



27<sup>th</sup> May 2022

p cialfi <request-821081-fd21d8c7@whatdotheyknow.com>

Dear P Cialfi

**Internal Review Request - Reference No: 2022-1116 or FOI Request – Reference No:2022-0894**

I am independent of the original decision-making process. Guidance states it is best practice for someone other than the original decision maker to conduct an Internal Review.

**REQUEST FOR INTERNAL REVIEW**

After receiving response to your original FOI request Reference No: 2022-0894 on the 12th of May 2022 you have submitter a request for Internal Review Reference No:2022-1116 on the 13th of May 2022, as follows:

"Please pass this on to the person who conducts Freedom of Information reviews.

I am writing to request an internal review of South Yorkshire Police's handling of my FOI request 'Who ordered the cover-up of child sex exploitation within South Yorkshire Police'.

Your refusal refers to a previous refusal that quoted S14 vexatiousness.

The reasons for invoking S14 were proved to be incorrectly and unlawfully applied, and so were dismissed in their entirety.

However, in repeating the S14 pretext, you now quote S17, despite there being no justification to do so.

Any casual reader of reasonable mind could not be criticised for concluding that South Yorkshire Police are involved with an ongoing cover-up relating to child sex exploitation.

The question is simple, as is the answer:

WHO ordered Detective Tony Brooks ( and his team ) to 'wind their necks in'. Once the name is provided, we can then determine who else was involved with this ongoing cover-up, and WHY, and WHO gave that senior officer the order to instruct Mr Brooks to stop investigating child sex exploitation, and so on.

Of course, South Yorkshire Police claim to be open, honest, transparent and accountable.

To date, on the basis of the evidence so far, and with respect to child sex exploitation, the opposite appears to be the case.

Of course, South Yorkshire Police could, if it wished, demonstrate professional integrity, respect for the law, and compassion for the survivors of child sex exploitation, and simply provide the unlawfully withheld information with your review.

Further to that review, please also provide all metadata associated with this request.

To date you have failed to comply with this request made on 8 February 2022 and therefore South Yorkshire police are in breach of S10, if not also S77. A full history of my FOI request and all correspondence is available on the Internet at this address:

[https://eur01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2Fwww.whatdotheyknow.com%2Frequest%2Fwho\\_ordered\\_the\\_cover\\_up\\_of\\_child\\_abuse%3Fdata%3D05%7C01%7CFOI%40southyorks.pnn.police.uk%7C52bc79aa625742888fe308da34fb3004%7Cb23255a18f784144890431f019036ade%7C0%7C0%7C637880550683821227%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTi6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C300%7C%7C&sdata=x46MGWKjTIZgV8Hs6wODqWTjxp5uBq9Ur2s2YvwYLtw%3D&reserved=0](https://eur01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2Fwww.whatdotheyknow.com%2Frequest%2Fwho_ordered_the_cover_up_of_child_abuse%3Fdata%3D05%7C01%7CFOI%40southyorks.pnn.police.uk%7C52bc79aa625742888fe308da34fb3004%7Cb23255a18f784144890431f019036ade%7C0%7C0%7C637880550683821227%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTi6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C300%7C%7C&sdata=x46MGWKjTIZgV8Hs6wODqWTjxp5uBq9Ur2s2YvwYLtw%3D&reserved=0)

Yours faithfully,  
p cialfi"

I accept that the contents of the email constitute an appeal following an expression of dissatisfaction following the response that was sent to you.

### **ORIGINAL FOI REQUEST**

On 10 march 2020 I asked for the name of the person(s) who gave the order: The Star published the following article with this headline on 15 March 2015: "Sheffield officers investigating child grooming 'told to wind necks in' by bosses"

You have obstinately not provided that information.

Your reasons for not providing that information that is being unlawfully withheld have each been dismissed in their entirety.

Nevertheless, I shall provide you with some extracts that will help you:

"Retired detective Tony Brookes, who spent 30 years with the force, worked on inquiries in 2007 which led to six abusers being convicted, and he wanted to build on the case as he recognised the size of the problem.

He said the issue of child sexual exploitation in Sheffield was 'massive' and bigger than in neighbouring Rotherham, where at least 1,400 children were abused over a 16-year-period.

Mr Brookes said his team was told by a senior officer to 'wind your necks in'. It is clear that, within South Yorkshire Police, the extent of child sex exploitation within Sheffield was known, but never publicised.

It was reasonably expected that SYP would have accessed the above article, as it provides names and dates and other references that would have facilitated a swift response with the information that remains unlawfully withheld.

You are now provided with another opportunity to do so.

### **ORIGINAL FOI RESPONSE**

We acknowledge receipt of your request above and remind you of our refusal notice dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022 (ref 20220063) relying on Section 14 (1) Vexatious. The above request is a continuing campaign requesting similar information and as such no further refusal notices will be issued under Section 17 (6).

Section 17(6) of the Act states that there is no need to issue a refusal notice if:

- the authority has already given the same person a refusal notice for a previous vexatious or repeated request; and
- it would be unreasonable to issue another one.

Please also be advised that we will no longer respond to any further requests on the same or similar topic.

### **INTERNAL REVIEW OF ORIGINAL REQUEST**

I have reviewed response you received from our Unit on 12th of May 2022. As per ICO guidance, a requester may ask for any information that is held by a public authority. However, this does not mean authority is always obliged to provide the information. In some cases, there will be a good reason why authority should not make public some or all the information requested. South Yorkshire Police can refuse to comply with a request (FOI Section 17) that is considered as vexatious (FOI Section 14). If so, we do not have to comply with any part of it.

The decision to refuse this request followed a long series of requests and correspondence between you and South Yorkshire Police including but not limited to a refusal notice dated 7th February 2022 (ref 20220063) relying on Section 14 (1) Vexatious. ICO has also supported our original stance via Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) Decision notice Reference: IC-110816-J1N4 from 23rd of March 2022.

Please note that this Internal Review is not Upheld and please also be advised that we will no longer respond to any further requests on the same or similar topic.

If you are unhappy with the way your request for information has been handled, you can request a review by following the advice contained in the separate notice enclosed with this correspondence:

If you remain dissatisfied with the handling of your request or complaint, you have a right to appeal to the Information Commissioner at:

The Information Commissioner's Office,  
Wycliffe House,  
Water Lane,  
Wilmslow,  
Cheshire, SK9 5AF.  
Telephone: 08456 306060 or 01625 545745  
Website: [www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

**Magda Schulz**  
**Senior Disclosure Officer**  
Data Office  
Performance & Governance  
South Yorkshire Police  
Unit 20, 35a Business Park  
Churchill Way  
Sheffield, S35 2PY

[southyorks.police.uk](http://southyorks.police.uk)



