



In the name of His Highness Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani,  
Emir of the State of Qatar

**Neutral Citation: [2025] QIC (F) 66**

IN THE QATAR FINANCIAL CENTRE  
CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL COURT  
FIRST INSTANCE CIRCUIT

Date: 15 December 2025

**CASE NO: CTFIC0041/2025**

AMANI AMORRI

**Claimant**

v

QLM SERVICES COMPANY LLC

**Defendant**

---

JUDGMENT

---

**Before:**

Justice Her Honour Frances Kirkham CBE

## **Order**

1. The Defendant's application for anonymisation is refused.

## **Judgment**

### **Background**

1. In this case the Claimant, Dr Amorri, claims that she was employed by the Defendant hospital ('QLM') as a Health Support Associate. On the day on which she began work, QLM dismissed her on the ground of non-disclosure of her pregnancy. She was asked to leave that day. Dr Amorri claims that QLM was guilty of unlawful and discriminatory conduct and in breach of the QFC Employment Regulations (as amended).
2. Dr Amorri seeks (i) a declaration that her dismissal was unlawful and discriminatory, (ii) an order that QLM issue an official termination letter and a clearance certificate, (iii) compensation, and (iv) her legal costs.
3. The Defendant denies that any employment relationship was created. It contends that Dr Amorri's non-disclosure of her pregnancy was non-disclosure of material information and constituted a breach of the duty of good faith.
4. Pursuant to Court orders the parties have filed pleadings, dealt with disclosure of documents, and filed witness statements and skeleton arguments.
5. The case was listed for hearing on Thursday, 4 December 2025. Dr Amorri asked that the hearing be postponed on the ground that the birth of her baby was imminent, possibly due on 4 December 2025 itself. QLM consented to the postponement.
6. QLM asks that the issues be dealt with on the basis of the documents filed and without a hearing. Dr Amorri resists that proposal. The Court is considering this application and will issue its conclusion shortly.
7. QLM also ask that the judgment in this case be anonymised. This judgment deals with that application.

### **Anonymisation**

8. In its skeleton argument QLM make the following submissions:

*16. The Defendant respectfully submits that the judgment in this matter should be anonymized in order to protect the legitimate interests of both Parties and to safeguard the fairness and integrity of the judicial process.*

*17. The proceedings concern a disputed dismissal involving sensitive factual circumstances. Publication of the Parties' identities, when read together with the nature of the allegations, carries a material risk of generating adverse or misleading public perceptions regarding the Defendant's employment practices, regardless of the Court's ultimate findings. Such perceptions may unduly affect the Defendant's standing with key stakeholders, including insured members, customers, regulators, and service providers. Anonymization would ensure that any public dissemination of the judgment focuses on the Court's reasoning rather than on the identities of the Parties.*

*18. The Defendant acknowledges the fundamental principle of open justice; however, as recognized across common-law jurisdictions, including England and Wales, this principle is not absolute. Courts may limit the publication of identifying information where necessary to prevent disproportionate harm, to protect privacy and reputational interests, and to ensure the effective administration of justice. These considerations are particularly relevant in cases involving sensitive subject matter or allegations which, if publicized without anonymization, could generate unwarranted reputational consequences.*

*19. Importantly, anonymization would not detract from the transparency of the Court's decision. In view of the above, the Defendant respectfully requests that any publicly accessible version of the judgment be anonymized, including the redaction of the Parties' names and any other information that may reasonably lead to their identification.*

9. In a recent email to the Court, QLM's lawyers repeated their request, as follows:

*We write to you on behalf of the Defendant, a prominent governmental medical insurance institution, in Case No. CTFIC0041/2025 to respectfully request that the judgment to be rendered in this matter be anonymised to protect the interests of the parties involved.*

