



Decision and Reasons for Decision

Application Number: 310084

Applicant: DH6Q05

Respondent: Department of Police

Decision Date: 29 June 2011

Catchwords: ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT – ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS – REFUSAL OF ACCESS – section 67(1) of the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) – sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) – whether document comprises information the disclosure of which would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT – ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS – REFUSAL OF ACCESS – section 67(1) of the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) – sections 47(3)(e) and 52 of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) – whether there are reasonable grounds for agency to be satisfied documents do not exist

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW – INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT – DELETION OF IRRELEVANT INFORMATION – whether document will disclose to the applicant information which is not relevant – whether agency may delete information pursuant to section 88(2) of the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld)

Contents

REASONS FOR DECISION.....	2
Summary	2
Background.....	3
Reviewable decision.....	3
Evidence considered	3
Information in issue.....	4
Deletion of irrelevant information.....	4
Relevant law – Contrary to the public interest	4
Findings – Contrary to the public interest	5
Relevant law – Documents nonexistent or unlocatable	6
Findings – Documents nonexistent or unlocatable.....	7
DECISION.....	10

REASONS FOR DECISION

Summary

1. On 18 September 2009, the applicant applied to the Department of Police¹ (**QPS**) for access to all information held about him and relating to him between June 1980 and September 2009. By decision dated 10 November 2009 (RTI/658), QPS released 17 full documents and 14 partial documents.
2. In response to this decision, the applicant wrote to QPS,² (the 'access application' the subject of this external review) raising a number of concerns about the existence of additional documents (**Additional Documents**). QPS treated this as a new access application (RTI/1124), rather than as a request for internal review. By letter dated 12 January 2010, QPS informed the applicant of its decision to:
 - release 8 full documents
 - partially release 2 documents subject to the deletion of information considered to be contrary to the public interest³
 - refuse to release a DVD, the release of which QPS considered to be contrary to the public interest⁴
 - partially release 2 documents (**Log Documents**) subject to the deletion of information considered to be irrelevant,⁵ and
 - refuse access to the Additional Documents on the basis that they were nonexistent or unlocatable.
3. In response to QPS's decision, the applicant applied for further information on 25 January 2010. QPS treated this as a new access application (RTI/1471), rather than as a request for internal review of RTI/1124, and refused to deal with the application on the basis that there had been an earlier application for the same material under section 62(3) of the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) (**IP Act**) (ie. RTI/658).
4. The applicant applied to the Office of the Information Commissioner (**OIC**) for external review of the decisions in both RTI/1471⁶ and RTI/1124,⁷ although subsequently agreed to deal with the issues raised in RTI/1471 in the external review of the decision made on file RTI/1124.
5. During the course of the external review, QPS agreed to provide the applicant with:
 - a full copy of one of the partially released documents (following consultation with the Department of Health); and
 - those segments of the DVD which contained images of the applicant, but not images of third parties.
6. After carefully considering all of the information before me, I am satisfied that:
 - access to full copies of the Log Documents and access to those segments of the DVD which did not contain images of the applicant may be refused under section

¹ Known as the Queensland Police Service.

² Letter dated 25 November 2009 and received 30 November 2009.

³ One of which is the Witness Page, as defined in paragraph 6 and the other, QPS agreed to release during the external review, as discussed at paragraph 5.

⁴ QPS did, however, allow the applicant to attend its office to view the DVD.

⁵ Whilst this was not specifically referenced in QPS's decision letter, QPS subsequently confirmed that information had been deleted from the Log Documents on this basis.

⁶ External review application received 10 February 2010.

⁷ External review application received 4 February 2010.

88 of the IP Act on the basis that giving access would disclose information which is not relevant to the access application

- access to the remaining partially released page (**Witness Page**)⁸ and those segments of the DVD containing the personal information of third parties, may be refused under section 67 of the IP Act and section 47(3)(b) of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (**RTI Act**) on the basis that their disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest under section 49 of the RTI Act;⁹ and
- access to the Additional Documents requested by the applicant may be refused under sections 47(3)(e) and 52 of the RTI Act on the basis that the documents are non-existent or unlocatable.

