

- a. (without notice) to join Counselor and Sobaldo, in their capacity as trustees, to the proceedings pursuant to Family Procedure Rules 2010 r.9.26B [“the FPR”];
 - b. (without notice) for freezing injunctions and ancillary orders against Counselor and Sobaldo;
 - c. for orders under s. 423 Insolvency Act 1986 [“the IA”] and/or s. 37 of the Matrimonial Causes Act 1973 [“the MCA”] setting aside all transfers of the Monetary Assets to trusts of which Counselor and Sobaldo are trustees, and ordering Counselor and Sobaldo to pay the value of the sums received by each of them to her. This substantive application should be determined on notice to Counselor and Sobaldo, and thus the Wife seeks only initial directions at this stage.
5. This application is being made without notice because the giving of notice is likely to frustrate its purpose – the Wife asserts that the history demonstrates that the Respondents will use any opportunity afforded to them to move assets again in order to ensure that any orders granted by this court are rendered futile. The grant of a freezing order is thus essential before Counselor and Sobaldo have any notice of these applications.
 6. I am grateful to Ms Dilnot for her thorough skeleton argument and her oral submissions. I have read three bundles of documents and been referred to a bundle of authorities. As this matter was listed before me a day before I ended my sitting duties in vacation, I indicated orally that I would make the orders sought by the Wife and reserved my written judgment to a later date. A return date is fixed for hearing before me on 2 October 2019.
 7. As in my judgment handed down in July 2019 (Akhmedova and Akhmedov and Others [2019] EWHC 1705 (Fam)), I intend to describe the background pertinent to an understanding of the Wife’s applications. I then consider the basis for the claims against Counselor and Sobaldo and deal with whether the Wife has discharged the duty on her of full and frank disclosure given that this is a without notice application. I finally consider whether I should make the orders sought.

Background

The Proceedings

8. The trial of the Wife’s application for financial relief took place between 29 November and 5 December 2016. By a judgment dated 15 December 2016, the Court granted the wife financial relief against the Husband in the sum of £453,576,152. On 20 December 2016 the Court gave two further judgments in consequence of which two Liechtenstein entities managed by Counselor entities – Qubo 1 and Qubo 2 – were joined as Fourth and Fifth Respondents to these proceedings. The Court also made a freezing order against the Respondents, including the Husband and the Fifth Respondent.
9. The following matters arising from the substantive order dated 20 December 2016 are pertinent:
 - a. The Husband had submitted to the jurisdiction of the English Court;