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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I have two matters of significance to raise for the benefit of those present. It relates to inaccurate reporting regarding two pieces of evidence that were stated in court yesterday.

The first relates to an allegation regarding evidence from Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey. It was inaccurate in that the newspaper report states that Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey withdrew large sections of his original statement dropping it from four pages in length to less than two. That is inaccurate, Commissioner. The position was that some redacted diary notes were tendered in a separate exhibit and it was explained in the evidence why those diary entries had to be redacted.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it would be perfectly obvious that the redactions had nothing to do with the matter before this Commission, surely.

MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner. There was some evidence to that effect and some statements from the Bar table as to why there were blackened pages regarding those particular diary entries that were exhibited yesterday.

Commissioner, a second matter was in relation to a question put by Mr Terracini which did not receive an answer from Ms McCarthy. Mr Terracini put a certain question to Ms McCarthy which she did not answer because you, Commissioner, advised Mr Terracini that the burden of question was really about the subject matter or the difficulty of this subject matter as it might present to investigating police.

Mr Terracini replied "Yes." But Ms McCarthy did not adopt the proposition that Mr Terracini put, which was that she had available to her and she gave to the police certain information regarding a certain person knowing about Father McAlinden interfering with children and doing nothing about it. Unfortunately, Commissioner, that exchange has been misreported in one media outlet to the effect that Ms McCarthy replied "Yes" and adopted that proposition. In fact the transcript, at page 1297, shows that there was no adoption of that proposition.

It is important that matters of this nature be
accurately reported and, in particular, if the media could bear in mind that a question or statement from counsel to a witness which is not adopted by a witness is not evidence and should not be reported as evidence, let alone reporting there was an answer from the witness which did not occur and is not in the transcript.

Commissioner, if anyone needs any clarification of any matters that occur in court or have any uncertainty about any particular exhibit, there is available a media liaison person, Mr Scott Crebbin, who is present in court. I understand all the media are aware of his identity and presence in court and if he could be approached, that may prevent some of these errors occurring, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. It should be obvious that, where there is any uncertainty, the material should be checked with Mr Crebbin.

The situation with Mr Humphrey's statement which, of course, is much longer than four pages, in any event, and was only changed to a very limited degree, could have been clarified. It needs hardly to be emphasised, I would hope, that fair reporting of the evidence is fundamental to procedural fairness and to the rights of all interested parties. I would ask everyone reporting on this Commission to observe those principles. Thank you, Ms Lonergan, for raising that matter.

MS LONERGAN: There is one other addendum to what I raised I should also make clear for those present in court. Any matter that moves into the territory of term of reference 2 inquiries in consideration of those matters will be postponed to next week and following. It is important to bear in mind that there are various interested parties who are not represented this week, so if a matter relating to term of reference 2 comes up, it can be dealt with once those hearings commence, with the opportunity for those interested parties in term of reference 2 to have their respective interests protected and any relevant questions or objections raised at that time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. That's a very important point to bear in mind, that we are still considering term of reference 1, and some parties who will be affected or have an interest in term of reference 2 are not present and it is important that the interests of all
parties be safeguarded and protected and advanced where necessary.

MR SAIDI: Could I raise a matter following that stated by counsel assisting? It relates to what fell from your lips as well in terms of the importance of accurate reporting. I refer to page 1308 of the transcript, Commissioner, where the statement made by Mr Humphrey at line 18, where Mr Humphrey indicated, "... have been pointed out to me are not relevant in fair to Mr Fox" firstly, that should be corrected to "unfair to Mr Fox"; but more importantly, it was reported in the Newcastle Herald today, as I understand it, and I don't know whether it has been reported anywhere else, it may have been reported in the electronic media yesterday, that this witness allegedly gave a personal apology to Mr Fox whilst in the witness box.

As the transcript records, the apology was given to the Commission and there was no apology given to Mr Fox. Following on from the comments made earlier today, one would hope that the accurate reporting does continue and the inaccurate reporting which is occurring does not continue.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi. The transcript will be amended to replace the words "and fair on line 18 and 19 of page 1308 with the word "unfair". Thank you.
<WAYNE DAVID HUMPHREY, sworn:
[10.13am]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR HUNT:

MR HUNT: Q. For the record, your name is Wayne David Humphrey?
A. It is.
Q. Mr Humphrey, I want to ask you some questions about your religious background, both in terms of education and current practice.
A. Yes.
Q. Your parents, I think, are practising Catholics; is that right?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. You were educated within the Catholic school system, at least some for your education?
A. "Educated" is your term. But, yes, I was in the Catholic school system.
Q. Where did you go to primary school?
A. In an area outside of Newcastle.
Q. And you went to a Catholic school?
A. I absolutely did, so I was raised by nuns.
Q. Did you go to a Catholic high school?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Was that there some link between the primary school education and the high school education?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. Would you now consider yourself a practising Catholic?
A. I am not a nihilist, but I am certainly not a practising Catholic. I have beliefs, but they have nothing to do with the Catholic religion.
Q. Do you go to Catholic mass and, if so, how often do you go?
A. Never. Never. Hang on, I'11 put it in context. I'11 go for police remembrance days, for weddings, for funerals and for christenings and then I'm concerned about the structure of the roof. I don't like going to church. I'm not a great fan of any religion and to suggest otherwise is a lie, an absolute lie, and it's not the only one that's been told.
Q. Don't volunteer things that aren't responsive to my questions.
A. It is part of the answer.
Q. Are your children --
A. No.
Q. -- christened Catholic tradition?
A. No. No.
Q. Apart from having had a professional association during the periods that you worked together, do you have a social relationship with Charles Haggett?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. I just want to take you to an item that is behind
tab 71 of volume 2.
A. I am sorry, 70?
Q. Tab 71, volume 2.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm just going to read you the last sentence on that page which forms part of an email from Detective Chief Inspector Fox, sent from his police email address, to Joanne McCarthy. This is said:

Both Humphrey and Haggett are practising Catholics from Nelson Bay and have a close rapport with Father Bill Burston.

Do you see that there?
A. I can see it.
Q. Your earlier answers would express your views about you being described as a practising Catholic?
A. That reference to me being a practising Catholic by Mr Fox is a lie.
Q. In terms of Father Bill Burston, I mentioned that name to you this morning?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. Is that a name that you know?
A. No, it's not. If I have met him, I certainly can't remember it, but I don't know who he is.
Q. Do you have a close rapport with Father Bill Burston?
A. I don't know him.
Q. If Charles Haggett has a close rapport with Father Bill Burston, is that something that you've come to know about in terms of your association with him?
A. No, no. I don't talk religion to Charles Haggett or anyone else. I'm not a supporter of religion, in that form any.
Q. Do you know anything about Charles Haggett's religious beliefs or practices from your own knowledge?
A. I know he goes to church, but that's all I know. It's none of my business, nor is it anyone else's.
Q. I want to ask you some further questions about
investigations in relation to Strike Force Lantle.
A. Will I put this folder back?
Q. Yes. You accept that you had involvement in relation to Strike Force Lantle during 2010 or the investigation that was to become Strike Force Lantle in 2010 principally as a result of you acting up as acting superintendent and commander of the Newcastle City Local Area Command?
A. Yes, I had had that overarching responsibility.
Q. From late 2010 to April 2011, accepting that for a period of some weeks or a month, you were away in New Zealand --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you had a closer relationship to that investigation because you were the crime manager supervising those allocated to it?
A. Yes, I had managerial oversight, yes.
Q. Did you, from time to time, having allocated Detective Sergeant Little to the strike force, discuss with him the investigation plan moving forward?
A. I'm not quite sure it was - whether it was in company with DI Parker or not, but there was a very thorough investigation plan finally presented. I can't say exactly when without accessing the document.
Q. But you were aware of its elements and so on?
A. Portions of it. It has evolved, yes.
Q. Were you aware that, at some stage in an email fashion, Detective Sergeant Little had administered effectively a questionnaire to DCI Fox to get his written email responses to certain things that he'd raised in a more general fashion?
A. Yes, I was aware - I saw that document ultimately, yes.
Q. Did you become aware that, in a telephone conversation between himself and Detective Inspector Parker, but witnessed by Detective Sergeant Little, Fox had effectively told Parker that he didn't have any more information to give to the strike force?
A. Yes, I was made aware of that.
Q. Had all those things happened by the time that you
went to have your meeting with Carlene York, Assistant Commissioner Carlene York, on 16 May that we talked about yesterday?
A. I couldn't say with any amount of surety without accessing the relevant investigator's notes and email. I couldn't be pinned down. It may have; it may not have.
Q. Can you say whether you saw to it that Fox being interviewed was part of the investigation plan?
A. I know it formed part of the investigation plan at one stage. I don't know whether ultimately that was followed through, but it was certainly my intention to ensure that occurred while I had managerial rights.
Q. In terms of your evidence yesterday in relation to your note of the meeting that you had with others and Assistant Commissioner York, I think you rely on you saying that Fox should be interviewed as being - and that's a document that's exhibit 36 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you suggesting that Fox being interviewed relates to your interest in him contributing further in relation to Strike Force Lantle; is that right?
A. Yes, it is, yes.
Q. Am I right in thinking that that isn't part of the statement that you prepared or that fact isn't dealt with in the statement that you prepared --
A. It's not in the statement --
Q. -- on this matter? It is not in the statement per se, but it was within all the documents that I handed up. How the process that - what's ended up attached to my statement, I had nothing to do with that.
Q. But what I'm getting to is that you see that as quite a relevant thing, don't you, that you --
A. Well --
Q. Bear with me, I hadn't finished the question. You see that as quite a relevant thing, don't you, that by 16 May 2011 you were contending that Fox should contribute to the Lantle material in a formal way by an interview?
A. I think it goes to the heart of the matter. Mr Fox's claim that he was being locked out, that he wasn't allowed to investigate and all these other outrageous claims, yet,
even then, $I$ was still supportive of him contributing - not running it, contributing.
Q. All right. What I'm wondering is, given you say it goes to the heart of the matter, why that is material that you didn't set out in your statement to the Commission? A. Oh, I can't say why. It was just, I suppose, part of the process of the dictation. I certainly handed it up in my handwritten notes together with a full transcript of those handwritten notes. If they weren't chosen to be used, I can't explain that. I spent some considerable time translating all of my handwritten notes that related to this matter and giving them to the Commission.
Q. You're not suggesting by that answer, though, that there was some responsibility in the Commission to put things in your statement, are you?
A. Not to put things in the statement, but if the notes are relevant to the matter, I would imagine you'd want to hear about them, wouldn't you?
Q. What I'm trying to understand, detective chief inspector, is that you've said that this view of yours about Fox contributing in a formal way went to the heart of the matter in terms of a response to Fox's assertions about being shut out, and I'm just inquiring why, given its relevance, it isn't included in the material that you prepared on 14 February 2013 to assist the Commissioner, which document I understand was prepared with the assistance of your legal advisers?
A. I can't explain why it is not in there. Maybe I have no idea. I have no idea. Were the term of reference released then, out of interest? That might clarify. Was TOR1 actually fully announced then or were we just asked to provide a statement?
Q. Yes, it was.
A. I have no reason that it is not in there, Mr Hunt. I apologise.
Q. All right. It would have been within the power of somebody of appropriate rank, that is, an assistant commissioner or a superintendent or an acting superintendent, to direct Fox to be interviewed in relation to Strike Force Lantle; correct?
A. It is within the senior officer's authority to be able to direct anything, yes, as long as it is lawful.
Q. I understand that.
A. Yes.
Q. It would have been a lawful exercise to require him to be interviewed in relation to Lantle particularly?
A. It would have been in terms of discussion with whoever had investigative managerial oversight of the matter then. It might not have been - I can't answer that apart from saying yes, it would have been appropriate at one stage; it might not have been appropriate later.
Q. Given that this was an issue that you felt strongly enough about to raise with the assistant commissioner on 16 May 2011, did you yourself ever direct Fox to be interviewed in relation to Strike Force Lantle?
A. No, that was not my responsibility to do that.
Q. Do you know from your own knowledge of others's actions whether he was ever directed to be interviewed?
A. The only direction that I gave was to surrender documents. I don't know if he was interviewed. I don't know - I wasn't the commander then. Superintendent Gralton was the commander and Detective Inspector Parker was the crime manager who had carriage of the matter. I'm not trying to abrogate my responsibility, but it wasn't mine. I haven't got access to the exhibit, but doesn't Assistant Commissioner York agree that he should be?
Q. Indeed.
A. Thank you.
Q. In fairness to you, I just want to read to you a part of paragraph $21(\mathrm{~d})$ of your statement because I don't want to mislead. You say:

It was always my intention (whilst I had managerial status over Strike Force Lantle) that [DCI] Fox would be so debriefed.

And that's a debrief relative to material that he possessed as part of his apparent comprehensive investigation. Is that a reference --
A. Comprehensive?
Q. -- of the kind that you're talking about?
A. Comprehensive investigation. Yes. Yes. I made that
position clear to Mr Parker, but once that's handed over, I don't drive Mr Parker unless I'm the commander or unless there's some specific reason.
Q. That reference there in $21(\mathrm{~d})$ would have been an opportunity, wouldn't it, to annex the notes of the meeting setting out your suggestion to York that Fox be interviewed about Strike Force Lantle?
A. I did annex it. It's not mentioned in the statement, but I gave them with the statement. There was a bundle of documents which I gave, some of which have been redacted, and I understand why, but they were there, Mr Hunt; I gave them --
Q. You understand enough about the statement-giving process, don't you, that things that are annexures are things that you sign and refer to in the statement?
A. Yes .
Q. Are you saying that you had given over either to your legal advisers or to the Commission these handwritten notes?
A. Yes.
Q. But you're not relying on them as being an annexure to the statement, are you?
A. Not - well, clearly they're not. I gave them with an intention, whether or not it is been a decision for the legal team, I don't know.
Q. All right.
A. They might have thought they were relevant. I don't know. You'd have to ask them.
Q. Can I just ask you to turn, if you would, first of all to tab 111?
A. Which volume, Mr Hunt, sorry?
Q. Volume 2, thank you, and go to page 528. Take it easy with those folders because they can rebel.
A. Yes, I've noticed.
Q. Would you look at the page numbers on the bottom, 528 should be a --
A. Newspaper article.
Q. -- newspaper article. For the benefit of those in
court, if you accept from me, DCI Humphrey, this document is separately marked as exhibit 24 ?
A. Thank you.
Q. Did you become aware of this article around the time that it was published?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it a fair proposition to say that you possibly, among other officers, formed a view that there was material sourced in this article that must have come to Ms McCarthy from sources within the NSW Police Force?
A. Yes, that and a conversation with DI Parker that he had with - a file note he provided to me in relation to a conversation he'd had with Joanne McCarthy.
Q. If you look three pages forward of that to page 524, is that the note that you're talking about that came to your attention?
A. Yes, yes, it is.
Q. It seems to be an investigator's note of DI Parker dated 14 April 2011?
A. Yes, that's right. There was a phone call. Graeme took the phone call. He rang up and he was livid - that's how I would describe it - about what was said. He immediately rang me and I asked for him to put a file note in. That arrived a day or two later and I put a covering report on it and gave it to Assistant Commissioner York.
Q. If you make your way then another three pages earlier to 521 , is that a file note by you attaching, if you look at the bottom of the signature page, both DI Parker's investigator's note of 14 April 2011 and the Newcastle Herald article that's now exhibit 24 as attachments to that file note?
A. It is not a file note. It is a complaint. It is a complaint about Mr Fox.
Q. Bear with me. I'm going to come to that. At the top it is titled "Strike Force Lantle/file note"?
A. Okay, yes, the form of the document.
Q. I was going to come to it, that its true character is a complaint made by you in relation to DCI Fox's conduct? A. And Detective Senior Constable McLeod.
Q. I understand. That was --
A. Or suspected conduct, I should say.
Q. Yes. That was dated 21 April 2011. Would that document have gone to northern region and to Assistant Commissioner Carlene York in the first instance?
A. It was hand delivered. I hand delivered it. It's not annexed to my statement, I apologise, but there is a note where I hand deliver that document together with a status report on Lantle.
Q. Did that complaint form part of the discussions that you had, among other things, to do with Lantle when you had discussions with Assistant Commissioner York on 16 May 2011?
A. No, the - no, not really.
Q. Help me with this. Turn to page 520. Do you see that, effectively, that seems to be on the 17 May 2011; in other words, the day after your meeting with York and others, if you'11 excuse the shortening of titles -A. Yes.
Q. -- and there is no disrespect intended. It seems that the very next day is when your complaint about Fox and McLeod is actioned from northern region; is that a fair proposition?
A. That seems to be fact, but it doesn't change what my intention was at that meeting, and that line - I know what I meant when I wrote that line. Once I gave that complaint to northern region, it's not my problem after that. It needed to be looked at. We were at the end of our tether with the interference or perceived interference; much more, it just became untenable and $I$ thought long and hard about having to put that in and I did, and ultimately clearly it has been agreed to.
Q. The document at 520 represents formally your complaint that had been at northern region and with Assistant Commissioner York being sent off to be actioned as a complaint?
A. I'd never seen that document before, but it's in the terms that - that you would normally do.
Q. You'11 accept, won't you, that the timing seems to suggest that something happened close to 17 May 2011 that meant the complaint went from northern region through to be
formally dealt with as a complaint?
A. I don't accept I've had anything to do with it, if that's the inference.
Q. I'm not suggesting anything impermissible. I'm just examining the --
A. The process.
Q. -- synchronicity between you having a meeting with Assistant Commissioner York on 16 May 2011 and a report that you made earlier in April then being moved forward?
A. I can understand how - I can understand how you would draw --
Q. I am not suggesting anything sinister; I'm just suggesting that there's some synchronicity between those two events?
A. Yes, I understand you could draw a nexus, but my reference in that meeting to interviewing Mr Fox related to what he had. I don't think we were ever sure that he had material that was still being withheld. It is not up to me to dictate when he should be interviewed in relation to an internal affairs matter.
Q. In any event, if you would just turn to 504 - in other words, a few pages backwards - is it a fair proposition that between 504 and 509 seems to be a transcript from an interview of DCI Fox in relation to a complaint matter?
A. I've never seen this document before.
Q. No, I'm not suggesting you have, but I'm asking is it a fair proposition that that's what it is?
A. Yes, I'm just putting it into context. It appears to be. I haven't read it, it certainly does appear to be. It looks like it's under the hand of Inspector Craig Reid and DCI Fox.