Background

7. Significant procedural steps relating to the application and external review are set out in the Appendix.

Reviewable decision

8. The decision under review is QPS's decision dated 12 January 2010.¹⁰

Evidence considered

9. In making this decision, I have taken the following into account:
 - applicant's access application in RTI/658 dated 29 September 2009
 - QPS's letter to applicant requesting further information dated 29 September 2009
 - Applicant's letter to QPS providing further information dated 12 October 2009
 - QPS's decision in RTI/658 dated 10 November 2009
 - applicant's access application in RTI/1124 dated 25 November 2009
 - QPS's decision in RTI/1124 dated 12 January 2010
 - applicant's access application in RTI/1471 dated 25 January 2010
 - QPS's decision in RTI/1471 dated 1 February 2010
 - applicant's external review application in RTI/1124 dated 4 February 2010
 - applicant's external review application in RTI/1471 dated 10 February 2010
 - consultation response from the Department of Health dated 21 March 2011
 - Statement of Senior Constable Schmidt dated 7 December 2009
 - Statement of Senior Sergeant Bolderrow dated 9 December 2009
 - Statement of Acting Senior Sergeant Simon dated 9 December 2009
 - Statement of Plain Clothes Constable Williams dated 16 December 2009
 - file notes of telephone conversations held between OIC staff members and the parties during the external review
 - the Information in Issue¹¹ and the information released by QPS to the applicant in RTI/658 and RTI/1124
 - submissions provided by the parties to the OIC
 - previous decisions of the Information Commissioner as referred to in these reasons; and
 - relevant provisions of the RTI and IP Acts.

⁸ Refer footnote 3.

⁹ Section 67 of the IP Act provides that QPS may refuse access to a document in the same way and to the same extent that QPS could refuse access to the document under section 47 of the RTI Act, were the document to be the subject of an access application under that Act.

¹⁰ Whilst the access application was received by QPS on 30 November 2009, evidence of identity was not provided until 11 December 2009 – see section 53(4) of the IP Act.

¹¹ Defined at paragraph 10 below.

Information in issue

10. The **Information in Issue** in this review comprises:

- the information deleted from the Log Documents on the basis that it did not relate to the applicant (see 'Deletion of irrelevant information' at paragraphs 11 and 12 below)
- the name of a witness on the Witness Page¹² (see 'Contrary to the public interest' at paragraphs 15 to 27 below); and
- the segments deleted from the DVD containing footage of Fortitude Valley Police Beat (**Beat**) (see both 'Deletion of irrelevant information' at paragraphs 11 and 12 below and 'Contrary to the public interest' at paragraphs 15 to 27 below).¹³

Deletion of irrelevant information

11. Where giving access to a document will disclose to the applicant information that QPS reasonably considers is not relevant to the access application, QPS may give access to a copy of the document with the irrelevant information deleted.¹⁴ However, QPS may only give access in this way if it considers from the terms of the application or after consultation with the applicant, that the applicant would accept the copy and it is reasonably practicable to give access to the copy.¹⁵

12. Having reviewed the Log Documents and those segments of the DVD which do not contain images of the applicant, I am satisfied that:

- the deleted information is not relevant to the applicant's access application, rather it concerns information about other members of the public who attended the Beat on the day in question; and
- QPS was entitled to consider from the access application that the applicant would accept a copy of the documents with the irrelevant information deleted given that the information clearly falls outside the scope of the access application.

Relevant law – Contrary to the public interest

13. Access must be given to a document unless disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.¹⁶

14. To decide whether disclosure of the Witness Page and those segments of the DVD containing the personal information of third parties would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest, I must:

- identify any irrelevant factors and disregard them
- identify relevant public interest factors favouring disclosure and nondisclosure
- balance the relevant factors favouring disclosure and nondisclosure; and
- decide whether disclosure of the information would, on balance, be contrary to

¹² As noted at paragraph 5 above, the applicant was initially provided with a partial copy of a page from the Beat electronic log with the name of a clinical nurse deleted, however, QPS subsequently agreed to release this information during the course of the external review.

