	UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL	Case No.:	UNDT/NBI/2018/056
		Judgment No.:	UNDT/2021/051
		Date:	7 May 2021
		Original:	

Background

1. The Applicant commenced service with the Organization in 2004. Prior to her separation from service, on 1 March 2018, she held a fixed-term appointment as a Nurse at the GL-4 level, with the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO).

On 7 May 2018, she filed an application with the United Nations Dispute
7 ULEXQDO LQ 1 DLUREL FKDOOHQJLQJ WKH 5 HVSRQGHQW

3. The Respondent filed his reply to the application on 8 June 2018.

4. The Tribunal heard the case on 7, 14, 17 and 21 December 2020, on 29 January 2021 and on 4, 5 and 19 February 2021 when oral testimony was received from:

a. the Applicant;

b. Dr. Pontife, V D Q G D, $V D O L P \setminus D$ WKH $S S @ th E D Q W \P V$ WU Centre Psychiatrique Sosame); and

c. Ms. Lesa Brittain, then 211LFH RI, QWHUQDO 2YHUVLJKW 6HU, QYHVWLJDWRU ZKR LQYHVWLJDWHG WKH SSOLFDQV

5. The Respondent and Applicant filed closing submissions on 10 and 12 April 2021 respectively. On 14 April 2021, the Applicant filed a motion seeking to amend her closing submissions. On 16 April 2021, the Respondent filed a response to the \$SSOLFDQW¶V PRWLRQ

Summary of the relevant facts

6. On 4 May 2015, the Applicant attended the Centre Hospitalier Biopharm to undergo a pregnancy check-up. This medical test confirmed that she was four and a

half months pregnant.¹

7. On or around June 2015, six months into her pregnancy, the Applicant suffered a miscarriage. She became depressed as a result of the miscarriage, was admitted to the Centre Psychiatrique Sosame in Bukavu and received treatment for major depressive disorder.²

8. On 30 6 H S W H P E H U W K H \$ S S O L F D Q Weighterio D W H U Q L W \ 5 October to 24 January 2016 was approved by her immediate supervisor.³

9. On 17 December 2015, the Investigations Division of OIOS received a report implicating the Applicant in child trafficking. In or around December 2015, OIOS opened an investigation under case no. 0572/15, to investigate the allegations of child trafficking implicating the Applicant. Specifically, there were four allegations: i) child trafficking; ii) knowingly obtaining a medical certificate for maternity leave without being pregnant; iii) submitting fraudulent medical insurance claims; and iv) accepting money from colleagues to assist with a pregnancy.⁴

The Applicant was interviewed in connection with these allegations on 1 July
2016.⁵

11. On 29 September 2016, OIOS informed the Applicant that the alleged misconduct was not substantiated and that the case was closed. She was also informed that a further investigation might be considered if new evidence was discovered.⁶

12. On 19 December 2016, OIOS finalized its Investigation Report in Case No. 0495/16 which found that, in 2015, the Applicant had fraudulently sought and was

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2018/056 Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/051

Considerations

Legal issues

The role of the UNDT in disciplinary cases

- 17. In keeping with UNAT jurisprudence¹² the Tribunal will examine:
 - a. whether the facts on which the sanction is based have been established;
 - b. whether the established facts qualify as misconduct under the Staff Regulations and Rules; and
 - c.

21. The impugned decision relates to a complaint that on 25 September 2015, the Applicant misrepresented to Dr. Cizungu that she was pregnant and obtained a medical certificate attesting to her pregnancy. Further, that based on this certificate, she sought and obtained maternity leave from the Organization from 5 October 2015 to 24 January 2016 to which she was not entitled.

22. In her testimony before the Tribunal, the Applicant was evasive when asked about whether she had lied to the Organization in order to secure maternity leave. In her UHVSRQVH WR WKH TXHVWLRQ ³&ODgQnizaRoX and GPLW WKD³ falsely claimed maternity le DYH ZKHQ \RX ZHU,HiQ (\$100) fiels tobult JQDQW « "

:HOO LW ¶V GLIILFXOW ±W,¶G DOQLWZDWUYW KUVYW KUVYW KDW, ¶G difficult to say that I lied, because I know I made a mistake in taking this leave as maternity leave -- WKDW ¶V ZK,D¶ Waken it NoQaR Z reason « , FRQVLGHU WKDW , & DfDnGolffhinD the LVWDNH LQVW organization. , FRXOGQ ¶W onDaOitAttRon Werly(DioD that Kwas happening, all the problems that I had. These are private matters. But I did it -- LW ¶V DQ I HidUitJutRkidg Wiskn2tMnity leave, because I took this leave with a great many things in my head burdening me, and , VLPSO\GLGQ ¶W HYHQ NQ Rhazwiks that I ZaRtt 200G JR EDFN \$O to die...

23. While the Applicant ¶ testimony falls short of constituting an admission of the material particulars of the allegation, she made several admissions in the Transcript of audio-recorded interview with the investigators. In the interview, she admitted that on 25 September 2015 she sought and obtained from Dr. Cizungu a medical certificate attesting to being pregnant while, in fact, she knew that she was not pregnant.¹⁶

24. She admitted that before issuing to her the medical certificate, Dr. Cizungu did not conduct a medical examination but instead relied on her false representation that she was pregnant.¹⁷ She further admitted that knowing that she was not pregnant, she used the fraudulently obtained certificate to request and receive maternity leave from

¹⁶ Annex R/2, Doc. 007, Transcript of audio-recorded interview with the Applicant, 1 July 2016, part

^{1,} pp. 149-151, 153.

¹⁷ Ibid, pp. 154-155.

Case No. UNDT/

the Secretary- * $H Q H U D O \P V G L V F LiSiOn Qthe Upole of the Tribun R O V consider the correctness of the choice made by the Secretary-General amongst the$

female.42

62. Based on the above, the Tribunal finds that the alleged translation mistakes and discrepancies between her OIOS interview and the transcript thereafter produced $G L G Q \P W$ have a material impact on the established facts that the Applicant knowingly and wilfully misrepresented her pregnancy to Dr Cizungu in order to fraudulently obtain a medical certificate attesting to her pregnancy and subsequently used that certificate to claim a benefit to which she was not entitled. The alleged translat L R Q P L V W D N H V G L G Q have a material impact on either her due process rights or on the established facts relevant to the proportionality of the sanction imposed.

63. In the result the Tribunal finds that that there is clear and convincing evidence that the Applicant committed the misconduct complained of, and that the established facts qualify as misconduct under the Staff Regulations and Rules, further that the sanction is proportionate to the offence and therefore lawful. The Tribunal also finds that there were no due process violations in the investigation and in the disciplinary process leading up to the disciplinary sanction against the Applicant.

Judgment

64. The application is dismissed.

(Signed) Judge Margaret Tibulya Dated this 7th day of May