

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO THE MANAGEMENT  
OF POLICE INFORMANTS

Held in Melbourne, Victoria

On Tuesday, 2 April 2019

Led by Commissioner: The Honourable Margaret McMurdo AC

Also Present

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Counsel Assisting:            | Mr C. Winneke QC<br>Mr A. Woods<br>Ms M. Tittensor<br>Ms P.A. Neskovic QC<br>Mr S. Mukerjea |
| Counsel for Victoria Police   | Mr S. Holt QC<br>Ms R. Enbom<br>Ms K. Argiropoulos<br>Mr B. Murphy QC<br>Mr M. McLay        |
| Counsel for State of Victoria | Dr C. Button SC<br>Mr L. Brown  |
| Counsel for Nicola Gobbo      | Mr P. Collinson QC<br>Mr R. Nathwani  |
| Counsel for DPP/SPP           | Mr C. Caleo QC<br>Mr P. Doyle<br>Ms K. O'Gorman   |
| Counsel for Police Handlers   | Mr G. Chettle<br>Ms L. Thies  |

09:14:15 1 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Neskovicin.  
09:41:52 2  
09:41:53 3 MS NESKOVCIN: Commissioner, there are two matters that  
09:41:55 4 we'd like to deal with before the witnesses resume. The  
09:41:59 5 first concerns the public interest immunity claims on  
09:42:02 6 behalf of Victoria Police. Last Friday Mr Holt provided  
09:42:06 7 the Commission with a confidential affidavit of Acting  
09:42:12 8 Commissioner Mahoney in support of those public interest  
09:42:14 9 immunity claims. The claims are made in relation to a  
09:42:17 10 number of discrete paragraphs of Assistant Commissioner  
09:42:21 11 Paterson's witness statement. We as counsel assisting have  
09:42:25 12 had an opportunity to consider the confidential affidavit  
09:42:28 13 and we understand the basis on which the claim is put.  
09:42:32 14 Aspects of that claim and Mr Paterson's evidence are going  
09:42:38 15 to have implications for the taking of evidence of other  
09:42:41 16 witnesses who are to come. If the claim is maintained  
09:42:46 17 counsel assisting are prepared for the time being to deal  
09:42:49 18 with that evidence in closed session, however counsel  
09:42:54 19 assisting will continue to review the claim in light of  
09:42:58 20 other evidence that comes to light in the course of the  
09:43:02 21 inquiry.  
22  
09:43:03 23 One matter that is likely to impinge upon the  
09:43:07 24 maintenance of the claim is the duty of disclosure to  
09:43:10 25 persons who, convicted persons who are affected by  
09:43:14 26 Ms Gobbo's conduct and counsel assisting are presently of  
09:43:19 27 the view that there will need to be disclosure to a  
09:43:23 28 particular individual identified in the confidential  
09:43:25 29 affidavit of Acting Commander Mahoney and in those  
09:43:28 30 circumstances there will likely come a point in time where  
09:43:33 31 that claim will not be able to be maintained.  
32  
09:43:36 33 COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Neskovicin, I could say that's my  
09:43:39 34 preliminary view also.  
09:43:40 35  
09:43:40 36 MS NESKOVCIN: In those circumstances, Commissioner,  
09:43:43 37 Mr Holt might like to address the Commission on whether or  
09:43:46 38 not that's the position that Victoria Police has arrived at  
09:43:51 39 or whether they will, whether the matter's under review  
09:43:57 40 from their position also.  
41  
09:43:58 42 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Is it necessary to close the  
09:44:01 43 Commission hearing to hear these submissions?  
44  
09:44:03 45 MS NESKOVCIN: At the moment I have kept my submissions  
09:44:06 46 very - - -  
09:44:07 47

09:44:07 1 COMMISSIONER: Bland.  
2  
3 MS NESKOVCIN: Yes, deliberately so. Mr Holt might wish to  
09:44:08 4 do the same.  
09:44:08 5  
09:44:09 6 MR HOLT: I'm content to be just as bland and if I can't  
09:44:12 7 achieve that then I'll ask for the Commission to be closed,  
8 Commissioner.  
9  
10 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Holt.  
11  
09:44:15 12 MR HOLT: I'm grateful for those indications. We are  
09:44:18 13 entirely supportive of the proposition that an attempt be  
09:44:23 14 made at least to see whether the public interest immunity  
09:44:26 15 claim issues could be dealt with initially by way of closed  
09:44:30 16 hearing, recognising that that doesn't represent a  
09:44:33 17 concession by the Commission as to the ultimate resolution  
09:44:35 18 of that public interest immunity claim. What I've  
09:44:39 19 indicated to our learned friends this morning is that  
09:44:42 20 simply to ensure that that process of the arrangements that  
09:44:45 21 are in place for the taking of that evidence in private are  
09:44:49 22 appropriate. We will simply need a little time to confirm  
09:44:52 23 those arrangements because I suspect that this will be an  
09:44:55 24 issue that may arise later in the hearing in respect of  
09:44:59 25 other persons and issues also and I think it's an  
09:45:01 26 appropriate way to try and resolve exactly how that  
09:45:05 27 happens.  
28  
09:45:05 29 I've heard what our learned friend has to say about  
09:45:08 30 the issue of duty of disclosure and that arising, and we  
09:45:12 31 are aware of the document that underlies that proposition  
32 and it's a matter which the confidential affidavit goes  
09:45:16 33 into to some extent in respect of which further inquiries  
09:45:19 34 are also being made. Can I say, Commissioner, my  
09:45:22 35 expectation is that that ultimately that public interest  
09:45:25 36 immunity claim will probably need to be the subject of  
09:45:28 37 actual argument and a decision being made, but I can't  
09:45:31 38 finalise that position unless and until we go further  
09:45:35 39 through that process.  
40  
09:45:36 41 In terms of when the Commission would see that duty of  
09:45:40 42 disclosure arising, who would owe that duty of disclosure  
09:45:43 43 and by what means it would then be facilitated, is a matter  
44 I think that can most usefully be progressed by  
09:45:51 45 discussions, at least in the first instance as between  
09:45:51 46 counsel to see whether we can identify a process that might  
09:45:57 47 be obviously acceptable.

