

## NINETY-SIXTH SESSION

(Applications for review)

Judgment No. 2321

The Administrative Tribunal,

Considering the applications for review of Judgments 2054 and 2167 filed by Mr F. P. on 31 July 2001 and 6 September 2002 respectively;

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, a former staff member of the European Southern Observatory (ESO), has filed two applications for review, which may appropriately be joined, against judgments delivered by the Tribunal. Firstly, he criticises Judgment 2054, by which his 14th, 15th and 17th complaints were dismissed, and secondly he criticises Judgment 2167, by which his 23rd, 24th, 25th and 33rd complaints were dismissed.
2. As in his numerous earlier complaints, the complainant is challenging decisions concerning the end of his appointment with the ESO and the replies to his requests for an "unsuitability pension" and for medical insurance in connection with the eye problem from which he suffers. The judgments targeted by the present applications for review carry the authority of *res judicata*, and whilst the complainant asserts that they are based on errors of fact and of law and that they disregard his rights, none of the pleas he puts forward warrants review of those judgments. The Tribunal therefore dismisses his pleas as clearly irreceivable in accordance with the summary procedure provided for in Article 7 of its Rules.

### DECISION

For the above reasons,

The applications are dismissed.

In witness of this judgment, adopted on 14 November 2003, Mr Michel Gentot, President of the Tribunal, Mrs Flerida Ruth P. Romero, Judge, and Ms Mary G. Gaudron, Judge, sign below, as do I, Catherine Comtet, Registrar.

Delivered in public in Geneva on 4 February 2004.

(Signed)

Michel Gentot

Flerida Ruth P. Romero

Mary G. Gaudron

Catherine Comtet

Updated by PFR. Approved by CC. Last update: 20 February 2004.