



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.:	UNDT/NBI/2025/075
Judgment No.:	UNDT/2025/068
Date:	26 September 2025
Original:	English

Before: Judge Sean Wallace

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Wanda L. Carter

HASSANEIN

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT

Counsel for Applicant:
Martine Lemothe, OSLA

Counsel for Respondent:
Camila Nkwenti, HRLU, UNOG

Introduction

1. The Applicant is a former staff member of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (“OCHA”), based in Khartoum.
2. By an application filed on 21 July 2025, he contests the decision awarding him only partial reimbursement of his claim for the loss of personal effects and for his dependents following the outbreak of war in Sudan and their evacuation.

Factual background

3. The Applicant served as a Translator/Arabic Editor with OCHA in Khartoum, under a fixed-term appointment during all applicable times.
4. On 15 April 2023, civil war erupted in Sudan. As a result, the Applicant relocated several times, ultimately residing in the United Arab Emirates.
5. On 26 December 2023, OCHA wrote to staff members who were evacuated from Khartoum informing them to submit claims for loss or damage of personal effects:

In case you suffered damage or loss of personal effects attributable to service and would like to claim compensation, you may submit your claims, along with all supporting documents, to the Head of Administration (Daud), for examination and submission to the Executive Office for quality assurance and subsequent submission of the consolidated claims to the New York Claims Board.

6. On 11 May 2024, the Applicant submitted a claim for compensation for loss of personal effects in the amount of USD67,386.00, including a vehicle and numerous other articles.
7. On 21 June 2024, OCHA sent the Applicant’s claim to the United Nations Claims Board (“the Board”) in New York for review.
8. The Board reviewed the Applicant’s claim on 25 July 2024 and 6 November 2024. The Board concluded as follows:

The Board reviewed the list of claimed items and took into account the Claimant provided his vehicle registration and photographs as proof of ownership of the claimed items.

Accordingly, the Board recommended compensation in the amount of USD28,728.00, including the automobile, pursuant to sections 3(b) and 8 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4 which provides that no compensation is payable for articles which “cannot be considered to have been reasonably required by the staff member for day-to-day life under the conditions existing at the duty station”, calculated as follows:

Total claim: USD67,386.00

Less

Disallowed: (USD25,350.00)

Excess over maxima: (USD13,308.00)

Net Compensation: USD28,728.00

9. On 13 December 2024, the Board transmitted this recommendation to the Controller. The Controller, on behalf of the Secretary-General, approved the Board’s recommendation on 26 December 2024.

10. On 31 December 2024, the Board communicated the approved compensation to OCHA. In the memorandum to OCHA, the Board provided a detailed spreadsheet of the approved recommendation, including the disallowed items, amounts exceeding the maximum limits, and the net compensation.

11. On 27 January 2025, OCHA communicated the Board’s decision to the Applicant saying:

I’m writing to you with a long-awaited update on the compensation claims that OCHA submitted on behalf of staff in Sudan. The UN Claims Board has recently concluded its review of these claims in accordance with the relevant policies and have determined the reasonable compensation for you and other colleague’s claims. The claims have now been endorsed by the Controller, and so I’m reaching out to update you in relation to your claim.

For your reference the claims were reviewed by the Board based on the policies covering compensation claims for loss of or damage to personal effects attributable to service ST/AI/149/Rev.4 and ST/AI/149/Rev.4/Amend.1 on ‘Compensation for loss of or damage to personal effects attributable to service’.

UN Claims Board decision

Based on these policies, and the applicable limits, the Board has determined that the reasonable compensation for your claim to be USD28,728.00.

12. On 22 March 2025, the Applicant requested reconsideration by the Board of his compensation. In his request, the Applicant lists items which he believes the Board should consider, including sports equipment, his children's school materials and the vehicle.

13. OCHA submitted the Applicant's request for reconsideration to the Board, and on 25 April 2025, the Board convened a meeting to consider the reconsideration request.

14. On 13 May 2025, the Board informed OCHA, *inter alia* that:

After careful review, the Board considered that the additional documentation submitted did not materially affect their initial recommendations and accordingly decided not to reconsider the claims. The Board concluded that their initial recommendations were in line with the applicable ST/AI.

15. On 19 May 2025, OCHA passed this information to the Applicant. On 2 June 2025, the Applicant requested management evaluation of the contested decision.

