



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

Judgment No. 2018-UNAT-882

**Rehman
(Appellant)**

v.

Secretary-General of the United Nations

Counsel for Ms. Rehman: Self-represented

Counsel for Secretary-General: Not represented

JUDGE RICHARD LUSSICK, PRESIDING.

1. The United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) has before it an appeal

... The Applicant requested management evaluation of the non-renewal decision on 27 November 2015. She received a response on 23 December 2015 upholding the contested decision.

... On 30 March 2016, the Applicant filed her complete application contesting the non-renewal of her contract and the Respondent filed his reply on 5 May 2016.

3. On 28 February 2018, the UNDT issued Judgment No. UNDT/2018/031. The UNDT noted that during the course of the proceedings before it, the Secretary-General changed the reason that constituted the basis for the contested decision and as a result, Ms. Rehman was deprived of her due process right to properly prosecute her case and to have a fair hearing. Her case was premised on a reason provided by the Administration, a lack of funds in the Thematic Grant, which two years later it admitted it could not defend or support with evidence. The fact that the Secretary-General conceded that he could not demonstrate the lack of funds resulting in the non-renewal of Ms. Rehman's appointment led the UNDT to draw the negative inference that the UNICEF PCO's decision not to renew Ms. Rehman's appointment was based on other reasons that were neither disclosed to Ms. Rehman nor the UNDT.

4. The UNDT found that the new *ex post facto* alleged reason for Ms. Rehman's non-renewal, namely that there was no longer a need for her position because her functions could be taken over by the new Global Shared Services Centre (GSSC) in Budapest and the Business Transaction Centre (BTC) in Islamabad and beyo4(t)577(h)-(21.0656 081D-.001 Tc182854 Tw[(to ren

T

Ms. Rehman was not entitled to pension benefits, medical coverage or other UN staff member benefits.

8. Furthermore, the UNDT failed to consider the following facts and variations in UNICEF's stance about Ms. Rehman's post for the period 2015 to 2017:

- Ms. Rehman's post was kept vacant following her separation in December 2015 and only abolished mid-2017, almost one and a half years later.
- When Ms. Rehman was separated in 2015, UNICEF claimed in its management evaluation that the Education Section needed a Programme Assistant post at the GS-7 level and associated Ms. Rehman's functions and duties to the GS-7 post. That post, however, was subsequently converted to the GS-6 level without any new selection process which reveals that the GS-7 post was not necessary for the Education Section and was only kept to expel Ms. Rehman from UNICEF.
- Ms. Rehman was the only Programme Assistant in the Education Section who was awarded a two-year fixed-term appointment in 2013 which was further extended to 2015. Pursuant to the retention order in Chapter IX of the Staff Rules, in a case of abolition of posts, preference must be given to permanent and longer serving fixed-term staff over others. The abolition of Ms. Rehman's position was therefore unlawful, especially since the remaining post was also at the GS-6 level and comparable to Ms. Rehman's post.
- Ms. Rehman's right to challenge the abolition of her post was violated when it was kept vacant at the time of her separation; and in 2017, she was not able to challenge the decision in light of her separation in 2015.

9. Ms. Rehman requests that the Appeals Tribunal refer her case to the Secretary-General for possible action to enforce accountability, pursuant to Article 9(5) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute. She further requests that the Appeals Tribunal direct the Secretary-General for reinstatement of her fixed-term contract beyond 31 December 2015 or, alternatively, order in-lieu compensation to "reinstatement" in the amount of Ms. Rehman's net base salaries from 31 December 2015 until the issuance of the Appeals Tribunal Judgment, in addition to one year's net base salary pursuant to Article 9(1)(b) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute. Finally, Ms. Rehman requests moral damages in the amount of USD 20,000 for prolonged

unemployment depriving herself and her family of a decent social and economic standard, the fact that her separation tainted her professional career and status, the loss of national and international job opportunities which were limited to internal candidates, and the anxiety, depression and mental stress she suffered.

