

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**

Preliminary Response on behalf of the Respondents in Adm.Pet. 4834-09-10 **HaMoked: Center for the Defence of the Individual v. Minister of Interior et al.**

attachment containing the interior ministry's response to HaMoked's questions regarding the implementation of resolution 2492:

[On letterhead of the Ministry of Interior, Population and Immigration Bureau, East Jerusalem, the State of Israel]

January 30, 2011

To
Ms. Leora Bechor, Attorney
HaMoked: Center for the Defence of the Individual
4 Abu Obeida St.
Jerusalem 97200

Dear Madam,

Re: Applications for Temporary Permits for Jerusalem according to Government Resolution 2492 of October 28, 2007

1. There is no specific protocol on the issue of implementation of the government resolution.
2. 841 applications for a temporary permit to remain in Jerusalem have been filed in accordance to the aforesaid government resolution. Of these, 817 were submitted up to April 30, 2008 and 24 were submitted after this time. The information requested in section 2b of the request is not clearly phrased.
3. Applications filed after April 30, 2008 were refused, as in view of the provision of section 4 of government resolution 2492, no applications may be submitted after that date.

4. It is impossible to extract the data requested in section 4 of the request for information. It is possible to state, based on data available to us, that in 354 of the 841 applications, previous applications containing claims of residency in Jerusalem prior to 1967 were submitted in the past.
5. No. See in this regard, section B1 of government resolution 2492.
6. See response to question 5.
7. To date, 31 applications have been approved, of which 8 are applications for families with accompanying minors. In total, 47 individuals have received a referral for a permit due to approval of their application.
8. 446 applications are still in processing, including files in which the applicants have been requested to produce documents proving they meet the conditions enumerated in the government resolution.
9. The requested information is not clear. Production of documents required for meeting the conditions of the government resolution is part of the processing of the application such that the information sought in this section is unclear.
10. 364 applications have been refused to date. As a rule, applications under the government resolution are filed per household including minors under the age of 18. Applications by children over the age of 18 are opened separately. As such, it is impossible to receive exact information with respect to the question of how many of the "individual" applications that were refused are connected. 165 included an application for a permit for accompanying minors.
11. The information sought in this section is unclear. No applications have been refused due to absence of documents. In such cases, demands for production of documents have been sent.
12. No applications were refused due to non-production of an aerial photo on the part of the applicants.
13. The information sought in this section is unclear. If all required documents were supplied, such that the eligibility criteria set in the government resolution were met, the applications would have been approved. As such, no applications were denied wherein all documents and all proof were supplied.
14. Six applications were refused for criminal reasons.
15. 14 applications were refused for security reasons.
16. When an application is approved, the applicants are provided with a response and a summons to receive a referral to the District Coordination Office (DCO). When the applicants arrive, the said referral for issuance of a permit is handed to them. Applicants are also informed of the approval of the application over the telephone.
17. The interior ministry-issued referral to the DCO is valid for two years. The permits are issued by the commander of the Area in accordance to his procedures.
18. For the purpose of obtaining a sample of a permit given as per the government resolution, one must contact the civil administration in the Judea and Samaria Area, which issues the permit.
19. As imprinted on the referral given to the applicants by the interior ministry, the applicants must contact our office approximately three months prior to the expiration of the DCO referral and provide documents proving center of life from the previous two years. A DCO referral for a further two years will be issued, subject to circumstances remaining the same, namely, continued center of

life within the area defined in the permit and the absence of a criminal or security preclusion, all in accordance with the provisions of the government resolution.

20. The reasons for refusing an application for extension are: criminal preclusion, security preclusion, absence of center of life.
21. Upon submission of applications, a process of recruiting and training examiners for the applications began. As of January 2009, processing of the applications was transferred to the East Jerusalem bureau.
22. The first application was approved on August 2, 2009.
23. The question does not seek information. The process of examining the applications is regulated in the government resolution. Examination of the applications is carried out in the East Jerusalem bureau. Special staff members were selected to conduct the examination of these applications.
24. Not every examination of an application requires a field examination.
25. As a rule, a hearing is held prior to reaching a final decision in an application, with the exception of unusual cases in which a hearing is not necessary.
26. No hearing is held when one of the particulars supplied by the applicant himself indicates that he does not meet the criteria set in the government resolution.
27. There is no possibility to file an objection to the decision. There is a possibility to petition the High Court of Justice.
28. There is no possibility to extract collated data with respect to the number of hearings held up to the end of 2009. Extraction of data will require manual review of all 841 application files and classification of the hearings in accordance to the dates and the question whether they were held orally and in writing. The interior ministry does not require this data, and it is, therefore, not found in the interior ministry's computers and requires unreasonable allocation of resources.
29. No objections were filed as there is no possibility to object to a decision.
30. There is no data with respect to the number of proceedings opened until the end of 2009.

Respectfully,

Liat Melamed

on behalf of the
Bureau Director