

Exhibit 1: Court cases on disputes related to the inclusion of agency VAT in the customs value of imported goods

No	Case Details	First In- stance	Court of Appeals	Cassation	Supreme Court of the Russian Feder- ation
1	№ A56-114310/2021 (Herbalife International Rus, LLC vs. Baltic Cus- toms)	✓	✓	Remitted for retrial	
2	№ A40-251204/2021 (Este Lauder Companies, LLC vs. Central Customs Administration)	x	x	X	X, The Supreme Court of the Russian Federation refused to refer the cas- sation appeal to the Judicial Cham- ber on Economic Disputes of the Supreme Court of the Russian Feder- ation
3	№ A40-3225/22-94-30 (NTB, LLC vs. Moscow Customs)	✓	✓	Cassation appeal was remitted	-
4	№ A56-90354/2021 (Baltimpax, LLC vs. St Petersburg Customs)	×	Х	x	A cassation appeal is filed with the Supreme Court of the Russian Feder- ation
5	№ A56-90356/2021 (Baltic Trans-Logistics vs. St Petersburg Customs)	X	x	X	X, The Supreme Court of the Russian Federation refused to refer the cas- sation appeal to the Judicial Cham- ber on Economic Disputes of the Supreme Court of the Russian Feder- ation
6	№ A40-4727/22-145-38 (Bosco Sports, LLC vs. Moscow Customs)	✓	✓	Remitted for retrial	-
7	№ A40-286907/21 (L'OREAL vs. Moscow Customs)	√	✓	Remitted for retrial	-

^{√ -} court decision in favour of the entry filer; inclusion of VAT on royalties in the customs value of imported goods is deemed unlawful

denuo.ru 1

X - court decision in favour of the customs authority; inclusion of VAT on royalties in the customs value of imported goods is deemed lawful; or court decisions of lower instances in favour of the entry filer are revoked

No	Case Details	First In- stance	Court of Appeals	Cassation	Supreme Court of the Russian Federation
8	№ A40-33892/22-21-260 (PUMA-RUS, LLC vs. Central Customs Administration)	√	✓	X, remitted for retri- al; adjudicated in favour of customs after retrial	
9	№ A40-11337/22-122-81 (Arneg, LLC vs. Moscow Customs)	X	X	×	
10	№ A40-79711/2022 (ZARA CIS, JSC vs. Moscow Customs)	✓	X	-	-
11	№ A40-10754/22-139-86 (Grundfos Istra, LLC vs. Moscow Customs)	X	X	X	-
12	№ A56-56919/2022 (Kronles, LLC vs. St Petersburg Customs, North Western Customs Administration, Federal Customs Service)	X	x	-	
13	№ A43-19135/2022 (Interservice, LLC vs. Volga E-Customs)	√	√	-	-
14	№ A43-19119/2022 (Interservice, LLC vs. Volga E-Customs)	√	√	✓	-
15	№ A56-39451/2022 (Petersburg Products International vs. Vyborg Customs)	X	X	-	-
16	№ A40-209102/22-149- 1619 (Profile-Euro, LLC vs. Moscow Customs)	X	X	-	-
17	№ A73-21404/2022 (KTNG RUS, LLC vs. Kha- barovsk Customs)	✓	✓	-	
18	№ A56-133200/2022 (URSA Eurasia, LLC vs. Baltic Customs, St Petersburg Customs)	X	-	-	-
19	№ A14-2192/2022 (Singenta, LLC vs. Voro- nezh Customs)	✓	√	-	
20	№ A08-804/2022 (Stern, LLC vs. Belgorod Customs)	✓	-	-	
21	№ A40-88352/2022 (Transport Development Group, LLC vs. Moscow Customs)	√	X	X	
22	№ A40-82219/2022 (Daimler Kamaz Rus, LLC vs. Central Customs Ad- ministration)	X	X	×	-

 $[\]checkmark$ - court decision in favour of the entry filer; inclusion of VAT on royalties in the customs value of imported goods is deemed unlawful

denuo.ru 2

X - court decision in favour of the customs authority; inclusion of VAT on royalties in the customs value of imported goods is deemed lawful; or court decisions of lower instances in favour of the entry filer are revoked