

Public Release

Approved for release on 10 February 2026

**Automated Surveillance Operations -
The King (on application of Gill) v Chief Constable of Kent Police**

On 31 October 2025, a principal of The Good State Project, Timandeep Singh Gill, commenced proceedings at the Administrative Court (High Court) with Kent Police regarding certain unlawful management practices of Kent Police in relation to its surveillance camera network (speed cameras)

The case centres on the non-disclosure of key integrity information to members of the public being prosecuted for speeding offences and the Crown Prosecution Service. This is crucial information - basic integrity information

This case follows a two-year investigation by The Good State Project into the management practices of Kent Police; and a precursor set of tangentially related proceedings at the General Regulatory Chamber (First Tier Tribunal)

Following discovery of critical contracts and information from another public authority, proceedings were commenced at the Administrative Court. Prior to this, Kent Police had denied the existence of both the contracts and the integrity information. The court submissions contain primary evidence that such information has not been disclosed to drivers being prosecuted, this evidence constitutes both prosecution bundles as well as statements made by the police on judicial case record

The Administrative Court is being requested to make the following findings of fact with regards to Kent Police and its current Chief Constable Tim Smith:

- 1. Breach of disclosure obligations under the CPIA 1996**
- 2. Breach of Rule 1.1(2)(a), (c), (d), (g), Criminal Procedure Rules**
- 3. Breach of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights**
- 4. Breach of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights**
- 5. Breach of Article 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights**
- 6. Breach of Tameside duty of inquiry**
- 7. Perverting the course of justice**
- 8. Misconduct in public office**
- 9. Breach of Section 77 FOIA**

Speaking about the case at the Administrative Court, founder of The Good State Project, Timandeep Singh Gill made the following statement :

“....This is a very serious case that tests the integrity of the prosecutorial regime linked to speed cameras going back decades. The submissions include contractual evidence that the police does in fact hold the integrity information that it is continuing to deny holding, and that this information could have exonerated thousands of people in the past

This is a significant breach of public trust, needless expense on ordinary households in the form of penalties from potentially malfunctioning cameras and a scheme that has gone unchallenged for decades

The findings of this case are expected to have a profound impact on how surveillance and related prosecution activity is conducted in the UK....”

Further public releases on this case will be made in due course

Wider Governance Implications

Furthermore, in the precursor set of proceedings, the judges of the General Regulatory Chamber have been shown to have committed a series of improper acts including manipulation of case scope, making false statements and accrued serious concerns regarding the accuracy and integrity of the record. These are very serious signs of governance failure. As such, The Good State Project is now seeking an operational review of the GRC at both the Upper Tribunal and the Administrative Court, having submitted detailed evidence of multi-level organisational failure and misconduct, including at the level of Chamber President, at the GRC

It is also important to note that the Information Commissioner’s Office is being directly alleged to have buried materials in judicial bundles, ignored evidence and actively covered for misconduct and false statements by the police (which itself carries a criminal charge in section 77 of the Freedom of Information Act)