## AFRICAN UNION Administrative Tribunal



UNION AFRICAINE TRIBUNAL ADMINISTRATIF

## auat@africa-union.org

Case No.: AUAT/2019/003 Order No.: AUAT/2020/004

IN THE MATTER OF:

M.I., Applicant

v.

## Chairperson of the African Union Commission, Respondent

FOR APPLICANT: *Pro se* FOR RESPONDENT: Namira Negm, Legal Counsel, African Union Commission BEFORE: S. <u>MAINGA</u>, President, J. <u>SEDQI</u>, and P. <u>COMOANE</u> HEARD ON: 19 November 2020

## Order

- 1. On 12 October 2020, the Tribunal issued Judgment No. AUAT/2020/006, which decided the application registered as AUAT/2019/003 in Applicant's favor.<sup>1</sup>
- 2. On 26 October 2020, Respondent filed the instant request under art. 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Statute seeking review of the judgment. The Tribunal invited Applicant to file her response, which she submitted on 5 November 2020.
- 3. Counsel for Respondent's chief contention is premised on the implausible claim that the Bond Agreement was entirely invalid or that it was signed without proper authority. This argument was never advanced prior to the close of proceedings. Nor is the request accompanied by new previously unavailable and decisive facts. The e-mail exchanges, dated September 2018, accompanying the request had always been available to Respondent and, with the exercise of minimal diligence by Counsel for Respondent, could have been submitted with his Answer. Further, the APRM Statute which entered into effect in February 2020, even if submitted in time, could not have altered the Tribunal's view as to the validity of the Bond Agreement concluded more than sixteen months prior.
- 4. Judgments of the Tribunal are final.<sup>2</sup> In limited circumstances, a party may seek review of a judgment when he or she has discovered new and decisive facts previously unknown to the party or the Tribunal.<sup>3</sup> Such application must state the new facts to be proved and must be supported by compelling new evidence.
- 5. We have inspected the application filed by Counsel for Respondent and the record and find no reversible error in the judgment. Counsel for Respondent has not submitted any previously unavailable and decisive new facts warranting a favorable review under art. 20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> M.I. v. Chairperson, AUAT/2020/006.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> AUAT Statute art. 17(vi).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> AUAT Statute art. 20.

 In the circumstances, the Tribunal concludes that the request for review filed by Counsel for Respondent is meritless and is hereby DISMISSED. Having determined so, Respondent is ORDERED to execute Judgment No. AUAT/2020/006 without delay.

Date: 20 November 2020

/signed/

Sylvester Mainga, President Jamila B. Sedqi Paulo D. Comoane

Secretary: Paulos alesclarie