



## Introduction

1. By application dated 10 November 2014, the Applicant, an Associate Child Protection Officer employed at the P-2 level by DPKO in New York, contests the “[d]ecision not to reset the clock on her request for rental subsidy on re-employment at a duty station where she had previously served”. On 10 November 2014, the New York Registry transmitted the application to the Respondent, informing that the reply was due on Wednesday, 10 December 2014.
2. On 10 December 2014, the Respondent filed his reply contending inter alia, that not only was the Applicant’s claim without merit as she had received the full entitlement sought, but also that it was not receivable since the application was time-barred.
3. On 13 January 2015, the Tribunal, by Order No. 2 (NY/2015), requested that the Applicant file a submission addressing alleged satisfaction of her claim/s and the issue of receivability raised in the Respondent’s reply.
4. On 15 January 2015, the Applicant filed a response to Order No. 2 stating that, although she had filed a request for a management evaluation on 27 September 2013, she had never received a management evaluation letter from the Management Evaluation Unit, nor an explanation of the impugned decision until the filing of the Respondent’s reply on 10 December 2014. Following the filing of the reply, having now had the opportunity to read and consider the Organization’s explanation for the contested decision, the Applicant wished to withdraw her application, fully and finally.



Conclusion

10. The Applicant has withdrawn the ~~case~~ case in finality, including on the merits, with the intention of ~~resolving~~ resolving all aspects of the dispute between the parties. There no longer being any determination to make, this application is dismissed in its entirety ~~with~~ without liberty to reinstate.

(Signed)

Judge Ebrahim-Carstens

Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of January 2015