

Date: 19th February 2025
Our ref: FOI/25/014003/N

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/25/014003/N

I write in connection with your request for information dated 20/01/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I am writing to request information under the Freedom of Information Act regarding police officer misconduct. Please could you provide the following information:

- 1. The total number of police officers accused of misconduct***
- 2. A breakdown of the number that proceeded to a misconduct hearing***
- 3. A breakdown of the outcomes in each case that proceeded to a misconduct hearing***
- 4. A breakdown of the type of misconduct alleged (e.g. Dishonesty, abuse of authority, discrimination)***
- 5. Please provide copies of summaries of the Modus Operandi (MO) sections for incident reports relating to misconduct cases that went to a hearing ensuring that all personal data is redacted to align with privacy regulation.***
- 6. The outcome of the above hearings***
- 7. How many officers resigned before the proceedings were completed***

I would like to request this information for the last 4 years. If this time frame is too broad I am happy to refine the scope to 3 years.

CLARIFICATION

Yes, please include cases which have gone to/ going to hearing regardless if the hearing has not happened yet.

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate information relevant to your request. I can confirm that the information you have requested is held by GMP. However, I am not obliged to supply you with all the information as an exemption applies to **question 5**.

The Freedom of Information Act is a piece of legislation designed to give the public access to information held by public authorities. It exists to make the decisions of those authorities transparent and to keep the populace better informed regarding matters which affect them.

A Public Authority is able to refuse requests which can divert resources away from more deserving requests and other public business or threaten to undermine the credibility of the freedom of information system. It is recognised that dealing with unreasonable requests can place a strain on resources and get in the way of delivering mainstream services.

When identifying potentially vexatious requests the indicators contained within the Information Commissioner's guidance on Section 14(1) should be considered. In this case we feel the following indicator applies specifically to question 5 of your request:

Burden on the Authority

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 14(1) of FOIA a request deemed as overly burdensome does not oblige GMP to comply with a request for information.

The ICO confirms within their guidance that they consider there to be a high threshold for refusing a request on such grounds if there is a viable case in line with the below recommendations:

- 1) The requester has asked for a substantial volume of information and
- 2) The authority has real concerns about potentially exempt information, which it will be able to substantiate if asked to do so by the ICO and
- 3) Any potentially exempt information cannot easily be isolated because it is scattered throughout the requested material.

As such question 5 of your request is being refused due to the amount of time required to review and prepare the information for disclosure, which would impose a grossly oppressive burden on the organisation.

To provide the data requested for question 5, would involve manual redactions to each piece of data within the allegation narrative as they do contain sensitive and personal information which could identify directly/indirectly a living human therefore Section 40(2) Personal Information will be engaged as this represents information that identifies a living individual, to disclose this information would 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.

The number of allegation narratives which would require manual redaction is 339. Therefore at a very conservative estimate of 10 minutes to review and redact, it would take approximately 56.5 hours to ascertain the data required for question 5.

For this reason, any further requests of this nature will be refused under Section 14(1) of the Act, which states that requests that are considered to be vexatious do not have to be complied with.

However, please see below for the results for all the other questions.

- The data includes any officer assessed as either Misconduct or Gross Misconduct at any point of an investigation between 01/01/21 & 31/12/2024. Severity can go up or down during an investigation.
- Only those assessed as Gross Misconduct at the end of an investigation can proceed to a Misconduct Hearing or an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing (Misconduct goes to a Misconduct Meeting – those figures are not in the request so have not been provided)
- More than one allegation can be present on any case – each allegation can have a different outcome including once at a Misconduct Hearing/ Accelerated Misconduct Hearing.
- Even if an officer has resigned, if the conduct is assessed as Gross Misconduct, they can still be taken to a Misconduct Hearing/Accelerated Misconduct Hearing in order to add them to the Barred list if the Gross Misconduct is proven.
- Some cases assessed as Misconduct/Gross Misconduct may still be under investigation. Even if the investigation has concluded, they may still be awaiting proceedings.
- Some subjects may feature in more than one year
- Year is the date the case was received which is not necessarily the same year as the case went to proceedings
- Misconduct Hearing Outcomes & narratives are published on the GMP website - [Published items | Greater Manchester Police](#) & so the narratives have not been provided.

Question 1

Year	Total
2021	231
2022	264
2023	291
2024	243
Grand Total	1029

Question 2

Year	Total
2021	31
2022	46
2023	40
2024	14
Grand Total	131

Question 3 & 6

Due to low numbers returned per outcome and allegation type per year, the totals have been merged together as by providing all this information as you have requested would significantly increase the likelihood of identifying the individual(s) concerned, and as such the exemption under S40(2) – Personal Information, would be engaged and result in information being refused. By merging this data it can be provided in its entirety.

Duplicate questions both asking for outcomes of misconduct hearings.

Proceedings Outcome	Grand Total
Dismissal	33
Final Written Warning	2
Not Proven	1

Would Have Been Dismissed if still serving	42
Written Warning	1
Grand Total	79

Question 4

Allegation Type	Grand Total
Abuse of position for financial purpose	2
Abuse of position for other purpose	7
Abuse of position for sexual purpose	11
Abuse of position for the purpose of pursuing an inappropriate emotional relationship	1
Decisions	5
Detention in police custody	1
Disability	8
Disclosure of information	5
Discreditable conduct	137
Evidential procedures	1
General level of service	8
Handling of information	3
Handling of or damage to property/premises	1
Impolite and intolerant actions	3
Impolite language/tone	3
Information	4
Obstruction of justice	2
Other	1
Other policies and procedures	4
Other sexual conduct	20
Overbearing or harassing behaviours	5
Police action following contact	12
Race	10
Sex	4
Sexual assault	24
Sexual harassment	32
Sexual Orientation	1
Unprofessional attitude and disrespect	1
Use of force	13
Use of police systems	10
Grand Total	339

Question 5

Exempt. Please see above.

Question 7

See above 'would have been dismissed if still serving'.