

Reclosure Panel – Public Minutes		THE
Date: 16 December 2025	Time: 10:30 – 12:00	NATIONAL
	Location: Meeting Room 21E / MS Teams	ARCHIVES
Attendees		
Lucy Fletcher (LF)		
		Linda Stewart (LS)
Apologies		

Minutes:

1) Actions/queries from previous meeting (held 2nd October 2025)

- 1.1. FCO 87/136: Panel queried whether information about the serving of writs is already in the public domain
 - Case handler consulted and, following further research, cited ICO guidance on [information in the public domain](#) and stated that although writs may be public at the time, they do not necessarily remain in the public domain as initially recommended.
 - **Panel noted and agreed to s40(2) redaction**
- 1.2. HO 391/602: Panel asked that the initial recommendation regarding the use of Section 40 is reconsidered (Panel did not fully agree with the approach taken). The case handler is currently engaging with the relevant stakeholder.
 - **Panel noted – rolled over**
- 1.3. J 84 various (30 records): on hold. Awaiting thoughts from external stakeholder before a decision can be made.
 - **Rolled over pending discussions.**

The following cases (1.4 – 1.15) were rolled over from the previous (i.e. October 2025) Reclosure Panel meeting.

- 1.4. ASSI 45/299 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) & 40(2) for 99 years until 2057
Recommendation agreed.
- 1.5. CAB 143/15 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 80 years until 2034

The case discussed in the record is notorious; the panel noted the importance of

ensuring redactions are not overzealous. On discussion with the case handler, the panel were content that due diligence has been done in seeing what is in the public domain. It was noted that redactions are few in light of this.

Recommendation agreed.

- 1.6. DEFE 70/213 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 84 years until 2057

The Panel sought clarification as to the specifics of the proposed redactions before a decision can be made.

Recommendation not agreed - to be clarified with handler (rolled over)

- 1.7. DPP 2/3939 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 84 years until 2050

It was noted that the redactions proposed only concern information unrelated to the Krays. The Panel noted the efforts of the case handler in their meticulousness in redacting *only* what is not already in the public domain and is found to be sensitive under FOIA.

Recommendation agreed

- 1.8. FCO 31/3828 – Recommendation: redacted open under sections 23/24 “In the alternative”, 26(1)(a)(b), 27(1)(a)(c)(d) and 27(2) for 51 years until 2035

Recommendation agreed

- 1.9. FCO 87/136 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 100 years until 2073

Recommendation agreed – see item 1.1

- 1.10. FCO 9/1616 – Recommendation: redaction open under sections 38(1)(b) and 40(2) for 82 years until 2055

The Panel sought clarification as to the specifics of the proposed redactions before a decision can be made.

Recommendation not agreed – Case handler asked for more explanation from the stakeholder.

- 1.11. J 267/1017 – Recommendation: redacted open under sections 27(2) and 40(2) for 77 years until 2065

Recommendation agreed

- 1.12. J 82/31 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 99 years until 2057

Recommendation agreed

- 1.13. J 82/450 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 87 years until 2052

The panel queried whether redaction is possible. It was however noted that this record is particularly graphic and distressing and that redaction was not recommended.

Recommendation agreed

- 1.14. MT 208/8 – Recommendation: redacted open under sections 26(1)(a)(b) and 40(2) for 82 years until 2084

Panel noted that the stakeholder viewed the record and suggested application of the section 26 exemption. Also noted that this particular redaction (under s26) is quite small.

Recommendation agreed

- 1.15. WO 423/8954 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 94 years until 2041

The Panel noted that this concerned a service personnel record. Upon review, through an FOI request, some information was not redacted as it should have been and requires reclosure to correct the error.

Recommendation agreed**2) Case recommendations – full closures & redacted opens**

- 2.1. ASSI 6/637 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 84 years until 2056

Recommendation agreed

- 2.2. CRIM 1/5213 – Recommendation: full closure under section 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 61 years until 2034

The panel queried the age of the victim and whether this could be included in report.

Recommendation agreed in principle but seek confirmation from handler.

- 2.3. HO 522/5 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 67 years until 2048

The panel queried the strength of the case for redaction – *some* information available in the public domain which may be of the data subject but needs verifying.

