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THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Lonergan, are we in a position to interpose Detective Superintendent Kerlatec?

MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner. I call John Steven Kerlatec.
<JOHN STEVEN KERLATEC, sworn
[9.50am]
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:
MS LONERGAN: Q. You are a detective superintendent in the NSW Police Force?
A. Yes.
Q. Your full name is John Steven Kerlatec?
A. Yes.
Q. You are currently the commander of the Sex Crimes Squad of the NSW Police Force?
A. Yes.

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, can I indicate, I will be taking this witness through. If it could be known that the witness gives his evidence unwillingly.

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

MS LONERGAN: Q. Detective Superintendent, you prepared, with the assistance of your lawyers and, on an unwiling basis, but in cooperation with the Special Commission of Inquiry, a statement in Apri1 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. I show you a copy of that statement, dated 9 Apri1 2013. Is that statement true and correct? A. Yes, it is.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that statement, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of Detective Superintendent John Steven Kerlatec will be admitted and marked exhibit 4.

EXHIBIT \#4 STATEMENT OF JOHN STEVEN KERLATEC
MS LONERGAN: Q. Detective Superintendent, you were
attested as a police officer in 1978?
A. Yes .
Q. And carried out general duties until 1985?
A. That's right.
Q. You then completed a couple of years as a crime investigator?
A. Yes .
Q. Including some experience in sexual cases?
A. Yes.
Q. In May 2003 you became a superintendent?
A. Yes.
Q. And became the commander of the Sex Crimes Squad at about the same time, was that?
A. No, that was about 2008; that was in 2008.
Q. Could you outline for those in court what the Sex Crimes Squad is and its day-to-day work?
A. The Sex Crimes Squad comprises of a number of investigators, analysts and specialists who lead the NSW Police response of investigations into adult sexual assault, child abductions, online predators, internet predators, manages the Child Protection Register, provides assistance to local area commands, to other police and jurisdictions throughout Australia, and works closely with international law enforcement.
Q. Detective Superintendent, you have a soft voice. If you wouldn't mind keeping it up.

You said one of the roles is to provide assistance to local area commands. Can you outline how the process works, where the local area command needs assistance with an investigation?
A. There are a number of opportunities. The first one is through our direct monitoring involvement, we monitor what occurs overnight through our COPS system. The detection of a matter will provide the on- call team to contact the local area command to provide assistance, whether that be consultancy over the phone or attendance at a crime scene to assist.
Q. But that's more a one-off piece of assistance, when a
particular event arises that needs urgent assistance?
A. Yes.
Q. What other types?
A. Other types may include a request from a local area command for assistance. That may consist of a joint investigation, led by the local area command, a joint investigation where the state Sex Crimes Squad will lead the investigation or provide a consultancy, where we will provide a member of our staff to assist and oversight provide ongoing advice.
Q. Can we ask you about the first option, where an investigation is led by a local area command. How does that procedure commence? Is there some sort of formal application by a local area command who has been allocated a particular investigation?
A. A local area command who may be investigating a matter can submit a written request to State Crime Command, outlining their needs, the circumstances of the event and the reason why they need assistance, and that's adjudicated and assistance provided on that basis.
Q. Who makes the decision about what the nature of the assistance that will be provided and whether or not they get that assistance?
A. Ultimately it is the director of the Serious Crime Directorate, but that's upon advice from the squad commander.
Q. The director of the serious crime investigating area, was that you at any point, or who was that?
A. I have regularly relieved in that position, but my substantive position is the commander of the Sex Crimes Squad.
Q. Would you have a role in deciding what type of resources and/or advice or assistance will be provided in relation to sex crimes?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Was that the position that you held in September to December 2010?
A. Yes .
Q. In terms of the way in which assistance is provided by your unit, is it the case that on occasion staff of the Sex

Crimes Squad are actually removed from the Sex Crimes Squad and reallocated to, for example, a local area command in a region, or does that not occur?
A. Yes, it does occur, yes.
Q. When that kind of assistance is given, do the officers or officer then go and relocate in the area where the investigation is being completed, or not necessarily? A. They will work from that particular location. They won't relocate, as far as permanently move there for some time, but they will certainly work out of that location.
Q. If there's a joint investigation, how does that happen in practice, a joint investigation with the local area command and the Sex Crimes Squad?
A. It can vary. It may be a matter that we can undertake investigations apart, depending on the geographic circumstances, and it may be a case that we co-locate it having all the investigators working out of the one location, or it may be a matter that we remain in our office, conducting our office inquiries essentially from that office and the local area command conduct their investigations essentially from their location.
Q. If an investigation is a standard kind of investigation that is thought to be within the abilities of a particular local area command, would the Sex Crimes Squad then provide additional manpower or not?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. So it's a case-by-case consideration?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall having some discussions with Detective Inspector Paul Jacob in 2010 regarding investigation into aspects of allegations of child sexual assault in the Maitland-Newcastle area?
A. Yes.
Q. If you look at your statement, annexure A, you will see that's an email from Detective Inspector Jacob to a Brad Tayler and you.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recollect whether you had any discussions with Detective Inspector Jacob before this email about the subject matter dealt with in the email?
A. I recall having some conversations, but the specifics of that conversation, I can't recall today.
Q. Do you recall receiving any particular documents or paperwork related to the matters that are referred to in this email?
A. No, I don't.
Q. In relation to the email, in the second-last paragraph, Detective Inspector Jacob mentions a request for Officer Tayler to contact a certain person about what may be an investigation taking place at the time, to ask questions about whether there is investigation taking place at the time. Do you see that in the second last paragraph? A. Yes.
Q. Is that a reasonable interpretation of what that seems to be suggesting?
A. Yes .
Q. Do you remember having any particular discussions with Detective Inspector Jacob around that time about whether he in fact made those inquiries, or what the results of those were?
A. No, unfortunately I don't, I don't recall.
Q. In preparing your statement, did you take the time to see whether you had any notations or contemporaneous records about discussions regarding these matters at around about this that time?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Were you able to locate anything?
A. No.
Q. Was it your usual practice to take notes of these kinds of exchanges with Detective Inspector Jacob?
A. No.
Q. Why is that?
A. For a matter that our crime squad wasn't
investigating, it would be a matter of more of a general conversation with Inspector Jacob. The matters that we had carriage of, I would take detailed notes. It's a matter of myself being briefed regularly. In regards to this matter, as I said, it was more a general conversation.
Q. More a general conversation at this point?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you some questions about Detective Inspector Paul Jacob. Could you outline, for the benefit of those in court, your understanding of Detective Inspector Jacob's experience and abilities as a member of your sex crime team?
A. Certainly. Detective Inspector Jacob, without a doubt, would be one of the most experienced investigators in New South Wales and one of the most experienced investigators in this country. He has undertaken probably the most complex matters that I've seen, spanning over a period of 30 years. He's trained on many courses, he's lectured numerous times, he's presented to different forums. He's been held in high esteem in various venues and called upon repeatedly for advice and guidance by junior and senior officers, because of his experience.
Q. Given what you just said, was it your position in 2010 to rely upon him in terms of what he was doing and advice he gave to you as to how matters should be managed?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Including how requests for assistance should best be managed?
A. Yes .
Q. Could you look at annexure B to your statement. At the same time, look at annexure $C$, which appears to be related to it. The first two-page document appears to be a type of report with a recommendation at the end, completed by an RL McKey, who is noted as a detective sergeant investigations co-ordinator, and the document is dated 5 December 2010. Could you explain what the purpose of this particular document is, or was?
A. This report prepared by Detective Sergeant Rachel McKey flows on from annexure $C$, which is a ministerial request for information. The assessment, from my reading of the report, by Sergeant McKey outlines the information she had and her recommendation that it be forwarded to Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
Q. I'm going to move to a more general question. These types of ministerial matters that form, in this case, annexure C, how are they generally dealt with in terms of the Sex Crimes Squad involvement in them?
A. We receive numerous ministerial requests. From my experience, they require an accurate and factual response --
Q. Can I stop you there. Is a ministerial request a request for information or a request for investigation, or what is it?
A. They differ. It could be for a number of reasons.
Q. All right. In this particular case, if you look at the documents that comprise annexure $C$, first of all, do you recall having discussions about this ministerial request that comprises annexure $C$ to your statement? A. No, I don't.
Q. Looking at the documents that comprise annexure C now, are you able to assist with how you interpreted them or what you interpreted them to require of the Sex Crimes Squad?
A. It required - my understanding is it required information as to the status of that particular allegation, and advice back as to that status.
Q. Did you rely on the recommendation made by Detective Sergeant McKey in terms of how it ought to be managed? A. Yes, I did.
Q. On the first page of that report by Detective Sergeant McKey, under the heading "Comment" is what appears to be a recommendation in the middle of that paragraph to this effect:

> I recommended that this file be forwarded to Detective Chief Inspector Fox for comment due to his intimate knowledge of the investigation, the hurdles encountered from the clergy possibly consistent with the issues highlighted by [BG].

What does that sentence suggest, in terms of what was to be required on the forwarding of that matter to Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. That Detective Chief Inspector Fox provide a comment in regards to the status of that situation, in regards to the ministerial request.
Q. Do you read that comment and the recommendation on the
following page as a request to carry out an investigation into the matters raised in the letter by [BG]?
A. No.
Q. You have notated it, number point 2, as the director of Serious Crime Directorate, an instruction; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read that out for the benefit of those in court, and given that the handwriting is a little difficult to read?
A. Yes:

Forwarded for consideration and attention of Detective Inspector Fox who had involvement in the 2004 investigation into Father Fletcher 7/9/10.
Q. 7 September 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Then Commander Gralton has written something under you, in terms of the matter proceeding, once it gets to the Central Hunter Local Area Command; is that the way it works?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there is at dot point 4, the commander at Port Stephens?
A. Yes.
Q. And dot point 5 is Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. Is that the usual way these types of requests are forwarded out to particular local area command for attention and response?
A. Yes .
Q. There doesn't seem to be any further direction as to what - or to whom Detective Chief Inspector Fox should provide the comment or response. Can you assist with what would be the usual course that would be expected to be taken by the officer receiving a request like this, in terms of getting it back up the line to the minister? A. It's left open, the two handwritten points 4 and 5
weren't included on the original report. It's left open to the person making the recommendations who it should go to next to comment to make its way back up.
Q. Are you able to assist with whether you had an expectation as to what would happen after this matter went to Detective Chief Inspector Fox, in terms of it being reported back up the line, first of all, in terms of how soon that would happen and, secondly, to whom that ought to be redirected, once the inquiry had been dealt with?
A. With matters of such nature, it's generally a seven-day turnaround, to provide that comment and response. Now, it may be the case it could either come back via the Sex Crimes Squad or if it's time sensitive it could go straight back to the Commissioner's office for the information of the minister.
Q. In the usual course, would the minister's office chase up these kinds of requests if they did come back within a sensible amount of time or a short amount of time or don't he know?
A. The Commissioner's office certainly chases them up, yes.
Q. Do you recollect whether you personally had any follow-up call from the minister's office about this particular matter?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. Is there any particular police policy regarding response to ministerial requests?
A. There are a number of policies in regard to ministerial requests, yes.
Q. Do they provide any particular guidelines as to how these ministerial requests ought to be managed, time frame, matter of that nature?
A. It's mainly time frames and through the chain of command once it's completed. The time frame is seven days, unless it's specified earlier, and to go back via the Commissioner's office, through the chain of command via the Commissioner's office.
Q. What would be the normal course if a request like this was given to a police officer who was about to take a month's leave? What would be your expectation as to how that ought to be managed with that kind of unfortunate
timing?
A. There are a number of opportunities. One is either to seek an extension for the file, find an alternative officer who may be able to provide the information, seek the information verbally from the officer and someone else prepare the report and forward it on behalf of that officer.
Q. Would you expect the commander of the particular local area command to be aware of that as a potential issue and therefore make other arrangements, or would you expect the officer receiving the matter to do it, or what would you expect to happen?
A. It could be one or the other. Whoever - either could initiate that process.
Q. There's a handwritten note at the bottom, "cc: Director, Serious Crimes Directorate" - that's you? A. Yes .
Q. Do you keep these types of recommendations and material on a particular file in your office or is it managed at another location? How are those copies dealt with?
A. All files are kept on a correspondence management system; all correspondence is record on a correspondence management system, TRIM, and it's captured and recorded on there.
Q. Could you look at annexure D. That seems to be a recommendation by Detective Inspector Paul Jacob that a request for assistance from Newcastle Local Area Command be accepted and that he be allocated a specialist consultant to the Newcastle Local Area Command Strike Force Lantle. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall whether you had any conversations with Detective Inspector Jacob between September 2010 and 10 December 2010 regarding Strike Force Lantle? You don't need to tell me the content of the discussion, just whether you had them, to start with.
A. Yes.
Q. Whether you have a recollection?
A. There were a number of conversations, yes. The specifics of the conversations I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall roughy how many? Were there more than 10, one or two?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. Are you able to assist with whether you had a perception that Strike Force Lantle had commenced investigation prior to this formal request for assistance being accepted by way of this report of 10 December 2010 by Detective Inspector Jacob?
A. Yes. I did believe it had commenced. Yes, I did believe it had commenced.
Q. Are you able to assist with how long before this memo from Detective Inspector Paul Jacob that investigation had commenced, to your knowledge?
A. I can't recall that.
Q. You have annotated that you support Detective Inspector Jacob's recommendation that he be allocated to it as a special consultant and you have made the comment:

Detective Inspector Jacob is the most appropriate member of this squad to provide consultancy support.

