
UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2019/115

Judgment No.: UNDT/2021/132

Date: 18 November 2021

Original: English

Before: Judge Agnieszka Klonowiecka-Milart

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Abena Kwakye-Berko

APPLICANT

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT

Counsel for the Applicant:

Brandon Gardner, OSLA

Counsel for the Respondent:

Nicole Wynn, AAS/ALD/OHR

Maureen Munyolo, AAS/ALD/OHR

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2019/115

Judgment No.: UNDT/2021/132

Organization on 18 April 2019.⁹

8. On 11 August 2017, the Applicant took a family leave approved until 21 August 2017.¹⁰ Upon expiry of the leave, she did not return to the duty station.

9. Between December 2017 and October 2018, the Applicant made three requests for certified sick leave (“CSL”). Her CSL requests, however, were rejected by the Medical Service Division (“MSD”) on the ground that the medical reports lacked a diagnosis or were otherwise ins.9981 799 Tm [(t)-22(3222(32)-170(l)37i-16(v)19(e)9(m)16BT /F1 12.0

of receipt of her request, or no later than 4 May 2019. It is the Tribunal's understanding that the management evaluation has never been done, which, unfortunately is not an isolated instance where the administration foregoes management evaluation in cases involving complex matters.¹⁶

14. On 30 March 2019, the Applicant received payment from MONUSCO in the amount of USD22,000. On 30 April 2019, she received a second tranche of USD16,500.¹⁷ The two were made as advance payments based on the projected amount that was due to the Applicant as from July 2018, while the Regional Service Centre Entebbe ("RSCE") continued to work on technical issues relating to her time and attendance record in Umoja.¹⁸ The Applicant separated effective April 2019 and checked out in May 2019. The extent of her sick leave entitlement remained disputed.

15. On 5 August 2019, the Applicant filed the instant application.

16. On 26 August 2019, the administration sent the Applicant's PF.4 form, i.e., the notification of separation that enables processing of the pension, to UNJSPF.¹⁹

17. On 28 August 2019, the Applicant received a letter from the UNJSPF Chief of Operations, informing her that she was retroactively placed on disability benefit effective 18 April 2019.²⁰

18. In September 2019 UNJSPF paid the Applicant USD38,891.34 as her retroactive disability benefit.²¹

¹⁶

The scope of the claim

19. The Applicant confirms that her application has become moot with respect to the i-7(e)008 Ta93QN24(s)8()-70(be)3pe 1-42(i)37(41-20(n)19(()-by0(n)19()] TJ ET Q q BT /F1

nothing more than a statement of position in the already pending dispute about the scope of her entitlements and certainly did not reset the process to require a fresh request for management evaluation. Thus, the claim to have the salary paid in accordance with the sick leave entitlement is properly before the Tribunal.

Merits

Applicant's case

23. The Applicant disagrees with the calculations performed by the RSCE and submits that she should still receive an equivalent of 72 days of sick leave with full pay. The difference in calculation was caused by the Administration's erroneous application of staff rule 6.2 (sick leave, maximum entitlements) in conjunction with staff rule 4.17 (re-employment).

24. The Applicant recalls that she joined the Organization in May 2006 and held an ALD contract. The ALD contract was extended periodically until July 2009. From July 2009, the Applicant was reappointed on an FTA. This appointment was a new one, therefore, she was reappointed and not reinstated. Accordingly, pursuant to staff rule 4.17, her terms of the new FTA were to be applicable without regard to any period of former service and, notably her service not to be considered as continuous between prior and new appointments.

25. In light of the foregoing, pursuant to staff rule 6.2, during the period 1 July 2009-1 July 2012, the Applicant was entitled to sick leave up to three months on full salary and three months on half salary in any period of 12 consecutive months. The Applicant's sick leave entitlements shifted three years after the date of her FTA, that is on 2 July 2012, and the Applicant became entitled up to nine months on full salary and nine months on half salary in any period of four consecutive years. The Applicant submits that from a proper reading of the controlling staff rule 6.2(b0 rg 0.9981 0.0 0.0 1.0 196.32 139.6

26. In accordance with her calculation pursuant to the above rule, the Applicant maintains that the Administration reduced her final payment by the amount equivalent to 72 days of sick leave with full pay.

