Before: Judge Sun Xiangzhuang

Registry: Geneva

Registrar: Liliana López Bello

SAMANDAROV

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

ORDER
ON CASE MANAGEMENT

Counsel for Applicant:
Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent:
Aleksandra Gjorgieska, HRLU/UNOG

Introduction

1. The Applicant, a staff member of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights ("OHCHR"), contests the decision not to select him for the position of Human Affairs Officer, P-3, in the Thematic Engagement, Special Procedures and Right to Development Division, OHCHR, Geneva, advertised under Job Opening No. 197899 ("JO 197899").

2. On 18 December 2025, the Applicant filed a motion for confidentiality.

3. On 24 December 2024, the Respondent filed his reply.

4. On 3 February 2025, the Tribunal instructed the Applicant to file a rejoinder and the Respondent to file a response to the Applicant's motion on confidentiality. Additionally, the Tribunal instructed the Parties to explore resolving the dispute amicably and to revert to the Tribunal in this respect.

5. On 17 February 2025, the Applicant filed his rejoinder.

6. On 18 February 2025, the Respondent filed his response to the Applicant's motion on confidentiality.

7. On 25 February 2025, the parties filed a joint submission informing the Tribunal that "there is no possibility of an informal settlement in this matter at this time".

Consideration

Motion on confidentiality

8. The Applicant requests that the Tribunal redact any sensitive information from the judgment and any other public documents produced by the Tribunal, including his name, that would allow the public to identify him. In his motion, the Applicant submits, *inter alia,* that public knowledge of his role at the United Nations would pose a risk to him.

9. In response, the Respondent, in essence, submits that the request is without merit. The Respondent points out that the Applicant's name is displayed in the OHCHR directory, and that a simple internet search leads to accessible information that allows the public to identify the Applicant and his connection with the Organization.

10. The Tribunal notes that the Appeals Tribunal in *Monasebian* 2024-UNAT-1476, para. 46, recognized that there have been increasing calls for greater privacy protections for individuals and parties in judgments in many jurisdictions, including in the Dispute and Appeals Tribunals, given increased access to judgments online, and that requests for anonymity must be balanced against the interests of transparency and accountability. The Appeals Tribunal has previously found that personal embarrassment and discomfort are not sufficient grounds for redaction, with redaction only to occur in the most sensitive of cases. What is required is that an individual put up sufficient material to show that there is a need for anonymization which justifies a departure from the ordinary rule.

The Tribunal notes that the Applicant's full name is displayed in the OHCHR directory. Further, in previous judgments of the Dispute and Appeals Tribunal, the Applicant's work history with OHCHR is presented and has therefore already been in the public domain for various years. On the written orders and judgments of the Tribunal, which are published on its website, only the surname of applicants is stated. The Tribunal has also reviewed the Applicant's motion and considers that the impact of displaying the Applicant's name of the Tribunal's written order(s) and judgment(s) is inconsequential in the different contexts presented by the Applicant. Therefore, his request for confidentiality is rejected.

Closing statements

11. Pursuant to art 19.1 of its Rules of Procedure, the Tribunal will order the parties to file closing statements.

Conclusion

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

a. The Applicant's motion for confidentiality is rejected;

b. By **Monday, 1 December 2025**, the Applicant is to file his closing statement, which is to be five (5) pages maximum, using font Times New Roman, font size 12 and 1.5 line spacing. The closing statement is solely to be based on previously filed pleadings and evidence, and no new pleadings or evidence are allowed at this stage;

c. By **Friday, 5 December 2025**, the Respondent is to file his closing statement responding to the Applicant's closing statement at a maximum length of five (5) pages, using font Times New Roman, font size 12 and 1.5 line spacing. The closing statement is solely to be based on previously filed pleadings and evidence, and no new pleadings or evidence are allowed at this stage;

d. By **Tuesday, 9 December 2025**, the Applicant may file a statement of any final observations responding to the Respondent's closing statement. This statement of final observations by the Applicant must be a maximum of two (2) pages, using font Times New Roman, font size 12 and 1.5 line spacing. It must be solely based on previously filed pleadings and evidence, and no new pleadings or evidence are allowed at this stage; and

e. Unless otherwise ordered on receipt of the latest of the aforementioned statements or at the expiration of the provided time limits, the Tribunal will adjudicate on the matter and deliver Judgment based on the documentation on record as soon as possible.

(Signed)
Judge Sun Xiangzhuang
Dated this 14th day of November 2025

Entered in the Register on this 14th day of November 2025
(Signed)
Liliana López Bello, Registrar, Geneva