

Counsel for Appellant:Self-representedCounsel for Respondent:Natalie Boucly

JUDGE A

had made in his initial application and submitted three additional documents in support.³ The UNRWA DT found that the documents were not unknown to him at the time of the underlying Judgment. The UNRWA DT further held that, in any case, those documents would not have changed the outcome on the case, and as such the conditions for a revision had not been met.⁴

Proceedings before the Appeals Tribunal

9. On 6 June 2023, Mr. Hammad filed an appeal of the impugned Judgment to which the Commissioner-General filed his answer on 18 August 2023.

Submissions

Mr. Hammad's Appeal

10. Mr. Hammad does not specify errors in fact or law in the impugned Judgment. He merely makes reference to a number of facts and documents related to his substantive claim that – in his view – would have altered the outcome of the case. It is on that basis that he asks this Tribunal to overturn the impugned a http://iconiicobnb3 (s(1 (a)4.1 (e)-4- (ak)s.1 (aw))A6b3er.8 (al)TJ/TT2 1

Judgment

17. The Appeals Tribunal dismisses the appeal and affirms the impugned Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2023/022.

Original and Authoritative Version: Arabic

Decision dated this 22nd day of March 2024 in New York, United States.

(Signed)