Case No.: UNDT/NY/2011/069

Judgment No.: UNDT/2011/158

Date: 7 September 2011

Original: English

Before: Judge Goolam Meeran

Registry: New York

Registrar: Santiago Villalpando

APPLICANT

٧.

SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT

ON APPLICATION FOR SUSPENSION OF ACTION

Counsel for Applicant: George Irving

Counsel for Respondent: Sarahi Lim Baró, ALS/OHRM, UN Secretariat

Notice: This Judgment has been corrected in accordationart. 31 of the Rices of Procedure of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal.

Case No. UNDT/NY/2011/069
Judgment No. UNDT/2011/158

Introduction

1. On 26 August 2011, at 1:38 p.m., theppNicant filed her application for

Case No. UNDT/NY/2011/069

Case No. UNDT/NY/2011/069 Judgment No. UNDT/2011/158

Consideration

Time limit for the Dispute Tribunal to consider the application

10. Under art. 13.2 of the Rules of Recodure of the Dispute Tribunal, the Tribunal "shall consider an application forternim measures withifive working days of the service of the application on the respondent".chording to the Information Note to Parties Appearing before the Undirections Dispute Tribunal, the Registry closes for filing purpose, at 5 p.m. note the application was only served on the Respondent after this hour, namel 15:202 p.m. (on Friday, 26 August 2011), the application is not considered as served on the Respondent before Monday, 29 August 2011. The time limit for the Tribunal to coider the case is therefore 10 September 2011, taking into account that 31 August 5 September 2011 were official holidays at the United Nation Secretariat, New York.

Does the decision appear to be prima facieunlawful?

11. The Applicant has to satisfy the test that the decision appears facie to be unlawful. In other words, does it apper to the Tribunal that, unless it is satisfactorily rebutted by evidence, the indi of unlawfulness will succeed? At this stage, the Applicant's allegations are atsisses that are not dequately supported by ed

Case No. UNDT/NY/2011/069 Judgment No. UNDT/2011/158

unlawfulness in relation to the only matter thats to be considered, i.e., whether the Tribunal should order a suspension medical evaluation process.