Is that because of the particular training, background and experience you have referred to?
A. Including that, yes.
Q. There are other reasons?
A. There are. He was the most appropriate, suitable and experienced, but also he was available. His current workload at that time allowed him to take this additional workload on.
Q. Whilst Detective Inspector Jacob completed his consultation on Strike Force Lantle, did he report to you now and then about the progress of the matter?
A. He did.
Q. In relation to those reports, were they formal or informal?
A. They were informal, verbal briefings.
Q. In relation to the particular resources of an investigation, is that something that you rely on the
detective inspector who is to be allocated, in terms of appropriate resourcing, or is that something you involve yourself in?
A. It's a combination of both. I take advice from the investigator allocated, who is providing the advice, but also $I$ would have my own value or experience into that as wel 1.
Q. In your role as the commander of the Sex Crimes Squad do you have any say in which local area command ought to handle the main investigation?
A. It's a matter of - each matter is different. It could be that where the incident primarily occurred would be where the local area command would investigate the matter.
Q. If a matter came to your attention where a local area command had already been allocated the overall investigation, would it be part of your mandate to interfere or change the decision and say, "No, I think X local area command should deal with it," or is that outside your particular mandate?
A. That's outside my mandate.
Q. So you can provide consultative assistance or plan to take over the full investigation, but it's not within your mandate to say, "No, local area command $X$ should do it"? A. That's correct.

MS LONERGAN: Those are my questions, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Detective superintendent, your counsel has indicated to this Commission that you come here unwillingly. That's so, isn't it?

MR SAIDI: I object to that. Commissioner, this cannot be a matter of relevance.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'm with you, Mr Saidi.
MR COHEN: I'm sorry, I don't follow, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I won't permit you to continue with this questioning, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. Are you by nature a careful and precise
man, detective superintendent?
MS LONERGAN: I object. Commissioner, this line of questioning should be related to this man's policing duties and be kept relevant to the subject matter before the inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: It has to be, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: It is clearly intended to be, Commissioner, I can't imagine it would relate to anything else, but if it is uncertain, I will put it this way.
Q. In your policing duties, are you a careful and precise man?
A. Yes, as best as I can, yes.
Q. It is your practice to record, in your police duties, all matters in writing that are important to the discharge of such matters?
A. Primarily, yes.
Q. And in doing or in contemplating your statement to the Commission, did you consider the material in the draft carefully before you signed it?
A. Yes.
Q. Having read that material in that draft statement, were you satisfied about its accuracy and truth and correctness?
A. Yes.
Q. The statement reflects only your words, does it?
A. It was prepared with the assistance of my lawyer, yes.
Q. Does that mean somebody knocked it up, put it down in front of you and you just adopted its contents?
A. No.
Q. Well, then what do you mean that it was prepared with assistance?
A. Well, I sat down with my lawyer and prepared the statement.
Q. So you were asked questions and you gave answers?
A. I provided a narrative. I was asked questions and provided a narrative, which formed the content of the
statement.
Q. So it's your work, your handiwork; is that right?
A. With the assistance of my lawyer, yes.
Q. How much time do you devote to the supervision of the rosters on a daily basis, would you estimate?
A. That's hard to quantify. It depends on the level of supervision that you're asking.
Q. If it's somebody like Detective Inspector Jacob, does he just run his own race, in effect?
A. Certainly not run his own race. He consults with me, I speak with him each day he's on duty, like I do with all my other senior members of my staff, so I'm aware what they are doing most days.
Q. Those discussions presumably focus on serious and important matters?
A. Yes .
Q. If something is down the chain of importance or regarded as less urgent a matter, it tends not to be reviewed by you, I take it, but just managed by him; is that the long and short of it?
A. Yes, I agree with that.
Q. Has Detective Inspector Jacob, to your understanding, been attending the daily proceedings of this Commission, to your understanding?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: This is not going to assist me, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Very well.
Q. Have you been reading the transcript of the daily proceedings in this Commission?
A. No.
Q. Have you been getting a source of information beyond the transcript about what's happening from day to day, if at all?
A. I have seen some media coverage of this inquiry.
Q. Have you had any discussions with anybody else other than your own observing the media about it?
A. Yes .
Q. What discussions were those?
A. I had discussions with my lawyer and the people representing me here today. I had discussions with Detective Inspector Jacob about my attendance here today.
Q. When did you do that; that is, to be fair to you, when did you speak with Detective Inspector Jacob about attending here?
A. Throughout the week, about scheduling my time frame, to make sure I was available.
Q. Has he given you any information about what's been happening in the proceedings when you were speaking with him during the week?
A. Just timings.
Q. In your statement, I ask you to direct your attention first to paragraph 9. Your evidence to the Commission is that you did not consider Strike Force Lantle to have been complex.
A. Yes.
Q. That's your evidence?
A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: I object. The sentence should be read in full.

> .. I did not consider the investigation itself to have been complex.

Not Strike Force Lantle.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is correct, Mr Cohen. Would you put it accurately?

MR COHEN: I shall.
Q. In paragraph 9 you identify Strike Force Lantle, you identify your understanding of your capacity as commander of the Sex Crimes Squad, you say.
... I did not consider the investigation
itself to have been complex.
A. That's right.
Q. Does that mean, and so that it's clear, and so the Commission understands, that you equate Strike Force Lantle and the investigation interchangeably? Is that what you mean, that Strike Force Lantle is the investigation and the investigation is not complex? What exactly does that mean?
A. What I considered there was in relation to the investigation to conceal serious offence, it's not a complex investigation in comparison to other investigations undertaken by NSW Police. Investigations of serious sexual assault or any sexual assault is and I separated the two and considered this matter, in regards to its investigation plan and its direction on the information provided to me by Detective Inspector Jacob, was a matter of investigating conceal serious offence.
Q. If you could keep your voice up, it will assist everybody. I know you have a soft speaking voice. A. Sorry, I'm losing my voice.
Q. In the pantheon of your various levels of seriousness, this investigation was towards the bottom; is that a fair comment?
A. I wouldn't say towards the bottom, by no means. What I'm saying is the investigative skills to investigate an offence of conceal serious offence is not as difficult as some other serious matter.
Q. And therefore not complex?
A. That's right.
Q. And could easily be undertaken by a local area command?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it the case that the genesis of this matter was attracting very little urgency, isn't that so, in your understanding?

MS LONERGAN: I object. The genesis needs to be defined in time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I find that a little hard to understand.

MR COHEN: Yes, my friend challenges me properly. I will approach it through the documents in the bundle.
Q. This will require a bit of navigation through documents. To your right you have three volumes. Can you fish out volume 1 and open it up to tab 30A. It may be one that is inserted, rather than machine pagination, it may be handwritten. It is a memorandum of 3 May 2010, Tayler to Wadde 11.
A. Yes .
Q. Have you seen that document before?
A. No, I don't believe I have.
Q. Would it assist you to have a moment or two to read it, to understand its contents?
A. If you're going to ask me questions, yes.
Q. I do want to do that, and I want to be fair to you. Would you please read it now.
A. Yes, I've read that.
Q. Before my learned friend Ms Lonergan properly chided me about taking you directly to the substance of the material, you will see from that document the gist of it is a recording, a communication to Detective Inspector Tayler, I believe, of serious allegations, but he does not exhibit a terribly great urgency about the matter, does he? I mislead you. The document is signed by Detective Inspector Waddell. I said Tayler, I apologise. Detective Inspector Waddell is not exhibiting a great sense of urgency about this matter, is he?
A. I wouldn't read that into it, no.
Q. In fact, it's just another file getting little or no attention, in that sense?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object. Commissioner, my friend is asking this witness to speculate on what is contained within the document. This witness wouldn't know whether or not - what Inspector Waddell would do. These questions should be properly directed towards Inspector Waddell, not this witness.

MR COHEN: I am not doing anything of the sort, Commissioner, I should explain what I'm doing. This
gentleman is, on any view, a leading expert in his field about these matters. He is also a senior commander of the police force and I imagine he would be in charge of a local area command if he was not doing his job. He can answer as to his view about whether or not the conduct --

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Carry on, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. There was not a lot of urgency being exhibited, was there?
A. Not from the content of this report.
Q. Can I take you to tab 36 in the same bundle, a few pages forward. Would you read the email at tab 36. Have you seen that email before?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. If you read the first email, the section on the first half of the page is the section that matters.
A. Right, I've read that.
Q. You understand, I believe, and I'm not sure if you want to check, that Detective Senior Constable McLeod was in the same command as Detective Inspector Waddell and he reported to him?
A. I don't know the --
Q. If I say it to you, you will accept that as a correct statement?
A. I'11 accept that if that's what you're telling me.
Q. Do you understand from this document that while Detective Senior Constable McLeod was keen to move on with these matters, that DI Waddell was shutting him down?
A. That's the content of that email, as I read that.
Q. You would accept that the material involved - that is, what we are discussing there as the material identified in the document at tab 30 that I have taken you to - is a very serious series of allegations, is it not?
A. The allegation of - what's the allegation you are referring to?
Q. If you recall the document behind tab 30 - perhaps go back to it - the allegations raised by Ms McCarthy, recorded by DI Waddell, on any view, are very serious allegations, aren't they?
A. The allegations regarding concealing a serious offence?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, as I mentioned earlier, yes, they are; they are serious.
Q. And deserving of serious consideration and investigation and ought --
A. Yes.
Q. -- not be shut down in this way?

MS LONERGAN: I object. "Not be shut down in this way" is a very general, almost submission-like point to make.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Perhaps if you just stick to the first part of the question, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. You accepted before that DI Waddell's conduct, as reflected in McLeod's email, was to stop him moving at all on this, and you accepted it when I referred you to that?
A. That's the email you're referring to?
Q. Yes, it is.
A. That's the inference in that email, yes.
Q. There was just not a lot of urgency in that email at this time, was there, and this is by the middle of May?
A. I can only go based on a few words in on one email, so it's difficult for me to discuss whether it's urgent or not, so --
Q. Fixing the time at 13 May - that is the email from McLeod in tab 36 - there's not a lot of urgency being exhibited, is there?
A. It doesn't reflect a lot of urgency, no, I agree with that.
Q. You accept that these facts, I take it, in May 2010 were the putative steps in the formation of Strike Force Lantle, do you?
A. I probably can't answer that in regards to my recollection of the amount of data that I had in 2010 when I made that decision. I hadn't seen these emails or this other correspondence you referred me to.
Q. But these emails were addressing the very subject matter that became the strike force that was named Lantle; that's right?
A. Yes.
Q. At this stage, there is not much that looks to be regarded by the system within the NSW Police Force as very sensitive or deserving of the designation "high1y protected," is there?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object. This is really misleading. He is asking this witness to make a comment on one email, when this witness has no idea what is happening elsewhere and is not involved in any other decision-making process. It's really unfair to try to direct him by those questions with what is contained in one email and to put those matters to a witness in that form.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Mr Saidi.

> Mr Cohen, I do agree.

MR COHEN: Very well.
THE COMMISSIONER: This witness was concerned in another area of doing other jobs and --

MR COHEN: Can I make this submission: he was certainly in another area, but in lockstep with the things that were being investigated. The fact that it was a local area command dealing with, or the Sex Crimes Squad, the same matters, it is the same meat and drink of day-to-day policing.

