

Dankner in his second appeal to the Supreme Court: "the verdict remains a riddle".

Shelly Appelberg, TheMarker

19.02.2014

Dankner's lawyers regarding the authority's report, which still remains confidential: "Our hands were tied behind our back, in sincere attempts to guess what brought the court to its decision".

Dankner, the former controlling shareholder of IDB, has yet to give up: today he filed with the Supreme Court an additional appeal regarding the verdict the Judge Eitan Orenstein, how transferred the control of IDB, leaving the report of the investigating authorities - The Israel Securities Authority, the Official Receiver and the overseeing Attorney Hagi Ullman - confidential. The appeal joins the appeal filed by Dankner a few weeks ago on Orenstein first ruling and the request for further reference was submitted to a judge in the District Court due to "new evidence sufficient to reopen the IDB case and cancel the transfer of the controlling interest."

In the appeal, thus explaining Dankner's attorneys, Shmulik Cassouto, Guy Noff and Ronen Bar-On, the "supplemental ruling, was surprisingly unprecedented - the District Court opposed its first ruling by undertaking an independent initiative - thus preventing creditors and parties from learning the information, checking its accuracy and perfecting their moves accordingly. Thus, in actual fact, the court left the report to be conducted under impossible and impractical conditions, confidential and in deep secrecy, while preventing creditors, as well as all other parties to the case that are affected by this report, from reviewing it. These actions are in stark contrast to the first judgment; the court prevented any possibility from creditors to make an informed decision based on such information. Thereby replacing the discretion of the creditors with his own discretion, and the final decision whether to choose wither arrangements on the basis of full information - was kept to himself."

According to the lawyers, "Once the court ruled that not he shall not force his mind onto that of creditors, he should have already revealed the report for the reference of the creditors to enable them to exercise discretion and conclude an informed decision."

The lawyers also argue that the District Court granted a relief that the parties had not requested, to keep the investigation report secret. The surprising decision which denied Dankner one of the fundamental rights hereby underlying the Israeli legal system which is "conducting a trial, with open cards, while all the data, material and information are placed before the parties litigants, and anyone may attempt to refute the data presented to the Court".

Furthermore, the attorneys added, that the second judgment rule remains a riddle: "We do not know what was basis for the supplemental judgment. The lack of understanding, in itself, creates the difficulty of establishing the reasons to appeal the verdict. As, if the basis for the court ruling is unknown (because the evidence was not disclosed to you) how should you know what to appeal? We had to challenge the result; our hands were tied behind our back, in sincere attempts to guess what brought the court to its decision."