


---

Judgment No. 2021-UNAT-1183



Counsel for Appellant: Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent: Raniel " #ers

T

T

11. The Appellant requested a deontological order on 20 January 2011. The filed application is contested on.

"The UNRWA Judgment

12. In the impugned judgment, the UNRWA Appeals Board applied a legal test: (1) the facts are as stated; (2) the facts are legally supported; (3) the facts are proportionate to the of the facts; and (4) the procedural irregularities are not significant. The Board applied a 40% test.

40%

)

13. The Appellant submits that the UNRWA Appeals Board's decision is based on the facts and the law. The Board's decision is based on the facts and the law. The Board's decision is based on the facts and the law.

14. The Appellant contends that the UNRWA Appeals Board's decision is based on the facts and the law. The Board's decision is based on the facts and the law. The Board's decision is based on the facts and the law.

15.

1B.

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Merits of the appeal

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL



THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Judgment No . 2021 - UNAT - 118

measures should lead to the prompt and effective implementation of the measures for the protection of the

0. Special to the allegations here are a number of other factors that are relevant to the assessment of the situation in the area. The Tribunal notes that the measures taken by the respondent are not in line with the provisions of the relevant instruments. The Tribunal also notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken.

2. The respondent's actions are not in line with the provisions of the relevant instruments. The Tribunal notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken. The Tribunal also notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken.

J

Definitions of Prohibited Conduct

8.09. The respondent's actions are not in line with the provisions of the relevant instruments. The Tribunal notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken. The Tribunal also notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken.

J

8.10. Use of power is the improper use of power by a person in a position of authority against another person. The Tribunal notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken. The Tribunal also notes that the respondent has not provided any explanation for the measures taken.

! s

- 2. 0237 65466- 15 TdN[ (! 56(e) 1. O. (8t) - 4. 39747( ) ) 3617' ) - 7. 10655(

an ) n t ) m ) d a t ) n g a n d o f f e n s ) # e 8 o n d u , t e m e # ) r t o r e m e d i a t ) . n ) t ) o n o  
and **D**a O u s e o f p o & e r **E**' n a m e l 4 a u s e p r o o f f e a r n e o a d i r t u m ) ! ! a t ) o n  
p e r s o n o r ) m p r o p e r u s e o f a p o s ) t ) o n o f ) n f l u e n e'

(iv) Whether there is any violation of the Appellant's due process rights

2. As stated in the Negussie v. Secretary-General of the United Nations

To ensure a fair trial, it is essential for the Tribunal to render a reasoned judgment. Although it is essential for the Tribunal to render a judgment, it is not necessary for the Tribunal to render a judgment. It is not necessary for the Tribunal to render a judgment. It is not necessary for the Tribunal to render a judgment.

3. Regarding the Appellant's alleged violation of his rights, the Tribunal has found that the Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Tribunal has found that the Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Tribunal has found that the Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence.

4. The Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence.

5. Therefore, the Tribunal finds that the Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Tribunal finds that the Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence. The Tribunal finds that the Appellant's complaint is not supported by the evidence.

<sup>1</sup> Negussie v. Secretary-General of the United Nations, Judgment No. 2018-UNAT-1000, para. 8. Internal footnotes omitted.

<sup>2</sup> Impugned Judgment, para. 10.

.,\$

- @ . T! e appeal ) s d) sm) s sed' and ) !se u p N E R I A + T Judgment

/ r) g) nal and Aut! or) tat) #e Mers) on: " ngl) s!

+ a ted t! ) d a 4 2 . o f / t o Oer 2021 .

\*igned(

\*igned(

\*igned(

Judge Sand! u' ( res) d) ngludge Colgan Judge Ra) , o s  
Man ou#er' Cana! a, land' Ne& 6ea l A n d e n s' \*ree e

" ntered ) n t! e Reg) sat 4 e r o n J a n u a r y 4 E 2 0 2 2 ) n Ne& 5 o r , ' Un)