



# Ministry of Justice

Mark Anthony Taylor  
mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com

Data Access & Compliance Unit  
102 Petty France  
London  
SW1H 9AJ

E data.access@justice.gsi.gov.uk

[www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

**Our Reference:** 108561

24 November 2016

## Freedom of Information Request

Dear Mark Anthony Taylor,

Thank you for your email of, in which you attached a two page document which asked for various information from the Ministry of Justice (MoJ):

**Please find attached a demand for disclosure of materials that will allow the general public to assess the integrity of the parties involved in Gina Miller's lawsuit against Brexit. The demand is pertinent, because it appears all sides in that lawsuit, including the judges, concealed their interests in Deutsche Bank which stands to gain bailouts from Britain's membership of the EU.**

**Also attached is a CRO for which HSBC applied, which prohibits me from suing Deutsche Bank for gold price manipulation. FYI HSBC were incriminated by DB for gold price manipulation in their New York settlement under Valerie E Caproni. The CRO is referred to in the primary attachment and the copy should allow you to expedite a reply before the Supreme Court have given their verdict next month.**

Your request has been handled under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

I can confirm that the department has considered your request for information, however we consider the request to be vexatious under Section 14(1) of the Act. In making this consideration, the department has considered the guidance provided in the Information Commissioner's Office guidance, "*dealing with vexatious requests*" which can be found on the following link:

<https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1198/dealing-with-vexatious-requests.pdf>

Section 14(1) states that the department is not obliged to comply with a request that is vexatious. In this case I consider your request meet some of the indicators of vexatiousness outlined on page 7 and 8 of the ICO guidance above.

In particular, the ICO guidance allows public authorities to consider the wider context of an FOI request when determining whether or not the request is vexatious. Clearly the request you have made relates to legal matters you have, or have had, with the court. It is my assessment that to respond to your request for information will create a burden on the department, causing a disproportionate amount of time to be spent on your case.

The Department is right to take steps under the FOIA to protect its resources from abuse. It is not the purpose of the FOIA to act as a vehicle for individuals to enter into correspondence on matters which should be addressed through the appropriate legal avenues. In considering the direction of your request, I consider that you have deliberately chosen to target the judiciary in respect of the Miller case and are using the FOIA in order to vent your frustration in respect of your other legal matters regarding judicial decisions on your dispute with Deutsche Bank. In making this request vexatious, I have considered that this approach is consistent with the ICO guidance in respect of burden on the authority, personal grudges, unreasonable persistence, unfounded accusations and futile requests.

You can find out more about Section 14(1) by reading the extract from the Act and some guidance points we consider when applying this exemption, attached at the end of this letter.

You can also find more information by reading the full text of the Act (available at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/36/section/14>).

You have the right to appeal our decision if you think it is incorrect. Details can be found in the 'How to Appeal' section attached at the end of this letter.

Finally, if you are concerned that there is a judicial misconduct issue surrounding your case, the correct investigatory body to consider this is the Judicial Conduct and Investigations Office. Details of how to contact them are below.

<http://judicialconduct.judiciary.gov.uk/making-a-complaint/>

Yours sincerely

**DATA ACCESS AND COMPLIANCE UNIT**

## How to Appeal

### Internal Review

If you are not satisfied with this response, you have the right to an internal review. The handling of your request will be looked at by someone who was not responsible for the original case, and they will make a decision as to whether we answered your request correctly.

If you would like to request a review, please write or send an email **within two months of the date of this letter** to the Data Access and Compliance Unit at the following address:

Data Access and Compliance Unit (10.34),  
Information & Communications Directorate,  
Ministry of Justice,  
102 Petty France,  
London  
SW1H 9AJ

E-mail: [data.access@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:data.access@justice.gsi.gov.uk)

### Information Commissioner's Office

If you remain dissatisfied after an internal review decision, you have the right to apply to the Information Commissioner's Office. The Commissioner is an independent regulator who has the power to direct us to respond to your request differently, if he considers that we have handled it incorrectly.

You can contact the Information Commissioner's Office at the following address:

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

Internet address: [https://www.ico.org.uk/Global/contact\\_us](https://www.ico.org.uk/Global/contact_us)

## **EXPLANATION OF FOIA - SECTION 14(1) – VEXATIOUS REQUESTS**

We have provided below additional information about Section 14(1) of the Freedom of Information Act. We have included some extracts from the legislation, as well as some of the guidance we use when applying it. We hope you find this information useful.

### **The legislation**

#### **Section 1: Right of Access to information held by public authorities**

- (1) 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 description specified in the request, and
  - (b) if that is the case, to have that information communicated to him.

#### **Section 14: Vexatious or repeated requests.**

- (1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious.
- (2) Where a public authority has previously complied with a request for information which was made by any person, it is not obliged to comply with a subsequent identical or substantially similar request from that person unless a reasonable interval has elapsed between compliance with the previous request and the making of the current request.

#### **Guidance**

Public authorities may sometimes be faced with a requester who sends in request after request, often slightly differently worded, but essentially asking the same question. Sometimes, in doing this, the requester may be trying to vindicate a long-standing grievance against an authority.

Handling such requests can be very resource intensive, in particular where the request is accompanied by a stream of correspondence, detailed representations and comments to which the applicant seeks to get the public authority to respond.

Whether a request is vexatious is determined by the information requested, not the person making the request. Vexatiousness needs to be assessed with reference to all the circumstances of an individual case. However, if a request is not a genuine endeavour to access information for its own sake, but is aimed at disrupting the work of an authority, or harassing individuals in it, then it may well be vexatious.