

Reference: 2026-010

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

- 1. The total number of referrals or reports received by the SFO regarding art investment fraud or art gallery-related fraud for each calendar year from 2020 to 2026.**
- 2. Of these referrals: a) How many were accepted for investigation b) How many resulted in prosecutions c) How many resulted in convictions**
- 3. Where art-related fraud cases were investigated, the total estimated value of alleged fraud (this may be provided as aggregate figures or ranges to avoid identifying specific cases).**
- 4. A copy of any published guidance or criteria used by the SFO to assess whether art-related fraud cases meet your investigation thresholds.**

Response

Please see below our response to your questions.

Questions 1 – 3

The 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:

(1) Information held by a public authority is exempt information if it has at any time been held by the authority for the purposes of—

(a) 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,

(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,

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

Section 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.

Question 4

The Director's Statement of Principle applies to all referrals and is publicly available here: [SFO Statement of Principle - GOV.UK](#)

With regard to our internal guidance and policy on referrals, we do hold this information. However, this is exempt from release under section 31(1) of the FOIA.

Section 31(1)(a), (b), and (c) provides that:

Information which is not exempt information by virtue of section 30 is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice—

- (a) the prevention or detection of crime,*
- (b) the apprehension or prosecution of offenders,*
- (c) the administration of justice:*

How the exemption is engaged

As a law enforcement agency, the SFO holds highly sensitive information, which is of interest to others, including those we investigate. Disclosing detailed referral guidance and policies could undermine our investigative functions and compromise our operational capacity, thereby prejudicing the interests at (a), (b) and (c) above. Repeated requests could allow offenders to identify when the SFO has adopted an interest in a particular sector, allowing them an opportunity to destroy/conceal evidence and prejudice a potential investigation.

Public interest test

Sections 31(a), (b), and (c) are qualified exemptions and require consideration of whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in exempting this data outweighs the public interest in disclosing it. 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 information about 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.

However, having carefully weighed these considerations, we conclude that the public interest in maintaining the exemption is stronger in this case. The SFO's ability to investigate and prosecute serious and complex fraud depends on preserving the integrity of its operational processes. Disclosing internal referral criteria, particularly in response to requests that may be targeted at a specific sector such as the art market, could allow those who seek to evade investigation to adjust their conduct accordingly. This would cause tangible harm to law enforcement interests that outweighs the benefit of disclosure.

Having considered the opposing arguments, I believe that the stronger public interest lies in exempting the information from release.