



J DGE MA HA HALFELD,

!! "# \$%&' '#

13. The Secretary-General requested the Appeals Tribunal to reverse the Order a

20. Our jurisprudence is well established that interlocutory appeals on matters of evidence, procedure, and trial conduct are not receivable. The general principle underlying the right to appeal under Article 2(1) of the Statute is that only appeals against final judgments will be receivable. Nevertheless, when it is clear that the UNDT has exceeded its jurisdiction or competence, an appeal of an interlocutory order may be receivable.

decision and the issue can be properly raised later in an appeal against the final judgment on the merits, there is no need to allow an appeal against the interlocutory decision.”

23. In the present case, the Appeals Tribunal is satisfied that there is no reason to depart from its jurisprudence and thus finds the appeal as non-receivable. The Appeals Tribunal has consulted the UNDT site and found out that Mr. Abdalla did not file an application within the extended time limit. The case was thus disposed of without application by means of Order No. 169 (NBI/2020) issued on 2 September 2020, which was after the filing of the present appeal. This renders the instant appeal inevitably moot and is thus not receivable.

---

*Nadeau, ibid*, para. 27; *Wasserstrom v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2010-UNAT-060, para. 19; see also *Chemingui v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2016-UNAT-641, para. 18.

Judgment

24. The appeal is dismissed as non-receivable.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 19 day of March 2021.

*(Signed)*

Judge Halfeld, Presiding  
Juiz de Fora, Brazil

*(Signed)*

Judge Sandhu  
Vancouver, Canada

*(Signed)*

Judge Raikos  
Athens, Greece

Entered in the Register on this 31 day of March 2021 in New York, United States.

*(Signed)*

Weicheng Lin, Registrar