THE COMMISSIONER: Superintendent Kerlatec hadn't seen the --

MR COHEN: No, I'm not asking him to go beyond 13 May. I thought I made that clear, and I apologise to you Commissioner, and to my friend. I said, "Fixing the time at 13 May, there was not a lot of urgency," and that was accepted. My next question was, this situation - let me put the question now, and it can be objected to at the end if that's the case.
Q. Detective superintendent, as at 13 May 2010, these are
not facts or circumstances that really justify the designation highly protected, are they?
A. Highly protected, you're saying, as a classification?
Q. Yes.
A. It's certainly something that I wouldn't encourage to be made too public, no.
Q. So that the Commission understands and the general community understands from your evidence, in community parlance, highly protected equals top secret, doesn't it? A. No, not necessarily, no.
Q. When does it not equal top secret and when does it equal top secret? If there's a distinction, let's have it.
A. It may be difficult to articulate. With highly protected, it can circulate quite widely, but it has parameters. Top secret is for the higher echelon only to read.
Q. What comes above highly protected in the police system?
A. As far as investigation, the exact - I can't recall right this minute, I'm sorry.
Q. Is there any other category that's even more sensitive and less likely to be open to anybody's eyes than highly protected?
A. Less open, did you say?
Q. Yes, to any set of eyes in the system than highly protected?
A. Yes, top secret does become --
Q. So there is a top secret?
A. Yes, there is, yes.
Q. I take it that might relate to a threat to the life of some person, particularly if they were a VIP. Is that what you're talking about, possibly?
A. That would include that, yes.
Q. Highly protected is the next level down --
A. Yes.
Q. But means not to be disseminated widely; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. A small category of people get in in the first place, and it is locked out of the system unless first authorised in; is that right?
A. Yes, that would be the case as well.
Q. At 13 May that wasn't happening on this?
A. I don't know.
Q. It doesn't look like it was?
A. Based on?
Q. On the email of 13 May.
A. Well, there's nothing to suggest to me that there was high1y protected, no.
Q. If you trave1 back a few tabs to tab 34, you will see - this is the difficulty of modern technology - it's a chain of emails. They invariably stack on top of each other, so that one reads the first in time as the last in the series. In fairness to you, to enable you to read these carefully, can I suggest this course: I direct your attention to the bottom of page 113, and do you see at the very bottom there's a little header, email from Joanne McCarthy, 8 May, to what I believe is the system email address for Detective Senior Constable McLeod. Do you see that at the foot of the page?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go over to the page of page 114, that's the body of the email. If you read that first and then come back to page 113 and read the page, it will make more sense. Will you be able to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. You know who Joanne McCarthy is now, I take it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know who she was at the time?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. But I think you understand also from the earlier document I took you to, which was behind tab 30A, that as Detective Inspector Waddell is recording it, he was being provided information from her about these matters. You accept, I take it, that at this time, as at 8 May, there's
some more information that's being provided by her. You understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's going through the conduit of her to McLeod, McLeod on to Wadde11; but, nonetheless Waddell on 13 May is being told just to stop his tracks. So there's a body of material emerging of quite serious allegations, but - do you agree with me that by the time of 13 May - going nowhere fast?

MS LONERGAN: I object. The question involved a number of what are, in my respectful submission, in effect overarching comments, and almost submissions, rather than just a direct question about the email chain.

MR COHEN: I was endeavouring to try to bring the witness's attention back to the documents I had taken him to. It's a difficult process and one cannot expect the detective superintendent to keep it in his mind. But we will do it the long way.
Q. Detective Superintendent Kerlatec, you have seen the documents I have taken you to, the initial document which was DI Wadde11's email to DCI Tayler about the investigation that was happening in early May; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. You have seen the material attached to the email of 8 May from Ms McCarthy to McLeod and McLeod on to Wadde11.
A. Yes.
Q. And my question to you then was that there is a blockage that's been reached in terms of this material going any further or anywhere at all at this point in time, isn't there?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by blockage.
Q. Well, McLeod is being told that he just can't do anything with it, and he's recorded that in his communication of 13 May that I referred you to.
A. Yes.
Q. There really is not much appetite in the system for him to do much about this at all, is there?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object. This is grossly unfair not only to this witness but in terms of generally. One knows, when one reads a brief, that there were things going on behind the scenes not involving Mr McLeod. To suggest, based on this limited information, that there was nothing happening at all is just wrong and misleading. Anyone who is listening to this evidence, let alone the witness, must be misled by what's going on.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.
Mr Cohen, Inspector Wadde11 had transferred matters on to Newcastle by then; isn't that right?

MR COHEN: Thank you. Yes.
Q. The matters - that is these matters - then went to Newcastle. You understand that, don't you, or do you? A. I don't recall that, but I'11 accept that to be the case.
Q. I apologise. I'm assuming that you have an overview of the chronology of this matter by reason of what you have done in your statement, but if that's not clear in your mind, allow me to take you through the steps. Would you prefer that?
A. Yes.
Q. At tab 38A, do you remember that document - have you seen that document?
A. No, I don't believe I have, no.
Q. I missed your answer. Did you say you have not seen it before?
A. That's correct, I have not seen that document.
Q. Do you accept from that that by 20 May, the file having got to Newcastle Local Area Command, it was then being - I use this word advisedly - shunted on to State Crime?

MR SAIDI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: That's not an appropriate expression, thank you, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I will withdraw that.
Q. The file was being sent on from Newcastle to your command, wasn't it?
A. That's what the report suggests, yes.
Q. But that didn't happen, did it?
A. I don't know.
Q. Isn't it the case that the region office, the Northern Region, intervened and created a report about these matters? Do you know that?
A. I don't know that.
Q. Let me take you to the relevant document. Again in the same bundle, if you could direct your attention to tab 57 - just before you leave that last document: in the same way that you identified or opined about what's exhibited by the original 3 May memorandum from DI Wadde11, would you say that there's any greater urgency being exhibited by the 20 May memorandum from DCI Tayler?

MR SAIDI: I object, Commissioner. Commissioner, I come back to my prior objection. This witness is being asked about material in one document, in which he has absolutely no idea, it would appear, as to what is going on elsewhere. It's a grossly unfair question.

MR COHEN: Commissioner, in my submission, one doesn't need to know anything more than what's on the face of the document, having regard to what --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, this document at tab 38A says:

It is my submission this file should be forwarded to Sex Crimes, State Crime Command for investigation.

Do you say that unless it says "Urgently" or "this minute" or "instanter" it --

MR COHEN: I am just asking the witness' opinion. Given that he deals with these things day in and day out, I am assuming it is his opinion. I take it you think not.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Do you have an opinion about it, Detective Superintendent Kerlatec?
A. Regarding the urgency of the matter?

MR COHEN: Q. Does it exhibit any urgency, is what I'm asking.
A. No, no more than usual.
Q. If you look at tab 57, have you seen that document before?
A. I don't recall seeing that document.
Q. Have you ever been told of a memorandum by Inspector Townsend, the operating manager of the Northern Region at the time, about his report into what ought happen to the facts and circumstances and matters that had arisen and that ultimately became Lantle, but which are the matters that were the focus of the memos I've just taken you to from DI Wadde11 and DCI Tayler?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object on the general ground of relevance. This is material that this witness was not involved with. It was material that happened in a command outside this witness's area. Whatever this witness has to proffer in relation to this document, whether he's read it or not, can have absolutely no bearing on what you are considering or in terms of any relevance, and I include in that phrase relevance, peripheral relevance.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.
Mr Cohen, are you seeking to establish whether the witness has been shown it in preparation for giving evidence in this inquiry or did you expect that Detective Superintendent Kerlatec would have seen it around the time it was written?

MR COHEN: I'm inquiring as to whether or not he has seen it now, in relation to the preparation of his statement.
Q. Is it a document that is familiar to you?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand the purpose of the document?
A. I haven't read it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, it is 11 pages long.
MR COHEN: I see. I'm not quite sure how I can do this.

Are you ruling this is an irrelevance and I can't pursue it?

THE COMMISSIONER: What are you going to ask the witness?
MR COHEN: I am trying to set up this --
THE COMMISSIONER: Even if he knows everything that is in this document, even if he was given time to read it, where is it going?

MR COHEN: It's going to this very proposition, that again there is neither urgency or high protection of this matter. I'm trying to establish the fact that there's a chronology where nothing happens until September, on a file that, on one view of it, is regarded as most urgent, high1y sensitive, come September, but all the activities up to then are not so exhibited, and this witness can give an opinion about this. It goes to informing you,
Commissioner, about just what the antecedents of the establishment --

THE COMMISSIONER: Ultimately, Mr Cohen, can't you make a submission that certain things happened in May and certain things happened in July --

MR COHEN: I certainly can.
THE COMMISSIONER: -- and that the timing itself suggests a speed of dealing with the matter.

MR COHEN: I certainly can. I take it you don't feel the need to have any --

THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't think this witness's opinion of whether a document he hasn't seen before shows any sense of urgency will be of assistance.

MR COHEN: Very well.
Q. You know, I take it, detective superintendent, about the commencement of Lantle in September 2010?
A. I have some recollection of the matter, yes.
Q. Did you ever see the terms of reference that established Lantle?
A. No, I don't recall seeing those.
Q. Would it assist you to see them, given there is a series of matters that you opine on about Detective Jacob's approach to Lantle, to understand what drove it as an operation?
A. Certainly, I will read them.

MR COHEN: I have one difficulty, Commissioner. I was not able to find in the bundles last night when $I$ was trying to do this cross-reference, where the terms of reference for Strike Force Lantle are. I know they are attached to a number of the witness statements, but I'm not sure they have reached the bundle. Can I direct the attention of the witness to the witness statement?

THE COMMISSIONER: They will be with us presently, thanks to Ms Sullivan.

MR COHEN: Q. The place that I find them is annexure D, the statement of Superintendent Gralton. I am grateful for the assistance of counsel assisting, I am told they are in tab 149.

We will need now volume 3. The only alternative I can see to getting the documents $I$ would like the witness to peruse is to have regard to the annexure to Commander Gralton's statement. Absent that, there is some difficulty.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have a copy of that document?
MR COHEN: I have my brief copy, which is what I'm making reference to. It is in the Gralton statement, if I may be permitted to refer to it that way. In volume A of the bundle, behind tab 1, will be found the witness statement and the relevant documents $I$ am searching for are annexure B to that statement.

THE COMMISSIONER: Detective Sergeant Little probably knows them off by heart.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, it may be the police witnesses could be given a copy of that particular term of reference.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Saidi, can you assist with this?
MR SAIDI: Yes, it is annexure $B$ to the statement of

Carlene York, which is tab 12.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Saidi.
MR COHEN: Q. Starting with tab 149 of the bundle, do you see that? If you look at page 743 and 744 - do you have volume 3?
A. I have a copy of something that's been handed to me.
Q. If you look at the foot of the page that's been handed to you, what is the printed number at the foot of the pages?
A. 546 to 548 .

MR SAIDI: It is annexure B to Carlene York.
MR COHEN: I am trying to avoid the dilemma or peril that the document Superintendent Kerlatec is looking at then goes into the ether and is unable to be identified.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have a copy of the terms of reference, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: I have a copy of the first terms of reference there are two - at tab 149, pages 743 and 744 . What I do not have, I regret to say, is the second version, the amended form. That's my dilemma. I'm trying to find both of them.
Q. Perhaps while that's being searched for, Detective Superintendent Kerlatec, you presumably have seen more strike force terms of reference documents in draft and final form than most people have hot meals; I assume, you see them day in and day out?
A. I've seen a fair few, yes.
Q. The form of the terms of reference in the first two paragraphs under the "Strike force" heading identifies what is to be done, does it not? That is to say, "investigate allegations of" and so on. Do you see that paragraph?
A. I'm reading that now, yes. Yes.
Q. Have you seen that term of reference before, or just know of it, that that is --
A. I don't recall seeing this before.
Q. Would you agree with me that those are very narrow

## terms of reference?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object. What is referred to State Crime Command are terms of reference. It is not for the State Crime Command to itself broaden the terms of reference, it is a local area command decision. At the moment, one fails to see any relevance as to why this witness is being asked questions in relation to the Strike Force Lantle terms of reference.

MR COHEN: I submit that it should be obvious. This command was providing specialist consultancy. It must have been doing it on the basis that there was a jurisdictional fact in the system that had created this strike force there it is. I'm asking this gentleman, evidently an expert, his opinion about whether or not these terms of reference are narrowly or widely drawn.

THE COMMISSIONER: How long is a piece of string, Mr Cohen? It's a relative term, isn't it? Do you wish to put that they should have included other considerations?

MR COHEN: Yes, and what $I$ want to ask - and I thought I had - is that these are very narrowly drawn terms of reference. That can elicit a response of "Yes" or "No", surely.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. A11 right. What do you say about that, Detective Superintendent Kerlatec?
A. It's difficult to say that they are narrow or broad. I don't think I can answer that either way. They do provide ample scope to investigate, whether it's broad for some people to understand or accept is a matter of opinion.

MR COHEN: Q. They are entirely backward-1ooking as we11, aren't they, the terms of reference?
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. We11, "investigate allegations of offences attached to the diocese stemming from complaints." This is complaints that were identified many years prior, not currently.

MS LONERGAN: I object. The terms of reference don't actually say when the complaints occurred, so perhaps the ground work could be laid as to what was known by this witness about the timing.

MR COHEN: Q. You heard Ms Lonergan. Do you know the time frame of the matters, or is this all information known to Detective Inspector Jacob and not oversightd by you?
A. I would definitely agree that Detective Inspector Jacob had greater knowledge of the time frame. My recollection is it was in 2000 and 2001, some period in there.
Q. Can I show you a further document which was provided to me by counsel assisting, which is the amended form of the terms of reference. In the absence of it being identified anywhere else in the bundle yet, perhaps it could be shown to the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: We should mark the first terms of reference that were shown to the witness MFI2, and the amended terms of reference MFI3.

