



**UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL
TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES**

Judgment No. 2017-UNAT-728

**Domzalski
(Appellant)**

v.

**United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board
(Respondent)**

JUDGMENT

Before: Judge Martha Halfeld, Presiding
Judge Deborah Thomas-Felix
Judge John Murphy

Case No.: 2016-966

Date: 31 March 2017

Registrar: Weicheng Lin

Counsel for Mr. Domzalski:

Self-represented

Counsel for United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board:

Sergio B. Arvizú

JUDGE MARTHA HALFELD, PRESIDING.

1. The United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) has before it an appeal filed by Mr. Henry Michael Domzalski against a decision of the Standing Committee of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (Standing Committee and UNJSPB, respectively) made on 29 July 2016. Mr. Domzalski filed his appeal on 2 September 2016. The United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (UNJSPF or Fund) filed its answer on 16 November 2016.

Facts and Procedure

2. Mr. Domzalski is a retired staff member of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). He was a participant in the UNJSPF from 1 February 1981 until 31 October 2008. Upon his separation from service, he elected a full retirement benefit under Article 28 of the Regulations, Rules and Pension Adjustment System of the UNJSPF (UNJSPF Regulations). When his benefit went into payment on 1 November 2008, he received an amount of USD 8,322.93 per month; and at the time of his appeal, following various cost of living increases, he received USD 9,182.24. Mr. Domzalski married twice and has two daughters under the age of 21. The issues giving rise to the appeal are related to his daughter Kira Domzalski from his second marriage with Ms. Thanda Domzalski, entered into on 25 April 2000 in New South Wales, Australia. The spouses are not divorced but live separately - she in Australia and he in Tanzania. Their daughter was born in Tanzania on 14 January 2001. Until January 2016, she resided with her mother in Australia and then moved to the United States of America remaining under her mother's custody.

3. On 13 November 2012, Ms. Thanda Domzalski applied for a deduction under Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations from Mr. Domzalski's pension benefit to be paid directly to her. The request concerned the provision of child support and school fees for their daughter Kira and was made pursuant to assessments for child support issued by the Australian Child Support Agency (CSA). The UNJSPF informed Mr. Domzalski of his spouse's request by e-mail of 12 December 2012. An exchange of e-mails unfolded regarding the issue of whether the CSA had the same standing as a court in issuing assessments of child support obligations as required by Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations. The discussion resulted in the UNJSPF informing Ms. Domzalski that it would not be possible to apply Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations in

her case as the UNJSPF was unable to confirm that the CSA assessment had equal legal standing as a court order.

4. On the other hand, the UNJSPF decided, based on the information received in connection with Ms. Domzalski's application to no longer pay the child's benefit of approximately USD 280 per month to which Mr. Domzalski was eligible under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations to him but rather to Ms. Domzalski as Kira's custodial parent with effect from 1 February 2013. By e-mail of 12 December 2012, Mr. Domzalski was notified that this payment would be made directly to his spouse. In an e-mail dated 23 February 2015, the UNJSPF informed him that "any deduction [under Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations], if approved, would be reduced by the Child's benefit".

5. In light of the UNJSPF's decision not to act on her request for deduction based on the assessments of the CSA, Ms. Domzalski took legal action in Tanzania and obtained an order, issued on 23 March 2015 by the Resident Magistrate's Court in Dar-es-Salaam at Kisutu, Tanzania, which awarded maintenance for both Ms. Domzalski and their daughter in the amount of USD 4,000 per month. On the basis of this court order, by letter dated 26 March 2015, she filed a second application under Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations through her legal representatives requesting that this maintenance payment be deducted from Mr. Domzalski's monthly periodic benefit. Subsequently, Ms. Domzalski submitted to the UNJSPF correspondence between the CSA and her husband from the period between February and April 2015 which contained the information that she had withdrawn from the CSA process following the issuance of the court order in Tanzania but that Mr. Domzalski still owed an outstanding amount of approximately AUD 20,000 in child support. She further provided a letter dated 17 February 2015 confirming that the CSA had been unable to collect the outstanding payments from Mr. Domzalski.

