



**Before:** Judge Vinod Boolell  
**Registry:** Nairobi  
**Registrar:** Abena Kwakye-Berko

DALGAMOUNI

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

---

**CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER**

---

**Counsel for the Applicant:**  
Alexandre Tavadian, OSLA

**Counsel for the Respondent:**  
Steven Dietrich, ALS/OHRM  
Alister Cumming, ALS/OHRM

### **The Application and Procedural History**

1. The Applicant is a Budget Officer at the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe, Uganda (RSCE). She serves at the P4 level on a fixed term appointment.
2. On 12 November 2014, the Applicant filed the subject Application of this Order before the Tribunal.
3. Taking into account the substantive application before the Tribunal, this is the Applicant's fifth challenge at the UNDT. All five of these applications stem from and essentially revolve around the same set of facts.
4. Given the multiple applications and motions by this Applicant before the Tribunal, the procedural history in this case is set out in full.
5. On 16 May 2014, the Applicant filed an application for suspension of action challenging the decision not to extend her fixed-term appointment. The Tribunal issued Order No. 137 (NBI/2014) on 23 May 2014, granting the application.
6. On 23 September 2014, the Applicant filed her second Application for Suspension of Action. The Applicant complained that she had been subjected to "a series of actions which cumulatively amount to a decision to constructively dismiss her by depriving her of her functions". The "most recent decision" was made on 19 September 2014.
7. The Respondent argued that the Applicant's second application for suspension of action was not receivable as a matter of substance; that it did not meet the statutory timelines; and that it had, in any event, been implemented.
8. On 24 September 2014, the Tribunal issued Order No. 214 (NBI/2014) setting the matter down for hearing.

9. The Tribunal heard the Parties on 25 September 2014. The Applicant and one other witness testified. The Tribunal admitted the written statement of one further witness for the Applicant, without objection from the Respondent. For his part, the Respondent called one witness. Closing submissions were filed by both Parties on 26 September 2014.

10. On 30 September 2014, the Tribunal issued Order No. 218 (NBI/2014) in which it found the second application receivable and granted the stay that the Applicant sought, pending management evaluation.

11. On 10 October 2014, the Tribunal issued Order No. 224 (NBI/2014) in which it fully set out its position in respect of the receivability and merits of the second application.

12. On 7 November 2014, the Applicant moved for execution of Order No.224 (NBI/2014) pursuant to arts. 32.2 and 36 of the Rules of Procedure.

13. Also, on 7 November 2014, the Applicant received the outcome of her second request for management evaluation.

14. In response to the motion for execution, the Respondent took the position that the Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to decide on the motion for execution as Order No. 224 (NBI/2014), which was issued pending management evaluation, was no longer in force.

15. On 12 November 2014, the Applicant filed an application on the merits and an Application for *interim* relief pursuant to art. 14 of the Rules of Procedure.

16. The Respondent replied to the Application on 13 November 2014, and the Applicant filed her Rejoinder to the Respondent's Reply on 16 November 2014.



Report on the status of the mediation. The Tribunal also directed the “Parties to consult between themselves and provide the Tribunal with a common position as to their willingness to have this matter settled.”

27. The Tribunal said then that it

[C]ontinues to take the view that mediation or informal resolution of this dispute would be in the best interest of the Parties; and in the interest of the efficient use of the Tribunal’s resources and the expeditious conduct of proceedings.

The Tribunal is also mindful of paragraph 27 of General Assembly resolution 69/203 (Administration of justice at the United Nations) in which the courts are exhorted to proactively promote the “successful settlement of disputes.”<sup>1</sup>

28. On 31 March 2015, OMS informed the Tribunal that the “Parties have agreed to actively continue to attempt to settle this case in mediation.”

29. On 1 April 2015, the Tribunal issued Order No. 111 (NBI/2015) suspending the proceedings and directing OMS to report to on the status of the mediation process by 29 May 2015.

30. On 29 May 2015, UNOMS applied on behalf of both Parties for the reporting deadline on the status of the mediation to be extended to 30 June 2015. The Mediator explained that the additional time is necessary given the “nature of the solutions being explored by the Parties”.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 27 states: “Recalls the emphasis placed by the General Assembly on the resolution of disputes, and requests the Secretary-General to report on the practice of proactive case management by the judges of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal in the promotion and successful settlement of

31. On 3 June 2015, the Tribunal issued Order No. 183(NBI/2015) commending the Parties for their efforts, and granting the extension of time sought by the Mediator.

32. On 20 July 2015, OMS wrote to the Registry

34. The Tribunal further **DIRECTS** that any other motion for interlocutory orders being sought by the Parties be filed by **31 August 2015**.

*(Signed)*

Judge Vinod Boolell

Dated this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of July 2015

Entered in the Register on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of July 2015

*(Signed)*

Abena Kwakye-Berko, Registrar, Nairobi