

Uzbekistan Supreme Court Clarifies Interim Measures in Civil, Administrative and Economic Proceedings

AUGUST 2026

On July 3, 2026, the Plenum of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Uzbekistan adopted Resolution No. 19 “On Certain Issues Concerning the Application by Civil, Administrative and Economic Courts of Measures to Secure a Claim (Preliminary Protection)” (“**Resolution**”).

The Resolution addresses interim measures in civil and economic proceedings and preliminary protection in administrative proceedings.

Rather than restating the rules already contained in the procedural codes, the Resolution also focuses on the procedural consequences, evidentiary standards and enforcement mechanisms that were not previously stated expressly in procedural codes.

Firm’s Note:

Under the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Courts” No. ZRU-703 dated July 28, 2021, the Plenum resolutions enter into force upon adoption, and its explanations are binding on courts and other bodies applying the relevant legislation.

1. Interim measures are enforceable without a writ of execution

The Resolution now expressly provides that:

- the court decision itself serves as the basis for enforcement; and
- no separate writ of execution is required.

Once an interim measure is cancelled, the court must:

- notify in writing the authority or official to whom the original decision was sent for enforcement; and
- identify in the operative part of the cancellation decision the court that imposed the measure, the date of the original decision and the specific measure being cancelled.

2. Documentary requirements for applications supporting domestic arbitration are clarified

The Civil Procedure Code and the Economic Procedure Code required a party seeking interim measures in support of domestic arbitration to provide evidence that the arbitration claim had been filed. They did not prescribe the specific form of that evidence.

The Resolution now provides that commencement of the domestic arbitration must be demonstrated by:

- a certified copy of the arbitral tribunal’s decision commencing the proceedings; or
- a certificate confirming commencement of the arbitration.

Where the dispute is being considered by an *ad hoc* domestic arbitral tribunal, the signature of the arbitrator on the ruling or certificate must be notarised.

The court must reject the interim application where:

- the required evidence of commencement is not provided; or
- the underlying dispute is not legally capable of being determined by a domestic arbitral tribunal.

3. Procedural requirements for applications for interim measures are clarified

Applications filed before commencement of proceedings

Where an application for interim measures is submitted before a claim, application or complaint has been filed, it must be returned by letter and without the issuance of a separate court decision.

The exception remains an application for interim measures in support of pending arbitration proceedings.

Applications for interim measures may be considered while proceedings are stayed

The Resolution expressly permits an interim application to be considered during a stay of proceedings:

- without resuming the principal proceedings;
- without notifying the parties; and
- within the ordinary expedited period applicable to interim applications.

Repeated applications require new grounds

A refusal to grant interim protection does not prevent a renewed application. However, the Resolution requires the applicant to rely on newly arising grounds and a new justification for the necessity of the measure.

Different treatment of defective applications

In civil and administrative proceedings, where the grounds or necessity for interim protection have not been stated precisely, the court may take steps to cure the deficiency and determine the application on its merits.

Although the Economic Procedure Code already required the requested measure to be stated, it did not specify the procedural consequence of failing to do so. Resolution now provides that such omission constitutes a ground for rejecting the application.

Where several measures are requested, the court must also provide a separate reasoned conclusion for each measure, specifying whether it is granted in full, granted in part or refused.

4. Applicants do not need to prove the merits, but must establish the need for the particular measure

The court must only assess the stated grounds for interim protection; the necessity of the requested measure; its connection with the subject matter of the claim; its connection with enforcement of the future judicial act; and its proportionality.

A request must be rejected if the proposed measure is unrelated either to the subject matter of the dispute or to enforcement of the future judicial act.

5. The Resolution expands and defines how particular measures may be used

The procedural codes already contain general lists of interim measures. Resolution adds rules concerning their permissible scope and practical operation.

Attachment is not limited to monetary claims

The Resolution expressly confirms that attachment of assets or funds may secure not only a monetary claim but also a non-monetary claim.

It also clarifies that perishable property should not be attached; the subject of attachment is the defendant's funds held in a bank account, rather than the bank account itself; and funds and other property may be attached in combination.

Any combined attachment must remain subject to the statutory requirement of proportionality.

A judgment in another case cannot be suspended as an interim measure

Resolution expressly prohibits a court from using an interim measure to suspend enforcement of a judicial act adopted in another case.

A party therefore cannot commence separate proceedings and use interim protection as an indirect means of blocking a judgment that must instead be challenged, stayed or otherwise addressed within the proceedings in which it was issued.

6. Additional gap-filling rules apply in civil and administrative proceedings

Resolution introduces several further clarifications specific to civil or administrative cases.

Affected non-parties may seek cancellation in civil proceedings

In civil proceedings, an application to cancel interim measures may be submitted not only by a person formally participating in the case, but also by another person whose rights or legitimate interests are affected by the measure.

Compensation for preliminary protection in administrative cases

The Economic Procedure Code and the Civil Procedure Code already regulate compensation for losses caused by interim measures following dismissal of the principal claim. The administrative procedural legislation did not contain an equivalent express provision.

Resolution now provides that, after a final judicial act dismissing an administrative application, the respondent or another interested person may bring a separate claim before the competent court for compensation for damages caused by preliminary protection measures.

Courts must enforce mandatory statutory suspension rules

If legislation provides that execution of a challenged administrative act or action must be suspended once it is contested in court, the Resolution requires the administrative court to verify whether the relevant authority or official has implemented that suspension.

If not, the court must order suspension on its own initiative.

This Legal Alert is intended for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal advice. Market participants should consult qualified legal counsel to address specific legal and regulatory issues.

Subscribe to our legal newsletters:



18 Anhor Buyi Street, Tashkent, 100011, Uzbekistan

Tel.: (+998 71) 209 0240

Web site: www.kostalegal.com

Email: info@kostalegal.com