Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2012/042

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2012/042

Judgment No.UNDT/2013/048

6. The Tribunal afforded the Applicanthe opportunity to respond to the Respondent's submissions on receivability, which response the Applicant filed on 7 January 2013.

Parties' Submissions

- 7. The Applicant submits that towards that of 2010, he noticed he was being passed over for several positions in field missions in favour of women candidates who were less tiplical and sometimes had of field experience. He approached the then Under Setary-General for the Department of Field Support, Ms Susana Malcorra for an explanation of the police. His queries were not responded to.
- 8. On 18 March 2012, the Applicant sough management evaluation of the "decision not to give [him] a decision?" he Management Evaluation Unit issued its decision against the Applicant on 21 April 2012.
- 9. The Respondent contends that the embesapplication must be dismissed because it does not identify the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being the specific administrative decision that is being challenged. The Application, the specific administrative decision that is being the specific administrative decision that it is being the specific administrative

Deliberations

10. The jurisdiction of the United Nation Dispute Tribunal is set out in the Statute. Article 2 of the Statute afforthse Tribunal the authority to hear and pass judgment on an application filed by an individuo appeal an administrative decision that is alleged to be in non-compliance with terms of appointme or the contract of employment.

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2012/042 Judgment No.:

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2012/042 Judgment No.UNDT/2013/048

decision and therefore subject to challenge, those cases are distinguishable from the facts of his Application.

17. The case of abair 2011-UNAT-177, for example, is distinguishable from the present application. Mr Tabari had specify requested the payment of hazard pay for a specified period. Two months after mequest was made, he began the process

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2012/042

Judgment No.UNDT/2013/048