

## Summary of Bodo v. IBRD, Decision No. 514 [2015]

The Applicant challenged the non-extension of her Short-Term Consultancy (STC) contract and raised claims of discrimination and retaliation against the Bank. The Bank contended that the evidence pointed to the conclusion that there were legitimate business reasons to deny the proposed STC contract and does not support any suggestion of wrongful motivations.

The Tribunal found that the Applicant did not provide any evidence to support her allegations that the non-approval decision was based on retaliation, discriminatory motives or both. The Tribunal noted that while the Applicant may have genuinely felt unfairly treated during her employment at the Bank, allegations of retaliation and discrimination are serious forms of staff misconduct which should not be alleged lightly. Furthermore, feelings are not a reliable indication of reality and the single statement: “It happened that I felt that it was retaliation due [to] the PRS review of my case,” was wholly insufficient to substantiate a claim of retaliation.

The Tribunal found that a review of the evidence and the chronological record demonstrated a reasonable and observable basis for the non-approval decision by the Bank. The record showed that even though the Applicant and the Sector Manager were engaged in proceedings before PRS and mediation services, the decision concerning the extension of the Applicant’s contract was entirely unrelated to the dispute between the Applicant and the Sector Manager. It was evident from the record that the Applicant’s Task Team Leader did not supply the Sector Manager with the necessary information for her to make the decision on the Applicant’s contract extension in a timely manner.

The Application was dismissed.