



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NY/2014/057  
Order No.: 268 (NY/2014)  
Date: 23 September 2014  
Original: English

---

**Before:** Judge Alessandra Greceanu

**Registry:** New York

**Registrar:** Hafida Lahiouel

OMWANDA

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

---

**ORDER**

**ON SUSPENSION OF ACTION**

---

**Counsel for Applicant:**  
Self-represented

**Counsel for Respondent:**  
Stephen Margetts, ALS/OHRM, UN Secretariat

Note: This Order has been corrected in accordance with Order 2014-NY-268/Corr.1.

## **Introduction**

1. On 16 September 2014, the Applicant, a Security Officer, Safety and Security Service (“SSS”), Department of Safety and Security (“DSS”), filed an application for suspension of action pending management evaluation, pursuant to art. 2.2 of the Statute of the Dispute Tribunal and art. 13 of its Rules of Procedure, of the decision of 12 September 2014 by the Chief of SSS concerning “the restriction of [his] service-issued weapon”.

2. In his application, the Applicant indicates that he requested management evaluation of the contested decision on 12 September 2014 and that he received a response to his request on 16 September 2014. To his application was appended:

a. A request for management evaluation dated 18 August 2014.

b. A letter from the Management Evaluation Unit (“MEU”) dated 29 August 2014 in which MEU acknowledges receipt of the aforementioned request and notes that it concerns the following matters:

(1) a decision to give you a performance notice and to place the adverse material in your file; (2) decisions to deny you a promotion in 2010 and 2014; (3) a decision to impose a \$3.50 ticket for security officers who have parking decals but work overtime; (4) a decision to prohibit the use of personal cellphones while on duty; (5) a denial of equal and fair treatment; and (6) a decision to refer your complaint (set out in your email of 2 July 2014) to the Chief of Security and Safety Service.

c. An email exchange from 12 to 14 September 2014 between various United Nations staff members, including the MEU’s generic email address (meu@un.org), in which, in an email dated 12 September 2014, the Applicant indicated that “I hope the noble office of the [Secretary-General] will look seriously into this matter [“decision to restrict [the Applicant’s] service-issued

weapon”] ... I plead, with utmost respect, to MEU to prevail upon [the Chief of SSS] to leave me alone so I can diligently serve the Organization that I love and remain loyal to the Secretary General”.

d. A letter dated 16 September 2014 to the Dispute Tribunal in New York from the Applicant in which he explains about the weapon restriction that:

Your Honor, the decision to restrict my weapon forms part of the performance notice I had previously contested through MEU and a letter sent to me that a decision will be reached on 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2014. I met [the Chief of MEU and a MEU staff member] today Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> September, 2014 at the Secretariat 20<sup>th</sup> Floor and we discussed the concerns. We also discussed the issue of the weapon restriction and they advised that I request [the Chief of SSS] for retraining since MEU did not have powers to view [the Chief of SSS] as having acted in contempt of a pending decision by MEU, a higher authority.

3. At 3:08 p.m., on 16 September 2014, the Registry, on behalf of the Tribunal, instructed the Applicant to upload his request for management evaluation concerning the case by 10:00 a.m. on 17 September 2014. At 3:39 p.m., the Applicant filed the same request for management evaluation dated 18 August 2014 which was appended to the application. At 4:03 p.m., the Registry, on behalf of the Tribunal, instructed the Applicant to file the request for management evaluation that he filed with the MEU, highlighting that the request which was to be filed was that of 12 September 2014. At 4:47 p.m., the Applicant filed the acknowledgement letter from the MEU dated 29 August 2014 and the letter to the Dispute Tribunal dated 16 September 2014, both of which were also appended to the application.

