019/01/ukrainian-oligarch-pavel-fuks-scrutinized-by-robert-mueller-was-rudy-giuliani-client/);

12 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/impeachment-inquiry-puts-new-focus-on-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/impeachment-inquiry-puts-new-focus-on-giulianis-work-for-prominent-figures-in-ukraine/2019/10/01/b3c6d08c-e089-11e9-be96-6adb81821e90_story.html)
13 [giulianis-work-for-prominent-figures-in-ukraine/2019/10/01/b3c6d08c-e089-11e9-be96-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/impeachment-inquiry-puts-new-focus-on-giulianis-work-for-prominent-figures-in-ukraine/2019/10/01/b3c6d08c-e089-11e9-be96-6adb81821e90_story.html)
14 [6adb81821e90_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/impeachment-inquiry-puts-new-focus-on-giulianis-work-for-prominent-figures-in-ukraine/2019/10/01/b3c6d08c-e089-11e9-be96-6adb81821e90_story.html);

15 [https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-06/trump-wanted-20-million-for-](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-06/trump-wanted-20-million-for-2006-moscow-deal-developer-says)
16 [2006-moscow-deal-developer-says](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-06/trump-wanted-20-million-for-2006-moscow-deal-developer-says).

17 There are multiple reputable Western investigative stories and news reporting concerning
18 Fuks, ranging from such mainstream legacy media publications as Washington Post and
19 the New York Times to credible investigative blogs and niche media watchdog sites such
20 as Opslens and Issues & Insights. Some of the recent reporting discusses Defendant Fuks
21 hiring former New York Mayor and President Trump’s attorney, Rudy Giuliani, to
22 (according to Fuks’ own words) *lobby* U.S. government; other stories focus on Fuks
23 threatening to kill Plaintiff Vanetik (and subsequently putting a hit on him, which has not
24 been reported in the media but verified, inter alia, through multiple sworn
25 statements/declarations). Other news stories highlight Fuks alleging and bragging that he
26 had done business with President Trump, Ivanka Trump, and other members of the
27 Trump family, Fuks collaborating closely with other foreigners designated for sanctions

1 by the U.S. Treasury Department’s Office of Foreign Asset Control, Fuks distributing
2 dubious gray market COVID-19 vaccines, and Fuks being involved in distribution of
3 heroin in Eastern Europe.

4 9. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that other reporting in Eastern Europe exposes
5 Fuks laundering money derived from criminal enterprise through U.S. banks to fund his
6 oligarch lifestyle involving multiple mansions, exotic purchases of rapper style
7 horological instruments and jewelry from Jacob the Jeweler, Rolls Royce automobiles,
8 multi-million-dollar weddings, Michelin restaurants and shopping sprees on the French
9 Riviera. Recent reporting from multiple media sources in Eastern Europe highlight with
10 details Defendant Fuks being involved in international distribution of contraband street
11 narcotics.

12 10. Andrei Telezhenko aka Andrii Yuriiovych Telezhenko “Telezhenko” or “Defendant
13 Telezhenko”, is a former Ukrainian embassy employee turned lobbyist and public affairs
14 consultant, who attempted to become a Trump-Russia scandal profiteer in his homeland
15 of Ukraine. Telezhenko’s short lived “career” ended abruptly when Telezhenko was
16 designated in U.S. for sanctions as a Specially Designated National (SDN) by the Office
17 of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) of the U.S. Treasury; Telezhenko has subsequently
18 been accused of being a Russian agent or associate of Russian political influencers.

19 11. Plaintiff, Vanetik is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Defendant
20 Telezhenko was sanctioned for interfering in U.S. elections.

21 12. Plaintiff, Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that Defendant
22 Telezhenko is a close Fuks associate, acting as Defendant Fuks’ cohort and media
23 consultant and unregistered lobbyist in U.S.

24 13. Plaintiff, Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that in this capacity,
25 Defendant Telezhenko works closely with Fuks to smear and extort Plaintiff Vanetik and
26 destroy his business and reputation and arrange for his assassination as part of Fuks’
27 criminal enterprise.

- 1 14. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that Telezhenko
2 became a close associate of Mayor Rudy Giuliani and infiltrated various conservative
3 political circles to access information, build his credibility, and avail Defendant Fuks of
4 influence in U.S. political circles.
- 5 15. Plaintiff, Vanetik is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that daily.rbc.ua,
6 hereinafter “Daily” or “daily.rbc” is a Ukrainian media web site that publishes a media
7 web site ([https://daily.rbc.ua/rus/show/biznesmen-fuks-suditsya-ssha-lobbistom-](https://daily.rbc.ua/rus/show/biznesmen-fuks-suditsya-ssha-lobbistom-obvinyaemym-1561632699.html)
8 [obvinyaemym-1561632699.html](https://daily.rbc.ua/rus/show/biznesmen-fuks-suditsya-ssha-lobbistom-obvinyaemym-1561632699.html)) in Russian and Ukrainian and conducts business
9 globally via the internet.
- 10 16. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that daily.rbc has an
11 address in Ukraine as follows: Gregory Skovordy Street, 21/16, Kyiv, 04070, Ukraine.
- 12 17. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Defendant
13 2000.ua, hereinafter “2000.ua”, published false stories about Plaintiff Vanetik
14 [https://www.2000.ua/v-nomere/forum/puls/uvlekatelnaja-biografija-pervogo-](https://www.2000.ua/v-nomere/forum/puls/uvlekatelnaja-biografija-pervogo-ukrainskogo-lobbista-v-kongresse-ssha.htm)
15 [ukrainskogo-lobbista-v-kongresse-ssha.htm](https://www.2000.ua/v-nomere/forum/puls/uvlekatelnaja-biografija-pervogo-ukrainskogo-lobbista-v-kongresse-ssha.htm). The address or names of principals of
16 2000.ua are not known.
- 17 18. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that tlg.today,
18 hereinafter “tlg.today”, is a Ukraine based media site that published false stories about
19 Vanetik (<https://tlg.today/s/criminalru?after=15478>). No address or other information is
20 available for tlg.today.
- 21 19. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that uainfo.org,
22 hereinafter uainfo.org” is a Ukraine and Europe based media and blog web site
23 (<https://uainfo.org/>) that published a false and damaging story about Plaintiff Vanetik in
24 collusion with Fuks ([https://uainfo.org/blognews/1543509154-posobniki-yanukovicha-](https://uainfo.org/blognews/1543509154-posobniki-yanukovicha-afelisty-i-ugolovniki-kto-pomogaet.html)
25 [afelisty-i-ugolovniki-kto-pomogaet.html](https://uainfo.org/blognews/1543509154-posobniki-yanukovicha-afelisty-i-ugolovniki-kto-pomogaet.html)). No address or other contact information is
26 available for uainfo.org.

1 20. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that the
2 aforementioned Ukraine based media and blog sites operate exclusively online and are
3 registered in Ukraine as Ukrainian media enterprises and collaborate with Fuks and
4 Telezhenko, and Fuks criminal enterprise, and acted as a cohesive union and enterprise to
5 smear Plaintiff Vanetik, destroy his business interests, and ultimately have him murdered.
6 At present Plaintiff Vanetik is not aware of the physical addresses of most of these
7 Ukraine based media web sites.

8 21. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the media
9 defendants delineated in ¶¶'s 10-120 make every effort to conceal and obfuscate their
10 physical addresses and whereabouts and names of their principals due to the nature of
11 their business of smearing others and publishing sponsored content for associates such as
12 Defendant Fuks and Telezhenko to further the influence of their criminal enterprise.

13 22. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks has a close, coordinated
14 relationship with such web sites as ukrinform.ru, daily.rbc.ua, 2000.uainfor.org, and other
15 Ukraine based web sites where each is paid for coordinated media attacks on Defendant
16 Fuks' targets as part of a plan to extort and or destroy their business and reputation in
17 Ukraine, and elsewhere in the world.

18 23. Defendants listed and named herein in ¶¶'s 9 – 22 shall be referenced hereinafter
19 collectively as (“the Media Defendants”).

20 24. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that the Media
21 Defendants have been paid (directly or indirectly) by Fuks or Fuks' agents to smear
22 Plaintiff Vanetik and destroy his business and reputation, by publishing false stories that
23 allege libelous and ridiculous claims concerning Plaintiff Vanetik, while referencing
24 other false stories allegedly influenced and funded by Defendant Fuks, such as those
25 published by the McClatchy DC and Sacramento Bee journalists and other bloggers
26 working in unison to defame Plaintiff Vanetik and destroy his business interests so that
27

1 he would acquiesce to do Fuks' bidding and become another financial victim in a long
2 line of Fuks' money making schemes and coverups for unpaid debts.

