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MS LONERGAN: I call Superintendent John Henry Gralton.
<JOHN HENRY GRALTON, sworn:
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:
MR SAIDI: Commissioner, could it be noted the same situation applies for this witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Saidi. That has been noted on the record.

MS LONERGAN: Q. Your full name is John Henry Gralton?
A. That's correct.
Q. You prepared a statement with the assistance of your lawyers in February this year, dated 15 February 2013?
A. I did.
Q. I'11 just hand a copy of that up for you and one for the Commissioner. Could I ask you to have a look at that statement. Bear in mind that there have been some redactions of that statement, including the removal of exhibits $C$ and $D$ related to matters of public interest immunity in relation to other police investigations and potential criminal matters. Excluding the removal of paragraphs relating to exhibit $C$ and $D$, is that statement and true and correct?
A. It is.
Q. Can I draw your attention to one date in paragraph 30, the third last line of that paragraph on page 5 of your statement.
A. Yes.
Q. You will see there the date in relation to an investigator's note. You say it is dated 3 December 2010. A. It looks like a typo.
Q. But I'11 just draw your attention to page 14 of your statement. Do you see that's a signature bar or ending to the investigator's note and it is dated 3 December 2010 ? A. Correct.
Q. Just for clarity, you're referring to that date as opposed to the date of the meeting?
A. I'm referring to the investigator's note.
Q. The investigator's note date?
A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender that statement.
EXHIBIT \#42 STATEMENT OF JOHN HENRY GRALTON, DATED 15/2/2013

MS LONERGAN: Q. You were attested a police officer in June 1988?
A. Correct.
Q. You worked in general duties for your first seven years?
A. That's right.
Q. Most of your work was general duties including some intelligence and plainclothes work?
A. That's right.
Q. You took up a position with the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence in Canberra for a secondment period of three years?
A. It was actually four years.
Q. Four years, thank you. During that time, you gained experience in the collection of intelligence relating to criminal activity?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you actually were promoted or took up a position of research intelligence coordinator for the Hunter region in 1999?
A. That's right.
Q. You did that for a couple of years as well?
A. I did.
Q. You did some human resources management for approximately a year --
A. That's right.
Q. -- again, in the Hunter region? Then in 2002, you took over the role of operations manager for the northern region and worked in that position for five and a half years?
A. That's right.
Q. In 2007, you were promoted local area commander for the Hunter Valley?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Later, in 2008, you became a commander of the Central Hunter Local Area Command?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Are you aware that the matters about which we're here discussing, police decision-making processes, concern main1y 2010 and 2011 and, to an extent, 2012 in terms of your involvement?
A. That's right.
Q. As at December 2010, what was your position in relation to the Hunter area or the Newcastle Local Area Command activities?
A. I was the commander of Central Hunter Local Area Command situated at Maitland.
Q. At the time of the meeting, that a lot of evidence has been heard about in these proceedings took place in December 2010, did you have any particular supervisory role or management role in relation to that investigation and the decisions made about it in and around December 2010?
A. No, I did not.
Q. The position is that you found out information about that at a later point in time, which we'11 come to?
A. That's correct.
Q. In your statement in paragraph 15, you outline in broad terms the role of the commander and you draw a parallel or a line explaining the relationship of the commander to the level of crime manager. Just in broad terms, could you outline the role of crime manager?
A. In very broad terms, the role of the crime manager is to oversight major investigations in a command, to look at the crime prevention strategies for volume crime, in some cases to act as a staff officer to the commander with respect to correspondence and other matters in the running of the local area command.
Q. You make the point in paragraph 15 that Newcastle

Local Area Command has, in fact, two senior officers who split the functions of crime manager. Are you able to say at what time that splitting of that role came into play? A. I don't know the exact date, but it was certainly in play when I arrived at Newcastle on 3 May 2011.
Q. And you're not able to say how many months or years before that?
A. I think it was earlier that year.
Q. Earlier in 2011?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. The reason for that was what, as you understand it?
A. As I understand it, Newcastle is the largest local area command in the state in terms of the number of staff and it is a very complex environment.
Q. Yes.
A. The role of crime manager for one person in that command is significant, so that the role was split into two to divide some of the workload. One side of the house - in fact, Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey - looked after the special operations group, the crime management unit, the proactive strategies to reduce volume crime, among other things; and on the other side of the house, Detective Inspector Parker looked after the oversight of major investigations, detectives and drug unit.
Q. You understand that was the position in terms of Newcastle Local Area Command from early in 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of those two officers sharing that role?
A. Yes.
Q. But that wasn't the position prior to early 2011?
A. I don't think so.
Q. In your statement - and it is fine for you to have a look at it - in paragraph 19 you talk about becoming aware of a particular meeting taking place about Strike Force Lantle. Can we take it that that was some time later than when the meeting took place?
A. Yes. I became aware of that much later.
Q. Have a look at paragraph 21 of your statement. My
question to you about paragraph 21 is: you mentioned you first became aware of Strike Force Lantle in around May 2011. Are you able to say whether you became aware of the meeting on 2 December having taken place at or around the time and the events you're talking about in paragraph 21 of your statement?
A. No, to be honest with you, I don't think I was aware of that meeting at that time. I became aware of Strike Force Lantle when I arrived at Newcastle soon after 3 May 2011.
Q. In paragraph 21, you refer to having attended a meeting involving Assistant Commissioner York and the two crime managers you've just referred to as well as Detective Sergeant Little?
A. That's right.
Q. You also outline the fact that the meeting provided an overview about the Lantle investigation and where it was up to?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that, up to that time, there had been some negative reports regarding the swiftness or otherwise with which the investigation was proceeding? A. Perhaps there may have been some in the newspapers, yes.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. At that meeting, was anything raised about any issue regarding Detective Chief Inspector Fox being involved or not involved in the investigation?
A. I don't think so. The meeting was essentially in regards to the progress of the investigation, where it was up to, were we satisfying the investigation plan, all of those sorts of things.
Q. As far as you are aware, from that briefing meeting, you understood that the investigation was proceeding and every effort was being made to ensure the investigation was being carried out thoroughly and professionally?
A. Absolutely.
Q. The next matter you raise in your statement is following paragraph 22 where you talk about a memo of

Detective Sergeant McKey dated 5 September $2010 ?$ A. Yes.
Q. That's annexure B to your statement. My question to you relates to your involvement in signing off on that document and its provision to Detective Inspector Fox -A. Yes.
Q. -- as the OIC. Can you just outline for the benefit of those in court what that memo is about and your particular role in allocation of it to Detective Inspector Fox at that time?
A. Certainly. It was correspondence received from the Commissioner's office in relation to a possible conspiracy to conceal crime by senior clergy of the Catholic Church. There was information outlined in there that Detective Inspector Fox was aware of and had previously investigated, I believe.
Q. Yes.
A. And there was a suggestion or a recommendation, sorry, that the attached correspondence be forwarded to Central Hunter LAC Detective Inspector Fox. He was no longer at Central Hunter and I forwarded the file to Port Stephens where he currently resided.
Q. Can we take from your evidence that you relied on the comment on page 1 by the author of the document, Detective Sergeant McKey, that Detective Inspector Fox, as he was at that time, may well know some information that would deal with the particular matter that had been raised?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the matter that had been raised was in the form of a ministerial complaint about whether or not certain things were being investigated, in short?
A. Yes, that's right. The actual attachment is not with the document. This is just the file itself.
Q. All right, but it's your understanding that it is related to matters that touched upon what Lantle ended up investigating?
A. Yes .
Q. And the usual procedure with these sorts of ministerial matters, is there a turnaround time within which a response needs to be received?
A. Sometimes in the ministerial itself, it will give a date when it's expected to be returned.
Q. Yes.
A. But there is no specific date or turnaround time that I'm aware of in relation to ministerials.
Q. In terms of general expectation, is there a turnaround time?
A. I would say as soon as possible.
Q. If the officer --
A. Or practicable, sorry.
Q. As soon as practicable?
A. As soon as practicable.
Q. You annotated this document to the effect:

Given this file relates to matters
specifically referred to Detective
Inspector Fox as the OIC, I am forwarding
the file to Port Stephens LAC where he is
currently attached for attention as
requested.
A. Correct.
Q. When you used the term "referred to Detective Chief Inspector Fox as the OIC" or - I'm sorry, "relates to matters specifically referred to Detective Chief Inspector Fox as the OIC", were you denoting there that you wanted Detective Chief Inspector Fox to carry out an investigation as the OIC or were you referring to an historical matter? A. I would suggest that that's in relation to the recommendations and comments made in the file that he had previously - if I could just refresh my memory on the file itself.
Q. Yes.
A. Where it states that he was the informant for the charges against that priest --
... reported difficulties encountered
throughout the investigation ...
So he was the OIC of that investigation. I wasn't
suggesting that he should be the OIC at the future investigation. It is just saying that he may have information that could assist.
Q. A11 right. Was it your understanding of the ministerial issue that had been raised that answers to questions were required as opposed to this being an invitation or order or request to carry out a full, fresh investigation?
A. I was searching for information that might assist.
Q. In the usual course, if no response is received to a ministerial request sent in this way within a month, is there any action that would need to be taken by way of follow-up or pursuit of response, or what do you recall? A. It would depend on what was on the original file to say whether there had to be a response. If there was a date required then I suppose there would be an action initiated.
Q. If a file like this is referred to an officer who is about to go on leave for a month, what is the normal expectation in terms of that officer indicating whether he can and when he can complete the provision of the information requested?
A. Up to that - the responsibility of that officer, did you say?
Q. Yes. Does that particular officer have an obligation to refer to any persons who forwarded the matter to him that he will be unable or she will be unable to do anything on the matter for a month?
A. It would depend on the turnaround time provided, but an expectation, a reasonable expectation would be that they would inform perhaps their commander or some other person that was linked in with the file to say that there's going to be some delays.
Q. At that time, did you know Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Did I know him?
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know anything in particular about him in terms of that particular historical investigation that he had
done?
A. No.
Q. You made no judgment in terms of his appropriateness or otherwise to carry out other investigative steps?
A. No.
Q. Neither negative judgment nor a positive judgment you just had no judgment?
A. No. I was just forwarding on the file to meet the requirements of the ministerial.
Q. Did you, at any stage, make any request to anybody in the NSW Police Force to retrieve that ministerial file from Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. No.
Q. If you wouldn't mind turning to paragraph 27 of your statement. You there, in that paragraph, set out some information that came to your ear via a senior officer, Detective Inspector Parker, as well as Detective Sergeant Little, regarding the progress of the Lantle investigation as at 15 December 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recollect the circumstances in which this information came to your knowledge?
A. I do. That was around the time when certain investigative processes were occurring that I believe we can't talk about.
Q. All right. Those investigative processes related to annexure $C$ and $D$ which have been removed from your statement?
A. That's right.
Q. And they've been removed from your statement because they relate to confidential aspects of the investigation of Lantle?
A. That's right.
Q. But are you able to be prompted by looking at those annexures that, on that date, or around the date certain investigation steps were taken, you had a discussion with Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little? A. Yes.
Q. And they told you certain things regarding the progress of Lantle?
A. That's right.
Q. It included that there was some concern on their part that they hadn't got all the information that they should have from Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. You say in paragraph 27 that he was suggesting Detective Chief Inspector Fox was suggesting - that he had information within his possession and knowledge that only he could elicit that was relevant to Lantle?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Did Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little give you documents that supported that proposition?
A. No, there were no documents provided.
Q. Did they say what the basis of their belief was?
A. The basis of their belief?
Q. Yes.
A. The basis - they told me that any attempts that they'd made to retrieve additional information from Detective Chief Inspector Fox that would enhance the investigation or assist the investigation was not forthcoming. They had received some information, but it did nothing to further the investigation or was nothing fresh or new that they didn't already know or have at that point.
Q. Did they discuss at that time that there had been a meeting in December 2010 at which requests had been made to Detective Chief Inspector Fox to hand over information? A. I'm not sure if I was aware at that time or otherwise.
Q. Given your rank, was it usual for you to make a particular note about these types of discussions? You don't mention in your paragraph 27 that you did so?
A. No. No. I don't run a diary or a duty book. I use file notes on the computer or $I$ will use email systems or documents to track conversations or anything of that nature, but a conversation of that is just a day-to-day conversation that I would not record.
Q. Did you rely on those officers to pursue any further investigative steps to ensure and to secure any other
information they needed to complete the investigation? A. I was satisfied that they were doing everything their power to track down every piece of information that they could possibly find to assist Strike Force Lantle.
Q. You didn't see a need to formally note it in some sort of memorandum form?
A. I don't think I did at that time, no.
Q. If you had done that at that time, you would have searched out that document and annexed it to your statement?
A. Yes .
Q. A little further down in paragraph 27 , $I$ want to clarify the time at which this particular information came into your knowledge. First of all, you talk about 15 December and certain things having come to your knowledge. In the later part of paragraph 27, about two-thirds of the way down, you talk about being provided with a general briefing by Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little, that:.

## ... when attempts had been made ... to

obtain any documentation or information from [DCI] Fox, no such documentation or fresh information had been provided. I was also made aware that some of the information that [DCI] Fox asserted he had, had been information which was contained within "his head" as he had described, and had not been documented.

I want to suggest to you that information to the effect that DCI Fox had information in his head came to the knowledge of Parker and Little only in April 2012, that particular piece of assessment?
A. Sure.
Q. Would you accept that paragraph 27 of your statement is it actually talking about a number of exchanges with those officers?
A. Correct.
Q. To that extent, the later part of that paragraph may well be referring to conversations you had in April 2012 with those officers?
A. Yes, or even March, possibly March or earlier than March - somewhere between December and March, or April.
Q. All right. In March 2012, you say in paragraph 28 of your statement you first became aware of the meeting that had been held on 2 December 2010. Can I ask you this: up to the email you received from DCI Fox, had any officer conveyed to you - other than the material that we've just been going over from Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little, had any officer, any officer at all, conveyed to you a negative opinion regarding DCI Fox having kept back information that might be relevant to Lantle?
A. Before March?
Q. Before the email at the end of March 2012?
A. Yes, in and around December.
Q. All right.
A. There had been conversations that he had not provided or was saying that he had other information, but it wasn't forthcoming.
Q. And that's officers in addition to Detective Inspector Parker and Detective Sergeant Little?
A. I don't recall anybody else specifically.
Q. That was my question. It was related to other officers, not those particular two officers?
A. Okay.
Q. You've got no recollection of anybody else making comments to you to the effect that they suspected that Detective Chief Inspector Fox was keeping information back? A. Possibly Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, but I'm not sure on that.
Q. The email that you received from Detective Chief Inspector Fox, which is annexed to your statement at annexure $E$, were you surprised to receive that as one of the people copied in? I'm sorry, it was actually -A. It was fairly out of the blue.
Q. It is page 24 of your statement.
A. Yes, it was fairly out of the blue and to myself, Senior Sergeant Ian Mather with a CC to Carlene York and Craig Rae. I think Craig Rae may have been relieving as
the region commander around that time.
Q. Ma'am York was the --
A. Region commander.
Q. -- region commander. Who was Ian Mather?
A. Ian Mather was the - he is the operations resource coordinator, who sits under the operations manager, possibly relieving as ops manager at that time for northern region, but I couldn't say that to be certain.
Q. Your role in March 2012 was senior to Superintendent Mitchell, was it, or were you parallel rank?
A. Parallel rank. At that time, Superintendent Mitchell was on, I think, on a secondment to Melbourne and I had been brought in to Newcastle.
Q. So you were filling his --
A. So what date was that? It was March 2012.
Q. You were filling his previous role, in effect?
A. Yes. I was seconded from Central Hunter Local Area Command as the commander to Newcastle.
Q. Did you read this as some sort of complaint, an informal one perhaps, of DCI Fox feeling he was prevented from assisting another officer with her investigations?
A. I didn't see it as a complaint under part 8A of the Police Act, but I saw it as an inquiry from Detective Chief Inspector Fox regarding information that he wanted to exchange or a discussion he wanted to have with a Lake Macquarie detective, and I also saw it as him seeking clarification about the matters pertaining to the meeting on 2 December 2010.
Q. According to paragraph 31 of your statement, you then consulted with Assistant Commissioner York and you also obtained a copy of the investigator's note, and that's annexure A to your statement?
A. I did.
Q. Was that investigator's note available to you through accessing e@gle.i or did you need to actually seek a copy of it from a confidential holding, or how did you get that document?
A. It probably would have been accessible to me by e@gle.i, but I asked others to seek - to produce that for
me.
Q. And accessible to you under e@gle.i, even though a highly protected investigation, because of your seniority? A. Because I'm the commander at Newcastle, yes. I didn't check on e@gle.i; I asked others.
Q. Al1 right. Did you interview anybody who had been present at the meeting to ask them about what had happened at the meeting or did you just rely on the investigator's note?
A. I think I spoke to Detective Inspector Parker about the meeting.
Q. Yes?
A. And I spoke to Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey and I understand that he wasn't at the meeting, but he had relieved as the commander and also had been in an exchange with - sorry, when I say "an exchange", there would have been a handover between Superintendent Mitchell and Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, so he would have had, I would imagine, some knowledge of the meeting occurring.
Q. In paragraph 33, you make some comments regarding the purposes of your responses to the matters raised in Detective Chief Inspector Fox's emails and we'11 come to that document. In particular, in relation to subparagraph (d), you refer to your opinion that it was appropriate to leave in force any instruction or direction so that the investigation isn't compromised, the current investigation?
A. That's true.
Q. Is there any distinction between instruction or direction, in effect, when given by --
A. Superintendent Mitchell.
Q. -- Superintendent Mitchell in the context of a meeting with more junior officers?
A. No. I think I said a direction or an instruction because that was how it was informed to me as being that Mr Mitchell had asked for the documents to be handed over. He'd also asked that no-one speak to the media. Now, if that was an instruction or a direction, it's something that people should abide by.
Q. You appreciate, just looking at page 22 and 23 of your
response - I'm sorry, page 22 and 23 of your statement, which includes your response provided to Detective Chief Inspector Fox --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in relation to the question about, "Are all the directions given to me by Mr Mitchell still in force and, if so, for what period?"; you have said, "Yes until lifted the direction remains in place." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. There you hadn't made any distinction that it was an instruction or a direction; you'd just confirmed, hadn't you, that it was a direction and it remained in place? A. Well, Mr Fox's language to me was that he'd been directed.
Q. Yes.
A. I was satisfied that he had been asked for the documents, to not speak with the media. If he wants to accept that as a direction, I was happy --
Q. My question is that you actually used the term "direction". You don't make any distinctions that softens in any way that it was a direction?
A. Yes, okay. I'm happy with that.
Q. That's because it was in fact a direction and, in the context of the meeting, it was a direction given by a senior officer to a more junior officer that was expected to be followed?
A. Yes, I wasn't at the meeting, I make that clear, but it would appear to be - if a junior officer is asked by a senior office to do something, then that is an instruction or a direction or a request and it should be abided by --
Q. All right.
A. -- if it's reasonable.
Q. Yes. You didn't cavil with the term "direction" based on what you had found out about the meeting because you understood it to be a matter which needed to be followed? A. Absolutely.
Q. And you expected that that would stay in place until another order from an appropriate senior officer removing that direction?
A. That is correct.
Q. One of the things that Detective Chief Inspector Fox raised in his initial email - just have a look at page 24 of your statement. Do you see what Detective Chief Inspector Fox asserts was that the direction or one of the directions from Superintendent Mitchell was, in addition to surrendering all the documentation he had including victim statements.
... to cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations or dealing with victims.

