

UNITED N

Introduction

1. On 15 July 2022, the Applicant, a former staff member of the Office of the impose on him the disciplinary measure of demotion with deferment, for two years, of eligibility for consideration for promotion, in accordance with staff rule 10.2(a)(vii). In his application the Applicant requests, *inter alia*, permission to exceed the page limit for the filing and anonymization of his name in all published orders and judgments.
2. The Respondent filed a reply on 15 August 2022 submitting that the contested decision was lawful. In his reply, the Respondent requested permission to exceed the page limit in the filing given the factual complexity of the case, the length of the application, and the need to summarize and cite relevant evidence.
3. On 5 October 2022, the Respondent filed additional documentation that was

Considerations

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 expeditious disposal of a case and to do justice to the parties.

On the requests for leave to exceed the page limits

5. requests to exceed the page limits for the application and reply respectively.

On

Respondent confirmed in his reply that the Applicant received a total of 266 supporting documents, only 20 of which (i.e., 7.5% of the casefile) were partially redacted, to protect the privacy or due process rights of other staff members, with the content relating to the Applicant being perfectly legible. The Applicant has not identified any document on which the Administration relied, that had not been provided to him, nor does he provide sufficient submissions to support his request for unredacted documents. Accordin

7. The Applicant further requests the production of all exchanges between B. Gawanas and K. Joenpolvi and between B. Gawanas and B. Swanson (OIOS) related

The Tribunal finds that the production of these , would not have any impact on the assessment of the respect of the due process rights of the Applicant. The request for their disclosure constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition.

8.

production of evidence.

On the Applicant's request for anonymity

9. The Applicant requests anonymization of his name in all published orders and j

sufficient grounds to grant confidentiality (*Buff* 2016-UNAT-639, citing *Kazazi* 2015-UNAT-557).

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

11. The
application and reply are granted;

Case No. UNDT/NY/2022/037

Order No. 070