

1



Introduction

1. The Applicant is a Radio Operator in the Security Section at the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI). She serves at the GL3 level on a fixed-term appointment.

2. On 12 January 2015, she filed an Application for Suspension of Action, pending management evaluation in respect of a decision by the UNAMI Chief of Mission Support (CMS) and the Chief of Administrative Services (CAS) to terminate her appointment.

3. The Respondent filed a Reply to the Suspension of Action Application on 13 January 2015. He appended the Management Evaluation Unit's response to the Applicant's request for management evaluation dated 12 January 2015.

Facts

4. In June 2014, UNAMI in cooperation with the Department of Field Support ("DFS") at United Nations Headquarters undertook a comprehensive Civilian Staffing Review (CSR) exercise. As a result of the CSR exercise, UNAMI decided to abolish a number of positions under the UNAMI Security Section.

5. On 15 November 2014, the Applicant received a letter from the UNAMI CMS notifying her that her post had been proposed for abolishment effective 1 January 2015.

6. The General Assembly took the final decision on UNAMI's 2015 budget on 29 December 2014 and approved the proposed abolishment of posts in the Security Section of UNAMI.

7. The Applicant requestm [(r)-8(e)-3(q)-11(u)31(e)-3(tm [(r)-8(e)-3(q)-11(u2 0.9981 0 0 -8(e)-3

Considerations

9. Applications for suspension of action are governed by arts. 2.2 and 10.2 of the Statute of the Dispute Tribunal and arts. 13 and 14 of the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure.

10. Article 2.2 governs applications for suspension of actions pending management evaluation whereas art. 10.2 governs, inter alia, suspensions of action at any time during the proceedings.

11. The three statutory prerequisites contained in the Statute for the grant of the interim relief of suspension of action, that is, ~~in~~ unlawfulness, urgency and irreparable damage, must be satisfied for an application for suspension of action to be granted where the contested decision is the subject of a management evaluation.

12. The three statutory prerequisites contained in art. 2.2 of the Statute, that is, ~~in~~ unlawfulness, urgency and irreparable damage, must be satisfied for an application for suspension of action to be granted where the contested decision is the subject of a management evaluation.

13. The wording of art. 2.2 makes it clear that the Tribunal has no authority to order suspension of action on a decision once the management evaluation has been completed.

14. The Appeals Tribunal in ~~in~~ 2010-UNAT-005¹, ~~in~~ 2010-UNAT-008² and ~~in~~ 2010-UNAT-011³ found that the Dispute Tribunal had exceeded the limits of the jurisdiction conferred

the limits and prohibitions established by the Statute since, otherwise, the legislative texts, spirit, and goals underlying them would be ignored or violated⁴.

16. In the present case, the Tribunal notes that the management evaluation was completed on 12 January 2015, thus rendering moot this Application for suspension of action.

Conclusion

17. In view of the foregoing, the Application for suspension of action is rejected.

(8)

Judge Nkemdilim Izuako

Dated this 20th day of January 2015

Entered in the Register on this 20th day of January 2015

(8)

Abena Kwakye-Berko, Registrar, Nairobi

⁴ (8) 2011-UNAT-159 at para. 20.