

UNDT/2012/151, Johnson

UNAT Held or UNDT Pronouncements

Judge Meeran handled the case since Judge Kaman issued the judgment on the last day of her tenure with the Dispute Tribunal. The Tribunal found that the only conclusion, which could sensibly have been drawn from the fact that UNDT/2011/124 did not address the claim in explicit terms was that either Judge Kaman considered it implicitly covered in the findings or alternatively she overlooked it in her final conclusions on remedies. To the extent that it may have been an oversight, on the basis of a full examination of the record and the judgments, Judge Meeran ordered that Judge Kaman had intended to admit the claim and granted the relief requested.

Decision Contested or Judgment/Order Appealed

The Applicant submitted an application for interpretation of the meaning and scope of the final judgment, Johnson UNDT/2011/124.

Legal Principle(s)

Judge concerned with interpretation of judgment: Applications on interpretation of judgments are normally dealt with by the judge concerned. However, if this is not possible, or impractical, it may be assigned to another judge.

Outcome

Revision, correction, interpretation or execution

Full judgment

[Full judgment](#)

Applicants/Appellants

Johnson

Entity

UN Secretariat

Case Number(s)

UNDT/NY/2012/066

Tribunal

UNDT

Registry

New York

Date of Judgement

12 Oct 2012

Duty Judge

Judge Meeran

Language of Judgment

English

Issuance Type

Judgment

Categories/Subcategories

Judgment-related matters

Interpretation of Judgment

Applicable Law

UNDT RoP

- Article 30

Related Judgments and Orders

UNDT/2011/123

UNDT/2011/124