



INTERNATIONAL SEABED AUTHORITY

JOINT APPEALS BOARD

ISBA/JAB/APPEAL/BOURREL-MCKINNON/GRIEVANCE 4/2025

Marie Bourrel-McKinnon

(the “Appellant”)

v.

Secretary-General of the International Seabed Authority

(the “Respondent”)

Judgment of the Board relating to Grievance 4 submitted by the Appellant

Alleged obstruction of misconduct investigation

Introduction

1. The Appellant is a former staff member of the International Seabed Authority (ISA/the Authority). At the time of events, she held the position of Chief of Staff and Head of the Strategic Planning Unit, at the D-1 level.

2. On 14 March 2025, the Appellant filed the present appeal, registered as Grievance 4 before the Joint Appeals Board (JAB/Board) of the ISA, pursuant to Staff Rule 11.2 (a)(i) of the ISA Staff Rules and Rules 11 and 17 of the Revised JAB Rules of Procedure (RoP). She contested the decision taken by the Respondent “sometime between her first day in office and 10th January 2025, to obstruct the investigation into the allegations of serious misconduct filed by the Appellant in November 2024.”



Procedural Background

3. On 24 November 2024, the Appellant submitted two formal complaints of abuse of authority, harassment, retaliation, and gender discrimination, against the Director of the Office of Administrative Services (Director, OAS), and the Budget and Oversight Officer.
4. On 2 December 2024, the Director, OAS, in his capacity as the first reporting officer of the Budget and Oversight Officer, submitted a response to the complaint filed against the Budget and Oversight Officer.
5. By Interoffice Memorandum dated 6 December 2024, the former SG advised the Appellant that, in accordance with section 5.14 of United Nations ST/SGB/2008/5 (Prohibition of discrimination, harassment, including sexual harassment, and abuse of authority), he had decided to appoint a panel to investigate her allegations of misconduct (the Fact-finding Panel).
6. On 9 December 2024, the Appellant wrote to the former SG seeking ten specific measures to protect her from “[...] further harassment, retaliation and discrimination [...].” She also requested a formal referral to the United Nations Ethics Office (UNEO), in accordance with section 5.2 of United Nations ST/SGB/2017/2/Rev.1 (Protection against retaliation for reporting misconduct and for cooperating with duly authorized audits or investigations).
7. By email dated 11 December 2024, the former SG informed the Appellant that he had “received two complaints dated 9 and 10 December 2024 respectively against [her] submitted by the Finance Officer, in which he alleges that [her] actions constituted harassment, abuse of authority and intimidation (one complaint), and leak of confidential information and retaliation (second complaint) which are prohibited conduct”. He had also received a complaint dated 9 December 2024 from the Budget and Oversight Officer alleging that the Appellant had engaged in bullying, harassment and intimidation against him. The former SG referred these complaints to the Fact-finding Panel that was already investigating the Appellant’s complaints of 24 November 2024.
8. On 15 December 2024, the Appellant wrote to the former SG complaining that the Director of OAS, and the Budget and Oversight Officer had violated the confidentiality of her complaints by copying them to the Staff Association. The Appellant reiterated her request for implementation of the measures detailed in her 9 December 2024 email to monitor her workplace environment and to prevent further retaliation.



9. On 16 December 2024, the former SG confirmed that the additional elements of the Appellant’s complaints had been provided to the Fact-finding Panel and that the UNEO had been contacted. Additionally, the former SG confirmed implementation of two of the Appellant’s requested measures and agreed to a modified remote working arrangement.¹ With respect to the other measures requested by the Appellant, the former SG invited her to provide “more specificity as to the well-defined risks of retaliation” she perceived to exist and to demonstrate a link to her requested remedies.²

10. The Appellant wrote again to the former SG on 19 December 2024, requesting that he convey to the Fact-finding Panel further information she had on new alleged misconduct by the Director, OAS, the Budget and Oversight Officer and the Finance Officer in the form of obstruction, continued retaliation, harassment and abuse of authority.

11. On 23 December 2024, the former SG notified the Appellant of the reception of the Fact-finding Panel’s preliminary response and recommendations highlighting the urgency of the case. The Panel further highlighted that the complexity of the investigation had increased due to the additional complaints requiring several months for investigation and to ensure due process for all parties. Given that the former SG’s term was expiring on 31 December 2024, he informed the Appellant that since there was no “reasonable possibility of contractually engaging the panel” for an investigation during his tenure, he would pass the Fact-finding Panel’s urgent recommendations on to the Respondent.