MR HUNT: Commissioner, could you just excuse me for a moment?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Q. Just turn to page 509 for me. Accepting that you hadn't seen this document before, do you see that the date, both under DCI Fox's signature and Inspector Reid's signature, is 19 May 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it a reasonable proposition that, you having said to Assistant Commissioner York that Fox should be interviewed and she agreeing, related to clearing up these media leaks and the complaint process rather than being interviewed in relation to Strike Force Lantle?
A. No. You've taken a quantum leap there. In fact, I'd never seen a complaint dealt with as quick as that, to be honest. Usually it takes a little bit more time to get through the system.
Q. But given that you say this persisting interest of yours in Fox being interviewed went to the heart of the matter in response to his assertions, doesn't --
A. The heart of this matter?
Q. The heart of this matter, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Doesn't its absence from your statements explicitly prepared for this Commission find an easier explanation if it was really about the complaint rather than about this matter?
A. No.
Q. The need to interview him?
A. No, I disagree with that. I know what I meant when I wrote that. I know what I said. I know what we were talking about.
Q. Al1 right.
A. How Commissioner York saw fit to deal with the complaint is her bailiwick, not mine.
Q. Is it a fair proposition - you will agree that you gave evidence --
A. Do I need this any more?
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. Do I need this at the moment?
Q. No, you don't, thank you. I'm sorry, I do want you to have it in front of you, if you would. Sorry, to do this to you, but you do need to get that out again.
A. That one, volume 2? I'm a bit concerned about this lever arch --
Q. Yes, 528, if you would, in other words, that media article. It is 519, I apologise to you, detective chief inspector. Page 519, down the bottom. That's it.
A. Yes, got it.
Q. Thank you. Do you see that, apart from material that I suspect you thought had come to the hands of Joanne McCarthy from DCI Fox, there was also some material - if you look at the fourth column line over, you'll see that there's some point-form matters under a heading "Police handling of the matter has included:"?
A. Yes.
Q. The third one down in relation to you said that you had some concerns about McLeod --
A. Yes.
Q. -- former Detective McLeod, you'11 see the third one goes to the loss of Shaun McLeod and assertions that his desire to investigate had been rejected. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the fourth bullet point you would have thought, at the relevant time, related to material that may well have come from DCI Fox?
A. Can I read it?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I agree with that.
Q. Do you see the second point?
A. Yes.
Q. That says:

The failure of a senior police officer with responsibility for the McAlinden matter to respond to an offer of help last year from the then police officer Troy Grant, who investigated Vince Ryan. Mr Grant, a newly elected New South Wales government MP, said this week he was "obviously concerned that there seemed to be issues that have to be fully investigated."
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that there?
A. I see that.
Q. In your reading of your note of the meeting with Assistant Commissioner York, I think you note that York agreed in relation to your suggestion that Fox was to be interviewed or needs to be interviewed; correct?
A. Yes, I haven't got the exhibit, but I remember.
Q. What you said yesterday is that she said, "Agree, so does Troy Grant"?
A. Troy Grant, yes.
Q. Doesn't that seem referrable to the article?
A. No, because I know what we were talking about. It was talking about amassing evidence for the Lantle investigation. That's what the meeting was about. It would be very unlikely, very unlikely, that Assistant Commissioner York would have discussed a complaint in the presence of the other police that were there. Even though I may have been a complainant, it just wouldn't happen. It was about amassing evidence for the Lantle investigation. Clearly that indicates Troy Grant has something to offer, so you can take it - you can look at it both ways. I'm not dissuaded that what you're saying could be seen like that. That's quite true. But it wasn't how it was.
Q. But, from your knowledge, Troy Grant didn't have direct knowledge about the things that were within the Lantle terms of reference, did he?
A. I didn't know. I didn't know. I don't know - not at that stage.
Q. Was he ever interviewed for Lantle?
A. I can't - I don't know. Probably. I suspect he would have been. Whether it was formally or debriefed, I don't know. But it's out of my bailiwick by then.
Q. Do you agree that it is a fairly extraordinary set of coincidences that the article is published; your complaint is made; there's a meeting at which suddenly you discuss with Assistant Commissioner York the necessity to interview Fox relative to Lantle; and then he's interviewed within days in relation to the internal investigation?
A. Certainly an extraordinary set of circumstances, but I can only reiterate my previous answers: we were there to talk about investigating Lantle, and that's clear by the
rest of the file note, and when $I$ wrote Fox was to be interviewed, it was in relation to what he had in relation to Lantle, what he claimed he had - or didn't have. As far as I was concerned, Assistant Commissioner York's was response in the same terms. I wasn't quite sure what Troy Grant's involvement was and it wasn't up for me to chase up then. It was more a handover meeting, I guess, and I backed out of it after that, it wasn't my job.
Q. Were there concerns generally raised about leaking at that meeting between yourself, Assistant Commissioner York and others on 16 May?
A. I'd have to check the note. I think we make reference to Ms McCarthy.
Q. It would make sense in the context broadly, wouldn't it?
A. Yes, of course. It would, but I've taken fairly detailed notes. I was taking notes as they were going. Hence, the quality of the writing, I guess; I was trying to keep up with the conversation. I haven't got the exhibit Mr Hunt. I can't comment.
Q. Just to make life a bit easier and, in fairness to you, DCI Humphrey, what I'm going to do is show you something that would seem to be a transcribed version of your note for that day?
A. Yes. By whom, do you know? Me or another person?
Q. I think by you or some - if I could broadiy say from your side of the fence?
A. Yes. No, I did this one.
Q. Al1 right. I apologise that $I$ don't have copies, but they will be made available. Do you adopt that as being your typewritten transcription of your notes relative to the 16 May --
A. If I can compare it to the note.
Q. Yes, we can give you a copy of that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 36.
MR HUNT: I'm wondering if the witness could have exhibit 36.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Hunt.

MR HUNT: Q. For that purpose, I don't need to you go to every single word, but --
A. No, no, it looks like it is --
Q. -- you might wish to focus on some particular words carefully, but so long as you are you broadly satisfy yourself it seems an accurate transcription.
A. Apart from a couple of typos. I'm not the greatest typist.
Q. Everyone is human. Is it fair to suggest that, at the top of your notes about the meeting, there's some discussion about matters that relate to the press?
A. Yes, what it says is:

Issues with media and investigation of
officers from other commands [is a]
separate issue.
And that's what why it wasn't addressed.
Q. Later on there's some mention in the text further down about Joanne McCarthy?
A. Dot points. So "McCarthy" with a question mark under "York". So obviously she has asked about Joanne and --
Q. So there was some discussion that was about Lantle and some discussion that was about media and questions about leaking, or at least McCarthy's concerns leading to the address?
A. Well, I think it was more how to manage Ms McCarthy's interests in the matter, that was from that - I'd take from that and it accords, I suppose, with a memory that Ma'am York made it very clear that we weren't talking about complaints. This was about Lantle.
Q. Is that a memory that's just coming back to you now or --
A. Yes, it is. It is prompting my memory, and it makes a lot of sense because you don't talk about internal
complaints. I didn't know how that complaint was going to be dealt with. It just needed to be raised because of the amount of perceived interference and the pressure it was putting on DI Parker and Detective Sergeant Little.

MR HUNT: I tender the transcript for completeness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. That will be exhibit 37.

## EXHIBIT \#37 TRANSCRIPT OF HANDWRITTEN NOTE OF 16/5/11 OF DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR HUMPHREY

THE WITNESS: Do I need this one again now?
MR HUNT: Q. I'm hoping not. Yes, you can put it away. A. Thank you.

MR HUNT: It may be that in the next few questions, Commissioner, I ask that you give limited lifting of non-publication orders in relation to this witness's evidence given at private hearing. Because I'm only taking him to some very limited matters, I have a copy of the transcript available for him in the witness box and a copy of the transcript for you. Because of the nature of it and because most of it will remain subject to non-publication orders, it is not proposed to provide it to others, but I will read out what it is that I am putting.
Q. Don't start to look at it yet, if you wouldn't mind detective chief inspector --

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you I understand.
MR HUNT: $Q$. -- because it hasn't had a non-publication order lifted over it, so we don't want to be in breach of the Commissioner's orders currently extant.
A. I'11 gouge my eyes out right now.
Q. Save us that spectacle, if you wouldn't mind.
A. Maybe one eye. I'11 need to read it later, I guess.
Q. Did you give evidence at a private hearing before the Commissioner on 13 March 2013?
A. I did indeed.
Q. Did my learned leader, Ms Lonergan SC, ask you questions on that day?
A. Many. Many.
Q. In fairness, is it the case that your view about DCI Fox as an investigator and other attributes or otherwise that he brings to his investigation has ameliorated or
improved since March 2013 to today?
A. No. If this is a reference to the fact he was a good detective, I was referring to the period we worked together during 1995 or in the 1990s. I don't necessarily hold that view now.
Q. When you said yesterday he was a good detective, that related - my question had related to when you were being supervised by him professionally. Is that the way that we ought understand --
A. That was the response I think to that question that --
Q. I understand.
A. He was a sergeant and --
Q. Your evidence, to the extent that your view was that Fox was a good detective, is that limited to that period? A. Yes. In essence, yes.
Q. All right. Do you adopt - and I'm just asking at least for purposes of the question - the non-publication order that relates to page 10 , points 39 to 44 , be lifted?
A. Can I look?
Q. I'll just read it out to you and see if you adopt it. You can look at it to check it is there?
A. What page was is it again?
Q. Page 10. You were asked this question --

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, before Mr Hunt continues can I respectfully suggest that if my client in the witness box is given a copy of the transcript, I should at least be given a copy of the transcript as his legal representative to protect his interests as he's being asked questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. In that, I understand that the relevant part of the transcript will be subject to an application for the lifting of a non-publication order, then I expect that it will be. Is that right Mr Hunt?

MR HUNT: It is proposed there be a formal lifting of certain parts. I can understand Mr Saidi's objection and I just take some instructions as to that.

Commissioner, if you think that's appropriate, I've got no difficulty with that.

THE COMMISSIONER: On1y insofar as it is necessary for Mr Saidi to look at the passages to which you are taking Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey. Thank You, Mr Hunt.

THE WITNESS: Which am I looking at?
MR HUNT: Q. Look at page 10. You were asked this question - I'm going to ask you whether you adopt a portion of your answer - at point 39 by Ms Lonergan on page 10:

Your opinion of his investigative skills just putting aside your other reservations about him, what did you think of his investigative skills in terms of any investigations you had seen him complete?

Your answer was:
An average investigator. I wouldn't say he was - you know, you used the term "mediocre" before. He was average.

Do you adopt that as being your view?
A. Yes, it do. That's my opinion. I also go on to say:

It is a subjective view on each
investigation. I think he was very strong
in how he deals with some of his witnesses.
He seems to bond very well with them -
probably sometimes too well. I don't
necessarily - from what I have seen of
examples of his interviewing techniques,
I don't think he has evolved into a modern interviewer, with the advent of video.

I don't resile from that.
MR HUNT: For completeness I would ask that the non-publication order be lifted from point 38 on page 10 to point 4 on page 11, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, the non-publication order in relation to the evidence of Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey of 13 March 2013 will be lifted in relation to pages 10 to 11, from 1 ine 39 on page 10 to 1 ine 4 on page 11.

MR HUNT: Would you add to that 1 ines 22 to 34 inclusive on page 11, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes lines 22 to 34 on page 11 will also be lifted.

MR HUNT: Q. I'm going to read out a section to you to see if you adopt it as part of your sworn evidence in this phase of the Commission:
Q. Did you have any concerns yourself about [DCI] Fox's lack of objectivity in his investigations?
A. Where are you now, Mr Hunt, sorry?
Q. About point 22 on page 11 , do you see that halfway down?
A. Yes, good.
Q. I'11 start again:
Q. Did you have any concerns yourself about Detective Chief Inspector Fox's lack of objectivity in his investigations?
A. I think I referred to him as a zealot, in one report. I think that encapsulates him. He was beyond driven with this.
Q. Particularly in relation to matters concerning sexual abuse of children?
A. No, particularly the Catholic Church.
Q. The Catholic Church?
A. That's how I interpreted it.

Do you adopt that as your sworn evidence before this Commission?
A. Yes, I do. It was my opinion and still is now.
Q. What led you to the view that, to use your language, DCI Fox was a zealot?
A. I think it was the totality of everything that occurred prior to that hearing. It just got to the stage where he couldn't be told no. He continually tried to take over Lantle, or he wanted to be a major part of Lantle and he just wouldn't say no.

Now, to go on and I'm going to have to be a little bit careful I guess, some of the assertions that he made about what holdings he had, what he'd done, were not true; yet, he purported that they were. Those are the actions of a person, in my view, that is obsessed with trying to take part in some type of activity.
Q. Al1 right. You gave some evidence about your perception that Detective Sergeant Steel would bring a lack of investigation bias to the investigation that became Strike Force Lantle. Do the comments that you've just made have any relevance to your view about investigation bias or other bias in DCI Fox in relation to the matter in 2010? A. Yes, it does.

MR HUNT: Could you excuse me, please, Commissioner, if you could just bear with me while I turn something up. They are matters that $I$ wanted to take the witness to in the private hearing transcript.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Q. I just want to explore a little further with you your evidence, DCI Humphrey, about the matters that you sought to no longer adopt that had been part of your statement as signed by you on 14 February 2013. Do you have your statement there with you?
A. Yes, I have. Actually when I look at that now, I probably shouldn't have redacted portion (d). It only related prior to my attendance at Port Stephens, but I've done it.
Q. Let me understand that. Are you retracting your retraction when you say that?
A. I'd better read it. Well, at the risk of bringing Armageddon upon me, yes, I do in relation to paragraph (d), but not in relation to paragraph 29. It probably explains --
Q. Hang on. First give me the chance to ask the questions to clear that up.
A. Yes, fine.

