

NITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

The Application and Procedural History

1. The Applicant is the Chief of the **St** counselling and Welfare Section at the African Union-United Nations Mission iDarfur (UNAMID). She serves on a fixed-term appointment at the P-5 level in El Fasher.

2. On 23 June 2015, the Applicant filed **app**lication for suspension of action seeking an injunction against the decoising to renew her appointment beyond 30 June 2015.

3. The Respondent filed his Replyttree Application on 25 June 2015.

4. On 25 June 2015, the Tribunal issumeder No. 223 (NBI/2015) granting the application for suspension of action pending management evaluation.

5. The Management Evaluation Ur(MEU) had, on 24 June 2015, however, issued its decision declaring the Applicant's challenge as not receivable because "no decision has been taken" to not renew Applicant's appointment. MEU also found the Applicant's challenge to be "moot" as her appointment had been extended through 31 July 2015.

6. On 22 July 2015, the Applicant filebler second request for management evaluation challenging the decision to sreape her on 31 July 2015; she also moved the court for an injunction against that decision.

7. On 29 July 2015, the Tribunal issued Order No. 247 (NBI/2015) granting the Applicant's motion pendingnanagement evaluation.

8. On 15 September 2015, the Applicant diltere subject motion of the present decision seeking extension of time withine therms of art. 8.3 of the Statute of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal.

Submissions

9. The Applicant has 90 days from the date of *f*the management evaluation decision to substantively challenge the cision not to renew her appointment. She also has 90 days from the date of *the eond* management evaluation decision to challenge the decision to septe her as of 31 July 2015.

10. The Applicant submits that it would bine the "interests of judicial economy and the expeditious conduct of proceedings" for her to challenge the impugned decision on the meritence. In other words, it wouldbe a waste of the Court's resources if the Applicant were to filtewo substantive applications on what is essentially the same set of facts.

11. Indeed, the Applicant submits, "internains possible that the MEU will determine the issue to the Applicants at is faction, thus vapiding litigation" altogether.

Deliberations

12. It is settled law that "[a]h application is only receivable when a staff member has previously submitted the impugned mandstrative decision for management evaluation and the application is the specified deadlines."

13. Article. 8.1(d)(i)(b) of theStatute of the Dispute ibrunal and 7.1(b) of its Rules of Procedure require an applicant to

14. The exception to that use is provided for in art.8.3 of the Statute and art. 7.5 of the Rules of Procedure, which presizions allow for suspension, waiver or extension of that deadien "in exceptional cases."

15. In this case, Counsel for the Appaint displayed prudence and suitable respect for the Court's resources in filing this Motion, and in doingetore the expiry of the deadline to challengetfirst management evaluation decision.

16. The Tribunal notes that the United Natio Appeals Tribunal has, in similar situations, adopted a more "flexible appro'a sob as not to penalise an applicant who has "made a good faith, diligent and timeous effort...[to] avoid unnecessary litigation."²

17. The Tribunal appreciates that is exactly what the Applicant is seeking to do in this case.

18. The Application for Extension of Time **G**RANTED as prayed for by the Applicant.

² See Markovic, Order No. 207 (NY/2011), citin**g***Iolari*, Order No. 15 (UNAT/2010)*Kaddoura*, Order No. 21 (UNAT/2010)*Lshak*, Order No. 22 (UNAT/2010)*Applicant*, Order No. 263 (NY/2011) and *Jaen*, Order No. 331 (NY/2010)*Jaen*, Order No. 331 (NY/2010).

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2015/096 Order No. 312 (NBI/2015)

(Signed) Judge Vinod Boolell Dated this^{to}day of October 2015

Entered in the Register on this $\mathbf{6}$ ay of October 2015

(Signed)

Abena Kwakye-Berko, Registrar, Nairobi