



Ministry of Defence Police

Freedom of Information Manager

Room 126 Building 1070

MDP Wethersfield

Braintree CM7 4AZ

United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0)1371 85[REDACTED]

E-mail: MDP-FOI-DP@mod.gov.uk

Our Ref: eCase: FOI 2019/09206
RFI:288/19

Date: 11 September 2019

Dear [REDACTED]

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000: MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE: ALLEGED POLICE CORRUPTION.

We refer to your email dated 7 August 2019 to the Ministry of Defence Police which was acknowledged on the same date.

We are treating your email as a request for information in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA 2000).

In your email you requested the following information:

- 1. Please state the number of cases of alleged police corruption that your force has investigated internally or referred to the IOPC over the last five calendar years, including 2019 to date.**
- 2. For each case, please provide the number of police officers involved and list the rank of each officer.**
- 3. Please provide the outcome of each investigation, including the effect on the officer's employment and what disciplinary or prosecutorial action took place. NB: Ongoing cases can be marked as "unresolved" or "ongoing".**
- 4. Please provide estimates of the amount spent on internal investigations.**
- 5. Please provide details of the alleged misconduct or criminal behaviour involving corruption.**

A search for information has now been completed by the Ministry of Defence Police and I can confirm that we do hold information in scope of your request.

1. Please state the number of cases of alleged police corruption that your force has investigated internally or referred to the IOPC over the last five calendar years, including 2019 to date.

- The MDP has 0 cases recorded that fall within the specific criminal offence of police corruption.
- The MDP has 7 cases of criminal and non-criminal matters that fall within the National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) and Independent Office for Police Conduct's (IOPC) definitions of corruption.

2. For each case, please provide the number of police officers involved and list the rank of each officer.

- 2 x Inspector
- 1 x Police Constable
- 1 x Police Constable
- 1 x Police Sergeant
- 2 x Police Constable
- 1 x Police Sergeant
- 1 x Police Constable

3. Please provide the outcome of each investigation, including the effect on the officer's employment and what disciplinary or prosecutorial action took place. NB: Ongoing cases can be marked as "unresolved" or "ongoing".

- 3 x Complaint not upheld, no action
- 2 x Ongoing
- 2 x Management Action
- 1 x written warning
- 1 x officer resigned during investigation

4. Please provide estimates of the amount spent on internal investigations.

No information held

5. Please provide details of the alleged misconduct or criminal behaviour involving corruption.

(Note: This excludes officers where the complaint was not upheld)

- 5 x Inappropriate use of police powers

- 1 x Inappropriate use of police resources

Additionally the Ministry of Defence Police can neither confirm nor deny that it holds any other information relevant to this request by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 30(3) Investigations

Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Section 40(5) Personal information

Sections 30 and 31 are prejudice based qualified exemptions which means evidence of harm must be considered with a public interest test.

Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to articulate the harm or consider the public interest. If it were to be possible to identify officers from information released then this would breach the first data protection principle.

I have conducted a public interest test and while the Ministry of Defence Police understands the importance of releasing information that is in the public interest, it has been concluded that the balance strongly favours neither confirming or denying the Ministry of Defence Police holds any other information.

Section 30(3) is engaged because to confirm or deny whether any other information is or isn't held relating to ongoing covert investigations would improve public debate into this subject area. It could be argued that the general public need to know that the Ministry of Defence Police are actively investigating these officers but on balance, to do so would undermine the whole investigative process.

Section 31(3) is engaged because while there is information within the public domain relating to the College of Policing Codes of Ethics and Corruption which in itself favours confirming other information is held, by confirming or denying whether any other information is or isn't held in respect to this request could compromise law enforcement tactics which would hinder the Ministry of Defence Police's ability to prevent and detect crimes which would not be in the public interest.

This should not be taken as conclusive proof that any other information that would meet your request exists or does not exist.

If you have any queries regarding the content of this letter, please contact this office in the first instance.

If you wish to complain about the handling of your request, or the content of this response, you can request an independent internal review by contacting the Information Rights Compliance team, Ground Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail CIO-FOI-IR@mod.gov.uk).

Please note that any request for an internal review should be made within 40 working days of the date of this response.

If you remain dissatisfied following an internal review, you may raise your complaint directly to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not normally investigate your case until the MOD internal review process has been completed. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF. Further details of the role and powers of the

Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website at <https://ico.org.uk/>.

Yours sincerely

MDP Secretariat and Freedom of Information Office