

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 27 August 2013

Public Authority: Prestatyn Town Council
Address: 7 Ffordd Llys Nant
Prestatyn
LL19 9LR

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant requested minutes and reports considered at meetings of Prestatyn Town Council ('the Council') for a particular period of time. The Council initially refused the request under section 21 of the FOIA and also asked the complainant if she wished to refine her request. At the time of internal review, the Council stated it was relying on sections 12, 14 and 39 of the FOIA. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation, the Council withdrew reliance on sections 12, 14 and 39 and stated it was relying on sections 21 for some information and section 1(3)(a) and (b) for other information. The Council reviewed its stance again during the Commissioner's investigation and confirmed its final position was that it did not hold some of the requested information, and it considered other information exempt under sections 21, 22, 40, 41, 42 and 43 of the FOIA.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that the Council does not hold some of the information requested, sections 21 and 40(2) apply to some of the requested information, and the exemptions at sections 22, 41, 42 and 43 are not engaged.
3. The Commissioner requires the public authority to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation.
 - Disclose document 3 – report on Prestatyn Artwork, subject to any names and/or contact details which the Council considers exempt under section 40(2). If the Council withholds any third party personal information from the document, it will need to issue a fresh response explaining the basis on which the names and/or contact details have been withheld.

- Disclose document 5 – Report on Council Charging Policy in full.
4. The public authority must take these steps within 35 calendar days of the date of this decision notice. Failure to comply may result in the Commissioner making written certification of this fact to the High Court pursuant to section 54 of the Act and may be dealt with as a contempt of court.

Request and response

5. On 20 January 2012, the complainant submitted a request via the whatdotheyknow.com website and requested information in the following terms:

“Under the Freedom of Information Act Please could I request a .pdf copy/s of the short hand notes and/or any documentation produced to include reports by either or Prestatyn Town Clerk and or chairs and or vice-chairs and or those involved in any official capacity reporting to Prestatyn and Meliden Town Council as part of the official Part One and Part Two of all and any Prestatyn and Meliden Town Council for the periods of 20th April 2011 to 18th January 2012 inclusive of those dates.”

6. The complainant initially contacted the Commissioner on 6 August 2012 stating that she had not received a response.

7. Following correspondence from the Commissioner, the Council responded on 2 October 2012 and stated that:

“1) Part One public documents, reports and minutes are available from Prestatyn Town Library. They may also be viewed at Town Council offices although restrictions may apply due to limited space and access. Part 2 documents are classified as confidential although context of item and any Council resolution will be recorded in minutes. Any documents collected at end of meeting are classified as confidential waste and sent for disposal.

2) The Freedom of Information Act Sections 21(1) is considered relevant to this request as documents are readily available by alternative means.

3) You may wish to refine your request identifying a particular subject matter or date of meeting to enable further consideration”.

8. On 8 October 2012 the complainant requested an internal review of the Council’s handling of the request. She also raised concerns about the

Council's records management policy in respect of the destruction of documentation relating to Council meetings.

9. The Council responded on 31 October 2012 asking the complainant to clarify whether she was making a new request about the Council's records management or an internal review of the original request of 20 January 2012. She confirmed on 31 October 2012 that she was requesting an internal review of the Council's handling of the request of 20 January 2012, and its response of 2 October 2012.
10. The Council provided the outcome of its internal review on 5 November 2012, and stated that:

"It is noted that Council responded on 2nd October 2012 and provided information and guidance. In particular it was noted that a suggestion was made to consider refining your request to subject matter, date or specific meeting to enable further consideration. It is not clear from later communications from yourself if such clarification has been provided.

We also notice that this is one of a number of requests from yourself, [other named individuals] and as such FOI Section 14 Vexatious/Repeated Requests, Section 39 Aggregated and Section 12 Costs were also established as factors in this matter".

