



[REDACTED]

Date
26 September 2024

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Post Office
100 Wood Street
London EC2V 9ER

Your Ref:

Classification:
Public

Dear [REDACTED],

Freedom of Information Request – FOI2024/00064

We are writing in response to your email received by Post Office Limited (“**Post Office**”) on 10 January, which has been dealt with under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (“**FOIA**”). We sincerely apologise for the delay in responding to this request.

In your email you have requested the information shown verbatim in bold below:

“I require you to report to me with a full plain text list of post codes and towns for each and every post office involved in the sub post office scandal.”

For the purposes of this request, we have interpreted “sub post office scandal” as the prosecution and conviction of individuals (with Post Office’s involvement) using data from Post Office’s Horizon IT system (“**Horizon**”), where disclosure should have been made about bugs, errors, and defects in Horizon. Such prosecutions and convictions happened after Horizon rollout in Post Office branches between 1999 and 2015, when all Horizon-related prosecutions ceased.

We confirm that Post Office does hold some of the information that you have requested and that each of Birmingham, Liverpool and London has 10 or more Post Office branches that were affected by the Post Office scandal, that is, 10 or more postmasters in each of those places were convicted of crimes using Horizon-related evidence between 1999 and 2015.

Other than the above, we have withheld the postcodes of all the affected Post Office branches as well as the names of places, including towns, where fewer than 10 postmasters were convicted due to the Horizon scandal. The withheld information constitutes personal data of the postmasters concerned and is withheld under sections 40(2) and 40(3A) of the FOIA.

These sections exempt personal data from disclosure if that information relates to someone other than the applicant, and if disclosure of that information would breach any of the data-protection principles in Article 5(1) of the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). We consider that disclosure of this information is likely to breach the first data-protection principle, which provides that personal data must be processed lawfully, fairly, and in a transparent manner.

Personal data means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person, including the address of their place of work, in this case, the location of the Post Office branch where they worked at the time. Such a disclosure would not constitute 'lawful', 'fair' or 'transparent' processing because the individuals would not reasonably expect the location of their Post Office branch to be disclosed in response to a request under the FOIA.

Even using town data alongside information already available in the public domain could lead to an identification of postmasters and the risk of such identification is much higher for towns where fewer than 10 Post Office branches were affected by the scandal.

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of this response, you do have a right to request an internal review. You can do this by writing to the address above within 40 working days of receipt of this response stating your reasons for your internal review request or alternatively, by emailing information.rights@postoffice.co.uk.

If, having requested an internal review by Post Office, you are still not satisfied with our response you also have a right of appeal to the Information Commissioner at:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire SK9 5AF

Telephone: 0303 123 1113
www.ico.org.uk/foicomplaints

Yours sincerely,

Information Rights Team
information.rights@postoffice.co.uk
<https://corporate.postoffice.co.uk/en/governance/access-to-information/access-to-information/>

Post Office Limited is committed to protecting your privacy, information about how we do this can be found on our website at www.postoffice.co.uk/privacy