Just focusing on that part, did you make inquiries as to whether a direction to that effect - "cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations" - was a direction that was in fact made?
A. I satisfied myself that the directions given or the instructions given to Mr Fox pertained to the file note or the meeting note and the discussions I had with Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, that he was to hand over documents and he was to not speak with the media, like everybody else was instructed.
Q. The difficulty with that, with what you've just stated, is that Detective Chief Inspector Fox also seemed to be under the impression, or at least made the statement in his email to you on 26 March, that he'd also been told to, I'm sorry, directed "to cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations or dealings with victims." My question is: did you raise that matter, that assertion, with any persons present at the meeting to satisfy yourself whether a direction to that effect had --
A. No, I don't think I did.
Q. Al1 right.
A. Because my understanding of the direction or the instruction was not as given by Detective Chief Inspector Fox in this correspondence.
Q. But you don't say, do you, in your reply, "Well, look, Peter, I understand the direction didn't go that far and you weren't directed to cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations"?
A. No, I didn't because I'd satisfied myself, through discussions with other people, through the file note,
through discussions with even AC York. This was done over a couple of days I think, from my response. I had sent my response to Assistant Commissioner York too, to see that she was satisfied with the response, given the circumstances.
Q. Yes?
A. Communication with Detective Chief Inspector Fox at that time was difficult given a number of other matters that were around.
Q. We don't need to go into that.
A. So I kept it short and sweet, to use the vernacular, because I'd satisfied myself that the directions given were in fact appropriate, that they were limited to the couple of things that have been discussed and I did not see a need to go any further.
Q. On page 23, which contains your response, in the first response that you provide to question number 1, you, in effect, redirect Detective Chief Inspector Fox to Detective Inspector Parker?
A. Correct.
Q. Can we take it from that direction - I'm sorry, "direction" in terms of sending him in that way --
A. Re-direction, yes.
Q. -- that you took the view that it was prudent for any interface about these types of matters to be conducted by the senior officer oversighting Strike Force Lantle so that you did not tread on anybody's turf or say anything inappropriate in relation to the ongoing investigations with that?
A. Because Detective Inspector Parker was much better placed than I to provide any information and direct him as to the inquiries that he needed to make with Lake Macquarie, and I trusted Inspector Parker to do his job and to provide any guidance to Detective Chief Inspector Fox, in those circumstances.
Q. You say that in your email response:

He should be in a position to guide you in relation to who is best to respond?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you learn from any officer that there had in fact been a direction at the meeting on 2 December to Detective Chief Inspector Fox that he was to cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations?
A. No, not at all.
Q. So, to that extent, there seems to be a mistaken understanding on the part of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, based on what you know?
A. On what I know, yes.
Q. In point 2, numbered point 2 of Detective Chief Inspector Fox's email, he asks this question.

Are all the directions given to me by
Mr Mitchell still in force and if so for what period?

You reply.
Yes, until lifted the direction remains in place.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that your reply to question 2 doesn't apply the correctness of the directions as stated by Detective Chief Inspector Fox in his email to you?
A. I would agree with that, but I did not consider Mr Fox had been directed at any stage to cease any involvement with paedophilia investigations in the Catholic Church. I had satisfied myself that the directions given to Mr Fox or the instructions, or however we would like to term it, were based upon handing over any document to actually assist and progress the strike force and for - no-one that was at that meeting, including Mr Fox, was to speak to the media. It only served to damage any future investigations.
Q. Do you see how Detective Chief Inspector Fox may well have interpreted your response as being a confirmation that he had in fact been directed to cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations?
A. That's reasonable to say.
Q. That he may have reached that --
A. That he may have.
Q. Did you have any discussion with Detective Chief Inspector Fox yourself other than the email exchange? A. No, I did not.
Q. On page 7 of your statement, which is paragraph 33(e), you made some mention of an awareness - about halfway down paragraph (e) - that you were aware that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had not provided any such documentation to the Strike Force Lantle investigators. I think I should, in fairness, read the whole of paragraph (e) to you, or you read it to yourself, but it is referring to information that had been requested on a number of occasions that hadn't been provided to the officers working on Lantle? A. Yes.
Q. And that you thought that you should also, in your email, refer to the fact that if he had any such documentation, he should refer it on?
A. Yes.
Q. And you received a courteous response saying:

Mr Gralton, thanks for the response. I'71 contact Graeme ...
A. Yes.
Q. That's Graeme Parker, I take it?
A. Correct.
Q. You were satisfied that the lines of communication were open and if there was any other information, it would duly be provided?
A. Absolutely. From his response, I thought that he took no issue with anything that $I$ had put into the email in response to his clarification of the direction and all of those things. I thought he was satisfied with my response and he would contact Graeme to work out any issues there may have been in relation - and also I took that, having said, "I'm advised you were to provide documents that you had that relate to investigations that were underway at Newcastle. Could you please discuss that when speaking with Detective Inspector Parker", as being very clear that I wanted him to discuss any information that he had that might assist the strike force.
Q. In paragraph 34 under the heading "April 2012 enquiries of Detective Chief Inspector Fox", you discuss having viewed some email exchanges between Detective Chief Inspector Fox and Detective Sergeant Little --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and Detective Inspector Parker.
A. Yes.
Q. You say that you don't think you received those emails at the time of sending, but that you were included into the email chain on 10 April 2012?
A. That's right.
Q. And that email chain you annex as annexure $G$ to your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. As well, annexure $F$ concerns a series of questions that were posed by Detective Sergeant Little to try and clarify the position as to what other information Detective Chief Inspector Fox had?
A. Yes.
Q. You considered that to be an appropriate way to go about ensuring that all relevant matters that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had, had been incorporated into the investigation?
A. I thought it was particularly thorough in trying to elicit whatever other information he may have had or had espoused that he had.
Q. Were you forwarded the email trail by one of your officers or did you end up being copied into it by action taken by Detective Chief Inspector Fox and including you in the CC of those matters which appears on page 48 in an email he forwarded to Graeme Parker and others?
A. I see that there that Peter Fox has cc'd - no, Jeff Little has sent it to Peter Fox and cc'd Graeme Parker and John Gralton.
Q. I understand. So you were cc'd in by Detective Sergeant Little, not by Detective Chief Inspector Fox, as you understand?
A. I think so.
Q. The document on page 48 ?
A. As I understand it, yes.
Q. I see. Do we understand that from the "Jeff Little" above at the top of 48 ?
A. Yes:

Church Inquiry
Jeffrey Little.
To: Peter Fox ...
Cc: Graeme Parker, John Gralton.
Q. I understand. Were you having discussions with Detective Sergeant Little and/or Detective Inspector Parker around about that time as to finalising the Lantle investigation or was it in that context that you were included in these things?
A. Yes. Yes. And I think there was a specific discussion we had at the RAAF base Williamtown in relation to the matter still - that they understood he was still suggesting he had information and it wasn't forthcoming, and so they were trying to clarify and elicit whatever they possibly could.
Q. You've lost me with the RAAF base at Williamtown.
A. Sorry. I just recall a discussion $I$ had with both of those gentleman at the RAAF base at Williamtown, at a meeting, and it takes to that time period, sorry.
Q. That's all right. That's Apri1 2012, on your recollection?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Again, would you have taken notes of that particular discussion or not?
A. No, because I was satisfied it was all being addressed through this correspondence and through eegle.i. There was no need for me to take notes about that.
Q. All right. Annexures $H$ and $I$ deal with certain correspondence that was prepared after or in late 2012. I just want to ask you a few questions about that from a human resources and other point of view?
A. Sorry, I'11 just get that.
Q. It is page 8 of your statement which deals with it and pages 50, 51 and 52.
A. Yes.
Q. You state in paragraph 36 that you drafted a particular letter, which is annexure H, to be forwarded to Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
A. Yes.
Q. First of all, as you were the commander of --
A. Newcastle.
Q. -- Newcastle --
A. Yes.
Q. -- what's your relationship in terms of supervision or human resources manager vis-a-vis Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. I'm a senior officer to him, but I had no line command, if you like. He was at Port Stephens.
Q. So what 1 ed you to preparing the letter of 24

September 2012 directed to Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Okay. It is quite clear in the letter that I say
that:

> On Monday, 17 September 2012, the Newcastle Herald newspaper published an article alluding to you having explosive information concerning child sexual abuse by clergy. Specifically, the article quoted you as saying." There is a lot more going on there than anyone wants to admit. There is so much happening behind the scenes. $\ldots$ to simply say the police got it in hand is wrong. Early in the 2000s I linked a number of paedophile priests. I linked them in the Hunter Valley and I called on the Police Department to initiate a major inquiry. I've continued to make these calls of late and nothing has been done. As a senior officer supervising those officers who are Q. Anding carrying out the Lantle investigation, what is the effect of that kind of statement being made by a serving police officer in the public arena in terms of an investigation that's being worked on and or in stages of completion?
A. It is incredibly damaging. It asserts that police aren't doing anything in relation to this investigation. In fact, it couldn't be further from the truth.
Q. You knew that for a fact because you had --
A. I was very confident in Mr Parker; Detective Sergeant Little, who I described as a man of integrity, intelligent, hard working, and it's been shown through this Commission that the brief of evidence that he prepared was exceptionally good --
Q. You took the step of writing to Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Was the purpose of the letter to chide Detective Chief Inspector Fox or was it to determine if there were other pieces of information or evidence that he had that the Police Force didn't have?

MR COHEN: I object to the question. It is not clear that that letter was ever sent.

MS LONERGAN: I'm only asking about the purpose --
THE COMMISSIONER: It was about the purpose of the letter, Mr Cohen.

MS LONERGAN: I might have said "purpose in the letter".
THE COMMISSIONER: No, you didn't, Ms Lonergan; you said "purpose of the 1etter"

MS LONERGAN: I thought I said "preparing". Did I say "preparing the letter"?

THE COMMISSIONER: No; you said, "the purpose of the 1etter".

MS LONERGAN: The purpose of the letter, and I will clarify whether it was sent or not.

MR COHEN: Thank you.
MS LONERGAN: Q. The purpose of preparing the letter, was that to follow through whether Detective Chief Inspector Fox had any information of this nature?
A. Certainly it was and I say in the letter.

Whilst it is acknowledged that what is

> reported in the media is not necessarily entirely accurate, you will appreciate it is critically important that you provide any further information so that it can be properly assessed.

And then I go on to say:
Inquiries with Strike Force Lantle investigators reveal email correspondence took place between you and Detective Sergeant Jeff Little during Apri1 2012, concerning information you may have that would assist Strike Force Lantle or other police investigations.
Q. Was the letter sent?
A. No, the letter was not sent, but I was reliably
informed that the content of the letter was read to Mr Fox.
Q. And who read the content of the letter to Mr Fox?
A. Detective Inspector Kerrie Lewis, from our

Professional Standards Command.
Q. Can you explain why the content of the letter was read to him as opposed to the letter being sent to him, without going into detail as to any personal matters behind that?
A. Yes. I was informed by Detective Inspector Lewis that Mr Fox had said, "I've given them all of the information that they require."
Q. I'm going to stop you there. The question is a broader managerial type question.
A. Sorry.
Q. Why is it that the letter wasn't sent as opposed to a telephone conversation?
A. Because he was off sick and we were concerned for his welfare and we didn't want to exacerbate any issues with them.
Q. Police protocol, informal or formal, when an officer is off on sick leave, they are not to receive formal correspondence from the Police Force --
A. No.
Q. Is that the situation?
A. No, not necessarily. Given the circumstances in which he was off sick, I believe, and some other matters that we can't discuss in this forum, it was determined the best course of action not to send the letter based on - and then we went with a telephone call through --
Q. You determined that course of action with your HR background and experience or others did?
A. Yes, and also in consult with Assistant Commissioner Carlene York.
Q. I'm sorry, I did cut you off, but I was trying to clarify for those in court why things were gone about in this way. Moving down to specifics, you say you were told by Detective Inspector Kerrie Lewis that she had a telephone conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox? A. That's right.
Q. In annexure I, you have attached an email from Detective Inspector Kerrie Lewis from you?
A. I have, yes.
Q. She states that she had contacted Detective Chief Inspector Fox at your request and explained the content of the letter that you would like to send him via email and he has stated he does not want to receive it?
A. Yes.
Q. She then said Detective Chief Inspector Fox said to her:

You can tell John Gralton that I have already provided a vast amount of material in the past, they would be aware what that is and if they have misplaced or lost it, that is their problem.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you take that to be, in effect, a reply to the request for whether there was any further information to be provided?
A. I thought it was particularly unhelpful.
Q. And did you form the view that that meant that Detective Chief Inspector Fox wasn't maintaining a position that he had any other material that had not been provided
to the police at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you see that response as particularly unhelpful?
A. If it had been the case that we had lost or misplaced any files - and I'm sure it was not - but if it was the case, I would expect a detective chief inspector of the NSW Police to provide that information and say, "That's terrible if you lost it. Here it is again." But I don't think that was the case. I have nothing to confirm that would be the case. I was confident that Detective Sergeant Little had elicited everything that he possibly could and this was nothing more than somebody asserting that they had information that they didn't.
Q. Do you know if Detective Inspector Kerrie Lewis read the letter to Detective Chief Inspector Fox in a formal way? Her email doesn't say that she did. It says.

```
I explained the content of the letter ...
```

A. No, but I had a - I had a telephone call, I made a telephone call --
Q. To whom?
A. To Kerrie Lewis.
Q. Yes?
A. And I say to Assistant Commissioner York:

I spoke to Inspector Kerrie Lewis ...
Kerrie indicated Peter Fox was adamant that he had provided all that he knew previously and he did not want to receive anything else from me or anyone else for that matter. He added that he did not wish to speak or communicate with anyone from within the [NSW Police Force] regarding any complaint matter either as a subject ...
Q. Stop there.
A. I won't go there:

Kerrie explained the content of the letter and told him it was not ... [just] an investigative issue (as per details in the

```
7etter). She said that he appeared
```

quite ...
Q. Don't worry about reading that out.
A. Okay.
Q. You are unable to confirm whether Detective Inspector Kerrie Lewis read the letter out, but your understanding was that she gave him notice of the contents of the letter? A. Yes, and my recollection is that $I$ was fairly firm in saying to Detective Inspector Lewis that he really needed to understand what it was about.
Q. You interpret the phone call and the note you have made of it that you forwarded to Ma'am York on 24 September that it appears that Detective Chief Inspector Fox understood that it was about providing information and providing all that he knew about the matter?
A. Yes .
Q. I just want to confirm, in terms of your email on 30 March 2012 that we were looking at previously, you said you didn't speak to Detective Chief Inspector Fox about the email. Did you take any other steps to disavow Fox as to what appears in his email to perhaps have been a misunderstanding of a direction to the effect that he's not to investigate any matters related to church paedophilia or talk to any victims?
A. I don't think I had any other discussions.
Q. Did you understand that the origin of the email that Detective Chief Inspector Fox sent to you was his assertion that he'd been asked by another officer who was working on a church paedophilia investigation for some information? A. Yes .
Q. Did you not see that that reinforced the position or perhaps the misunderstanding that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had that he couldn't talk to another officer about church paedophilia and that led to his email?
A. I directed - I'm a little bit confused there, I think, but I directed him to Detective Inspector Parker, who was best placed, so that he could share information for the benefit of the strike force. There was no suggestion whatsoever that he couldn't continue to investigate, share information, help progress the investigation.

