National Police Chiefs' Council

National Police
Freedom of Information
and Data Protection Unit

c/o PO BOX 481
Fareham
Hampshire
PO14 9FS

Tel: 02380 478922
Email: npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk

17/08/2026

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NUMBER: 3072/2026

Thank you for your request for information regarding Threats against MPs, which has now been considered.

Applicant Question:

I'm looking for figures from the police to indicate the number of incidents reported by MPs, and crimes against them under the freedom of information Act. If this information is collected nationally, please give those figures, but if the only collated data is that held by the Parliamentary Liason and Investigation Team, please share the figures held by that team and specify their scope.

1. How many crimes against MPs were recorded in 2026 by the police to date, and each calendar year as far back as records are available? If cost prohibits going back as far as when records begin, please provide each year since and including 2016. Do not include any crimes in which the MP was the perpetrator.

   For each year, how many of these crimes were recorded against MPs who were women, and how many were against MPs who were men?

   For each year, how many of these crimes were recorded against MPs from each party?

2. How many incidents have MPs reported to the police in 2026 to date, and every other calendar year as far back as records are available? If cost prohibits going back as far as when records begin, please provide each year since and including 2016, and do not include any crimes in which the MP was the perpetrator.

   For each year, how many of these incidents were recorded against MPs who were women, and how many were against MPs who were men?

   For each year, how many of these incidents were recorded against MPs from each party?

3. For each calendar year, how many of the incidents reported or crimes recorded were violent or included the threat of physical violence:

Against MPs who are women
Against MPs who are men
Against MPs from each political party

4. Looking at crimes and incidents reported since February 2026:

   Which 5 MPs have had the highest number of crimes and incidents against them, and for each MP how many crimes and how many incidents were there

   How many incidents, and how many crimes, has Nigel Farage reported to PLaIT since February?

   How many incidents and crimes have all MPs reported since February

NPCC Response:

The NPCC does hold recorded information within scope of your request.

The National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) does not hold a national dataset recording crimes and incidents against MPs. The information provided below has been supplied by the Metropolitan Police Service Parliamentary Liaison and Investigation Team (PLaIT), which maintains records relating to incidents and crimes reported concerning MPs. The figures therefore reflect information held by PLaIT and should not be interpreted as representing all reports made to all police forces held by PLaIT and should not be interpreted as representing all reports made to all police forces across England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Unless otherwise stated, figures for 2026 are correct up to and including 30 June 2026.

Question 1

How may crimes against MPs were recorded?

Year	Crimes
2021	408
2022	499
2023	513
2024	919
2025	989
2026	450

By gender

Year	Female	Male
2021	161	226
2022	204	273
2023	193	272
2024	380	479

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

2025	439	516
2026	190	234

By political party

Party	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Conservative	235	289	247	261	53	27
DUP	1	2	1	8	1	1
Green	1	0	0	7	1	3
Labour	128	162	183	478	784	349
Liberal Democrat	2	4	7	28	35	11
Plaid Cymru	1	0	0	0	1	0
Reform UK	0	0	0	19	21	23
SNP	16	17	16	7	4	0
Sinn Féin	0	0	0	2	4	1

Question 2

How many incidents were reported?

Year	Incidents
2021	869
2022	859
2023	2,004
2024	2,615
2025	3,881
2026	1,609

By gender

Year	Female	Male
2021	351	502
2022	338	500
2023	683	1,117
2024	911	1,442
2025	1,734	1,953
2026	621	849

By political party

Party	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Conservative	638	494	933	587	255	134
DUP	0	0	2	3	4	2

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

Green	0	1	2	13	24	10
Labour	278	260	667	1,573	2,895	1,068
Liberal Democrat	18	23	31	79	221	107
Plaid Cymru	1	2	0	1	18	1
Reform UK	0	0	0	33	70	62
SNP	13	26	41	15	12	2
Sinn Féin	0	0	0	1	0	3
Workers Party of Britain	0	0	0	21	0	0
Your Party	0	0	0	0	24	33

Question 3

For each calendar year, how many incidents reported or crimes recorded were violent or included the threat of physical violence?

The NPCC does not hold information that would enable this question to be answered.

PLaIT has advised that 'threat of physical violence' is not a category recorded within its systems and there is no recorded field by which reports can be identified and extracted on that basis.

The Freedom of Information Act provides a right of access to recorded information held at the time a request is received. It does not require public authorities to create new information, conduct subjective review of individual records, or generate new datasets in order to answer a request.

Accordingly, this information is not held for the purposes of section 1(1)(a) of the Act.

Question 4

How many incidents and crimes have all MPs reported since February 2026?

Category	Total
Incidents	1,330
Crimes	404

Which five MPs have had the highest number of crimes and incidents against them since February 2026?

How many incidents and crimes has Nigel Farage reported since February 2026?

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

The information requested identifies individual MPs and the volume of incidents and crimes reported concerning them.