3 25. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, limited liability company,
4 associate, or otherwise, of the named Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50,
5 inclusive, hereinafter also referred to as the "Fictitiously Named Defendants" or
6 ("DOES"), are currently unknown to Plaintiff Vanetik who, therefore, sues said
7 Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and
8 based upon such information and belief alleges, that each of the Fictitiously Named
9 Defendants are responsible to Plaintiff Vanetik in some material manner for the acts,
10 omissions, or other conduct as hereinafter alleged, or is a necessary party for the relief
11 sought herein; and is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court; and further, are being sued
12 in both their individual and official capacity. Plaintiff Vanetik will seek leave of court to
13 amend this Complaint to allege each of their true names and capacities when same have
14 been ascertained.

15 26. Each reference to "Defendant," "Defendants," "DEFENDANT" and/or
16 "DEFENDANTS" herein is intended to be a reference to all Defendants named herein,
17 including the Fictitiously Named Defendants, unless otherwise expressly indicated or the
18 context otherwise requires.

19 27. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and based upon such information and belief
20 alleges, that at all times herein relevant, each of the Defendants was and is the principal,
21 agent, representative, supervisor, employee, servant, alter ego, partner, shareholder,
22 director, officer, joint venture, parent corporation, subsidiary corporation, co-conspirator,
23 licensor, licensee, inviter, invitee, predecessor-in-interest, successor-in-interest, assignor
24 and/or assignee (hereinafter referred to as an "Interrelationship"), as may be applicable,
25 of each the other Defendants, and, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was (a) acting
26 in concert with all of the other Defendants; (b) under the direction, instruction, demand,
27 requirement, and/or control of some or all of the other Defendants; (c) in furtherance of a
28 common plan, scheme, enterprise and/or control of some or all of the other Defendants;

1 (d) in furtherance of a common plan, scheme, enterprise and/or conspiracy with some or
2 all of the Defendants; and/or (e) with the knowledge, consent, acquiescence, and/or prior
3 or subsequent ratification of some or all of the other Defendants. Plaintiff Vanetik is
4 further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the acts and conduct herein
5 alleged of each such Defendant were known to, authorized by, and/or ratified by the other
6 Defendants, and each of them.

7 28. Plaintiff Vanetik further alleges that each of said Defendants proximately caused the
8 injuries and damages by reason of negligent, careless, deliberately indifferent, intentional,
9 willful or wanton misconduct, including the negligent, careless, deliberately indifferent,
10 intentional, willful or wanton misconduct in creating and otherwise causing the incidents,
11 conditions and circumstances hereinafter set forth, or by reason of the direct or imputed
12 negligence or vicarious fault or breach of duty arising out of the matters herein alleged.

13 29. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that in connection
14 with the acts set forth herein, each of the Defendants acted willingly, intentionally, and
15 knowingly, both for himself, herself, or itself, and in concert with each other Defendant,
16 and as an agent for each other Defendant, and was at all times acting within the course
17 and scope of such agency, with the consent, authorization and/or ratification of each
18 other Defendant, and in furtherance of a common scheme to defame Vanetik and interfere
19 with and destroy his business interests globally, as further discussed below.

20 30. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that the Defendants have been actively
21 working on an ongoing basis to defame Vanetik and interfere with his business interests
22 not only in U.S., but globally.

23 31. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks, relying on public
24 relations intermediaries, unregistered lobbyists (some of whom, such as a Ukrainian
25 lobbyist and alleged Russian agent Andrei Telezhenko, have been recently sanctioned by
26 U.S. Treasury for interfering with U.S. elections), and shady Ukrainian operatives, search
27 engine optimization specialists and programmers disseminated false and misleading
28 information about Vanetik and his businesses to various media companies, websites,

1 bloggers, and business people that conduct business in United States, Ukraine, Russian
2 Federation, Germany, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Israel, and other jurisdictions,
3 which as a result of technology and the Internet have syndicated and actively continue to
4 syndicate this false and misleading information globally mostly through electronic
5 forums.

6 32. BEM Global Corporation, (“BEM”) is a part and parcel of Fuks’ transnational criminal
7 enterprise and a conduit (one of a series of offshore shell companies that Fuks sets up,
8 sells to other criminals, and uses to launder money or front criminal schemes) through
9 which Fuks conducts his money laundering operations, pays criminal gangs to support his
10 hostile raids on businesses inn Ukraine and assets that he targets, and occasionally
11 conducts pretextual business transactions, including but not limited to investing money
12 for transnational criminal enterprises, and paying for his extravagant living expenses, and
13 each of them, used assets of the other party for their separate, individual purposes, and
14 caused assets to be transferred to each other without adequate consideration. BEM and
15 Fuks have intertwined their interests and shared funds to such a degree that all aspects of
16 the corporate form have not been followed and thereby Plaintiff Vanetik alleges that there
17 is such unity between Fuks and BEM that the corporation will and should be dissolved by
18 piercing of the corporate veil as alleged below.

19 33. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, on that basis alleges that Media
20 Defendants are Ukrainian media sites that publish news stories and commentaries but are
21 predominantly paid to launch and publish smear campaigns and generate sponsored
22 content as part of a collusive effort of Defendant Fuks to eliminate competitors, take over
23 businesses through force and machinations for which former Soviet racketeers became
24 notorious in the early 1990s. These and other Ukrainian enterprises have published false
25 and defamatory stories about Plaintiff Vanetik as part of Fuks’ conspiracy and criminal
26 enterprise to defame Vanetik and destroy his reputation and business, globally.

1 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

2 34. Plaintiff Vanetik alleges that approximately between November of 2016 through
3 September 2017 Defendant Fuks and DOES, on a limited basis, and in the county of
4 Orange, retained Vanetik as well as others to advise a Ukrainian Politician, Gennady
5 Kernes, Mayor of the city of Kharkov (and recently deceased purportedly due to COVID-
6 19 complications and poor health resulting from wounds due to murder attempts), in
7 Ukraine in order to analyze Kernes’ criminal cases and his political and business
8 challenges, focusing on alleged human rights violations and also arrange a conference to
9 bring human rights experts, media, and legal experts as observers to Ukraine for an
10 assessment of various allegations leveled against Kernes at the time ongoing criminal
11 cases in Ukraine. See details of Kernes’ death: [https://www.unian.info/society/kernes-](https://www.unian.info/society/kernes-kharkiv-mayor-with-corona-airlifted-to-german-hospital-11149694.html)
12 [kharkiv-mayor-with-corona-airlifted-to-german-hospital-11149694.html](https://www.unian.info/society/kernes-kharkiv-mayor-with-corona-airlifted-to-german-hospital-11149694.html).

13 35. With regard to Defendant Fuks, in or about November 2016, Plaintiff Vanetik was
14 introduced to Fuks by several businessmen and acquaintances from Ukraine, who
15 explained that Defendant, Fuks- is tangential to the introduction and is a recent immigrant
16 to Ukraine - who acts as Kernes’ associate and was an occasional advisor in Kernes’
17 inner circles. Fuks was favorably, albeit incorrectly described by a mutual acquaintance as
18 a controversial Russian developer who recently had to escape to Ukraine to hide from
19 former business partners and creditors most of whom are based in Moscow. In fact, as
20 Plaintiff Vanetik subsequently learned, Fuks is a criminal figure known as the
21 “Mercenary” in the world of Russian organized criminal gangs, a money launderer,
22 human trafficker and narcotics distributor who used real estate businesses as a cover and
23 platform to launder money from his criminal enterprise and as a third-party laundromat
24 for a myriad of nefarious organizations and individuals in the former Soviet Union and
25 Eastern Europe.

26 36. Most of Defendant Fuks’ criminal associates have either been murdered, are in prisons,
27 or are in hiding as fugitives, and or are subject to sanctions and criminal investigations

1 (just as Defendant Fuks is presently) in corrupt jurisdictions where extraditions are
2 difficult, and rule of law is heavily compromised.

