requested management evaluation of the 2 June 2015 decision by the request dated 26 May 2015.

11.

17. The Tribunal finds that the submission of the 2016-2017 UNJSPF budget estimates did not have direct legal consequences on the Applicant's terms and conditions of appointment. Therefore, in accordance with the Appeals Tribunal's finding in *Lee*, the contested decision is not an administrative decision subject to judicial review.

18. Having found the application not receivable, it is not necessary to consider the merits of the application.

Costs

19. At the CMD held on 22 July 2015, the Applicant was advised by the Tribunal that if he wished to proceed with his claims in this case and Case No. UNDT/NY/2014/087, notwithstanding the advice received from the Tribunal, and he

irrelevant documents) by a staff member who has prior experience before the tribunals of the United Nations' internal justice system is a manifest abuse of the Dispute Tribunal's process.

23. In *Gehr* 2013-UNAT-328, the Appeals Tribunal ordered costs against the applicant, noting that it had previously indicated that he should be prepared to face an award of costs if he filed an appeal lacking in merit.

24. There is nothing in the Applicant's additional submissions dated 27 July 2015 to persuade the Tribunal that there is any merit in his application. The Tribunal finds that the Applicant has manifestly abused the proceedings by his persistence in advancing a legally unsustainable contention, despite guidance offered at the CMD on the applicable legal principles settled by the Appeals Tribunal. The Applicant may well be frustrated by what he perceived as a failure to consult the staff representatives on a matter over which they feel that they had a right to be consulted. However, a challenge before the Tribunal is wholly inappropriate in circumstances where it is clear that the Tribunal does not have power to grant the relief sought. The manner in which these proceedings have been conducted by the Applicant constitutes a manifest abuse of process. In assessing the amount of costs, the Tribunal has taken into account the circumstances of the case, including the fact that the Applicant is self-represented and acted in his capacity as a staff representative.

Judgment

25. The application is dismissed.

26. In exercise of power under art. 10.6 of its Statute, the Tribunal orders costs against the Applicant in the sum of USD500.

(*Signed*)

Judge Goolam Meeran

Dated this 2nd day of September 2015

Entered in the Register on this 2nd day of September 2015

(*Signed*)

Hafida Lahiouel, Registrar, New York