



Date: 24/09/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015428/Q

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015428/Q

I write in connection with your request for information dated 02/09/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Freedom of Information Act Request

Please could you provide us with a list of all female victims of homicide killed between 1 January 2024 and 31 December 2024 (inclusive) which your authority has been responsible for investigating and, for each victim:

- 1. the date of the homicide;*
- 2. the names of the victims and the accused / perpetrator;*
- 3. the age of the victim;*
- 4. the ethnicity/race of the victim;*
- 5. the relationship between the accused and the victim;*
- 6. the sex of the accused / perpetrator;*
- 7. the ethnicity/race of the perpetrator;*
- 8. if identified, the way in which the victim was killed;*

Also, if possible, we would appreciate the following information.

- 9. whether there were any previous reports from the victim (or any third party) regarding the accused / perpetrator; and*
- 10. whether there were any previous reports and / or convictions of any other offences related to violence against women perpetrated by the accused / perpetrator.*

However, if you are unable to provide information on points 9 and 10, please provide information on the first eight points only.

I understand that at times, information we request is already available in the public domain. However, to ensure information in the Femicide Census is robust, verifiable and useful in turn as a learning tool for the police, we kindly ask that your force provides us with the information directly, without redirecting us to news sites or weblinks.

Further to this, please note it is not possible nor correct to establish the race/ethnicity of a victim from publicly available information, such as news reports. I therefore kindly request that race/ethnicity is always only provided by your force.

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police to locate information relevant to your request. I can confirm that the information you have requested is held by Greater Manchester Police. However, I am not obliged to supply the information you have requested as exemptions apply.

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.

The requested information is exempt under:

- **Section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means**
- **Section 30(1)(a)(b)(c) – Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities**
- **Section 38(1)(a)(b) - Health and Safety**
- **Section 40(2) – Personal Information**

There have been 5 homicides relevant to your request. All of which have some details in the public domain.

The first is this case: [Gorton: Suspect in woman's stabbing placed under Mental Health Act - BBC News](#).

As this matter is still before the courts, any further information that is not already in the public domain is exempt under Section 30(1)(a)(b)(c). Section 30 is a class based qualified exemption and there is a requirement to carry out a public interest test, which can be found at the end of this letter. Additionally, further details about the deceased are exempt under Section 38(1)(a)(b). Section 38 is a prejudice based qualified exemption; there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in disclosing such information as well as carrying out a public interest test. This can be found at the end of this letter. Details about the living person involved is exempt under Section 40(2). Section 40(2) represents information that identifies a living individual. To disclose this information would breach the principles of the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data is defined by Section 1 of the Data Protection Act 1998 and means data that relates to an individual who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data. Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to conduct a public interest test for such data.

The second is this case: [Bury woman was stabbed to death, inquest opening hears | Bury Times](#).

The third is this case: [Woman believed to have killed herself and her child 'not a monster', says friend | Greater Manchester | The Guardian](#)

As both the victims and suspects are deceased, further information relating to these cases and the deceased people involved is exempt under Section 38(1)(a)(b). Section 38 is a prejudice based qualified exemption; there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in disclosing such information as well as carrying out a public interest test. This can be found at the end of this letter.

The fourth is this case: [Guilty: father-in-law who murdered woman just six months after she flew to UK to marry his son | The Crown Prosecution Service](#).

The fifth is this case [Guilty: Killer who callously disposed of woman's body in his shed | The Crown Prosecution Service](#).

As these two cases involve victims who are deceased and offenders who are alive, further details about the case and the deceased individuals involved is exempt under Section 38(1)(a)(b). Details about the living persons involved is exempt under Section 40(2). Section 40(2) represents information that identifies a living individual. To disclose this information would breach the principles of the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data is defined by Section 1 of the Data Protection Act 1998 and means data that relates to an individual who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data. Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to conduct a public interest test for such data.

Harm – S38

The Freedom of Information 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 victims' surviving families and friends is unquestionably as profound now as it was when the crimes 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 victims. 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 Favouring Disclosure – S30

To disclose the information requested into the public domain would show GMP's accountability and satisfy the public that investigations into the incident are being conducted. It would also show GMP's use of public funds in investigating homicides.

Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure – S30

We accept that there is a legitimate and important public interest in publishing information about the investigation, however, conversely to the factors in favour of disclosure, to publicly release information that is related to prosecutions that remain ongoing may seriously undermine the criminal justice process and the defendant's right to a fair trial.

Whilst this case might be seen as high profile by some, to disclose any details may still hinder the criminal justice process.

Factors favouring disclosure – 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 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.

Factors favouring non-disclosure – S38

Although some information may already be in the public domain and that information relates to deceased persons, due to the nature of the crimes 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 deceased.

Balancing Test

When balancing the public interest test GMP must consider whether the information should be released into the public domain, therefore arguments need to be weighed against each other. The most persuasive reason for disclosing the information would be the fact that disclosure would encourage transparency. This needs to be weighed against the strongest reason for non-disclosure, which in this case is the impact on the criminal justice process and concerns for the health and safety, both mental and physical, of family and friends of the deceased.

Therefore, having considered all the factors for and against disclosure it is the decision at this time to maintain the above exemption and withhold the information from disclosure.