The Information is withheld in full by virtue of S38 Health and Safety and S31 Law Enforcement.

The NPCC can neither confirm nor deny whether any other information is held by virtue of Section 30(3) Investigations, Section 31(3) Law Enforcement & Section 40(5) Personal Information.

- Section 30 is a class based qualified exemption and the public interest considerations must be articulated.

- Section 31 is a prejudiced based qualified exemption and the prejudice (harm) of confirming or denying whether information is held must be articulated as well as the public interest considerations.

- Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to evidence the harm of consider the public interest.

For further information relating to the legislation, please see Annex A.

Yours sincerely
Freedom of Information Officer & Decision Maker

www.npcc.police.uk

COMPLAINT RIGHTS

Internal Review

Any request for an internal review will be acknowledged and responded to, based on the specific wording of your initial request only.

We ask that any rationale to request an internal review, does not include any requests for new information and ask that these be submitted by separate email. We will acknowledge as a new request and may aggregate to your initial request in compliance with the legislation.

If you are dissatisfied with the response you have been provided with in compliance with the Freedom of Information legislation, you can lodge a complaint with NPCC to have the decision reviewed within 40 working days of the date of this response.

The handling of your request will be looked at by someone independent of the original decision and a fresh response provided.

It would be helpful, if requesting a review, for you to articulate in detail the reasons you are not satisfied with this reply.

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

NPCC
National Police Chiefs' Council

National Police
Freedom of Information
and Data Protection Unit

If you would like to request a review, please write or send an email to NPCC Freedom of Information, c/o PO Box 481, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 9FS.

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

National Police Chiefs' Council

National Police
Freedom of Information
and Data Protection Unit

Annex A

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the NPCC, when refusing to provide information by way of exemption in question and (c) states why the exemption applies. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a refusal notice to those aspects of your request.

The legislation: Section 38 Health & Safety

(1) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to—
    (a) endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or
    (b) endanger the safety of any individual.
(2) The duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, compliance with section 1(1)(a) would, or would be likely to, have either of the effects mentioned in subsection (1).

Section 38 provides an exemption where disclosure would, or would be likely to, endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or the safety of any individual.

The NPCC considers that disclosure of information identifying specific MPs and the number of incidents and crimes reported concerning them would be likely to reveal information concerning individual threat profiles and victimisation levels.

Members of Parliament occupy a unique public role and subject to dedicated protective security arrangements. Disclosure would identify those MPs who are currently experiencing the highest levels of reported incidents and criminality and could therefore contribute to assessments by hostile individuals regarding vulnerability, targeting, or the level of police attention associated with particular individuals.

The NPCC is satisfied that disclosure would be likely to create a real and significant risk to the safety of identifiable MPs and that section 38 is engaged.

The legislation: Section 31 Law Enforcement

(1) Information which is not exempt information by virtue of section 30 is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice -
(a) the prevention or detection of crime
(b) the apprehension or prosecution of offenders

Section 31 provides an exemption where disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice:

- The prevention or detection of crime; and/or
- The apprehension or prosecution of offenders.

The information requested relates directly to reports and criminality affecting identifiable MPs. Disclosure of victimisation levels associated with named MPs may provide insight into areas of current policing focus and protective activity, thereby reducing the effectiveness of measures deployed to prevent crime and protect those individuals.

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

The NPCC therefore considers that disclosure would be likely to prejudice law enforcement functions and section 31 is also engaged.

Public Interest Test

S38 and 31 are qualified exemptions and the NPCC has therefore considered the public interest test.

Factors favouring disclosure

- Promoting transparency and accountability
- Increasing public understanding of threats and criminality directed towards elected representatives.
- Informing public debate regarding the scale of abuse, intimidation and offending affecting MPs
- Assisting public understanding of the work undertaken by policing bodies in addressing such matters.

Factors favouring maintaining the exemptions

- Protecting the safety and security of identifiable MPs
- Preventing disclosure from contributing to threat profiling or assessment by individuals who may wish to target MPs.
- Avoiding prejudice to policing and protective security functions.
- Protecting the effectiveness of law enforcement activity designed to prevent and detect crime against MPs.
- Ensuring information which could assist hostile actors is not placed into the public domain.

Balance of the public interest

The NPCC recognises the significant public interest in transparency concerning crimes and incidents affecting Members of Parliament. This interest has been met, in part, through disclosure of aggregated annual and total figures.

However, the NPCC considers that the public interest in protecting the safety of identifiable MPs and safeguarding policing activities outweighs the public interest in disclosure of individualised victimisation data.

The NPCC has therefore concluded that the public interest favours maintain the exemptions.

To neither confirm nor deny with any other information is held:

The Legislation: S30(3) Investigations and Proceedings Conducted by Public Authorities

Section 30(3) provides that the duty to confirm or deny whether information is held does not arise where, if held, the information would fall within section 30(1) or 30(2).

