

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 28 March 2022

Public Authority: Ministry of Defence
Address: Main Building
Whitehall
SW1A 2HB

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant submitted a request to the Ministry of Defence (MOD) seeking a copy of the service record of his late father. The MOD responded by explaining that it could not locate any such record. The complainant challenged this decision and the Commissioner issued a decision notice concluding that on the balance of probabilities no information was held. The complainant appealed that notice to the First-Tier Tribunal who concluded that the MOD had not conducted sufficient searches to locate the requested information and ordered the MOD to issue a fresh response to the request. The MOD did so, and after conducting extensive further searches, again concluded that it did not hold the requested information. The complainant has challenged this finding to the Commissioner. The Commissioner has again concluded that on the balance of probabilities the MOD does not hold any information falling within the scope of the request.
2. No steps are required.

Request and response

3. The complainant submitted an application to the Royal Navy Disclosures Cell (RNDC) of the MOD which was received on 3 September 2019. This application sought the Royal Navy Service records of the complainant's late father. In support of this application the complainant provided what he understood to be his late father's service number.
4. The RNDC responded on 25 September 2019 and explained that it had not been able to locate any service records for the complainant's late father.¹
5. The complainant contacted the RNDC on the same day to express his disappointment in this response. The RNDC replied on 30 September 2019 and confirmed that they could not find any service records relating to his late father. It also explained that the service number that he had provided was not a Royal Navy service number.
6. The MOD subsequently conducted an internal review into its handling of the request. The MOD set out the findings of this review in a letter dated 21 November 2019. It explained that it had conducted a number of searches for the service record but could not locate any relevant information. In line with its duty at section 16 of FOIA to advise and assist requesters the MOD suggested to the complainant that it may be the case that the complainant's father had worked alongside British armed forces whilst serving in the armed forces of another nation.
7. The complainant subsequently complained to the Commissioner about the MOD's handling of his request and its failure to provide him with a copy of his father's service record. The Commissioner issued a decision notice on 4 March 2020 which found that on the balance of probabilities the MOD did not hold the requested information.² As a result the decision notice did not require the MOD to take any further action or steps in relation to the request.

¹ The MOD processed the request under the provisions it had in place in its publication scheme for accessing records of deceased service personnel
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/request-records-of-deceased-service-personnel>

² FS50895606 <https://ico.org.uk/media/action-weve-taken/decision-notice/2020/2617420/fs50895606.pdf>

8. The complainant appealed the decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (the Tribunal). He argued that the MOD would be likely to hold the information he had requested.

9. The Tribunal promulgated its decision on 29 September 2021.³ The Tribunal was not satisfied that the MOD had:

- (a) conducted sufficiently detailed searches in order to locate the service records of the complainant's late father;
- (b) provided advice and assistance to the complainant in accordance with the duty under section 16 of FOIA to provide such assistance that is reasonable in the circumstances.

10. The Tribunal required the MOD to take the following steps to ensure compliance with FOIA:

'The Ministry of Defence shall make a fresh response to the Appellant's request for information which will be subject to the rights given under s50 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to make a new complaint to the Information Commissioner.'

11. The MOD issued the complainant with a further response to his request on 22 November 2021. The MOD explained that using the information he had provided to the Tribunal, much of which had not been available to the MOD when it first processed the request, it had conducted further extensive searches to locate information falling within the scope of the request. However, it explained that despite these searches it could find no record of the complainant's father having served in any branch of the British armed forces. The MOD also explained although it could not provide the complainant with any specific advice and assistance which would assist him in locating his late father's records, it did provide him with some general advice regarding records relating to the period during which the complainant understood his father to have served with British armed forces.

Scope of the case

12. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 23 November 2021. He explained that despite the MOD's further searches for information relevant to his request, he continued to dispute the MOD's position that no information was held. Rather, the complainant's position was that his

³ Tribunal reference EA/2020/0105. The Tribunal's decision is not available online.

father had served with British armed forces and therefore the MOD would hold his service record.

Reasons for decision

Section 1 – Right of access to information

13. In cases such as this where there is some dispute as to whether information falling within the scope of the request is held, the Commissioner, following the lead of a number of Information Tribunal decisions, applies the civil standard of the balance of probabilities.
14. In other words, in order to determine such complaints the Commissioner must decide whether on the balance of probabilities a public authority holds any information which falls within the scope of the request.
15. In applying this test the Commissioner will consider the scope, quality, thoroughness and results of the searches, or other explanations offered as to why the information is not held.

