

Date: 07/08/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015086/O

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015086/O

I write in connection with your request for information dated 10/07/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Please can I request?

- 1. The Operation Wolverine Policy***
- 2. The Operation Tutelage Policy***
- 3. The standard operating procedure covering when police pull a driver over for suspected no insurance***
- 4. total number of roadside seizures referred to operation wolverine between 2024-2025***
- 5. standard operating procedure of operation wolverine referrals following seizure***
- 6. Average time taken for vehicles to be returned to owner under operation wolverine between 2024-2025***
- 7. Percentage of vehicles returned to owner under operation wolverine***
- 8. Standard operating procedure for when when car is seized for suspected no insurance***
- 9. Number of complaints relating to operation wolverine between 2024-2025***
- 10. Number of operation wolverine referrals dropped with no further action (i.e. FPN/points cancelled by police)***
- 11. total number of misconduct / corruption cases under operation wolverine between 2024-2025***
- 12. Standard operating procedure to manage complaints***

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate the requested information. Some information is available below.

However, Greater Manchester Police can neither confirm nor deny whether it holds any data for **question 11** as the duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the Act) does not apply by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 30(3) - Criminal Investigations
Section 31(3) - Law Enforcement

Section 30 is a 'class-based' exemption and would apply to any 'class' of information that would, if held, have been held by the GMP for the purpose of an investigation that we have a duty to conduct. The harm in disclosing information relating to an investigation is inherent in the exemption. However, section 30 is subject to a public interest test.

Section 31 is a "qualified" and "prejudice" based exemption, which requires explanation of the harm and a test of the public interest.

Harm

A Freedom of Information Act request is not a private transaction. Both the request itself and any information disclosed, are considered suitable for open publication. This is because, under the Act, any information disclosed is released into the wider public domain, effectively to the world, not just to an individual.

Whilst not questioning the motives of the applicant, confirmation or denial as to whether information is held in relation to this request would prejudice our law enforcement functions of preventing and detecting crime, apprehending and prosecuting offenders, and undermine investigations into allegations of misconduct. Issuing confirmation or denial responses as to whether these investigations have been concluded or not, would likely open the door to further repeated requests that seek to establish whether or not any criminal allegations and misconduct matters are still being pursued.

Confirming or denying any investigation/s are ongoing would be likely to undermine investigative processes and GMP's ability to deliver effective law enforcement specifically in any covert situations.

Favouring confirming or denying whether the information is held (Section 31)

There is inherent public interest in knowing that the Police Service has correctly investigated all allegations of criminality and misconducts brought to GMP's attention.

The release of the requested information would enable the public to hold GMP accountable in its use of public funds in ensuring that it is robustly investigates this type of criminal activity.

Favouring neither confirming nor denying whether the information is held (Section 31)

The public interest is not what interests the public but what will be of greater good if released to the community as a whole. It is not in the public interest to disclose information that may compromise GMP's ability to accomplish its core functions of law enforcement.

To confirm or deny that GMP holds information as to any investigations has the potential to damage GMP's ability to prevent and detect crime or apprehend or prosecute offenders in this matter. In addition, the duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, compliance with s1(1)(a) would, or would likely to, prejudice any matters mentioned in subsection (1), namely s31(1)(g) by virtue of (2)(b); the purpose of ascertaining whether any person is responsible for any conduct which is improper.

Where confirmation or denial would reveal whether a particular person is, or is not, under investigation and where this would, or would be likely to, prejudice such an investigation or the circumstances that underpin any allegations against them, public authorities should be alert to the need to apply the NCND provision.

Favouring confirming or denying whether the information is held (Section 30)

Maintaining public confidence in the police is vital, and there is inherent public interest in knowing that all allegations of criminality are robustly investigated and dealt with from within the Police Service.

Confirming or denying whether any information is held as to whether investigations are ongoing, have ceased or not, and any reasons why, would serve the public interest in knowing whether GMP has appropriately and effectively investigated matters relating to Operation Wolverine.

Favouring neither confirming nor denying whether the information is held (Section 30)

GMP takes all allegations of criminality and corruption from within the force extremely seriously. What may be of interest to the public is not the same as what is in the public interest. In this instance, it would not be in the public interest to disclose information (even inadvertently, through a confirmation or denial) which could identify investigative activity into any corruption or misconduct cases that may be taking place or any covert operations into such matters.

GMP has a duty to conduct investigations with a view to ascertaining whether an offence has been committed, and if so, whether a person should be charged with that offence, and whether a person charged with an offence is guilty of it. Consequently, where confirmation or denial would reveal whether a particular person may or may not be under investigation at this time and where this would, or would be likely to, prejudice such an investigation, public authorities should be alert to the need to apply the NCND provision.

Balance Test

After weighing up the competing interests I have determined that the Public Interest favours the application of the neither confirm nor deny stance in respect of your request concerning whether or not we hold information about whether investigations are ongoing or not regarding any corruption in Operation Wolverine.

I consider that the benefit that would result from issuing a confirmation or denial does not outweigh the considerations favouring the neither confirm nor deny response. This is because of the impact it would have on any individuals and the impact it would have on the ability of GMP to fulfil our law enforcement functions and conduct any potential investigations into this matter, either now or in the future.

It is because of this that I feel the balance falls in favour of the maintenance of this stance, and why these exemptions are engaged and made out in this case.

Citing this exemption in no way confirms or denies the existence of the information you seek.

Please see the remaining information that GMP can respond too.

1. No information held
2. Operation Tutelage is an external operation, that GMP supports. As such GMP does not hold any policy for this Operation. It is a nationwide National Police Chief's Council and the Motor Insurance Bureau led event.
3. Officers are obliged to follow the Road Traffic Act.
4. Markers for Operation wolverine were only added in March 2025 – Therefore any data prior to this will not be held in an easily retrievable format. Due to this I have provided the data readily available from Apr – June 2025. **985 seizures were referred to operation wolverine**
5. No information held.
6. Data held from March 2025 –
 - Days between Seizure and Collection Appointment – Average 9 days.
 - Days between Initial Contact and Collection Appointment – Average 7 days.
7. Between Mar-June 2025 – Average 65% released.
8. No recorded information held; however, the officers must ensure members of the public comply with Section 165 Road Traffic Act.
9. 136 complaints have been submitted via GMP's complaints since September 2024. Anything prior to this is not recorded.

10. None- Operation Wolverine deals with the seizure, retention, and disposal of vehicles under Section 165 RTA. It does not deal with any Traffic Offence Report.
11. See exemption above
12. See exemption below.

When refusing to provide such information because an exemption applies, Section 17(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires GMP, 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.

Question 12 is exempt under **section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means**. The response to this request is available online. Please follow the IOPC link below confirming all the complaint legislation. For any complaints made to GMP directly, the public should use [Complaints | Greater Manchester Police](#)

[Complaints | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#)