Recommendation not agreed – to be queried with case handler

- 2.4. J 265/101 & J 82/4090 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 95 and 94 years respectively, until 2074

Recommendation agreed

- 2.5. FCO 93/3179 – Recommendation: redacted open under sections 27(1)(a)(c)(d) and 27(2) for 50 years until 2033

The Panel queried whether the threshold of section 27 is met.

Recommendation not agreed – seek further information on s27 arguments from case handler and stakeholder.

- 2.6. HO 140/917 – Recommendation: full closure under section 40(2) for 86 years until 2058

Recommendation agreed

- 2.7. BN 90/1 – Recommendation: full closure under section 40(2) for 85 years until 2064

The Panel queried whether full close needed – the case handler confirmed that the level of information and detail necessitates full closure.

Recommendation agreed

2.8. BN 90/2 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 85 years until 2064

Recommendation agreed

2.9. BN 90/4 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 83 years until 2062

Recommendation agreed

2.10. T 319/2456 – Recommendation: redacted open under sections 24(1) and 26(1)(a)(b) for 100 years until 2075

Advice sought as report is unclear on what the stakeholder views are.

Recommendation not agreed – seek stakeholder views

2.11. BT 176/10 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 81 years until 2052

Recommendation agreed

2.12. LO 2/128 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 73 years until 2044

Recommendation on hold – clarification on whether the recommendation is for redaction or a full close, as there was a discrepancy between the report and agenda.

2.13. LO 2/130 – Recommendation: full closure under section 40(2) for 73 years until 2044

Recommendation agreed

2.14. LO 2/132 – Recommendation: full closure under section 40(2) for 75 years until 2046

Panel queried whether redaction is possible.

Recommendation not agreed – pending input from DPO and a re-review from the case handler

2.15. LO 2/134 – Recommendation: full closure under section 40(2) for 75 years until 2046

Recommendation not agreed – as above (2.14)

2.16. FD 23/1764 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 99 years until 2070

Recommendation agreed

FD 23/1765 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 91 years until 2063

Recommendation agreed

2.17. FD 7/1675 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 90 years until 2063

Panel queried why some reports concerning Thalidomide records are grouped and others are not. It was explained that it depends on the nature of the information within and reclosure recommendation. To consider efficient ways of presenting recommendations for multiple

records on the same subject matter going forward.

Recommendation agreed

FD 7/1676 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 90 years until 2063

Recommendation agreed

FD 7/1677 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 90 years until 2063

Recommendation agreed

FD 7/1678 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 90 years until 2063

Recommendation agreed

2.18. MEPO 21/210 – Recommendation: full closure under section 40(2) for 100 years until 2090

Recommendation agreed

2.19. DPP 2/1018 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 100 years until 2043

The Panel queried the closure period as it was unclear. The Panel also queried whether redaction was possible, based on contents in the report.

Recommendation not agreed – to be queried with case handler

DPP 2/987 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 100 years until 2043

Recommendation not agreed – as above

2.20. PRO 84/612 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 23(1) for 82 years until 2069

Recommendation agreed

2.21. PRO 84/924 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 23(1) for 82 years until 2069

Recommendation agreed

2.22. DEFE 24/1480 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 82 years until 2060

Recommendation agreed

2.23. DEFE 24/1481 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 84 years until 2062

Recommendation agreed

2.24. DEFE 24/1482 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 81 years until 2060

Recommendation agreed

2.25. BN 62/1296 – Recommendation: redacted open under section 40(2) for 84 years until

2059

Recommendation agreed

2.26. T 640/2 – Recommendation: under sections 23 and 40(2) for 79 years until 2063

The Panel noted that most of the file will remain open and that the sensitivities concern 4-5 pages.

Recommendation agreed

2.27. DEFE 70/495 – Recommendation: redacted open under sections 38(1)(b) and 40(2) for 82 years until 2054

Recommendation agreed

2.28. CRIM 1/3485 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(a) and 40(2) for 100 years until 2061

The panel queried the proposed closure date. The Panel noted the case is very notable & public – this particular defendant was 18 when he was hanged, and thus there is a lot in the public domain, making this different to less notable cases.

Following discussion, the Panel agreed that the case should be looked at again, in light of the amount of information in the public domain. It was also queried whether redaction was feasible.