¹³ As noted at paragraph 5 above, whilst QPS initially refused access to the DVD in its entirety, it subsequently agreed during the course of the external review to release those segments which did not contain the personal information of third parties attending the Beat (ie. individuals other than the applicant and officers of QPS). QPS also removed footage taken after the applicant left the Beat from the copy of the DVD provided to the applicant, on the basis that it was irrelevant.

¹⁴ Section 88(1) and (2) of the IP Act.

¹⁵ Section 88(3) of the IP Act.

¹⁶ Sections 64 and 67 of the IP Act and section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.

the public interest.¹⁷

Findings – Contrary to the public interest

15. No irrelevant factors arise in this case.

Factors favouring disclosure

16. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that the factors favouring disclosure of the Information in Issue include:

- some of the Information in Issue comprises the applicant's personal information, (images of the applicant in the DVD where other third parties are present);¹⁸ and
- disclosure could reasonably be expected to promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance QPS's accountability.¹⁹

17. With respect to the relevant personal information, I note that it comprises the shared personal information of both the applicant and other individuals attending the Beat and that in a practical sense, it is not able to be separated.

18. In relation to the name which has been removed from the Witness Page, I am satisfied that little or no weight should be afforded to accountability in this circumstance because the applicant has already been provided with the substance of this document. Learning the name of a witness would not assist the applicant to understand why QPS decided not to proceed further with the investigation.

19. The applicant also contends that he requires access to the above information to determine whether it is incorrect and requires amending,²⁰ however, I am not satisfied there are grounds on which to doubt veracity of the Information in Issue. Accordingly, I do not consider that this gives rise to a public interest factor favouring disclosure.²¹

Factors favouring nondisclosure

20. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that the factors favouring nondisclosure include, that disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to:

- prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy;²² and
- cause a public interest harm if disclosure would disclose personal information of a person.²³

21. The concept of 'privacy' is not defined in the IP Act or RTI Act. It can, however, be viewed as the right of an individual to preserve their personal sphere free from interference from others.²⁴

¹⁷ Section 49(3) of the RTI Act.

¹⁸ Schedule 4, part 2, item 7 of the RTI Act.

¹⁹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 1 of the RTI Act.

²⁰ External review application dated 4 February 2010 and letter dated 21 March 2010.

²¹ That is, schedule 4, part 2, item 12 of the RTI Act does not apply.

²² Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 of the RTI Act

²³ Schedule 4, part 4, item 6 of the RTI Act.

²⁴ Paraphrasing the Australian Law Reform Commission's definition of the concept in "For your information: Australian Privacy Law and Practice" *Australian Law Reform Commission Report No. 108* released 11 August 2008, at paragraph 1.56.

22. Taking into account all of the information before me, I consider that:
- when an individual attends the Beat or provides evidence as a witness, this comprises a private action falling within an individual's 'personal sphere'; and
 - disclosure of this information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy.
23. I am also satisfied that as the information referred to in paragraph 14 above comprises the personal information of individuals other than the applicant, its disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause a public interest harm under part 4, schedule 4 of the RTI Act.
24. I note that the applicant has already viewed the entire footage on the DVD, however, I am satisfied that this does not change the weight to be accorded to the privacy interests of other individuals in the footage (as compared to granting the applicant a copy of the footage, with no restriction on further use or dissemination).

Balancing relevant public interest factors

25. Having identified and carefully considered the public interest factors for and against disclosure, I consider that the public interest in:
- safeguarding personal information; and
 - protecting individuals' right to privacy and avoiding public interest harm
- outweighs those factors favouring disclosure of the information referred to in paragraph 14 above, in the circumstances of this review.
26. While I accept the importance of individuals being able to access their personal information held by QPS and the importance of QPS being accountable for the services it provides, I am satisfied in the circumstances of this case that:
- these public interests have been adequately served by disclosure to the applicant of the bulk of the DVD and the Witness Page; and
 - QPS has provided the applicant with sufficient information to demonstrate the reasoning behind its ultimate response to his allegation.
27. Therefore, I am satisfied that the public interest factors favouring nondisclosure outweigh those favouring disclosure in the circumstances of this review.