16. On 2 July 2025, the Management Advice and Evaluation Section issued its decision upholding the contested decision. Thereafter, the Applicant filed the instant application.

Procedural background

17. On 21 July 2025, the Applicant filed the present application.

18. The Respondent filed a reply arguing that the contested decision is lawful as it was made in line with staff rule 6.5, ST/AI/149/Rev.4 and ST/AI/149/Rev.4/Amend.1. (Compensation for loss of or damage to personal effects attributable to service).

19. After reviewing the submissions on record, the Tribunal deemed that it was sufficiently apprised of the issues in order rule on the case and thus called for the parties to file closing submissions.

20. The parties filed their closing submissions on 17 September 2025, so the case is ready for ruling.

The Parties' Submissions

Applicant's submissions

21. The Applicant's case is that the overall amount of compensation awarded to him was unreasonable. In support of his position, the Applicant raises four grounds.

22. Firstly, the compensation offered of USD28,728.00, which consists of USD15,000 for a vehicle and an additional USD13,728.00 for other personal effects, was less than 50 percent of the amount sought and thus fails to comply with the requirements of staff rule 6.5 as it is not reasonable in the circumstances.

23. Second, the Applicant argues that the Organization should have invoked paragraph 22 of ST/AI/149/Rev. 4 which authorizes the Board to recommend to the Controller compensation in excess to the limits when "unusual hardship would be caused, or it would be clearly unreasonable if the amount of compensation were limited to the relevant maxima prescribed".

24. Third, applying individual limits from 1993, unadjusted for subsequent inflation, rendered the compensation unreasonable. ST/AI/149/Rev. 4 set the limit of compensation for automobiles at USD15,000 on 14 April 1993. Although ST/AI/149/Rev. 4/Amend. 1 updated the overall limit for other claims, it left the maximum for automobiles, and other individual items, untouched. This was an arbitrary distinction which was particularly unfair in relation to automobiles as these types of items are not subject to the general limit.

25. Relying on the United States Department of Labor inflation calculator, the Applicant submits that adjusted for inflation, USD15,000 in April 1993, amounts to USD33,090 in January 2025 when the Applicant was notified of his

compensation. This effectively lowers the maximum in real terms by more than 50% and renders the compensation unreasonable. If inflation over the course of more than 30 years would have been taken into account, the Applicant should have been compensated USD33,090. The Applicant only requested the maximum of USD15,000 since it is the limit offered.

26. Fourth, it was erroneous to disallow items on the basis of paragraph 8 of ST/AI/149/Rev. 4. It appears from the memorandum that the Board relied on paragraph 8 of ST/AI/149/Rev. 4 to reject compensation for many items. However, the Applicant was not informed of the reasoning for determining which items were deemed “not reasonably required in the duty station”. Despite ST/AI/149/Rev. 4 limiting compensation for items not deemed reasonably required for day-to-day life, the Applicant is deserving of compensation due to the specific context of his circumstances. What constitutes a “reasonable need” is not universal; it varies depending on geographic, cultural, and individual factors. In this case, several of the lost items, while potentially viewed as non-essential in one context, are in fact vital to maintaining the Applicant’s well-being, dignity, and ability to function in his particular environment.

27. The Applicant, thus, states that in the absence of an itemized assessment of the reasons why each item was disallowed, he argues that Khartoum was at the relevant time a family duty station; all the possessions he claimed were integral to his daily living in Sudan, and all personal effects that were lost were indeed “reasonably required.”

28. The arbitrary exclusion of certain items, particularly a generator, a fixed air cooler and basic household goods such refrigerators, raises significant concerns regarding the fairness and rationale applied in assessing the Applicant's claim. These items were not luxuries but everyday necessities for a stable and functional home. The distinction between needs and wants must be carefully assessed with sensitivity to local standards and the client’s lived reality—what may appear as a “want” in one context could be a “need” in another. Lastly, while resource prioritization is crucial, the Applicant is not requesting luxury or excessive

compensation, but rather the replacement of items foundational to his standard of living and daily functioning.

29. For the foregoing reasons, it was clearly unreasonable and arbitrary for the Board to disallow these items which were reasonably required for day-to-day activities in the duty station.

