



محكمة قطر الدولية  
ومركز تسوية المنازعات  
QATAR INTERNATIONAL COURT  
AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

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

**Neutral Citation: [2026] QIC (F) 1**

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

Date: 27 January 2026

**CASE NO: CTFIC0069/2025**

INTERNATIONAL LAW CHAMBERS LLC

**Claimant**

v

LEARNVERT TRADING WLL

**Defendant**

---

**JUDGMENT**

---

**Before:**

**Justice Fritz Brand**

## **Order**

1. The Defendant is directed to pay the Claimant forthwith:
  - i. The amount of QAR 18,612.50.
  - ii. Interest on the said amount calculated at the rate of 5% per annum from 3 December 2025 to the date of payment.
2. The Defendant is to pay all reasonable costs incurred by the Claimant in pursuing its claim, to be determined by the Registrar if not agreed upon between the parties.

## **Judgement**

1. The Claimant, International Law Chambers LLC, is a corporate entity of legal practitioners, established and licenced to render legal services in the Qatar Financial Centre (the ‘QFC’). The Defendant, Learnvert Trading WLL, is a corporate entity established in the State of Qatar, but not within the QFC. This Court has jurisdiction to determine the dispute between the parties by virtue of article 9.1.1.3 of its Rules and Procedures since it arises from a contract involving an entity established in the QFC.
2. Because of the sum and the nature of the issues involved, the claim was allocated by the Registrar to the Small Claims Track of this Court under Practice Direction No.1 of 2022. As was said by this Court in earlier cases such as in *Al Hattab Security Services v Flank Technologies LLC* [2024] QIC (F) 12, paragraph 2:

*We consider that where cases have been allocated to the Small Claims Track, it is important that such cases be determined as quickly and efficiently as possible and that, it is in keeping with the Practice Direction for the Court to go on to determine the claim, usually on the papers, without the need for any application for summary judgment to be made. This will ensure that the objective of the Practice Direction- to deal with small claims quickly and efficiently- is met.*

3. Accordingly, and because I am persuaded on the basis of the written material before me that the Defendant has no reasonable prospect of successfully defending the claim on the merits, I have decided to determine the case without hearing oral evidence or argument.

4. The Claimant's claim, as formulated in its Statement of Claim, is in broad terms that:

- i. The Claimant was previously engaged by the Defendant for a variety of legal services starting in 2023. On 9 July 2025, the Defendant urgently sought legal advice from the Claimant in connection with a dispute with Akwad Programming ('**Akwad**') arising from a Learning Management System contract drafted by the Claimant and executed on 20 October 2024. Given this urgency and the pre-existing professional relationship, the parties proceeded on the basis of the Claimant's emailed fee proposals and the Defendant's written confirmations and instructions, which together constituted a binding agreement to provide services (the '**Agreement**').
- ii. As appears from an email dated 9 July 2025, the legal advice sought by the Defendant related to the termination of the contract due to Akwad's non-performance. The Claimant proposed a Legal Strategy Note (the '**Strategy Note**') for a fixed fee of QAR 1,500, which the Defendant accepted. The Defendant also acknowledged the Claimant's standard hourly rate of QAR 750 for any additional work to be done subsequently.
- iii. Following the delivery of the Strategy Note on 13 July 2025, the Defendant instructed the Claimant to proceed with the preparation of a Demand Letter and a Termination Notice. The Claimant quoted fixed fees of QAR 3,000 for each of the Demand Letter and Termination Notice.
- iv. On 15 July 2025, the Defendant confirmed its acceptance of these fixed fees, fully aware that any additional services beyond the scope of the fixed fees would be charged on an hourly basis, in accordance with the previously agreed rate of QAR 750 per lawyer as set out in the Claimant's email dated 9 July 2025. The Defendant also expressly acknowledged that the fees were not contingent upon any recovery from Akwad.
- v. On 17 July 2025, the Claimant shared the draft versions of the Demand Letter and Termination Notice with the Defendant. The Defendant requested revisions to the

Demand Letter, which were duly incorporated by the Claimant. By email dated 23 July 2025, the Claimant confirmed that the Demand Letter had been sent to Akwad. The Defendant also reviewed the Termination Notice, as evidenced by its comments dated 24 July 2025.

