



ARCHIVES

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Peace Palace, The Hague · Tel. 39 23 44 · Cables: Intercourt, The Hague

communiqué

*unofficial
for immediate release*

No. 72/9
10 July 1972

Application for the Review of a Judgement of the
United Nations Administrative Tribunal

The following information is communicated to the press by the Registry of the International Court of Justice:

On 3 July 1972 the Court received from an organ of the United Nations a request for an advisory opinion on an administrative issue.

Mr. Mohamed Fasla, an official of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), was the holder of a fixed-term appointment which was due to expire on 31 December 1969. As this appointment was not renewed, Mr. Fasla appealed successively to the two bodies competent to hear applications alleging non-observance of the terms of appointment or contracts of employment of staff members, namely the Joint Appeals Board (1969-1971) and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal (1970-1972). As a result, the Administrative Tribunal, sitting in Geneva on 28 April 1972, rendered Judgement No. 158, whereby it decided in particular that Mr. Fasla should receive six months' salary and was entitled to submit certain claims for reimbursement to the Secretary-General.

Mr. Fasla considered that the Administrative Tribunal had not fully considered and passed upon all his claims, and he therefore applied under Article 11 of the Tribunal's Statute for a review of the Judgement. In accordance with the provisions of that Article, his application was examined by the Committee on Applications for Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgements, a committee which is composed of the member States the representatives of which have served on the General Committee of the most recent regular session of the General Assembly. In New York on 20 June the Committee on Applications decided to request of the International Court of Justice an advisory opinion on the question whether the Administrative Tribunal had failed to exercise jurisdiction vested in it or had committed a fundamental error in procedure which had occasioned a failure of justice. When the Court has given its advisory opinion, the Secretary-General has either to give it effect or to request the Tribunal to convene specially in order to confirm its original decision or render a new one.

The request for advisory opinion was transmitted to the Court by a letter of the Secretary-General dated 28 June, which reached the Registry on 3 July.