Scope of the case

11. The complainant contacted the Commissioner 9 February 2013 to complain about the way her request for information had been handled. She specifically asked the Commissioner to consider the Council's reference to sections 14 and 12 of the FOIA. She also asked the Commissioner to consider the Council's records management practices which she believed had been implemented to circumvent the destruction of information pertaining to complaints made to the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales.
12. The Commissioner advised the complainant that his remit was to consider whether a public authority has complied with the provisions of the FOIA to a request. He confirmed that the FOIA did not place any requirements on a public authority in terms of the timescales for retaining information. This is a decision that the public authority itself needed to make based on its own business requirements and any other statutory requirements it has to comply with. The Commissioner confirmed that he would be unable to investigate any concerns about the Council's records management policies relating to the Council's policy to destroy short hand/personal notes following the approval of formal minutes of meetings.

13. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation he initially asked the Council for further representations in relation to its application of sections 21, 12, 14 and 39 of the FOIA, as stated in its internal review response. The Council responded stating that:

"The Council do not wish to continue their reliance on sections 12, 14 and 39 of the FOIA. However, the Council will seek to rely on sections 1(3)(a) and (b), 19 and 21".

14. The Council stated that "the request appears to fall into four distinct categories of information:-

- 1) Request for copies of Part 1 minutes and reports;
- 2) Request for copies of Part 2 ("confidential") minutes and reports;
- 3) Request for handwritten notes taken during meetings and;
- 4) Request for background papers to the reports".

15. The Council confirmed it was relying on section 21 in relation to category 1 information. In relation to category 2 information, the Council stated that it was relying on section 1(3) of the FOIA. The Council also confirmed that it did not hold any handwritten notes relevant to the request as they were destroyed once the formal minutes of a meeting were been approved. The Council also stated that background papers to Council reports were "required to be available for public inspection by virtue of the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act and are, therefore, exempt under the provisions of Section 21(2)(b)".

16. Following further enquiries the Commissioner made about the Council's handling of the request, it confirmed that, at the time of the request (20 January 2012), it did hold handwritten notes of its meeting on 14 December 2011 as the formal minutes of this meeting were not approved until the next Council meeting on 8 February 2012. However, the Council stated that, as it was unaware of the complainant's request of 20 January 2012 until after the Commissioner's initial involvement in this case (his letter of 26 September 2012 about the lack of response), the handwritten notes were destroyed in line with Council policies once the minutes of the meeting had been approved on 8 February 2012.

17. The Council also provided further explanations about its handling of the request, and in particular the part of the request relating to reports considered at closed session meetings of the Council. The Council initially relied on section 1(3) of the FOIA in relation to this information. However, during the Commissioner's investigation, the Council confirmed that it had located the information in question, but considered it exempt under sections 22, 40, 41, 42 and 43 of the FOIA.

18. In light of the responses the Commissioner has received from the Council to his detailed enquiries about this complaint, he has found it difficult to assess the exact provisions of the FOIA that the Council has relied on in relation to this request. This is because the Council has reviewed its position on a number of occasions and its responses to his enquiries have been somewhat confusing. However, the Council's final position appears to the Commissioner to be as follows:

- 1) Handwritten notes of meetings – information not held as handwritten notes of meetings are destroyed once the formal minutes have been approved.
- 2) Minutes of Council meetings (both Part I (open) and Part II (closed meetings) – section 21 of FOIA applies as the information is reasonably accessible to the applicant by other means.
- 3) Reports considered in Part I (open) meetings of the Council - section 21 of FOIA applies as the information is reasonably accessible to the applicant by other means.
- 4) Reports considered in Part II (closed) meetings of the Council – sections 22, 40, 41, 42 and 43 of the FOIA apply.

19. In view of the above, the scope of the Commissioner's investigation is to establish what information the Council holds relevant to the request and whether any information held should be disclosed or whether the Council was correct to withhold the information by virtue of the exemptions claimed.

Reasons for decision

Section 1 –General right of access

20. Section 1 of the FOIA provides that any person making a request for information to a public authority is entitled (a) to be informed in writing by the public authority whether it holds information of the description specified in the request and (b) if that is the case to have that information communicated to him.

21. As part of the request for information, the complainant asked for the short hand notes in relation to meetings held between 20 April 2011 and 18 January 2012. The Council's initial position was that it did not hold any handwritten notes of meetings as its policy was to destroy handwritten notes once the formal minutes of a meeting are approved.