Relevant law – Documents nonexistent or unlocatable

28. Section 47(3)(e) of the RTI Act allows an agency to refuse access to documents where those documents are nonexistent or unlocatable, as defined in section 52 of the RTI Act.²⁵ Section 52(1) of the RTI Act relevantly provides:

52 Document nonexistent or unlocatable

(1) For section 47(3)(e), a document is nonexistent or unlocatable if—

²⁵ Section 67 of the IP Act provides that QPS may refuse access to a document in the same way and to the same extent that QPS could refuse access to the document under section 47 of the RTI Act, were the document to be the subject of an access application under that Act.

(a) the agency or Minister dealing with the application for access is satisfied the document does not exist; or

...

(b) the agency or Minister dealing with the application for access is satisfied—

(i) the document has been or should be in the agency's or Minister's possession; and

(ii) all reasonable steps have been taken to find the document but the document can not be found.

29. The principles that apply when refusing access to nonexistent and unlocatable documents were detailed in *PDE and the University of Queensland*.²⁶

... [T]he FOI Act [equivalent of section 52] address[es] two different scenarios faced by agencies and Ministers from time to time in dealing with FOI applications: circumstances where the document sought does not exist and circumstances where a document sought exists (to the extent it has been or should be in the agency's possession) but cannot be located. In the former circumstance, an agency or Minister is required to satisfy itself that the document does not exist. If so satisfied, the agency or Minister is not required by the FOI Act to carry out all reasonable steps to find the document. In the latter circumstance an agency or Minister is required to satisfy itself that the document sought exists (to the extent that it has been or should be in the agency's possession) and carry out all reasonable steps to find the document before refusing access

30. In *PDE*, the Information Commissioner stated that, in order to be satisfied that documents are nonexistent, agencies must rely on their particular knowledge and experience and have regard to various key factors including:

- administrative arrangements of government
- structure of the agency
- functions and responsibilities of the agency
- practices and procedures of the agency (including but not limited to its information management approach); and
- other factors reasonably inferred from information supplied by the applicant including nature and age of the requested documents and nature of the government activity the request relates to.

31. The RTI Act is silent as to how an agency is to satisfy itself that documents do not exist when relying on section 52(1)(a). When proper consideration is given to the key factors identified at paragraph 30, and a conclusion reached that the documents do not exist, it may not be necessary for an agency to conduct searches.²⁷

Findings – Documents nonexistent or unlocatable

32. Throughout the external review process, the applicant raised a number of concerns about the existence of Additional Documents, which he claimed had not been provided to him. These concerns are addressed individually below.

²⁶ (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 9 February 2009) (*PDE*), a decision which concerned section 28A of the FOI Act, replicated in section 52(1) of the RTI Act.

²⁷ See *PDE*. The Information Commissioner further noted in this decision that where searches are used to justify a decision that documents do not exist, the agency must take all reasonable steps to locate the documents.

Audio recordings

33. The applicant sought access to audio recordings to accompany the DVD footage provided to him during the course of the external review,²⁸ submitting that he was advised that the CCTV cameras might have audio recording capacity and that police officers have personal recorders.²⁹
34. In response, QPS provided the following submissions:
- there was no requirement under the Queensland Police Operational Procedures Manual or the QPS Electronic Recording of Interviews and Evidence Manual for the officer to record the conversation with the applicant
 - Senior Sergeant Stream advised that *'[s]ome officers do carry recording devices. In this instance those devices were not being carried or were not activated'*; and
 - Senior Sergeant Stream advised that *'This incident occurred at the [Beat]. The main custody areas of the beat are covered by CCTV that records visual images only... There are not any other independent recording systems in existence at the [Beat].'*³⁰
35. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to the audio recordings under section 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied these documents do not exist.

CCTV footage

36. The applicant also requested access to *'the visual footage outside the [Beat] in August 2009 when the Police and RBWH nurses walked me to the Police wagon'*.³¹
37. QPS submitted that the only relevant CCTV footage is that monitoring the interior of the Beat and that any CCTV footage of the exterior would be held by Brisbane City Council.³² Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to these documents under section 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied these documents do not exist in its possession or under its control.

