



' " ())) * "

1. Mr. Neupane contested before the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT) or Dispute Tribunal the decision to reassign him from the position of Chief of Engineering Section at the , -7 level. It is the United Nations multidimensional Integrated Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA) to the position of Chief of Section, Central Africa. The UNDT's decision and support of the UNDT.

2. The Judgment on Appeal No. UNDT/2022/101 impugned Judgment of the Dispute Tribunal dismissed Mr. Neupane's application as not receivable.

3. Mr. Neupane has filed an appeal before the United Nations

10. On 2/11/2021, Mr. Neupane's personnel file, as processed through the HR system, shows transfer from the position of Chief of Engineering & IT to the position of Chief of HR & Administration. In 38NU&CA.

11. On 30/11/2021, Mr. Neupane submitted a request for management evaluation (challenging his reassignment and requesting his reinstatement to his initial position of Chief of Engineering & IT. On 7/1/2022, the Chief of the Management Evaluation Unit (MEU) considered his request not eligible.

12. On 7/1/2022, Mr. Neupane filed an application before the UNOT.

13. On 1/1/2022, the UNOT issued Judgment on Appeal No. UNOT/2022/101 dismissing Mr. Neupane's application. The UNOT found that the (contested decision of reassignment was (communicated to Mr. Neupane at the latest on 7/3/2021 in unambiguous and unconditional terms. (In the 70-day deadline for requesting management evaluation began to run from that date and Mr. Neupane only filed a management evaluation request on 30/11/2021, his request was untimely. The UNOT (concluded that Mr. Neupane's application was thus not eligible.

14. Mr. Neupane appealed the impugned Judgment on 10/1/2022 and the (revised) appeal was filed on 10/1/2023.

, - % %#

(

17. Mr. Neupane submits that the UNOT erred in fact and in law (finding that his application was not eligible since he had failed to timely submit his request for management evaluation. The UNOT failed to understand that (the decision of Mr. Neupane (contested. (He never (challenged the reassignment decision. (In fact, he readily agreed to the reassignment and took up his new duties as assigned. (Instead, Mr. Neupane (challenged the structural demotion he had been subjected to. (Mr. Neupane had been promised during a meeting held on 2/1/2020 that the Administration would take the necessary steps to get him (reinstated to the Central (Office (of the (Government).

36. The Court found that the UNOT's determination is final and there is no need to further assess the content of the Appellant.

37. The appeal accordingly fails.

' & 0-

37. The appeal is dismissed and Judgment No. UNOT/2022/101 is hereby affirmed.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Decision dated this 27th day of 1 (to be 2023 in New Zealand and the United States.

+ & ,
Judge & "a", residing

+ & ,
Judge -ao

+ & ,
Judge Colgan

Judgment published and entered into the register on this 7th day of November 2023 in New Zealand and the United States.

+ & ,
Juliet E. Johnson, Registrar

/# % 0 % %#, ' &0 " - /# 0

1. 8 (on(ur !t" t"e Judgment of t"e Appeals Tr!*unal and !s" to add on!\$ t"!"s !n t"e sp!r!t of ass!st!ng !n t"e promot!on of good emplo\$ment relat!ons"!ps !t"!"n t"e Un!ted Nat!ons.

2. 9"en 3r Neupane as ad' !sed formal\$!n r!t!ng of "!"s reass!gnment+ "e as !n' !ted to (onta(t a ?uman %esour(es off!(!al !f "e "ad an\$ (on(erns and "e d!d so+ see4!ng an assuran(e t"at t"e formal!t!es of t"!"s reass!gnment ould *e follo ed. T"ere as no response to "!"s en@u!r\$. 9"!"le t"at non-response ould not "a'e >ust!f!ed t"e "ole dela\$ unt!! "e soug"t management e'aluat!on+ "e ne'ert"eless (ould reasona*\$ "a'e eCpe(ted a response and al!ted for one.

3. 8 t"!"n4 t"!"s a*sen(e of an\$ repl\$+ or e'en an a(4no ledgment of re(e!pt of "!"s reasona*le memorandum+ *\$ t"e Adm!n!strat!on as a fa!!!ng on t"e part of ?uman %esour(es and d!s(courteous to 3r Neupane. ?e "ad a reasona*le po!nt to ma4e and made !t proper!\$+ reasona*\$ and respe(tfull\$. Assum!ng t"at "!"s memorandum as re(e!'ed+ t"e fa!lure to respond does not ass!st t"e good and mutuall\$-respe(tful emplo\$ment relat!ons t"at s"ould eC!st !n t"ese s!tuat!ons.

1r!g!nal and Aut"or!tat!' e Jers!on: Engl!s"

Oe(!s!on dated t"!"s 27" da\$ of 1 (to*er 2023 !n Ne Lor4+ Un!ted &tates.

+ & ,

Judge Colgan