4. At 4:27 p.m., on 16 September 2014, the Registry acknowledged receipt of the application and, on behalf of the Tribunal, ordered the Respondent to submit his reply by 5:00 p.m., 18 September 2014. The Respondent did so and submitted that the application should be dismissed as the Applicant has “failed to establish the three

necessary preconditions for the grant of an order for suspension of action”. The Respondent made no mention of whether the Applicant had filed an additional request for management evaluation regarding the contested decision made by the Chief of SSS of 12 September 2014, namely to revoke the authorization to carry a service-issued weapon, but did refer to the performance notice which the Applicant mentioned in his 16 September 2014 letter (see para. 7 of the reply).

5. In response to Order No. 266 (NY/2014) dated 19 September 2014, the Respondent informed the Tribunal that the contested decision did not form part of the performance notice but was a separate decision and that, on the basis of his 12 September 2014 email (see para. 2(c) above), the MEU was currently assessing this decision. The Respondent further submitted some documents, including a SSS document labelled “in-service performance record” dated 1 July 2014 issued by an SSS Inspector. This document also included the performance notice referred to in his reply (see paras. 2(b) and 4 above).

6. On 21 September 2014, the Applicant filed and served an additional submission together with a series of documents. By Order No. 267 (NY/2014) dated 22 September 2014, the Tribunal requested the Respondent to file and serve his comments, if any, on the same day by 3:00 p.m., which the Respondent did.

### **Relevant background**

7. Based on the parties’ submissions and the documents before the Tribunal, the relevant factual background may be presented as set out below.

8. On 27 February 2014, the Applicant was posted at an entrance to the United Nations Secretariat building in New York where he was operating the gate controls (the so-called “Delta barriers”), when the gate operated by the Applicant closed on a car, causing minor damages to it. An investigation was conducted and determined that the incident occurred due to the Applicant’s negligence. This information is

included in the SSS document entitled “in-service performance record”. The performance notice (see paras. 2(d) and 4 above) was also included in this document, and in it was indicated that this notice was issued for “negligent performance, or behavior pattern that warrants greater than just counselling, but less than the more serious ‘Notice of Counsel.’ Performance Notices will be reflected in an individual’s ePerformance Report”.

9. By email of 10 September 2014 from a SSS Sergeant from the SSS training unit, the Applicant was instructed to participate in a re-training program on how to handle the gate, apparently at the request of the inspector who had issued the performance notice.

10. By email of 12 September 2014, at 9.37 a.m., the SSS Sergeant informed the Applicant that he had been scheduled for a one hour “Delta Barriers Re-Training” on Monday, 15 September 2014.

11. On the same date, the Applicant emailed the MEU, copying a range of United Nations staff members, including the Chief of SSS and the SSS Sergeant, stating:

This is another email from [the SSS Sergeant], who has been treating my case contemptuously since the matter is already before your noble office. He has chosen to re-train me on a post that I have competently performed and his insistence that I be re-trained is formed in very bad faith and malice. The junior SSS team, even after receiving my complaint and MEU writing to them that a decision will be reached soon to solve the issue, has resorted to unorthodox means of arm twisting me into submission. I will not attend the re-training session until my case is cleared.

12. In response to this email, on the same date, the Chief of SSS emailed the Applicant and explained:

The question of whether or not your performance was correct or not, or whether a written counselling or retraining directly associated with your performance was required is not under review by the MEU. Even

if it was, you do not get to decide what orders you will follow and what orders you decide not to follow. There is no dispute that you were the barrier operator on post 103, on Thursday, 27 February 2014, when the gate you were operating closed on a vehicle causing damage. The Service has an absolute duty of care to ensure that you are retrained in the proper operations of these devices, and it is somewhat surprising, that you would not jump at the opportunity for retraining, even if to reinforce or refresh your own knowledge. An organization, such as SSS, with the responsibility for the safety and security of all staff members, premises and operations in NY, whose members are armed, requires compliance with the lawful orders issued by superiors.

As such, your actions--specifically the refusal of the direction by your chain of command to be at an appointed place and time to receive training in my view calls into question your fitness to be armed and use, if required, deadly force. Therefore, as the authority for assigning weapons to members of SSS I must err on the side of caution. I am placing you on weapons restriction effective immediately in accordance with the DSS Weapons MOI dated May 2014. This restriction will be until further notice.

