

Introduction

1. By a decision rendered on 12 August 2014, the Administrative Tribunal (the Tribunal) was requested to annul the decision of the Director of Confessions, Management and Information Systems of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva, dated 12 October 2013, which denied the applicant's request for a permanent position (beyond the end of November 2014).

Facts

2. The Administrative Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General. The Tribunal is composed of a President and five members.

4. In 2011 and 2012, the Administrative Tribunal was requested to annul the decision of the Director of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva, dated 14 August 2012, which denied the applicant's request for a permanent position. The Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General.

4. In 2014, the Administrative Tribunal was requested to annul the decision of the Director of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva, dated 1 July 2014, which denied the applicant's request for a permanent position. The Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General.

5. The Administrative Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General.

"> The Administrative Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General. The Tribunal is composed of a President and five members. In 2011 and 2012, the Administrative Tribunal was requested to annul the decision of the Director of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva, dated 14 August 2012, which denied the applicant's request for a permanent position. The Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General. In 2014, the Administrative Tribunal was requested to annul the decision of the Director of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva, dated 1 July 2014, which denied the applicant's request for a permanent position. The Tribunal was established pursuant to article 3 of the Statute of the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva on 4 June 2011, after 25 years of its existence under the mandate of the Secretary-General.

for the amount of the year (the amount of the year) payment
of amount-s0 "n eA#ess of t&e !m"t of 125 days a#tua!!y ' o\$Bed
' "!! (e effe#ted.

6.

11. 3 n 25 No+em(e\$ 2014% t&e A !"#ant \$e: uested manage

16. A &ea\$ng "n t&e \$esen#e of t&e a\$t'es ' as &e!d on 2C 3#to(e\$ 2014. Du\$ng t&e &ea\$ng% and (y 3\$de\$ No. 195 -GVA/20140 of 2C 3#to(e\$ 2014% t&e T\$(una! \$e: uested t&e *es ondent to \$o+"de add"t"ona! eA !anat"ons% inter alia% ' "t& \$es e#t to t&e fa#t t&at "n &"s ema"! of 1C No+em(e\$ 2014 to t&e A !"#ant% t&e C&"ef% CT2% &ad stated t&at .t&e C&"nese T\$ans!at"on 2e\$+"#e "n DGAC , &ad d"s#ont"nued use of tem o\$a\$y on)(oa\$d f\$ee)!an#e #ont\$a#ts "n +"e ' of #ont\$a#tua! t\$ans!at"on/ and t&e *es ondent<s adm"ss"on "n t&e f\$ame ' o\$B of t&e \$esent \$o#eed"ngs t&at "n fa#t s"A f\$ee!an#e\$s% out of ' &"#& fou\$ ' e\$e \$et"\$ees% &ad (een em !oyed "n De#em(e\$ 2014.

19. T&e *es ondent f"led t&e \$e:u"\$ed eA !anat"ons on 1 De#em(e\$ 2014% and t&e A !"#ant \$es onded t&e\$eto on 15 De#em(e\$ 2014.

Parties' contentions

1;.

d. The C&EF CT2 a !es su#& d"ffe\$ent"a! t\$eatment of Set"\$ees also ' "t& \$es e#t to t&e t"m"ng of #ont\$a#ts a##o\$d"ng to e\$sona! needs and t&e #om !eA"ty of t&e ass"gnment

e. The a\$gument t&at &e ' as g\$anted a #ont\$a#t (y t&e C&EF CT2 "n 2012 and 2014 does not s&o ' t&at t&e !atte\$ t\$eats &"m e:ua!!y \$at&e\$ "t s&o 's t&at t&e C&EF CT2 ' anted to a+o"d any #&a\$ges of sta\$B d"s#\$"m"nat"on

f. The *es ondent<s a\$gument of #ost)effe#t"+eness does not stand s"n#e on t&e #ont\$a\$y Set"\$ees ' &o a\$e !ess \$odu#t"+e! eff"#ent and :ua!"f"ed t&an t&e A !"#ant &a+e (een g\$anted t&e maA"imum of 125

od\$eas .84125(-3.81746(")0.96024.76.

treatment of the staff to the extent of the employment contracts and assignment of documents and to take a position against the C&EF CT2 for a number of years.