The Respondent's case

27. The Respondent submits that the Applicant exhausted her sick leave entitlement and is not entitled to 72 additional days of sick leave as she claims.²⁵

28. The Respondent confirms that the Applicant completed three years of service on 30 June 2012, effective 1 July 2012. The Respondent however maintains that the completion of three years of qualifying service does not cause the sick leave entitlement to be re-set and counted afresh as of that date. Rather, the Applicant became entitled to an additional 130 days of sick leave ~~via~~ ~~alecant~~

had used 78 sick leave days at full salary between 15 November 2011 and 7 March 2012. These days had not been revived because 12 months had not passed since the leave was taken.³⁰ Therefore, those 78 days were deducted from the new 195-day entitlement, resulting in a sick leave balance of 117 days as of 1 July 2012.

31. The Respondent further explains that one month later, the Applicant went on Special Leave Without Pay (“SLWOP”) from 1 August 2012 to 30 June 2015. When the Applicant returned to service on 1 July 2015, her sick leave balance remained at 117 days.³¹

32. The 78 days of sick leave that the Applicant had used from 15 November 2011 to 7 March 2012 were revived after the Applicant’s return from SLWOP.³² Specifically, the Applicant used these 78 sick leave days at full salary from 2 to 17

days, on full salary and 3 months, *i.e.* 65 days, on half salary in any period of 12 consecutive months (65-day regime). Staff rule 6.2(b)(iii) provides that a staff member who has completed three years or more of continuous service shall be granted sick leave up to nine months, *i.e.* 195 days, of full salary and nine months, *i.e.* 195 days, on half salary in any period of four consecutive years (195-day regime).

35. The Human Resources Handbook explains the practical application of the above rules as follows:

The 12-month and 48-month (four-year) consecutive periods are counted as running periods from the month in which sick leave is taken, including the preceding 11 or 47 months, as applicable. The periods are determined on the basis of calendar months, not calendar years (and does not necessarily commence with the date of the staff member's

37. The application fails on the score of sick leave; therefore, the Tribunal, will not entertain the counter-claim of set-off. However, as pointed out by the Respondent, as per the applicable rules, the Applicant cannot validly claim to have had unused sick leave on full pay *and* retain the special leave with half pay for the period pending the decision on disability.

Compensation for moral harm

Applicant's case

38. The Applicant submits that she is entitled to adequate compensation for moral harm resulting from the lack of cooperation on the part of the administration to resolve for more than 14 months the issue of her status and entitlements. In addition, during the period July 2018 to September 2019, the Organization was not contributing to her health insurance.

39. The Applicant submits that the prolonged period of uncertainty regarding her personal finances and stress resulting from daily follow-ups with the administration, significantly aggravated her anxiety and depression.³⁷ As a remedy, the Applicant requests an equivalent of six months' net base salary awarded to her in compensation for moral damages.

Respondent's case

40. With regard to moral damages, the Respondent contests that the Applicant suffered compensable harm and that she is entitled to damages.³⁸

41. The Respondent explains that that the Applicant's late and incomplete sick leave requests caused the delay in the payment of her salary, while her continuous disagreement with RSCE about the calculation of her time and attendance record

9564 453.36 Tm [()] TJ ET Q425.36 317.2799 0(c)3(e)82 Tm [(9564453.36 T267(t)-6.32 Tm3(-)-210

42. Regarding the Applicant's claims relating to health insurance, the Respondent submits that the Applicant was continuously covered by Cigna from July 2018 to April 2019.³⁹

43. In view of the above, the Respondent maintains that the Applicant did not suffer any compensable harm and that she is not entitled to damages.

Considerations

44. In order to attribute responsibility for a moral harm, the impugned decision must be unlawful. T

have initially refused certain entitlements. The Tribunal below will examine whether these facts suffice for the attribution of an ulterior motive.⁴²

Whether the Organization showed lack of cooperation regarding the Applicant's sick leave

46. The Applicant's case is that, while she had not promptly submitted a certificate to the satisfaction of the administration, she remained in continuous contact with MSD and MONUSCO's Sick Leave Division.⁴³ In these communications, she clearly communicated her diagnosis certified both by her first contact physician and the specialist in charge of her case. At various occasions, she invited MSD to contact her physicians to clarify the matter and request necessary documents. However, MSD never reached out to her physicians. Following months of exchanges, when she filed correct documents in September 2018, MSD rejected them at first, saying that they were submitted late. In her view, therefore, the administration did not act in good faith.

