
UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NY/2024/006

Order No.: 050 (NY/2024)

Date: 9 May 2024

Original: English

Before: Duty Judge

Registry: New York

Registrar: Isaac /TQEMC q140.42 61.42 61.42 61.42 61.42 6140.42 666.7 396.07 27 reW*nB

been established; (b) whether the established facts amount to misconduct; (c) whether the sanction is proportionate to the offence; and (d) whether the staff member's due process rights were respected. When termination is a possible outcome, misconduct must be established by clear and convincing evidence, which means that the truth of the facts asserted is highly probable. (In line herewith, see the Appeals Tribunal in para. 51 of *Karkara* 2021-UNAT-1172, and similarly in, for instance, *Modey-Ebi* 2021-UNAT-1177, para. 34, *Khamis* 2021-UNAT-1178, para. 80, *Wakid* 2022-UNAT-1194, para. 58, *Nsabimana* 2022-UNAT-1254, para. 62, and *Bamba* 2022-UNAT-1259, para. 37). The Appeals Tribunal has further explained that clear and convincing proof “requires more than a preponderance of the evidence but less than proof beyond a reasonable doubt—it means that the truth of the facts asserted is highly probable” (see para. 30 of *Molari* 2011-UNAT-164). In this regard, “the Administration bears the burden of establishing that the alleged misconduct for which a disciplinary measure has been taken against a staff member occurred” (see para. 32 of *Turkey* 2019-UNAT-955).

6. The Appeals Tribunal, however, underlined that “it is not the role of the Dispute Tribunal to consider the correctness of the choice made by the Secretary-General amongst the various courses of action open to him” or otherwise “substitute its own decision for that of the Secretary-General” (see *Sanwidi* 2010-UNAT-084, para. 40). In this regard, “the Dispute Tribunal is not conducting a ‘merit-based review, but a judicial review’” explaining that a “[j]udicial review is more concerned with examining how the decision-maker reached the impugned decision and not the merits of the decision-maker’s decision” (see *Sanwidi*, para. 42).

7. Among the circumstances to consider when assessing the Administration’s exercise of its discretion, the Appeals Tribunal stated “[t]here can be no exhaustive list of the applicable legal principles in administrative law, but unfairness, unreasonableness, illegality, irrationality, procedural irregularity, bias, capriciousness, arbitrariness and lack of proportionality are some of the grounds on which tribunals may for good reason interfere with the exercise of administrative discretion” (see *Sanwidi*, para. 38).

Case No. UNDT/NY/2024/006

Order No. 050 (NY/2024)

Case No. UNDT/NY/2024/006

Order No. 050 (NY/2024)

Case No. UNDT/NY/2024/006

Order No. 050 (NY/2024)

statement may also be adopted as the examination-in-chief at a potential hearing if the party leading the witness should wish to do so.

21. Upon receipt of the above-referenced submissions and when the case has been assigned to a Judge of the Dispute Tribunal, relevant instructions for further case management will be issued.

(Signed)

Judge Joelle Adda

Dated this 9th day of May 2024