1C. The respondent's arguments are:

a. The Applicant's letter of appointment states that following the settlement of the appointments of the United Nations staff to the conditions that the employee must have a minimum of 125 days of actual work. The letter of appointment further notes under the heading 'Conditions that to the extent of the provisions of the rules of the employment organization governing the staff rules and conditions of work' as provided by the Agreement between the United Nations System/Chief Executive Board for Coordination and the Association internationale des traducteurs de conférence regulating the conditions of employment of short term translators and persons serving in related functions - CEB/ATC agreement that the status of the Applicant did not have any effect on the grant of the 125 working days of work.

(. The Applicant's argument that he had a legitimate right to have

&ad no o(!"gat"on to offe\$ t&e A !"#ant s&o\$t)te\$m #ont\$a#ts% su o\$ted t&e
A !"#ant<s a o"ntments "n 2012 and 2014G

d. T&e (a#B!og "n CT2 ' as "ns"gn"f"#ant as of 14 No+em(e\$ 2014 and
#ou!d (e \$o#essed ."n)&ouse/ and no "m o\$tant meet"ngs ' e\$e to (e &e!d "n
De#em(e\$G t&e\$efo\$e% "n +"e ' of \$o!e#ted ' o\$B!oad t&e A !"#ant<s se\$+"#e
' as no !onges\$ needed and t&e \$easons \$o+"ded to &"m ' e\$e su o\$ted (y
t&e fa#tsG

e. T&e *es ondent adm"ts t&at &"s \$efe\$en#e to .Segu!a\$ staff/ (e"ng a(!e
to \$o#ess t&e ' o\$B!oad e+en "f "t ' e\$e s"gn"f"#ant% #onta"ned "n t&e \$es onse
to t&e sus ens"on of a#"on% ' as "na##u\$ateG &o ' e+e\$% t&"s ' as @ust an .e+en
"f/ eAt\$a o!at"on% and t&e \$e#o\$d s&o ' s t&at "n fa#t% t&e C&"ef% CT2% &ad
#ons"stent!y &e!d t&at t&e ' o\$B!oad #ou!d (e \$o#essed (y t&e .stand"ng
#a a#"ty/"n)&ouse/% ' &"#& &as a d"ffe\$ent mean"ng t&an .Segu!a\$ staff/G

f.

1. The nature of the status of the issue at stake is the right to be heard and to be given an additional 10 days in 2014 and four in 2012. The amount of the award is 121 days in 2012 and 106 in 2014. The amount of the award is to be paid as damages and the award is to be paid in full.

2. The award should be set aside in its entirety.

Consideration

20. According to the longstanding jurisprudence of the Administrative Tribunal (under the former law) and the provisions of the law, the award of damages is not subject to any limitation of the amount of the award to any type of award - ordinary

22. The employment of Settees' staff (y Adm'n'stSat+e nst\$u#t'on 2T/A8/2004/;/Amend.2 -*etent'on "n se\$+"#e (eyond t&e mandato\$y age of se a\$at'on and em loyment of Settees' ' &"#& \$o+"des t&atF

5.1 Some staff mem(e\$s a(o+e t&e mandato\$y se a\$at'on age of 60% o\$ 62 fo\$ staff a o"nted on o\$ afte\$ 1 Janua\$y 1CCO% s&a!! not (e em loyed (y t&e 3\$gan"Hat"on% un!essF

-a0 T&e o e\$at'ona! \$e:u"\$ements of t&e 3\$gan"Hat"on #annot (e met (y staff mem(e\$s ' &o a\$e :ua!"f"ed and a+a"!(e to e\$fo\$m t&e \$e:u"\$ed fun#t"onsG

