

Response

Thank you for your email of 22 February 2017.

I note your concerns regarding the Commission's independence. The Commission is funded by licence fees which come from all licensed operators, which includes betting, bingo, casinos, lotteries, arcades and certain suppliers of gaming machines and software. This includes both high street shops as well as on-line gambling companies.

We also receive funding for work undertaken in regulating the National Lottery.

The Commission is an independent public body sponsored by the Departments for Culture Media and Sport. More details of which are available here: [about us](#)

Taking your questions in turn:

1. The actual numbers of complaints that you hold in regard to CORALS.UK.

The Commission does not comment on compliance matters relating to individual operators unless there is significant public concern about a particular operator. An example of this is the investigation the Commission carried out into Gala Coral in relation to failings around their anti-money laundering and social responsibility controls which is available here: [Gala Coral investigation](#)

With regards to complaints received, we consider this information exempt from disclosure under section 31 of the Freedom of Information act 2000 (FOIA). This is explained in more detail in the attached.

2. I would like to understand the different levels of complaints that the Gambling Commission have been seeing and to understand why there has been nothing good in Regulating these Corporations where the trend is seen that they are not abiding by your Regulations which you yourselves set out to protect people who choose to give companies like Corals their business.

This does not appear to be a request for specific identifiable information. This element of your request is in effect a comment and currently too unclear for us to identify what you are looking for. Consequently, we are unable to process this any further.

However, public authorities are under a duty to advise and assist requestors with their requests, including instances where a request is too unclear or ambiguous. You may wish to narrow the scope of your request allowing us to identify what specific information it is you are looking for.

3. I would seek to be informed which companies have been looked into by the Gambling Commission over the past 10 years and especially those where the Company has been prosecuted due to the input and findings /recommendations of this Gambling Commission.

All gambling operators will be subject to some level of compliance activity during the course of their licence. This may take the form of desktop reviews of websites or visits to premises. This may be looking at the information the operator provides to customers on its website, or visits to premises, such as betting shops.

Our [policy statement](#) provides more details of this. Section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) makes provision for public authorities to refuse requests for information where the cost of dealing with them would exceed the appropriate limit, which for public authorities, such as the Commission, is set at £450. This represents the estimated cost of one person spending 2.5 working days in determining whether the department holds the information, locating, retrieving and extracting the information. We estimate that it would take well in excess of 2.5 working days to determine appropriate material and locate, retrieve and extract these figures (where held) in relation to “*which companies have been looked into by the Gambling Commission over the past 10 years*”. Therefore, this part of your request will not be processed further.

When we take enforcement action and apply a regulatory sanction under the Gambling Act 2005, it appears on our sanctions register which is available [here](#).

For ease of reference, the following table shows prosecutions the Commission has carried out over the past 10 years.

Name	Details	Date
Dylan Rigby & Craig Douglas directors of Game Gold Trading's Limited	plead guilty to providing unlicensed facilities for gambling and advertising unlawful gambling	February 2017
Christopher Mosdall	plead guilty to the offence of cheating	December 2015
David Lawson	plead guilty to providing unlicensed facilities for gambling	October 2015
Thomas Griffiths	plead guilty to providing unlicensed facilities for gambling	October 2015
Kevin Holleran director of Nexus Gaming Limited	convicted of making gaming machines available for use without a licence	October 2012
Amarjit Singh Mann, Kamlesh Panchal, Jagjeet Singh Chahal directors of Agora Bet Ltd	convicted of providing facilities for gambling without a licence, using premises for gambling without a licence and making a gaming machine available for use without a licence	March 2012
Peter Croome	plead guilty to making gaming machines available for use	August 2010
Simon Carr director of Coinfactory Limited	plead guilty to making gaming machines available for use without a licence	July 2009
Marc Bird	convicted of making a gaming machine available for use without a licence	January 2009

4. I would like to understand where and who the Gambling Commission wholly relies upon to gather the information which then is able to form the commission on those tasks that require action.

After considering this element of your request the Gambling Commission is of the opinion that it would not be appropriate to disclose the sources from which information is gathered in order for decisions to be made. As such, this information is therefore exempt under s.30 of

the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Please see attached document for an explanation of this decision.

Review of the decision

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your Freedom of Information request and wish to make a complaint or request a review of our decision, you should write to FOI Team, Gambling Commission, 4th floor, Victoria Square House, Victoria Square, Birmingham, B2 4BP.

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner (ICO) for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Gambling Commission. The ICO can be contacted at: The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliff House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.

Request

I would therefore be seeking under the Freedom of Information Act.

1. The actual numbers of complaints that you hold in regard to CORALS.UK.
This could include a graph of the past 10 years which would give me an insight as to what I believe is not to be underestimated that there has been a Sharp Increase in the number of complaints since 2007 till now being 2017.
2. I would like to understand the different levels of complaints that the Gambling Commission have been seeing and to understand why there has been nothing good in Regulating these Corporations where the trend is seen that they are not abiding by your Regulations which you yourselves set out to protect people who choose to give companies like Corals their business.
3. I would seek to be informed which companies have been looked into by the Gambling Commission over the past 10 years and especially those where the Company has been prosecuted due to the input and findings /recommendations of this Gambling Commission.
4. I would like to understand where and who the Gambling Commission wholly relies upon to gather the information which then is able to form the commission on those tasks that require action.

I look forward to the response from proving to myself while providing myself with my serious concerns in what I regard as not an Independent Commission but one that is in fact financially backed by the Bookmakers Corporation who are required to pay an annual subscription to the Commission to maintain it's activities which I do believe are decisions made on entirely bias opinion and a very weak research program that fails to paint a realistic and true picture of the Gambling Industry as a whole.