

included in the non-privileged portion o

ST/AI/371/Amend.1 was attached to the letter of reprimand, although his communications in response to the letter of reprimand show that he incorrectly relied on ST/AI/371/Amend.1. In any event, ignorance of the law is no excuse and staff members are deemed to be aware of the regulations and rules applicable to them (see, for example, *Diagne et al.* 2010-UNAT-067; *Staedtler* 2015-UNAT-546). Second, the Applicant argues that under staff rule 10.3(c), which he claims to be inconsistent with staff rule 11.2, he can submit an application challenging the imposition of non-disciplinary measure directly to the Dispute Tribunal. However, staff rule 10.3(c), like staff rule 11.2, states that only disciplinary or non-disciplinary measures imposed following the completion of a disciplinary process can be directly challenged to the Dispute Tribunal, which is not applicable to the present case as explained above.

15. Therefore, the Applicant was required to request management evaluation of the contested decision, which he failed to do and hence the present application is not receivable.

Conclusion

16. The Tribunal rejects the application as not receivable.

(Signed)

Judge Francis Belle

Dated this 6th day of December 2019

Entered in the Register on this 6th day of December 2019

(Signed)

Nerea Suero Fontecha, Registrar, New York