30. Lastly, the Applicant maintains that the only reasonable compensation would be for him to receive payment for all the items lost. Even if the disallowed items are included and the maximum values for individual items, including the automobile, are adjusted for inflation, his overall award should not be limited to the maximum provided for in ST/AI/149/Rev. 4/Amend.1. Limiting his compensation to USD 47,000 (USD 32,000 plus USD 15,000 for his automobile) when his actual loss is USD67,386.00 would not be reasonable compensation pursuant to staff rule 6.5.

Respondent's submissions

31. The Respondent's position is that the recommended compensation amount was lawful. The Board reviewed the Applicant's claim in compliance with sections 8, 11, 19, and 22 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4 and ST/AI/149/Rev.4/Amend.1. Pursuant to sec. 8, the Board assessed whether the items claimed, and the corresponding value, were required for day-to-day life, taking into consideration the family status of the staff members (i.e., single, married and with or without dependent children) or whether they related to personal preferences and tastes. For the commonly claimed items that satisfied the requirements of section 8 of the Administrative Instruction ("AI"), the Board established a fixed amount that was applied to all claims, thereby ensuring fairness and equality of treatment amongst claimants, as well as an efficient review process. Based on the above considerations, the Board did not find that there was a need to invoke sec. 22 of the AI. As noted above, the Board did not find the maximum limits set forth under sec. 9 of the AI to be unreasonable.

32. The Respondent further submits that, since the Applicant did not provide documents as proof of purchase, the Board could not determine the depreciation of the items. The Board only considered whether the items were necessary and

reasonable replacement costs for the items that were deemed necessary for the duty station, in line with sec. 19 to determine the amount of compensation.

33. The Respondent avers that in reviewing the maximum limit set under sec. 11 Amend.1, the Board determined that it could not recommend the maximum amount due to the presence of disallowed items in the claim. The Board can only apply the maximum limit when the total recommended compensation exceeds that threshold.

34. The Respondent also responded to specific arguments raised by the Applicant.

35. Regarding the Applicant's averment that it was erroneous to disallow items on the basis of sec. 8 of ST/AI/149/Rev. 4, the Respondent submits that sec. 8 reflects the core principle of the AI: compensation is only payable for items that are reasonably required for day-to-day life at the duty station. It does not entitle staff members to reimbursement for items acquired to support a specific lifestyle. Staff members who wish to protect such items have the option of obtaining private insurance coverage.

36. In relation to the Applicant's complaint that the reasoning used for each item was not provided; the Respondent argues that there is no obligation for the Board or the Administration to provide the Applicant with an explanation of the rationale behind the Board's recommendation or final decision. The Applicant does not contend that there was an error on the part of the Board in its computation of compensation, he has not identified any procedural irregularities in the Board's assessment of his claim for loss or damages, and he has not indicated that the review was not done in compliance with ST/AI/149/Rev.4 and ST/AI/149/Rev.4/Amend.1.

37. On the Applicant's assertion that "reasonable" compensation equates to full reimbursement for all lost items, the Respondent opines that such assertion is incorrect. Staff rule 6.5 provides for "reasonable" compensation for loss or damage to personal effects attributable to official duties. This standard does not imply full restitution but rather compensation that is fair and proportionate, considering the circumstances and applicable limits.

38. Regarding the Applicant's submission on inflation adjustments, the Respondent submits that this contention is misplaced. Section 11 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4/Amend.1, sets the maximum allowable limit for compensation for automobiles. This limit applies independently of the age or condition of the vehicle and reflects a distinct category of award governed by its own criteria. Further, the Applicant's argument challenges the validity of the AI itself, rather than its application in the present case. The appropriateness and lawfulness of these provisions fall outside the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, which is mandated to apply the rules in force, not to assess their policy rationale or legislative history.

39. On the Applicant's contention that the Board failed to invoke sec. 22 of the AI, which allows for recommendations above the maximum allowable limits in cases of unusual hardship or clear unreasonableness is misplaced. The application of sec. 22 is discretionary in nature. The use of terms such as "may" and "in the opinion of the Board" confirms that the Board is not obligated to apply this provision unless it determines that the circumstances warrant it. In this case, the Board did not find that the Applicant's situation met the threshold for invoking sec. 22, and its decision falls within the scope of its discretionary authority.

40. In view of the above, the Respondent requests the Tribunal to dismiss the application in its entirety.

Applicable law

41. Staff rule 6.5 provides that:

Staff members shall be entitled, **within the limits and under terms and conditions established by the Secretary-General**, to reasonable compensation in the event of loss or damage to their personal effects determined to be directly attributable to the performance of official duties on behalf of the United Nations. (emphasis added).