09:45:58 1  
09:45:59 2 COMMISSIONER: If we get to the point where the  
09:46:02 3 Commission's preliminary view becomes a firmer view then  
09:46:06 4 under the terms of the Letters Patent we would be obliged  
09:46:11 5 to inform the Director of that.  
09:46:13 6  
09:46:13 7 MR HOLT: Yes.  
09:46:13 8  
09:46:13 9 COMMISSIONER: So at that point it would have to be argued.  
09:46:17 10  
09:46:17 11 MR HOLT: Yes. And the Commissioner has, with respect,  
09:46:20 12 entirely accurately noted the necessary involvement of the  
09:46:24 13 Director in that process. As the Commissioner will also be  
09:46:27 14 aware there is a process which Victoria Police is  
09:46:31 15 undertaking presently with the Director and it may well be  
09:46:31 16 that this issue can be dealt with in part by way of that  
09:46:35 17 process or by accommodation of that process and obviously  
09:46:40 18 ensuring the Commission also complies with its obligations.  
09:46:43 19 I'm being coy for obvious reasons, I'm sorry, Commissioner.  
09:46:45 20  
09:46:45 21 COMMISSIONER: No, no, I understand perfectly what you are  
09:46:47 22 saying.  
09:46:47 23  
09:46:47 24 MR HOLT: The short point is we think it is sensible from  
09:46:51 25 the Commission's perspective in terms of getting the  
09:46:54 26 evidence that it needs to see whether matters can be dealt  
09:46:56 27 with by way of closed hearing. We'll simply need a little  
09:47:00 28 time to confirm the appropriate arrangements for that which  
09:47:02 29 are acceptable from our perspective, and then we understand  
09:47:07 30 the underlying resolution of the PII issue which will need  
09:47:07 31 to be resolved quickly and we'll progress that.  
09:47:07 32  
09:47:08 33 COMMISSIONER: All right. In the meantime you want the  
09:47:11 34 confidential affidavit of Acting Commander Scott Mahoney  
09:47:14 35 placed in a sealed envelope.  
09:47:16 36  
09:47:16 37 MR HOLT: I think, Commissioner, you have already made  
09:47:18 38 those orders and we seek that they be maintained.  
09:47:23 39  
09:47:23 40 COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right then. Yes, Ms Neskovicin.  
09:47:24 41  
09:47:25 42 MS NESKOVICIN: Thank you, Commissioner. The second matter  
09:47:26 43 this morning is the application by the media parties to  
09:47:30 44 revoke a non-publication order the Commission made on 27  
09:47:34 45 March 2019.  
09:47:36 46  
09:47:36 47 COMMISSIONER: Yes.

09:47:36 1  
09:47:37 2 MS NESKOVCIN: Commissioner, we consider it appropriate  
09:47:39 3 that that application be heard in closed session and seek  
09:47:43 4 an order to that effect.  
09:47:44 5  
09:47:44 6 COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.  
09:47:45 7  
09:47:46 8 MS NESKOVCIN: And we'll ask for appearances to be taken in  
09:47:50 9 relation to the application.  
09:47:51 10  
09:47:51 11 COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'll take the appearances first.  
09:47:55 12  
09:47:55 13 MS NESKOVCIN: From the outset, Commissioner, can I  
09:47:58 14 announce the appearance of counsel assisting Mr Mukerjea.  
15  
16 COMMISSIONER: Yes.  
17  
09:48:03 18 MS NESKOVCIN: In addition to counsel.  
09:48:05 19  
09:48:06 20 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Ms Neskovicin. Yes, now, who else  
09:48:09 21 is appearing in respect of this application? I don't know  
09:48:12 22 whether it will be necessary for all parties with leave to  
09:48:20 23 appear to take part in this but we'll see. Yes.  
09:48:25 24  
09:48:26 25 MR OTTER: Commissioner, my name is Otter, I seek to appear  
09:48:28 26 in relation to this application.  
09:48:30 27  
09:48:30 28 COMMISSIONER: You are for the applicants?  
09:48:31 29  
09:48:32 30 MR OTTER: I'm for the applicants.  
31  
09:48:33 32 COMMISSIONER: The media applicants. Yes, thank you.  
09:48:36 33 There's some other appearances.  
34  
09:48:39 35 MR OVER: Commissioner, Mr Patrick Over appearing for  
09:48:43 36 Mr [REDACTED] and the firm [REDACTED].  
09:48:51 37  
09:48:51 38 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Patrick Over. Yes. Room  
09:48:57 39 should be made for Mr Over to sit at the Bar table.  
09:49:03 40  
09:49:03 41 MR HOLT: Commissioner, we're not sure whether Victoria  
09:49:06 42 Police would have an interest in this. It simply relates  
09:49:10 43 to redactions of statements but I think as I understand it  
09:49:13 44 only in terms of orders which the Commission has made. We  
09:49:13 45 might simply remain and assist if we can.  
09:49:16 46  
09:49:16 47 COMMISSIONER: All right then, thank you Mr Holt.