22. The Commissioner asked the Council to confirm whether, at the time of the request (20 January 2012) there were any "outstanding" formal minutes awaiting approval by Council, and thus the handwritten notes would still be available. The Council confirmed that a meeting had taken place on 14 December 2011 and the minutes of this meeting were not "confirmed" by resolution until the next meeting of the Council took place on 8 February 2012. As such, the Council acknowledged that the handwritten notes of the meeting on 14 December 2011 would have been held at the time of the request.
23. However, the Council advised the Commissioner that it had experienced a problem with the receipt of the request of 20 January 2012, which was submitted via the whatdotheyknow.com website. As a result, the Council was unaware of the request until the Commissioner's involvement on 26 September 2012. In view of the problems with receipt of the request, the Council stated that the handwritten notes of the meeting on 14 December 2011 had been destroyed in line with its policies and procedures on or around 8 February 2012 (following formal approval of the formal minutes of the meeting). The Council also contends that any handwritten notes held at the time of the request would have been exempt under section 22 – information intended for future publication.
24. Section 1(4) provides that the information to which the duties apply under the FOIA is that which is "held at the time when the request is received, except that account may be taken of any amendment or deletion made between that time and the time when the information is to be communicated [...], being an amendment or deletion that would have been made regardless of the receipt of the request."
25. This means that a public authority does not have to release information under FOIA if it is scheduled to be destroyed under its usual disposal schedule before the time for compliance with the request expires. This cannot apply to situations where the decision to delete or destroy is prompted by the request, or if destruction is scheduled for a date later than the 20 working day deadline for responding. Where this is the case, a public authority must still consider the request in the usual way.
26. The Commissioner considers that the Council's explanation as to why the handwritten notes of the meeting on 14 December 2011 were destroyed is reasonable. He accepts that the information was scheduled for deletion at the time the request and has seen no evidence to suggest that, in this case, the Council decided to delete the handwritten notes of the meeting outside the ordinary course of business.
27. In this case the Commissioner has no documentary evidence to prove whether the Council did or did not receive the request of 20 January 2012 when it was submitted by the complainant. However, he notes that

following his initial involvement in this case on 25 September 2012, the Council provided a prompt response to the request on 2 October 2012. He also notes that the handwritten notes were destroyed on or around 8 February 2012 which is within the statutory time period for responding to the request, had the request been received at the time it was submitted.

28. Based on the explanations and representations provided by the Council the Commissioner accepts that the handwritten notes in question were scheduled to be destroyed under the Council's usual disposal schedule at the time of the request and before the time for compliance with the request expired. As such, even if the Council had received the request at the time it was submitted, it could have been lawfully able to state that the information was not held.

Section 21 – Information reasonably accessible by other means

29. Section 21(1) provides that information which is reasonably accessible to the applicant otherwise than under section 1 is exempt information.
30. The Commissioner accepts that information is reasonably accessible if the public authority:
 - Knows that the applicant has already found the information; or
 - Is able to precisely direct the applicant to the information. In this case the public authority has to be reasonably specific to ensure it is found without difficulty and not hidden within a mass of other information.
31. The Council has applied section 21 of the FOIA to the complainant's request for minutes of Council meetings – both part 1 (open) sessions and part 2 (closed) sessions, and to reports considered at part 1 (open) sessions of Council meetings.
32. In its initial response to the request dated 2 October 2012 the Council stated that:

“Part One public documents, reports and minutes are available from Prestatyn Town Library. They may also be viewed at Town Council offices although restrictions may apply due to limited space and access. Part 2 documents are classified as confidential although context of item and any Council resolution will be recorded in minutes”.
33. In correspondence with the Commissioner, the Council confirmed that the minutes of the closed session meetings are written in such a way as to record discussions and decisions reached without divulging “confidential” information discussed in closed sessions. The Council also

confirmed that all agendas and minutes (both open and closed session) and reports considered in open sessions of Council meetings were listed within its publication scheme prepared in accordance with section 19 of the FOIA.

34. The Commissioner's position is that the combined effect of section 21(2)(b) and section 21(3) is generally taken to be that information published in accordance with a public authority's publication scheme is to be taken to be reasonably accessible. In this case, therefore, the Commissioner considers that the information requested is reasonably accessible to the complainant and is therefore exempt under section 21(1) of the FOIA.

