

Introduction

1. The Applicant, a Conduct and Discipline Officer at the P-4 level with the [redacted] in Sudan, challenges the [redacted] of 28 November 2022 to recover the amount of US\$ 17,213.00 from his final entitlements or emoluments, in accordance with Staff Rule 3.18(c)(ii).
2. On 5 January 2023, the Applicant filed an application requesting suspension of [redacted]

UNISFA HR showing that steps have been taken towards implementation of the contested decision.

20. The Tribunal rejects this application for suspension of action on the basis that the Applicant failed to prove the element of urgency.

21. The Tribunal recalls that:

I
or he must come to the Tribunal at the first available opportunity, taking the particular circumstances of her or his case into account (*Evangelista* UNDT/2011/212). The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate the particular urgency of the case and the timeliness of her or his actions. The requirement of particular urgency will not be satisfied if the urgency was created or caused by the applicant (*Villamorán* UNDT/2011/126, *Dougherty* UNDT/2011/133, *Jitsamruay* UNDT/2011/206; *Maloka Mpacko* UNDT/2012/081, reiterated in *Majoul-Hunter* UNDT/2012/117).

22. The Applicant indicated in his application that the contested decision was notified to him on 28 November 2022, but he waited until 5 January 2023 to request management evaluation and file this application. He does not explain why he chose to wait more than a month to contest a decision he knew would be forthcoming in the wake of his dismissal from service.

23. Under the circumstances of this case, the Tribunal finds that the urgency is self-created and, accordingly, that the Applicant has failed to meet the test of urgency under art. 2.2 of the Tribunal's Statute.

24. Since one of the three cumulative conditions required for temporary relief under art. 2.2 of the UNDT Statute has not been met, the Tribunal does not need to examine

Conclusion

25. In view of the foregoing, the application for