09:49:23 1 Mr Chettle, I don't think you have any interest at all?  
09:49:27 2  
09:49:27 3 MR CHETTLE: I have no interest, Commissioner.  
09:49:30 4  
09:49:30 5 COMMISSIONER: I doubt whether the DPP has any interest in  
09:49:33 6 this.  
09:49:34 7  
09:49:34 8 MR DOYLE: As do I, Commissioner.  
09:49:36 9  
09:49:36 10 COMMISSIONER: The State of Victoria has an interest?  
11  
09:49:38 12 MR DOYLE: No.  
13  
09:49:39 14 COMMISSIONER: No, all right.  
09:49:41 15  
09:49:42 16 MS NESKOVCIN: Commissioner, in light of those appearances,  
09:49:43 17 particularly Mr Over's appearance, it is appropriate that  
09:49:49 18 the live stream be terminated immediately.  
09:49:55 19  
20 COMMISSIONER: Yes.  
21  
22 MS NESKOVCIN: It's not streaming now I'm told.  
23  
24 COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'm sorry, someone else wants to make  
25 an appearance.  
26  
09:49:58 27 MS WHITING: The State of Victoria does not seek to appear.  
09:50:04 28  
09:50:04 29 COMMISSIONER: All right. I'll order that the live  
09:50:08 30 streaming cease for the hearing of this application and I  
09:50:10 31 order under s.24 of the *Inquiries Act* that access to the  
09:50:15 32 inquiry is temporarily limited to - access to the  
09:50:20 33 Commission, rather, to the Commission hearing is  
09:50:25 34 temporarily limited to those parties who have indicated  
09:50:31 35 they wish to appear at the hearing and their legal  
09:50:35 36 representatives, legal representatives and staff assisting  
09:50:38 37 the Royal Commission, and I think that's probably all I  
09:50:49 38 need to say really.  
39  
09:50:52 40 Non-publication order is in relation to the  
09:50:55 41 transcript, I make a non-publication order in relation to  
09:50:58 42 the transcript.  
43  
09:51:02 44 So all people other than those who have permission to  
09:51:05 45 remain in the hearing room please leave. And I direct that  
09:51:12 46 - do I need to direct that a copy of this order be placed  
09:51:16 47 on the hearing room door as well?

09:51:21 1  
09:51:21 2  
09:51:22 3  
09:51:22 4  
09:51:25 5  
6  
09:51:28 7  
09:51:28 8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

MS NESKOVCIN: Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER: And a copy of this order be placed on the hearing room door.

(IN CAMERA PROCEEDINGS FOLLOW)

09:51:45 1  
2  
09:51:49 3  
09:51:50 4  
09:51:51 5  
09:51:53 6  
09:51:56 7  
09:51:57 8  
09:51:58 9  
09:51:58 10  
09:51:58 11  
09:52:00 12  
09:52:06 13  
09:52:09 14  
09:52:13 15  
16  
09:52:18 17  
09:52:21 18  
09:52:21 19  
09:52:23 20  
09:52:24 21  
09:52:24 22  
09:52:30 23  
09:52:32 24  
09:52:35 25  
09:52:40 26  
09:52:43 27  
09:52:47 28  
09:52:50 29  
09:52:53 30  
09:52:54 31  
09:52:56 32  
09:53:00 33  
09:53:01 34  
09:53:01 35  
09:53:02 36  
09:53:02 37  
09:53:06 38  
09:53:11 39  
09:53:15 40  
09:53:21 41  
09:53:21 42  
09:53:24 43  
09:53:28 44  
09:53:31 45  
09:53:36 46  
47





09:53:40 1  
09:53:43 2  
09:53:47 3  
09:53:50 4  
5  
6  
7  
09:53:53 8  
09:53:57 9  
09:54:01 10  
09:54:07 11  
09:54:12 12  
09:54:27 13  
09:54:31 14  
09:54:35 15  
09:54:38 16  
17  
09:54:38 18  
09:54:41 19  
09:54:44 20  
09:54:52 21  
09:54:56 22  
09:55:02 23  
09:55:06 24  
09:55:13 25  
09:55:16 26  
09:55:20 27  
09:55:26 28  
09:55:30 29  
09:55:33 30  
09:55:41 31  
09:55:44 32  
09:55:46 33  
09:55:46 34  
09:55:47 35  
09:55:47 36  
09:55:51 37  
09:55:55 38  
09:56:00 39  
09:56:03 40  
09:56:07 41  
09:56:11 42  
09:56:14 43  
09:56:18 44  
09:56:24 45  
09:56:27 46  
09:56:28 47



