



**GREATER MANCHESTER
POLICE**

Date: 06/07/2026

Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017090/N

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017090/N

I write in connection with your request for information dated 12/06/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Email 1

To Greater Manchester Police

1. Please can you provide the recorded information relating to [REDACTED] his remains and possessions and the location of human remains connected with him:

- (1) The decline in health (from the latter part of April/early May 2017) of ISB;**
- (2) the disposal of the late [REDACTED] (including the plan to scatter his ashes at Ashworth Hospital)**
- (3) The investigation led by [REDACTED] regarding the location of human remains on the Moors**

(4) Operation Chrome

(5) Operation Foxfield

(6) The investigation in 2022 [Senior Investigating Officer, [REDACTED]

(7) The information provided by [REDACTED] to GMP

(8) The dealings with

(a) the Home Office and Ministry of Justice (including in respect of the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill);

(b) Mayor of Greater Manchester (and his Office);

(c) Merseyside Police (including matters relating to and arising out of the inquest in which officers from Merseyside Police acted as Coroner's officers);

(d) Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services;

(e) Sefton Council

(f) Tameside Council [REDACTED]

(h) Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (and its former constituent parts including the Royal Liverpool and Broadgreen University Hospitals NHS Trust ['RLBUHT'] and DAC Beachcroft

(i) Mersey Care NHS Foundation Trust (Ashworth Hospital)

(j) HM Coroners for Sefton and Liverpool and the Chief Coroner (his office)

Page 2 of 2

(k) [REDACTED]

(l) The Court – in respect of an application for a warrant (regarding searching of cases which had already been gone through) in 2017

(m) [REDACTED]

(n) North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust

(o) the media including Longtail Films ([REDACTED]), BBC and ITV.

(9) Any internal communications and records relating to the above and any dealings relating thereto with involving the following external bodies (providing the full detail of anything recorded):

Email 2

4. Please can you advise me as to:

(i) the purposes of the Data Controller processing;

(ii) the categories of personal data concerned;

(iii) the recipients and the categories of recipient (including within the Data Controller) to whom there is disclosure of the personal data;

(iv) the Data Controller retention period for storing my personal data or, where this is not possible, the Data Controller criteria for determining how long the Data Controller will store it;

(v) the existence of any right to request rectification, erasure or restriction or to object to such processing;

(vi) the right to lodge a complaint with a supervisory authority;

(vii) information about the source of the data, where it was not obtained directly from me;

(viii) the existence of automated decision-making (including profiling); and

(ix) the safeguards the Data Controller provide if personal data to a third country or international organisation (such as for storage and back-up).

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 some of the information requested is held by GMP.

However, I am not obliged to supply the information held as an exemption applies to email 1 and email 2.

The exemptions that apply to **Email 1** are:

Section 30(1)(a)(i) – Investigations and proceedings conducted by public authorities.

Section 38 (1)(a)(b) – Health and safety.

Section 40(2)(a)(b) – Personal information.

Section 42(1) – Legal professional privilege.

Section 30(1)(a)(i) and Section 42(1) are class-based exemptions. There is a requirement to carry out a public interest test which weighs the public interest in favour of the disclosure of information against the public interest in withholding it.

Section 38 (1)(a)(b) is a prejudice-based, qualified exemption. There is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused by disclosing the information as well as carrying out a public interest test, when engaging this exemption.

Section 40(2) is an absolute exemption and there is no right to the information under the FOIA.

Harm as per Section 38

The FOIA provides the public with a general right of access to recorded information held by public authorities. Information disclosed under the Act is released into the public domain or to the “world at large”.

[REDACTED]. To disclose information purporting to his crimes would undoubtedly have a profound effect on the health and safety of the surviving members of the victims' families; with disclosure of such information causing further distress to the grieving families who remain affected by these historic crimes.

Protecting the safety of the public is of paramount importance to GMP and information that would compromise the health and safety of the families of victims of crime would not be disclosed under FOI provisions.

Section 30 – Factors favouring disclosure

Disclosing the information into the public domain would demonstrate GMP's accountability in meeting its responsibilities in accordance with the investigation into the unknown whereabouts of the remaining Moors victims. It would also demonstrate GMP's use of public funds and resources in continuing to investigate the crimes with the end result of providing closure to the affected families.

Section 30 – Factors favouring non-disclosure

Disclosing information about an active police investigation and ongoing legal proceedings could compromise their effectiveness. Consequently, this may undermine GMP's ability to perform its statutory duties, prevent crime, and secure justice for victims.

Furthermore, releasing these details sets a harmful precedent that could expose specific investigative techniques and hinder future law enforcement operations.

Section 38 – Factors favouring disclosure

Sharing information that impacts personal health and safety promotes openness and transparency. This ultimately helps the public make better-informed decisions.

Section 38 – Factors favouring non-disclosure

Due to the severity of the nature of the crimes committed by Ian Brady, it is not unreasonable to assume that disclosure of information relating to these crimes to the wider public would cause significant mental and physical harm to the families of the deceased victims.

Section 42 – Factors favouring disclosure

It is acknowledged that there is a public interest in the disclosure of legal advice relating to the ongoing investigation and legal proceedings connected to the Moors murders and crimes of Ian Brady. Access to the legal advice would be in the interests of transparency and enable the public to understand how GMP has made decisions in relation to these investigations and legal proceedings in the administration of justice.

Section 42 – Factors favouring non-disclosure

GMP is reliant upon the provision of impartial legal advice to inform and guide its decision-making in the performance of its statutory functions. The public release of legal advice would be likely to impede the free and frank channels of communication that exist between GMP and its professional legal advisors. This is because, over time, those seeking legal advice on behalf of GMP and/or providing advice would be less likely to be candid in future communications due to the risk of their advice being made public in future. This would affect the quality of advice provided by legal advisors to GMP and GMP's ability to obtain open, informed and unbiased legal advice.

The client-legal professional privilege is a principle enshrined in history that must be respected. Releasing the requested information would impede that relationship by deterring the complete free and frank flow of information that exists between GMP and its legal advisors. Should the relationship be less candid in future due to the continued release of legal communications as a result of FOI requests, GMP risks jeopardising the quality of legal advice it receives, which in turn, would negatively affect its ability to make effective and efficient decisions.

Balancing test

When balancing the public interest of disclosure, GMP must consider whether the information should be released into the public domain. Arguments need to be weighed against each other.

The most compelling reason for making the requested information available would be in the interests of openness and transparency in respect of GMP's official undertakings. This, however, needs to be weighed against the strongest reasons for non-disclosure, which concerns the mental and physical effect of the disclosure on the victims' surviving relatives and the effect disclosure would be likely to have on the ongoing legal proceedings and live investigations into the Moors murders.

Having considered all the factors for and against disclosure, I have reached the conclusion that factors weighing in favour of non-disclosure outweigh the reasons for disclosure and the information is therefore exempt from disclosure.

This letter serves as a Refusal Notice for the elements of your request in Email 1 which fall within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act. (Most recent correspondence sent 11/06/2025)

Email 2.

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.

This request is exempt under **Section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means**. The response to this request is available online. Please follow the link below.

[Privacy notice | Greater Manchester Police](#) (previously provided to you on 12/03/2025)

PLEASE NOTE

Greater Manchester Police (GMP) has previously received and responded to multiple Freedom of Information Act requests from you regarding this specific subject matter. On almost all of these occasions, our response and the information provided have remained identical.

Given this established pattern, any future requests received on this or substantially similar topics will be carefully reviewed, and GMP may refuse to process them under Section 14(1) of the Act on the grounds that they are vexatious and place a disproportionate burden on public resources.