



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/GVA/2025/052

Order No.: 124 (GVA/2025)

Date: 11 November 2025

Original: English

Before: Judge Sun Xiangzhuang

Registry: Geneva

Registrar: Liliana López Bello

RAMAN

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

**ORDER ON A MOTION FOR
INTERIM MEASURES**

Counsel for Applicant:

Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent:

Halil Goksan, AS/ALD/OHR/UN Secretariat

Fabian M. Preger, AS/ALD/OHR/UN Secretariat

Introduction

1. On 31 October 2025, the Applicant, a staff member of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (“ESCAP”) in New Delhi, filed a motion for interim measures seeking suspension of the decision to change his First Reporting Officer (“FRO”).

2. For the reasons set out below, the Applicant’s request for interim measures is dismissed.

Facts

3. By email dated 2 June 2025, the Head of Office, Economic Affairs (“HO/EA”), ESCAP, informed the Applicant that the Assistant Administrative Officer at the National Officer-A level would serve as the Applicant’s FRO during the 2025-2026 performance cycle (“the contested decision”).

4. By email dated 24 June 2025, the HO/EA, ESCAP, reiterated to the Applicant that the contested decision was final, requested him to comply with that decision and submit his workplan to his FRO for his review.

5. Upon the Applicant’s request for reconsideration, by email dated 25 June 2025, the HO/EA, ESCAP again reiterated the contested decision and informed the Applicant that she would “no longer respond to [his] continued complaints and failure to comply”.

6. On 30 July 2025, the Applicant filed a request for management evaluation of the contested decision.

7. On 2 August 2025, the Applicant filed an incomplete application together with an incomplete motion for interim measures. The Tribunal instructed the Applicant to complete his submissions by using the appropriate forms.

8. On 8 August 2025, the Applicant filed a motion for extension of time to complete his application.

9. On 11 September 2025, the Chief, Management Advice and Evaluation Section (“MAES”) informed the Applicant that his request for management evaluation was not receivable.

10. On 16 October 2025, the Registry instructed the Applicant to complete his application, including his motion for interim measures, by 31 October 2025.

11. On 31 October 2025, the Applicant filed the present motion for interim measures. He did not complete the application on the merits, as instructed.

12. The motion for interim measures was served on the Respondent, who filed his reply on 7 November 2025, contesting, *inter alia*, the receivability of said motion.

Consideration

13. Interim measures during the proceedings are governed by art. 10.2 of the Tribunal’s Statute and art. 14.1 of its Rules of Procedure. The latter, which replicates almost completely the former, provides that:

At any time during the proceedings, the Dispute Tribunal may order interim measures to provide temporary relief where the contested administrative decision appears *prima facie* to be unlawful, in cases of particular urgency and where its implementation would cause irreparable damage. This temporary relief may include an order to suspend the implementation of the contested administrative decision, except in cases of appointment, promotion or termination.

14. In light of the above-mentioned provisions, the motion on interim measures pending proceedings can only be entertained when there is an ongoing or pending substantive application (see *Corcoran* UNDT/2009/071, para. 35; *Utkina* UNDT/2009/096, para. 31; *Igbinedion* UNDT/2011/110, paras. 22-24).

15. In *Noor* Order No. 157 (NBI/2024), the Tribunal held that “these articles require the filing of a substantive application challenging a given administrative decision before an applicant can come before the Tribunal with a motion for interim measures during the proceedings”. Therefore, in the absence of a substantive application, “an applicant has no standing to file a motion for interim measures”.

16. In the current case, the Applicant filed his motion for interim measures in an incomplete application (Case No. UNDT/GVA/2025/052) for which he was granted an extension of time, but so far has not completed. It thus follows that since there is no substantive application before the Tribunal, the Applicant cannot invoke the Tribunal's power to grant injunctive relief through interim measures.

17. Furthermore, the legal provisions referred above prevents the Tribunal from passing judgment on a motion for interim measures seeking suspension of a decision that has already been implemented. Indeed, an application for interim measures serves only to preserve the *status quo*, not reverse it.

18. The Tribunal's jurisdiction in an application for interim measures is, therefore, limited.

19. In the present case, the Tribunal agrees with the Respondent in that the contested decision was implemented in June 2025 and cannot be reversed by a motion for interim measures. This is evident from the email of the HO/EA, ESCAP, to the Applicant dated 2 June 2025, whereby he was informed about the change of this FRO; this decision was also reiterated by the HO/EA in subsequent emails of 24 and 25 June 2025. Therefore, there is nothing to suspend at this stage.

20. It thus follows that, under the above two reasons, the motion for interim measures is not receivable.

Conclusion

21. In view of the foregoing, it is ORDERED THAT the Applicant's motion for interim measures is denied.

(Signed)

Judge Sun Xiangzhuang

Dated this 11th day of November 2025

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2025/052

Order No. 124 (GVA/2025)

Entered in the Register on this 11th day of November 2025

(Signed)

Liliana López Bello, Registrar, Geneva