IN THE DUBAI INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL CENTRE COURTS

IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

BETWEEN

COINMENA B.S.C. (C)

Claimant/Respondent

and

FOLOOSI TECHNOLOGIES LTD

Defendant/Applicant

ORDER WITH REASONS OF H.E. JUSTICE SHAMLAN AL SAWALEHI

UPON the Defendant's Application No. CFI-067-2025/1 dated 4 August 2025 seeking immediate judgment pursuant to Rule 24.1 of the Rules of the DIFC Courts ("RDC") and/or strike out pursuant to RDC 4.16 (the "Application")

AND UPON the Order with Reasons of H.E. Justice Shamlan Al Sawalehi dated 26 January 2026 dismissing the Application and ordering the Applicant to pay the Respondent's costs of the Application (the "January Order")

AND UPON the Order with Reasons of H.E. Justice Shamlan Al Sawalehi dated 6 February 2026 (the "Costs Order")

AND UPON the Applicant's Appeal Notice dated 16 February 2026 seeking permission to appeal the January Order (the "PTA Application")

AND UPON the Defendant's Application No. CFI-067-2025/4 dated 20 February 2026 seeking a stay of enforcement of the Costs Order pending determination of the PTA Application (the "Stay Application")

AND UPON the Claimant's evidence in answer dated 6 March 2026 and the Defendant's evidence in reply dated 16 March 2026

AND UPON the Order with Reasons of H.E. Justice Shamlan Al Sawalehi dated 10 April2026 dismissing the PTA Application

AND UPON reviewing the parties' submissions

AND PURSUANT TO the Rules of the DIFC Courts ("RDC")

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Stay Application is dismissed.

2. The Applicant shall pay the Respondent's cost of the Application. The Respondent shall submit a statement of costs not exceeding 3 pages within 5 days of this Order.

Issued By:
Delvin Sumo
Assistant Registrar
Date of issue: 21 May 2026
At: 9am

SCHEDULE OF REASONS

1. The Stay Application was brought pursuant to RDC 4.2(6) and RDC 48.22. The Defendant sought to stay the enforcement of the Costs Order on the basis that there was a real risk of injustice if it were required to pay that sum pending the outcome of the PTA Application.

2. The Stay Application was expressly conditional in its scope. The relief sought was a stay pending, first, the determination of the PTA Application and, second, if permission were granted, the final determination of the appeal. The Defendant's own evidence framed the Stay Application on that basis throughout the submission.

3. The PTA Application has since been dismissed by Order dated 10 April 2026. Therefore, the entire premise upon which the Stay Application was advanced has therefore fallen away.

4. A stay of enforcement is an interlocutory remedy, the purpose of which is to preserve the position of the parties pending the resolution of an identified future event. Where the event in question has been resolved, the stay application is spent.

5. The Stay Application is accordingly dismissed.