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MR HUNT: Good morning, Commissioner. I can't enumerate them, but there have been a number of requests from the media for exhibits that have been tendered in evidence since the PIC complaint by Ms McCarthy which was, I think, the last item that was released. If those at the Bar table could let myself, Mr Kell or Ms Lonergan know by the end of morning tea whether there's a difficulty with the release of any of the more recent exhibits, that would be helpful.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: I now recall Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey.
THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, Mr Humphrey.
MR HUNT: Mr Cohen was in the midst of his
cross-examination when the witness was last in the witness box.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: It was extraordinary what occurred overnight, Commissioner. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: A good day for Queenslanders.
MR COHEN: It would seem to be.
<WAYNE DAVID HUMPHREY, sworn: [9.30am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:
MR COHEN: Q. Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, are you ready?
A. Good morning, Mr Cohen.
Q. Thank you. Are you ready, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Very well. I regret in the circumstances you may need to cast your mind back a little because there were a few interruptions that weren't anticipated, but yesterday we had reached a point where a series of propositions had been put to you. I want now to move back to your statement so that my first question is: I take it, you have a copy of your statement there.
A. I have a copy, yes.
Q. Could I ask you, please, to have regard to paragraph 17 in your statement. It is a lengthy document and, indeed, it refers to annexure B. Would it assist you to read it and have a quick reference to the annexures before I ask you questions?
A. Yes, that's fine.
Q. Would you do that? I want to ask you a number of questions about it.
A. (Witness does as requested). Yes, Mr Cohen, I've read those.
Q. Thank you, detective inspector. You've identified in the body of the paragraph extracted the material that formed the term of reference, but it is the first term of reference, is it not, not the second?
A. That's right.
Q. You focused upon the first. Can I ask you is it not the case that you were focusing, for these purposes, on the wrong term of reference there? Isn't the one that matters the second term of reference?
A. Well, I suppose that's a matter for the Commission to decide. That was led in my statement. That's the one I discussed. I suppose, again, it comes down to determining what it's relevant when we're making the statement compared to what's evolved now.
Q. Let me put this proposition to you very squarely so we understand each other. Is it not the case that the substantial work and the detailed work of Strike Force Lantle occurred on and from the time of the amended terms of reference being adopted or being executed?
A. I would agree with that, yes.
Q. Is it not the case, therefore, that the one that matters - this is the question really I'm getting to: does not the term of reference, for these purposes that matters, is it not the one that is the second part of your annexure $B$, the second document, the one that identifies Detective Sergeant Little as the officer in charge?
A. Yes, I would say so, but I don't know what you're getting at here. I'm sure I'll find out.
Q. It will all become clear. You understand that the terms of reference themselves provide the boundaries of the
investigation; that's a fair statement, isn't it?
A. It sets the parameters, yes.
Q. Rather, like for us lawyers, pleading a cause of action that sets out the facts of what is to be focused on; that's a fair --
A. But you're predicating that that can't be moved, though.
Q. I'm not suggesting it can't be, but unless and until it is, that's what you work from, isn't it?
A. It sets out the parameters of the investigation, but there are times that you might have to go outside the terms of reference.
Q. The terms of reference that first arose talked about concealment of serious offences but had no time period identified. You would accept that?
A. I should say I've had nothing to do with the compilation of either document, so you're only asking my opinion I presume on this, are you?
Q. I'm just asking you, for these purposes - given your experience, you would be accepted as an expert in the field - this process is a formal one and this set of terms of reference really are what give --
A. I understand. I want to be clear on my ability to comment on --
Q. Go to annexure --
A. -- something that was done by somebody else.
Q. Go to annexure B?
A. I am.
Q. Look at the first page of the first term of reference, apart from the direction - this is to Detective Sergeant Steele - and apart from the formal direction to take command of the Strike Force Lantle, the terms of reference are, as you see them there, on about the first third of the page?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. You've identified those in your statement and reprinted them there?
A. I did. I did.
Q. But you didn't reprint them for the other term of reference?
A. No. That document speaks for itself.
Q. I see. On that footing, you will agree with me, won't you, that the second term of reference does two things at once: it broadens the ambit of the concealment offences that's the first element. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. Sorry?
A. I would, yes.
Q. And the second element is that it materially narrows the time period. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes - well, it predicates the time period.
Q. Yes.
A. The first one did not.
Q. Quite. Given the sorts of offences contemplated that is to say, as it goes on to, in each case, identify stemming from complaints made by various people - in the second term of reference, there is one additional set of complaints identified first. There are three people in the first term of reference, four in the second?
A. Yes.
Q. So that that is the factual basis upon which the complaint is identified and the --
A. It appears to be, yes.
Q. Is it not the case that, in the circumstances of these amended terms of reference, that's the time period - and I'm asking this as a conceptual question, not that you had anything to do with this, although I think there is some suggestion that you may have been involved in reviewing these terms of reference before they were settled, we'11 come to that. But at the threshold conceptually, would it not have been better that there would be no time period constriction like this?
A. I couldn't say that was the case because I don't know what evidence Detective Sergeant Little, Jeff Little's review of the holdings had indicated. There may have been some specific reason, but this is a question you have to put to DI Parker. I can't - I'm not prepared to comment.
Q. Don't you say in your statement - and correct me if I am wrong --
A. What paragraph was it again?
Q. This is 17. You say that the first terms of reference were settled by Detective Sergeant Steel and were approved by the then crime manager Detective Chief Inspector Tayler. That's uncontroversial.
A. Yes.
Q. And then you identify them in a formal sense. And then you say:

Annexed to this statement and marked with the letter "B" are the terms of reference for Strike Force Lantle as initially formulated and signed by Detective Sergeant Stee 1 together with the terms of reference as subsequently signed by Detective Sergeant Little.

That's the second part.
A. Yes.
Q. In 19 you go on to say:

Before personne 1 were assigned and the terms of reference were settled ... I had discussions with other senior police officers in relation to how the investigation was to be conducted, as well as matters generally.

I take it that fixes the time when you were the acting commander of the Newcastle LAC; is that right?
A. I don't think it would fix totally there, but that would be primarily there.
Q. I'm trying to be fair to you as to timing and why you were involved.
A. I appreciate that. Thank you.
Q. I'm grateful. Therefore is it fair to understand, as it would seem to be implicit in this second document of your evidence, that you did have something to do with settling or approving or commenting upon at least the second - that is, (Little) - term of reference?
A. No, I wouldn't agree with that. I would have had some input in my discussions and handover with Detective Inspector Parker certainly, but once Detective Inspector Parker took his position up, part of that entire project was understanding who was responsible for what.
Q. Yes, indeed.
A. And I was not responsible for that.
Q. Quite. But the discussion that you identify in paragraph 19 presumably included some discussions about what were the terms of reference and what they ought to be?
A. I don't recall there being any specific conversation about the exact wording of the terms of reference. It was about getting an investigation plan, my view on who should be interviewed as part of that - and I've been very clear in my evidence so far about that, I think - and general matters about resourcing. I can't recall the exact conversation, but at the end of the day, Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little are responsible for that. I can't comment on it any further.
Q. Is it not the case that the dates that ultimately were selected that went into this second term of reference that is, between ' 85 and '99 - are quite arbitrary? A. I have no idea.
Q. If one has regard to, if I may describe it, the Townsend report - that's the document of 12 July 2010 to which I took you yesterday?
A. Yes I recall.
Q. You know the one I'm referring to?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. That is Inspector Townsend's review of all the facts and circumstances and what was effectively suggested?
A. He is a barrister he puts together a fairly good document.
Q. I'm glad to hear it. I take it that that document then went to the Assistant Commissioner York and that ultimately led to her forming a view of the world. But my point is: is it not the case that the term of reference as it finally was settled really just plucked arbitrarily a number of dates out of the document without much science involved?
A. Again, I can't say because I didn't do it. I didn't prepare that document.
Q. Very well. Again the proposition I want to put to you conceptually, not that you were involved in it, but I assume you can express what must be an expert opinion in the circumstances?
A. You keep going "expert". I'm just doing my job. I don't know whether I'm an expert at anything. An opinion is --
Q. Forgive me. So that it is clear, I'm thinking of the definition of the Evidence Act which, given your specific knowledge and training presumably, presumably --
A. It hasn't been established I guess, but I'm happy to give an opinion for you.
Q. Al1 I'm asking is this: having regard to this term of reference and having regard to the facts, matters and circumstances that Inspector Townsend identified in his report, it is rather arbitrary just to constrain the period of time, is it not, given that many of the offences of concealing may have occurred from, say - and appear on the face of it to have occurred from - the mid-70s and indeed may well have gone on well past 1999? Was it not sensible just to keep the period, as it were, unstated and open-ended?
A. I can't agree because I don't know what Detective Sergeant Little's review at that stage had established was evidence that could support the allegation.
Q. You wouldn't dispute the fact that there could easily have been concealment offences occurring after 1999?
A. I'm sure there probably - no, I'm not sure, but I can see that; there could be. There would be some specific reason that those dates were put in. I'm not party to why those dates were put in. I have no knowledge of why they were. So I can't help you, Mr Cohen, I'm sorry.
Q. Very well. You made mention in a number of occasions in your statement to - I think it fair to describe them as this - the views of senior officers of the command. That's right, isn't it, in your statement?
A. In regards to what?
Q. On various occasions you've made mention of senior officers having discussions or expressing views and you've
taken, for your purposes, some heed of those opinions? A. Yes.
Q. I'm not trying to pin you down to a particular item, but I'm asking that you accept that you are informed in part, especially at the time you were the acting commander, by the views of others in the command?
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. We are agreed about that.
A. I'm sure we'11 agree about much more.
Q. I'm delighted to hear that again. Can I ask you, please, do you have volume 1 there handy, of the bundle?
A. Yes, I do.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1453, line 17, to page 1455, line 6]

MR COHEN: Q. The question is: it was the case at this time, and by "this time", I mean May, June, July, August September of 2010, the period when these issues were evolving - do you understand that proposition?
A. I understand, but $I$ wasn't even at the command in May
so I can't make any comment on what --
Q. When did you get there?
A. June.
Q. June to September 2010?
A. Yes. It was late June, probably --
Q. This is the question --
A. -- more July.
Q. -- and the Commissioner will consider it first. In this period when you were there, June onwards to September at least, there was a view in the command amongst senior officers that it was not a good idea to confront and take on the senior members of the Roman Catholic Church?

THE COMMISSIONER: That's a statement, Mr Cohen, for starters.

MR COHEN: I'11 ask the question.
Q. Is that the concerns that were abroad in the command?

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Are you able to answer that, sir? A. I can say that I have no knowledge, no-one said anything like that to me. I'll contextualise that as I was a duty officer initially starting. I was not part of any decision-making process in relation to that investigation, and the first time that $I$ knew we were getting the file back, there was no reluctance on my part specifically. I'm happy to take on the Catholic Church - happy.

MR COHEN: Q. It was also at this time, that is, June, July, August, September, this period that is relevant to you being the acting commander, or at least the duty officer and then acting commander - that's right, isn't it?
A. I'm just getting my timeline so can I speak with some accuracy on dates for you.
Q. To what are you referring there may I ask?
A. It was submitted. It's a Gant chart to say who was doing what during what period.
Q. I'm not sure I've ever seen that. Is that in your statement?
A. No. It was given to the Commission. If you don't want me to look at it, that's fine, but I can't answer any of your questions.
Q. The difficulty is this, if you're looking at something that I've not seen I can't really ask you questions about? A. Fine. I'11 put it away. My answers are now restricted to "I guess."

MR SAIDI: I think there is a misunderstanding. Mr Cohen is asking questions. If the witness wants to refer to a document to be accurate with the answers, he should be permitted to do it. Just because Mr Cohen hasn't seen it --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, I gather it is a document which indicates the dates upon which this particular witness took particular appointments and particular positions.
Q. Is that right, sir?
A. Yes, it is, Commissioner. It refers to a number of police when they were there and when they left. It has an aide-memoire and it was given in the tender bundle that requested from day one.

MR COHEN: I have no doubt about that. It's just that I have never seen it. I have no clue what it says or means. That is my difficulty and I'm hesitant to embark on a one-sided cross-examination.

THE WITNESS: Commissioner, I'm happy not to refer to it, but obviously my answers will now be very restricted to.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, surely it would be unobjectionable for a witness in the position of this witness to have a look at a document that shows the movements of particular staff, including himself.

MR COHEN: Without question. I would just like to be let in on the secret. That's all.

MR HUNT: It is not a secret. I've just been shown it now. I'm happy to show a record to Mr Cohen.
Q. Just for the record Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey you have another folder of material there?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Would you put that down for a moment?
A. Am I allowed to have that document?
Q. Have the Gant, or whatever it's called --
A. Yes, and put the other one down?
Q. -- but put the rest out of reach, if you would.
A. Okay, fine.

MR HUNT: It is certainly not meant to be a secret --
THE WITNESS: No, no.
MR HUNT: -- it was something that those assisting the Commission did not think was of sufficient utility to serve.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
THE WITNESS: My apologies.
MR COHEN: With no disrespect to those assisting you, Commissioner - just the opposite; I have enormous respect for their industry and ability - I was astonished to know that this might have been a document that was material and hadn't got out of the bundle, so to speak.
Q. Excuse me, Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey. I need a moment to absorb this material.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Mr Hunt. It appears I've caused a ruckus again.

MR COHEN: Q. I take it, was this produced or prepared by you?
A. No, at my direction, and it accords with the records
of my memory, the best I can, but like any personnel record, there may be a day or two out.
Q. Quite.
A. I had an analyst prepare it. I have a number of analysts that work for me.
Q. Indeed, and I assume its purpose was to show for the relevant senior officers identified what I'd call a chronology or a timeline that, in a charted form, showed periods where they were doing various tasks. Is that its purpose?
A. It was just - yes, it indicates who was doing what at any particular period, to the best that we can determine from existing records. It helped clarify my mind because at different times I'll have different responsibilities and different jobs.
Q. Quite. Excuse me. Allow me to put this to you: if I understand this document correctly, it records for your purposes that from 29 June 2010 to 30 August 2010, you were the Newcastle City LAC duty officer.
A. One of them, yes.
Q. Then from that date, 30 August 2010 or perhaps the next day, 31 August?
A. Whatever the Monday fell on.
Q. Whatever the barrier time is?
A. Yes.
Q. Through to 13 October 2010, you were the, I assume, relieving commander of the LAC?
A. That's correct.
Q. The Newcastle City LAC?
A. That's right.
Q. And then back to duty officer from 13 October to 1 November 2010?
A. Yes, that's right. But bear in mind that, in those periods, even though it might say that I am the duty officer or between that period, I may have taken leave. I would have to check diaries to see whether I was actually at work, but it's my --
Q. But the substantive work, the substantive job at the
time was at the LAC?
A. Yes, that's right.
MR HUNT: Could I pause for a little bit of housekeeping.
I'm sorry to interrupt my friend's flow, but I am wondering
whether the document that Mr Cohen has could be marked for
identification.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUNT: I'm disinclined to tender the document for
various reasons, but given it is forming part of the
questioning, it ought to be identified.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you,Mr Hunt. MFI7.
MFI \#7 DIAGRAMS DATED 2010 AND 2011 RE DATED FOR VARIOUS
OFFICERS PREPARED AT REQUEST OF DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR
WAYNE HUMPHREY (GANT CHART)
MR COHEN: I don't seek to have it tendered, but in
fairness to the witness this clarifies the position. If
I can, in this simple way, I read it on to the record so
that everyone understands the basis.
Q. I think I took you from 13 October 2010 to 1 November
2010 when you were back as one of the duty officers in the
substantive role for that period?
A. That's right.
Q. Then from 1 November to 10 November, again the
relieving commander of the LAC?
A. For a short period.
Q. Yes. Then from 10 November through to 20 December,
again duty officer?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Then I assume from 20 December 2010 you commenced
substantively as the crime manager or one of the crime
managers?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. 25 December.
Q. I'm so sorry. I just have one date there, 20 December
on the --
A. Is it the date that I - oh, no, that's Trevor Shields. 20 December, sorry. I do apologise, yes.
Q. Not at all. And from that time on --
A. I was the sole crime manager then until the arrival of Mr Parker, which was some time after we returned from Christchurch in March of 2011. But, of course I was in Christchurch - do you want to take me through the rest of the dates? I'm doing your job here.
Q. No, not at all. That was the period that you identified and I wanted to be sure about. I'm grateful for that. My question, having identified that period: in one role or another during that period, the entirety of the period from 29 June 2010, you were attached in one form or another to the Newcastle LAC?
A. That's right.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1460, 1 ine 20 to page 1461, line 13]

MR COHEN: That's a convenient point if could I return that document and allow that to be marked, which is now MFI7.

MR HUNT: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Are you continuing on in that vein, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: No, that might be a convenient spot to do that.
THE COMMISSIONER: The last question and answer will be subject of a non-publication order. Thank you Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: The MFI has been dealt with, has it?
THE COMMISSIONER: That's MFI7.
MR COHEN: Thank you very much, Commissioner.
Q. It might not be fair to say that the Strike Force Lantle file gathered dust until the end of calendar 2010, but not much happened, did it?
A. Oh, I don't know. I didn't have responsibility for it. There seemed to be some activity on e@gle.i. there were certainly some attempts to interview [AL], I think it is, but I can't comment on what Detective Sergeant Steel and Detective Chief Inspector Tayler were up to specifically.
Q. You have given evidence in your statement that, around about this time, there was a discussion between journalist Joanne McCarthy and Inspector Fay Dunn.
A. That was the phone call, yes, that I had with Inspector Dunn. There'd been a phone call, contact of some description, I'm not sure, but certainly there had been some form of communication.
Q. That phone call, on your evidence - in your evidence yesterday, you were questioned by Mr Hunt about the circumstances of the Fay Dunn telephone conversation. You, in your evidence, in fact, in fairness to you, let me go to it, indicated - it was put to you that by Mr Hunt that it was an extraordinary set of coincidences that an article was published by Joanne McCarthy - do you remember this evidence?
A. I'm just waiting to hear the rest of it.
Q. Let me go through it in fairness. The question was.
... extraordinary set of coincidences that the article is published --

I interpose there that that's the McCarthy article.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { your complaint is made; there's a meeting } \\
& \text { at which suddenly you discuss with } \\
& \text { Assistant Commissioner York the necessity } \\
& \text { to interview Fox relative to Lantle; and } \\
& \text { then he's interviewed within days in } \\
& \text { relation to the internal investigation. }
\end{aligned}
$$

A. That's not relevant to the phone call of Fay Dunn.
Q. The Fay Dunn phone call, that was a prompt for all this, wasn't it?
A. No, not at all. 12 October, Fay Dunn made the phone call and then I go and get the file. The meeting Mr Hunt questioned me on yesterday occurred much later. That's when DI Parker there and Mr Gralton.
Q. Well, let's go back to the Fay Dunn phone call because 12 October is much earlier. You're saying she was suddenly searching for a file because of a call from Joanne McCarthy; is that right?
A. I've just said --

MR SAIDI: I object. I object on the basis of the fairness of the question. This is a very delicate area because I need to refer to material which is not before the

Commission and it has been ruled to be confidential. Pardon me, I would like to mention something to Mr Hunt about this.
(Mr Saidi and Mr Hunt confer)
MR SAIDI: We'll see where it goes. I'm just concerned about the question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.
MR COHEN: I will endeavour --
THE COMMISSIONER: Try to remember what it was, Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: No, that's not the problem. I'11 just now endeavour to walk through this minefield with the blindfold on and hope I don't step the wrong way. It is very difficult, Commissioner, to know exactly what the difficulty I'm creating is.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I assure you I don't know. Would you please continue.