47. The Respondent's case is that, in accordance with the applicable rules, the Applicant was required to submit a sick leave request and a supporting medical report no later than 10 days after her initial absence. However, she did not do so until December 2017, four months after her approved leave had expired.⁴⁴ The Applicant's allegations⁴⁵ that she had contacted the MSD in September 2017 and that she clearly communicated her diagnosis to the MSD are denied. Neither is it true that she had submitted a correct medical report in September 2018. The record supports neither of these allegations.⁴⁶ The record shows that the Applicant submitted the requested medical report including a diagnosis to support her sick leave only on 27 October 2018, which the MSD promptly approved two days later.

48. The Tribunal recalls that the applicable legal framework is as follows:

⁴² *Liu* 2016-UNAT-659; *Assale* 2015-UNAT-534.

⁴³ Reply, R/7.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, para. 6; reply, R/2 and R/3, p. 4.

⁴⁵ In her submission, pursuant to Order No. 186 (NBI/2021), para 28.

⁴⁶ Reply, R/3 and R/6-R/7.

Staff rule 6.2(a) concerning sick leave:

Staff members who are unable to perform their duties by reason of illness or injury or whose attendance at work is prevented by public health requirements will be granted sick leave. All sick leave must be approved on behalf of, and *under conditions established by, the Secretary-General* [emphasis added].

Staff rule 6.2(f) obligations to submit medical certificates:

Staff members shall inform their supervisors as soon as possible of absences due to illness or injury. They shall promptly submit any medical certificate or medical report required *under conditions to be specified by the Secretary-General* [emphasis added].

Section 2.3 of ST/AI/2005/3/Amend.1 (Sick leave):

After 20 working days of sick leave have been certified in accordance with section 2.2, certification of further sick leave by the Medical Director or designated medical officer shall be required. For that purpose, the staff member shall submit to the executive officer or other appropriate official, in a sealed envelope, *a detailed medical report from a licensed medical practitioner* [emphasis added]

ST/AI/400 (Abandonment of post), which applies as *lex specialis*, notwithstanding the change of numbering in the staff rules, provides in relevant parts:

Section 5

The absence of a staff member from his or her work, unless properly authorized as leave under staff rule 105.1 (b), as special leave under staff rule 105.2, as sick leave under staff rule 106.2 or as maternity leave under staff rule 106.3, may create a reasonable presumption of intent to

days he or she shall refer the matter to the appropriate personnel officer [...]. The communication should remind the staff member of the provisions of staff rule 105.1 (b) (ii), under which payment of salary and allowances shall cease for the period of unauthorized absence. It should allow a further period of up to 10 working days for reporting to duty or submission of a medical certification or plausible explanation, and should warn the staff member that failure to do so would be considered abandonment of post and would lead to separation on that ground.

Section 13

[...] If the staff member fails to produce [medical] certification or if the certification produced is not acceptable to the Medical Director and sick leave is not certified, the executive or administrative officer shall immediately advise the staff member, with a copy to the personnel officer, that sick leave has been refused and that the staff member must report for duty immediately or be separated for abandonment of post. If the staff member disputes the decision, he or she may request that the matter be referred to an independent practitioner or to a medical board [...].

49. The record before the Tribunal shows that the Applicant did not submit any certificate or explanation of her absence until December 2017, i.e., four months after her home leave. No explanation has ever been provided for her inaction. She was clearly in breach of her obligations under staff rule 6.2(f).

50. The December 2017 certification request was rejected, just as it was in January 2018 and February 2018, for the lack of diagnosis.⁴⁷ Afterwards, the Applicant fell silent and ignored the Mission's requests for medical certificates made in February and May 2018. It is, therefore, not true that the Applicant was in "constant contact with the MSD and MONUSCO Sick Leave Division".

