

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 18 March 2025

Public Authority: North Yorkshire Council
Address: County Hall
Racecourse Lane
Northallerton
North Yorkshire
DL7 8AL

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant requested information regarding whether a named Councillor had taken equalities training as a result of a complaint made against them and the outcome of a further complaint. North Yorkshire Council (the Council) stated it held no information regarding the first part of the request and cited section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA to refuse to confirm or deny if it held information for the second part of the request.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that the Council is entitled to rely on section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA to refuse to confirm or deny whether it holds the information requested.
3. The Commissioner does not require any steps to be taken as a result of this decision.

Request and response

4. On 20 May 2024, the complainant wrote to the Council and requested information in the following terms:

"In September 2019, a senior Conservative Councillor on Scarborough Borough Council (a predecessor authority of North Yorkshire Council) liked a post on social media comparing a black squirrel to a Muslim.

Standards complaint, 2019/57226 found that due to the nature of the language and content of the posts that the Councillor in question should undertake Equalities training.

Please provide the recorded information that the Councillor in question did undertake Equalities training as a direct result of the complaint? To include both the date and content of the training and where/ how it was delivered.

I understand that a further complaint was submitted following comments from the same Councillor at a Scarborough Borough Council meeting.

What was the outcome in of that complaint?

Were the required outcomes adhered to.

If so, when and via what means were they satisfied."

5. The Council responded on 18 June 2024 and refused to confirm or deny whether it held information in scope of the request, citing section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA.
6. The Council provided an internal review on 24 July 2024, in which it stated no information was held for the first part of the request and upheld its original position regarding the second part.

Reasons for decision

7. Section 1(1)(a) of FOIA provides that where a public authority receives a request for information, it is obliged to tell the applicant whether it holds that information. This is commonly known as the duty to confirm or deny.
8. There are however exemptions from the duty to confirm or deny. It should be noted that when applying an exemption from the duty to confirm or deny, a public authority is not restricted to only considering the consequences of the actual response that it would be required to

provide under s1(1)(a). For example, if it does not hold the information, the public authority is not limited to only considering what would be revealed by denying the information was held, it can also consider the consequences if it had to confirm it did hold the information and

9. Section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA provides that the duty to confirm or deny does not arise if it would contravene any of the principles relating to the processing of personal data set out in Article 5 of the General Data Protection Regulation EU2016/679 ('GDPR') to provide that confirmation or denial.
10. Therefore, for the Council to be entitled to rely on section 40(5B) of FOIA to refuse to confirm or deny it holds information falling within the scope of the request the following two criteria must be met:
 - Confirming or denying whether the requested information is held would constitute the disclosure of a third party's personal data; and
 - Providing this confirmation or denial would contravene one of the data protection principles.

Would the confirmation or denial that the requested information is held constitute the disclosure of a third party's personal data?

11. Section 3(2) of the DPA 2018 defines personal data as:

"any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual."

12. The two main elements of personal data are that the information must relate to a living person and that the person must be identifiable.
13. Information will relate to a person if it is about them, linked to them, has biographical significance for them, is used to inform decisions affecting them or has them as its main focus.
14. Having reviewed the request and the Council's submissions the Commissioner is satisfied that if the Council were to either confirm or deny it held the information, it would involve the disclosure of personal data. This is because it would relate to a specific individual and specifically members of the Council, who would be identifiable. The first criterion set out is therefore met.
15. The fact that confirming or denying whether the requested information is held would reveal the personal data of a third party (or parties) does not automatically prevent the Council from refusing to confirm whether it holds this information. The second element of the test is to determine whether such a confirmation or denial would contravene any of the data protection principles.

16. The Commissioner considers that the most relevant data protection principle is principle (a).

Would confirming whether or not the requested information is held contravene one of the data protection principles?

17. Article 5(1)(a) GDPR states that:

“Personal data shall be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject.”

