



Gloucestershire Constabulary
Police Headquarters
No.1 Waterwells, Waterwells Drive
Quedgeley, Gloucester. GL2 2AN
www.gloucestershire.police.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: FOI_26_0660

E-mail: FOI

@gloucestershire.police.uk

Direct dial: 01452 754304

Postal Address: As above

Date: 31/07/2026

Dear

Gloucestershire Constabulary Freedom of Information request 26_0660

On 11/07/2026 you sent an email constituting a request under the Freedom of Information Act asking the following:

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, please provide the number of distinct crime records, broken down by the year in which the crime was recorded, for:

each calendar year from 2020 to 2025; and 1 January to 30 June 2026.

Please identify crime records where the occurrence summary, modus operandi description or equivalent electronically searchable free-text field contains:

“Roblox”; and

at least one of the following terms:

“terrorist”, “terrorism”, “Terrorism Act”, “counter-terrorism”, “counter terrorism”, “ISIS”, “ISIL”, “Islamic State”, “Daesh”, “Al-Qaeda”, “Al Qaeda”, “Islamist”, “Islamism”, “jihad”, “jihadist”, “jihadi”, “radicalisation”, “radicalization”, “radicalised”, “radicalized”, “extremism”, “extremist”, “Prevent referral” or “referred to Prevent”.

Please provide annual totals only, count each matching crime record once and record nil returns as zero.

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 s1, I can confirm that Gloucestershire Constabulary holds some relevant information.

Section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) places two duties on public authorities. Unless exemptions apply, the first duty at Section 1(1)(a) is to confirm or deny whether the information specified in a request is held. The second duty at Section 1(1)(b) is to disclose information that has been confirmed as being held. Where exemptions are

relied upon s17 of FOIA requires that we provide the applicant with a notice which: a) states that fact b) specifies the exemption(s) in question and c) states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies.

Gloucestershire Constabulary can neither confirm nor deny that it holds any information in relation to systems used for intelligence purposes as the duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply, by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 23(5) Information relating to the Security bodies;
 Section 24(2) National Security
 Section 31(3) Law enforcement;

Section 23 is an absolute class-based exemption and therefore there is no requirement to conduct a harm or public interest test

Sections 24 and 31 are prejudice based qualified exemptions and there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in confirming or not that the information is held as well as carrying out a public interest test.

Harm – Sections 24(2) and 31(3)

Confirming or denying whether the Force holds information falling within the scope of this request would, in itself, reveal information about whether the Force has identified, recorded or otherwise encountered matters linking Roblox to terrorism, extremism, radicalisation or Prevent-related concerns.

Whilst Roblox is a widely used online gaming platform, the request is not simply seeking information about its use. Rather, it seeks to establish whether police records contain references to Roblox in conjunction with terminology associated with terrorism, extremism, radicalisation and Prevent activity. Confirmation or denial would therefore provide insight into whether such matters have come to the attention of the Force and have been recorded within crime and safeguarding systems.

Even where no information is held, confirmation of that fact would itself be informative. Responses provided by individual forces could be compared and aggregated, enabling a requester to build a broader picture of the extent to which particular online platforms feature within police records relating to terrorism, extremism, radicalisation and Prevent-related activity across the United Kingdom. This mosaic effect could assist those seeking to understand policing's awareness of particular platforms, assess the extent to which such environments are associated with police activity, or identify perceived gaps in police knowledge and intelligence. Such information could be used to adapt behaviours, exploit vulnerabilities or otherwise seek to avoid detection and intervention.

The release of information capable of contributing to a broader understanding of policing's knowledge and activity concerning terrorism and extremism would be likely to prejudice the prevention and detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders and the broader law enforcement functions of the police service.

Furthermore, counter-terrorism and Prevent-related activity forms part of the wider framework for protecting national security. Confirmation or denial of whether information is

held would provide insight into the extent to which such matters have been encountered by policing and could undermine efforts to identify and respond to threats associated with terrorism and extremism. Accordingly, confirmation or denial would be likely to result in prejudice to both national security and law enforcement functions.