12. On the same date, 23 December 2024, the Appellant requested UNEO protection against retaliation.

13. In its email dated 27 December 2024, the UNEO notified the Appellant that its mandate extends only to Secretariat personnel and that, “As ISA is an autonomous international organization and not part of the UN Secretariat, we unfortunately cannot accept your request for protection.”

14. On the same date, 27 December 2024, the Appellant shared with the former SG the UNEO’s reply to her request for protection against retaliation.

¹ See measures 1 to 3 in the Appellant’s 9 December 2024 email to the former SG.

² See measures 4 to 10 in the Appellant’s 9 December 2024 email to the former SG.



15. By email dated 27 December 2024 addressed to the former SG and copied to the OiC Legal Counsel and the Human Resources (“HR”) Officer, the Appellant requested implementation of the panel’s recommendations and confirmation of the measures taken not later than 13 January 2025.

16. On 30 December 2024, the former SG instructed the HR and the OLA to urgently proceed with the engagement of the Panel and to take notice of the protective measures taken as described in his email.

17. On the same date, 30 December 2024, the former SG notified the Appellant that all relevant documents related to the investigation Panel’s appointment were incorporated into his handover notes for the incoming SG.

18. By Interoffice memorandum dated 3 January 2025, the Respondent notified all ISA staff members of the following key reassignments within the ISA, effective 3 January 2025:

- [The Director, OAS] as the Officer-in-Charge of the Office of Legal Affairs for an initial period of three months to address current gaps during this transitional phase.
- [The Budget and Oversight Officer] as the Officer-in-Charge of the Office of Administrative Services for an initial period of three months, ensuring the smooth functioning of all administrative operations.

19. By email dated 7 January 2025, the OiC of the OAS informed all ISA staff members that, “[...] as part of the recently initiated and ongoing restructuring of the organizational structure of the International Seabed Authority (ISA), the position of Chief of Staff & Head of Strategic Planning Unit, amongst others, has been restructured and reclassified in accordance with the Authority’s existing regulations and rules. With this change, [the Appellant] concluded her tenure with the ISA on 7 January 2025.”

Procedural History

20. On 14 March 2025, the Appellant, through her Counsel, submitted this appeal, identified as Grievance 4 with the Secretariat of the JAB, pursuant to Staff Rule 11.2(a)(i) of the ISA Staff Rules and Rules 11 and 17 of the Revised JAB RoP.



21. The JAB Secretariat requested confirmation from Counsel regarding the completeness of Grievance 4, including the annexes and supporting documentation. The confirmation was received on 14 March 2025.
22. On the same date, the Chair of the JAB invited the parties to engage in conciliation in accordance with Rule 9 of the Revised JAB RoP. Both parties declined the offer of conciliation.
23. Consequently, the JAB Secretariat formally notified the Respondent of the present appeal and invited her to submit a reply, with a deadline of 16 April 2025.
24. On 28 March 2025, the JAB Secretariat notified the Appellant that her appeal would be heard by the full Board, as it is substantively similar to other pending appeals in context and compensation sought to other pending appeals. To ensure consistency and avoid conflicting outcomes, the Chair, pursuant to Rule 28 of the Revised RoP and established tribunal practices, decided to hear them together.
25. On 3 April 2025, the Appellant submitted a request under Rule 26 of the Revised RoP seeking the disqualification of four JAB members, including the Chair, citing actual or apparent conflicts of interest and concerns regarding the composition and reconstitution of the full Board.
26. On 16 April 2025, the Respondent submitted her reply.
27. On 17 April 2025, the JAB Secretariat transmitted the Respondent's reply to the Appellant and invited her to submit comments no later than 19 May 2025.
28. On 19 May 2025, the Appellant submitted her comments to the Respondent's reply.
29. On the same day, the Chair invited the Respondent to submit additional comments in response to the Appellant's submission dated 19 May 2025. The deadline for submission was set for 17 June 2025. The JAB Secretariat received comments from the Respondent on the due date.

Summary of the Appeal

30. The Appellant challenges the decision to obstruct an investigation into her allegations of misconduct. She contends that the Respondent acted unlawfully in the handling of her two misconduct complaints.



