

UNDT/2013/129, Al-Mulla

UNAT Held or UNDT Pronouncements

In that judgment, the Tribunal had inter alia found that the decision to require the Applicant to revert to his initial P-3 post had not been the subject of a management evaluation and consequently was not receivable. He requested the Tribunal to vacate certain paragraphs of the judgment. The Tribunal held that for a request for revision to be successful, all the requirements in art.12.1 of its Statute have to be met.

Decision Contested or Judgment/Order Appealed

The Applicant is a staff member of UNODC. On 3 July 2013, he filed an application for revision of judgment UNDT/2011/105.

Legal Principle(s)

Negligence: The Applicant's lack of awareness of the importance of the need for the decisive fact to have been clearly adduced at the hearing can only be attributed to his negligence or that of his counsel advising him throughout the proceedings.

Request for revision: Request for revision is only receivable if it is made within the appropriate time frame.

Outcome

Revision, correction, interpretation or execution

Full judgment

[Full judgment](#)

Applicants/Appellants

Al-Mulla

Entity

UNODC

Case Number(s)

UNDT/GVA/2013/37

Tribunal

UNDT

Registry

Geneva

Date of Judgement

24 Oct 2013

Duty Judge

Judge Shaw

Language of Judgment

English

Issuance Type

Judgment

Categories/Subcategories

Judgment-related matters

Revision of Judgment

Applicable Law

UNDT RoP

- Article 29.1
- Article 29.2

UNDT Statute

- Article 12.1

Related Judgments and Orders

UNDT/2011/105

2012-UNAT-226

2013-UNAT-320

2013-UNAT-317