



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: [2025] QIC (F) 4**

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

**Date: 16 January 2025**

**CASE NO: CTFIC0035/2022**

**RUDOLFS VEISS**

**Claimant/Applicant**

**v**

**PRIME FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS LLC**

**Defendant/Respondent**

---

**JUDGMENT**

---

**Before:**

**Justice Fritz Brand**

## Order

1. Permission is hereby granted in terms of paragraph 5(ii) of the Litigation Restraint Order made in respect of the Applicant ([2024] QIC (F) 24), allowing it to proceed with its application for summary judgment against Prime Financial Solutions LLC, the Respondent. This application was filed and served on 7 January 2025.
2. The costs of this application, including the costs of the hearings on 11 and 30 December 2024, are reserved for determination by the Judge(s) presiding over the proposed action for final relief to be instituted by the Applicant.

## Judgment

1. The Applicant is Mr Rudolfs Veiss. On 5 June 2024, he was made subject to a Litigation Restraint Order pursuant to Practice Direction No. 1 of 2024 (the ‘LRO’). As stated in paragraph 5 of the LRO, its effect is that, absent permission by the President of this Court or a Nominated Judge, the Applicant may not:
  - (i) *file any fresh claims or applications; and*
  - (ii) *file any applications within extant claims, for a period of 2 years from the date of this judgment.*
2. This is an application for permission under paragraph 5(ii) of the LRO. I am nominated by the President to consider this application. The application has its background in a case between the Applicant as the Claimant and Prime Financial Solutions LLC (‘PFS’), a limited liability company established and licensed within the Qatar Financial Centre (the ‘QFC’), as the Defendant in the main case (*Rudolfs Veiss v Prime Financial Solutions LLC* [2023] QIC (F) 8) (the ‘Main Case’). In the Main Case the Applicant, who was once a director of PFS, brought a claim against PFS on the basis of article 91 of its Articles of Association, which provides in relevant part, that “*the LLC shall indemnify every director ...of the LLC in respect of any liability incurred in defending any proceedings to the extent allowed by the Regulations*”.

3. The Regulations referred to are the QFC Companies Regulations 2005 (the ‘**Regulations**’). The relevant qualification to article 91 of the Articles of Association is to be found in article 61(2) of the Regulations, which precludes PFS from indemnifying a director against liability which “*may attach to him in respect of any fraud or dishonesty*”.
4. PFS’s answer to the claim was, in short, that these costs resulted from charges of fraud or dishonesty as contemplated in article 62(2) of the Regulations. It sought to support this defence with certain findings by the Qatar Financial Centre Regulatory Authority (the ‘**QFCRA**’). In the circumstances, the Court held in its judgment that (paragraph [31]):

*If the Regulatory Tribunal were to set aside these findings of the QFCRA on appeal, it will remove the whole factual basis of the Respondent’s argument. If, on the other hand, the appeal is unsuccessful, the question will arise whether the findings by the Tribunal amounts to fraudulent or dishonest conduct. In consequence we believe that this part of the claim should be stayed pending the outcome of the appeal to the Regulatory Tribunal. Once the appeal has been decided, it will be open to the parties to approach this Court for directions pertaining to the further conduct of this case.*

5. Concomitantly, paragraph 4 of the Court’s order provided:

*Once the Regulatory Tribunal has given its decision in the appeal, the parties are hereby authorised to approach this Court for directions regarding the further conduct of the proceedings pertaining to these claims.*

6. On 4 September 2024, the Appellate Division of this Court ultimately determined the appeal against the decision of the Regulatory Tribunal ([2024] QIC (A) 10) which had found the Applicant to have lacked integrity for breaching matters contained in Prohibition Orders from the QFCRA. The Regulatory Tribunal reduced the financial penalty that the QFCRA had imposed in relation to the Applicant but upheld a prohibition preventing him from performing any function in the QFC for a period of 5 years. Contending that the judgment of the Appellate Division exonerated him from any allegations of fraud and dishonesty as contemplated in article 62(2) of the Regulations, the Applicant sought to proceed

with his suspended claim against PFS for the recovery of costs incurred by him in the QFCRA proceedings, by way of an Indemnity Application. After receiving permission to do so under the LRO, the Indemnity Application was duly served on PFS on 2 December 2024.

7. Since no opposition was entered into by PFS within 28 days as prescribed under article 20 of the Court's Regulations and Procedural Rules (the '**Rules**'), the Applicant seeks permission to pursue his claim by way of an application for Summary Judgment pursuant to article 22.6 of the Rules, which was filed and served on 7 January 2025.
8. In these circumstances, I find that the Applicant has reasonable prospects of success in the proposed proceedings. Accordingly, the permission sought under paragraph 5(ii) of the LRO is granted.

**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 Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP (Doha, Qatar).