31. The Appellant submits that the investigation was obstructed by the Respondent, who failed to acknowledge her request for administrative review, dated 15 January 2025, until its eventual rejection on 14 February 2025. She argues that the Respondent did not comply with the Code of Conduct of the Authority, the Staff Rules and Regulations of the Authority, and ST/SGB/2017/2/Rev.1, particularly in regard to the obligation to ensure protection against retaliation for reporting misconduct and cooperating with duly authorized audits or investigations.

32. The Appellant further submits that the Respondent's 3 January 2025 designation of the Director, OAS and the Budget and Oversight Officer as the Officers-in-Charge (OiCs) of the Office of Legal Affairs and OAS, respectively, who were themselves subjects of her complaints, facilitated the obstruction of the investigation and interfered with the proper conduct of the inquiry. She alleges that the two OiCs failed to respect their duty of confidentiality and that their continued involvement led to acts of retaliation, including the delivery of her termination letter by one of the subjects of her complaint. She claims that such actions amounted to humiliating behaviour and undermined the integrity of the investigation.

33. The Appellant contends that the Administration failed to comply with the recommendations of the Panel, despite the urgency of her case as outlined in the investigation documents. She asserts that the decision dated 3 January 2025, which placed the two OiCs in positions of authority, raised a conflict of interest under Staff Rule 1.2, compounded the harm already caused, and interfered with the impartiality and independence required by the Panel.

34. According to the Appellant, the obstruction of the investigation constitutes an administrative decision by omission, which violates the procedural and substantive guarantees under the Staff Rules and applicable harassment policies. These rules and policies she submits, form an integral part of her contract of employment.

35. The Appellant maintains that such failure amounts to a denial of her entitlements, producing direct legal consequences. Therefore, it meets the threshold of a reviewable administrative decision as defined by the jurisprudence of the United Nations Appeals Tribunal (UNAT).

Relief Requested:

36. The Appellant seeks the following relief:



- a) The resumption of the investigation against the Director, OAS and the Budget and Oversight Officer in compliance with the relevant regulatory framework in place and by the same Panel members.
- b) To be reinstated in her post with her fixed-term appointment until completion of the investigation.
- c) Compensation for moral damage and reasonable legal costs be awarded.
- d) A written apology for the manner in which she was treated.

Request for Oral Hearing

37. The Appellant requests an oral hearing including the examination of the following witnesses:

- a) The Director, OAS and the Budget and Oversight Officer who are subjects of complaints made by the Appellant;
- b) The former ISA SG;
- c) The former JAB Chair.

Request for Recusal of the Current JAB

38. The Appellant further challenges the legitimacy of the current JAB to adjudicate the matter. She submits that the internal justice system of the ISA was unlawfully dismantled by the Administration in January 2025, with no successor body in place at the time of her filing. She refers to UNAT Order No. 592 (2025), wherein the President of the Tribunal acknowledged with concern the Administration's unilateral dismantling of the JAB without notice or justification.

39. Invoking the principle of the natural judge, the Appellant argues that a tribunal must exist at the time the cause of action arises. The JAB constituted after the dismantling cannot qualify as such for purposes of adjudicating her claim, which arose prior to its establishment. She submits that the absence of a pre-existing and impartial tribunal undermines due process and renders the current JAB procedurally defective.



40. Accordingly, the Appellant requests that the JAB recuse itself from hearing the present dispute on grounds of lack of jurisdiction and procedural irregularity and that the matter be referred directly to the UNAT pursuant to Article 2.1(b) of the UNAT Statute.

Summary of the Reply of the Respondent

41. The Respondent submits that the appeal is not receivable, arguing that the Appellant has failed to identify an administrative decision amenable to challenge. It is asserted that the claim concerning an alleged decision by the Secretary-General to obstruct the investigation into allegations of serious misconduct is vague, unsubstantiated, and speculative. The Respondent emphasizes that the Appellant has not demonstrated how the designations of the two Officers-in-Charge constituted an obstruction that interfered with the conduct of the inquiry.

42. Furthermore, the Respondent contends that the ISA Staff Regulations and Rules provide clear procedures for addressing allegations of misconduct, and that no formal investigation had been initiated at the time of the alleged obstruction. The Respondent denies that any investigation was obstructed and asserts that the ISA Rules do not assign any formal investigative role to the Directors of OLA, OAS, or their respective Officers-in-Charge.