13. Responding to the email exchange, on the same date, the Applicant requested the MEU to undertake a management evaluation of the contested decision (see paras. 2(c) and 5 above). In a subsequent email of the same date, the Applicant noted that he had handed over his weapon with three magazines.

14. On 14 September 2014, responding again to the same email exchange, the Applicant stated that:

It is the second day of my duty without a weapon as part of my job description of protection of the UN staff, clients and property. [The Chief of SSS's] decision to withdraw my service-issued weapon has exposed me to a very serious insecurity as an unarmed unformed personnel. On Sunday 14/09/2014 few minutes after midnight, there was a breach of security at Post 97 (gate on 48 st 1 av) when a man shook the gate severally before sliding into the complex. [The New York Police Department] responded to the scene. I have been posted at a post within the building and my uniform exposes me to grave dangers of active shooting incident, should this happen, unfortunately! Previously, unauthorized persons have jumped over the fence, took the elevators to the 38th floor and into the [Secretary-General's] office

before being arrested. I would like you to take this matter into serious consideration before something bad happens to me in the course of my job as an unarmed uniformed personnel with nothing to protect myself and staff members who see the uniform as a sign of their protection. I am very worried since I do not know the intention of [the Chief of SSS] regarding the restriction of my weapon and what the recent incident at Post 97 means to me.

### **Consideration**

15. Pursuant to art. 2.2 of its Statute, the Dispute Tribunal:

... shall be competent to hear and pass judgment on an application filed by an individual requesting the Dispute Tribunal to suspend during the pendency of the management evaluation, the implementation of a contested administrative decision that is subject of an ongoing management evaluation, where the decision appears *prima facie* to be unlawful, in cases of particularly urgency, and, where its implementation would cause irreparable damage. The decision of the Dispute Tribunal on such an application shall not be subject to appeal.

16. Article 13.1 of the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure states that:

The Dispute Tribunal shall order a suspension of action on an application filed by an individual requesting the Dispute Tribunal to suspend, during the pendency of the management evaluation, the implementation of a contested administrative decision that is the subject of an ongoing management evaluation, where the decision appears *prima facie* to be unlawful, in cases of particular urgency and where its implementation would cause irreparable damage.

17. The Tribunal considers that, for an application for suspension of action to be successful, it must satisfy the following cumulative conditions:

- a. The application is receivable because it concerns an administrative decision that may properly be suspended by the Tribunal;
- b. The contested decision has not yet been implemented;

- c. The Applicant has submitted a request for management evaluation of the contested decision, which evaluation is currently pending;
- d. The impugned administrative decision appears *prima facie* to be unlawful;
- e. The case is of particular urgency; and
- f. Its implementation would cause irreparable damage.

*Procedural conditions, including receivability*

18. In *O'Neill* 2011-UNAT-182 (as also affirmed in *Christensen* 2013-UNAT-335), the Appeals Tribunal established that the UNDT shall examine its own jurisdiction although not contested. In this regard, it follows from art. 2.2 of the Statute of Dispute Tribunal and art. 13 of its Rules of Procedure that the suspension of a challenged decision may only be ordered when the management evaluation of that decision is ongoing (*Igbinedion* 2011-UNAT-159 and *Benchebbak* 2012-UNAT-256).

19. In response to Order No. 266 (NY/2014), the Respondent confirmed that the decision to revoke the Applicant's weapon authorization made on 12 September 2014 due to the Applicant's insubordination is a separate decision to the performance notice which was issued on 1 July 2014, that the Applicant filed a management evaluation request on 12 September 2014, and that the contested decision is currently undergoing management evaluation.

20. The Tribunal is therefore satisfied that the application is receivable because it concerns an administrative decision that may be properly suspended by the Tribunal and the contested decision is currently under review by the MEU.