MS LONERGAN: Those are my questions.
MR COHEN: Before I commence could I have a quick discussion with my learned friend? I want to ask her something.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.
(Mr Cohen and Ms Lonergan confer)
THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have any questions, Mr Irving?
MR IRVING: I do, Commissioner, and I'11 be very brief.
MR COHEN: I am happy to yield to Mr Irving.
<EXAMINATION BY MR IRVING:
MR IRVING: Q. You're aware Ms McCarthy submitted a complaint to the PIC in April 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. And that complaint was resolved on the basis that remedial action had been taken, so there was no need for the complaint to be progressed?
A. The complaint was declined on the basis that Strike Force Lantle was progressing successfully, as we saw, and was progressing and did not - that the elements of the complaint that she'd made were being addressed.
Q. I think that your letter - I don't know if you've got a copy of it, but I can provide it to you --
A. I don't have it here.
Q. It uses the phrase:

Action is currently being taken to remedy the subject matter of the complaint.

Do you want to see a copy of that?
A. Sure.
(Mr Irving and Ms Lonergan confer)
MS LONERGAN: My learned friend Mr Irving has just handed me a particular letter that he would like to put to this witness. It comprises exhibit 30 . Could exhibit 30 be
passed down to Mr Irving and he can turn up that letter.
MR IRVING: My apologies. I didn't realise it was in that document. (Document shown to witness).
Q. This is a letter of yours dated 21 June 2011. Could I take you to the second paragraph.
A. Yes.
Q. Your exact words were:

Action is currently being taken to remedy the subject matter of the complaint.
A. Can I just have a quick read, please?
Q. Certainly.
A. I might just take myself to the subject matter of the complaint, if you don't mind.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I don't wish to interrupt, Mr Irving, but that document, as well as another document that Mr Cohen wishes the Commission to tender, need to be read by Superintendent Gralton in an unhurried fashion. Given Mr Cohen has just raised with me that he wants this particular document tendered - it is the description of the crime manager position - I should, as counsel assisting ask him some questions about the document. Can I propose a 10-minute break to allow the witness to read those documents.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course. Thank you Inspector Gralton.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, two additional documents have been raised with me, hence the adjournment, to allow the witness to have time to read the documents and also to allow me to consider whether there was a need for me to examine on them.

Could I note, for the record, that it would be very helpful if parties present at the Bar table could give me a little more notice than 30 seconds about documents they wish to go into evidence and then there can be appropriate arrangements to either lead evidence in relation to them or
to tender the documents at the appropriate time.
It may be easier if Mr Irving continues his examination on the complaint document and then, if it suits you, Commissioner, I'11 interpose myself after that to ask some questions about the crime manager duty statement.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you, Mr Irving.
MR IRVING: Thank you, Commissioner. My apologies.
Q. Superintendent, you've read that document, the letter of 21 June?
A. I have.
Q. You accept it does use the words:

Action is currently being taken to remedy the subject matter of the complaint?
A. That's correct.
Q. You accept, in essence, the subject matter of the complaint was delay?
A. Correct.
Q. Going to the last paragraph of your letter, you make the observation.

Whilst I appreciate that you may be disappointed by this decision, I trust you understand the reason given.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall being contacted by Ms McCarthy by telephone after that letter was sent out?
A. I honestly can't remember whether or not I spoke to Ms McCarthy, but I'm aware that contact - she attempted contact and I was provided a message from the then acting crime manager Matthew Moroney. But I cannot recall a conversation I had with her or otherwise.
Q. You cannot comment on the proposition that she said to you:

I'm not disappointed about this complaint.
I just wanted to see Lantle properly investigated.

Does that refresh your memory at a11?
A. My recollection is that she told that to Matt Moroney, who told that to me. I could be wrong on that, but the essence of that statement is correct as told to me by another officer.

MR IRVING: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

MS LONERGAN: Q. Would you mind looking at tab 183 of the bundle of material in the witness box with you. That's the --
A. Yes.
Q. It is volume 3.
A. Thank you.
Q. Do you have that?
A. I do.
Q. Is that a duty statement of the crime manager for a any local area command?
A. No, it is what we refer to as a JSR, an investigation supervisor, which applies to the duties of crime manager, but it could also be used for a detective sergeant level as well.
Q. Can we take from your answer that the document --
A. Sorry, I apologise. On this one, it does say "Chief Inspector" or "Inspector". So perhaps it is not the same duty statement that $I$ just referred to - to a detective sergeant. So it is to chief inspector or inspector.
Q. It sets out in general terms the duties of a person performing the role of crime manager of a local area command?
A. Yes.
Q. In the NSW Police Force?
A. It does.
Q. You have, in your role, supervised crime managers or been their human resources manager at least? What's your
interface in terms of your actual knowledge of how these jobs are executed?
A. I had a fair bit to do with crime managers when I was the operations manager for northern region. I interacted with them on a daily basis. I did relieve as the crime manager at Lower Hunter for a period of three months and, as a commander, I have very close contact with my crime managers.
Q. Just going through the bullet points under the heading "Position overview", which occurs about a third of the way down the page, you see one of the points made is that the job entails a requirement to:

> Manage all criminal investigations within the Local Area Command and across LACs?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the emphasis that you understand to be the requirement of the position that it is a management role as opposed to an active investigative role?
A. Correct.
Q. The second bullet point talks about the need to provide key advice in formulating and implementing crime strategy, review and evaluation of its impact. Again, is that a managerial type oversighting role as possessed an actual on-the-ground investigative or strategising role?
A. Definitely more managerial.
Q. The third bullet point is obvious:

Manage the Crime Management Unit?
A. Correct.
Q. The fourth bullet point raises this requirement:

Lead and direct complex investigations as required.

As you're aware, this Lantle investigation was a highly protected investigation and, on any analysis, it is a complex and a sensitive investigation; do you agree? A. Yes.
Q. Is there any particular distinction made in terms of a crime manager's requirements to be involved in a complex and sensitive investigation, such as, involving critical incidents or matters of that nature?
A. You lost me a little bit in that question.
Q. I'11 try again.
A. Yes. Thank you.
Q. "Complex and sensitive investigation" is a description that would fit Lantle - are you with me?
A. Yes .
Q. The fact that these requirements mentions the need to "lead and direct" such investigations, does that entail in that description an aspect of on-the-ground investigation? A. Not necessarily. "Lead and direct", I think, is what Detective Inspector Parker does with Detective Sergeant Little, for example.
Q. Is it common for a crime manager at any LAC to perform that role you've just outlined Detective Inspector Parker performed for Lantle?
A. Is that common, did you say?
Q. Is that common?
A. Yes.
Q. It is common?
A. Yes.
Q. It is common for a crime manager to carry out the role Detective Inspector Parker carried out for Lantle, is it? A. Yes, that's common.
Q. The critical incident matters, what does that entail?
A. They're matters where usually somebody has been either seriously injured or even killed as a result of a police operation in some way, shape or form. Often crime managers will lead and direct those investigations, but the officer in charge or the lead investigator may sometimes be a detective sergeant. Yes, that's --
Q. All right. In terms of a particular investigation being allocated to one local area command --
A. Yes.
Q. -- does it commonly occur that an investigation of the type of complexity of Lantle is monitored or managed over two different local area commands; if it is, why, and if it is not, why not?
A. No, it is normally - normally it would be contained within the one local area command. It is not - it is unusual, but it would not be unprecedented for a detective inspector to be brought off-line. But that is an unusual occurrence that they would be take away from their day-to-day responsibilities from their local area command leaving that command vulnerable. In the case of Newcastle, we had the fortunate position where we had two crime managers.
Q. On your understanding, was the fact that there were two crime managers for the Newcastle Local Area Command something that meant that, in this case, Detective Inspector Parker was able to have a more active role in Lantle or are you not able to say whether that was in fact a matter that was relevant?
A. I wouldn't say he had a more active role, but he certainly had the capacity to lead and direct, as required, Detective Sergeant Jeff Little.
Q. Were there any matters in the crime manager job description document that I've just had you read in the adjournment that you think would be of assistance to point out to the Commissioner, in terms of your HR background or any other matters you think would assist the Commissioner?
A. Could I just say it is an incredibly complex role to be a crime manager. You have to be across many things, not only the major investigations in the command, but you have to be across crime prevention strategy, consultation with the community. There's a whole range of different duties. At Newcastle, we are lucky that we have two people performing the role due to the complex nature of this command.

MS LONERGAN: Those are my additional questions, Commissioner, thank you. I tender this document.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS LONERGAN: The proper title for it, I think Superintendent Gralton, has given it.
Q. What is the title?
A. JSR. It also says - sorry no, it doesn't. It says, "Also refer to JSR5"; I beg your pardon. That's not the case. It is a job stream --
Q. A job stream description for crime manager. Is that a fitting title?
A. Job description. I think you might have referred to it as something like that, anyway, so job description.
Q. For crime manager?
A. For crime manager.

THE COMMISSIONER: The job description for crime manager will be exhibit 43.

EXHIBIT \#43 JOB DESCRIPTION FOR CRIME MANAGER
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner. I take it Mr Irving has finished. I apologise to Ms Lonergan and to you for causing that.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is no apology required, Mr Cohen.
MS LONERGAN: I know there was no discourtesy intended, nor do I suggest that there was.

MR COHEN: I understand that. It is very useful to have that document exposed in that way for which I'm enormously grateful.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. I don't have many questions for you, superintendent, which I'm sure will cause a number of people to cheer, but can I ask you to have regard, please to your statement.

First, let me put this to you: in your evidence that you gave orally this morning, you referred to annexure $B$, or you were referred to it, but in particular to the provisions of your paragraphs, the burden of them, 22 and 24 , and speaking about the events that led you to refer on what I'11 call the McKey memorandum on. Do you recall that evidence?
A. I do.
Q. I'm, in fairness, trying to set the scene for you. Can I ask you - I'm sorry, this is difficult, because it is a rather small witness box - you have a volume in front of you. I believe it is volume 3; is that right? I would be very grateful if you could close that and return it to its place. I think you have a need for volume 2. When you've got that, would you go to tab 62. Do you have volume 2? My apologies, they're out of order. Tab 62 should be very close to the front, almost the first one, I suspect. A. Yes.
Q. It is the nature, I'm afraid, in a matter that involves many, many documents like this that there's a certain amount of navigation around them. So that it is fair to you and everybody is, as it were, on the same page, can I ask you to look at your own statement and at the same time - I'm sorry if there is a juggling exercise required. A. That's okay.
Q. You include as your annexure H, I think it is - I'm sorry, I've lost the reference to it. Excuse me. I'm sorry, it is your annexure B.
A. Yes.
Q. You include what, I suppose, is the initiating document or the cover sheet over the top of the file, what I think has been referred to in other evidence as the green?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see your annexure B, the one that has your comments on it, which is the McKey memorandum of 5 September 2010, has a TRIM number at the very top of it. I'm sorry, you don't have it. I beg your pardon.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. It is annexure B. It is page 15 in the document.
A. Thank you.
Q. You have got it?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you see the document?
A. I do.
Q. That's is it, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see there's a TRIM number at the top?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is $\mathrm{D} / 2010 / 133845$. Are we agreed about that?
A. Correct.
Q. That TRIM number, as I understand matters, corresponds to the handwritten number but with the same effect, on the top of the page, the first page in tab 62, page 244 ; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. That first page I'm looking at in that bundle in and behind tab 62 is the ministerial memorandum that, in effect, kicked off the green that you got and dealt with; is that so?
A. Correct.
Q. Just so that it is clear for everybody, there can't be any doubt because the TRIM numbers line up and these two documents, even though they're disembodied across a number of different things like your statement and this bundle, would ultimately have come together under this green; is that right
A. They appear to be, yes.
Q. Could I ask you to look, please, at the memorandum that's behind tab 62 and over which your countersigned memorandum in the chain of command is directly relevant. It is to the Commissioner's Secretariat. I take it that means to the Commissioner of Police?
A. Yes.
Q. It is from the liaison unit in the minister's office, and I assume that meant, presumably, the Attorney General or the Minister for Justice; is that right? It is likely but I'm not sure. Would you have any idea?
A. Possibly Minister for Police, but --
Q. Minister for Police, did you say?
A. Yes, possibly Minister for Police or Minister --
Q. In any event, it would be the responsible minister, if I can use that phrase?
A. Yes.
Q. With appropriate ministerial oversight of something such as the police --
A. Yes. Well, it says Ministerial Liaison Unit.
Q. That document identifies - it's got a rubber stamp on it 12 August, and it says, "Ministerial correspondence from [BG]." [BG], by the way, is an acronym on the list. It matters not who [BG] is for these purposes -- -
A. Okay .
Q. -- but it was from a person who has now been anonymised in that way. As you can see the document identifies that the minister has received correspondence from [BG]. The observation then is that the matter is forwarded - the minister had referred it to the Commissioner, Commissioner Scipione. Then the minister is forwarding it for information and referral to the relevant command for consideration and appropriate attention.

There is a further observation, or perhaps instruction or suggestion, however you want to characterise it, and apart from noting a copy of the parliamentary secretary's letter is attached, the burden of what I want to put to you is this: the final sentence says:

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

Then there is just an observation that the signatory of the letter can be contacted by some external extension for inquiries. I assume that reference is to a telephone number?
A. Yes, that's Eaglenet, 45276, a phone number.
Q. An internal phone system?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. That means, doesn't it, that the minister's office wasn't either looking for any specific response or for this to go anywhere. That must mean, I take it, that this document is not something that was, in the scheme of things, red hot urgent. It was referred for action if any action was required; is that right?
A. That's right. It's not unusual to see that comment at the bottom of a ministerial liaison file note.
Q. It is unusual?
A. It is not unusual?
Q. That presumably pushes it right down the list of priorities, I assume.
A. I wouldn't suggest that.
Q. Pardon me?
A. I wouldn't suggest that, but it doesn't demonstrate that it is urgent.
Q. Accordingly, if somebody like DCI Fox got this on the last day of his period before he was about to go on leave, in the way of - that's badly worded. Let me start again.

Your green had these documents ultimately attached to it. It came to you from Detective Sergeant McKey, started its journey from Detective Sergeant McKey on 5 September, I think it got to you - this is the document in your statement at page, ultimately, 16 - in terms of the chain of command materials by the look of it, I think I'm right in saying, 9 September?
A. I normally deal with correspondence on the day, so --
Q. Yes. It made its way through the various people in the chain of command, as you can see there. You got it, you forwarded it on. It would appear from the evidence that Detective Chief Inspector Fox, who was the ultimate recipient of this through his commander, got it on 16 September of that same month in 2010, and that happened to be the day that he was on his last day of work before he was going away for leave for four weeks.

