

Introduction

1. On 15 March 2017, the Applicant, a Human Rights Officer at the P-3 level,

step 8,400 of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights ()JT111)-323(E77

she makes the following appeal:

As the present Application will make clear, the contested decision consists of two inextricably intertwined components.

to the express terms of a post-matching exercise whereby she was informed in writing that she would be laterally transferred from her former post in the Asia-

(GVA/2016) and Order No. 070 (GVA/2017) issued by the Dispute Tribunal and that the Respondent acted in good faith to find an interim solution to accommodate the Applicant.

4. The present case was reassigned to Judge Alexander W. Hunter, Jr. on 8 January 2018.

5. By Order No. 10 (NY/2018) issued on 19 January 2018, the Tribunal instructed submissions on non-receivability by 2 February 2018.

6. On 29 January 2018, the Applicant filed a motion for extension of time to file

7. By Order No. 22 (NY/2018) issued on 31 January 2018, the Tribunal granted ion of time and instructed the Applicant to file a response to the non-receivability by 9 February 2018.

8. On 8 February 2018, the Applicant filed

9. On 12 February 2017, by Order No. 35 (NY/2018), the Tribunal instructed the parties to participate in a Case Management Discussion (CMD) on 22 February 2018.

10. At the 22 February 2018 CMD, the Tribunal noted, *inter alia*, that the instant case appears to raise a preliminary issue of receivability *ratione materiae*. Both parties agreed that receivability can be dealt with on the papers as a preliminary issue.

the facts as set out in the application. Accordingly, it would therefore be appropriate for the Tribunal to decide the outstanding matters on the papers already on record. Furthermore, it would appear to the Tribunal that the remaining issues on the merits of the case can be identified as follows:

a. Was it appropriate for OHCHR to place the Applicant on a general temporary assistance funded post, also considering Orders No. 189 (GVA/2016) and 70 (GVA/2017) issued by the Dispute Tribunal in Geneva, or should they have done differently (for instance, by placing her on a post with a regular budget)?

b. Did the Respondent meet its obligation to provide the Applicant with functions commensurate to her skills and professional experience?

17. Accordingly, pursuant to art. 19 of the Dispute Tribunal's Rules of Procedure, for the fair and expeditious disposal of the case and to do justice to the parties,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

18. InJ GfdG(me149(A)-7(ppli)-3(c)4(a)4(nt))JTJETQ00000912 0 612 792 reW*n21 169/F1 12 Tf1 0 0