



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 (RT) 1**

IN THE QATAR FINANCIAL CENTRE  
REGULATORY TRIBUNAL

Date: 4 May 2026

**CASE NO: RTFIC0002/2025**

RUTHERFORD, BESS AND ATTWOOD LLP

**Appellant**

v

QATAR FINANCIAL CENTRE AUTHORITY

**Respondent**

---

**Judgment**

---

**Before:**

**Justice Sir William Blair, Chairman**

**Justice Gopal Subramaniam SA**

**Justice Sean Hagan**

1. Following its judgment dated 30 March 2026 remitting the matter to the Regulatory Tribunal ([2026] QIC (A) 7), the Appellate Division handed down a further judgment as to costs dated 9 April 2026 ([2026] QIC (A) 9).

2. On 30 April 2026, the Qatar Financial Centre Authority ('QFCA') stated that:

*Further to the QFC Court's judgment in [2026] (QIC) A 6, we write to notify the Tribunal that the QFCA no longer opposes the appeal. This notification is made pursuant to Article 21.2.1 of the QFC Regulatory Tribunal Regulations and Procedural Rules, the matter not yet having proceeded to a remitted hearing.*

3. This judgment deals with the costs issues.

4. As the Regulatory Tribunal understands the Appellant's submissions dated 30 April 2026, the Appellant seeks a costs order in relation to the proceedings before the Regulatory Tribunal covering counsel's costs.

5. The Regulatory Tribunal's Rules and Procedures provide in article 24 that the Regulatory Tribunal "...will not normally order one party to pay another's legal costs, but is entitled to do so if it considers that justice so requires". This is consistently applied by the Regulatory Tribunal in the case law.

6. Justice does not require a departure from the ordinary rule in this case, particularly since the Appellate Division "...resolved the appeal in [the Appellant's] favour by reference to arguments based on the definition of "LLP Agreement", which had not been at the forefront of the Appellant's arguments, if articulated at all".

7. The sole issue on costs, therefore, is the costs on appeal.

8. The Order made by the Appellate Division as to costs is "*If the Appellant is successful before the Regulatory Tribunal, the maximum amount of costs it can be awarded in respect of this appeal is 50% of those costs*".

9. The QFCA argues that the costs of the appeal should be less than 50%. The Regulatory Tribunal considers, however, that the Appellant should have 50% of its costs of the appeal to the Appellate Division. The Appellant accepts that these costs are to be limited to the costs of Counsel.

10. The Regulatory Tribunal consequently orders that the Appellant have 50% of its costs of the appeal to the Appellate Division limited to the costs of counsel, such costs to be assessed by the Registrar failing agreement between the parties.

**By the Regulatory Tribunal,**



**[signed]**

**Justice Sir William Blair, Chairman**

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

Representation

The Appellant was self-represented.

The Respondent was self-represented.