Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency

MHRA Central Freedom of Information Team
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU

foi.request@mhra.gov.uk.

MHRA Website

[redacted]

Our Ref: **FOI2026/00869**

01 September 2026

Dear [redacted]

Thank you for your Freedom of Information (FoI) request received on 31 July. You wrote:

> *Dear MHRA Central Freedom of Information Team, This is a single, standalone request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It concerns one subject only: whether MHRA assessed an allegation that its own inspection function was deliberately obstructed.*
> *Purpose and validity of this request*
> *This request supports an active complaint to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman, referred through my MP Edward Morello, concerning MHRA's handling of my protected disclosure CEC 227535. MHRA's Administrative Complaints Officer directed me to the PHSO on 12 March 2026 and confirmed in the same letter that she could not review any decision to take or not take regulatory action. The information sought is necessary documentary evidence for that live complaint and is not obtainable by any other route.*
> *This request concerns a distinct subject matter which no previous request or response has addressed. My earlier request FOI2026/00599 concerned the storage and quality assessment and the inspection decision. This request concerns a different matter entirely: the alleged deliberate deception of an inspector, which I raised in my disclosure of 10 July 2025 and again in my correspondence of 19 November 2025, and which no response received to date has engaged with. In Information Commissioner v Devon County Council and Dransfield [2012] UKUT 440 (AAC), the Upper Tribunal held that the test for vexatiousness turns on whether a request lacks adequate purpose or value and amounts to a manifestly unjustified or improper use of the Act. A request asking whether a regulator assessed an allegation of deliberate deception of its own inspector has a clear and serious purpose.*
> *Request*
> *In relation to Exchange Supplies Ltd (WDA(H) 20973) and case CEC 227535, limited to the period 9 July 2025 to the date of this request:*
>
> *1. Any record of an assessment of the allegation that products were concealed from [redacted] during her inspection of Exchange Supplies Ltd, or that [redacted] was otherwise deliberately misled as to the location at which wholesale distribution activities were carried out.*
> *2. Any record of an assessment of the allegation that I was coached in advance as to what to say to the inspector, and that I was induced as a junior employee to participate in the continued operation of the unlicensed site at Romans Building.*

3. Any record of a decision as to whether the allegations at 1 and 2 warranted investigation, including the recorded reason for that decision and the post or grade of the decision maker.
4. Any record of whether those allegations were referred to, considered by, or declined by the Criminal Enforcement Unit, including any recorded reason for a decision not to proceed.
5. Any record of consideration of whether the conduct alleged engaged the offence provisions of the Human Medicines Regulations 2012 concerning obstruction of, or the provision of false or misleading information to, a person exercising inspection or enforcement functions.

To assist location and retrieval within the cost limit, please confine the search to recorded information held by the GDP Inspectorate, the Criminal Enforcement Unit, and the Compliance team handling CEC 227535.
Format
Emails, case management records, assessments, referral forms, file notes and internal communications, as defined by section 84 FOIA.
Processing
Please comply with sections 1 and 10 FOIA. If you consider the section 12 cost limit is likely to be exceeded, I ask that, consistent with your section 16 duty and the advice given in IR2026/00360, you contact me to agree further narrowing before issuing any refusal. Where information is withheld, please specify the exemption relied upon and, for any qualified exemption, provide the public interest test. Where a document is partially exempt, please disclose it in redacted form rather than withholding it in full.
If any part of this request is answered "not held," I ask that you confirm expressly which teams and record systems were searched. I make that request having regard to your response of 23 July 2026 on FOI2026/00599, in which further information within scope was located and released after your initial response and after the internal review had been completed.

MHRA Response
In our response to FOI2025/00930 (14 November 2025) we provided email correspondence and documentation held in relation to the assessment of your disclosure. Further emails regarding this were released in response to FOI2026/00599 (23 July 2026).

We can confirm that for the present request we have identified two chains of email correspondence where the allegations specified above were discussed. Please find this correspondence attached. Please note that the much of the information in the email chains is out of scope of the request and so has been redacted on this basis. We have highlighted this on the attached documents.

Some of the information has also been redacted as it constitutes personal data of someone other than yourself and as such, it is being withheld in accordance with Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act.

Section 40(2) exempts information in response to a request if it is personal data belonging to an individual other than the requester and it satisfies one of the conditions listed in the legislation. In this case the condition contained in Section 40(3A)(a) applies - that disclosure would breach one of the data protection principles, specifically that “Personal data shall be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner...”.

We do not consider that disclosing this information is necessary or justified in order to satisfy your information request and the requirements of the FoI Act. In relation to this request, we consider that there is no strong legitimate interest that would override the prejudice to the rights and freedoms of the data subject.

Personal data are subject to UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018.

In addition, personal information about you is exempt under Section 40(1) of the FOI Act. For this reason, we have redacted your name in the disclosed correspondence.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact us quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely,

MHRA Central Freedom of Information Team
Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency

Your right to complain under the Freedom of Information Act

If you are not happy with this response you may request an internal review by e-mailing foi.request@mhra.gov.uk or by writing to: MHRA Central Freedom of Information Team, 10 South, Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London, E14 4PU
Any request for an internal review must be received by us within 40 working days of the date of this letter. Please note we are not obliged to provide a review if it is requested after more than 40 working days.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner's Office for a decision. Generally, the Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted our own complaints procedure. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
Website: ICO FOI and EIR complaints or telephone 0303 123 1113.

Re-use of our information
The MHRA information supplied in response to your request is subject to Crown copyright. Information created by the MHRA which is disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act is made available for re-use under the Open Government Licence (OGL) v3.0, except where this is otherwise stated. There are some restrictions on re-use under the OGL and these can be viewed here:
https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/