

UNDT/2013/100, Mohammed

UNAT Held or UNDT Pronouncements

MEU's decision was issued one month after the deadline for its issuance. UNDT held that the Applicant could not be penalized for MEU being dilatory in its obligations. UNDT held that this matter must properly be found to be receivable. UNDT refused the Respondent's request to have the Application dismissed on grounds of receivability.

Decision Contested or Judgment/Order Appealed

The Applicant contested the decision not to renew his fixed-term appointment beyond 31 December 2011.

Legal Principle(s)

Timelines before UNDT will normally begin to run from the date of receipt of a decision by management evaluation or the expiry of the time allocated to the; Management Evaluation Unit to respond, i.e. ninety days from the date of the receipt of a management evaluation decision or ninety days following the expiry of the thirty or forty-five day, depending on where the request was filed, deadline.

Outcome

Judgment entered for Applicant in full or in part

Full judgment

[Full judgment](#)

Applicants/Appellants

Mohammed

Entity

ICTR

Case Number(s)

UNDT/NBI/2012/39

Tribunal

UNDT

Registry

Nairobi

Date of Judgement

5 Aug 2013

Duty Judge

Judge Boolell

Language of Judgment

English

Issuance Type

Judgment

Categories/Subcategories

Jurisdiction / receivability (UNDT or first instance)

Management Evaluation

Management Evaluation

Time limit

Applicable Law

UNDT RoP

- Article 35
- Article 7

UNDT Statute

- Article 8.1