

Date: 06/06/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/014775/C

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/014775/C

I write in connection with your request for information dated 16/05/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Please could you provide us with the relationship between victim and perpetrator for the following female victims of homicide killed:

- 1. 2023 Charlene Mills PERPETRATOR: Peter Pitt**
- 2. 2022 Alisha Apostoloff-Boyarin PERPETRATOR David Alex Taylor**

Result of Searches

Freedom of Information Act 2000

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) allows access to recorded information held by a public authority. Greater Manchester Police is a public authority defined by the FOIA and information we hold relating to deceased persons falls within the scope of this Act which may be considered for release. Your request has therefore been considered under the provisions of the FOIA.

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'm not obliged to provide the data 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.

Part 1 is exempt under **section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means**. The response to this request is available online. Please follow the links below.

<https://www.gmp.police.uk/news/greater-manchester/news/news/2025/january/man-given-hospital-order-for-the-killing-of-his-ex-partner/>

The exemptions that apply to part 2 of this request are **Section 30(1) – Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities** and **Section 38(1)(a)(b) - Health and Safety**.

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

With Section 38 being prejudice based qualified exemptions there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in confirming or denying that the information is held as well as carrying out the public interest test.

Harm Section

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.

The pain and suffering caused to the victim's surviving families and friends is unquestionably as profound now as it was when the crime took place.

To disclose the exempt information into the public domain would undoubtedly have an impact on the health and safety of the surviving family members of the victim.

Disclosing such information could cause further distress and hurt to grieving families, many of whom would no doubt still be greatly traumatised by the events. Such information being disclosed could resurface these traumatic experiences and cause the victim's families to again revisit this most terrible period of their lives.

Protecting the safety of the public is of paramount importance to Greater Manchester Police and information that would compromise such health and safety would not be disclosed within a response to a Freedom of Information request.

Factors in favour of disclosure S30/S38

There may be occasions when it is appropriate to disclose information that would have an impact on the health and safety of an individual or the public in general. In this particular case, I cannot identify any benefit to the wider public (in terms of health and safety) to disclose such sensitive details.

There are, however, more general arguments that must be considered such as openness and transparency, which would lead to a more informed public.

Disclosure would also reassure the public that investigations are carried out properly and thoroughly. It would also show GMP's use of public funds in investigating incidents of this nature.

Factors against disclosure S30

Protecting the integrity of police investigations, including methods and sources of intelligence are paramount to GMP and any disclosure would compromise investigations from being carried out.

Exempting this information, ensures GMP can conduct investigations without any undue external interference and scrutiny that could undermine operational effectiveness and prevent those investigations to a full and correct conclusion.

Factors against disclosure S38

Although some information may already be in the public domain and that information relates to named person/s, due to the nature of the crime committed, and that disclosure under Freedom of Information Act is disclosure to the world at large with no specific controls, disclosure carries the potential risk of causing significant mental and physical harm and distress to the loved ones and friends of the victim.

Balance Test

When balancing the public interest Greater Manchester Police must 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 reasons for non-disclosure which is concerns for the health and safety, both mental and physical, of family and friends of the victim and any impact revealing information may have against any ongoing cases or information which may reveal how GMP investigate cases in the future.

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 exemption and withhold the information from disclosure.