MR HUNT: Perhaps this is why I wasn't in favour, Commissioner, of crossing it out but rather to use underlining - not that I'm in any way clairvoyant.
A. Do we now understand that where you sought to excise on paragraph $21(\mathrm{~d})$ the words "and despite numerous requests to provide that information the information had not been provided by him", you adopt that as part of your sworn evidence?
A. Yes, I do, yes. It is in terms of that paragraph relates to an overarching view of Mr Fox in this statement, where paragraph 29 is at chronological issue. So by the end of it, by the end of my association with Lantle, my formal association with Lantle, it was clear a number of requests had been made and it was believed that that material had not been provided. Where at 29 where I'm you can ask the questions to me --
Q. Bear with me for the moment. Doesn't the beginning of 21 make this statement:

> Detective Chief Inspector Fox was not selected to play a direct role in the Strike Force Lantle's investigation, for a number of reasons. The reasons include the following:
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. A fair reading would suggest that all the material in subparagraph (d) were reasons that related to him not being selected to play an active role?
A. At any part, subsequently, not just at the start.
Q. But in context, it must be read, must it not as --
A. I don't agree.
Q. Bear with me. It must be meant that it at least related to decisions up until 2 December because that's effectively the most formal indication to Fox that he wasn't to participate in it?
A. No, no, no, no, not at all. I don't agree with you. That paragraph, as dictated, and presented, is an overarching view up until the date $I$ made this statement.
Q. As now adopted by you, doesn't $21(\mathrm{~d})$ go, for instance, to not delivering up statements?
A. It does, yes.
Q. And he did deliver up statements, didn't he, by -A. Some.
Q. By some time shortly after the meeting 2 December 2010, you understand he delivered up --
A. Some .
Q. -- some statements?
A. Some statements, yes.
Q. He delivered up the ministerial report as well; correct?
A. I presume so, yes.
Q. That was --
A. It was never delivered to me, but I believe it is in the holdings.
Q. You and Haggett searched for it and couldn't locate it?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. You know that it came into police holdings?
A. Later, yes, later.
Q. It's a fair assumption that Fox delivered it up?
A. I'm sure he did. I am sure he did.
Q. At some stage?
A. I'm sure he did.
Q. All right. Apart from not delivering up material, what else does that section go to?
A. That goes back, I think, to the ultimate outcome of the email that Detective Sergeant Little sent to Fox to try to - to DCI Fox to pin him down on exactly what he did and didn't have.
Q. But wasn't your understanding of the character of the email communication between Little and Fox and then the further telephone conversation between Fox, DI Parker and Detective Sergeant Little, that Fox had delivered up, by that stage, all his knowledge and it simply wasn't as great a knowledge as had been --
A. Represented by him?
Q. -- represented?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. All right. The point that you seek to make in relation to paragraph 29 is that, in narrative form, it is clearly the words that you seek to no longer rely on and that's the fact, isn't it, that you --
A. Yes, I do.
Q. -- remain recanted in relation to this area?
A. Yes, that was not - I interposed my thought processes, I suppose, during the typing of this.
Q. Let me just ask you this: you say that the things that are set out in paragraph 29 relate to your state of knowledge as at 12 October 2010; correct?
A. Yes, apart from that bit that needs to be taken out.
Q. Because point that you're making is that, you say, paragraph 21 can be read more broadly as to your general state of knowledge about Lantle?
A. Yes.
Q. But paragraph 29, just on the face of it, relates to how matters stood as at 12 October 2010?
A. Yes, that's right. That's describing - now, it would be unfair of me to say that DCI Fox had been requested of anything in relation to this matter that day because, on reflection, that can't be true.
Q. What I'm trying to understand is why it was there originally?
A. I have no idea. I can only say that I've - in the process of the statement giving, which was done verbally, that it's gone in as an interposed or encapsulating comment. I can't take it any higher than that.
Q. You knew that this was a document that was going to be relied on?
A. Yes, absolutely. Absolutely, I've made an error.
Q. By the Commissioner?
A. Yes.
Q. And it is a document that you adopted?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. In sworn evidence at your private hearing on 13 March?
A. Yes, that's right. It was after the private hearing and sitting down and thinking about reflecting on the whole
situation that that couldn't be true, and I brought it to the attention of my legal team and, at the first available opportunity here, I've tried to correct what is an error and nothing more than an error.
Q. When did you make this realisation?
A. After the private hearings.
Q. All right. Did you communicate it to your lawyers at that stage or when did you tell them?
A. Shortly afterwards. I can't say exactly when, but shortly afterwards. Certainly before the start TOR1. But the appropriate time, in my view, I guess to address it was when I'm in the witness box. I think you said before not all of us are perfect, Mr Hunt, and I'm afraid a made an error there.
Q. To the extent that you concede that it was unfair to Fox to have it in there and remain part of your sworn evidence, was that any of your motivation in originally include it, to be unfair to him?
A. That's offensive, no. If it was, I would have left it there.
Q. I'm not putting to you. I'm just asking.
A. Well, it is still offensive. In fact, if I was going to try to be unfair to Mr Fox, I would have left it there and argued that it was legitimate. But no, it is not true and I'm not about to tell lies. Despite the fact that people sitting here can besmirch me and call me foul names and the flow on from that, I'm not prepared to do it to Mr Fox. I will tell the truth.
Q. Are you able to indicate what the numerous requests were that had been made that related to this matter or do you say that they are they just were not --
A. Which paragraph are we talking about?
Q. This section?
A. Twenty-nine?
Q. Yes.
A. I just said that that's to be taken out, redacted. As far as I was aware, Mr Fox wouldn't have been aware that there was suddenly an urgency at region to recover that file. If he was working, I'm sure Fay Dunn would have rung him and said, "Bring the file in", and I'm sure he probably
would have.
Q. I accept that your evidence is that the reason that you and Superintendent Haggett undertook the search that you did at Port Stephens was at the direction or request of Fay Dunn from region?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you accept the proposition that, in terms of what you narrate as at 12 October, reading that paragraph, including the sentence that's now extracted --
A. Yes .
Q. -- that the sentence that asserts that there had been numerous requests made of him to deliver things up and he hadn't, gives the narrative justification for the search alongside you having been directed to?
A. Yes, it appears to do that, but it's - it was an error.
Q. Was that the effect that was originally intended, to provide some pragmatic support for why it was necessary to search his office?
A. Oh, I suppose. I don't know. I really don't know. It just formed part of - it was a very rushed time making those statements, a short time frame, which is no excuse. It's my responsibility to make sure that it's accurate.
Q. Well, not to be too coy about that, you would have had the assistance of a solicitor, somebody from within the department and a barrister when you were drafting this statement?
A. Yes .
Q. And I suggest it took place across a number of hours, that exercise?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. And you had access --

MR SAIDI: I object to these questions. They're unfairly being put. If one goes to paragraph 29, the witness makes it very clear why he undertook the search. It was at the request of Inspector Dunn.

MR HUNT: I've made that clear in my question.

MR SAIDI: So why are we asking these questions, with respect, about him putting matters in the statement so as to give a particular meaning when, whatever he may believe, he was acting on Inspector Dunn's request? That's the important point of it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that much I think is clear and understood Mr Saidi.

MR HUNT: I'm just not quite sure that I understand the objection, because at the moment I'm asking the witness some questions to explore what he said about it being a fairly rushed process, taking the statements. In a sense, even though the topic goes to the search, I've moved away from that and I think, quite fairly, I did put to the witness that I accepted his evidence about it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, you did, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Q. I'm almost finished my examination, Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, but the question was that the taking of the statement with - no suggestion of anything being wrong with this - a number of legal advisers, was that it was a process that took some period of hours?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. You had a chronological bundle of material with you that you were able to refer to and some of those things got annexed to your statement?
A. I'm sorry, I drifted off there for a second.
Q. Some of the things within the chronological bundle got annexed to your statement and others you had reference to to get the contact right?
A. That's right. I don't know whether it was a subjective decision-making process about what at that stage was believed to be relevant and what wasn't and what it evolved into. I --
Q. All right. Are you able to indicate when you became aware of your view at that time about - at that time - your perception of errors to $21(d)$ and to paragraph 29, who you communicated that to?
A. My legal team.
Q. Anyone in particular?
A. Mr Cooley, I think I raised it with, not at - that was between the private hearings and the start of TOR1.

MR HUNT: That's the examination.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Single?
MS SINGLE: No, thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Terracini?
MR TERRACINI: I will leave it to Mr Fox's counsel. If there's anything I want to ask, I'll ask it afterwards, if I may.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Terracini. Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen. How is the sound today?
MR COHEN: I will test it now and see if I keep everybody appropriately happy. Can I ask through you, Commissioner, if the transcription service can hear me clearly? I have, I think, at least one thumb up.

MR HUNT: Could I be so bold as to make one suggestion to assist Mr Cohen? I think he's entirely unaware that what happens sometimes when he's asking questions is that his voice trails away at the end of the question and I think it is that issue that creates the challenge.

MR COHEN: Yes, I think I must be a softie like Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey. I'll try to be, in terms of my questions.
<EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:
MR COHEN: Q. Is a fair summation of the evidence you gave yesterday - the reference is at transcript 1318, 1ines 27 to 42 - concerning crime managers, that, like snowflakes, no two are alike?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. There's no crime manager from central casting, is there - each is a human being and each does his job according to his dictates and experience; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Even if there are various ways of conducting oneself according to the police regulations and indeed the position statement, people will, nonetheless, be their own man or their own woman and do it as they see fit?
A. Yes.
Q. And on that footing, people will, from time to time, even in that senior position, involve themselves in investigations if the appropriate circumstances warrant that involvement; isn't that right?
A. It is the decision for the crime manager, but strictly speaking it relates to, as I've mentioned earlier, critical incidents, charging of police.
Q. The crime manager is not an automaton. He exercises a discretion, or she exercises a discretion, and makes decisions about those things on a daily basis?
A. Within the parameters of what his commander or her commander will allow him to do.
Q. Or indeed pursuant to some terms of reference if there's a strike force?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to ask you a few general questions before we get into the detail of your statement. Allow me to deal with those firstly because it seems to be an appropriate place. You also gave some evidence, and the reference here from yesterday was transcript 1323.
A. I don't have the transcript.
Q. I understand you don't. This is for the assistance particularly of your own counsel. It is transcript 1323, lines 1 to 7 . You gave evidence about the police force being a paramilitary organisation. Do you recall that? A. Yes, I do. I recall I mentioned it. I don't know the exact terms, but I'm sure you will tell me shortly.
Q. They were your words, weren't they?
A. Yes absolutely, yes.
Q. Do you accept that the exemplar of the paramilitary organisation might be the Nazi Waffen SS or the Provisional IRA in Northern Ireland?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, that is really unacceptable.
MR COHEN: Q. Isn't it silly to call the NSW Police Force, a civil operation to maintain civil society, a paramilitary organisation?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, it would be within the knowledge of everyone in this courtroom that the Police Force is a paramilitary organisation, and that refers to its structure, the rank structure and disciplinary --

MR COHEN: Did you say it is or it is not?
THE COMMISSIONER: It is. That refers to its rank structure --

MR COHEN: Very well.
THE COMMISSIONER: -- not the way it deals with members of the public.

MR COHEN: Very well. If you are persuaded to that effect, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Go on, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Very well.
Q. In your statement, you have chosen your words very careful, haven't you, you say?
A. To the best of my ability I'd say that, yes.
Q. It is correct to say, isn't it, that DCI Fox and yourself just don't get on as individuals; that's -A. Sorry?
Q. It is correct to say --
A. You tailed off. There was an example of you tailing off.
Q. I'm so sorry. It is correct to say, isn't it, that you and DCI Fox just don't get on as individuals; isn't that right?
A. I had no idea what Mr Fox thought of me until he decided to out his opinion in the witness box. I have no opinion of Mr Fox. I'm ambivalent.
Q. No, no --
A. I'm ambivalent.
Q. I'm not asking you about your opinion of him or his of you. I'm just asking you a simple question. You two simply don't get on, do you?
A. I never thought that was the case. Clearly it is on his side of the house. He made that very clear.
Q. You've given evidence about what your view of him as an investigator is or was and that is hardly complimentary, isn't it?
A. That's an opinion, yes.
Q. And that must be based on your personal perception of him as a person?
A. No, on his ability and that. I gave him also some compliments about how he deals with witnesses. It's like it's no different than me saying that Detective Inspector Parker is not a good trainer - physical trainer than I am. It's just - it's nonsense to suggest that this is a personal issue, Mr Cohen.
Q. When did you give the compliments about Detective Chief Inspector Fox --
A. Did I not say --
Q. $\quad-\quad$ in and after 1995 ?
A. Did I not say that he --
Q. No, please you don't answer with a question.
A. I'm answering the question, Mr Cohen. I said that he was very good with witnesses, sometimes too good, but he was good with witnesses. That's the evidence.
Q. But it was given as at 1995, wasn't it?
A. No, that was in my private hearing.
Q. No, no. Your evidence this morning fixed those things at 1995?
A. I said he was a good detective in 1995. He appeared to be a good detective to me.
Q. But after that time your view was completely different, wasn't it?
A. I didn't have anything to do much with Mr Fox after
then, apart from managerial level type meetings. I didn't appreciate his behaviour with the press, so I suppose I'm I'11 tell you what, I would concede I'm disappointed in how he behaves. That's my opinion of my Fox. I'm disappointed in him.
Q. The answer to my original question is you just don't get on, do you?
A. No, I don't agree with that premise at all. Clearly not now I guess. I don't think we're going to be holding hands and skipping down the street.
Q. But you never did that, did you?
A. What, hold hands and skip down the street?
Q. Act in a civil fashion?
A. I'm sorry; I've always acted in a civil fashion.
Q. Towards Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. In my opinion, yes.
Q. Very well. Isn't it the case that your intention has been in the evidence you gave in your statement, as it was originally written and printed and provided to the Commission, and the way it apparently was adopted, at your private hearing in March of this year, that it was your plan to damage and inhibit DCI Fox within the police force? A. I didn't hear the last bit of that.
Q. Wasn't it your plan to damage and inhibit DCI Fox within the police force?
A. No, it was in response to the allegations in Lateline. That's what started this.
Q. Is it not an explanation for what originally appeared in paragraphs $21(d)$ and paragraph 29 of your statement when you signed it on 14 February 2013?
A. No.
Q. Have you not only resiled from those statements as at yesterday, or you've purported to resile from them as at yesterday, and then resiled from the resiling today, four months after you signed those documents, isn't that right? It was a tactical decision yesterday in the witness box? A. No. It was the appropriate time to raise that I made an error, in my experience in court, anyway.
Q. You indicated yesterday that you'd made two errors, in paragraph $21(\mathrm{~d})$ and in paragraph 29, and there was no equivocation with or qualification of that evidence yesterday, was there?
A. No.
Q. That reason for that resiling from what was written in those paragraphs was because you had heard the evidence of Ms Joanne McCarthy, hadn't you?
A. No, no, not at all.
Q. And you realised that what was going on was that the very opportunity that you had planned in your statement to damage DCI Fox had been removed because the evidence was out, that he didn't have what you said he had?
A. Not the case at all - you can paint that all you like, Mr Cohen, but that's not the case at all.
Q. Do you regard the evidence you're giving in this Commission as some sort of elaborate forensic game?

MR SAIDI: I object to the question. Could I ask for this concession to be made, for the purposes of these questions. My understanding is that it was advised to counsel assisting that those changes needed to be made before Ms McCarthy had given and completed her evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: I won't allow the question, Mr Cohen. Would you move on to something touching the terms of reference, please.

MR COHEN: I must say, Commissioner, the question of whether or not there is or is not a personal animus between these two gentlemen --

THE COMMISSIONER: Your question was whether the witness regarded his evidence as an elaborate forensic game.

MR COHEN: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: I don't really understand the question and I won't be assisted by the answer.