- vi. The Claimant continued to provide additional services at the Defendant's request, charged at the agreed hourly rate of QAR 750. Such additional services included, inter alia, advisory services, communications with Akwad, and meetings with the Defendant and Akwad.
  - vii. Apart from payment of QAR 1,500 for the Strategy Note, no further payment was made by the Defendant. The Claimant's invoice for further services rendered was first issued on 23 October 2025. Upon receipt of this invoice, the Defendant requested for a meeting to discuss the invoice.
  - viii. During an online meeting held on 27 October 2025, the Defendant, for the first time, raised concerns regarding the quality of the legal services which complaints were never raised during the extensive prior course of engagement. The Claimant requested these new concerns be detailed in writing, which the Defendant failed to provide.
  - ix. Further negotiations proved to be unsuccessful and on 3 December 2025 the Claimant issued its final demand for payment of QAR 18,612.50 comprised of an agreed fees of QAR 6,000 for the Demand Letter and the Termination Notice and QAR 12,612.50 representing the fees for further work done by the Claimant at an hourly rate of QAR 750 per hour. But despite this final demand, no payment was made by the Defendant.
5. In its Statement of Defence the Defendant does not deny the terms of the Agreement relied upon by the Claimant. Its first defence is that during prior engagements the Claimant always charged a fixed fee without any charges at an hourly rate. But the Claimant's rather obvious response in its Reply is that those engagements were governed by fixed fee agreements while this one was governed by different terms, which terms are not in dispute.

6. While admitting that the QAR 3,000 for the Demand Letter is owing, the Defendant contends that the fee for the Termination Notice is not, because it was never sent to Akwad. The Claimant's response, which is patently valid in law, is that the Termination Notice was prepared on the Defendant's instructions, approved by the Defendant and not sent to Akwad because it was the Defendant who decided not to do so.
7. The further defence raised by the Defendant is that the Claimant's detailed statement reflects a duplication of work, particularly between the Strategy Note and subsequent hourly billing. The Claimant's response is that, following upon this complaint, it revised its timesheets by removing all entries which could conceivably be perceived to be overlapping. I have no reason to doubt the veracity of this response.
8. A further defence raised in the Statement of Defence objects to the charges for more than one lawyer to attend meetings. The Claimant's response to this defence is two-fold. First, that the contractual term explicitly agreed to was "*QAR 750 per hour per lawyer*". Second, that this objection was only raised after receipt of the Claimant's invoice, despite the Defendant's awareness of the staffing model from the outset and after accepting the benefit of a team's work during the engagement.
9. In sum, the Claimant has formulated a detailed and well-motivated claim to which the Defendant has raised no sustainable answer. Accordingly, I find that the Claimant is entitled to judgment in the amount claimed.
10. The Claimant also claims interest on the amount owing at the rate of 5 % interest per annum and I can see no reason in principle why it should not be compensated for being deprived of the use of money owing to it from date of the final invoice to date of actual payment. As to the rate of interest, I believe that 5% per annum will be fair. The Claimant's claim for compensatory damages, on the other hand, has in my view not been substantiated.
11. Finally, the Claimant seeks an order that the Defendant should pay the costs of these proceedings, and I believe it is only fair that the Defendant should pay the reasonable costs

incurred by the Claimant in pursuing its rightful claim. The amount of such costs to be determined by the Registrar if not agreed upon between the parties.

**By the Court,**



**[signed]**

**Justice Fritz Brand**

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

Representation

The Claimant was self-represented.

The Defendant was self-represented.