The complainant's position

16. In his first decision regarding this complaint, the Commissioner summarised the complainant's position as follows:

'The complainant explained to the Commissioner that his father was born in Berbera in 1933 which is now in modern day Somalia, but in 1933 was in British Somaliland. The complainant explained that as a result his father was British and did not hold any other nationality. The complainant also explained that his father was a member of the British armed forces and that he had fought in the Korean War and also served in Suez canal Crisis and in Aden. The complainant explained that his father was injured as part of his service. In light of this the complainant was of the view that the MOD should have a service record for his father.'⁴
17. The Tribunal's decision also includes useful background to the complainant's current complaint. It states that:

'6. Before he died the Appellant's father, Mr Mohamood Abdullah Hasan told his son that he served the British Crown in the conflicts in Korea, Suez and Aden where he was wounded in the neck and hand in the war

⁴ Decision notice FS50895606, paragraph 11.

at Little Aden in three days of fighting. The Appellant believed his father to be a "Royal Navy Soldier".

7. The Appellant believes that his father began his military career at a young age before becoming a fully-fledged soldier as he reached his majority. He had told his son that as part of his service he had been sent to London to study the law of the Navy and fighting. His father said he was working in the Navy store alongside his studying and that after he passed the exam he was sent to Aden [45]. He had worked at the Aden headquarters.

8. Mr Hasan was still serving in Aden when, in 1966, he travelled to Somalia to visit his ailing father, this Appellant's grandfather. In Somalia he was arrested and put in jail where he was kept until 1991 by which time he was in poor health due to the conditions of his imprisonment. This Appellant believes that he was imprisoned because he was a serving member of the British forces and that his father had never resigned from his service. On his release he was unable to contact any authorities in Aden due to the change in government but during an interview with the British Embassy, once his documents had been examined, questions had been asked about why he ran away from the army.'

18. In support of his further complaint to the Commissioner, the complainant provided detailed submissions which emphasised and elaborated on the previous biographical details summarised by the Tribunal at paragraphs 6 to 8 of its decision. The Commissioner has not included all of these submissions in this decision notice, but considers it useful to include some extracts of the complainant's submissions. In relation to his father's early military career the complainant stated that:

'My Father Was Born In Berbera (Former British Colony) In 1933.

He Traveled HM Navay Ship From Berbera Port To The London City In UK.

This Royal Naval Ship for The First Battalion Own Queen Camero Highlanders Who Took My Father To London In 1944.

He Began His Military Career In A Younge Age In London.

He Studied Law Of The Navy And Fighting In London.

Alongside In His Study He Was Working Navy Store For HM and He Became The Officer Of The Office. As My Told Me.

This Navy store for HM was administering The Uniform Of the Royal Navy.

My Father Became A Fully-fledged Soldier In 1951 when he Passed The Exam In Military Seaman Rank, And He Served The British Crown In The Conflicts In Korea , Suez And In Aden When He Wounded In The Neck And Hand In Three Days of War At Little Aden.

My Father Held His Petty Rank after The Korean and Suez war After The Secretary Of Defence Sent My Father Letter And Key To Back London For Next Course To Promote A Petty Officer Rank.

As My Father Told Me He Risen His Hand To Ask Question For The UK Secretary Of Defence Who Visited The Royal Navy Near Hong Kong After Korean War. But The Commander Of the Navy Told My father To Put Down His Hand.

The Secretary Of Defence Allowed To Listen My Father's Question.

My Father Told The Secretary Of Defence That he Was Five Years In A War And He Did Not Hold Officer Rank.

The Secretary Of Defence Sent Letter and Key to the Headquarter to send My Father A new Course In London.

The Key Has Two Photos.

One side Of The Key Was The Secretary Of Defence's Small Photo And Wrote "Me".

The Other Side Of the Key Was My father's Small Photo And Wrote "My Friend"

My Father Back To London And He Studied This Course For Six Months. And He Got Petty Officer Rank.

When He Passed The Exam He Was Sent To Aden Colony And He Was Petty Officer Military Rank, And He Worked The Aden Headquarter.