MR COHEN: Very well.
Q. Isn't it the case that the evidence you gave yesterday about particularly paragraphs $21(d)$ and paragraph 29 was
just what you were putting forward by way of a revisionist history of the two events?
A. I don't understand that question, I'm sorry, Mr Cohen.
Q. Weren't you just changing the facts to suit the position at the time?
A. No. I was correcting an error I had made.
Q. But when you signed your statement in February of this year, on 14 February, you didn't have a skerrick of
evidence to support the assertion in paragraph 21(d), did you?
A. $21(\mathrm{~d})$ ?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I disagree with that. I certainly didn't have any evidence for the paragraph - excuse me for a second - 29. $21(d)$ the context that was --
Q. Stop there and let me ask you this question.
A. Yes, okay.
Q. In relation to $21(\mathrm{~d})$, who did you rely upon to give you the information that you fashioned in your statement that you understood numerous requests had been made to DCI Fox to provide this material?
A. DI Parker and Detective Sergeant Little and --
Q. And what about Detective Chief Inspector Tayler?
A. No. No.
Q. When you signed your statement in relation to paragraph 29, at the same time, who did you rely on for that information?
A. Paragraph 29?
Q. Yes.
A. As I said, I've encapsulated the material in the earlier paragraph into that one and that was the error. I didn't pick it up until after the private hearings.
I just - as I've said, I apologise to the Commission that that occurred. I made an error and I've raised it at the appropriate time, in light of what I've been trained to do, when I get into the witness box and adopt this statement.
Q. Does it occur to you now to apologise to DCI Fox about it?
A. For what?

MR SAIDI: I object. What a terrible question to put. That question is not directed to the interests of justice or the interests of this Commission. It is directed towards people in the public gallery. It is no part of the function of Mr Cohen to ask the witness to apologise to DCI Fox or anyone else.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think it is unhelpful, Mr Cohen. Would you proceed to the next question, please.

MR COHEN: Q. You identified in your paragraphs, in your statement, the common belief?
A. Which part, Mr Cohen?
Q. Excuse me. Let me take you to it to be entirely sure.
A. Yes.
Q. If you have paragraph $21(\mathrm{~d})$ - I'11 withdraw that question and go to it this way. What I want to do is take you to the document that you've been taken to previously. It is in volume 2. It is behind tab 111 and it is, if I can call it compendiously, the complaint document. That's a fair way of describing it in summary fashion?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Do you have tab 111?
A. I do. I'm at the cover page.
Q. At the beginning? Very well. You've given evidence the complaint was commenced by you?
A. I've given evidence I put in a complaint, yes.
Q. And that's what commences such a complaint, isn't it?
A. Yes, generally. I didn't know what other holdings there may have been in relation to Mr Fox in regards to the same matter.
Q. In these circumstances before you did what you did formally, did you take any step to communicate with DCI Fox?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. I see. So this was an entirely administrative step that had the potential to affect him in his position in the police force; isn't that right?
A. I don't know what the ultimate outcome of it would be, but I have an obligation under the Police Service Regulations to report conduct of that type. I did what I was obliged to do and in, I suppose, protection and support of my investigators who were clearly under some pressure from what they thought was leaking within the organisation, which I believe has been agreed to.
Q. We're talking now, aren't we, at May 2011?
A. I'll just have a look at the date. I think it was that date. No, sorry, April. April.
Q. April 2011?
A. Sorry, 21 April is when I put it in.
Q. You assert that there was perception of leaking, but there was no basis for that perception, was there? A. Are you saying did I know specifically that it was occurring.
Q. No, no. I'm just saying this: You were relying upon a series of representations made to you by others. That's the first step, isn't it, in this analysis?
A. Not just on that.
Q. I see. What personally did you do to assess whether or not these perceptions or allegations of leaking actually had substance?
A. That's not - well, firstly, I did think they had substance.
Q. No, no. My question was very specific. What did you do to assess whether or not they in fact had substance not what you thought, but what did you do?
A. I don't understand the question, Mr Cohen.
Q. It is a --
A. Hang on, can I finish? I'll tell you why I don't understand it. It is clear what I've done. I've put it --
Q. I don't need you to tell me --
A. I've put it into a - I asked for a file note. I had a discussion with Mr Parker. I examined the newspaper reports. I had memory of a number of other newspaper reports in relation to this matter, and others, that suggested to me that there was absolutely no doubt that Mr Fox was leaking information to Ms McCarthy. However --
Q. Which newspaper reports?
A. However - I hadn't finished. However it is not up --
Q. Which newspaper reports?

MR SAIDI: I object. If Mr Cohen wants to ask questions, let the witness finish --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. Finish the answer to the first question firstly.
A. There's specific reports that I can't go into in this Commission. Absolutely can't go into in this Commission and I won't.

MR COHEN: Q. Newspaper reports you can't?
A. Yes, not just about Lantle. If you want to take me there, Mr Cohen, take me there.
Q. I'm just asking: you are asserting there are newspaper reports you relied upon. What were they?
A. The complaint revolves around Mr Fox's and, to a lesser extent, Mr McLeod's dealing with the press overall and when you read it, you will see that. There were newspaper reports prior to that date - and I can't specifically mention them, I can't recall them - but clearly indicated to me that Mr Fox was leaking to Ms McCarthy. And I believe that's been agreed to.
Q. You can believe what you like, but answer the question.
A. Well, it's in evidence, Mr Cohen.
Q. If there was a complaint about non-compliance by DCI Fox with a direction - because the complaint was about the direction, wasn't it?
A. The complaint was about --
Q. At its simplest the complaint was about non-compliance with the direction given on 2 December 2010; isn't that so?

MR SAIDI: I think more fairly, the question ought be about directions; the direction encompassed more than one aspect.

MR COHEN: Perhaps if I can ask my questions unaided.

MR SAIDI: I'm entitled to object and I do object.
MR COHEN: Can I have the basis of the objection, please?
MR SAIDI: I've given the basis. I'm not sure Mr Cohen was listening. The direction, whilst referred to in the singular, encompassed different matters; that is, only one of them was not to talk to the media. The other one related to handing over of documentation. Mr Cohen seems to be putting it to the witness that the direction only covered one matter.

MR COHEN: I didn't say that at all. I simply referred to the direction identified in the complaint.
Q. That was a direction made on 2 December 2010, was it not?
A. That forms part of what the complaint is about.
Q. I see.
A. Part.

MR HUNT: Mr Cohen might have lost track of the time, but it is --

MR COHEN: I'm sorry. I apologise, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will adjourn for 20 minutes.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MR HUNT: Commissioner, Ms Lonergan has asked to be excused. She is attending to something but is content that the matters proceed

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. Yes, Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Just before the adjournment, there was an objection about a question I put to you and I referred to the complaint as focusing upon a direction. In fairness to everybody, yourself included, I would like to clear that matter up.
A. Yes.
Q. The complaint, which I think in your evidence early this morning you said you had not seen before - that is the document per se; is that right?
A. Apart from the document I prepared obviously, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. But I've never seen that file, nor would I ever expect to.
Q. Yes, but the relevant bit of the process that kicked off the complaint $I$ think is found at page 476 of tab 111; is that correct?
A. Okay, yes, that's the triage form.
Q. Is that what starts the process?
A. No, the process is started by the complaint. The complaint is submitted to the senior officer.
Q. And that is Commander Haggett in this case, isn't it? A. No.
Q. I'm sorry.
A. In this case it was Assistant Commissioner York, because I was an acting superintendent, and that was my direct line report. Then what would happen it would appear - it go to a triage process, which could be done at region. It would be done by the region professional standards manager, or they can mention it at a complaint management meeting and send it to the command they wish to investigate it, where it is then triaged by the professional standards duty officer. They determine from the nature of the contents of the document submitted what the issue is and they pull that from a defined list of issues - it is about six pages - that covers all ambits of misdeeds.
Q. Which are found in the regulations?
A. The issues aren't, no, no, no.
Q. I am sorry, the concepts, the boxes to be ticked are, the regulatory steps, are they not?
A. I'm not sure if they're in the regs. I would not like to mislead you there.
Q. In the Act perhaps?
A. No, certainly not in the Act. It will be a process that's been agreed to, tried and tested through the New

South Wales Ombudsman and PIC.
Q. But that process, once it leads to a document such as this --
A. The triage form?
Q. Is at page 476,111 --
A. Yes, but I don't.
Q. I understand you don't have any input into that?
A. That's right.
Q. You have seen this process before, I take it?
A. Extensively, yes
Q. So that when it got to this point - the document is dated 22 June 2011 - the process you just characterised in your evidence in the last few minutes distilled this into the complaint which is identified, apart from the catchy reference in the first box --
A. c@ts.i Mr Cohen.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. c@ts.i.
Q. c@ts.i very well. The second box distills, according to that process you've just described, the complaint, does it not?
A. The c@ts.i reference, "IPC. Disobey reasonable direction", yes.
Q. The reason I put to you before in my question to you on "direction" is because the term used there, there was an identification of a "Disobey reasonable direction", singular; isn't that so?
A. Yes, but that's not authored by me.
Q. I understand that.
A. Yes.
Q. But that was the complaint that was investigated, wasn't it?
A. Yes, absolutely, or it appears that was the issue. Having said that, there can be issues arising that are also addressed during a complaint, just so you understand the process. I'm not saying that happened here, but that is the process.
Q. That was what was investigated here, was it not?
A. I didn't --
Q. According to this document on this process, logically that must be so?
A. On the face of this, that was what was investigated here, yes.
Q. The single "disobey reasonable direction" issue was the issue of the direction, singular, identified as at 2 December 2010, was it not?
A. I can't say what that was. That would be a question you would need to put to whoever did the triage, which looks like it was Inspector Meares.
Q. Presumably, Inspector Meares is a competent and experienced officer with these things?
A. I don't have an opinion about Inspector Meares.
Q. Just before the short adjournment, I was asking you to identify the news articles that you were referring to, and you identified a number, but is it not the case that there was simply one news article included in the materials that formed part of the complaint in behind this tab 111?
A. Yes, that's right. That's the one had I access to.
Q. That document has, as its identification for the Commission's purposes, exhibit 29, but you can find it in this bundle in a couple of places, the first and most convenient is at page 519. This is the second volume, tab 111, page 159.
Q. Do you have that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you tell the Commission where in this document there is a proper basis for identifying Detective Chief Inspector Fox as a leaker?
A. Sorry?
Q. I'll repeat the question.
A. Sorry, I was reading the article.
Q. Can you tell the Commissioner where in this article there is a proper basis for you to identify Detective Chief Inspector Fox as a leaker?
A. Would you like me to go through the article paragraph by paragraph?
Q. I'm asking you where the proper basis is that --
A. I can do it paragraph by paragraph if you wish. I think I can see - my opinion is that it is littered with input from material DCI Fox, I believed, was feeding to Ms McCarthy.
Q. That was a belief, was it?
A. That was my belief at the time I put the complaint in.
Q. A belief?
A. Yes.
Q. Founded on nothing other than your belief?
A. No. It couples with the conversation and the file note supplied by DI Parker when the conversation - and that speaks for itself. I can't talk to that because I wasn't in that telephone conversation. But the matters raised by Parker, in accordance with his obligations under the regulations, indicated through certain periods - phrases in the conversation, that there had been contact.
Q. So somebody uses a phrase in a conversation and that, to you, is definitive proof --
A. No, it's not definitive.
Q. -- that somebody else is involved, is it?
A. Not definitive, but there was a grand suspicion.
Q. A grand suspicion. That wouldn't even get close to be reasonable grounds to suspect, would it?

MR SAIDI: I object. This police officer is under an obligation under the Police Act and the Police Regulations to report any belief on his part that there may be conduct, whether it be corrupt conduct or the other instances of conduct. It is not fair to start interpreting his reporting matters based on, firstly, the criminal standards. Secondly in relation to these questions I object on the basis of relevance in terms of we now know that the basis of the complaint had substance and we know that the complaint was dismissed because of lies told by Detective Chief Inspector Fox.

At least if these questions are being put on the basis
of some credibility issue, I take an objection on that ground, as well as the relevance ground.

MR COHEN: My response if I may be heard on that, is post hoc, ergo propter hoc. You cannot define the proposition the way my learned friend does simply by saying because we know now, that somehow influences the past. That's clearly a non sequitur. I'm trying to investigate the basis upon which Detective Chief Inspector Fox was being pursued at the time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Cohen. I don't know whether attributing the various levels of standard of proof is much of much assistance, but I consider that you're free to ask Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey what he had in order to ground this suspicion.

MR COHEN: Q. You didn't have enough to ground a suspicion, did you?
A. No, I did.
Q. You didn't, you said?
A. No, I did. Sorry, my voice trailed off.
Q. I put it to you that you did not?
A. I'm sorry I missed that last one.
Q. I put it to you that you did not?
A. No, I did. I had a suspicion absolutely, well founded but absolutely.
Q. The material that was provided to Joanne McCarthy for this article came from third-party sources, did it not?
A. Which third-party sources are you referring to?
Q. Don't you know?
A. I don't know exactly where it came from, but based on the telephone conversation and the file note from Inspector Parker and my knowledge and my suspicions surrounding Mr Fox's contact with Joanne McCarthy, I submitted a report. It wasn't beyond a reasonable doubt. It wasn't probably even to the civil onus, but as I am obliged to do it, and I felt it very necessary at that time because $I$ had a crime manager that was under the pump because of this media intrusion. We wanted to get the job done and it wasn't supposed to be done on the front page of the Newcastle Herald.
Q. The source of this material wasn't DCI Fox at the time, it was Mrs Helen Keevers, wasn't it?
A. I have no idea who it was.

MR COHEN: Excuse me, Commissioner.
MR TERRACINI: Perhaps I can take an objection. There is material in another hearing about this, so the information is known to the Commission and the source was not Mr Fox.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Terracini.
MR COHEN: I'm indebted to my learned friend Mr Terracini for that.
Q. I'll put it on this basis so that there is no ambiguity: it is clear Detective Chief Inspector Fox is not the source of this material?
A. I can't say.
Q. It was always so?
A. No.
Q. Wasn't it?
A. No, it wasn't always so. That's why the report was submitted.
Q. But you wanted it to be so, didn't you, at the time? A. Actually quite the contrary. I was hoping that it wasn't right because it is pretty disgraceful behaviour for a police officer to be white-anting another investigation by leaking to the press.
Q. You used the phrase "disgraceful behaviour". Do you consider it proper for an internal email by one officer about another circulated to subordinate officers to speak in derogatory terms?
A. You would have to draw my attention to the precise example you're speaking of.
Q. Let me draw your attention to the concept in the first instance. Do you consider it improper or unacceptable behaviour for a senior officer to circulate an email about another senior officer of cognate rank and communicate it to subordinate officer?
A. If the comment was inappropriate, yes.
Q. Can I ask you to look, please, in that same volume at tab 64.
A. Yes.
Q. For the assistance of all concerned, including the Commissioner, this document is also part of - and I'd ask you just to confirm this, detective chief inspector - what is annexure $C$ to your statement.
A. Yes, I gave it up. I'11 just check the number.

MR COHEN: I think, if my memory is correct, Commissioner, it may have been admitted as an exhibit by now, but I'm not sure about that.

THE COMMISSIONER: You might be right.
MR COHEN: In any event, there are multiple sources so that all concerned can have access to it, in particular, annexure C to the chief inspector's statement, but also in this bundle. For the convenience of Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, I'm taking him to the bundle because it is easier to get to.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. I can say that, yes, I certainly had a copy of that note and I attached it to the statement.

