

Introduction

1. On 23 June 2014, the Applicant, a former staff member of the United

an “Order” on an application for suspension of action. The Respondent submits that the Tribunal can consider an application filed by a party for interpretation of the meaning of a “final judgment” but not an “order”. Noting that the Order on the

17. The submission of Respondent that the Application is not receivable on the ground that the Applicant has not filed an Application on the merits ignores

powers beyond those conferred under their respective statutes”. The same resolution, however, also emphasized that the new system of administration of justice is “independent, transparent, professionalized, adequately resourced and decentralized” and is “consistent with the relevant rules of international law and the principles of the rule of law and due process to ensure respect for the rights and obligations of staff members”. For the Appeals Tribunal to hold that no interest can be awarded would not be reconcilable with the tribunals’ mandates. Moreover, the award of interest by the tribunals is necessary to ensure that payments to staff are made by the Organization.

22. The Tribunal holds that, since an order is subject to an appeal as decided

(Signed)

Judge Vinod Boolell

Dated this 30th day of October 2014

Entered in the Register on this 30th day of October 2014

(Signed)