



## **Introduction**

1. On 24 May 2024, the Applicant filed an application to contest the decision to impose on her the disciplinary measure of separation from service with compensation *in lieu* of notice, and without termination indemnity, in accordance with staff rule 10.2(a)(viii).

of

7. Article 14.1 of the Rules of Procedure is similarly worded:

At any time during the proceedings, the Dispute Tribunal may order interim measures to provide temporary relief where the contested administrative decision appears prima facie to be unlawful, in cases of particular urgency and where its implementation would cause irreparable damage. This temporary relief may include an order to suspend the implementation of the contested administrative decision, except in cases of appointment, promotion, or termination.

8. In the present case, as correctly argued by the Respondent, the travel authorization constitutes a distinct administrative action separate from and irrelevant to the decision to terminate the Applicant's employment. The action regarding the Applicant's travel authorization pertained to her entitlement to terminal benefits (i.e., repatriation travel), and not to the legality or reasonableness of her separation from service.

9. Article 10.2 of the Tribunal's Statute does not allow the suspension of an action or decision (in this case, the travel authorization) unrelated to an appeal; only the contested administrative decision itself can be suspended, provided the requisite elements for suspension have all been met. Nothing on the case record indicates that the Applicant requested management evaluation of the travel authorization, which is a jurisdictional prerequisite for the Tribunal's review. To the contrary, the Applicant admits that she did not seek management evaluation.

10. The Applicant argues that "there was no time and need for [her] to seek a management

12. However, it is important to be clear about the nature of the impugned decision.

The Applicant is challenging the