There Was A Heavy War In Aden Colony And My Father Attended All Wars From 1959 To 1966. In He Was Petty Officer Rank.'

19. In relation to the complainant's understanding that his father was a 'Member In First Battalion Own Queens Cameron Highlanders' he noted that the 'The Ministry Of Defence Corrected My Father's History But This Means That my Father Was Member in The British Forces And He Blooded for The British Flag , not Somalia or any Other Country.'⁵

⁵ In its response to the complainant of 22 November 2021 the MOD noted that in his grounds of appeal to the Tribunal the complainant had explained that his father had told him

20. The complainant noted that 'The Queens Own Cameron Highlanders' did serve 'in the Korean Conflict Under UN (United Nation) And Suez And In Aden.' And that 'This History Is Similar of My Father's History That He Told Me So My Father's Word Is Right.'

21. In addition, as part of his submissions in respect of this current complaint, the complainant described his father's later life as follows:

'My Father Arrestes To Somalia after He Visited His Father's Sick And Due The Change of the system In Aden He Unable To Back to Aden, when He kept In The Somalian jail Intil 1991.

My Father told Me That The Reason Of The Jail Was For The Some Of Somali Trader Who Saw My Father In Aden Told The Somali Government That My Father Was high Rank Officer Of British Forces And He Part Of British Officer's Accused For Killing Thousands Of Yemeni In Aden Wars. But The somali Government Accused my Father For Spying For Uk. AS he Informed Me , and His Interview On 10 May 2012.

The Injury Of My Father's Neck Big And There Was Tube In My Father's Neck So My Father Did Not Get A Care In The Jail In This Poriod And He Became Poor Health, For This Effects My Father Passed Away In Addis Ababa On 09 January 2013.

My Father Told In His Interview That He did Not Resign From The British Royal Navy.'

22. The complainant urged the Commissioner to verify this information via his father's interview with the British High Commission in Nairobi which he stated took place on 10 May 2012.

23. In support of his position the complainant noted that the MOD had not been able to locate his father's service record using the number he had provided, but it was his understanding that more than one service number could have been issued to serving personnel.

24. The complainant acknowledged that the MOD had conducted further searches of its records using different spellings of his father's name (a

that he was a 'Member In The Royal Navy (First battalion On Queen Comoro Highland)'. The MOD's response advised the complainant that the Royal Navy is not divided into battalions, but this is a term used within the British Army. The MOD explained that it assumed that the name had been passed down orally and may have been transcribed incorrectly. After some consideration of possible variations of battalion names, the MOD explained that it considered that this was most likely a reference to 'The Queen's Own Cameron Highlanders'.

searching strategy that had been recommended by the Tribunal). However, the complainant explained that he was dissatisfied that the MOD had not used other ways to locate any information falling within the scope of the request. He therefore remained unsatisfied with the nature of the searches conducted by the MOD.

25. Finally, the complainant also argued that:

'The First Tier Tribunal Accepted all Documents of my father Including His Interview On 10 May 2021 and The Opon Bundle 1 to 264 pages, And the Documents that I sent to the Tribunal On 26 April 2021 And My Answering in The Hearing On 30 April 2021.

The Tribunal Accepted my father's these Words After Further Investigation That I Asked On May 2020 . So my father is Member in The first Battaion own queens Cameron Highlanders.'

The MOD's position

26. In its original internal review of this request the MOD explained that it had conducted searches of Royal Navy records for individuals with the name stated on the complainant's application, 'Mohamood Abdullah Hasan' but no records had been located. The MOD also explained that it had searched records of the Army and Royal Air Force (RAF) using the same name and again no records had been located. With regard to the service number provided by the complainant, the MOD explained that this was not a number issued by the Royal Navy and nor was it a number that had been used or issued to any member of the British armed forces.
27. In its response of 21 November 2021 following the Tribunal's decision, the MOD set out in detail the further steps it had taken to try and locate information falling within the scope of the complainant's request. These steps were as follows:

Searches by name – Royal Navy

28. The MOD noted that, as explained above, when this request was first processed searches were undertaken using the name stated by the complainant on his application form, ie 'Mohamood Abdullah Hasan'. The MOD explained that it had now conducted searches of Royal Navy records against the following name variations:
- Mohamood Abdullah Hassan
 - Mohamood Abdulla Hasan
 - Mohamood Abdallah Hasan
 - Mohamood Abdallah Hasan
 - Mohamood Abdallah Hassan