Reports considered in Part II (closed) meetings of the Council

35. As mentioned earlier in this notice, the Council initially relied on section 1(3) of the FOIA in relation to this information stating that.

"It is impracticable for the Council to comply with the request under category 2. In the absence of a considerably more focused request, no reasonable Council would be able to identify 'those items given protection by the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act, but exempt, or not exempt, under the FOIA. Furthermore, even if it were possible it would not be possible to apply the public interest test in the case of an exempt item, in absence of any 'clear, compelling and specific justification that, at least, equals the public interest in protecting the information'. Despite being invited to refine her request, in accordance with Section 1(3) (a) & (b) no response has been received".

36. During the Commissioner's investigation he pointed out to the Council that section 1(3) is intended for circumstances in which a public authority cannot easily identify the information which has been requested, and requires clarification from the applicant in order to correctly identify it. As the Council appeared to have identified what information had been requested –reports considered in closed session meetings of the Council, section 1(3) would not apply. The Commissioner advised the Council that if its position was that it would take a significant amount of time to locate the information requested, then section 12 may be applicable if the time taken to locate, retrieve and extract the information exceeded the appropriate limit. The Commissioner advised that if the appropriate limit was not considered applicable, the Council would need to confirm whether the information was held and either disclose it directly to the applicant or provide full details of any exemption(s) considered applicable, with full details of the Council's public interest test consideration if it was seeking to rely on any qualified exemptions.

37. The Council responded to the Commissioner confirming that it held reports considered in closed sessions of Council meetings during the period in question. It provided copies of the information in question to the Commissioner and confirmed that it was seeking to withhold the information under sections 22, 40, 41, 42 and 43. A table of the information withheld and the exemptions claimed is below:

Doc No	Document	Exemptions claimed
1	<i>Minute 42 – Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 29 June 2011</i> <i>Report on Staff Records</i>	Section 40
2	<i>Minute 44 - Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 29 June 2011</i> Report on Information requests/Public Accounts	Sections 40, 41 and 42
3	<i>Minutes 102 – Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 21 September 2011</i> Report on Prestatyn Artwork	Section 43
4	<i>Minute 103 – Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 21 September 2011</i> Report on Information requests/Public Accounts	Sections 40, 41 and 42
5	<i>Minute 104 – Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 21 September 2011</i> Report on Council Charging Policy	Section 22
6	<i>Minute 106 – Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 21 September 2011</i> Staff Secondment	Section 40
7	<i>Minute 164 – Meeting of Full Council on 14 December 2011</i> Report on Information requests/Public Accounts	Sections 40, 41 and 42
8	<i>Minute 185 – Meeting of Finance and Management Committee on 18 January 2012</i> Insurance Claim	Section 40

38. However, other than a list of the exemptions considered applicable to each withheld document, the Council did not provide the Commissioner with any detail as to how any of the exemptions were engaged. The only additional representations the Council provided to the Commissioner comprised:

- a “combined” public interest test in relation to three related documents (documents 2,4 and 7) withheld under sections 40, 41, and 42.
 - A public interest test in relation to document 3 which the Council withheld under section 43.
39. In the absence of any detailed representations to support the engagement of the exemptions claimed in relation to this set of withheld information, the Commissioner has been unable to conclude whether any of the exemptions cited are engaged. As he has been unable to determine whether the exemptions are engaged in the first instance, he has not considered the public interest test considerations in relation to the qualified exemptions claimed – that is, sections 22, 42 and 43.
40. However, in cases where personal data is involved the Commissioner considers he has duty to consider the rights of data subjects. These rights, set out in the Data Protection Act 1998 (‘the DPA’), are closely linked to article 8 of the Human Rights Act and the Commissioner would be in breach of his obligations under the Human Rights Act if he ordered disclosure of information without having considered these rights, even if the public authority has not provided detailed representations to support its position in relation to information withheld under section 40.
41. The Commissioner has therefore ordered disclosure of information which the Council has withheld under sections 22, 41, 42 and 43, unless the Council has also applied section 40 to the information in question. Based on this and the information outlined on the table provided at paragraph 37 of this notice, the information which the Council should disclose is detailed below:
- **Document 3 - Information on Prestatyn Artworks**
The Commissioner notes that this document contains personal data (names and email addresses of third parties). When disclosing this information, the Council should consider the third party personal data contained within it, having regard to his published guidance on the exemption for personal data¹. If the Council withholds any personal data from the email, it will need to issue a fresh response explaining the basis on which the information is exempt under section 40(2).