43. Lastly, the Respondent maintains that the Appellant has not established a sufficient connection between the alleged decision and her former status as a staff member. In view of the absence of a reviewable administrative decision and the lack of demonstrated legal consequences, the Respondent submits that the appeal is not receivable as a matter of law.

Appellant's Comments on the Respondent's Reply

44. In her comments dated 19 May 2025, the Appellant maintains that the suspension or delay of an investigation into misconduct constitutes an administrative decision by omission, with adverse legal consequences on her conditions of employment. She asserts that, by shielding her alleged harassers, the contested decision compromised her well-being in the workplace and undermined her dignity and sense of security. The Appellant further submits that being required to work in proximity to individuals against whom complaints had been filed altered her ability to carry out her professional duties without intimidation and fear, thereby degrading her working conditions. She argues that the inaction of the Administration violates both procedural and substantive guarantees under the Staff Rules and the applicable harassment policies, which she considers integral to her contract of employment.



Respondent's Further Comments

45. In her additional comments submitted on 17 June 2025, the Respondent reiterates that, pursuant to Staff Regulation 11.2 and Staff Rule 11.2 of the Authority, the burden lies with the Appellant to establish the existence of a contested administrative decision. The Respondent contends that this requirement has not been met, as the Appellant has failed to identify any specific administrative decision that is subject to review.

Considerations of the JAB

Request for Oral Hearing

46. The Board recalls that, under Rule 29 of the Revised RoP, oral hearings are not held as of right but may be granted where the Board considers that such a hearing is necessary for the fair and expeditious disposal of the case, or for the clarification of specific factual or legal issues. As will be seen below in this judgment, in the present matter, the appeal concerns the Respondent's conduct of an investigation into allegations of prohibited conduct.

47. The Appellant has not demonstrated that live evidence or oral submissions would provide further clarity on the material facts or assist in resolving any contested legal question. The documentary submissions from both parties are comprehensive and sufficient to enable the Board to render its determination.

48. Accordingly, the Board finds that the Appellant's request for an oral hearing is not warranted in the circumstances of this case and is hereby denied.

Preliminary matters: Competence and recusal of the JAB

49. The Appellant challenges the jurisdiction of the Board itself in her appeal, asserting that the JAB lacks competence to adjudicate matters arising before its reconstitution in January 2025. She submits that the prior dissolution of the internal justice system left a procedural vacuum and invokes the principle of the "natural judge" to argue that her claim should be heard by the UNAT under Article 2.1(b) of its Statute, rather than by the newly reconstituted JAB.

50. The JAB notes that the issue of its competence was first raised by the Appellant in her Statement of Appeal dated 14 March 2025, whereas her request for recusal of the entire JAB panel was only submitted subsequently, on 3 April 2025. Given the foundational nature of the jurisdictional objection namely, that the JAB lacks competence to adjudicate matters



arising before its reconstitution, it is appropriate to address this issue first. A tribunal must confirm its authority to hear a case before considering the composition of the adjudicating body.

51. The JAB recalls that, pursuant to ISBA/ST/SGB/2020/1/Amend.3, the ISA Staff Rules were amended on 23 January 2025 to clarify and enhance the judicial powers of the JAB in accordance with UNAT Judgment No. 2023-UNAT-1369. These reforms granted the Board the authority to issue binding determinations, adjudicate disciplinary appeals directly, and function with full judicial independence. The reconstitution of the JAB, implemented on the same date, ensured continuity in the administration of justice and maintained the Appellant's access to an independent adjudicatory mechanism.

52. Moreover, the Appellant's argument that a tribunal must already be constituted at the time the cause of action arises in order to be competent is without merit. Accepting such a proposition would risk undermining the very possibility of institutional reform or reconstitution of adjudicatory bodies, potentially leaving staff members without recourse during transitional periods. Furthermore, as set out in the procedural history above, there is no doubt that the current composition of the Joint Appeals Board had been fully established by the time Grievance No. 1 was filed on 5 March 2025.

