

Date: 24/03/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/016584/A

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/016584/A

I write in connection with your request for information dated 16/03/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Please provide the following information relating to the arrest (or any police involvement) concerning an individual named Ameen Hadi in connection with an alleged assault on a female journalist/YouTuber.

Incident details known publicly:

- ***Date of incident: Sunday 15 March 2026 (some reports reference related events around International Women's Day period in March 2026)***
- ***Approximate time: around 3:00 pm***
- ***Location: Piccadilly Gardens, Manchester city centre***

Questions:

- 1. Was a man named [REDACTED] arrested by Greater Manchester Police in relation to this incident (or any related assault at/near that location and date)? If yes, please confirm the date and approximate time of arrest.***
- 2. If an arrest took place, please state:***
 - o The offence(s) for which he was arrested, and***
 - o Whether he was subsequently charged with any offence(s).***
- 3. What is the current status of any investigation or proceedings relating to Ameen Hadi and this incident (e.g. released under investigation, released on bail with/without conditions, no further action, charged and appeared in court, or any other outcome known as of the date of this request)?***

Result of Searches

Section 30(3) – Investigations
Section 40(5) – Personal Information

Section 30 is a class based qualified exemption and consideration of the public interest must be given as to whether neither confirming nor denying information exists is the appropriate response.

Section 40 is a class based absolute exemption and there is no requirement to evidence the harm or consider the public interest.

Section 40(5B)(a)(i) - Personal Information – giving information to a member of the public of the confirmation or denial that would have to be given to comply with section 1(1)(a) would (apart from this Act) contravene any of the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018.

To confirm that any information is held or not, could confirm personal data. In some circumstances confirming or denying whether information is held could itself identify a living individual and would therefore 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.

This use of neither confirm nor deny should not be taken as proof that such information does or does not exist.

Factors favouring confirmation or denial for Section 30

There is a strong public interest in showing that the police are investigating serious crimes effectively and that public funds are being used correctly

Confirming or denying whether information exists relevant to this request would lead to a better-informed general public by identifying that Greater Manchester Police robustly investigate all individuals reported.

Acknowledging a case might encourage members of the public who have relevant information to come forward and assist with the investigation.

Factors against confirmation or denial for Section 30

Conversely to the factors in favour of disclosure, to publicly confirm or deny any case is open may seriously undermine GMP's ability to complete the investigation to a full and correct conclusion.

Any confirmation or denial of any arrest or investigation, if any charges have been brought against anyone and the status of enquires can unfairly damage the reputation of an individual who may never be prosecuted.

Balance test.

After weighing up the competing interests I have determined that the Public Interest favours the application of the neither confirm nor deny stance in respect of your request concerning whether or not we hold information about this individual.

I consider that the benefit that would result from issuing a confirmation or denial does not outweigh the considerations favouring neither confirm nor deny response. This is because of the impact it would

have on the individual and the impact it would have on the ability of GMP to fulfil our law enforcement functions and conduct any potential investigations into this matter, either now or in the future.

It is because of this that I feel the balance falls in favour of the maintenance of this stance, and why these exemptions are engaged and made out in this case.