I assume, in those circumstances, given the notation on the memorandum and the way that it was forwarded on and there being no notation in the relevant comments from officers such as yourself in the chain of command that, "by the way this is something that requires real urgency", the fact that it sat in his office for a month while he was on leave is not something that could be regarded as a matter for great displeasure in the chain of command, do you think?
A. I don't have what commander - it what have been Haggett, I believe at the time. I don't have --
Q. Yes. I regret that's all we've got.
A. Okay. It would depend on what Commander Haggett decided was to occur from that point. This is a document that went through the chain of command. It was sent over there for his attention and Commander Haggett would be the one, then, to determine when and how it would be responded to, I would imagine.
Q. You are in a cognate position at this stage, and presumably now, but at this stage certain1y in 2010, you were in a cognate position --
A. What's a "cognate", sorry?
Q. I am sorry, a directly relevant and related position. He was commander of Port Stephens. You were commander of Lower Hunter?
A. Yes, the Central Hunter.
Q. I beg your pardon. Thank you for that. You were doing much the same job, just in different physical locations in different LACs, but you had the same sorts of interests and a daily slate of responsibilities and matters to discharge; is that right?
A. Yes, pretty much so.
Q. Having regard to that, and I know it is a bit difficult, I take it, given your comments on this, given you were the commander of Lower Hunter, sending this on to Port Stephens, it seems fair to assume that Commander Haggett would observe and respond in much the same fashion as you did?
A. I don't know how he would respond. I would expect.

MR SAIDI: Whatever this witness's opinion may be, the memorandum itself says that the matter is forwarded for referral to the relevant command for consideration and appropriate attention. So it is to Commander Haggett. He's the commander of the relevant command, not this witness.

MR COHEN: I'm not suggesting otherwise.
MR SAIDI: This witness's evidence is irrelevant. It is Commander Haggett who makes the determination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen is just asking Mr Gralton about comparisons between the duties, is that right, of commanders?

MR COHEN: In fairness, so that all are clear and so that, most importantly, you understand, Commissioner, as to my forensic purpose here, Commander Haggett is not available, but Commander Gralton is, and it does not seem to me - I'11 clearly be guided by your ruling - to be an impermissible question.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will allow you to ask it, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Given the fact that Commander Haggett is not here to answer directly, having regard to the practice of daily life of a commander in a LAC, it is likely his view, if not directly established, would be similarly conceptually to yours, would it not, in these circumstances?
A. I can't answer that question, but I can tell you what I would expect.
Q. Please. What would you do?
A. I would expect my crime managers to advise me of the nature of a ministerial file like this if they couldn't attend to it for a month or more.
Q. So, if possible, in the circumstances of the exigencies of the day, if that happened, we just don't know, that is to say, there was a discussion between DCI Fox and --

MR SAIDI: I object.
THE WITNESS: How can I answer that question?
MR SAIDI: I object. We do know. We know that DCI Fox did not bring it to the attention of Haggett on his evidence.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, that's my reflection of the evidence as well.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR COHEN: I stand corrected. I'm happy not to pick a fight about that.
Q. Do you know in relation to this file as to whether or not you got a response from, at any stage, Commander

Haggett about it?
A. I wouldn't expect one.
Q. You were also asked in your evidence about the document that is annexed in your statement - the bundle you can put away now. We're done with that.
A. Yes.
Q. That might give you more room and make it more convenient in the witness box.
A. Thank you.
Q. You were asked about the email request and response that you received from DCI Fox and to which you responded and that's your - I'm sorry, Superintendent Gralton, I do apologise. I've just lost the reference in the back of your --
A. I think it is E.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. I think it is E.
Q. I'm much indebted to you. You're quite right.

Indeed, E has, in substance, two parts. You have a copy of the original email without any commentary, pages 24 and 25 ? A. Yes.
Q. And then your responses, 22, 23. Again in the nature of these things, the later in time comes first in that sequence?
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked about this and your understanding?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
Q. I put it to you, superintendent, you must accept that, to use your phrase, it was - I think you said you kept it "short and sweet". That was your phrase. I don't want to misquote you, but that's what I recall you said about this? A. Yes, I did.
Q. Quite a simple response. Can I put it to you that in the circumstances of quite a detailed request - and by that I mean what is found at pages 24 and 25 of your statement, the original email, where the introductory statement made in the very beginning identifies submissions that were made by DCI Fox with victims and then goes on to say he was

## directed.

... to surrender all the documentation I had, including victim statements, cease any involvement in church paedophile investigations or dealings with victims.

I put it to you that your response to that, was simply to say - in response to the ultimate question "Are all directions given by me still in force?", your response, which was in your phrase short and sweet, was:

Yes until 7 ifted the direction remains in place.

There was no other basis for Detective Chief Inspector Fox than thinking everything he said in his email to you was a direction in force; that is to say, he was indeed to cease any involvement in church paedophilia investigations. What else could he think in those circumstances?

MR SAIDI: I object. I didn't take this objection earlier, but in view of these matters being put by Mr Cohen, can I remind the Commission that the evidence given by DCI Fox himself was that he understood the direction was limited to Strike Force Lantle; he understood that he was not directed to cease all other investigations; he was not directed to cease any investigations into church-related paedophilia activities. That's his evidence. However he expresses his email request may be one thing, but to suggest, based on DCI Fox's own evidence, that he never understood that to be the position, is somewhat misleading.

MR COHEN: I certainly would never, never countenance misleading anybody. I genuinely do not recall that being the evidence. If my friend says it is, I would be indebted if he would take us to it.

MR SAIDI: I would be quite happy to do that if it means that the situation be remedied that there be any belief formed by this Commission that DCI Fox was under any misapprehension as to what the instruction, direction, or whatever one wants to call it, was given to him. If my friend wants to leave this topic for the moment I'11 give him the exact references.

MR COHEN: In the transcript I'm talking about.
MR SAIDI: In the transcript.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Isn't the fundamental question what Commander Gralton meant when he spoke about the direction?

MR COHEN: Yes, I would --
THE COMMISSIONER: Because it is very hard to say what the recipient of this response may have understood by it.

MR COHEN: No, it wasn't what Detective Chief Inspector Fox understood about it, but what the words conveyed to the ordinary reasonable reader. Maybe I should put that question to him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Anyone, whether it be DCI Fox, the Commissioner or any third party reading this email - that is the response by you to DCI Fox in response to his request to you of 28 March 2012 - could not think otherwise than what was stated in the body of the email was being responded to "Yes, that's all in place; the direction remains in place in respect to all of it"?
A. I don't know what other people might think. I have satisfied myself as to what the directions that had been given were. In Mr Fox's response, he said, "Thanks Mr Gralton. I'11 contact Detective Inspector Parker today about all of the issues." From that, I was satisfied that he was satisfied, on the directions that had been given on that day, which, as Mr Saidi has rightly indicated, were given in evidence by Mr Fox during these proceedings, and I do recall that.
Q. We'11 come back to that because, in fairness, we don't have the transcript and unless and until we have, it is not fair --
A. I think it was on day one or day two.
Q. Pardon?
A. I think it was on day one or day two, Mr Cohen.
Q. That may well be, but that's not what I mean. I meant the detail of the evidence and, in the absence of it,

I won't pursue this any further.
MS LONERGAN: I could assist with one transcript reference and that may well be the one that Mr Saidi is talking about. I think it is just one of a number that deal with the subject matter. It is at page 147 of the transcript on day two, and I'11 keep looking for any others that may assist Mr Cohen.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MR SAIDI: On that, my recollection is that it wasn't said on one occasion, but it was said by Detective Chief Inspector Fox on a number of occasions.

MS LONERGAN: That's right. That accords with my recollection, Commissioner.

MR SAIDI: At Mr Cohen's invitation, I refer to pages 144 to 145 as well:
Q. Did Superintendent Mitchell say to you that you were to not investigate anything to do with church paedophilia?
A. No.
Q. He didn't say, "You are not to talk to any other officers in the police force about church paedophilia"?
A. No.

MR COHEN: I'm indebted to my friend. I don't need any further instruction on that. I understand the burden of the evidence. I can't pursue that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: May I say, Commissioner, I genuinely didn't recall it. Thank you, Commissioner, I have no other questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Single, do you have any questions?
MS SINGLE: No, thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi?
MR SAIDI: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. Do you still have exhibit 30 there in front of you?
A. Exhibit 30? This one?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to take you to the sequence of events in relation to it. On the second page, do you see there an email from Matthew Moroney to yourself at 14.37 on 15 July? A. I do.
Q. It refers to a photocopy message from Joanne McCarthy?
A. Correct.
Q. While you were out?
A. Yes.
Q. It was in that email, it was indicated to you via Matthew Moroney that apparently Ms McCarthy wanted to relay to you that she was not disappointed in the decision to decline the complaint?
A. That's what it appears from Mr Moroney.
Q. That, of course, was what was passed on to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you go to the next email, 15 July 2011, at 15.50?
A. Yes .
Q. Sorry, I misled you. The next one is at 2.52 pm "Re phone message from McCarthy." That's where you respond to Mr Moroney; is that so?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And then there's a further email where, perhaps somewhat jocularly, Mr Moroney advises you or refers again to being thanked for declining the complaint?
A. That's right.
Q. Is that what you're referring earlier to in your evidence as to how the matter was dealt with?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. I just want to deal with a couple of other issues with you if I may. The term "Catholic mafia" has raised its head during the course of this Special Commission of Inquiry. Prior to evidence being given prior to the inquiry, evidence of which you are aware, had you heard of that term before?
A. No, I had not.
Q. Whether you were aware of the term before or not, did you have any belief or suspicion one way or the other as to whether or not there was such a group of people within the NSW Police Force who comprised or could be considered to comprise a Catholic mafia?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Or indeed any interaction between the police and the members of the church?
A. Not at all.
Q. Evidence has been given during the course of this inquiry relating to the leaking of information by a police officer to a member of the media, unbeknown to police officers involved in a strike force conducting the investigation. In terms of your experience as a police officer over the years, do you have a view about the appropriateness or otherwise of such conduct taking place?
A. I think it demonstrates a clear lack of integrity. I think it demonstrates a clear lack of professionalism, and I think it only goes to damage an investigation and affect victims in any such matters.
Q. How and why do you say it affects victims in any such matters?
A. If people are leaking information that served to or can damage an investigation, or if there are details that are getting out and about in the media, certainly potential prosecutions could be affected and victims' privacy.
Q. Another piece of evidence presented during the course of this Special Commission of Inquiry relates to a suggestion by DCI Fox that he was deliberately excluded from the investigation of Strike Force Lantle. From your knowledge of the operation of the strike force, your interaction with the police officers who were involved in it as well as other senior officers, what do you say about that suggestion?
A. My information is that Mr Fox was asked repeatedly for information to assist this strike force, to assist the investigation into all of these matters. He gave some information, but he purported quite publicly that he had explosive information to give, and that explosive information has never been forthcoming as far as I'm concerned. The matters that - the information that he has given, Detective Sergeant Little and Detective Inspector Parker have informed me that some of the information was of assistance, but anything more, in 2012 at least, has done nothing to further - no fresh information, nothing to progress the investigation any further than it was already being very, very professionally handled by Detective Sergeant Little.
Q. At any time during the course of your interaction with the officers involved with Strike Force Lantle - and I'm referring in a general sense but also specifically if I put these names forward - such as Inspector Humphrey and, indeed, any other senior officers, was there any suggestion, whether indeed very slight or indirect, that DCI Fox was being excluded for reasons other than suspected leaking to the media?
A. No, that's correct. I was going to say that only to the point where there were suggestions that he was leaking information.
Q. The strike force elected Detective Sergeant Little as the officer in charge after Kirren Steel went on sick leave. Firstly, what knowledge did you have of Detective Sergeant Little and what can you say about the appropriateness of the selection of him?
A. I didn't have a great deal of knowledge of Detective Sergeant Little. I had dealt with him on another matter, but, in relation to that and any dealings that $I$ had with him, I describe Detective Sergeant Little as very professional, an officer of immense integrity and very intelligent and certainly a fantastic selection to lead what has been a very complex, difficult investigation and that he has, as we've heard in evidence at this hearing, provided an exceptional brief of evidence.
Q. In terms of DCI Fox's, if I can use the term enthusiasm, or lack of enthusiasm, however one describes it, to help the officers attached to Strike Force Lantle, based on your experience and your direct knowledge, what can you say about that?
A. I'm now aware of some email correspondence between Detective Chief Inspector Fox and Ms McCarthy where he'd even made a comment that John Gralton could go to hell if they've lost or misplaced documents. Not that that was true, regardless, that fact indicates to me he was being particularly unhelpful at that time, and I don't understand his motivation. I think that Detective Chief Inspector Fox, if he had done what he ought do as a crime manager, as a detective inspector of the NSW Police, and shared whatever explosive information that he had or has, that was the only way that this - he could have been helpful in progressing this investigation. That has not been forthcoming, as far as I'm aware.
Q. I'm going to deliberately lead you through some of this in the next series of questions. You went to a Catholic school when you were young?
A. I did.
Q. In terms of any information that was forthcoming to you as a result of your own knowledge and experiences, did you pass that information on to Detective McLeod at Strike Force Georgiana?
A. I did.
Q. I don't want to restrict you. If you want to elaborate, please feel free.
A. I will. I was assaulted by a priest in front of 40 students and I provided a statement in regards to that to Detective Senior Constable MacLeod.
Q. Did you also provide information about other potential victims?
A. I did. I gave details of probably five or six other friends of mine who were indecently assaulted - to investigators.
Q. Let me ask you this general question. What would you say to any suggestion, whether made by DCI Fox or anyone else, that you would be a party to cover-ups in terms of reporting matters?
A. It couldn't be further from the truth. It is fanciful and offensive at its highest.
Q. What would you say to any suggestion that you would be involved in allowing a less than adequate investigation to be carried out?
A. Couldn't be further from the truth.
Q. Do you want to elaborate on that?
A. I feel - every time I see a paedophile hit the dock and charged with serious matters in relation to child paedophilia, I celebrate that, and I find any suggestion that any senior police officer in this region would do anything to stop an investigation - I find that abhorrent, both the offences and the suggestion that anything was concealed.

MR SAIDI: That's the evidence.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi. Ms Lonergan?
MS LONERGAN: No re-examination, thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Commander Gralton, thank you very much nor your evidence. You are excused.
A. Thank you, Commissioner.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, would that be a convenient time? We have only one remaining witness.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MS LONERGAN: I call Kristi Lee Faber, detective sergeant.
<KRISTI LEE FABER, sworn: [11.43am]
MR WILLIS: Commissioner, I apologise. Mr Cohen expected that he would be able to go to the bank and be back in time. My client has left the hearing room to see if he could call him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Willis.
MR SAIDI: I was going to ask Mr Willis how long does it take to wheel a wheelbarrow back.

Could it be noted with this witness that I take the usual or seek the usual protection.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.

Mr Willis, did you wish us to wait until Mr Cohen returns?

MR WILLIS: Could we at least wait until my client returns and he may have some news?

MS LONERGAN: I'm content with that, Commissioner.
MR WILLIS: No news, I'm afraid, Commissioner. My client's call went through to Mr Cohen's voicemail. I have no news on that. He wasn't expecting to be long.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Perhaps we'11 just twiddle our thumbs for a minute to see if he's on his way through the door.
Q. I'm very sorry, Detective Sergeant Faber, it must be difficult sitting in the hot seat waiting.