- Mohamood Abdullah
- Mohamed Mohamood

29. The MOD explained that searches were also conducted using 'Mohamed', 'Mohamad' and 'Mahmoed' as alternative spellings of the complainant's forename. No records were located. The MOD explained that a wider search, for any and all records relating to people who had served under the surname 'Hasan' or 'Abdullah' and their variations, was also conducted.⁶ Again, no records were found that matched the details provided by the complainant about his father (such as his date of birth, place of birth and dates of service).
30. The MOD noted that the complainant had described his father as a 'soldier' in the Royal Navy. The MOD explained that that the Royal Navy does not call its members 'soldiers'. However, the MOD considered whether this could have been a reference to the complainant's father having served as a member of the Royal Marines, the Navy's infantry land fighting element. The above searches were therefore extended to cover the records that the MOD holds for service in the Royal Marines and the Royal Navy Reserve. Again, no service records relating to the complainant's father had been located.

Searches by name – British Army

31. The MOD noted that in his submissions to the Tribunal, the complainant had stated that his father had told him that he was a 'Member In The Royal Navy (First battalion On Queen Comoro Highland)'.
32. As per footnote 5 above, the MOD advised the complainant that the Royal Navy is not divided into battalions, but this is a term used within the British Army. The MOD assumed that the battalion name was passed on to the complainant orally and may have been transcribed incorrectly. After some consideration of possible variations of battalion names, the MOD explained that it believed that this is most likely a reference to 'The Queens Own Cameron Highlanders'. The MOD explained that this regiment was part of the United Nations forces stationed in Korea after the Korean War and was deployed to Aden in 1956. The MOD explained that as the complainant's father advised him that he was also in these places at these times, the MOD asked for fresh searches of Army Personnel records to be conducted. The MOD explained that it had conducted searches using the same name combinations outlined above

⁶ Hasan, Hassan, Abdullah, Abdulla, Abdulah, Abdula, Abdallah, Abdalla, Abdualla.

for searches of the Army records. Again, no records were found under the complainant's father's name, or its variations.

Searches by name – RAF

33. The MOD noted that the complainant had not made any references to the RAF, or any of its divisions, in his submissions to either the MOD or the Tribunal. However, it was aware that there were RAF units in Aden at the time the complainant's said his father lived there. Therefore, to be thorough, the MOD conducted searches of RAF records using the same name combinations set out above. Again, as with the other two Services, no trace of any records relating to the complainant's late father were found.

Searches by name - Defence Business Services (DBS)

34. The MOD noted that the information the complainant had provided to the Tribunal included a document that appeared to be a membership card for a trade union. The MOD explained that members of the British armed forces were not allowed to be members of trade unions. However, it noted that the card relates to 'The Forces & Associated Organisations Local Employees Union'. The MOD suggested that if the complainant's father was a member of this union, he would have been engaged as a 'Locally Employed Civilian'.
35. The MOD explained that the Royal Navy dockyards in Aden engaged 'local employees'. It therefore considered the possibility that the complainant's father served 'with' the Royal Navy as a civilian dockyard worker, rather than serving 'in' the Royal Navy. As DBS manage the MOD civilian records, the MOD asked it to search their records. The MOD explained that while records for persons with names similar to the complainant's father were found, these did not match the other details he had provided (date of birth and date of service).

Searches by Service Number

36. The MOD explained that the application form which the complainant had submitted to the Royal Navy Disclosures Branch stated that his father's 'Official Service Number' was 'ARP.008809'. However, the MOD explained that there is no record of any service number being issued to any member of the British armed forces that started with the letters 'ARP'. The MOD explained that the document the complainant had provided to the Tribunal on which this number is written was issued by the Immigration Office in Aden in 1958. The MOD explained that there is no evidence in the documents provided by the complainant, or from information it had examined as part of its review of the case following the Tribunal decision, that confirms that this number was related to any military service.

Outcome of Personnel Service Records Searches

37. The MOD argued that all reasonable searches of the relevant areas of the organisation have been completed and there is no record of the complainant's late father having served in any branch of the British armed forces.
38. Therefore the MOD found that on the balance of probabilities, it is likely that the complainant's father was a 'locally employed' person who was engaged by, but not a member of, the Royal Navy or any other Service. The MOD explained that to try and determine what kind of work he may have undertaken it had asked for further historical research to be undertaken on his behalf.

