

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 10041/08

The Petitioners

_____ **Hijaz et al.**
represented by counsel, Adv. Adi Lustigman
27 Shmuel HaNagid St., Jerusalem
Tel: 02-6222808; Fax: 03-5214947

v.

Minister of Interior
represented by the State Attorney's Office
Ministry of Justice, Jerusalem
Tel: 02-6466590, Fax: 02-6467011

Response on behalf of the Ministry of Interior

Subject to the decision of this Honorable Court dated November 27, 2008 (which was provided to the State Attorney's Office on December 1, 2008), the Respondent hereby respectfully submits his response to the petition and Motion for Interim Injunction.

As explained below, the petition must be dismissed as it has been rendered moot.

1. On August 13, 2008, the professional committee operating pursuant to the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law (Temporary Order) 5763-2003 recommended the Petitioner be granted a stay permit issued by the Area commander, which shall be renewed so long as the Petitioner cares for her minor children.
2. On December 15, 2008, the minister approved the recommendation of the humanitarian committee.
3. Pending the execution of the decision (which will be provided to the Petitioner in the near future) by way of issuance of stay permits, the Petitioner will not be required to leave Israel, as stated in the requested interim injunction.
4. In these circumstances, the petition appears to have been rendered moot and must be dismissed.
5. To complete the picture it is stressed that processing of the Petitioner's application proceeded independently of the petition, in due speed, given the number of applications pending before the

humanitarian committee. In these circumstances, if it were not for the aforesaid, the petition should have been dismissed *in limine* as it is premature.

6. In conclusion – the Honorable Court is requested to order the dismissal of the petition.

[signed]
Uri Keidar, Adv
Senior Deputy, State Attorney's Office