MR COHEN: Yes.
Q. Let's approach it this way and let's go to documents that are in evidence, so that unless there's a hidden trap there, we're all safe from the difficulty.
A. I'm sure we'll soon find out, Mr Cohen.
Q. Could I ask you to have regard to volume 2, please, of the bundle and if you would go to tab 62 there.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall yesterday that you identified this as part of the green; it was the document that arose out of the ministerial --
A. I perceived this. I never saw the green personally.
Q. But you accept --
A. Yes.
Q. -- ostensibly this is part of it? I can do no better than that.
A. Yes, and I accept it 100 per cent.
Q. That document - I understand you haven't seen it, but it's been given a TRIM number, it is in the system, it relates to this issue - forms part of what you say Inspector Dunn was exhorting you on the phone to look for; is that right?
A. I presume it was, yes.
Q. I'm very curious, because the document itself says, does it not, that the matter was forwarded for information and referral to the relevant command for consideration and appropriate attention. Then it goes on to say, at the foot of the page:

Please note that the Ministerial Liaison Unit does not require a report in relation to this matter.

That couldn't possibly have been something that would cause the great fuss and excitement and the panic you identified in Inspector Dunn, surely?
A. I don't know about panic, but if you coupled with it with the documents Mr Hunt showed me yesterday in respect of, I think, an email that was sent to Inspector Dunn, it is not about whether we are replying to the ministerial, it was - I perceived Inspector Dunn wanted to see what was in the file so she could brief the region commander and prepare a response to the email that Ms McCarthy had sent. That was the tenor of the phone call.
Q. Did Inspector Dunn say to you, "I want a file which has that TRIM number 2010/133845?
A. No, no, she said, "There's a green. Can you get the green and anything that goes with it that can help me answer this question?" That's to the best of my memory.
Q. That green was identified --
A. She might not have used the term "green", Mr Cohen. That was my term, but, yes, I knew what she was talking about.
Q. If she didn't use the term "green" - which is shorthand for a ministerial request, I assume --
A. I made some notes. I think it said "ministerial".

She may have said "ministerial", but --
Q. The question I want to put to you is this: Inspector Dunn would not even have known of the existence of this
file, would she, at the time? This is at 12 October?
A. She must have. She rang and asked me about it.

I don't know. You'd have to ask her.
Q. You're saying your understanding was that

Inspector Dunn rang you because she had received a phone call from Joanne McCarthy about this topic?
A. That was my belief.
Q. Ms McCarthy couldn't have known about the existence of the file either, could she?
A. I don't know.
Q. The chain of events that you contend led up to this request by Inspector Dunn was just fanciful, wasn't it? A. No.
Q. Isn't it more likely that, just as was put to you yesterday by counsel assisting, Mr Hunt, this was just giving colour to the background as a pretext to search Detective Chief Inspector Fox's office?
A. Did Mr Hunt put that to me yesterday?

MR SAIDI: Was that put by Mr Hunt yesterday?
THE WITNESS: I don't recall it being put.
THE COMMISSIONER: I don't recal1 it being put.
MR COHEN: Let me withdraw that and let me check. I thought it was, but let me be - I don't want to be unfair to anyone.

MR SAIDI: For what it's worth, let me positively assert it was not put.

MR COHEN: I think that must be right. I withdraw that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Close that bundle now and I'll take you back to your statement, in particular, to your statement at paragraph 21(d). Now, this is one of the two paragraphs that became somewhat controversial yesterday. In any event, you refer in that paragraph in the second line to, as you put it, "despite numerous requests". What were the "numerous requests" you were referring to there? That's a
general narrative statement --
A. It was a broad statement, yes, it was.
Q. What are the particular --
A. That's information I'd received from Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little and I think also Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn, although I can't be 100 per cent certain on that.
Q. That's information you got from them, but what requests did they identify to you that they say had not been satisfied?
A. I can't remember specifics. It was a general comment, "we've asked for material and he's not giving it over."
Q. Wasn't that general comment just sheer speculation.

There was no substance to it?
MR HUNT: I object to that. That question posits this witness having the knowledge of what was going on in the minds of others.

MR COHEN: I'11 withdraw it and put it another way.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR COHEN: Q. You just had no basis for knowing when you wrote that sentence in 21(d) that any of this was other than sheer speculation?
A. No, I don't agree with --

MR SAIDI: I object. I object to the use of the terminology "sheer speculation" in particular in terms of the evidence that has emerged. It is anything other than sheer speculation.

MR COHEN: I would say one more time, post hoc, ergo propter hoc. We're talking about 2010, not 2013.

MR SAIDI: Could you interpret that for me? I'm not going to bring out my Latin book. Please interpret it.

MR COHEN: It means that which follows does not cause it.
MR SAIDI: I maintain my objection. I don't care what the Latin phrase is.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen I think the problem is about speculation and, no, I won't permit you to put there was speculation only.

MR COHEN: I'11 approach it this way.
Q. To what document can you refer to make good on that assertion in 21(d)?
A. None that spring to mind.
Q. That's because there are none; isn't that right?
A. I don't know. I know I sent a request for documents to be surrendered. That weren't as of 2 December, but that paragraph you're referring there, as I said earlier, is a broad statement that encompasses the whole.
Q. Just stop there. The documents that you said to be surrendered as at December were the documents in the ministerial file, weren't they?
A. Yes, "and any other relevant documentation" I think I worded it. I'd have to see the email.
Q. We'11 come to that. I put to you that what you sought was the ministerial file?
A. And any other relevant documentation.
Q. To the ministerial file?
A. Yes.
Q. That is to say, the one I've just shown you behind tab 62?
A. Well, I never saw it, so I can't say. Relevant documentation in relation to an investigation and concealment of child sexual offences by the Catholic Church, I think that is a fairly wide ambit.
Q. You refer in that paragraph as well to your intention to debrief Detective Chief Inspector Fox so a comprehensive investigation could be planned and conducted?
A. It wasn't my plan to personally debrief him, but

I thought he should have been debriefed, yes.
Q. Well, an intention. This is speaking as at a period from October to December 2010, isn't it?
A. Oh, it's a general comment.
Q. But "at the time", you must have mean that period,
surely?
A. I believe he had evidence material to the investigation, yes.
Q. So we're clear, this intention for him to be debriefed in your mind as you had testified about it yesterday, related to this period of October, roughly, to December 2010, did it not?
A. Yes. I would say then, yes. Probably stronger later, but clearly he had some information. It would be foolish not to see what it was.
Q. The debrief would, in the vernacular, be getting one's heads together; is that right?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. I'm sorry, I missed that.
A. No, not necessarily. That's a term that infers many things. My interpretation of a debrief would be what material do you have, do you have any evidence that's relative and material, take a statement --
Q. But a physical process --
A. If you want to call it heads together you can call it that. I don't necessarily agree.
Q. It would certainly be a physical process where people sat down together --
A. Oh, yes.
Q. -- in the same room, in a conference room? Wherever it was, you did in perhaps a formal way, but in the company of each other?
A. I would like to think so, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Unless there was some reason that either party couldn't get together and then you could scan an email, and things like that, but in the normal course of events --
Q. But absent great physical distance?
A. Yes. Yes, I would expect to get together, absolutely, at the appropriate time.
Q. You've annexed some documents to your statement, in particular, in annexure $C$ to the statement, and these appear in various places in the bundle. I'm afraid I don't
have the cross-references for the convenience of others, but in your statement, it is convenient to you, detective chief inspector. Do you see in that email that you've sent, principally, to Detective Sergeant Steel and also copied to Detective Chief Inspector Tayler and to Superintendent Mitchell and Inspector Townsend, in the third line you say:
'Getting our heads' together --
You're quoting back from Detective Chief Inspector Fox's phrase --
with Peter Fox will not necessarily be the most advantageous strategy despite his best intentions.

That speaks for all time, doesn't it, not just -A. It actually confirms what I've just said. Getting our heads together is not the right way to approach this. It should be formal.
Q. That means not getting together at all, doesn't it?
A. No, that's your interpretation, not mine.
Q. Isn't that the only interpretation you can put on those words?
A. No, not at all, not in my view, anyway.
Q. You go on to say:

Last7y, Fox will address communications through the Crime Manager in future. I will address that.

And then he's on four weeks leave:
I look forward to some robust discussion on this matter.

Does that mean with Fox?
A. No, Tayler.
Q. Well, if you're not going to get together, if there's not going to be a getting together of heads and you're looking to robust discussion, surely the only construction you can put on that document is he is never to be involved;
isn't that right?
A. No, that's ridiculous. Absolutely not. Absolutely not.
Q. Did you look at the various materials in the file at the time of having this discussion in September of 2010 that's referred to in broad terms?
A. Which file?
Q. If you look at your email, that contemplates, does it not, the file has come back in the direction of the commander to the Newcastle LAC? That's correct, is it?
A. I presume it was. I didn't see it.
Q. That file is what I'm referring to and, so it is clear in your mind, I took you to a document yesterday that had two TRIM numbers on it?
A. Yes, I remember.
Q. That file, and indeed, that file, again so defined, is what gets a jersey in the Townsend report?
A. Yes.
Q. Focusing on that one?
A. That one, yes.
Q. That definition, that file means those materials in that report and associated with it. Excuse me, Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, excuse me, Commissioner.

In the email that you've identified in annexure C, your last comment to everyone is, "I look forward to robust discussion on this matter." My question I'm going to put to you, after identifying the file, is "this matter" means the file, does it not, in broad terms?
A. No. More to the fact that what we perceived would occur had occurred and how we were going to manage that.
Q. You say "what we perceived would occur had occurred", but all that had occurred was that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had written a memorandum that he'd sent to Detective Sergeant Steel?
A. Exactly what we thought would happen - some type of contact early once she was assigned on to the case.
Q. But, with respect, so what? It was a perfectly proper email that indicated --
A. It would be if there wasn't a strong suspicion that the Herald was behind it as well or getting information from Detective Chief Inspector Fox. You seem to ignore that fact. That was what was operating on my mine and particularly Tayler's.
Q. I'm not ignoring anything at all, what I am trying to put, and I'11 put it to you directly now, is that there was just an antithetical approach towards Detective Chief Inspector Fox because everybody suspected that he was the bad guy when he was, in fact, not anything of the sort; that's so, isn't it?

MR SAIDI: I object to the question. I think there needs to be some definition of what "bad guy" means, if my friend wants to re-put the question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: Q. You are making the proposition to the Commissioner that Detective Chief Inspector Fox is the leaker in all this, aren't you? That's what's implicit in all your evidence, isn't it?
A. That was the belief, yes, absolutely
Q. The belief was founded on nothing but a puff of the breeze, wasn't it; is that right?
A. We've been down this road yesterday, Mr Cohen.

I don't agree with that assertion at all.
Q. There was just not a proper basis for holding that belief on any --
A. A suspicion is not based on belief.
Q. With respect, it is, is it not?

MR SAIDI: I object to the question. I object to the line of questions. Indeed, I object to the argument about the definition of "belief" and "suspicion" and the rest of it. In terms of relevance, if I can get to the point, what is the relevance of this, now that we know, with the benefit of hindsight, the evidence before this Commission that the suspicion referred to by the witness was completely and absolutely accurate? Why is this being pursued?

THE COMMISSIONER: We have gone through it before, Mr Cohen. Was there anything that would you like to put to
wrap-up the subject area?
MR COHEN: I tried to put it and there was a vociferous objection. Do you rule the question out?

THE COMMISSIONER: I think the last question was - I don't have it, actually, but do you recall what it was?

MR COHEN: What I was endeavouring to put was that there was not a proper basis for Detective Chief Inspector Fox to be suspected of anything, let alone being a leaker.
Q. That's right, isn't it?
A. No, there was.

MR COHEN: I'11 finish this with one more question, Commissioner on this topic.
Q. The proof of the pudding in this proposition: as at this time, that is to say, 18 September 2010, what had been leaked?
A. In relation to this --

MR SAIDI: I object. How would this witness know, as of that date, what communications, whether by telephone, email or otherwise - what had been leaked? He is being asked as a fact what had been leaked. How would he know? It was all done in secret between Fox and McCarthy.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is difficult to answer. Where were we?

MR COHEN: The objection, again in vociferous terms, about whether or not this is a proper question to put and the assertion from the Bar table that it's been demonstrated that there was leaking going on.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You've asked what was leaked by that time.

MR COHEN: It seemed a proper question to me.
MR SAIDI: The question, to make it proper and anywhere near proper, was, "What was the suspicion", not "What was leaked?" I'm sorry for my vociferous approach.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is an impossible question for this
witness to answer, is it not, Mr Cohen? You could ask him did he know anything that was leaked. Is he aware --

MR COHEN: I thought I had. Let me do that. I thought the answer was "No" to that question.
Q. What was it that you had identified that gave you the material that gave you the suspicion that there had been a leak?
A. There had been - I have to be careful here. There had been articles in relation to this and other matters which helped me form my suspicion and, as I understand, that was a suspicion that was also strongly held by DCI Tayler.
Q. We went over this ground yesterday, I'm sorry, but I need to press you on this. You say articles, plural. Please identify the articles?
A. I can't.
Q. Why not?
A. Not here now. I can't.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1473, line 23, to page 1474, line 1]
Q. Why was there not a formal complaint made about this in September 2010?
A. Sorry?
Q. Why was there not a formal complaint in the system made about this in September 2010?
A. Because the suspicion didn't amount to enough to complaint about it. By the time the complaint went in later, in light of the phone call and the file note, there was enough.
Q. I put it to you, detective chief inspector, there was no suspicion, just a dislike of DCI Fox?
A. No, not at all. Not at all.
Q. I put it to you that your evidence in your paragraph 22 of your statement about concerns for the integrity of the investigation equally are invention for the purposes of this Commission?
A. No, they are not.
Q. And the true position was that this was an opportunity to get Fox, wasn't it?
A. For what purpose, Mr Cohen? There's no reason to get Fox.
Q. To get him out of the Police Service?
A. Do you want me to answer?
Q. You were asking a question. I'm putting it to you that this was to get DCI Fox --
A. No.
Q. -- out of the Police Service?
A. No. Why would I want him out of the Police Service?
Q. Please don't answer with an answer; answer my question.
A. Well, it is a nonsense question. I had no control over Mr Fox at all, nor did I want to. There would be no reason why I would want to get him out of the police service. He is ambivalent to what I do, superfluous. Like, he's doing his job, presumably, and I'm trying to do mine. You want to paint some, or your client does, some suspicious or sinister motive and it is just nonsense.
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[Transcript suppressed from page 1475, line 2 to page 1477, line 10]

MR COHEN: Q. The complaint that was made in the first instance instituted by materials you provided to the Newcastle LAC in, I think it was April 2010 - am I right about that? That's what commenced complaint?
A. I haven't got the documents, but I think that complaint was in 2011, wasn't it? It was to the region commander.
Q. I beg your pardon. You're quite right; it was Apri1 2011, but the documents were provided by you, either to the region or LAC?
A. Yes, hand delivered to the region commander.
Q. That commenced the complaint. That dealt with, on its face, the circumstances of the events of 2 December 2010, did it not?
A. It made reference to it, as far as I can remember, yes.
Q. You weren't at that meeting, were you?
A. No.
Q. Surely in the circumstances the proper complaint was Commander Mitchell, wasn't it?
A. What do you mean "the proper complainant"?
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't --
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. The complaint was about circumstances of the meeting and asserted failure to comply with the direction. That was the complaint?
A. We went down this road yesterday, didn't we? The complaint was about my belief, based on documentation that I received, that there was an improper association with a media person. It was not --
Q. But the complaint?
A. The triage identified it being a disobeyed direction. I don't know. I wasn't at the meeting.
Q. And that complaint properly was the province of Commander Mitche11, wasn't it?
A. No.
Q. He was at the meeting, he understood what he said, he was the man with the interest in his statement being conformed to, he was the proper complainant in this; wasn't he?
A. No, for two reasons: one my line commander at that time was Assistant Commissioner York; and the second was Mr Mitchell was gone. He wasn't the commander. He was in Melbourne working with the Victorian Police.
Q. I put it to you that Commander Mitchell was the proper complainant, but you stepped in as his proxy?
A. Proxy for what?
Q. The complaint?
A. I made the complaint.
Q. So he didn't have to make it?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. So he did not have to make it personally?
A. He was in Melbourne. I don't know - I don't know what you're getting. I made the complaint. I made the complaint on the basis of the telephone call and file note I received from DI Parker and some of my suspicions.
Q. There is a file note in your statement which is dated, on the face of it, 19 April. This is annexure G. I think you've indicated it was hand delivered on 21 Apri1 2011.
A. It is actually dated 21 April where I signed off.

That's the more accurate date. The way the macro works on that letterhead, if you don't remember to change that since the last time you'd used it --
Q. The reason I identified it that way is that there are two documents that have the date 21 April. In fairness, in annexure G, the first in time even allowing for your evidence of yesterday, the first page of annexure $G$ identifies a document at the position on the letterhead
that says 19 April?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. So we're clear that's the page?
A. Yes, that's the one.
Q. The other document that bears the date 21 April is annexure H ?
A. That's right.
Q. So there's no confusion for the Commissioner's purposes if she has to review this from the transcript -A. Yes.
Q. -- it is understood that you signed it on the 21 st, but, for ease of identification, annexure $G$ at the top says 19 April. That's one way of identifying it?
A. Yes.
Q. That document, that, in effect, is a file note? Well, how would you describe it? It doesn't have a title, but it is effectively a file note, isn't it?
A. Annexure G? I would say it is more a status report.
Q. However you want to label it, that was based upon the earlier file note status report, again, whatever label is appropriate, of Detective Inspector Parker of 14 April, was it not?
A. No. We11, it could have been, I suppose, in part.