MR WILLIS: Commissioner, at the risk of losing another body, would you excuse me for a moment? I will see if I can locate him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course, Mr Willis.
MR WILLIS: Thank you.
(Mr Willis leaves the hearing room)
(Mr Cohen and Mr Willis return to the hearing room)
MR COHEN: I apologise.
THE COMMISSIONER: No harm done, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: I'm grateful, Commissioner. I'm indebted to you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

MS LONERGAN: Q. Detective sergeant, is your full name Kristi Lee, L-E-E, Faber?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. You prepared, with the assistance of your lawyers a statement, dated 8 May 2013?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. I'11 hand a copy up to you for use in the witness box and a copy for the Commissioner.
A. Thank you.
Q. If you wouldn't mind running your eye over it, you will note there are certain redactions within it to protect the names of persons who are the subject of current criminal proceedings. There have also been various redactions regarding matters that were determined to not relevant to the work of the Special Commission of Inquiry. Other than those redactions, is the statement true and correct, to the best of your knowledge?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Thank you. You're a detective sergeant of police currently serving at the Lake Macquarie Local Area Command?
A. That's correct.
Q. You were attested as a police officer in 1992?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You commenced your general duties shortly after your attestation, moving in 1994 to criminal investigation?
A. That's right.
Q. Did those criminal investigations in the initial few years prior to you being promoted to detective in 1999 include investigations of sexual offences against children? A. Yes, they did.
Q. Is it the position in the NSW Police Force that female police officers and female investigators often have an aspect assigned to them of terms of investigating sexual offences particularly regarding children?
A. Yes, that is correct. A lot of people who come in do prefer to speak to female police officers, so it is more likely that we take statements and then we continue the investigation.
Q. You were promoted to detective in 1999. You shifted to Lake Macquarie Local Area Command in 2001; correct? A. No, no, that was end of March, beginning of April

1999, to Lake Macquarie, yes.
Q. Prior to that, you worked in Sydney - or other places?
A. I worked at Maitland for a short time and then, prior
to that, I worked at Bankstown and Campsie detectives.
Q. Your direct line supervisor, if that's the right term, from the time you joined Lake Macquarie, was that Detective Chief Inspector Waddell?
A. When I first started there in 1999, it was Detective Chief Inspector Henderson; then it was Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler; and then it was Detective Inspector Waddell, primarily. We had a couple of people come in for very short times to relieve, but they're primarily.
Q. Detective Inspector Wadde11, when did he start being your supervisor?
A. It was after Georgiana commenced, but it was probably late 2008 or by about August, maybe, September 2008.
Q. With Detective Inspector Tayler, did he supervise you in the period he was your supervisor in relation to any investigations of sexual abuse on the part of officials of the Catholic Church?
A. Yes, he did. He was my direct line supervisor in relation to Strike Force Georgiana.
Q. I'11 just ask you a few questions about him and I'm move back to Detective Inspector Waddell shortly.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you at any time encounter any resistance on the part of Detective Chief Inspector Tayler to properly resource and pursue investigations of suspected sexual abusers from the Catholic Church?
A. Absolutely not. He was instrumental in assisting us set up Strike Force Georgiana and without his assistance, we never would have got off the ground.
Q. Turning now to - is it Detective Inspector Waddell or --
A. Detective Inspector Waddel1.
Q. Did you encounter any resistance on his part to properly resourcing and pursuing investigations of officials of the Catholic church, in terms of sexual abuse offences?
A. Again, absolutely not. He was instrumental in the large success of Strike Force Georgiana in continuing to resource us and continuing to support myself and all of our investigators both - might I say mentally as well, but supported us through the entire investigation and resourced us through the entire investigation.
Q. In paragraph 7 of your statement, you refer to an award that you received - most outstanding female investigator - from the Austral media outlet and the Australian Council of Women in Policing?
A. Yes, that's the Australasian Council of Women in Policing.
Q. Was that related to investigations of child sexual abuse type matters or was it a broader award?
A. From my understanding, it related primarily to Strike Force Morey, which was an historical sexual assault investigation but also related to a child homicide and an armed robbery.
Q. So not related to investigation of child sexual abuse regarding officials of the Catholic Church in particular?
A. No, not at --
Q. Strike Force Georgiana commenced in September 2007, and you make that comment in your statement in paragraph 8. Prior to Strike Force Georgiana being officially set up in September 2007, did you take part in any investigations of allegations of paedophile activity by any officials of the Catholic Church?
A. The Catholic Church, no.
Q. But you carried out investigations into other paedophile activities by other persons outside the Catholic Church?
A. Other organisations, other religious organisations, other persons.
Q. Are the terms of reference of Strike Force Georgiana annexed to your statement, annexure A, if you wouldn't mind just turning to those? My copy isn't perfect, but it appears that the date on the second page of that terms of reference document is 18 September 2007. Am I reading that correctly?
A. Yes. That's possible, yes.
Q. But your recollection is it happened to be set up in that formal way in September 2007?
A. Yes, that's right. But I wasn't actually on the strike force at that time.
Q. The terms of reference appear, and I appreciate you weren't a part of the strike force at the time, to be very general to investigate "Not for publication 4", which is the pseudonym the person has, in relation to allegations of child sexual assault?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is it the position that, as the investigations proceeded, there had to be some widening of the scope of the investigation to investigate additional alleged offenders that were related to [NP4]?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Did you encounter any resistance in widening the investigation in that way?
A. No; on the contrary I had a lot of support from varying LACs.
Q. It is the position, is it, that on application or on request from serving officers, management can choose to widen investigations without changing the terms of reference?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. They can choose to widen the terms of reference and broaden an investigation?
A. They can do that too, yes.
Q. And they can also choose to narrow the investigative parameters if thought to be appropriate?
A. Yes. That would come in consultation with myself and a crime manager.
Q. I was about to come to that. Those decisions are made at a level where there's an assessment of the importance of the matters being pursued?
A. Yes, I would put the information to them, what I would want to do and then make the decision whether we would go ahead and investigate.
Q. You've heard the expression "mission creep" being used by some of the officers who have given evidence before this

Special Commission, or you may not have been in court? A. No, I haven't.
Q. Have you heard that term --
A. No.
Q. -- and do you have any particular understanding of what it means?
A. No.
Q. In terms of your statement you have, under the heading "Resourcing of Strike Force Georgiana", set out and outlined some information in paragraph 16 to paragraph 35 of your statement. First of all, can I ask you this: your preparation of the statement where you set out the details in that way, the resourcing of Strike Force Georgiana, was prepared in response to a particular request from the Special Commission of Inquiry?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. In the same way, your setting out of the status briefly of Strike Force Georgiana and its operations was also in direct response to a request from the Special Commission of Inquiry to do so?
A. Yes, it was.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1629, line 27 to line 44]
Q. The second matter I'11 draw to your attention in terms of the questions I'11 now move into is: for the benefit of those present in court, some of the material in your statement has been redacted because it is relevant to
ongoing police investigations, so there have been certain redactions to your statement to protect those ongoing investigations.
A. Yes .
[Transcript suppressed from page 1630 1ine 6 to line 16]

MS LONERGAN: Q. I'll just ask a few general questions about the part of your statement that deals with the resourcing of Strike Force Georgiana. I've already asked introductory questions in terms of the particular officers who supervised you at different stages.
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 17 of your statement you talk about the early stages of the investigation related to Strike Force Georgiana. Was your role at those early stages actively investigating or were you more supervising the progress of investigations of more junior officers?
A. No, I was actively investigating, but I was also actively investigating a number of other matters, whereas the officers on it were purely on the strike force.
Q. At that early stage you refer to in paragraph 17, was the focus on one particular Catholic priest or were there a number that were being looked at at that time or did it develop?
A. In the early stages, it developed virtually immediately to others.
Q. To other Catholic priests?
A. Other Catholic priests and other persons.
Q. And other persons? Did you encounter any resistance from those who supervised you to pursue the lines that involved other Catholic priests?
A. No, on the contrary.
Q. Did you encounter any resistance in relation to pursuing lines of inquiry that were related to lay persons or non-Catholic priests?
A. I have never had any resistance whatsoever.
Q. In paragraph 23, you outline that there were a number of different phases to Strike Force Georgiana. You also set out the investigators who were attached to those investigations. You do so to identify that there was various persons provided to properly resource the investigation.
A. Yes, that's right. When I actually set out the phases, they're not official phases. Strike Force Georgiana is one long-running investigation.
[Transcript suppressed, page 1631, line 17 to 19]
Q. In paragraph 25, you mention that a request for assistance for staff from State Crime Command was submitted and rejected. Do you know why that was rejected?
A. That was in the early phase. That wasn't whilst we were going. That was very, very early and, no, I'm not, that's not at my level.
Q. Have you subsequently obtained assistance, on occasion, from the State Crime Command in parts of Georgiana where it was thought to be appropriate that that assistance be provided?
A. No. The State Crime Command hasn't worked on Georgiana, but I have worked with them many times before.
Q. And staff at the State Crime Command are available for consultation should something come up that you need assistance with, at least on an informal level?
A. Yes, most definitely. I liaise with Detective Inspector Paul Jacob on numerous matters.
Q. In paragraph 26, you talk about there being a process of consultation with the then northern region commander Shearer and others about obtaining further resourcing at one particular stage for Georgiana. Do you see that in paragraph 26?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And that led to the securing of another officer?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you assist the Commissioner with whether that escalation up was supported by those who supervised you at Lake Macquarie?
A. Yes, it was. By that time, by the time I got to meeting with Ma'am Shearer and getting more officers, we had already had support from the Newcastle Local Area Command. They readily supplied us with two investigators to continue to investigate matters that were crossing over our borders.
Q. I'm going to move to the part of your statement where you have set out some matters regarding Strike Force Georgiana's operations, including a table of de-identified or largely de-identified persons who have been convicted of offences involving paedophilia. Is that a fair summary of the table that appears in paragraph 40?
A. These are offenders that have been convicted, have been convicted and are now before the court again, or are primarily before the court for the first time. So there's a mixture in that.
[Transcript suppressed, page 1632, line 25 to line 30]
Q. You may be aware, and let me know if you're not, that there has been an assertion made that there's some resistance to pursuing crimes of concealing of child sexual abuse on the part of some elements in the NSW Police Force. Are you aware that that assertion has been made?
A. I am aware of that, and I take that as offensive because police see child sexual assault or the covering up of child sexual assault as an offence akin to murder. It is an offence that we investigate to the fullest and I think we show that here.
Q. I'm going to move now, in very broad terms, to the involvement of Detective Senior Constable Shaun McLeod. Are you aware that there have been allegations made that Detective Senior Constable Shaun McLeod was shut down by those who supervised him and prevented him from
investigating matters regarding child sexual by officials of the Catholic Church and related concealing?
A. Look, I'm not fully aware that that was the allegation, but, yes, if you tell me
Q. Assume that that allegation has been made. You were requested by the staff of the Special Commission of Inquiry to address in your statement matters related to that particular officer?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. You supervised him for a period while he worked at Lake Macquarie Local Area Command; is that right?
A. Yes. Detective McLeod came from a different command. When we asked for resources, he came from a different command and came to us. He primarily worked on what I would call phase 1 , which ended up with the charging of four offenders.
Q. Yes?
A. From there he then received a transfer after - or after that phase, he managed to get a transfer to the Lake Macquarie office, so he was then within my office.
Q. I'm just going to go back a little in time to deal with something that you mentioned in paragraph 49 of your statement. There you deal with a contact that you had from Ms McCarthy from the Newcastle Herald on 30 May 2008. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. In that paragraph, you refer to having had information conveyed to you by Ms McCarthy based on information she obtained from Detective Chief Inspector Fox; is that a fair summary of paragraph 49?
A. This is a conversation that I had with Ms McCarthy intimating that she had received information, yes.
Q. Did you make a diary note or a duty book note of that phone conversation with Ms McCarthy at the time?
A. Yes, I made an investigator's note in our e@gle.i holdings and I also noted in my duty book for this day.
Q. I'm going to hand up first a handwritten document which I understand is an extract from your duty book and a copy for the Commissioner. Do you recollect actually making this note or was it just your usual practice to go
about notes of this kind in a certain way?
A. Look, it would be my usual practice. I doesn't have any recollection of actually writing it.
Q. Is it your usual practice to make a note at the time an event occurs or very shortly afterwards?
A. I would say very shortly afterwards before I finish for the day.
Q. In here you have noted a conversation with Joanne McCarthy regarding [NP] and, for our purposes I believe it is [NP4], and that she informed you that Lake Macquarie were looking at [NP] and that she had spoken to him about some other persons of interest as well. Were you surprised that Ms McCarthy had that information regarding your investigations?
A. I was surprised that she told me she was talking to a police officer, not surprised that she would get the information, but definitely surprised that she was talking to a police officer. At the time we were in very important investigative stage in relation to [NP]. We had some very important covert investigations in place and any sort of leak was just dire to our investigation.
Q. Can we take it that Detective Chief Inspector Fox did not have a role in those particular investigations?
A. Detective Chief Inspector Fox should have had no knowledge or role or - yes, that's correct.
Q. Is it possible that you're mistaken about the source of the information that Ms McCarthy stated to you in that telephone conversation?
A. Absolutely not. I recorded it immediately.
Q. Did you know Detective Chief Inspector Fox then from the Police Force Association?
A. Yes, yes, I did. We worked together.
Q. Did you tell your supervising officer that this information had been conveyed to you by Ms McCarthy?
A. As I said, we were in a very important covert part of the investigation, so $I$ went immediately to Detective Chief Inspector Tayler, because this comes under his responsibility, and I spoke to him about the conversation and, if it was true, the ramifications it could have had and then I left it with him.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that.
THE COMMISSIONER: The duty book extract?
MS LONERGAN: Yes, I tender the duty book extract subject to one further redaction. Could the parties keep it to themselves for the moment until we secure that further redaction and the details that are required to be redacted.
[Transcript suppressed, page 1635, line 10 to line 12]

MS LONERGAN: I'11 just ask again that all legal representatives not show the document to their clients or anybody else at the moment pending that redaction being secured.

THE COMMISSIONER: The extract from the duty book of Detective Sergeant Faber dated 30 May 2008 will be admitted and marked exhibit 44.

EXHIBIT \#43 EXTRACT FROM THE DUTY BOOK OF DETECTIVE SERGEANT FABER DATED 30/5/2008
[Transcript suppressed from page 1635, 1 ine 26 to line 44]

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Lonergan, you haven't tendered

Detective Sergeant Faber's statement yet.
MS LONERGAN: Did I not? I tender Detective Sergeant Faber's statement.

## EXHIBIT \#45 STATEMENT OF DETECTIVE SERGEANT FABER, DATED

 6/5/2013MS LONERGAN: Q. Detective sergeant, if you wouldn't mind turning to the other annexure A to your statement which appears to be a print-out of an entry in the police system.
A. Yes.
Q. This entry appears to be dated 2 May 2008 - I'm sorry, 2 June 2008?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Is that a record of the conversation we've just been looking at in your duty book.
A. Yes, it is, but also a record of the results of Detective Chief Inspector Tayler's inquiries.
Q. Thank you. Can we take it that the detective chief inspector conveyed that information to you and that's why you were able to complete that investigator's note in that way?
A. Yes, that's correct.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1636, line 29, to page 1637, 1 ine 43]

MS LONERGAN: Q. I'm moving now to the paragraphs in your statement that deal with cooperation you received from those you dealt with at the Catholic diocese of

Maitland-Newcastle. You see that in paragraphs 96, 97, 98 and 99 you deal with those matters. First of all, you address assistance provided by Bishop Michael Malone and you state that you found him to be extremely cooperative? A. Yes.
Q. Can you detail also some other aspects of his assistance and cooperation? Could you articulate for the benefit of those in court your experience of his cooperation with police investigations?
A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I'm just minded that we're dealing with term of reference 1 . The evidence, may I say, is all positive in terms of the diocese, and Ms Single is present. I didn't see that as committing any violence to our duties to lead some evidence from the witness since she is present and not proposed to be called for term of reference 2. If Ms Single is content for this evidence to be put on now, I'11 proceed; if not, we can put it to one side and have the detective sergeant recalled in term of reference 2.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS SINGLE: Commissioner, my only concern is I don't act for Bishop Malone and this evidence is directly related. I only act for the diocese.

THE COMMISSIONER: For the diocese, generally.
MS SINGLE: Yes, that's correct, and that's my only concern in relation to this. I think, for abundant caution, it would be better this evidence is heard in term of reference 2 .

THE COMMISSIONER: While Mr Harben is present?
MS SINGLE: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I do emphasise that the paragraphs I was addressing and all comments from Ms Faber regarding Bishop Malone are overwhelmingly positive, but I don't want to create any difficulty. My only observation is Bishop Malone was head of the diocese at the time and it would provide some balance and some assistance for the detective sergeant to express her views. I'm happy to be
guided.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Single, having heard that, are you prepared to relax your stand?