Historical Research

39. The MOD explained that The Navy Historical Branch (NHB) advised that individuals from the British Protectorate of Somaliland (now Somalia) were able to serve with the Royal Navy as 'Locally Entered Personnel' (LEP). The Somali ratings were normally engaged for periods of 2½ years' service, either on shore (for example in dockyards) or on ships, up to the age of 50.
40. The MOD explained that the Somali ratings were administered by the Resident Naval Officer (RNO), Aden. The Standing Orders for the Arabian Seas and Persian Gulf Station for 1958, which is the year the immigration document provided by the complainant was issued, stated that:

'The Resident Naval Officer, Aden, maintains two entry rosters: -
(a) A roster of all Somali ratings who have previously served in the Royal Navy and are still eligible for re-engagement, arranged in order of discharge from last ship.
(b) A new-entry roster of Somalis who have applied and are eligible for engagement arranged in order of date of application

The combined roster is to be maintained at a strength of between 280 and 320 names in the approximate proportion of 60% Seamen, 25% Stokers and 15% Sweepers. Ratings on the roster must report to the Resident Naval Officer, Aden, annually, otherwise their names will be removed from the roster.'

41. The MOD explained that it was clear from the Standing Station Orders that the Resident Naval Officer kept the roster for LEPS, along with comments on the suitability and service of Somali sailors, in Aden. However, it explained that despite extensive searches conducted in all relevant archives within the MOD, it had not been able to locate any information that confirms what happened to these rosters once the

withdrawal from Aden took place. However, they are not held with the Royal Navy Rating service records at the archive at Swadlincote.

Miscellaneous

42. The MOD emphasised to the Commissioner that the information the complainant had provided to the Tribunal contained detail that was not available to the MOD during the original processing of the request. The MOD explained that this had opened up further areas for research and it estimated that staff have spent more than 50 hours conducting searches within various holdings across the department. The MOD explained that despite this effort, which is more than double the appropriate limit set under section 12 of FOIA, no information that confirms that the complainant's father served in the Royal Navy has been located.⁷

The Commissioner's position

43. The Commissioner appreciates that the complainant's position that the MOD will hold service records for his father is based on both an oral history provided to him by his father as well as a number of records concerning his father's life (eg the document which the complainant understands to contain a service record and the photograph referred to in the complainant's submissions at paragraph 18 above). Furthermore, the Commissioner acknowledges the importance of this matter to the complainant; he has explained that he needs his father's service records in order to apply for a British passport. The Commissioner is also conscious of the Tribunal's findings that he erred in finding that the MOD had conducted sufficient searches for information in the first decision notice in relation to this request.
44. However, having taken into account both the complainant's submissions and those of the MOD following the Tribunal decision, the Commissioner remains of the view that on the balance of probabilities the MOD does not hold the requested information, ie the service records of the complainant's late father. The Commissioner has reached this conclusion for the following reasons:
45. Firstly, as detailed in the first decision notice, the MOD initially only conducted searches using the spelling of the complainant's father as detailed on his application form, ie 'Mohamood Abdullah Hasan'. However, the MOD has now conducted searches of Royal Navy service

⁷ Section 12 of FOIA allows a public authority to refuse to comply with a request if the estimated cost of doing so exceeds the appropriate limit. The limit for the MOD is the equivalent of 24 hours' work.

records using a number of different potential spellings and variations on this name but no records have been located.

