

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**

At the Supreme Court sitting as the High Court of Justice

HCJ 1326/17

Before:

Honorable Justice I. Amit
Honorable Justice M. Mazuz
Honorable Justice Y. Elron

Petitioners:

1. _____ Abu 'Odeh
2. _____ Zir
3. _____ Salahut
4. _____ Abu NejmeH
5. Adv. Adi Lustigman
6. Adv. Hagar Shechter
7. Workers Advice Center Ma'an
8. HaMoked: Center for the Defence of the Individual

v.

Respondents:

1. Population and Immigration Authority Bureaus Department
Director, Ministry of Interior
2. Employment Service Executive Director
3. Security Director of the Population and Administration Bureau
in East Jerusalem
4. Security Director of the Population and Administration Bureaus
in Jerusalem
5. Government Housing Administration Supervisor, Accountant
General, Ministry of Finance

Decision

1. Following our review of the respondents' notice dated June 22, 2018 and the petitioners' response, we hereby issue an *order nisi* instructing the respondents to explain why they are not taking the necessary steps to realize all the remedies requested in the petition.
2. Responses to the *order nisi* will be submitted 60 days from today.

Prior to the hearing on the objection to the *order nisi*, the parties will submit main arguments no more than 6 pages long. In accordance with the regulations, the main arguments will include the arguments of each side in relation to the *order nisi* that has been issued in a concise manner, and the legal references in support of the claims. Reference to the petition or the response do not constitute a substitute for detailed main arguments, the stated purpose of which is to focus and concentrate the material in its entirety, in order to make the hearing more efficient.

Issued today, Tamuz 25, 5778 (8.7.2018).

Justice

Justice

Justice