42. Section 8 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4 provides:

No compensation shall be paid for loss of or damage to any articles which, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, cannot be considered to have been reasonably required by the staff member for day-to-day

life under the conditions existing at the duty station. In addition, no compensation shall be paid for loss of or damage to animals, motorcycles, boats, motors of all types and their appurtenances, jewelry, money (except as provided in subpara. 9 (h) below), negotiable instruments, tickets or documents.

43. Section 19 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4 states:

Where an article is lost, the amount of compensation shall be determined having regard to the following factors:

- a. The age, condition and place of purchase of the article;
- b. The original cost and the amount by which it had depreciated in value at the time of loss;
- c. The replacement of the article; and
- d. Any other relevant factors.

44. Section 22 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4 states:

When in the opinion of the Claims Board, unusual hardship would be caused or it would be clearly unreasonable if the amount of compensation were limited to the relevant maxima prescribed in paragraphs 9 to 11 above, or where the claim is otherwise not compensable under this instruction, the Claims Board may forward its recommendation in a particular case to the Controller together with its views as to what would constitute reasonable compensation.

Considerations

45. The Applicant labours under the misconception that the Board, the Comptroller, and this Tribunal should apply the law as he wishes it existed and not as it actually exists. Thus, while acknowledging that staff rule 6.5 provides for reasonable compensation “within the limits and under terms and conditions established by the Secretary-General”, his arguments are directed at those limits, terms, and conditions established by the Secretary-General in ST/AI/149/Rev.4.

46. For example, sec. 6 of ST/AI/149/Rev.4 limits compensation for personal effects of a staff member, the staff member’s spouse and dependent children residing with the staff member at the time of the loss. However, the Applicant claims compensation for “his (extended) family”, which according to the application includes “his three-generation-extended family (*The applicant, spouse,*

three grown-up sons, one son who is a student in Turkish Cyprus, one daughter-in-law, and a granddaughter.)”

47. Even more, the Applicant claimed USD3000 for clothes and shoes of his “mother, wife, six children, female house assistant and myself”. Of these eight listed family members, the Applicant is only entitled to be compensated for the personal effects of two (the Applicant and his spouse). And certainly, he is not entitled to compensation for the personal effects of his female house assistant.

48. The Applicant also argues that numerous excluded items should have been considered because they “constitute medical/physical therapy equipment and gear for my ageing mother, who needs almost 90% bedside support.” While the Tribunal has sympathy for a bed-ridden parent, her personal effects are not covered under the limits, terms, and conditions set out in the AI.

49. The same is true with respect to the Applicant’s argument against the maximum permissible as compensation for a lost automobile. He argues that failure to update this amount to reflect inflation was arbitrary and unreasonable.¹ His argument is not with the decision but with the applicable rule, but the AI is not subject to judicial review. *Oglesby* 2019-UNAT-914, para. 37. Of course, the General Assembly left it to the Secretary-General to set the limits which he did in the AI. Whether or not the maximum should be recalculated periodically to reflect inflation is a policy matter committed to the Secretary-General’s discretion and not subject to review by the Tribunal.

50. As the Applicant notes, the USD15,000 maximum had been promulgated for 30 years before the losses claimed. Faced with this maximum, staff members considering the purchase of a vehicle have several choices: they can purchase a vehicle whose value does not exceed the USD15,000 maximum; they can purchase a more expensive vehicle and buy insurance coverage for the excess value; or they can purchase a more expensive vehicle and take the risk on not being fully

¹ This argument is premised on the United States Department of Labor inflation calculator. One strains to understand what the inflation rates for American consumers have to do with the value of goods in another country.

reimbursed if the vehicle is lost. What a staff member cannot do is buy a more expensive vehicle and expect the United Nations to provide reimbursement, beyond the limit set in the AI, if that expensive vehicle is lost.

51. Further, it is important to note that the Applicant concedes he “only requested the maximum of USD15,000 [for his automobile] since it is the limit offered.” The Board awarded him USD15,000 which is the amount requested, so he cannot be heard to complain about that part of the contested decision.²

52. Regarding the Applicant’s claim that awarding him less than half of the amount sought is unreasonable, this argument is completely without merit. Under the Applicant’s reasoning, if he had sought total compensation of USD1 Million anything less than USD500,000 would be an unreasonable award.

53. The initial fallacy in this argument is that the amount sought by the Applicant was obviously unreasonable. In addition to claiming for the personal effects of uncovered people, as noted above, the Applicant made absurd claims.

54. Using just one example, he claimed for: 90 dinner sets, 7 dozen plates of different sizes plus a dozen buffet plates, 2 dozen “Luxury Tea Thermoses (Flasks)”, 200 plates of different sizes, 40 dozen plain tea cups, 9 dozen milk cups, 40 dozen juice glasses, 8 dozen water glasses, 6 sets of “Genuine Heavy-Duty Stainless-Steel Cooking Pots”, 8 sets of steel plates, 2 dozen “Deep Plates”, 4 sets of dessert cups and 6 sets of coffee cups. That amounts to more than 320 plates and 1163 glasses or cups (not counting the plates and cups included in the 90 dinner sets), 24 thermoses, and 6 sets of cooking pots. This dramatically exceeds the personal effects of the Applicant and his wife; it sounds more like the inventory of a restaurant or catering service.

55. For this reason alone, the Applicant’s argument premised on a percentage of the total claimed is itself unreasonable and hereby rejected by the Tribunal.

² The Applicant claims he purchased the vehicle, a Nissan Patrol, in 2008 for USD100,000., while acknowledging this amount to be “almost four times the factory cost - USD29,000 at the time.” Apparently, there was no evidence regarding the depreciation in value over 15 years.

56. Reasonable compensation is not a function of calculating a percentage of any arbitrary amount, whether that amount is reasonable or not. Instead, determining reasonable compensation entails a careful analysis of the law and facts applicable in the situation.

57. The AI reflects this in sec. 8 which provides that “[n]o compensation shall be paid for loss of or damage to any articles which, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, cannot be considered to have been reasonably required by the staff member for day-to-day life under the conditions existing at the duty station.” The record reflects that this is exactly what the Board did in reviewing his request, so the contested decision is neither arbitrary nor unreasonable.

58. The Applicant faults the Board for not invoking sec. 22 of the AI which authorizes the Board to recommend exceeding the prescribed maximum when:

in the opinion of the Claims Board, unusual hardship would be caused, or it would be clearly unreasonable if the amount of compensation were limited to the relevant maxima... the Claims Board may forward its recommendation in a particular case to the Controller together with its views as to what would constitute reasonable compensation.

59. Of course, the very language of sec. 22 makes clear that this authority is discretionary and to be used in exceptional cases. The only basis the Applicant proposes for why his is an exceptional case of “unusual hardship” or “clearly unreasonable” is that he was approaching the age of mandatory retirement and thus had limited opportunities to compensate his extended family. That basis is irrelevant, not unusual or clearly unreasonable, so the Tribunal rejects this argument.

60. The Applicant next complains that it was erroneous to disallow items on the basis of sec. 8 because the Board did not explicate its reasoning for each item and “the needs and wants must be carefully assessed with sensitivity to local standards and the client’s lived reality.” However, the reasoning is clear from the record.

61. For example, the Board found that claims for SUV accessories (\$988), a 6th spare tyre with metal hub included (\$500), tool kit (\$300), air pump (\$150), anti-

theft lock (\$60), GPS gear (\$50), and 4 fuel tanks (\$400) exceeded the maximum permissible under the AI. These items are all automobile accessories which come within the USD15,000 maximum of sec. 9(a) of the AI, and that maximum was reached when the Board approved the USD15,000 requested by the Applicant for his automobile.

62. Similarly, the Board found that USD360 of the USD3360 requested for computer equipment exceeded the USD3000 maximum for personal computer equipment under sec. 9(f). The Board also disallowed USD120 for a RICOH AFICIO MP C3000 *Multifunction (Scanner/Photocopier/Printer)*. This disallowance was also proper under sec. 10 (“[n]o compensation shall be paid for loss of or damage to more than one of the each of the articles mentioned above, for any one incident”), given that the Applicant had already claimed for an Aficio Rex-Rotary DSM 520 printer. Again, these are examples that the Board complied with the limitations included in the AI.

63. Apparently applying the same limitation under sec. 10, the Board disallowed USD50 of the USD400 that the Applicant claimed for five smart TV sets. If anything, this was generous to the Applicant, since disallowing 4/5 of the USD 400 sought for five televisions would be amount to a disallowance of USD320. The Board also properly disallowed a second washing machine, obviously for the same reason.

