



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) 21

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

Date: 1 June 2026

CASE NO: CTFIC0012/2026

AEGIS SERVICES LLC

Claimant

v

BAKERTILLY ADVISORY SERVICES LLC (formerly MOORE QATAR)

Defendant

JUDGMENT

Before:

Justice Fritz Brand

Order

1. The Defendant is to pay to the Claimant forthwith the sum of QAR 6,500 together with interest on the said amount calculated at the rate of 5% from 28 October 2025 until the date of payment.
2. The Defendant's Counterclaim is dismissed.
3. The Defendant is ordered to pay the reasonable costs incurred by the Claimant in pursuing its claim against the Defendant and in defending the Counterclaim, the quantum of such costs to be assessed by the Registrar if not agreed.

Judgment

1. The Claimant and the Defendant are both corporate entities established and licenced to do business under the regulations of the Qatar Financial Centre (the '**QFC**'). This Court has jurisdiction to determine the dispute under article 9.1.1.1 of the Court's Rules and Procedures because it is a civil and commercial dispute arising between two entities established in the QFC.
2. The dispute arises from an agreement between the parties which came into existence on 28 August 2025 when the Defendant's representative, Mr Mohamed Half Zaki, accepted a written proposal by the Claimant for ISO 2700I Certification at a contract price of QAR 6,500.
3. 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 (the '**Practice Direction**'). After the claim was served on the Defendant, it filed a Defence, which was followed by the Claimant's Reply. It appears from the papers that there is a clear factual dispute between the parties. Nonetheless, I 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. Accordingly, I have decided to determine the case on the basis of the written material before me and without hearing oral evidence or argument.

4. The Claimant’s case is that it performed its obligations under the agreement by issuance of the ISO 2700I Certificate which was admitted by the Defendant and successfully listed on the International Accreditation Forum (‘IAF’) platform on 27 October 2025, thereby rendering the contractual sum payable by the Defendant under the agreement. But, despite repeated demands since 28 October 2025, so the Claimant contends, the Defendant has consistently refused to meet its end of the bargain.
5. In its Statement of Defence, the Defendant raises wide ranging defences. Besides averments of incomplete performance by the Claimant, these include serious allegations of fraud and forgery of corporate documents on the part of the Claimant. Apart from serving as the basis for its defences against the Claimant’s claim, the Defendant purports to rely on the same wide-ranging allegations for its unquantified Counterclaim.
6. What these allegations have in common is that, despite their severity in nature, they are virtually unsubstantiated by facts. Thus, by way of example, the accusation of “*forged corporate documents*” is ‘motivated’ by no more than the bald statement that:

...the claimant presented a falsified corporate document to misrepresent its legal standing and induce the defendant to proceed with payment. The document was not genuine. The defendant reserves the right to file a criminal complaint with the competent authorities in relation to this conduct.

7. With regard to the charges against the Claimant of malperformance, it is pointed out by the Claimant that these were raised for the first time in answer to the Claimant’s claim in these proceedings with the sole purpose of avoiding payment. Before that, so the Claimant contends, not a single allegation contained in the Statement of Defence was raised at any

point during their period of engagement, which spanned over many months. On the contrary, so the Claimant contends, during that period the Defendant approved deliverables, confirmed IAF Certification listing, requested additional services, and on multiple occasions acknowledged the outstanding amount.

8. Moreover, so the Claimant avers, the Defendant's complaint that critical documents were not delivered by it, is incompatible with the fact that the ISO 27001 Certification was audited and approved by the IAF. This is so because no certification body would issue an ISO 27001 Certificate – and no Certificate would be accepted onto the IAF platform – if mandatory documents were absent. Accordingly, the successful issuance of the ISO 27001 Certification and IAF listing constitutes conclusive proof that all documentation was delivered.
9. According to the Claimant, the same goes for the Defendant's allegation that the documents were inadequately prepared. Since the documentation was submitted to, assessed, and approved by an independent accredited certification body, the ISO 27001 Certificate itself is proof of quality.
10. With regard to the Defendant's allegations of fraud and forgery, the time-honored approach is that allegations of this kind are hard to establish. Not because the onus of proof is different, but because of the sanctions against such conduct, including criminal sanctions, it is regarded as inherently unlikely to have occurred. In this case, as I have said, the Defendant's accusations are marked by a complete dearth of evidence. Hence, I find that the defence based on these accusations are unsustainable.
11. In all these circumstances, I hold that the factual allegations relied upon by the Defendant for both its Defence and Counterclaim can be rejected on the basis of the papers as inherently unlikely and held to be unfounded. In consequence, the Claimant's claims are to be upheld, while the Defendant's Counterclaim is to be dismissed, both with costs.

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.