UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL	
UNITED INATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL Date:	: 202 (NBI/2014)
	4 September 2014
Original:	English

Before: Judge Vinod Boolell

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Abena Kwakye-Berko

#### KIMUNGUI

v.

# SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

## ORDER ON RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO HAVE RECEIVABILITY CONSIDERED AS A PRELIMINARY ISSUE

Counsel for Applicant:

### Introduction

1. The Applicant filed an Application on 12 August 201th contest the decision to suspend him from duty in connectionithwan investigation into allegations of misconduct. He was serving as a driver the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) and the Somalia Eritrea Monitogi Group (SEMG) at the time of the Contested Decision.

2. The Application was served on the Respondent on 12 August 2014 with a deadline of 12 September 2014 by with he was to file a Reply.

3. On 23 August 2014, the Respondent filed a Motion for leave to file a Reply limited to receivability and tohave receivability consided as a preliminary issue along with a Reply on receivability. He subtred in his Reply on receivability that the Application is manifestly inadsociated on the following grounds: (a) the Applicant was not a staff member atethtime of the contested events, and the contested events are unrelated to floismer service as a staff memberat(one personae); (b) the Applicant has not requested management evaluation of the contested decision (tione materiae); and (c) the Application was filed outside of the time limit set out in article 8.1 of the UNDS tatute, and the three year statute of limitation in article 8.4 of the Statuter (tione temporis).

#### Case Management

4. Pursuant to art. 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Dispute Tribunal, the Tribunal may at any time issue an order or give any direction which appears to be appropriate for the fair and expeditiousspotisal of a case and to do justice to the parties.

5. Noting that the Respondent has raised the issue of receivability in this matter, it is judicious for the Tribunal to dealith this preliminary matter prior to making any rulings that relate to the **rite** of the Applicant's case.

6. In view of the fact that a hearing will not be held prior to a decision being rendered on the issue of receivability, the bunal must ensure that it has all documentary evidence and information that extremes vant to the issue than during its deliberations. In this vein, it is importation the Applicant to begiven the opportunity to file a response to the Respont be assertion of receivability.

In light of the foregoing,

It is hereby ORDERED that:

7. The Respondent's Motion to have receivility considered as a preliminary issue is granted. Consequily, the 12 September 2014 deadline for submission of the Respondent's substantive Reply is suspended.

8. The Applicant is to submit to the Registin Nairobi, via the e-filing portal (CCMS), no later than 21 September 2014 is comments on the ceivability of his claims and any documentary evidence **bends** relevant to this particular issue.

9. The Applicant is to limit himselfsolely to the issue of receivability in his response and not make any submission the substantive aspects of his case.

10. In the event that the Apipation is found to be reiozeable, the Tribunal will provide the Respondent with the rinstructions on the delande for submission of his substantive Reply.

(Signed)

Judge Vinod Boolell

Dated this <sup>4</sup>/<sub>4</sub> day of September 2014

Entered in the Register on this day of September 2014

(Signed)

Abena Kwakye-Berko, Registrar, Nairobi