MR COHEN: Q. There are two pages in the bundle, 250 and 251. There's a series of chain emails. In the way of these things, the most recent in time is the one on top and the earliest is it the far these removed from the front. A. That's right.
Q. Working backwards, at page 251 there's an initiating email from Detective Sergeant Steel - 251?
A. 250 is Steel on mine.
Q. No, if you look at 251, is there not a copy of the original email that kicked this off?
A. Oh, that DCI Fox sent to Stee1. Yes, I'm sorry,

I misunderstood.
Q. Then that was forwarded by her, that is Detective Sergeant Steele? She may have been Acting Inspector Steel at this stage. I'm sorry if I've inadvertently been disrespectful to her rank at the time.
A. It appears she was by her signature block, yes.
Q. She forwarded that communication, amongst others, to yourself?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you responded in substance to her referring to you, and this is the document I particularly want to take you to. Having regard to the evidence you just gave, isn't that an unacceptable way to refer to another colleague in an email that's circulating in an official sense?
A. What, the first line I presume you mean?
Q. Well, any of it?
A. No --

THE COMMISSIONER: Which part of it, Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Q. Look at the first line. Doesn't that establish - let me be blunt - your contempt for DCI Fox? A. No, not at all. It established that the discussions that we'd had were accurate.
Q. You didn't first have a conversation with DCI Fox about this, did you?
A. No, he was on holidays.
Q. You were on holidays?
A. No, he was on holidays.
Q. But you could have called if you'd wanted to?
A. No, I'm not going to ring him on holidays, and nor would there be any reason to ring him.
Q. You could have waited until he got back?
A. No.
Q. I see. There was no need to express yourself in this way, was there?
A. I expressed myself in the way I did.
Q. That is clear.
A. To ask the question, there was no reason; the reason was I typed it because it was true, and it wasn't derogatory; it was a statement of fact that we'd discussed the fact we expected this to happen and this is what happened.
Q. But you must concede that it is dripping with insolence in the way it's put --
A. I'm sorry, it's what? I could not hear you.
Q. You must concede that this email in the way it starts off, the way it expresses itself, is dripping with insolence towards Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. No. No, it is private email between the officers that already had knowledge of this going to occur.
Q. But DCI Humphrey, this is not a private email. This a formal email on NSW Police Force systems for its public purposes, is it not?
A. If it wasn't a private email, it would have been sent - it could have been sent a lot more widely. It had selected recipients. It's not a public email at all. And for a formal - I don't even agree that it's formal; it's more conversational. A formal email, and I'm sure you'11 get me to it soon, is that one that I later sent to others in respect of the direction of surrender of the documents.
Q. This much is clear - this email circulate on the police system, didn't it?
A. Yes, of course.
Q. It was for work purposes and no other?
A. Yes.
Q. It was not the occasion for informal chatter, was it, about a subject such as this?
A. How I determined to deal with my contemporaries and subordinates, whether it be in informal chatter or otherwise, is my business.
Q. It might be your business, but there was no place for this sort of disrespectful approach --
A. That may be your opinion. That may be your opinion.
Q. Let me finish the question.
A. Sorry.
Q. There was no place for this sort of disrespectful approach towards Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. That may be your opinion and your client's, but I don't see it as I disrespectful. If anything, it was - it just stated a matter of fact.
Q. Very well. Could I take you to your statement, please. The statement has been identified as exhibit 33. Do you have a copy with you?
A. I have copy. Thank you, Mr Cohen.
Q. In the first instance could I ask you to close the folder and focus on the statement, please.
A. Is it all right to put it up or will I need it again shortly?
Q. You'11 need another, but in the short order, you'11 need only that one.
A. It's fairly cramped, as you said.
Q. Paragraph 14, in the way you've expressed yourself, the Commissioner should understand, should she not, that this is intended to fix matters as to time around about May 2010; is that so?
A. Can I read it?
Q. Please.
A. (Witness reads document). That's - I think that's right, yes.
Q. Very approximately, not exactly to a day, but May 2010 is a reasonable basis to assume matters that have been discussed here?
A. Well, it might have been a little bit later than May because I didn't arrive at Newcastle after that.
Q. I understand that. But you, by the way, don't resile from the fact that in your statement you give a certain narrative of the facts that happened historically; is that correct?
A. Yes, of course.
Q. I said we'll need to go to another volume. Could you fish out volume 1, please, and turn it to what is tab 38A. If you allow me a moment, I will do the same.
A. Yes, I have that document.
Q. Excuse me. In the way that Mr Hunt prognosticated, this bundle might rebel, mine is doing just that. Excuse me for a moment.
A. It does have some fight in it, Mr Cohen, I must admit.
Q. Do you have 38A?
A. I do.
Q. Having regard to what you say in paragraph 14 of your statement and you have had a chance to scan that document? A. Yes, I have. I've never seen this report before, but --
Q. I accept that. Having regard to your statement, what is annexed to it and the material you put into it, do you accept that the only document that relates to the question of discussions amongst senior officers about alleged cover-ups is this one, at that time?
A. I can't answer that Mr Cohen. I didn't get --
Q. I want you to direct the Commissioner to any other document than this that you say does the very thing that you're talking about in paragraph 14?
A. I think I talk about discussions, don't I?
Q. Yes, indeed.
A. When I got to Newcastle in I think - if I can just check my timeline. I didn't arrive in Newcastle until the end of June, 29 June 2010 - sometime after that. I can't specifically give you a document, I can't specifically relate a conversation, but I was aware that something was in the wind about a cover-up investigation.
Q. I accept that, but in your statement and in your bundle the way you've described it, this would be the document to be pointed to, wouldn't it?
A. I don't know what you're after.
Q. I'm just asking, is there anything else other than this in the evidence that goes to the matters that you identify in paragraph 14 of your statement? Does that make it clear?
A. Yes, I understand where you're going with this now or what you want from me. The discussions relate to discussions that were had generally when I arrived. The rest of that paragraph relates to documents I later see and in fact reports by Inspector Townsend, the meeting, et cetera. You see, you can't really - I can't really be tied down to a specific date that that paragraph refers to. It is an encapsulation of a period where I became aware that Lantle was coming into existence.
Q. In the second half of the paragraph, it is a long one,
if you regard it as two parts?
A. Yes.
Q. Starting at about the fourth sentence, after your
reference to cover-ups, and what you say emerged, you say:
You are aware that the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command may have been involved as the command that initially received information relating to the allegation.
A. Yes. That comment was based on a later reading of a report that came from -- -
Q. Yes. That would be the Townsend report, would it?
A. No, it came from - no, I don't think it was the Townsend report. I think it might have originated from Waddell. I've seen it somewhere and that's what the - and it goes to Mr Gralton, Central Hunter. He then sends it to Mr Fox, but that's something that I've seen much later.
Q. But at this time, in May, there was not quite bouncing around but there was some back and forth between Lake Macquarie and Newcastle?
A. I can't say what was happening.
Q. Have a look then, if you would, at the document that is behind tab 30A.
A. I've never seen that document.
Q. I understand that, but that document at 30 A and the document at 38A are the bases in the material, the documents, that in effect form the foundation of your views --
A. No.
Q. -- in paragraph 14 ?
A. No, I've never seen those documents.
Q. I did say "in effect". The substance of them is the material that you became aware of in light --
A. No, no. No, there were different reports than these.
Q. Then presumably all you relied upon at the time that you drafted this statement was the Townsend report; is that right - this sort of information about these sorts of facts?
A. I can't recall what $I$ relied on. It was a general comment that there was something around during 2010. I can't go any narrower than that.
Q. Very well.
A. It could have been - I'm sure the Townsend report ultimately would have formed part of it, but that paragraph, the way I read it, it doesn't talk about, "In May or June 2010", in that general sense, "my understanding of how Strike Force Lantle came to be as follows". Now, that takes into account the reading of documents, conversations with other police and ultimately what occurred.
Q. That's why I asked you whether or not you accepted about May 2010 and I think, if I understand your evidence, you did?
A. I said I wasn't there in May 2010. You're telling me it was May 2010 and I'11 accept that.
Q. Very well. We're agreed on that.
A. Yes, we are. I'll try to agree with you as much as I can, Mr Cohen.
Q. I'm delighted to know it. Thank you very much indeed. Can I ask you this - if I can describe it in this rather diffuse way - having regard to the way you've described matters in your paragraph, the view that was abroad across Lake Macquarie and Newcastle at the time, a fair way to put it is that there was not such appetite for taking on this matter that's identified, if I can call them, the Waddell and Tayler memoranda?
A. I can't comment on the Waddell and Tayler interchanges because I have no knowledge about that. By the time I got there, or very shortly after, it is my memory that we knew we were getting it back. Now, I was aware it was sent away. I don't know why. I was a duty officer then, I wasn't a crime manager. It wasn't in my area of concern. I'm not trying to abrogate my responsibilities to the Commission, but I just didn't know, nor did I need to know.
Q. I accept that. If you read these two documents, and having regard to your experience and you're an experienced officer, that is, the documents at 30A and 38A?
A. Could I take the time to read them fully now?
Q. Please go right ahead.
A. (Witness reads document). Sorry, what was the other one?
Q. 38A.
A. Thank you.
Q. The first is, if I can call it, the Waddell memorandum?
A. The Wadde11 report, yes.
Q. The second is the Tayler memorandum. That's an adequate description of them for summary purposes so we understand each other on that. That's what I'm referring to, those two documents.
A. Yes.
Q. Does that suit your convenience?
A. Sorry?
Q. To refer them to them that way, does that suit your convenience?
A. The Wadde11 and Tayler documents?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. (Witness reads document). I don't know whether I am prepared to say they should be linked in any way because they're different TRIM numbers.
Q. I'm not suggested they should be linked.
A. Okay.
Q. Perhaps read them so you are aware of the contents and then I'll ask you the question I'm leading up to.
A. Yes. Yes, I've read both of those.
Q. You accept, notwithstanding different TRIM numbers, that there was a conceptual link which was this notion of investigation of concealment of child sexual abuse by Catholic clergy; that much is clear, isn't it?
A. Yes, it appears Detective Inspector Waddell has notified region of the serious nature of the allegations, yes, by report.
Q. On any view, I put it to you, in these two documents there's not much appetite for taking on this investigation in either local area command - that much is so, isn't it?

MR SAIDI: I object, Commissioner. This has very little to do if anything with this witness in terms of what happened in relation to events in which the witness was not involved, was not the decision maker and played no part. This is all pre his involvement. Whether or not it went from Lake Macquarie to Newcastle or vice versa, it had nothing to do with him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that much is clear. Thank you, Mr Saidi.

Mr Cohen, I'll allow to you ask the question to see whether the witness has a response and whether he has any reasons for his response.

MR COHEN: I'm endeavouring to explore the substance of paragraph 14.

THE WITNESS: Sorry, you will very to give me that one again.

MR COHEN: Q. Surely. Having regard to those two documents, as I, hopefully usefully, summarily described them as the Waddell and Tayler memoranda, both of May 2010, in both locations there was not a lot of appetite to take on this type of investigation, was there?
A. I can't comment on that. I can't comment on what Waddell and Tayler are thinking, not based on this report. This document, the Tayler document, has a different TRIM numbers. There could have been other pages attached to that. I don't know what conversations Tayler had with Wadde11, what conversations Tayler had with Mitchell. Whether it was appetite or not, he's asked it to go to State Sex Crimes.
Q. But from what you know of the matters at the time, the irritant in the process was DCI Fox because he was saying to anybody who would listen, "We have to do something about these things," wasn't he?
A. I wouldn't describe him as an irritant at that stage. He was - well, I don't know if I can say at that period that I knew he was around with that. I don't think I do. It is later that I became aware of that.
Q. You accept, don't you, at all material times DCI Fox's view was that this is serious and urgent and something has to be done, don't you?
A. I can't comment on what his views were. Certainly serious. I wouldn't agree it was urgent.
Q. It is the case, is it not, that - allow me to use this phrase and tell me if you disagree with it as an all-encompassing view - you talked about corridor chatter, but the view that was abroad about this issue was that it was something, if nothing else occurred, which was to be kept off the front page of the Newcastle Herald, wasn't it? A. That was consistent with any investigation, I don't know whether just this one. By the time that I had a working knowledge, and it wasn't that deep a working knowledge, but a working knowledge, there were concerns that it was going to be held on the front page of the paper and that's not where, in this particular investigation, that needed to occur.
Q. But that was the primary concern of the northern region about this issue, not whether or not -A. No.
Q. -- offending clergy or associated parties were brought to book, but no publicity that looked bad for the command; isn't that right?
A. No, I don't agree with that. It is just a nonsense to run an investigation - I can refer to DCI Tayler's
evidence. I concur completely. It is ridiculous to let people know you're coming after them if you want to do a thorough investigation. There are times when media strategy was very important, but this was not one where you would be outing it in the press. Notwithstanding, as I know now, of course, Ms McCarthy has some source of a lot of the information, but --
Q. Well, she had the comprehensive and sole source of the information in the first instance, didn't she?
A. Well, according to the evidence, yes.
Q. And nobody inside the police force really was giving her the time of day about these things, were they?
A. I don't know whether they were giving her the time of day. It would be fair to say that there's generally a degree of caution dealing with journalists, particularly investigative journalists of Ms McCarthy's expertise, and there was no guarantee that anything that was discussed and this is later I'm talking; this is an overarching comment - in my view, there's no guarantee a journalist is
necessarily going to maintain the confidentiality --
Q. You don't suggest --
A. -- that you might require.
Q. I'm so sorry.
A. Sorry.
Q. You don't suggest to the Commissioner that in police investigations you expect there to be guarantees of outcomes or approaches? You follow the evidence, don't you?
A. Of course you follow the evidence, but there's also strategies that you use to obtain the evidence.
Q. Wasn't the evidence coming from one source, Joanne McCarthy?
A. I don't know at this time, Mr Cohen. I don't know. I wasn't there.
Q. Having regard to what you were putting in your statement, this --
A. Overarching --
Q. -- historical narrative, the source was McCarthy and no-one else, wasn't it?
A. I don't know that.
Q. By your paragraph 16, you refer to the discussion on 6 October 2010, to a file in relation to the Catholic Church, as you put it, believed to exist coming back to Newcastle City LAC. Those are your words?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the basis for that belief?
A. Inspector Townsend told me there was a file coming back.
Q. When did he do that?
A. Sorry, when did --
Q. Yes.
A. Sorry?
Q. When did he do that?
A. At a meeting at his office. That was on 6 September.
Q. That day?
A. Yes. It was just a general comment that the Catholic Church brief was coming back or something similar along those lines. I made a couple of short notes. I noticed I recall in my notes I write "Steel" so whether or not - and I think it was Brad Tayler raised me that Kirren was going to deal with the matter. She had been assigned.
Q. So that we're clear, the file, to use that description, that was coming back, was the file that had in its journey gone to Lake Macquarie, back to region, then back to Newcastle; is that so?
A. I'm not quite sure. I'm not sure. As it turns out, with the benefit of hindsight, there are a couple of files floating around.
Q. Let me be clear. The file that became Strike Force Lantle - that identifies it for you - had gone to Lake Macquarie, gone back to region, had been considered there and then initially went back to Lake Macquarie, got turned around --
A. I don't know.
Q. -- and then got sent to Newcastle. That was the chronology, wasn't it?
A. You could tell me that is. I couldn't - I couldn't dispute it.
Q. So you're not so well aware of the background?
A. No, I just knew there was a file coming back. If I recall, I wasn't in the commander's chair when it came back, so I don't know which file Tony was referring to, Tony Townsend.

MR HUNT: Could I make an observation rather than an objection. The questioner and the witness are occasionally falling into the trap of talking over each other in the interchange between --

MR COHEN: I see that's entirely my fault.
THE WITNESS: No, my fault too, Mr Cohen.
MR HUNT: In the interests of a nice clean transcript, it would be helpful if that could be done.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.

THE WITNESS: Should we do the point thing, Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Q. We'11 have a seconds out and we can see how we go.
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. I've taken you to paragraph 16. The discussion on 6 October, in that discussion with Inspector Townsend, did he give you some appropriate, unique identifier like a TRIM number for some reference?
A. No, absolutely not.
Q. It was just a reference to what? Having regard to the conversation, doing the best you can, to what did he refer? A. Can I have access to my notes? That might jog my memory.
Q. By your notes, you mean the handwritten notes?
A. There's a handwritten note about that meeting. It is only - like, it's one line. I don't know if it's in evidence, another one.
Q. I have to concede to you, I haven't a clue where it is.
A. I'11 do my best.
Q. Please, in the first instance.
A. I'll do my best. It was - it was - we were there, Brad Tayler and I were there in relation to a number of matters, and that's held out by the fact that the redactions of that file note show we spoke about a number of matters, and one of those was "Catholic Church brief". I don't know whether I wrote "coming back" or something, "Steel" and then Brad's given me a brief on the way back in the car, just to fill it in.
Q. I'm sorry, I wasn't ignoring you.
A. I understand.
Q. I was listening. I was endeavouring to undertake two things at once, but I wasn't successful.
A. We're the wrong gender for that, aren't we, Mr Cohen?
Q. Excuse me, Commissioner, and, detective chief inspector. I have been very helpfully informed that what I was shown by Mr Hunt, counsel assisting, is a copy of the
notes to which you were referring and is now exhibit 34 . A. It is a paragraph short, I think.

