



Judgment No. 2016-UNAT-629



Counsel for Appellants:

Self-represented

JUD E DEBORA' T' O&AS-(ELI) *PRESIDIN .

1. T"e Un#ted Nat#ons Appeals Tr#&unal 6Appeals Tr#&un

617 ¶ 62 and no 22) and its effect (see 1 June 2015) applicable only to staff recruited on or after one November 2015. B. Corrected net salaries reflect the annual adjustment of 6-7 1: .5 per cent for UNSS and 6-7 19.5 per cent for UN<<.

627 Amend BC one to ¶ 61 and no 21) effect (see 1 Jul 2012) applicable to eligible staff already on board prior to one November 2015) the amendments are issued to reflect revised allowances.

rece#8a&##t ma &e ad?ud#cated proprio otu and ; #t"out ser#ng t"e appl#cat#on on
t"e . espondent for a repl) t"e UN\$T dec#ded & ; a of summar ?udgment t"at t"e
appl#cat#ons ; ere not rece#8a&le rati#e ateriae.

S+, - \$ss\$! ns

Prasad et al.'s Appeals

4.

Appellants suffered due to the implementation of the decision. The Appellants also asD

manifest abuse of process on behalf of the Secretary-General. The Appellants request

14. - "at occurred before the Dispute Tribunal is not contested: the staff members submitted ; written requests for an extension of time to file an application the Dispute Tribunal did not address the staff members' requests for an extension of time the Dispute Tribunal converted sua sponte the requests for an extension of time into incomplete applications and the Dispute Tribunal summarily adjudged the applications not receivable.

15. As the language of the statutory scheme suggests) a request for an extension of time to file an application is not the same document as an application. The requests for an extension of time were made so that the staff members could obtain information needed to prepare an application. In other words) the staff members were not read to

THE UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL