



UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES

Case Nos. 2013-510 & 2013-512

Hunt-Matthes

(Applicant)

v.

Secretary-General of the United Nations

(Respondent)

ORDER No. 167 (2014)

1. On 28 May 2013, the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT or Dispute Tribunal) in Nairobi issued Judgment No. UNDT/2013/084 and Judgment No. UNDT/2013/085 in the cases of *Hunt-Matthes v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*. On 26 July and 29 July 2013, respectively, the Secretary-General appealed the Judgments to the United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) and Ms. Caroline Hunt-Matthes, represented by counsel, filed her answers on 27 September 2013.
2. On 10 December 2013, Ms. Hunt-Matthes filed two identical Motions seeking leave to withdraw her claim for costs on each appeal.
3. On 10 January 2014, the Secretary-General advised the Appeals Tribunal that he has no comments on the Motions.
4. The Appeals Tribunal has consistently held that “a party may withdraw an appeal simply by giving notice and need not necessarily provide any further justification”.¹ The same rationale applies to a party’s withdrawal of a specific claim raised on appeal.

¹ See *Amar v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 73 (2011), quoting *Perrot-Maître v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 69 (2011); *Fayek v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 34 (2011).

5. For the foregoing reason, Ms. Hunt-Matthes's Motions to withdraw her claim for costs on appeal are granted. Thus, as she has requested, the following portions of her appeals documents are stricken:

In UNAT Case No. 2013/510

In the Answer Brief, at paragraph 53:

As in the companion case, she requests (one order of) costs for the preparation of UNDT trial transcript, which have been used in the companion appeals: CHF 3831.

In the Answer Form, under the heading "Relief":

Reimbursement for transcription costs of UNDT oral evidence (the same order is sought in UNAT/2013/510 or [sic] UNAT/2013/512, but only one such order of costs should be granted).

Annex 1.

In UNAT Case No. 2013/512

In the Answer Brief, paragraph 59 in its entirety, and part of paragraph 60, as follows:

Ms. Hunt-Matthes seeks reimbursement for costs incurred in transcription of the trial evidence in the appeals.

In the Answer Form, under the heading "Relief":

Reimbursement for transcription costs of UNDT oral evidence (the same order is sought in UNAT/2013/510 or [sic] UNAT/2013/512, but only one such order of costs should be granted).

Annexes 1 and 2.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 14th day of January 2014 in
Los Angeles, United States.

(Signed)
Judge Rosalyn Chapman
Duty Judge

Entered in the Register on this 14th day of
January 2014 in New York, United States.

(Signed)
Weicheng Lin, Registrar