



---

The Federal Supreme Court (F S C) has been convened on 10.7.2018 headed by the Judge Madhat Al-Mahmood and membership of Judges Farouk Mohammed AL-Sami, Jaafar Nasir Hussein, Akram Taha Mohammed, Akram Ahmed Baban, Mohammed Saib Al-nagshabandi, Aboud Salih Al-temimi, Michael Shamshon Qas Georges, Hussein Abbas Abu AL-Temman and Mohammed Rajab Al-Kubaisi who authorized in the name of the people to judge and they made the following decision:

Plaintiff / (ain. ra. ha. kha. lam.) his agent (feh. sin. kha.).

Defendant/Speaker of the House of Representatives / being in this capacity his attorney the tow human rights officers (sin. taa. yeh.) and (haa. mim. sin.)

Claim:

The plaintiff claimed that the House of Representatives issued the third amendment Law of the House of Representatives elections No. (45) of 2013 , article (3) of the amendment provides as follows:

(With the exception of the votes of minorities covered by the quota system, the results of the outside of all governorates will be canceled and the election of the population movement of the provinces of (Anbar, Salah-Alddin, Nineveh and Diyala) elections for displaced persons in the camps, conditional voting elections and special voting elections in the Kurdistan Region), the plaintiff challenges the unconstitutionality of this article for several reasons, including that the cancellation of the voting results of some categories was randomly and the abolition of competence the Judiciary, the plaintiff reinforces the reasons given by

him for violating the challenge article of the constitutional provisions (2/beh) , (2/jim) & (14) and also the article (16). In response to the allegation, the agents of the defendant filed a pleading date 26/6/2018 request for rejection of the case for the judgment of the case No. (99,104,106/federal/2018) on 21/6/2018. On the appointed day of the pleadings, the court was formed and the two parties were declared and attended and accompanied by public outreach, the plaintiff repeated what in the petition of the case and asked for the judgment under it the adding that the press chargers was dated 20/6/2018 and the judgment issued by the FSC unconstitutionality of the article (3) of the third amendment Law of the House of Representatives elections was date 21/6/2018 which ruled that article (3) is unconstitutional and invalid, so the subject of his client's case remains, the agents of (the defendant/ being in this capacity) that the date adopted is the date of the case, both sides repeated their statements and, as it is not said, the verdict was understood publicly in the hearing.

#### The Decision :

For scrutiny and deliberated by FSC found that the agent of the plaintiff claims that the House of Representatives issued the third amendment Law of the House of Representatives elections No. (45) of 2013 and he challenge unconstitutional the article (3) of amendment which state that (With the exception of the votes of minorities covered by the quota system, the results of the outside of all governorates will be canceled and the election of the population movement of the provinces of (Anbar, Salah-Alddin, Nineveh and Diyala) elections for displaced persons in the camps, conditional voting elections and special voting elections in the Kurdistan Region), where the court noted that the challenge had been judgment in the above article in the case No. (99,104,106/federal/2018) under judgment of the FSC on 21/6/2018 -attachment- where it ruled that the mentioned article was unconstitutional and void for violating constitutional provisions (14,20 & 38/1<sup>st</sup>) as the subject of this case has been settled in the case referred to and cannot be judgment again for the author of that judgment and

accordingly decided to reject the plaintiff's case and not to charge the bank and the fees of the lawyer because he press charges to request the judgment unconstitutional the article (3) of the third amendment Law of the House of Representatives elections No. (45) of 2013date 20/6/2018 , the judgment issued by the FSC unconstitutional the article (3) and their abolition of the date 21/6/2018 No. (99,104,106/federal/2018). Therefore, the plaintiff was right in his request contained in this case No. (119/federal/2018) when set up, so do not be charged expenses and fees of the lawyer of his opponent either objectively, the previous judgment requires the rejection of this body decided to reject the verdict and issued the ruling binding and in agreement according to the provision of article (94) of constitution it was publicly understood on 10/7/2018.