



UNIVERSITY  
of HULL

**Request Reference: 3488**

FOI Request dated 28/08/2025 –

**QUESTION ONE**

*Please provide copies of any correspondence (emails, letters, notes of meetings, with any attachments) sent to or from:*

- a) *your campus security team (or equivalent)*
- b) *your careers and employability service (or equivalent)*

*and representatives of each of the below listed organisations, between 1 October 2023 and the date of this request. The list of organisations is as follows:*

- (i) *ADS Group (@adsgroup.org.uk)*
- (ii) *Airbus (@airbus.com)*
- (iii) *Babcock (@babcockinternational.com)*
- (iv) *BAE Systems (@baesystems.com)*
- (v) *Boeing (@boeing.com)*
- (vi) *Caterpillar (@cat.com)*
- (vii) *Cobham Limited (@cobham.com)*
- (viii) *Elbit Systems (@elbitsystems.com)*
- (ix) *General Dynamics (@gd-ms.uk / @gdlsuk.com)*
- (x) *GE Aerospace (@geaerospace.com)*
- (xi) *GKN PLC (@gkn.com)*
- (xii) *Leonardo (@leonardo.com / @uk.leonardo.com)*
- (xiii) *Lockheed Martin (@global.lmco.com / @lockheedmartin.com)*
- (xiv) *MBDA (@mbda-systems.com)*
- (xv) *Meggitt (@meggitt.com)*
- (xvi) *Qinetiq (@qinetiq.com)*
- (xvii) *Royal Air Force (@mod.gov.uk)*
- (xviii) *Raytheon / Raytheon UK (@raytheon.co.uk)*
- (xix) *Rolls Royce (@rolls-royce.com)*
- (xx) *Thales (@uk.thalesgroup.com)*

*To assist searches, this may be limited to correspondence to/from the corporate email domains of the above organisations. For your ease, I've provided (to the best of my knowledge) the email domain for each organisation in brackets above.*

**QUESTION 2**

Please provide copies of any correspondence (emails, letters, notes, with attachments) sent to or from:

- a) your campus security team (or equivalent)
- b) the Vice-Chancellor/Principal
- c) your Prevent lead (or equivalent)

between 1 June 2025 and the date of this request, which contain any of the following phrases:

- (i) "Palestine Action"
- (ii) "Proscribe"
- (iii) "Proscribed"
- (iv) "Proscription"

## **Response**

### **Q1 –**

Please find attached.

Please note we have applied partial exemptions of Section 31 and Section 40 to the entirety of your request as per below.

Section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) places two duties on public authorities. Unless exemptions apply, the first duty at Section 1(1)(a) is to confirm or deny whether the information specified in a request is held. The second duty at Section 1(1)(b) is to disclose information that has been confirmed as being held. Where exemptions are relied upon Section 17 of FOIA requires that we provide 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 applies.

Disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is deemed to be released to the public at large. Therefore, no information if deemed would identify a living individual would be released. Therefore section 40(2) of the Act is engaged. As section 40(2) is an absolute exemption there is no requirement for me to conduct a public interest test. However I am satisfied that disclosure would breach the 1<sup>st</sup> principle of the Data Protection Act – fair and lawful processing.

If information requested under the Freedom of Information legislation is the personal data of the data subject, an absolute exemption is automatically applicable to the request, furthermore there is no requirement for a public authority to consider whether the public interest favours disclosure where the information falls within the scope of the exemption.

If we were to disclose personal data under the Freedom of Information Act, theoretically anyone in the world could request and receive personal information of anyone they may please. With this in mind, Freedom of Information is not the lawful or appropriate method of access to the data that you require.

### **Q2 -**

\*Section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) places two duties on public authorities. Unless exemptions apply, the first duty at Section 1(1)(a) is to confirm or deny whether the information specified in a request is held. The second duty at Section 1(1)(b) is to disclose information that has been confirmed as being held. Where exemptions are relied upon Section 17 of FOIA requires that we provide 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 applies.

The Freedom of Information Act gives you the right to know whether we hold the information you want and to have it communicated to you, subject to any exemptions which may apply.

Unfortunately, we are unable to provide you with the information you have requested. This is because the information is covered by the exemption at section 31(1)(a) of the FOIA.

Section 31(1)(a) exempts information if its disclosure is likely to prejudice the prevention or detection of crime.

This is a qualified exemption and as such, when it applies, we are required to conduct a Public Interest Test to see whether the information it covers can be released. For the results of this test and a full explanation of this exemption and why it has been applied please see the Public Interest Test below.

#### Exemption applied

### **Section 31: Law Enforcement**

**(1) Information which is not exempt information by virtue of section 30 is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice—**

#### **(a) The prevention or detection of crime**

Because section 31 is a qualified exemption, we are required to conduct a public interest test. This means that after it has been decided that the exemption is engaged, the public interest in releasing the information must be considered. If the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in withholding it then the exemption does not apply and the information must be released. There is a presumption running through the FOIA that information should be released unless there are compelling reasons to withhold it.

The public interest has now been concluded and the balance of the public interest has been found to fall in favour of withholding information covered by the section 31(1)(a) exemption on this occasion. Considerations in favour of the release of the information included the principle that there is a public interest in transparency and accountability through disclosure of information relating to public authority security issues.

However, release of this information would make the University more vulnerable to crime; namely, a malicious attack on the University's computer systems. As such release of this information would prejudice the prevention or detection of crime by making the Universities computer system more vulnerable to hacking. There is an overwhelming public interest in keeping personal data and computer systems secure which would be served by non-disclosure. This would outweigh any benefits of release. It was therefore decided that the balance of the public interest lies clearly in favour of withholding the material on this occasion.