09:56:28 1 [REDACTED]  
09:56:31 2 [REDACTED]  
09:56:32 3 [REDACTED]  
09:56:32 4 [REDACTED]  
09:56:33 5 [REDACTED]  
09:56:36 6 [REDACTED]  
09:56:36 7 [REDACTED]  
09:56:38 8 [REDACTED]  
09:56:42 9 [REDACTED]  
09:56:48 10 [REDACTED]  
09:56:52 11 [REDACTED]  
09:56:56 12 [REDACTED]  
09:56:56 13 [REDACTED]  
09:56:59 14 [REDACTED]  
09:57:01 15 [REDACTED]  
09:57:02 16 [REDACTED]  
09:57:04 17 [REDACTED]  
09:57:06 18 [REDACTED]  
09:57:06 19 [REDACTED]  
09:57:16 20 [REDACTED]  
09:57:20 21 [REDACTED]  
09:57:26 22 [REDACTED]  
09:57:27 23 [REDACTED]  
09:57:27 24 [REDACTED]  
09:57:28 25 [REDACTED]  
09:57:28 26 [REDACTED]  
09:57:30 27 [REDACTED]  
09:57:33 28 [REDACTED]  
09:57:33 29 [REDACTED]  
09:57:34 30 [REDACTED]  
09:57:34 31 [REDACTED]  
09:57:35 32 [REDACTED]  
09:57:38 33 [REDACTED]  
09:57:41 34 [REDACTED]  
09:57:45 35 [REDACTED]  
09:57:47 36 [REDACTED]  
09:57:48 37 [REDACTED]  
09:57:49 38 [REDACTED]  
09:57:50 39 [REDACTED]  
09:57:54 40 [REDACTED]  
09:57:57 41 [REDACTED]  
09:57:57 42 [REDACTED]  
09:57:59 43 [REDACTED]  
09:57:59 44 [REDACTED]  
09:58:00 45 [REDACTED]  
09:58:06 46 [REDACTED]  
09:58:07 47 [REDACTED]

09:58:12 1  
09:58:18 2  
09:58:22 3  
09:58:28 4  
09:58:31 5  
09:58:33 6  
09:58:33 7  
09:58:35 8  
09:58:39 9  
09:58:40 10  
09:58:42 11  
09:58:42 12  
09:58:45 13  
14  
15  
09:58:46 16  
09:58:46 17  
09:58:46 18  
09:58:49 19  
09:58:53 20  
09:58:57 21  
09:59:02 22  
09:59:04 23  
09:59:08 24  
09:59:11 25  
26  
09:59:14 27  
09:59:19 28  
09:59:21 29  
09:59:23 30  
31  
09:59:28 32  
09:59:34 33  
09:59:36 34  
09:59:39 35  
09:59:42 36  
09:59:45 37  
09:59:48 38  
09:59:50 39  
09:59:53 40  
41  
09:59:55 42  
09:59:59 43  
10:00:03 44  
10:00:09 45  
10:00:13 46  
10:00:16 47



10:00:19 1  
10:00:23 2  
10:00:27 3  
10:00:30 4  
10:00:33 5  
6  
10:00:38 7  
10:00:41 8  
10:00:46 9  
10:00:50 10  
10:00:55 11  
10:00:58 12  
10:01:02 13  
14  
10:01:02 15  
10:01:07 16  
10:01:11 17  
10:01:18 18  
10:01:22 19  
10:01:25 20  
10:01:31 21  
10:01:35 22  
23  
10:01:35 24  
10:01:38 25  
10:01:41 26  
10:01:44 27  
10:01:48 28  
10:01:53 29  
30  
10:01:54 31  
10:01:59 32  
10:02:03 33  
10:02:08 34  
10:02:10 35  
36  
10:02:12 37  
10:02:17 38  
10:02:21 39  
10:02:25 40  
10:02:29 41  
42  
10:02:31 43  
10:02:34 44  
10:02:40 45  
10:02:44 46  
10:02:51 47



10:02:55 1  
10:02:59 2  
10:03:03 3  
10:03:08 4  
10:03:14 5  
10:03:18 6  
10:03:21 7  
10:03:27 8  
9  
10:03:34 10  
10:03:38 11  
10:03:41 12  
10:03:44 13  
10:03:48 14  
10:03:52 15  
10:03:54 16  
10:03:57 17  
18  
10:04:02 19  
10:04:05 20  
10:04:09 21  
10:04:14 22  
10:04:18 23  
10:04:21 24  
10:04:24 25  
10:04:27 26  
10:04:34 27  
10:04:38 28  
29  
10:04:58 30  
10:05:01 31  
10:05:07 32  
10:05:13 33  
10:05:17 34  
10:05:23 35  
36  
10:05:27 37  
10:05:31 38  
10:05:35 39  
10:05:38 40  
41  
10:05:43 42  
10:05:46 43  
10:05:50 44  
10:05:57 45  
10:06:01 46  
10:06:04 47



