



UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES

Case No. 2025-1984

Amjad Hanna Issa

(Applicant)

v.

Commissioner-General

of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency

for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

(Respondent)

Order No. 613 (2025)

1. On 18 December 2024, the United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) issued Judgment No. 2024-UNAT-1503 (UNAT Judgment) in the case of *Amjad Hanna Issa v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*, in which it dismissed the appeal filed by Mr. Amjad Hanna Issa (Mr. Issa), a staff member of the Agency. Mr. Issa had challenged the Administration's decisions related to the payment of his salary.
2. On 8 January 2025, Mr. Issa filed an application for revision of the UNAT Judgment with the Appeals Tribunal. On 7 February 2025, the Commissioner-General filed comments on the application.
3. On 25 June 2025, Mr. Issa filed a motion titled "Motion for Additional Pleadings" requesting leave to also file additional documentary evidence: an e-mail from the Director of UNRWA Affairs (DUA).
4. Mr. Issa submits that the Appeals Tribunal was unaware of the closure of all operations of the Agency during the 2023 strike in the West Bank Field Office and that the DUA's e-mail, addressed to West Bank local staff members, confirms the closure of all installations during the strike.

5. On 7 July 2025, the Commissioner-General filed a Response to the Motion, requesting that the Appeals Tribunal deny the Motion in its entirety.

6. The Commissioner-General submits that Mr. Issa has offered no explanation as to why the document was not already introduced in the proceedings before the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal or submitted with his appeal or application for revision to the Appeals Tribunal. The Commissioner-General argues that, in any event, the Motion has no merit as Mr. Issa has failed to establish any unknown decisive fact warranting revision of the UNAT Judgment.

7. Section II.A.3 of the Appeals Tribunal's Practice Direction No. 1 provides that a motion to file an additional pleading may be granted if there are "exceptional circumstances justifying the motion".

8. Article 2(5) of the Appeals Tribunal's Statute (UNAT Statute) states that "[i]n exceptional circumstances, and where the Appeals Tribunal determines that the facts are likely to be established with documentary evidence, including written testimony, it may receive such additional evidence if that is in the interest of justice and the efficient and expeditious resolution of the proceedings".

9. According to well-established UNAT jurisprudence, "where an additional pleading merely consists of supplementary arguments to those already submitted in an appeal or answer, there are no 'exceptional circumstances' which would allow the admission of the additional argument".¹

10. The Appeals Tribunal has consistently found that it may admit additional evidence, in terms of Article 2(5) of the UNAT Statute and Article 10(1) of the Appeals Tribunal Rules of Procedure, where the party shows: i) exceptional circumstances; ii) that it will be in the interest of justice and the efficient and expeditious resolution of the proceedings to receive the additional evidence; and, iii) the evidence was not known to either party and should not have been presented at the Dispute Tribunal level.²

¹ *Tejbir Singh Soni v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 527 (2023), para. 7; *Mihai Nastase v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 514 (2023), para. 12.

² *Milunka Tadic v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 594 (2025), para. 8.

11. In the present case, Mr. Issa has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances that would warrant the admission of additional pleadings and documentary evidence. On the contrary, as correctly observed by the Commissioner-General, the additional pleadings Mr. Issa seeks to submit would merely repeat and supplement the assertion made in his application for revision, that the Agency's facilities, offices, and services in the West Bank Field Office were closed during the strike. Regarding the additional evidence, I find that he has not demonstrated that he could not have submitted the document with his application for revision.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion for Additional Pleadings and Evidence is **DENIED**.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Decision dated this 8th day of September 2025
in Paris, France.

(Signed)
Nassib G. Ziadé,
President

Order published and entered in the Register on this
8th day of September 2025 in New York,
United States.

(Signed)
Juliet E. Johnson,
Registrar