



UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2025/081
Order No.: 158 (NBI/2025)
Date: 11 September 2025
Original: English

Before: Duty Judge
Registry: Nairobi
Registrar: Wanda L. Carter

OKONGO

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

**ORDER
ON CASE MANAGEMENT**

Counsel for Applicant:

Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent:

Halil Goksan, ALD/OHR, UN Secretariat
Nisha Patel, ALD/OHR, UN Secretariat

Introduction and Procedural History

1. The Applicant was an FS-4 Administrative Assistant with the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (“MINUSCA”) based in Bangui.
2. On 17 November 2023, the Applicant requested flexible working arrangements (FWA) to telecommute from outside the duty station “due to serious medical condition”. The request was denied by the Applicant’s First Reporting Officer.
3. On 10 September 2024, the Applicant requested an agreed termination, which was approved, effective 7 October 2024.
4. On 19 February 2025, the Applicant wrote to the Under-Secretary-General for Peace Operations protesting “unfair and unjust treatment,” stating that her agreed termination was forced, due to the denial of her FWA. She further contended that the amount of her final entitlement benefits had been incorrectly calculated. These three actions form the basis of the “contested decisions.”
5. On 4 August 2025, the Applicant filed a management evaluation request challenging the contested decisions.
6. On 7 August 2025, while the management evaluation was still pending, the Applicant filed this application challenging the three contested decisions.
7. On 14 August 2025, the Management Advice and Evaluation Section (“MAES”) responded, holding that the request for management evaluation was not receivable because it was time-barred.
8. On 8 September 2025, the Respondent filed a reply in which it argues that the application is not receivable “as a matter of law” in that the Applicant did not timely request management evaluation of the contested decisions.

9. The Respondent further contends that the application violated the terms of the Applicant's agreed termination memorandum of understanding ("MOU").

Consideration

10. Pursuant to art. 19 of its Rules of Procedure, the Tribunal may at any time issue an order or give any direction appearing to be appropriate for the fair and expeditious disposal of a case and to do justice to the parties.

11. Having taken into consideration the pleadings of the parties, the Tribunal considers it appropriate and in the interest of justice to give the Applicant an opportunity to comment on the Respondent's reply by means of a rejoinder.

12. The Tribunal notes that the Applicant has listed the Office of Staff Legal Assistance ("OSLA") as her legal representative in this matter. However, the application was signed by the Applicant in proper person and not by anyone from OSLA. The Applicant submitted emails confirming that she requested OSLA assistance, and OSLA's confirmation of the request, but nothing indicating that OSLA had taken her case.

13. Upon inquiry, the Registry was advised via email dated 7 August 2025, that the Applicant's case was "still under assessment" by OSLA.

Conclusion

14. In view of the foregoing, it is ORDERED THAT by **Friday, 26 September 2025**, the Applicant shall file a rejoinder addressing the Respondent's arguments in the reply, specifically responding to the receivability issues raised.

15. This order shall be served on OSLA, who is directed to update the Registry by the same above date on the status of the Applicant's request for representation.

(Signed)

Judge Sean Wallace (Duty Judge)

Dated this 11th day of September 2025

Entered in the Register on this 11th day of September 2025

(Signed)

Wanda L. Carter, Registrar, Nairobi