

## NINETY-FOURTH SESSION

(Application for interpretation)

Judgment No. 2212

The Administrative Tribunal,

Considering the application for interpretation of Judgment 2047 filed by Mrs J. M.-E. on 8 July 2002;

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

Having examined the written submissions;

### CONSIDERATIONS

1. By her twenty-sixth complaint the complainant asks the Tribunal to give an interpretation of Judgment 2047. In support of this request she alleges first, that she has given and acted upon certain interpretations of certain passages of that judgment, and, second, that certain alleged statements and actions by the EPO demonstrate that it has a different view of what the Tribunal said.

2. The latter, in her view, also constitute "new facts" which would justify the Tribunal's reconsidering Judgment 2047.

3. The application is clearly devoid of merit and it must be summarily dismissed in accordance with Article 7(2) of the Tribunal's Rules. The simple fact that parties may disagree as to the meaning of what the Tribunal has said is no basis for seeking its intervention, especially where, as appears to be the case, other complaints already pending before the Tribunal will give it ample opportunity, if that be necessary, to interpret what it said on the earlier occasion. Likewise, the fact that one or both parties may have acted in a manner contrary to the Tribunal's view of the law, while it may give rise to a variety of recourses, is not a ground for reconsidering the earlier decision.

### DECISION

For the above reasons,

The application is dismissed.

In witness of this judgment, adopted on 7 November 2002, Mr Michel Gentot, President of the Tribunal, Mr James K. Hugessen, Vice-President, and Mrs Flerida Ruth P. Romero, Judge, sign below, as do I, Catherine Comtet, Registrar.

Delivered in public in Geneva on 3 February 2003.

Michel Gentot

James K. Hugessen

Flerida Ruth P. Romero

Catherine Comtet

