

NITED \ ATIONS ISPUTE T

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202
UNDT/2015/001, 006
UNDT/2015/007 to 024
UNDT/2015/026 to 028
UNDT/2015/030 to 038
UNDT/2015/041 to 072
UNDT/2015/077 to 083
UNDT/2015/086, 087
UNDT/2015/089 to 094
UNDT/2015/097, 098, 099,
and 100

Judgment No. UNDT/2015/026

Introduction

1. Each of the Applicants, General staff members of the United Nations Children's Fund ("UNICEF"), India, in the service of the Organization from a date prior to 1 November 2014, filed a motion for extension of time to file an application against "the decision of [United Nations Office of Human Resources Management, International Civil Service Commission] ("UN/OHRM/ICSC")]

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202
UNDT/2015/001, 006
UNDT/2015/007 to 024
UNDT/2015/026 to 028
UNDT/2015/030 to 038
UNDT/2015/041 to 072
UNDT/2015/077 to 083
UNDT/2015/086, 087
UNDT/2015/089 to 094
UNDT/2015/097, 098, 099,
and 100

Judgment No. UNDT/2015/026

(1) child, per child, subject to maximum of six children

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202
UNDT/2015/001, 006
UNDT/2015/007 to 024
UNDT/2015/026 to 028
UNDT/2015/030 to 038
UNDT/2015/041 to 072
UNDT/2015/077 to 083
UNDT/2015/086, 087
UNDT/2015/089 to 094
UNDT/2015/097, 098, 099,
and 100

Judgment No. UNDT/2015/026

Consideration

6. As a preliminary matter, since the present individual applications concern identical decisions, rely on common facts and raise the same questions of fact and law, and since all Applicants are staff members of UNICEF, India, the Tribunal considers it appropriate to adjudicate upon them jo

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202
UNDT/2015/001, 006
UNDT/2015/007 to 024
UNDT/2015/026 to 028
UNDT/2015/030 to 038
UNDT/2015/041 to 072
UNDT/2015/077 to 083
UNDT/2015/086, 087
UNDT/2015/089 to 094
UNDT/2015/097, 098, 099,
and 100

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202
UNDT/2015/001, 006
UNDT/2012015/189,

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172
UNDT/2014/176 to 179
UNDT/2014/181, 184, 189,
190, 195
UNDT/2014/197 to 199
UNDT/2014/202
UNDT/2015/001, 006
UNDT/2015/007 to 024
UNDT/2015/026 to 028
UNDT/2015/030 to 038
UNDT/2015/041 to 072
UNDT/2015/077 to 083
UNDT/2015/086, 087
UNDT/2015/089 to 094
UNDT/2015/097, 098, 099,
and 100

Judgment No. UNDT/2015/026

20. The [OHRM] promulgated the salary survey results on its website on 6 February 2012, indicating that the salary scale applicable to staff already on board would be frozen “until the gap is closed”, whereas secondary salary scales would be applied to staff recruited on or after 1 March 2012.

11. Judgment *u a a* was appealed, and this Tribunal decided to suspend its proceedings in the present case until the outcome of said appeal was known.

12. On 26 February 2015, the Appeals Tribunal, in its public announcement of the outcome of its 2015 spring session, dismissed the appeal and upheld the above referenced Dispute Tribunal Judgement.

13. It follows from the public announcement that the receivability findings of Judgment *u a a* UNDT/2014/026 were confirmed without reservation by the Appeals Tribunal (Case No. 2015-UNAT-526). Considering that the Dispute Tribunal should “recognize, respect and abide by the Appeals Tribunal’s jurisprudence” (*do* 2014-UNAT-410), it cannot but reiterate that the decision to freeze the existing salary scales and to review downward allowances did not constitute an administrative decision for the purpose of art. 2.1(a) of it,H24’40”cftz2c1t,H24

Case No. UNDT/2014/112, 123, 125,
131, 134, 146, 148, 155, 162,
163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172

]TJ T [

