7. The Tribunal notes that there indeed appears to be a dispute regarding a material fact as the parties disagree on whether a decision to terminate the Applicant permanent appointment has actually been taken. Accordingly motion is misguided, and must be rejected.

Case management

8. The Tribunal notes that the Respondent claims that the application is not receivable because (a)

d not contest a decision to

terminate his permanent appointment in a request for management evaluation a

9. The Respondent, however, has entirely failed to make any submissions on the merits of the application, and in the reply, he seeks leave from the Tribunal to do so if the application is considered receivable.

10.

Case No. UNDT/NY/2019/038 Order No. 104 (NY/2020)

12. Unless otherwise ordered, on receipt of the aforementioned response or at the expiration of the provided time limit, the Tribunal will adjudicate on the matter of receivability and deliver Judgment based on the papers filed on record.

(Signed)

Judge Joelle Adda

Dated this 19th day of June 2020