MR COHEN: Please excuse us.
THE COMMISSIONER: I no longer have it, Mr Hunt. I think I may have handed it to Mr Humphrey yesterday and not received it back.

MR COHEN: Excuse me, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not blaming Mr Humphrey.
MR COHEN: Not at a11. I remember now. It was a sole copy and copies had to be distributed. I think in the pressure of business we might not have got to a stage where a copy has come back. I think there might just be one.

THE WITNESS; I have a copy here in my folder if you want me to refer to that, exactly what was provided. What date was it?

MR COHEN: Q. This must be 6 September. I'11 withdraw that. 6 October. I think I may have misled you inadvertently. Excuse me for a moment.
A. I have it.
Q. I misled you. It is 6 September.
A. Yes, I've got it, 6 September. At 13.20, Tayler Townsend, Mather. It refers to DCI Tayler, inspector Townsend and Detective Senior Sergeant Mather, and the relevant entry says:

Re: Catholic Church brief, file coming back. Local investigation - Steel.

MR HUNT: Can I indicate for the transcript it is exhibit 35 , not 34 . I'm sorry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: That's what the witness is referring to.
MR COHEN: I apologise to all concerned. We do have that. I apprehend that this is material - excuse me, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: I do not have that in exhibit 35 either. Mr Hunt, may I hand you exhibit 35.

MR COHEN: Q. Excuse us, detective chief inspector, but there is a small infelicity in the documents and we need to be sure before I put anything to you.
A. You're right.

MR HUNT: God forbid. We'11 try to fix it.
MR COHEN: That was not meant as an implied criticism of anybody, I might add.

MR HUNT: I might be obtuse, but I thought - and I'm not saying that cheaply - that the questioner was asking the witness about a note of 21 September.

THE COMMISSIONER: No. I don't think the note has become an exhibit.

MR HUNT: I am obtuse, and everyone is at cross purposes. For clarity, exhibit 35 is this witness's notes of 21 September 2010, 12 and 13 October 2010. I'11 return the exhibit. Exhibit 36 , for clarity, is this witness's notes of 16 May 2011.

THE COMMISSIONER: Correct.
MR HUNT: I accept that in examination-in-chief I took the witness to a meeting and the substance of a conversation with Inspector Townsend on 6 September 2010, but I didn't take the witness to his notes. I'm going to provide them to Mr Cohen now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR COHEN: I apologise, Commissioner. I'm sorry this must be intolerable for you and the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Not at all.
MR COHEN: I would rather be out in the light than in the dark.

THE WITNESS: I'm just glad I didn't have it.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I am sorry; I hadn't handed it to
you, sir, because I hadn't seen it before, and I apologise. A. Not at all, Commissioner.

MR COHEN: The reason is because this material hadn't gone into evidence. That's the reason for my befuddlement, rather than my usual state of befuddlement.
Q. You have read on to the record what you have indicated there?
A. Yes.

MR COHEN: Perhaps at some stage, unless there's a very great objection by those who assist the witness, it might be sensible --

MR HUNT: I'm happy to tender it. I'11 tender it now and then we might make some copies, subject to any view that those who produced it have, but I don't see any difficulty with that. I tender the witness's notes of 6 September 2010.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. It will be admitted and marked exhibit 38.

MR HUNT: The redactions are ours, that is, the Commission's, as to relevance.

## EXHIBIT \#38 NOTES OF DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR HUMPHREY DATED 6/9/2013

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. Do you need to have those?

MR COHEN: At some convenient time that would be useful.
Q. Having regard to that material that you've, amongst things, read on to the record from the notes, which is now a part of exhibit 38 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that material related to the file or files - I'm sorry, I'll withdraw that. That's an awkward question. What was discussed at this meeting on 6 September 2010 related to the file or files that had been identified by Inspector Townsend in his report of July 2010? That much is correct, isn't it?
A. I can't say.
Q. Perhaps I'd better take you to Inspector Townsend's report. Indeed, I think, it is, is it not, annexed to your own affidavit, your own statement?
A. I think it is, actually. When I say I can't say, Mr Cohen, I agree that that report from Inspector Townsend, I've seen that, but I can't say that that's the specific file that he was talking about. I can only presume it is, but presumption is not what you're after.
Q. Quite.
A. Certainly it is the one that Assistant Commissioner York predicates that it is a Newcastle City job, so I presume it is the one we're talking about.
Q. I want to do better than a presumption so it is fair to everybody, most importantly to you.
A. Yes.
Q. Allow me to turn it up and show it to you for this purpose. Would you look at annexure A to your own statement, please, detective chief inspector. That's some 10 or a dozen pages. I'm sorry I hadn't counted it by number. There are 11 pages there.
A. Yes, inspector Townsend's report.
Q. 12 July 2010, and it seems to have what $I$ take to be two TRIM numbers, if you look at page 1, which is the first page of annexure A.
A. Yes, it does, actually.
Q. Yes. So however it has been characterised in your system, whether it is two or more, there they are, that's the unique identifying reference numbers in your system. That is the police system. That is the material Inspector Townsend was referring to, and this is the material you discussed at the meeting of 6 September; is that so?
A. I believe it is. I can't say for certain because there was no file produced, but looking at the dates, that would probably accord with it. 12 July he finishes the report. It goes to region and Ma'am York responds on the 1/9. I'm speaking to him on the 6/9. Bearing in mind I used to do that job, so there would be daily briefings with the OC. He would have been advised probably that that file was coming back. There would have been some discussion, I'm presuming that. Then he has just given us a heads up that it is coming back and wanted to know who
the investigator was.
Q. That is suggesting that it was beyond reasonable doubt. It would be more probable than not that that's the case?
A. Yes, I would accept that.
Q. The discussion, therefore, in that meeting did not refer on any basis to what has been called, I think, in some places, the ministerial file. What you referred to as "the green", I think; is that correct?
A. No, I don't - no, the first $I$ knew about a green being in existence was when Inspector Dunn rang me urgently looking for it.
Q. And the green, as it turned out, had, in the various steps through the chain of command that were undertaken at the time, been directed with approval of the senior command up the chain by Detective Sergeant McKey, as it turned out, on 5 September 2010 to DCI Fox. Is that your recollection? A. I can't say what my recollection is. I don't recall the document exactly. If you've got it here, I can agree with it.
Q. Yes. Just bear with me. Excuse me one moment. Do you have volume 1 or volume 2 in front of you?
A. One.
Q. Could I ask you to close volume 1 and extract volume 2, please. I'm sorry this is laborious but with this many documents, it is unavoidable.
A. Which volume did you say? Two?
Q. Volume 2, please?
A. I've got that.

MR COHEN: I apologise, Commissioner, I've committed the worst heresy. I've got the wrong cross-reference in my notes. I'm after the ministerial file which is in the bundle. I need a moment to identify its location. Excuse me, please.
Q. This will require a bit of navigation, detective chief inspector. In the first instance --
A. Are you looking at 72?
Q. I'm actually thinking of --
A. Is it the back part of 72 .
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. It looks like it is the back part of 72 .
Q. Could I ask you to look at 62 first.
A. Yes.
Q. This may make it easier.
A. A, B or C.
Q. No 62, without a subdivision, like a battleaxe block.
A. Yes, I've looked at that document.
Q. There are about five pages?
A. There are.
Q. Do you see a TRIM number at the top right-hand corner of the page, page 244 in the running --
A. Yes, 133845.
Q. That TRIM number --
A. Of 2010.
Q. That TRIM number refers to an appropriate document that went off via the chain of command at the instigation, in the first instance, of Sergeant McKey to DCI Fox, did it not?
A. No, it doesn't look like it did.
Q. Is it not the case that that's why perhaps we need to back to 72?
A. That document there has come from the minister's office. There is a letter and it is on the back of that that it has been sent to the minister's office. The minister has instigated a ministerial file.
Q. Wait for the next question. That's the file that was covered by a further document given a TRIM number that relate to that TRIM?
A. That would --
Q. That document is behind tab 72, is it not?
A. Yes, that would accord to the --
Q. Have a look at tab 72, please.
A. Yes. Tab 72 has two separate documents.
Q. It does. Look at page 274.
A. That looks like the green and it's the same TRIM number. So I would say it is and signed by McKey, as you've mentioned.
Q. Right. That document got to Detective Chief Inspector Fox, as he has testified, on the last day that he was in his office in September 2010 before he went on leave and went overseas?
A. According to the email, yes, that's right. I have no reason to doubt that.
Q. That's the ministerial file with the green. Those are the two bits that constitute the total document that was flying around internally and ended up with Detective Chief Inspector Fox - tabs 62 and 72 ?
A. Yes. I don't know about this one in front of it, though.
Q. Don't concern yourself with that. That is there by reason of the Commission's purposes. What we're focused upon is in and behind 72, pages 274 and 275?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was covered by the documents at 62 , which was the ministerial request?
A. I presume it was. I've never seen the green.
Q. And that total of documents is what you mean by the green; is that so?
A. It is called a green because it is on green paper.
Q. Indeed. But all those things together with a green cover become the green you referred to in your evidence yesterday?
A. I presume it is because I never saw the green.
Q. You gave evidence about being requested by Inspector Dunn to go and find it, don't you?
A. Yes, that's right, yes.
Q. You say you knew of the existence of the green on 6 September 2010?
A. No, no, I don't. I don't believe I did.

MR COHEN: Commissioner, Mr Hunt has very properly
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reminded me of the time and $I$ was about to go on to something else. That's a convenient time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION:

MR HUNT: Commissioner, you will know that you have excused from chambers the attendance of the current witness at this stage, Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUNT: Could I say, on the record but also for the benefit of people, particularly the public who are here following this matter, that a very difficult issue has arisen that involved a fair bit of consideration from those assisting you and other lawyers involved in the matter. Accordingly, the application is that we interrupt DCI Humphrey's evidence at this stage and it will be resumed at some stage during the fixture.

The proposal is that my learned friend Mr Kell will now lead evidence from Senior Constable Freney.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. Thank you, Mr Kell.

MR KELL: I call Senior Constable Freney.
<JASON RICHARD FRENEY, sworn:
[3.07pm]
<EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:
MR KELL: Q. Please state your full name?
A. Jason Richard Freney.
Q. You're a detective senior constable with the NSW Police Force?
A. Yes I am.
Q. You're attached to the Newcastle City Local Area Command?
A. Yes .
Q. How long you have been there?
A. Since 2010.
Q. Do you have in front of you a copy of a statement dated 8 May 2003?
A. 8 May 2013.
Q. 2013, sorry, with certain redactions?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you have a look at page 4 of that statement. Is that your signature?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes, they are.

MR KELL: I tender that, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of Detective Senior Constable Freney will be admitted and marked exhibit 39.

MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner.

## EXHIBIT \#39 STATEMENT OF DETECTIVE SENIOR CONSTABLE FRENEY DATED 8/5/2013

MR KELL: Q. Senior constable, I want to ask you some questions about your background and experience in the period leading up to your involvement with Strike Force Lantle. You were attested as a police officer in 1997? A. That's right.
Q. From 1997 to 2000, you performed general duties at Chatswood?
A. That's right.
Q. From 2001 to 2002, you were stationed at Gosford with the anti-theft squad?
A. Yes.
Q. In 2002, were you promoted to the rank of detective senior constable?
A. Senior constable.
Q. To senior constable?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And in about that year, were you then attached to the Tuggerah Lakes antitheft squad?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Soon after, did you become a trainee detective?
A. Yes.
Q. When was that?
A. 2003 .
Q. From 2003 to 2006 were you a detective based at the Tuggerah Lakes Local Area Command?
A. Yes .
Q. You've been a detective ever since that time?
A. That's right.
Q. And your experience includes involvement in homicides, armed robberies and serious indictable sexual offences; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Then did you move in 2006 to the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. To the detectives office there?
A. Yes.
Q. During at least part of that time when you were working at Lake Macquarie Local Area Command, were you working with, at that time, crime manager Max Mitchell?
A. Not at Lake Macquarie. At Tuggerah Lakes, I was.
Q. At Tuggerah Lakes?
A. Yes.
Q. How long did you work with Max Mitchell at Tuggerah Lakes?
A. He would have been there, I suppose, about six months at Lake Macquarie as the superintendent.
Q. How long was he superintendent at Lake Macquarie when you were there, approximately?
A. I'm not too sure how long he was there.
Q. Similarly, when you were at Lake Macquarie, were you also working with Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. For how many years did you work with DCI Tayler, at Lake Macquarie?
A. I think he left about 12 months before I did and

I moved to Newcastle.
Q. So how many years?
A. The entire time. So I moved to Newcastle in 2010. I was at Lake Macquarie in 2006, so --
Q. So you worked with him for a period of three or fur years?
A. Three years, I'd say.
Q. Three years?
A. Yes.
Q. Later after DCI Tayler did you work with Inspector Dave Waddell also at Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes I did.
Q. In June 2010 you transferred to Newcastle City Local Area Command?
A. That's right.
Q. Then you came to work again with DCI Brad Tayler in Newcastle; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the position that DCI Tayler encouraged you to move across to Newcastle?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Then, from June 2010 onwards, you've remained at Newcastle City Local Area Command as a detective?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. In terms of Strike Force Lantle, when did you first become involved with that strike force?
A. Towards the end of 2010.
Q. And towards the end of 2010 , are you talking about November, December?
A. That's right.
Q. Are you able to fix a more precise date at this time?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. You give evidence in your statement about a meeting that you attended on 2 December 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Just looking at the question of timing, had you been involved in Strike Force Lantle for a number of weeks before that meeting or was it shortly before?
A. It was shortly before.
Q. We're talking days?
A. I can't be certain.
Q. All right. You remained working in one form or another with Strike Force Lantle, did you, until late 2011? A. That's right.
Q. Which month in 2011 was it?
A. I'm not too sure.
Q. I'll just ask you to look at your statement. Have a look at paragraph 15.
A. Yes, it was October 2011.
Q. That accords with your recollection that you were involved as an investigator with Strike Force Lantle up to about October 2011?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Did you work with two OICs during the time of your involvement with Strike Force Lantle?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Who was the first one?
A. Detective Sergeant Kirren Steel.
Q. What period of time did that cover?
A. It wouldn't have been too long.
Q. So from the time that you started in about late, do we put it at about late November 2011 - sorry, 2010?
A. Up until she went on sick leave.
Q. And that was some time in December?
A. Yes.
Q. And thereafter who did you work with as the OIC?
A. Detective Sergeant Jeff Little.
Q. I'll come back and ask you about a couple of the tasks that you did as an investigator.
A. Sure.
Q. I just want to take you to the meeting of 2 December 2010. You refer to that in paragraph 8 of your statement. Do you have a general recollection of the circumstances of that meeting?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you tell the Commissioner when you became aware that such a meeting was to take place?
A. Not too long before the meeting.
Q. On the same day?
A. I don't know.
Q. Was it on the same day or shortly before, was it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall how you became aware that the meeting was to take place?
A. It was either Detective Inspector Tayler, Detective Senior Sergeant Justin Quinn or Detective Sergeant Kirren Steel asked me to come.
Q. Did you have an understanding before the meeting as to what the purpose of the meeting was going to be?
A. I understood that Newcastle City Local Area Command was going to have carriage of this investigation.
Detective Inspector Fox had been working on it and he was going to provide documents in relation to what he'd done and he was also going to provide an overview of what he'd done.
Q. Do you recall now where you got that understanding?
A. It would have been one of those three people that told me that.
Q. In discussions shortly before the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. You attached to your statement as annexure $A$ an investigator's note referring to the meeting of Thursday, 2 December 2010 with the title note "Case conference in relation to Strike Force Lantle".
A. Yes.
Q. I appreciate that this is not a note you prepared; is
that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know who did prepare it?
A. Detective Senior Sergeant Justin Quinn.
Q. Accepting that it is not a document that you prepared, what do you say as to the accuracy of that note insofar as it accords with your recollection of the events of the meeting?
A. It's accurate.
Q. At annexure B of your statement, you include some handwritten notes and they're handwritten notes prepared by you, are they?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Can I ask you to turn to those.
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see that there is a date 2 December 2010?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Commissioner, do you have a copy?
THE COMMISSIONER: I don't have a copy. Could I trouble you for one? It is going to become necessary, I think.

