

Translation Disclaimer: The English language text below is not an official translation and is provided for information purposes only. The original text of this document is in the Hebrew language. In the event of any discrepancies between the English translation and the Hebrew original, the Hebrew original shall prevail. Whilst every effort has been made to provide an accurate translation we are not liable for the proper and complete translation of the Hebrew original and we do not accept any liability for the use of, or reliance on, the English translation or for any errors or misunderstandings that may derive from the translation.

**The State of Israel
Ministry of Interior
Local Authority Administration
Freedom of Information**

To	Jerusalem: 21 Shvat 5769 15 February 2009
Adv. Yotam Ben-Hillel HaMoked: Center for Defence of the Individual	

Dear Sirs,

Re: Revocation of Residency Status of Permanent Residents of Jerusalem
References: your appeal dated 2 February 2008, our response dated 3 November 2008, your letter dated 17 November 2008

In response to your appeal of 17 November 2008 referenced herein, I respectfully reply as follows:

1. Regarding the information requested in section A of your letter, first, we stress that the accurate data was provided in my letter of 3 November 2008.
As regards expirations updated for minors, the figures are as follows:
In 2005, 222 expirations were updated for East Jerusalem residents, 15 of them for minors
In 2006, 1360 expirations were updated for East Jerusalem residents, 44 of them for minors
In 2007, 289 expirations were updated for East Jerusalem residents, 32 of them for minors
2. Regarding the information requested in section B of your letter referenced herein, with respect to the causes of the expirations, as my letter of 3 November 2008 stated, we are unable to perform a computerized break down of expirations by causes, as the computerized coding for the expirations is uniform, and does not include subdivision by cause. It is possible that in certain cases the computerized system will include a detailed reference to the cause of the expiration, but this is true only for some cases, and not for all expirations. In any case, the specific

information which the computerized system contains regarding an individual is not fixed. The computerized application file has no mandatory fields which must be filled out, and thus a cause is not always entered.

In light of the above, as my letter of 3 November 2008 stated, a response to this inquiry necessitates individual examination of each and every file in the East Jerusalem Population Administration Bureau in which an expiration was implemented. According to an estimate by East Jerusalem Population Administration Bureau clerks, it would take a single staff member 148.4 work-days (7 hours of work per day, per staff member) to respond to the detailed contents of the request under discussion.

Thus, pursuant to the provisions of Sections 8(1) and 9(b)(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 5758 – 1998 which establish that a public authority may reject a request for information when the processing of such a request requires unreasonable allocation of resources, and when disclosure of the information may obstruct the proper functioning of the public authority or its ability to carry out its duties, indeed there is no obligation to provide the requested information.

3. As to the information requested in section C of your letter referenced herein, when a resident of Israel contacts an Israeli diplomatic mission abroad in order to receive services, the mission is required to contact the Population Administration of the Interior Ministry, in order to provide these services. In cases when, incidentally, following the appeal to the mission abroad, a suspicion is raised as to the person's status in Israel, the diplomatic mission transfers the information to the relevant Population Administration Bureau.
4. As to the information requested in section D of your letter referenced herein, the notice of expiration is served to persons whose residency expires in one of two ways, the notice is either served in person, or it is sent by registered mail to the registered address of the person to whom the decision pertains. If the notice of expiration is returned by the post, a copy of the notice is kept in the relevant file at the Bureau.

As to your inquiry regarding the number of appeals against expiration decisions, and the hearings held in the process of reviewing the appeals, I refer you to my response in section B of this letter. As is the case regarding the causes for the expirations, data concerning appeals and hearings is not regularly fed into the computerized system, and therefore, an inquiry into these subjects would necessitate individual examination of each and every file in the Bureau, and, as section B of this letter states, such an examination would require allocating 148.4 work days (7 hours of work per day per employee), and thus, constitutes an unreasonable allocation of resources, in accordance with Sections 8(1) and 9(b)(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 5758 – 1998.

5. Regarding the information requested in section E of your letter, as my letter of 3 November 2008 stated, with respect to the break down of expirations according to countries of acquired citizenship, the computerized coding of expirations is uniform and does not include a subdivision according to the new country of residence. However, the computerized system does include a special indication of immigration to the Area [the Occupied Territories] (as opposed to immigration to

any other foreign state) and therefore, we were able to trace the requested information as to the number of expirations updated due to immigration to the Area.

Respectfully,

[signature]

Daniel Segev

Freedom of Information Commissioner