10:06:09 1  
10:06:14 2  
10:06:19 3  
10:06:24 4  
10:06:29 5  
10:06:33 6  
10:06:37 7  
10:06:45 8  
10:06:51 9  
10:06:57 10  
10:07:01 11  
12  
10:07:09 13  
10:07:13 14  
10:07:15 15  
10:07:15 16  
10:07:16 17  
10:07:19 18  
10:07:28 19  
10:07:34 20  
10:07:41 21  
10:07:49 22  
10:07:51 23  
10:07:57 24  
10:08:01 25  
10:08:05 26  
10:08:09 27  
10:08:16 28  
10:08:19 29  
10:08:24 30  
10:08:29 31  
32  
10:08:35 33  
10:08:38 34  
10:08:41 35  
10:08:45 36  
10:08:52 37  
38  
10:08:53 39  
10:08:57 40  
10:09:00 41  
10:09:04 42  
10:09:07 43  
10:09:08 44  
10:09:13 45  
10:09:16 46  
10:09:20 47



10:09:23 1  
10:09:27 2  
10:09:32 3  
10:09:35 4  
5  
10:09:37 6  
10:09:42 7  
10:09:46 8  
10:09:50 9  
10:09:54 10  
10:09:57 11  
10:10:01 12  
10:10:04 13  
10:10:09 14  
10:10:12 15  
10:10:15 16  
10:10:19 17  
10:10:22 18  
10:10:27 19  
10:10:32 20  
10:10:34 21  
22  
10:10:39 23  
10:10:41 24  
10:10:45 25  
10:10:50 26  
10:10:54 27  
10:11:00 28  
10:11:02 29  
10:11:05 30  
10:11:10 31  
10:11:15 32  
10:11:19 33  
10:11:22 34  
35  
10:11:27 36  
10:11:31 37  
10:11:36 38  
10:11:40 39  
10:11:43 40  
10:11:47 41  
42  
10:11:51 43  
10:11:53 44  
10:11:55 45  
10:11:59 46  
10:12:04 47



10:12:09 1  
10:12:15 2  
10:12:21 3  
4  
10:12:28 5  
10:12:30 6  
10:12:33 7  
10:12:37 8  
10:12:43 9  
10:12:47 10  
11  
10:12:48 12  
10:12:51 13  
10:12:54 14  
10:12:59 15  
10:13:02 16  
10:13:06 17  
10:13:09 18  
10:13:15 19  
10:13:18 20  
10:13:22 21  
10:13:27 22  
10:13:30 23  
10:13:36 24  
10:13:39 25  
10:13:43 26  
10:13:47 27  
28  
10:13:51 29  
10:13:54 30  
10:13:59 31  
10:14:01 32  
10:14:05 33  
10:14:09 34  
10:14:14 35  
36  
10:14:15 37  
10:14:18 38  
10:14:22 39  
10:14:26 40  
10:14:29 41  
10:14:31 42  
10:14:40 43  
10:14:48 44  
10:14:56 45  
10:15:03 46  
10:15:10 47





10:15:14 1  
10:15:22 2  
10:15:25 3  
10:15:31 4  
10:15:36 5  
10:15:41 6  
10:15:45 7  
10:15:51 8  
10:15:55 9  
10:16:00 10  
11  
10:16:03 12  
10:16:07 13  
10:16:14 14  
10:16:19 15  
10:16:19 16  
10:16:23 17  
10:16:26 18  
10:16:30 19  
10:16:37 20  
10:16:37 21  
10:16:39 22  
10:16:47 23  
10:16:51 24  
10:16:56 25  
10:16:59 26  
10:17:06 27  
10:17:10 28  
10:17:15 29  
10:17:20 30  
10:17:28 31  
10:17:32 32  
10:17:33 33  
10:17:33 34  
10:17:36 35  
10:17:45 36  
10:17:51 37  
10:17:51 38  
10:17:52 39  
10:17:53 40  
10:17:56 41  
10:18:00 42  
10:18:07 43  
10:18:12 44  
10:18:19 45  
10:18:24 46  
10:18:29 47



10:18:30 1  
10:18:33 2  
10:18:34 3  
10:18:34 4  
10:18:39 5  
10:18:45 6  
10:18:46 7  
10:18:48 8  
10:18:50 9  
10:18:55 10  
10:18:59 11  
10:19:05 12  
10:19:08 13  
10:19:14 14  
10:19:18 15  
10:19:23 16  
10:19:28 17  
10:19:34 18  
10:19:35 19  
10:19:36 20  
10:19:41 21  
10:19:46 22  
10:19:51 23  
10:19:57 24  
10:20:00 25  
10:20:02 26  
10:20:03 27  
10:20:08 28  
10:20:16 29  
10:20:18 30  
10:20:18 31  
10:20:19 32  
10:20:20 33  
10:20:22 34  
10:20:22 35  
10:20:23 36  
10:20:23 37  
10:20:26 38  
10:20:28 39  
10:20:33 40  
10:20:37 41  
10:20:41 42  
10:20:46 43  
10:20:49 44  
10:20:54 45  
46  
10:20:59 47



10:21:03 1  
10:21:07 2  
10:21:11 3  
10:21:21 4  
10:21:21 5  
10:21:24 6  
10:21:29 7  
10:21:34 8  
10:21:37 9  
10:21:37 10  
10:21:42 11  
10:21:47 12  
10:21:51 13  
10:21:55 14  
10:22:00 15  
10:22:04 16  
10:22:08 17  
10:22:12 18  
19  
10:22:25 20  
10:22:31 21  
10:22:38 22  
10:22:41 23  
10:22:45 24  
10:22:49 25  
10:23:00 26  
10:23:05 27  
10:23:08 28  
10:23:11 29  
10:23:16 30  
10:23:19 31  
10:23:22 32  
10:23:25 33  
10:23:34 34  
10:23:38 35  
10:23:42 36  
10:23:44 37  
10:23:51 38  
10:23:55 39  
10:24:02 40  
10:24:08 41  
42  
10:24:15 43  
10:24:21 44  
10:24:26 45  
10:24:30 46  
10:24:40 47



