

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2014/058

Judgment No. UNDT/2014/126

decision (and that the request would not be entertained). He stressed that UN/C0- actions were considered to be one of more immediate administrative decisions' (the Applicant) (advised to present the

15. The respondent's actions are

a. The respondent failed to identify a contestable administrative decision in his request for management evaluation UN/C0-7 as opposed to dismissive of the request and to make a decision on appeal

4. The respondent understands that in the applicant's administrative decision that UN/C0-7 is a management evaluation decision as follows

%. The applicant on the part of UN/C0-3 is not the "national" of the Commission of the UN Staff Regulations and General Conference

%. UN/C0-3 is not taking an "administrative" decision on the "safety" and "protection" of the "national" of the Commission and the investigation against the applicant and

%%. The decision of the applicant UN/C0-7 is a "national" and "national" environment.

&. The respondent to the question 7 (the administrative decision referred to in the applicant's administrative decision) constitute a management evaluation as manifested in the respondent's answer to the applicant's question 7 as a result of the alleged national to the issue of the proceedings before the national courts in 2012

d. The respondent's actions before the national courts ()-357.546(s)-5.2122-0.96

5T/A//266 read 7(t(5T/5G!/168 to #+o8%de safet" and #+ote&t%ion to fun&t%iona\$ %mmun%t" of staff mem4e+s' and as g%8en unde+ t(e 1646 Gene8a Con8ent%on1.

1 . As stated a4o8e' t(e A##%&ant fu+t(e+ +efe+s to t(e)%na&t%ion on t(e #a+t of *UN/C0-3 %n not t%me\$" %n8o@%ing #+o8%is%ions of C(a+te+ of t(e UN' 5taff Aegu\$at%ions/Au\$es and Gene8a Con8ent%on1 and UN/C0-)not (a8%ing ta@en an" de&%s%ion on #+o8%d%ing t(e safet" and #+ote&t%ion at t(e 7o+@#%a&e and t%me\$"

considered that the arbitration must be selected as the one on
the ground above.

21. On 8th of August 2014 the administrative decision was identified by the
applicant in submitting the request for management evaluation on 24 August 2014
relating to issues 7 and 8 of the 'latest' name to an end in November 2014. The
applicant failed to refer to the 60-day statute time limit to request management
evaluation under staff rule 11.2.2. The failure to file a time request for
management evaluation renders the arbitration clause 'null and void'

2014 UNAT B4022.

22. In 8th of the foregoing the Tribunal D0C/D05D

The arbitration is selected.

2

Judge Thomas

Dated this 20th day of September 2014