3 37. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks' former business partners are Russian
4 and Kazakhstan banks, well known criminal syndicates, and private investors comprised
5 of mostly Russian citizens who were scammed by Fuks, as has been proven through
6 disposition of various court cases adjudicated in Russia, United Kingdom, Kazakhstan,
7 and other jurisdictions. These former business associates and investors lost all the money
8 that they had invested in Fuks' Russia-based real estate development projects, majority of
9 which started out solely as money laundering schemes. The following recent open-source
10 reporting highlights some of Fuks schemes: [https://focus.ua/world/477685-pod-sankcii-](https://focus.ua/world/477685-pod-sankcii-snbo-popali-19-kompaniy-iz-sfery-polzovaniya-nedrami-video)
11 [snbo-popali-19-kompaniy-iz-sfery-polzovaniya-nedrami-video](https://focus.ua/world/477685-pod-sankcii-snbo-popali-19-kompaniy-iz-sfery-polzovaniya-nedrami-video)
12 [https://versia.ru/s-kakoj-celyu-kombinator-pavel-fuks-ishhet-pokrovitelstva-viktora-](https://versia.ru/s-kakoj-celyu-kombinator-pavel-fuks-ishhet-pokrovitelstva-viktora-medvedchuka-i-pri-chyom-zdes-trup-gennadiya-kernes-a)
13 [medvedchuka-i-pri-chyom-zdes-trup-gennadiya-kernes-a](https://versia.ru/s-kakoj-celyu-kombinator-pavel-fuks-ishhet-pokrovitelstva-viktora-medvedchuka-i-pri-chyom-zdes-trup-gennadiya-kernes-a);
14 <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/1232021-37665>;
15 [http://rucompromat.com/articles/vmesto_provarovavshegosya_zastroyschika_v_rozysk_](http://rucompromat.com/articles/vmesto_provarovavshegosya_zastroyschika_v_rozysk_obyavili_pastora-afroamerikantsa)
16 [obyavili_pastora-afroamerikantsa](http://rucompromat.com/articles/vmesto_provarovavshegosya_zastroyschika_v_rozysk_obyavili_pastora-afroamerikantsa); <https://pravo.ru/news/225136/>;
17 [https://news.obozrevatel.com/economics/analytics-and-forecasts/vskryita-masshtabnaya-](https://news.obozrevatel.com/economics/analytics-and-forecasts/vskryita-masshtabnaya-shema-oligarha-fuksa-i-chlena-nabsoвета-tapanovoj-minyust-obezvredil-desyatki-notaruisov.htm)
18 [shema-oligarha-fuksa-i-chlena-nabsoвета-tapanovoj-minyust-obezvredil-desyatki-](https://news.obozrevatel.com/economics/analytics-and-forecasts/vskryita-masshtabnaya-shema-oligarha-fuksa-i-chlena-nabsoвета-tapanovoj-minyust-obezvredil-desyatki-notaruisov.htm)
19 [notaruisov.htm](https://news.obozrevatel.com/economics/analytics-and-forecasts/vskryita-masshtabnaya-shema-oligarha-fuksa-i-chlena-nabsoвета-tapanovoj-minyust-obezvredil-desyatki-notaruisov.htm).

20
21 38. When Defendant Fuks and Vanetik became acquainted (initially via a telephone call
22 which Fuks made purportedly on behalf of the deceased Kharkov Mayor Kernes, whom
23 Fuks together with another controversial Ukrainian-Israeli Oligarch, Igor Kolomoyski
24 referred to as his mentors) Fuks explained to Plaintiff Vanetik that he would not be a
25 client of Vanetik's, but would rather help communicate with Kernes who needed
26 Vanetik's help because of poor health and onslaught of criminal cases and investigations
27 that were directed to torment, discredit, disparage and bankrupt Kernes.

1 39. Defendant Fuks' role, as he described it, would be that of a third-party consultant on a
2 limited basis and he would arrange logistics and facilitate the initial meeting with Kernes
3 in Rome, Italy.

4 40. He was also responsible to arrange for payments for consulting services to be performed
5 mostly in U.S., and in part in Ukraine and Europe; and on that basis, Plaintiff Vanetik
6 agreed to undertake the engagement with Kernes, which said agreement was
7 jurisdictioned here in the United States, California, in the County of Orange.

8 41. At some point after Plaintiff Vanetik's retention as a third-party consultant, Vanetik
9 learned and is now informed and believes that Fuks is an associate of East European
10 criminal organizations, an agent of Russian intelligence services, and a money
11 Launderer.

12 42. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and on that basis believes that Defendant Fuks began his
13 criminal career as a human trafficker, (moving underaged girls from impoverished
14 families throughout the former Soviet Union to be sold in the illicit child pornography
15 industry in the early 1990s); subsequently Fuks aligned with Russian criminal groups to
16 launder money through real estate development projects.

17 43. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and on that basis believes that Defendant Fuks has a
18 sustaining association in the post-Soviet criminal world. Many criminals and criminal
19 associates in the former Soviet Union have equivalents to criminal nicknames, known in
20 Russian criminal slang as "Paganyala". Fuks is no exception. In various East European
21 and Eurasian organized criminal groups and in Russia generally, Fuks is known as
22 "Funtik" or the "Mercenary", a paganyala that allegedly stuck from his days as a pimp
23 and human trafficker.

24 44. On March 26, 2018, Dorogomilovksy Moscow Court made a final adjudication (after
25 numerous appeals) in the civil fraud and breach of contract case where Plaintiff Russian
26 International Bank obtained final judgment exceeding \$60 Million against Defendant
27 Fuks and his defunct Mos City Group development company, case No. №2-14/18.

1 Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendant Fuks' Mos
2 City Group is bankrupt and is subject to numerous investigations and cases for massive
3 scale fraud and breach of contract.

4 45. In November 2018 Defendant Fuks was criminally charged as a fraudster subject to
5 special economic measures in the Russian Federation Presidential Decree No. 592.

6 46. In October 2019, a warrant for Fuks' arrest was issued in absentia by Taganskiy District
7 Court of Moscow on charges of large-scale criminal fraud in connection with phony real
8 estate investment schemes and defunct development projects in Moscow, Russia.

9 47. Plaintiff Vanetik is also informed and believes that recently Defendant Fuks applied for
10 an Israeli citizenship and passport, falsely asserting that he can immigrate to Israel on the
11 basis of Jewish ethnicity.

12 48. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis asserts that Defendant Fuks
13 misled the Israel authorities, having been deported from Israeli in the past as a threat to
14 Israel's security, having gone through a public christening (and publicly announcing that
15 he was Christian), having concealed various ongoing criminal investigations and charges
16 from Israeli authorities; and having publicly taken pro-Palestinian and anti-Israeli
17 political views.

18 49. Having been granted Israeli citizenship through illicit means, Defendant, Fuks has been
19 featured and criticized in Israeli press (equivalent to America's 60 Minutes News Hour)
20 as one of high-profile Russian criminals who obtained Israeli citizenship solely to be able
21 to travel with an altered name, and bypass various arrest warrants and travel restrictions.
22 See <https://13tv.co.il/item/news/hamakor/season-19/episodes/ep05-2070236/> .

23 50. After agreeing to perform consulting services for Kernes with Fuks serving as an
24 intermediary and guaranteeing payment, Plaintiff Vanetik discovered that Fuks had no
25 intention to pay for anything. Plaintiff Vanetik also learned that Fuks is a reputed
26 "earner" for several Russian based criminal syndicates and drug cartels as well as a low-
27 level informant for Russian intelligence services, but ultimately for anyone that pays him
28

1 or protects him from creditors and those whose businesses he strong armed; Ultimately
2 Fuks reports to his Russian handlers and various other criminals that he works with and
3 on matters involving Ukraine’s national security.

4 51. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis asserts that, Defendant Fuks
5 continues to be a Russian national despite claims that he no longer holds Russian
6 citizenship. See <https://youtu.be/uMBuzLFFb1E> .

7 52. Plaintiff Vanetik also subsequently discovered and is informed and believes that Fuks
8 was involved in laundering mostly proceeds from organized crime (racketeering,
9 prostitution and human trafficking, distribution of narcotics, murder for hire, and
10 embezzlement of government assets and funds) into real estate development projects in
11 the Russian Federation, namely a major mixed-use development in Moscow called
12 MosCity, with various linked development projects under different names including
13 cemeteries and business centers.

14 53. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that majority of the real estate projects Fuks
15 launched have failed due to poor management or deliberate plans concocted by Fuks and
16 his gangster cohorts, while Fuks purchased and imported Rolls Royce automobiles and
17 bought homes and commercial buildings in Miami Beach (Fisher Island), London,
18 Moscow, New York, Bodrum, Kyiv, and the South of France.

19 54. After the global collapse of the real estate market in approximately 2008/2009, Defendant
20 Fuks absconded with proceeds from criminal enterprises and deposits from various
21 purchasers and investors that had bought into his development projects in Moscow. It is
22 believed that the proceeds from criminal activities were earmarked to be laundered
23 through MosCity and related development projects.

