
UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Cases Nos.: UNDT/NY/2019/028
UNDT/NY/2019/029
UNDT/NY/2019/031
UNDT/NY/2019/033
UNDT/NY/2019/087
UNDT/NY/2021/022
Order No.: 028 (NY/2022)
Date: 15 March 2022
Original: English

Before: Judge Joelle Adda
Registry: New York
Registrar: Nerea Suero Fontecha

RUSSO-GOT

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

ORDER
ON REQUEST FOR ANONYMITY

Counsel for Applicant:
Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent:
UNOPS

Note: This order has been corrected.

Cases Nos.: UNDT/NY/2019/028
UNDT/NY/2019/029
UNDT/NY/2019/031
UNDT/NY/2019/033
UNDT/NY/2019/087
UNDT/NY/2021/022

Order No.: 028 (NY/2022)

Introduction

1.

7. The Applicant argues that he has “received inquiries from the European Union officials, Human Rights Organisations officials, and [his] business partners about the concert situation, and they have requested to share with them all my applications and information. For a transparent and democratic approached a share of my applications must be considered also by you (*sic.*)”.

8. Finally, the Applicant avers that “all the above harm [his] private and professional life/image, as well as on the image of the United Nations as a whole and it is good subject for unfriends of the United Nations system (*sic.*)”.

9. The Tribunal notes that pursuant to art. 11 of its Statute and art. 26 of its Rules of Procedure, the judgments of the Dispute Tribunal are published, while protecting personal data.

10. The Tribunal further recalls that the Appeals Tribunal has repeatedly stated the principle of transparency in the administration of justice and recalled that judgments normally state the names of the parties. The Appeals Tribunal has further clarified that a request for confidentiality, in particular the anonymization of a published judgment, may be granted where necessary to protect information of a confidential and sensitive nature, such as personal medical information (see, for instance, *Kadri*, 2017-UNAT-772, para. 15, *Appellant*, 2020-UNAT-1001, para. 47).

11. Moreover, the Appeals Tribunal stated that the fact that a judgment contains information that may cause embarrassment to the appellant is no basis for departing from the requirements that justice should be done transparently and denied a request for confidentiality on that basis (*Aghadiuno*, 2018-UNAT-811, para. 91).

12. The Tribunal notes that none of the judgments concerned by this request contain any confidential sensitive information and therefore, the Applicant shows no reason for a departure from the principle of transparency.

