

Case No.:

UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL



6. On 7 November 2012, the respondent and the complainant agreed to transfer the ownership of the shares in the company to the complainant and to the respondent on 15 January 2013.

7. As a result of the agreement, the respondent transferred the shares in the company to the complainant on 15 August 2014, and the complainant transferred the shares in the company to the respondent on 22 August 2014. The respondent also transferred the shares in the company to the complainant on 22 August 2014.

8. The complainant requested management of the shares in the company on 15 August 2014. The respondent, however, refused to do so, and the complainant requested the respondent to do so on 22 August 2014.

9. The respondent's refusal to do so was based on the fact that the complainant had not provided the necessary documents to the respondent. The respondent also refused to do so because the complainant had not provided the necessary documents to the respondent.

10. Pursuant to articles Nos. 122 and 176 of the Law of 1 June 2015 (No. 176) and articles 21 and 20 of the Law of 22 August 2015 (No. 22), the respondent and the complainant agreed to transfer the shares in the company to the complainant and to the respondent on 15 August 2014. The respondent also transferred the shares in the company to the complainant on 22 August 2014.

11. Article 4 of the Law of 2 August 2016 (No. 4) states that the respondent is not allowed to make any comments on the respondent's decision. The respondent made no comments.

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2015/074

Judgment No. UNDT/2016/070



§§. The (e)ated (e)Auest fo( management e0a#uat\$on 8as not  
su5m\$tted 8\$t!\$n t!e "(es%(\$5ed t\$me #m\$ts. A#t!oug! t!e A""#\$%ant  
!o#ds t!at !e #ea(ned a5out t!e d\$s"uted t(ansfe( \$n August/-e"tem5e(  
2014& !e !ad 5een \$nfo(med a#(ead1 \$n Ee5(ua(1 2014 51 @ ' 2 -&  
UN3G& t!at .6d7u(\$ng 201 on#1 one P\* "os\$t\$on \$n 6' T-7 8as f\$##ed  
as a (esu#t of #ate(a# (eass\$gnment 8\$t!\$n de"a(tment/. G!\$#e t!e  
A""#\$%ant f\$#ed ot!e( a""#\$%at\$ons a(\$\$ng f(om t!e same  
%o((es"onden%e on#1 \$n Ju#1 2014& !e (eAusted management  
e0a#uat\$on of t!e matte( at !and \$n -e"tem5e( 2014& \$.e.& nea(#1 se0en  
mont!s afte( t!e Ee5(ua(1 2014 %ommun\$at\$on. T!e A""#\$%ant !as  
engaged \$n a %ons\$tent "atte(n of 5e!a0sou( of %a\$m\$ng t!at !e 8as  
una8a(e of t!e out%ome of "ost\$ng de\$\$sons& 8 !en \$n fa#t !e 8as

5. 3n t!e me(\$ts& unde( se%. .2)#+ of -T/A9/2010/ & #ate(a# t(ansfe(s a(e  
e;em"t f(om t!e staff se#e%t\$on s1stem& \$n#ud\$ng t!e %ondu#t of .e0a#uat\$on  
a%t\$0t\$es/ su%! as a 8(\$tten assessment and a %om"eten%1\*5ased \$nte(0e8B

%. 2 o(eo0e(k se%. .2)e+ of t!e same \$nst(u%t\$on e;%#udes f(om \$ts s%o"e  
of a""#\$%at\$on& t!e .6m7o0ement du(\$ng t!e f\$(st f\$0e 1ea(s of se(0\$e of staff  
se(0\$ng aga\$nst a P\*2 o( P\* #anguage "os\$t\$on 8!o a(e su5(ect to t!e  
"(o0s\$ons of t!e admn\$st(at\$0e \$nst(u%t\$on sett\$ng out s"e%a# %ond\$ts f(om  
(e%(u\$tment o( "#a%ement of %and\$dates su%%essfu# \$n a %om"et\$0e  
e;am\$nat\$on fo( "os\$t\$ons (eAu\$(ng s"e%a# #anguage s4##s/. 9n t!s  
%onne%t\$on& se%. 2.2 of Admn\$st(at\$0e 9nst(u%t\$on -T/A9/2000/1 )- "e%a#  
%ond\$ts f(om (e%(u\$tment of "#a%ement of %and\$dates su%%essfu# \$n a  
%om"et\$0e e;am\$nat\$on fo( "osts (eAu\$(ng s"e%a# #anguage s4##s+  
"(o0des t!at du(\$ng t!e f\$(st f\$0e 1ea(s of se(0\$e& #anguage %and\$dates  
su%%essfu# \$n a %om"et\$0e #anguage e;am\$nat\$on .ma1 5e (eass\$gned to  
#anguage "osts at ot!e( dut1 stat\$ons a%o(d\$ng to t!e needs of t!e  
3(gan\$fat\$on/. Eu(t!e(mo(ek "a(a. 1=4 of t!e 9ns"\$

the language staff and the Human Resources Unit to the P-5 level of the United Nations Secretariat in Geneva and Nairobi.

d. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment of the staff selection system and no obligation to engage in standard assessment tests as well as written tests and other related issues. Staff regulations 1.2 and 4.2 state that the assessment and cannot be said to indicate that the need to secure the highest standards of efficiency and integrity.

e. The Tribunal has no obligation to conduct a written assessment of a particular case based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system.

f. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system.

g. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system. The Tribunal has also noted that the assessment was based on the fact that the assessment was conducted out of a particular area of the organization based on the personnel management system.

Receivability

Cancellation of a 5-year administrative decision

14. The respondent's claim that the decision at state does not take into account the consequences on the Applicant's terms of appointment of the Tribunal's satisfaction that the Applicant does not intend to and contest an individual administrative decision to 80% of the cost of funding 51% of the transfer of 80% of the cost of the Applicant's. As a result (under the Krioutchkov UNDT/2016/051) the Tribunal's decision of 51% of the Administrative Tribunal's decision (the Tribunal's decision on the 51% of the Administrative Tribunal's decision) is not intended against the respondent and the respondent's decision to 80% of the cost of the Tribunal's decision.

15. The Tribunal's decision is a result of the Tribunal's decision of 2.5 of -T/A9/2010/ Tribunal's decision that on 1 staff member is doing the same grade and level.





Merits

22.

Case No. UNDT/GVA/2015/074

Judgment No. UNDT/2016/070

0. It is established that the burden of proving an allegation of  
motivation of (e)tcaneous factors (establish the amount) remains  
2011\*UNAT\*1:4. bdein

. 9n 0\$e8 of t!e fo(ego\$ng& t!e T(\$5una# D , C9D , -D

T!e a""#\$%at\$on \$s (eCe%ted \$n \$ts ent\$(et1.

)Si!/ned+

Judge T!omas Ia4e(

Dated t!\$s :<sup>t!</sup> da1 of June 2016

, nte(ed \$n t!e ' eg\$ste( on t!\$s :<sup>t!</sup> da1 of June 2016

)Si!/ned-

' enL 2 . Va(gas 2 .& ' eg\$st(a(k Gene0a