24 55. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks had settled with some of his creditors
25 and investors, but left most of them in the “cold,” and ran off to Ukraine, his birthplace,
26 which is a notoriously corrupt former Soviet Republic of some 45 million people,
27 currently in conflict with its neighbor, Russia, which controls several separatist regions
28

1 (Lugansk and Donetsk), and officially annexed Ukraine’s Crimea, a resort region of
2 strategic value to Russia. At present time, and at the time the acts occurred, due to an
3 ongoing conflict with Russia and political turmoil, Ukraine does not extradite criminals
4 to Russia or U.S.

5 56. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that while living in Ukraine, Defendant Fuks
6 positioned himself as a straw buyer of certain strategic assets, and was raising money to
7 develop a Holocaust memorial in an area called Babiy Yar, which is currently a stalled
8 project he developed to attempt to create a positive image in Ukraine and raise operating
9 capital for himself to support what continues to be an extravagant lifestyle that he
10 maintains despite numerous creditor judgments and unpaid alimony and debts owed to
11 business partners, banks, and various women and former spouses with whom Fuks has
12 had children that he abandoned.

13 57. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks has escaped from the criminal and
14 business elites in Russia and is playing cat-and-mouse with his Russian “creditors” by
15 making occasional payments on his debts and protection money to corrupt Russian
16 officials and a Ukrainian- Russian organized criminal group such as Solntsevskaya and
17 Luzhnikovskya syndicates that Fuks admits to hiring for assassinations, “raiding” of
18 businesses by taking over companies by forged documents, bribed judges and
19 commissioners, and force and intimidation. https://youtu.be/q_4J5PzzSdc

20 58. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks maintains residences in
21 Kiev, Ukraine, London, United Kingdom, Cap du Antibes, France, Moscow, Russia,
22 Bodrum, Turkey, Kyiv, Ukraine, and New York, and Fisher Island, Florida, U.S.A.

23 59. Fuks has other real estate holdings in the West, most of which are owned by offshore
24 entities where either his brother, Roman Fuks, is a director or professional nominees
25 serve as proxies for Fuks.

26 60. Roman Fuks is also a fugitive in Russia, and has recently obtained Israeli citizenship,
27 similarly in breach of Israeli immigration mandates and for the purpose of having travel
28

1 documents that would enable him and Defendant Fuks to avoid being flagged by Interpol
2 or jurisdictions where both Fuks brothers are wanted.

3 61. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks also hires other nominee
4 directors and straw principals for a network of offshore entities that he sets up regularly
5 to conceal his ownership from creditors and tax authorities.

6 62. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that through credible sources, it is estimated
7 that Fuks has stolen between 270 to 800 Million Euros from mostly Russian investors and
8 lenders, many of whom are reputed criminal kingpins.

9 63. Presently, Fuks works as a shill for former Ukrainian cabinet members that were in
10 power during the Yanukovich administration, until his regime was toppled, and he and
11 his cabinet fled to the Russian Federation, while some temporarily settled in Israel.

12 64. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that the following is a partial list of Fuks'
13 current and former business partners (individuals and entities) that have been sanctioned
14 by U.S. and European countries for egregious and ongoing transnational and U.S. focused
15 criminal activities: Oleksandr Onyshchenko, Andrii Telizhenko aka Andrei Telezhenko,
16 Suleiman Kerimov, Artem Pshonka, Gennady Kernes (recently deceased), Andrei
17 Portnov, Mukhtar Ablyazov, Sberbank, Alfa Bank, Andrei Skoch, Eduard Stavvitsky,
18 Sergei Kurchenko, Sergei Arbuzov, Viktor Vekselberg, Viktor Yanukovich, and Oleg
19 Deripaska. <https://youtu.be/sFKmqRa5-iU>

20 65. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks began his criminal career
21 in the early 1990s. Towards the end of 1980s he developed a friendship with a
22 controversial criminal authority figure, Gennadyi Kernes (nicknamed "Gepa" and
23 currently deceased), who later became the mayor of Kharkov, which is the second largest
24 city in Ukraine, and its former capitol bordering the Russian Federation.

25 66. Kernes had rebranded himself as a capable mayor but was banned from traveling to U.S.
26 He was the target for assassination attempt that left him in a wheelchair after a sniper's
27 bullet went into his back. He was also criminally charged for torturing demonstrators and
28

1 opposition members in Ukraine. Assassinations, murder, and torture are a common
2 occurrence in Fuks' world, and he has bragged multiple times to the press how he relishes
3 violence and enjoys torturing people. See Fuks' interview where he nonchalantly tells a
4 female journalists how he forced construction workers to swallow cigarette butts when he
5 caught them smoking on the job. <https://youtu.be/UAwXVWsokYE> .

6 67. Prior to his recent death, which is being investigated by German authorities, Kernes was
7 considered one of the people that provided protection for Fuks in Ukraine, in addition to
8 the Fuks Gang, a notorious criminal organization that Fuks keeps on retainer. Fuks is
9 currently involved in splitting up Kernes assets and the city budget of Kharkov. He is
10 also accused of using fraudulent means for installing former vice mayor as acting mayor
11 in order to participate in the embezzlement of Kharkov's development budget, which is
12 estimated at approximately \$300 million U.S. dollars.

13 68. In January of 2017, Fuks threatened to murder Plaintiff Vanetik because the Plaintiff
14 allegedly failed to deliver on a promise to get Fuks admitted attending a dinner with
15 President Trump during the inaugural week. Plaintiff Vanetik denies ever making any
16 such promises to Fuks.

17 69. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that in 2018, Fuks
18 hired former New York Mayor and President Trump's attorney, Rudy Giuliani to
19 allegedly meet up with Kernes in Kharkov to assess the Ukrainian city's security
20 concerns and city emergency operations. Subsequent to the New York Mayor's visit,
21 Fuks publicly referred to Mayor Giuliani as lobbyist for him and the city of Kharkov.
22 Fuks also started using his alleged relationship with Giuliani to exact "favors" from
23 Ukrainian politicians and business associates, similar to the alleged behavior attributed to
24 Giuliani former associates who have been indicted for campaign law violations, Igor
25 Fruman and Lev Parnas.

26 70. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that in or around
27 1992, Fuks, as a young gangster and local pimp, immigrated to Moscow to work for a
28

1 major Russian Crime boss (criminal authority figure known in Soviet and post-Soviet
2 parlance as “Thief in Law” analogous to mafia boss or Godfather) Sergey Batozkiy aka
3 “Baton”, who had close ties to key criminal networks in Russia and former Soviet Union.
4 “Baton” was assassinated in 2001, as most of Fuks’ bosses and “partners” have been
5 throughout his crime spree/ “career”. Violent death has been a consistent career hazard
6 for most of the people that Fuks has been associated with from the inception of his
7 criminal career that took off in the early 1990s Russia.

8 71. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that, while in Moscow, Fuks began “running
9 business deals” under the authority of another crime boss, Yuri Dementa, who was
10 recently assassinated in Kharkov, Ukraine. Dementa, was friends and business partner of
11 “Baton” and “Gepa” Kernes. Fuks was subsequently employed in corporate structures
12 under the “roof” (which is a term meaning criminal protection in the former Soviet
13 Union) of organized criminal organizations in Russia.

14 72. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that around this time Sergey Batozkiy begins
15 to explore real estate business and directed Fuks who graduated from being a pimp and
16 gopher to serving as one of Baton’s lieutenants to work in this sector. After Batozkiy was
17 assassinated, major changes occurred. Financed by notorious Russian Criminal
18 Organizations, several companies were set up to launder money for criminal gangs,
19 including OOO Techinvest.

20 73. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that Fuks was
21 ordered to be one of the straw founders of Techinvest. In essence, Fuks became one of
22 the people in charge of investing funds from criminal enterprise in real estate
23 development in Russia to launder it, with profits or success of the projects being – at
24 most – an unexpected externality.

25 74. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that in 1990s Organized Criminal Group of
26 Baton laid its eyes on a quickly growing company Ingeocom which belonged to Mikhail
27 Rudyak, a close associate of Yuri Luzhkov, notorious and at one point virtually
28

1 omnipotent mayor of Moscow, who in 1997 gave Rudyak for reconstruction Manezhnaya
2 Plaza in Moscow, a very lucrative Moscow city development. It was at this point that
3 Rudyak already had a business partner, Alexander Shishkin, future Russian Senator from
4 the party of United Russia (and already a multi-billionaire).