6. By letter dated 3 June 2015, the UNJSPF informed Mr. Domzalski of his spouse's second application of 26 March 2015 under Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations. In his reply to the UNJSPF dated 5 June 2015, he objected to any deductions from his pension and stated that he would appeal the Tanzanian court order, claiming that the latter was obtained in a fraudulent way and in violation of his due process rights and that the court lacked jurisdiction and an adequate evidentiary basis to issue the order. He also reiterated that he did not owe any other payment than child support to his estranged spouse and that he intended to extinguish the

existing arrears. In light “of the pending appeal(...) of the Kisutu Court ruling, and in reflection of [his] good faith towards the matter of Kira’s child support”, he further proposed that, in order to:¹

reduce the CSA arrears of approximately AUD (...) 20,000, the UNJSPF pay Thanda Domzalski:

- a. The Child benefit as long as:
 - i. Thanda unequivocally agrees to apply it to the CSA child support arrears; and
 - ii. The USD amounts paid are correctly converted into AUD so that [his] CSA arrears can be fairly reduced.
- b. [He pays] an ADDITIONAL USD 1,000 a month, directly from [his] pension to Thanda Domzalski under the same conditions as above.

He further suggested that “the above agreement last only until the CSA arrears ha[ve] been cleared or the appeals in Tanzania have been finalized, whichever is first”. The UNJSPF answered the same day requiring proof of his appeal against the court order as well as proof that he would be making alternative support payments for his daughter pending the appeal.

7. On 12 August 2015, Mr. Domzalski submitted by e-mail proof of his appeal lodged on 4 August 2015 against the order of the Tanzanian court.

8. By letter of 9 October 2015, the UNJSPF notified Mr. Domzalski of the decision of the UNJSPF Chief Executive Officer (CEO, UNJSPF) to grant Ms. Domzalski’s request of March 2015 to order a deduction of USD 1,435.92 per month from his pension pursuant to Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations with effect from October 2015. The CEO, UNJSPF applied the Tanzanian court order “in so far as it addresses child support for Kira”. However, the amount to be deducted was calculated on the basis of the CSA assessment for the period from January to April 2015 which the CEO, UNJSPF considered “reasonable”, also taking into account that “both parties were previously engaged in the process”. The UNJSPF further stated that Mr. Domzalski had confirmed that the child’s benefit paid to Ms. Domzalski under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations would be credited against the arrears and it determined that the child’s benefit would continue to be paid directly to his spouse as a separate payment.

¹ Emphasis in original.

9. By e-mail of 10 October 2015, Mr. Domzalski acknowledged receipt of the CEO, UNJSPF's decision and expressed the opinion that previous payments of child's benefit should be applied in the reduction of his arrears. The CSA had accepted these payments to be credited to his arrears for the period between August and December 2014 but subsequently opposed such a course of action based on Ms. Domzalski's refusal. The UNJSPF informed Mr. Domzalski via e-mail dated 13 October 2015 that his spouse had agreed to the amount paid to her as a child benefit being credited to the arrears upon implementation of the deduction decision, provided that she would continue to receive the child's benefit in addition to the deducted amount for child support. On 29 September 2016, she submitted a decision of the Australian Administrative Appeals Tribunal of 16 September 2016 to the UNJSPF in which the tribunal affirmed that the child benefit payments between March and October 2015 (thus before the deduction decision was implemented) were not to be credited to the arrears since they were not intended by both parties as payments with respect to an enforceable child support liability.

10. On 7 December 2015, Mr. Domzalski filed a request with the Standing Committee for a review of the CEO, UNJSPF's decision as contained in the letter of 9 October 2015. He argued that Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations was not applicable in the absence of a "final and executable" court order. Mr. Domzalski further disputed the UNJSPF's assertion that he had agreed to the deduction of USD 1,435.92, arguing that the offer to pay USD 1,000 in his 5 June 2015 e-mail was conditioned upon assurances from his spouse that the payments would be credited to his CSA arrears which she had previously refused. In addition, he stated that the CEO, UNJSPF did not have any "discretion" to make a unilateral decision on deductions but could merely accept a retiree's offer or make a counter-offer. Moreover, if the CEO, UNJSPF considered the amount of USD 1,435.92 "reasonable", the combined amount for both child support and child's benefit per month (USD 1,722.28 if the child benefit of USD 286.36 already paid to Ms. Domzalski is added) was clearly too high. He further noted that the UNJSPF's decision to pay the child's benefit directly to Ms. Domzalski had been taken without consulting or notifying him in violation of his due process rights. By way of relief, he sought the "immediate cessation of the unagreed deduction of USD 1,435.92 from [his] pension" and the "reimbursement of all USD 1,435.92 payments (which began in October 2015)".