64. The Board disallowed a claim for diesel generator and most related items. This is clearly consistent with sec. 8 that no compensation be paid for “motors of all types and their appurtenances”. The Applicant’s argument about the need for a generator ignores the clear language of the AI, which the Board must apply.

65. As mentioned above, the Applicant also claimed thousands of USD for “medical/physical therapy equipment and gear for my ageing mother”. The Board properly disallowed these items as they are not the personal effects of the Applicant, his spouse or dependent children residing with him.

66. The Tribunal could continue in this bookkeeping exercise, but that is not its role.

67. In a landmark ruling, the Appeals Tribunal pointed out that “decision makers have some latitude or margin of discretion to make legitimate choices between competing considerations and priorities in exercising their judgement about what action to take.” *Sanwidi* 2010-UNAT-084, para. 39.

68. The Appeals Tribunal went on to explain that:

[i]n exercising judicial review, the role of the Dispute Tribunal is to determine if the administrative decision under challenge is reasonable and fair, legally and procedurally correct, and proportionate. During this process the Dispute Tribunal is not conducting a merit-based review, but a judicial review. Judicial review is more concerned with examining how the decision-maker reached the impugned decision and not the merits of the decision-maker’s decision. *Id.*, para. 42.

69. In doing so, “due deference is always shown to the decision-maker, who in this case is the Secretary-General.” *Id.*

70. Moreover, the jurisprudence is clear that “managerial decisions should be sustained provided that they are free from invidious or improper motivations and are based upon the exercise of reason and proper judgment.” *El-Awar* 2019-UNAT-931, para. 34.

71. The Applicant has not shown any evidence of invidious or improper motivation in this case, and the examples set out above make clear that the decision was based on the exercise of reason and proper judgment in the context of the applicable AI. As such, it must be upheld.

72. Finally, the Tribunal notes that art. 10.6 of its Statute provides that “[w]here the Dispute Tribunal determines that a party has manifestly abused the proceedings before it, it may award costs against that party.” Frivolous applications have been held to be an abuse of process. *Ishak* 2011-UNAT-152, para. 30; *Gehr* 2013-UNAT-328, para. 25; *Chaaban* 2016-UNAT-611, paras. 24-26; *Auda* 2017-UNAT-740, para. 28; and *Kulga* UNDT/2025/12, para.55.

73. It is clear that this application was patently frivolous. As noted above, the Applicant's initial claim was replete with items that were clearly not reimbursable, and his subsequent application to the Tribunal challenging the denial of compensation for such items was supported by neither facts nor law.

74. The Respondent did not request costs, so they will not be awarded. *Auda, supra*. However, as previously stated by this Tribunal, "it will refrain from ordering costs against the Applicant and his Counsel. Instead, the Tribunal will repeat relevant portions of the observations it made in *Haydar* UNDT/2017/050:

[...], the Tribunal needs to reiterate here that it is committed to dealing with genuine applications that come to it with a view to granting necessary reliefs to wronged and diligent applicants.

It is expected at all times that all applicants, especially those who have legal representation, present their applications with a good degree of articulation and a high sense of responsibility. This Tribunal is properly set up by law and has legal parameters for the applications it entertains. It is therefore not the forum for presenting soap box speeches and for making vague and insubstantial claims.

This Tribunal is a court of law and therefore it is the duty of the Applicant's counsel to properly school himself/herself in the relevant laws, procedures and processes before approaching this Tribunal [...].

Applications that are filed by legal counsel must be well articulated and disclose proper causes of action ...

It is mention-worthy that where an applicant has legal representation, this Tribunal will readily presume that there are no concerns about the said applicant's access to justice. It needs also to be emphasized that the bringing of shoddy and vexatious applications and the abuse of the Tribunal's processes will not only result in the offensive applications being struck out but may be met by other sanctions that the Tribunal deems appropriate in the circumstances. *Mbok* UNDT/2017/061, para. 52. affirmed *Mbok* 2018-UNAT-824, para. 47

Conclusion

75. In view of the foregoing, the application is denied in its entirety.

(Signed)

Judge Sean Wallace

Dated this 26th September 2025

Entered in the Register on this 26th day of September 2025

(Signed)

Wanda L. Carter., Registrar, Nairobi