Further audio and CCTV footage

38. The applicant also requested *'the information and discussions including audio and visual recording between QPS officers and RBWH nurses held without [his] presence and discussions held in [his] presence.'*³³
39. QPS provided a signed statement from Acting Senior Sergeant Simon, who stated that the discussion referred to by the applicant *'... was a verbal discussion between myself, [the applicant], and the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital Mental Health Clinical Nurses as can be seen on the supplied DVD containing all CCTV footage of [the applicant] whilst at the [Beat]. There is no audio recording of this discussion.'*³⁴

²⁸ Refer paragraph 5 above.

²⁹ Letter dated 21 March 2010.

³⁰ Letter dated 4 April 2011.

³¹ Letter dated 21 March 2010.

³² Letter dated 4 April 2011.

³³ Letter dated 25 November 2009, 21 March 2010 and letter dated 25 January 2010.

³⁴ Statement dated 9 December 2009.

40. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to these documents under section 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied these documents do not exist.

Alleged assault at 355 Queen Street - CCTV footage

41. The applicant requested access to CCTV footage of the location of his alleged assault in Queen Street in July 2008.³⁵
42. QPS explained that while an officer of QPS viewed footage captured by a CCTV system operating at the location of the alleged assault, that officer did not take a copy of relevant footage. This was confirmed as follows by Senior Constable Schmidt:

*I recall viewing CCTV at the office block of 355 Queen Street. I however never took possession of a disk containing CCTV as there was no CCTV footage of the incident. I note in the supplementary report 14/08/2008 I have written that CCTV is ready for collection. When the CCTV was viewed however, it was deemed unsuitable due to it not capturing the incident or any persons of interest. This was due to external factors such as sun glare and camera angle. Therefore, to reiterate, no CCTV was obtained in relation to this matter.*³⁶

43. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to this footage under section 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied these documents do not exist in its possession or under its control.

Alleged assault at 355 Queen Street - CD of photographs

44. The applicant also claims that he provided a disc containing photographs of injuries he had sustained to Senior Constable Schmidt.³⁷
45. Senior Constable Schmidt was asked directly about this disc and advised that he 'never received such a CD containing photos from the victim.'³⁸ Another document released on file RTI/658 also states 'As of this date [02/03/2009], the victim has not supplied police with any photographs of his alleged injuries, even though it has been eight months after the alleged assault, and it appears that the complainant may have failed to have his injuries photographed or did not have his injuries documented.'
46. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to this disc on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied such a document does not exist.

Alleged assault at 355 Queen Street - 'Unfounded'

47. The applicant requests documents that determined that the alleged assault on 355 Queen Street was unfounded.³⁹ In response, QPS noted that no further documents of this kind exist.⁴⁰ I have also considered the information which was released to the applicant which provides further details about why the allegations were considered unfounded.

³⁵ Letter dated 21 March 2010 and letter dated 8 February 2010.

³⁶ Letter dated 4 April 2011.

³⁷ Letter dated 21 March 2010 and submissions dated 24 June 2011.

³⁸ Letter dated 4 April 2011.

³⁹ Letter dated 21 March 2011.

⁴⁰ Letter dated 23 February 2010.

48. Taking into account all of the information before me, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to the documents referred to in paragraph 47 above, under section 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied these documents do not exist.

'Amended' documents with time/date stamps

49. Lastly, on a number of occasions, the applicant referred to documents he had already received and requested to be provided with copies of the same documents showing the time/date stamps for when they were received.⁴¹

50. The information access provisions of the IP and RTI Acts only oblige agencies to identify and deal with documents as they exist at the date of a valid access application; agencies are not required to create new documents containing additional information (such as, for example, time/date stamps).

51. Therefore, I am satisfied that QPS is entitled to refuse access to the documents referred to in paragraph 49, under section 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that there are reasonable grounds for QPS to be satisfied these documents do not exist.