11. On 5 February 2016, the UNJSPF approved a reduction of the amount of the monthly deduction as requested by Mr. Domzalski based on the fact that Kira would no longer be attending school in Australia after resettling to the United States of America and that school fees

constituted a significant part of the support amount determined by the CSA. Following confirmation of the changed circumstances by the school and by Ms. Domzalski, the UNJSPF requested that Mr. Domzalski propose an amount that he believed would be reasonable as reduced child support in lieu of the amount of USD 1,435.92. He proffered two amounts: USD 530 per month and USD 713.64 per month noting that the former might be too little and the latter more reasonable. The UNJSPF informed his spouse of his request for the reduction and the amounts that he proposed and she confirmed that the higher amount of USD 713.64 would be acceptable for her. The CEO, UNJSPF approved the reduction and determined that the higher amount be applied with effect from 1 February 2016 for the February 2016 pension benefit. His letter further stated that the child's benefit in the amount of USD 286.36 payable under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations would continue to be paid directly to Ms. Domzalski and incorporated into a total child support figure of USD 1,000 per month.

12. By letter dated 29 July 2016, the Deputy CEO, UNJSPF informed Mr. Domzalski of the Standing Committee's decision at its 198th meeting held on 20 July 2016 to uphold the CEO, UNJSPF's decision, finding that the latter acted reasonably within his discretion in applying Article 45 to Mr. Domzalski's case. The Standing Committee further stated that the UNJSPF correctly applied only that part of the Tanzanian court order related to the "incontrovertible obligation" to pay child support and "[i]n making its determination, the Committee took cognizance of the arrears of child support following the assessment by the CSA and [of the fact] that [Mr. Domzalski] had not shown any alternative arrangements to meet [his] obligation in response to the request for deductions for child support by [his] spouse under Article 45". According to the Standing Committee, it was reasonable to implement the deductions based on the amount determined by the CSA because Mr. Domzalski had participated in the process leading to the determination of the amount payable. Since it was "very unlikely" that any appeal of the court order in Tanzania would lead to a court finding that there was no obligation to pay child support, the appeal of the order was no bar to the application of Article 45. Finally, with regard to the payment of a child's benefit under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations, the Standing Committee confirmed that this was a matter between Mr. Domzalski and Ms. Domzalski and there was no obligation on the part of the UNJSPF to ensure that child's benefit paid by the UNJSPF be applied in reducing the arrears in child support with the CSA.

Submissions**Mr. Domzalski's Appeal**

13. In his appeal, Mr. Domzalski requests repayment of USD 6,889.12, comprised of USD 286.36 per month paid as child's benefit under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations and USD 1,435.92 per month deducted as child support from his pension pursuant to Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations for the period from October 2015 to January 2016.

14. He makes the following contentions:

- (a) The CEO, UNJSPF acted *ultra vires* when unilaterally deciding to make deductions from Mr. Domzalski's pension in the absence of a final and executable court order. The CEO's "discretion" in applying Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations finds its limits in the "plain language" of the UNJSPF Regulations requiring such court order. The interim court decision of the Tanzanian court, however, was subject to appeal and was thus neither final nor executable.
- (b) The UNJSPF incorrectly used the CSA's child support figures although the Fund had acknowledged that the CSA is an administrative, not a judicial entity. Its use of the CSA calculation was further misguided because Ms. Domzalski had already terminated her arrangement with the CSA and the CSA figure was variable and had not been recently adjusted.
- (c) The deductions were also incorrect insofar as deductions for child support have to be reduced by any child's benefit paid under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations. It was only in January 2016 that the UNJSPF correctly decided to incorporate the child's benefit paid into the total child support figure.
- (d) The UNJSPF initiated child benefit reductions in January 2013 without any prior consultation in violation of his due process rights. He was "never contacted by the UNJSPF regarding the direct payment of the Child Benefit to Ms. Domzalski" although "due process/natural justice" would have required the UNJSPF to contact members and seek their view before "earned entitlements are directed to other parties". In contrast, the adjustment of the child support deduction effective February 2016 was properly implemented.

