



Case Nos. 2015-787 through 2015-797, 2015-800 through 2015-814, 2015-816 through 2015-818, 2015-827 to 2015-828, 2015-832 to 2015-833 and 2015-835 through 2015-838

Thomas et al .

vs.

Secretary-General of the United Nations

ORDER No. 252/Corr.1 (2016)

Case Management - Consolidation

1. On 24 March 2015, the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT or Dispute Tribunal) in Geneva issued Summary Judgment No. UNDT/2015/026, in respect of 111 individual applications filed by staff members of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) based in India, in which they challenged a local salary survey and the resulting salary freeze. The UNDT consolidated the 111 applications and issued a single judgment addressing them, as they "concern[ed] identical decisions, rel[ied] on common facts and raise[d] the same questions of fact and law". The Dispute Tribunal concluded the 111 applications were not receivable *ratione materiae* .

2. Of the 111 applicants, George Thomas, Manish Khetawat, Tarun Arora, Chander B. Dhoundiyal, George Poulouse, Piyush Choudhary, Siddharth Kumar Mohanty, Mallesh Bazar, Smita Sinha, Sheena George, Rashim Bhagotra, Beena Sudin Pillai, Rajender Prasad Sharma, Shikha Wadhwa, Jaishankar Vridhaigi, Sukanya Subramanian, Bhuvaneshwari Arun Kumar, Pankaj Mathur, Isolene Donna Rebello, Manisha Chawla, Mamta Das, Koushik Kumar Nag, Sony Abraham, Swati Mohapatra, Tulsi Vinod Kumar, Aviral Vikas Bartar, Suman Yashwant Karkera, Fiona Rodrigues, Meena Ganesh, Soumik Sinha, Gautam Das, Uttam Kumar Behera, Pallikaranai Thirumalai Seshadri, Jaiprakash Dhanesh Yadav, Monica Gupta, Ravindran Narayan and Imran Khan (Thomas et al.) have filed separate, almost identical appeals against Judgment No. UNDT/2015/026.

Reissued for technical reasons on 2 March 2016.

3. On 9 September 2015, the Secretary-General submitted a consolidated answer to the 37 appeals filed by Thomaset al.<sup>1</sup>

4. Article 18bis, subsection 1, of the Appeals Tribunal Rules of Procedure, provides that “[t]he President may, at any time, either on a motion of a party or on his or her own volition, issue any order which appears to be appropriate for the fair and expeditious management of the case and to do justice to the parties”.

5.