





the decision of the Secretary of the ABCC and the actions of the ABCC by preventing full and fair consideration of his claim for compensation”. The Applicant further contends that “identical evidence would be presented in all applications” and that any other “disposition” than joining or consolidating the cases “would result in considerable duplication and could conceivably risk inconsistencies in result”.

5. The Dispute Tribunal consolidated the proceedings of C

7. It appears to the Tribunal that the contested administrative decisions in Cases Nos. UNDT/NY/2018/011 and UNDT/NY/2018/032 concern exactly the same circumstances as those of Case No. UNDT/NY/2020/008 and that the outcome was alike, namely the ABCC rejecting the Applicant's claim for compensation for his alleged psychological injuries (Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder) resulting from his service with UNICEF in Chad and in Somalia. Essentially, the decision contested in Case No. UNDT/NY/2020/008 would therefore seem to have the same legal consequence as those decisions challenged in Cases Nos. UNDT/NY/2018/011 and UNDT/NY/2018/032. In addition, the principal remedy sought in Cases Nos. UNDT/NY/2018/011 and UNDT/NY/2018/032 already appears to have been granted by Judgment No. UNDT/2019/098, namely that the case be remanded to the ABCC for reconsideration, for which reason it could be argued that those cases are now moot. Similarly, any request for compensation for delay, or otherwise, raised as part of Cases Nos. UNDT/NY/2018/011 and UNDT/NY/2018/032