5 75. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that in the 1990s, Shishkin was known as a
6 major crime boss in Russia; he was in charge of the common criminal funds of the
7 “Kemerovsky syndicate”. Rudyak had several dozen companies for each project.

8 76. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks became the front for the
9 Batozky Gang’s real estate development business in Russia. At around the same time
10 Defendant Fuks was appointed as the chairman of Ingeocom Invest, one more specially
11 organized subsidiary entity of Ingiocom.

12 77. Plaintiff Vanetik is also informed and believes that in 2003 Rudyak and Defendant Fuks
13 entered into a partnership with a notorious Kazakhstani businessman, Mukhtar Ablyazov.
14 Ablyazov, currently a fugitive just as Fuks, had organized and subsequently headed
15 investment -industrial conglomerate Eurasia. Fuks, Ablyazov, and Rudyak launched the
16 project Moscow City. There is credible evidence that Fuks’ senior partner was former
17 head of Lipitskoy Organized Crime Group, senator of the federation of the Komstroyskoy
18 Region, Russia, Alexander Ter-Avanesov.

19 78. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks combined all the assets he
20 had into Moscow City and assets that he had jointly with Rudyak into Moscow City
21 Group.

22 79. After Rudyak’s murder in 2006, Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that
23 Defendant Fuks illegally and ruthlessly seized Rudyak’s assets similar to what Fuks has
24 attempted to do with the now deceased mayor of Kharkov, Gennady “Gepa” Kernes.

25 80. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks’ Rudyak’s and Ablyazov’s partners
26 in Moscow City was a group “Guta” (Gushin, Khlebnikov, Yuri Petrov – in 1991 head of
27 Russian President Yeltzin’s administration). After Rudyak’s murder Guta sold his shares
28

1 of Moscow City Group to the corporate structures of Oleg Deripaska and Valentin
2 Yumashev.

3 81. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that hereafter in 2008, after many years of
4 stagnation for reasons that are not clear, the company Techinvest, Fuks and Ablyazov
5 received from Sberbank a credit line of 12.5 Billion Rubles (\$500 Million Dollars) for the
6 construction of Eurasia Tower; however, in 2009 Ablyazov who was the head of the
7 Kazakhstan bank, Turan Alem, was criminally charged in Astana, Kazakhstan for
8 embezzling in excess of 5 billion USD, and took flight overseas.

9 82. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that as these events came about, Ablyazov was
10 able to divert and abscond with 70 Million USD in Russia from his construction schemes
11 in Moscow.

12 83. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks immediately seized the
13 moment and somehow acquired the share of fugitive Ablyazov for \$50 million of the
14 capitol he was laundering through large construction projects.

15 84. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Sberbank, largest Russian government-
16 controlled banking institution in the Russian Federation, having learned about the fraud,
17 and Ablyazov's machinations, terminated the financing of Eurasia Tower, and the
18 construction of the project never started.

19 85. Thereafter, Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks used this
20 situation to his advantage: he stopped all development work but did not return the loan
21 which amounted to over 5 billion rubles.

22 86. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that in 2011, Sberbank sued Fuks to force him
23 to return the construction loan. It assigned Fuks' debts to a firm called Demoginet
24 Limited, which belonged to a powerful Dagestani businessman, Sulayman Kerimov, also
25 sanctioned by U.S. government (OFAC – Office of Foreign Asset Control of the U.S.
26 Treasury).

1 87. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that a residential construction scheme fraud
2 was also perpetrated by Fuks in a project called Sky House, which is unrelated to Fuks'
3 Moscow City projects. This project is located on Mitnoy street in Moscow and was co-
4 headed by Roman Fuks, (Fuks' fugitive brother).

5 88. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that the Sky House construction began in 2008
6 pursuant to investment contract no. 13-052868-5001-0012-0001-08 between city of
7 Moscow and a firm called Olter Ltd. Completion date for the Sky House project was set
8 for end of 2012. However, Sky House was never built. This project, like most of
9 Defendant Fuks' real estate projects was determined to be a scam.

10 89. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks stole from Moscopstroy which
11 invested \$115 million USD into the project. Efforts to get the stolen funds through
12 Russian courts failed.

13 90. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks offered to settle the case against him
14 with refurbished sport complex in Moscow called Trud which was owned by Moscow
15 City Group. It was quickly determined that Fuks exaggerated the costs of reconstruction
16 of the complex, in fact, running yet another scam.

17 91. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that thereafter, Fuks defrauded the family of
18 the former governor of Tuls koy Region Russia, Vladimir Gruzdev. It is believed that
19 Fuks promised him 100 apartments and 200 parking spaces in the new complex, but
20 never delivered anything and kept the funds invested to build out that high rise complex.
21 The other victims were hundreds of small investors who continue to protest until today,
22 as their lives were destroyed by Defendant Fuks' financial scams.

23 92. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that out of the 3 largest projects of Moscow
24 City, Fuks technically only completed one at a loss to everyone but himself and the
25 money laundering gang he serviced. The other two never got off the ground.
26
27
28

1 93. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that in 2008 Fuks met with Donald Trump,
2 (“Trump”). Enamored with the former U.S. President and flamboyant developer, Fuks
3 attempted to see him during the inauguration in January 2017.

4 94. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks tried to convince Trump
5 to invest in Moscow City development project in Moscow, promising to call the proposed
6 high-rise the Trump Tower. Instead, the Trump organization wanted large licensing fees
7 for the Trump name, and the deal never progressed.

8 95. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks has been seeking out contacts with
9 President Trump to feign influence in U.S. with Ukrainians and others from the former
10 Soviet bloc. To this end, Defendant Fuks aligned himself with the likes of former New
11 York mayor Rudy Giuliani, Andrei Telezhenko, (a self-proclaimed and now sanctioned
12 by the U.S. as a public relations operative) and sought out Plaintiff Vanetik, and others to
13 get access to American politicians, but refused to pay for legal work and consulting
14 services, brashly ignoring his contractual obligations.

15 96. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that in the mid 2000s Fuks tried to develop a
16 project called Kiev City. The project was contemplated to be built on Rybalsky Ostrov
17 near Kyiv with the owners of a factory called Remdytal Burlikoy. That project also
18 failed.

19 97. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that since 2015 Fuks fled to Ukraine for good
20 but maintained his relationship with Russian intelligence services and authorities as a
21 hedge and protection from the aggrieved investors and criminal syndicates he cheated.
22 With mounting debts, money he stole from criminal syndicates he was laundering for, his
23 presence in Russia became a high risk for Fuks.

24 98. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that presently, Defendant Fuks is hiding out in
25 Kyiv, and travels around with close to a dozen heavily armed bodyguards provided by
26 Ukraine’s law enforcement on a contract basis, and as a paid accommodation of the
27 minister of the interior.

1 99. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks is actively buying regional energy
2 production companies from former members of Ukraine's pro Russia Party of Regions.
3 Thus far, Defendant Fuks has acquired the following: (a) OOO DB Neftegaz
4 Dobivayushyaya Compania, 90 percent of which was owned by former Minister of
5 Energy of Ukraine and head of the Pro Russian Opposition Block and Party of Regions;
6 10 percent was owned by Yuliy Yoffi, through Fuks' corporate structure. CAO Devon 51
7 percent was owned by Yuri Boyko, another Ukrainian politician being investigated in
8 U.S., was also acquired by Defendant Fuks.

9 100. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks is essentially a
10 proxy, brokering these deals for key Party of Regions fugitives in Moscow, Russia.

11 101. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that the true beneficiaries of these
12 assets are Russian government officials and fugitives designated by U.S. and Europe for
13 sanctions and that even though Fuks is persona non grata in Russia, he is being paid by
14 former Party of Regions intermediaries whom he lobbied to acquire the position of straw
15 buyer of these interests in Ukraine.

16 102. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that in pursuit of these efforts on behalf
17 of Russia-based handlers Fuks is acquiring Russian owned BEBY Bank's subsidiary
18 PromInvestBank in Ukraine together with Ukrainian MP and developer Mikitas and
19 right-hand advisor of the mayor of Kyiv, Klitschko aka Klytchko, Vadim Stolar.
20

21 103. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that the development of a philanthropic
22 project Babiy Yar, led by Defendant, Fuks in Kyiv Ukraine is fundamentally a front for
23 another unscrupulous financial scam orchestrated by Fuks. Babiy Yar is an area in
24 Ukraine where Ukrainian Nazi collaborators murdered 33,771 Jewish people in Kiev in a
25 gory two-day massacre.

