



Before: Judge Sean Wallace

Registry: Nairobi

Registrar: Wanda L. Carter

REN

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

**PRELIMINARY ORDER ON THE
APPLICANT’S MOTION FOR SUSPENSION
OF ACTION PENDING MANAGEMENT
EVALUATION**

Counsel for Applicant:

Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent:

Sandra Baffoe-Bonnie, UNEP

Wambui Kahama-Bernard, UNEP

Introduction

1. The Applicant serves as an Environmental Affairs Officer at the United Nations Environment Programme (“UNEP”) in Nairobi, Kenya. She holds a fixed-term appointment at the P4 level.

Procedural History

2. On 17 November 2025, the Applicant filed an application for suspension of action to stay the Respondent’s decision to terminate her appointment effective 28 November 2025 following a comparative review process.

3. The Applicant submits that the Management Advice and Evaluation Section (“MAES”) suspended the impugned decision on 6 November 2025. Her application to the Tribunal included the letter from MAES indicating that “the decision to terminate [your] FTA has been suspended pending the management evaluation,” and that she should expect a response to her request for management evaluation by 18 December 2025.

4. The Applicant alleged in her application, *inter alia*, that **after** MAES suspended the decision to terminate her appointment, UNEP sent her: a) a separation memo; b) a request to handover equipment; and c) an email notifying her on the process for repatriation travel. The Applicant subsequently provided these communications to the Tribunal.

5. The Respondent, in his reply, submits that “[a]ny correspondence issued to the Applicant after 6 November 2025 occurred before the MAES suspension was fully disseminated across all operational units and was promptly rectified once clarification was received.” The Respondent expressed regret for the confusion caused by delay in fully disseminating the MAES suspension and reiterated that the relief sought by the Applicant in this application has already been granted given the MAES suspension of the impugned decision pending management evaluation.

Considerations

6. As held by the Appeals Tribunal in *Kallon* 2017-UNAT-742, para. 44:

A judicial decision will be moot if any remedy issued would have no concrete effect because it would be purely academic or events subsequent to joining issue have deprived the proposed resolution of the dispute of practical significance; thus placing the matter beyond the law, there no longer being an actual controversy between the parties or the possibility of any ruling having an actual, real effect. The mootness doctrine is a logical corollary to the court's refusal to entertain suits for advisory or speculative opinions.

7. In the circumstances of this case, the Applicant has obtained the relief she seeks so there is no longer an actual controversy between the parties.

ORDER

8. Accordingly, the Application for Suspension of Action is dismissed as moot.

(Signed)

Judge Sean Wallace

Dated this 20th day of November 2025

Entered in the Register on this 20th day of November 2025

(Signed)

Wanda L. Carter, Registrar, Nairobi