







“The decision not to renew my contract was vitiated by a lack of due process and tainted by prejudice. OIOS, the Secretariat, ICTY and DPKO all played a critical role that in the end has left me with a shattered professional reputation and financially challenged. Had I been extended, even month to month until the results of the investigations most of the damage would/could have been avoided [...]”

that “my complaints are all related to the fact that my appointment was not extended and the reasons and the manner in which this non-extension was handled” “my appeal to the Secretary-General within the required deadline from the receipt of the letters from the OIOS and ICTY clearing me of any misconduct which was a significant development in my case and should constitute “exceptional circumstances”” “I did not appeal the fact that an investigation into allegations against me was conducted, but that this was used as the basis for non-extension of my appointment by the Secretary-General”.

*ratione materiae*      *ratione temporis*

“should the Joint Appeals Board take the view that the appeal’s receivability should be judged on the basis of the other matters referred to in the Applicant’s submissions (being the non-renewal of his appointment; the waiver of his immunity; and the conduct of the investigations into allegations against him), the Respondent would again submit that the appeal is not receivable”:









□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