DECISION

52. I vary the decision under review by finding:

- QPS is entitled to refuse access to part of the Information in Issue⁴² under section 88 of the IP Act on the basis that giving access would disclose information which is not relevant to the access application
- QPS is entitled to refuse access to the remaining Information in Issue⁴³ under section 67(1) of the IP Act and section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act, on the basis that its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest under section 49 of the RTI Act; and
- QPS is entitled to refuse access to the Additional Documents under section 67(1) of the IP Act, and sections 47(3)(e) and 52(1)(a) of the RTI Act, on the basis that these documents do not exist or are unlocatable.

53. I have made this decision as a delegate of the Information Commissioner, under section 139 of the IP Act.

Jenny Mead
Right to Information Commissioner

Date: 29 June 2011

⁴¹ Letter dated 21 March 2010 and submissions dated 24 June 2011.

⁴² Information deleted from the Log Documents and segments deleted from the DVD because they did not contain footage of the applicant.

⁴³ The name deleted from the Witness Page and the segments of the DVD which were deleted because they contained personal information of third parties.

APPENDIX**Significant procedural steps**

Date	Event
18 September 2009	Access application RTI/658 (received 29 September 2009)
10 November 2009	Decision RTI/658
25 November 2009	Access application RTI/1124 (received 30 November 2009)
2 December 2009	Letter from QPS to applicant requesting evidence of identity
10 December 2009	Letter from applicant to QPS attaching evidence of identity
12 January 2010	Decision RTI/1124
25 January 2010	Access application RTI/1471
1 February 2010	Decision RTI/1471
2 February 2010	External review application RTI/1124 (received 4 February 2010)
8 February 2010	External review application RTI/1471 (received 10 February 2010)
9 February 2010	QPS provided the Information in Issue
19 February 2010	OIC advised parties that external review accepted and requested that QPS conduct further searches in relation to the concerns raised by the applicant
23 February 2010	Letter from QPS to OIC responding to sufficiency of search enquiries (received 3 March 2010)
26 February 2010	OIC received submissions from applicant
17 March 2010	OIC letter to applicant attaching QPS's submissions
22 March 2010	OIC received submissions from applicant (dated 21 March 2010)
29 June 2010	OIC received submissions from applicant re-submitting letter of 21 March 2010
2 July 2010	Update letter to applicant from OIC
19 July 2010	Email from applicant to OIC querying delay
22 July 2010	Update letter to applicant from OIC
27 July 2010	Email from applicant to OIC re-submitting letter of 21 March 2010
30 August 2010	Email from applicant to OIC requesting update on progress
7 September 2010	Update letter to applicant from OIC
2 November 2010	Update letter to applicant from OIC
12 November 2010	Email from applicant to OIC requesting update on progress and re-submitting letter of 21 March 2010
10 January 2011	Letter and email from applicant to OIC requesting update on progress and re-submitting letter of 21 March 2010
25 January 2011	Update letter to applicant from OIC
2 March 2011	Letter and email from applicant to OIC requesting update on progress

15 March 2011	Update letter to applicant from OIC
21 March 2011	OIC letter to Department of Health to consult regarding release of the name of a clinical nurse in the Information in Issue
21 March 2011	Department of Health responded that it had no objection to the release of the clinical nurse's name
23 March 2011	Update letter to applicant from OIC
23 March 2011	Submissions received from applicant
28 March 2011	OIC letter to applicant declining to provide requested information
29 March 2011	OIC email to QPS requesting further submissions
4 April 2011	QPS letter addressing remaining sufficiency of search issues
19 April 2011	Submissions received from applicant
20 April 2011	OIC letter to applicant responding to submissions
17 May 2011	QPS agreed to release a copy of the DVD with segments containing personal information of third parties removed
1 June 2011	OIC sent preliminary view letter to applicant
9 June 2011	Email from applicant to OIC requesting extension to reply to preliminary view
10 June 2011	Email from OIC to applicant allowing extension until 22 June 2011
7 June 2011	Letter from QPS to applicant with a copy of page containing the name of the clinical nurse and CCTV footage with segments containing personal information of third parties removed
17 June 2011	Applicant email to OIC requesting extension to reply to preliminary view
20 June 2011	OIC email to applicant allowing extension until 24 June 2011
24 June 2011	Final submissions received from applicant