The UNJSPF's Answer

15. On the issue of deductions for child support, both the applicable jurisprudence and legislative history of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations support the view that the CEO, UNJSPF has discretion to make a decision as to whether or not to apply Article 45. The UNJSPF's decision to make deductions in this case was a reasonable exercise of this discretion. The UNJSPF notes, in particular, that during the three-year period between Ms. Domzalski's first application under Article 45 in 2012 - at a time when there were already arrears of over AUD 17,000 in child support - and the decision to grant her request in October 2015, "there was no proof that [Mr. Domzalski] had made any payments to meet his obligation to support his daughter; rather, the arrears with the CSA continued to increase".

16. The UNJSPF maintains that the rationale of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations does not apply to the case at hand. It is clear from the UNJSPB's discussions in 2000 resulting in the adoption of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations that the main concern leading to the requirement of a final executable court order was a situation where the Fund would be faced with competing court orders from different jurisdictions and with participants' lifelong commitments towards former spouses.

17. Concerning Mr. Domzalski's appeal of the Tanzanian court order, the UNJSPF submits that after Ms. Domzalski had withdrawn from the CSA process and obtained the court order, the UNJSPF correctly considered it unlikely that any appeal court would negate Mr. Domzalski's legal obligation to support his daughter. While Mr. Domzalski's obligation to support his wife was disputed, his obligation towards his daughter was "incontrovertible as established by law generally in his capacity as a parent, the CSA and the court in Tanzania" and was acknowledged by him in his response of 5 June 2015. In addition, since the child was 14 years old at the time the court order was issued, "[w]ithout an indication of how long the appeal process would take, it was conceivable that the child could be 18 or older by the time the appeals process [would be] finalized". At the time of the contested decision, the appeal still had not been heard.

18. The UNJSPF further argues that since there was a "sufficient connection" with Tanzania, it was reasonable to apply Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations on the basis of the court order. Further, considering that both spouses had submitted to the proceedings before the CSA, it was reasonable to use the CSA's assessment in the determination of the amount of child support.

19. With respect to the second issue, namely the direct payment of the child's benefit pursuant to Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations to Ms. Domzalski, the UNJSPF reaffirms that the Fund merely changed the payee to the custodial parent responsible for the day-to-day care of the child in accordance with its normal practice and that Mr. Domzalski was informed of that change. It adds that while "as a matter of practice", the UNJSPF applies such child's benefit by reducing the amount to be deducted from the retiree's pension benefit entitlement for child support, the UNJSPF Regulations do not contain a stipulation to this effect. The UNJSPF concludes that by requesting repayment, Mr. Domzalski makes "the assumption that [the child benefit] is his benefit" while in fact it is "deemed to be payable solely for the benefit of the child".

20. Hence, the UNJSPF prays this Tribunal to deny Mr. Domzalski's request for reimbursement.

Considerations

Receivability

21. Article 48 of the UNJSPF Regulations establishes the jurisdiction of the Appeals Tribunal over cases like the present one: #

Article 48

- (a) Applications alleging non-observance of these Regulations arising out of decisions of the Board may be submitted directly to the United Nations Appeals Tribunal by:
 - (i) Any staff member of a member organization which has accepted the jurisdiction of the Tribunal in Joint Staff Pension Fund cases who is eligible under article 21 of these Regulations as a participant in the Fund, even after his or her employment has ceased, and any person who has succeeded to such staff member's rights upon his or her death;
 - ...
- (c) The decision of the Tribunal shall be final and without appeal.
- (d) The time-limits prescribed in article 7 of the Statute of the Tribunal are reckoned from the date of the communication of the contested decision of the Board.

