

Date: 04/12/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015591/A

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015591/A

I write in connection with your request for information dated 03/10/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, I am requesting the following information in relation to the terror-related incident that occurred at a synagogue in Manchester on 2 October 2025:

- 1. The time of the first 999 call relating to this incident was received.***
- 2. The time the first responding unit arrived on scene.***
- 3. The time any shots were fired during the incident.***
- 4. The time a "critical incident" or "major incident" was formally declared.***
- 5. The time the scene was declared and/or made safe for other emergency service assets to enter.***
- 6. A list of other police forces or mutual aid units that responded or provided support (Welsh Police/Heddlu were spotted at the scene).***
- 7. The expected response time for an Armed Response Vehicle (ARV) to incidents of this nature within Greater Manchester (as per policy or guidance).***
- 8. The actual response time of the ARV(s) that attended this incident (from dispatch to arrival on scene).***
- 9. The number of shots fired by police officers during the incident.***
- 10. Confirmation of whether a mutual aid or regional counter-terrorism response was activated.***
- 11. The time the scene was handed over to investigators or counter-terrorism units.***
- 12. The time RLC EOD Teams secured any devices or made them safe.***
- 13. The time officers made entry into the suspects vehicle at the scene.***

This request is made in the public interest, to improve understanding of emergency response coordination, timing, and proportionality during major public safety incidents.

This request concerns a single incident and I understand that all requested details are likely recorded within the same incident logs, command reports, or response records. Therefore, I do not expect this to exceed the Section 12 cost limit.

If any information is withheld, please release all non-exempt material and specify the relevant FOIA exemption(s) applied.

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 supply the information you have requested as exemptions apply.

The following exemptions apply to this request.

Section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means

Section 24(1) – National security

Section 30(1) – Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities

Section 31(1) – Law enforcement

When refusing to provide such information because an exemption/s 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.

Questions 1 - 4 and 8 are exempt under **Section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means**. The response to this request is available online. Please follow the links below.

[What we know about the synagogue attack in Manchester | UK News | Sky News](#)

[Police share major update on Manchester synagogue terror attack suspect | UK | News | Express.co.uk](#)

[How Manchester synagogue attack unfolded - BBC News](#)

Questions 5, 9, 11, 12 and 13 are exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption:

Section 30(1) – 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

Section 30 - Factors Favouring Disclosure

To disclose information about an ongoing case into the public domain, would show GMP's accountability, and satisfy the public, that investigations into such incidents are being conducted correctly. It would also show GMP's use of public funds in apprehending suspects of crimes.

Section 30 - Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure

Conversely to the factors in favour of disclosure, to publicly release the data that is related to investigations that remain open may seriously undermine GMP's ability to complete those investigations to a full and correct conclusion.

Question 7 has been exempted from disclosure by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 31(1) – Law Enforcement

Section 24(1) – National Security

Section 31 – Harm

The threat of terrorism cannot be ignored. It should be recognised that the international security landscape is increasingly complex and unpredictable. The UK has faced a sustained threat from violent terrorists and extremists. More recently that threat has increased where there have been numerous terrorist atrocities. Since 2006 the UK Government have published the threat level based upon current intelligence. Recently the threat level was classified as 'substantial' following the Manchester attack in October 2025. See below link:

[Threat Levels | MI5 - The Security Service](#)

To provide the requested information for would undermine GMP's policing capabilities which consequently would be detrimental to their ability to deal with the on-going terrorist threat we face. By providing "the expected response time for an Armed Response Vehicle" to any scene, in this particular case to a terror threat will mean that those members of the public who are committing or wish to commit crimes and pose a risk to the public, would be able to formulate ways to circumvent or overwhelm GMP's law enforcement strategies.

Whilst not questioning the motives of the applicant, providing any further information relating to armed response times within Greater Manchester Police would reveal our operational capability, which would be of intelligence value to criminals.

As such, the disclosure of any further information which would hinder the forces law enforcement functions cannot be in the public interest.

Section 24 - Factors favouring disclosure

The public are entitled to know how public funds are spent and by providing this information it would allow the public to see where money is being spent and know that forces are doing as much as they can to combat terrorism.

Section 24 - Factors favouring non-disclosure

To provide this information it would render security measures less effective which would compromise ongoing or future operations to protect the security and infrastructure of the UK. The risk of harm to the public would be elevated if any areas of GMP which appear vulnerable were identified which would also provide the opportunity for terrorist planning. Ongoing or future operations to protect the security and infrastructure of the UK would be compromised by providing terrorists with the knowledge of individual force capability.

Section 31 - Factors favouring disclosure

Providing this information would make members of the public more aware of the threat of terrorism and allow them to take steps to protect themselves and families. Where public funds are being spent, there is a public interest in accountability and justifying the use of public money. Disclosure of the requested information would enable the public to assess whether the force has appropriate measures in place to respond to incidents requiring the deployment of armed response vehicles in a timely manner.

Section 31 - Factors against disclosure

Disclosure that reveals our operational capabilities would compromise law enforcement tactics. Criminals could use the information to target areas of weakness knowing that their activities are less likely to be detected. It may be used by criminals who are intent on pursuing their criminal activity, to identify and exploit the limitations of these resources.

A fear of crime will be realised as terrorists identify vulnerable areas and target and exploit these areas resulting in the public being in fear of more terrorist activity occurring. This would have a much wider impact on how GMP responds to these incidents to keep the public safe.

Balance Test

When balancing the public interest Greater Manchester Police has to consider whether the information should be released into the public domain. Arguments need to be weighed against each other.

The most persuasive reason for disclosing the information would be openness. This needs to be weighed against the strongest reason for non-disclosure which are concerns for harm to law enforcement and national security along with the impact on GMP's ability to complete investigations to a full and correct conclusion.

The security of the country is of paramount importance. The police will not divulge any information that would place the safety of an individual at risk or undermine national security. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing, and in this case providing assurance that the Police Service is appropriately and effectively engaging with the threat posed by terrorist activity, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding both national security and the integrity of police investigations and operations in the highly sensitive subject of terrorism.

Having considered all the factors for and against disclosure it is my belief that in this case, the reason against disclosure outweighs the reason for disclosure and so the decision at this time to maintain the above exemptions and withhold the information from disclosure.

Please see the remaining responses below.

1. See S21 exemption above.
2. See S21 exemption above.
3. See S21 exemption above.
4. See S21 exemption above.
5. See S30 exemption above.
6. **Mutual aid was provided by Lancashire Police, Cheshire Police and South Yorkshire police forces overnight.**
7. See S24/S31 exemption above.
8. See S21 exemption above.
9. See S30 exemption above.
10. **Yes.**
11. See S30 exemption above.
12. See S30 exemption above.
13. See S30 exemption above.