Information Access Unit
Information Management and Data Directorate

Date: 21/09/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017395/B

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017395/B

I write in connection with your request for information dated 06/08/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

This query is in relation to the ban on puberty blockers for transgender minors, which was made on 3 June 2024 and extended indefinitely on 11 December 2024.

https://www.gov.uk/government/news/ban-on-puberty-blockers-to-be-made-indefinite-on-experts-advice

I am advised that this is covered by The Medicines Act 1968, section 67

Please provide the following information for the 2 year period between June 2024 and May 2026.

1) *Number of people reported to your force for illegal possession of puberty blockers?*

2) *Number of people charged with illegal possession of puberty blockers?*

3) *Number of people prosecuted for illegal possession of puberty blockers*

4) *Relationship between the people making the reports and those reported for illegal possession of puberty blockers, if known?*

Result of Searches

1. 0.

2. 0.

3. Prosecution information is not held by GMP. Please contact His Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Service for this information.

4. No information held by GMP as there have been no such crimes recorded.

GMP can neither confirm nor deny that any further information is held in relation to questions 1 and 4 by virtue of **Section 30(3) – Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities.**

Harm
Whilst some information may be disclosed in response to this request, GMP can neither confirm nor deny whether any further information is held. The disclosed figure, where provided, reflects only those reports that can safely be included within an aggregate response. GMP can neither confirm nor deny whether any additional reports exist which fall outside that disclosed figure.

To confirm or deny whether further information is held would itself reveal information about the existence of reports where an alleged perpetrator has not yet been identified, approached, interviewed, or otherwise made aware that a report has been made. In such circumstances, confirmation or denial could directly undermine the purpose of the NCND position by indicating whether a particular individual is, or is not, currently the subject of police interest.

Disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is disclosure to the world at large. A confirmed position regarding the existence or absence of further information may therefore enable individuals to make inferences about whether police have received information relating to them, whether investigative enquiries are ongoing, or whether any law enforcement interest exists.

There is a real risk that such disclosures could prejudice current or future investigations by alerting individuals to police interest at a stage where enquiries remain ongoing or where officers have not yet had the opportunity to engage with those individuals. The cumulative effect of confirming or denying information in circumstances of this nature would weaken established NCND positions designed to protect investigative activity, preserve opportunities to obtain evidence, and safeguard personal information.

Factors favouring Confirming or Denying for Section 30 - Confirmation or denial would promote openness and transparency regarding police investigations and would assist public understanding of how the police record, investigate, and manage matters reported to them. Disclosure may increase public confidence that GMP appropriately investigates allegations and exercises its powers responsibly. There is a general public interest in ensuring accountability for police decision making and the use of public resources.

Factors favouring Neither Confirming nor Denying for Section 30 - There is a stronger public interest in protecting the integrity of investigative processes. Confirming or denying whether further information is held could reveal the existence of reports relating to individuals who are not yet aware that allegations have been made against them or that police interest exists. Such disclosures may compromise investigative opportunities, affect the collection of evidence, influence witness accounts, or alter the behaviour of those concerned. The public interest is not served by a disclosure that risks undermining police enquiries or revealing sensitive investigative information through inference. The effectiveness of law

enforcement depends upon police being able to receive, assess, and investigate reports without prematurely disclosing whether particular individuals are the subject of attention.

Factors favouring Confirming or Denying for Section 31 - Confirmation or denial would contribute to public understanding of policing activity and may increase transparency regarding the way reports are handled. Disclosure could assist public scrutiny of how law enforcement resources are deployed in relation to allegations concerning puberty blockers and support broader public debate on the issue.

Factors favouring Neither Confirming nor Denying for Section 31 -Confirming or denying whether additional information is held would be capable of revealing whether police have received information relating to individuals who remain unaware of any report. Such information could be of value to those seeking to determine whether they are currently of interest to law enforcement.

The ability of police to prevent and detect crime relies in part upon individuals not being able to use public disclosures to assess whether allegations have been reported, recorded, or are subject to ongoing consideration. Confirmation or denial in these circumstances could undermine law enforcement activity by revealing information about police knowledge, investigative status, or operational interest which would not otherwise be available.