



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) 40

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

Date: 29 June 2026

CASE NO: CTFIC0037/2026

**TAMAM CAPITAL FOR COMMERCIAL
MEDIATION LLC**

Claimant/Applicant

v

GROWTH INVESTMENT HOLDING LLC

1st Defendant/Respondent

AND

HAMAD MUBARAK AL HAJRI

2nd Defendant/Respondent

JUDGMENT

Before:

Justice Fritz Brand

Judgment

1. On 25 June 2026, this Court made an order (the ‘**Order**’) in the following terms:
 1. *The following without-prejudice undertaking offered by the Claimant is hereby made an Order of the Court.*
 2. *The Claimant and its director Mr Mourad Aly shall not:*
 - i. *publish the contents of any document that remains confidential under Practice Direction No. 1 of 2023 (as distinct from the Court’s published orders and judgments); nor*
 - ii. *assert in any publication that the Court has made a final determination of liability or wrongdoing or a final award of any sum.*
 3. *The Order is made on the basis of the Claimant’s undertaking and without any finding by the Court on the issues arising in the application.*
 4. *The costs of the application will stand over for later determination.*
 5. *Reasons for this Order are to follow.*
2. The above Order was made pursuant to an urgent application (the ‘**Application**’) by the Defendants for interim relief pending the outcome of an action instituted by the Claimant against the Defendants in the main case under Case No. CTFIC0033/2026 (the ‘**Main Case**’). These are the reasons for that Order.
3. The Application resulted from an earlier interim order made on 7 June 2026 (and amended on 18 June 2026) against the Defendants as Respondents, essentially in the following

terms (the ‘**Earlier Order**’):

The Respondents shall comply with the following measures, which shall apply pending the final outcome of the proceedings in the main case (CTFIC 0033/2026):

- (i) The Liquidator of the First Respondent shall provide an undertaking to this Court, on or before 21 June 2026, that assets to the value of QAR 30 million shall be preserved and maintained for the purpose of satisfying any judgment which may ultimately be entered into in favour of the Applicant.*
- (ii) The Respondents shall implement and maintain internal ring-fenced arrangements within the group treasury structure to ensure that the value equivalent of QAR30 Million remains identified and preserved pending the final determination of the main case.*
- (iii) The Respondents shall by 30 June 2026 procure the issuance of an irrevocable, unconditional and on-demand guarantee issued by a reputable bank in the State of Qatar for an amount of QAR30 million in favour of the Applicant.*

4. According to the Application, the Defendants’ complaint results from publications by the Claimant’s director and Chief Executive Officer, Mr Mourad Aly, through publications on the social media platform X. Broadly stated, the Defendants’ case is that these publications, particularly when read against the background of a series of earlier publications by Mr Aly on social media, presented the Earlier Order “*in an overly dramatized and misleading manner which harms the reputation of the Defendants*”. More specifically, so the Defendants contend, the publications complained of contain statements which, individually and cumulatively, are:

...liable to convey to the ordinary and reasonable reader that:

- 62.1 this Court has finally upheld the Claimant’s allegations against the Defendants in the main case;*
- 62.2 the Court has determined that the Defendants acted improperly or unlawfully;*
- 62.3 a sum of approximately QAR 30 million has been finally awarded to the Claimant;*

62.4 *the Defendants have been found to have interfered with, concealed or misapplied investor assets;*

62.5 *criminal, punitive or regulatory consequences have been imposed or are expected to follow as a result of findings already made; and*

62.6 *the underlying dispute has been resolved in the Claimant's favour.*

5. Relying on these grounds, the Defendants sought an interim injunction, on an urgent basis pending the final determination of the main case, directing:

...the Claimant and its representatives to cease immediately publishing or causing to be published any statements or content relating to these proceedings which fall within the scope of the proposed injunction.

6. As explained by the Defendants' legal representative in argument at the urgent hearing on 25 July 2026, the "*proposed injunction*" is essentially intended to preclude the Claimant's representative from publishing statements which may reasonably be understood to convey that this Court has made findings of wrongful or unlawful conduct, or findings of liability, or has made any final award against the Defendants.

7. The Claimant's answer to the Defendants' case is, in essence, that the publications by Mr Aly relied upon by the Defendants are not reasonably capable of the interpretation contended by the Defendant. On the contrary, so the Claimant avers, the publications were intended, and will be reasonably understood, to convey no more than the contents of the Earlier Order. But, so the Claimant continued, in order to allay the Defendants' alleged fears, it is prepared to give an undertaking, without prejudice and without any admission that it is obliged to do so, in the following terms:

That Tamam and Dr Aly (or any other representative or employee of Tamam):

- i. will not publish the contents of any document that remains confidential under Practice Direction No. 1 of 2023 (as distinct from the Court's published orders and judgments); and*

ii. will not assert in any publication that the Court has made a final determination of liability or a final award of any sum.

8. But for the undertaking, I would seriously consider granting the relief sought, mainly for the reason that the threatened harm to the Defendants' interest, if the Application were wrongly refused, would patently outweigh any potential harm to the Claimant if the relief were to be wrongly granted. However, be that as it may. Because I thought that the undertaking, if slightly amplified and confirmed by an Order of this Court, would afford sufficient protection of the Defendants' interest against the alleged harm, I found it unnecessary to give further consideration as to whether the Application should be granted on its merits. Instead, I asked the Claimant's representative to amplify the undertaking, to which he fairly agreed.
9. In consequence, I made an Order in accordance with the Claimant's without-prejudice undertaking, without deciding the Application on its merits. I also find it appropriate to direct that costs should stand over for later determination.

By the Court,



[signed]

Justice Fritz Brand

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

Representation

The Claimant/Applicant was represented by Mr Rahul Kumar of International Law Chambers LLC (Doha, Qatar).

The Defendants/Respondents were represented by Mr Kyle Grootboom of Sharq Law Firm (Doha, Qatar).