51. The Applicant was only moved to act in July 2018, after the Mission had informed of locking her salary pursuant to an abandonment of post procedure. Still, communications received from her were not constructive. To the extent it is maintained that "[a]s stated in her e-mail of 24 July 2018, Ms. Waberi understood that the

⁴⁷ Reply, R/3.

additional documents had been sent to MSD and her leave was approved”⁴⁸, nothing on the record suggests that she had any basis for such understanding,

extension, it is required to provide a detailed diagnosis, description of impact of the treatment on the patient and treatment plan. The latter is notably necessary where, as in this case, the medical condition is diagnosed solely upon symptoms reported by the patient, without lab tests, imaging exams or other objective method.⁵⁵

55. In the present case, the MSD refusal to certify the sick leave was not only based on a formal inadequacy of the submitted medical reports, that is, that they did not adhere to the template, but also reasonable by common sense standards.

56. The record demonstrates⁵⁶ that medical documents submitted by the Applicant were lacking diagnosis, they were at times anti-dated (with 2017 written over 2018) and, even though they attested up to three months of inability to work at a time, they were not issued by a specialist. A generic, one-word diagnosis appears for the first time in December 2017 and is not attested by a specialist. A specialist certificate comes into the picture only with a date 30 August 2018, and, rather cursory in its form, it still does not address areas required by the template that had been provided. It is only the document dated 26 October 2018 that constitutes a proper medical report, with detail commensurate with the length of the absence from work.

57. The Tribunal finds that there was no lack of cooperation on the part of the administration in handling of the Applicant's sick leave. To the contrary, both MSD and MONUSCO showed extraordinary tolerance and patience with the staff member who disappeared from the duty station and persistently ignored the requirements for sick leave certification.

Whether there was lack of cooperation in renewal of appointment

58. The Applicant submits that her appointment was not renewed promptly from 1 November 2018 to 30 June 2019 after the MSD's approval of her sick leave requests. Initially, MONUSCO limited the extension of her contract for purposes of exhausting her sick leave entitlements only. It was only following the intervention of the Office of

⁵⁵ *Da Silveira* UNDT/2020/055; affirmed in *Da Silveira* 2021-UNAT-1081.

⁵⁶ Applicant's submission pursuant to Order No. 186 (NBI/2021), application, annex I.

Staff Legal Assistance (“OSLA”) on 28 November 2018, that on 11 December 2018, the Applicant’s contract was retroactively extended from 1 November 2018 through 30 June 2019. The Applicant’s letter of appointment was only issued on 21 December 2018.⁵⁷

59. The Respondent confirms that the Applicant’s appointment expired on 30 June 2018. The Organization did extend the Applicant’s appointment for three months from 1 July 2018 to 30 September 2018 and for one month from 1 October 2018 to 31 October 2018, and following the approval of her sick leave, it extended her appointment until she separated on medical grounds.

60. The Tribunal notes that the Respondent, although specifically asked, does not address the period between 31 October (sick leave approval) and 21 December 2018 (issuance of the letter of appointment). It results nevertheless, from the email correspondence submitted by the Applicant⁵⁸, that the Applicant on 19 November 2018 was notified of the approval of her sick leave and, on 11 December 2018, of the issuance of the personnel action pertinent to the extension of her appointment. Communications exchanged in the interim demonstrates that there was a need to clarify the duration of the appointment, with the Applicant’s Counsel requesting an extension through January 2019, in accordance with the duration of the sick leave, and the Administration granting the appointment through June 2019. The Tribunal considers that the Applicant’s apparent absenteeism, including that the abandonment of post procedure had been initiated, could have plausibly merited a reflection on both whether the position encumbered by the Applicant was to be maintained and whether the Applicant was fit for it, thus, whether her appointment was to be extended and for how

Whether there was lack of cooperation in placement on special leave

61. The Applicant submits that MONUSCO had initially refused to place her on special leave with half pay pending the Pension Fund Committee's decision regarding her placement on disability benefit. The initial position of MONUSCO was not to pay any salary to the Applicant following the exhaustion of her sick leave entitlements. It required the intervention of OSLA for the Administration to vacate this position.