## MFI \#2 FIRST TERMS OF REFERENCE

## MFI \#3 AMENDED TERMS OF REFERENCE

MR COHEN: I apologise that this is just occurring, but I'm afraid, in a big-document case, often something is hard to find. I am terribly sorry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Not at all, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Detective Superintendent Kerlatec, do you have in your hand now what I refer to as the amended form and the original form of the terms of reference?
A. Well, neither were dated so I don't know which preceded which.
Q. Can I indicate to you that the first I showed you arose in September 2013, and the best understanding I have is that the amended terms of reference arose in about December 2010, or perhaps January 2011. That's the approximate time frame. I'm happy to be corrected if that's in error, but my understanding is that's the time at which you can fix these and --
A. I accept that, so --
Q. I'm not hearing any complaints about that. So on the footing the first is September 2010 and the second is late 2010 or perhaps early 2011, do you see the second terms of reference?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see it's been amended by imposing a narrowing of the time on which it is to investigate?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you offer the Commissioner any view or explanation as to why there would be a need to narrow the time frame, having established the strike force in, say, September 2010, to amend it and narrow its reach in late 2010, the purpose behind that?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, really, how is this witness going to know the purpose behind it?

MR COHEN: Could there be any purpose, is what I was endeavouring to elicit?

THE COMMISSIONER: Could he know?
MR SAIDI: I think the question was, "Do you know"?
MR COHEN: I'11 withdraw it and put in this way.
Q. Could there be any purpose in narrowing the terms of reference in this way.

MS LONERGAN: I object. There is no evidence before the Commission, putting those views on it that it is narrowing the terms of reference. It is unclear from the first terms of reference, which is MFI2, what time frame is being considered then. It may well be an expansion, for all this officer knows.

MR COHEN: Q. In your experience, is it a practice to limit the terms of reference to a specific period in this way, as opposed to allegations that may be received? A. Terms of reference are structured in such a way to ensure a thorough investigation is undertaken, providing parameters. By the inclusion of those dates, I don't know one way or the other whether that included or expanded the parameters or narrowed the parameters.
Q. Is it your experience that dates like that are included?
A. Not on every occasion, no.
Q. Is it intended to include them in every case?
A. Again, each case is dealt with on its own merits.
Q. I understand that, but doing the best you can, in your experience, is it your experience that there needs to be a limiting time or not?
A. When we are looking at matters such as conceal serious
offence, I'm not sure whether including or omitting the dates adds to or deletes the focus of the investigation.
Q. Is it something you would choose to do if you were drafting such terms of reference, to limit the dates?

MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, it is too hypothetical.
MR COHEN: Very well, Commissioner.
Q. You saw in the evidence-in-chief, when you were lead through the evidence by my learned friend, the annexure which is included to your own statement, which is the document annexure B provided by you, which was authored by Detective Sergeant McKey. Do you remember that? A. Yes.
Q. You gave a series of answers to my friend about its purpose. Can I ask you this: you identified when you were giving your initial evidence what appeared to be a pecking order of things, and I want to be sure that I understood what you meant by that. You initially indicated that there can be, I think, three categories: a request from an LAC for assistance from your squad - sorry, a joint investigation led by an LAC; a joint investigation led by you; or an LAC investigation led with consultant advice. Those are the three categories. Have I stated them correctly?
A. Yes, they are the categories.
Q. And this Strike Force Lantle was the last of those categories, led by the LAC with consultant advice, and that was Detective Chief Inspector Jacob?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the lowest level of pecking order, if I can
describe it that way, or the lowest rung on the ladder?
A. I would not rank it as a low, no, by any means.
Q. Sorry?
A. I would not regard that as a low response, by any means. I would regard it as that was the appropriate level of response for this particular matter.
Q. Certainly you understood it was the appropriate level, but the one requiring least active involvement by your squad?
A. That's right.
Q. Most likely to be conducted locally, as opposed to higher level specialist intervention or active input, as opposed to consultancy?
A. One that required less of the expertise provided by the Sex Crimes Squad.
Q. Less intensive activity; is that right?
A. Yes, I accept that, yes.
Q. You gave some more evidence. You were asked whether
or not there was a third election for comment or response. You were asked what was the usual course, and you said, it was left open to the person making recommendations or comments. That was in respect of your annexure B, you were referring to that document, and you were contemplating ultimately comments being made in respect of annexure $B$ by Detective Chief Inspector Fox; is that so?
A. Are you referring to the signature block on the footnote of that report?
Q. Yes, and the series of instructions or directions?
A. Yes.
Q. If it was left open to Detective Chief Inspector Fox to comment, presumably that comment could be for there to be an investigation; is that right?
A. He could make any comment.
Q. But that's certainly one that would be perfectly orthodox and acceptable, if he did?
A. Had he chosen to do so, yes.
Q. If he did make it later, would it be unusual that that
comment was not had regard to in the scheme of things of such an investigation as something like Strike Force Lantle?
A. I'm not sure the --
Q. Let me put it this way. That documents that is annexure B to your statement, did you ever understand what its ultimate fate was, what happened to it in the system?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever interrogate the system to understand what had occurred with it?
A. No, I don't recall I did that.
Q. Is it possible even today to know what, if anything, happened to it?
A. Yes, I believe there may be opportunities to track that document down.
Q. It had as its genesis a request from a minister's office, presumably the Attorney-General?
A. No.
Q. No
A. Sorry, I don't know which.
Q. Sorry, I thought you did. Would you accept from me it was likely to come from the Attorney-General in that officer's role as the Minister of Justice.
A. Can I refer back to that exhibit?
Q. Please.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you satisfied that is the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Presumably in your specialist command you more often than not - you receive many ministerial briefing requests; is that a fair comment?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have given evidence about how quickly the turnaround time is for these, and the expectations of turnaround?
A. Yes.
Q. You have said 7 to 10 days in the ordinary course?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know whether or not this one got the 7 to 10-day turnaround?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Would it be unlikely for it just to sit there unnoticed and without any follow-up by the minister's office?
A. It would be unlikely that there wouldn't be any follow-up by the minister's office or the Commissioner's office.
Q. So there is no follow-up on this ministerial file that you can think of or are been aware of? It did become something of a hot potato that you could not possibly forget.
A. Well, it is certainly that didn't come to my attention. Having said that, it's nor my role to chase it up. There are other mechanisms in place to follow it up.
Q. If it was one that got a lot of attention and became, as it were, the squeaky wheel that had to be oiled, you would have known about it, had that situation occurred?? A. What happened to the report afterwards, I don't know. I deal with many urgent and highly important matters daily, sadly they all relate to sexual abuse and each and every one receives the best attention I can give it. Now, whether one floats to the top more than others, that may occur, but I certainly don't recall on this occasion.
Q. If there was a record of it of the type that could be interrogated, it would be on the TRIM system; is that right?
A. The TRIM system, yes.
Q. That system would show presumably what was the ultimate fate of this ministerial inquiry if there -A. Yes. It should be - it should record that, yes.
Q. Would there be any reason why there wouldn't be? A. I can't think of any. Perhaps if the report wasn't responded to, but then I suspect there would have been follow-up. So no, I really can't think of an answer to that.
Q. Should there have been some sort of file disposition?
A. There should have been some resolution to the inquiry.
Q. If there is one, is that a cause for some inquiry or suspicion?
A. It's a cause for some follow-up inquiry. I wouldn't say suspicion.
Q. Well, it's an unusual situation?
A. There are circumstances when reports aren't responded to, but there are certainly methods in place to follow and to see what's happened to them as well.
Q. A seven-day turnaround, as you indicated in your evidence a couple of times, when in your understanding was the first report written and go off to Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Are you referring to the report by McKey?
Q. Yes, that's annexure B to your statement?
A. I would say the day of or the day after that report was signed off by - it left State Area Command, on or about 7 September 2010.
Q. It went through the various hands in the chain of command?
A. From looking at the signature block, yes.
Q. It got to the commander of Central Hunter, who I understand is Superintendent Gralton, on 9 September, so the progress - is your understanding the same as mine - is this: the document was written on 5 September, given the blessing of the immediate superior of Sergeant McKey that same day, who is Detective Acting Superintendent Haddow? Is that the right chronology?
A. Yes, it looks like 6 September 2010.
Q. Is that 5 or 6 under Haddow's signature? I read it as 5. Do you read it differently?

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, 5 or 6 . It doesn't make much difference, does it, Mr Cohen, seeing the one before is 5 and the one after is 7 ?

MR COHEN: Q. It gets to you on the 7 th and you deal with it?
A. Yes.
Q. It goes off presumably to the commander of Central Hunter?
A. Yes.
Q. He gets it on the 9th?
A. Yes.
Q. How quickly would you expect it to move on from there?
A. Unfortunately I don't know the inner sanctions of how the machinations of transferring correspondence from that command might work, so I couldn't tell you.
Q. If and when it got to, as it was intended to go to Detective Chief Inspector Fox as identified, if this file was to be retrieved from him, how would that be done formally in the system? This has been directed to him and goes to him and he has to give comments on it. If that could be superseded by some formal step, what is that step to retrieve this and recall the file from him, having regard to this chain of command direction?
A. Are you suggesting once the file is completed or responded to?
Q. No, so that we're very clear, the file goes through this series of steps, through the chain of command, go gets to Detective Chief Inspector Fox's desk, he receives it. If it's intended that that file is then to be retrieved from his custody and he is not to do anything about it, what is the formal step, if any, that is required for that to occur?
A. Well, it's recanted on TRIM and his supervisor or someone else could physically ask for the file back.
Q. And do it with a direction in writing?
A. Not necessarily. It could be physically, "May I have that file back, please," for whatever reason, and TRIM is updated, whatever action is taken from there.
Q. So that step would be on TRIM if it's been taken?
A. That's how I'd do it, yes.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
MR SAIDI: Commissioner, I was going to ask, that I go after everyone else, since he's my witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles, do you have any questions?
MR GYLES: I have no questions.
MR IRVING: No, Commissioner.
MR McILWAINE: No questions.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:

MR SAIDI: Q. You have made some reference - and I think I have interpreted your evidence correctly, but if I haven't, please correct me - to there might be a difference between investigating a conceal serious offences as distinct from investigating a sexual crime itself?
A. Yes.
Q. Do I understand you correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you see as the differences between an investigation of a conceal offence and what is required for the investigation of a serious sexual crime offence that is required?

MR COHEN: I object, it is on a principle basis, and perhaps this will elicit a ruling for the rest this Commission. In my submission, this is in the nature of essentially re-examination and should be done by non-leading questions. That being so, if you are with me, Commissioner, then there should not be cross-examination, there should not be an opportunity --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, you asked some questions about prioritising an offence of concealing serious offence.

MR COHEN: Yes, indeed, and if anything is unclear and if it is truly requiring clarification or elucidation, because there is lack of clarity, then, in my submission, that is the quintessence of re-examination. It is not an opportunity to run through a series of Dorothy Dix questions and give --

THE COMMISSIONER: No, I will allow the question and it does arise from cross-examination.

MR SAIDI: Q. Do you recall the question? I'11 ask it again. What do you see as the major differences between an investigation relating to conceal serious offences as distinct from an investigation into the commission of a primary sexual serious offence?
A. Yes. The investigation into a primary sexual offence involves obtaining very detailed statement from the victim, obtaining corroborative evidence of the first complaint, establishing forensic evidence in regard to that complaint, looking for witnesses, canvassers, any other evidence that would assist in identifying the perpetrator and leading to the prosecution of that perpetrator, in broad terms. There may be others.

The conceal serious offence could be any offence. It could be a homicide, it could be a large theft, it could also be a sexual assault, or any other matter. It doesn't necessarily need to be a sexual offence. The objective of identifying the serious offence is to identify the knowledge and what action was taken.

The exact details of the sexual offence in this regard doesn't have a great bearing on the investigation of conceal serious offence. The fact that the person knew about the sexual offence is sufficient or they knew about the homicide or they knew about the large theft is sufficient to commence an investigation into conceal serious offence.
Q. From what I understand from that answer, when investigating a conceal serious offence matter what you need is sufficient information to identify the offence which is concealed; is that so?
A. Yes.

MR COHEN: I object on the same basis, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will allow it for the time being, Mr Cohen.

MR SAIDI: Q. And on that basis, to what extent does one need to actually go into the terms of the investigation as to what constituted the offence which was concealed?
A. I would suggest that a victim statement would be a starting point, solid evidence that an offence had occurred, and whatever supporting evidence to fill that definition of serious offence.
Q. I want you to assume this for the moment: assume that there was a victim statement or multiple victim statements already obtained in relation to the commission of the offence. In your opinion, would it be sufficient for an investigator, in undertaking the investigation of a conceal serious offence, to have that material provided to them? A. Yes.

