

## **Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)**

### **Decision notice**

**Date:** 25 April 2024

**Public Authority:** Bolton NHS Foundation Trust

**Address:** Royal Bolton Hospital  
Minerva Road  
Farnworth  
Bolton  
BL4 0JR

#### **Decision (including any steps ordered)**

---

1. The complainant requested copies of all reviews into governance concerns since 2022. Bolton NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust) cited section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA to refuse to confirm or deny if it held the requested information.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that the Trust is entitled to rely on section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA to refuse to confirm or deny whether it holds the information requested.
3. The Commissioner does not require any steps to be taken as a result of this decision.

## Request and response

---

4. On 19 October 2023, the complainant wrote to the Trust and requested information in the following terms:

“Please can you provide the following under FOI laws:

Copies of all reviews into governance concerns raised by some directors and governing body members since June 2022. These should include a review conducted by PwC, commissioned by the trust.

If any words/personal info within the documents are deemed to trigger an exemption, then please redact them and provide the rest of the document, providing a specific justification for each exemption.”

5. The Trust responded on 16 November 2023 and refused to confirm or deny whether it held information in scope of the request, citing section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA.
6. The Trust provided an internal review on 13 December 2023, in which it upheld its original position.

## Reasons for decision

---

7. Section 1(1)(a) of FOIA provides that where a public authority receives a request for information, it is obliged to tell the applicant whether it holds that information. This is commonly known as the duty to confirm or deny.
8. There are however exemptions from the duty to confirm or deny. It should be noted that when applying an exemption from the duty to confirm or deny, a public authority is not restricted to only considering the consequences of the actual response that it would be required to provide under s1(1)(a). For example, if it does not hold the information, the public authority is not limited to only considering what would be revealed by denying the information was held, it can also consider the consequences if it had to confirm it did hold the information and vice versa.
9. Section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA provides that the duty to confirm or deny does not arise if it would contravene any of the principles relating to the processing of personal data set out in Article 5 of the General Data Protection Regulation EU2016/679 ('GDPR') to provide that confirmation or denial.

10. Therefore, for the Trust to be entitled to rely on section 40(5B) of FOIA to refuse to confirm or deny it holds information falling within the scope of the request the following two criteria must be met:

- Confirming or denying whether the requested information is held would constitute the disclosure of a third party's personal data;

and

- Providing this confirmation or denial would contravene one of the data protection principles

**Would the confirmation or denial that the requested information is held constitute the disclosure of a third party's personal data?**

11. Section 3(2) of the DPA 2018 defines personal data as:

"any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual".

12. The two main elements of personal data are that the information must relate to a living person and that the person must be identifiable.

13. Information will relate to a person if it is about them, linked to them, has biographical significance for them, is used to inform decisions affecting them or has them as its main focus.

14. Having reviewed the request and the Trust's submissions the Commissioner is satisfied that if the Trust were to either confirm or deny it held the information, it would involve the disclosure of personal data. This is because it would relate to directors and governing body members, who would be identifiable. The first criterion set out is therefore met.

15. The fact that confirming or denying whether the requested information is held would reveal the personal data of a third party (or parties) does not automatically prevent the Trust from refusing to confirm whether it holds this information. The second element of the test is to determine whether such a confirmation or denial would contravene any of the data protection principles.

16. The Commissioner considers that the most relevant data protection principle is principle (a).

**Would confirming whether or not the requested information is held contravene one of the data protection principles?**

17. Article 5(1)(a) GDPR states that:

“Personal data shall be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject”.

18. In the case of a FOIA request, the personal data is processed when it is disclosed in response to the request. This means that the information can only be disclosed – or as in this case, the public authority can only confirm whether or not it holds the requested information – if to do so would be lawful (i.e. it would meet one of the conditions of lawful processing listed in Article 6(1) GDPR), be fair and be transparent.

