

Date: 28th August 2025
Our ref: FOI/25/015206/E

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/25/015206/E

I write in connection with your request for information dated 28/07/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

- 1. Please provide copies of all documents, powerpoint presentations, and/or guidance materials regarding the identification of support for "Palestine Action".**
 - a. I note that a document was disclosed (<https://www.met.police.uk/foi-ai/metropolitan-police/disclosure-2024/july-2024/instructions-tackling-hate-speech-actions-hamas-supporters-marches/>) by the Metropolitan Police regarding "instructions about tackling the hate speech and actions by HAMAS supporters on the marches." I am seeking similar, equivalent, and/or updated documents that may include mention of "Palestine Action".**
 - b. Please also disclose documents related to this that may have been delivered to the police constabulary from the Home Office, Counter Terrorism Policing, or other organisations. Please disclose from which organisation the document originated.**
- 2. Please disclose relevant documents related to the identification of Hamas, Houthi, and/or Hezbollah supporters that have been used/published since July 2024 (not including the one I included in the link above)**

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 provide the information requested as exemptions apply.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires Greater Manchester Police, when refusing to provide such information (because this 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.

The information requested is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 31(1) – Law Enforcement

Section 24(1) – National Security

Section 31 and 24 is a qualified and prejudice based exemption and as such, subject to a harm and public interest test.

Evidence of harm:

Disclosure of the information would reveal specific strategies, rationale, intelligence and tactics in relation to the identification and policing of proscribed terrorist groups. This could be used by criminals, those with criminal intent, members of proscribed organisations, and terrorists to undermine and obstruct operational policing, as well as amend their current practices to evade detection. This would consequently be detrimental to the police's ability to ensure the law is enforced, offenders apprehended, public safety is maintained and threats to the security of the UK are identified and prevented.

Public Interest Test:

In favour of disclosure s24:

The public are entitled to know public money is spent in areas of operational policing. Release of the information would facilitate transparency. It would also encourage public debate about how the police prevent and detect crime and uphold the law in terms of proscription of terrorist groups in order to protect the security interests of the UK.

In favour of exemption s24:

To disclose information would render security measures less effective by revealing details of individual force capabilities which could be put together to formulate a national picture of operational counter terrorism strategy. Taking into account the current security climate within the United Kingdom, no information that may aid a criminal, terrorist or proscribed organisation should be disclosed. To what extent this information may aid terrorism in the UK is not precisely known, but it is clear that a disclosure of information will have an impact on the force's ability to monitor and police proscribed terrorist groups and terrorists effectively; compromising the security of the UK.

In favour of disclosure s31:

Disclosure of information would provide the public with better understanding of operational policing, increase public debate and provide information which may allow the public to take steps to better protect themselves. This awareness may also lead to more information being passed to police by the public as they become more alert to suspicious activity.

In favour of exemption s31:

By disclosing the information, law enforcement tactics would be compromised which would hinder the prevention and detection of crime specific to terrorism. More crime would be committed because members of proscribed terrorist organisations as well as terrorists more widely, would have knowledge of operational capability, tactics, strategy and intelligence which would allow them to operate more effectively as well as avoid detection. This places the public at a significant risk of harm, particularly in areas which may have been perceived to be more vulnerable than others as a result of the mapping effect explained within the harm. Any information which undermines operational law enforcement or places the public at risk is not in the public interest to disclose.

Balance test:

The security of the country is paramount, and the police service will not divulge any information if to do so would place the safety of an individual, the public at large or the national security of the UK at risk. Whilst there is a public interest in transparency of policing and promotion of public debate to improve response, there is a far stronger public interest in safeguarding national security, the integrity of operational policing and keeping the public safe. For these reasons we believe that the balancing test for disclosing the information is not made out in this case.