

Disclaimer: The following is a non-binding translation of the original Hebrew document. It is provided by **HaMoked: Center for the Defence of the Individual** for information purposes only. The original Hebrew prevails in any case of discrepancy. While every effort has been made to ensure its accuracy, **HaMoked** is not liable for the proper and complete translation nor does it accept any liability for the use of, reliance on, or for any errors or misunderstandings that may derive from the English translation. **For queries about the translation please contact [site@hamoked.org.il](mailto:site@hamoked.org.il)**

**At the Supreme Court**  
**Sitting as the High Court of Justice**

**HCJ 7961/15**

**In the matter of:**

**Dwyat ID No. et al.**

Represented by counsel, Adv. Benjamin Agsteribbe et al.  
Of HaMoked: Center for the Defence of the Individual  
founded by Dr. Lotte Salzberger  
4 Abu Obeida St., Jerusalem 97200  
Tel: 02-6283555, Fax: 02-6276317

**The Petitioners**

**v.**

**The Government of Israel et al.**

Represented by the State Attorney's Office  
29 Salah a-Din St., Jerusalem  
Tel: 02-6466590, Fax: 02-6466713

**The Respondents**

### **Urgent Request for Clarification on behalf of the Petitioners**

The Honorable Court is hereby requested to clarify to the Petitioners its decision in the petition herein, dated November 23, 2015, which orders the Respondents to submit their response to the petition within 30 days.

**The grounds for the request are as follows:**

**The facts in brief:**

1. This petition concerns the Respondents' decision to launch proceedings for the revocation of the permits for permanent residency held by Petitioners 1-4 in particular, and other permanent residents of East Jerusalem in general. Since this is an issue of principle, currently pending the decision of this Honorable Court, which has also issued an *order nisi* against the Respondents in HCJ 7803/08 **Abu Arafah v. Minister of Interior**, the Petitioners have asked that the Court order the Respondent to stay all residency revocation proceedings for the time being, and in particular those pertaining to Petitioners 1-4.

2. It is noted, beyond requirement, that in both the motion for order nisi and the petition itself, the Petitioners specified in detail why the order was required immediately and why the Respondents must stay proceedings for the revocation of permits for permanent residency in Israel. Thus, among other matters, in paragraph 35 of the petition, the Petitioners noted that the Respondents had notified Petitioners 1-4 that they may submit written arguments against the decisions to revoke their permanent residency permits to Respondent 2 **by December 8, 2015**.
3. However, the decision issued by the Honorable Court, and which is the subject of this request, contains no reference to the order nisi requested by the Petitioners in tandem with the petition.
4. Moreover, **in the current state of affairs, wherein the Respondents have already launched proceedings for the revocation of Petitioners' permanent residency permits, and allowed them to submit their arguments against these decisions by December 8, 2015, it appears that the current decision, whereby the Respondents would respond to the petition within 30 days, would render the petition entirely moot.** This is so as the administrative process of revoking Petitioners' permits for permanent residency will likely conclude within thirty days and the petition herein would become irrelevant.
5. Thus, since the decision issued by the Court, which is the subject of the request herein, is silent on the motion for an order nisi, which, the Petitioners believe to be cardinal in the state of affairs created after the Respondents launched proceedings for the revocation of the Petitioners' permanent residency permits, The Petitioners ask the Honorable Court to clarify to them what has been decided with respect to the motion for an order nisi.
6. Alternatively, should the Honorable Court find no room to grant the motion for order nisi, given the direct impact such a decision has on the Petitioners, as well as the additional possible ramifications a decision on the remedies sought in the petition would have, the Court is hereby requested to schedule an urgent hearing of the petition itself, **prior to December 8, 2015**, the last day on which the Petitioners may submit their arguments against the revocation decisions to the Respondents.
7. In the interest of law and justice, this request should be granted.

Jerusalem, November 24, 2015.

---

Abir Joubran-Dakwar, Adv.  
Counsel for the Petitioners