21. The Applicant stated that he had handed over his weapon with three loaded magazines on 12 September 2014. As results from the contested decision, the Applicant was placed on weapons restriction with immediate effect from 12 September 2014 until further notice. Consequently, the Tribunal considers that the contested decision only started to be implemented on 12 September and its implementation is still ongoing until an unknown date. The Tribunal observes that the Respondent makes no submission as to the contested decision having already been “implemented” pursuant to art. 2.2 of the Statute and 13.1 of the Rules of Procedure.

22. In conclusion, the Tribunal finds that the first three procedural conditions for the application to be receivable are fulfilled.

*Substantive conditions*

23. The Tribunal will further analyze the three substantive conditions: *prima facie* unlawfulness, urgency and irreparable harm.

*Prima facie* unlawfulness

24. Concerning *prima facie* unlawfulness, the Applicant contends that the Chief of SSS restricted his “service-issued weapon without giving [him] a reason for doing so and signing a form to that effect” contravened ST/AI/309/Rev.2 (Authority of United Nations Security Officers). In his additional submission filed on 21 September 2014, the Applicant submits that the relevant Security Operating Standards (“SOP”) were changed intentionally so the Applicant’s alleged accident dated February 2014 could be used to intimidate and harass him. The Applicant contends that he continued to work at the Delta barriers after an incident in February 2014. He also avers that he contested the performance notice and the entire investigation process which breached his due process rights and that the Chief of SSS was aware that the MEU review is currently ongoing. The Applicant submits that

a weapons restriction can be ordered only in relation to a weapon related infraction, medical fitness or failure of the annual weapon qualifications and that Delta barrier training do not represent a firearm qualification. On the contrary, it is a requirement that a security officer possess a weapon in order to work at exterior Delta barrier posts as well as interior posts. The Applicant states that restricting his service-issued weapon is a punitive and not a corrective measure. The Applicant contends that he did not disobey an order but respectfully informed the Chief of SSS that the re-training was a recommendation by the SSS Special Investigation Unit (“SIU”) related to the administrative review of the performance notice. The Applicant notes that the accident in February 2014 should have been referred to the car’s insurer and resolved by the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs in accordance with ST/SGB/230 (Resolution of torts claims). The Applicant alleges that the Delta barriers re-training was connected to the incident in February 2014 for which he is not responsible. The Applicant avers that the SIU recommendations were implemented by keeping the Applicant off the Delta barriers, placing the performance notice in his file and recommending re-training as a measure to correct his negative performance. The Applicant submits that, since he did not receive a copy of the performance notice and the investigation report, he had no chance to defend himself (including having access to review the original recording of the accident) or to make any observations before the notice was included in his file.

25. In response, the Respondent submits that the decision was lawful as the Applicant had been “insubordinate” by refusing “to carry out his supervisor’s direction to attend a ... re-training” and that:

... [t]he Applicant has presented no evidence to establish that there can be any serious or reasonable doubt that [the Chief of SSS], in his role as a commander of a paramilitary security force, authorized to use deadly force, acted lawfully and appropriately in revoking weapon authorization where the Applicant refused to carry out directives of his superiors.

26. The Respondent contends that the Appeals Tribunal in *Kamunyi* 2012-UNAT-194 held that “a security officer was required to comply with a direct order even where he believed the order was unlawful” and that the Applicant had failed to do so by not attending the re-training program. The Respondent refers to the “DSS Manual of Instruction on the Use of Force Equipment, including Firearms” (“MoI”) which in sec. 2.33 provides that “[a]ny breach of [...] unit SOP may result in the withdrawal of the [Weapon Authorization Card] by [Chief of Service]” and, sec. 2.34(1) states that “as determined by the [Chief of Service] any behavior, statement or act made by the Security Official which brings into question the Security Official's fitness to be armed” may result in the revocation of weapon authorization.