MS SINGLE: Commissioner, there's no issue in relation to the evidence relating to the diocese being led at the moment. Perhaps if it can be reserved so that if those representing Bishop Malone are of the belief that this witness should be recalled in terms of reference 2 , that may be the appropriate course.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Single.
MS LONERGAN: We will make that arrangement. That's a very sensible comment by Ms Single and I adopt that. I'11 ensure those who represent Bishop Malone are informed today of the nature of the evidence and we'11 recall Detective Sergeant Faber, if we need to do so, if they have any other matters that they want to put to her.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: Q. You were about to outline your experience of the interface you had with Bishop Malone. A. Yes. Obviously, investigating these matters is very difficult, when we're approaching the church and we went to Zimmerman Services and they readily came to us. I'm aware through Zimmerman Services that Bishop Malone told them they were to exchange all information with us, and they did so.

Bishop Malone also gave us permission, written permission, to search any church or records or anything that we needed. As far as Zimmerman Services are concerned, we've worked very closely with them over the entire five years and they have brought to us numerous complainants and when we get complainants, we contact Maureen O'Hearn from Zimmerman Services, who works tirelessly in relation to counselling and support of our victims in these matters.

MS LONERGAN: Thank you. That's the examination.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Anything arising Ms Single?
MS SINGLE: Yes, there is. Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS SINGLE:

MS SINGLE: Q. You've also outlined in your statement your interaction with Ms Keevers, who at the time was head of Zimmerman Services?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you find your interaction with her?
A. She was extremely professional and she supplied us with a vast amount of information that we did not have.
Q. What were your dealings in relation to Mr Sean Tynan?
A. The same. Once he came, he continued to work with Strike Force Georgiana, and when they received a complaint, they contacted me immediately with the details of that person.
Q. You also make mention of your dealings in relation to the two investigators, Michael Elliott and David Muxlow. What have your interactions been with those two gentlemen? A. Again, they've provided us with information, when we do these matters, full records, whatever we require, you know, I found them to be very professional.

MS SINGLE: Thank you. No further questions,
Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Single. Mr Irving?
MR IRVING: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR IRVING:

MR IRVING: Q. Detective Faber, you've prosecuted a significant number of these types of matters with Georgiana. My client, Ms McCarthy, has reported significantly on those matters as they've progressed through the court system.
A. Yes. I don't read the paper, but --
Q. You are aware, she does that?
A. -- I'm aware that she has reported - yes.
Q. As a consequence of those reports, you would be aware that people, be they further victims or people perhaps with information, have contacted her about matters that she has
published in the Herald?
A. Oh, most definitely, yes.
Q. And where those persons have expressed a wish to speak to police, she will either contact police - that is, Ms McCarthy - or she will provide those persons with your details or other officers' details to take the matter further?
A. Yes. In the last 12 months since I've known Ms McCarthy, she has supplied or people have come to us round about through the Herald, yes.
Q. As part of that process, you've become aware that Ms McCarthy does have a substantial, could I call it, database of sources, information, documents, materials relating to paedophilia by priests and brothers associated with the Catholic Church?
A. Yes, she does.
Q. Has that process in terms of people coming to you from the Herald assisted the police?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. Going to the phone call in 2008, that was your first contact with Ms McCarthy?
A. Yes. I didn't even know who Ms McCarthy was at the time.
Q. When you get a call out of the blue and she's asking questions about [NP] and [NP4], it would appear from the documents that this took you by surprise?
A. Probably not took me by surprise. We have media call all the time. I wouldn't say it took me by surprise, no.
Q. At that time, were you aware that [NP4] had already been suspended --

MS LONERGAN: I object. Commissioner, it is not appropriate, in my respectful submission, to run a survey into police operations and cross-referencing with whether that person was suspended or otherwise from their duties. The evidence of Detective Sergeant Faber was requested in relation to Georgiana to address a very specific assertion that had been made regarding overall reluctance to pursue matters involving prosecution or investigation of officials of the Catholic Church. It is not part of this inquiry's obligations to drill down into those operations any
further.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR IRVING: My submission, Commissioner, is that the evidence from Detective Faber, amongst other things, was that there was a leak to our client, which goes to the relationship between our client and Detective Fox. I wish to explore that period prior to May 2008 which touches upon where the information actually came from, if $I$ can put it that way.

MS LONERGAN: Can I be heard on that, Commissioner? The relevance of that one paragraph in Detective Sergeant Faber's statement is to address a very specific matter, and that is one incident that she has noted of evidence of leaking by Detective Chief Inspector Fox to a journalist based on the information she had available to her and recorded in the document that I tendered.

THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 44.
MS LONERGAN: Yes. In my respectful submission, Commissioner, that is the limit of the relevance. Whether Ms McCarthy chose to write a story about it, not write a story about it, is totally irrelevant to this Special Commission.

MR IRVING: The Commission led evidence from Ms McCarthy about that article presumably because it was relevant.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but what I'm finding difficult to see the relevance of, Mr Irving, is what happened to particular offenders is not part of this --

MR IRVING: No, I think the reason I'm addressing those issues is my client's knowledge and where it came from.

MS LONERGAN: There's no issue about Ms McCarthy's knowledge or where the information came from in terms of her reporting. There are no aspersions to be cast on her even if she did report that information. The leaking issue is relevant to Detective Chief Inspector Fox's activities. It is not relevant to Ms McCarthy's decision to report or not report certain matters and there's no need to go into that for your purposes, Commissioner.

MR IRVING: I think our evidence, in terms of assisting the Commission, is this circumstance was not a leak --

MR SAIDI: Could I ask Mr Irving to raise his voice.
MR IRVING: I'm sorry, our position - and it is for the assistance of the Commission - is that this was not a leak. She has given evidence about where it came from which, as I say, was presumably relevant to the Commission at that time, and I wish to speak to this witness about her knowledge at that time and the reasonableness of Ms McCarthy's conduct, if I can put it that way.

THE COMMISSIONER: The on1y thing that Detective Sergeant Faber can say about this phone call is that Ms McCarthy told her that the information came from the source of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, nothing behind that, isn't it?

MR IRVING: Yes, but --
THE COMMISSIONER: Is that disputed?
MR IRVING: The terminology is disputed. I think my client's evidence was she'd rung Detective Chief Inspector Fox, and he'd said, "It is not my matter. Try Lake Macquarie" - and she tried Lake Macquarie. The inference is that she must have known about this matter from Fox. What I wanted to raise was other evidence which indicated where she got it from, or evidence that indicates there was no leaking.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can you put the evidence that you say would suggest there was no leaking without drilling down, as Ms Lonergan says, into what happened to various offenders in their duties?

MR IRVING: I can certainly try, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR IRVING: Could I just have one moment, Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR IRVING: Q. Detective Faber, you were present in court when Ms McCarthy gave evidence that there was a press
release by the diocese at the time she commenced this inquiry?
A. Well, which inquiry, though, into which --
Q. Ringing around to ask questions about [NP] and [NP4]?
A. No.
Q. You weren't aware of that press release?
A. No.
Q. In fact, taking your statement at paragraph 49, as
at I think it was May this year, you acknowledge at
paragraph 49:
I am unaware where she received this information.

Even this year, you were still unaware of that press release?
A. Yes. Look, I had no problem with where they got that information or whatever. That wasn't the problem. It was the problem that [name suppressed] - sorry, that [NP4] was mentioned. That was the problem, yes. It wasn't the problem that she'd rung for that other information.
Q. That [NP4] was mentioned in the press release?
A. In that one?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I would like to interrupt Mr Irving to ask for a non-publication order over that name that was just uttered.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
[Transcript suppressed from page 1644, line 38 to page 1645, 1ine 6]

MS LONERGAN: I object to any continuation delving into this detail in relation to this document. It is annexed to the statement.

Could Mr Irving please sit down while I make my objection.

MR IRVING: Sorry, Ms Lonergan; my apologies.
MS LONERGAN: The document we're looking at is annexed to the statement for a very limited purpose. It hasn't been as fully redacted as perhaps it ought to be and that will be attended to. Most importantly, it has been annexed to illustrate only one matter which is of relevance to this Special Commission. It is not proper, not necessary, to go into other details here which are irrelevant to this Special Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Irving, I am attracted by Ms Lonergan's submission. You may, on behalf of your client wish to put certain things forward about her, but that's not legally relevant to the terms of reference. The evidence was tendered simply in relation to this phone call and what was said by the client, not the background of it. So I won't permit you to continue on this line.

MR IRVING: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Detective Faber, could I put to you that Ms McCarthy rang you in May 2008. She said, "I'm ringing around trying to work out who is investigating - someone is investigating [NP] and [NP4]"?
A. No, that's not correct. She did say, "I'm ringing around" - or something similar; it was just a normal media type inquiry - "and I've been told that you might be in charge of [NP]." So it was more along that line. [NP4] came up later. When I said, "No, we're not talking about anything, I don't know where you've got it from", [NP4] then came up later that she had talked with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about [NP4] and various other priests.
Q. Could I put to you that she said, "Look, I've spoken to Peter Fox. He couldn't help me, but he suggested I speak to you"?
A. Look, I can't recall that. That's possibly - yes, possibly that's how she said it.
Q. Could I suggest that she, at no stage, suggested that Peter Fox was a source or that he was the source of her information?
A. No, no. I did ask her, "Where did you get your source? I'm not speaking to you about it until I know where you're getting your source from", the source of information.
Q. When you say "source", you mean source of --
A. The source of the information.
Q. -- the information about [NP] --
A. [NP].
Q. Just [NP]?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you accept, having heard her evidence, that the source of her information may well have been the press release by the diocese?
A. In relation to [NP]?
Q. Yes.
A. Oh, definitely. It could have come from anywhere for [NP], yes.
Q. And [NP4]?
A. Well, [NP4] came up directly as a result of the conversation that she told me that she speaks to Detective Chief Inspector Fox about [NP4] and other priests. That was the conversation.
Q. Do you accept that [NP4] was referred to in the press release?
A. I don't know.

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

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Detective Sergeant Faber, you indicated in evidence to Ms Lonergan of senior counse1, and your word was - when you were being asked in relation to paragraph 49 of your statement - that Ms McCarthy "intimated" these things. That was your word, wasn't it?
A. I don't know. You'd have to read it back to me.
Q. That was your evidence, wasn't it?
A. That Ms McCarthy intimated these things, yes.
Q. Your assertion that Detective Chief Inspector Fox was a leaker was not founded on any basis in fact. It was simply your wish that it be so, wasn't it?
A. Sir, I didn't actually assert that he was a leaker of information. I asserted a conversation between myself and Ms Joanne McCarthy where she mentions Detective Chief Inspector Fox. The possibility that there is a leak from there, yes, but I didn't assert that there was definitely a leak.
Q. You were just joining up the dots and saying, "He's the guilty party", aren't you?
A. No, I'm telling you a conversation that I had.
Q. The conversation that was had was simply, "I've spoken to Fox. He doesn't know anything about this. He has suggested I ring Lake Macquarie. I'm calling you." That's the long and the short of the conversation, isn't it? A. No, that's not true.
Q. This file note of yours and your evidence is just fanciful, isn't it?
A. No.

MR SAIDI: I object, Special Commissioner. How can Mr Cohen possibly have instructions to be putting this material to this witness when his client was never a party to that conversation?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is a legitimate question, Mr Saidi.

MS LONERGAN: I agree with Mr Saidi.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is not a file note. It is an extract from the duty book, Mr Cohen

MR COHEN: I am talking about annexure A.
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry.
MR COHEN: Anyway, I hear what you are saying.
MR COHEN: Q. It is the case, is it not, Detective
Sergeant Faber, that you have simply never liked Detective Chief Inspector Fox and this is an opportunity of damaging his reputation, isn't it, that was presented to you?
A. No, sir, that's not true.
Q. Isn't it the case that the description you give about Detective Chief Inspector Fox, which in your statement is at paragraph 44, is most charitably described as icy, if not positively glacial?
A. No, sir. That's pretty accurate, I would say.
Q. I did not asking you whether or not it was accurate. I said that it is best described as being positively icy, isn't it?
A. No, I would not say that, sir. I don't have any - at the time of making this statement, I certainly didn't have any animosity towards your client.
Q. You've never had a reason to dislike Detective Chief Inspector Fox, is that your evidence?

MS LONERGAN: I object. Is this of assistance to you, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: No. I'm not interested in whether people like people or not.

MS LONERGAN: The proposition has been put that this officer does not like Detective Chief Inspector Fox and she said, "That's not true." That, in my respectful submission, should be the end of it and moving on to matters of substance would be of assistance.

MR COHEN: There is only this difficulty, Commissioner. If there is some historical reason why there is animosity between persons, subsequent conduct can be influenced by
that. It is important.
THE COMMISSIONER: Do you really want to go into that?
MR COHEN: I just want to establish that there was a period where there was a conflict between them that coloured the future approach.

MS LONERGAN: Can I be heard on that? How is that relevant to this officer's file note of the conversations that she had with another person, that she has simply recorded in her duty book? That's the evidence, Commissioner. This officer has produced something she wrote in her duty box that someone told her.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: She has tried to be accurate, as I understand her evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's the size of it, Mr Cohen. You couldn't possibly have instructions that the duty book was incorrect, and annexure A to exhibit 45, are you saying that's dependent on some incident that occurred between the witness and Mr Fox at some stage earlier?

MR COHEN: Q. Would you look at your extract in exhibit 44 from your duty book.
A. Can I just look at it, sir, before you ask a question?
Q. Sure.
A. Thank you. Yes?
Q. You've identified, you say:

Informed her police source, "Peter Fox" ...
Peter Fox is in inverted commas?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. I am sorry. We're at cross-purposes.
A. Yes, we are.
Q. Do you have a copy of what is exhibit 44 , the extract from your duty book?
A. I'm sorry, I'm stil1 looking at paragraph 44 in relation to --
Q. What I was examining initially was paragraph 44, but it happens to be the case that your duty book is now exhibit 44. Do you have it with you?
A. So that's my duty book of 30 May 2008, yes.
Q. Which is now exhibit 44.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Do you see you record:

Speak to Joanne McCarthy Newcastle Tele ...
"Tele", I assume, is just a contraction of "Telegraph", is it?
A. No, that's my lack of knowledge of papers, sir.
Q. Pardon me?
A. That's my lack of knowledge of papers. It should be the Herald.
Q. No, I'm just trying to understand that's a reference to the Newcastle Herald, not to the Telegraph; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Then it says:

Re NP. Informed --
That is you were informed --
her police source --
And then in inverted commas --
"Peter Fox"?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is there a need to put that name in inverted commas?
A. I don't know sir. It is just the way I wrote it up.
Q. If you're just writing a name down, what's the point of doing that? There must be some special purpose of high1ighting in that way?
A. No, I think it was just significant, sir, that, in the investigation we were in at this stage, there could have been a potential leak and that's why I've probably done it that way.
Q. I put it to you that you weren't told by Joanne McCarthy that Peter Fox informed her that Lake Macquarie were looking at [NP]. He simply informed her he knew nothing about [NP] and she - McCarthy - ought speak to Lake Macquarie.

MR SAIDI: This relates to the earlier objection I took, which was made quite clear, that one has difficulty understanding how Mr Cohen can put matters as to what the terms of the conversation were.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I join in Mr Saidi's objection and note that Mr Irving very properly put a different proposition to the witness and that the question that is relevant has been asked by the relevant legal representative and answered.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, and isn't it the case, Ms Lonergan, that [NP] there should be [NP4] on the fifth did you make that correction earlier?

MS LONERGAN: I didn't make the redaction, Commissioner, and that's why I paused and said the matter needed to be reconsidered for redactions. We just need to carefully check that and ensure its accuracy. I reinforce that the relevance of the document is purely the contemporaneous record of the understanding this officer had of the conversation with Ms McCarthy.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR COHEN: I think I understand. We're at cross-purposes. I understand the consternation because it may be that that reference is the wrong one. If that's so --

THE COMMISSIONER: I understood Ms Lonergan to indicate that should be [NP4].

MR COHEN: I hadn't caught up with that fact; hence, I was on the wrong tram, Commissioner. I'm sorry for that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Not at all.

MR COHEN: Just excuse me, please, Commissioner, and detective sergeant. I'm sorry, Commissioner, I'm just double-checking my notes. Commissioner, I have no further questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. Mr Saidi? <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. Could I seek to update some of the information you gave in your statement... [Transcript suppressed from page 1652, line 12, to page 1653, line 42]













[Transcript suppressed from page 1652, line 12, to page 1653, line 42]

MR SAIDI: Q. There is a term that's been used during this the course of this Special Commission of Inquiry, that term being "Catholic mafia". You have heard that phrase before or not?
A. Yes I have.
Q. When did you hear it for the first time?
A. In a conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
Q. Was it he or was it you who used that term?
A. No, he used that.
Q. When was that conversation?
A. That conversation was on - can I just check my statement to be sure?
Q. Certainly.
A. That conversation was on 10 April 2012, whilst I was down at a trial for [NP].
Q. If I take you to that time period of 2012, in tota1, how many conversations did you have with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in that period?
A. I would say there was probably three conversations.

