



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2009/008

Judgment No.: UNDT/2009/069

Date: 6 November 2009

Original: English

Before: Judge Nkemdilim Izuako

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Jean-Pelé Fomété

1. APPEARANCES/LEGAL REPRESENTATION

1.1 Applicant: The Applicant was absent. The Applicant's Counsel, Ms. Katya Melliush of the Office of Staff Legal Assistance, Nairobi was present.

1.2 Respondent: The Respondent's Counsel Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, Principal Legal Adviser, UNEP, appeared via audio-conference, also present for the Respondent was the Deputy Director, UNEP Division of Regional Cooperation (UNEP/DRC) and a Senior Programme Officer, UNEP/DRC.

2. FACTS

2.1 The Applicant joined the UNEP Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA), Manama, Bahrain, on a fixed-term appointment as a Programme Officer, Natural Resources at the P-4 level on 4 October 2004. On 12 May 2008, the Applicant was informed that his fixed-term appointment would not be extended beyond 3

Applicant and the Respondent were accordingly informed on 8 July 2009 and 30 July 2009 respectively.

2.4 On 30 July 2009, the Respondent's Counsel filed a motion asking the Nairobi UNDT, which was now seised of the matter, for extension of the time to submit comments on the Applicant's Observations on the Respondent's Reply on the grounds that she had to travel to her home country on a family emergency. The Applicant's Counsel at that time did not object to the grant of an extension of time. On 31 July 2009, the Tribunal granted an extension of time as per the Respondent's motion and directed the said Respondent to file the required submission by 18 August 2009. The Respondent's Rejoinder was subsequently filed on 17 August 2009.

2.5 On 28 October 2009, the Registrar of the Nairobi UNDT invited the Parties to a status conference scheduled to take place on 2 November 2009. The Registrar informed the Parties that the general objectives of the status conference were to look into and attend to all issues having a bearing on the readiness of the case for consideration and determination by the Tribunal and to come up with a timeline for the processing of the case.

2.6 On 29 October 2009, the Applicant's Counsel filed a Notice of Withdrawal of Appearance in which she requested the leave of the Tribunal to withdraw her representation of the Applicant on the grounds that she had incomplete instructions. The Applicant's Counsel also informed the Tribunal that the Applicant was aware of the Status Conference but that he was unable to attend. On the same date, the Tribunal advised the Applicant's Counsel that her request for withdrawal had been denied and requested her to attend the status conference so that she could apprise the Tribunal of the status of the Application.

2.7 On 30 October 2009, the Respondent's Counsel filed the following documents with the Tribunal:

- (i) A copy of a letter dated 18 September 2009 from the Deputy Director and Officer in Charge of the Division of Regional Cooperation, UNEP, to the Applicant in which the latter was

- (v) That she had reached a stalemate with the Applicant who had instructed that she ask the Tribunal to adjourn the hearing in this Application to January 2010.
- (vi) That she was formally asking the Tribunal to adjourn the Hearing of the case to January 2010 and that she beallowed to withdraw as the Applicant's Counsel at this stage.

3.2 The Respondent's Counsel on their part submitted as follows:

- (i) That there were two issues to be resolved, namely, the issue of withdrawal of the Applicant's Counsel and the issue of adjournment to January 2010.
- (ii) That as the Applicant's Counsel had indicated that the substantive matter has been resolved and that nothing remained to be resolved by the Tribunal adjourning to January 2010.
- (iii) That she had no objection to the withdrawal by the Applicant's Counsel.
- (iv) That she had submitted 2 documents to the Tribunal and that these documents were proof that this matter had been resolved.
- (v) That as the Applicant's Counsel had no further instructions the matter had been resolved.

4. CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 In considering the Parties' submissions, the Tribunal observed as follows:

- (i) The Applicant had failed to give new instructions to his Counsel in respect to the Application contesting the non-renewal of his fixed-term appointment beyond 3 October 2009.
- (ii) The Applicant had been informed about the Status Conference by his Counsel and had failed to make an appearance or to contact the Tribunal to give reasons for his absence.

- (iii) The Applicant's Counsel had advised that as far as she was concerned, the substantive matter in this Application had been resolved.
- (iv) From the documents tendered by the Respondent on 30 October 2009, the Tribunal is convinced that the substantive matter in this Application had been addressed and resolved.
- (v) The Applicant has not actively or diligently pursued his case.

5. DECISION