

## **Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)**

### **Decision notice**

**Date:** 15 December 2022

**Public Authority:** Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (Executive Agency of the Department for Health and Social Care)

**Address:** 10 South Colonnade  
Canary Wharf  
London  
E14 4PU

### **Decision (including any steps ordered)**

---

1. The complainant has requested information about adverse reactions to the coronavirus vaccination.
2. The Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency ('MHRA') refused to comply with the request, citing section 14(1) (vexatious requests) of FOIA.
3. The Commissioner's decision is that the MHRA has incorrectly relied upon section 14(1) to refuse the request.
4. The Commissioner requires the public authority to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation.
  - Issue a fresh response to the request not relying upon section 14(1) FOIA.
5. The public authority must take these steps within 35 calendar days of the date of this decision notice. Failure to comply may result in the Commissioner making written certification of this fact to the High Court pursuant to section 54 of FOIA and may be dealt with as a contempt of court.

## Request and response

---

6. The complainant made the following information request on 6 December 2021:

"Having regularly studied the weekly yellow card reports published by the MHRA relating to **Covid 19 vaccine** adverse effects and indeed fatalities, I request to be furnished with the following information.

Can you please furnish me with a copy of the conclusive risk assessment and data that evidentially concludes that the adverse effects and fatalities reported via the yellow card reporting system are not the results of the administration of the **Covid 19 Vaccinations** that have taken place during 2021?

I am sure this should be a fairly straightforward request as I am sure this information is probably, almost certainly published somewhere, bearing in mind what's stated in the copy of the below paragraph copied from the MHRA website. It's just that I cannot find this information."

7. The MHRA responded on 14 January 2022. It refused to comply with the request, stating that it was vexatious.
8. The complainant requested an internal review. The MHRA provided the outcome to its internal review on 24 February 2022. The MHRA upheld its original position.

## Scope of investigation

---

9. The Commissioner has considered whether MHRA was correct to refuse to comply with the request under section 14(1) FOIA.

## Reasons for decision

---

### Section 14(1) – vexatious requests

10. Section 14(1) of FOIA states:

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

11. The Commissioner's guidance<sup>1</sup> states that a vexatious request will represent 'a manifestly unjustified, inappropriate or improper use of a formal procedure.'
12. Some requests will be clearly vexatious whilst other requests will be less clear cut. In all cases, the important question for a public authority to ask is whether the request is likely to cause a disproportionate or unjustified level of disruption, irritation or distress.
13. The Commissioner's guidance also states, 'In some cases, you may believe that several different requesters are acting together as part of a campaign to disrupt your organisation by the sheer weight of FOIA requests they are submitting. Then, you can take this into account when determining whether any of those requests are vexatious.'
14. A public authority must have sufficient evidence to substantiate its position that requests have been submitted as part of a campaign. Some indicators of a campaign might be:
  - The requests are identical or very similar;
  - The public authority has received email correspondence in which other requesters have been copied in or mentioned;
  - There is an unusual pattern of requests, for example a large number have been submitted within a relatively short space of time; or
  - A group's website makes an explicit reference to a campaign against the public authority.
15. The Commissioner has previously considered six very similar complaints against the MHRA<sup>2</sup>. These requests were dealt with under IC-160439-J9F2, IC-157922-W9F0, IC-158671-P2H2, IC-165779-Y0C7, IC-162613-G4R6 and IC-161116-G0F3.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guidance-index/freedom-of-information-and-environmental-information-regulations/dealing-with-vexatious-requests-section-14/what-does-vexatious-mean/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://icosearch.ico.org.uk/s/search.html?collection=ico-meta&profile=decisions&query&query=&f.By+authority|publicAuthority=Medicines%20and%20Healthcare%20Products%20Regulatory%20Agency>

16. In these cases, the Commissioner determined that the requests were vexatious because they were part of a campaign and therefore the MHRA was entitled to rely upon section 14(1) to refuse to comply.
17. The MHRA has explained that the request was submitted at a similar time, and using similar wording, to those the Commissioner previously investigated and referred to above. Therefore, the MHRA considered the request was also part of the same campaign and therefore vexatious.
18. However in the internal review in this case, MHRA quoted the request as including the following wording:  
  
"The COVID-19 vaccine quantitative risk assessment data and report which demonstrates that the MHRA Yellow Card vaccine adverse reactions and death reports are NOT the result of the vaccine adverse effects."
19. This does not appear to be the wording of the request (or the request for internal review) provided to the Commissioner by the complainant in support of their complaint.
20. In the complaint to the Commissioner the Complainant has confirmed that "This is not the text I used in my original FOI request".
21. Whilst the request in this case was made at a similar time it does not appear to use similar wording and would appear to have been misquoted by the MHRA in the internal review response.

### **The Commissioner's view**

22. For the reasons above, the Commissioner is not satisfied that this request was made as part of a campaign and cannot therefore be categorised as vexatious. Section 14(1) FOIA was incorrectly applied in this case.

## Right of appeal

---

23. 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: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: [grc@Justice.gov.uk](mailto:grc@Justice.gov.uk)

Website: [www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber](http://www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber)

24. 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.
25. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

**Signed.....**

**Gemma Garvey**  
**Senior Case Officer**  
**Information Commissioner's Office**  
**Wycliffe House**  
**Water Lane**  
**Wilmslow**  
**Cheshire**  
**SK9 5AF**