MR COHEN: I maintain my objection, Commissioner.
MR SAIDI: The question is an open-ended one.
THE COMMISSIONER: And it's been answered.
MR SAIDI: Commissioner, since my friend wants to raise it, let me deal with it. Number 1, I asked "To what extent" so I deliberately asked an open-ended question. Secondly, I am not bound to ask non-leading questions. This witness may be my client, but he is not my witness, he is counsel assisting's witness and I am entitled to put any proposition I want to this witness, without interference, whether it be from Mr Cohen or anyone else. It is a question of weight as to how I frame the questions and how he answers the questions, it is not a matter for my friend.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, if I can be heard on that, I agree with and repeat Mr Saidi's comments. This witness is a witness of the Commission. He is here giving evidence, in effect, unwillingly, as noted on the record at the beginning of his evidence. He has been asked by those who assist you to direct his mind to certain issues, to assist in providing relevant evidence to you, Commissioner, and he's called by the Commission. In those circumstances Mr Saidi's submission is correct. You can at any time, Commissioner, if you consider the questions to be inappropriate or leading in a way that the answers will not assist you, intervene, but at this stage Mr Saidi's approach is, in my respectful submission, correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Yes, you have asked a question, Mr Saidi.
Q. Superintendent, do you recall the question or would you like to have it again?
A. I think I answered it.
Q. You think you did?
A. Yes.

MR SAIDI: Q. In terms of the expertise required in investigating a conceal serious offence to the expertise required in terms of investigating the primary offence of the commission of a serious sexual offence, are you able to tell us whether or not there is a difference in terms of what is required?
A. Yes. I regard the investigation of a sexual offence to require greater skills, experience and understanding, firstly, of the needs of the victim, the forensic process and the supporting statements, the requirement for supporting statements. The investigation to conceal serious offence is not as complex and requires, I would suggest, basic investigative skills, with some guidance.
Q. From what you are saying, then, are you able to indicate whether or not it would be mandatory or compulsory, in terms of allocating an investigative officer to investigate a conceal serious offence, that that officer has extensive experience in terms of investigating sexual offences themselves?
A. No.
Q. Can you tell us why you say that?
A. Just going back to what I commented before about the nature of the conceal serious offence, it's to identify that a serious offence has occurred, regardless of whether it's a sexual offence, whether it's homicide or large theft, just the knowledge that that occurred. Then the investigative effort would be directed towards identifying knowledge and then what action or inaction took place.
Q. I want to take you to a different area now, and I want to take you to the work of the State Crime Command. In terms of matters coming to the State Crime Command, whether it be for the State Crime Command to take them over or whether it be in terms of calls for assistance, or whatever category one puts it, are you able to say whether or not the call for assistance in terms of State Crime Command would be made in relation to matters to be considered of importance within the local area command or not?
A. They are certainly matters of importance to the local area command, yes.
Q. In other words, you would not expect to have referred
to you matters which are not of great significance from a criminal investigation point of view?
A. Yes.
Q. The mere fact of a matter being forwarded to your command, would that indicate to you that the local area command was looking at the matter seriously in terms of its investigation?
A. Yes .
Q. And in terms of what resources are to be allocated or what approach is to be taken, is that a joint decision to be made between your command and the local area command, or is it one that's made unilaterally, or can you tell us how it operates?
A. It does vary, but it's generally in consultation with the local area command, as to the level of response being sought, and the level of response provided it does vary.
Q. In this case, what was allocated by way of assistance was Detective Jacob - I'11 leave his rank out - for assistance?
A. That's right.
Q. And you have given information as to what you perceived to be his experience and his capabilities as a detective?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of his assisting the investigation when called upon, what would you say to a situation whereby, whether it be Detective Jacob or any other officer allocated to a particular investigation, if they were to form a view, for example, that more assistance were required or further steps were to be taken, would you expect that to be reported back to you or to not? A. Most certainly.
Q. And if resourcing were to be an issue or not, would you expect that to be reported back to you?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of assisting with investigations, if indeed a local area command were to place inadequate resourcing, for example, to an investigation, and if that were reported back to you, are you in a position to take action in relation to that as a commander?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. What could you do in relation to a situation such as that?
A. I would contact the local area commander, discuss my concerns with that person, raise the potential risk to the investigation, and I've yet to date not progressed further resources being allocated to an investigation.
Q. If it be the case that either inexperienced or inefficient detectives were engaged in an investigation at the local area command level, that is an investigation being oversightd by your office, what steps, if any, could you take as commander upon being made aware of that fact?
A. Similarly I could contact the local area commander, or I have contacted the local area commander, raised my concerns and made a recommendation for a more experienced officer to be assigned to the investigation.
Q. Are you able to say whether or not at any stage Detective Jacob came back to you and indicated either a lack of resourcing on the one hand or an inefficient investigation on the other?
A. No.
Q. Are you able to say whether at any time there were any concerns expressed in terms of the investigation being carried out by Strike Force Lantle?
A. No.
Q. At any time did any complaint of any kind come to your attention in terms of how Strike Force Lantle was conducted?
A. No, not at all.
Q. You were receiving briefings on, I take it, a regular basis from Detective Jacob; is that correct?
A. Verbal briefings regularly, yes.
Q. The purpose of those briefings, can you give the Commission an idea?
A. To just give me a brief overview of how it's progressing, what Detective Chief Inspector Jacob was involved in, but that was also in concert with the other matters that he had responsibility for as well.
Q. I asked you questions about what your view was of the
suggestion that the strike force was not operating efficiently or up to standards. Is there an expectation on your part, and if so what is it, of an officer allocated to an investigation, such as Detective Jacob, if there were an investigation not being carried out efficiently? Would you expect it to be reported back to you?
A. Most certainly.
Q. What about in terms of his taking action in relation to the matter; what are your expectations as a commander?
A. My expectations would be that he would be speaking with either the local area commander himself or the crime manager of the particular area to raise concerns in regard to the resourcing or the response to the investigation.
Q. In terms of your updates that were provided to you by Detective Jacob, to what extent if any were you satisfied as to the progress of the investigation?
A. I was satisfied completely with the progress as to how it was moving on. I was satisfied with the level of consultation that Inspector Jacob was providing, and from what I've seen of the investigation, I considered it to be quite comprehensive.
Q. I am going to ask you this and ask you for a comment in relation to it, in terms of whether it has any substance or not from your position as a commander involved with the strike force. There's been a suggestion made that this strike force was set up to fail from its very inception. Do you have any comment to make about that as to --

MR COHEN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will allow it.
MR SAIDI: Q. Do you have any comment to make about that, from your knowledge of your involvement in the strike force and from the perspective of State Crime Command, as to whether or not there were any indications or any facts in terms of it being bound to fail?
A. Certainly not. From everything I saw, everything I was told, the investigation was progressing very well. Detective Chief Inspector Jacob was providing professional, comprehensive advice to those who needed it and oversighting the investigations to move forward. It certainly wasn't one to fail; in fact I would say it had a high probability of succeeding.
Q. I want you to assume for a moment that a local area command did indeed set up a strike force to fail.
I appreciate you may find that a difficult assumption but I want you to assume it. Assume a strike force was set up to fail and assume that State Crime Command came in and assisted in terms of the investigation. From your experience as a commander of the State Crime Command, and from your knowledge of your investigators attached, such as Detective Jacob, are you able to say whether or not any such approach by a local area command would be detected by your command?

MR COHEN: I object. That's a question for you, Commissioner.

MR SAIDI: It's a question for his experience, with respect.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's somewhat hypothetical, I think, as you put it.

MR SAIDI: It's certainly hypothetical, as is the hypothesis put forward by one of the primary witnesses, or rather the unsupported assertions by a witness that the strike force was set up to fail. This witness, with his experience, should be able to meet that proposition.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I will allow it.
THE WITNESS: I believe I would or, through the processes that are in place, should or would detect any effort to undermine the investigation.

MR SAIDI: Q. Now I want to come to the ministerial that you were referred to earlier. You recall that document, of course, and that document is attached to your statement. In terms of the ministerial, you have already given some evidence that you wouldn't expect the ministerial to operate as a request for Detective Chief Inspector Fox to investigate, as it is there - have I understood you correctly?
A. That's correct.
Q. Just assume for the moment, whether it be Detective Chief Inspector Fox or any other person in that position receiving such a ministerial, assume that that person
determined to embark upon an investigation of the matter. What steps would you expect that person to take in terms of embarking upon the investigation; that is, firstly, would they be required to make a notation on the ministerial itself?
A. That could be an option, a response to that regard, that an investigation would commence.
Q. In terms of advising the commander or the appropriate senior officer in the command that they were embarking upon an investigation in terms of the ministerial, what would your expectations be?
A. Yes, that would be an expectation, that you would advise your commander.
Q. Indeed, in terms of any action taken in relation to the ministerial, whatever the action may be, to what extent would you expect a response from the police to have been being provided to the ministerial, that is a formal response?
A. Well, a response to that ministerial would comprise a report setting out the knowledge of the question asked, and that would go through the chain of command, including the commander.
Q. Do you include in that answer that if an officer determined, as part of the response, to embark upon an investigation, that would also be recorded officially? A. Yes, it may be included in that report, yes.

MR SAIDI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Lonergan, is there anything arising?
MS LONERGAN: No, nothing arising, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Might Superintendent Kerlatec be excused?

MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, given the time taken with various witnesses to date, it is proposed by those assisting you that from today the Commission sits from 9.30 to 4.30 daily.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Does anyone have any major objection to that course?

MS LONERGAN: And that includes next week, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.
MS LONERGAN: I have been reminded by Mr Hunt that we will not be sitting until 4.30 today, because of particular arrangements regarding our transcription service.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will adjourn for 20 minutes.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: Just a matter of housekeeping, ladies and gentlemen: for various reasons to do with the transcription staff, we will be rising at 3.30 this afternoon. Given that that has to be the case, does it cause anyone any great inconvenience if we have only half an hour for lunch today?

As of next week, we will try to stick to the 9.30 to 4.30 timetable, to get things done.

MR COHEN: I have an inquiry that flows from that, which is this: that suggests there might be some significant chance that the evidence of Detective Chief Inspector Fox will flow into Monday. The gentleman will have been in the witness box for five days by then. Is there anything we can do to shorten his evidence today, so that he can have at least the weekend --

THE COMMISSIONER: Let's try to get on with it.
MR COHEN: All right.
THE COMMISSIONER: Before we do, Mr Kell. .
MR KELL: Commissioner, I take the opportunity to tender sworn evidence in the form of a statutory declaration from Andrew Grono. I hand up to the Commission an outline of what that evidence relates to.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell. .

MR KELL: It is a statutory declaration dated 2 May 2013. Mr Grono was formerly a detective senior constable with the Western Australian police force. He gives evidence that in 2005 he was contacted by Sergeant Mark Watters of the NSW Police Force, who had a warrant for the arrest of Father Denis McAlinden. Father McAlinden was thought to be living in Western Australia. The then Detective Senior Constable Grono was engaged to assist NSW Police to try to locate McAlinden. That was in September 2005.

Mr Grono made certain inquiries. He then located what he believed to be an address for McAlinden in Wannerup in Western Australia. Mr Grono gives evidence that he attended the address, an elderly male answered the door. Upon inquiry, he was identified as being Father Denis McAlinden. Mr Grono said to him that he wanted to speak to him about a matter to do with the NSW Police and that it was an arrest warrant, and McAlinden appeared frail and to be struggling walking, carrying an oxygen bottle.

Grono told him about the warrant and the particular charges regarding child sexual abuse for offences committed in New South Wales, and Mr Grono's evidence is that McAlinden said to him words to the effect, "I was previously charged with child abuse matters and I beat those charges, so if I'm around long enough I will beat these charges too." Detective Senior Constable Grono said, "McAlinden's attitude toward me appeared to be to a significant extent defiant and dismissive."

McAlinden was then asked to clarify what he meant, and he indicated that he had terminal cancer and only a short time to live.

Detective Grono then made further inquiries with McAlinden's doctor. Those inquiries indicated that McAlinden was in fact terminally ill with advanced cancer and did not have long to live. Detective Grono then communicated with Sergeant Watters and conveyed the information regarding McAlinden's state of health, and it was decided by NSW Police, based upon that medical evidence that was conveyed, and Detective Grono's observations, not to execute the warrant in relation to McAlinden, who, in fact, died a short time later.

Detective Grono also indicates that, in his communications in relation to the McAlinden matter in 2005,
all his dealings with NSW Police were with Sergeant Watters, and, upon inquiry, that he didn't have any dealings with Detective Chief Inspector Fox at that time.

I tender that declaration, Commissioner, and ask that it be marked as an exhibit.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Ke11. The statutory declaration of former Detective Senior Constable Andrew Stefan Grono will be admitted and marked exhibit 5.