The one that was basis of the foundation is annexure H from Parker's, but this one was bringing Commissioner York, as I recall, at her request, up to speed, where it was at.
Q. You accept, don't you, that when this was first recorded by Parker, his knowledge, as he states it, was very limited?
A. Knowledge about specifically what?
Q. Strike Force Lantle? He'd just come into the job, hadn't he, in the LAC?
A. What date is this? It was April.
Q. Early April?
A. Could have been.
Q. He says, doesn't he, very clearly, his knowledge was very limited about Strike Force Lantle?
A. I don't recall what he says, but I accept what you're saying.
Q. Your evidence yesterday, as I recall it, was that you got a phone call from him on this day, 14 April, and you testified to the Commissioner that, when he was on the phone, in terms speaking to you, he was, to use your phrase "livid"?
A. Yes, he was pretty cranky.
Q. If he had a limited knowledge of these matters of Strike Force Lantle, then it was difficult to have also any knowledge about DCI Fox in these matters, wasn't it?
A. Oh, you'd have to ask him. I don't know what his knowledge was of DC Fox in those matters. I was aware he would have been - I briefed him about the earlier parts, which we've discussed. And I don't know how limited his knowledge of the Lantle brief was. I don't know what he knew exactly, but I knew he was cranky when he got the call, or when I took his call, I should say.
Q. It is the case, isn't it, that he wasn't cranky about DCI Fox, was he?
A. No, I don't agree with that.
[Question and answer suppressed[
Q. I put it to you that this is the view that was adopted by senior officers in the Newcastle LAC that anything that Fox does is a leak and anything that he does is going to put the investigation at risk. That's the approach that was taken, wasn't it?
A. No, it was probably a major concern, but I wouldn't say everything.
Q. Proof wasn't required for that view to be formed. It just had to have the name Fox attached to it, didn't it? A. No, no, it was not like that at all.
Q. This was all being recycled into your document provided to the region commander to be able to poison the well; that was what was going on, wasn't it?
A. No, it was not.
Q. Your proposition that Detective Chief Inspector Fox as at April 2011 was a leaker had this serious difficulty, hadn't it, he had been off with a broken leg for four months from the job?
A. I'm not sure how long he had been off, but him being off work doesn't mean he's still not in contact. I think that's been clearly evident as well.
Q. You just have no proper basis to recall that, do you?
A. I had a suspicion. It became much more solidified after that telephone call between McCarthy and Parker and at that stage, after much soul searching, the complaint went in.
Q. This is the chronology is it: Fox broke his leg in December 2010?
A. I don't know when Fox broke his leg.
Q. He's off work for four months or more, but McCarthy phones Detective Inspector Parker about something - Aha! It is Fox's fault. That's the thought line, isn't it? A. Look, I can't comment. I didn't have the conversation with Joanne McCarthy. You would have to ask Mr Parker. If that is what you say the timeline is, so it is.
Q. The notion that Fox could be responsible for any of this is just preposterous, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. The real position, the real problem here, at this point in time in April 2011, is that the region were petrified that there was going to be bad publicity on the front page of the Newcastle Herald. That's what the concern was, wasn't it?
A. I don't know. You would have to ask whoever was in region at that time. It is no secret we're always attuned to media, but you would have to ask them. I wasn't at region. And it goes on to another step too. Talk about --
Q. No, don't go there.
A. I haven't finished my answer. You asked about what was on the front page of the paper. What probably --
Q. No, with respect, I simply said --
A. Okay.
Q. -- the proposition was keeping this off the front page of the Herald. That doesn't need to be expanded upon.

THE COMMISSIONER: The region was petrified, Mr Cohen.
THE WITNESS: You took me to the front page. There's a lot of risks about what goes in the front page in an investigation, particularly in relation to victim care.

MR COHEN: Q. The real concern was just to avoid bad publicity because it is bad for the image --
A. I have no idea what --
Q. It was that simple, wasn't it?
A. No, I have no idea. You can make that proposition, but $I$ can't agree with it.
Q. The conduct of Lantle, or at least of the holdings of Lantle by your predecessor in the role of crime manager, you described in quite disparaging terms to the region commander, didn't you?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And your use of the phrase was because the situation was just a shambles, wasn't it, at this time?
A. No, it wasn't a shambles, no. That's not what I've given evidence about.
Q. Abysmal management but not a shambles; is that what you say?
A. Of the holdings.
Q. And the holdings are what drive the investigation, aren't they?
A. No, not necessarily. The holdings form different parts. I also gave evidence yesterday, and I repeat it again now, that the e@gle.i seemed okay. But the paperwork was not how I would expect it to be presented. Why that is it I can't comment, but I didn't like the way it was left.
Q. This was your comment upon the capabilities of DCI Tayler, wasn't it?
A. No, because I don't know whether he had carriage of the folder or Detective Sergeant Steel.
Q. One of those two?
A. It would be, yes. But as I said yesterday, every one of us of my profession in this room do things differently and my subjective view was that I was not happy with what I was handed and it needed organisation as soon as possible. Maybe I'm a bit linear. Other people look at things differently.

MR COHEN: I'm close to the end, Commissioner, I just want to check my notes to see that I hadn't overlooked anything.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. In your evidence yesterday, you asserted to the Commissioner that DCI Fox continually tried to take over Lantle. Now, the true position was that DCI Fox wrote one memorandum in September 2010 and then was directed to deliver up documents and had nothing more to do with Lantle. That's the true position, isn't it?
A. He was directed up - to give the documents. He had nothing formally to do with it, no, that's right.
Q. He didn't try to take over Lantle. There was nothing he could do. He was directed to give up documents and have nothing else to do?
A. Well, I don't know whether directions have any meaning to Mr Fox, but I don't resile from the comment. He was trying to inject himself in and take it over.
Q. That sort of gratuitous comment is just directed to blackening DCI Fox's reputation?
A. No, it's my opinion. You asked the question and I answered it.
Q. There was nothing he could do to take over Lantle, was there?
A. That's two different questions.
Q. The evidence that you gave about that is just hyperbole, isn't it?
A. No.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
Yes, Mr Irving?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR IRVING:

MR IRVING: Q. I have a note that, on Tuesday, you said word to the effect you wanted to get Lantle to get going? A. Yes, I recall something along those lines.
Q. Can we draw from that that Lantle, wasn't going?
A. There was no-one on it at the time I took it.

Everyone had gone off sick, so there was a short period, I guess.
Q. Just from the form of words you used, you appeared somewhat frustrated?
A. I wouldn't say I was frustrated, but to put it into context, Lantle was the only brief I picked up and, accordingly, there was a lot to get my head around. Lantle was important and I wanted it to get going, yes.
Q. Just go to Apri1 2011. There were a fair few things happening with Lantle at that time. Ms McCarthy published an article, and it is at page 528 in document 111.
A. Which bundle?
Q. Number two.
A. What number was it again?
Q. Document 111 at page 528.
A. That's it - 528, sorry, yes.
Q. She makes a number of assertions in that article, but would you accept that one of them is that, after 12 months, in effect, not much had happened?
A. Oh, that's a - I couldn't have a view.
Q. I'm not asking you about the investigation. I'm asking you that's her assertion?
A. Yes, that's the assertion in the article, without reading the whole article, I would accept that.
Q. Would you accept that proposition?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I take you, then, to a memo that I'm sure you're familiar with, number 101.
A. Yes.
Q. Just on the very first page, you make the observation in the second paragraph:

There had clearly been a period prior to the commencement of this Strike Force where numerous commands had knowledge of the allegation and had seen fit for reasons unknown to me at this time not to commence an investigation.
A. That's right.
Q. Impliedly, you can draw from that that it didn't go anywhere for a while?
A. I think it was going between commands. There was trying to be a decision on who would take --
Q. The investigation didn't go on for a while?
A. Yes.
Q. You would accept that as a proposition?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. Could I go then to the sentence before that. You make the observation that when Lantle was established in October, "inquiries were to take the form of review, assessment of current holdings and initial inquiries to determine whether or not the matter should proceed." A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Early October 2010. If we go then to the third paragraph on the next page, if I could take you to the third sentence:

Detective Sergeant Little 's mandate was to review the current holdings --

I'11 skip the words in parentheses --
... determine and prepare an investigation
plan and submit that plan for approval, and initiate contact with the victim.
A. Yes.
Q. Could we draw from that that what Lantle was to commence work on in October 2010 had not really been
achieved at the time Detective Sergeant Little was appointed to Lantle?
A. I know what you're asking, but I can't agree with the way you've put it. There was some activity, I'm aware of some activity. There was the issue with trying to interview [AL] --
Q. I understand.
A. -- the letter that she sent to Detective Chief Inspector Tayler, and that's what the reference
I contacted her by phone and initiated the contact or introduced the contact for Little to re-contact. So, no, there had been things happening but --
Q. But, substantively, the review of the current holdings - working out what was going to be done with Lantle - that was set up on 12 October had not really been completed. As you say, aspects had been done?
A. No, I think --
Q. I suppose what I'm saying is that Detective Sergeant Little, in effect, was starting afresh?
A. No, I don't think he was starting afresh. There had obviously been activity; there had been meetings; there had been attempts to interview the witness. A fresh start, not --
Q. Could we say at that stage when Detective Sergeant Little was appointed, there was not actually a completed statement taken from any witness?
A. I don't know. You'd have to ask Detective Sergeant Little - oh, well, there were statements that were in possession.
Q. There were statements which had come from Ms McCarthy?
A. Yes, or DCI Fox, I'm not sure what the source was.
Q. When I say "statements from Ms McCarthy", I'm talking about the original statements taken from [AK] and [AL] by Catholic church officials?
A. Yes - no, the only ones that I saw were police statements.
Q. Would you accept from me that in amongst the documents that Ms McCarthy provided back in Apri1 of 2010 were statements taken by church officials?
A. Yes, I'11 accept that.
Q. So you're not aware if any statements had actually been completed?
A. No, I'm not. I haven't got knowledge.
Q. I think you may have been present yesterday when Constable Freney gave his evidence --
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. Would you accept from me that the warrant or the documents held by the Maitland-Newcastle diocese was executed in May 2011?
A. I would accept that. I wouldn't know.
Q. I suppose the point of my question, what I'm working up towards, DCI Humphrey, is: when you made the observation that the holdings were, frankly, abysmally managed, one issue on your mind, in the context of Ms McCarthy's article as to what Strike Force Lantle had achieved at that time, was that not much had been achieved to that time?
A. No. It related strictly to the manila folder that I found in the office, in my new office, and I just didn't like the way it was organised. It didn't give me any sense of what had or hadn't been done. I had to go to e@gle.i to do that. I suppose, in retrospect, e@gle.i is the proper place to do it, but, as I said earlier, I'm a little bit prehistoric, I like my paperwork. I like to see it like that, tabbed and in order and ready to go.
Q. This was a report going to your superior Assistant Commissioner York?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm sure you would give her frank and fearless advice?
A. Not necessarily accepted on all occasions, but, yes.
Q. I'm sure. Did you take the view that really here we were 12 months into the supply of this material, it was not an important factor to bring to her attention?
A. No, I brought to her attention the current status and the fact that Little was on the case and Parker had managerial responsibility. There was certainly - I concede this: there was a momentum shift once Little and Parker took it on.
Q. We concede that, but I think my comment is that we're

12 months in, not a great deal had been achieved; was that something that you felt you should bring to the attention of your assistant commissioner?
A. No, there's probably a number of reasons - I can't comment on that - because in that 12 months, apart from the fact it's an historical matter, so it's going to be impacted by what other things are happening, set aside Steel's fresh play, but it is like any complex investigation or intricate investigation. There may only be little steps in 12 months, there might only be two or three statements. It doesn't necessarily predicate that nothing's happening. Having said that, once Detective Sergeant Little was on the case, he was on the case.
Q. I concede that, yes. One question just in that context: It would have been preferable, would it not, for the warrant to have been executed earlier?
A. I can't say when. From an investigative strategy or an investigative point of view, I don't know when it would have been best to execute the warrant. I don't know --
Q. But as a broad principle, it would be better to secure documents of that type, internal documents of the diocese, as soon as possible?
A. After there had been numerous article on the front page of the paper?
Q. No, that's not my question.
A. Well, it's an indicator, isn't it? Is there a rush after it's already been outed?
Q. Well, that's not the question.
A. You can see what I'm getting at.
Q. Yes, but my observation is, as a general principle - I am just talking about as a general principle. We don't have to talk about the specifics of this matter.
A. I'll agree in the general principle.

MR IRVING: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Irving. Mr Gyles, do you have any questions?

MR GYLES: I have no questions, thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Saidi,

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. Mr Cohen put - indeed he put it as a positive assertion - that there was no basis for there being a genuine concern in relation to Ms McCarthy and Detective Chief Inspector Fox up to 30 September 2010. Do you remember that being put to you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. From my recollection, it was put in the context of what you were suggesting were leakages that were taking place or rather suspicions of leakages?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to assume this. I want you to assume that on the following dates articles appeared in the Newcastle Herald up to the period of 30 September 2010: 28 April, 2010; 29 April 2010; 30 April 2010; 1 May, 8 May, 19 May, 16 September, 17 September? A11 right?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you got those dates in mind?
A. Not all of - but, yes, there's a lot of dates. It accords with my memory. There seemed to be a lot of press about it.
Q. When you say there seemed to be a lot of press, on the assumption that the dates I've given you are correct, did that have any bearings on your suspicion at that time as to what was going on between DCI Fox and a member of the media?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Can you articulate for the Commission the concerns one would have about an investigation or the subject matter of an investigation appearing, whether it be on the front page, on the second or third page or anywhere in a newspaper available to members of the public?
A. There are a number of reasons. Depending on the nature of the article, it could destroy investigative momentum. It could warn possible offenders of our strategies. It adversely affects the victims by seeing their business on the front page of the paper. It is just that that was not a strategy - media in that particular investigation, that at that time was not a strategy. It should not have been played out in the paper.
Q. I want to be very careful how I ask you about this. You're aware that investigations, particularly major investigations, such as strike forces have investigation plans?
A. Yes, I do.

MR HUNT: I object to where my friend is going. I think he's going to material that's not proper to examine in public.

MR SAIDI: I'm going to approach it the best I can, but it's been suggested to this witness that, in effect, it was deliberately overlooked or that he contrived or, indeed, that he fabricated his evidence in terms of suggestions that DCI Fox should be interviewed. I'm going to suggest that the interviewing of DCI Fox, and indeed Troy Grant, was a decision made at a very early point of time during the course of the investigation. I want to rebut - let me see if I can do it very carefully.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.
MR SAIDI: I'11 do it in this way.
Q. Are you aware that, for his part, the officer in charge of Strike Force Lantle had determined that an interview of DCI Fox - whether one calls it an interview, a debriefing of DCI Fox - occurred as at early 2011; that is, when he determined when it should be done.

MR COHEN: I object. This is no evidence of that. It is being asserted from the Bar table. To put it to this witness that whether he agrees or disagrees about the existence of the fact has the principal difficulty that I can't, for the life of me, remember where in the evidence that fact is found. That's my difficulty.

MR HUNT: I object to the question as well. My friend knows why I object.

MR SAIDI: I appreciate why they object, but I have had advocates putting it to this witness in positive terms, I will use the term, that he was contriving or fabricating his evidence. I'm trying to do it is as neutrally as I can. If it is going to continue to be asserted this witness, as a matter of fairness, should be entitled to
respond to it.
MR COHEN: There is a compensating difficulty for my client, that the gentle-person's agreement I keep referring to has constrained what we're forensically able to do. It cannot be the case that my learned friend can approbate and reprobate at the same time on this proposition. If, as his client has done, he has stepped into the agreement, he has to remain bound by it. I'm simply asking where in the evidence is the foundation for it. There appears to be none. It is that simple and that is prejudicial to my client.
the Commissioner: Mr Hunt?
MR HUNT: Madam Commissioner, if Mr Saidi is referring to my examination of this witness on the issue of the meeting of 16 May, what he puts is not what I put to the witness. I put another available explanation for some material and nothing more than that. I explored properly, as counsel assisting should, the aspects of the witness's evidence and no more than that.

There is a fundamental difficulty with what Mr Saidi is wanting to put that relates to the difficulty that this Commission labours under in dealing with the matter, notwithstanding that there is a live extant criminal prosecution and there is a whole lot of material that's not before this Commission for very good reason. It is not a prosecution, but police investigation - I overstepped that - but with the possibility of a future prosecution or prosecutions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUNT: For that reason there is a whole lot of material that's quarantined. I accept there might be a basis for Mr Saidi to go there if that material was before this Commission, but it is not, so it is simply not available.

I'm prepared to concede on the record that there might be other records that might have been available, and I think that should end the line. Otherwise, one of the difficulties is, and I'm sure Mr Saidi wouldn't want this in the interests of his other client - that is, the NSW Police Force - that this Commission miscarry in relation to a very important part of its functions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR SAIDI: I appreciate what Mr Hunt says. I am reminded that two police officers gave evidence orally in this court that it was part of the investigation's plan. It has already been given that DCI Fox was to be interviewed. That was, without using their ranks, Mr Little and Mr Jacob. They've already used it. In saying that, perhaps I've argued against myself and you may say "We11, it's already there", but at least a witness should be given an opportunity. My having said that, that evidence has already been given and I don't need to go, based on that, to any confidential material, if I'm correct in the assertion that evidence is there.

There's one other point and I want to come to it and that's the suggestion about Troy Grant. If one goes to volume A of the statements at page 168, there was the plan drawn up by Paul Jacob.

MR HUNT: Can I just say this is all very helpful material that Mr Saidi will be able to put in due course in written submissions in response to anything that the Commission chooses to publish for parties to respond to.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUNT: It is really not the time for legal submissions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, if the material is there.
MR HUNT: I think Mr Saidi has answered the issue. Because it is an important and critical issue, if he withdraws the line on the basis that he can rely on some other material that's already in, I think that simply answers it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR SAIDI: I'11 be sensitive to what has been said.
THE COMMISSIONER: Save for this Mr Hunt - perhaps Mr Saidi wishes the witness to make some further explanation about the perceived coincidence of events that you put to him yesterday.

MR HUNT: I've got no problem with a question that directs it to that perceived coincidence and asks him to answer it. There is a body of material that is well understood is confidential and not before the Commission and not going to be before the Commission in evidence, and it is just a delicate matter. It is something that's really quite important to this Commission's whole integrity.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Saidi, without the need for referring to other people's determinations where they may appear in the documentation, are you able to put a general question designed to elicit some more oral evidence from this witness about the perceived coincidences and the notes that he took of the meeting?

