Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/182

Date:

22 October 2020

Original:

English

Before: Judge Margaret Tibulya

UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Abena Kwakye-Berko

TOSON

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT ON RECEIVABILITY

Counsel for the Applicant:

Self-represented

Counsel for the Respondent:

Katrina Waiters, UNFPA

Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/182

Background

1. The Applicant is a staff member of the United Nations Population Fund (õWP FRAÖ) ugtxkpi cu Tgrtgugpvcvkxg cv the UNFPA Oman Country Office (õCQ/Qo cpö) y ký kp vý g Atcd Uvcvgu Tgi kqpcnQhhleg (õAUTQÖ) cv vý g R-5 level.

- 2. On 14 February 2019, he filed an application with the United Nations Dispute Vtkdwpcn kp Pcktqdk ej crigpi kpi yj g Tgur qpf gpwu f gekukqp to renew his fixed term crr qkpvo gpv (õFVAö) d{ yj tgg o qpyj u kpuvgcf qhwy q {gctu (õvj g eqpvguvgf f gekukqpö) that is, from the expiration date of 19 March to 19 June 2019.
- 3. The Respondent filed his reply to the application on 22 March 2019

Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/182

7. The Applicant again contacted Mr. Shabaneh on 8 November 2018 who

informed him that he would consult with DHR and revert.⁴

8. On 10 December 2018, the Applicant sought management evaluation of the

contested decision.

9. On 20 February 2019, the Applicant received a new PA granting him a further

extension of appointment until 19 March 2020.⁵

10. On 25 May 2020, the Applicant filed submissions on the issue of receivability

pursuant to Order No. 093 (NBI/2020).

Partiesø submissions

Receivability

The Respondent

11. The application is not receivable *ratione materiae*. The contested decision has

been superseded and rescinded by effect of the second PA dated 20 February 2019.

12. The Applicant now has a one year renewal of appointment rather than three

months. The contested decision has no legal effect on the Arrnecpytu vgto u qh

appointment or contract of employment. Accordingly, the Dispute Tribunal does not

have jurisdiction to receive the application.

The Applicant

13. Any decision vitiated by bias, bad faith, retaliatory or abusive of authority is

receivable and reviewable by the Tribunal. The Tribunal may examine the

circumstances surrounding a decision to determine whether it was tainted by abuse of

authority.

⁴ Application, annex 10.

⁵ Reply, annex 1.

Page 3 of 7

Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/182

14. What constitutes an administrative decision will depend on the nature of the decision, the legal framework under which the decision was made and the consequences of the decision.

15.

Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/182

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2019/008

Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/182