Considerations

10. Ms. Rehman requests the Appeals Tribunal to order the Secretary-General to reinstate her fixed-term appointment beyond 31 December 2015.

11. The UNDT, having found that the non-renewal of her contract was unlawful, ordered the rescission of that decision and set the amount that the Secretary-General may pay as an alternative to the rescission at one-year net base salary.

12. This order was made pursuant to its jurisdiction under Article 10(5) (a) of the UNDT Statute, which provides:

As part of its judgement, the Dispute Tribunal may only order one or both of the following:

(a) Rescission of the contested administrative decision or specific performance, provided that, where the contested administrative decision concerns appointment, promotion or termination, the Dispute Tribunal shall also set an amount of compensation that the respondent may elect to pay as an alternative to the rescission of the contested administrative decision or specific performance ordered, subject to subparagraph (b) of the present paragraph.

13. This provision does not confer on the UNDT the power to enforce the reinstatement of a staff member's contract in a non-renewal case. The Appeals Tribunal is subject to the same legislative constraint by Article 9(1)(a) of its Statute, which corresponds in terms to Article 10(5) (a) of the UNDT Statute.

14. Therefore, Ms. Rehman's claim for an order for reinstatement must be rejected.

15. Ms. Rehman also claims "compensation of net base salaries for the period beyond 31 December 2015 from which the decision is rescinded by UNDT till the decision of Appeals Tribunal along with the addition of one year net base salary as compensation to the rescission of administrative decision according to UNAT Statute Article #9.1(b) for which the UNDT was also authorised according to Article 10.5(b) of the UNDT Statute".

16. She further claims that the UNDT compensation for moral damages is “not fair and unjust” and requests an award of USD 20,000.

17. Article 10(5) (b) of the UNDT Statute is in these terms:

As part of its judgement, the Dispute Tribunal may only order one or both of the following:

...

(b) Compensation for harm, supported by evidence, which shall normally not exceed the equivalent of two years’ net base salary of the applicant. The Dispute Tribunal may, however, in exceptional cases order the payment of a higher compensation for harm, supported by evidence, and shall provide the reasons for that decision.

The law on compensation for harm, as decided by the majority of the Appeals Tribunal in *Kallon*, a decision which is binding on the UNDT, is that “a staff member’s testimony alone is not sufficient to present evidence supporting harm under Article (...)10(5)(b) of the UNDT Statute”.³ Therefore, the testimony of an applicant in such circumstances needs the corroboration of independent evidence to support the contention that harm has occurred.⁴

18. The Appeals Tribunal’s decision in *Kallon* follows the amendment of the statutory law governing an award of compensation. In 2014, Article 10(5) (b) of the UNDT Statute and Article 9(1) (b) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute were amended by General Assembly resolution 69/203. They now provide, in relevant part, that the Dispute Tribunal and Appeals Tribunal may award compensation for harm only if such harm is “supported by evidence”.⁵ It is therefore incumbent on a claimant to submit specific evidence to sustain an award of moral damages.⁶

19. This is the current law on compensation for harm and it is the law which the UNDT must apply when it is contemplating such an award.

20. In the present case, there is no evidence of harm to support an award of compensation apart from Ms. Rehman’s own claims. Those claims must accordingly be rejected.

³ *Kallon v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2017-UNAT-742, Concurring Opinion of Judge Knierim, para. 2.

⁴ *Langue v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2018-UNAT-858, para. 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 14.

⁶ *Dahan v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2018-UNAT-861, para. 23.

21. However, the UNDT's award of moral damages of USD 5,000, which is wrong in law

Judgment

25. The appeal is dismissed and Judgment No. UNDT/2018/031 is affirmed.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 26th day of October 2018 in New York, United States.

(Signed)

Judge Lussick, Presiding

(Signed)

Judge Knierim

(Signed)

Judge Halfeld

Entered in the Register on this 20th day of December 2018 in New York, United States.

(Signed)

Weicheng Lin, Registrar