26 104. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that at the present time, developer and
27 operator of this philanthropic fund is Defendant Fuks.
28

1 105. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks has begun raising
2 money and is soliciting business in Eastern Europe to participate in his project. The
3 amount he was seeking is \$100 million USD with the purpose of serving as a developer
4 and ultimately syphoning off majority of the funds into offshore accounts Fuks uses to
5 launder and divert money.

6 106. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that the Baby Yar project was
7 structured to look like a philanthropic project; but fundamentally it has become another
8 Fuks concocted get rich fast failed scam.

9 107. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks controls the
10 money and the development the same way as he has done in Moscow where most of the
11 development projects failed as he ran off with the diverted investor funds.

12 108. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that there are over 15 criminal cases
13 against Fuks from his past dealing.

14 109. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that having entered the orbit, Fuks'
15 OOO DV Neftegazodobivayushaya Compania became the subject of criminal
16 investigation.

17 110. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that this entity is being charged with
18 tax evasion. It started buying coal from phony companies. It was confirmed that OOO
19 Euro-Test from July 2016 through February of 2017, Fuks formulated tax credits through
20 chain of supply from fictional entity OOO Norvig Group for a real sector entity OOO
21 OOO **UkrGazDobicha** Compania is another entity where Defendant Fuks (together with
22 Vitaly Khomutynnik, former politician and Igor Kolomoyski, a Ukrainian oligarch own
23 major interests – 1/3 each). This has been substantiated in the recent investigation and
24 case.

25 111. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that recently a criminal case was
26 initiated by the Prosecutor General's Office in Ukraine against Defendant Fuks and the
27 company. There are three criminal code charges: No. 205, Forgery of Documents for
28

1 Registration of Corp. Entity, No. 209, legalization of criminal profits, and No. 212, tax
2 evasion.

3 112. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that this criminal case became active in
4 the Shevchenkovsky Regional Court of the city of Kyiv, which affirmed criminal
5 complaint of the Prosecutor General's Office.

6 113. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that as a result of the prosecutor's
7 searches and seizures from the office of OOO DV Neftegazadobivayushaya, the
8 authorities have shown, there is a criminal case that can proceed to trial and as a result,
9 discovery of criminal wrongdoing can proceed against the company for tax evasion and
10 other law violations.

11 114. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that as the case moves forward, the
12 Ukrainian prosecutors expect more managers of the company will be charged along with
13 Fuks.

14 115. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that despite Fuks' unconventional
15 efforts to obtain Israeli citizenship, Fuks has ongoing problems with Israel's intelligence
16 services (MOSSAD). Israeli government has made inquiries regarding Fuks with SBU of
17 Ukraine in 2011,2015, and yet again more recently.

18 116. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks made attempts to provide
19 some sensitive Israeli intelligence to the Russian intelligence agencies that he is directed
20 by and attempts to ingratiate himself to.

21 117. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant Fuks is a close business
22 associate of Igor Kolomoyski, and the two are partners (together with Vitalii
23 Khomutynnik) in a major oil company referred to as "Sahalinka", located in the Poltava-
24 Kharkov region of Ukraine, and better known as Sakhalinskaya Mestorozhdeniya. In
25 Ukraine, Fuks admits in multiple open-source interviews that he works closely with Igor
26 Kolomoyski, and influential oligarch that has recently been sanctioned by U.S. State
27 Department, and is subject of various administrative actions and investigations in U.S.

1
2 **FUKS' ACTIONABLE BEHAVIOR**

3 118. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, based thereon alleges that
4 Defendant Fuks, and at all times relevant hereto was, an individual doing business in the
5 County of Orange, State of California as a counter party to certain contractual
6 arrangements between himself and Plaintiff Vanetik.

7 119. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Fuks
8 from February 2017 through present has been engaged in an international smear
9 campaign against Plaintiff Vanetik, his family, and his businesses, causing various false
10 and defamatory stories to be published originating in the U.S., Ukraine, Russian
11 Federation and elsewhere, and subsequently disseminated via internet syndication and
12 internet links and search engine manipulation.

13 120. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that some of the stories Fuks succeeded
14 in publishing in U.S. through paid public relations intermediaries, such as recently
15 sanctioned for interference with U.S. elections, Andrii Telezhenko.

16 121. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and, based thereon alleges that on or
17 about 2017 and again, subsequently in 2018 , Defendant Fuks directly or indirectly
18 motivated and engaged journalists at McClatchy DC, Kevin G. Hall and Ben Wieder, and
19 succeeded in having them launch a smear campaign against Plaintiff Vanetik by
20 developing a false and ridiculous narrative about Plaintiff Vanetik and publishing false
21 stories attacking Vanetik's integrity and attempting to suggest that he is involved in
22 unsavory dealings such as working with the Russians, collaborating with disgraced
23 former Lobbyist Paul Manafort and business people with a questionable past, and having
24 had a criminal history – all baseless falsehoods

25 122. Subsequently, Fuks' intermediaries facilitated a story in a regional paper that
26 falsely claimed that Vanetik was in trouble with the Department of Justice and has a
27 criminal record. This was patently false and intended to do nothing other than harm
28 Vanetik's reputation and cast him in a false light. Although Vanetik secured corrections

1 by having his lawyer contact the media companies that participated in the smear that was
2 ultimately paid for and instigated by Defendant Fuks, the smear was damaging to
3 Vanetik, his family and his businesses.

4 123. Plaintiff Vanetik published a response to the Fuks sponsored smear in the
5 Wallstreet Journal and other prominent publications, explaining the false and ridiculous
6 nature of the fabricated stories, however the damage was done. See,
7 <https://www.wsj.com/articles/russiagates-collateral-victims-11555022432>
8 [https://www.newsweek.com/cancel-culture-no-longer-defends-vulnerable-establishment-](https://www.newsweek.com/cancel-culture-no-longer-defends-vulnerable-establishment-opinion-1568047)
9 [opinion-1568047](https://www.newsweek.com/cancel-culture-no-longer-defends-vulnerable-establishment-opinion-1568047)
10 [https://www.lifezette.com/2020/12/lessons-learned-as-a-target-of-a-media-](https://www.lifezette.com/2020/12/lessons-learned-as-a-target-of-a-media-disinformation-campaign/)
11 [disinformation-campaign/](https://www.lifezette.com/2020/12/lessons-learned-as-a-target-of-a-media-disinformation-campaign/) [https://stream.org/why-the-left-will-never-let-go-of-the-russia-](https://stream.org/why-the-left-will-never-let-go-of-the-russia-collusion-hoax/)
12 [collusion-hoax/](https://stream.org/why-the-left-will-never-let-go-of-the-russia-collusion-hoax/) [https://amgreatness.com/2020/12/22/why-is-media-stoking-](https://amgreatness.com/2020/12/22/why-is-media-stoking-disinformation-campaigns/)
13 [disinformation-campaigns/](https://amgreatness.com/2020/12/22/why-is-media-stoking-disinformation-campaigns/) [https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2021-02-09/now-elections-](https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2021-02-09/now-elections-are-over-why-media-still-clinging-russiagate-scandal)
14 [are-over-why-media-still-clinging-russiagate-scandal](https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2021-02-09/now-elections-are-over-why-media-still-clinging-russiagate-scandal)

15 124. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that false and misleading publications
16 targeting him have been published in a wide circulation aided by the ubiquity of the
17 Internet, and Fuks' efforts to optimize negative search engine results targeting Plaintiff
18 Vanetik.

19 125. The defamatory publications are read and seen by a great number of people in the
20 geographic areas in which Plaintiff Vanetik lives and works. More specifically, starting
21 in March 2017 until the present, Defendant Fuks has engaged in a sustained global smear
22 campaign against Plaintiff Vanetik.

23 126. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based there on alleges that Defendant Fuks
24 financed fake stories in such publications as McClatchy, DC (written by reporters Kevin
25 G. Hall and Ben Wieder), Sacramento Bee (fabricated smear written by Sacramento
26 Bee's former reporter Angela Hart), various blogs, and conspiracy riddled twitter
27 networks, and Russian language websites too numerous to name.
28

1 127. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, based thereon alleges that the fake
2 stories claimed, inter alia, that Plaintiff Vanetik is a Russian spy, that he has ties to
3 dubious criminals, that he is bankrupt and that he engages in criminal behavior and is
4 being investigated by U.S. State Department and various law enforcement agencies. All
5 these claims are patently false and made with knowledge of their falsity and financed
6 directly or indirectly by Defendant Fuks.

