

Your Reference:
Our Reference: 1002019-001

Derek Canning
By e-mail to:
request-28572-0a6c9040@whatdotheyknow.com

31 August 2010

IPCC Contact:
Philip Johnston
Tel: 020 7166 3000

Dear Mr Canning,

Internal review of IPCC FOIA decision

I refer to the letter from Amanda Kelly of 27th August 2010 giving the outcome of her review of my handling of your request. As you will be aware your complaint has been partially upheld in regard to requests 2 and 3 and I have now re-considered these requests in light of the findings of the internal review.

In request 2, you refer to the prosecution of Ali Dizaei and ask for information explaining '*why you are at this stage allowing a similar situation to go on in relation to the following people's complaints as well as others*'. You provide 13 names.

Request 3 is as follows: '*What information does the IPCC hold that reconcile with the statements from the CPS, the IPCC, the police and the trial judge in the Commander Ali Dizaei case that police officers are not above the law, criminal and bullies in uniform should be confronted and prosecuted, given the continual refusal of the police and the IPCC to investigate the corruption of various persons that you have been made very familiar with over a number of years?*'

In relation to both requests, I told you that the IPCC does not hold any information which could reasonably be interpreted as confirming that it has allowed corrupt officers to avoid justice or refused to investigate alleged corruption. I explained that it is a matter of subjective opinion as to whether or not any of the information you are requesting actually exists and for this reason no relevant information can be identified from the description given.

In accordance with the review letter I have considered whether, in relation to the list of 13 names contained in your e-mail, the IPCC holds any information falling within the terms of request 2. I find that the IPCC does not hold any information in connection with these named individuals which could reasonably be interpreted as confirming that it has allowed corrupt officers to avoid justice or refused to investigate alleged corruption.

As regards request 3, I have noted the review finding that your request is not sufficiently clear and the contents of your e-mail of 27th August responding to the review letter.

Yours sincerely

Philip Johnston

Independent Police Complaints Commission