



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

Our Ref: FOI 21707
Your Ref: FOI 21656
Date: 08 June 2026

Internal Review – Revised Response

Re: Request for internal review of response to application for information under the provisions of the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act 2000, original request first notified to Staffordshire Police (SP) on 29/07/2025.

SP refer to the above request which was expressed in the following terms:

Given the following statement made by the U.N. representative.

Volker Türk, the UN human rights commissioner, said ministers' decision to designate the group a terrorist organisation was "disproportionate and unnecessary" and called on them to rescind it.

In a statement on Friday, he said the ban amounted to an "impermissible restriction" of people's rights to freedom of expression and assembly that was "at odds with the UK's obligations under international human rights law".

Volker Türk, the UN human rights commissioner, said ministers' decision to designate the group a terrorist organisation was "disproportionate and unnecessary" and called on them to rescind it.

In a statement on Friday, he said the ban amounted to an "impermissible restriction" of people's rights to freedom of expression and assembly that was "at odds with the UK's obligations under international human rights law".

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2025/jul/25/uk-ban-palestine-action-odds-international-law-un-rights-volker-turk>

In that case.

1) On what legal grounds was the severely disabled young man in a wheel chair arrested on Saturday 26th July 2025 outside the Elbit factory Shenstone Staffordshire? Photographs have gone around the world as an example of policing at odds with International Law. This is causing both embarrassment and consternation in Staffordshire. It may also have other legal consequences where the taxpayer has to pay a bill for breaches of International Law committed in the Staffordshire County Council area.

2) Which police officer gave the order for that arrest?

3) What political order was given for that arrest by who?

4) Who was the lead police officer on duty that day on the ground?

5) Who was silver command?

6) Who was gold command?

7) What guidelines were used?

8) Given the young man is severely disabled what guidelines were used for his specific arrest and detention?

9) It is clear from video and photographic evidence that the young man was not given opportunity to wheel himself. Why was it necessary to lift his wheel chair at all? Why couldn't the chair simply be pushed? How many police were used to lift his wheelchair?. Since an arrestee should be treated the same as a fully abled bodied person The Equality Act 2010 applies - reasonable adjustments - What ramp did you have to enable the wheel chair user to wheel himself into the police van? What was its specifications? And - How could he have been given an option if no ramp exists?



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

- 10) What station was the arrestee taken to? How many ramps does that police station have? where?
- 11) On what charge?
- 12) Given the arrestees disability has he been given access to independent medical care? Please state if they are registered - who with?
- 13) Has he been given access to an independent qualified care assistant? Please state if they are registered - who with?
- 14) How many times has this arrestee seen a medical professional?
- 15) How many times has he seen a care assistant during the day and night time?
- 16) Do you have a detailed observation sheet available for inspection by his own legal/medical team? From medical practitioners? From the care assistants? from the police?
- 17) How long has he been kept away from his own legal help? On what grounds, please state which section, sub section and paragraph please?
- 18) Has he been taken to hospital for any treatment?
- 19) Has he received any of his normal medical, physiotherapy and other medical or social assistance whilst detained?
- 20) Which police station/s has he further been taken to or transferred to since his arrest? Why?

Thank you for your kind consideration of the above questions.

Further to the above, SP note the following comments made within your request for Internal Review.

I am writing to request an internal review of Staffordshire Police's handling of my FOI request 'UK's obligations under international human rights law'. I am requesting an internal review, with particular focus on the public interest test, which I think has overlooked some important points in favour of disclosure.

1) Your assessment of International Law is in direct conflict with the assessment by the U.N.'s Human Rights Commissioner. It cannot be in The Public Interest for that assessment to be ignored by Staffordshire Police. This law was not addressed in your response at all.

2) You fail to address competing laws which favour a response specifically The Equality Act 2010. I fail to see how counting wheel chair ramps for example has anything to do with any other law. Is it in The Public Interest to evade that law.

3) Is this just a bid to use the Terrorism Act to avoid engaging with any other laws and civil society as it suits you. Is that in the Public Interest and was that and only that considered in this Public Interest Test.

5) Christopher Noble Chief Constable of Staffordshire National Lead police for Protest Policing ex overt counter terrorism at the RUC has been suspended from duties on a serious matter. As Chief Constable he sanctioned this arrest of a severely disabled man when other forces have turned away from conducting such arrests of people obviously and clearly incapable of being of any harm to civil society. That appears a severe error of judgment. Is that in the Public Interest and has that been included in the Public Interest Test. And if not him who was responsible. Get to the bottom of this. That is certainly in The Public Interest and those questions must be answered as part of The Public Interest Test.

4) The taxpayer is likely to be held accountable for these breaches of International Law commitments and its consequences. Will that compensation come out of the Staffordshire policing budget. Have you considered that point in your Public Interest Test.

For points one to five you have failed to address salient parts of what is in The Public Interest and must be addressed as part of The Public Interest Test.

