

approach to tackling and deterring this type of crime. This could empower individuals to make more effective decisions about their own activities regarding criminal behaviour.

Section 31(1) Public interest considerations favouring non-disclosure

Policing today is intelligence led and the MPS share information with other law enforcement agencies as part of their investigative process. To disclose what intelligence was shared and by whom (on a case by case basis) would identify tactical approaches used by police forces, and identify cases or persons of interest to the police. This could hinder the prevention and detection of crime as well as undermine the partnership approach to investigations and law enforcement.

Balancing Test

The MPS is charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency policing abilities, processes and techniques, there is a strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of the MPS.

It is therefore in our opinion, that the balancing test for full disclosure is not made out.

Section 31(3) - Evidence of Harm

The public interest is not what interests the public but what will be of greater good if released to the community as a whole. It is not in the public interest to disclose information that may compromise the MPS's ability to complete any future criminal investigations.

[You have also asked for the details held of organisers for the stated illegal raves you referred to above, and whether any of the events were organised by Every Decible Matters.](#)

The release of such information, if it exists, would reveal policing tactics regarding who was of interest to the police generally. This could be to the detriment of providing an efficient policing service and a failure in providing a duty of care to all members of the public.

Information disclosed under the Act is considered to be a release to the world as once the information is published the public authority in this case the MPS has no control over what use is made of that information. Whilst not questioning the motives of the applicant it could be of use to those who seek to disrupt any police investigation as it would be a process of elimination, enable them to identify whether specific people or groups have or have not been subject of a police investigation. This would lead to an increase of harm to either the investigation itself or the subject of the investigation. To release details as to whether specific individuals, groups or events have or have not been investigated would enable any member of the public to define and identify who or who is not of interest to the MPS.

This could be to the detriment of providing an efficient policing service and a failure in providing a duty of care to all members of the public.

Section 31(3) Factors favouring confirmation or denial

By confirming or denying whether information is held would enable the public to have a better understanding of the type of events and individuals the police are focussing their resources on, in order to disrupt and deter such events from taking place, in line with their law enforcement role.

Better public awareness may lead to more information from the public about individuals who they believe may be linked to organising illegal raves, thereby providing intelligence to reduce crime.

Section 31(3) Factors against confirmation or denial

By confirming or denying that the requested information exists, law enforcement would be compromised which would hinder the prevention and detection of crime. More crime of this nature would be committed and individuals would be placed at risk. This would result in further risks to the public and consequently require the use of more MPS resources.

Disclosure of information, if it exists would provide valuable intelligence into the public domain, which would be useful to criminals captured by this request, in that they can take steps to evade apprehension and prosecution, thereby continuing with criminal behaviour. This will directly affect the law enforcement role of the MPS.

Balance Test - Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

The disclosure of this information to the public by the MPS would undermine individuals' confidence in