10:24:45 1  
10:24:49 2  
10:24:53 3  
4  
10:25:00 5  
10:25:06 6  
10:25:12 7  
10:25:19 8  
10:25:24 9  
10:25:32 10  
10:25:36 11  
10:25:40 12  
10:25:42 13  
14  
10:26:02 15  
10:26:10 16  
17  
10:26:14 18  
10:26:20 19  
10:26:23 20  
10:26:28 21  
10:26:36 22  
10:26:44 23  
10:26:51 24  
10:26:55 25  
10:26:57 26  
10:27:19 27  
10:27:19 28  
10:27:23 29  
10:27:32 30  
10:27:36 31  
10:27:37 32  
10:27:39 33  
10:27:39 34  
10:27:39 35  
10:27:40 36  
10:27:43 37  
10:27:46 38  
10:27:46 39  
10:27:47 40  
10:27:47 41  
10:27:48 42  
10:27:52 43  
10:28:00 44  
10:28:04 45  
10:28:07 46  
10:28:12 47



10:28:15 1  
10:28:19 2  
10:28:23 3  
10:28:27 4  
10:28:33 5  
10:28:38 6  
10:28:50 7  
10:28:55 8  
10:28:58 9  
10:29:02 10  
10:29:07 11  
10:29:10 12  
10:29:14 13  
10:29:19 14  
10:29:23 15  
10:29:26 16  
10:29:26 17  
10:29:26 18  
10:29:27 19  
10:29:29 20  
10:29:33 21  
10:29:38 22  
10:29:43 23  
10:29:45 24  
10:29:46 25  
10:29:46 26  
10:29:49 27  
10:29:52 28  
10:29:59 29  
10:30:04 30  
10:30:04 31  
10:30:07 32  
10:30:10 33  
10:30:14 34  
10:30:17 35  
10:30:20 36  
10:30:28 37  
10:30:40 38  
10:30:40 39  
10:30:44 40  
10:30:48 41  
10:30:48 42  
10:30:50 43  
10:30:50 44  
10:30:53 45  
10:30:57 46  
10:30:58 47



10:30:58 1  
10:31:05 2  
10:31:07 3  
10:31:07 4  
10:31:10 5  
10:31:17 6  
10:31:19 7  
10:31:19 8  
10:31:22 9  
10:31:22 10  
10:31:26 11  
10:31:26 12  
10:31:31 13  
10:31:39 14  
10:31:44 15  
10:31:48 16  
10:31:48 17  
10:31:49 18  
10:31:53 19  
10:31:58 20  
10:32:03 21  
10:32:06 22  
10:32:06 23  
10:32:08 24  
10:32:08 25  
10:32:11 26  
10:32:17 27  
10:32:20 28  
10:32:23 29  
10:32:26 30  
10:32:33 31  
10:32:36 32  
10:32:38 33  
10:32:38 34  
10:32:41 35  
10:32:45 36  
10:32:46 37  
10:32:47 38  
10:32:49 39  
10:32:49 40  
10:32:52 41  
10:32:55 42  
10:32:56 43  
10:33:00 44  
10:33:05 45  
10:33:12 46  
10:33:17 47



10:33:19 1  
10:33:22 2  
10:33:26 3  
10:33:29 4  
10:33:31 5  
10:33:35 6  
10:33:39 7  
10:33:41 8  
9  
10:33:46 10  
10:33:52 11  
10:33:55 12  
10:33:58 13  
10:34:03 14  
10:34:06 15  
10:34:11 16  
10:34:15 17  
10:34:22 18  
10:34:26 19  
10:34:29 20  
10:34:38 21  
10:34:43 22  
10:34:47 23  
10:34:52 24  
10:34:57 25  
10:35:01 26  
10:35:05 27  
10:35:09 28  
10:35:14 29  
10:35:19 30  
31  
10:35:24 32  
10:35:26 33  
10:35:31 34  
35  
10:35:36 36  
10:35:41 37  
10:35:45 38  
10:35:48 39  
10:35:52 40  
10:35:55 41  
10:36:00 42  
10:36:04 43  
10:36:08 44  
10:36:12 45  
46  
10:36:17 47



10:36:25 1  
10:36:30 2  
10:36:34 3  
10:36:38 4  
10:36:43 5  
10:36:50 6  
10:36:54 7  
10:36:57 8  
10:37:00 9  
10:37:04 10  
10:37:08 11  
10:37:13 12  
10:37:19 13  
10:37:20 14  
10:37:20 15  
10:37:24 16  
10:37:24 17  
10:37:27 18  
10:37:30 19  
10:37:35 20  
10:37:38 21  
10:37:40 22  
10:37:43 23  
10:37:48 24  
10:37:50 25  
10:37:54 26  
10:37:57 27  
10:37:59 28  
10:37:59 29  
10:38:04 30  
10:38:09 31  
10:38:12 32  
10:38:16 33  
10:38:20 34  
10:38:23 35  
10:38:27 36  
10:38:32 37  
10:38:32 38  
10:38:32 39  
10:38:35 40  
10:38:40 41  
10:38:40 42  
10:38:40 43  
10:38:40 44  
10:38:43 45  
10:38:48 46  
10:38:49 47





