



Date: 10/11/2025  
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015673/B

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015673/B**

I write in connection with your requests for information dated 16/10/2025 and 21/10/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP). Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, public authorities can amalgamate requests from the same individual that are on the same subject matter if they are received within 60 working days of each other. Therefore, the 2 requests you sent to us on 16/10/2025 and 21/10/2025 regarding the Sam Wall case have been merged into one request.

Your request was as follows:

*Thank you for your response to my FOI (ref: 01/FOI/25/015524/P).*

*Please conduct an internal review on the following basis:*

1. *Whether information is held (communications about the adjournments/listings)*

*I accept that detailed reasons for adjournments sit with HMCTS/CPS. However, GMP is likely to hold communications and log entries created or received by GMP regarding the scheduling/listing changes and progression of the above cases.*

*Please confirm whether GMP holds, and disclose where possible (with appropriate redactions), any of the following for the period 1 January 2025 to present:*

- *Emails, case notes or tasking records between GMP Criminal Justice (CJ) clusters, OICs and/or CPS/courts that refer to the listed hearing dates (21 Jan, 27 Mar, 12 May, 6 June, 28 Aug, and 24 Oct) and the movement/adjournment of those dates.*
- *Any risk/escalation notes recorded by GMP in light of the restraining-order history (Crime\_No: [REDACTED]) relating to case progression/safeguarding while sentencing was pending.*

*If exemptions (e.g. s30/s31/s40) are relied upon, please still confirm whether information is held, provide redacted copies where feasible, and supply a public interest test and a schedule of documents (descriptions/dates/senders/recipients) for withheld material.*

2. *Disclosure of current GMP process documents (which should be disclosable)*

*Please disclose current versions of:*

- The terms of reference / SOPs / guidance for Criminal Justice clusters covering case progression/monitoring and liaison with CPS/courts.*
- The SOPs/guidance for units “specifically to monitor high-risk domestic abuse and/or sexual offenders,” including escalation criteria, victim safeguarding measures during repeated adjournments, and coordination protocols with CPS/courts.*

*If full documents cannot be supplied, please provide extracts or a summary of the relevant sections.*

*3. Narrowing and format*

*I'm happy to narrow by custodians if helpful (e.g. the CJ cluster for the district that owns these cases, named OIC/supervisor, and the CJ mailbox). Electronic copies (PDF/MSG) are preferred.*

*Please let me know if any clarification is required. I look forward to the internal review outcome within the ICO's recommended timescales.*

*Additional received - 21/10/25*

*the case of [REDACTED], which has already seen five separate sentencing dates: 21 Jan, 27 Mar, 12 May, 6 June, 28 Aug, and now 24 Oct.*

*It is my understanding that a restraining order was issued against [REDACTED] 10-13 years ago (Crime\_No: [REDACTED]). Given this long-standing history of harassment, the repeated adjournments raise serious questions about victim protection and the urgency of sentencing.*

*I am seeking clarity on the following points:*

- 1. Why have sentencing dates been repeatedly adjourned, and what factors contributed to these delays?*
- 2. What measures are in place to ensure timely progression of cases, particularly those with documented long-term threats to victims?*
- 3. How does Greater Manchester Police monitor or coordinate with the CPS and courts to prevent prolonged delays in cases with prior history?*
- 4. Are any internal reviews being conducted regarding administrative or procedural factors that have contributed to this repeated adjournment?*
- 5. The GMP linked the previous [REDACTED] case and whether this will form part of the submission for sentencing?*

## **Result of Searches**

As your request asks for information that was not included in your original request, we have treated it as a new FOI request, rather than an internal review.

Information relating to part one of your request is not held in an easily retrievable format, if it is indeed held at all. There is no centrally held record of correspondence and to provide such data would require each division, sub-division and possibly each individual officer to undertake necessary searches to establish if any such correspondence is held.

To comply with the whole of your request the process would take over 18 hours' work and therefore exceeds the appropriate limit of £450.00, the amount to which we are legally required to respond i.e. the cost of locating and retrieving the information exceeds the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (Fees and Appropriate Limit) Regulations 2004.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice

In this instance, Greater Manchester Police will be unable able to provide advice for you to reduce the request for the force to keep this within the fees limit in accordance with Section 16(1), the duty to provide advice and assistance, of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.