*The proceedings concern a disputed dismissal which is sensitive in nature. Publication of the parties' identities, together with the sensitive factual context of the dispute, carries a material risk of generating adverse or misleading public perceptions regarding the Defendant's conduct with respect to its employment practices, irrespective of the Court's findings. Such perceptions may unduly affect the Defendant's standing among its key stakeholders, including insured members, customers, regulators, and service providers. Anonymisation would therefore support the fairness and integrity of the judicial process by ensuring that public focus remains on the Court's reasoning rather than on the identities of the parties.*

*We fully acknowledge the fundamental importance of open justice. However, it is well recognised in common-law jurisdictions, including England and Wales,*

*that the principle is not absolute. Courts may restrict the publication of identifying information where this is necessary to protect the legitimate interests of the parties, prevent disproportionate harm, preserve the effective administration of justice, and ensure a fair and proportionate balance between transparency and privacy. These considerations may be especially relevant in cases involving sensitive subject matter or allegations that, if publicised, could generate unwarranted reputational impact.*

*Importantly, anonymisation would not diminish the transparency of the Court's judgment. The reasoning, findings, and legal conclusions would remain fully accessible to the public, thereby upholding the core elements of the open justice principle while mitigating unnecessary harm.*

*While we do not intend to assume any facts on behalf of the Claimant, we note that she may, should she wish, make her own submissions regarding any personal grounds for anonymisation.*

*In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Court anonymise the names of the parties and any identifying details in the publicly accessible version of the judgment.*

10. Dr Amorri's response is as follows:

*1. I respectfully disagree with the Defendant's characterisation of events. I was fully ready and willing to commence my employment, and it was the Defendant's own decision to terminate my employment upon learning of my pregnancy that created any interruption to their business operations. Accordingly, any alleged impact on business continuity cannot reasonably be attributed to me.*

*2. There are important factual matters in dispute, and for this reason, I respectfully oppose the Defendant's request for summary judgment. A hearing is necessary to allow the Court to consider the evidence from both sides properly.*

*3. Regarding anonymisation, I have no objection should the Court consider it appropriate.*

## **Conclusion**

11. In this Court the identities of parties to litigation are included in Court orders and judgments. The question here is whether an exception should be made to that.

12. The Court will usually anonymise the parties in cases concerned with issues arising out of and in connection with arbitration. This is because arbitration itself is usually a confidential process. That is not the position here. Here, Dr Amorri has issued her claim and QLM has raised its defence in the usual way.

13. The fact that Dr Amorri has raised no objection to QLM's request for anonymisation is not definitive. There remains the important question of open justice which the Court should consider even when there is agreement, or lack of challenge, between parties. This, in my judgment, overrides any such agreement or absence of challenge.
14. Open justice is the part of the bedrock on which this Court operates. Exceptional reasons are required to justify a conclusion that the parties' names should not be shown.
15. QLM's application is based on the consequences to its reputation if the facts and circumstances of its dealings with Dr Amorri are made public. QLM describes itself as "*a prominent governmental medical insurance institution*". It submits that its conduct with respect to its employment practices, irrespective of the Court's findings, will give rise to perceptions which may unduly affect its standing among its key stakeholders.
16. QLM's application is based on surmise. It has adduced no evidence to support their case that disproportionate harm might be caused by publication of their identity, or as to the need to protect its privacy, or as to risk of reputational interests. It has not explained how the effective administration of justice would be assisted by anonymisation.
17. I conclude that it is not the role of the Court to facilitate concealment of QLM's identity on the ground that its employment practices might adversely affect QLM's standing with stakeholders.
18. I do not consider that the embarrassment which might be caused to either Dr Amorri or QLM is a sound reason to direct anonymisation in this case. The risk of reputational damage in this case is no different from the potential reputational damage to any litigant using this Court. It is not sufficient in this case to justify absence of transparency or making an exception to the normal approach.
19. I refuse QLM's application.

**By the Court,**



**[signed]**

**Justice Her Honour Frances Kirkham CBE**

A signed copy of this Judgment has been filed with the Registry.

**Representation**

The Claimant was self-represented.

The Defendant was represented by International Law Chambers LLC (Doha, Qatar).