



Home Office

Shared Services  
Directorate  
2 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DF

020 7035 4848  
(switchboard)

[www.homeoffice.gov.uk](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk)

Mr Wayne Pearsall  
[request-156803-  
bf30284f@whatdotheyknow.com](#)

1 May 2013

Dear Mr Pearsall

**Freedom of Information request (our reference 27166)**

Thank you for your email of 9 April 2013 in which you requested details about the roles currently held by Andrew Pestell and Jim Williamson. Your request has been handled as a request for information under our Freedom of Information Act 2000.

We neither confirm nor deny whether we hold the information requested by virtue of section 40(5) (personal information). This section of the Act absolves us from the requirement to say whether or not we hold information, where to do so would contravene any of the data protection principles.

We are responding in this way because to confirm or deny whether or not we hold the information you request would in effect provide information about the employment status of named individuals (i.e. whether they are still employed by the Home Office). This is in our view personal information as defined in the Data Protection Act 1998.

This response should not be taken as conclusive evidence that the information you have requested is or is not held by the Home Office.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to the address below, quoting reference 27116. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

Information Access Team  
Home Office  
Ground Floor, Seacole Building  
2 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DF

e-mail: [FOIRequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:FOIRequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request will be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you remain dissatisfied after this internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

I now write in response to your second query about why the redactions took place on the document located at this link:

<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/18496/response/64975/attach/4/BRP%20PO%20Accom%20consultation%20report.pdf>

Your enquiry asked “*other than the names of the people I really cannot see why the redactions took place... surely the public interest test far outweighs other factors?*”.

Your enquiry in to this matter is not classed as a request for information under the Act as it is not asking for specifically held information and has therefore been dealt as a general enquiry.

I draw your attention to the covering letter that accompanied this document located at the following link:

<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/18496/response/64975/attach/3/FOI%20Request%2012874%20JEB.pdf>

This covering letter explains the exemptions engaged and the required public interest test arguments in detail (for those exemptions that require a public interest test) and should provide you with sufficient information as to why the exemptions are engaged and the information was redacted.

Yours sincerely

M Riddle  
Information Access Team

Switchboard 020 7035 4848

E-mail [info.access@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:info.access@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)

## **Annex**

### **Freedom of Information request from Mr Wayne Pearsall (reference 27116)**

#### **Information requested**

What role do Andrew Pestell and Jim Williamson currently hold within UKBA? / or rather at the home office.

By the way, in relation to:

<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/18496/response/64975/attach/4/BRP%20PO%20Accom%20consultation%20report.pdf>

I bet that Mr Andrew Pestell has a lot of explaining to do for approving the use of this document with such shoddy redaction work...

But other than the names of the people I really cannot see why the redactions took place... surely the public interest test far outweighs other factors???

**Date**

1/5/2013