



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

Neutral Citation: [2025] QIC (F) 71

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

Date: 24 December 2025

CASE NO: CTFIC0037/2025

ABDULRAHMAN AL-RAYYAN

Claimant

v

TRICION DOHA QFC BRANCH

Defendant

JUDGMENT

Before:

Justice Ali Malek KC



Order

1. The application for disclosure is refused.

Judgment

Background

1. This is an application for disclosure by the Defendant (**‘Tricion’**) against the Claimant (**‘Mr Al-Rayyan’**). The background to this application can be briefly described as follows.
2. Mr Al-Rayyan brings a claim against Tricion alleging he was employed by Tricion and that Tricion has failed to pay salary. In his claim he identifies various documents including an agreement dated 1 September 2021 (the **‘Employment Agreement’**) and an agreement executed in 2023. He contends that Mr John Hall of Tricion acted on its behalf. The Employment Agreement states Mr Al-Rayyan’s position as *‘Executive Vice-President’*. He relies on the Employment Agreement and the fact that he performed what he describes in the Reply as *“material operational and commercial duties”*.
3. The detail of Mr Al-Rayyan’s claims does not matter for present purposes. He seeks compensation for unpaid salary as well as *“consequential damages”*. It seems from the Claim Form that he is seeking, inter alia, salary in the sum of QAR 45,000 per month from September 2021.
4. Tricion disputes that any contract of employment was entered into between Tricion and Mr Al-Rayyan. In particular, Tricion contends that Mr Hall and Mr Al-Rayyan were friends and that there was no contract of employment between Tricion and Mr Al-Rayyan.
5. Although the Employment Agreement was signed, Tricion contends the parties to it did not intend it to be legally binding. According to Tricion, the Employment Agreement was provided by Tricion to enable Mr Al-Rayyan to bring his family to Qatar, open a bank account, and enter into a lease agreement. In short, Tricion alleges that *“the sole purpose of the employment contract was to facilitate [Mr-Al Rayyan’s] personal administrative arrangements”*. In its Defence, Tricion points to various matters which



it contends indicate that there was no genuine employment contract. It describes the Employment Agreement as “*fictitious*”. Tricion relies on a document entered into on the same date as the Employment Agreement, entitled “*Acknowledgement and Release Agreement*”, the preamble of which reads “[Mr Al-Rayyan] *has requested an employment agreement for the purpose of renting an apartment or opening a bank account*”.

6. In summary, the Court considers that the dispute between the parties will centre on the nature of the arrangements between them. Mr Al-Rayyan will say there was a contract of employment between them that conferred legal rights. Tricion will say that there was no contract of employment, and it was never intended that there should be legal relations between Tricion and Mr Al-Rayyan.

7. The trial of this action will take place on 25 January 2026.

Disclosure Application

8. On 25 November 2025, Tricion issued an application for disclosure against Mr Al-Rayyan. The application has been made pursuant to the Court’s directions order dated 13 November 2025.

9. Tricion seeks an order that the Mr Al-Rayyan produces the following documents:

- i. “*The original document submitted by the Claimant dated 14/2/2024, entitled ‘Salary Certificate’*” (**Request 1**).
- ii. “*The Claimant’s original account statement evidencing receipt of any wages from the Defendant*” (**Request 2**).
- iii. “*The original documents evidencing the Claimant’s alleged contribution to securing business and contract for the Defendant*” (**Request 3**)

10. The Court dismisses the application for the following reasons.

11. The Court does not consider that the documents requested are likely to assist the Court in the resolution of this dispute. The parties have made serious allegations against each other, and the Court expects them to set out their evidence in detailed witness statements.



12. In particular, the parties have made allegations about the authenticity of documents and there are allegations of forgery. However, these matters do not directly go to the issues in dispute. If the position appears different at trial, the position on disclosure can be revisited.

13. The Court stresses that allegations of fraud need to be pleaded and supported by cogent and positive evidence. The Court will not order disclosure on matters that go to issues of credibility.

14. On the specific document requests.

Request 1

15. Tricion contends this document is a forgery. However, the Court does not consider this document is material to the pleaded issues in dispute. At most, it raises an issue of credibility which is not the proper subject of a disclosure request. Disclosure is therefore unnecessary.

16. Tricion contends that it requires the original salary certificate in order to pursue its allegation of forgery before the competent authorities. The Court does not accept this as a valid basis for ordering disclosure. The Court's function is to determine the dispute between the parties.

Request 2

17. The Court considers that Tricion will be able to explain in its evidence whether any wages were in fact paid to Mr Al-Rayyan. The Defence says that nothing was paid. Mr Al-Rayyan knows what was paid to him. Disclosure will not assist.

Request 3

18. This request is too broad and unspecific. The parties will be able to give evidence (supported by all relevant documents) that go to the issue of what Mr Al-Rayyan did as an alleged employee of Tricion. The request does not identify any specified documents. Moreover, it appears to be Tricion's case that there are in fact no documents in the possession of Mr Al-Rayyan that fall within this request. This is not a good reason to make a request for documents.

Conclusion

19. The application for disclosure is dismissed. The question of costs is reserved.



By the Court,



[signed]

Justice Ali Malek KC

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

Representation

The Claimant was self-represented.

The Defendant was represented by Al-Haji Legal Consultant and Attorneys (Doha, Qatar).