MR KELL: I will hand up a copy.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR KELL: Q. You'11 see the entry for 2 December 2010? A. Yes.
Q. There is a reference there to 11.20. You will see just under it a further reference to 12.25?
A. Right.
Q. Then if you turn on the next page, you'11 see towards the bottom of that page a reference to 12.50 - so three different time periods. I'm going to ask you about each of those different time periods.
A. Sure.
Q. The first reference to 11.20 , can you read out what that says after 11.20?
A. The note says:

Meeting - Tayler/Quinn/Mitche11/Freney.
Re: [Strike force] --
"SF" --
Re: [Strike force] - Catholic Church.

- Lantle.
Q. Do we take it that that is a different meeting, as you've described it, from the events that took place at 12.25 that you refer to underneath, where Detective Chief Inspector Fox is referred to?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the gathering at 11.20 , as far as you can recall?
A. I can't recall. There were obviously other things being said there. I was taking notes on what was relevant to me. It appears that - I was told there was an - given an overview of what was happening, what the strike force name was called. I mentioned that, Lantle, and it was relating to the Catholic Church. That's about all that was relevant to me that was mentioned.
Q. Can you recall now where that took place?
A. Waratah police station.
Q. That was at the same place , the same room, was it, that the gathering at 12.25 took place?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. You then include some notes about the gathering at 12.25pm --
A. Yes.
Q. -- over the page. Then you end at 12.50 pm with a further meeting, or a further description?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want you to track back to annexure A just so we can link up the time periods. If you go to the investigator's note that you referred to and if you go to the third page of the investigator's note --
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see about halfway down there it says:

The meeting was concluded at this point and [Superintendent] Haggett and [Inspector] Fox departed.
A. Yes.
Q. Then there's a reference to Inspector Townsend having arrived?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that junction coincide with the reference in your handwritten note to the events at 12.50 pm - that is to say, what appears to be a further meeting, if you like, where Inspector Townsend attended?
A. Yes.
Q. It does? A11 right. I just want to ask you your purpose in preparing the notes that are annexure B to your statement, including the notes at the 12.25pm - can we just ask, what was your purpose in preparing these handwritten notes? What did you have in mind?
A. I wasn't tasked to take notes. They were for more personal purposes.
Q. Just pausing there - you weren't tasked?
A. No, I wasn't tasked to take them. I am a note-takers, so I'11 take notes of things that are relevant to me at meetings. Obviously the notes I've take there were of relevance and the majority of the notes are notes in relation to what Inspector Fox was telling us.
Q. Were they matters that were of interest to you as an investigator in Lantle as to particular information that you might be able to obtain for your investigative holdings?
A. Well, they appeared so. It was an overview given by Inspector Fox in relation to what he'd done. We went there to receive documentation, which $I$ believe he'd forgotten to being, so I could use that to match up with the documentation once it was received.
Q. But you indicated you weren't there as the note-taker in any form?
A. No, I wasn't, no.
Q. You weren't intending to take a comprehensive note of all the events of the meeting?
A. That's right.
Q. I just want to ask you some questions about the tone of the meeting, if I can. Do you have a recollection as to the general tone of the meeting?
A. It was fine.
Q. By saying that it was fine, is that a reference to that there was no undue heated tone?
A. No, there wasn't.
Q. Could you describe to the Commissioner whether it was a cordial meeting?
A. Yes. To my recollection, it was cordial. There were no issues.
Q. Was there any particular person, as far as you can recall, that did most of the talking at the meeting?
A. Inspector Fox and Superintendent Mitchell.
Q. And they were the two principal people that did the talking?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you speak at all at the meeting?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. I just want to ask you a couple of questions about the time as your involvement as an investigator in Lantle. At each of those two periods of time that we referred to where you were involved, that is to say, the period from about late October - sorry, late November up to December where you were working with Detective Sergeant Steel, that's the first period of time?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the second period of time when you were working with Detective Sergeant Little, up until I think you indicated about October 2011?
A. Mmm.
Q. In each of those periods of time you held the position, did you, of investigator?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. It may sound obvious, but what was your general role as an investigator on such a matter?
A. Essentially, the officer in charge's role was to the direction of where the investigation was going to go, task the duties for the investigators on it, and I'd perform those tasks.
Q. In each of those time periods were you a dedicated investigator on Lantle in the sense of was that your work exclusively?
A. No, it wasn't.
Q. Are you able to say in approximate terms what
proportion of your time was spent during those two periods as an investigator on Lantle?
A. It is hard to say. At some point I might have been 100 per cent, at other times it was 50 per cent. Whatever strike force I've ever been on, I was always carrying a case load anyway, you're never free of a case load. So if there were other priorities at the time, I'd work on that. If I was working on - if they weren't as a high priority as this, I would work on this, so --
Q. So it varied over time?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. As an average, is it something like about 50 per cent or less than?
A. It would be yes, at least - at least 50 per cent.
Q. I want to ask you some questions about particular tasks that you might have done as an investigator just to get a greater sense of that.
A. Sure.
Q. In doing so, there's no need for you to refer to particular names of victims or of persons of interest. During the period of time where you were working as an investigator, what were some of the particular tasks that you undertook in terms of matters that might normally be undertaken by an investigator?
A. Essentially I applied and executed search warrants. Once we received the documents that we sourced in relation to that search warrant, I went through the documents and reviewed and collated what was relevant and then I submitted that to the e@gle.i database for the notice of Detective Sergeant Little or Steel, whoever it may have
been.
Q. It was a significant job, was it, reviewing particular documents?
A. Yes, it was. There was a large amount of documents.
Q. Were you also involved in work in terms of assisting with interviewing of witnesses?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Was that with Detective Sergeant Little?
A. Sergeant Little, yes.
Q. Were you there generally as a corroborative role?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Were there a number of witnesses that you saw in that role?
A. Yes.
Q. That was during the period of time up until October 2011; is that right?
A. That's right.

MR KELL: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Cohen?
<EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:
MR COHEN: Commissioner, you'11 forgive me, I'm doing this al fresco. I wasn't quite expecting this now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do your best.
MR COHEN: Thank you.
Q. Detective senior constable, in your evidence that you've just given, led from Mr Kell of counsel, you referred to, as I understand it, the interviewing or the assisting of the interviewing of witnesses by, presumably, both Detective Sergeant Steele and Detective Sergeant Little, up to October 2011, with Detective Little?
A. Detective Sergeant Little up to October, yes
Q. The changeover point between them was approximately the end of December 2010?
A. I couldn't be sure on that.
Q. Doing the best you can, have you got any rough idea?
A. Well, not really. It was when Steele went off on sick leave, whenever that was.
Q. But you know there was a changeover?
A. Yes, there was, yes.
Q. Do you recall a change of what is referred to as "terms of reference"?
A. I wasn't aware of that, no.
Q. You weren't?
A. No.
Q. Were you aware of the terms of reference themselves at any time?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. What was the basis upon which you then had an understanding or an appreciation of the terms of reference of Strike Force Lantle?
A. I wasn't aware of them.
Q. How were you able to navigate the necessary tasks that fell out of Lantle?
A. Well, I wasn't investigating the - I wasn't allocating the task. Detective Sergeant Little was, yes.
Q. So you were there to take on such tasks as were provided to you and you were instructed to undertake?
A. Exactly, yes.
Q. In the conduct of the interviewing of witnesses, and I'm correct in my understanding that that was entirely a subordinate assisting corroborative role?
A. That's right.
Q. Were you, as it were, flying solo or the lead interviewer?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. But always with one or other of Detective Sergeant Steel or Detective Sergeant Little?
A. Detective Sergeant Little, yes.
Q. If I say to you that Detective Sergeant Little came on formally to Lantle at the end of calendar 2010, would you object violently to that as a proposition?
A. No, I wouldn't.
Q. Working on that footing, up to the time that Detective Sergeant Steele was still the officer in charge, so starting at approximately from early September 2010 to the end of calendar year 2010, that is the end of December 2010, how many interviews or additional statements were take in that period for the purposes of Strike Force Lantle?
A. By Detective Sergeant Steele?
Q. Yes. With or without you?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you have any recollection of how many it was?
A. No, I don't. I don't have access to the
investigation. I'm no longer on it so I can't - I couldn't refresh my memory on that.
Q. Do you have any memory of the process of interviews and statement-taking during this period?
A. That I was a part of or that Detective Sergeant Steel was a part of?
Q. Well, either. The fact of --
A. During that period, probably zero for me, and I don't know how many that Detective Sergeant Steele did.
Q. That's the extent of your recollection?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Did Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey ever say to you directly anything with respect to the role or presence or otherwise of Detective Chief Inspector Fox in Strike Force Lantle?
A. No, he didn't.
Q. Did anybody else mention Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any occasion at any stage to speak to Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. During this investigation?
Q. Yes, I'm sorry, I apologise to you. During the course of your role as an investigator in Strike Force Lantle?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Was it ever suggested to you that Strike Force Lantle would, at some point, whenever it was, seek to have contact with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about matters in the holdings of Strike Force Lantle or other matters that might be relevant to or pertain to it - this investigation? A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Was it ever put to you by anyone, whether it was Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey or anybody else for that matter, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox was leaking information?
A. No.
Q. Was that --
A. That was never suggested to me, no.
Q. Or that he, that is Detective Chief Inspector Fox, was refusing to surrender documents?
A. No, that wasn't the case.
Q. Or to alert these people - that is, Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey or other people in the command at Newcastle - if you were contacted by Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. No, that hasn't happened.
Q. You've also given evidence in relation to the events of 2 December, if I can call it the meeting day -- A. That's right.
Q. -- if that makes it easier for to you comprehend what I'm referring you to?
A. Yes.
Q. You've given evidence about an investigator's note which is annexure A to your statement.
A. Yes.
Q. You've given evidence about your handwritten notes which is annexure B. Can I just ask you, with respect to the way you have arranged your handwritten notes - and please if you need to look at them, I invite you to do
that - in annexure B to your statement, in terms of your method, I observe there that for the various times, this is - I am sorry, I don't have a page number, but it is the first page of annexure $B$. It identifies various times, $11.20,12.25$ and then also 12.50 on the following page. What is there recorded, apparently, is your method of recording about the meeting. For example, it refers to " 12.25 meeting." Then there are a series of names:
"Mitchell/Haggett/Quinn/Tayler/Steel/Freney." That's to indicate, I take it, the participants in the meeting?
A. Those who were present, yes.
Q. You've done likewise for the meeting at 11.20?
A. Yes.
Q. Likewise at 12.50?
A. Yes.
Q. While they might have been in the same conference room, they were different meetings for these purposes during this period of time; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. In the meeting that you recorded at 12.25, having regard to your practice of recording the participants, you've done as much as I've taken you through. Then there's a reference off to the side and the name "Fox". Does that imply, should the Commissioner understand, that Fox was not, in effect, a member or a participant in the meeting?
A. Well, those notes relate to what Inspector Fox told us.
Q. Certainly, I accept that.
A. Yes.
Q. But his name doesn't appear as one of the ones beside the hashes. Is there any reason for that?
A. Well, it's the next point down, "Fox".
Q. I'm sorry, I don't quite follow. When you say "the next point down", so we're clear about what you're referring to, this is annexure $B$, is it, the first page? A. Yes.
Q. Relative to the times, can I take it you're referring to 12.25 ?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. You say "the next point down". At that point of the page exactly what are you referring to, so the Commissioner can follow your evidence? You say "the next point down", or you did just a moment ago. What do you refer to when you say "next point down"?
A. Well, the next point down mentions Inspector Fox. I don't know why $I$ put it like that, but certainly Inspector Fox was there.
Q. Is it the case that he might have been recorded in that way by you because he wasn't really there to participate in the meeting; he was there just to be given a message?
A. No.
Q. That it was an inquisition of him rather than a position where he was truly participating as an equal member of a meeting to discuss issues?
A. No, that's not correct.
Q. On the day, you've recorded, as you've indicated, for your working purposes so you've got an understanding of what happened, I take it, having regard to your practice for the future if you need to refer back in a relatively quick way - is that the point?
A. Well, the dot points that I could refer to a short time after when we received the documents that were relevant that we didn't have on the day.
Q. But these are not any sort of e@gle.i or TRIM document; these are just personal for you?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Presumably in a personal file you keep with your papers; is that the way you do it?
A. Oh, it's just a notebook.
Q. So not quite a diary, but it has the effect of one?
A. Yes.
Q. And it is a running record of events that are material to your working day?
A. Yes.
Q. On the day, on 2 December, I take it the meeting that
was conducted from 11.20 to 12.25 did not include Detective Chief Inspector Fox; is that so?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. He arrived at about 12.25 and joined the meeting in the conference room, did he?
A. Yes.
Q. Along with, I take it, by a process of elimination, Superintendent Haggett?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Detective Sergeant Steel also join the meeting at that time?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. She wasn't there previously prior to 12.25 ?
A. It doesn't appear to be so, no.
Q. Relying on your note, which was contemporaneous, your best understanding is she wasn't there between 11.20 and 12.25?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. What I now wanted to do, detective senior constable, is put to you a series of propositions and I'll ask you, when I put them, if you agree with them or not. Allow me to put them. What I'm going to do is put a series of passages of speech that I'm instructed, on the evidence, Detective Chief Inspector Fox says he said at the meeting. I want to know if you accept or not these passages. Let me put them as a block and then I'll stop --
A. Okay, sure.
Q. -- if that is a convenient process, and tell me if you understand what I'm saying. At this meeting at 12.25, after presumably the initial greetings as people joined the meeting and everybody sat down and got down to business, when the business of the meeting commenced, it was the case, was it not, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox spoke, and I can only put in narrative terms first, about having been provided with a lot of material by the journalist Joanne McCarthy about matters involving child sexual abuse. Do you recall that?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox pointed out to the
meeting that Ms McCarthy had already spoken to all of the witnesses, had gathered documents and provided such documents to the police before there had even been any thinking about having an investigation. Do you understand that proposition being put by him? What I'm saying to you is that's what he said. What do you respond?
A. I don't recall him saying that.
Q. You don't recall it?
A. Yes.
Q. But equally, you don't deny it, is that a fair way of putting?
A. Yes.
Q. No recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't say it is impossible; you just don't recall it?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. Then Detective Chief Inspector Fox said:

The only reason we are here having this meeting is because of the contacts and information Joanne McCarthy has turned up. It is not a case of me giving her information but more a case of her giving us information. She's all over this better than anyone. I know it's unusual but you have to stop working against her and bring her on board. She has more information on this investigation than the rest of this room put together.

Do you remember that passage?
A. No, I don't recall specific conversations at that meeting.
Q. May I take it or should the Commissioner understand that the position is that you don't recall specific conversations, but you're not saying in a completely adamant way that it didn't occur this way, just that you have no recollection independently of it. Is that it? Is that a fair way of putting it?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. It was the case at this point that the last comment I've just put to you by Detective Chief Inspector Fox had the effect of visibly angering Superintendent Mitchell, who said in response:

She's not running this investigation. She's to be cut out of this from here on. I'll be the only one dealing with her from here on. Any inquiries by her are to go through me.

Superintendent Mitchell said that, didn't he?
A. I can't recall the conversation, but he certainly didn't get angry as I said. It was quite a cordial meeting.
Q. Do you dispute the burden of those words that were spoken by?
A. As I said, I can't recall --
Q. You just don't recall?
A. -- specific conversations, but certainly I can rule out the fact that there was any anger in the meeting, that's for sure.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox then responded:

That's madness. She knows a lot more witnesses, contact numbers and has access to information we don't. Victims trust her. They ring Joanne McCarthy and the Herald before they ring us. If it means you get her to sign a confidential agreement until the investigation is over so be it. I know we don't normally do that but this isn't a normal investigation. You have to have her in the loop.

DCI Fox said those words, did he not?
A. That sounds quite confrontational. It certainly wasn't a confrontational meeting. I can't recall the specifics of the conversation, so --
Q. Are you saying it didn't happen, that he never spoke those words?
A. No, I'm not, no.
Q. Can I say to you, I hope you're not inferring from the way I'm putting the conversation necessarily that it was confrontational. I'm expressing those words, but I'm reading the substance of the words. If you think just about the words and just what was said, that's what I'm asking you to give evidence about. Forget about "confrontational", were the words said or not?
A. Well, I don't - I don't know.
Q. You don't rule out the possibility they were spoken in that way?
A. I can't rule it in and can't rule it out.
Q. And then Superintendent Mitchell responded to that comment by DCI Fox:

That's not how we operate. Region has decided that this will be investigated by Newcast7e.

