Date: 15th January 2026
Our ref: FOI/25/015957/K

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/25/015957/K

I write in connection with your request for information dated 03/12/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Please treat this as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
For the period from 1 February 2024 to December 1 2025, please provide:
1. The number of dogs seized by your force under the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 (broken down by Section 1 and Section 3, if possible).
2. The number of seized dogs currently being held in kennels.
3. The names of approved kennels in your force area and the total amount paid to each over the same period.
4. The number of seized dogs that were (a) euthanised, (b) returned to owners, or (c) rehomed / other outcome.
If full data cannot be provided within cost limits, please supply what is readily available.

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate the requested information. I can confirm the information requested is held by GMP. However, I am not obliged to provide all the information requested as exemption applies to part of question 3.

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 you have requested in question 3 in relation to the names of the kennels used is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption:

Section 31(1)(a)(b) – Law Enforcement.

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

S31(1) - Evidence of Harm

Disclosing information into the public domain - specifically details of the businesses and/or locations used to kennel seized dogs - would undermine the core principles of policing, namely to prevent and detect crime. Disclosure of this information could cause substantial harm not only to those businesses and locations, the people that are employed at those establishments, our own operations in this field and also potentially to members of the public. If GMP were to place this information into the public domain, this could prejudice our ability to prevent and detect crime, and provide potential offenders with the information they would need to conduct targeted activity – this could in turn affect GMP's ability to protect the community.

Factors favouring disclosure

Disclosing this information into the public domain would lead to an increased public awareness on these matters. Disclosure would also show that GMP are being as open and transparent with the public as possible.

Factors against disclosure

Disclosing details of the businesses and/or locations where GMP currently house seized dogs would hinder the prevention and detection of crime. Disclosure of this information would provide either the owners of dogs that have been seized with the requisite knowledge to undertake reprisal activity should they wish to – such as targeting these locations for criminal damage, attempting to seize-back the animal in question and would endanger those businesses and the staff employed by them. Not only would this pose a risk with regards to a potential increase in crime, but it would also indicate our current Force capabilities in this area and should the disclosure of this information result in anything negative, then it would undoubtedly cause either reputational harm to those businesses concerned or would be to the detriment of current commercial arrangements

Any disclosure of information which would compromise law enforcement tactics and thus lead to more crime being committed by reducing the opportunity for the prevention and detection of crime, would therefore increase the risk to public safety, which is not in the public interest.

Balance Test

Whilst there is a public interest in transparency and openness between the Force and the public, in addition to the public seeing how the Force deal with seized dogs, there is a stronger interest in ensuring that both these businesses and the public in general are protected from the threat of criminal activity, and that the enforcement of the law and the prevention and detection of crime is upheld.

To disclose information which is likely to assist potential offenders or endanger individuals Involved including the general public, would seriously undermine the effective delivery of operational law enforcement and is therefore exempt from disclosure.

As much as there is public interest in knowing that policing activity is appropriate and balanced in matters of law enforcement, this will only be overridden in exceptional circumstances. Any disclosure which hinders our capability and assists criminals cannot be in the public interest.

Please see the remaining response to questions not exempt.

Please note, due to changing databases, the data provided is what is currently held and retrievable and may not be accurate.

Question 1

Section 1 – 554 dogs

Section 1 and other offence, mainly section 3 DDA, also animal welfare and breaches of orders – 121 dogs

Section 3 – 524 dogs.

Question 2 – 54 dogs.

Question 3

Total cost of kennelling between the dates requested is £1,801,828.

Question 4

529 dogs were destroyed during the above period after being seized for DDA offences. The other would have been either returned to their owners, rehomed or still in kennels.