27. In his response to the additional submission filed by the Applicant on 21 September 2014, the Respondent submits that the allegations of harassment and discrimination against the Chief SSS are false and that the Applicant has failed to establish that there are serious or reasonable doubts as to the lawfulness of the contested decision which represented the Chief of SSS's broad discretion to disarm an officer as a result of refusing a direct order. The Respondent contends that the Applicant's insubordinate behavior brought into question his fitness to be armed, which may result in a revocation of weapon authorization according with the initial provisions included in the MoI. The Respondent avers that the orders for the safe operations of the Delta barriers had been in place since 2011, before the incident of February 2014. The Respondent submits that the Applicant is currently working on a night shift when there are very little to no activities in the United Nations complex and there is no need for him to carry a weapon.

28. The Tribunal notes that, as results from secs. 7.3(b), (c) and (d) of ST/SGB/2013/5 (Organization of the Department of Safety and Security), the Division of Headquarters Security and Safety Services is responsible for, *inter alia*:

7.3 The Division of Headquarters Security and Safety Services is responsible for the strategic management of safety and security operations at the Security and Safety Services/Sections locations, providing primary operational and technical support, including:

...

(b) Providing the framework to ensure standardization, and the integration of, practices and procedures in the Security and Safety Services/Sections;

(c) Acting as the focal point for consultation and advice within the Secretariat and with specialized agencies of the United Nations system regarding all security and safety policy issues, in particular the provision of security and safety operations at any United Nations system premises by providing policy direction and standards;

(d) Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of existing security arrangements, procedures, modalities and practices at the Security and Safety Services/Sections locations

29. It results that the activity of ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of existing security arrangements, procedures, modalities and practices at the SSS/Sections locations (see sec. 7(d) of ST/SGB/2013/5) represents one of the important objectives of the Division of SSS at Headquarters.

30. The Tribunal notes that, as results from the uncontested facts presented by the parties, the Applicant, when operating a Delta barrier security point, was involved on 27 February 2014 in an incident resulting in a car being damaged by the barrier. After an investigation took place, the Applicant received a performance notice issued in July 2014.

31. The administrative sanctions which can gradually be applied are: verbal counselling, formal counselling, performance notice and notice of counsel. A performance notice is an administrative sanction issued for negligent performance or behavior pattern that warrants greater attention than just counselling, but less than

the more serious “Notice of Counsel“ and which must be signed by the assistant chief or inspector and which is to be reflected in an individual’s performance report.

32. The Applicant filed a management evaluation request on 18 august 2014 in which he contested the following matters: the decision to give him a performance notice and to place the adverse material in his file; the decision to deny him a promotion in 2010 and 2014; the decision to require him to pay USD3.5 for parking; the decision to prohibit the use of personal cellphone while on duty; a denial of equal treatment and a decision to refer his complaint from 2 July 2014 to the Chief of SSS.

33. The Tribunal observes that the Applicant did not request a suspension of the implementation of the decision to impose on him a performance notice pending the management evaluation before the MEU or before the Tribunal in accordance with art. 2.2 of the Statute of the Dispute Tribunal and art. 13 of its Rules of Procedure. Consequently, the performance notice was implemented and reflected in his performance report.

34. On 14 August 2014, the Chief of SSS in New York issued a directive titled “Corrective Performance Training” in which he stated that:

1. All negative performance issues require the full attention of supervisors to ensure that the lapse is corrected at the earliest point. Supervisors who become aware of a performance issue have not fully discharged their responsibility by simply issuing a performance notice. It is also important for them to ensure the officer is fully equipped for the task to which assigned. ... As a consequence, and with immediate effect, every negative performance notice shall be accompanied by a note of the steps taken to ensure the officer is fully aware of his/her responsibility and as such is equipped to accomplish the assignment.
2. ... One of the most important aspects of the retraining is to ensure the officer understands how the sub-standard performance can impact security effectiveness.
3. Re-training must meet the following minimum standards:

- a) It must be operationally practical, meaning that it should be conducted immediately following the sub-standard performance.
- b) The re-training must be formally documented and become part of the officer's admin folder with SSS - formal retraining such as firearms, delta barriers, will require the use of established training programs with SSS Training and Development Unit.
- c) Re-training must focus on the sub-standard performance
- d) The retraining must be taught in accordance with existing SOP.