7 128. Fuks hired a Ukrainian public relations consultant, Andrey Telezhenko (who has
8 just as Fuks recently been banned from entering the U.S. and subsequently sanctioned by
9 the U.S. Treasury for, inter alia, interfering with U.S. elections) to send out packages of
10 derogatory and false information packages about Vanetik.

11 129. In February of 2019 Fuks contacted a well-known oligarch who shall be referred
12 to as “Mr. X” from Eastern Europe that was in negotiations with one of Plaintiff Vanetik
13 associated enterprises and encouraged and subsequently persuaded him not to complete
14 an investment transaction into a private equity fund valued at 20-40 million USD. After
15 being contacted by Fuks and his cohorts, the transaction stalled, and ultimately did not
16 close. The principles and the oligarch disclosed Fuks’ efforts to disrupt the deal and
17 confirmed that he was successful at creating enough concerns that the deal stalled and
18 then timing led to it being sidelined for other projects. Ultimately, the principles
19 recognized that Fuks’ disruptive efforts were predicated on lies, but it was too late to
20 salvage the transaction and fund the project.

21 130. In June 2019 Fuks and his cohorts yet again attacked Vanetik’s business sending
22 letters and packages to several businesses in the mining industry and real estate
23 development and infrastructure that Vanetik was negotiating with and materially harmed
24 several projects that Plaintiff Vanetik was working on. Plaintiff Vanetik attempted to
25 mitigate the damage causes by Defendant Fuks’ interference, but the projects did not
26 close as a direct result of Fuks’ malicious interference. Defendant again was harmed by
27 the Defendants and each of their ongoing campaign to harm the Plaintiff.
28

1 131. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Fuks made death threats to him and
2 his colleagues in Washington, DC in the first quarter of 2017. Fuks told Vanetik that he
3 would blow up his car, and will have him “ripped to shreds,” explaining that he has
4 experience in making people disappear. Fuks made similar references regarding
5 principles of Keelen & Associates, a Washington, D.C. based government relations firm
6 that arranged a series of private inaugural events for Fuks, Vitaly Khomutynnik, and his
7 wife.

8 132. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that beginning in early 2020 Fuks hired
9 an East European criminal network to have Vanetik murdered.

10 133. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and thereon alleges that numerous
11 efforts have been made by third parties familiar with Fuks’ long criminal background to
12 persuade him to call off the ordered assassination. Various people that came into contact
13 with Plaintiff Vanetik inquired about his public dispute with Fuks because Fuks stories
14 and quotes came up in online searches and during deeper vetting.

15 134. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, based thereon alleges that various
16 inquires through his contacts in Eastern Europe law enforcement community showed that
17 “connected” sources and criminal contacts confirmed that Fuks has taken steps to turn his
18 threats into reality.

19 135. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, based thereon alleges that in
20 public statements made directly by Defendant Fuks to television reporters and in
21 statements attributed to Fuks in interviews, he boasted about torturing and humiliating his
22 employees by forcing them to swallow cigarette butts. He also boasted that when he was
23 younger, he enjoyed beating people up for sheer pleasure. See
24 <https://youtu.be/UAwXVWsokYE> .

25 136. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and, based thereon alleges that
26 Defendant Fuks told Ukrainian journalists during an interview that if he saw a well-
27 known Ukrainian publisher, Mikhail Brodsky, he would “punch him in the face”.

1 137. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Fuks
2 operates through violence and criminal schemes borrowed from the 1990s post-Soviet
3 street gangs' warfare. However, Fuks does not abide by the old-fashioned rules of the
4 street harkening back to the Stalin gulags and the culture of the thieves in law.

5 138. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that, instead,
6 Defendant Fuks is a post-Soviet swindler and hustler that operates as an informant and
7 earner for gangs and corrupt politicians.

8
9
10 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

11 **(Violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act)**

12 **(Against Defendants Fuks, BEM Global Corporation, and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

13 139. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by references paragraphs 1 through 138 as
14 though fully set forth herein.

15 140. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that Defendants Fuks, an organized
16 criminal groups operating in Eastern Europe, and assassins Fuks hired through this group
17 and multiple Ukraine based media companies on Fuks' payroll (daily.rbc.ua,
18 tlg.today,.2000.ua, uainfo.org) and each of them, constitute an enterprise (hereinafter, the
19 "Enterprise"), as defined by 18 U.S.C. §1961, the activities affect interstate commerce.

20 141. Defendants are persons defined under 18 U.S.C. §1961, employed by or
21 associated with the Enterprise who have participated, directly or indirectly in the conduct
22 of the Enterprise's affairs, and have agreed to conduct or participate, directly or
23 indirectly, in the conduct, management, or operation of the Enterprise's affairs through a
24 pattern of racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C § 1962(c).

25 142. The state courts have jurisdiction over the violations alleged herein pursuant to
26 the holding of *Cianci v. Superior Court*, (1985) 710 P. 2d 373, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575 .

1 143. Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants have used the mail and wire to further the
2 scheme of the Enterprise in violation of *18 U.S.C §§ 1341 and 1343*.

3 144. As a direct result of the Defendants' conspiracy and the acts of the racketeering
4 activity of the Enterprise, Plaintiff Vanetik has been injured in his business and has
5 wrongfully lost over the last 2 years in excess of \$84,000,000 U.S. dollars in various
6 business stakes, projects, and clients which exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limit of
7 this court to be proven at the time of trial.

8 145. Under 18 U.S.C § 1964(c), Plaintiff Vanetik is entitled to treble damages and
9 attorney fees to be proven at the time of trial.

10
11 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
12 **(Defamation)**
13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 146. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by references paragraphs 1 through 145 as
15 though fully set forth herein.

16 147. Defendants Fuks, Telezhenko and daily.rbc.ua, tlg.today, 2000.ua, uainfo.org
17 made and continue to make these false representations and statements as alleged herein,
18 while knowing that their representations were materially false and designed with the
19 intent to specifically injure the reputation of Plaintiff Vanetik. Each and all of those
20 false, material representations were published to various media sources including
21 Western media, East European media, and various internet third parties, and third parties
22 that Plaintiff Vanetik has social, business, and political relationships with or that are
23 aware of Plaintiff Vanetik's business and exert influence on it directly or indirectly.

24 148. Defendants made these false representations, false submissions to the press and
25 published on their own sites and various executives, business leaders, politicians in the
26 hopes of damaging and destroying Vanetik's reputation and ultimately his interests in
27 ventures that he is involved in globally. These false representations and false submissions
28

1 were relied on by the various business leaders, politicians, and members of the legitimate
2 press.

3 149. Plaintiff Vanetik has been substantially harmed as a result of the Defendants'
4 fraudulent conduct which injured the reputation and his business interests in an amount
5 that is presently unknown but certainly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this
6 Court.

7 150. Defendants knew that the representations, allegations against the Plaintiff were
8 knowingly false and were made with the intent to harm and injure Vanetik.

9 151. The Defendants and each of them are guilty of recklessness, oppression, fraud and
10 malice and, therefore, Plaintiff Vanetik is entitled to compensatory, punitive damages and
11 recovery of attorney fees against each of them.

12 152. Defendants have caused damages to Plaintiff's reputation in an amount of at least
13 \$84,000,000.00 to be proven at the time of trial.

14
15
16 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

17 **Unjust Enrichment**

18 **(Against Defendants Pavel Fuks, BEM Global, Andrei Telezhenko, daily.rbc.ua, tlg.today,**
19 **2000.ua, uainfo.org and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

20 153. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by references paragraphs 1 through 152 as
21 though fully set forth herein.

22 154. Defendants have usurped Plaintiff Vanetik's business in Ukraine, Israel, United
23 States, and in Eastern Europe generally, which was based on false and fraudulent
24 documents the defendants submitted Plaintiff Vanetik's business associates, media, law
25 enforcement, and elsewhere.

1 155. Therefore, the defendants have obtained Plaintiff's Vanetik's business interest in
2 various media businesses and consulting projects based on their tortious, illegal, and
3 fraudulent conduct, as set forth herein.

4 156. Principles of equity require that this Court prevent Defendants from stealing In
5 Plaintiffs businesses and destroying his good name.

6 157. Because of the defendants' fraudulent activity, they have been unjustly enriched,
7 all to the detriment of Plaintiff Vanetik in an amount of at least \$84 Million to be proven
8 at the time if trial.

9
10
11 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **Tortious Interference with Perspective Economic Advantage**

13 **(Against all Defendants and Pavel Fuks, BAM Global,, daily.rbc.ua, tlg.today, 2000.ua,
14 and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

15 158. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by references, as though set forth in
16 full, paragraphs 1-157, above.