Thank you for your kind consideration of the above points for review.

SP Response

SP have now conducted a second Internal Review following appeal to the ICO (reference IC-425846-X3X4) and as a result, SP are revising the response follows:

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

SP Police can neither confirm nor deny that it holds the information you requested as it believes that the duty under s1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the duty to confirm whether the public authority holds information of the specified description) does not apply. The following exemptions have been applied.

- Section 30(3) – Criminal Investigations

Section 30 is qualified and class-based and, as such, SP are required to apply the public interest test.

- Section 31 (3) - Law Enforcement

Section 31 is a qualified and prejudice-based exemption and, as such, SP are required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

Harm

Any release under FOIA is a disclosure to the world, not just to the individual making the request. To confirm, or not, whether any information is held pertinent to this request would reveal whether there has been any information received on the dates specified, in respect of potential criminal activity.

Police forces work in conjunction with other agencies and information is shared in line with information sharing protocols. Modern day policing is intelligence led and this is particularly pertinent regarding law enforcement. The public expect police forces to use all powers and tactics available to them to prevent and detect crime or disorder and maintain public safety.

If SP were to confirm or deny whether any information was held in respect of this request, this would undermine the policing capabilities of SP, which consequently would be detrimental to the ability to deal with the on-going threats faced by policing.

The prevention and detection of crime is the foundation upon which policing is built and the threat from terrorism cannot be ignored. It is recognised that the international security landscape is increasingly complex and unpredictable.

To counter criminal behaviour, it is vital that the police can work together to ensure the successful arrest and prosecution of offenders who encourage, support, commit criminal acts.

The impact of providing information under FOI would disclose crucial information on the police intelligence picture in respect of those who may be supportive of criminal activity. This would provide criminals, or those intent on committing criminal or terrorist acts, with valuable information as to where the police are targeting their investigations. Confirmation or denial would undermine the effective delivery of operational law enforcement by highlighting which areas have, or have not, received police attention from these types of reports.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring confirming or denying information is held – Section 30(3)

There is a public interest in the transparency of policing and to provide assurance that SP is appropriately and effectively dealing with crime. Confirming or denying that any information exists relevant to this request would lead to a better-informed public, demonstrating that police resources are being used correctly to focus on criminal/terrorist activity and to protect the public.

This would provide an insight into the police service and enable the public to have better understanding of effectiveness of the police, particularly in relation to the spending of public funds and the decisions taken by officers. As transparency is intrinsically linked to public confidence, confirming or denying whether any information is held, would be likely to improve public confidence in the force.

Factors favouring not confirming or denying information is held – Section 30(3)

Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing operations and providing assurance that SP is appropriately and effectively dealing with crime, there is a strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of police investigations and operations, and in maintaining confidence in the police as a public service. As this is a specific area of investigation which could also relate to inviting support for a proscribed terrorist group(s), confirmation or denial would identify police focus and attention which could be used by criminals, including terrorists to disrupt investigations and evade detection. This risks the integrity of investigations and places the public at severe risk.

Factors favouring confirming or denying information is held – Section 31(3)

The Home Office publishes national counter terrorism data, under the Terrorism Act 2000 (TACT), on a quarterly and annual basis, this data includes arrests, outcomes, stop and search and court proceedings. This data includes membership of a proscribed organisation under Sections 11-13 of TACT 2000. This favours confirming information is held, the link to the data is <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/counter-terrorism-statistics>

Therefore, to confirm information is held by SP would demonstrate openness and transparency. When a request for information is made to the SP it is correct that appropriate information is made available to the public. The provision of information, through confirming or denying whether information relevant to this request is held would accordingly, reinforce the commitment of SP to be an open and transparent organisation.

Factors favouring not confirming or denying information is held – Section 31(3)

SP has a duty of care to the community at large and public safety is of paramount importance. If an FOI disclosure revealed information to the world (by citing an exemption or stating no information held) that would undermine the security of the national infrastructure. Offenders, including terrorist organisations, could use this to their advantage which would compromise public safety and more worryingly encourage offenders to conduct further crimes.

Therefore, confirming or denying information is held, would allow those who are intent on criminal activity to gain an operational advantage over SP, consequently requiring an increase in resources, which cannot be in the public interest.

Balance test

The points above highlight the merits of confirming, or denying, whether any further information pertinent to this request exists. Whilst it is recognised that there is a public interest in the transparency of policing operations and providing assurance that the police service is appropriately and effectively engaging with the threat posed by various groups or individuals, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of police investigations and operations in this highly sensitive area.

The public entrust the Police Service to make appropriate decisions regarding their safety and protection and the only way of reducing risk is to be cautious with any information that is released. Confirming or denying whether any information is held would reveal data around force level activity relating criminal activity. This would result in an increase of harm to either current or future investigations, or the subject of the investigation. Any disclosure of information, if held, which has the potential to jeopardise an investigation, is therefore likely to prejudice law enforcement and would therefore be of assistance to those who are intent on causing harm.