### **Lawful processing: Article 6(1(f) GDPR**

19. Article 6(1) of the GDPR specifies the requirements for lawful processing by providing that “processing shall be lawful only if and to the extent that at least one of the conditions listed in the Article applies. One of the conditions in Article 6(1) must therefore be met before disclosure of the information in response to the request would be considered lawful.
20. The Commissioner considers that the condition most applicable on the facts of this case would be that contained in Article 6(1)(f) GDPR which provides as follows:

“processing is necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by a third party except where such interests are overridden by the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require protection of personal data, in particular where the data subject is a child”.
21. In considering the application of Article 6(1)(f) GDPR in the context of a request for information under FOIA it is necessary to consider the following three-part-test:
  - (i) Legitimate interest test: Whether a legitimate interest is being pursued in the request for information;
  - (ii) Necessity test: Whether confirming or denying that the requested information is held is necessary to meet the legitimate interest in question;
  - (iii) Balancing test: Whether the above interests override the legitimate interest(s) or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject(s).
22. The Commissioner considers that the test of “necessity” under stage (ii) must be met before the balancing test under stage (iii) is applied.

### **Legitimate interests**

23. In considering any legitimate interests in confirming whether or not the requested information is held in response to a FOI request, the Commissioner recognises that such interests can include broad general principles of accountability and transparency for their own sake as well as case specific interests.
24. Further, a wide range of interests may be legitimate interests. They can be the requester's own interests or the interests of third parties, and commercial interests as well as wider societal benefits. They may be compelling or trivial, but trivial interests may be more easily overridden in the balancing test.
25. In this case, it is clear that the complainant is seeking the requested information due to their own interests as an investigative journalist.
26. The Commissioner is satisfied that there may also be a wider legitimate interest, i.e. transparency about the Trust's procedures when handling complaints, along with the safety of the general public and the competency of senior professionals.

### **Is confirming whether or not the requested information is held necessary?**

27. 'Necessary' means more than desirable but less than indispensable or absolute necessity. Accordingly, the test is one of reasonable necessity which involves the consideration of alternative measures, and so confirming whether or not the requested information is held would not be necessary if the legitimate aim could be achieved by something less intrusive?
28. Confirmation or denial under FOIA that the requested information is held must therefore be the least intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aim in question.
29. The Commissioner is satisfied in this case that there are no less intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aims identified.

### **Balance between legitimate interests and the data subject's interests or fundamental rights and freedoms**

30. It is necessary to balance the legitimate interests in confirming whether or not the requested information is held against the data subject(s)' interests or fundamental rights and freedoms. In doing so, it is necessary to consider the impact of the confirmation or denial. For example, if a data subject would not reasonably expect the public authority to confirm whether or not it held the requested information in

response to a FOI request, or if such a confirmation or denial would cause unjustified harm, their interests or rights are likely to override legitimate interests in confirming or denying whether information is held.

31. Disclosing whether the requested information was held would reveal whether or not an individual, who could be identified, had been the subject of a review or otherwise.
32. Information released under the FOIA is to the world at large. As the information, if held, would relate to identifiable individuals, it is considered personal data, and an individual would expect their personal data and circumstances would remain confidential.
33. The Trust has also argued that as the exemption is an absolute exemption the public interest balancing test which would be applied to a qualified exemption is not the same, therefore, any argument would need to be strong enough to override the rights of the individuals in protecting their personal data.
34. Based on the above factors, the Commissioner has determined that there is insufficient legitimate interest to outweigh a data subjects' fundamental rights and freedoms, and that confirming whether or not the requested information is held would not be lawful.
35. The Commissioner has therefore decided that the Trust was entitled to refuse to confirm whether or not it held the requested information on the basis of section 40(5B)(a)(i) of the FOIA.

## Right of appeal

---

36. 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: 0203 936 8963

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: [grc@justice.gov.uk](mailto:grc@justice.gov.uk)

Website: [www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber](http://www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber)

37. 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.
38. 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 .....**

**Susan Duffy**  
**Senior Case Officer**  
**Information Commissioner's Office**  
**Wycliffe House**  
**Water Lane**  
**Wilmslow**  
**Cheshire**  
**SK9 5AF**