17 159. Defendants at all times were aware of various business relationships and contracts
18 that Plaintiff Vanetik had with various businesses in Ukraine, Israel, Germany, and U.S.

19 160. By their fraudulent activity as alleged herein, defendants have caused
20 harm to Vanetik in such a pervasive manner that it has caused Vanetik to lose business globally.

21 161. Because of the defendants' fraudulent conduct, Plaintiff Vanetik can no longer
22 develop business in Ukraine, and other regions of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

23 162. Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial which is presently
24 believed to be at least \$84 million, and in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this court
25 to be proven at the time of trial.

1 163. Defendants are guilty of recklessness, oppression, fraud and malice within the
2 meaning of *Civil Code § 3294*. An award of punitive and exemplary damages is justified
3 in an amount according to proof.
4

5 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

6 **Civil Conspiracy**

7 **(Against Defendants Pavel Fuks, and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

8 164. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by references, as though set forth in
9 full, paragraphs 1-163, above.

10 165. At all relevant times herein, defendants, and all of them, formed a civil
11 conspiracy to misappropriate Plaintiff Vanetik's interests in various businesses interests through
12 the use of fraud and other unlawful acts.

13 166. As a direct result of the defendants' conspiracy, Yuri Vanetik has been
14 Damaged by the loss of business opportunities and income by means of the fraudulent conduct
15 of the defendants, which amount is believed to be at least \$84 million but will be proven at the
16 time of trial, in an amount that is certainly in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this court.

17 167. Defendants are guilty of recklessness, oppression, fraud and malice
18 within the meaning of *Civil Code § 3294*. An award of punitive and exemplary damages is
19 justified in an amount according to proof, which is unknown but in excess of the minimum
20 jurisdiction of this Court.
21

22 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

23 **Breach of Contract**

24 **(Against defendants Pavel Fuks and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

25
26 168. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as though set forth in
27 full, paragraphs 1-167, above.
28

1 169. On or about April 2016, Fuks entered into a written agreement with Plaintiff
2 Vanetik (agreement was assigned to Vanetik for this litigation).

3 170. The essential terms of the agreement were that for payment of \$3,000,000.00 that
4 the Plaintiff and affiliated entities would conduct a feasibility analysis of various human
5 rights violations that Kernes claimed he was subjected to during his criminal
6 investigation. Further, Fuks entered into an agreement to develop a PR and government
7 relations campaign for himself and for the city of Kharkov similar to what he had
8 described that Mayor Rudy Giuliani was hired to perform. The written agreement was
9 executed in Newport Beach, County of Orange California.

10 171. Pursuant to the written agreements, Defendant Fuks was to pay \$1,965,000 to
11 entities affiliated with Plaintiff and to Plaintiff Vanetik.

12 172. Plaintiffs performed all services that were called for in the agreement.

13 173. Defendants Fuks did not provide Vanetik with any payments other than a wire to
14 a consulting company for \$200,000 which was an earned retainer for the initial work and
15 consultation for former Mayor of Kharkov, Gennady Kernes. Subsequently, Fuks'
16 scheme did not work, and when he did not get to sit next to POTUS, which was never
17 offered and never promised, he demanded that the consulting funds be sent back and
18 failed to pay for any of the work that was provided by the Plaintiff Vanetik in the past.

19 174. On its part, plaintiff Vanetik has performed all conditions required under
20 the written agreements with Fuks. Defendant, Fuks breached the agreement on approximately
21 and throughout the March 2017 and through April 2018 when he refused to pay the \$1,965,000
22 despite the demands from Plaintiff Vanetik.

23 175. As a result of defendant Fuks breach of the written contract, Plaintiff Yuri
24 Vanetik has suffered damages in an amount greater than \$1,965,000.00, according to
25 proof at trial.

1
2 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

3 **Fraud**

4 **(Against defendants Pavel Fuks and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

5 176. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as though set forth in
6 full, paragraphs 1-175, above.

7 177. At the time that the Defendants named in this cause of action, each and all of
8 them made representations to the Plaintiff that they would pay \$1,965,000.00 for the
9 work that was provided by the plaintiff.

10 178. The representations that were made to the Plaintiff were material and at the time
11 the representations were made by the Defendants, they knew them to be false.

12 179. At no time did the Plaintiffs have any notice or concern that the representations
13 made by the Defendants were fraudulent and made with no intent to perform.

14 180. As a result of the representations, the Plaintiff made significant investments in
15 travel, and work in order to perform its part of the agreement, which it did, only to be left
16 with no pay which caused significant injuries and damages in an amount of at least
17 \$1,965,000 to be proven at the time of trial.

18 181. Plaintiff prays that the court award punitive damages to punish the Defendants
19 and each of them, for their malicious and oppressive behavior in an amount to be proven
20 at the time of trial.

21
22 **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

23 **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress**

24 **(Against defendants Pavel Fuks, and Does 1-50, Inclusive)**

25 182. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as though set forth in
26 full, paragraphs 1-181, above.

1 183. As stated above, in 2017 while Plaintiff was in Washington, DC, the Defendant,
2 Fuks made death threats toward the Plaintiff Vanetik, and told Plaintiff that, he (Fuks)
3 would, “blow up your car, and would have Plaintiff (you) ripped to shreds,” explaining
4 that he has experience in making people disappear. Fuks made similar references
5 regarding Matt Keelen, principles of Keelen & Associates, a Washington, D.C. based
6 government relations firm that arranged a series of private inaugural events for Fuks, his
7 close associate and former politician, Vitaly Khomutynnik aka Vitalii Khomutynnik, and
8 his wife, Svitlana Khomutynnik.

9 184. In attrition to this, as plead above, Fuks caused false and defamatory articles to be
10 published which also caused extreme and emotional harm to the plaintiff. Plaintiff also
11 alleges that those publications made by Fuks were knowingly false and were meant to
12 cause extreme emotional distress. The articles were also outrageous and essentially were
13 designed to harm Plaintiff’s reputation.

14 185. In early 2020, Plaintiff understands that Fuks also hired an East European
15 criminal network to have Vanetik murdered and deliver on his earlier threats.

16 186. Plaintiff Vanetik is informed and believes that he was told by Defendant Fuks that
17 he is “associated with” a Russia-based criminal syndicate, which he identified as the
18 Luzhnikovsky group, but pointed out that his reach and access to gangster and assassins
19 is global.

20 187. The above conduct by definition is extreme and outrageous behavior that was
21 undertaken by Defendant Fuks and others who are presently unknown and are hereby
22 named as DOES.

23 188. The Defendant acted intentionally as his threats and actions were designed to
24 cause and did cause extreme emotional distress. In fact, the actions were tantamount to a
25 terrorist threat, as Fuks and DOES unlawfully threatened Plaintiffs to commit a crime by
26 death and great injury to his person, the statements were to be taken as a threat, and on its
27

1 face the statements were unequivocal. The great harm and fear sustained by Plaintiff was
2 real and reasonable under the circumstances.

3 189. The conduct has injured, harmed Plaintiff in an amount that is in excess of the
4 minimum jurisdiction of this court, which will be proven at the time of trial.

5 190. Plaintiff also prays for punitive damages in an amount that will punish and deter
6 others from engaging in such extreme, outrageous, malicious and vile conduct in an
7 amount that will exceed the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.

8 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

9 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable in the present action.
10

11
12 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, as follows:
13

14 **On The First Claim for Relief**

- 15 1. For general damages according to proof at trial but no less than \$252,000,000, trebled
16 according to statute,
17 2. For prejudgment interest according to statute;
18 3. For Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs according to statute; and
19 4. For Attorney's fees and costs according to statute.
20

21 **On Causes of Action 2 through 8 Claims For Relief:**

- 22 1. For general damages according to proof at the time of trial;
23 2. For compensatory, and Special Damages according to proof but amounting to at least
24 \$84,000,000.00;
25 3. For contractual damages of \$1,965,000.00 according to prove at the time of trial;
26 4. For prejudgment interest on all amounts found to be due to Plaintiff from Defendants,
27

1 at the legal rate.

2 5. For punitive damages and exemplary damages according to proof at the time of trial,

3 6. For attorney's fees according to statute according to proof, and

4 7. For such other and further relief in favor of Plaintiff as the Court deems

5 just and proper.

6

7

8 DATED: June 4, 2021

Respectfully submitted,
A.G. Assanti & Associates, PC

9

10

11

Alessandro G. Assanti, Esq.
Alessandro G. Assanti, Esq.,
Attorney for Plaintiff, Yuri Vanetik

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28