18. In the case of a FOIA request, the personal data is processed when it is disclosed in response to the request. This means that the information can only be disclosed – or as in this case, the public authority can only confirm whether or not it holds the requested information – if to do so would be lawful (i.e. it would meet one of the conditions of lawful processing listed in Article 6(1) GDPR), be fair and be transparent.

Lawful processing: Article 6(1)(f) GDPR

19. Article 6(1) of the GDPR specifies the requirements for lawful processing by providing that “processing shall be lawful only if and to the extent that at least one of the conditions listed in the Article applies. One of the conditions in Article 6(1) must therefore be met before disclosure of the information in response to the request would be considered lawful.

20. The Commissioner considers that the condition most applicable on the facts of this case would be that contained in Article 6(1)(f) GDPR which provides as follows:

“processing is necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by a third party except where such interests are overridden by the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require protection of personal data, in particular where the data subject is a child.”

21. In considering the application of Article 6(1)(f) GDPR in the context of a request for information under FOIA it is necessary to consider the following three-part-test:

(i) Legitimate interest test: Whether a legitimate interest is being pursued in the request for information;

(ii) Necessity test: Whether confirming or denying that the requested information is held is necessary to meet the legitimate interest in question;

(iii) Balancing test: Whether the above interests override the legitimate interest(s) or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject(s).

22. The Commissioner considers that the test of “necessity” under stage (ii) must be met before the balancing test under stage (iii) is applied.

Legitimate interests

23. In considering any legitimate interests in confirming whether the requested information is held in response to an FOI request, the Commissioner recognises that such interests can include broad general principles of accountability and transparency for their own sake as well as case specific interests.
24. Further, a wide range of interests may be legitimate interests. They can be the requester’s own interests or the interests of third parties, and commercial interests as well as wider societal benefits. They may be compelling or trivial, but trivial interests may be more easily overridden in the balancing test.
25. In this case, the complainant is seeking the requested information due to their own interests as a member of the public.
26. The Commissioner is satisfied that there may also be a wider legitimate interest, i.e. transparency about the Council’s procedures when handling complaints.

Is confirming whether or not the requested information is held necessary?

27. ‘Necessary’ means more than desirable but less than indispensable or absolute necessity. Accordingly, the test is one of reasonable necessity which involves the consideration of alternative measures, and so confirming whether or not the requested information is held would not be necessary if the legitimate aim could be achieved by something less intrusive?
28. Confirmation or denial under FOIA that the requested information is held must therefore be the least intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aim in question.
29. The Commissioner is satisfied in this case that there are no less intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aims identified.

Balance between legitimate interests and the data subject's interests or fundamental rights and freedoms

30. It is necessary to balance the legitimate interests in confirming whether or not the requested information is held against the data subject(s)' interests or fundamental rights and freedoms. In doing so, it is necessary to consider the impact of the confirmation or denial. For example, if a data subject would not reasonably expect the public authority to confirm whether or not it held the requested information in response to a FOI request, or if such a confirmation or denial would cause unjustified harm, their interests or rights are likely to override legitimate interests in confirming or denying whether information is held.
31. Disclosing whether the requested information was held would reveal whether or not an individual, who could be identified, had been the subject of a complaint or otherwise.
32. Information released under the FOIA is to the world at large. As the information, if held, would relate to identifiable individuals, it is considered personal data, and an individual would expect their personal data and circumstances would remain confidential.
33. The Council has also argued that as the exemption is an absolute exemption the public interest balancing test which would be applied to a qualified exemption is not the same, therefore, any argument would need to be strong enough to override the rights of the individuals in protecting their personal data.
34. Based on the above factors, the Commissioner has determined that there is insufficient legitimate interest to outweigh a data subjects' fundamental rights and freedoms, and that confirming whether or not the requested information is held would not be lawful.
35. The Commissioner has therefore concluded that the Council was entitled to refuse to confirm whether or not it held the requested information on the basis of section 40(5B)(a)(i) of FOIA.

Right of appeal

36. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0203 936 8963

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: grc@justice.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

37. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.
38. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Deirdre Collins
Senior Case Officer
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF