



NORFOLK
CONSTABULARY
Our Priority is You

January 2020

Freedom of Information Request Reference N°: FOI 000152/20

I write in connection with your request for information received by Norfolk Constabulary on the 9th January 2020 in which you sought access to the following information:

Could you please let me know how much alleged crime was recorded where the suspects job title included 'door staff', 'security staff' or 'bouncer' from 2012 - 2019?

And if possible, could you also let me know what disciplinary action was taken against licensed door supervisors if any?

Response to your Request

Norfolk Constabulary has considered your request and our response is below.

When responding to a request for information under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act, a public authority is not obliged to provide information if the authority estimates that the cost of the retrieval of the information requested would be in excess of £450 (equivalent to 18 hours work).

The costs criteria relates to a request in its entirety, which means that if we cannot retrieve *all* of the information requested within the costs limit, we are not obliged to retrieve *any* of the information requested.

The Norfolk Constabulary estimates that to retrieve all the information you have requested would exceed cost in excess of £450.

The following refers to the current crime recording system which has been in place since October 2015. When inputting a crime, the suspect occupation is not a mandatory field.

When an occupation is recorded on a nominal record, this is updated to the occupation field. A search can then be undertaken for a particular role and this will extract all records where that occupation, has been recorded on the nominal's record, at some point. Therefore, any results would need to be reviewed to see if the offence occurred whilst the nominal was working in the role of a bouncer/door staff.

There is also a large number of records where no occupation has been recorded. It would therefore be necessary to review the crime offence texts, in order to see if any refer to the suspect being door staff, bouncer or security staff.

Even if we only look at crimes on licensed premises only, this would still involve a manual review of the offence text.

Due to the volume of records where the occupation is blank, even for a short period of time, this would be an enormous task.

Therefore, based on all of the above, to provide an accurate response, we would need to carry out a manual review of thousands of records. This would significantly exceed the appropriate limit for

dealing with a Freedom of Information request, in terms of cost, and therefore Section 12(1) of the Freedom of Information Act applies.

Section 12(1) of the Freedom of Information Act states that a public authority is not obliged to:

“...comply with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of Complying with the request would exceed the appropriate limit”.

The Freedom of Information (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004, defines the ‘appropriate limit’ for the Norfolk Constabulary as £450, and specifies that this sum equates to 18 hours work at a standard rate of £25 per hour.

In accordance with Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act (2000), this serves as a Refusal Notice for your request.

Advice and Assistance

Although excess cost removes the Constabulary’s obligations under the Freedom of Information Act, as a gesture of goodwill, I have supplied information, relevant to your request, which was retrieved or available before it was realised that the fees limit would be exceeded. I trust this is helpful, but it does not affect our legal right to rely on the fees regulations for the remainder of your request.

The following information was disclosed in December and relates to violent crimes only. This was identified by using a keyword search where we looked for the terms ‘Bouncer or Door Supervisor or Door Staff’ within the text of the crime report.

As advised above, there may be other relevant records held, but these have not been identified by using a keyword search.

Offence	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
ASSAULT WITH INJURY	4	12	9	5	30
Bouncer	-	1	2	1	4
Door Staff	3	11	7	3	24
Door Supervisor	1	-	-	1	2
ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY	4	4	8	6	22
Bouncer	1	-	-	1	2
Door Staff	3	4	8	5	20
SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A F 13 OR OVER	-	-	1	-	1
Door Staff	-	-	1	-	1
Total	8	16	18	11	53

The crime outcomes have been provided below.

Offence & Outcome	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
ASSAULT WITH INJURY	4	12	9	5	30
Type 1 - Charged/Summoned/Postal Requisition	-	1	-	-	1
Type 14 - Evidential Difficulties Victim Based- Suspect Not Identified: Crime Confirmed But The Victim Either Declines Or Unable To Support Further Police Investigation To Identify The Offender	1	2	3	-	6
Type 15 - Named Suspect Identified: Victim Supports	3	3	1	1	8

Police Action But Evidential Difficulties Prevent Further Action					
Type 16 - Named Suspect Identified: Evidential Difficulties Prevent Further Action: Victim Does Not Support (Or Has Withdrawn Support From) Police Action	-	1	1	-	2
Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified. Crime Investigated As Far As Reasonably Possible- Case Closed Pending Further Investigative Opportunities Becoming Available	-	3	2	4	9
Type 20 - Further action resulting from the crime report will be undertaken by another body or agency subject to the victim (or person acting on their behalf) being made aware of the act to be taken	-	1	1	-	2
Type 21 - Further investigation resulting from crime report which could provide evidence sufficient to support formal action against the suspect is not in the public interest - police decision.	-	-	1	-	1
Type 3A - Caution Adult - alternate offence. Offender has been given a simple caution under the alternate offences rule.	-	1	-	-	1
ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY	4	4	8	6	22
Type 14 - Evidential Difficulties Victim Based- Suspect Not Identified: Crime Confirmed But The Victim Either Declines Or Unable To Support Further Police Investigation To Identify The Offender	2	2	3	2	9
Type 15 - Named Suspect Identified: Victim Supports Police Action But Evidential Difficulties Prevent Further Action	1	1	1	1	4
Type 16 - Named Suspect Identified: Evidential Difficulties Prevent Further Action: Victim Does Not Support (Or Has Withdrawn Support From) Police Action	-	-	1	3	4
Type 17 - Prosecution Time Limit Expired: Suspect Identified But Prosecution Time Limit Has Expired	-	1	-	-	1
Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified. Crime Investigated As Far As Reasonably Possible- Case Closed Pending Further Investigative Opportunities Becoming Available	-	-	3	-	3
Type 21 - Further investigation resulting from crime report which could provide evidence sufficient to support formal action against the suspect is not in the public interest - police decision.	1	-	-	-	1
SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A F 13 OR OVER	-	-	1	-	1
Type 14 - Evidential Difficulties Victim Based- Suspect Not Identified: Crime Confirmed But The Victim Either Declines Or Unable To Support Further Police Investigation To Identify The Offender	-	-	1	-	1
Total	8	16	18	11	53