



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) 16

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

Date: 19 May 2026

CASE NO: CTFIC0001/2026

RED DOT FILMS

Claimant

v

HOOT MEDIA LLC

Defendant

JUDGMENT

Before:

Justice Fritz Brand

Order

1. The Defendant is to pay the Claimant the sum of QAR 106,000 forthwith, together with interest on this amount calculated at the rate of 5% per annum from 3 March 2025 until the date of actual payment.
2. The Defendant is to pay the reasonable costs incurred by the Claimant in pursuing this claim, to be assessed by the Registrar if not agreed.

Judgment

1. The Claimant, Red Dot Films, is a company established in the State of Qatar but not in the Qatar Financial Centre (the '**QFC**'). The Defendant, Hoot Media LLC, is a company incorporated and licenced to do business in the QFC. The dispute has its origin in a written agreement between the parties which came into existence on 12 February 2025, when the Defendant's duly authorised representative accepted a quotation submitted on behalf of the Claimant for the rental of certain professional filming equipment (the '**Agreement**'). Because this is a commercial dispute arising from a contract between an entity established in the QFC and an entity established in the State of Qatar, it falls within the jurisdiction of this Court pursuant to article 9.1.1.3 of the Court's Rules and Procedures (the '**Rules**').
2. On 12 February 2025, and in response to a request by the Defendant to do so, the Claimant company, specialising in cinematography and the renting out of filming equipment, submitted a written quotation to the Defendant for the provision of the professional filming equipment specified in the quotation, for use by the Defendant in its film shoot in the State of Qatar over a period of five days, between 12 and 16 February 2025, at a total rental of QAR 123,000 (the '**Contract Price**'). The list of equipment specified in the quotation included a "*DJI Inspire 2 Drone equipped with a Zenmuse X7 system, including lenses and filter (without pilot)*" at a quoted rental of QAR 15,000. Apart from the list of equipment, the quotation also provided for the services of a sound recording technician and a digital imaging technician. According to the quotation, the total rental became payable within two weeks of the Claimant's invoice. This quotation was accepted and signed on the Defendant's behalf by its authorised signatory on the same day.

3. The Claimant's case is that it complied with all its obligations under the Agreement by providing the equipment and technical services specified over the period of five days between 12 and 16 February 2025 and that, on 17 February 2025, it presented the Defendant with an invoice for the agreed Contract Price of QAR 123,000. But, despite formal demand for payment on 18 August 2025, the Claimant contends that the Defendant has, to date hereof, failed to pay the Contract Price.
4. The Defence filed on behalf of the Defendant was clearly prepared by someone unqualified in law. I say this because it raises several defences which then appear to be abandoned later in the same document. Included amongst these is the complaint that the rental agreed upon was unreasonable and only agreed to by the Defendant because it was in urgent need of the equipment. But this defence is not pursued, and wisely so in my opinion. I say that because there is no suggestion that, in entering into the Agreement, the Defendant was induced by any misrepresentation or undue influence on the part of the Claimant. Hence the potential objective unreasonableness of the Contract Price, voluntarily agreed to by the Defendant, is not a defence recognised by law.
5. One of the grounds raised in the Defence is that, during the filming period, it became evident that the most expensive item of rented equipment – the drone – was defective and incapable of fulfilling its intended purpose. Upon discovery of the defect, the Defendant alleges that it promptly raised the issue with the Claimant. Moreover, according to the Defence, the defect was acknowledged on site by the Claimant's employee and authorised representative.
6. In its Reply to the Defence, the Claimant denies that any of the rented equipment, including the drone, suffered from any defect. Regarding the alleged defective drone, the Claimant avers that, despite retaining possession of the drone for the full five days of the contract period, the Defendant failed to raise any complaint about the drone during this period. The Claimant averred that it was only after the services were rendered and payment was claimed that the Defendant raised these allegations to avoid payment.

7. Because of the dispute of fact thus arising on the pleadings, I found myself unable to decide the matter without the hearing of oral evidence. Accordingly, I referred the matter to a hearing which occurred on 17 May 2026. At the hearing, the Claimant was represented by Ms Natalie Abdulrahman of the law firm of Dr Mohammed Hassan Al Kaabi, while the Defendant was represented by its director, Mr Paul Woolnough.
8. Two witnesses were called on behalf of the Claimant: Mr Rupan Goswami and Mr Subhash Koyyot. They were both employed by the Claimant at the time of the film shoot; Mr Goswami as the sound recording technician and Mr Koyyot as the digital intermediate technician. According to these two witnesses, no problem occurred with the equipment provided by the Claimant during the five-day filming period. The witnesses further testified that no one on behalf of the Defendant ever complained to them about the functioning of the equipment. On the contrary, those representing the Defendant indicated to them that they were happy with the Claimant's performance. Although given the opportunity to do so, Mr Woolnough elected not to cross-examine the two witnesses. Nor was any witness called by the Defendant to gainsay their version. In the circumstances, I am bound to accept the Claimant's version: that its obligations under the Agreement were properly performed.
9. At the hearing, Mr Woolnough for the first time raised a defence not pleaded: namely, that part of the Contract Price, in an aggregate amount of QAR 77,000, had been paid by the Defendant by way of five instalments during May 2025. In response to these allegations, it was admitted on behalf of the Claimant that an amount of QAR 17,000 had been paid by way of four instalments. But for the rest, Mr Woolnough's allegations of payment were denied. In accordance with well-established principle, allegations of payment are to be pleaded and, when denied, proved by the Defendant through evidence. Since the Defendant has neither pleaded nor proved the unsubstantiated allegations of payment raised by Mr Woolnough in argument, I am precluded from having any regard to these allegations. Accordingly, I hold that the Claimant is entitled to judgment in an amount of QAR 106,000 (that is, the Contract Price of QAR 123,000 minus the partial payment of QAR 17,000 which the Claimant admitted to having received).

10. Apart from the Contract Price, the Claimant also claimed an amount of QAR 50,000 for “*material and moral damages*”. But, as I see it, no proper basis has been established for this claim. On the other hand, I believe that the Claimant is entitled to be compensated by way of interest for the loss it has sustained through being deprived of the money to which it was entitled, under the Agreement, from two weeks after rendering its invoice on 17 February 2025, i.e. from 3 March 2025, at the rate of 5% per annum, which is the rate regularly applied by this Court in matters of this kind.
11. For these reasons, judgment is awarded in the sum of QAR 106,000 together with interest on this amount, calculated at the rate of 5% per annum from 3 March 2025 to the date of payment. The Defendant must also pay the reasonable costs incurred by the Claimant in bringing this claim, the amount of such costs to be assessed by the Registrar if not agreed.

By the Court,



[signed]

Justice Fritz Brand

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

Representation

The Claimant was represented by Ms Natalie Abdulrahman of the law firm of Dr Mohammed Hassan Al Kaabi Law Office & Legal Consultations.

The Defendant was self-represented.