

c/o PO BOX 481
Fareham
Hampshire
PO14 9FS

Tel: 02380 478922

Email: npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk

05/08/2026

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NUMBER 3089/2025

Thank you for your request for information regarding PNC lost or stolen (los) weeding reports; which has now been considered.

Applicant Question:

The Home Office has advised, in response to FOI2026/09165, that it generates and issues VE602 (VE602J) vehicle weeding reports but considers those reports to be held on behalf of police forces.

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/daf_ve602_pnc_los_weeding_report

The Home Office has suggested that the NPCC may be able to assist in relation to these reports.

I therefore seek the following recorded information held by the NPCC.

1. Please provide any information which records, describes or explains whether the NPCC receives, accesses or retains VE602 / VE602J reports generated by the Police National Computer.
2. Please provide any recorded information held by the NPCC derived from, summarising, analysing or otherwise referring to VE602 / VE602J reports, including any statistical, management or assurance information.
3. Please provide any policy, guidance, governance documentation, terms of reference, meeting minutes, memoranda, reports or other recorded information describing the NPCC's role (if any) in the governance, assurance or oversight of the VE602 / VE602J process or the associated vehicle weeding process.
4. If the NPCC does not undertake such governance or oversight, please provide any recorded information identifying the organisation or authority responsible for national governance or assurance of the VE602 / VE602J process.

If the NPCC holds VE602 / VE602J reports,

5. please provide the most recent report, suitably redacted if necessary. If the report is withheld, please identify the exemption(s) relied upon and explain why they apply.

For clarity, this request is confined to governance, process and organisational responsibility. It does not seek personal data or individual vehicle records.

NPCC Response:

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the NPCC, when refusing to provide information by way of exemption, to provide you with a notice, which, (a) states that fact (b) specifies the exemption in question, and (c) states why the exemption applies. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a refusal notice for your request.

The Freedom of Information creates a statutory right of access to information held by public authorities. Section 1(1) of the FOI Act provides that any person making a request for information to a public authority is entitled:

- (a) To be informed in writing by the public authority whether it holds information of the specified in the request, and
- (b) if that is the case, to have that information communicated to him.

That right of access to information is not without exception and is subject to a number of exemptions and other provisions under the Act, including Section 14(1) which provides:

Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious.

Section 14(1) the legislation

- (1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious.

Under Section 14(1) of the Act, public authorities do not have to comply with vexatious request. There is no public interest test and no requirement to provide any information or confirm or deny whether the information is held.

Section 14(1) may be used in a variety of circumstances where a request, or its impact on a public authority, cannot be justified.

The term 'vexatious' is not defined in the legislation in [ICO vs Devon County Council & Dransfield](#) the Upper Tribunal defined the purpose of Section 14 as '...must be to protect the resources (in the broadest sense of that word) of the public authority from being squandered on disproportionate use of FOIA....'.

The Tribunal commented that vexatious could be defined as the 'manifestly unjustified, inappropriate or improper use of a formal procedure'. The Tribunal's definition clearly establishes that the concepts of proportionality and justification are relevant to any consideration of whether a request is vexatious.

To identify and deal with a vexatious request the ICO suggests that there are some typical key features of a vexatious request and four broad themes:

1. The burden (on the public authority and its staff);
2. The motive (of the requester);
3. The value or serious purpose (of the request); and
4. Any harassment or distress (of and to staff).

The ICO states that the key test to determine whether the request is likely to cause a disproportionate or unjustified level of disruption, irritation or distress. A starting point is to assess the value or purpose of the request. When considering the issue the Upper Tribunal in Dransfield asked itself, “Does the request have a value or serious purpose in terms of there being an objective public interest in the information sought?” (paragraph 38). The public interest can encompass a wide range of values and principles relating to what is in the best interests of society, including, but not limited to:

- Holding public authorities to account for their performance;
- Understanding their decisions;
- Transparency; and
- Ensuring justice.

When considering the amount of work that would be involved in dealing with a request and whether it would impose an unreasonable burden, the NPCC takes into account the level of resources available. There are two NPCC FOI Decision Makers and the threshold at which the burden becomes grossly oppressive is lower than for a larger public authority with many staff.

It is common for a potentially vexatious request to be the latest in a series of requests submitted. The greater the number of requests received, the more likely it is that the latest request is vexatious. This is because the collective burden of dealing with the previous requests, combined with the burden imposed by the latest request, becomes a tipping point, rendering the latest request vexatious.

