

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2011/010



Support Services Service to reflect the complexity and value of the activities being managed.

5. In an effort to address the structural weaknesses pointed out by IAD/OIOS in its report, the then Director-General of UNON, Ms. Anna Tibaijuka, issued an Information Circular (“IC/ODG/UNON/2008/2”), dated 4 August 2008, notifying all staff of UNON, UNEP and UN-Habitat and all heads of offices of UN Funds, Programmes and Agencies in Kenya that effective 1 September 2008, the UNON Procurement, Travel and Shipping Section (“PTSS”) would no longer be part of the UNON Support Services Service. IC/ODG/UNON/2008/2 designated PTSS as a separate section that would report directly to the UNON Director, Division of Administrative Services, Mr. Alexander Barabanov.

6. In November 2009, a group of Procurement staff members submitted a complaint of harassment, abuse of authority and intimidation against the Applicant to Mr. Steiner, who initiated an informal dispute resolution mechanism to address the complaint. In May 2010, Mr. Steiner, at a meeting with the Applicant and Mr. Barabanov, told the Applicant that in light of the complaint that had been brought against her by the group of Procurement Section staff members in 2009, she should consider leaving UNON for another duty station as, in his view, she had contributed to the problem in the Procurement Section. The Applicant refused to seek a transfer out of UNON.

7. Subsequently, a decision was taken to establish a new Chief, Procurement Section post at the P5 level at UNON. Mr. Barabanov informed the Applicant of the decision to create this new post in the Procurement Section and undertook to discourage her from applying for this post because, in his considered view, Mr. Steiner was not minded to give her the P-5 post.

8. On 8 July 2010, Mr. Steiner approved the job description for the post of Chief, Procurement Section at the P-5 level (“the contested post”), which had been sent to him by Mr. Barabanov. The job description indicated that the Chief,



Case No. UNDT/NBI/2011/010

Judgment No. UNDT/2011/051

15. Based on the available evidence, the Tribunal finds that the Applicant has established a *prima facie* case of unlawfulness by identifying troubling anomalies that the Respondent will have to refute should she decide to pursue her case through an application on the merits. The Tribunal is of the considered view that one of the anomalies that may need to be dealt with comprehensively by the Respondent is the Applicant's contentions at paragraphs 35 to 39 of her request for management evaluation.

### **Particular urgency**

16. Pursuant to section 10.2 of ST/AI/2010/3 (Staff selection system), the decision to select a candidate shall be implemented upon its official communication to the individual concerned.

17. The Tribunal notes that the selection decision was officially communicated to the selected candidate by HRMS/UNON before the Applicant filed her application for suspension of action. Thus, the Tribunal can only conclude that the contested decision in this case had already been implemented prior to the filing of the application for suspension of action. The Tribunal finds therefore that the test of particular urgency in this case has not been made out by the Applicant.

18. It is rather unfortunate however that a suspension of action can only be granted if the implementation of the administrative decision would cause irreparable damage but if the decision has been implemented, as in the present case, the question of suspension does not arise. In other words a patently unlawful act is allowed to survive in view of the legal provisions that do not authorize the Tribunal to suspend the execution of such an illegal act.

### **Irreparable damage**

19. After listening to the Applicant's evidence at the hearing, it became quite clear that one of her primary concerns is the fact that the non-selection decision will result in irreversible damage to her career prospects in and outside of the United

Nations as she will be reaching the mandatory retirement age in two years. The Applicant also asserted that there would be harm to her reputation as a result of the contested decision as colleagues would assume that she was not selected for the position due to non-performance.

20. Based on the above, the Tribunal finds that the Applicant has established the element of “irreparable damage”.

### **Conclusion**

21. The Applicant has satisfied two elements under Article 13 of the Tribunal’s Rules of Procedure in that she raised a *prima facie* case that the contested decision was arguably unlawful and that she will suffer irreparable damage. However, she was unable to establish the third element, i.e. that the matter is of particular urgency.

### **Decision**

22. In view of the foregoing, the application for suspension of action is rejected.

*(Signed)*

Judge Vinod Boolell

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March 2011

Entered in the Register on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March 2011

*(Signed)*

Jean-Pelé Fomété, Registrar, UNDT, Nairobi