Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2015/072

Order No.: 230 (NBI/2015)

Date: 2 July 2015 Original: English

**Before:** Judge Vinod Boolell

Registry: Nairobi

**Registrar:** Abena Kwakye-Berko

LEE SIN CHEONG

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

ORDER ON AN APPLICATION FOR SUSPENSION OF ACTION

## **Counsel for the Applicant:**

Jiries Saadeh, OSLA

## **Counsel for the Respondent:**

Steven Dietrich, ALS/OHRM

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2015/072

Order No.: 230 (NBI/2015)

The Application and Procedural History

1. The Applicant is a Receiving and Inspection Assistant at the United Nations

Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

(MONUSCO). He serves on a continuing appointment at the FS-4 level in Entebbe,

Uganda.

2. On Saturday, 27 June 2015, the Applicant filed an Application for Suspension

of Action seeking an injunction against the decision not to renew his appointment

beyond 30 June 2015.

3. The Application was seen and processed by the Registry of the United

Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT) in Nairobi on 29 June 2015, and was served on the

Respondent on the same day.

4. The Respondent filed his Reply to the Application on 30 June 2015, and the

Applicant was afforded the opportunity to make submissions in response to the

Reply.

5. The Respondent informed the Tribunal that the impugned decision has been

stayed pending management evaluation, and that there is therefore no issue to be

adjudicated upon by the Tribunal.

6. The Applicant contends that the Respondent's assurance to suspend the

"unlawful decision to terminate his continuing appointment" is inadequate, and does

not "cure or otherwise remedy the unlawful actions of the Respondent which form the

substance of the Applicant's case." Only an order of the court "can provide the

Applicant with sufficient peace of mind that his substantive rights will not continue to

be violated by the Respondent." (By way of example, the Applicant informs the

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2015/072

Order No.: 230 (NBI/2015)

Tribunal that as at the time of filing, the Applicant has not been paid for the month of

June and that no explanation has been forthcoming).

**Deliberations** 

7. Applications for suspension of action are governed by article 2.2 of the

Statute of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal and article 13 of the Tribunal's Rules

of Procedure.

8. The three statutory prerequisites contained in art. 2.2 of the Statute, i.e. *prima* 

facie unlawfulness, urgency and irreparable damage, must be satisfied for an

application for suspension of action to be granted.

9. The remedy under art.13 is only available for the period of review by the

Management Evaluation Unit (MEU). Whatever the Tribunal's decides and orders in

respect of the lawfulness or otherwise of an administrative decision, the order lapses

as soon as MEU completes its review and issues its decision. That period can be for

as long as 45 days, but it has in many cases been seen to be shorter.

10. In the present case, the Tribunal and the Applicant have on record the

Respondent's undertaking that the impugned decision has been suspended pending

review of the matter by MEU.

11. As it is the role of MEU, as prescribed in ST/SGB/2010/9 (Organization of

the Department of Management), to conduct "an impartial and objective evaluation of

administrative decisions contested by staff members of the Secretariat to assess

whether the decision was made in accordance with rules and regulations," the

Tribunal finds it appropriate under the circumstances of the present case, and given

the Respondent's undertaking, that the Unit be afforded the opportunity carry out that

evaluation and, if necessary, "propose means of informally resolving disputes"

between the Applicant and the Respondent.

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2015/072

Order No.: 230 (NBI/2015)

12. Since the Respondent has stated that the decision to terminate the Applicant

would not be taken until MEU gives its decision it would make no difference if the

Tribunal makes a similar order as whatever order the court makes will automatically

lapse through the decision of MEU, an emanation of management itself. To that

extent it may be wondered whether article 13 still has its raison d'être.

13. The Application for Suspension of Action pending management evaluation is

therefore moot, and so **DISMISSED**.

(Signed)

Judge Vinod Boolell

Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July 2015

Entered in the Register on this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July 2015

(Signed)

Abena Kwakye-Berko, Registrar, Nairobi