1

http://www.ico.org.uk/for_organisations/guidance_index/~/media/documents/library/Freedom_of_Information/Detailed_specialist_guides/personal-information-section-40-and-regulation-13-foia-and-eir-guidance.pdf

- **Document 5 - Report on Council charging policy.**

42. The Commissioner has gone on to consider the Council's application of section 40 to certain documents.

Section 40 – the exemption for personal data

43. Section 40(2) of the FOIA provides an exemption for information that is the personal data of an individual other than the requester and where the disclosure of that personal data would be in breach of any of the data protection principles. Consideration of this exemption is a two-stage process; first, the information must constitute the personal data of a third party. Secondly, disclosure of this personal data must be in breach of at least one of the data protection principles.

44. The withheld information can be split into three categories – information about Council staff, information about a particular individual and his dealings with the Council, and other third party information. The Commissioner has considered the application of section 40 in relation to these three classes of information.

45. In order to establish whether this exemption has been correctly applied the Commissioner must first consider whether the withheld information is the personal data of third parties, other than the requestor. Personal data is defined in section 1 of the DPA as data which relates to a living individual who can be identified:

- from that data,
- or from that data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller.

Documents 1 and 6 - Information about Council staff

46. This information comprises a summary of Council personnel records in relation to the number of days each member of staff has taken as annual leave, sickness and training (document 1) and details of one member of staff's secondment to a County Council (document 6).

47. The withheld information includes the names of the relevant Council officers. The Commissioner accepts that a living individual can be identified from their name and is satisfied the information constitutes the personal data of the Council employees referred to.

Documents 2, 4 and 7 - Information about one particular individual

48. This class of withheld information comprises three reports outlining a particular individual's dealings and interactions with the Council. The individual is referred to throughout the three reports either by name or by initials.
49. Information will relate to a person if it is about them, linked to them, has some biographical significance for them, is used to inform decisions affecting them, has them as its main focus or impacts on them in anyway. Based on the content of the three reports the Commissioner is satisfied that the information constitutes the personal data of the individual concerned as he/she is the focus of the withheld information and can clearly be identified from it.

Document 8 - Information about other third parties

50. This information comprises correspondence about a public liability claim against the Council following an accident in front of Council Offices.
51. The correspondence relating to the public liability claim comprises exchanges between the Council and an insurance company about the claim and includes the name of the claimant and the date of the accident. The Commissioner accepts that a living individual can be identified from their name and is satisfied that the information constitutes personal data as it relates to the individual involved in the accident in question.

Would disclosure breach one of the Data Protection principles?

52. Having accepted that all the information requested constitutes the personal data of a living individual other than the applicant, the Commissioner must next consider whether disclosure would breach one of the data protection principles. He considers the most relevant principle in this case is the first principle.

The first principle

53. In determining whether a disclosure is fair under the first principle of the DPA for the purposes of section 40 of the FOIA, the Commissioner considers it appropriate to balance the consequences of any disclosure and the reasonable expectations of the data subject with general principles of accountability and transparency, as well as any legitimate interests which arise in the specific circumstances of the case. The Commissioner will consider the release of the withheld information in the three separate classes of information referred to above.

