

2025-UNAT-1519, Fernando Salon

UNAT Held or UNDT Pronouncements

The UNAT rejected Mr. Salon's argument that the prior UNAT Judgment made incorrect findings of fact regarding the dates that he made requests for management evaluation or filed complaints. The UNAT held that Mr. Salon was not seeking clarification of the UNAT Judgment but was rather attempting to relitigate his case, which is not an appropriate use of the UNAT Statute's provisions for an application for interpretation.

The UNAT found that there was no ambiguity in its Judgment and there was no basis for the application for interpretation. The meaning and scope of the UNAT Judgment was clear and there was no reasonable doubt as to the intention of the Appeals Tribunal. Accordingly, the application was dismissed.

Decision Contested or Judgment/Order Appealed

A former staff member with the Internal Audit Division, Office of Internal Oversight Services, filed an application for interpretation of Judgment No. 2024-UNAT-1432. In the latter UNAT Judgment, the UNAT dismissed the staff member's appeal and affirmed UNDT Summary Judgment No. UNDT/2023/029.

Legal Principle(s)

An application for interpretation will be admitted only if the meaning or scope of a judgment is unclear or ambiguous. Interpretation is only needed to clarify the meaning of a judgment when it leaves reasonable doubts about the will of the Tribunal or the arguments leading to a decision. If the judgment is comprehensible, whatever the opinion the parties may have about it or its reasoning, an application for interpretation is not admissible.

An application for interpretation is only admissible if the wording of the judgment is not sufficiently clear, owing to ambiguity or incoherence, such that a party might, in good faith, be unsure of the meaning or scope of that judgment.

Outcome

Revision, correction, interpretation or execution

Outcome Extra Text

Application for interpretation is dismissed.

Full judgment

[Full judgment](#)

Applicants/Appellants

Fernando Salon

Entity

OIOS

Case Number(s)

2024-1918

Tribunal

UNAT

Registry

New York

Date of Judgement

22 Apr 2025
President Judge
Sandhu
Judge Colgan
Judge Gao
Language of Judgment
English
Issuance Type
Judgment
Categories/Subcategories
Interpretation of Judgment
Judgment-related matters
Applicable Law
UNAT RoP

- Article 25

UNDT Statute

- Article 10.6
- Article 11.3

Related Judgments and Orders

2024-UNAT-1432

UNDT/2023/029

2021-UNAT-1148

2010-UNAT-064