The first time I rang him, because I'd come across something in relation to Fletcher - sorry, in relation to another priest for the investigation of [NP]. I needed some information on that, so I rang Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
Q. Was that only to obtain information or --
A. It was only to obtain names. Oh, sorry, and a photograph. I did ask for a photograph, if he had one as wel1. It was a short conversation. He got back to me, very cordial, got back to me and gave me the information, which was good for us. And then I had this conversation with him approximately two weeks later. I was still at the trial and that's when he mentioned "Catholic mafia" to me.
Q. Was there a further conversation after that or not?
A. After that day, no.

MR SAIDI: That's the examination, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.
MS LONERGAN: Nothing arising, Commissioner. Could I substitute exhibit 44 for a newly redacted copy of that and ask that those at the Bar table provide back to me the previous iteration of exhibit 44?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. Detective Sergeant Faber, I would be interested to know what it was that Detective Chief Inspector Fox said to you in relation to "Catholic mafia" when you had this conversation with him?
A. It was a conversation and he told me that my life could be in danger from the Catholic mafia. I made a joke about it, and he just intimated that I had investigated them so thoroughly and that they wouldn't like me and that my life could be in danger. I did make a joke about it, but he asserted that that was the case and at no time when he was talking about "Catholic mafia", he was actually talking about the Catholic Church and community.
Q. How were you able to know who he meant by "Catholic mafia"?
A. Because we were actually just talking about the Catholic Church. We weren't talking - he was talking about cover-ups within the Catholic Church. He was giving me some information. Then he said that my life would be in danger and I made a joke about not being scared about the priests. Then he said, again, that I had done so much in the Catholic Church that I should take what he said seriously.

THE COMMISSIONER: Anything arising from that Mr Gyles?
MR GYLES: I would seek a non-publication order in relation to the matter that fell from you, Commissioner. I'm not saying it is not relevant to the inquiry, but to allow that and to not make a non-publication order would be to give - to what we know to be essentially a baseless allegation on the evidence that has been presented before this inquiry from DCI Fox as to his beliefs - evidentiary support. For this inquiry to be used as a mouthpiece for a scandalous allegation like that, would be against the public interest, in my submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: When you say what fell from me, you mean --

MR GYLES: I am sorry, your questioning, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, could I clarify, I was
discussing something with my instructing solicitor relevant to a number of further redactions that are required of Detective Sergeant Faber's statement. I missed the name or the matter about which you were questioning --

THE COMMISSIONER: I wished to have clarified what it was that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had said in relation to the expression "Catholic mafia". Detective Sergeant Faber gave me an answer in relation to that, indicating, in short, that Detective Sergeant Faber's life would be in danger from the Catholic mafia, by which she took Mr Fox to have meant people within the Catholic Church or the Catholic Church itself. I'm paraphrasing, as you can imagine.

MS LONERGAN: Mr Gyles's application is that that detail ought not be published?

THE COMMISSIONER: That's right.
MS LONERGAN: May I make a submission in reply to that?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, please.
MS LONERGAN: I understand Mr Gyles's position but it has been the subject of other evidence in this inquiry that there has been an attribution of that particular statement to another person who denied that had been the position. It is of significance that this particular witness can give evidence providing a different source for that allegation, that is, DCI Fox. If that isn't published, then all that's in the public domain is the previous evidence regarding "Catholic mafia", which is attributed to persons in the police force.

It seems there's a lacking in balance, if only part of the evidence that has been surveyed is published and other parts of it aren't. Excuse me, I'11 just take some further instructions.
(Ms Lonergan and Ms Sullivan confer)
MS LONERGAN: I see I've slightly confused things in the way I made that submission. The evidence to date is that there's an attribution of Detective Chief Inspector Fox of that phrase to a former police officer and an attribution to the effect that that former police officer, when he was
investigating matters to do with sexual assault, encountered problems from the "Catholic mafia". There's a lack of clarity as to exactly who that was referring to, and the person who was supposed to make that statement has denied he made that statement. There is no non-publication order over that part of the evidence; it has already gone into the public domain.

The fact that this particular witness can offer some evidence that throws some light on perhaps where that phrase actually came from should be a matter that is the subject of publication.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. There are two aspects, as I understand it, and tell me if you disagree, Mr Gyles, to the evidence which has fallen from the evidence. The first is the assertion that by this witness that Mr Fox meant when he was speaking to her of "the Catholic mafia" was the church rather than the police. Would you say that that is as objectionable for your purposes to actually getting out into the public as the other aspect?

MR GYLES: Yes, and more so, because there is absolutely no evidence in this inquiry that that was - DCI Fox has told us what he meant by that expression. We've heard that from him in the witness box. The basis of it was, as my learned friend says, a comment that had been made to him by a former policeman.

MS LONERGAN: Allegedly made, Commissioner.
MR GYLES: Allegedly made, and he has denied it. That is where the evidence sits. This evidence is of a completely different character. It is of a different understanding that this witness may have had of that expression and, of itself, it is of no probative value. It is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles, I would have to disagree for my purposes. Whether or not it gets out into the public domain is a different issue, but for my purposes it is of probative value that Detective Sergeant Faber took Detective Chief Inspector Fox to mean that the Catholic mafia existed in the church rather than in the police.

MR GYLES: When I stood up, I did say I was not saying that this wasn't relevant to your considerations. My concern is this material being published in circumstances
where it could be published in a way that has potentially a damaging effect on the church as an institution with no proper foundation, in my respectful submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: There's that aspect that there's a Catholic mafia within the church. The second aspect, which I would imagine Would you consider more damaging, is if someone within it, if it exists, may be a threat to the life of Detective Sergeant Faber.

MR GYLES: Absolutely. That's even worse.
THE COMMISSIONER: But you say, do you, you wish both matters not to reach the public domain?

MR GYLES: Yes, although obviously, Commissioner, you appreciate the second is obviously more important.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. However, of course, the witness has indicated that she took the matter with some degree of levity. She thought that it was not serious or she certainly didn't take it seriously and almost greeted it with some sort of amusement.

THE WITNESS: A joke.
THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Is that right?
A. Yes, I did joke about it.

MR GYLES: Yes, but that doesn't necessarily mean that that will be fully reported if the first allegation is raised, so it is a contextual question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, the phrase "Catholic mafia" and any assertions negative or positive associated with it is already in the public domain and has been since May. The fact that Detective Chief Inspector Fox used that term to Detective Sergeant Faber is an important part of not only matters you are looking at, but balanced representation of evidence regarding that important phrase going into the public domain. Otherwise, there will be an unbalanced position where only the assertion and denial of the use of the phrase - DCI Fox versus the evidence from Mr Grant - is in the public domain, but not this further important piece of evidence that DCI Fox actually used this
term to this officer which may provide a different view as to the veracity or otherwise of DCI Fox's attributing the phrase to Mr Grant.

THE COMMISSIONER: What do you say about the public circulation of the idea or suggestion that the Catholic mafia may be a threat to the life of Detective Sergeant Faber?

MS LONERGAN: It provides an important context to the comment made by DCI Fox and may be the subject - I would expect to be the subject - of submissions regarding the nature of the type of comments made by Detective Chief Inspector Fox of an intemperate nature to do with matters concerning the Catholic Church and assertions to the effect that there is some sort of association in a mafia-type way between the church and the police force, which appears to be part of Detective Chief Inspector Fox's approach to these matters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Although if I were to accept the evidence of Detective Sergeant Faber, that was not the way the expression was used by Detective Chief Inspector Fox on that occasion.

MS LONERGAN: That's true, Commissioner, but it just provides further evidentiary information regarding the significance or otherwise of that phrase and whether it was used in the way asserted by Detective Chief Inspector Fox by Troy Grant.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Gyles, particularly in view of the way that this comment was received by Detective Sergeant Faber, which I would hope, if there were any reporting of the conversation, would be reported fairly, I am not disposed to grant a non-publication order in relation to that evidence.

MR GYLES: May it please you, Commissioner.
MR COHEN: Commissioner, might I rise on this point?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: I need to say, quite candidly, that I didn't go to this area with Detective Sergeant Faber by reason of my own error, if I could be very candid about this, I was
relying upon my earlier version --
THE COMMISSIONER: And also, of course, because it only arose when Mr Saidi --

MR COHEN: Yes, and, in fairness, what I am, in substance doing, is applying for me to have leave to ask further questions on this topic, because, being candid, I miscued. I thought it was something that had to be acted on --

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you able to do that before we rise for lunch?

MR COHEN: I think very quickly.
THE COMMISSIONER: Very well,

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Detective Sergeant Faber, this
conversation that you refer to, did you make a diary note about it?
A. I made some notes, yes, just some very quick notes. I was in the middle of a trial speaking to numerous people.
Q. They're not with you or --
A. Yes, they are. They're probably --

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, it would be helpful if I could have an opportunity to review those and, in particular, to look at whether any other notes on the page need to be redacted and to lead evidence from this witness regarding the note that she has. I must admit this has not come to my attention or I wasn't at least cognisant of its significance if I had seen it amongst the materials. Perhaps that could be done over the luncheon adjournment because it may take a little time.

MR COHEN: I'm perfectly happy to step back and allow my learned friend to examine first, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. We will resume at 2 o'clock.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

UPON RESUMPTION:

## <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I recall Detective Sergeant Faber. There is no need to re-swear the witness at this stage
Q. Ms Faber, I've stood up to ask some questions regarding a matter that's come to our attention, and it relates to a telephone conversation that you had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in 2012. Do you recall being asked some questions by Mr Cohen regarding that matter? A. Yes, I do.
Q. I'm going to hand you the relevant piece of paper. Those are your own papers in the witness box with you? A. That's right.
Q. Put them to one side, just to make sure we're all working off the same extract and the same material. I'm going to hand up two handwritten pages, one set for you and one for the Commissioner. I'11 ask you some questions to place that document in time.
A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: Can I emphasise for the information of all present at the Bar table, that there is a very large amount of private and personal information on these two pages relevant to parts of ongoing police investigations, but to make sense of the document, we haven't redacted that material out of the document. So this will be tendered as a confidential exhibit when I ask a few more questions about it, Commissioner.
Q. First of all, Ms Faber, would you turn to the second page of the papers that have just been handed to you.
A. The one for 10 April?
Q. Yes, that's the one. Do you see next to 10-04-12 is D-E-T I-N-S-P Fox?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Are you able to assist with what, without going into the content of the note, what these pages refer to in terms of contact with that particular officer?
A. Do you want me to explain the conversation or just
what the page is - just what this page is?
Q. How we should read the pages because you have a date in the middle of the second page. I'm just not sure if we've got them in the right order or how that note works. A. No. The note 10th of the 4 th is the second one. The first one, with no date at the top, with "Peter Fox" and then it goes on, "2 people for photos", that relates to Detective Chief Inspector Fox and that's the conversation I had with him, I think it was 26 March, where I'd asked him to supply and he'd given me some information that we were able to use with that; so down to, "We spoke about his matter", because Fletcher - this person had come up in our trial --
Q. All right. I don't want you to refer to any of the names in that first page of notes.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
Q. Can we take it that conversation was 26 March 2012?
A. I'm fairly certain it was, yes.
Q. Do you understand the information contained on that page to be intelligence and other information, including contact details of people that Detective Chief Inspector Fox identified as people who may be able to assist you in work on Strike Force Georgiana?
A. Yes, that's true.
Q. Was this note part of a notebook? Where does this note normally live?
A. No, it's a notepad. When I'm at trial or at jobs like that, I'm talking to so many people just outside the court, so I'm scribbling on this pad to try to keep a record of who I'm speaking to.
Q. Does the note of the conversation you had on 26 March go over on to the second page or is that something new?
A. No, no, it stops where you see that line. Obviously, there's a whole heaps of names under $1,2,3$, all the way down. It stops - where I put that little line above it, that's where it stops.
Q. A11 those names and phone numbers - and I don't want you to mention any of the names or any of the phone numbers, for obvious reasons - are they part of your conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox, or any
other conversation with him, or something completely unconnected?
A. No, that was my own notes when I was trying to locate witnesses. Obviously, some of those witnesses were given to me by Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
Q. On the second page of the note you have in front of you, is that anything to do with any conversations with Detective Chief Inspector Fox above the first "10/04/12"? A. No, that's not.
Q. The part that relates to a conversation with

Detective Chief Inspector Fox begins with the second "10/04/12"?
A. That's correct, with his name next to it, yes.
Q. I don't want you to read any of the material, but you commence with the words, "Long conversation re", and don't say the name that occurs after that, and there are other matters that are referred to there, and again I don't want you to refer to any of those. I note for the assistance of those present at the Bar table, it is requested that there be no reference to any of that materia1. And then there's a dash and the word - what is it?
A. "Mafia".
Q. What's next to it?
A. That's four exclamation marks.
Q. Four exclamation marks. What does that note tell you regarding the matters you've been speaking about in answer to a question by Mr Cohen?
A. Basically, that just tells you that $I$ had a conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about a number of persons. That note marked there with the four exclamation marks, I did it because I actually thought it was comical - not comical, but odd maybe and so that's why I did it.
Q. Only the word "mafia" appears there. There's nothing about "Catholic mafia"
A. No.
Q. You agree with that? Why then do you recollect that what was said was something about "Catholic mafia"?
A. Because it was a bizarre conversation. It was a weird thing to say. We were talking about the Catholics and it
was the term "Catholic mafia".
Q. Why didn't you write the term "Catholic mafia"?
A. I was writing fast and, as I said, this wasn't a conversation where I'm writing to go into court, not back then. You know, it was just an off-the-cuff - he rang me to see how his witnesses went. You know, it was a very cordial conversation and I just wrote that in there because I thought it was a very bizarre conversation, but it was definitely the term "Catholic mafia".

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, could that be tendered as a confidential exhibit?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: I think we're up to confidential exhibit T.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That extract from Detective Sergeant Faber's notes will be admitted and marked confidential exhibit T.

## CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT \#T EXTRACT FROM DETECTIVE SERGEANT FABER'S NOTES

MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Detective Sergeant Faber, I think you understand, I'm sure better than most, the need to tread on eggshells with respect to references in this document. I shall do that and I'm sure those around me will kick me in the shins if I tread across the line. Likewise, if something appears to you that potentially could do the same, please volunteer that immediately.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Having said that, you say in your statement proper, which I hope you've still got with you --
A. Would you just give me one moment, please, sir, and I'11 go over it?
Q. Please take your time.
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You make reference to a number of things. For
example - and my learned friend Ms Lonergan, as senior counsel, has already taken you to the inconsistency between your statement making reference to the "Catholic mafia" and the fact of the handwritten note just having the word "mafia", but I'11 move on beyond that to this proposition: if you, as you've recorded in your statement, particularly in paragraph 58, had been informed as a police officer, a serving officer, in a sensitive role in investigations from day to day and dealing with sensitive matters, by another police officer evidently of senior rank, a commissioned officer, that your life was in danger, it is something you would report, is it not?
A. No, sir. He's a senior officer. If he had information that my life was in danger, I think that's something he would report and make it a serious matter.
Q. No, please answer my question. That's something you would report, isn't it?

MR SAIDI: She did answer the question, with respect.
MR COHEN: All right. I'11 put it this way.
Q. That's a proposition that you would immediately report to a senior officer in your command, isn't it?
A. No, sir. I didn't take it that what he was saying to me was correct.
Q. I'm instructed to put to you that the propositions that you've recorded in paragraph 58, from the first sentence down to the words "mid-1990s", did not occur in that way and it was not the case that Detective Chief Inspector Fox ever asserted to you that your life was in danger, did he?
A. He most certainly did, sir.
Q. Had he done so, you would have recorded that in your contemporaneous note on 10 April 2012, would you not? A. No, sir. It was a bizarre conversation and I only noted it because it was a bizarre conversation and, as I said, I made a joke of it, about, you know, old men, bald men, sort of, you know, I wasn't scared of that, and I apologise to all the bald men. I did make a joke of it and he asserted that I should just, you know, take it seriously and I'd done so much work in the Catholic Church, but he didn't give me any actual reason, like, any person who was going to assault me or --
Q. He didn't give you any reason because he didn't say it, did he?
A. He most certainly said it.
Q. This proposition of your life being in danger was not put to you by him, was it?
A. It most certainly was.
Q. You go on in your statement to indulge in a series of what can only be described as homespun observations about people's psychological state; isn't that right?