## EXHIBIT \#5 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF FORMER DETECTIVE SENIOR CONSTABLE ANDREW STEFAN GRONO

<PETER RAYMOND FOX, resworn:
[12.20pm]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR ROSER CONTINUING:

MR ROSER: Q. Mr Fox, yesterday I was taking you through, I suggest to you, a conversation you had with - or your dealings with [AJ]. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I suggest to you that you said to her, around about --

MR HUNT: I hesitate to interrupt my friend. I indicated yesterday afternoon, Commissioner, that I would be seeking a provisional non-publication order at the commencement of evidence today. I make that application and I will indicate to Commissioner when I consider that the non-publication order ought cease, depending on the evidence that flows.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That is to commence now with this subject matter?

MR HUNT: With the current question, yes.
[Transcript redacted, per suppression order, from page 452, line 39 to page 477, line 13]

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a convenient time to rise for a short lunch?

MR ROSER: Yes, thank you.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION

> MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, may I raise one matter before Detective Chief Inspector Fox returns to the witness box. It is just a point of clarity.

Earlier today, Officer Kerlatec, the phrase was used that the officer gives his evidence unwillingly. What this denotes simply is that certain protections under the Special Commission of Inquiry Act are enlivened by the use of that phrase. It does not denote any lack of willingness to assist the Commission and no inference should be drawn in relation to that phrase used in relation to any witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Quite so. Thank you, Ms Lonergan, for clarifying that for everyone's information.

MR HUNT: Commissioner, could I deal with one other interlocutory matter. I indicated that I would indicate to you, Commissioner, a point in the evidence at which I submitted that there should no longer be a non-publication order.

The short submission is that all the evidence given in the last session, commencing at about 12.20 pm and continuing until about 1.15 pm , ought be caught by the non-publication order that you made provisionally, and that the evidence commencing at this point is unlikely to attract an application for non-publication order.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. Pursuant to section 8 of the Special Commission of Inquiry Act 1983 I make a direction preventing publication of the evidence given in the last session.

I am also obliged to indicate that it is a criminal offence under section $31(2)$ of the Act to contravene my direction preventing the publication case of the evidence.

MR ROSER: Q. Mr Fox, you have given evidence that on 2 December 2010, Commander Haggett informed you of a meeting later that day at Waratah?
A. I think I had amended that, in that I believe now that it was the preceding day. Yes, it was the preceding day, 1 December, that I was advised that there was going to be a meeting.
Q. And you knew what the meeting was about?
A. I did not know --
Q. Did you know what the meeting was about - "Yes" or "No"?
A. No.
Q. I suggest to you that did and it was in relation to the material that you were holding, [AJ], [AL] and [AK]?
A. It was in relation - from what I understood, the meeting was to be about, to discuss investigations into the Catholic Church, and I was asked to bring along the statements of [AK], [JK] and Mr Stanwe11, and any other material that I had.
Q. Who is [JK]?

MS LONERGAN: I object.
THE WITNESS: [AJ]. Sorry, my apologies.
MR ROSER: I'm not sure what my friend is objecting to. I'm just repeating the evidence.
Q. Sorry?
A. I corrected that.
Q. Which statements were you asked to take along?
A. I was asked to take along - he did not specify the statements, but the statements that I believe he intended me to take were those of [AK], [AJ] and Mr Mike Stanwell.
Q. That is not correct, is it?
A. And, sorry, I should have added --
Q. That is not correct, is it?
A. Yes, it is, and I probably should have added other material that related to those that had been provided by Joanne McCarthy.
Q. How could Commander Haggett ask you to bring along [AJ] when he didn't even know that you had that statement? A. Sir, you may not have heard my answer. What I did say was that, without specifying what statements $I$ was to bring along, and he didn't specify them by name - I believe I did say that - is that he asked me to bring along, and I believe the statements that he intended for me to bring
were those.
Q. First off, you gave evidence that you intended to take it, and then subsequently you have changed your evidence to say that you had no intention of taking it; is that correct? Is that the evidence you have given in this Commission?
A. I'm not sure. I think what I did say, I think I - by the second statement I corrected it. I did say that initially I was going to take it, but then I made the decision to leave it behind, in view of the fact that I was completely au fait with the contents of those statements.
Q. I suggest to you - this is page 104, Commissioner, line 23 - you were asked this question by Ms Lonergan:
Q. Did you deliberately fail to take that material --

Talking about the statements --
to the meeting because you did not want to share the information with those present?
A. No.

Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So you didn't deliberately fail to take the material to the meeting on 2 December 2010?
A. Yes. I did.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, because there were two negatives, "You didn't deliberately fail" --

MR ROSER: I am sorry.
Q. Did you deliberately fail to take those statements to the meeting on 2 December 2010? ?
A. But not for the reasons stated, yes.
Q. You were asked this question:

Did you deliberately fail to take that
material to the meeting because you did not want to share the information with those present?

And you answered "No."
A. That's correct, that's exactly what I was saying.
Q. You attended the meeting, there were a number of people there?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have identified some of those people?
A. Yes.
Q. You said you didn't know a young person that was there?
A. Yes.
Q. That was Detective Sergeant Freney, wasn't it?
A. I didn't know who that person was. I don't believe it was a sergeant.
Q. A senior constable?
A. I don't know the person. I'd never - to my knowledge, I hadn't encountered them before, and that's why I said it was a person I didn't know. If I had known who that person was, and I take your word that's who it was, I would have stated that. The reason I have stated I didn't know who that individual was that I didn't know him.
Q. Is that a person who you know had some 15 years experience or thereabouts?
A. Sir, I've just said I didn't know him, so --
Q. You didn't know him. But you've given evidence that persons attached to the strike force were inexperienced, haven't you?
A. At the meeting I was given the name of --
Q. Have you given the evidence that the people who were appointed to this strike force were inexperienced?
A. I was not told by anybody that the constable --
Q. Have you given that evidence?
A. That the constable I didn't know was attached to it.
Q. Have you given that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Fifteen years experience, would you say that's
inexperience?
A. I didn't know that individual, sir, and I was not told by anybody that he would be taking part in the
investigation, and I don't know him. My assertion in that respect was specifically in relation to individuals not people in supervisory or other capacities.
Q. During the meeting, I suggest to you that notes, minutes were taken of the meeting? Weren't they?
A. I have never been shown any minutes or --
Q. No, that's not the question. Can you just listen to the question and answer the question. During the meeting, minutes were taken of the meeting?
A. I don't believe so, no.
Q. Haven't you given evidence before that you observed someone taking minutes of the meeting?
A. I observed someone on the odd occasion jotting down the odd thing, but I did not consider that the volume of or small amount of writing I observed, translated into minutes. You may enlighten me, sir, as to what it was, but I certainly did not see any transcription, I've never been shown a document at the end of it. Those short notes may have been in that process. It was certainly very minute, compared to the volume of conversation had at that meeting, but someone was writing. If you're asking me, did I see someone writing? Yes.
Q. The meeting, when you were there, how long did it go for?
A. Probably - I think I've got a time frame. I think it started at about 12.10 and would have went for - certainly no longer than half an hour, probably 20 minutes to half an hour.
Q. Then you left and you left with Commander Haggett?
A. No, sir, that's not correct. The evidence I've given is that Commander Haggett had independently travelled down there that morning. I saw him when I arrived down there, and I left alone, and he obviously had his own vehicle, and travelled back of his own accord.
Q. Did you and him leave the meeting at the same time?
A. I don't know when Mr Haggett left the meeting.

I certainly - I never left the room with Mr Haggett, no.
Q. If you turn up number 85 , please, I suggest to you that at the meeting Detective Sergeant Quinn was taking minutes of the meeting; is that correct?

MR COHEN: I object. The minutes are internal, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. That is true, but I gather Mr Roser was asking whether the witness agrees that the minutes were taken by that particular detective sergeant.

MR COHEN: In my submission, it matters not whether he agrees or not. The minutes are the minutes. Where can this take us?

THE COMMISSIONER: Are we going anywhere, Mr Roser?
MR ROSER: If my friend concedes that the minutes were taken by --

MR COHEN: I concede nothing more than that the minutes are the minutes.

MR ROSER: I'11 move on Commissioner.
Q. Have you read that document?
A. No, sir, I haven't seen that before. I'11 have a read through it now, if you would like, sir.
Q. While you're reading through it, I suggest to you that they are a correct notation of what occurred at that particular meeting?
A. I don't know, sir. I haven't read them.

MR COHEN: I object. There is no way the witness can know, from the evidence he has given, whether they are correct or otherwise. They are what they are.

MR ROSER: If my friend listens to the question, it was, when he was reading through that document - that is the proposition I'm putting.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you ask that the witness be given the time to read through them?

MR ROSER: Yes, thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Please take your time to read through that document, sir.
A. Thank you, Commissioner.

We are talking about page 360 , are we, Mr Roser?
Q. Page 361.
A. I don't know whether we're looking at the same document, sir.
Q. Do you have number 85 ?
A. Tab 85?
Q. Page 361.
A. Page 361, yes.

MR McILWAINE: There are two numbers on the page. It might be confusing.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes, page 361 is in the middle of the page; page 431 is in the bottom corner.
A. Sorry, if it's still under tab 85, I'm --
Q. I think you have the right one there, sir.
A. Sorry, I was under the apprehension I would be reading the minutes of the meeting. So that's a statement, is it?

Sir, I take it you are only desirous of me reading up to the point on page 363, at which point it states that I left and --
Q. Yes, thank you. Have you finished reading?
A. I have read to that point. I haven't finished reading the whole document.
Q. That's when you left?
A. I left, yes.
Q. I suggest to you that reflects what occurred at this particular meeting on 2 December 2010?
A. Many points in it are correct. A great deal of detail has been omitted. Certainly much of what I had to say is certainly missing, and certainly the direction specifically given to me by Superintendent Mitchell not to speak to Joanne McCarthy is not in those minutes. Had they been presented to me at an earlier time, I would not have signed
them as true and correct because there's - even though generally speaking a lot of it is correct, a vast amount of what I considered to be very important detail has been omitted.
Q. I suggest to you that that's a correct reflection of what occurred at the meeting, and the direction which was given in relation to not talking to the media included Joanne McCarthy?
A. Sir --
Q. Is that correct?
A. -- in the terms you are putting it to me, no.
Q. You gave evidence on Monday of this week that you had a conversation with Troy Grant and you assert that he was highly critical of senior police at Newcastle? Do you remember that evidence?
A. I do, sir.
Q. That's a total lie, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. You also said that Troy Grant told you that he had been hindered in his investigation of Father Ryan. Do you remember that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a lie also?
A. No.
Q. You also asserted that the police did this deliberately to him, you assert that from a conversation you allege you had with Mr Grant?
A. From the conversation - sorry, not my assertion, but from the conversation I had with him, yes.
Q. Again, that's a lie?
A. No, sir.
Q. You also said that he mentioned about a Catholic Mafia in the police force?
A. I'm in no doubt whatsoever about that, sir, absolutely.
Q. And that is an absolute lie, isn't it?
A. That's the first time I ever heard that quote, and
that is the reason why $I$ recollected it so strongly.
Q. You've made up that to generate publicity for yourself, haven't you? ?
A. Sir, number 1, I didn't - the first part of your question, I didn't make it up. Number 2, publicity, I've got no desire to draw publicity to that. Had he used another term or had he generalised it differently - I've heard the evidence of Mr Grant. He and I still maintain a great deal of respect for each other. I understand it's a conversation 11 years ago and he's saying that he did not use that term. I'm saying that he did. I understand that our views differ, but I can probably understand that after 11 years. But that is the conversation I recollect and I don't move from it, sir.
Q. In relation to the investigation of Father Ryan by the then - what was he, a constable or a senior constable?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Well, he was a plainclothes police officer, which is different to a detective, isn't it?
A. He had been long term. My understanding was he took up a position down there where normally he probably would have progressed through the detective process and been designated, but because - he may have actually spent a lot more time there, I think, than what a lot of people who have been designated as detectives are. It was an unusual situation.
Q. When he did the investigation of Father Ryan, he was a plainclothes officer, wasn't he?
A. You are correct, sir. I think that's - I heard the evidence as well and that's the evidence he gave.
Q. Which is different to a detective.
A. Yes, he simply hasn't done the course, I understand that sir.
Q. When this investigation was done, it was one of the biggest investigations into sexual assaults by the priests or clergy in New South Wales?
A. I think the evidence Troy Grant gave was that it was the first one in the Hunter. I certainly recall it because obviously most of the offences were where I was at Cessnock at the time, literally out the backdoor of the police station in the church, which is why I recall it. But

I think you are correct, it was the first one, and I think the number of victims indicates that it was significant, yes.
Q. It was more than significant; it was a major investigation, wasn't it?
A. As any investigation concerning child paedophilia by clergy and the covering up of it should be, yes.
Q. I think you heard the evidence from him that he was 25 years of age when he conducted this investigation?
A. I think he conducted it over a number of years. Was that the age that he commenced investigating it? I do recall he was stating his age was 25 at one stage, sir. Yes.
Q. In your opinion, from the evidence you have given, you would classify him as an inexperienced officer to conduct such an operation, wouldn't you?
A. My opinion is that, having known Troy Grant and observed him for a period of time - he had been at Kurri Kurri. He had spent a lot of time in the anti-theft unit, which was a precursor to embarking upon a plainclothes career, and I actually approached him to do this. He spent six months or thereabouts working with me and then went down to the regional crime squad. So he was continually working in criminal investigation and plainclothes work for a reasonable period of time before undertaking this.

