



**In the name of His Highness Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani,
Emir of the State of Qatar**

Neutral Citation: [2025] QIC (F) 59

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

Date: 18 November 2025

CASE NO: CTFIC0053/2025

CHEIKH TIDIANE NIANG

Claimant

v

CLEMENT SPORTS QFC LLC

Defendant

JUDGMENT

Before:

Justice Fritz Brand



Order

1. The Defendant is directed to pay to the Claimant forthwith the amount of QAR 32, 750.
2. The Defendant is directed to pay the reasonable costs incurred by the Claimant in these claims. The quantum of such costs to be determined by the Registrar if not agreed.

Judgment

1. This is a request for default judgment pursuant to article 22 of the Rules and Procedures of this Court (the '**Rules**'). The Claimant is a former employee of the Defendant. The Defendant is a company registered and licenced in the Qatar Financial Centre (the '**QFC**').
2. The Claimant alleges he was unfairly dismissed after being denied emergency leave to attend to his critically ill wife and seeks financial compensation for unpaid wages, withheld allowances, benefits not provided, and damages. The quantified parts of the claim consist of a claim for QAR 68,000 for eight months of wages allegedly due since March 2025, plus QAR 3,000 which the Claimant alleges was withheld from his wages during the period October 2024 to March 2025.
3. From the employment contract (the '**Employment Contract**') annexed to the Claim Form, it appears, however, that the Claimant was employed under a fixed term contract which expired on 30 June 2025. It follows that, on his own version, he is entitled to no more than three and a half months' salary, which is QAR 29,750, plus QAR 3,000, which comes to QAR 32,750 in aggregate.
4. Since the dispute arises from a contract between an individual and an entity established within the QFC, it falls within this Court's jurisdiction by virtue of article 8(3)(c) of the QFC Law (Law No. 7 of 2005).
5. The claim was allocated to the Small Claims Track under the Practice Direction No. 1 of 2022 (Small Claims) by the Registrar given its value.
6. Whereas:



- i. The claim was duly served on the Defendant on 30 October 2025 in accordance with the provisions of article 18 of the Rules.
- ii. The Defendant failed to file and serve a Defence within the 14-day period during which it was allowed to do so under the Practice Direction No. 1 of 2022.
- iii. The claim is for a specified amount of money as contemplated by article 22.2 of the Rules.
- iv. Article 22.5 of the Rules states:

The default judgment shall include the names of the parties, the amount awarded (if applicable), and confirmation that it was issued due to the Defendant's failure to file a Defence. No further reasons shall be stated in the judgment.

7. I propose to grant an order by default without further reasons.

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 did not appear and was not represented.

