



Introduction

1. The Applicant is the Director of the Programme Planning and Technical

6. On 5 September 2013, in Case No. UNDT/NBI/2013/060 filed by Ms. Okuda, the Dispute Tribunal issued Order No. 202 (NBI/2013) for suspension of action against the decision to reassign her pending management evaluation.

7. The Applicant avers that Ms. Okuda received a decision from the Management Evaluation Unit (MEU) on 13 December 2013 in which the MEU upheld the contested decision.

8. Based on the MEU response to Ms. Okuda's request for management

21. The contested decisions do not concern any administrative decisions that are in non-compliance with the Applicant's own contract of employment. The Applicant lacks the standing to intercede in contractual relationships that exist between other staff members and the Organization which is what he is trying to achieve by seeking the suspension of decisions regarding the assignments of two other staff members.

22. The contested decisions have already been implemented. The two decisions were to take effect "with immediate effect" after Ms. Okuda and Mr. Alvaro-Rivero received the notifications thus making the Application not receivable.

23. The Respondent therefore requests that the Dispute Tribunal should find

28. The two contested decisions in this case have no direct link to the Applicant's own contract of employment. All the substantive issues impacted upon by the decisions relate to the terms of employment of Ms. Okuda and Mr. Alvaro-Rivero who are the two individuals with the requisite standing to challenge their reassignments. The Applicant's assertion that the reassignment of Ms. Okuda and the assignment of Alvaro-Rivero to take her place would negatively affect his own performance is at best speculative.

29. The Applicant therefore lacks the *locus standi* to litigate and to contest the two decisions as they directly affect the employment contracts of Ms. Okuda and Mr. Alvaro-Rivero, both of whom have the capacity to litigate on their own behalf.

30. Having determined that the Applicant lacks the *locus standi* to institute the present Application, the Tribunal finds