



UNITED NATIONS APPEALS T

THE UNITED NATIONS A

10. As this Tribunal stated in *Shanks* and *Costa*, “the authority of a final Judgment – *res judicata* – cannot be so readily set aside. There are only limited grounds, as enumerated in Article 11 of the Statute of the Appeals Tribunal, for review of a final judgment.”²

11. This Court also held in *Beaudry* that “any application which, in fact, seeks a review of a final judgment rendered by the Appeals Tribunal can, irrespective of its title, only succeed if it fulfills the strict and exceptional criteria established by Article 11 of the Statute”.³

12. The request filed by Mr. Ghahremani constitutes, in fact, a disguised way to criticize the Judgment or to expose grounds to disagree with it, following a style of cross-references to other documents that makes it mostly incomprehensible and certainly indirectly violates the page limitation for such an application.

13. There is no reason Mr. Ghahremani could not have filed his petition for revision within 30 calendar days of the discovery of the facts as provided for in Article 11(1) of the Statute, since he knew the Judgment when his counsel was notified with a full copy on 2 December 2011.

14. Thus, the petition submitted more than four months late is time-barred.

Judgment

15. The application for revision is dismissed.

² *Shanks v. United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board*, Judgment No. 2010-UNAT-026bis, para. 4; *Costa v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2010-UNAT-063, para. 4 (citing *Shanks, ibid.*).

³ *Beaudry v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2011-UNAT-129, para. 16.

THE