He said that, didn't he?
A. I was aware going to the meeting that it was being investigated by Newcastle. I think everyone was.
Q. So he said that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you indicate in your personal file notes or your personal note, if I can put it that way in the lowest level of formality, if you would accept that, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox made reference to a number of matters including, for example, a reference to Bishop Clarke lying to him; that is, to Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Do you recall that?
A. Based on my notes, yes.
Q. Is it entirely possible, then, that, in this meeting at this time, Detective Chief Inspector Fox also indicated - again I need to put this in a narrative form to you - or explained that he had knowledge of the Father Denis McAlinden investigation back to an early involvement in 1999? Do you recall that?
A. Well, I have got a note here in relation to McAlinden, so, yes.
Q. It is entirely --
A. That he spoke about McAlinden, yes.
Q. He also indicated he'd spoken to a number of other victims, the list running to 20 by number, and indicated that he believed - that is Detective Chief Inspector Fox believed - there were a lot more?
A. Based on my notes, yes.
Q. I'm not sure if you have handy in the witness box a list of pseudonyms. Can you see that list there?
A. Sure.
Q. So that this makes sense to you, just so that you understand the procedure, in the Commission, for reasons of concern about the confidentiality of witnesses and protecting their interests, relevant people's names have been reduced to a list of pseudonyms. The one to which I'm referring now is [AE]. Do you see that name on the list? I'm not asking you to speak it. I'm just asking you to see if you identify it?
A. [AE]?
Q. Yes.
A. I see it.
Q. The reason I've asked you to refer to that is that makes sense of the anonymisation process that occurred on your statement. For example, if you look at page 2 of your handwritten note, you'11 see in a number of places references by you to names that were removed and initials, for example, [AK] or [AJ], have been inserted. Do you see the process? Look at your handwritten --
A. No.
Q. Look at page 1, for example, annexure B, the first page?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see at the foot of the page there's a word redacted and immediately above it there's the word [AJ]? A. Yes, I do.
Q. That process of inserting a reference such as [AJ] is the process of anonymisation of people's identification.
A. Sure.
Q. Their identities. So that this process makes sense,
you've looked at the reference to the person identified in that list as [AE]. Again, without speaking the name, do you see who [AE] is? Now, in the meeting, then Detective Chief Inspector Fox - if I can bring you back to what is being spoken at this time on 2 December 2012. I hope I hadn't confused you with this process, but you see what I'm driving it, I take it?
A. I'm just looking at [AE] and I see those.
Q. Let me read this to you. Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say that his knowledge included important conversations with one of McAlinden's victims, [AE]. Now, allowing for the fact that [AE] is referred to in that list, do you recall that conversation?
A. No, I don't.
Q. He went on to say, that is, Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say --

MR GYLES: Before my learned friend asks the question, might I be heard?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gyles.
MR GYLES: In relation to this cross-examination, Commissioner, you would appreciate from seeing the document, and indeed from the evidence given, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox, during the course of the meeting was, in effect, giving his view of the world as to the substance of these allegations as to concealment. That is obviously the subject matter of what we're dealing with in the next week. I'm concerned that this witness not be used as a mouthpiece for the publication of those allegations. As you would appreciate, Commissioner, the allegations are only as good as the factual basis of them, and that's what we will be dealing with. To be fair to those who are referred to and to have regard to those who are not here and are dealing with the TOR2 issues, unless there's a matter really of substance here, I would respectfully submit my learned friend should not be able to cross-examine unless there's good reason for it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Gyles. I am cognisant of the fact that something that may have attracted your objection was said some questions ago, but I take it that the last question doesn't offend it. Would it suffice if Mr Cohen is asked to be wary about your
concerns?
MR GYLES: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. Thank you, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I will tread as carefully on the giant eggshells as I can, Commissioner, but might I also indicate that I'm repeating it because Detective Senior Constable Freney was a participant of this meeting. For the purposes of term of reference 1, I am taking him through, I hope assiduously, the same process to which I subjected, relevantly, Superintendent Mitchell --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, the other participants.
MR COHEN: -- and the others.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: I can say only my name is Browne $v$ Dunn, I suppose is the only way to put it in shorthand.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand that, Mr Cohen. You won't have to repeat, for example, the references in this witness's notes to the things that he says Detective Chief Inspector Fox said.

MR COHEN: You mean orally here?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: Possibly not. What I am doing is putting what Detective Chief Inspector Fox says he said.

THE COMMISSIONER: Over and above these, yes.
MR COHEN: Submissions will go as to whether or not this is corroborative evidence of what DCI Fox said he in fact said on the day, but I need, in fairness, to give this witness the opportunity to say, "Yes", "No" or "I don't remember", as he's doing it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right.
MR COHEN: And that's my forensic purpose. I am alive to
my learned friend Mr Gyles' concerns but I must say that my primary interest is my client's concerns, having regard to the issues that are alive in term of reference 1 . I will navigate it carefully but I would always cleave to the TOR1 shore rather than TOR2, I must say, with the greatest respect to my learned friend, for that forensic, I think, proper reason.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Let's just see how we go and bear in mind Mr Gyles' concerns.

MR COHEN: I assure you, I'm alive to those concerns.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR COHEN: Excuse me, detective senior constable, I just need to pick up the thread. Commissioner, just before I proceed, I'm just looking at the relevant information, the relevant material that on any view is before all concerned. I am going to have to put a number of propositions. If it be the case that my learned friend seeks some sort of non-publication order to cover his client's position, I assume my client will be content with that for the time being. I am getting an affirmative nod. I do need to put these things. There is no way around it.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Mr Gyles, if something is uttered to which you take objection, would it be able to be cured, do you expect, by a non-publication order?

MR GYLES: I don't think I could resist that. I might say that it is not with respect to my client. There are individuals who are separately represented who are concerned with these matters who aren't here and that's one of the reasons I rose to my feet to raise my concerns.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand. Thank you, Mr Gyles. Carry on, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I am indebted to you, Commissioner. Excuse me, Commissioner, and excuse me, detective senior constable.

```
(Mr Cohen and Mr Kel1 confer)
```

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, could I just formally indicate that this witness would also be seeking the protection of section 23? I forgot to mention it earlier.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's perfectly all right. Thank you.
MR SAIDI: Could I just place on the record, if I overlook it, that all of my clients would be seeking the protection of section 23.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Saidi, that is understood.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. My apologies to you, detective senior constable. I hope you appreciate, as I'm sure you understand, being an investigator, in this material there are sensitivities that have to be observed and we're endeavouring not to stand inadvertently upon a metaphorical landmine. Directing this back to you, detective senior constable, then Detective Chief Inspector Fox indicated, in the context of this meeting on 2 December 2010, that he'd also had dealings with the Maitland-Newcastle diocese who concealed Father McAlinden's whereabouts from the police until 2005. Do you remember that being identified?
A. I see that he has had dealings with someone from that diocese, yes.
[Transcript redacted, per suppression order, from page 1434, line 27, to page 1434, 1ine 44]
Q. Then Superintendent Mitchell said these words:

Where are the statements you were told to bring down?

That was directed to DCI Fox, to which he responded:
I just explained to Brad that they are on my desk and I forgot to grab them.

Do you recall those words?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And then Commander Mitchell said:

You are directed to bring them down and hand them over to Brad Tayler. He will be running this investigation from Newcastle with Justin Quinn and Kirren Stee7, is that clear?

Do you recall those words?
A. I don't recall the direct words, but certainly it was a matter of just forwarding the documents down to Newcastle, they've got carriage of it. That's essentially how it went.
Q. But also including a direction?
A. Superintendent Mitchell said it. Whether he said it as a comment or a direction - certainly, if he said it to me I would do it.
Q. He said it to DCI Fox, didn't he?
A. Certainly, not so much in those words. Had he said, "Forward them down", I would have thought that Detective Chief Inspector Fox would have forwarded them down. That there was an official direction standing there saying, "I direct you to do this," essentially said, "Just forward them to the investigators."
[Transcript redacted, per suppression order, from page 1435, line 39 , to page 1436, line 43]

THE COMMISSIONER: ... Thank you, Mr Cohen. Carry on.
MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner. I will be as quick as I can. I apprehend that, with a little indulgence as to time, I can conclude my examination of Detective Senior

Constable Freney this afternoon. Would that be of assistance?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it would, thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: I am being asked how long. I think maybe 10 minutes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Is that convenient to all concerned?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I believe so, thank you.
MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Do you still have in your mind the last passage of conversation I put to you that I said was spoken by Detective Chief Inspector Fox? Is that still clear to you. Would you like me to repeat it?
A. Yes, could you repeat it?
Q. Surely. I will give you the last couple of sentences to give you the gist of it:

I am not building myself up. If you don't believe me you can ring her or Joanne McCarthy now.

It is a similar situation with two people:
It took a lot of convincing to get them to come in. You just can't pass these people around like numbers. They have been through enough.

Then Commander Mitchell responded:
The decision has already been made at region. You will give those statements to Brad and that's final.

Do you recall that?
A. I don't recall specific conversations, but it's certainly consistent with asking him to forward those documents down.
Q. Thank you. Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say these things:

> Max I know more about how the church operates than most. I have been studying them for years and most of it is in my head. I put together tendency and coincidence evidence in the Father Fletcher trial that was upheld in the High Court and is now cited as a test case. With all respect to Brad, he has only oversighted these sorts of investigations; I've been in the middle of them.

Do you recall those words?
A. No. Look, as I said, I don't recall specific conversations. I have in my notes that he's mentioned Fletcher: that's essentially it.
Q. And commander Mitchel1 responded:

You are to hand everything over. I don't want you interfering or contacting any of the witnesses from today.

Do you recall that?
A. My understanding was that he was able to contact the witnesses.
Q. Allow me to proceed. Detective Chief Inspector Fox said:

> I have to call them to let them know what is going on. I am not prepared to treat them like dirt and just cut them off. These people have been hurt enough.

That's Detective Chief Inspector Fox, to which, I put it to you, Commander Mitchell said this:

All right. You can ring them to 1 et them know that Brad Tayler's team will be dealing with them from now on and that's $i t$.

Are those the words you were thinking of a minute ago?
A. I can't remember specific conversation that occurred
in that meeting, as I said.
Q. But that conversation you would not --
A. My understanding was that he allowed to contact the victims to say he was no longer involved.
Q. Then Commander Mitchell continued:

I am formally directing you to stop all contact with Joanne McCarthy. Any contact from her $I$ am directing you to report it to me immediately in writing. Is that understood?

That's it.
A. I don't recall that conversation. Certainly we were told that there would be no contact with the media, Joanne McCarthy or otherwise.
Q. That proposition I just put to you was from Commander Mitche11. DCI Fox responded:

I can't understand why. She has done nothing but help. I will have to let her know what's going on.

And Commander Mitche11 responded:

> Did you hear what I said? You are to stop all contact with her from now. That is a formal direction and it will be recorded in the minutes.

Do you recall that?
A. I don't recall that specific conversation but
certainly we were told not to talk to the media.
Q. It was so recorded in the minutes, wasn't it?

I'm sorry, I'm quite rightly chided by counsel assisting.
I must specify that by "the minutes" I'm talking about the
investigator's note which is annexure A to your statement.
Do you accept that that proposition is in the investigator's notes?
A. Yes, it is on the first paragraph of the second page.

MR COHEN: Yes. I can assure you, Commissioner, I'm motoring here and I should not be too much longer.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox responded then:

The statement from [AJ] ...
And in your list of names you will see a reference to [AJ].
MR KELL: Number 23.
MR COHEN: Q. You also see that [AJ] is included in this anonymised form both in the investigator's note, annexure $A$, and your handwritten note, annexure $B$ ? A. Yes.
[Transcript redacted, per suppression order, from page 1440, 1 ine 18 , to page 1441 , line 38]

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner, I'm very nearly done. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. Superintendent Mitche11 then responded:
Just make sure you get the statements and anything else to Brad and Justin

> immediately. Anyone you have contact just give them the numbers. That also includes anything that Joanne McCarthy gave you. They will be running the investigation from here on.

At that point, in substance, as I understand the evidence, the meeting ended at least as far as Detective Chief Inspector Fox was concerned; is that your recollection? A. Certainly, yes, Superintendent Mitchell said to forward the documents down.
Q. And then Detective Chief Inspector Fox --
A. He said, "Fine" and then left.
Q. He left?
A. Yes.
Q. Who else left at that time?
A. Superintendent Haggett, Mr Fox, Detective Chief Inspector Fox.

MR COHEN: Excuse me, Commissioner, excuse me, detective senior constable. I apologise, Commissioner, I'm doing this on the run. Sometimes it actually turns out to be the most expeditious way to do it. Could I just have one moment? I'm indebted to you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is it possible to finish this witness today?

MR SAIDI: Certainly.
THE COMMISSIONER: There is nothing from you, Mr Gyles?
MR GYLES: There is nothing from me, Commissioner, thank you.

MR KELL: Commissioner, could I just raise one matter quickly? It is my fault. Detective Senior Constable Freney had wanted to make a minor correction to one paragraph of his statement. I didn't give him the opportunity to do so.
<EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:
MR KELL: Q. I wonder if you could turn to paragraph 20.

You mentioned there that at the time of the meeting of 2 December 2010, that you didn't know DCI Fox and that you met him there for the first time. Is there some correction you want to make to that sentence?
A. Yes. I had met him on a prior occasion in 2008. I was running an armed robbery operation at Maitland and Detective Chief Inspector Fox was the crime manager there at the time. I was in the detectives office and he came and introduced himself and spoke to me and asked what we were doing and he offered any staff to us that we needed: that was his own staff.
Q. That was the one occasion before --
A. That was the only one occasion, yes.
Q. When you prepared this statement, you just didn't have that in your mind at the time?
A. That's right.
Q. You would like the Commissioner to take that into account as being an amendment to that statement?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi?
<EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:
MR SAIDI: Q. I want to put some propositions to you and get your comments on them. The suggestion that the forum was less a meeting than an inquisition of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, what do you say about that?
A. That's incorrect.
Q. The suggestion that Superintendent Mitchel 1 showed extreme hostility towards Detective Chief Inspector Fox at the meeting, what do you say about that?
A. That's incorrect.
Q. The suggestion that Inspector Tayler showed extreme hostility towards Detective Chief Inspector Fox, either before or at the meeting itself, what do you say about that?
A. Incorrect.
Q. The suggestion that during the course of the meeting

Superintendent Mitchell was visibly angered towards anyone, including Detective Chief Inspector Fox, what do you say about that?
A. I've never seen Superintendent Mitchell angry.
Q. The suggestion that at any stage the meeting was confrontational, what do you say about that?
A. That's incorrect.
Q. Any suggestion that were raised voices during the course of the meeting, what would you say about that?
A. There wasn't; that's incorrect.
Q. From the evidence which you've given earlier today is a fair description of the meeting one of general - how can I put it - professionalism amongst those present?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. I want to ask you very briefly about Strike Force Lantle. During the course of Strike Force Lantle, what can you tell us about being supported or resourced from your perspective?
A. It was supported like any other strike force.
Q. At any stage did anyone place pressure on you not to investigate or properly investigate any matter?
A. That's never happened to me in my career on any investigation.
Q. During the course of - I'm sorry, could you repeat that? Did you say, "That's never happened to me in my career"?
A. In my entire career no-one has ever put pressure on me not to investigate --

MR ROSER: He said in any investigation of his.
MR SAIDI: Q. In any investigation?
A. That's right.
Q. Have you heard the term "Catholic Mafia" before?
A. No.
Q. At any stage did anyone mention to you - I think to use the street term - to go easy in terms of the investigation?
A. No.

MR SAIDI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Is there anything arising, Mr Kell?
MR KELL: No, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I will adjourn until 9.30
in the morning.
AT 4.15PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO THURSDAY, 27 JUNE 2013 AT 9.30AM
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