

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)**

Unclassified

-1-

[Emblem]

**State of Israel**  
Ministry of Defense

Coordination of Activities in the Territories		
Operations		Division
Public	Liaison	Office
Tel:		03-6977957
Fax:		03-6975177
General	-	13015
Shvat	8	5775
February	8	2015

Advocate Bilal Sbihat – HaMoked for the Defence of the Individual

Re: **Response to a request according to the Freedom of Information Act entitled: "A sweeping prohibition on the exit abroad of residents of the West Bank, in general, and on the residents of Hebron, in particular, during June-August this year"**

Yours: 31250 dated October 7, 2014

1. Firstly, I wish to apologize for the long time which was required to respond to your request, which stemmed, *inter alia*, from the need to receive the positions of various agencies.
2. In your above referenced letter dated October 7, 2014, you requested to receive information regarding a "sweeping ban" which was allegedly imposed on the travelling abroad of the residents of the Hebron district between the months of June-August. Following an examination of the request, please be advised as follows:
  - a. With respect to the information requested in paragraph 4 of your letter – it should be initially noted that according to security legislation, the Judea and Samaria area is a closed zone and that for the purpose of entering and leaving said area a permit of the military commander is required. In addition to the issues which were clarified in the notice of the State Attorney's Office in H CJ 4554/14, it should be noted that during "Shuvu Achim" Operation, as a result of an **urgent security need**, and *inter alia*, in view of the concern that the three youths would be smuggled abroad and/or that parties involved in the abduction would go abroad, a limitation was indeed imposed on the travelling abroad of residents of the Hebron district between the ages 20-50. Said limitation was removed on the night between June 28, 2014, and June 29, 2014. Notwithstanding the allegations contained in your letter, it was not a "sweeping" limitation, in view of the fact that it was limited to a certain age group and place of residence, and was time-limited. In addition, the civil administration officers in the "Allenby Bridge" border crossing were authorized to examine humanitarian or

exceptional cases, and transfer specific cases for the examination of the security agencies, to check whether travelling abroad may be allowed.

With respect to the information requested in paragraph 8 of your request and its sub paragraphs, please be advised as follows:

- 1) Sub-paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) – the requested information cannot not be disclosed according to section 9(a)(1), in view of the concern that its disclosure may impinge on state security. In addition, the requested information concerns internal consultations, and as such there is no obligation to disclose it according to section 9(b)(4) of the Freedom of Information Act as well. Moreover, it is information which was created and which belongs to the Israel Security Agency and therefore the Freedom of Information Act does not apply thereto. On this issue see section 14(a)(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. Under the circumstances of the case, we have also concluded that the information cannot be disclosed partially or subject to conditions.
- 2) Sub-paragraph (d) – our position is that the requested information which, in fact, is a question posed to the authority, does not constitute "information", as this term is defined in the Freedom of Information Act. Moreover, and as noted above, no "sweeping ban" was imposed on the relevant date. With respect to the framework for the imposition of specific security preclusions, the meaning of said preclusions and the manner by which a decision is made by the military commander to ban the exit abroad of residents with respect of whom preclusions were introduced – this information has already been transferred to you in a response and in an additional response to your freedom of information request dated April 10, 2013 (your reference: 69041).
- 3) Sub-paragraph (e) – as noted in the letter of the Civil Administration Public Liaison Officer to you dated October 1, 2014, on the relevant date specific preclusions on travelling abroad were introduced based on professional-security criteria. In this case neither a "general order" nor an "oral instruction" was given.
- 4) Sub-paragraph (f) – as noted above, no "order" was issued.
- 5) Sub-paragraph (g) - as noted above, no "oral instruction" was given.
- 6) Sub-paragraph (h) - as noted above no "instruction/order" was issued. With respect to the removal of specific security preclusions – see the letter of the Civil Administration Public Liaison Officer to you dated October 1, 2014.
- 7) Sub-paragraph (i) - as noted above, no "instruction and/or order" were issued. With respect to the handling of humanitarian and exceptional cases – see section 3(d) of the letter of the Civil Administration Public Liaison Officer to you dated October 1, 2014.

Sincerely,

(Signed)  
Amitai Cohen,                      Captain  
Public Liaison                      Officer  
C      O      G      A      T