Therefore, after weighing up the competing public interests, SP have found that confirmation or denial of whether information is held is not made out.

- **Section 40(5) Personal Information**

Section 40(5) is an absolute exemption which means that there is no need to quantify the harm that may arise from the disclosure; neither is it subject to a public interest test.

The information, if held, would constitute personal data as described in Section 3 (2) of the Data Protection Act 2018 as;

“any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual”

To release personal or third-party information held by SP, would breach the data protection principles; namely –

- Data is lawfully and fairly processed.
- Processed in line with an individual's rights.
- Data is secure.

Whilst neither confirming nor denying the presence of any individuals related to in your request, were any information to be held, SP does not believe that seeking to obtain consent to allow disclosure would be practical or freely given. Nor does SP have a legitimate interest in seeking to disclose the requested information - should any be held.

SP have considered, were information to be held and disclosed, would such a disclosure be fair and transparent. In such cases, SP must be mindful whether any information placed into the public domain, either on and of its own, or when compared to other publicly available material, would have the likelihood of identifying a specific individual or individuals. Where the risk of identification is significant, whether accurate or not, SP would be in breach of the Data Protection Act.

Special Category Data

In the FOI request the applicant poses several questions that relate to the health of an individual. Bearing in mind the above, if any information were to be held by SP, this would constitute special category data.

Criminal Offence Data

The requested information, were this to be held, would fall under section 11(2) of the Data Protection Act 2018, as it would be construed as criminal offence data relating to;

- (a) the alleged commission of offences by the data subject

Any information released under the FOI Act is, by its definition, available to the wider world. Should SP confirm or deny whether any relevant information is or is not held, it would reveal to the wider world that an individual had or had not been involved in the criminal justice system. To disclose this fact would be unfair to the individual concerned. Where information is held indicating that any individual may have been involved in the criminal justice system, there is a strong expectation that the personal data of any such individual will be held in confidence and not disclosed to the public under the FOI Act.

No inference can be taken from this refusal that the information requested does or does not exist.



For Clarity SP are specifying which exemption applies to each specific question:

1) On what legal grounds was the severely disabled young man in a wheel chair arrested on Saturday 26th July 2025 outside the Elbit factory Shenstone Staffordshire? Photographs have gone around the world as an example of policing at odds with International Law. This is causing both embarrassment and consternation in Staffordshire. It may also have other legal consequences where the taxpayer has to pay a bill for breaches of International Law committed in the Staffordshire County Council area.

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

2) Which police officer gave the order for that arrest?

S40(5)

3) What political order was given for that arrest by who?

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

4) Who was the lead police officer on duty that day on the ground?

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

5) Who was silver command?

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

6) Who was gold command?

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

7) What guidelines were used?

S30(3) S31(3)

8) Given the young man is severely disabled what guidelines were used for his specific arrest and detention?

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

9) It is clear from video and photographic evidence that the young man was not given opportunity to wheel himself. Why was it necessary to lift his wheel chair at all? Why couldn't the chair simply be pushed? How many police were used to lift his wheelchair?. Since an arrestee should be treated the same as a fully abled bodied person The Equality Act 2010 applies - reasonable adjustments - What ramp did you have to enable the wheel chair user to wheel himself into the police van? What was its specifications? And - How could he have been given an option if no ramp exists?

The FOI Act 2000 only extends to requests for recorded information. It does not require public authorities to create information to answer questions generally; only if the information is already held in recorded form. The Act does not extend to requests for information about policies or their implementation, or the merits or demerits of any



proposal or action - unless, of course, the answer to any such request is already held in recorded form.

10) What station was the arrestee taken to? How many ramps does that police station have? where?

S40(5) S31(3)

11) On what charge?

S30(3) S31(3) S40(5)

12) Given the arrestees disability has he been given access to independent medical care? Please state if they are registered - who with?

S40(5)

13) Has he been given access to an independent qualified care assistant? Please state if they are registered - who with?

S40(5)

14) How many times has this arrestee seen a medical professional?

S40(5)

15) How many times has he seen a care assistant during the day and night time?

S40(5)

16) Do you have a detailed observation sheet available for inspection by his own legal/medical team? From medical practitioners? From the care assistants? from the police?

S40(5)

17) How long has he been kept away from his own legal help? On what grounds, please state which section, sub section and paragraph please?

S40(5)

18) Has he been taken to hospital for any treatment?

S40(5)

19) Has he received any of his normal medical, physiotherapy and other medical or social assistance whilst detained?

S40(5)

20) Which police station/'s has he further been taken to or transferred to since his arrest? Why?

S40(5) S31(3)



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

This is the full and final response from SP which will be shared with the ICO.

Please be advised that all FOI requests and response letters are published on the SP website although personal details are not included.

Kind Regards,

Information Access Team Management

Email: IAT@staffordshire.police.uk