22. Moreover, Articles 2(9) and 7(2) of the Statute of the Appeals Tribunal read as follows:

Article 2(9)

The Appeals Tribunal shall be competent to hear and pass judgement on an appeal of a decision of the Standing Committee acting on behalf of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, alleging non-observance of the regulations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, submitted by:

- (a) Any staff member of a member organization of the Pension Fund which has accepted the jurisdiction of the Appeals Tribunal in Pension Fund cases who is eligible under article 21 of the regulations of the Fund as a participant in the Fund, even if his or her employment has ceased, and any person who has acceded to such staff member's rights upon his or her death;

...

Article 7(2)

For purposes of applications alleging non-observance of the regulations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund arising out of a decision of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, an application shall be receivable if filed within 90 calendar days of receipt of the Board's decision.

23. Pursuant to these provisions, the appeal is receivable insofar as it relates to the UNJSPF's 9 October 2015 decision to deduct USD 1,435.92 per month as child support from Mr. Domzalski's pension in accordance with Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations because the appeal concerns a decision of the Standing Committee and was filed on 2 September 2016 and thus within 90 days of receipt of the Standing Committee's decision on 29 July 2016.

24. We have examined the aspect of Mr. Domzalski's appeal related to a request for repayment of USD 286.36 per month (USD 1,145.44 in total) which was paid directly to his estranged spouse as child's benefit under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations and we find that it is not receivable. The Appeals Tribunal finds that Mr. Domzalski did not timely challenge the decision to initiate direct payments with effect from 1 January 2013, since the decision was communicated to him by e-mail dated 12 December 2012. Therefore, Mr. Domzalski is now precluded from claiming repayment of the amount paid as child's benefit and the appeal is not receivable in this regard. Moreover, his due process claim is without merit. Mr. Domzalski was informed prior to the initiation of direct payments under Article 36 of the UNJSPF Regulations and did not oppose to it. Instead, he restricted his objection to the application of Article 45

of the UNJSPF Regulations and the use of the CSA figures. Consequently, his due process rights were not violated.

Merits of the case: child support related to the period from October 2015 to January 2016

25. The *punctum saliens* that remains for consideration in the present appeal is whether the Fund correctly applied Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations when deducting from Mr. Domzalski's pension child support payments for his daughter Kira on the basis of the Tanzanian court order issued on 23 March 2015.

26. Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations generally provides for the non-assignability of rights obtained by participants or beneficiaries of the Fund under the UNJSPF Regulations. Notwithstanding such non-assignability:²

- (a) ... the Fund may, to satisfy a legal obligation on the part of a participant or former participant arising from a marital or parental relationship and evidenced by a *final and executable order of a court or by a settlement agreement incorporated into a divorce or other court order*, remit a portion of a benefit payable by the Fund to such participant for life to one or more former spouses and/or a current spouse from whom the participant or former participant is living apart. Such payment shall not convey to any person a benefit entitlement from the Fund or (except as provided herein) provide any rights under the Regulations of the Fund to such person or increase the total benefits otherwise payable by the Fund.
- (b) To be acted upon, the requirement under the court order must be consistent with the Regulations of the Fund, as determined by the Chief Executive Officer of the Fund to be *beyond any reasonable doubt, and on the basis of the available evidence*. Once implemented, the assignment shall normally be irrevocable; however, a participant or former participant may request, upon satisfactory evidence based on a court order or a provision of a settlement agreement incorporated into a court decree, a new decision by the Chief Executive Officer that would alter or discontinue the payment or payments. (...) In the event that the payment or payments have been diminished, discontinued, or have failed to commence or have ceased, the amount of the benefit payable to the participant or former participant shall be duly adjusted.

