



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) 4

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

Date: 17 February 2026

CASE NO: CTFIC0071/2025

OSAMA ELFADEL FAKI AHMED

Applicant

v

VICOMMS LLC

Respondent

---

JUDGMENT

---

Before:

Justice Fritz Brand

## **Order**

1. The Court's judgment in the matter of the Application to enforce the Qatar Financial Centre Employment Standards Office ('**ESO**') Determination against the Respondent, seeking payment of QAR 15,250 together with interest on that amount, is deferred pending this Court's judgment in *QFC Employment Standards Office v Experts Credit Solutions Consultancy LLC* (Case No. CTFIC0067/2025).
2. The Respondent is restrained from disposing of any of its assets within the State of Qatar up to the amount of QAR 15,250.
3. All banks and financial institutions licenced in the State of Qatar are directed to freeze all assets held by or on behalf the Respondent up to an amount of QAR 15,250.
4. It is directed that the freezing order in paragraph 3 above be communicated to the Qatar Central Bank with the request that it be communicated to all banks and financial institutions licenced in the State of Qatar.
5. The Respondent is directed to inform the Registrar and the Applicant within 7 days of the date of this judgment of all accounts held by it at banks and financial institutions licenced in the State of Qatar.
6. The Respondent is to pay all reasonable costs incurred by the Applicant in this Application, to be determined by the Registrar if not agreed upon between the parties.

## **Judgment**

1. The Applicant, Mr Osama ElFadel Faki Ahmed is a Sudanese citizen resident in the State of Qatar. The Respondent, Vicomms LLC, is established and licenced in the Qatar Financial Centre (the '**QFC**') to undertake motion pictures, video, and television productions. The director of the Respondent is Mr Wissam Sabra. Since June 2024, when the Respondent was established in the QFC, the Applicant was employed by the Respondent under an employment contract (the '**Employment Contract**') as a Senior Editor at a salary of QAR 14,000 per month. The Employment Contract was terminated by the Respondent on notice to the Applicant with effect from 28 August 2025. This Court

has jurisdiction to determine the dispute between the parties by virtue of article 9.1.1.3 of the Court's Rules and Procedures (the '**Rules**') since it arises from a contract between an entity established in the QFC and its employee.

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. In *Al Hattab Security Services v Flank Technologies* [2024] QIC (F) 12, the Court stated the following in 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 Respondent has no reasonable prospect of successfully defending the Application on the merits, I have decided to determine the case without hearing oral evidence or argument.
4. After termination of the Employment Contract on 28 August 2025, the Applicant lodged a complaint with the QFC Employment Standards Office ('**ESO**') on the basis that the Respondent had failed to pay his salary of QAR 14,000 for August 2025, and had made unauthorised deductions from his salary in June 2025 in an amount of QAR 1,000. Hence, he claimed payment of the amount QAR 15,000. The Respondent raised the defence that because the Applicant acted in breach of contract, it is entitled to withhold payment of the amounts claimed.
5. After investigation and in a well-reasoned, careful Determination dated 11 December 2025, the ESO held in favour of the Applicant. Accordingly, it directed the Respondent to pay the Applicant the amount claimed by him together with interest in an amount of QAR 250, that is QAR 15,250 in aggregate. The Determination also informed the Respondent that he

could appeal against the decision to the Tribunal, failing which, the award against him would become final.

6. The Respondent did not lodge an appeal against the Determination, nor did he pay any part of the determined amount in any way. In consequence, the Applicant made this Application with due notice to the Respondent. Broadly his claim is for (i) a judgment enforcing the ESO Determination in his favour; (ii) an order freezing the Respondent's bank accounts in the State of Qatar up to an amount of QAR 15,250; and (iii) a travel restriction order preventing Mr Wissam Sabra from leaving the State of Qatar until the amount of the claim had been paid. In support of the Application, the Applicant contended in essence that the Respondent has ceased doing business; that it has sold its equipment; that its assets are being dissipated and diminished; and that Mr Wissam Sabra intends to leave the State of Qatar. Hence, so the Applicant avers, he reasonably apprehends that the Respondent will avoid making payment of the amount due to him by these nefarious means.
7. In response, the Respondent's request is that the proceedings be stayed pending finalisation of criminal investigations that it has instigated against the Applicant on allegations of fraud and falsifications. But I think the short answer to this response is that the instigation of criminal charges do not in itself justify the suspension of civil proceedings. Particularly where those proceedings have in effect been finally determined in favour of the Applicant by way of an ESO Determination against which appeal had been noted within the prescribed period.
8. Of even greater concern is the fact that Respondent did not respond to the allegations advanced by the Applicant in support of his apprehension of irreparable harm. More specifically, Respondent does not deny that it has ceased doing business, that it has sold its equipment and that its assets are being dissipated. Nor is it denied that Mr Sabra is planning to leave the State of Qatar.
9. As to the relief sought by Applicant, the question whether this Court is empowered to enforce determinations by the ESO is pertinently raised in the case of *Employment*

*Standards Office v Experts Credit Solutions Consultancy LLC* (Case No. CTFIC 0067/2025) which is set down to be heard on Monday 16 February 2026. Hence, I propose to stand the Application for that relief over until that case has been decided. As to the freezing order, I hold that the Applicant is entitled to the relief that he seeks.

10. The travel restriction sought, on the other hand, would in my view constitute a disproportionate infringement of Mr Sabre's personal freedom, having regard to the relatively small amount of the claim and the absence of any indication that the freezing order will not lead to a satisfactory solution of the Applicant's plight. Finally, I hold that the Applicant is entitled to the costs he may have incurred in pursuing this Application, in which he has achieved substantial success.

**By the Court,**



**[signed]**

**Justice Fritz Brand**

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

Representation

The Applicant was self-represented.

The Respondent was self-represented.