



Before: Judge Goolam Meeran

Registry: New York

Registrar: Nerea Suero Fontecha

PARRONDO-RODRIGUEZ

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT

ON WITHDRAWAL

Counsel for Applicant:

Daniel Trup, OSLA

Natalie Puchalka, OSLA

Counsel for Respondent:

Elizabeth Gall, ALD/OHR, UN Secretariat

Introduction

1. On 15 May 2017, the Applicant, a Human Resources Officer at the P-4 level in the Department for Management, filed an application in which she described the contested decision as the decision of the Administration to reduce her contracted salary and the manner in which that decision was implemented. As remedy, the Applicant requested that the decision be rescinded, and that she should receive outstanding backdated pay. The Applicant also requested an expedited hearing.
2. On 15 June 2017, the Respondent filed the reply submitting that the application was not receivable and that, in any event, the impugned decision was lawful.
3. Following several case management orders, the case was reassigned to the undersigned Judge on 1 April 2019.
4. By Order No. 57 (NY/2019) dated 2 April 2019, the Tribunal issued an order in this and other cases raising the same or similar factual and legal issues:

... **On or before Tuesday, 9 April 2019**, the Applicants and each of them are to respond to the following questions:

- a. Is it accepted that, in his responses to Orders No. 133-136 (NY/2018) and 25 (NY/2019), the Respondent has correctly characterised the nature of the claims and, if so, are his submissions accepted or challenged, that the claims “are identical to the arguments already considered and rejected by the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* [2018-UNAT-840] and *Quijano-Evans et al.* [2018-UNAT-841]”;
- b. If the answer to question “a” is in the affirmative, do each of the Applicants seek to distinguish their case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal and, if so, to state the grounds in a submission not exceeding five pages.
- c. If the Applicants and each of them accept that the Dispute Tribunal is bound by the Judgments of the Appeals Tribunal to state if they wish to withdraw their claim and, if

not, to state what other consideration and/or disposal they are seeking.

5. On 9 April 2019, the Applicant filed her submission in response to Order No. 57 (NY/2019) indicating, “separate from Counsel”, that (a) it is not for the Applicant to determine whether her claims are identical to the arguments considered by the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842; (b) the Applicant has nothing to add with respect to such judgments; and, (c) the Applicant does not wish to withdraw her claim.

6. By Order No. 65 (NY/2019) dated 10 April 2019, the Tribunal instructed the Respondent to file a response to the Applicant’s submission by 18 April 2019.

7. By Order No. 68 (NY/2019) dated 23 April 2019, the Tribunal ordered Counsel for the Applicant to clarify whether they still represent the Applicant and to state whether and how the Applicant would distinguish her case from the rulings of the Appeals Tribunal in *Lloret Alcañiz et al.* 2018-UNAT-840, *Quijano-Evans et al.* 2018-UNAT-841 and *Mirella et al.* 2018-UNAT-842. In the event that the Applicant did not seek to distinguish her case from these rulings, she was to “show cause why [her] claim should not be struck out on the ground that it has no or no reasonable prospect of success”.

8. On 29 April 2019, the Applicant filed a notice of withdrawal of claim UNDT/NY/2017/046.

Judgment

9. There being no matter for judicial consideration and determination in this case, it is ordered that Case No. UNDT/NY/2017/046 be closed.

(Signed)

Judge Goolam Meeran

Dated this 30th day of April 2019

Entered in the Register on this 30th day of April 2019

(Signed)

Nerea Suero Fontecha, Registrar, New York