

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**

Date: 3 November 2025

Please indicate in response: 1154731

To:

Brigadier General Hisham Ibrahim
Head of the Civil Administration

Lieutenant Colonel Ilan Nevoani
Head of the Jerusalem Periphery DCO
Civil Administration

By email: mnz@mgar.co.il

URGENT

Dear Sirs,

Re: Mass Rejection of Applications for “Permanent Resident in the Seam Zone” Permits for Residents of Beit Iksa on Security Grounds

1. We write on behalf of the Head of the Beit Iksa Village Council, Mr. Murad Zaid, ID No. 942319187, regarding the mass rejection of applications by Beit Iksa residents for entry permits to the Seam Zone, allegedly on security grounds. Attached is a power of attorney.
2. Beit Iksa is located near the municipal boundary of Jerusalem, between the Ramot neighborhood and the village of Beit Surik. Approximately 2,000 residents live in Beit Iksa. When the Separation Barrier was constructed in this area, it was built in such a way that Beit Iksa, along with the villages of Nabi Samuel and Badou al-Khallayla, remained on the “Israeli” side of the Barrier, i.e., within the Seam Zone. A map of the area is attached and marked A.
3. In legal proceedings concerning the route of the Barrier, HCJ 426/05 *Biddu Village Council v. Government of Israel* (Published in Nevo, 10.9.2006), the State informed the Court that it had decided to alter the Barrier route between Beit Surik and Beit Iksa and shift it eastward so as to encircle Beit Iksa and place it on the “Palestinian” side of the Barrier, outside the Seam Zone. Relying on this declaration, the Court decided not to rule on that segment of the route (see para. 4 of the judgment).



4 Abu Obeidah St.
Jerusalem 97200
Tel. +972.2.6283555
Fax. +972.2.6276317

شارع أبو عبيده ٤
القدس ٩٧٢٠٠
هاتف. ٠٢. ٦٢٨٣٥٥٥
فاكس. ٠٢. ٦٢٧٦٣١٧

mail@hamoked.org.il
www.hamoked.org.il

4. In reality, however, the route was never changed. Beit Iksa remains on the “Israeli” side of the Barrier, and residents’ passage through the checkpoint has been permitted pursuant to lists maintained by the military.
5. Some nineteen years after the judgment, on 7 September 2025, the military published Order Regarding Security Provisions [Consolidated Version] (Judea and Samaria) (No. 1561), 5770-2009, Declaration Regarding the Closure of an Area No. 01/25/S (Seam Zone) (Judea and Samaria), 5785-2025. Under this Order, the enclave where Beit Iksa is located was declared a closed area. Entry and presence are prohibited except for permanent residents of the Seam Zone, holders of valid Seam Zone permits, and persons traveling through the enclave on the roadway.
6. In advance of publication of the Order, in August 2025, the military conducted a population survey in Beit Iksa. Some residents received permits recorded in the “Al-Monasak” application. Residents who did not receive permits were referred to the DCO, where Civil Administration officials submitted applications on their behalf. These appeared in Al-Monasak as applications for “New Seam Zone Resident” permits, despite the fact that these residents have lived in Beit Iksa their entire lives.
7. Recently, dozens of residents were notified, via the village council, that their applications had been rejected on security grounds. In the Al-Monasak system the applications appear as rejected for failure to meet the necessary criteria, accompanied by a note indicating a security bar regarding entry into Israel. However, the oral explanation given was that the applications were denied for security reasons (with no details or a paraphrased summary).
8. It must be emphasized that **refusing Seam Zone permits to residents who lived in the area prior to the declaration of closure is contrary to the law**, regardless of any alleged security information.
9. The Seam Zone Entry Regulations explicitly provide:

Existence of a security prevention and/or misuse of a permit shall not disqualify the applicant’s eligibility for a Seam Zone Permanent Resident Certificate, where the applicant resided in the Seam Zone prior to its declaration.”
(Chapter B, Section 6(b))

A copy of the relevant page is attached and marked B.

10. Accordingly, all rejection decisions issued against Beit Iksa residents who lived in the village before 7 September 2025 and are based on alleged security grounds are unlawful and must be cancelled immediately.

11. This conclusion is also supported by the Order Regarding Security Provisions (No. 1561), 2009, and the Seam Zone Permanent Resident Certificate Regulations, 2025, which provide that a certificate shall be issued to a person lawfully present, aged 12 or older on the date of the declaration, who proves to the satisfaction of the competent authority that they resided in the Seam Zone on the date of the declaration (Section 2(a)(1)). The only condition for issuing a permanent resident certificate to long-standing residents of the Seam Zone is residency. The Order contains no condition relating to the absence of a security preclusion.
12. The refusal to issue Seam Zone permits to dozens of lifelong Beit Iksa residents on alleged security grounds amounts, in effect, to forcible transfer of a protected population, in violation of international law. It would compel these residents to leave their lifelong homes, gravely infringing their fundamental rights, including freedom of movement, family life, and dignity. Given the number of affected residents relative to the village population, this would severely harm the community as a whole and threaten its continued existence.
13. As you know, jurisprudence has consistently held that the State must maintain, to the greatest extent possible, the pre-existing fabric of life when closing an area affected by the Separation Barrier (see HCJ 9961/03 *HaMoked v. Government of Israel*, para. 33 (Nevo, 5.4.2011) and HCJ 6896/18 *Ta'ameh v. Military Commander in the West Bank*, para. 2 of President Hayut's opinion (Nevo, 6.3.2022)).
14. The wholesale rejection of dozens of permit applications from Beit Iksa residents on security grounds will cause dramatic — and potentially irreversible — harm to residents affected by the Barrier and to the village's established social fabric, contrary to binding case law. Moreover, keeping Beit Iksa within the Seam Zone contradicts the State's representations to the Supreme Court, calling the legality of the situation into question. The current measures, taken after implementation of the permit regime, are especially unjustified.
15. It is therefore clear that the rejection decisions — based on alleged security grounds rather than claims of lack of residency — are unlawful and must be reversed.
16. Copies of identity cards of some affected residents, as reported by the village council, are attached and marked C. Additional residents may have received similar decisions, but their details have not yet been provided.
17. In light of the foregoing, we request that all rejection decisions concerning Beit Iksa residents' applications for Seam Zone permanent residency permits on security grounds be cancelled immediately, and that all residents present in the village as of 7

September 2025 be issued permanent resident certificates without delay.

18. We would appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your written response.

Respectfully,

Tehila Meir, Attorney

cc: Brigadier General Kobi Markus, Legal Advisor for the West Bank