
UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NY/2020/012

Judgment No.: UNDT/2020/068

Date: 5 May 2020

Original: English

Before: Judge Joelle Adda

Registry: New York

Registrar: Nerea Suero Fontecha

HEJAMADI

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT

Counsel for Applicant:

Dorota Banaszewska, OSLA

Counsel for Respondent:

Camila Nkwenti, UNEP

Isabel Martinez, UNEP

Introduction

selection system) which provides for appropriate evaluation mechanisms of the candidates. She states that by providing such a short deadline for the response without prior notification, the Administration acted unreasonably and unjustly.

8. The Applicant further argues that the Administration acted against(a)4(c)pme to-9(mwn)JTJETC

14. The Respondent submits that the Applicant was afforded full and fair consideration in the recruitment process as she was shortlisted and invited to sit a written test. The Administration in this case minimally showed that the procedure was followed appropriately.

Receivability

15. arguments on the receivability of the application, the Tribunal will address this issue first.

16. this Tribunal has previously found that an applicant being found ineligible for a post or being excluded from a recruitment process were reviewable decisions.

17. The Respondent responds that the contested decision is not an administrative decision that is challengeable because t process does not have legal consequences as it was . The Applicant deprived herself of the possibility of being considered for selection for the position. The Applicant cannot therefore request the Organization to remedy the consequences of her own voluntary action.

18. As the Applicant rightly points out, in Order No. 117 (NY/2019) of 9 August 2019, the Tribunal acknowledges the jurisprudence of the Appeals Tribunal concerning the challenges brought against preliminary decisions in recruitment processes. The Tribunal referred to *Ishak* 2011-UNAT-152 in which the applicant sought administrative review and challenged the preliminary steps leading to the decision to ps may be challenged only in the context of an appeal against the outcome of the selection process,

19. The Tribunal distinguished *Ishak* from the case in which the applicant was excluded from continuing further in the recruitment process after she was found to have failed a written test. In Order No. 117 (NY/2019), the Tribunal found that

to exclude the Applicant from further consideration has immediate effects in the

applicant who then must show through clear and convincing evidence that he or she was denied a fair chance of selection (*Rolland*, para. 26).

23. The Applicant argues, in essence, that the Administration acted unreasonably in providing too short a deadline for shortlisted candidates to confirm their interest in participating further in the recruitment process. While she received the invitation email on Friday, 1 November 2019 at 1:44 a.m., the Applicant only read it on Monday, 4 November 2019 in the morning.

24. The Applicant argues that the short deadline allowed for candidates to confirm their participation in the written test
in the Hirin

25. Section 7.5 of ST/AI/2010/3 provides that shortlisted candidates shall be assessed to determine whether they meet the technical requirements and competencies of the job opening through a competency-based interview and/or other appropriate evaluation mechanisms, such as written tests. Chapqe

Case No. UNDT/NY/2020/012

Judgment No. UNDT/2020/068