

## EIGHTY-EIGHTH SESSION

### ***In re Masens (No. 4)***

**(Application for review)**

**Judgment 1944**

**The Administrative Tribunal,**

**Considering the application for review of Judgment 1700 filed by Miss Liana Yvonne Masens on 20 February 1999 and corrected on 16 May 1999;**

**Considering Article II, paragraph 5, of the Statute of the Tribunal and Article 7 of its Rules;**

**Having examined the written submissions;**

### **CONSIDERATIONS**

**1. The complainant has already applied on two occasions for review of Judgment 1700 of 29 January 1998, which dismissed as irreceivable the complaint which she had filed against the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) challenging the Director-General's decision to place her on special leave. In Judgment 1751 of 9 July 1998, the Tribunal dismissed a first application for review as being clearly irreceivable on the grounds that the complainant had failed to show any mistake of fact warranting review. In Judgment 1799 of 28 January 1999, the Tribunal dismissed a second application for review, which it also found to be clearly irreceivable on the grounds that the alleged new facts cited by the complainant were not matters warranting review of its judgment.**

**2. In her third application for review, the complainant produces documents which, she says, are inexact and incorrect and misrepresent her service with UNIDO. She once again challenges the conditions under which her services were terminated. None of these arguments warrants a review of Judgment 1700. With regard to her claims for the cancellation of the documents which she considers to be incorrect, the correction of certain errors and the granting of various sums corresponding to the taxes which she had to pay in the United States and the moral damages which she suffered, the Tribunal finds that they are irreceivable because they do not challenge prior decisions by UNIDO which were contested within the time limits.**

**3. In these conditions, the application for review is clearly irreceivable and must be dismissed in accordance with the summary procedure in Article 7 of the Rules of the Tribunal.**

### **DECISION**

**For the above reasons,**

**The application is dismissed.**

**In witness of this judgment, adopted on 5 November 1999, Mr Michel Gentot, President of the Tribunal, Miss Mella Carroll, Vice-President, and Mr James K. Hugessen, Judge, sign below, as do I, Catherine Comtet, Registrar.**

**Delivered in public in Geneva on 3 February 2000.**

***(Signed)***

**Michel Gentot  
Mella Carroll  
James K. Hugessen**

