UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL	Case No.:	UNDT/NY/2017/042
	Judgment No.:	UNDT/2019/024
	Date:	21 February 2019
	Original:	English

**Before:** Judge Ebrahim-Carstens

**Registry:** New York

**Registrar:** Nerea Suero Fontecha

#### BUFFLER

v.

# SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

# JUDGMENT

### **ON WITHDRAWAL**

**Counsel for Applicant:** 

Daniel Trup, OSLA Natalie Puchalka, OSLA

### **Counsel for Respondent:**

Elizabeth Gall, AAS/ALD/OHR, UN Secretariat

# Introduction

1. On 26 April 2017, the Applicant, a Chief of Section at the P-5 level with the Department of Management, filed an application in which he contested the decision of the Administration to reduce [his] contracted salary and the manner of the . As a remedy, the Applicant requested

that the administrative decision to reduce his salary be rescinded, and that he receive the outstanding backdated pay accordingly . As part of the application, the Applicant requested . This case forms part of a group of cases commonly referred to as the salary scale cases that were filed before the undersigned Judge.

2. On 30 May 2017, the Respondent filed the reply. He submitted that the application is not receivable and that, in any event, the impugned decision was lawful.

3. By Order No. 120 (NY/2018) dated 7 June 2018, the Tribunal instructed the parties to file a jointly signed submission by 12 June 2018 in which they were to inform the Tribunal of their views on whether reading all the salary scale cases before the undersigned Judge:

a. It would beneficial to consolidate the proceedings of, at least some of, the present cases. If so, the parties are to outline and list the categories of cases that may appropriately be handled together;

b. If, as a matter of judicial economy, it would be appropriate to order a stay of proceedings in any of the possible categories of cases until the Appeals Tribunal has issued its judgment(s) in some similar cases that are currently pending before it.

4. On 12 June 2018, the parties filed a joint submission as per Order No. 120 (NY/2018), listing the salary scale cases into three categories of cases, namely: staff members with a non-dependent spouse and dependent children including a 21-year old (Group 1); staff member with a non-dependent spouse and dependent children (Group 2); and staff members with a dependent spouse (Group 3).

5. On 29 June 2018, the Appeals Tribunals issued its judgments in *Lloret Alcañiz* et al. 2018-UNAT-840 and *Quijano-Evans* et al. 2018-UNAT-841.

6. By Order No. 25 (NY/2019) dated 1 February 2019, the Tribunal instructed (a) the parties to file a submission addressing the implications, if any, of the Appeals Tribunal judgments in *Lloret Alcañiz* et al. and *Quijano-Evans* et al. and (b) in particular, if the Applicant wished to withdraw his claims, he should state this in clear and unequivocal terms.

7.

he stated that he Dispute Tr

8. On 15 February 2019, the Respondent filed a submission in which, *inter alia*, he stated that,

On 29 June 2018, the Appeals Tribunal issued its judgment in the case of *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* [reference to footnote omitted]. In that case, the affected staff members challenged the payment of their salary and related allowances according to the unified salary scale and the transitional allowance approved by the General Assembly. The Appeals Tribunal held that it was lawful for the Secretary-General to introduce a new unified salary scale. The Appeals Tribunal also held that any challenge to introduction of the transitional allowance was not receivable.

The Applications raise identical arguments to those already

#### 10. In the instant case, the Applicant filed a submission stating that he

to the present case.

11. clear and unequivocal withdrawal of all of his allegations and

claims signifies a final and binding resolution with regard to the rights and liabilities

#### of #14 (000021.f491824 spects)(a) history requiring 700 period and the internet find the internet of the inter

concluding the current matter before the Tribunal. As the Applicant has withdrawn fondjudicatio1641s.000 puteTribu4.2, easeUthe NDT/NY4(s-17(in)017[(/)] TJETQ0.00000912 0 612 792 r the application and decided to end the pending litigation, there is no matter remaining

for adjudication by the Dispute Tribunal