The Panel noted that this decision may have implications for other records relating to this case that are closed until 2061.

Recommendation not agreed – case handler to respond to queries.

2.29. DEFE 70/176 – Recommendation: full closure under sections 38(1)(b) and 40(2) for 81 years until 2054

The Panel queried whether redaction is possible.

Recommendation not agreed – case handler to response to queries.

2.30. . Reclosure project: BN 29 review (16 records)

Recommendations noted & agreed

2.31. Reclosure project: BN 27 review (15 records)

Recommendations noted & agreed**3) Access Under Review (AUR) records returned to open access**

A schedule of 43 records that were reviewed by the FOI Centre and are to revert to open status was presented to the Panel for their information. These records previously had an 'access under review' status and were found not to contain any sensitive information.

3.1. DEFE 13/1398

3.2. DEFE 24/827

3.3. HO 140/476

3.4. IR 40/7336

- 3.5. IR 40/11027
- 3.6. IR 40/18048
- 3.7. HO 140/477
- 3.8. HO 140/475
- 3.9. BT 176/46
- 3.10. BN 35/24
- 3.11. IR 40/14741
- 3.12. IR 40/13837
- 3.13. FV 38/74
- 3.14. FV 38/73
- 3.15. WO 106/6250
- 3.16. T 534/53
- 3.17. T 383/306
- 3.18. T 215/1753
- 3.19. T 555/157
- 3.20. BN 62/1451
- 3.21. BN 62/721
- 3.22. BN 62/1218
- 3.23. BN 62/1208
- 3.24. BN 62/1086
- 3.25. BN 62/1226
- 3.26. BN 62/1177
- 3.27. BN 62/3180
- 3.28. BN 62/712
- 3.29. BN 62/1710
- 3.30. BN 62/521
- 3.31. BN 62/1749
- 3.32. PCOM 9/700
- 3.33. PCOM 9/2093
- 3.34. BN 27/21
- 3.35. BN 27/23
- 3.36. BN 27/24
- 3.37. BN 27/25
- 3.38. BN 27/30
- 3.39. BN 27/33
- 3.40. BN 27/38
- 3.41. BN 27/41
- 3.42. BN 27/48
- 3.43. DO 133/138

4) Virtual FOI Reclosure cases (BAU)¹

The Panel noted that the 4 records on the Virtual Schedule (BAU) that had previously been 'Access

¹ Virtual' reclosure occurs where a Freedom of Information request is received for a record held at The National Archives which has the status of 'access under review'. The review of these records is conducted through the standard FOI process, which includes consultation with the transferring department and (if a qualified exemption applies), the Advisory Council for National Records and Archives (ACRNA) and the Secretary of State for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

under Review' were now resolved following FOI requests, having been through the complete FOI process.

- 4.1. COAL 95/139
- 4.2. COAL 95/176
- 4.3. COAL 95/177
- 4.4. HO 195/13/324

5) Virtual FOI Reclosure cases (seen by Panel Chair)

The Panel noted that the 2 records on the Virtual Schedule (further consideration) that had previously been 'Access under Review' were now resolved following FOI requests, having been through the complete FOI process. These cases were also seen and approved by the Reclosure Panel Chair, as they met the criteria for further consideration.

- 5.1. PREM 13/2841
- 5.2. HO 291/228

6) Any other business

- 6.1. Panel Membership – to be re-considered by panel chair.
- 6.2. Love Letters item – records put forward for exhibition, had previously been cleared as having no s40 sensitivities. Some, however, were later found to contain a small amount of personal information.

Exec Team due to discuss this item at their meeting on 18th December and a discussion to be had with the Keeper.

- 6.3. Recurring item: Access Under Review (AUR) data at TNA
Panel noted:

- There will be a spike in AUR due to New Year Openings. In the past year ~1000 fewer AUR records.

- 1.1. Most AUR records continue to be AB/ES records

- Core reclosure caseload reduced: ~70 cases left to review (doesn't include projects).

- 1.2. ~430 records seen by panel this year.

- 6.4. Upcoming review - PREM 15 records (Northern Ireland digitisation).

Noted by the Panel.

- 6.5. Date of next meeting: 4th February 2026, 14:00 – 15:30 (Meeting Room 21C & MS Teams)