I would never have sort of walked up to Troy, I think at the stage when he was working at Kurri Kurri in uniform, and asked him to walk into my office and the following week and given him that brief, but that was obviously a decision for his supervisors at Newcastle.
Q. And that was a successful prosecution by him?
A. I think in the end it was the overwhelming number of victims, and Father Ryan, as he told me, felt that he had no alternative other than to plead guilty because the evidence was overwhelming.
Q. It was a successful investigation, wasn't it?
A. That aspect of it was, yes.
Q. Your evidence is, I suggest to you, that a 25 -year-old officer would be too inexperienced to do such a major investigation as this?
A. Sir, I have at no stage raised age as a barrier or part of my considerations in any of the comments $I$ have made. So I don't see the relevance of the question you're asking me in that respect, sir.

MR ROSER: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR McILWAINE:

MR McILWAINE: Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox, I represent the interests of former Detective Chief Inspector Tayler and former Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn.

Could you turn to tab 87, page 368. It is in folder 2. You have been asked a number of questions about it. If you just open that up initially, I want to ask you a few questions before I take you to that document.
A. These are the entries for --
Q. It is part of an email from yourself to Ms McCarthy dated 10 December 2010. Is that the document you have? It is behind tab 87, numbered page 368.
A. Sorry. Yes, I do.
Q. Before I ask you specific questions about that, your position is, is it not, that this investigation Strike Force Lantle was a sham and was set up to fail; correct? A. Yes, it is.
Q. You posit a number of reasons for that. One of those reasons, you suggest, is that the officers appointed to it were inappropriate, due to their background and experience; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. To be fair, I think you suggest there are other reasons on which you would base your suggestion that it was set up to fail, but that's a pretty critical part of it; do you agree with that?
A. It's not all by any means, there's a lot more to it, but the aspects you're pointing to, I don't apply that, or course, to all, that wasn't clarified for me, but in varying degrees, yes.
Q. The question to you is that your position is that a critical part of the fact that it was set up to fail was
the nature and experience of the officers appointed to it? MR COHEN: I object. That's not the evidence.

MR McILWAINE: I am asking. I'm not asking what his evidence was, Commissioner; I'm asking his view here and now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr McIlwaine can ask him whether he agrees.

MR McILWAINE: Q. Do you agree that a critical fact that leads you to the view that Strike Force Lantle was set up to fail and was a sham was the experience and capacities of the officers appointed to it - "yes" or "No"?
A. No.
Q. Do you say that the officers appointed to it had the appropriate experience and capacity?
A. The officers appointed to it, I was aware, and I think it was confirmed by Superintendent Mitchell only weeks later, that Detective Chief Inspector Tayler and Senior Sergeant Quinn were - their going off sick was not unexpected. I --
Q. Mr Fox, that answer is not responsive to the question.
A. Sorry, that was part of my consideration.
Q. No, that's subsequent. At the time - let's go to 10 December --
A. I was already aware. One of your clients, Mr Tayler, had personally told me that he was intending to go off sick. He personally said that to me in my office.
Q. Let's go to your document at page 368. If you turn to the next page, page 369.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. This is the document - you are providing information to Ms McCarthy, and it was important, was it not, that it be accurate and reliable; correct? Well, you weren't A. Yes.
Q. You were careful about the information you provided her?
A. Yes, I was - it's an email that I - it's not like it was going to the Prime Minister. It's an email that

I typed out to someone that $I$ wanted to convey thoughts to. I haven't proofread it and sort of said every word is accurate, but generally speaking, yes.
Q. My question was: You sought to be careful and accurate in the information you provided in the email, didn't you?
A. I have, yes, what's in it is fairly accurate, yes.
Q. Let's go to the second paragraph on page 369. You say this:

> By the way, I've been doing some research.
> Stee 1 was a detective at Newcastle from about 2000 to 2003 . (Very short CI
> career). Since then she has been in GDs, \&
> was transferred to CI duties in September
> this year. Around the time this was
> allocated to her. Justin Quinn has been
> made Investigations Manager. He has never
> been a detective or investigator. This is
> the only person I am aware of in that position in New South Wales who has never been a detective. Stay with me.

My first question: What was the research that you undertook that enabled you to make that statement?
A. I asked another officer at Raymond Terrace that had been at Newcastle for a period of time, what he knew about the background of those individuals, and that's --
Q. That's what he told you?
A. I didn't know too much about them, as I explained earlier, but that's what was conveyed.
Q. Your research was asking an officer at Raymond Terrace; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That was the sole basis of your research; is that correct?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Who was the officer?
A. One of them was Inspector Dave Matthews, and I spoke to a couple of the detectives, but specifically --
Q. Who?
A. Specifically I don't recall now who they were.
Q. So this statement was based on information from

Officer David Matthews and two other officers whose names you can't remember; correct?
A. Yes, and I should put if in context, in that it was just --
Q. No, please. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Turning in relation to Justin Quinn, do you now know whether or not, as at 10 December 2010, he had ever been an investigator or detective?
A. I'm gathering from that you're going to tell me that he was and --
Q. Don't gather anything, Mr Fox. The question

I asked --
A. I don't know.
Q. Mr Fox, the question I asked --
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know?
A. I don't know.
Q. You have absolutely no idea other than the information provided to you by Mr Matthew, as to former Detective Quinn's background - that's the situation isn't it; correct?
A. No.
Q. What other information do you have about Detective Quinn's investigative background?
A. I had known Justin Quinn for quite many years as a prosecutor at Newcastle. I think most police around the area were aware that he had been a police prosecutor for a considerable period of time. Now, I'm not suggesting there that I have a complete and total knowledge, and that wasn't the purpose of what I was conveying to Ms McCarthy.
Q. I'll just take you up on that. You don't just convey, "I've been told by another officer certain facts"; you say, I've done some research?
A. I had done some research, yes.
Q. She was entitled to assume that that statement you had made to her was something she could rely upon.

MR COHEN: I object. That's a question that should be put to Ms McCarthy.

MR McILWAINE: No, it's not, with respect.
MR COHEN: What she was given to rely upon must be in her knowledge and nobody else's.

MR McILWAINE: I won't press that question, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR McILWAINE: Q. Let me ask you whether you know some things about Detective Quinn. I'm going to put them to you. I am going to suggest that you to Detective Quinn was attested as a police officer in 1989. Do you know whether that's true or not?
A. No.
Q. I am going to suggest to you that in 1990, he undertook an investigator's course; is that known to you? A. No.
Q. I am going to suggest to you that from 1991 unti1 1998 he undertook investigative duties in the Tweed region. Did you know that?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did you know that in 1994 he was designated as a detective?
A. No.
Q. Did you know that?
A. No.
Q. Did you know that he undertook a secondment at the child mistreatment unit at Lismore?
A. No.
Q. And you understand, of course, the child mistreatment unit is a unit that specialise in the investigation of sexual assaults and other offences against children; is that correct?
A. Specifically against children, yes, at that time.
Q. And had a specific task, the very difficult task, of interviewing child sexual assault victims; correct?
A. It is, yes, as I've had to do myself. I understand that, yes.
Q. And do you know that he undertook the specialist course at the Goulburn academy in the first response unit investigating sexual assault - the first response officer in sexual assaults? Do you know that
A. Is that the one referred to as IROC officers?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, many police have done that course, yes.
Q. That was not my question.
A. But I didn't know that he'd done it, no.
Q. Did you know that he had also undertaken a course in the management of sexual assault investigations - another course in relation to that? Did you know that?
A. No.
Q. Did you know that, because of his particular interest in that area, he had conducted numerous sexual assault investigations in the Tweed region from 1991 until 1998? A. No.
Q. Of course, you did know that he was an experienced prosecutor?
A. I did know that, sir. That's really the time I got to know him.
Q. And you know that when he was appointed as investigations manager at Newcastle, he had been in that position for some two years prior to December 2010? Did you know that?
A. Yes.
Q. Having been appointed, I think, in about July 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know that by 2008 he was legally qualified? He held a law degree. Did you know that?
A. No, sir, no.
Q. Where did you get the information that Detective Quinn was the only person in New South Wales that had been appointed to an investigation management position who had never been a detective?
A. That was the comment that was passed back to some of my detectives from the detectives at Newcastle, that felt that it wasn't appropriate for him to move from the prosecuting branch into that role.
Q. So that information --
A. The police grapevine, yes, absolutely.
Q. That information was information received by you from one of your detectives who had received it from detectives at Newcastle?
A. Yes, it was general rumour mill in the police force, yes.
Q. That's part of your research; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It's not very good research, is it?
A. On what you're saying, yes and no.
Q. What's good about it?
A. We11, the aspect that he had been out of general criminal investigation for 12 years, $I$ see as problematic. But, at the end of the day, what I was saying is my understanding from that meeting that he and Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler were in supervisory roles, they weren't to be performing investigative roles. You may have misunderstood my comment, which I was trying to explain, is my assertion was that the actual investigator, Kirren Stee1, I did not feel that she had - and I don't want to be unfair to her - I have a lot of time for the lady, she's a wonderful girl, but to have been moved from the role only very shortly before she was assigned such a significant investigation, from uniform into plainclothes, I had, and still maintain, significant concerns about.
Q. Have you finished, detective? My question was: what was good about your research?

MR COHEN: I object. That was a perfectly responsive answer, in my respectful submission.

MR McILWAINE: In my respectful submission it is not,

Commissioner. It was rambling character assassination, in my respectful submission.

MR COHEN: But you asked the question, with respect.
THE COMMISSIONER: I understood it, Mr McIlwaine, to be directed to inquire as to what was good about the research about Detective Senior Sergeant Quinn, was it?

MR McILWAINE: Yes, I've only been asking that since we started.

THE WITNESS: And I still maintain what I said in that you know, it's not a character assassination. I have a lot of time for Justin. It's not a case that I dislike the man, but I did have reservations in that he had been out of general criminal investigation for quite an extended period of time. As investigations manager at Newcastle, my understanding of his role was management of the cases and predominantly an office role, not actually going out and getting statements from individuals. Again, I'm not being critical --
Q. May I stop you there.
A. I'm not being critical of him.
Q. How is it not a character assassination to allege, without any proper basis, that Detective Quinn was the only officer ever to be appointed an investigations manager in the NSW Police without ever having been a detective or investigator when it was simply not true?
A. I concede, sir, that's not true. But in a private email between Joanne McCarthy and I, which was not intended to go any further, and certainly not to be a character assassination of your client --
Q. How did you know it wasn't going to go any further, detective?
A. These were just confidential emails between Joanne McCarthy and I. I think most of us are aware that before a journalist or anyone else, if that's what you're alluding to, would publish something of this nature, there would have to be confirmation of any information on that base. But I think emails of this nature are exchanged between people, whether they be in the police force or any other location, on a regular basis.
Q. Can I just stop you there. You say it was a confidential email. Turn, please, to page 368 and look at the top, the first page of the email.
A. Yes.
Q. It found its way to two other people, didn't it?

MR COHEN: I object. That's not a fair question, for this reason --

THE COMMISSIONER: That may be misconceived.
MR McILWAINE: I withdraw that. I apologise.
Q. Did you tell Ms McCarthy that none of the material that you were providing her was to find its way into any newspaper article?
A. In the conversations that I had with Ms McCarthy over a period of time, we had a very clear understanding that the discussions between us were for our own assistance and I was of that understanding, that the material that we discussed - unless she, you know, I don't preclude the fact that she may have come into any of that information from another source or another method, but what we discussed between us, and I've got no reason to believe that anything outside of what you are asserting occurred.
Q. Detective Fox, did you tell Ms McCarthy that none of the material that you provided to her was to find its way into any newspaper article - "yes" or "no"
A. I think in a number of conversations - I don't know whether, of course, I used those exact words, but along those lines, yes, and it was agreed upon, yes.
Q. What was the conversation where you told her nothing you told her - none of your emails or the material you provided her - was to find its way into newspaper articles? Tell the Commission the words you can recall?
A. Sir, it would have occurred over numerous phone calls.

