



Home Office

Performance Assurance and
Governance Directorate
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

020 7035 4848
(switchboard)

www.gov.uk

Becca Martin
request-354759-cde54f18@whatdotheyknow.com

7 November 2017

Dear Ms Martin

Freedom of Information request (our ref. 40890): Further Response

Information within scope of your request has been located. Our earlier response informed you that there were 12 visits within scope of your request. Now that the files have been located we have established that two of the visits did not take place. Of the 10 visits that did take place we have been able to locate 7 files.

We are currently unable to locate the remaining files as this time period is in the process of being archived and the files are in transition. We will continue to search for these files and can provide the information once they have been located.

I attach copies of the premises Search Record for those 7 visits. As mentioned in our revised response of 3 August the information that populates the forms is personal and operational, and therefore most of it has been redacted under the exemptions at section 40 and 31. Section 40 is an absolute exemption applied to withhold personal information.

Explanations for the public interest test applicable to section 31(1)(b) and (e) have been provided in our previous responses. In summary; there is a public interest in the disclosure of this information to the extent that it would allow the public to assess whether the Home Office is adequately carrying out its functions in regard to the apprehension and prosecution of immigration offenders.

However, there is clearly a strong public interest in doing everything we can to apprehend and prosecute offenders. Disclosing the requested information would not be in the public interest as it could compromise any subsequent action to be taken by the Home Office and could alert others to the intended course of action the Home Office plans to take against them. It would also reveal patterns of enforcement action which could allow offenders to change behaviours to avoid detection.

We maintain that the public interest favours withholding the times of visits and the details of the premises visited.

Additionally as advised previously in both the internal review and the revised response section 31(3) applies to question 3 of your request. To confirm or deny whether any

intelligence was held on individuals would be prejudicial to the Home Office and all other law enforcement agencies ability to prevent and detect crime.

I would like to offer my sincere apologies for the time taken to deal with your response.

Yours sincerely

J Millar
Information Rights Team