



3. In support of the Motion, Mr. Powell submits that his counsel had just returned from a mission when he discovered his oversight and “[i]n his haste to file the [answer]

5. The Appeals Tribunal has so far made no ruling on whether or not the above provisions apply *mutatis mutandis* to orders. However, in the present case, I need not further consider this matter since, even presuming that the above provisions applied, Mr. Powell provided no decisive new fact under the above provisions. In addition to the arguments presented in his application underlying the contested Order, he merely refers to jurisprudence of the Appeals Tribunal on requests for extension and/or waiver of time. The Appeals Tribunal previously held that “law” is not a “fact” under the above provisions and can therefore not constitute a ground for revision.¹

6. For the foregoing reasons, the request for revision is dismissed.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated 20th day of September 2012 in Montevideo,
Uruguay.

(Signed)
Judge Luis María Simón, President

Entered in the Register on this 26th day of
September 2012 in New York, United States.

(Signed)
Weicheng Lin, Registrar

¹ Cf. *Eid v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2011-UNAT-145.