10:38:50 1  
10:38:52 2  
10:38:58 3  
10:39:00 4  
10:39:06 5  
10:39:21 6  
10:39:23 7  
10:39:23 8  
10:39:26 9  
10:39:29 10  
10:39:30 11  
10:39:33 12  
10:39:37 13  
10:39:41 14  
10:39:46 15  
10:39:46 16  
10:39:48 17  
10:39:49 18  
10:39:51 19  
10:39:55 20  
10:39:57 21  
10:40:04 22  
10:40:06 23  
10:40:09 24  
10:40:13 25  
10:40:16 26  
10:40:19 27  
10:40:23 28  
10:40:24 29  
10:40:26 30  
10:40:36 31  
10:40:40 32  
10:40:40 33  
10:40:43 34  
10:40:46 35  
10:40:49 36  
10:40:52 37  
10:40:55 38  
10:40:55 39  
10:40:56 40  
10:40:56 41  
10:41:00 42  
10:41:04 43  
10:41:07 44  
10:41:08 45  
10:41:08 46  
10:41:13 47



10:41:15 1  
10:41:16 2  
10:41:16 3  
10:41:18 4  
10:41:22 5  
10:41:26 6  
10:41:30 7  
10:41:32 8  
10:41:36 9  
10:41:39 10  
10:41:42 11  
10:41:45 12  
10:41:48 13  
10:41:48 14  
10:41:49 15  
10:41:50 16  
10:41:51 17  
10:41:51 18  
10:41:54 19  
10:41:56 20  
10:41:56 21  
10:42:01 22  
23  
24  
25  
10:42:01 26  
10:42:03 27  
10:42:03 28  
10:42:05 29  
10:42:06 30  
10:42:08 31  
10:42:10 32  
10:42:15 33  
10:42:18 34  
10:42:20 35  
10:42:22 36  
10:42:25 37  
10:42:30 38  
10:42:33 39  
10:42:36 40  
10:42:39 41  
10:42:41 42  
10:42:44 43  
44  
10:42:49 45  
46  
10:42:50 47



10:42:55 1  
10:42:58 2  
10:43:01 3  
10:43:06 4  
10:43:09 5  
10:43:11 6  
7  
10:43:17 8  
10:43:18 9  
10:43:19 10  
10:43:19 11  
10:43:22 12  
10:43:22 13  
10:43:23 14  
10:43:26 15  
10:43:39 16  
10:43:51 17  
10:43:54 18  
10:43:57 19  
10:44:01 20  
10:44:01 21  
10:44:01 22  
10:44:05 23  
10:44:07 24  
10:44:07 25  
10:44:10 26  
10:44:13 27  
10:44:16 28  
10:44:18 29  
10:44:21 30  
10:44:23 31  
10:44:26 32  
10:44:27 33  
10:44:27 34  
10:44:29 35  
10:44:30 36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
10:44:35 41  
10:44:37 42  
10:44:38 43  
10:44:38 44  
10:44:41 45  
10:44:47 46  
10:44:47 47



10:44:48 1  
10:44:51 2  
10:44:53 3  
10:44:57 4  
10:45:01 5  
10:45:08 6  
10:45:11 7  
10:45:18 8  
10:45:24 9  
10:45:26 10  
10:45:30 11  
10:45:34 12  
13  
10:45:41 14  
10:45:43 15  
10:45:46 16  
10:45:46 17  
10:45:48 18  
10:45:48 19  
10:45:50 20  
10:45:56 21  
10:46:05 22  
10:46:09 23  
10:46:14 24  
10:46:19 25  
10:46:22 26  
10:46:29 27  
10:46:32 28  
10:46:38 29  
10:46:43 30  
10:46:48 31  
10:46:51 32  
10:46:58 33  
10:47:01 34  
10:47:09 35  
36  
10:47:10 37  
10:47:14 38  
10:47:14 39  
10:47:18 40  
10:47:19 41  
10:47:19 42  
10:47:22 43  
10:47:26 44  
10:47:33 45  
10:47:38 46  
10:47:43 47



10:47:46 1  
10:47:49 2  
10:47:52 3  
10:47:54 4  
10:47:58 5  
10:48:02 6  
10:48:07 7  
10:48:10 8  
9  
10:48:15 10  
10:48:21 11  
10:48:25 12  
10:48:28 13  
10:48:32 14  
10:48:39 15  
10:48:42 16  
10:48:46 17  
18  
10:48:50 19  
10:48:55 20  
10:48:58 21  
10:49:01 22  
10:49:05 23  
10:49:09 24  
10:49:12 25  
10:49:20 26  
10:49:24 27  
10:49:29 28  
10:49:31 29  
10:49:32 30  
10:49:32 31  
10:49:36 32  
10:49:37 33  
10:49:40 34  
10:49:43 35  
10:49:47 36  
10:49:52 37  
10:49:56 38  
10:49:59 39  
10:50:02 40  
10:50:07 41  
10:50:09 42  
10:50:12 43  
10:50:16 44  
45  
10:50:20 46  
10:50:23 47