MS LONERGAN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: That's not appropriate, Mr Cohen.
MS LONERGAN: It is offensive to this witness who was asked by the Commission to make certain relevant observations regarding a particular officer's health and she did so, and to be insulted by being told they are homespun observations is maybe not meant to be pejorative but it is --

THE COMMISSIONER: It is offensive in many ways, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: [Sentence suppressed].
I am talking about my client. As I understand it, there were no requests for any observations about his mental health. Is that right? Can I inquire of that,
Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: Were there any requests made for observations about his --

MS LONERGAN: I object to the term "homespun", because it is pejorative to this witness's observations as a police officer in her statement. It is that term that I have a problem with.

THE COMMISSIONER: Will you withdraw that adjective and ask your question again?

MR COHEN: I will.
Q. You have no qualifications in psychology, do you, detective?
A. No, sir, I don't.
Q. Nothing at university level of any type?
A. No.
Q. No other qualifications, working from long experience in, for example, counselling with youth groups or such that would give you experience beyond academic qualifications?
A. No, sir.
Q. You're not in a position to express opinions about what you regard as the behaviour of my client, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, are you?
A. Well, I would say that I could express an opinion on how I saw his behaviour during that conversation, yes.
Q. How could you express any opinion of that type when you were talking to him by phone?
A. In the manner that he was speaking, sir. In actual fact, by the time I'd finished the conversation, you know, I actually felt sorry for your client.
Q. The manner in which he was speaking was fairly calm and collected, wasn't it, including providing you all the information that you've recorded?
A. No, sir, it wasn't.
Q. You go on in the various paragraphs in your statement to blacken him, apart from anything else, by association, don't you, comparing him to Detective Senior Constable McLeod, don't you?
A. I don't blacken him by association. I don't see Detective Senior Constable McLeod as black. Are you asking me did I think that his behaviour was very similar?
Q. No, I'm not, in fact. I'm asking you this: in paragraph 60 you indicate a guilt by association, don't you, between, in your mind, DCI Fox and Senior Constable McLeod, don't you?
A. No, I don't see a guilt by association.
Q. All right. Then there can be no basis for the assumption, upon hearsay upon surmise, that constitutes the basis of your evidence in paragraphs 61 and 62, can there? A. No, sir --

MS LONERGAN: I object, Commissioner. There needs to be some specificity put in there to roll up that sort of proposition to the witness.

MR COHEN: I'11 go through it line by line.
MS LONERGAN: May I add that one of the comments is that this officer was of the view there was a friendship between these two officers. Surely that can't be suggested to be some sort of casting of aspersions.

MR COHEN: I'11 go through it line by line.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. In addition to these two incidents - you refer in the first instance as incidents the two incidents to DCI Fox providing you information on the phone; is that right?
A. In addition to the twice that I had contact with him is that what you're saying?
Q. You say in addition to these two incidents --
A. So the two incidents - the first would be not when I had contact with him, that's when his name was mentioned to me by Ms McCarthy, but the second incident is when I actually for the only time during Georgiana had contact with him, that was in relation to this phone call.
Q. You go on to say in paragraph 60:

Once it was evident that Detective Senior Constable Shaun McLeod had become obsessive with the investigation, and I had to limit his tasks ...
A. I am sorry, sir, where are you going from now?
Q. Look at paragraph 60. Do you have that? I'm sorry, I thought you did. Look at paragraph 60 --

THE COMMISSIONER: You are quoting from the middle of the paragraph, which is right at the end of page 855.

THE WITNESS: Okay, yes. Paragraph 60, I follow you now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Page 855.
MR COHEN: Q. You go on to say:
... I believe he began conversing with [DCI] Fox.

The evidence the Commission should rely upon is your observation that once it was evident to you that Detective Senior Constable McLeod had become obsessive, you had a proper basis to believe there was conversing with DCI Fox; Is that what you say?
A. No, that's not correct.
Q. Isn't that what the words say?
A. No, sir. It says that I had a suspicion that he was conversing with DCI Fox.
Q. You had more than that. You say you believed that, he began conversing, don't you?
A. Yes, that's a suspicion. I believe; a suspicion; I'm not saying it's a fact.
Q. You have no basis for it, do you?
A. No, that's not true.

MR SAIDI: Can I object to the relevance of this? With all due respect to the cross-examiner, what is the relevance in terms of cross-examining this witness about what she has stated in a matter when we know as a fact her suspicions were not merely concrete but occurred?

MR COHEN: It is the expression of opinion about my client's psychological state that I'm --

THE COMMISSIONER: So far there's nothing about that, is there?

MR COHEN: I am working up to it. I've got to say, with respect, there's no other way of doing it. I was accused of rolling things up, so what $I$ have to do it lead up to it.

MS LONERGAN: Can I add to the objection raised by Mr Saidi? Using the words "had become obsessive" doesn't descend into the area of some sort of psychological or psychiatric diagnosis. Other officers have offered
opinions about Detective Chief Inspector Fox being a zealot. There was no objection to that. It seems to be that this word "obsessive" has prompted some kind of particularly fulminant reaction from counsel for Detective Chief Inspector Fox along the lines that there's an effort to make a diagnosis about Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Perhaps that preliminary question could be asked and determine what footing the use of this word was offered on.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is not even about Detective Chief Inspector Fox, is it? It is about someone else who was obsessive and then the witness formed a belief that Detective Chief Inspector Fox was conversing with the obsessive detective.

MS LONERGAN: That is certainly the way I read it, Commissioner. I was worried that I was perhaps missing some subtlety that is being seen by Mr Cohen that I'm missing. I did think the word was about the other officer.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: The concern I have is simply the proposition that one followed the other; that is to say, McLeod, it is said, became obsessive and then the consequence is, "I believe he began conversing with DCI Fox."

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but that's not because the other officer was obsessive, necessarily, is it?

MR COHEN: Commissioner, if you read it that way, then I'm content.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Obviously, the belief came from something else, not just that.

MR COHEN: I will make sure of it. I will go to it directly this way, Commissioner.
Q. You don't express an opinion, when you use the word "obsessed" or "obsession", that has any foundation or any understanding of a psychological state, do you?
A. No, that's my opinion, that they sounded obsessive with an investigation; that's how I would term it. No.
Q. That's just common parlance in everyday expression. It is not a medical opinion that you resorted to in any way
to express the word or use the word "obsessive", is it?
A. No.
Q. It is a term you used?
A. It is a term I used.
Q. In paragraph 62, you express an opinion that, I take it you, you intend the Commissioner to understand to be expressed in respect of both Detective Senior Constable McLeod and Detective Chief Inspector Fox; is that right?
A. Did I believe they were both obsessive?
Q. No.
A. No.
Q. Is it your intention that 62 expresses an opinion in respect of both of them in the same fashion?
A. Yes.
Q. Then I put it to you that you've got no basis
whatsoever to express any opinion about any state of the type that you identify in paragraph 62?
A. No, that's not true, sir. I've had a conversation numerous conversations with Detective Senior Constable McLeod, and I've had this conversation where I saw it as very similar in the conversation that I had with Detective Senior Constable McLeod. The one I had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox was very similar to the ones I'd had with Detective Senior Constable McLeod.
Q. You could not possibly have the basis to form a belief about what you assert to be an obsession by Detective Chief Inspector Fox or any inability by him to investigate anything at all, could you?

MR SAIDI: I object. The word is not "obsessive", it is "passionate".

MR COHEN: No, that's not right.
MR SAIDI: If it's not right, let me read it out.
MR COHEN: I am looking at paragraph 62. I am quoting from it. It says:

I believe this obsession can lead to the inability to objectively investigate.

That is what I am examining her on. It is a perfectly proper question, in my respectful submission.

MR SAIDI: "... appear to be passionate in terms of their investigations". That's what the previous questions were directed towards.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi, the material comes from further in the paragraph. In any event, Mr Cohen, is it not the case that a detective sergeant of police in charge of an investigation should be keeping an eye on unhealthy obsessions or obsessions which might affect a junior detective's ability objectively to investigate a case? Isn't that part of her duties as a detective sergeant with detectives reporting to her?

MR COHEN: That may well be, but I'm not referring to McLeod. I'm referring to the expression of opinion about Fox.
Q. You have no proper basis to express any opinion about Detective Chief Inspector Fox, do you?
A. I had that very lengthy conversation with him which I would consider as obsessive from him, to the point that, you know, I did feel sorry for him and, you know, the assertion of the Catholic mafia, so that's where my opinion is based on merely for him, if you're asking me that. As far as being obsessed with something, this happens on a daily basis, you know, with police - not on a daily basis but it happens a lot, and you have to make sure you're not obsessed with an investigation to objectively investigate it. That's what I'm stating there.
Q. You've never worked with DCI Fox, except for a period of six months 14 years ago?
A. A very short time, yes.
Q. You've got no basis to express that opinion that you just gave to the Commissioner, have you?
A. That conversation - I do have a basis. That conversation $I$ just had, that's the basis of my opinion.
Q. Your opinion is just psycho babble, isn't it?
A. No, sir, it's not.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi?
MR SAIDI: I may need leave to ask this question but I'11 ask it and I'll see if there's a problem with it.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. It has been suggested during the course of this inquiry and elsewhere that in terms of police investigations in relation to Catholic related paedophilia and activities such as that, that either they're not taken seriously or there's not a will to undertake those investigations. I call on your experience with Strike Force Georgiana and as a police officer, what do you say about those allegations?
A. Look, I say that's completely and utterly incorrect.

As I think I've stated before, sexual abuse or the cover up of child sexual abuse is an offence that we consider akin to murder. It's a hideous crime. They're difficult to investigate, but we don't care who you are. You could come from a religious organisation or you could be the king of the world, we don't really care. If you've committed those crimes then we will investigate you and we'll investigate you to the fullest. To suggest that we wouldn't investigate a religious organisation is just nonsense and insulting to the police that do it every day.

MR SAIDI: Thank you.
MR GYLES: Could I ask a couple of questions in relation to the topic that came up, the "Catholic mafia" topic?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:

MR GYLES: Q. Ms Faber, you've referred to the conversation with DCI Fox in which the reference was made to the threat concerning the Catholic mafia. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. I think you've said it wasn't something that you took serious7y?
A. No, it wasn't.
Q. One of the words that fell from you in relation to that after lunch was you used the word "comical"?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we take it that it did not affect in any way whatsoever the manner in which you discharged your duties with Strike Force Georgiana then or at any time?
A. No, it didn't.
Q. To the extent that one might infer that the reference was to the church itself rather than a Catholic mafia within the police force, your dealings with the church in your role at Strike Force Georgiana have been inconsistent, haven't they, with some idea that you would be under threat if you didn't do your job properly?
A. I am sorry? So you're saying - sorry, could you repeat that, please?
Q. Yes. To the extent that one might infer that the comment was directed towards the church rather than a Catholic mafia within the police force, your dealings with the church in your role at Strike Force Georgiana have always been cooperative, haven't they?
A. No. Can I say, sir, if you ask me about

Zimmerman Services, they are cooperative.
Q. But so far as your work in respect of Strike Force Georgiana, you have operated in a way, haven't you, that you would not be under threat if you did your job properly?
A. That's how I operate, yes.

MR GYLES: I have no further questions. Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MS LONERGAN: I have nothing in re-examination.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Detective Sergeant Faber, thank you very much for your evidence. You are excused.
A. Thank you very much.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MR KELL: Commissioner, may I take the opportunity to tender as an exhibit a statutory declaration from Miriam Sybil White? I hand up a tender copy and a copy for you,

Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: That is a statutory declaration dated 26 June 2013. Miriam White was an administrative officer of the NSW Police who observed to some extent the search being undertaken of the offices of Detective Chief Inspector Fox. It is not proposed to call her to give oral evidence. I understand that the relevant parties also have no objection to the document, when it becomes an exhibit, being made available to the media.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Kell. That will be admitted and marked exhibit 46.

## EXHIBIT \#46 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF MIRIAM SYBIL WHITE DATED 26/6/2013

MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner. There has been a request by the media for access to a copy of the statement of Superintendent John Gralton. I would normally ask that any parties who object to that being released to the media speak to me or any of the team that assists you in the next half an hour or so.

However, during this week there have been a number of objections raised in relation to annexures to the statements of various police officers, namely, the statement of Detective Sergeant Little, the statement of Detective Chief Inspector Humphrey, the statement of Detective Senior Constable Freney, the statement of Graeme Parker and, in addition, the statement of Superintendent Gralton which was traversed in the evidence today.

The nature of the objection is not objecting to the material contained within the narrative part of the statements of the police officers, but an objection has been taken to various annexures to those documents and it is the position of those who assist you, Commissioner, that because we are conducting a public inquiry, it is important that part of that inquiry is the appropriate access to members of the media with documents that are tendered during its proceedings.

We have a role in balancing the countervailing
considerations of those whose reputations might be affected by assertions made and, on the other hand, the right for the public to be aware of material that's covered in open court and the reporting of that by the media.

We considered whether it was possible or appropriate to simply release to the media the text of the statements of those officers without those important annexures which inform the material that the officers have set out in their statements and formed the view that without that material and the annexures, that the facts only tell part of the story.

An important part of the assessment of matters before you in term of reference 1 are the evaluation and assessments that these officers made at different times of the reliability, veracity or relevance of matters raised by Detective Chief Inspector Fox in various assertions and other material that are annexed to the statements that inform the opinions of those officers.

In those circumstances, we formed the view that those statements can't be released to the media at the moment. But that further discussions wil1 continue with the representatives of the diocese, who we have been engaged in discussions with off and on during the week, to try to narrow areas of differences of opinion and should matters not be able to be sorted out before next week, at some point during the week there may well be a debate about those matters.

Another matter that Mr Gyles has raised also on behalf of other persons who are not legally represented today and yesterday in term of reference 1 is that there may be matters they wish to raise, also joining in some objections raised by the diocese. Those deliberations and argument, if necessary, will be postponed until next week. I am just being reminded about something.

MR ROSER: While my friend is getting some instructions, we have no objections at all that they be released to the media, thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Roser.
MS LONERGAN: Again, we thank the assistance of all those parties at the Bar table with redactions and privacy
matters and there are always improvements that can be had to redacting these important documents.

Can we substitute a further copy of exhibit 44 because it has been pointed out that there's another name in that exhibit that needed to be redacted. I will just hand that up now as a substitute of the exhibit 44 that's currently before you, Commissioner. Again, could we have return of the previous version?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: Mr Kell will be the enforcer in terms of disposal of those documents, so everyone can pass their inappropriately redacted copies to him to appropriately dispose of.

In terms of the plan for other evidence that needs to be tendered in relation to term of reference 1 , it is proposed - and this has been discussed with the legal advisers - that the current tender bundle be looked at with some care before tender and a combined tender bundle relating to term of reference 1 and term of reference 2 will be tendered later after the evidence is complete in term of reference 2.

The other matter to raise is there's a number of statements of other police officers who have not been called to give evidence orally and they will be tendered but need to be put into the form of appropriately sworn testimony. That will be attended to in the next little while. It is proposed that they be tendered some time during next week.

Commissioner, I have another request from the media for a copy of the statement of Detective Sergeant Faber. Could any parties who have objection to the release of that document let me know prior to 3 pm ?

MR ROSER: I can indicate that we don't object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I understood that.
MR GYLES: I can indicate that we don't object either, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.

MS LONERGAN: Thank you very much.
MR COHEN: We have no objection.
MS LONERGAN: Mr Cohen has indicated that his client doesn't object to the release of that document either. We again thank the practitioners and counsel for all the cooperation and assistance that they've provided to those who assist you, Commissioner, and the court and the courteous and cooperative way they have conducted themselves during the proceedings.

THE COMMISSIONER: I too, of course, am most grateful for the cooperation of all counsel and solicitors and that also includes my counsel assisting.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, can I add an extra thank you to the transcript reporters who have assisted every day for long hours and also the court staff of the Newcastle Court.

THE COMMISSIONER: I certainly second that. Thank you to the transcription reporters and to the officers.

MS LONERGAN: There is nothing further, unless any other party wishes to raise any other matter.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS LONERGAN: I understand we're adjourning until Monday at 10am for the commencement of the evidence in term of reference 2.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Ms Lonergan.
AT 2.40PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO MONDAY, 1 JULY 2013 AT 10AM
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