

# **A New Zealand perspective on Israeli judgment against New Zealand-based activists under Israel's Anti-Boycott Law**

Last year the New Zealand singer Lorde cancelled a concert in Tel Aviv following an open letter by two New Zealand-based activists urging her to take a stand on Israel's illegal occupation of Palestine. A few weeks later, the two activists found themselves the subject of a civil claim brought in the Israeli court. The claim was brought by the Israeli law group Shurat HaDin, on behalf of three minors who had bought tickets to the concert, pursuant to Israel's so-called Anti-Boycott Law (the Law for the Prevention of Damage to the State of Israel through Boycott). The Israeli court has now released a judgment upholding the claim and ordering the activists to pay NZ\$18,000 in damages (plus costs).

Readers who are interested in a New Zealand perspective on the decision may wish to visit *The Conflict of Laws in New Zealand*, where I offer some preliminary thoughts on the conflict of laws issues raised by the judgment. In particular, the post addresses - from a perspective of the New Zealand conflict of laws - the concern that the judgment represents some kind of jurisdictional overreach, before discussing the enforceability of the judgment in New Zealand (and elsewhere).