The information requested concerns identifiable Members of Parliament and whether incidents and crimes have been recorded concerning those individuals. Any such information would be information recorded and maintained for policing and investigative purposes.

Public interest factors favouring confirmation or denial

- Promoting openness and transparency regarding the handling of reports made to the police.
- Increasing public understanding of the scale of incidents and crimes affecting Members of Parliament.
- Demonstrating that allegations of criminality affecting elected representatives are appropriately recorded and investigated.
- Supporting public confidence in policing and accountability.

Public interest factors favouring maintain the neither confirm nor deny position

- Preserving the confidentiality of information recorded for investigative purposes.
- Avoiding disclosure that may reveal whether specific individuals are recorded as victims within policing systems.
- Preventing the disclosure of information that may reveal patterns of offending, victimisation or police activity concerning identifiable individuals.
- Protecting confidence in the reporting of incidents and crimes to the police.
- Ensuring information obtained and recorded for criminal investigations is not indirectly disclosed through confirmation or denial.

Balance of the public interest

The NPCC recognises the public interest in openness and transparency regarding crimes and incidents affecting Members of Parliament. This interest has been met, in part, through the disclosure of aggregate annual and total figures.

However, confirming or denying whether further information is held concerning identifiable individuals would itself reveal information connected to policing and investigative records. The NPCC considers there is a stronger public interest in preserving the integrity of information recorded for investigative purposes and protecting individuals whose details may be contained within such records.

The NPCC therefore concludes that the public interest favours maintaining the neither confirm nor deny position.

The Legislation: Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Section 31(3) provides that the duty to confirm or deny whether information is held does not arise where confirmation or denial would, or would be likely to, prejudice law enforcement functions.

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

The requested information concerns reports and criminality affecting identifiable Members of Parliament.

Confirmation or denial that information is held in relation to particular individuals may itself disclose information regarding victimisation levels, policing focus and protective activity.

Harm

Members of Parliament occupy a unique public role and remain the subject of dedicated protective security arrangements.

Confirmation or denial that information is held concerning a named MP, or concerning those MPs experiencing the highest levels of incidents and crimes, may enable conclusions to be drawn regarding vulnerability, targeting, threat levels or patterns of offending. Such disclosures may also reveal information concerning the extent of police engagement with particular individuals.

The NPCC considers that confirmation or denial would be likely to prejudice law enforcement functions by revealing information capable of assisting those seeking to assess or target elected representatives.

Public interest factors favouring confirmation or denial

Promoting transparency and accountability.
Supporting public understanding of threats and criminality directed towards elected representatives.
Informing public datable concerning the policing response to crimes against MPs

Public interest factors favouring maintain the neither confirm nor deny position

Protecting law enforcement tactics and operational activity.
Preventing disclosure of information which may contribute to threat profiling or targeting.
Protecting the effectiveness of measures designed to prevent and detect crime.
Avoiding prejudice to policing activity and protective security arrangements.
Ensuring information that could assist offenders is not placed into the public domain.

Balance of the public interest

While the NPCC recognises the public interest in transparency concerning crimes and incidents affecting Members of Parliament, there is a significant public interest in ensuring that law enforcement activity is not prejudiced.

The NPCC considers that the public interest in protecting policing functions, preventing crime and safeguarding those who may be at risk outweighs the public interest in confirming or denying whether further information is held.

The NPCC therefore concludes that the public interest favours maintaining the neither confirm nor deny position.

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk

National Police Chiefs' Council

National Police
Freedom of Information
and Data Protection Unit

The Legislation: Section 40(5A) and 40(5B) Personal Information

Section 40(5A) and Section 40(5B) provide that the duty to confirm or deny does not arise where confirmation or denial would itself disclose personal data and disclosure would contravene one or more of the data protection principles.

The requested information relates to identifiable Members of Parliament and seeks information concerning crimes and incidents reported about them.

Although Members of Parliament undertake public functions, information concerning whether an individual has reported incidents to the police, been recorded as a victim of crime or is otherwise represented within police-held records constitutes personal data.

Confirmation or denial that information is held would disclose information relating to identifiable individuals and their interaction with law enforcement systems.

Furthermore, where information is requested concerning named individuals, or concerning very small and readily identifiable groups of MPs, confirmation, denial, low-number disclosures or nil returns may permit conclusions to be drawn about identifiable persons and whether they have been recorded as victims of crime or incidents.

The NPCC considers that such disclosure would be unfair and would not meet the reasonable expectations of the individuals concerned. Confirmation or denial would therefore contravene the first data protection principle requiring personal data to be processed lawfully, fairly and transparently.

Accordingly, the duty to confirm or deny does not arise by virtue of Sections 40(5A) and 40(5B) of the Act.

50 Broadway
London
SW1H 0BL

info@npcc.police.uk
www.npcc.police.uk