In addition, the pattern of request is overwhelming with numerous requests made in quick succession. Requests are submitted before the NPCC has had the opportunity to respond to previous requests. The Upper Tribunal in Dransfield said:

“A requester who consistently submits multiple FOIA requests or associated correspondence within days of each other, or relentlessly bombards the public authority with e-mail traffic, is more likely to be found to have made a vexatious request” (paragraph 32).

The ICO provides advice on Duration. Where requests have been submitted over a long period, possibly years, this may indicate that requests will continue to be made in the future. Therefore, even if the latest request appears entirely reasonable, when viewed in isolation, you may take into account the anticipated burden of those future request when assessing burden.

It is also recognised that a request which is the latest in a series demonstrating obsessive behaviour can have the effect of harassing staff due to the collective burden they place on staff.

In [Rod Cooke vs IC EA/2018/0028 23 July 2018](#) the Tribunal considered requests made to Kirby Cane and Ellingham Parish Council regarding a dispute over the ownership of a certain piece of land. When looking at any harassment or distress caused to the parish council the Tribunal stated that:

“We do not find that the appellant has deliberately harassed or caused distress to the Council members or clerk. Nonetheless, we note that there has been a considerable volume of correspondence over a number of years directed at a single issue. In the context of a small council run by volunteers and a part time clerk, we find that the burden of dealing with this matter would potentially cause a feeling of harassment and distress to the individuals involved.” (paragraph 26).

Your request relates to multiple similar requests previously received from you. The below have all been received in relation to stolen vehicles.

425/2024 – Weeding of PNC Lost or Stolen (LoS) Records
426/2024 – ACRO LoS Notifications
450/2024 – IR of 426/2024
012/2025 – IR of 425/2024
014/2025 – PNC LoS Records Communication
039/2025 – IR of 14/2025 LoS Records Communication
044/2025 – ICO Appeal of 426/2025
093/2025 – PNC Inaccuracy & Disclosure of Vehicle Makes and Models
2022/2025 – PNC LoS 9VRM) Info
2233/2025 – NavCIS PNC LoS Submissions
2236/2025 – Disclosure advice on LoS Vehicles
2255/2025 – Disclosure Advice on Vehicles Makes & Models
2266/2025 – NavCIS PNC LoS Submissions
2298/2025 – ICO Appeal
2838/2026 – Vehicle Theft Investigations
2859/2026 – IR of 2838/2026

The requests listed above have already generated a significant workload on the NPCC, not only within the FOI team but also within NavCIS, which is only added to by this latest request.

In addition to the above, the time taken to discuss progress with your requests with Senior Management continues to be disproportionate to progressing other requests.

It is appropriate to highlight the Decision notice [ic-387981-n0t4.pdf](#) issued in November 2025, where the commissioner supported the NPCC's decision to rely on Section 14 in almost identical circumstances.

Whilst acknowledging there is value in the accountability and transparency of public authorities, especially in relation to finance/funding, your repeated requests demonstrate a tendency towards unreasonable persistence on a particular topic the NPCC does not consider there is enough value in this to outweigh the collective burden of your requests.

Yours sincerely

Freedom of Information Officer & Decision Maker

www.npcc.police.uk

COMPLAINT RIGHTS

Internal Review

Any request for an internal review will be acknowledged and responded to, based on the specific wording of your initial request only.

We ask that any rationale to request an internal review, does not include any requests for new information and ask that these be submitted by separate email. We will acknowledge as a new request and aggregate to your initial request in compliance with the legislation.

If you are dissatisfied with the response you have been provided with in compliance with the Freedom of Information legislation, you can lodge a complaint with NPCC to have the decision reviewed within 40 working days of the date of this response.

The handling of your request will be looked at by someone independent of the original decision and a fresh response provided.

It would be helpful, if requesting a review, for you to articulate in detail the reasons you are not satisfied with this reply.

If you would like to request a review, please write or send an email to NPCC Freedom of Information, c/o PO Box 481, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 9FS.

Annex A

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the NPCC, when refusing to provide information by way of exemption in question and (c) states why the exemption applies. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a refusal notice to those aspects of your request.

Legislation – Section 16

- (1) It shall be the duty of a public authority to provide advice and assistance, so far as it would be reasonable to expect the authority to do so, to persons who propose to make, or have made, requests for information to it.