



**UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL  
TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES**

---

A faint, grayscale background image of a large, modern building with a prominent archway, likely the United Nations Secretariat Building.

**Amarah  
(Appellant/Respondent on Cross-Appeal)**

**v.**

**Commissioner-General**

A large, solid black rectangular redaction box covering the majority of the page's content.

Date: 29 March 2019

Registrar: Weicheng Lin

---

**JUDGE DEBORAH THOMAS-FELIX, PRESIDING.**

1. The United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) has before it an appeal against Judgment on Remedies No. UNRWA/DT/2018/041 rendered by the Dispute Tribunal of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA DT or UNRWA Dispute Tribunal and UNRWA or Agency, respectively) on 27 June 2018, in the case of *Amarah v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*. Mr. Jamal Omar Mohammad Amarah filed the appeal on 19 July 2018, and the Commissioner-General filed his answer on 17 September 2018.
2. On 17 September 2018, the Commissioner-General filed a cross-appeal against Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2018/041 as well as Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2018/004 issued by the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal on 15 January 2018 in the same case (Judgment on the Merits). On

4. On 31 August 2015, Mr. Amarah's EVS application was approved and he was separated from 2283/TT1t19gency's service.

5.

would not be eligible for re-employment with UN RWA for a minimum period of 18 months after his EVS.

7. Mr. Amarah appealed, by first requesting a decision review and then filing an application with the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal.

8. In its Judgment on the Merits, the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal found that the Agency had unlawfully appointed Mr. Amarah to the post of CSO, in violation of Area Staff Rule 109.15, Area Staff Personnel Directive A/9/Rev. 10 (PD A/9/Rev. 10), and General Staff Circular 03/2015 (GSC 03/2015), and that the Agency was therefore liable for the consequences of that unlawful decision. However, Mr. Amarah also contributed to the unlawful decision, as he was “deemed to know the Agency’s Regulations and Rules”, and should consequently be held partially liable. The UNRWA Dispute Tribunal apportioned the liability as 75 per cent for the Agency and 25 per cent for Mr. Amarah. To assist it subsequently in making monetary awards

that it is permissible, as a matter of evidence, to infer logically and legitimately that [he] suffered moral injury”,<sup>3</sup> for which the UNRWA DT affixed the monetary compensation at USD 1,000, though it noted that Mr. Amarah had failed to submit evidence in support of his claim for moral damages.

### **Submissions**

#### **Mr. Amarah’s Appeal**

12. The UNRWA Dispute Tribunal erred in fact and in law in erroneously calculating the compensation due to the Agency’s negligence in the selection process that caused Mr. Amarah to lose his Ph.D. scholarship and salary and sustain material and moral damages. Mr. Amarah complied with the court order by submitting sufficient and credible evidence to prove the exact amount of the damages. The UNRWA Dispute Tribunal, however, did not consider any of his evidence. Mr. Amarah had proven the loss of a full scholarship including a tuition exemption, an allowance of EUR 6,300 per year for at least three years, in addition to the loss of his 33.6 months’ contract as a CSO with UNRWA and his Provident Fund contribution, totalling USD 67,232.

13. It was not a “clear consideration” for the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal to conclude that the decision to appoint Mr. Amarah as CSO was unlawful, but the subsequent decision to cancel his appointment was lawful. Mr. Amarah’s employment was a valid and binding contract as the Agency was aware that he did not pass the 18-month separation period and, in effect, waived that requirement in the interest of the Agency when it recruited Mr. Amarah.

14. Mr. Amarah requests that he be paid USD 67,232 in compensation for his lost Ph.D. scholarship and related benefits, lost career opportunity, and adequate moral damages.

#### **The Commissioner-General’s Answer**

15. The Commissioner-General requests that the Appeals Tribunal find inadmissible Mr. Amarah’s submissions relating to the selection process, the alleged validity of his employment contract, and the waiver of the condition of eligibility for re-employment, as those claims are new elements that were not put forward at the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal level and cannot be introduced for the first time on appeal.

---

<sup>3</sup> Impugned Judgment, para. 22.

16. Mr. Amarah has failed to establish any basis to warrant an increase in the material and moral damages awarded or to identify any error warranting the reversal of the contested Judgment. Contrary to Mr. Amarah's allegations, the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal considered the issues of alleged loss of salary and the documents that Mr. Amarah had presented in relation to his scholarship claim. The UNRWA Dispute Tribunal's consideration of these matters "remain[ed] unassailed".

17. Mr. Amarah merely repeats his submissions made before the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal. As there is no legal basis for considering his plea for an enhanced award, the Commissioner-General requests that the Appeals Tribunal reject all of his pleas, deny all reliefs sought and dismiss the present appeal in its entirety.

**The Commissioner-General's Cross-Appeal**

18. The UNRWA Dispute Tribunal erred in law and in fact, resulting in a manifestly unreasonable decision when it found the Agency liable and awarded Mr. Amarah USD 247.50 as material damages and USD 1,000 as moral damages. Having held that the cancellation of Mr. Amarah's contract was lawful, there was no basis for the awards, as there was no breach of a contractual right.

19. The UNRWA DT's reasoning was flawed as it was predicated on its holding that, because of the unlawful decision to appoint Mr. Amarah to the post of CSO, he declined a scholarship to

21. The Commissioner-General requests that the Appeals Tribunal allow his cross-appeal and vacate the contested Judgments (both on the merits and on remedies) in their entirety.

**Mr. Amarah's Answer to the Cross-Appeal**

22. In his answer to Mr. Amarah's appeal, the Commissioner-General highlighted the corrective nature of the appeals procedure, but he has failed to comply with this requirement in his cross-appeal, as he reiterates the same arguments that had already been addressed by the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal. The cross-appeal has therefore no legal basis.

23. The UNRWA Dispute Tribunal correctly held the Agency liable for the decision to unlawfully appoint Mr. Amarah on 18 October 2016, as there was a direct link between the lost

26. The main issue to be determined in the present case is whether the UNRWA DT erred in apportioning the liability as 75 per cent for the Agency and 25 per cent for Mr. Amarah.

27. Mr. Amarah, as a beneficiary of an EVS, signed the respective EVS application and, in so doing, acknowledged that his EVS was subject, *inter alia*, to the provision of PD A/9/Rev. 10, which prohibits his re-employment for at least 18 months. He knew that the prohibition was a condition with respect to obtaining the EVS and he signed acknowledging same. However, in breach of the prohibition, he applied for the CSO position less than nine months after his EVS and accepted the position some 13 months after his separation.

28. The maxim “he that comes to equity must come with clean hands” is very relevant here. Mr. Amarah cannot be allowed to knowingly breach the rules, engage in an activity which is unlawful and then seek compensation. The integrity of this justice system and the administration of justice must be protected and maintained, therefore the Appeals Tribunal will not allow Mr. Amarah to profit from his own wrong.

29. We deem Mr. Amarah’s conduct self-serving and unlawful and find as a fact that Mr. Amarah knew the law with respect of EVS when he applied for the CSO position, and that he



31. With respect to the issue of moral damages which is raised in this appeal, the Appeals Tribunal in *Kallon* stated in its majority decision that compensation for harm, generally speaking, must be supported by evidence.<sup>6</sup> There is no such evidence to support a claim for moral damages in the instant appeal.

**Judgment**

32. Mr. Amarah's appeal is dismissed. The Commissioner-General's cross-appeal is granted and Judgment Nos. UNRWA/DT/2018/004 (Judgment on the Merits) and UNRWA/DT/2018/041 (Judgment on Remedies) are vacated in their entirety.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of March 2019 in New York, United States.

*(Signed)*

Judge Thomas-Felix,  
Presiding

*(Signed)*

Judge Raikos

*(Signed)*

Judge Knierim

Entered in the Register on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of May 2019 in New York, United States.

*(Signed)*

Weicheng Lin, Registrar

---

<sup>6</sup> *Kallon v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2017-UNAT-742.