53. In this regard, the JAB finds relevant guidance in the jurisprudence of the United Nations internal justice system, particularly the Campos decisions. In *Campos* UNDT/2009/005, the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (UNDT) explicitly rejected the applicant's request for the recusal of all judges of both the UNDT and UNAT. As noted in paragraph 7.3.1 of the UNDT judgment, "the recusal of all the Judges of the UNDT and UNAT would result in a denial of justice to the Applicant as the only body vested with power to determine his case is the UNDT with an appeal to the UNAT. The Tribunal cannot countenance such a situation and cannot be a party to denying justice to a party." This reasoning was later affirmed by the UNAT in Judgment No. 2010-UNAT-001, which emphasized at paragraph 65 that UNDT/UNAT lacked any statutory authority to dissolve a tribunal established by the United Nations General Assembly.

54. By analogy, the Appellant in the present case cannot unilaterally negate the mandate of the JAB, which was reconstituted pursuant to ISBA/ST/SGB/2020/1/Amend.3, nor demand wholesale recusal in a manner that would effectively deprive her of access to any competent forum. The JAB, as the body currently empowered by the ISA legal framework to adjudicate



internal appeals, cannot entertain arguments that would lead to a procedural vacuum and the denial of justice.

55. Furthermore, the Appellant's argument has already been addressed by the UNAT in Order No. 592 (2025), in which the Tribunal reaffirmed the JAB's competence to consider appeals filed after the reconstitution of the Board and dismissed the Appellant's request for interim relief as moot. The UNAT's finding confirms that the JAB, as currently composed, is a competent body under the ISA framework to adjudicate matters such as the present appeal.

56. The JAB also notes the settled jurisprudence of the UNAT emphasizing the need for judicial finality (*Shanks* 2010-UNAT-026 bis, para. 4; *Dalgaard et al.* 2016-UNAT-646, paras. 9-14; *Loeber* 2018-UNAT-844, paras. 26-28 ; *Ocokoru* 2024-UNAT-1483, para. 50; *Chernov* 2023-UNAT-1320, para. 70). The Appellant's current jurisdictional challenge seeks to reopen matters that have already been settled by the UNAT and this JAB in the context of the earlier proceedings of SoA. While the Board acknowledges that these jurisdictional issues might remain under review by the UNAT on appeal, it finds that the Appellant's current jurisdictional objections merely revisit those same arguments without presenting any new or compelling basis. As such, these objections do not alter the Board's assessment of its competence in the present case.

57. For these reasons, the JAB confirms its jurisdiction and competence to hear the present appeal and finds no legal basis for referring the matter directly to the UNAT.

Preliminary matters: Request for Disqualification of the JAB Chair and Members

58. The Board notes that the Appellant submitted a request for the disqualification of four members of the Board, including the Chair, alleging actual or apparent conflicts of interest and raising concerns about the legitimacy of the Board's composition. Such requests engage important principles of impartiality and independence fundamental to the administration of justice.

59. It is well established that adjudicative bodies must be impartial and free from any bias or appearance of bias. The standard for disqualification requires a reasonable apprehension of bias, judged by an objective test whether a reasonable and informed observer would perceive a real likelihood of bias.



60. While the Board notes that the Appellant filed a separate claim in this regard (Grievance # 6), the Board has carefully examined the Appellant's allegations and the circumstances relating to the appointment and constitution of the current JAB. To the extent of this specific case, the Board finds no sufficient basis to conclude that any member's impartiality is compromised or that there exists a real risk of bias. The formation of the JAB complied with the applicable ISA Staff Rules and procedural requirements, and the Board operates independently from the Administration.

61. Accordingly, the Board rejects the Appellant's request for disqualification and confirms its jurisdiction to hear and decide this matter, consistent with its determination in the prior proceedings concerning the Suspension of Action, as set out in Judgment No. *ISBA/JAB/Bourrel/2025*.

Preliminary matters: Full Board Composition Justification

62. The Board recalls that, in the present case, the judgments were deliberated upon and adopted by the full composition of the Joint Appeals Board. This approach reflects both the significance of the issues under review and the Board's concern of ensuring collective responsibility in its determinations.

63. The Board observes that, while Staff Rule 11.2(e)(i) provides for a Panel to ordinarily hear an appeal, it must be read together with Staff Rule 11.1(e), which authorizes the Joint Appeals Board to establish its own rules of procedure. Pursuant to this authority, Rule 28 of the Revised RoP expressly provides that when the Chair, or any two members sitting on a particular Panel, consider that the appeal so warrants, the case shall be heard by the whole Board. This framework is consistent with the Staff Rules, which do not preclude the hearing of cases by the full Board.