MR SAIDI: Let me ask a very general question. I'm not insensitive to what Mr Hunt says. Let me ask a very general question along these lines.
Q. In terms of the interviewing of or any potential interview or debriefing of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, did you have any or do you have any personal knowledge as to when Mr Little, for his part, first determined to debrief him or to interview him?
A. No, I don't have personal knowledge - only the investigation plan.
Q. In terms of Troy Grant, if I come to him for the moment - this is at page 168 of the statements; this shouldn't cause a problem - were you aware that Paul Jacob, in his suggestions made to Mr Little, indicated, after having reviewed the investigation plan in or about May of 2011, that Troy Grant was a person who should be spoken to? A. Yes, I was aware of that.
Q. When you were aware of that, was that around about May or thereabouts in 2011?
A. I don't have an exact memory, but, yes.
Q. I want to take you to some evidence given during the course of this inquiry. Do you have the statement of Mr Watters there? I'11 direct you to it specifically. It is tab 11 of volume B.
A. Volume 2?
Q. Would you be kind enough to go to that statement.

MR HUNT: That statement isn't in evidence. I'm just wondering, this is an unusual approach to take in cross-examination, to take a witness to the statements of other witnesses.

MR SAIDI: I want to take him to an annexure. That's why I asked him if he's got the statement. I didn't want to take him to the statement per se, but to the annexure. It is an annexure Detective Chief Inspector Fox has given evidence about.

THE WITNESS; Can I ask what volume it was again?
THE COMMISSIONER: Was it annexure 11, tab 11, did you say, Mr Saidi?

MR SAIDI: It is page 491.
THE COMMISSIONER: Tab 111 do you mean?
MR COHEN: If I could assist, it is tab 11 in statement volume B, tab 81.

MR SAIDI: Q. Can I direct your attention to tab 81?
A. What I've got at page 491 is the minutes of a complaint management team meeting held at region.
Q. No, you've got a different document. I'11 take you to tab 81 of the documents.
A. Tab 81 in my book is a status report under the hand of Inspector Watters. It's a COPS entry; is that what I'm looking at is.
Q. Could you be kind enough to go to page 355 .
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see a reference there to a case history, administrative action?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see a series of dates which are given there?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to the dates but specifically of 2007 ,

27 December 2007 - do you see that?
A. Yes, I've got that.
Q. Do you also see November 2010, the transfer out of the case?
A. Yes.
Q. If one accepts this document at face value, what it appears to indicate is Detective Chief Inspector Peter Fox in 2010, and specifically, on 23 November 2010, made an entry.
A. What date again, I'm sorry?
Q. 23 November 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. After the case having been finalised on 27 December 2007, he came back into it on 23 November 2010 and made a number of entries on that day. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. At that time there was a split of the LAC commands; is that right?
A. Around that period, yes.
Q. Were you familiar with the process that occurred during the course of the split?
A. Yes, I was at region then.
Q. From your knowledge of how the administration worked at that time, was it necessary for one to carry out a process of reopening a case in order to transfer it out to another local area command?
A. It would depend on the purpose.
Q. Can you give an explanation?
A. Well, if it's a case that's finalised and there's nothing fresh to be done on it there's, no reason to reopen it. To reopen it, it's --
Q. Do you see the entries there --
A. During that period there was - just remembering Waratah and Newcastle split of cases, just because it was a Waratah and Newcastle case, the merging by BTS of cases occurred normally. You didn't have to do anything. If you needed to reopen a case, you just reopened it if you had the appropriate priority.
Q. Looking at the entries there of November 2010, with your knowledge of how the administration works, was there
any need, from an administrative or bureaucratic viewpoint, from the NSW Police Force for Detective Chief Inspector Fox to have opened the case in order to transfer it?

MR COHEN: I object. How can this witness possibly know what need DCI Fox may have had? This witness can't give useful evidence to you about the mechanics of the c@ts.i system or the COPS system. The document speaks for itself.

THE COMMISSIONER: We have had evidence from Detective Chief Inspector Fox about what happened.

MR COHEN: Yes. This doesn't arise in any way. I object.
MR SAIDI: Can I refer my friend to page 366 of the transcript where Detective Chief Inspector Fox gave an explanation as to a need on his part to transfer the matter across. It was put quite clearly, one would have thought, by Mr Roser that he had no need to reopen the case on that day, it being a finalised case.

MR COHEN: I accept all of that, but this witness can't assist you with that, Commissioner, because this witness can't possibly tell you the mechanics of the system on that footing, having regard to what Fox did. What one needs is expert evidence that relates to its limitations, its extent, its mechanics and its procedures and then you will be appropriately apprised.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, the witness may know the intricacies of the system. I will allow the question.

THE WITNESS: Generally, if you reopen a case, or if you transfer a case and reopen it, or accept it and reopen it, it is to add something to it or it's just - why do you do that? It is like adding a name to a charge sheet after it has been completed. It just doesn't make sense.

MR SAIDI: Q. And in terms of your knowledge of the spirit of the commands --
A. He may well have had a reason. I don't know, but it just doesn't make sense to do that, especially then because there was nothing going on with that case.
Q. This is what I want to ask you about. From a policing point of view, can you see a reason for that having been done in circumstances where the case has been closed and
the alleged perpetrator is deceased?
A. It is just highly unusual. No, I can see no reason, on what $I$ have in front of me, no.
Q. I just want to ask you a series of further questions if I can.

THE COMMISSIONER: Should we take an adjournment Mr Saidi?
MR SAIDI: Thank you, Commissioner.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MR HUNT: Mr Saidi was cross-examining Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey.

MR SAIDI: Q. Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, I want to bring you to the topic of the meeting of 2 December 2010 which was held?
A. Yes.
Q. You're aware such a meeting was held?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Did you have any part in the calling of such meeting together?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Or any input in terms of what was to occur at the meeting?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any discussions with now Assistant Commissioner Mitchell about a meeting being called?
A. No, I don't recall I did.
Q. And in terms of the directions which were given during the course of the meeting, when did you first become aware of the fact that such directions were given?
A. After the meeting. I had no input into Mr Mitchell's decision-making process.
Q. When after the meeting, can you tell us?
A. No - oh, days. I was off for a period over that meeting, it's - so I can't tell you exactly.

MR SAIDI: That's the examination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi. Mr Hunt is there anything arising?

MR HUNT: There is no re-examination, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Hunt.
Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, thank you for your evidence. You are excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioner.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MS LONERGAN: I call Detective Chief Inspector Parker.
MR ROSER: I rely upon section 23(3).
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Roser. That is noted.
<GRAEME JOHN PARKER sworn: [12.40pm]
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:
MS LONERGAN: Q. Your full name is Graeme John Parker?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you're a detective inspector?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. I'm sorry, I think gave you the wrong rank as you approached the witness box. Can I refer to you as detective or inspector; is that the most appropriate? A. Either is fine.
Q. You prepared a statement with the assistance of your lawyers in March this year?
A. That's correct.
Q. I'm going to show you a copy of that statement. I note for you and for the record, that the copy that's coming up to you now, and a copy for the Commissioner, has been redacted to remove certain matters of sensitivity regarding current police investigations. I'11 ask you to have a look at your statement. Focusing on the text of the statement, detective inspector, is the contents of that
statement true and correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Is there anything that you wish to change in that statement?
A. No, nothing at all.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that statement.
THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of Detective Inspector Parker will be admitted and marked exhibit 40.

EXHIBIT \#40 STATEMENT OF DETECTIVE INSPECTOR PARKER DATED 7/3/2013

MS LONERGAN: Q. You were attested a police officer in December 1987?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And then you carried out some general duties and, in 1992, you began working in special operations?
A. That's correct.
Q. Special operations, has that any particular relevance to an investigation of sexual abuse or criminal investigations of a complex nature?
A. It touches on criminal investigations of a complex nature, but certainly not sexual assaults, so it would more strictly be a criminal investigation or CI-type role.
Q. In 1994 you transferred to plainclothes at Raymond Terrace and for some years did various investigating duties including investigation of child sexual abuse matters?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Did you also have a period as a prosecutor?
A. No.
Q. No, just preparing briefs for prosecution?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. In 1996, you were promoted to detective?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. In 1998, you worked on various investigations involving outlaw motorcycle gangs in particular?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Before that, you were on secondment and then, in 2000, returned to the Lower Hunter detectives where you continued to work up until the year 2000?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You were promoted to the position of crime manager for Lower Hunter Local Area Command to work on a particular operation regarding drug distribution?
A. I wasn't promoted to crime manager. I was put in that role by the crime manager.
Q. So you had a period where you worked as crime manager in the Lower Hunter Local Area Command?
A. No.
Q. No.
A. I was selected by the crime manager to --
Q. I see, I'm terribly sorry. You performed further investigative duties and it wasn't until later that you worked as a crime manager?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. In 2002, you were promoted to the rank of detective sergeant and did some work at Singleton police station with your primary duties being general criminal investigations? A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. In 2006, you were promoted to inspector?
A. Yes.
Q. And in 2008, you were transferred to the crime manager's position at Brisbane Waters Local Area Command? A. Yes .
Q. Can you outline for the benefit of those present your perception of the crime manager's role in the local area command - just in short terms; it doesn't need to be a very detailed description.
A. Basically, the crime manager's role is basically charged with the proactive addressing of crime within the LAC and also basically the criminal investigation of any serious crime that's occurred.
Q. Is it part of a crime manager's role to carry out the day-to-day carriage of investigative duties in relation to
crimes relevant to the local area command?
A. No, it is more a management role.
Q. Managing other officers carrying out those investigative duties?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Just in terms of the general management of these sorts of investigations of the sort that Lantle ended up being, is that the type of investigation that's better managed by one local area command or can it be run across a number of local area commands?
A. Under the terms that Lantle was run, it could be managed, by - well, I believe we did manage it at a local area level.
Q. The benefits or otherwise of running it at one local area command level, as you are able to attest, are what? A. There are advantages and disadvantages in basically managing in any way, shape or form. But the advantages are, obviously, that you're able to keep a much tighter control of things at a local level. It doesn't involve or impact on the rest of the Police Service because it really only impacts on the local area command that it is assigned to. There are a couple of benefits of it. There's, obviously, advantages in doing it the other way as well.
Q. And "doing it the other way", you mean spread across a number of local area commands?
A. Absolutely.
Q. An investigation of the nature of Lantle, is that something that would be a good idea having a number of officers over a number of local area commands working on; and if not, why not?
A. Look, again, there are pros and cons to both sides of that. However, it was a moot point to me; when I took it over the assistant commissioner had already decided it was going to be managed at a local level and that's what it was.
Q. I'm going to ask you some questions about a meeting that occurred on 2 December 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. You deal with that in paragraph 12 to paragraph 20 of your statement. First of all, your role, as at the date of
this meeting on 2 December 2010, was that you were acting as operations manager; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the operations manager's duties are what, just in general compass?
A. It is a rather large role, but basically, in the format that it relates to this particular matter, it was to stay abreast of that particular issue and to keep the region commander briefed on what was occurring in relation to it and also to feed back any information or desire that the assistant commissioner required of the investigation.
Q. Stepping forward a little in time, but just to clarify your role in relation to the Lantle investigation that I've asked you some questions about, in March 2011, you were appointed the crime manager to the Newcastle Local Area Command?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. At that point you became involved in the Lantle investigation in a supervisory capacity?
A. Yes, that's 100 per cent correct.
Q. We'11 step back to the meeting on 2 December 2010. At that point you weren't part of the Lantle investigation team in any way?
A. No, not at all.
Q. You were present at the meeting on 2 December only as acting operations manager in a supervisory type of capacity or oversighting capacity. Is that a fair summary, or how would you describe your need or presence at that meeting? A. My presence, I took a briefing prior to that meeting from the full-time operations manager who had been taken off-line and from the assistant commissioner as to --
Q. Can we clarify who those people are?
A. Yes, Inspector Townsend and Assistant Commissioner York.
Q. Are you able to say when that briefing occurred in relation to the meeting on 2 December?
A. My recollection is that it was over a number of days. I read a number of documents that related to it. I was given them to read at my leisure.
Q. You were given them by Ma'am York or by Mr Townsend? A. No, by Inspector Townsend.
Q. Are you able to assist us as to whether it was a file of documents or whether you were given things to read on TRIM or how did it work?
A. Yes. One was a document that related to a basic appraisal or - actually start the other way. One was a document submitted by Mr Fox that related to - it was a report relating to his desires to initiate, for want of a better term, a task force or a major investigation into the Catholic Church.
Q. Can I ask you to have a look at the annexures to your statement. I want to cross-reference the evidence you've given with documents annexed to your statement. Do you see at the bottom middle of your statement, there is a page number? Do you see it down the bottom there?
A. Yes.
Q. Page 371 is a document prepared by Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Could you confirm whether that is the document that you've just given evidence about?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. You're absolutely confident that's the position?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Were you given a photocopy of this particular document we're looking at now or did you read it in the original within the material you were provided, or how did it come about?
A. I would be grasping at straws there. I believe it was the original, but I wouldn't like to give evidence to that fact.
Q. Perhaps I can approach it this way. Did you need to return what you looked at back to the officers who gave it to you?
A. Yes. Yes, I did.
Q. Was that because, at that time, you didn't have an active role in that investigation but you were being briefed to understand what was happening?
A. Inspector Townsend just asked could he have the documents back when I was finished with them.
Q. What was your role at the meeting on 2 December 2010, as you understood it, prior to the meeting commencing?
A. My role was fairly simple. The assistant commissioner wanted Newcastle Local Area Command to take carriage of the matter. There was no ifs or buts about that.
Q. Who told you that?
A. The assistant commissioner.
Q. Who was that?
A. Ma'am York.
Q. She told you that that was your role in the meeting, to ensure that that line was held?
A. Yes. Newcastle had, I believe, a different position to that, but ma'am had made the decision and my position there was to ensure that that occurred.
Q. Did you discuss the wisdom or otherwise of the decision-making process?
A. No.
Q. It is not your role to debate that with Ma'am York?
A. I've debated things with Ma'am York, but not that one.
Q. Can I ask you if you debated that matter with Ma'am York's who opinion would prevail?
A. Oh, Ma'am York's.
Q. We get one in for the team there.
A. Yes.
Q. Annexed to your statement is an investigator's note, annexure A, which was supposed to have been prepared by an officer, Justin Quinn, Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn. Do you see that as annexure A?
A. Could you tell me the page number again, please, madam?
Q. Yes, the page number is easier. It's page 318 and following.
A. I have it, thank you.
Q. In your statement in paragraph 12, you note that that's a copy of the minutes of the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to draw a couple of matters to your attention in that investigator's note. You will see on page 319, there's an entry in the second last paragraph noting your arrival at the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You would agree with me, would you not, that you missed some proportion of the meeting?
A. Yes, I did. I was instructed not to, but I did.
Q. Are you able to now state how much in terms of time you missed of the meeting that started at 12.25, as noted by that particular officer?
A. I don't think I was particularly late. I had something else I had to attend to, and I explained that later on to Ma'am York, but I wasn't particularly late. I don't think I missed a great deal.
Q. Is it fair to say you're unable to say whether the first part of those notes - that is, what occurred to you prior to you attending - is an accurate reflection of what occurred in the meeting because you weren't there?
A. No, I wasn't --
Q. I am sorry; I asked that badly. You weren't there for the first part of the meeting, so you can't say whether those notes are right or not, can you?
A. No, I can't.
Q. Whilst you were present in the meeting, did you notice any animosity or raised voices on the part of Superintendent Mitchell?
A. No.
Q. Raised voice, I should say. Whilst you were there, are you able to estimate how long Detective Chief Inspector Fox was also present for that part of the meeting you were present?
A. He was certainly there while I was present. He did leave during the meeting, but $I$ couldn't accurately give a time frame on how long it was. I know that the file note indicates that a certain thing was said at a certain point and my recollection is that I was there when that was said as well. What I would suggest may have happened it may
have been said more than once. In fact, I think that was probably the case.
Q. All right. From the evidence you've just given, may we take it that you're referring to annexure B, which is your handwritten notes --
A. Yes.
Q. -- of what occurred at the meeting?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Just turn to annexure B which is page 323, please. In
that note, you say:
Meeting with Mitchell, Taylor, Quinn, Steel, Haggett and Fox.

Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Then:

Re Catholic Church investigation.
Mitchell issues direction that all
officers involved in investigation and management --

And I can't read the next bit.
A. :
involved in investigation and management issue --
Q. Yes. Can you keep reading?
A. Yes:
are not to speak with press on issue without authorisation of himself.
Further enforced when I explained region's position of this issue. It was clear that NMH.
Q. That's "Newcastle Herald"?
A. Yes, "Newcastle Herald".
Q. "Has pipeline to"?
A. "Has pipeline to investigation which needs to be
stopped as it ..."
Q. "Effectively"?
A. "Effectively" --
Q. "Hamstrings the progress"?
A. My copy is really poor.
Q. "Hampering the process"?
A. "Hampering the process of same. Everyone states they understand" - and I've got a puncture hole there -
"discuss", I think it is, "Newcastle will have carriage of matter." And that's where --
Q. I think that's, "Fox to pass on all knowledge and statements"?
A. "Fox to pass on all knowledge and statements, et cetera, to Steel in handover."
Q. All right. The note that you made, this is in your duty book, is it, or your diary?
A. My diary.
Q. Did you make it the day your meeting occurred?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you only recorded in there things that you observed in the meeting, or does it include things that you were told occurred prior to your attendance?
A. No, I've only recorded things I observed.
Q. Do you recall any statements by Detective Chief Inspector Fox, while you were present, to the effect that indicated he was unhappy about not being involved in the investigation?
A. I was aware that he wanted to be involved in the investigation.
Q. Were you aware of that from statements he made in that meeting or are you aware from another source?
A. Oh, both, but he certainly wasn't antagonistic or anything.
Q. You became aware of him wanting to be involved in the investigation prior to the 2 December 2010 meeting?
A. It was pretty clear from his report that he wanted to be involved in the investigation.
Q. Any other sources of information that led you to that view?
A. Not that I recal1 --
Q. And --
A. -- other than, obviously, the conversation he was having in the thing, in the meeting. He --
Q. All right. And that conversation occurred in the meeting in your presence?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. You note in paragraph 15 of your statement that there was a concern to region that there appeared to be someone within the NSW Police Force leaking information to the Newcastle Herald. You mention that in paragraph 15.
A. Yes, region were convinced of that.
Q. And that it was important to reinforce at that meeting that there should not be any unauthorised media statements? A. Absolutely. Ma'am's direction was that the leak will stop.
Q. Are you sure you were present when that statement was made? I don't mean by you, but when that statement was made by anyone other than you?
A. Sorry, you just lost me there.
Q. Sorry, I've lost myself. Were you present in the meeting when a person other than yourself made a statement to that effect; that is, that any unauthorised media statements were not to be made and were to cease immediately?
A. I believe I was present when Max Mitchell said that, yes.
Q. Max Mitchell said that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you interpret what he said to be a direction to all those present?
A. I know I've said "direction" there. I guess, yes, it is a direction.
Q. When you said, "I said direction there", you mean in your memo of 2 December, sorry, the handwritten note in
your diary --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you actually used the word "direction"?
A. Yes.
Q. There was no doubt, is there, that was a direction that was being issued?
A. No, it was either a direction or a command. It wasn't a request.
Q. I understand. I want to ask you some questions about your role between 2 December and March 2011. Can we take it you had no role in relation to Strike Force Lantle after you finished your acting operations manager role in December 2010?
A. To my recollection, I don't think I did another thing in relation to Strike Force Lantle after I walked out of the meeting on the $2 n d$.
Q. You resumed a role over Lantle, as you refer to in paragraph 21 of your statement, in March 2011?
A. Yes, by virtue of the fact that I transferred into the position of crime manager, yes, for Newcastle.
Q. So you weren't officer in charge or officer supervising the officer in charge or anything of that nature --
A. No.
Q. -- in terms of direct involvement in active investigative steps?
A. No, I had the managerial carriage of it.
Q. Is that because the role of crime manager means you don't delve into that amount of detail with active investigatory steps but you supervise. Is that a fair statement of the position?
A. Yes, that's how I do. Wayne Humphrey - Chief

Inspector Humphrey, sorry, was very correct in saying that we all do it slightly differently. That's how I do it.
Q. All right. In paragraph 28 , you make an observation amongst other observations regarding Detective Chief Inspector Fox's potential involvement in Strike Force Lantle. You say that if Detective Chief Inspector Fox had been given any role in Strike Force Lantle, it wouldn't
have been an active primary role as an investigator because it should have been something that more befits his rank and position with the NSW Police Force. Can you just outline for those present in court what you mean there?
A. Yes, certainly. It is unheard of, basically, for a crime manager to actually get down on the tools and work at that level. I'm not saying that it can't occur, it certainly can, if that's what's deemed appropriate; but, for all intents and purposes, the crime manager would need to be taken off-line, I mean, and actually put into that role by someone in authority above them. So, say, the assistant commissioner would need to take - or, I guess, the super would need to take that crime manager off-line and put them in charge of something different to what Strike Force Lantle was.
Q. Did anyone tell you that there was to be no contact with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about Strike Force Lantle? I'm not suggesting that there was, but was there?
A. I don't believe anyone told me that. I mean, this part of Strike Force Lantle, it was always our intention to speak to Mr Fox.
Q. Are you able to recollect occasions on which you spoke to Detective Chief Inspector Fox prior to some conversations that occurred in April 2012 that I will take you to?
A. Prior to April?
Q. Yes, prior to Apri1 2012. Between March 2011 and April 2012, did you personally have discussions with Detective Chief Inspector Fox regarding the subject matter of Lantle or matters relating to Lantle, including -A. Not that I recall.
Q. -- things he knew independent of what you were doing in Lantle?
A. No.
Q. Is there any reason why not?
A. We were pursuing, you know, other information.

I believe - I don't know this for a fact, but I believe Mr Fox may have been off work sick in that period as well. We were just busy with other things.
Q. Did you become aware when you began working as crime manager in March 2011 that information and documents had
been obtained from Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any reason to doubt that what had been provided was the complete holdings of Detective Chief Inspector Fox; that is, at the time, March 2011?
A. I've never been sure that we've received everything from Mr Fox.
Q. That's your statement now. In March 2011, did you have any reason based on your knowledge --
A. I had no reason, no.
Q. I should finish the question just so it is clear in the transcript.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. That's all right. Did you have any reason to suspect or worry that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had not been open with the police force and had not provided all the material he had available to him that was relevant as at March 2011?
A. I'd have to say I've always had some concerns regarding that.
Q. If Detective Chief Inspector Fox was considered to have this information or potential knowledge of contacts that may be able to assist the investigation, why wasn't he debriefed earlier than April 2012, to the extent you're able to say given your role from March 2011 to April 2012? A. As I said, we were pursuing other lines of inquiry.
Q. Yes?
A. From my understanding of - Mr Fox's own admission is his information was mainly gained from Ms McCarthy, who I was talking to. There was no need to approach Mr Fox prior to that.
Q. You've just mentioned Ms McCarthy and talking to Ms McCarthy. The inquiry has heard evidence that police employ strategic contacts with media to get information? A. Yes.
Q. And without going into the details of any content of information you received from Ms McCarthy, are you able to confirm that during 2011, you did receive from Ms McCarthy information that assisted some lines of inquiry relevant to

Strike Force Lantle?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to ask you a question about an annexure to your affidavit. It is page 361. You will see it appears to be a file note dated 18 October 2010 authored by Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to say when you first saw that memo by Detective Chief Inspector Fox, if at all?
A. I was going to say I don't recall ever seeing it, to be honest, but --
Q. But we will assume you saw it for the purposes of preparing the papers attached to your statement because it is attached to your statement?
A. I didn't attach it to my statement.
Q. Oh, you did not attach it to your statement?
A. No.
Q. Just to explain its origin, can I go about it this way - would you have a look at annexure $G$ to your affidavit. Do you see that's a memo that you prepared for --
A. The page?
Q. Yes, it is page 339. It appears to be a special briefing prepared for Ma'am York?
A. Yes.
Q. Regarding delays associated with the investigations conducted by Strike Force Lantle?
A. Yes .
Q. Including investigation contacts with DCI Fox of Port Stephens command. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The origin of the preparation of this document was the public discussion of Lantle; is that a fair summary?
A. Yes.
Q. This document briefs Ma'am York as to what's been happening. Is that a fair summary also?
A. Yes.
Q. Annexed to that document is some material that informs what you've said in the summary for Ma'am York and included in that material are various documents that were collected from the Lantle holdings?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that explain the --
A. Yes, it does.
Q. -- existence of that particular memo from Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Are you able to, now looking at it in that context, confirm you have at some stage read that memo or not?
A. At best I probably would have only scan read it. I was requested to - and as is explained in that memo, all I did was do a drop out of e@gle.i in relation to that particular name, Mr Fox's name and that's what dropped through.
Q. But in relation to the memo of 25 November 2010, which is the more detailed document prepared by DCI Fox, your evidence is that you read that shortly after - I'm sorry, shortly before the briefing on 2 December 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. You're confident about that recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. There are just a couple of things before I finish the examination-in-chief, if I may. In April 2012, do you recall having a telephone conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox, early in April 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. He made contact with you, or you with him?
A. It was either early March or early April, the initial contact.
Q. Are you able to assist in what prompted that contact? A. Yes. Mr Fox contacted me in relation to a request that he'd received from Detective Sergeant Faber. He'd requested information in relation to a priest. Do you want me to --
Q. No, need to. I think [NP] is the pseudonym we're referring to. If you look at annexure C, I appreciate this is an email exchange, not one you were included in, but annexed to your statement at page 324, there's an email from DCI Fox to Superintendent Gralton and others?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see certain issues are raised in that email regarding permission to contact or discuss with Ms Faber certain matters?
A. Yes .
Q. Does that assist in your recollection as to the prompt for the call?
A. Yes. [NP] is correct; and, yes, that's what prompted the call.
Q. Did you discuss with him at that time whether he had any other information he could provide to assist Strike Force Lantle investigations?
A. No, I was rather busy at the time and we kept it very businesslike. It was simply a phone call where he said, "I've been asked by Detective Sergeant Faber to supply a photograph of [NP]."
Q. Yes.
A. He also asked me whether he could discuss another I presume if it is not redacted, I can say it?
Q. No. Don't say it just to be on the safe side?
A. Okay.
Q. Whether he could discuss other matter?
A. No, it related to [NP] and another member of the Catholic Church.
Q. All right. Don't say the name.
A. Okay, fine, because he had been told by Mr Gralton that he had to contact me to ask whether it was going to interfere with our investigation.
Q. Yes.
A. It was really this brief, I basically said, "No, that's fine."
Q. Did you have any discussion during that phone call regarding his report of 25 November 2010.
A. I told him I would get back to him, that I'd contact him because I - we needed to speak to him, and it was a fairly timely phone call for him at that point.
Q. No, that's okay. I'm asking you something very specific, though.
A. Sorry.
Q. Did Detective Chief Inspector Fox raise with you or did you raise with him his 25 November 2010 report?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. At any time in April 2010, did you have a discussion where Detective Chief Inspector Fox said to you "Look, you know, this is all in my report. Haven't you read my report"?
A. That was a later phone call.
Q. In a later phone call?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember what was said about that? Did you say to Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you'd never seen that report and you didn't know what he was talking about?
A. I did.
Q. Why did you say that given your evidence today has been that you read it shortly before the briefing in 2010. A. Absolutely. It was a rather long phone call. It happened as a result of, as I said, this call where I said to him I'd get back to him. I got back to him on 2 April.
Q. How much later was the phone call?
A. Oh, it would only have been a couple of days, so it was in that time frame. 2 April was - this particular phone call I'm talking about now, the one you've referred to --
Q. Yes?
A. -- I actually rang him. I'd spoken to Sergeant Little and we'd discussed a number of matters in relation to this before I spoke to him. We were looking to find out what it was he had to - that was one of the last areas that needed to be investigated.
Q. What was one of the last areas that needed to be investigated?
A. His holdings.
Q. His holdings?
A. What he had.
Q. Why was that one of the last matters that needed to be investigated?
A. Well, we'd already done a reasonable amount at that point. We were starting to get towards - it had been going for a while. We were starting to get towards coming to terms with just about all our other sources of information.
Q. Could I ask you this: given your evidence is that you read Detective Chief Inspector Fox's November 2010 report back in December --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and I appreciate you didn't have an active role in the investigation, and I appreciate you didn't work on it even as crime manager until a few month later, are you able to state whether the matters raised in Detective Chief Inspector Fox's report of November 2010 were considered in terms of the Lantle investigation?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Were they followed through to the extent that they fitted within the terms of reference pursuant to which Lantle was operating?
A. Yes.
Q. The purpose of the discussion with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in April that you're just referring to, 2 April, was that specifically designed to find out if there was more you needed to find out and pursue?
A. There had been filtering through for some time and Mr Fox had intimated on a number of occasions that there were other things, or he spoke of other things that clearly weren't contained in the documentation that we had.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, is that a convenient time? I've still got about 10 minutes to go.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION:

MS LONERGAN: Could Detective Inspector Parker resume in the witness box, please.
Q. Detective inspector, you're on your former oath.
A. Yes.
Q. We were just working through your statement and we are nearly at the end of the matters raised in it. In annexure $E$ is an investigator's note prepared by Detective Sergeant Jeffrey Little at page 328. Did you review the note prepared by Detective Sergeant Little at or around the time it was prepared?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Is it an accurate note of at least that part of the conversation recorded in it?
A. Yes.
Q. And why was that conversation important to record in that way?
A. That was the first occasion when Mr Fox informed us that he had nothing further that he could supply.
Q. Are you aware of an email exchange between Detective Sergeant Little and Detective Chief Inspector Fox which goes through in some detail certain matters raised by Detective Chief Inspector Fox in an email in April 2012, which is annexure $F$ to your affidavit?
A. Yes.
Q. Annexure $F$ is the email from Detective Sergeant Little to Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Do you see that?
A. Yes. I am just having a look.
Q. Page 329?
A. Basically, it is a chain of emails rather than one particular email, but it does contain the email that you refer to.
Q. What was the purpose of that chain of email exchanges in terms of your position as crime manager with an overarching supervisory role over Lantle?
A. Detective Sergeant Little and I discussed the best possible way to ensure that we had everything that was
available to us and that there could be no speculation or error in any later proceedings regarding what it was that Mr Fox had with regard to evidence. That was the final attempt by Detective Sergeant Little to ensure that he'd covered every possible area that he could.
Q. Were you satisfied that that had the desired effect and that you had an appropriate level of detail and response from Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Absolutely. At that point, which I think was what you were alluding to earlier, that was when I was satisfied that he had said that he had nothing more that he could give us.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1518, line 15 to page 1520, line 41

MS LONERGAN. .... those are my questions in chief. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Mr Cohen? [Transcript suppressed from page 1520, line 46 , to page 1522, line 22]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Detective inspector, do you have a copy, as I think you do, of your witness statement in the witness box?
A. I do.
Q. Could I ask you kindly to move in it to paragraph 12. Indeed, can I simply ask you this question: have you, in your mind, a good current understanding of what you've put in paragraphs 12 to 14 inclusive or would you like a moment to reread them?
A. I'11 read them.
Q. Would you kindly do that?
A. Absolutely. (Witness reads document). How far, sorry.
Q. Just to the end of paragraph 14, which is at the top of page 312.
A. Yes.
Q. Having regard to that material and, as I understand it, is those paragraphs are the background, the lead-up to
the meeting of 2 December --
A. From my perspective, yes.
Q. That's a fair way of putting it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you tell the Commissioner, as I think your evidence goes to this, that before your formal transfer into the substantive role of one of the positions of crime manager in the Newcastle Local Area Command in March 2011, that your knowledge of Strike Force Lantle was limited really to a general briefing and some basic information?
A. Yes, it was very limited.
Q. And that basic information was what you had gleaned, I think your evidence was, when you went to the materials provided to you by Inspector Townsend?
A. Yes.
Q. And from the briefings, the oral briefings you got?
A. And the documents.
Q. Yes. Those oral briefings, if I understand your evidence correctly - please correct me if I am wrong in this - occurred very late November or early December of 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Before the time of the briefing that you got, and I'11 call it, for the sake of an arbitrary date, on or around 1 December 2010, the day before or leading up - I'm sorry I'11 withdraw that. It is a difficult question. There were a couple of days, I think your evidence was this morning, leading up where you were reading materials progressively; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. It might have been as early as, say, 30 November?
A. It might have been even earlier than that.
Q. Even earlier than that. So maybe a week roughly?
A. I don't --
Q. For the sake of an arbitrary number, say it was the previous Monday.
A. Right, yes.
Q. Before that time you had little or absolutely no understanding of Strike Force Lantle; would is that a fair --
A. That's fair.
Q. I need to take you to some of the documents. You have access - to your right just outside the witness box -- to volume 2 of the bundles. If you could pick that up, please, and if you would go in that bundle to tab 98. It is marked along the side, I think you can see.
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Hunt's injunction to Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey yesterday was a wise one - they tend to rebel, those folders.
A. Yes.
Q. This is your investigator's note dealing with contact on 8 April, I take it?
A. Yes.
Q. Is your evidence to the Commissioner also that, even as late as this date, you were not across the full scope of the Strike Force Lantle holdings and materials and facts and circumstances?
A. Yes.
Q. Indeed, to paint the relevant picture of the time, you had quite recently come into the command as one of the two crime managers, had you not?
A. My recollection was 27 March.
Q. I assume, to put it in the vernacular, you were getting your arms and legs wrapped around a big workload? A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. I take it by virtue of that, this was certainly not high on the list of pressing or urgent or very much immediate business; is that right?
A. It was just another one of the matters that $I$ had to become acclimatised to.
Q. Yes. You did that in time, but not as a priority? A. No.
Q. Even around this date, 14 April, having regard to the fact that the file note is that date, referring back to a
conversation on 8 April, is it a fair proposition, should the Commissioner understand, that at that time you were still with rather sketchy knowledge of the facts and circumstances even at the time you got the phone call from Joanne McCarthy?
A. Of the actual holdings and - yes.
Q. And, indeed, the background facts and circumstances,
if I can use that description, of what Lantle was?
A. Yes. I knew what it was - but yes.
Q. Indeed, yes. Let's explore this very carefully, in fairness to you. I take it by this stage, by the time of the discussion with Joanne McCarthy, by telephone on 8 April, which is what you refer to in this memorandum? A. Yes.
Q. Albeit it, it occurred about a week later?
A. Yes.
Q. But it is talking as at 8 April?
A. 8 April is the first bit.
Q. At that date, at the time of the conversation, presumably you had perhaps even slightly degraded memory of what you had looked at in late November or early December of 2010 at the time of this conversation?
A. Yes. I had - on 2 December that you're talking about, I had no knowledge of the actual intricacies of all of it. A11 I was aware of at that point was region's position and region's opinion of who was leaking the information.
Q. You had read material about that up to and just before the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. You hadn't done anything further after the meeting?
A. No.
Q. And by the time you'd come into the job, you hadn't done any more either?
A. No.
Q. At the time of this discussion by telephone on 8 April your information was whatever you still had in front of mind --
A. And what I'd read.
Q. Pardon me?
A. And what I'd read.
Q. And when did you read that?
A. In the period between the 27 th and the $8 t h$, what I'd got across.
Q. But it was your memory in April of what you had read in late November, early December?
A. No, no, what I'd read when I took over. Like, the moment I became, for want of a better term, the crime manager at Newcastle, I was - had managerial access of e@gle.i. so I was able to read then the holdings of Strike Force Lantle, which prior to that I hadn't done.
Q. When did you do that?
A. In the period between the 27 th and the $8 t h$.
Q. Of April?
A. 27 March, 8 April.
Q. Very well. When you spoke to Ms McCarthy, you
indicate, don't you, in your statement that your
understanding, even at this time, was still limited to what I think you call some basic information; is that right, or am I wrong in that?
A. I'm trying to find where I termed it. Look, I would agree that $I$ wasn't right across the brief, if that's what you're asking, absolutely.
Q. And you, to some extent, got the phone call from Ms McCarthy out of the blue?
A. Yes.
Q. Accordingly, at the time that you got her phone call, it was something that occurred but without notice and you were dealing with it as best you could, but in effect, on the run; is that a fair way to put it?
A. I just told her that I was - would you actually like me to actually read it on to the record? I was - I had just taken carriage of the matter and it was my intention to familiarise myself with the investigation plan over the weekend.
Q. Thank you. I'm grateful for that. Could I ask you to cast your mind back in time to the time when you were
initially being briefed by Assistant Commissioner York, and I think Inspector Townsend at the time, and this is, on your evidence, late November of 2010 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You identify in your statement, in particular, I think at the foot of page 312 in paragraph 14 - I take it when you say "I was made aware", that relates back to this general briefing from Ma'am York and Inspector Townsend? A. From Ma'am York and Inspector Townsend, yes, that's correct.
Q. You were made aware that Newcastle City Local Area Command was reluctant to take carriage of the investigation. Is that something that, in this bit of background briefing you were getting, was identified by the regional commander, Assistant Commissioner York, as a particular concern to her?
A. No, I don't think so. It was a normal police progression. Ma'am York wanted it made clear to all involved that it was region's determination that Newcastle would do it. I now, having been privy to the hearings, understand why that was the case.
Q. I think we're slightly at cross-purposes. Before the time of the meeting, you were given an instruction to go to the meeting --
A. Yes .
Q. -- this is 2 December, and make it clear to all concerned that Newcastle was to take the matter. That's so, isn't it?
A. That's correct.
Q. The reason for that was, I take it, and I take it the Commissioner should also understand, because, if I can use a phrase, Assistant Commissioner York was putting her foot down and saying, "You will do as you're told. You will take this matter, reluctant or not"?
A. You'11 have to ask Commissioner York that. The impression I got was that Ma'am York wanted that particular message taken to the meeting.
Q. And you did it?
A. Yes.
Q. Given the briefing you had prior to the meeting - that
is to say, you were given materials, you read documents, but you also had an oral briefing from Ma'am York in the company of and presence of Inspector Townsend, I think, as I understand your evidence?
A. Yes .
Q. And that message was what you were to take and presumably why you were to be there as soon as the meeting began; is that right?
A. I was to be there to ensure that region's two matters were addressed.
Q. But you were told to be there at the beginning of the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. And not to be late?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. That was so that this message, as it were, from on high could be delivered with clarity and without --
A. So I could return to Ma'am York and ensure her that everybody at the meeting understand region's position.
Q. Apart from the fact that you were a little late, and I assure you your secret is safe, it was the case that you had a particular purpose of being there, and it was to deliver this message?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it not the case that both the commander - I'm asking you to have regard to the briefing you've got from the commander, from Inspector Townsend at this meeting in late November. Is it not the case that the commander and Inspector Townsend had detected and were concerned about a general reluctance across the region, if can I put it that way, in respect of those LACs that had access to it or had been confronted by this issue? There was a general reluctance to deal with it, and I'm thinking particularly of Lake Macquarie and Newcastle; is that right?
A. If that's the case, I wasn't briefed on that.
Q. Very well. Could I ask you again, as you did initially when I first started asking some questions, and I'm grateful - I want to take you to the burden of the materials that deal with the facts of the meeting at the time. As I understand the way your statement is arranged,
paragraphs 16 to 19 inclusive do that. Would you care again to read those materials. Would you kindly do that? Thank you?
A. How far do you want me to read?
Q. Just to the end of paragraph 19, because that deals with the events of the day.
A. (Witness reads document). Yes.
Q. Thank you. I'm right, am I not, that is your evidence about the events of that particular day?
A. Yes.
Q. Apart from, if I can say, two more things - the annexing by you of a copy of the investigator's note that was prepared by Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn and your own handwritten note to the same effect, so annexures $A$ and B?
A. That's correct.
Q. That's the totality of your evidence about the events of the day, 2 December 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. You tell the Commissioner, I think I understand - and please confirm this or correct me if my understanding is wrong - that the investigator's note - that is annexure A to your statement - accords with what occurred during the meeting?
A. In general terms, yes.
Q. At least so far as you were a witness to it?
A. Yes.
Q. I think when you were being first led through your evidence by my learned friend Ms Lonergan you were taken to this investigator's note but again, so I'm completely sure and you are too, do you need a quick opportunity to review its terms just to have it front of mind, as it were? Would that be of assistance to you?
A. It is a rather long thing. I'11 probably --
Q. Yes. It starts at page 318 , using the pagination numbering at the foot of the page.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you wish to have a quick look --
A. That's the part you want me to read?
Q. What I want to know is: do you need to go back to it to be across the material? I take the answer is yes? A. Yes.
Q. Please do that.
A. (Witness reads document). I have read page 318, Mr Cohen.
Q. As a matter of the general period of your attendance at the meeting, do you see that the investigator's note refers in substance to either two parts to the meeting or, in effect, two meetings?
A. Sorry, I have on1y read 318, but that's correct.
Q. That's identified, in particular, at page 319, the second page of the note, and it is disclosed by the fact that the single sentence, which is the second last sentence on the page, identifies, "Detective Inspector Parker arrived at this stage of the meeting"?
A. Yes.
Q. You accept that's when you got there?
A. No.
Q. Really? You say this note is not accurate, do you?
A. I don't say it is not accurate. I say that I don't accept that's when I arrived. I don't know when I arrived.
Q. Let 's explore that.
A. Yes.
Q. If it is accurate - let me start from that proposition. Do you tell the Commissioner that this note is accurate as far as you understand it?
A. I think I believe I said it is accurate to the best of my recollection.
Q. Yes. Does not that mean that it is accurate including the time that it affixes that you arrived --
A. It does affix a time, Mr Cohen.
Q. It does in substance, doesn't it?
A. No.
Q. Not with respect to an actual time, but with respect
to after a certain period of business is transacted?
A. I'm sorry, but I won't concede that indicates any time whatsoever.
Q. Let me put it to you directly. I put this to you, that you arrived at the meeting with about five minutes of it left to run?
A. No, that's not --

