



Thames Valley Police
Chief Constable John Campbell QPM

Headquarters
Oxford Road
Kidlington
Oxfordshire
OX5 2NX

S Rhosier

Telephone: 101

Email: publicaccess@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk

Our ref: HQ/PA/002450/21
Your ref:

1 July 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

I write in response to the above-referenced Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request submitted on 1 June 2021. Thames Valley Police has now considered this request, which for clarity, has been repeated below:

<u>Request</u>	<u>Response</u>
<p>With reference to: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/fox-hunting-video-police-charge-b1854331.html and the Kimblewick hunt captured on CCTV 12/12/20</p> <p>Specifically: 'Somerset Wildlife Crime said Dorset Police told members they would not press charges because the video did not show proof of "intent" to hunt the animal.'</p> <p>1. As the Kimblewick investigation also astoundingly resulted in a failure to prosecute, please provide all policy, training and instruction documentation referencing 'intent to hunt an animal' and how it can be demonstrated if video and witness evidence is 'insufficient'.</p> <p>2. Please also explain why decisions not to prosecute are delayed until the approach of the six-month time limit on summary offences as this is now a standard practice across all</p>	<p>1. No information held. Thames Valley Police holds no documentation that meets the given criteria of "referencing 'intent to hunt an animal' and how it can be demonstrated if video and witness evidence is 'insufficient'"</p> <p>2. No information held.</p>



Thames Valley Police
Chief Constable John Campbell QPM

forces, allowing no time for the reporters of crime to take action in response. This practice shows unprofessional conduct and a level of unacceptable bias that protects the hunt reported at the expense of the wildlife they kill.

3. On December 12 2020 there was an identical report of illegal hunting made to your force re the Kimblewick. The excellently-high quality CCTV footage, some with sound, was deemed 'insufficient evidence' after that force interviewed the huntsman involved, as he successfully claimed that he had no intention to hunt a wild animal that day despite being captured on video actively encouraging hounds to a successful kill.

4. The inference is that something as subjective as 'intent' is decided by police without reference to the actual reporters of such crimes and in a way which clearly benefits the hunts reported for breaches of the Hunting Act, which is the least-enforced legislation on the statute book.

It thus appears there is a national agreement across all police forces to avoid prosecution costs by this questionable method of excluding inarguable evidence on the word of hunts who will naturally use any means of avoiding justice. This is unacceptable to any reasonable member of the public and calls the policing of hunts into disrepute.

3. & 4. There is no request for information in these sections.

It should be stated for clarity that the case quoted was referred by Thames Valley Police to the Crown Prosecution Service who took the decision not to proceed with the case.

Complaint Rights

If you are dissatisfied with the handling procedures or the decision made by Thames Valley Police, you can lodge a complaint with the force to have the decision reviewed within two months of the date of this response. Complaints should be made in writing to the FOI inbox; publicaccess@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk.

If, after lodging a complaint with Thames Valley Police, you are still unhappy with the outcome, you may make application to the Information Commissioner at the Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.



Thames Valley Police
Chief Constable John Campbell QPM

If you require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours sincerely

Darren Humphries
Public Access
Joint Information Management Unit