Introduction

1. On 3 December 2020, the Apintants filed anapplication challenging the

- b. "In the present case, the Applicants haven sitted arguments which are specific to the WMO's implementation of the ICSC Pay Cut Decisions by its Secretary General. The issues will obviously not be addressed by the UNAT in the other pending cases and
- c. "The Respondent's request is without meritid awould only unnecessarily prolong theresent proceedings, which have already been unnecessarily delayed by WMO's failute timely implement an independent and impartial first instance
- 5. The Tribunal notes that the formal track of theeinal justice system is designed as a two instance system and that the Appeals Tribunal has consistently affirmed the secalled doctrine of stare decisis whereby the judgments of the Appeals Tribunal are binding for the Dispute Tribunal (see, for instange inedion 2014 UNAT-410, paras. 23 and 24
- 6. If the outcome of the casescurrently pending before the Appeals Tribunal namely *Doedens et al.* UNDT/2020/148, *Çdaleiq RI tsD\NorredaltDte of* (1) T3\TIS \Table 224 (nt(1))\Text{Text})

AppealsTribunals.While the Applicants in the present case might have franthed rarguments in a different and perhaps broader, WMO-specific manner the Tribunal finds that the judgments of the Appeals Tribunadould, nevertheless have a dispositive effect on the present case all the cases concern the same basic issue Further, the Tibunal notes that the cases before the Appeals Tribunal are to be considered tits next session from 8 to 19 March 2021.

- 9. Accordingly, if the Tribunal processed with the pending prosseding in the presentcase, this could lead to additionable lays due to possible apperal of this Tribunal's final determination and a waste of valuable ujdicial resources Further detailed observations from the Applicant are therefore not necessed this stage
- 10. The Respondent request for a stay of the proceeds is therefore granted until the Appeals Tribunal has issued its judgments with full written reasons in the relevant cases

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 11. The Respondent request for a stay of the proceedingsginanted The proceedings of the present case are suspermented the Appeals Tribunal has issued its judgments with full written reasons in the relevant abronventioned ases
- 12. The Applicant's request to file further detailed bservations to the Respondent's reply is deni(e)4 (s)9vaes