-(0 T&e \$o osed em loyment 'ou!d not ad+e\$se!y affe#t t&e #a\$ee\$ de+e!o ment o\$ \$ede loyment o o\$un"t'es of ot&e\$ staff mem(e\$s and \$e \$esents (ot& a #ost)effe#t"+e and o e\$at'ona!!y sound so!ut'on to meet t&e needs of t&e se\$+"#e.

and t&at

6.1 Em loyment of fo\$me\$ staff ' &o a\$e "n \$e#e" t of a ens'on (enef"t f\$om t&e Un"ted Nat"ons Jo"nt 2taff Pens'on 7und s&a!! (e su(\$e#t to t&e fo!lo "ng \$est\$#"t"onsF

D

-(0 1 language se\$+"#es staff may not (e \$e)em loyed fo\$ mo\$e t&an 125 days a#tua!y ' o\$Bed du\$ng a #a!enda\$ yea\$

24. 2e#t'on 9 of t&e same adm'n"stSat+e "nst\$u#t'on \$o+"des t&atF

*et"\$ees f\$om anot&e\$ #ommon system o\$gan"Hat"on may eA#e t'ona!y (e em loyed "n t&e a(sen#e of :ua!"f"ed and a+a"!(e non)\$et"\$ee #and"dates% as 'e!! as of :ua!"f"ed and a+a"!(e Un"ted Nat"ons \$et"\$ee #and"dates% \$o+"ded t&e #ond"t"ons "n se#t'ons 5 and 6 of t&e \$esent "nst\$u#t'on a\$e met.

24. The !"m"tat'on offset fo\$& "n se#. 6.1-(0 "s #onf"\$med (y t&e A !"#ant:s lette\$ of a o"ntment on f"le% ' &"#& notes unde\$ s e#"a! #ond"t"ons% inter alia% t&at .t&"s offe\$ and #onse:uent a o"ntments a\$e su(\$e#t to a maA"mum !"m"t of 125 days a#tua!y ' o\$Bed e\$ #a!enda\$ yea\$/.

25. 8t "s #!ea\$ f\$om t&e a#tua! ' o\$d"ng of t&e a(o+e):uoted \$o+"s"ons t&at \$et"\$ees ' &o a\$e em loyed as !anguages se\$+"#es staff do not &a+e an ent"t!ement o\$ a /\$g&t/ to (e em loyed fo\$ a maA"mum of 125 ' o\$B"ng daysG \$at&e\$% t&e a !"#a(!e \$ules I #onf"\$med (y t&e s e#"a! #ond"t'on #onta"ned "n t&e A !"#ant:s

letter of appointment issued by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPO) to the staff member in question, beyond the maximum of 125 days actually worked in the calendar year. As such, the conditions of employment of the staff member in question are in accordance with the provisions of the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations Secretariat, and the conditions of employment of the staff member in question are in accordance with the provisions of the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations Secretariat.

26. In the case at hand, the Applicant was granted separate temporary appointments upon his reassignment to UN3N and at DC, UN3G. It is not disputed that the Applicant was employed for a total of 106 working days in 2014. In the event of the Applicant's absence, he did not receive an entitlement per se to be granted an extension of his appointment up to the maximum of 125 days actually worked.

29. The foregoing notwithstanding, and taking into account the fact that the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate) and the fact that the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate), the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate).

2;. In the event of the Applicant's absence in 2014, the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate) and the fact that the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate).

2C. The Applicant's absence in 2014 was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate) and the fact that the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate).

40. The Applicant's absence in 2014 was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate) and the fact that the Applicant's absence was due to the Applicant's illness (which was certified by a medical certificate).

Conclusion

4; 8n + "e ' of t&e fo\$ego"ng% t&e T\$" (una! DEC8DE2F

T&e a !"#at"on "s \$e#ted.

-Signed0

Judge T&omas 1aBe\$

Ente\$ed "n t&e *eg"ste\$ on t&"s 1C^{t&} day of D 2()-5.808160()-5.808169 11.28 T f D-155.698 664.56 T