

Subject Access Request 11/05/2025

From: Sophia Brooks <[REDACTED]@protonmail.com>
To: gengar@legalgengar.com <gengar@legalgengar.com>
Cc: stephanie.hayden@ia-legal.co.uk <stephanie.hayden@ia-legal.co.uk>
Subject: Subject Access Request 11/05/2025
Date: Sunday, 11 May 2025 3:32 PM
Size: 26 KB

Dear Mr Matthew James Heath,

I write in relation to a series of 'Discord messages' you sent to a 'Discord Account' on or about the 13th of December 2024.

These messages were downloaded and are accessible by me despite your attempts to delete messages at that time.

In those 'Discord Messages' you expressed that you had confidential information from Police affiliated sources.

I have perused your public Twitter/X account '@LegalGengar' formerly known as '@GengarQC' where you publicly state that you are a 'Lawyer' and 'Law Firm'. You have also put out a series of tweets over the past few years where you claim to both be in receipt of confidential information and assisting others in legal matters.

This means that you are likely operating as a Sole Trader if not as a director of your many companies. This also means that you are a data controller as defined by the Data Protection Act 2018 and the UK's implementation of Regulation 2016/679 or otherwise more simply known as GDPR.

In the circumstances, please accept this email as my formal Subject Access Request. I require you to confirm whether or not you are processing personal data about me. Further, I require copies of any and all data (whether electronic or "hard copy") you are processing about me. If you dispute that you are a data controller then I require you to explain why this is the position, given your public assertions to be a 'Lawyer' running a 'Law Firm'. Further, please confirm if you are registered with the Information Commissioner and, if appropriate, explain the basis of any exemption.

You should ensure that you provide your response to me by the 9th of June 2025. If you fail to comply with my request then I do have the option of applying to a court for an appropriate order.

There is no fee payable as the request is not 'manifestly unfounded or excessive'. It is your burden to prove that a request is unfounded or excessive.

There are also concerns about your processing of other individuals' data such as your refusal to issue data to another requester without paying a nominal fee. It may paint a pattern of attempting to

defraud others by charging needless fees in a period of time where you are allegedly struggling with your finances.

If you need me to narrow my request or have any reasonable requests/questions please do not hesitate to reply.

Yours Sincerely,
Sophia A. Brooks