46. Secondly, the Commissioner notes that despite the complainant's position that his father served in the Royal Navy, these broader searches have also been conducted for both Army and RAF records; and again, no relevant service records have been located.
47. Thirdly, the complainant provided what appears to have been his father's membership card for a trade union. However, as noted above, members of the British armed forces are not allowed to be member of a union. Therefore, in the Commissioner's view the existence of this card casts doubt on the complainant's position that his father was in the British armed forces, as opposed to, as suggested by the MOD, working alongside the Royal Navy as a locally employed person. On this point, the Commissioner notes that the MOD's searches of DBS records have also not been able to locate any employment records which could, with any certainty, be determined to be the complainant's father's. However, in the Commissioner's view the absence of such records does not support the complainant's position that MOD would hold the requested service records. That is to say, the fact that no employment records could be located does not automatically mean that the complainant's father must, by default, have been a serving member of the British Armed forces.
48. Fourthly, the Commissioner appreciates that the complainant has identified what he considers to be his father's service number. However, the MOD has explained that no part of the British armed forces issued service numbers beginning with the letters 'ARP'. Moreover, the Commissioner notes that this number was written on a document issued by the Immigration Office in Aden in 1958. Therefore, the Commissioner does not consider that such a number provides any evidence of the complainant's father being in the British armed forces, and thus does not support the complainant's position that the MOD would hold a service record for the complainant's father. The Commissioner notes that the complainant has suggested that this number could be just one of a number of service numbers provided to his father. However, in the absence of any of these further possible numbers the Commissioner does not see how the MOD could conduct any additional searches by service number for the requested information.
49. Fifthly, taking into account the further research undertaken by the MOD and the biographical details provided by the complainant, the Commissioner considers it to be a plausible suggestion that the complainant's father was a 'locally employed' person who was engaged by, but not a member of, the Royal Navy or any other branch of the armed services. If this were the case, in the Commissioner's view this

would provide some further rationale as to why the MOD could not locate a service record.

50. In reaching this conclusion the Commissioner notes that the complainant stated that the Tribunal had 'accepted his Father's words' and that it was clear (in his view) that the Tribunal had concluded that the MOD held his father's service record.

51. However, the Tribunal did not in fact conclude that the MOD held his father's service record. Rather the Tribunal's findings at paragraph 53 were:

'We make it clear that we are not deciding that the MOD does hold the information requested but that in this case there was insufficient evidence to support the conclusion that it was more likely than not that the MOD did not hold the information requested.'

Section 16 – advice and assistance

52. Section 16(1) of FOIA states that:

'It shall be the duty of a public authority to provide advice and assistance, so far as it would be reasonable to expect the authority to do so, to persons who propose to make, or have made, requests for information to it.'

53. As noted above, the Tribunal concluded that when it initially processed this request the MOD did not provide the complainant with adequate advice and assistance. In its response of 21 November 2021, in addressing this finding the MOD explained to the complainant that it was unable to provide him with specific advice and assistance that would assist him in locating his father's service record. However, it did provide him with the following general advice:

'While it is not a requirement under the Act to conduct any searches outside of the MOD, we have interrogated the online catalogue of The National Archives to confirm if any relevant records had been released by MOD under the Public Records Act.

I can advise that some information relating to the British Colony of Aden is held at The National Archives, the Imperial War Museum, and the British Library. It is possible that the rosters maintained by the RNO Aden may have been transferred to one of these repositories if they were not destroyed following withdrawal'

54. The MOD provided the complainant with the contact details for these organisations so that he could continue his research. The MOD also

noted that the some information on the Queen's Own Cameron Highlanders can be found online.⁸

55. Furthermore, the MOD explained that:

'In accordance with the FtT instruction to provide you with information on "the foreign forces who served with the British Military in Korea, Suez and Aden"; in Korea, the British Commonwealth Forces Korea (BCFK) was the formal name of the British Commonwealth army, naval and air units serving with the United Nations (UN) in the Korean War. BCFK included Australian, British, Canadian, Indian, and New Zealand units.

In respect of Suez and Aden, the other foreign force who served alongside the British Armed Forces were the French during the Suez crisis in 1956. Further details can be found here:

[https://www.nam.ac.uk/explore/suez-crisis.](https://www.nam.ac.uk/explore/suez-crisis)'

56. Following the provision of this information to the complainant the Commissioner is satisfied that the MOD has provided all advice and assistance to the complainant that it could be reasonably expected to do in the circumstances of this request. In particular, in reaching this finding the Commissioner is conscious that the complainant's aim is to locate the service record of his father, but for the reasons set out above the MOD's position (which the Commissioner accepts) is that no such record is held. In light of this it is very difficult to envisage what further advice and assistance could be provided to the complainant.

⁸ <https://www.thehighlandersmuseum.com/>

Right of appeal

57. 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: 020 3936 8963

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: grc@justice.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

58. 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.

59. 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

Jonathan Slee
Senior Case Officer
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF