

UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Introduction

1. On 16 May 2017, the Applicant, a Translator at the

not, to state what other consideration and/or disposal they are seeking.

5. On 9 April 2019, the Applicant filed her submission in response to Order No. 57 (NY/2019) indicating that (a) it is not for the Applicant to determine whether her claims are identical to the arguments considered by the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842; (b) the Applicant has nothing to add with respect to such judgments; and, (c) the Applicant does not wish to withdraw her claim.

6. By Order No. 65 (NY/2019) dated 10 April 2019, the Tribunal instructed the Applicant to clarify whether they still represent the Applicant and to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842. In the event that the Applicant did not seek to distinguish her case from these rulings, she was to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842. In the event that the Applicant did not seek to distinguish her case from these rulings, she was to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842.

7. By Order No. 68 (NY/2019) dated 23 April 2019, the Tribunal ordered Counsel for the Applicant to clarify whether they still represent the Applicant and to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842. In the event that the Applicant did not seek to distinguish her case from these rulings, she was to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842. In the event that the Applicant did not seek to distinguish her case from these rulings, she was to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842. In the event that the Applicant did not seek to distinguish her case from these rulings, she was to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842.

8. On 29 April 2019, the Applicant filed a notice of withdrawal of claim UNDT/NY/2017/047.

Judgment

9. There being no matter for judicial consideration and determination in this case, it is ordered that Case No. UNDT/NY/2017/047 be closed.

(Signed)

Judge Goolam Meeran

Dated this 30th day of April 2019

Entered in the Register on this 30th day of April 2019

(Signed)

Nerea Suero Fontecha, Registrar, New York