4. An officer who has been cited for not correctly performing a task such as delta barrier operations, whether through accident or negligence, shall not be permitted to resume that task until the appropriate training occurs. ...

35. The Applicant's supervisor considered it necessary for the Applicant to take a one-hour re-training course on Delta barriers in order to ensure that he would be formally ready to exercise his duties, including at the barrier posts. It appears that this measure was taken by the Applicant's supervisor, the Chief of SSS, in accordance with sec. 10.1 of ST/AI/2010/5 (Performance Management and Development System), which provides that

... When a performance shortcoming is identified during the performance cycle, the first reporting officer, in consultation with the second reporting officer, should proactively assist the staff member to remedy the shortcoming(s). Remedial measure may include counselling, transfer to more suitable functions, additional training and/or the institution of a time-bound performance improvement plan, which should include clear targets for improvement, provision for coaching and supervision by the first reporting officer in conjunction with performance discussions, which should be held on a regular basis.

36. In case the performance shortcoming is not rectified following the remedial actions indicated in sec. 10.1 at the end of the performance appraisal (see sec. 10.2), the supervisor can apply the measure indicated in secs. 10.2–10.5 of ST/AI/2010/5.

37. The Applicant stated in his additional submission that he continued working at the Delta barrier controls with the knowledge of SSS after the incident until end of August, and this aspect is not contested by the Respondent. It appears that, in the present case, the re-training course was recommended a few months after the incident from February 2014 and the Applicant believed that, during the intermediate time, he proved his abilities to work at a Delta barrier security point. It also appears that the Applicant finds that it would be appropriate to wait for the outcome of the management evaluation of the decision imposing a performance notice, which was expected to be finalised on 19 September 2014, before doing the re-training program because, as he contested the performance notice and the result of the SIU investigation and taking the course before then could be viewed as him admitting to his alleged negligence.

38. It also appears that the Applicant's supervisor considered that the re-training course was necessary for the Applicant to address the performance shortcoming according with sec. 10.1 of ST/AI/2010/5 in order to be able to assign him as a Security Officer to any security point, including at a Delta barrier control. It does not appear that the Applicant was targeted personally by the Chief of SSS's directive of 14 August 2014 because this document reflects lessons learned from previous events and refers both to the Security Officers which by accident or by negligence can be involved in similar incidents as the one of February 2014.

39. The Respondent confirmed in his response to Order No. 267 (NY/2014) that "[t]he Applicant was not 'coerced' to attend training. This is strictly a performance issue and supervisors were trying to correct a performance issue". It appears that the Applicant's second refusal of 12 September 2014 to take the re-training course before the finalization of the management evaluation was considered by the Chief of SSS not only to be a performance issue but also a refusal of a direct order and an act of insubordination by an experienced Security Officer. Consequently, the Chief of SSS decided that such a behavior breached the Section's SOPs and decided to restrict

his weapon authorization, effective 12 September 2014 and until further notice. It appears that this administrative measure was taken in accordance with sec. 2.34(l) of the MoI which provides that: “Security officers may have restrictions placed upon their carrying a weapon by the [Chief of Security, Chief Security Advisor and Chief Security Officer (“CSA/COS/CSO”)]. A Weapons restriction may be applied where the following has occurred; ... as determined by the CSA/COS/CSO any behavior, statement or act made by the Security Official which brings into question the Security Official’s fitness to be armed”.

40. The Tribunal notes that art. 2.35 of the MoI stipulates that: “In every case where a Security Official is placed on Weapons Restriction by the CSA/COS/CSO, the concerned Security Official shall be notified in writing of the expected duration”. It appears that, in the present case, the decision made by the Chief of SSS does not contain the mandatory element concerning the expected duration of the restriction. The Tribunal observes that an unlimited weapons restriction may be considered as equivalent to a withdrawal of the authorization or as a punishment.

