1. The appropriate forum for a declaration in the matter of the implications of the change in status of the Parties on the alimony payments, i.e., that from the date of divorce of the Parties, the husband is to be charged for alimony, is the court in Israel, since these are Jewish spouses who were married and divorced in Israel and the personal law applicable in their action is Hebrew law/Israeli law.
2. The appropriate forum is also the court in Israel because personal law prevails under the circumstances. This applies even more so as the wife did not act as plaintiff (there) in order to prove this in her claim, and as the court in California was deceived and did not take notice of this, and due to the fact that since 2019, the woman, with a lack of good faith, despite her divorce, has been collecting alimony from the man and thus has been unjustly enriching herself.
3. The Supreme Court, in Permission for Civil Appeal 8256, Jane Doe vs. John Doe, *Piskei Din* 213 (10 December 2003), determined that in the event that only a civil marriage took place, the discussion should be divided into two issues: first, the question of the validity of the marriage, which should be discussed in accordance with private international law; and, second, the question of the alimony charge, which should be determined in accordance with personal law. Consequently, even if only a civil marriage took place, or even if both a civil marriage and a Jewish marriage took place, the issue of the validity of the marriage and the issue of the alimony charge are both to be clarified according to the personal law governing the parties. Accordingly, if the question of the validity of the marriage is separated and examined first according to international personal law, it will be found that the civil marriage was invalid from the outset, thereby eliminating any basis for charging alimony under American law. However, even if this burden was successfully met, there is no alimony obligation in a civil marriage, particularly following the dissolution of the religious and the civil marriage.
4. In our case, the Parties were married under Jewish law in Israel, and therefore the issue of the validity of their marriage, which ended on 31 December 2019, and the issue of the legal basis of the alimony obligation should have been heard and decided according to criteria pursuant to the personal law of the Parties.
5. The decision given in the United States is invalid, as it overlooks the special legal status in the matter of the Parties.

The contention of the father regarding jurisdiction in the matter of the claim for reduction of child support of the minors

1. With regard to his claim for a reduction in the child support of the minors, the father contends that the court has international jurisdiction to hear the claim according to its subject matter, and the material and local jurisdiction to hear it according to its substance and pursuant to the law of the place of residence of the minors.

…

Hearing and Determination

1. I believe that the applications for outright dismissal should be accepted. This is due both to the existence of a pending procedure in California; and in light of the existence of a jurisdiction stipulation between the Parties in the matter of the jurisdiction of the court in California over the subject matter of the lawsuit; and because I am convinced that the claims were filed with a lack of good faith and since the continuing insistence on their being conducted under the circumstances, and specifically in light of the ruling on 22 January 2020, in which the court in California again stated that it had jurisdiction, and the husband’s recent request for the reduction of the alimony and child support before the court in California.

General

1. A distinction must be made between the matter of jurisdiction and that of the exercise of discretion and when to use it.
2. On the subject of jurisdiction in general, the jurisdiction of the court derives from the serving of the claim on the defendant either within or outside the country. The execution of the service by law grants the court international jurisdiction under private international law, and, in accordance with it, the court in Israel has international jurisdiction over a John Doe defendant found within its borders (A. Goren, Issues in Civil Procedure, 72 12th Edition – 2015 (hereinafter – Goren).
3. Based on the rules of local jurisdiction stated in Section 258(c) of the Civil Procedure Regulations, 5744-1984 (which were in force at the time of filing of the claims under dispute), and pursuant to Sections 1(3) and 3(A) of the Family Court Law, it appears that the court in Israel is vested with international jurisdiction to hear the claim. Therefore, it appears to me that the man has met the standard of jurisdiction.