



Freedom of Information Request Reference N°: FOI 003937-18

I write in connection with your request for information received by Suffolk Constabulary on the 25 October 2018 in which you sought access to the following information:

“All info broken down by month.

- 1. A list of dine and dash crimes – people running off and not paying for meals – reported in 2017 and 2018, including the top ten worst cases (i.e. most expensive), specifying date and cost, as well as any notable alcohol/expensive meals, outcome of incident, and sorted by year and location (i.e. town/village).*

Please can this data be provided for 2017 and 2018 so far.

- 2. A list of ride and run crimes – people running off and not paying for taxis – reported in 2017 and 2018, including the top ten worst cases (i.e. most expensive), specifying date and cost of taxi ride, as well as taxi company, sorted by year and location (i.e. town/village).*

Please can this data be provided for 2017 and 2018 so far.”

Response to your Request

The response provided below is correct as of 30 October 2018

Suffolk Constabulary has considered your request for information and the response is below.

The information provided below relates to all relevant offences of ‘Make off Without Payment’. With specific search parameters used for each question as described below.

Please note that a number of offences of this nature, where a verbal contract has been made to make payment, will be recorded as Action Fraud Call for Service offences and non-countable locally.

- 1. A search has been completed of the Constabulary’s crime system for all ‘Make off Without Payment’ offences reported for the 2017 and 2018 calendar years, where the premise type is a ‘Café/Restaurant’ or ‘Hotel/B&B/Guest House’.*

There were a total of 15 offences located for the time frame specified, details of which are provided below, where recorded. Please note that the recording of the amount stolen is not a mandatory requirement and therefore this level of information is not always available.



**SUFFOLK
CONSTABULARY**
Taking pride in keeping Suffolk safe

2017			
Date	Location	Amount	Outcome
20 May	Ipswich	45.85	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
29 Oct	Ipswich	35.2	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
01 Dec	Newmarket	34.25	Type 16 - Named Suspect Identified: Evidential Difficulties
01 Mar	Brandon	31	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
19 Aug	Bury St Edmunds	30	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
02 Oct	Ipswich	20	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
21 Nov	Beccles	17	Type 16 - Named Suspect Identified: Evidential Difficulties
26 May	Wherstead	Not Recorded	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
28 Aug	Sudbury	Not Recorded	Type 14 - Evidential Difficulties Victim Based- Suspect Not Identified
18 Oct	Sudbury	Not Recorded	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified

2018			
Date	Location	Amount	Outcome
12 Aug	Wherstead	206	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
21 Feb	Bury St Edmunds	£100+	Type 14 - Evidential Difficulties Victim Based- Suspect Not Identified
07 Jan	Ipswich	Not recorded	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
30 Mar	Bury St Edmunds	Not recorded	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified
06 Jun	Ipswich	Not recorded	Type 18 - Investigation Complete; No Suspect Identified

2. A search has been completed of the Constabulary's crime system for all 'Make off Without Payment' offences reported for the 2017 and 2018 calendar years, where the word 'TAXI' appears in the freetext of the crime. Each offence was then reviewed to ensure relevancy. Please be aware that freetext searches by their very nature are not entirely accurate and there maybe additional relevant offences not provided here as they were not picked up in the manual search.

There were a total of 138 offences located for the time frame specified; details of the 10 with the most recorded value are provided below. Please note that the recording of the monetary value is not a mandatory requirement and therefore this level of information is not always available. The data provided therefore relates to those offences where a monetary value is present.

The name of the taxi firm is also not always present; this may be as a result of the information not being recorded or because the victim was a private taxi driver. However this information has not been provided as a result of exemptions within the Act.

2017 – 73 offences recorded

Date	Amount	Location	Taxi Company
07 Jan 2017	190	Ipswich	Not recorded
09 Jan 2017	95	Rendlesham	Exempt
02 Aug 2017	70	Stowmarket	Not recorded
24 Sep 2017	58	Haverhill	Not recorded
22 May 2017	50	Lowestoft	Exempt
13 Aug 2017	45	Halesworth	Not recorded
10 Aug 2017	40	Lowestoft	Not recorded
22 Mar 2017	40	Ashbocking	Not recorded
14 Jul 2017	40	Lowestoft	Not recorded
01 Jul 2017	39	Woodbridge	Not recorded

2018 – 65 offences recorded

Date	Amount	Location	Taxi company
29 Apr 2018	130	Bury St. Edmunds	Not recorded
30 Jun 2018	85	Newmarket	Exempt
01 Jan 2018	70	Lowestoft	Not recorded
04 Apr 2018	65	Bury St Edmunds	Exempt
19 Jul 2018	65	Beccles	Not recorded
27 Jun 2018	53.9	Ipswich	Exempt
29 Jul 2018	49.4	Felixstowe	Not recorded
09 Jun 2018	38.4	Lowestoft	Not recorded
16 Feb 2018	38	Beccles	Not recorded
19 Feb 2018	32	Ipswich	Not recorded



In respect the name of the company concerned, the information has not been disclosed as a result of exemptions within the Act.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires that Suffolk Constabulary, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) is to provide you the applicant with a notice which:

- (a) States that fact
- (b) Specifies the exemption(s) in question and
- (c) States (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption(s) applies.

