

U I ED NA I DI ET IB A



ICEF's position is not required to be set out in its

in D. The Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert. The Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert.

in the present case, the Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert. The Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert.

in the present case, the Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert. The Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert.

in the present case, the Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert. The Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert.

in the present case, the Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert. The Appellant's request is not a request for the production of documents or for the appointment of an expert.



**Parties submissions**

Applicants present the following submissions:

At the request of the applicant, the Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent. The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent.

As requested, the Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent. The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent.

The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent. The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent.

The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent. The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent.

The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent. The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent.

The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent. The Commission should not refer the case back to the respondent.



n s s t r un **inter alia** to r t ons to r ss n r  
s r ontr t or t G ro r Ass st nt post o o  
t on ICEF Is unt r nt post o ro r Ass st nt  
G E u t on t on ts un to or rs to r on u t t  
r tt n t st s ur n tr nsp r nt t o n r on u t t s t on  
pro ss

• spon nt s pr n p ont nt ons r

t A n str t on s s r t on n r ru t nt tt rs t  
ust t n oo t n r sp tr nt pro ur s n ts s ons  
s not r tr r or ot r s ot t tr n ous tors  
App nt st ur no pro n t tt pro ur s o t t tt  
s on s s or t t rr nt tr s ons r or r nt  
t r nor

t st s pr p r su t tt r p rt n t n t s  
ns rs r stor n t n o ss n n nu r o to  
n t s r tt n t st t Hu n sour s t on or t r  
tr ns tt to t t o su t tt r p rt ss ssors to t r t  
s or n t t o ss ssors n ss ss t t st n t n  
on r s t tt su st n o t t st su tt t App nt n t  
o t st su tt to t ss ssors s nt t on n s to  
t App nt s r tt n t st to s ur ts non t r

In the present Appellate proceedings, the respondent has not  
presented any evidence in support of his claim that the  
respondent's conduct was not in accordance with the  
provisions of the Staff Regulations.

The respondent has not provided any evidence to  
support his claim that the Appellate Tribunal's decision  
is not in accordance with the provisions of the  
Staff Regulations.

It is noted that the respondent has not provided  
any evidence in support of his claim that the  
Appellate Tribunal's decision is not in accordance  
with the provisions of the Staff Regulations.

The respondent has not provided any evidence to  
support his claim that the Appellate Tribunal's  
decision is not in accordance with the provisions  
of the Staff Regulations.

pp. 10-11 of the Staff Regulations.

**Consideration**

It is noted that the respondent has not provided  
any evidence in support of his claim that the  
Appellate Tribunal's decision is not in accordance  
with the provisions of the Staff Regulations.



App s r un urt rru n **Rolland** A t to  
ts r pr su to nr ur pr or A or n n r rut nt  
pro ur t A n str t on s to n n s o t t st  
r s n tur s n u n r ons r t on t ur no proo  
s ts to t n t o ust t n to s o t rou r n  
on n n n t t r n ors t on s n  
s on not to s t t App nt to t post o G o o t on

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2016/002

Judgment No. UNDT/2017/019

B or t r un t App nt urt r nt on t t t t st s not  
prot t n t s n t usto o t Hu n sour s t on ro





or on not t st n n t r un s on rn t t ICEF  
ntrust t tt r su st n str ton o r ru t nt t st to  
p rson o s not su t to t t u s n u t ons n t r or to  
t st n r s o ount t n nt r t t r t to t ut r to  
ICEF A n str t Instru ton o rn n Consu t nts n n u  
ontr tors CF AI A n Furt r ntrust n t pp rs to  
st un t ons to t Hu n sour s Ass st nt o s r ru t s  
onsu t nt t pp rs t t t A n str ton ontr n s  
n s o CF AI A n

Ho r s st t o t n o t Hu n sour s Ass st nt  
s r n t no ou t t t not n n t r or

r un not s rst t t t r s r s t sp o roun  
 t r nt tr s t nt t o quot s n n s t ut to pt t t n  
 or n r t t ou tt n su s sp on t r un  
 ons rst t t pp rs o r nt to tr In to r s n Contr t n  
 t s st rst u t pont rst I t s n ppro  
 s r t r r t r t n ns rt n n or n r t n t t o  
 r un st us not s t s t t t App nt s r o t on nt s t t r s  
 orr t n t t t onst tut on n n n t t r t st n tr  
 D sp t n s to o so t App nt s not to pro n ot r  
 on r t p o t n tr n r t st

r un urt r not s t t t App nt s rst n op o r  
 o t st Co o r on r n ICEF su tt ts  
 r p to t pr s nt pp t on n tt t App nt s o t st to  
 s t s st t nt t t t s nt to t on t t t App nt n  
 o r t us r op o t ICEF sust n to r o t st  
 r t os to t t on s un rt n t on o r r  
 Fu ou t r or ssu t t t t t Fs n F nt t st t t t t Fn F F



Case No. UNDT/GVA/2016/002

Judgment No. UNDT/2017/019





4. In support of the claim, the respondent has submitted evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the damage to the respondent's property. The respondent has submitted evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the damage to the respondent's property. The respondent has submitted evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the damage to the respondent's property.

4. The respondent has submitted evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the damage to the respondent's property. The respondent has submitted evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the damage to the respondent's property. The respondent has submitted evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the damage to the respondent's property.

**Conclusion**

4. In light of the above, the Tribunal DECIDES to grant the respondent's claim for compensation.

**Signed**

u. n. Do. n. n.  
 D. t. t. s. i. o. r.

Ent. r. n. t. s. t. r. o. n. t. s. i. o. r.

**Signed**

n. r. s. t. r. r. G. n.