



Date: 16/09/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017599/L

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017599/L

I write in connection with your request for information dated 07/09/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

On 16 June 2026 the University of Salford published a statement stating that it is “working closely with the Greater Manchester Police who are actively monitoring the situation” in relation to public allegations of a rape cover-up.

The University’s statement that GMP was “actively monitoring the situation” raises the question of what that monitoring actually involved. Given that the situation concerned serious public allegations of a systemic rape cover-up at the University, it is reasonable to ask whether GMP, in carrying out that monitoring, assessed, considered or otherwise recorded any substantive consideration of the underlying rape cover-up allegations. If GMP did not substantively consider the rape cover up allegations, that is itself relevant to understanding what “actively monitoring the situation” meant in practice and what basis there was for that monitoring. This request therefore seeks to establish whether such consideration occurred, rather than assuming in advance that it did.

Please therefore provide:

- 1. Copies of any recorded assessment, review, briefing, risk assessment, decision log, or internal consideration by Greater Manchester Police of the allegations of a systemic rape cover-up at the University of Salford.*
- 2. Any recorded information showing how, when, and by whom those allegations were assessed or considered before (or in connection with) the decision to monitor the situation / work with the university.*

3. Copies of any correspondence or meeting records between GMP and the University of Salford that refer to the assessment or consideration of the underlying allegations (as opposed to purely operational discussion of the posters or the campaign).

Interpretation of the request

This request is clear in the information it seeks. It is not a request for keyword matches alone. I ask that search terms are not applied too narrowly and that a common-sense approach is taken by reading the request as a whole. The purpose is to identify any recorded assessment, consideration, or institutional response by Greater Manchester Police to the public allegations of a systemic rape cover-up at the University of Salford, particularly in light of the university's own public statement that it is working closely with the force. Please interpret the request in that context rather than confining the search to isolated phrases.

Clarification of scope

This request is not for information about any individual criminal investigation, reported offence, victim, suspect, or witness. It seeks only recorded information about whether, and how, Greater Manchester Police assessed or considered the public allegations of a systemic rape cover-up at an institutional level.

Public interest

The university has publicly stated that the police are actively involved. There is a strong public interest in understanding whether that involvement included any assessment of the serious allegations being made, or whether the focus was solely on the campaign making them.

Greater Manchester Police and the University of Salford have longstanding institutional partnerships beyond day-to-day policing, including collaboration on police officer education, research and knowledge-exchange agreements, and information-sharing arrangements. Given that the allegations concern the possible institutional handling of serious sexual offences, there is a public interest in establishing whether GMP independently considered the substance of the allegations, and whether that relationship allowed the university's account to be received with limited independent scrutiny.

There is a significant public interest in transparency where allegations concern the handling of serious sexual offences, particularly given the current climate around the criminal justice system's response to violence against women and girls and institutional safeguarding. If the allegations were examined and found to have no merit, disclosure of that fact would equally serve the public interest by correcting misinformation and demonstrating the concerns were appropriately addressed.

This also sits within a wider context of regulatory scrutiny of how universities handle allegations of sexual violence and misconduct. Since 1 September 2024, providers have been prohibited from using NDAs to prevent students disclosing information about allegations of harassment or sexual misconduct, and the OfS's broader regulatory requirements on harassment and sexual misconduct came fully into force on 1 August 2025. The OfS's 2025 survey found nearly one quarter of respondents had experienced sexual harassment since entering higher education, and around one in seven reported sexual assault or violence. Against that background, allegations that a university may have mishandled or concealed information concerning sexual offences plainly engage substantial public interest, and where a police force

is publicly described as "actively monitoring" such a situation, transparency about the nature of that monitoring is particularly important.

If GMP considers it entitled to neither confirm nor deny whether information is held, I would ask it to weigh the strong public interest in transparency here, given that a refusal even to confirm or deny may itself affect public confidence in this context. Similarly, if GMP's position is that no relevant information is held, I would ask that this be explained sufficiently to be reconcilable with the University's own statement that GMP was "actively monitoring the situation" and "working closely" with it. This is not to suggest the university's statement establishes what records GMP holds — only that a clear explanation of GMP's position is particularly important here.

I note that GMP, the CPS and the Ministry of Justice each issued "not held" responses to related requests within three working days of one another. I do not assert coordination occurred, but the pattern makes transparency about the underlying decision-making particularly important — especially alongside GMP's early Section 14 warning after only three requests. I also note that this matter already attracted significant public attention, which increases the public interest in a transparent, on-the-record response rather than one that risks appearing evasive.

I also note that this matter has already gained public visibility: google searches for "GMP scandals" now surface this series of Freedom of Information requests, including in AI-generated search summaries. That visibility increases the public interest in GMP responding transparently and on the record, rather than in a way that risks appearing evasive or defensive.

The public interest here does not depend on the allegations being true — it lies in establishing whether they were properly considered, and in the public being able to distinguish clearly between: GMP substantively considering the allegations (in which case, disclosure of the non-exempt process would serve the public interest); GMP not substantively considering them (which is itself significant, given the university's statement); or relevant records being held but exempt (in which case the exemption should be applied precisely, with non-exempt material disclosed and the reasoning explained).

Severability and itemised identification of withheld information

If any information is withheld, I ask that this be identified on an item-by-item basis rather than by a general reference to an exemption. The ICO's guidance on refusal notices states that authorities should consider release within a document rather than withholding it wholesale, and should indicate how much has been redacted, from where, and under which exemption, wherever this is possible without itself disclosing exempt information.

Accordingly, for each item withheld, please provide, so far as this would not itself disclose exempt information:

A description of the item;

Where it appears (document, correspondence, meeting record, paragraph or section); The specific exemption relied upon; The reasoning for why that exemption applies; Where the exemption is qualified, the public-interest factors considered and the reasoning for withholding; and Where practicable, the extent of material withheld.

This is not a request to disclose information that is legitimately exempt — it is a request for enough detail about the withholding decision to allow it to be understood and, if necessary, challenged at internal review or by complaint to the ICO, subject only to the extent that identifying an item's existence would itself defeat the exemption's purpose.

Duty to assist (section 16): if the request risks exceeding the cost limit, please advise how it can be refined.

University of Salford (2026), University response to recent allegations, 16 June 2026. Available at: [University response to recent allegations | University of Salford](#).

Result of Searches

Your request is refused under **Section 14(2) - Vexatious Requests**.

Under section 14(2) of the Freedom of Information Act, GMP do not have to comply with a request which is identical, or substantially similar to a previous request submitted by the same individual, unless a reasonable period has elapsed between those requests. There is no requirement to consider the public interest.

Section 14(2) applies when a public authority has:

- previously provided the same requester with the information in response to an earlier FOIA request; **or**
- previously confirmed that it does not hold the information, in response to an earlier FOIA request from the same requester.

In the responses to your three previous requests on this matter, dated 06/08/2026 and two on 13/08/2026, you were informed that no information was held in relation to your request. On 13/08/2026, you were also warned that any further requests on the topic would be treated as vexatious.

This letter serves as a refusal notice under Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act. It would be unreasonable for GMP to continue issuing refusal notices for requests relating to this matter. Any further requests will not be responded to.