



UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES

Case No. 2025-2055

ABI¹
(Appellant)

v.

Secretary-General of the United Nations
(Respondent)

Order No. 615 (2025)

1. On 21 August 2025, the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT) issued Order No. 99 (GVA/2025) on case management (UNDT Order), in which it rejected ABI's motion for anonymity.
2. ABI's prospective appeal of the UNDT Order would be due on 22 September 2025.
3. On 5 September 2025, ABI filed with the United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal or UNAT) a motion requesting an extension of the time limit to file an interlocutory appeal of the UNDT Order (First Motion) and a motion requesting anonymity (Second Motion). The Motions are registered as Case No. 2025-2055.
4. In the First Motion, ABI requests that the Appeals Tribunal extend the time limit for filing an interlocutory appeal of the UNDT Order from 30 days, as set in Article 7(1)(c) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute, to 60 days. ABI submits that she has four pending cases before the UNDT, all of which are linked to a misconduct case concerning her former supervisor. She argues that the denial of anonymity undermines the anonymity granted in two of those cases and would cause undue personal and professional harm and expose her to further retaliation. ABI submits that she represents herself and contends that while she devotes significant time to the preparation of the UNDT proceedings, it is not feasible

¹ This unique three-letter substitute for the party's name is used to anonymize the Order and bears no resemblance to the party's real name or other identifying characteristics.

for her to draft three rejoinders and an appeal (as well as other documents such as motions and submissions with the Data Protection Authority) within the prescribed 30-day period.

5. In the Second Motion, ABI requests that the Appeals Tribunal grant her anonymity in the case before it, that all documents and references to her person refer to her as “Applicant”, and that all identifying information be redacted. ABI reiterates that the present case is linked to four matters pending before the UNDT, all of which are linked to a misconduct case concerning her former supervisor, and the disclosure of her identity undermines the anonymity that was granted to her in two of those cases. She argues that anonymity cannot operate selectively and submits that in all the cases there is an overlapping of the facts and repeated references to common events, rendering the anonymity previously granted entirely ineffective.

6. On 10 September 2025, the Secretary-General filed responses to the Motions.

7. In response to the First Motion, the Secretary-General submits that the Appeals Tribunal may wish to take into account that, while it is not common, it is also not rare for staff members to be parties to more than one proceeding before the Tribunals and that the Appeals Tribunal “has been strictly enforcing, and will continue to strictly enforce, the various time limits”.

8. In response to the Second Motion, the Secretary-General submits that the Appeals Tribunal may wish to take into account two considerations. First, the UNDT, being aware of ABI’s other cases, explicitly determined that no exceptional circumstances justified anonymization in that particular case. Second, the Appeals Tribunal has consistently held that in the interests of transparency and accountability, the names of litigants are routinely included in the judgments of the internal justice system of the United Nations and that names should be redacted only in the most sensitive of cases when a staff member has demonstrated exceptional circumstances justifying anonymity.

Considerations

9. Article 7(1)(c) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute provides that an appeal must be “filed (...) within 30 calendar days of the receipt of the interlocutory order of the Dispute Tribunal or, where the Appeals Tribunal has decided to waive or suspend that deadline (...), within the period specified by the Appeals Tribunal”.

10. Pursuant to Article 18*bis*(1) of the Appeals Tribunal Rules of Procedure, “[t]he President may, at any time, either on a motion of a party or on his or her own volition, issue any order which appears to be appropriate for the fair and expeditious management of the case and to do justice to the parties”.

11. Under Article 7(3) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute, the Appeals Tribunal may decide in writing, upon written request by the applicant, and in exceptional cases, to suspend or waive the deadlines for a limited period of time. In the same vein, Article 30 of the Appeals Tribunal Rules of Procedure allows this Tribunal to shorten or extend a time limit when the interests of justice so require.

12. The Appeals Tribunal has granted additional time where, e.g., a party has an especially complex case with voluminous materials, must address a lengthy UNDT Judgment, and requires more time for consultation with counsel.²

13. I find that this case presents a sufficiently similar situation in which ABI has a number of pending cases before the Tribunals with several other time limits approaching for filing rejoinders, and she requires more time for the preparation of the appeal among her several submissions which are without the assistance of counsel. The Secretary-General has not objected to ABI’s statements of the facts underlying the First Motion.

14. Therefore, I find that the circumstances justifying ABI’s request for extension to be exceptional and that it is consequently in the interest of justice to grant her an extension. However, an extension of 30 days is excessive and, in the circumstances of the present case, I find that an extension of 20 days until 10 October 2025 is more appropriate.

15. Because ABI’s prospective appeal concerns the denial of her motion for anonymity, I find it appropriate for the fair and expeditious management of the case to provisionally anonymize ABI’s identity in this Order.³ This ruling will remain in force until the Judgment is rendered. ABI is anonymized by substituting for her name a three-letter acronym as assigned by the Registrar, pursuant to UNAT practice.

² *IK v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 575 (2024), para. 7 (internal citation omitted).

³ *ABB v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Order No. 590 (2025), para. 6 (internal citation omitted).

16. In light of my decision in this Order, ABI's Motion for Additional Pleadings, filed on 12 September 2025, is denied as moot.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that ABI's Motion for an extension of the time limit to file an appeal of UNDT Order No. 99 (GVA/2025) and the Motion for anonymity are both **GRANTED IN PART. ABI is to file her appeal no later than 10 October 2025.**

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Decision dated this 15th day of September 2025
in Beirut, Lebanon.

Judge Nassib G. Ziadé,
President

Order published and entered in the Register on this
15th day of September 2025 in New York,
United States.

Juliet E. Johnson,
Registrar