

To : The Upper Tribunal

From : Timandeep Singh Gill

Party : Appellant (litigant-in-person)

GRC case reference number : FT/EA/2025/0195

Date : 4 January 2026

Summary Request to Appeal to the Upper Tribunal regarding the GRC's Judgement

Dear Judges of the Upper Tribunal -

This Appeal to the Upper Tribunal regards a judgement by the GRC that determined that section 14 of the FOIA should be applied to two information requests made by the Appellant to Kent Police (the Second Respondent) dated October 2024. The GRC determined that the information request is considered burdensome to the public authority and low value to the public interest in its November 2025 judgement

Request for Permission to Appeal : made to the Upper Tribunal

This Appeal to the Upper Tribunal is based on a series of material procedural errors by the GRC and the admission of a false factual basis by Kent Police in a submission to the Administrative Court (High Court) one day following the release of the GRC judgement, in separate proceedings on the related matter of unlawful management practices in regards to the camera network. These are all detailed and contextualised in the following letter (in Addendum 1 : 'Detailed Request to Appeal' section 2 : 'Grounds for Appeal to the Upper Tribunal'):

- False factual basis : the purported non-existence of a material operating contract contrary to fact and later admission by Kent Police (the Second Respondent)
- Breach of the Appellant's Article 6 ECHR rights
- Breach of Rule 2 of the GRC Rules regarding false and misleading conduct of its Judge, Registrar and Chamber President
- Failure in the statutory duty of candour
- Failure of Tameside duty of inquiry
- Abuse of the already-agreed 'reasonable adjustments' per section 20 of the Equality Act 2010, and contrary to Rule 2 GRC Rules with respect to the ability of the Appellant to participate fully and fairly in proceedings as well as the duty of the GRC to treat the Appellant's case fairly and justly
- Potential failure of Rule 2(2)(d) and Senior President of Tribunal Practice Guidance with regards to panel constitution with appropriate expertise

Refusal Letter from the GRC

In keeping with Rule 42(1) of the GRC Rules, the Appellant corresponded with the GRC to seek permission to appeal. It was refused. The note below - and in the attached Addendum 3 'Important comments regarding the GRC's refusal letter' - shows how this refusal letter further evidences gross failure and internal governance issues at the GRC. The refusal letter from the GRC is shown to be further evidence of its own misconduct in the following respects:

1. It should be noted that the related matters of Kent Police's management practices is now active in the Administrative Court (case reference AC-2025-LON-003800)
2. It should be noted that on 21 November 2025, Kent Police submitted to the Administrative Court admitting to past falsehoods in its FOIA responses. This came one day after the GRC judgement was released to all parties. The lack of candour and seemingly conflicting factual matrix in separate jurisdictions has been flagged to the Administrative Court; and is now being flagged here for the Upper Tribunal
3. These Appeal Papers describe in detail the basis for an appeal to the Upper Tribunal. Separately, the note in the Addendum is highlights the following:
 - A. This refusal letter itself is further evidence of procedural failure at the GRC and supports the case for intervention - both in this case and generally with regards to the operations of the GRC
 - B. The refusal letter is authored by the same Judge who has been documented as engaging in improper conduct
 - C. The refusal letter repeats the same errors and improprieties identified in my appeal papers based on the original judgement
 - D. Minimal comments in the refusal letter that are "new"; though these are shown to be false

Deliberate Oversight of Material Errors in Law : Procedural

The First-tier Tribunal committed a material error of law by expressly adopting and applying an incorrect legal principle. It held that procedural fairness—specifically, "the way that this appeal... has been handled"—is "not relevant to the issues to be decided" (Judgment, para 60; Refusal Letter, para 15)

This principle is fundamentally incompatible with the Tribunal's governing legal framework and renders its decision unlawful for three interrelated reasons:

1. **Breach of the Overriding Objective (Rule 2, Tribunal Procedure Rules):** Rule 2(1) imposes a statutory duty on the Tribunal to "deal with cases fairly and justly." The Tribunal's handling of a case is the very subject of this duty. To declare its own conduct irrelevant is to nullify Rule 2, which is a freestanding error of law
2. **Breach of Article 6 ECHR (Right to a Fair Hearing):** Article 6 guarantees a fair process. A tribunal cannot deliver a lawful determination under Article 6 if it refuses to consider whether the process that led to that determination was itself fair. The Tribunal's statement is a direct repudiation of this core constitutional safeguard
3. **Error of Principle:** By defining the "issues to be decided" in a way that excludes the lawfulness of its own procedure and the conduct of public authority respondents, the Tribunal misdirected itself on a basic principle of justice. This error infects its entire approach, causing it to disregard evidenced procedural abuses (e.g., scope manipulation, ignored outstanding matters, bundle tampering, unresolved matters of procedural abuse by respondents) that were directly material to a fair resolution of the substantive appeal

Consequence:

- The Tribunal's decision was made pursuant to an unlawful self-directing principle. This error is so grave that it contaminates the entire proceeding
- The Upper Tribunal must intervene to correct this fundamental misunderstanding of a Judge and possibly the Tribunal itself, and reaffirm that how a tribunal handles a case is inseparable from the justice of its outcome

Currently Inconsistent Judicial Record

It is suggested to the Upper Tribunal that the Appeal should be heard given that the underlying factual matrix of the GRC judgement is demonstrably false and corrupted (by admission of the Respondent itself). This is in addition to the serious procedural failures of the GRC detailed in the Appeal Papers and this note

There are currently two different versions of the same factual premise at the judiciary : one claimed by the GRC and one being determined (based on admitted false statements) by the Administrative Court (High Court)

Judicial consistency demands the material falsehood to be corrected in this case

It is again highlighted that a section 14 notice may not reasonably be applied to an information request where the information request *exists* entirely to (i) refute a material statement by the public authority previously demonstrated in the Bundle and now shown unequivocally to be untrue; and (ii) that sought alternative information based on the past falsehood of the public authority. This is presently a gross failure in substantive judicial reasoning at the GRC : contrary to the evidenced assertions of the Appellant and in keeping with misrepresentations made to the GRC by Kent Police (the Second Respondent)

The current case record and disparate representation of the factual matrix in different forums of the judiciary is a deeply concerning issue

Structure of this Appeal Bundle

For ease of understanding and reference, this letter is the first part of several components in this Appeal Bundle. The attached components comprise the following:

1. Addendum 1 : Detailed Request to Appeal
2. Addendum 2 : Various Supporting Materials
3. Addendum 3 : Important comments regarding the GRC's refusal letter
4. Addendum 4 : Evidenced Contradictions in the DAR Audio Recording and Implications for Procedural Integrity

I hope that you find this appeal bundle clear and informative, and consider the case appropriate for consideration by the Upper Tribunal

sincerely -

Timandeep Singh Gill

Appellant (litigant-in-person)