

Introduction

Applicant's submission on not to consider its position or to post on the report of the Director of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva.

Facts

The applicant is a former employee of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva. The applicant was employed by OHCHR from 2008 to 2014. The applicant was employed in the position of a staff officer in the Department of Administration and Finance.

In August 2014, the applicant was notified that her position was being reclassified. The applicant was notified that her position was being reclassified from a staff officer to a staff officer (senior). The applicant was notified that her position was being reclassified from a staff officer to a staff officer (senior) in the Department of Administration and Finance.

The applicant's position was reclassified from a staff officer to a staff officer (senior) in the Department of Administration and Finance. The applicant was notified that her position was being reclassified from a staff officer to a staff officer (senior) in the Department of Administration and Finance.

Parties' submissions

Applicants present contentions regarding the Commission's interpretation of the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial. They argue that the Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial.

The Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence is based on the principle of equality before the law. The Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with this principle.

The Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial. The Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial.

The Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial. The Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial.

Consideration

As previously stated, the Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial. The Commission's interpretation is inconsistent with the Human Rights Committee's jurisprudence on the right to a fair trial.

Crstns n

r n s putt n or r o s not st ro s or r on t ons o
s r Inst t r s s ro n pr s nt s n t r n n t
“ t r t t n t t ons t t s o n st t nt o urr on
D r r t s s t r un s o p a t n r
n or t on on t s po nt n “ t us not r pronoun nt n t s
r sp t

r un “ t r or o o nto t r t r t on t r o
t pr s nt p a t on

t ru n nt E u t on pro s t t

A st r s n to or “ ont st n
n str t s on “ n non o p n t s or r
ontr t o p o nt or t r s o p po nt nt n u n “
p rt n nt r u t ons n ru s pursu nt to st

pa n t t t p r s n t s o s n o t a t n n o t s t t u t o r p t o n s
r o r r q u s t o r n n t a u t o n s r q u r

— In t o n t o t u n u o u s t r s o t o r s p r o s o n s t
r q u r n t o r q u s t n n n t a u t o n p r o r t o a n n p a t o n
t t r u n a s n n r a u p a t A p p a s r u n a
o s n

It is also important to understand that Applicant's motion for
restitution is not a claim for compensation or damages, but a claim for
restitution of the property itself. The Applicant's motion is not a claim
for compensation or damages, but a claim for restitution of the property
itself. In particular, the Applicant's motion is not a claim for
restitution of the property itself.