



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/GVA/2025/058

Order No.: 109 (GVA/2025)

Date: 22 September 2025

Original: English

Before: Duty Judge

Registry: Geneva

Registrar: Liliana López Bello

MRAZ

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

**ORDER
ON CASE MANAGEMENT**

Counsel for Applicant:
Kalaycia Clarke, OSLA

Counsel for Respondent:
Federica Midiri, UNDP

Introduction

1. On 1 September 2025, the Applicant, a former staff member of the United Nations Development Programme (“UNDP”), filed an application contesting the decision not to renew his fixed-term appointment (“FTA”) beyond 31 March 2025. With the application, the Applicant filed a motion to exceed the page limit.
2. On 4 September 2025, the application was served to the Respondent, who was given until 6 October 2025 to file his reply.
3. On 8 September 2025, the Respondent filed a motion objecting to the Applicant’s motion to exceed the page limit, which the Applicant responded to on 11 September 2025.

Consideration

4. The Applicant requests leave to exceed the page limit in the application by 18 pages. He submits that this is necessary because, *inter alia*, the procedural history of this case is relatively long and complex, with several factual and legal matters that need to be properly posed, and also the fact that there are a number of complex legal arguments that are novel to the Dispute Tribunal, the Organization and its performance management system.
5. On the other hand, the Respondent requests that the Applicant’s motion be rejected for the following two reasons. First, the Applicant did not seek leave to exceed the page limit before filing his application, as he is required to do. Second, because the application contains facts and raises claims concerning matters that arose after the decision not to renew the Applicant’s FTA. These issues, thus, were not posed before the decision-maker and are consequently not relevant to the assessment of the lawfulness of the contested decision.
6. The Tribunal agrees that the application references several facts that arose after the contested decision was made and that, therefore, may not be crucial to the scope of judicial review in the instant case. It also agrees, however, that some of those facts are relevant and connected to the contested decision, and that the

challenges made by the Applicant to the assessment of his performance involve two consecutive Performance Improvement Plans (“PIP”) that may include relatively long and complex facts and legal issues.

7. In view of the foregoing, the Tribunal has decided to adopt a balanced approach. Accordingly, the Applicant shall revise and limit his application to a maximum of 20 pages, excluding the cover page, list of annexes, and signature pages. In accordance with the principle of equality of arms, the Respondent shall enjoy the same page limit to his reply.

Conclusion

8. In view of the foregoing, it is ORDERED THAT:

- a. The Applicant’s motion to exceed page limit is partially granted;
- b. By **Monday, 29 September 2025**, the Applicant shall revise and limit his application to a maximum of 20 pages, as per para. 7 above; and
- c. By **Wednesday, 29 October 2025**, the Respondent shall file his reply, as per para. 7 above.

(Signed)

Judge Sun Xiangzhuang (Duty Judge)

Dated this 22nd day of September 2025

Entered in the Register on this 22nd day of September 2025

(Signed)

Liliana López Bello, Registrar, Geneva