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 (C) 10

IN THE QATAR FINANCIAL CENTRE

CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL COURT

COSTS ASSESSMENT

Date: 1 November 2026

CASE NO: CTFIC0051/2026

DG

(BY HIS LITIATION GUARDIAN MOHIT GOYAL)

Claimant

v

PLAY RIVALS GAMING LLC

Defendant

JUDGMENT

Before:

Dr Umar Azmeh, Registrar

Order

1. The Defendant is to pay the Claimant the sum of **QAR 1,500** within 7 days of the date of this judgment.

Judgment

Introduction and background

1. On 20 September 2026, judgment was issued in favour of the Claimant in the sum of INR 8,000 (a little over QAR 300). The Defendant was directed to pay the reasonable costs of the Defendant to be assessed by me if not agreed ([2026] QIC (F) 56).

2. It is a matter of regret that in such a low value case that judicial time is required to assess costs as the parties are unable to agree. The parties filed their submissions in the body of emails in open correspondence.

Submissions

3. The Claimant, acting as a litigant-in-person ('**LiP**') through a litigation guardian, claims 78 hours at the LiP rate of QAR 200 for a total of QAR 15,600. His submissions, via email at the end of the September 2026, set out that he had, inter alia, spent time "*analysing evidence and communications*", "*preparing and responding to the procedural application*" (an application by the Defendant which claimed that Court had no jurisdiction on account of the Claimant's age), correspondence, submissions, and other case-related matters.

4. The Defence submitted (in an email dated 25 October 2026) that the costs claim is "*rejected in full*", and that the amount is "*unreasonable and unsupported by evidence*". It also noted that "*some of the Claimant's submissions and emails appear to have been prepared with the assistance of AI tools, raising concerns about the 7 hours claimed*". The Defendant submitted a schedule attached to that email which purported to record "the occasions on which the Claimant sent written responses within minutes of receiving an email from the

Court" and that this is "*relevant to the 78 hours … claimed in the Claimant's costs schedule of 21 September 2026*".

5. The Claimant replied the same day by email, clarifying some of the work undertaken during the case, and maintaining the hours claimed were a true reflection of the time spent. He noted that any use of AI tools supplemented rather than replaced his work.

Approach to costs

6. Article 34 of the Court's Rules and Procedures reads as follows:

> *34.1. The Court shall make such order as it thinks fit in relation to the parties' costs of proceedings.*
>
> *34.2. The unsuccessful party pays the costs of the successful party. However, the Court can make a different order if it considers that the circumstances are appropriate.*
>
> *34.3. In particular, in making any order as to costs, the Court may take account of any reasonable settlement offers made by either party.*
>
> *34.4. Where the Court has incurred the costs of an expert or assessor, or other costs in relation to the proceedings, it may make such order in relation to the payment of those costs as it thinks fit.*
>
> *34.5. In the event that the Court makes an order for the payment by one party to another of costs to be assessed if not agreed, and the parties are unable to reach agreement as to the appropriate assessment, the assessment will be made by the Registrar, subject to review if necessary by the Judge.*

7. In *Hammad Shawabkeh v Daman Health Insurance Qatar LLC* [2017] QIC (C) 1, the Registrar noted that the "… *list of factors which will ordinarily fall to be considered*" to assess whether costs are reasonably incurred and reasonable in amount will be (at paragraph 11 of that judgment):

    i. Proportionality.

    ii. The conduct of the parties (both before and during the proceedings).

    iii. Efforts made to try and resolve the dispute without recourse to litigation.

    iv. Whether any reasonable settlement offers were made and rejected.

v. The extent to which the party seeking to recover costs has been successful.

8. *Hammad Shawabkeh v Daman Health Insurance Qatar LLC* noted as follows in relation to proportionality, again as non-exhaustive factors to consider (at paragraph 12 of that judgment):

    i. In monetary … claims, the amount or value involved.

    ii. The importance of the matter(s) raised to the parties.

    iii. The complexity of the matters(s).

    iv. The difficulty or novelty of any particular point(s) raised.

    v. The time spent on the case.

    vi. The manner in which the work was undertaken.

    vii. The appropriate use of resources by the parties including, where appropriate, the use of available information and communications technology.

9. One of the core principles (elucidated at paragraph 10 of *Hammad Shawabkeh v Daman Health Insurance Qatar LLC*) is that "*in order to be reasonable costs must be both reasonably incurred and reasonable in amount*."

10. The relevant principles from the caselaw are now codified into Practice Direction No. 2 of 2024 (Costs).

11. Practice Direction No. 3 of 2026 (Litigants-in-Person – Hourly Rates) sets a standard hourly rate of QAR 200 for LiPs in this Court.

Analysis

12. The Claimant maintains his claim in full. The Defendant has submitted that no costs should be awarded. In my view both positions are wrong. Maximalist positions are rarely right,

and may explain why circa QAR 300 became the subject of litigation which involved two judgments, and an ongoing dispute over costs.

13. I will deal with this costs assessment briefly given that this case is of such low value that I must take care not to expend disproportionate judicial resource on it (see article 4 of the Rules – Overriding Objective).

14. The Claimant plainly spent some time on the case. That is self-evident as he took part in the case, filed and served a Claim Form, a response to the jurisdiction application, and a Reply on the merits, among other things. However, to direct the Defendant to meet the cost of 78 hours would be unjust in this type of matter.

15. In my view, 15 hours would be a reasonable time for a LiP to have spent conducting this type of simple case. As I have noted in a number of previous judgments in the context of law firms conducting litigation to recover unpaid fees, no matter the value of a case, there is a minimum amount of time that litigants/lawyers must spend to conduct a case, and these can at times exceed the value in dispute (in the context of a law firm, see *Whitepencil LLC v Ahmed Barakat* [2024] QIC (C) 3 at paragraph 18; this applies to any litigant). This figure comes to QAR 3,000.

16. This sum is reasonable in my view reflecting that this was contested litigation and that the Defendant filed a jurisdiction challenge that had to be dealt with by the Claimant. I have no evidence of any proper attempts to settle the matter prior to the matter coming to Court and therefore this factor does not assist me. The Claimant has been successful in his primary claim.

17. That said, on the question of proportionality, I am of the view that for this type of (straightforward) case where only QAR 300 was sought, QAR 3,000 would be disproportionate. Furthermore, the Claimant has not had to incur a debt to external lawyers. In view of this I will make a reduction of 50% and award the Claimant his reasonable costs in the sum of QAR 1,500.



Conclusion

18. The Defendant is to pay the Claimant the sum of **QAR 1,500** within 7 days of the date of this judgment.

By the Court,

[signed]

Dr Umar Azmeh, Registrar

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

Representation

The Claimant was self-represented.

The Defendant was self-represented.

DIGITALLY SIGNED AND VERIFIED
موقّع رقمياً ومعتمد