Public Interest Test

Section 24(2) National Security

Factors favouring confirmation or denial - There is a public interest in transparency regarding the extent to which online platforms may feature within policing activity relating to terrorism, extremism and radicalisation. Confirming or denying whether information is held would contribute to public understanding of emerging risks associated with online environments and provide greater insight into the challenges faced by policing.

There is also a public interest in demonstrating that police forces appropriately identify and record matters associated with terrorism, extremism and safeguarding. Greater openness can promote accountability, reassure the public that relevant concerns are recognised and addressed, and support informed debate regarding online safety and radicalisation.

Factors favouring neither confirming nor denying - There is a compelling public interest in safeguarding national security. Confirming or denying whether information is held would reveal whether police records contain information linking a specific online platform to terrorism, extremism, radicalisation or Prevent-related concerns.

Information of this nature could enable those with malicious intent to make inferences regarding policing's awareness of particular platforms, environments or behaviours. Even seemingly limited disclosures can be valuable when combined with information already available from other sources.

Responses from multiple police forces could be compared and aggregated, contributing to a broader understanding of the extent to which such matters have come to police attention across the United Kingdom. This could assist those seeking to assess counter-terrorism awareness, policing activity and potential vulnerabilities.

There is a strong and enduring public interest in ensuring that information is not released where doing so could undermine activities undertaken to protect national security and public safety.

Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Factors favouring confirmation or denial - There is a public interest in promoting openness and transparency regarding police recording practices and the way in which policing responds to concerns relating to terrorism, extremism and radicalisation.

Confirming or denying whether information is held would assist public understanding of the prevalence of such matters within police records and facilitate scrutiny of the effectiveness of policing responses to emerging online threats and safeguarding concerns. Disclosure would also contribute to public confidence by demonstrating accountability in respect of

the identification and recording of matters relating to terrorism, extremism and Prevent activity.

Factors favouring neither confirming nor denying - There is a significant public interest in protecting the ability of the police service to prevent and detect crime and apprehend offenders. Confirming or denying whether information is held would reveal information about the extent to which particular online platforms feature within police crime and safeguarding records relating to terrorism, extremism and radicalisation.

Information regarding whether such records exist could assist those seeking to understand policing's awareness of particular online environments, avoid detection or identify perceived gaps within police knowledge and intelligence.

Furthermore, responses from different police forces could be compared and aggregated, enabling a broader picture of policing activity, awareness and record holdings concerning terrorism and extremism to be developed. This would increase the risk of prejudice to law enforcement functions.

There is a strong public interest in ensuring that policing's ability to identify, prevent and respond to criminal and extremist activity is not undermined through incremental disclosures that contribute to a wider intelligence picture.

Balance Test

Whilst the Force recognises the public interest in openness, transparency, and accountability regarding policing's response to terrorism, extremism, radicalisation and safeguarding concerns, greater weight must be afforded to the significant public interest in protecting national security and the effectiveness of law enforcement.

Confirming or denying whether information is held would reveal whether police records contain information linking Roblox to terrorism, extremism, radicalisation, or Prevent-related concerns. Responses from multiple forces could also be compared and aggregated, contributing to a broader understanding of policing's awareness of such activity and the extent to which it has been encountered across the United Kingdom.

The Force considers that confirmation or denial would be likely to prejudice both national security and law enforcement functions. Therefore, the potential prejudice arising from confirmation or denial outweighs the benefits of increased transparency and the balance of the public interest favours maintaining the neither confirm nor deny position under Sections 24(2) and 31(3) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

If you are not satisfied with this response or any actions taken in dealing with your request, you have the right to ask that we review your case under our internal procedure. Please note that a request for an internal review must be made within 20 working days of the response to your original request.

If you decide to request that such a review is undertaken and following this process you are still unsatisfied, you then have the right to direct your complaint to the Information Commissioner for consideration.

The Information Commissioner can be contacted via the following means:

Website - <https://ico.org.uk/>

Call their helpline - 0303 123 1113

Email - casework@ico.org.uk

Post –

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

Yours sincerely,

Disclosure Officer
Gloucestershire Constabulary