MS LONERGAN: I object. We need some clarity about "five minutes left to run". Five minutes from Detective Chief Inspector Fox's point of view or five minutes from the overall meeting?

MR COHEN: Five minutes from the overall meeting. I'm sorry if that was unclear. Let me clarify it.
Q. There was a period when Detective Chief Inspector Fox arrives and when he leaves. You are relevantly put as arriving at a time about five minutes before, I put it to you, before he left.

MS LONERGAN: I object. I'm sorry, I understand.
I withdraw the objection. I assume "he" is Detective Chief Inspector Fox

MR COHEN: I'11 make that abundantly clear.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Having regard to how this investigator's note is constructed, the proposition I'm putting to is that, in the period when Detective Chief Inspector Fox was present - call it the first meeting or the first half of the meeting, however it suits to understand it, he was not there for the whole of the meeting - I put to you that you arrived about five minutes before the time that he left the meeting; that is, before Detective Chief Inspector Fox left the meeting?
A. There's nothing to indicate that. I'm sorry, but that's not my recollection of it.
Q. Very well. Your earlier evidence this morning, and I think it was before the luncheon adjournment in response to questions by my learned friend Ms Lonergan, when she asked you about how you could hear things that appeared to have occurred before you arrived, was that you said they
might have been said twice. That was your evidence, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. You accept that there's nothing in the file note that identifies such a repetition of these matters, is there?
A. There's nothing to say there's not.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. There is nothing to indicate that it wasn't said twice.
Q. It is in the nature of such --
A. Mr Cohen, perhaps can I tel1 you there. A11 I can tell you is that I made notes like everyone - well, not like everyone, but like some other people at the meeting and my notes are those presented at annexure B, and that is my evidence.
Q. Those notes give a narrative of matters that lasted a very short time, don't they?
A. Sorry?
Q. Those notes at annexure $B$ give a narrative of events that lasted a very short time?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that's what I'm putting to you, detective inspector.
A. You're putting to me that $I$ arrived with five minutes remaining in the meeting. I have no idea how long was remaining in the meeting --
Q. No, I'm not putting that at all. I'm putting to you that you arrived at the meeting and joined the meeting five minutes before Detective Chief Inspector Fox left?
A. Sorry, now I am confusing you. I understand what it is you're saying to me. I have no idea at all whether it was five minutes or 15 minutes or whatever.
Q. The other proposition I'm putting to you is that the matters that are identified in the investigator's note, the author of which was Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn, identified in the investigator's note at pages 318 to 319, identified as occurring before the time you arrived at the meeting, you could not possibly have witnessed; isn't that right?
A. Sorry, could you repeat the question?
Q. Certainly. At page 319, the investigator's note identifies that you arrived, and it simply says, "Detective Inspector Parker arrived at this stage of the meeting." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. The proposition I'm putting to you is that everything that's recorded in the investigator's note before that entry in the note occurred in your absence and you could not possibly have heard what was said, could you?
A. That is if that's a correct chronology of this meeting. All can I tell you, Mr Cohen, is that the notes that I have recorded in my diary are my recollection of what was said at that meeting. I will concede to you they're not a particularly long account of what was said at the meeting which would tend to indicate that I may not have been there for a long time; however, they are my recollection of what occurred.
Q. But your recollection of what occurred, and indeed prompted by what is in your annexure B, your hand --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is the material that is recorded at the top of page 320 , is it not?
A. Quite possibly. I have no idea --
Q. Please have a look at 320. This is in your statement. This is annexure A. It is marked page 320 , I hope, at the bottom of the page?
A. Yes.
Q. You've got it? It says:
[Inspector] Parker indicated that the
Region's Commander's firm view [was] ...
And it recites the very proposition you've given in evidence before?
A. Yes.
Q. That proposition, in that investigator's note at that point, is what is recorded by your own handwritten note in annexure B, is it not?
A. Some of it.
Q. And anything else that's recorded there occurred after that point in time, didn't it?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. Anything that you say occurred in your handwritten note at annexure B was your evidence a moment ago that this investigator's note, annexure A, records some of what's in your handwritten note?
A. Yes.
Q. Anything else in the handwritten note occurred in the chronology of these events, on this investigator's note, annexure $A$, after that point in time in the note; that is, following on from that point, page 320 that I've just taken you to - that must be so, surely?
A. I can only reiterate again, Mr Cohen, that what is recorded in annexure $B$ is my recollection of the meeting I'm sorry if that doesn't fit with the chronology or whatever you're trying to point at, but that's my recollection and they were made at the time. So I'm going to stand by those notes.
Q. You concede --
A. No, I don't.
Q. Wait for the question. Do you concede, detective inspector, that there is an inconsistency between maintaining this investigator's note, annexure A, is accurate and can be relied upon but only to the point in time when it suits you not to?
A. No, I don't, Mr Cohen. I don't, at any stage in Senior Sergeant Quinn's investigation, note that that is purported to be a time-based chronology of what occurred. I'm sorry, but I don't.
Q. But it is not a question of it being fixed in particular times in the way, say, a transcript is; it is this proposition - the investigator's note, annexure A, records that you arrived at a point in time, that is, evidently on the face of page 319. It also must be logically the case that if you arrived at that point in time, you heard none of what occurred and transpired at the meeting before that point in time.

MR ROSER: I object to this. This is the fourth time we have been over this territory, Commissioner. The witness
has answered the question on every other occasion. There's got to be a limitation on how many times the proposition is put.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Sir, is your answer the same?
A. I was about to same I'm quite happy to answer that. I can only reiterate again, Mr Cohen, that annexure B are the handwritten notes that I made at the time, and I can't help that they don't coincide with your appraisal of what you'd like said.

MR COHEN: Q. Let me put to you your evidence this morning when you said that what was identified in your statement must have occurred because it was said on the second occasion can't possibly be correct; that's the case, isn't it?
A. You can put it to me however you like. I again reiterate to you that annexure $B$ are the handwritten notes that I made of that meeting at that time. If they don't fit with what you like, I apologise, but there's nothing I can do about it. The fact of the matter is that's the truth and all I can tell you, I'm sorry, is the truth. If you don't accept that, that's fine I can probably live with that. I'm not going to, for a moment, suggest to the court I'm going to lose any sleep tonight over it, but that's just the facts.
Q. To ensure we're not at cross-purposes, I need to put this point to you. You gave evidence before the luncheon adjournment, when learned senior counsel was examining you about these matters in respect of this investigator's note, that if it is not recorded there, it must be because it was said twice. That's your evidence, wasn't it?
A. It could have been said 15 times, Mr Cohen. I don't know how many times it was said. Yes, it was my evidence. It may have been said twice, it may have been said 10 times. A11 I can tell is you that what I have recorded in my diary and is annexed to my statement, at annexure B, is a handwritten note from my diary that was made at the time, and that is my recollection of what I heard at the meeting. I'm sorry; like, I don't know what more I can tell you in relation to it.
Q. I put it to you that your evidence this morning about hearing these matters twice, given in response to the question --
A. I didn't say I heard them twice, Mr Cohen.
Q. You didn't say that?
A. I said perhaps they were said twice.
Q. Well, whatever way you want to put it, whether you heard it or you said "perhaps they were said twice", I put it to you that the evidence you gave this morning in response to senior counsel's questions was tailored to meet the exigencies of this case because you cannot explain the inconsistency here. That's right, isn't it?
A. No, Mr Cohen. All can I tell you is that the handwritten note that is attached at annexure B is the handwritten note that $I$ made in the meeting at the time. I'm sorry, if that doesn't fit with the chronology that the time-based chronology that you seem to think appears at annexure A. I honestly can't see a time-based chronology there. If you see one, that's fine - I can't. All I can tell is you that annexure $B$ is the attached copy of my diary that was made at the time.

MR COHEN: I think I have what I need, Commissioner. I'11 move on.
Q. Would you look at paragraph 31 of your statement, please.
A. Yes.
Q. And then paragraph 32 is with it. Would you just scan that quickly, please.
A. Yes.
Q. You tell the Commissioner that you had everything, in effect, that you needed as a result of coming to grips with the file in March of 2011?
A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you?
Q. I beg your pardon. Do you tell the Commissioner that you had everything you needed from DCI Fox by the time you came into the role in March 2011. Is that the burden of what you say in paragraph 31?
A. No.
Q. Your belief was that he had produced copies of all relevant information he had?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that mean that you had from him everything that
you needed?
A. No. That means I believed he'd produced all the documentation he had. Sorry if it doesn't --
Q. That's all right. You then go on to say you realised that DCI Fox had forgotten to bring copies to the meeting on 2 December. But you were aware, weren't you, that that same day those materials were provided in some form of interoffice transfer between --
A. No --
Q. -- where he was?
A. Are you talking about right here?
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. What particular point in time are we talking about?
Q. You're dating this at March 2011.
A. Yes and that's --
Q. You make reference back?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. -- to 2 December?
A. I just wanted to make sure that that was the period you were talking about. I wasn't aware of - I don't remember when I became aware, but it wasn't at this point how they were ferried, but as soon as I spoke to Detective Sergeant Little, I was aware that the documents that hadn't arrived at the meeting had arrived in the holdings.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you say that, after several discussions with Detective Sergeant Little, you decided a more formal approach would work. When were discussions with Detective Sergeant Little to which you refer in paragraph 32 ?
A. Basically we had been having discussions since I took over. There was a meeting on, I believe it was 13 April, with Detective Inspector Jacobs, which was basically the genesis point of our investigation. When I say "our investigation", the investigation conducted by myself - or well, by Detective Sergeant Little with me oversighting it.
Q. Is this in the year 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. You, Detective Sergeant Little, Detective Inspector Jacob had a discussion to consider the investigation plan. A. Yes, and --
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. Yes, the investigation plan.
Q. That consideration informally, but then presumably more formally with the work of Detective Sergeant Little, produced the document, did it?
A. Yes .
Q. An investigation plan which could be embraced and adopted, in a formal way?
A. Yes.
Q. And go on to the file and everybody would have their working plan document for the purposes that had to be undertaken to discharge your tasks?
A. Yes. Well, all e@gle.i investigations are internal investigations.
Q. That occurred relatively promptly, did it, from the time this paragraph speaks; that is to say, when you and DI Jacob and Detective Sergeant Little got together, what was the period of time that flowed before you got to that point with an investigation plan with which everybody was happy and could go on to the file and you could be --
A. The investigation plan was prepared by the detective sergeant prior to the meeting on the 13th. However amendments were made as a result of that meeting.
Q. But it was well advanced?
A. I think it was nearly complete.
Q. And the few amendments didn't take very long to be implemented?
A. No.
Q. Being quite arbitrary, but nonetheless it seems to be a sensible point in time, by the end of April that process of completing the investigation plan --
A. You'11 have to ask Detective Sergeant Little. I don't recall when he completed it.
Q. It is not a fanciful proposition that it occurred
around about that time, relatively promptly after the meeting?
A. I've got no idea. I would imagine so. Detective Sergeant Little is a fairly efficient officer, so I imagine it was completed fairly soon after that.
Q. For the sake of allowing a little leeway, I'm just trying to understand when this was likely to have happened.
You're not sure, it might have been late April, possibly into May, but presumably by the end of May, given the efficiency of Sergeant Little, you would have the investigation plan --
A. Sorry, I missed that as a result of Ms Sullivan's cough. No, that's all right. Could you repeat it again.
Q. Sure. By virtue of this discussion and by virtue of Sergeant Little's industry, presumably by late April or some time into early May, there was an investigation plan that was in final form with which everybody was happy and could act upon?
A. Oh, I wouldn't like to put a date on it. I have no idea, to be honest. You could have adduced that from Detective Sergeant Little if that was an issue. I have no idea.
Q. No, it is not an issue; simply I want to be fair to you.
A. I have no idea, Mr Cohen. As I said, there was one in place for all intents and purposes before the meeting.
Q. All right, let's work from that one. So by the time of the meeting, which is April, you had a working document that was all but final, a few minor amendments that could be relied upon. Did that document include within its relevant contents a reference to obtaining from Detective Chief Inspector Fox appropriate information by way of a debriefing or interview?
A. Yes.
Q. What did it identify as the necessary time for that to occur?
A. It didn't.
Q. I see. Speaking at April 2011, even in a working draft sense, but not a final document sense --
A. Yes.
Q. -- there was a plan, even in an informal way, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox would be interviewed/debriefed?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a fair statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did that not occur unti1 April 2012?
A. I thought I'd answered that, but I am happy to do it again.
Q. Pardon me?
A. Sorry, I thought I'd answered that in chief. That was as a result of - we were doing other things. As I said, by his own admissions, most of what Detective Fox had had come from Ms McCarthy, on speaking with Ms McCarthy, on occasions far too often for my liking. But there didn't appear to be any urgency to debrief Mr Fox regarding anything. I presumed that he'd handed over all his documents. That was just the time that we'd followed through all the other 1 ines of inquiry and we got around to move on to chief - I'm sorry, we got around to Mr Fox.
Q. Did you have a discussion on this topic also with Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey when he was the acting commander?
A. When we were going to debrief Mr Fox?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Not at all?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Excuse me, detective inspector, and excuse me, Commissioner. Can I ask you to look at page 341 in your annexure to your statement, in effect?
A. Yes.
Q. It is part of what is annexure G.
A. Yes.
Q. You've got 341?
A. I have it.
Q. There is a comment. This is a document dated

19 November 2012. It is part of a three-page document that was provided by you to Assistant Commissioner York, was it not?
A. Yes.
Q. It arose because of some media interest in matters, amongst other things, didn't it?
A. It arose because Ma'am York asked me the question which is the issue at the top.
Q. You say in 341, as your conclusion:

What is, however, quite apparent is the Strike Force's willingness to accept assistance from [DCI] Fox, even when he appeared to display an absence of enthusiasm to do so.
A. Yes.
Q. That was just a gratuitous comment, wasn't it?
A. No, not at all.
Q. What absence of enthusiasm had been disclosed on the Lantle file by DCI Fox?
A. I believe in the 2010, 2 December meeting, he was asked to produce documents.
Q. Which he did, didn't he?
A. Not at the meeting.
Q. It was the same day, wasn't it?

