

3. On 14 June 2004, the Applicant, a UN, C-69 staff member, signed a Bank of America (C) loan agreement to C.T.T. on the basis of a document entitled International Agreement Covering the Reimbursable Loan of [the Applicant] from the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to the Provisional Technical Secretariat of

tem o!a! / natu!e. Ne!the! CT . T) no! the A \$&#ant & nfo!med UN,C69 a*out the
leass!gnment at the t!me.

C. . / memo!andum dated 2()#to*e! 2013+ the Ch!ef+ =uman >esou!#es
5e#t!on+ CT . T)+ #onf!&!med the A \$&#ant&s e!manent \$ate!a\$!eass!gnment
%&th&n CT . T) to the)ff!#e of the 67e#ut!-e 5e#!eta!/+ as the \$atte!&s 5 e#!a\$
Ass!stant.

@. A*out one month \$ate!+ */ ema!&\$ sent afte! #&ose of *us!ness on 9!&da/+
22 No-em*e! 2013+ the A \$&#ant & nfo!med the =uman >esou!#es Banage!+
D!-!&st!on of =uman >esou!#es+ UN,C69+ of the de#!&st!on */ CT . T) to !eass!gn
he! to the os!t!on of 5 e#!a\$ Ass!stant+ and asFed 2%hethe! UN,C69 %as
#onsu!ted o! & nfo!med a*out th!s3.

(.

requested he! letu!n to the ost of Ch&ef+ ,nte!na\$ Aud&t+ CT . T)+ a/ment of mo!a\$ damages and !e&m*u!sement of he! \$ega\$ fees.

11. . / \$ette! dated 23 De#em*e! 2013+ the C/PA<U+ D&-&s&on of =uman >esou!#es+ UN,C69+ !e \$&ed to the A \$&#ant that he! management e-a\$uation !e?uest %as not !e#e&-a*\$e+ g&-en that the #ontested de#&s&on %as not taFen on *eha\$f of the 67e#ut&-e D&!e#to!+ UN,C69+ o! %&th h&s a#?u&es#en#e+ and that he %as+ the!efo!e+ ne&the! a##ounta*\$e fo! &t no! a*\$e to !e a&! &ts a\$\$eged un\$a%fu\$ness.

12. The 67e#ut&-e 5e#!eta!/+ CT . T)+ !e \$&ed to the A \$&#ant&s !e?uest fo! !e-&e% of A De#em*e! 2013 */ memo!andum dated @ Janua!/ 2014. =e noted that a!a. @ of the Ag!eement st& u\$ated that the A \$&#ant %ou\$d *e ass&gned to CT . T) as Ch&ef+ ,nte!na\$ Aud&t+ and #on#\$uded that the o!&g&na\$ tem o!a!/ !eass!gnment and the de#&s&on to e!manent\$/ !eass!gn the A \$&#ant %as not &n a##o!dan#e %&th the Ag!eement+ as no %!&tten ag!eem

from ensatlon fo! UN,C69 *!ea#h of the Agreement. She le?uested le-!e% of the
de#lslon to !e"e#t a/ment of damages fo! *!ea#h of #ont!a#t.

15. . / t%o se a!ate \$ette!s dated 2@ 9e*!ua!/ 2014+ the C/PA<U+ UN,C69+

1A. On 17 June 2014, the C/PA<U> UN,C69, filed to the
A – 4 A – 2014, stating that he requested for removal from the
website and that he requested for management re-assignment as moot.

20. On 24 June 2014, the A – filed the application registered under Case
No. UNDT/GVA/2014/054 (see para. 1. above). On 24 June 2014, the

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2014/011

UNDT/GVA/2014/013

UNDT/GVA/2014/054

Judgment No. UNDT/2014/143

d. The Applicant claims that UN,C69 failed to inform her with an alleged obligation to inform her in her assignment and to inform her interests as well as without identifying her. As the Applicant requested in her email of 22 November 2013 as well as her UN,C69 had been informed of her assigned work in her assignment; she did not request any other action from UN,C69 and she made no attempt to follow up on this email until several days after her termination of assignment. The Applicant's claims on the alleged dishonesty of UN,C69 that she did not request any action or information from UN,C69 when she was terminated/assigned with UN,C69 (T) in 2013, which in her opinion is a violation of the Agreement constituted a breach of the Agreement;

e. There is no action or omission on the part of UN,C69 that can be construed as a breach of the Agreement. To this extent, her request for compensation is without merit;

f. Even on the other side that UN,C69 was under an obligation to pay some action upon receipt of the Applicant's email, in view of the fact that the Applicant did not attempt to inform her termination of assignment it cannot be argued that she suffered any harm, in the amount of the net salary/;

)-14.4775(n)-058661(o)-3.8876(1)2500(1)176(1)9692(05)(0)969520()-91.0778(14)(0)09620(14)(502105136)

2(. Additional\$+/ unde! a!t. 2.5+ of its Statute+ the T!*una\$\$s "u!sd#t#on ma/
e7tend to a \$&#at&ons f&sed against a s e#&a&0ed agen#/ o! othe! &nte!n&tona\$
o!gan&Oat&ons o! ent&t&es a!t&#& ating &n the #ommon s/stem+ %he!e a s e#&a&
agreement has *een #on#\$uded *et%een the agen#/+ o!gan&Oat&on o! ent&t&/
#on#e!ned and the 5e#!eta!/:Gene!a\$ of the United Nations to a##e t the te!ms of
the "u!sd#t#on of the Dis ute T!*una\$.

2A. CT . T) has not #on#\$uded an/ su#h agreement unde! the te!ms of a!t. 2.5 of
the T!*una\$\$s 5tatute. As a #onse?uen#e+ the T!*una\$ \$a#Fs #om eten#e to assess
the \$ega&t/ of a de#&sk&on emanat&ng f!om CT.T) and+ the!efo!e+ Case
No. UNDT/GVA/2014/011 &s &!e#e&-a*\$e rati&ne materiae %&th !ega!d to the
leassignment de#&sk&on lsee /spinosa

omitted to take information into account; this is as the motive when the staff member has at no point requested his/her services assistance. In taking no action following the Applicant's email of 22 November 2013, UN/C69 did the employee not interfere with his duties as the Applicant.

3A. The Tribunal in the second and third decisions issued as paras 1.1 and 1.1.1 of the Applicant's decision UN/C69 refused to allow compensation for his failure to cooperate with the assignment. In reaching this conclusion, the Tribunal found that the employee was not interfered with by UN/C69 of the Applicant's terms of appointment; the Tribunal finds that an investigation for compensation purposes is necessary without merit.

40. In addition, the respondent made no effort to provide a statement of investigation costs under article 10.C of the Tribunal's Statute. The Tribunal does not find the respondent to be a manifest abuse of the proceedings on the part of the Applicant, amounting to such a sanction. In the absence of the elements of good faith and due diligence of the respondent to justify the costs against the Applicant.

41. In view of the foregoing, the Tribunal awards D6C, D65'

The applicant is entitled.

Signed

Judge Thomas

Dated 21 February 2014