

2025-UNAT-1540, Angiolo Rolli

UNAT Held or UNDT Pronouncements

The UNAT found that the unexplained delay of almost a year in filing the request for interpretation would alone cause the UNAT to reject it. The UNAT held that, in addition, the request for interpretation lacked a jurisdictional basis. The UNAT found that the staff member had demonstrated no equivocality or lack of clarity of the Judgment.

The UNAT was of the view that the request for execution relied on the staff member's success in having the earlier Judgment interpreted in the manner he sought and, therefore, his request for execution was moot. The UNAT further noted that the Judgment had been executed.

The UNAT noted that the staff member was represented by counsel and was not a litigant in person when he criticized the chief administrative officer before the governing body of the Organization. The UNAT found that even if he were covered by the provisions of the Code of Conduct, it was doubtful whether his conduct, while not decorous, went to the extent intended to be prohibited.

The UNAT considered that the staff member's delay in bringing the application for interpretation and execution was not misconduct in terms of the Code of Conduct.

The UNAT dismissed the application for interpretation and execution.

Decision Contested or Judgment/Order Appealed

A former staff member contested a decision to summarily dismiss him. In Judgment No. UNDT/2021/154, the UNDT found the contested decision unlawful and, in Judgment No. UNDT/2022/025, it granted remedies. In Judgment No. 2023-UNAT-1346, the Appeals Tribunal modified the remedies payable to him.

The staff member filed an application for interpretation and execution of the UNAT Judgment.

Legal Principle(s)

There is no statutory time limit for making applications for interpretation and execution. However, unreasonable and unexplained delay in doing so may cause the Appeals Tribunal's discretion to be exercised against an applicant, as a matter of fairness and justice to the Secretary-General.

An interpretation application must establish that the meaning or scope of the judgment as worded is equivocal or otherwise so unclear that the parties cannot reasonably agree on what it requires either, or both, to do to satisfy or implement the judgment.

An application for interpretation cannot be an opportunity to re-litigate the issues or the remedies allowed by the judgment. Nor can an application for interpretation be a disguised application for revision of a judgment, changing its outcome substantively.

An application for revision is the only mechanism by which the outcome of a UNAT judgment can be modified. Even then, a final judgment can only be altered (revised) under very tightly defined conditions.

The Code of Conduct governs the conduct of representatives and litigants in person (that is, unrepresented staff or former staff) in proceedings. No behavioural responsibilities are placed on parties unless they are unrepresented.

Outcome

Revision, correction, interpretation or execution

Outcome Extra Text

Application for interpretation and execution dismissed.

Full judgment

[Full judgment](#)

Applicants/Appellants

Angiolo Rolli

Entity

WMO

Case Number(s)

2024-1932

Tribunal

UNAT

Registry

New York

Date of Judgement

20 May 2025

President Judge

Colgan

Judge Sheha

Judge Ziadé

Language of Judgment

English

Issuance Type

Judgment

Categories/Subcategories

Manifest abuse

Execution of judgment
Interpretation of Judgment
Abuse of process before UNDT/UNAT
Judgment-related matters

Applicable Law

Other UN issuances (guidelines, policies etc.)

- Code of Conduct for Legal Representatives and Litigants

UNAT Statute

- Article 11.3

Related Judgments and Orders

2023-UNAT-1346

2018-UNAT-827

2024-UNAT-1438

2021-UNAT-1148