



**UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL  
TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES**

---

Case No. 2010-184



**Ibekwe  
(Appellant)**

---



**(Respondent)**



---

Counsel for Appellant: Not represented

Counsel for Respondent: Stéphanie Cartier

**JUDGE KAMALJIT SINGH GAREWAL, Presiding.**

### Synopsis

1. Ms. Ngozi Ibekwe's case is that the Administration's responses to her complaints of discrimination were placed in her Official Status File (OSF) without her knowledge. A decade later she competed for promotion to the G-6 level, but was unsuccessful. In *Planas*<sup>1</sup> we stated that complaints of general discrimination are not relevant when the staff member challenges his or her non-selection to a specific post. We also stated in *Rolland*<sup>2</sup> that in non-selection cases all official acts are presumed to have been regularly performed. This is a rebuttable presumption. The presumption stands satisfied if the Administration is able to minimally show that full and fair consideration was given to the candidate. The burden of proof then shifts to the staff member to show, through clear and convincing evidence, that she was denied a fair chance of promotion. Lastly, a complaint which emanates from a staff member and the response thereto, which has been shown to the staff member concerned, can be placed in the staff member's OSF. In the absence of evidence of specific discrimination, we hold that the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT or Dispute Tribunal) did not exceed, or fail to exercise, its jurisdiction, and moreover it did not err on questions of law, fact or procedure.

2. The appeal is dismissed. Judgment No. UNDT/2010/159 is affirmed.

### Facts and Procedure

3. Ms. Ibekwe joined the United Nations Volunteer Program as a clerk/stenographer at the G-3 level in May 1980. Beginning January 1984, she held several fixed-term and short-term appointments as a clerk, typist and secretary with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Centre for Human Rights (predecessor to the Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)). She was promoted to the G-5 level in October 1989 and was granted a permanent appointment in September 2006. Ms. Ibekwe retired from the Organization on 31 December 2007.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Planas v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2010-UNAT-049.

<sup>2</sup> *Rolland v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2011-UNAT-122.

THE UNITED N

OHCHR Management withheld filling [post No. 414977] simply because I was probably the only candidate meeting all requirements for the post. Here, I am not only being discriminated due to character, but also due to age. With barely 19 ½ years contribution at the pension fund, I had thought being favourably considered for either post, [sic] would enable me to round up the minimum 21 years. Whatever illusion I had entertained that either of these two posts would eventually render me justice at OHCHR to forget these 10 years of inhuman treatment, [sic] had finally crumbled.

Ms. Ibekwe devoted the rest of her request to the elaboration of the unfair treatment that she had received at OHCHR during the previous 10 years.

9. After she had received a negative response to her request for administrative review, Ms. Ibekwe appealed to the Geneva Joint Appeals Board (JAB/Geneva). In its report dated 4 December 2008, the JAB/Geneva determined that the main issue on appeal was whether the decisions not to select Ms. Ibekwe for either of the two G-6 posts were taken properly. It concluded that the contested decisions

T

18. The Secretary-General maintains that the UNDT correctly determined that the decisions not to select Ms. Ibekwe for either of the two G-6 posts were not properly before it, and, moreover, that her claim relating to the placement of two letters in her OSF and in a “confidential” file was time-barred.

19. The UNDT properly rejected Ms. Ibekwe’s claim of harassment and discrimination on the grounds that she had failed to identify and contest an “administrative decision”, such as to trigger the subject matter jurisdiction of the UNDT.

20. Regarding the two letters placed in Ms. Ibekwe’s OSF, the Secretary-General submits that they were not adverse material, as they did not make any adverse comment about Ms. Ibekwe or her work performance. They were follow-ups on her requests for investigation. The Secretary-General clarifies that ST/AI/292 does not prevent the placement of adverse material in personnel files. Instead, it protects the staff members’ right to be informed about them and to make

**Considerations**

23. In every United Nations agency or programme there will be a few staff members who will complain about systematic discrimination, harassment or injustice. This tendency becomes more pronounced when the staff member is continuously ignored for promotion.

24. Ms. Ibekwe's employment history has been recounted above. Her case is that sometime in 1995 she lodged a complaint before the Chief of Personnel Service of UNOG.

fol

rce

of

u1

4 February 2008. By this time she had retired. Nevertheless, she took the matter to the JAB/Geneva on 27 March 2008. The JAB/Geneva in its report dated 4 December 2008 unanimously recommended that the non-selection decisions had been made in accordance with the established procedures, and Ms. Ibekwe had failed to prove that her right to full and fair consideration was violated.

28. The learned UNDT Judge declined to examine Ms. Ibekwe's contentions regarding her denial of promotion with respect to the two G-6 vacancies because they were not submitted for administrative review. At this stage, reference must be made to the JAB/Geneva's finding that Ms. Ibekwe's appeal with respect to the non-selection was admissible. Therefore, one cannot understand how the UNDT could hold that Ms. Ibekwe's challenge to her non-selection was not receivable.

29. Be that as it may, Ms. Ibekwe has not been able to establish on appeal before us that her non-selection to the two G-6 posts was flawed, or that sh



in the shape of the two letters written in 1995 and 1997, cannot constitute evidence of real discrimination sufficient to upset the two non-selection decisions taken in 2007. We would not like to delve in the jurisprudential differences on the doctrines of burden of proof which Ms. Ibekwe has tried to raise because in the present appeal she has failed to show how the UNDT Judgment was flawed.

31. Ms. Ibekwe has attempted to make a lot out of the fact that her complaints of discrimination and the Administration's responses were placed in her OSF. This had been done behind her back, and she only learned about the placing of those letters on her record much later. This, according to her, was a violation of the procedure set forth in paragraph 2 of ST/AI/292 of 15 July 1982 "Filing of Adverse Material in Personnel Records". This provision provides that as a matter of principle any material which reflects adversely on a staff member "may not be included in the personnel file unless it has been shown to the staff member concerned and the staff member is thereby given an opportunity to make comments thereon." We fail to understand how Ms. Ibekwe can complain. The responses to her complaints, from the Chief of Personnel Service of UNOG dated 13 December 1995 and 6 November 1997 respectively, were sent to her by the Administration and she must be aware of their contents. Nothing was placed in her file behind her back. A staff member who chooses to file a complaint against the Administration must expect that the Organization will examine the complaint. Ms. Ibekwe must also expect that both her complaint and the Administration's response shall remain in the official record for all times. Such material is not adverse material at all. It would be adverse material if an adverse report, of indiscipline or misconduct, were placed on the staff member's file without it first being shown to the staff member to make comments thereon. Such action shall definitely be frowned upon, but not if the material placed on record emanated from the staff member himself or herself.

32. In the absence of evidence of specific discrimination, we must hold that the UNDT Judgment did not exceed, or fail to exercise, its jurisdiction, and moreover it did not err on questions of law, facts or procedure.

**Judgment**

33. The appeal is dismissed. Judgment No. UNDT/2010/159 is affirmed.

Original and authoritative version: English

Done this 21<sup>st</sup>