62. The Respondent submits that MONUSCO never refused to place the Applicant on special leave pending the Pension Committee's decision regarding her placement on disability benefit. MONUSCO submitted a request to the Secretary of the Pension Committee for the award to the Applicant of a disability benefit on 31 January 2019⁵⁹, and on 5 March 2019 informed the RSCE that the Applicant was placed on special leave with half pay until the date of the Committee's decision in accordance with section 3.2 of ST/AI/2005/3.⁶⁰ Consequently, the RSCE pro3

64. The Tribunal finds neither an undue delay in the action of the administration, nor indication of improper motive.

Whether there was lack of cooperation in payment of the salary and separation entitlements

65. The Applicant submits that the Administration failed to resolve the issue for more than 14 months. Amo

68. The Respondent further explains that the delay in effecting the final payment is attributable to the Applicant's continued disagreement with the RSCE's calculation of her time and attendance record. Contrary to the Applicant's allegation, the administration did cooperate with her to address her concerns and to pay her promptly. For three months, between May and August 2018, the RSCE responded to the Applicant's queries and had several conference calls with the Applicant and her

the record shows that the Applicant sent her ticket for reimbursement some time at the end of May 2018, and in July 2018 the administration corrected the amount to be paid.

73. The Tribunal finds that the Applicant's complaint about a 14-month processing time is grossly exaggerated. The timeline for updating the Applicant's attendance record, and thus, calculating the salary due to her, could not have started before the approval of the sick leave and the decision on the extension of appointment, that is, November/December 2018. The manual calculation that was eventually necessitated must have been time-consuming, given the complicated accounting formula, the multiplicity of absences which included the 2012 and 2015 periods of leave without pay, and the need to do the audit of sick leave going back to 2007. All considered, however, no justification has been put before the Tribunal as to why it had taken until March 2019 to arrive at a constation that Umoja could not perform the calculation automatically. The three months that passed since the approval of sick leave signify a lack of prompt action, inappropriate in the face of the Applicant not receiving a salary since July 2018. The Tribunal agrees, on the other hand, that under the circumstances, paying the advances was reasonable and capable of mitigating the Applicant's inconvenience.

74. The Tribunal finds no inordinate delay in the reimbursement of the ticket cost and the sending of a notification to UNJSPF. Regarding the latter, it is an established and not unreasonable practice that the administration releases the form to the UNJSPF after the calculation of leave balance and the final payment. It was not unreasonable that the administration tried to accommodate the Applicant until it became clear that an agreement could not be reached. It was upon the Applicant, who was at all time represented by OSLA, to accept separation payments "under protest"⁷⁹ earlier than July 2018.

⁷⁹ *Ahmed*, 2013-UNAT-386, para 21.

Whether there was a break in insurance coverage due to lack of cooperation

75. The Applicant submits that during the period from July 2018 (when she received her last salary through regular payroll) to September 2019 (when she was retroactively placed on disability benefit), the Organization was not contributing to her health insurance. Cigna refused to process direct payments on account of the Applicant, and she had no choice but to pay for the necessary medical bills out of her own pocket. The total amount incurred on such bills is EUR2,286.67.⁸⁰ On 19 June 2019, the Applicant received confirmation of her eligibility in the After Service Health Insurance (“ASHI”) programme⁸¹, she called Cigna Infoline to inquire whether she could submit medical claims she had been advancing since July 2018. However, the Cigna representative informed her that “[she was] *not on the list of persons covered by ASHI*” and hence she cover

evidence to support her allegation that she was uncovered by the medical insurance between May and September 2019.

78. The Tribunal finds that, in light of the documents produced, there was no disruption in the Applicant's insurance. Most importantly, however, the Applicant does not demonstrate any claims made to, or refused by, Cigna during the relevant period.

The length of time elapsed until the obtaining of the payments is mainly attributable to reasons on the part of the Applicant, that is, her failure to obtain consecutive certification of sick leave over a protracted period. To the extent it has been found that the administration failed to act promptly, the period of delay was relatively short compared with the Applicant's lateness in fulfilling her obligations toward the Organization; moreover, these were technical issues, which do not suggest improper motive.

81. Furthermore, in castigating the administration, the Applicant appears to have expected that her claims had to be addressed instantly. This is not a reasonable expectation. The Applicant's case, being complex and time-consuming, involved determinations by different offices. Among them, the RSCE, the human resources entity that administered the Applicant's salary and entitlements, has obligations which include providing human resources services and payroll and entitlement processing to 77 percent of all United Nations peacekeeping missions and political offices. Its capacity is not unlimited. The Applicant's case could not have been handled at the expense of the overall flow of the operations.

82. The Tribunal therefore does not find circumstances warranting compensation for moral damages.

JUDGMENT

83.

Entered in the Register on this 18th day of November 2021

(Signed)

Abena Kwakye-Berko, Registrar, Nairobi