

holding fixed-term appointments shall be retained in preference of staff members with lower level protection.

8. The Applicant further claims that her long service with the Organization and excellent performance were not taken into account for the posts within the Secretariat to which she applied. It cannot therefore be said, she submits, that there were no suitable posts onto which she could have been placed pursuant to staff rule 9.6.

9. The Respondent states that her contract expired rather than was terminated and, therefore, staff rules 9.6(e) and (f) do not apply. Thus, there was no applicable decision to be made. Further, the Respondent states that in any event no administrative decision was made under article 2.1

10. The Respondent states that her contract expired rather than was terminated and, therefore, staff rules 9.6(e) and (f) do not apply. Thus, there was no applicable decision to be made. Further, the Respondent states that in any event no administrative decision was made under article 2.1 is also a reviewable administrative decision. She refers to previous jurisprudence of this Tribunal such as *Evans* Order No. 281 (NY/2017) stating:

35. 6] TJET00.00000912 0 612 792 reW*nBT/F1 12 Tf1 0 0 1 1233 q81.24 Tm0 g0 3

Case No. UNDT/NY/2019/016

Judgment No. UNDT/2020/066