


Judgment No. 2019-UNAT-913



Counsel for Respondent/Applicant      " o# med A\$dou%&' (A

Counsel for Appellant/Respondent!      Jo#n ' tompor



THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

§. This constitutes misconduct under C-12/2012-0013, Decs E 1, 2, 3 and 4.

c. The appropriate sanction is dismissal.

12. In its Judgment of 12 July 2019, the UNAT rescinded the contested decision to dismiss Mr. 'iddi and replaced the disciplinary measure of suspension with a three-month period. The UNAT set in lieu compensation amounting to one month's net salary based on Mr. 'iddi's salary on 4 November 2010. In finding there is no evidence of bad faith, the UNAT rejected his claim for compensation under Article 10 of the UNAT Statute.

13. Given that the evidence is essential, based on witness testimonies, the UNAT held

54(N) 6. 1 3005 (24) (1) 15-0183248 (5) 41074 (1) 239 (1) (2) 826) - 1 10311 (1) 311 (8) 230 (9) 4 9153 (6) 721 285 1 (15) 200

imp rti lit. nd/or competence. :n ddition%t#e 8itness st tement s 8ere not t -en under  
o t#. =urt#er%t#e UN, T #e ring re6e led t# t " r. 'iddi7i 8 s spe -ing = rsi 8#en #e m de  
t#e llegend st tement 2not <nglis#3 8#ic# 8 s not mentioned in n. 8itness st tement  
summ ries or in t#e in6estig tion report. T#e UN, T noted t#is 8 s critic l since it could not  
\$e e>cluded t# t t#e st tement 8 s not ccur tel. tr nsl ted \$. t#e 8itnesses. T#ere 8ere

requests that the UN, T; s **8** rd of compensation in lieu of rescission be reduced. In support of the  
 'secret r. -5ener I argues that the UN, T erred in fact and law in finding that there **8** s not clear  
 and convincing evidence that " r. 'iddi7i # d#re tened to -ill ot#er st ff mem\$ers. The UN, T  
 \$ sed its conclusion on the finding that the **8**itness statements **8**ere unreli \$le%" r. 'iddi7i did  
 not identif. specific st ff mem\$ers in #is t#re t% nd #is t#re t **8** s not sufficientl. serious. In  
 finding the **8**itness statements **8**ere not reli \$le% the UN, T noted the. **8**ere not t -en under o t#  
 s re7uired in Nyambuza.<sup>4</sup> **As 6er** the facts of this case are distinguished from Nyambuza in  
 that the **8**itness statements **8**ere consistent 2" r. \*R st ted that " r. 'iddi7i t#re tened to -ill  
 " r. A< nd " r. " **HM**' s. (" st ted that " r. 'iddi7i t#re tened to -ill " r. A< nd " r. " **HM** nd  
 " r. <" testified that " r. 'iddi7i t#re tened to -ill " r. A< nd " r. " **H3** This consistenc. is  
 mple indicati of reli \$ilit. in line **8**it#

T





T

mount to misconduct. The sanction is proportionate to the offence and the staff members' due process rights were respected.

The UN's finding that there was no clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Siddiqi had threatened to harm identified staff members

29. The finding that the UN, T erred in its finding to manifestly unreasonable decision when it held that Mr. Siddiqi did not threaten to harm identified staff members and did not mention unspecified threats to harm some staff members.

30. The statements of the three witnesses who were present during the meeting on 14 February 2010 ("R") and Mr. Siddiqi's ("S") statements do not constitute clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Siddiqi did not threaten to harm identified staff members. From the beginning of the disciplinary investigation and before the UN, T the witnesses' statements were continuous and consistent. The UN, T identified specific staff members and mentioned names when uttering threats to harm. All three witnesses agreed that the names were mentioned in Mr. Siddiqi's First Reporting Officer and Mr. Siddiqi's Affidavit of UN:CAER to the Office. Their testimonies differed as to whether ("and four staff members named) were also targeted. The UN, T's conclusion that due to this contradiction the evidence is insufficient is unreasonable. There is no reason to believe that the UN, T did not find that the witnesses colluded and no single compelling statement. As all three of them heard the exact same names in error can also be excluded. In the contrary, the remaining discrepancies between their testimonies can be explained given the fact that all three witnesses indicated that Mr. Siddiqi was very upset/emotionally and spoke freely. Also all three witnesses testified that Mr. Siddiqi directly addressed "S" and spoke only to her while Mr. Siddiqi and Mr. Siddiqi were sitting at their desks. Therefore Mr. Siddiqi should not be uttered the name "S" ("I said C. out instead).

31. It is also unreasonable that the UN, T questioned the credibility of the witness statements. As Mr. Siddiqi testified that Mr. Siddiqi intended to scare those who were conducting the spot check exercise and "S" is in charge of the spot check-s. Mr. Siddiqi and Mr. Siddiqi were not involved in conducting this exercise.<sup>10</sup> In his appeal the 'secretary' generally correctly points out that the UN, T's assumption is not correct and that "S" and Mr. Siddiqi were connected to the spot check-. Not only did Mr. Siddiqi testify to this

<sup>10</sup> :mpugned Judgment para 40.

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL

3B. The UN, in its conclusion from its assumption that the respondent's statements were general and unspecified, did not refer to any identified staff members. Moreover, this is a factual and legal error. Section 6 of the Rules is clear and convincing evidence that the respondent's statements were made to any identified staff members.

34. Under the circumstances it is sufficient and reasonable presumption of the respondent's intent to consider the respondent's statements serious. Three witnesses have testified that the respondent uttered statements to any identified staff members in Mel. The respondent and the respondent's counsel have argued that the respondent's statements were made in a poor relationship with the respondent for a long time.

30. The UN, in its reasoning that the witnesses confirmed that the respondent did not take the statements seriously and did not report it to the relevant authorities, has no merit.<sup>13</sup> The UN, in itself, found that the respondent informed the respondent's counsel that the respondent's statements were made in a poor relationship with the respondent. Furthermore,





members. Therefore, the Administration is best suited to select an adequate sanction to fulfil the general requirements of these -inds of measures! In addition, it is within the limits set by the respective norms sufficient to prevent repetition of wrongdoing and punish the wrongdoer. It is also necessary to provide victims and restore the administrative discipline etc.

Only if the sanction imposed appears to be manifestly illegal or disproportionate to the limits set by the respective norms excessive, discriminatory, or absurd in its severity, that the Tribunal should conclude in its unfavourable case the consequence is, e.g., imposing different ones. This criterion is followed in the jurisprudence of this Tribunal. Therefore, it is not the case that the Tribunal should not interfere with administrative discretion.

@3.

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL



, 1.

The secret r. -5ener l; s ppe l is gr nted nd Judgment No. UN, T/201//0/4 is #ere\$. 6 c ted.

& rigin l nd Aut#orit ti6e Persion! <nglis#

, ted t#is 29<sup>th</sup> d . of " rc# 2019 in Ne8 Hor-%United ' t tes.

-Signed.

-Signed.

-Signed.

Judge \*nierim%+residing

Judge R i-os

Judge " urp#.

<ntered in t#e Register on t#is 29<sup>th</sup> d . of " . 2019 in Ne8 Hor-%United ' t tes.

-Signed.