41. It appears from the facts that the Applicant’s refusal to take the re-training course was “temporary” until the finalization of the management evaluation regarding the imposition of the performance notice. The Tribunal observes that the corrective measure should be proportionate and reasonable in accordance with sec. 4.50 of the MoI (“[a]ny decision ... to place a Security Official on weapons restrictions based on questionable fitness-for-duty must be both reasonable and objective”). For this reason, the Tribunal considers that it *appears* that the Chief of SSS exercised his discretion when imposing a weapons restriction without taking into consideration sec. 2.35 of the MoI and thus the contested decision appears to be *prima facie* unlawful.

42. The Tribunal observes that, in a suspension of action case, it cannot make any final legal determination regarding the two aspects of the Applicant’s refusal to



follow a re-training program, which are: the performance issue and insubordination, and the question of the measure imposed in the contested decision, namely the restriction or withdrawal of the Applicant's weapons authorization. These are related to the merits of the case that are currently being reviewed by the MEU and, should the Applicant subsequently file an application on the merits before the Dispute Tribunal, then this would be the correct forum for the Tribunal to assesses them.

43. The Tribunal observes that sec. 2.36 of the MoI includes another mandatory provision, namely that, "Supervisors shall not use the duration of Weapons Restrictions as a punishment for misconduct where normal investigative or disciplinary procedures are applicable".

44. Regarding the Applicant's refusal to take the re-training course, the Tribunal observes that the deadline for the management evaluation of the decision to impose on him a performance notice expired on 19 September 2014 and therefore he can reconsider his participation in the course.

#### Urgency

45. The Applicant contends in his additional submission filed on 21 September 2014 that a suspension of the contested decision is urgent because his life has been put in a great danger as a uniformed officer without a weapon. He submits that an incident that took place two days after the weapons restriction was effectuated on Sunday, 13 September 2014, while he was assigned in the Secretariat Lobby, when a stranger gained access into the United Nations complex. The Respondent submits that the Applicant continues to perform the security functions within the premises where possession of a weapon is not required and also notes that there are currently three duty stations around the world where Security Officers perform the same functions as those in New York and they are unarmed.

46. The Tribunal considers that SSS is the only authority to establish which premises require Security Officers to carry a weapon and that the Tribunal has no competence to decide otherwise. Pursuant to sec. 1.51 of the MoI, after the weapons restriction was applied to the Applicant, he was assigned to a post that does not require possession of a weapon. If the Applicant considers that the Security Officers should have a weapon in such a post, he must then formally inform his superiors and ask them to reconsider the potential risk of the unarmed posts (or location). Consequently, The Tribunal concludes that there is no particular urgency to suspend the implementation of the contested decision pending management evaluation.

Irreparable harm

47. The Applicant contends in his additional submission of 21 September 2014 that Security Officers are expected to work on different posts through a rotation policy and that they are also required to take different, both internal and external, training courses. He further submits that promotions and conference mission assignments also require weapon qualification and that, without his weapon, he will not be able to participate in these events. He states that he no longer has the opportunity to work overtime and earn extra money since most of posts require a weapon and that he risks losing his job since a weapon qualification is the deciding factor for job retention.

48. The Respondent submits in the reply that the Applicant continues to perform the same security functions at the same level in accordance with the terms of his appointment, and that there is no impact on the Applicant's career prospects simply because he is assigned to a different location within the United Nations premises. The Respondent contends that the Applicant is not exposed to any risk to lose his job since there is no current downsizing in SSS. The Tribunal accepts these submissions as facts.

49. The Tribunal notes that the Applicant was recommended to participate in a re-training course and there is no evidence before the Tribunal that he will not be able to attend the course based on his weapons restriction and that he will be retaliated against or sanctioned.

50. The Tribunal finds that the Applicant will suffer no irreparable harm as a result of the weapons restriction pending the management evaluation.

51. Taking into consideration that two of the cumulative conditions for a contested decision to be suspended pending management evaluation are not fulfilled, the application is dismissed.

**Conclusion**

52. The application for suspension of action is dismissed.

*(Signed)*

Judge Alessandra Greceanu

Dated this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2014