64. In the present circumstances, the pending appeals share significant similarities, both in their factual context and in the nature of the remedies sought. Referring these cases to the full Board avoids the risk of divergent conclusions by different Panels and promotes consistency, coherence, and procedural efficiency. Moreover, the practice of referring complex or precedent-setting cases to a full bench is well established in other international administrative



tribunals, reinforcing the legitimacy of this approach. Accordingly, the referral of the Appellant's case to the full Board was justified and fully in line with the applicable Staff Rules and the Revised RoP.

Issues for Determination

65. The JAB is called upon to determine:
- a) Whether there was an administrative decision leading to the obstruction of an investigation of misconduct.
 - b) If there was such an administrative decision:
 - i. Whether the Appellant has demonstrated that the administrative decision to obstruct an investigation constitutes a valid administrative decision subject to appeal under Staff rule 11.2;
 - ii. Whether the decision was tainted by improper motivation.
 - iii. Whether the Appellant is entitled to remedies, including compensation for reputational harm, moral and material damage, or other appropriate relief.

Receivability and Nature of the Contested Decision

66. The JAB will examine the matter of receivability in the sections below.

I. Legal Framework and Threshold for Receivability

67. The central issue in this appeal is whether it is receivable *ratione materiae* that is, whether it concerns a final administrative decision that produces direct legal consequences to the Appellant's terms of appointment or contract of employment.

68. The test for receivability is well-established in United Nations jurisprudence. As the UNAT has consistently held, a tribunal must assess receivability independently from the merits of the case (*Gehr* 2013-UNAT-313; *Christensen*; *Cooke* 2013-UNAT-380; *Lee* 2014-UNAT-481).

69. Pursuant to Rule 17. 1(b) of the RoP of the JAB, the Appellant must clearly identify:
- b) ... the administrative decision being contested and the terms of appointment and/or provisions of Staff Regulation or Rule which have allegedly not been observed;



70. The UNAT reiterated this principle in *Argyrou* 2019-UNAT-969, para. 32:

“a staff member is required to clearly identify the administrative decision which is contested”.

II. Lack of a Clearly Identifiable and Final Administrative Decision

71. In her submissions, the Appellant identified the contested decision as:

“the one taken by the Secretary General (“SG”), (...), sometime between her first day in office and 10th January 2025, to obstruct the investigation into the allegations of serious misconduct filed by the Appellant in November 2024”.

72. This assertion is vague and fails to pinpoint a specific administrative decision. Rather, it references a general perception of inaction or obstruction. According to the UNAT’s seminal definition in *Andronov* 2004-UNAT-1157, para. 5, an administrative decision must:

“... produce direct legal consequences affecting a staff member’s terms or conditions of appointment.”

73. The Appellant also refers broadly to a series of alleged actions, but none of these amounts to a singular, final and reviewable decision with a direct legal impact. She fails to describe how, when, or by whom a final determination was made, nor does she provide documentation that demonstrates that such a decision was ever formally taken.

74. The Appellant’s grievance therefore lacks the precision required for judicial review and fails to demonstrate directly an act that affected her contractual status, terms of employment, or legal entitlements.

75. The JAB finds that these shortcomings render the appeal non-receivable, as there is no demonstrated link between the alleged administrative conduct and a change or effect on the Appellant’s employment conditions (*Obino* 2014-UNAT-405, para. 19; *Haydar* 2018-UNAT-821, paras. 13 and 15).

Conclusion on Receivability

76. After carefully considering the parties’ submissions, the evidence, and the applicable legal framework, the JAB concludes that the Appellant:

- (a) Has not demonstrated the existence of a final administrative decision with legal consequences;



(b) Has not provided sufficient information to establish how the impugned acts affected her employment rights.

Conclusion

77. Accordingly, the appeal (Grievance 4) is dismissed on grounds of receivability.

Dated this 17th day of September 2025

Judge Martha Halfeld Furtado de Mendonça Schmidt

Chair, Joint Appeals Board

Judge Abena Kwakye-Berko

Member, Joint Appeals Board

Judge Jiefang Huang

Member, Joint Appeals Board

Judge Johnny Ibrahim

Member, Joint Appeals Board



Judge Helmut Tuerk

Member, Joint Appeals Board

Judge Georgina Guillén Grillo

Member, Joint Appeals Board

Judge Courtney Maxwell

Member, Joint Appeals Board