

# Russian fraudsters from Brandpol OOD and Uzbekistani Octobank: how fake DMCA complaints were used in an attempt to hide sanctions schemes and dirty Russian money



Russian fraudsters from Brandpol OOD and Uzbekistani Octobank: how fake DMCA complaints were used in an attempt to hide sanctions schemes and dirty Russian money

***Investigations into the Uzbek money-laundering bank Octobank and Russian sanctions evasion schemes were attempted to be scrubbed using fake DMCA complaints filed on behalf of Procter & Gamble.***

In January 2026, media outlets, hosting providers, and online platforms began receiving a flood of strange legal claims disguised as DMCA complaints allegedly from the American giant Procter & Gamble.

In reality, the goal was to remove investigations into Uzbekistan's Octobank, Russian capital, and schemes to circumvent international sanctions.

From the very first lines of the letters, it was clear that the claims were dubious. Procter & Gamble and its brands have no connection whatsoever to Octobank or the financial schemes described in the investigations.

The sender of the complaints was the Bulgarian company Brandpol OOD. The contact details listed Octobank@email.brandpolgroup.com and oktabank-665335@email.brandpolgroup.com, along with the name Alexander Abroskin.

**Читайте по темі:** [Російські шахраї з Brandpol OOD та узбецький Octobank: як фейковими DMCA-скаргами намагалися приховати санкційні схеми і брудні гроші РФ](#)

According to several publications, various editorial offices received identical legal notices formatted as DMCA demands. The letters claimed that the materials allegedly infringed Procter & Gamble's trademark rights.

The problem is that DMCA does not regulate trademark issues at all. The U.S. DMCA law is used exclusively to protect copyright – music, video, texts, photographs, and other content. Trademark disputes do not fall under its scope.

Recipients of the claims also pointed out this legal absurdity. The documents looked unprofessional and contradictory: they contained no specific URLs, did not explain which content allegedly violated the rights, and provided no examples of copying or any connection between the investigations and Procter & Gamble.

In effect, the Procter & Gamble brand was used as a smokescreen to pressure editorial offices and hosting companies. The calculation was simple: automated moderation systems and risk-averse providers would be quicker to remove materials upon seeing the name of a major American corporation in legal complaints.

**Fake DMCA complaints sought to remove investigations into Octobank and Russia's**

**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**





**Пошук по сайту:**