The information is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption(s);

Section 40(2) – Personal Information

Section 30(1)(a)(b) – Investigations

Section 40 is an absolute; class based exemption and applies to third party personal data. This would not be released under the FOIA unless there is a strong public interest. This is because any release would breach the Principles contained within Article 5(1) of the GDPR and Part 2 of the Data Protection Act 2018.

One of the main differences between the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act is that any information released under FOI is released into the public domain, not just to the individual requesting the information. As such, any release that identifies an individual through releasing their personal data, even third party personal data, is exempted unless there is a strong public interest in its release. The public interest is not what interests the public but what benefits the community as a whole.

Personal data is defined under the Data Protection Act as data that is biographical in nature, has the applicant as its focus and/or affects the data subject's privacy in his or her personal, professional or business life.

Principle a of Article 5(1) states that information must be processed fairly, lawfully and in a transparent manner. In this case the individuals would have a reasonable expectation that information would not be processed if it resulted in their identification, or equally led to an individual be wrongfully identified as a suspect.

FOIA disclosures are to the world at large and will remain in the public domain indefinitely. Therefore, provision of this information would exceed the original Policing requirement for the processing of the information and would not be lawful or fair to the individuals in question.



It is for these reasons outlined above; that I feel the principle a would be breached by this disclosure and the Section 40 exemption remains in place. I am not obliged to consider any further principle in my arguments.

This is an absolute, class-based exemption and, as such, there is no requirement to consider the public interest test.

Section 30 is a qualified class-based exemption and I am therefore obliged to consider the public interest test.

Public Interest Test - Section 30 - Investigations

(When applying a qualified exemption a public authority is required to consider whether 'in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information')

Favouring Disclosure

Investigations are expensive and use the resources provided from public funds. To disclose information about such cases would show to the public how we spend their money.

Such information would provide the general public with an understanding that we take such matters seriously and we ensure all offences are investigated thoroughly.

Favouring Non-Disclosure

Information that relates to an investigation will rarely be disclosed under the FOI Act. By doing so we could risk prejudicing this and future like investigations by providing vital information that could provide a tactical advantage over the Constabulary.

Where suspects, witnesses or the victim provides information through the course of the investigation, it is done so in the strictest of confidence for the purpose of which it was required. Provision of information that may identify an individual to the general public would breach that confidentiality, impeding any future assistance that individual can provide.

We are law enforcers and we aim to provide a sufficient and positive approach to the way we conduct our investigations, we would not want a disclosure of this nature to compromise this in any way.

Balancing Test

There is always a public interest in the provision of information that will identify where funds are being spent and that the Constabulary is effectively investigating offences.



However, there is a strong public interest in preserving the integrity of investigations and ensuring that individuals have confidence in approaching the Constabulary with any concerns they may have.

Having weighed up the factors favouring disclosure and those favouring non-disclosure, I have decided that the balance lies with non-disclosure.

Police forces in the United Kingdom are routinely required to provide crime statistics to government bodies and the recording criteria is set nationally. However, the systems used for recording these figures are not generic, nor are the procedures used locally in capturing the crime data. It should be noted that for these reasons this force's response to your questions should not be used for comparison purposes with any other response you may receive.

Should you have any further queries concerning this request, please contact Clair Pack, FOI Decision Maker, quoting the reference number shown above.

A full copy of the Freedom of Information Act (2000) can be viewed on the 'Office of Public Sector Information' web-site;
<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/>

Suffolk Constabulary is not responsible for the content, or the reliability, of the website referenced. The Constabulary cannot guarantee that this link will work all of the time, and we have no control over the availability of the linked pages.



Your Right to Request a Review of Decisions Made Under the Terms of the
Freedom of Information Act (2000).

If you are unhappy with how your request has been handled, or if you think the decision is incorrect, you have the right to ask Suffolk Constabulary to review their decision.

Ask Suffolk Constabulary to look at the decision again.

If you are dissatisfied with the decision made by Suffolk Constabulary under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), regarding access to information, you must notify Suffolk Constabulary that you are requesting a review within 40 working days of the date of its response to your Freedom of Information request. Requests for a review should be made in writing and addressed to:

*Freedom of Information Decision Maker
Information Management Department
Suffolk Constabulary
Police Headquarters
Martlesham Heath
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP5 3QS
OR
Email: information@suffolk.pnn.police.uk*

In all possible circumstances Suffolk Constabulary will aim to respond to your request for us to look at our decision again within 20 working days of receipt of your request for an internal review.

The Information Commissioner.

After lodging a request for a review with Suffolk Constabulary, if you are still dissatisfied with the decision, you can apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision on whether the request for information has been dealt with in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

For information on how to make application to the Information Commissioner please visit their website at www.ico.org.uk or contact them at the address shown below:

The Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF
Telephone: 01625 545 700