

Our Ref: 2018-090

Date: July 2018

Subject: SFO Investigations

This request asked:

Please could you provide the following data for the financial year 2017/18?

1. The total number of restraint orders obtained by the SFO in the course of investigations into all types of cases and the number of restraint orders obtained within a two-month period of an investigation being opened.
2. The total number of criminal investigations opened and the total number of civil investigations opened.
3. The total number of compensation orders obtained by the SFO in all types of cases.

During 2017-2018 the Serious Fraud Office (SFO):

- Obtained four restraint orders of which none were obtained within the first two months of the investigation period.
- Opened seven criminal investigations. No civil investigations were opened.
- Have obtained no compensation orders

For your information - There are a range of possible operational reasons for not seeking Restraint Orders (RO) at the immediate outset of an investigation. These include:

- Cases where the exact role of the suspects is unclear at the start of the criminal investigation, particularly with regard to the identification of any benefit.
 - Investigations in a covert phase where crucial evidence is still being gathered.
 - Tactical considerations in cases where, even if the investigation has become overt, it is judged that the consequences of seeking and serving a RO on a suspect are undesirable.
 - Cases where the conduct has already come to light through a private internal investigation or action by a regulator, and which have then been referred to law enforcement.
 - Cases where a RO is not appropriate, such as where there has been civil litigation or bankruptcy proceedings.
-