Documents 1 and 6 - Information about Council staff

54. As mentioned earlier this class of withheld information comprises records of annual leave, sickness and training and secondment arrangements of one Council employee.
55. The Commissioner considers that employees of public authorities should be open to scrutiny and accountability and should expect to have some personal data about them released because their jobs are funded by the public purse. However, it is generally accepted that information of this type, usually considered human resources (HR) information, is always kept private and that colleagues and members of the public are not permitted access to it, regardless of the seniority of the individual concerned. In this case, therefore, the Commissioner accepts that the Council officers' expectations of privacy regarding their personal data are reasonable, well accepted norms and weigh significantly on this case.
56. In terms of the consequences of disclosure the Commissioner is mindful of the fact that it is not always possible to quantify or prove the impact that disclosure may have on the data subject(s). In this case however he considers that disclosure of the Council Officers' personal data is likely to cause unwarranted interference into the rights and freedoms of the individual.
57. Notwithstanding a data subject's reasonable expectations or any damage or distress caused to them by disclosure, it may still be fair to disclose the requested information if it can be argued that there is a more compelling public interest in disclosure.
58. There is always some legitimate public interest in the disclosure of any information held by public authorities. This helps to encourage the general aims of increasing transparency and accountability. However taking into account the nature of the withheld information and the expectations of the individuals concerned that the information would not be disclosed into the public domain, the Commissioner considers that disclosure would be unfair and therefore the Council correctly withheld this information under section 40(2).

Documents 2, 4 and 7 - Information about a particular individual

59. This class of withheld information comprises three reports outlining a particular individual's dealings and interactions with the Council.
60. Having viewed the withheld information, the Commissioner is satisfied that he/she would have had a reasonable expectation that their personal information would not be disclosed into the public domain. The report outlines details of the individual's correspondence exchanges with the

Council and incidents involving the individual and Council employees and Councillors.

61. In assessing the consequences of disclosure the Commissioner has considered what those consequences might be and has then looked at other related factors. Based on the withheld information, the Commissioner considers that any disclosure would cause unnecessary and unwarranted and unnecessary distress and interference into the rights and freedoms of the individual concerned.
62. Again, the Commissioner considers that there is always some legitimate public interest in the disclosure of any information held by public authorities. This helps to encourage the general aims of increasing transparency and accountability.
63. However taking into account the nature of the withheld information, the Commissioner does not consider there is a significant legitimate interest in disclosure of the information which is sufficient to override the reasonable expectations of the individual in question, and the likely damage or distress that disclosure would cause to the individual. The Commissioner considers that disclosure would be unfair and therefore upholds the Council's application of section 40(2) to the information.

Document 8 - Information about other third parties

64. This information comprises correspondence about a public liability claim in relation to an accident that took place in front of Council offices.
65. The Commissioner considers that the individual concerned would have a strong expectation that the information would not be disclosed into the public domain. The Commissioner also considers that disclosure has the potential to cause significant distress to the individual and he has been unable to identify any significant legitimate interest in disclosure which would outweigh the reasonable expectations of the individual and the potential consequences of disclosure. The Commissioner considers that disclosure would be unfair and therefore upholds the Council's application of section 40(2) to the information.

Other matters

66. Although they do not form part of this decision notice the Commissioner wishes to highlight the following matters of concern:
67. The Commissioner wishes to express his concerns about the general handling of this request by the Council. In its initial refusal notice, the Council referred only to section 21 of the FOIA and suggested the

complainant may wish to refine the request. In its internal review the Council referred to the complainant not having refined the request and stated that:

"FOI Section 14 Vexatious/Repeated Requests, Section 39 Aggregated and Section 12 Costs were also established as factors in this matter"

68. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation the Council withdrew reliance on sections 14, 12 and 39, introduced and subsequently withdrew reliance on section 1(3), and also introduced reliance on sections 22, 40, 41, 42 and 43 but provided no detail to explain how these exemptions were applicable.
69. The responses from the Council concerning this case and the fact that it has reviewed its position on a number of occasions during his investigation have significantly hampered the Commissioner's assessment of this case.
70. Furthermore, in correspondence with the Commissioner the Council asked him to:

"...bear in mind that Town Council does not employ large numbers of staff and all ongoing appeals.....are seriously disrupting Council business and other regulatory processes."

The Commissioner is fully aware of the burden that complying with requests for information under the FOIA places on public authorities, especially on smaller public authorities like the Council. However the FOIA allows any individual to submit a request to a public authority and if they are dissatisfied with the response received, they have the right of appeal to the Commissioner under section 50 of the FOIA. He expects every public authority to engage with him sufficiently to enable him to properly investigate each complaint.

Right of appeal

71. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0116 249 4253

Email: informationtribunal@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/information-rights/index.htm

72. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.
73. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Signed

Anne Jones
Assistant Commissioner
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF