



NORFOLK
CONSTABULARY
Our Priority is You

January 2020

Freedom of Information Request Reference N°: FOI 004600/19

I write in connection with your request for information received by Norfolk Constabulary on the 20th December 2019 in which you sought access to the following information:

- 1 How many Norfolk constabulary employees have been convicted of fraud during the period January 2000 to December 2019 and what is the known total amount defrauded?
- 2 How many Norfolk constabulary employees have been dismissed, charged or convicted due to misconduct or illegal activity regarding illicit drugs and/or controlled substances from January 2010 to December 2019?
- 3 How many Norfolk constabulary employees have been dismissed, charged or convicted due to misconduct or illegal activity regarding child sex offences from 2010 to December 2019?
- 4 How many Norfolk constabulary employees have been dismissed, charged or convicted due to misconduct or illegal activity regarding perverting the course of justice and/or wilfully withholding/spoiling/destroying/tampering with evidence from January 2010 to December 2019?

Response to your Request

The response provided below is correct as of 9th January 2020.

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.

Between January 2000 and December 2019, a total of 1064 conduct cases have been recorded for Norfolk Constabulary officers and staff. The first conviction information recorded on the conduct system appears to be in 2009. Therefore, to provide a response for question 1, we would need to undertake a review of every case, in order to identify any fraud cases and whether they resulted in a conviction.

Due to the number of cases, this would significantly exceed the appropriate limit for dealing with Freedom of Information requests, in terms of costs, 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 & 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.

A review of internal conduct cases, recorded by the Professional Standards Department (PSD), has been undertaken. The following information relates to Police Officers and members of Police Staff.

Q1 The following information has been identified by carrying out research of cases using the word ‘fraud’:-

Within the requested timeframe, three serving police officers have been convicted of fraud.

One officer was convicted for possess/control articles for use in fraud. The officer resigned.

One officer was convicted of conspiracy to defraud and resigned prior to misconduct proceedings.

One officer was dismissed at misconduct proceedings.

The amount defrauded is unknown.

Q2 A review of records relating to officers or members of staff who have been dismissed, charged or convicted, between January 2010 and December 2019, has been undertaken.

There were no individuals charged or convicted for drugs offences.

A former officer was subject to misconduct proceedings following a drugs test, which took place whilst the officer was serving, and indicated the presence of a Class A drug. The former officer would have been dismissed had they not resigned.

Q3 With regard to this question, please see below:-

One officer was dismissed at a misconduct hearing for possession of indecent images of a child.

One officer was convicted, whilst serving, for possession of indecent images of children and was subsequently dismissed at misconduct proceedings.

Q4 No officers or members of staff have been dismissed, charged or convicted in respect of this question.