

ICLR Search case law Search

ICLR.4 Case Genie Products Knowledge Blog About Contact

Timandeep Singh Gill v Information Commissioner & Anor

Table of Contents

Hearings

AI Summary & Issues

Hearings

United Kingdom

20 Nov 2025 [2025] UKFTT 1360 (GRC), FTT

AI Summary & Issues

This summary was created by AI. Learn more about AI Case Summaries.

✦ The First-tier Tribunal dismissed Timandeep Singh Gill's appeal against the Information Commissioner's decision, which upheld Kent Police's refusal of his Freedom of Information requests as vexatious under section 14(1) FOIA. The Tribunal determined that the requests were burdensome, connected to prior interactions, and primarily served the Appellant's private interest rather than the public good, thereby constituting an improper use of FOIA. The Tribunal affirmed the Commissioner's decision and dismissed the appeal.

✦ Issues

- Did the Tribunal determine whether the Information Commissioner correctly upheld Kent Police's reliance on section 14(1) of FOIA to refuse the Appellant's requests for information?
- Was the Appellant's pattern of previous requests and correspondence considered by the Tribunal in assessing whether the current requests were vexatious under section 14(1) of FOIA?
- Did the Tribunal evaluate the public interest and value of the information sought by the Appellant in relation to the determination of whether the requests were vexatious?

Subscribe or Register to access the full case information page. Registered users can access three Law Reports, three case information pages and perform three Case Genie searches per month. If you already have an ICLR account please log in. For other queries or to request a free trial please contact ICLR.

Mod users should log in here.

[Index card Timandeep Singh Gill v Information Commissioner & Anor - ICLR](#)

“.... The First-tier Tribunal dismissed Timandeep Singh Gill's appeal against the Information Commissioner's decision, which upheld Kent Police's refusal of his Freedom of Information requests as vexatious under section 14(1) FOIA. The Tribunal determined that the requests were burdensome, connected to prior interactions, and primarily served the Appellant's private interest rather than the public good, thereby constituting an improper use of FOIA. The Tribunal affirmed the Commissioner's decision and dismissed the appeal....”

Timandeep Singh Gill v Information Commissioner's Office and Kent Police

Venue : General Regulatory Chamber (First Tier Tribunal)

Hearing Date : 20 November 2025

What is this?

This judgement from the GRC was released following tangential proceedings to the current broader case at the Administrative Court case regarding the unlawful management practices of Kent Police in relation to its speed camera network

A learning point for the public

What ordinary members of the public should note is that usually when a case is put into appeal for reasons of error in law, parties may seek to have a judgement suspended for the time being whilst the appeal is determined by a higher court. This is especially important when the conduct of a judge or a judicial venue is under question with evidence. In this case, the GRC has ignored this procedural safeguard and sought to release its 'version of the story' prior to determination of the higher courts

The GRC published this judgment notwithstanding a live suspension request grounded in alleged procedural and factual contamination. This reflects a structural model in which first-instance tribunals appear to rely exclusively on correction by the higher courts rather than common-sense internal pause mechanisms. It is disappointingly symptomatic of a lack of recognition within the GRC that the GRC exists as a venue within the wider judiciary; and as not a standalone venue subject only to higher court intervention

Evidenced failure in the GRC as a proper judicial venue

From The Good State Project's perspective, it has appealed to the Upper Tribunal to bring attention to the conduct and systemic failures with the GRC as a continuing venue - including severely improper conduct of tribunal staff, its judges and Chamber President. It has formally applied for an operational review of the GRC's current practices and provided evidence of unlawful conduct bordering on suppression of public interest information. At the same time, along with its submission to the Administrative Court, the Good State Project has brought the matter to the attention of the Kings Bench Division and formally raised it as a potential candidate for a future judicial review

Certain Parties Like the Good State Project Act For Everyone's Benefit

The Good State Project handles high risk cases where institutional misconduct is not only embedded in the substance of the case, it has been seen occurring in the course of proceedings as individuals in positions of authority help 'cover' for other public authorities

The Good State Project is able to make clear, strong public assertions like this as it has documented evidence *and* is currently pursuing operational negligence of the GRC in follow-on proceedings at two higher courts. As such The Good State Project documents and discusses in the higher courts in official case record; this is significantly stronger and much more durable than making casual public assertions

Misfunctioning lower judicial venues - with lesser judges - are as much a hygiene problem for the state as the matters raised in cases themselves

This should *not* put people off from pressing for resolution and remedy for their interests. Instead, poorly managed state institutions are targets for stronger accountability organisations like The Good State Project that bring light to dangerously negligent, unhealthy parts of our state; as it is currently doing by bringing the procedural flaws in this case to the attention of both the higher courts for operational reform and the public so that people may learn and apply these learnings in their own cases

There Is More To Come For The Three Public Authorities In This Case Group

The GRC is fully aware that The Good State Project is pursuing the conduct of certain of its individual judges and Chamber President inside and outside of these proceedings. The Good State Project also intends to pursue the ICO for its complicity. From a case sequencing perspective, reviews of the GRC and ICO will follow the determinations in the case with Kent Police at the Administrative Court

Status of Case :

In Appeal at the Upper Tribunal. Adjacent though separate to the case at the Administrative Court

Basis of Appeal :

Multiple 'errors in law' of the GRC (notably its Judge Saward)

To understand how serious these matters are, consider that the appeal invites consideration of the following specific questions:

1. Scope manipulation:

Was the GRC correct to seek to alter the agreed scope of the hearing — contrary to the signed GRC1 form — only days before the substantive hearing?

2. Litigation certainty

Is it acceptable for litigants to conduct proceedings without knowing whether agreed scope may be unilaterally amended by the Tribunal, particularly where parallel High Court proceedings depend on stable framing?

3. Refusal of discovery

Was it consistent with public interest and Rule 2 for the GRC to avoid discovery when discovery was expressly sought in the original form GRC1 application to the GRC?

4. Refusal to order accessible, case-determinative evidence:

Was it appropriate for the GRC to refuse to order plainly relevant, easily accessible evidence, instead directing the Appellant back to FOI requests from a Respondent already documented as evasive and obstructive?

4. Non-attendance of the ICO at its own hearing

Was it proper for the GRC to refuse to determine the Appellant's Rule 16 application requiring the ICO to attend its own hearing, leaving key questions in the "Questions" document unanswered and depriving the Upper Tribunal of necessary content for the Appeal Record?

5. Ignoring evidence of potential criminal conduct by Kent Police

Was it appropriate for the GRC to ignore evidence that the Appellant had flagged potential section 77 FOIA offences to the ICO, and that this potentially criminal conduct of the police was the direct genesis of the two information requests now being curtailed under section 14(1)?

These questions illustrate the core problems that the Upper Tribunal is being invited to address when determining whether the GRC judgment of 20 November 2025 should be set aside and the appeal upheld

For the avoidance of doubt, an 'error of law' includes misdirection, failure to consider relevant evidence, procedural unfairness, irrationality, breach of statutory duty, and breach of the Tribunal's own Rules