MS LONERGAN: I object. There needs to be some preliminary questions about the same day, in my respectful submission.

MR COHEN: I'm sorry, I missed that.
MR ROSER: It wasn't the same day.
MR COHEN: Q. You know from your interrogation of the e@gle.i holdings that what Detective Chief Inspector Fox did when directed was to produce those material the same day, don't you?

MR ROSER: I object to that. That's not the evidence. It
wasn't produced on that same day.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, the evidence is although Detective Chief Inspector Fox said he collected the material and handed it to someone, there may be some ambiguity in the term "produced", and this witness has also outlined his somewhat limited involvement in terms of an active role in the paperwork of Lantle as it was at the time. To be fair to the witness, he should be given the opportunity to explain that.

MR COHEN: Q. I'11 approach it this way. You know that DCI Fox did what was necessary to send it that day in the way directed, don't you?
A. A11 I know was that, at 2 December 2010, he was asked to bring the documents to a meeting. He didn't do that; right? That's one, and please let me finish. He refers in a number of documents, on a number of occasions, to having interviewed a number of witnesses - would you like me to go to those documents?
Q. Detective inspector, $I$ asked you a simple question.

MS LONERGAN: I object to this gentleman being interrupted when he's trying to give an answer to the question, which was a general one, asking whether and he knows about DCI Fox's cooperation with requests. The officer is trying to do so and he's being interrupted and that's not fair.

MR COHEN: My question wasn't a general question; it was about --

THE COMMISSIONER: The lack of enthusiasm.
MR COHEN: No, we had moved from that. The last question I put, as I understand it, was that he knew that DCI Fox had dispatched the documents that day. It didn't need a discursive response. It just needed, with respect, a "Yes" or "No" answer. I'm not sure why I'm being chided by my learned friend about that because I had moved past that question because I had been told, and I thought properly, I had to clarify the basis of it

THE COMMISSIONER: Weren't you putting to Detective Inspector Parker that he had made a gratuitous comment about Detective Chief Inspector Fox's lack of enthusiasm --

MR COHEN: I got well past that, I thought.
THE COMMISSIONER: I understood Detective Inspector Parker was still addressing himself to that question.

MR COHEN: Very well. I understand.
MS LONERGAN: So did I, Commissioner. The lack of enthusiasm comment, I apprehended the witness to be attempting to explain that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Why he said that.
MR ROSER: I agree with what my learned friend just said.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Would you continue to answer the question, sir.
A. I was trying to answer that
Q. Please continue.
A. Mr Fox alludes, on a number of occasions, in a number of documents and in a number of public forums, that he has interviewed a multitude of witnesses - both alive and dead, I think he refers to in one document - that he has interviewed members of the clergy, a number of members of the clergy. These are one of the premises he has constantly used to put forward the proposition that he's the person best placed to conduct this investigation. I don't know whether that's correct or not, but that's the premise he's put forward. But if that is correct, then he has never produced those documents to any member of Strike Force Lantle and, on those terms, I would suggest to you that he has been less than enthusiastic or whatever the term, sorry, was.

MR COHEN: Q. They were your words.
A. Yes, I know. I'm trying to get back to it, if you could just hold your bowlies for about two moments.

MS LONERGAN: Page 341.
THE WITNESS: "His apparent display of an absence of enthusiasm" - that is based on those particular facts, Mr Cohen, that your client has consistently, in the public arena, in documentation form, put out the fact that he has interviewed multiple people, that he has interviewed
members of the clergy, and I have seen none of those documents, despite numerous requests from my organisation which he shouldn't have to be asked to supply, at any rate. He's a senior detective, Mr Cohen. He's more than aware that the documents are not his documents. They are documents that belong to the NSW Police Department and, if available, could be more than happily used by Strike Force Lantle. That is why I was unable to answer Ms Lonergan's question earlier today as to whether I'm 100 per cent certain he doesn't still hold documents. To be quite honest, I have no idea what Mr Fox has.

MR COHEN: Q. And that little peroration is driven by -A. Sorry, I don't understand what the word "peroration" means.

MR ROSER: I object to the question put on that basis. What the witness was answering the question put to him by my learned friend.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. We'11 just call it an answer rather than a peroration.

MR COHEN: Q. That answer was simply an endeavour in the witness box to demonstrate your dislike for DCI Fox, wasn't it?
A. Mr Cohen, if you're going to ask me questions I'm going to --
Q. Perhaps you will answer them, please.
A. I thought I answered it.
Q. I just asked you a question. Kindly answer it.
A. I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.
Q. Your evidence two questions ago, your response, was simply an endeavour to make good on your dislike of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, was it not?
A. My answer two questions ago was an attempt to answer the question you asked me.
Q. The question was about an absence of enthusiasm and your response was about anything other than that concept.

MR ROSER: I object to that. The response was directly related to the question that was asked.

MS LONERGAN: I share that objection.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I agree with the other counsel, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. So you take it, therefore, that when Detective Chief Inspector Fox provided the lengthy email response to the questions that were put by Detective Sergeant Little, that was an absence of enthusiasm, was it? A. Again, I reiterate, Mr Cohen, your client has gone into the public arena into documentation form intimating he has documents pertaining to interviews he has conducted with witnesses, interviews he has conducted with members of the clergy. Detective Sergeant Little, his question email was to try to solve some of the issues that your client has created by confusing issues to a point beyond what I would consider to be acceptable from a senior officer --
Q. I see. So --
A. Just let me finish. I believe that the answers to the questions, if you read them, that Detective Sergeant Little asked, are little more an attempt to obfuscate the issue, to be honest. That's the only way I could put it, I believe that he was deliberately trying to muddy the waters to a point - he was asked simple questions. He didn't answer them. I don't think he was being cooperative at all.
Q. Where in the public pronouncements that you have identified in your earlier evidence of a few minutes ago has Detective Chief Inspector Fox indicated that he holds more documents or interviews?
A. In an email to me, is that - would that do?
Q. Which one is that?
A. It's the one on the 5th.
Q. Whereabouts is document so we can all follow it?
A. It is annexure - sorry, it's page 334-335.
Q. Sorry, page 334 , did you say?
A. 334-335.
Q. Yes. Where does that say that he holds more materials?
A. Sorry, I've got the wrong report.
Q. Can I ask you also about that particular email that you've identified at 335 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Where in that document is there an evident lack of enthusiasm?
A. Well, perhaps the - it is a reply to this particular comment:

Pete,
I know we spoke on the phone yesterday, but I've only just read the report you sent through --

Which is actually the report I was looking for --
the other day, and I just want to make sure that there's definitely no other statements, reports, diary entries or file notes etc that relate to either McAlinden or any concealment offences relating to [Father] Fletcher, [AJ], [AL], [AK], or Gogarty. Our investigation is just about to finality and I just want to ensure we haven't missed anything.
Q. Where do you say his reply demonstrates a lack of enthusiasm?
A. I would think that that simply is a "Yes" or "No" answer. "Yes, I have more and this is what I have"; or "No, I do not."
Q. So answering in a more detail than a "Yes" or "No" answer is a lack of enthusiasm, is it?
A. Mr Cohen, there is no detail in that. It is nothing more than a diatribe.
Q. The reference to the report referred to you by just a moment ago --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is the report he provided to you after you said you hadn't received it, wasn't it?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that you hadn't read it?
A. No. I said I hadn't read - I said I hadn't read the report he was referring to.
Q. But you had, hadn't you?
A. No.
Q. You'd read it at the time you reviewed the holdings in Lantle when you got into the job, hadn't you, in March 2011?
A. I had read a report. I had a report, absolutely.
Q. What you are doing is trying to set up a straw man to knock it over, accuse someone of infractions which just are fantasies to blacken their reputation?
A. Sorry, you've lost me there.
Q. It is a straightforward question. Aren't you setting up a straw man to knock it over; that is, you are accusing Fox of doing things he hasn't done --
A. No.
Q. -- to blacken his reputation amongst people in the NSW Police Force?
A. No. Not, not at all.
Q. The fact that you can't find any reference to withheld documents in the email that you could took me to or that there is a lack no enthusiasm is for that very reason, isn't it, because you're looking for reasons to make him look bad, aren't you?
A. No. I'm just trying to find - (witness reads document).
Q. The document which you said you didn't read is the document that's in your bundle, your annexure G, at page 371, isn't it? Is that right?
A. I'm looking for the one where he refers to - yes, sorry, that one will do.
Q. Are there others?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. So there are others that you say you didn't read; is that right? Am I understanding you correctly?
A. Sorry, that I didn't read?
Q. Well, you should listen carefully --
A. Sorry, I've lost track of the question. I thought you were asking me about where the particular instances are that he'd said things regarding - you know, the enthusiasm side of things, so I've lost track of what we're talking about.
Q. So the document at 371 through to 376 , exhibits a lack of enthusiasm, does it?
A. I don't have - mine stops at 371.
Q. I'm sorry, I beg your pardon.
A. Mine stops at 371 .
Q. Look behind the red folder that divides them. It possibly runs on past that.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have it?
A. Yes, I do. The red thing?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Is the succeeding number of the pages you're looking for behind that red divider in that bundle?
A. Well, you mean this side of it?
Q. Yes.
A. 311 to 345 .
Q. Let's approach it this way. Do you have pages 372 and following in that bundle you have with you in the witness box?
A. Mine stops at 371 , Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I apologise to you. I didn't realise that.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, it appears something must have become detached. I asked some questions about 371 this morning.

MR COHEN: Q. Detective, is that what's happened? It appears to have fallen out.

MS LONERGAN: Do you want me to re-collate it for you. -. THE WITNESS: No, I'11 get there.

MR COHEN: Q. If you're going to do it, so it is clear, would you look for, apart from pages 371, pages 372 to 376 inclusive? You have got those now?
A. No. 376 .

MS LONERGAN: We have a copy that's securely clipped for the benefit of the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MR COHEN: Q. Those clips are treacherous and that's what's happened to you. I am sorry if you've not been embarrassed in the witness box. That was certainly not my intention.
A. No, I've been embarrassed in a lot worse situations than - 371. Sorry, Mr Cohen, as I said, I actually thought we were still addressing the enthusiasm thing. That was one of the thing - he intimates there. Are we dealing with that or not, sorry?
Q. No, we're not. I want to ask you this question. That document, the first question you answered because you recognised the front page --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the one that you said you hadn't read, but you had, hadn't you?
A. No, I never said I never read that.
Q. You read it when you read the holdings --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in Lantle at the time you came into the meeting?
A. Absolutely.

MR ROSER: I object to that question. This witness has said on numerous occasions, both in chief and in cross-examination, that he read that particular document back in 2010.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's right, isn't it, Mr Cohen?
MR ROSER: So the proposition that is put by my learned
friend is incorrect.
MR COHEN: He said to Detective Chief Inspector Fox he hadn't seen it. That's what I was exploring.

MS LONERGAN: I object. There's an assumption there that hasn't been explained.

MR COHEN: I withdraw the question. Let me withdraw it so there's no difficulty. I'11 put it this way.
Q. That document in totality that you have in the witness box --
A. Yes.
Q. -- what about that document from 371 to 376 discloses a lack of enthusiasm?
A. I think it went back to documentation, didn't it? He said he interviewed --

MS LONERGAN: The witness probably should be given five, at least, uninterrupted minutes to read that without pressure. It is a long document and questions are being asked about the merits and inclusions in it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: I'm happy with that. Could you kindly read it detective inspector?
A. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Wi11 I take a short adjournment?
MS LONERGAN: If you would, thank you.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MR COHEN: Q. You've read the document?
A. I have.
Q. What in that document discloses a lack of enthusiasm on the part of Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. No, I'm sorry, I was incorrect. That is not the correct document.
Q. You still have the second volume of the bundle in the witness box with you, part of your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I ask you to go in it to the documents behind tab 98.
A. That's where we are, yes.
Q. Very well. That's your investigator's note of 14 April?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you go forward in it to page 448. You identify in the last full paragraph about three-quarters of the way down the page, where it starts off, "Although my knowledge"; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You record there:

Although my knowledge, at this time, is very limited ...
A. Yes.
Q. That is as at 14 April. You, nonetheless, go on to express an opinion, just from the conversation with Ms McCarthy, that someone is leaking within the organisation.
A. Yes .
Q. You go on to identify that as DCI Fox, don't you?
A. And I believe DSC McLeod.
Q. You then identify, "Without any prior knowledge of" what you identify as a relationship with Ms McCarthy, "I can only speculate as to why this would be the case"?
A. Yes.
Q. That's all this was. It was just pure base speculation, wasn't it?
A. No, it is my opinion, Mr Cohen.
Q. But it was just speculation, wasn't it?
A. Well, if it was speculation, it was a pretty almost what would you say? - psychic speculation because it turned out to be 100 per cent correct.
Q. You call it speculation in your own document, don't
you?
THE COMMISSIONER: That's not quite fair, Mr Cohen. The reason for the leak is the area for speculation. The reason that has been --

MR COHEN: I'm sorry.
Q. Would you go forward to page 449. You record there, presumably as your opinion:

It is difficult to say why DCI Fox would wish to be in charge of this investigation given that most experienced investigators would quickly identify it as one which would fall into the category of 'undesirable'.
A. Yes.
Q. What does "undesirable" mean --
A. It means they wouldn't want to do it.
Q. -- in the context of investigating child sexual abuse?
A. You might find this difficult to believe but it's got nothing to do with child abuse. Most detectives like to win matters and unfortunately our record in relation to those particular type of matters is not great, for one reason or another. It is just the way the law is. In saying that, that doesn't indicate any - that they won't do a 100 per cent satisfactory job. It just indicates that there are no - I'm sure if you asked Paul Gallen last night was he enthusiastic about running smack into the Queensland pack of forwards, he would probably say no, but it doesn't mean he didn't do it. So that's - yeah, absolutely, I would suggest to you that it would fall into the category of undesirable.
Q. Does that betray a position where you only want the easy briefs of evidence?
A. I don't even think it reflects whether it is easy or difficult. It just says "undesirable".
Q. "Undesirable" is a very definite word, isn't it?
A. It is; it is undesirable.
Q. It is undesirable because it's --
A. It doesn't say it's undesirable because it's difficult. You put it to me that it was difficult. I didn't say that. I said it's undesirable.
Q. Isn't that because it's difficult?
A. No, not necessarily. Mr Cohen --
Q. Please, wait for the question.
A. It's an answer to your question. Most detectives find child sexual abuse rather unsavoury. I'm sorry if that offends you but it is the truth. They find it - most of them are married men with children and they find it particularly abhorrent. I don't think it's unfair to say that if it could be - if they could avoid doing them they probably would, but the fact of the matter is we do them because we have to because the victims need someone to stand up and represent them. The fact that it's undesirable is no reflection at all on how they perform their duty. They do them to 100 per cent to their ability, or I believe most of them do at any rate.
Q. You go on to say --
A. May I just further add to that?
Q. Please --
A. No, I'm not finished yet. May I further add to that, that you may be the most enthusiastic person in the world and absolutely make an abysmal job of an investigation. Enthusiasm is only one of the many, many, many aspects that make up a good investigation. I mean, even you alluded to the fact of experience. I could probably get an A-lister straight out of the academy and give them a job, this particular job, and they'd have been enthusiastic with it, but I don't necessarily think that they would have produced the brief of evidence that Detective Sergeant Little did with his experience. So enthusiasm, I'm quite happy to acknowledge that that is one of the areas that make up a good investigation but it is not the only one.
Q. You go on to say:

Given the problematic nature of historic sexual assault investigations involving the Catholic Church, there is a better than average chance the investigation will attract adverse comments from the media.
A. Yes.
Q. That was at the time the primary concern in the Newcastle LAC, wasn't it, avoiding adverse comments from the media?
A. No.
Q. That's a principal issue you're identifying for the consideration of Assistant Commissioner York, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. No? Then why did you say it?
A. Well, detective - the then, sorry, Acting Commander Humphrey requested I make a file note. I didn't know what he was going to do with it. That's a file note to Acting Commander Humphrey. It has nothing to do with Assistant Commissioner York, which is what you asked me.
Q. You knew it was going to Assistant Commissioner York? A. No, I did not.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I apprehend there may be a confusion about documents here. This was appended to a report that ultimately went to Ma'am York at the end of 2012, but there's no evidence in the investigator's note that it was in fact intended for Ma'am York.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, quite so, Ms Lonergan.
MR COHEN: Q. But it was intended for the record, wasn't it?
A. I was asked to make a record of it, so I would presume it was intended for the record.
Q. It is entirely likely that senior officers in the command would see what you're expressing as your opinion? A. Absolutely - and the senior officer in the command did.
Q. The issue that you're identifying is the one that was of principal concern to the command, wasn't it, avoiding further media scrutiny?
A. I think I - actually, I think I indicate a number of issues within that --
Q. I'm not suggesting otherwise. My question was the principal concern in the command was avoiding media
scrutiny, wasn't it?
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, that is the third time that proposition has been put. Mr Cohen is making noises and saying, "Oh, please", but the reality is this witness doesn't need to be asked the same question over and over and over again.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. Mr Parker, I think that's not the first of the issues that you address as concerns in that paragraph, is it? A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you.
MR COHEN: My question, Commissioner, was that it was the principal one and I asked that question once.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Is that the case, Mr Parker? Let's put it to bed now.
A. I wouldn't like to point to any particular - as to what was Acting Commander Humphrey's principal issue, if I was to ask what my principal issue was in relation to this, certainly, as the person that had managerial carriage over Strike Force Lantle, my primary issue with this was who was leaking information and what they were leaking. You know, there's an obvious inference, that if certain things are getting out then the question would be - and it later proved correct - what other information that shouldn't have been getting out was getting out?

MR COHEN: Commissioner, I think I've got to the point where I would ordinarily go on to annexures $H$ and $I$.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I understand.
MR COHEN: On that footing, might I indicate that I have not concluded my cross-examination. Might I reserve it to the appropriate time?

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course; I understand; thank you.
MR COHEN: I am indebted to you, Commissioner.
MS LONERGAN: I think before Mr Saidi, or whoever is going next, questions this witness, there's a matter that's been
drawn to my attention by Ms Sullivan that I should have asked some questions of Detective Inspector Parker. With leave, may I deal with that subject matter?

