

Case No.

Harding (Respondent)

v.

cretary-General of the United Nations

Counse lant: Antigoni Axenidou

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Order No. 44 (2011)

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Order No. 44 (2011)

of several legal officers and is expected to reasonably manage its workload and staff in order to comply with the time limits under Statute of the Appeals Tribunal.

- 7. Neither the travel of legal officers nor the scheduling of an oral hearing by the Appeals Tribunal constitutes exceptional circumstances for extending a party's statutory time limits. In this regard, the present case differs from previous cases, where the absence of a legal officer was extensive and work-related² or where the absence was unforeseen due to a family emergency.³
- 8. The Secretary-General has provided no valid reason warranting an extension of time.

² UNAT Case No. 2010-102, *Chen v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, communication from the Registry to counsel from OSLA, dated 8 July 2010: The Appeals Tribunal granted an extension of solely five days from the day counsel for the staff member returned from extensive travel on behalf of the Office of Staff Legal Assistance (OSLA), to file an answer to an appeal

³ Appellant v. Secretary-General of the United Nations, Order No. 25 (2010): The Appeals Tribunal granted a 15-day extension for filing an answer to an appeal, on the grounds that the legal officer representing the case had to unexpectedly return to her home country to attend to a family emergency.

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Order No. 44 (2011)

ORDER

	ONDEN
9.	For the foregoing reasons, I, Judge Jean Courtial, President of the Appeals Tribunal
reject	the Secretary-General's request for an extension of time to file an appeal.
Dated	this 2 nd day of March 2011 in New York, United States.
Origir	nal: English
	(Signed)
Jı	ıdge Jean Courtial, President
Enter	ed in the Register on this 2^{nd} day of March 2011 in New York, United States.
	(Signed)
Weich	neng Lin, Registrar