

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2023/077

1. On 27 November 2024, the Tribunal issued its judgment in the above-captioned case. *ATR UNDT/2024/100*.
2. On 18 December 2024, the Respondent filed a Motion for Correction of Judgment, pursuant to article 12.2 of the Statute of the Dispute Tribunal. The motion alleges that footnote 1 of the judgment “contains inaccurate information” and requests that the footnote be deleted “in its entirety.”
3. In particular, the Respondent takes issue with Tribunal’s observation that it appears higher-level staff members receive lighter punishment than others for sexual harassment. He claims that this “wrongly suggests that the Organization applies class-justice, which it pertinently does not.”
4. Respondent’s motion implies that the Tribunal conflated sexual harassment with workplace harassment of a non-sexual nature. He further asserts that “data maintained by the Administrative Law Division, Office of Human Resources, ... supports the conclusion that higher-level staff members were sanctioned more severely in sexual harassment and in workplace harassment cases.” The motion then proceeds to give what Respondent believes to be illustrative examples over the period of 2020 to 2024, differentiating between staff members at grades “P4 & above” and those at grades “P3 & below”.
5. The Tribunal first notes that its observations in footnote 1 are based upon language in a related case, *Sophocleous UNDT/2024/080*, para. 126, where the Tribunal summarizes the sanction letter, which in turn referenced the Compendium of Disciplinary Measures. The most recent compendium posted online by the Office of Human Resources (OHR) covers cases from 1 July 2009 to 31 December 2023. Thus, the illustrative analysis described in the instant motion draws from a different data set (2020-2024) than the data upon which the challenged footnote was based.
6. Additionally, by referring only to staff members in the Professional (“P-

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2023/077

Order No. 167 (NBI/2024)

- iii. a summary of the established misconduct;
- iv. whether the Administration determined the misconduct to sexual harassment, (non-sexual) workplace harassment, and/or a combination of sexual and workplace harassment; and
- v. the precise disciplinary measure that was imposed.

(Signed)

Judge Sean Wallace

Dated this 19th day of June 2024