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Your recent request for information is replicated below, together with our response.

## How PD Saul sustained his injury in January 2023 and what was the actual injury.

On the 10 January 2023 Saul snapped his left canine during a GPD Initial Course. Saul engaged the bite sleeve and on doing so, the Decoy observed Sauls left canine snap. He showed no sign of pain or discomfort at the time of the incident and remained engaged on the bite sleeve until instructed to leave.

## What was the explanation given to the vet by officers as to how the dog sustained this injury, what vets practise was saul under at the time of the injury and did he require any further specialist treatment elsewhere, if so where

Immediately following the incident his mouth was examined by revealing the snapped canine, with some of the tooth still intact. Saul was thereafter conveyed to his vets for treatment. Upon vet examination it was deemed the remainder of the tooth could not be saved and an appointment was made for the remainder of the tooth to be extracted.

With regards to providing you with the name of the vet practice, he information sought is held by Police Scotland, but I am refusing to provide it in terms of section 16(1) of the Act on the basis that the following exemptions apply:

**Section 33(1)(b) - Commercial Interests**

Disclosure would prejudice substantially the commercial interests of any person.

Commercial interest is not defined in the Act, however, a person’s or organisation’s commercial interests will usually relate to the commercial trading activity they undertake, commonly for the purpose of revenue generation and this activity will normally take place within a competitive environment.

In this instance disclosure of this document would be detrimental to both the vet practice and Police Scotland and as such is considered to be commercially sensitive.

This is a non-absolute exemption which requires the application of the Public Interest Test.

**Public Interest Test**

There are a number of arguments in support of disclosure for example, disclosure of the requested information would allow greater scrutiny of the way public funds are spent, it would increase accountability and transparency, and it is in the public interest for Police Scotland to purchase services competitively, to ensure best value for money.

Additionally, there are several arguments in support of withholding the information, for example it would be unfair to disclose commercially sensitive information which has the potential to damage Police Scotland’s relationship with partners.

Police Scotland is a publicly funded organisation and therefore the Service has an obligation to obtain best value for money. In order to do this, it is essential to maintain working relationships with companies we work with.

As such, Police Scotland will not disclose any information that would impact on the ability to do both. The public interest would not be served if it were no longer possible to engage companies if they believed that conducting business with Police Scotland would result in their information being released**.**

Accordingly, such information will not be disclosed whilst remaining relevant.

## What was the end prognosis for Saul.

Due to the fracture of the canine being under the gum line, it was decided at a dental hospital that a titanium implant was not suitable, and a full extraction was required.

## What was the vets verdict on the injury and could he have remained a working police dog, if not what were the reasons given for this decision and was this a decision taken by a veterinary practise or Police Scotland.

Initially the vet believed he could continue as an operational police dog, however, on 31 January 2023 Saul presented with an infection. On 07 February 2023 Saul was admitted for treatment due to the infection. During an operation vets were required to remove multiple pieces of necrotic bone, leaving significant defect in bone of muzzle, leaving nothing to bite against lower canine.

Following this and in discussion with veterinary professionals Saul was removed from Police service due to the defect in his bone muzzle which would inhibit ability to perform operational duties.

## Where was the dog cared for during his recovery from the injury sustained particularly is the dog had to go through any sedation was he monitored on leaving a veterinary practise. Can the force provide a copy of his medical records for this incident.

Saul was cared for at his home address following any medical treatment, including after sedation, and released from the vets.

With regards to providing a copy of Saul’s medical records section 17 of the Act applies as the information sought is not held.

By explanation, Saul is no longer with Police Scotland and so we do not have access to his medical records.

If you require any further assistance, please contact us quoting the reference above.

You can request a review of this response within the next 40 working days by email or by letter (Information Management - FOI, Police Scotland, Clyde Gateway, 2 French Street, Dalmarnock, G40 4EH). Requests must include the reason for your dissatisfaction.

If you remain dissatisfied following our review response, you can appeal to the Office of the Scottish Information Commissioner (OSIC) within 6 months - [online](https://www.foi.scot/appeal), by email or by letter (OSIC, Kinburn Castle, Doubledykes Road, St Andrews, KY16 9DS).

Following an OSIC appeal, you can appeal to the Court of Session on a point of law only.

This response will be added to our [Disclosure Log](http://www.scotland.police.uk/access-to-information/freedom-of-information/disclosure-log) in seven days' time.

Every effort has been taken to ensure our response is as accessible as possible. If you require this response to be provided in an alternative format, please let us know.