



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2017/052

Judgment No.: UNDT/2017/059

Date: 21 July 2017

Original: English

Before: Judge Nkemdilim Izuako

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Abena Kwakye-Berko

MONTICELLI

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Application

1. The Applicant is a former Regional Administrative Officer and Area Security Coordinator with the United Nations Operations in Burundi (ONUB).
2. This application, for the payment of entitlements, was filed on 14 June 2017.

Procedural History

3. On 27 June 2017, the Tribunal issued Order No. 117 (NBI/2017) directing the Applicant to provide the Tribunal with a copy of his request for management evaluation. The Applicant was asked to comply with that directive by 4 July 2017.
4. Recognising that the Applicant is self-represented, the Tribunal also advised that he seek legal representation. To this end, the Tribunal directed service of the Order on the Office of Staff Legal Assistance (OSLA) and set a deadline of 18 July 2017 for any submissions that

the Administration the opportunity to correct any errors in an administrative decision to obviate the need for judicial review before the Tribunal.¹

8. In *Nagayoshi*, the Appeals Tribunal stated as follows:

This Tribunal has held that the purpose of management evaluation is to afford the Administration the opportunity to correct any errors in an administrative decision so that judicial review of the administrative decision is not necessary and that for this goal to be met it is essential to clearly identify the administrative decision the staff member disputes.²

9. In seeking review of the impugned decision by the Management Evaluation Unit (MEU), a staff member is required to clearly identify the administrative decision he or she is seeking to challenge. In the event of litigation before the Dispute Tribunal, an applicant must demonstrate that the decision being challenged is pending review before the MEU or has previously been the subject of a request for management evaluation and that both the request and the claim to the Tribunal complied with the required deadlines and time limits.

Case No.