



Date: 11/08/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015310/D

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015310/D

I write in connection with your request for information dated 11/08/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act 2000, I am formally requesting access to all records, documents, and media related to the reported assault incident involving a police officer at Manchester Airport in 23 lipca 2024 r

Specifically, I am requesting:

All available body-worn camera (BWC) footage from any Greater Manchester Police officer involved in the incident, covering the time from the officer's initial engagement to the conclusion of the event.

Incident logs, CAD reports, and call logs relating to this event.

Any internal communications or reports discussing this incident from: 23 July 2024 r

For reference, the incident was reported as follows:

Location: Manchester Airport, Terminal 2 (paid parking area)

Date: 23 lipca 2024 r

Description: An officer stated they were "absolutely terrified" after being assaulted during their duties at Manchester Airport.

*people engaged: [REDACTED], a Greater Manchester Police officer.
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED], armed officers.*

Two suspects: [REDACTED] and his brother [REDACTED] from Rochdale.

Course of Events:

Police were called after suspect [REDACTED] allegedly struck a customer at a Starbucks. Officers, including [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], approached him at a ticket machine. [REDACTED] then resisted and attacked, and his brother, [REDACTED], joined the confrontation. During the scuffle, [REDACTED] was knocked down by a single blow, which resulted in a broken nose. She later testified before the jury, stating that "everything went dark."

Legal Consequences:

[REDACTED] was found guilty of assaulting two female officers, including [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], as well as the prior attack at Starbucks.

For now, no charges have been filed against the officers, despite controversial footage from the recordings, such as a clip of [REDACTED] kicking a suspect who was already on the ground. The prosecution defended the actions as proportionate to the threat.

The case against [REDACTED] is ongoing - a retrial has been scheduled for [REDACTED] in April of next year.

Result of Searches

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 exemptions apply.

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 exemptions that apply to this request are **Section 30(1)(2)(a) – Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities** and **Section 40(2) – Personal Information**.

Section 30 is a class based qualified exemption; there is a requirement to carry out a public interest test, which can be seen below.

Section 40(2) represents information that identifies a living individual, to disclose this information would breach the principles of the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data is defined by Section 1 of the Data Protection Act 1998 and means data that relates to an individual who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data.

Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to conduct a public interest test for such data.

Factors Favouring Disclosure – S30

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

Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure – S30

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 prosecutions that remain ongoing may seriously prejudice the judicial process.

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 must 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.