

Translated from French

Translated from French

Judgment No. UNDT/2011/125

- 12. On 13 July 2006, the Applicant was informed that another review of his case had been carried out with the involvement of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Establishment of the Ethics Office. However, the Ethics. Office remained of the same view.
- 13. In an email dated 14 July 2006, the Applicant reiterated his disagreement and again requested a copy of document A/58/708, which was subsequently sent to him.
- 14. On 21 July 2006, the Applicant again requested revision of the Office's decision.
- 15. On 9 August 2006, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Establishment of the Ethics Office replied that although the Applicant might feel that his rights had been violated, his case did not lie within the purview of the Ethics Office but that that opinion was without prejudice to his right to appeal to another forum.
- 16. On 4 September 2006, the Applicant sent another request for review of the decision made by the Ethics Office; by letter dated 14 December 2006, the

Judgment No. UNDT/2011/125

20.

By Order No. 99 (GVA/2011) of 10 June 2011, the Tribunal requested the

parties to provide additional input on the receivability ratione temporis of the

application under review, which the Applicant and the Respondent did on 16 and

23 June 2011, respectively. On 25 June, the Applicant requested permission to

submit observations on the Respondent's comments of 23 June. By Order No. 109

(GVA/2011), the Tribunal authorized him to do so. The Applicant submitted his

observations on 5 July 2011.

Parties' contentions

21. The Applicant's contentions are:

a. With regard to the receivability of the application, the Tribunal

stated in Hunt-Matthes UNDT/2011/063 that a decision of the Ethics

Office was an administrative decision for the purposes of article 2.1(a) of

the UNDT Statute and that accordingly, the application contesting the

Office's decision on a complaint by a staff member was receivable;

b. The Applicant's request for review is not time-barred since the

contested decision was taken on 9 August 2006 and he submitted his

request to the Administrative Law Unit on 4 September 2006, less than

two months later. Only in his second reply did the Respondent maintain

that the application was inadmissible because it was time-barred, whereas

there was nothing to prevent him from doing so sooner;

c. The Ethics Office abused its discretionary authority. The

Organization's discretionary authority is not unlimited and cannot be

invoked to violate United Nations rules;

d. In issuing the contested decision, the Ethics Office committed

numerous flaws that undermined the whole review procedure: it did not

give the reasoning for its decision or identify the legal foundation thereof,

and it relied on an Office of Internal Oversight Services report that had no

legal standing. The consideration of his case by the Ethics Office lacked

Page 5 of 9

Judgment No. UNDT/2011/125

A staff member wishing to appeal an administrative decision ... shall, as a first step, address a letter to the Secretary-General requesting that the administrative decision be reviewed; such letter must be sent within two months from the date the staff member received notification of the decision in writing ...

- 24. Furthermore, former staff rule 111.2(f) provided that "[a]n appeal shall not be receivable unless the time limits specified ... have been met ... ".
- 25. It is clear from these provisions that the present application would only be admissible if the Applicant had submitted a request for review within two months of notification of the contested decision.
- 26. The facts as stated above indicate that, on 23 May 2006, the Applicant submitted a complaint to the Chief of the Ethics Office concerning acts that, in his view, constituted retaliation and that on 30 June 2006, the Ethics Office replied that the acts that he had reported did not show any retaliatory action. On the same

Translated from French

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2011/040 (UNAT 1646) Judgment No. UNDT/2011/125

(Signed)