27. In the present case, Mr. Domzalski and Ms. Domzalski have reached an agreement on deductions for child support of a reduced amount effective February 2016. There is nothing in the UNJSPF Regulations to prevent the Fund from assisting a retiree in satisfying his or her legal

² Emphases added.

obligations by making deductions from the pension based on a voluntary agreement outside the scope of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations such as the one reached in this case. #

28. The question that still needs to be considered is whether, for the period from October 2015 to January 2016 when no such agreement was in place, the deductions for child support in the amount of USD 1,435,92 per month were lawful under Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations. #

29. Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations sets out the following two requirements for an order of deduction: (i) a “legal obligation on the part of a participant or former participant from a marital or parental relationship”, which is (ii) “evidenced by a final and executable order of a court or by a settlement agreement incorporated into a divorce or other court order”. The wording is clear in that it does not bestow discretion on the UNJSPF to exceptionally make deductions if these criteria are not fulfilled.

30. With regard to the first requirement, both parties agree that Mr. Domzalski has a parental obligation towards his daughter. In his reply to the UNJSPF of 5 June 2015, Mr. Domzalski accepted his obligation (also recognized by the CSA and the Tanzanian court) and he merely requested the child’s benefit payments to be credited against the arrears. We note that there is no evidence that Mr. Domzalski disputes his “legal obligation” from a “parental relationship”.

31. Regarding the second criterion, it is uncontested that Mr. Domzalski and Ms. Domzalski live apart, but there is no divorce or legal separation and, thus, no “settlement agreement incorporated into a divorce or other court order”. As a consequence, the only valid basis for deductions would have been a “final and executable court order” within the meaning of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations.

32. Ms. Domzalski repeatedly approached the Fund, requesting the application of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations, based first on an assessment dated 25 September 2012 by the CSA, and, subsequently, on a court ruling issued by the Resident Magistrate’s Court of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, on 23 March 2015. The latter ordered the payment of USD 4,000 per month as support for both the estranged spouse and their daughter. #

33. The UNJSPF correctly stated that the CAS assessment did not constitute a “court order” within the meaning of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations since the CSA is an administrative, rather than a judicial, entity and therefore does not qualify as “court”. The UNJSPF, however,

erred by stating that the Tanzanian court order was “final and executable”. Mr. Domzalski submitted proof of his appeal against that order. In accordance with generally accepted rules of procedure, a court order which is subject to appeal is stayed and therefore neither “final” nor “executable”. As a result, the order of the Tanzanian court was not “final and executable” within the meaning of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations and, thus, was not a valid basis for the deductions. As the provision also does not afford discretion to the Fund, the latter incorrectly applied Article 45 when making deductions from Mr. Domzalski’s pension and the Standing Committee erred in law by upholding the Fund’s decision.

34. It is nevertheless worth noting that, pursuant to the main objectives of Article 45 of the UNJSPF Regulations, which are to avoid serious injustice and/or hardship to both retiree and child,³ a retroactive payment could eventually occur, if and when the court order becomes final or in case of an agreement incorporated into a divorce or other court order or if the parties reach an agreement on the amount due for the period in question, as was the case for the period from February 2016 onwards. #

35. Finally, the Appeals Tribunal acknowledges the great efforts made by the UNJSPF, as demonstrated by the voluminous electronic and hard correspondence and considers that those efforts were crucial for the agreement effective February 2016, which partially resolved the issue between the interested parties. #

36. Having regard to all the circumstances and relevant submissions on the appeal before it, the Appeals Tribunal partially grants the appeal, insofar as it relates to the reimbursement of child support for the period from October 2015 to January 2016, amounting to USD 5,743.68 (USD 1,435.92 per month). #

Judgment

37. The appeal is in granted in part. The decision of the Standing Committee is affirmed to the extent that it confirms the payment of USD 1,145.44 as child’s benefit. The decision of the Standing Committee is partially reversed insofar as it relates to the deductions for child support for the period from October 2015 to January 2016, amounting to USD 5,743.68.

³ General Assembly resolution 55/224.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 31st day of March 2017 in Nairobi, Kenya.

(Signed)

Judge Halfeld, Presiding

(Signed)

Judge Thomas-Felix

(Signed)

Judge Murphy

Entered in the Register on this 26th day of May 2017 in New York, United States.

(Signed)

Weicheng Lin, Registrar