

16 December 2025

FOI Ref 22201

Request - You asked us the following:

Please treat this as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

For the period from 1 February 2024 to December 1 2025, please provide:

1. The number of dogs seized by your force under the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 (broken down by Section 1 and Section 3, if possible).
2. The number of seized dogs currently being held in kennels.
3. The names of approved kennels in your force area and the total amount paid to each over the same period.
4. The number of seized dogs that were (a) euthanised, (b) returned to owners, or (c) rehomed / other outcome.

Staffordshire Police (SP) received your request on 03/12/2025 and have processed this under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Staffordshire Police's response to your enquiry is as follows:

SP holds the requested information.

- Please treat this as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
- For the period from 1 February 2024 to December 1 2025, please provide:
 - 1. The number of dogs seized by your force under the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 (broken down by Section 1 and Section 3, if possible).
– **Disclosed, 110 Section 1 Dogs and 60 Section 3 Dogs.**
 - 2. The number of seized dogs currently being held in kennels.
– **Disclosed, 30 dogs.**
 - 3. The names of approved kennels in your force area and the total amount paid to each over the same period.
– **Partially disclosed, £541,366.00. Please see the below exemptions.**
 - 4. The number of seized dogs that were (a) euthanised, (b) returned to owners, or (c) rehomed / other outcome.
– **Disclosed,**
 - a. 139 – this includes for all reasons, signed over, strays unable to be rehomed etc.**
 - b. 68**
 - c. 22**

Please be advised that the data for question 2 and 4 relates to all types of dogs that have been seized.

Please note that this data has been provided to the best of the ability of SP, subject to the limitation of current recording protocols and systems/software. Additional records may have been recorded during

these timescales but are awaiting finalisation and input onto these systems and would not be present within this dataset.

Every effort is made to ensure that the data presented is accurate and complete. However, it is important to note that this has been extracted from multiple sources, developed for specific policing purposes, for which data extraction methods have not been specifically designed to directly correlate with the terminology of this request. Therefore, the data presented is subject to the inaccuracies and idiosyncrasies inherent in any large-scale recording system.

Consequently, care should be taken in the interpretation and presentation of this data, to not misrepresent the whole or any part of the data disclosed.

The following exemptions have been applied:

In accordance with Section 17(1) of the Freedom of Information Act, this letter represents a refusal notice for parts of this request.

- Section 31 (1)(a)(b) Law Enforcement
- Section 38 (1)(a)(b) Health & Safety

Information is exempt from disclosure under Section 31 and Section 38 where the release of Information would, or would likely to, prejudice the prevention and detection of crime and/or the apprehension or prosecution of offenders. This exemption is qualified and prejudice-based and, as such, we are required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

Harm:

To provide the businesses/organisations Staffordshire Police use to kennel dogs could undermine existing or future investigations, operations and police tactics. Disclosure of the specific businesses for each facility used would enable individuals with intent on disrupting police activity to conduct detailed research on the available facilities and therefore identify the locations of such kennels.

Members of the criminal fraternity, armed with such information could then take steps to disrupt operational policing; therefore, prejudicing the prevention and detection of crime, the administration of justice and placing both members of the public and police staff at a significantly increased risk of harm.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure - Section 31

To disclose this information would adhere to the basic principle of being open and transparent, it would also lead to a better public awareness of the workings of the police force and how public funds are utilised.

Factors favouring non-disclosure - Section 31

Releasing such data would give those individuals with the intent to do so, the intelligence required to disrupt police activity. If a location was made public, or by disclosure, such locations could be identified, these locations could then be targeted by members of the criminal fraternity or other adversaries; seized

dogs could be released into the public before any court procedures; therefore jeopardising our capacity to protect the public and bring offenders to justice. This would inevitably lead to an increased likelihood of criminal activity and unnecessarily endanger members of police staff and the public in general. Any disclosure of information which is likely to undermine the ability to serve the public in preventing and detecting crime can only be considered as being harmful.

Factors favouring disclosure - Section 38

In addition to the basic premise of being open and transparent, disclosure of the businesses of kennelling provision would allow for greater public awareness around the kennelling facilities employed by Staffordshire Police and inform public debate upon how public funds are being spent.

Factors favouring non-disclosure - Section 38

Our kennelling provision for seized dogs is kept confidential for security reasons; this is to ensure the safety and security of the staff and kennels, but also to ensure that seized dogs are cared for in a secure and safe environment. Disclosure of detailed information from which these locations could be determined would therefore be of detriment to these functions and unnecessarily place the wellbeing of staff, animals and the public at risk.

Balance Test

When considering whether disclosure is appropriate, we must weigh the strongest reason for disclosure against the strongest reasons for non-disclosure. In this case, whilst the factors favouring disclosure are important in that it would adhere to the basic principle of being open and transparent, we believe when weighed against the risk of disclosure undermining our ability to prevent and detect crime and hindering our ability to protect the public, then non-disclosure takes precedence.

Please be advised that all Freedom of Information request responses are published on the Staffordshire Police website although personal details are not included.

Freedom of Information Request Appeals Procedure

1. Who Can Ask for a Review

Any person who has requested information from SP, which has been dealt with under the Freedom of Information Act, is entitled to complain and request an internal review, if they are dissatisfied with the response they received.

2. How to Request a Review

Requests for review of a Freedom of Information request must be made in writing within two months of the date of receipt of this email, and should be addressed to:

IAT@staffordshire.police.uk

Or by Post to:

Information Access Team

Staffordshire Police HQ
PO Box 3167
Stafford
ST16 9JZ

The reference number, date of the request and details of why the review is being requested must be included. Requests for review should be brought to the attention of the Information Access Team within two months of the SP response to the original FOI request.

3. Review Procedure

Receipt of a request for review will be acknowledged in writing. The review will be conducted by a supervisor who is independent from the original Decision Maker. The Information Access Team will set a target date for a response. The response will be made as soon as is practicable with the intention to complete the review within twenty working days. In more complex cases the review may take up to forty working days.

The independent supervisor will conduct a review of the handling of the request for information and of decisions taken, including decisions taken about where the public interest lies in respect of exempt information where applicable. The review enables a re-evaluation of the case, considering the matters raised by the complaint.

4. Conclusion of the Appeal

On completion of the review the independent supervisor will reply to the appellant with the result of the review. If the appellant is still dissatisfied following the review they should contact the Information Commissioner to make an appeal. The Information Commissioner can be contacted via the following link:
<https://ico.org.uk/make-a-complaint/foi-and-eir-complaints/foi-and-eir-complaints/>

Freedom of Information
Information Access Team