



UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL
TRIBUNAL D 'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES



Mansour
(Appellant)

v.

Commissioner-General

Date: 26 October 2018

Registrar: Weichen Lin

JUDGE SABINE KNIERIM , PRESIDING .

1. The United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) has before it an appeal against Judge No UNRWA/DT/2018/021, and

the Appeals Tribunal has before it an appeal against the Decision of the

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Judge No 2018-UNAT-881

the UNRWA DT alleged that Mr Mansour had been raised in the
city of Haifa and that he had been raised in the
UNRWA DT alleged that Mr Mansour had been raised in the
city of Haifa and that he had been raised in the
UNRWA DT alleged that Mr Mansour had been raised in the
city of Haifa and that he had been raised in the

Submissions

Mr. Mansour's Appeal

11.

13. Mr Masri requested the decision in his appeal; he stated that he had been ordered to pay the amount of USD 3,000 for the costs of his appeal. He stated that he had not received the decision in his appeal.

The Commissioner-General's Answer

14. The appeal is defective in that it fails to comply with Article 2(1) of the Appeals Statute (Stat), he stated. The appeal is inadmissible because the Appeals Tribunal has already issued a decision in the matter. He stated that the UNRWA DT had issued a decision in the matter.

15. The UNRWA DT Judgment is a final and binding decision. The UNRWA DT has considered the legal facts and circumstances of the case and has issued a decision. He stated that the UNRWA DT had issued a decision in the matter. He stated that the UNRWA DT had issued a decision in the matter.

16. It is the right of every person to be heard in a fair and equitable manner. Mr Masri has the right to be heard in a fair and equitable manner. He stated that the UNRWA DT had issued a decision in the matter.

- (b) Failure to disclose it
- (c) Error of law
- (d) Omission of a fact which affected the decision; or
- (e) Error of fact which affected the decision

18. These are provided by Article 8(2) of the Appeals Tribunal Rules. The Tribunal has held that the appeal must be accepted by (a) A brief

- The OSO argued that the human rights were violated by the Agency and that the Agency was not taking adequate steps to protect the human rights.
- The OSO argued that the Agency was not taking adequate steps to protect the human rights.

23. As a result of the OSO's oral and written submissions, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. *inter alia*, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO.

24. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO.

25. We are satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Agency has not demonstrated that it has taken adequate steps to protect the human rights of the A/OSO.

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Judgment No. 2018-UNAT-881

Judgment