



Date: 06/09/2024
Our ref: 01/FOI/24/013103/R

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/24/013103/R

I write in connection with your request for information dated 12/08/2024, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

1. *Can I ask to make Subject Access Request to disclose information regarding [REDACTED], who attended [REDACTED] and release all information and documents held as to why he visited that address???. (Date for the visit was [REDACTED])?. I was present at the address at the time of his visit. Who ordered him to turn on his video camera when he didn't even seek prior permission from the owner of the house? (THE VIDEO CAMERA WAS ALREADY ON in some one else's premises?, who gave him consent to turn on the video camera?. THIS COMPLAIN is not against [REDACTED], because his conduct was amazing and displayed the highest professionalism. I need to know who gave him the orders regarding his body worn video camera, to attend the address and why ?? What are documents and materials in question being held regarding the officer's presence at the address?. Moreover, he was a single patrol officer, would he not risk his life by coming alone esp when Manchester Police was kind of exaggerated as a bad police force in the media. He must have been given full reassurance (some one knew our family far too well) or alternatively the force have no resources and risking the officers???*
2. [REDACTED] - *Can I ask you to disclose information regarding whether the above 3 name whether they are linked ([REDACTED]) directly or indirectly through third parties to any politicians, or political parties, Law enforcement agencies and government bodies and individuals whether in employment of any country including UK?. (2014 - August 2024). [REDACTED] - why did he resign or leave them in the middle of no where? (July and August 2024)?*
3. *Their solicitor [REDACTED] has claimed [REDACTED] was then threatened by an officer, thrown to the ground and had his neck knelt upon in an area of the terminal without cameras - Is this incident of Manchester Airport in July 2024, connected to the riots or used as a Propaganda by the EDL or any other personnel on social media to*

promote hatred and violence?. (July and August 2024)?. Misinformation spreads over Manchester airport arrests. Pictures of a female police officer with a broken nose being shared widely online are from 2020 and not connected to the Manchester airport incident. (DID a similar thing happen)?.

Result of Searches

Questions 1 and 2

This Act provides the public with a general right of access to recorded information held by public authorities. However, information disclosed under this Act is effectively released into the public domain, or to the 'wider world', and not only to the person making the request. In cases where the public request information relating to individuals, it would be extremely rare for a public authority to release such information to the whole world under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Therefore, in accordance with the Act, this letter represents a refusal notice for questions 1 and 2 of your request.

Greater Manchester Police can neither confirm nor deny that it holds the information you requested in questions 1 and 2 as the duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply, by virtue of the following exemption: **Section 40(5)(b)(i) - Personal Information**. Giving information to a member of the public of the confirmation or denial that would have to be given to comply with section 1(1)(a) would (apart from this Act) contravene any of the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018.

To confirm that any information is held or not, could confirm personal data. In some circumstances confirming or denying whether information is held could itself identify a living individual and would therefore breach the principles of the GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data is defined by Article 4 of the GDPR and Part 1 of the Data Protection Act 2018, and means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person ('data subject'). An identified natural person is one who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data.

This use of neither confirm nor deny should not be taken as proof that such information does or does not exist.

Question 3

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate the requested information and I can confirm the information requested is held by GMP. However, I am not obliged to provide the information requested as exemption applies.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires GMP, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) to provide you the applicant with a notice which: (a) states that fact, (b) specifies the exemption in question and (c) states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies.

The exemption which applies to this request is **Section 30(1)(2)(a) – Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities**. Section 30 is a class based qualified exemption; there is a requirement to carry out a public interest test, which can be seen below.

Factors Favouring Disclosure

To disclose the information requested into the public domain would show GMP's accountability and satisfy the public that investigations into the incidents are being conducted. It would also show GMP's use of public funds in investigating incidents of this nature.

Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure

We accept that there is a legitimate and important public interest in publishing information about the investigations however, conversely to the factors in favour of disclosure, to publicly release information that is related to investigations that remain ongoing may seriously undermine GMP's ability to complete the investigations to a full and correct conclusion. Whilst these investigations might be seen as high profile by some, to disclose any details may still hinder the process needed to be followed.

Balancing Test

When balancing the public interest test GMP has to consider whether the information should be released into the public domain, therefore arguments need to be weighed against each other. The most persuasive reason for disclosing the information would be the fact that disclosure would encourage transparency. This needs to be weighed against the strongest reason for non-disclosure, which in this case is the impact on GMP's ability to complete investigations to a full and correct conclusion. Therefore, having considered all the factors for and against disclosure it is the decision at this time to maintain the above exemption and withhold the information from disclosure.

Further Information

Updates are published on GMP's website. Please follow the links below for further information:

[Updating following a thorough review of further information | Greater Manchester Police \(gmp.police.uk\)](#)

[GMP opens Public Portal in appeal for further information about events leading up to footage filmed in Manchester Airport Terminal Two | Greater Manchester Police](#)

[Update on incident at Manchester Airport | Greater Manchester Police \(gmp.police.uk\)](#)