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

MS LONERGAN: Q. At page 393 of your statement - can you just close up that volume of material that you have in front of you and go back to your statement.
A. That will make life a bit easier.
Q. That one in front of you, Detective Inspector Parker, to your left, there's a clipped version of the statement: they are all together.
A. Yes.
Q. We might work with that one, if it's all right.
A. Yes.
Q. That's not the complete one. Could you turn to page 393, please?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that's a newspaper article from the Newcastle Herald?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see in the far right column there's a bullet point and a comment regarding the transfer of the McAlinden case between police commands? Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And a comment about the officer now managing the case. Then under that there's the paragraph I want to ask you about. It is the result of an interview with you; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it correctly and accurately reports what you said to Ms McCarthy?
A. Yes.
Q. What it says is that you'd made a concession that there had been problems, but you said the matter will be fully investigated and any matters of criminality arising
will be prosecuted. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. "I will use whatever resources I need"?
A. Yes. My recollection of the conversation is that that didn't immediately follow, but yes.
Q. Those two comments?
A. They were two comments, absolutely.
Q. You made both those comments?
A. Yes.
Q. That was against the background of the matter taking a slow course because members from the initial strike force took stress and sick leave in December 2010. I just want you to look at the paragraph above the one you've just read.
A. The transfer part? That bit?
Q. Yes, just that paragraph.
A. Yes. (Witness reads document). Yes.
Q. Does that correctly reflect why the matter had a bit of a slow start?
A. I'd have to say yes. It is not an ideal situation when you lose basically your entire investigative team.
Q. You were content to concede to Ms McCarthy that the matter had had problems?
A. Well, that's patently obvious, I would have thought.

MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Mr Irving?
<EXAMINATION BY MR IRVING:
MR IRVING: Q. Detective Inspector Parker, this was a slightly unusual matter that came from a journalist, in the first instance?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And that journalist had significant contacts with a significant number of your witnesses?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's quite unusual?
A. Yes.
Q. You would concede that Ms McCarthy also had significant contacts with persons within the Roman Catholic Church?
A. Yes.
Q. And so she had a great number of sources of information?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I take you to your investigator's note when she rang you on 8 April. If I could put a gloss on it, it is fairly clear in that conversation that she was providing you with information?
A. Yes.
Q. You may have known some of it, but she was giving you the lay of the land as she saw it?
A. Yes.
Q. And then subsequent to that conversation, you've given evidence she provided you with an email in July?
A. Yes.
Q. I won't go into the content of it, but it was of assistance; is that correct?
A. Sorry?
Q. It was of assistance?
A. Yes.
Q. The information flow was not from the police to Ms McCarthy; it was from Ms McCarthy to the police?
A. When I took over the investigation, yes.
Q. Could I take you to the second paragraph of your investigator's note.
A. Hang on, I'm not sure that I have it any more.
Q. Page 524, tab 111.
A. Could I have access to the - is that where it is?
Q. Yes, it would be. It is volume 2, my apologies.
A. I don't think it's in my statement, that's all.

Is it?

MS LONERGAN: It is the same investigator's note, I believe, attached to the witness's statement at page 395.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you.
MR IRVING: Q. You would agree that in that conversation Ms McCarthy said to you, "I'm going to publish an article"? A. Yes.
Q. She subsequently did and you've been taken to that article?
A. Yes.
Q. In respect of the supply of material to you in July, she didn't publish anything in respect of either the material or the fact that she'd even given it to you, had she?
A. No.
Q. In fact, after April of 2011, would you agree that she, in fact, didn't publish anything about Lantle at all? I might rephrase that. She didn't publish anything critical of Lantle?
A. Yes, I think that's probably correct.
Q. I'11 just take you to the second paragraph of your investigator's note in light of those circumstances. Starting on the second line, "In an attempt", to the end of the sentence, that's an inference that you've drawn --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from that conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you now concede, in light of your actual
dealings over 2011, that that inference was incorrect?
A. No. Probably the best way I can put it for you is, look, Ms McCarthy - Ms McCarthy was - I don't really know how to term it - possibly conflicted in this; that's my opinion. She - her motives to me were very transparent and very honourable.
Q. Thank you.
A. But she was also servicing her occupation as well, so I was always very careful what I said to Ms McCarthy. She's a very good journalist and I was very careful in my
dealings with her. However, yes, I think - the impression I got when I dealt with her was that she was more than happy to deal with me in the way I wanted to deal with her, but she always was also happy to have a little bit of a poke and see whether I would give her any more than I was prepare to. Does that sort of balance --
Q. She was doing her job?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Thank you. Detective inspector, did the thought ever occur to anyone associated with you in Lantle or the police, if there was a perception that the reporting might have been causing problems, to request that certain issues not be reported?
A. After I took over, you're pretty right, we didn't have too many more problems with her doing that, so I wouldn't comment. You'd have to speak to one of the ones that had prior to me, because that's where the errors, the issues occurred.
Q. Prior to your taking over Lantle?
A. Yes.
Q. There are a few matters I would take you to from your investigator's note. Ms McCarthy is quite adamant she would not use the words "drop a bucket". Is use of that term a paraphrase by you of the general sentiment of what she was going to publish?
A. Where is that?
Q. If it is of any assistance --
A. I recall it being in there. I just can't see it right at the moment.
Q. Yes. It is 396 in your statement at paragraph --
A. 396. Paragraph?

MS LONERGAN: It is the last paragraph.
THE WITNESS: 396?
MR IRVING: That's what I'm told. I'm working on it --
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, in the last paragraph.
THE WITNESS: Yes. I haven't put it - and you'11 notice

I've put some things in brackets, or in inverted commas. It may have been a paraphrase.
Q. It may have been a paraphrase?
A. Yes. I wouldn't say it definitely was because Ms McCarthy can be fairly colourful when she like to be as well, but I wouldn't dispute that it is colourful.
Q. Can I say I've noticed that too, detective inspector. The other comment I would make, she instructs me that she didn't make a comment critical of any of the officers on the original Lantle. On my instruction, the comments made about the officers from the original Lantle was made by Mr Morrison and she stated to you that Mr Morrison said two of those officers would be no good at all. Now, if you're looking - it is at the top of the second page.
A. Yes. (Witness reads document). I was about to concede that but I notice that I have put both her barrister and her, so I'd have to - I'd have to go with what I've put there, I'm sorry, yes.
Q. That's all right. There is a suggestion in the investigator's note that she advanced the proposition that [AL] was her friend. You're going to ask me where it is, aren't you?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Could I take you to the third page of the investigator's note, the third paragraph down.
A. The third paragraph down. Yes.
Q. You may have been in court when Ms McCarthy gave evidence about what we might call a relationship she has with people and I think she described them as significant relationships but not necessarily friendships. Would you accept that that was the thrust of what she was saying? A. I'd put that particular word in inverted commas, but I would suggest to you that she said that at some point. What her relationship with [AL] I couldn't comment. You know, I don't know, to be honest.

MR IRVING: Thank you, Commissioner. .
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Irving. Mr Gyles, do you have any questions?

MR GYLES: I don't, thank you, Commissioner.

MR ROSER: I have no questions.
MS LONERGAN: I have no questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your evidence, Detective Inspector Parker. You're excused. Thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, it has been suggested that we call the next witness. It would be Inspector Dunn and Mr Kell will be taking the inspector's evidence.
<FAY DUNN, sworn:
[4.00pm]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:

MR KELL: Q. Would you please state your full name?
A. My name is Fay Dunn.
Q. You're an inspector of the NSW Police Force?
A. Correct.
Q. And you're presently attached to the Education and Training Command?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's located at Windsor in Sydney?
A. Yes, at Richmond.

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, could it be noted that I seek the same --

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi, that's understood.
MR KELL: Q. You have prepared a statement to the inquiry, with the assistance of your legal advisers, dated 20 June 2010?
A. I did.
Q. I am sorry, 2013. I'd just hand you a copy of the statement and a copy for the Commissioner. Is that your signature on page 5?
A. It is.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I tender that document.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell. The statement of Inspector Dunn of 20 June 2013 will be admitted and marked exhibit 41.

EXHIBIT \#41 STATEMENT OF INSPECTOR FAY DUNN DATED 20/6/2013
MR KELL: Q. Inspector, you were attested as a police officer in 1980?
A. Yes .
Q. And then in 1999 you were promoted to the rank of sergeant?
A. That's correct.
Q. At some point you joined the Forensic Services Group?
A. Yes.
Q. That is the division of police that deals with crime scene examinations, among other things?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. When did you join that division?
A. 2004 .
Q. In 2007 you were promoted to the rank of inspector?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was while you were attached to the FSG?
A. That's correct.
Q. And at FSG your initial duties were those of a training officer and you subsequently became a staff officer.
A. That's correct.
Q. You became the staff officer to Assistant Commissioner Carlene York when she headed up the FSG; is that correct? A. Yes, I did.
Q. In about February 2010 Assistant Commissioner York moved from the FSG to become region commander for the northern region?
A. I don't recall the exact date but

Assistant Commissioner York took up the position. I started there in February 2010. It could well have been the same time.
Q. You moved across from the FSG to become staff officer to Assistant Commissioner Carlene York when she was in the northern region command?
A. That's correct.
Q. You held that position as staff officer up until about December 2011 is that correct?
A. Yes, December 2011 I went on leave and I didn't return to that job after the end of the leave.
Q. And at that point in time you transferred to your present position?
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder if you can indicate in brief terms what are some of the principal duties as staff officer to the assistant commissioner when you were based in the northern region command?
A. Yes. As an assistant assisting managing her diary, her commitments, for meetings with various people; to obtain information that she would need for any particular issue which may arise; to act as a liaison in relation to her and her direct reports, to provide information to the assistant commissioner from them if they weren't speaking with her directly; to manage her correspondence, or to oversight her correspondence is probably a better way to say it; and if she were or anyone in that role was not in the office at the time and I was there, to provide a customer service response for people who may call the office.
Q. Is it fair to say that you were a link in many instances between the assistant commissioner and local area command?
A. "A link" did you say?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. A conduit, if you like?
A. Yes.
Q. And that you would make requests to local area
commands on behalf of the assistant commissioner?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And you would obtain information and documents from local area commands to enable you to be in a position to report and assist with briefing reports to the assistant commissioner?
A. It would be the briefing report I obtained. The briefing report would come from a command and then I would provide it to the assistant commissioner.
Q. Was part of your role also from time to time dealing with requests from the media for information from the assistant commissioner?
A. Yes. What I would do is often I would receive the request and then convey that request to the assistant commissioner.
Q. Thank you. In your statement from about paragraph 17 onwards, you refer to having contact with Joanne McCarthy --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in 2010. She's a senior journalist at the Newcastle Herald?
A. Yes. Regretfully, I don't remember exactly when that was, but I did have a telephone conversation with Ms McCarthy.
Q. You indicate that that was on at least one occasion? A. Yes.
Q. It is possible, is it, that you had further discussions with Ms McCarthy?
A. I don't recall any more. I certainly recall one conversation. I don't recall any more.
Q. In terms of the timing of that conversation that you recall, are you able to assist as to when that was?
A. I have no independent record of it, but I think it was in October 2010.
Q. Could I ask you to turn to annexure $D$ of your statement.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that an email that you've received attaching a
situation report?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Does that assist you as to the timing of the
conversation that you recall having had with Ms McCarthy?
A. I would expect, looking at the document there, that

I had a conversation with Ms McCarthy and then requested
information on behalf of the region commander from Newcastle Local Area Command.
Q. The document itself, the email and the attached situation report are dated 12 October 2010. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Based on the date of that document, are you able to indicate as to whether it was on that day or some earlier day perhaps, in terms of timing, when you would have had the discussion with Joanne McCarthy?
A. My expectation is it would have been that day.
Q. It would have been the same day?
A. That's my expectation.
Q. Do you recall any of the terms or substance of that conversation?
A. From my recollection, Ms McCarthy was intending to publish an article in the paper within the next few days in relation to allegations of Catholic Church involvement in I think it was child abuse. I actually don't recall whether it was child abuse, it was some sort of abuse, and she was requesting a comment in relation to that from the region commander.
Q. As a consequence of that inquiry being made to you, to your knowledge were steps taken by the region office to obtain or request a situation report?
A. Yes. My normal - what I would normally do in that situation is contact the local area command and ask them for information to provide to the region commander.
Q. Would you just have a look on the bottom paragraph of that situation report that was sent to you. Do you see there's a reference under the heading "Further/Proposed Action"?
A. Yes.
Q. And you'11 see the first sentence says: Other relevant documentation is being collected from other Commands in respect of this matter.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection now about whether you were aware then as to what steps were being taken to obtain documentation to assist with the situation report that was being provided to you?
A. No, I'm not aware of any.
Q. Could I just ask you to have a look at paragraph 31 of your statement. You've got a heading there, "Search of the office of Detective Chief Inspector Peter Fox"?
A. Yes.
Q. You indicate under that that you've got no recollection one way or the other of being involved in the search of DCI Fox's office during October 2010?
A. I certainly had no involvement in any search.
Q. In saying you had no involvement in any search, you're indicating that you no physical involvement in attending the premises?
A. Correct.
Q. I just want to ask you this, whether the search of the office of a police officer for documents while he's on leave, whether or not that's a matter that you would be able to authorise personally in your position as a staff officer?
A. No, I had no authority to do that.
Q. Is that a matter that could be authorised by the assistant commissioner?
A. I would expect so, yes.
Q. Do you recall on any occasions relaying a request to any officer at the Newcastle Local Area Command that a search be undertaken --
A. No.
Q. -- of Detective Chief Inspector Fox's office?
A. No, I have no recollection of that at all.
Q. When you say you've got no recollection, have you got any recollection of having done it in any circumstances for any particular police officer?
A. No, no, none at all.
Q. Is that a matter that would be particularly unusual?
A. It would be unusual, yes, in my position, yes.
Q. And striking?
A. Yes. For me to say that?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. I have no authority to indicate - to suggest a search.
Q. Putting to one side the question of authority, in terms of you relaying to an officer from the local area command that a search should be undertaken of an officer's room, again, with authority from the assistant commissioner, is that something that would be particularly unusual?
A. Extremely unusual.
Q. Do you recall it ever having occurred in your time as a staff officer?
A. No, I don't recall any instance.
Q. And you're fairly confident that that's something you would recall had it occurred?
A. If I had conveyed that message?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. You indicate in those paragraphs that you're unable to say, based on your current recollection, one way or the another, as to whether you had any conversations with Acting Commander Wayne Humphrey in relation to the matter. This is in paragraph 31.
A. Is this referring to - yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. By that are you indicating that you've got no recollection now one way or another of speaking with

Acting Commander Wayne Humphrey in relation to the topic of whether there are any documents to be obtained from DCI Fox at all?
A. I have no recollection of that.
Q. Putting to one side the reference to any searching of an office, is it conceivable that you had a discussion with Acting Commander Humphrey in relation to the topic of obtaining a file or documents from DCI Fox?
A. It is entirely possible he may have mentioned it.
Q. Thank you, inspector.
A. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Inspector Dunn, the issue of the file that has been mentioned in evidence, the request, you didn't grant it; is that your evidence?
A. Sorry, the file that's referred to in the sit-rep?
Q. Yes.
A. I'm sorry, could you ask that question again?
Q. The file that was sought from you and suggested by Acting Superintendent Humphrey was not raised by you; is that so?
A. Correct.
Q. And that was a matter that would be something in these circumstances that you'd recall had you raised it?
A. I'd expect I would have, yes. I had no - my request
to the acting commander at the time was to get information to provide to the region commander. What information that entailed would really be at the discretion of the commander.
Q. If it had involved searching for a ministerial file under a so-called green, you would have recalled that, I take it?
A. I'm sorry, Mr Cohen?
Q. If the request had involved seeking out a ministerial file under a so-called green, I take it you would recall it if it occurred that way?
A. If I requested it?
Q. Yes.
A. I'm not quite sure I understand what you're after.
Q. You didn't seek a ministerial file under a green?
A. No. No. I think it's called a pink.
Q. I beg your pardon, I'm so sorry, I do apologise. I'm sure the colour coding is very clear if you're on the inside of the police force. I apologise if I've got it wrong.
A. Yes .
Q. You also gave evidence about the unusual circumstances of a search in the context of your evidence a few minutes ago and I think the word you adopted from my learned friend was that it was a situation that was striking; is that right? Did I understand your evidence correctly?
A. What was the question?
Q. The circumstances in which there was to be a search of an office was so unusual as to be striking. Was that your evidence?
A. Not the search of the office; my request to search an office.
Q. I see - and something that you had never ever done?
A. I don't ever recall requesting anyone to search an office.
Q. Certainly not on this occasion?
A. I don't recall it, no.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Cohen.
Mr Irving?
MR IRVING: No, thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi?
MR SAIDI: I just want to find a passage, if I may, Commissioner.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1570, line 47 , to

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. Do you have your statement there in front of you?
A. I do, Mr Saidi.
Q. Would you go to annexure C, if you don't mind?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that that refers to an email from Wayne Humphrey to, amongst other people, yourself?
A. I was a cc, yes.
Q. Could I take you to the second paragraph commencing, "Detective Chief Inspector Fox has initiated"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see reference there to the file that originated at State Crime Command was sent to Central Hunter and then ultimately to DCI Fox?
A. Yes.
Q. The next sentence is what I want you to pay attention to:

That file and any associated documentation should be collected and hand delivered to Detective A/Inspector Quinn, Crime Manager Newcastle City LAC as soon as possible.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. That email refers to various dates, specifically 13 October 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any independent recollection one way or the other of having received that email from Mr Humphrey?
A. I don't have any independent recollection of it.

I have a copy of that - I had a copy of that in my records.
Q. I take it from that that you've got no independent recollection of having discussed the issue of the collection of a file with Mr Humphrey?
A. That's correct, Mr Saidi.
Q. Or indeed you have no recollection of having discussed that file being collected with anyone else, that is, any independent recollection; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. By having no independent recollection, so it be clear, you have no recollection one way or the other whether you discussed the collection of a file with Mr Humphrey or anyone else at that time?
A. That's correct.

MR SAIDI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi. Is there anything arising, Mr Kell?

MR KELL: No, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Q. Inspector, thank you very much for your evidence. You are excused.
A. Thanks very much.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner. We ask that you adjourn and we ask that we're able to resume at nine in the morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, we will resume at nine in the morning. Thank you.

AT 4.20PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO FRIDAY, 28 JUNE 2013 AT 9AM
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