Claim No. ENF 270/2026

THE DUBAI INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL CENTRE COURTS

IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

BETWEEN

PALOMA

Judgment Creditor/Claimant

and

PEARL

Judgment Debtor/Defendant

ORDER WITH REASONS OF H.E. JUSTICE NASSIR AL NASSER

UPON the Judgment of SCT Judge Alia Alobeidli dated 21 July 2026 issued in Claim No. SCT- 167-2026 (the "Judgment")

AND UPON the Defendant's Application No. SCT-167-2026/1 dated 4 August 2026 seeking an order to stay the enforcement of the Judgment (the "Stay Application")

AND UPON reviewing the documents and evidence filed and recorded on the Court file

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Stay Application is dismissed.

2. There shall be no order as to costs.

Issued by:
Hayley Norton
SCT Judge and Assistant Registrar
Date of Issue: 18 August 2026
At: 11am

SCHEDULE OF REASONS

1. On 21 July 2026, the Judgment in Claim SCT-167-2026 was issued (the "Judgment").

2. Within the Judgment, the following orders were made:

> "1. The Defendant shall pay the Claimant the sum of AED 200,000.
>
> 2. The Defendant shall deliver vacant possession of the Premises to the Claimant by 31 July 2026.
>
> 3. In the event that the Defendant remains in occupation of the Premises after 31 July 2026, the Defendant shall pay the Claimant a further sum of AED 1,639.34 for each additional day of occupation.
>
> 4. The Defendant shall pay the Claimant the DIFC Courts' filing fee in the sum of AED 10,000."

3. On 4 August 2026, the Claimant filed an application for enforcement of the Judgment (the "Enforcement Application"), seeking enforcement of orders 2 and 3 of the Judgment: the order to deliver vacant possession of the Premises and the order for payment of AED 1,639.34 for each day of continued occupation.

4. On the same date, the Defendant filed an application to stay enforcement of the Judgment (the "Stay Application"), seeking an order staying enforcement of the order to deliver vacant possession until 31 December 2026, and noting the Defendant's willingness to continue paying the daily sum of AED 1,639.34 during that period.

5. The issue for determination is whether the Stay Application should be granted. I do not consider that it should, for the following reasons.

6. The Judgment already required the Defendant to deliver vacant possession of the Premises by 31 July 2026. That date has now passed, and the Defendant remains in occupation of the Premises without having complied with the Judgment.

7. The underlying Claim itself arose from the Defendant's unlawful overstay in the Premises following expiry of the tenancy agreement concluded between the parties, notwithstanding the Claimant's repeated requests that the Defendant vacate.

8. The Defendant has, since the Judgment, continued in that same course of conduct.

9. Order 3 of the Judgment, providing for payment of AED 1,639.34 for each day of continued occupation after 31 July 2026, was intended to

compensate the Claimant for continued occupation pending the Defendant's compliance with Order 2, and to discourage continued non-compliance.

10. It was not intended, and cannot properly be treated, as a mechanism by which the Defendant may elect to purchase continued occupation in lieu of complying with the order to vacate.

11. To grant the Stay Application on the basis proposed: permitting continued occupation until 31 December 2026 in exchange for payment of the daily sum, would convert an order intended to secure compliance into a schedule of rent, and would undermine the purpose and effect of Order 2 of the Judgment.

12. The Defendant has not identified any exceptional circumstance that would justify departing from the order made in the Judgment or delaying its enforcement. Willingness to continue paying the daily sum does not, of itself, amount to such a circumstance.

13. I am accordingly satisfied that the Stay Application should be dismissed, and that the Judgment should be enforced according to its terms.