It wasn't just that case that, you know, I sent or had a single conversation where that was stated and a rule placed down from that point onwards --
Q. Tell us one conversation where you told her that the material you provided her, in a general sense, not specific items, in a general sense, was not to find its way into any newspaper article?
A. One of those conversations related to the statement referred to earlier today from Mr Roser, in that there was very specific conversations between us that that statement was not to be used for that purpose in any way, shape or form. That was one. But I do recall - actually, even before 2 December, in our conversations, we had discussed, and Joanne McCarthy had told me that she would tell me of anything that she was going to publish, and if I had concerns about it hindering investigations or damaging them in any way, she gave me an undertaking that she would not publish those. And, sir, I believe that that undertaking and that understanding between us carried on right through.
Q. Going back to your understanding of the make-up of task force Lantle as at 10 December 2010, who did you understand were the officers who had been allocated to be involved in that?
A. The three officers I understood, as is in my affidavit that I've served on this Commission, were Kirren Steel, Brad Tayler and Justin Quinn.
Q. You have already been asked some questions about Jason Freney, and I think you described him in your evidence as the young constable who was present at the meeting at Waratah police station?
A. I think I actually even described him. I thought he was an intel constable. No one actually said who he was.
Q. I think your word was that he was a young constable who wasn't known to you who was taking some notes?
A. That's right.
Q. It want to suggest to you that - at the time Detective Senior Constable Jason Quinn?
A. I don't dispute that that is what you are telling me, sir
Q. I want to suggest to you he allocated to the conduct of the task force, and you can't dispute that, I take it?
A. I accept what you are saying, sir. All I can tell you is that that was not told to me at that meeting on 2 December. I can only relay what was told to me.
Q. Who else apart from - so we've got Steel?
A. Steel, Quinn and Tayler.
Q. You now accept Detective Senior Constable Jason Freney was as well?
A. Yes. I don't know why they didn't tell me that, but it was not mentioned at that meeting.
Q. I want to go through the experience and background of the officers on that task force. I won't go to Detective Quinn, because we have already covered that.

In regard to Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler, were you aware, around December 2010, that he was an officer who had 20 years of investigative experience as a detective?
A. No.
Q. Were you aware that he held the Australian police medal for his services to the community?
A. He had the which?
Q. The APM, the Australian police medal.
A. To the community or was that in respect to --
Q. For policing?
A. I thought I read something about the Orkopoulos investigation.
Q. No, you are quite correct. It arose, it would appear, subsequent to his investigation and prosecution with Detective Faber and others of Orkopoulos?
A. I think he was given that some time after I went off sick. I was aware of that. It was in the newspapers, sir.
Q. You are aware, as you referred to, that he, together with Detective Faber, was responsible for the successful investigation and prosecution - the high profile prosecution - of Mr Milton Orkopoulos ?
A. I don't know what Detective Tayler's role was in that investigation. I can only say that I was aware that he was recognised in respect to whatever he did. I don't know whether he got a statement or interviewed people or signed a charge, but he obviously had some role, whether it was administrative or whatever, I don't know.
Q. You simply don't know, do you, what his experience was in that matter? That's correct, isn't it?
A. Yes, that's what I'm saying, sir, yes, exactly.
Q. Please don't volunteer, responses like "It may have been administrative."
A. I --
Q. That's part of your whole process, isn't it, to dismiss other people's experience and competence, based on material and information you don't know?
A. Sir, I --
Q. That's the way you operate, isn't it?
A. Sir, I added a lot of things to that and I simply make the point that I don't know what he was doing and I concede that.
Q. Just confine your answer; if you don't know what he was doing, without volunteering matters you don't know. Thank you.
A. Thank you.
Q. In regard to Detective Jason Freney, I suggest to you that, as at December 2010, he had been a police officer for 15 years, he had been conducting investigations for six years, and he had been a designated detective for four years? You didn't know those facts, did you?
A. Sir, I don't know the officer, I don't know anything about him, so whatever you're going to tell me about him, I'11 concede that $I$ know nothing of it because I don't know him at all.
Q. Can you tell the Commission why you didn't research those sorts of matters before you made the statement to Ms McCarthy?
A. Because, as I said before, when I was at the meeting on 2 December the three names told to me were Quinn, Tayler and Steel. It was not mentioned at any stage that Freney was on that investigation.
Q. I think you have also become aware, if not before today, today, that the State Crime Command sex unit was involved to assist the investigators if they required assistance. Did you know that before today?
A. Yes, I did, I knew that they were in a consultation role with the investigation, yes, I did.
Q. When did you first know that?
A. I think when it was - at some stage the following year, when I - I don't know whether I heard it at work
through the grapevine or whether I read something in a newspaper, halfway through the following year, that they had come on board.
Q. Do you agree that would be an appropriate course of action for investigators to seek the advice and support of the specialist unit, to review what they were doing?
A. Yes.
Q. Highly proper?
A. Yes. I would have hoped that they would have taken on a much greater role, of course, but it was certainly a role.
[Transcript redacted, per suppression order, from page 500, line 15 to page 502, line 30]

MR McILWAINE: Nothing further, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr McIlwaine. Mr Irving?
MR IRVING: No, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Lonergan, anything?
MS LONERGAN: I will go last, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles?
MR GYLES: Commissioner, I do not propose to ask any questions now. I will keep my powder dry until stage 2. THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: I have nothing by way of re-examination, Commissioner.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, could we adjourn for five minutes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certain1y.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, there is a further appearance to be noted on the record.

MR RUSH: May it please the Commission. My name is Rush. I am instructed by Ms Irving, who has leave, and I seek leave to appear for Ms McCarthy.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Rush.
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:
MS LONERGAN: Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox, just one question. Late yesterday afternoon, Mr Roser was asking you some questions about the way in which you interacted with Ms Smith, leading up to the Lateline program in December 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall those questions? In answer to one of the questions from Mr Roser, you said words to the effect of "I held some things back. We didn't want to run with them yet."
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall giving an answer to that effect?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think it was, "I didn't want to run with some of it yet.

MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. "I didn't want to run with some of it yet."
A. Yes.
Q. What were you referring to there that you didn't want
to run with yet?
A. If I could look at the document, I might be able to assist. Just off the top of my head at the moment - it might be the hour of the day, but --

MS LONERGAN: I don't think the material actually is in a document, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Lonergan, may I ask a question of the witness?

MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$, I think it was in the context, sir, of you thinking it was a good idea to drip feed information to the public, when you were speaking to Ms Smith, and you said you didn't want to run with some of it yet.
A. I understand. I'm just thinking, there were a number of aspects that I didn't want to run with. One of those was in relation to aspects surrounding the handling of some matters by the Ombudsman's office, that I won't elaborate unless you want me to elaborate further on.

MS LONERGAN: $Q$. There is no need to elaborate. If I can assist you, volume 3 , tab 139 seems to be the relevant statement, page 712. That is in the first paragraph of an email from you to Ms Smith.

The words are underlined in that email, and the order of words as they appear in this email are:

I really don't want that to run yet.
Do you see that on page 712 in the second-last paragraph? A. I do.
Q. What didn't you want to run then? What are you referring to there? You have mentioned the Ombudsman. A. That was one component that I didn't want to - I know that there were a number of - sorry, I understand the time, but could I just peruse that, and I just want to give as accurate a response as possible, if I can have a read through that.

Part of what I was referring to is on page 715, under point 8.36. I was desirous of holding back aspects of
discussing Cardinal Pell and the upper hierarchy of the church at that stage.
Q. What else, just that one, or was there other material?
A. No, there may be others.

The aspects under 8.6, if I'm able to go through that document, I might be able to assist you even further, because, under 8.6, I believe that --
Q. I'm just going to stop you there. Commissioner, would it be of assistance to you if the witness goes through this process or not?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. Could I ask you, sir, you might have a close look at page 714. Under the first part in block capitals, it says:

Peter Fox named the Assistant Police
Commissioner as the person who stood him down to the investigation.

It looks as though your response is:
This of course ties in with the previous and I'd like to hold this back for now ...
A. Yes.
Q. Does that help you?
A. My comments are actually - and I may be able to
highlight them for you, if you like, there was another page to make it easier, but --

MS LONERGAN: Q. I think the better course will be just to identify in short compass what those matters were that you did not want to run with at that stage.
A. If I start from the very first page and just walk through it.
Q. Yes, just identify the issues. There's no need to expand on them.
A. Page 713, under 2.02, as it says there, "I have no problem with this at present." So I have no issue there. Again --
Q. I'm going to stop you there. We are only interested in the ones you didn't want to run with.
A. The okay. The ones I'm alluding to holding back there is the aspect under 3.23; at the bottom of page 713, the aspect under 3.31 and flowing down, of course, on the top of page 714.
Q. Yes.
A. The aspect under 4.19 on page 714.
Q. Yes.
A. I've suggested a singular word be substituted under 4.50. I've suggested that the word "super" be substituted with either "critical" or "significant".

The rest of that page is fine. On page 715, the item under 8.06.
Q. Yes.
A. The aspect under 8.36 on page 715. And that's it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. May I ask you this, Detective
Chief Inspector Fox: in relation to the entry on page 713 under 3.23, the question states:

Do you have any concerns that one of the chief investigators in the Maitland Newcastle cases Peter Fox was stood down despite the fact he had been investigating the issue for many, many years?

Was that a question which was meant to be put to Mr Shoebridge?
A. I think it was.
Q. And that was something that you didn't wish pursued at that stage?
A. Yes .
Q. You answered:

I think this is one the things we need to hold onto. I wouldn't use the term 'stood down'.
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you want to hold on to that aspect of the matter for the time being?
A. Because I was - I just felt the way it was being asked wasn't a clear and proper reflection of it.
Q. Am I to understand from that that you --
A. Not that I'm suggesting that it was the - I just didn't feel that it accurately reflected the situation closely enough, and that the person possibly being asked that question didn't really - wouldn't have been able to understand that aspect, and I thought it was probably unfair to ask that individual that question, with what I was aware of was his degree of knowledge about that subject matter.
Q. Who was that person?
A. The Upper House MP David Shoebridge.
Q. Why did you not wish the interviewer to use the term "stood down" in relation to what you say had happened to you?
A. Because I just didn't like the term. I felt that the term "removed" or something like that was more appropriate. But I wasn't arguing with the overall context of what was being suggested. It was just that I was uncomfortable with the terminology, and I equally felt that, at that stage, it would be better off me discussing that later on personally myself, rather than somebody else coming in on that issue, that may not have been fully au fait with the circumstances surrounding it.
Q. You said then:

We need to get a reaction on the open letter first."
A. Yes.
Q. That was your letter to the Premier, was it?
A. Indeed, ma'am, yes.
Q. So were you intending to say to Ms Smith that you preferred to focus on the church rather than what had happened within the police force in relation to decisions concerning your investigation?
A. I think at that stage, if - of course, you are asking what I was trying to convey to Ms Smith, I think that would
be a fair comment, yes. I felt that the focus should be on the church aspect. That was certainly foremost in my mind, more so than the concerns I had about the handling - even though they were concerns, and I still feel that they are justified, the predominant concern was certainly the conduct of the church.
Q. Your intention was, if you were running the $A B C$, to "drip feed", as I think was your term, by starting with the church and, if necessary, later on seeking some answers from the police force?
A. Not - Commissioner, I should say that by this stage, although the open letter, and I had been assisted in the open letter to the Premier by the Newcastle Herald by Joanne McCarthy, it wasn't that I wanted exclusivity for any particular TV network or printed media. Certainly the $A B C$ were very obliging and assisting, so far as me being able to air those grievances. But so far as later on progression of it, I hadn't made my mind up as to other methods that $I$ was going to take it along.

It may well have been, as eventuated the following day, there were a number of other networks and printed media that were wanting to run aspects of the story, and I had made provisional arrangements with a number of those. But as events progressed quite quickly, that wasn't required, as it turned out, because the Premier announced this commission the following day and the Prime Minister announced the Royal Commission three days after that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right. Thank you, sir. Anything arising from that, Ms Lonergan?

MS LONERGAN: No, there isn't, Commissioner. Could Detective Chief Inspector Fox be excused, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for your evidence, Detective Chief Inspector Fox.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, Mr Kell will take the next witness, who will be DCI Wadde11. However, I understand there needs to be a short adjournment to allow for some arrangements to be made for the transcript reporters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I did promise everyone an early mark, on the instructions I was given earlier. Is it the case that we can sit for some additional time today?

MS LONERGAN: I think that's a matter for you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Has anyone made any arrangements which are immutable, since $I$ said that we would rise at 3.30 .

MR ROSER: No, Commissioner.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, Mr Hunt noted there could be about a 15-minute changeover with equipment. In those circumstances, it would mean that Detective Inspector Waddell would probably only get in 15 minutes of evidence and then be part heard over the weekend. In those circumstances, unless anyone has a strong objection, it may be better to postpone his evidence until Monday.

There are various nods around the bar table, so 9.30 on Monday may be suitable.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I will adjourn until 9.30 on Monday.

AT 3.26PM THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED UNTIL MONDAY, 13 MAY 2013 AT 9.30AM
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