Reference: 2025-037

Thank you for your email in which you requested the following information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA):

Please provide a list of any and all contact your organisation and/or staff have had with British American Tobacco, Imperial Brands, Japan Tobacco International, Philip Morris International, as well as any other domestic or transnational tobacco companies or anyone representing the tobacco industry including subsidiaries of tobacco industry.

I would like this information for the period from 23 April 2023 - 10 March 2025

Contact would primarily include attending or arranging meetings or functions and responding to correspondence or phone calls.

- **Please break down the information by:**
- **Tobacco company or representative's name**
- **Date of contact(s)**
- **Type of contact (meeting, email, letter, phone call, text/app message or video call, e-card or any other form of electronic communication)**
- **Place of contact, if relevant**
- **Purpose of contact**
- **Outcome of contact, including if no action taken**

Response

In relation to the SFO's investigation into the British American Tobacco, this information is in the public domain, which you can access on the National Archive website: British American Tobacco - Serious Fraud Office.

In response to the rest of your FOIA request, the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) neither confirms nor denies whether it holds information falling within the description specified in your request. The duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the FOIA does not apply, by virtue of sections 30(3) of that Act. Nothing in my reply should be taken as an indication that the information you requested is or is not held by the SFO.

Section 30(3) provides that:
The duty to confirm or deny does not arise in relation to information which is (or if it were held by the public authority would be) exempt information by virtue of subsection (1) or (2).

Section 30(1) provides that:
(2) Information held by a public authority is exempt information if it has at any time been held by the authority for the purposes of—
(c) any investigation which the public authority has a duty to conduct with a view to it being ascertained—
(i) whether a person should be charged with an offence, or
(ii) whether a person charged with an offence is guilty of it,
(d) any investigation which is conducted by the authority and in the circumstances may lead to a decision by the authority to institute criminal proceedings which the authority has power to conduct,
or (c) any criminal proceedings which the authority has power to conduct.

How the exemption is engaged

Section 30(1) exempts any information held by a public authority if it has at any time been held by the authority for the purposes of (b) any investigation which is conducted by the authority, and in the circumstances may lead to a decision by the authority to institute criminal proceedings which the authority has power to conduct.

Section 30(3) allows the respondent to "neither confirm nor deny" whether any information is held in relation to the question where the requested information, if held, is described by section 30(1).

It is clear that your questions relate to information that you believe may be held by the SFO for the purposes of criminal investigations, as set out in section 30(1)(b), meaning the SFO must neither confirm nor deny whether the information is held in accordance with S30 of the FOIA (2000).

Public interest test

Sections 30(3) is a qualified exemption and requires consideration of whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exclusion of the duty to confirm or deny outweighs the public interest in disclosing whether the public authority holds the information. More information about exemptions in general and the public interest test is available on the ICO's website at www.ico.org.uk

It is recognised that there is a general public interest in publicising the work of the SFO, so that the public knows that serious fraud, bribery and corruption are being investigated and prosecuted effectively and so that the public can be reassured about the general conduct of our organisation and how public money is spent. The SFO takes steps to meet this interest by publishing casework information on its website where appropriate.

However, it is also recognised that it is in the public interest to safeguard the investigative process and that investigating bodies should be afforded the space to determine the course of any investigation. On some occasions, releasing information about what is held or not held by law enforcement bodies would be detrimental to that process. To confirm or deny whether the information you have requested is held (if held) would, for reasons outlined earlier, be likely to prejudice the SFO's conduct of any criminal investigation/ability to tackle and prevent serious crime. This would not be in the public interest as the right of access to information should not undermine the investigation and prosecution of criminal matters.

Having considered the opposing arguments, it is clear that the benefits of confirming whether or not the information is held are outweighed by the disbenefits and thus the public interest favours maintaining the exclusion of the duty to confirm or deny whether information is held.