10:50:30 1  
10:50:36 2  
3  
10:50:39 4  
10:50:43 5  
10:50:49 6  
10:50:53 7  
10:50:56 8  
10:51:01 9  
10:51:01 10  
10:51:02 11  
10:51:02 12  
10:51:05 13  
10:51:09 14  
10:51:11 15  
16  
17  
18  
10:51:14 19  
10:51:17 20  
10:51:20 21  
10:51:24 22  
10:51:28 23  
10:51:28 24  
10:51:31 25  
10:51:34 26  
10:51:35 27  
10:51:35 28  
10:51:36 29  
10:51:36 30  
31  
10:51:42 32  
10:51:48 33  
10:52:08 34  
10:52:24 35  
10:52:28 36  
10:52:33 37  
10:52:38 38  
10:52:45 39  
10:52:51 40  
10:52:55 41  
10:53:03 42  
10:53:12 43  
10:53:17 44  
10:53:21 45  
46  
10:53:40 47



10:53:46 1  
10:53:56 2  
10:54:03 3  
10:54:07 4  
10:54:15 5  
10:54:21 6  
10:54:28 7  
10:54:34 8  
10:54:42 9  
10:54:52 10  
10:55:00 11  
10:55:06 12  
10:55:10 13  
10:55:16 14  
10:55:22 15  
10:55:28 16  
17  
10:55:40 18  
10:55:44 19  
10:55:49 20  
10:55:55 21  
10:56:04 22  
10:56:09 23  
10:56:12 24  
25  
10:56:16 26  
10:56:21 27  
10:56:26 28  
29  
10:56:31 30  
10:56:40 31  
10:56:46 32  
10:56:51 33  
10:56:59 34  
10:57:06 35  
36  
10:57:10 37  
10:57:16 38  
10:57:20 39  
10:57:27 40  
10:57:36 41  
10:57:47 42  
10:57:56 43  
44  
10:57:58 45  
10:58:02 46  
10:58:06 47



10:58:16 1  
10:58:21 2  
10:58:27 3  
4  
10:58:33 5  
10:58:35 6  
10:58:51 7  
8  
10:58:55 9  
10:59:02 10  
10:59:14 11  
10:59:23 12  
10:59:27 13  
10:59:31 14  
10:59:41 15  
10:59:54 16  
10:59:59 17  
11:00:06 18  
11:00:15 19  
11:00:18 20  
11:00:18 21  
11:00:23 22  
11:00:27 23  
11:00:33 24  
25  
11:00:40 26  
11:00:52 27  
11:00:57 28  
11:01:08 29  
11:01:16 30  
11:01:23 31  
32  
11:01:26 33  
11:01:36 34  
11:01:44 35  
36  
11:01:51 37  
11:01:58 38  
11:02:03 39  
11:02:14 40  
41  
11:02:16 42  
11:02:21 43  
11:02:29 44  
11:02:36 45  
11:02:48 46  
11:02:49 47





11:02:50 1  
11:02:59 2  
11:03:10 3  
11:03:14 4  
11:03:16 5  
11:03:20 6  
7  
11:03:26 8  
11:03:31 9  
11:03:36 10  
11:03:40 11  
12  
11:03:45 13  
14  
11:03:47 15  
16  
11:03:52 17  
18  
11:03:56 19  
20  
11:03:56 21  
11:04:00 22  
11:04:03 23  
11:04:07 24  
11:04:12 25  
26  
11:04:18 27  
11:04:22 28  
11:04:27 29  
30  
11:04:33 31  
32  
11:04:37 33  
11:04:40 34  
11:04:44 35  
11:04:47 36  
11:04:51 37  
11:04:54 38  
11:04:58 39  
11:05:00 40  
41  
11:05:04 42  
11:05:07 43  
11:05:10 44  
11:05:14 45  
11:05:18 46  
11:05:22 47



1  
11:05:26 2  
11:05:36 3  
11:05:40 4  
11:05:43 5  
6  
11:05:47 7  
11:05:50 8  
11:05:54 9  
11:05:56 10  
11:05:57 11  
11:05:59 12  
11:06:01 13  
11:06:02 14  
11:06:02 15  
11:06:02 16  
11:06:05 17  
11:06:11 18  
11:08:17 19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

[REDACTED]

(Short adjournment.)

11:10:04 1 UPON RESUMING IN OPEN COURT:  
2  
11:19:16 3 COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Winneke.  
11:19:17 4  
11:19:18 5 MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, we're ready to resume with  
11:19:20 6 Mr Pope.  
11:19:20 7  
11:19:21 8 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.  
11:19:28 9  
11:19:31 10 <JEFFREY POPE, recalled:  
11:19:35 11  
11:19:35 12 COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Winneke.  
11:19:36 13  
11:19:36 14 MR WINNEKE: Thanks, Commissioner. Mr Pope, I was asking  
11:19:38 15 you last night, I think I'd got to about 19 May 1999, and  
11:19:46 16 it was on that day, in fact it was on that day that there  
11:19:51 17 was a continuation of the process of registering Ms Gobbo  
11:19:56 18 as an informer. I wonder if the application for  
11:20:00 19 registration can be put up. It's VPL.0005.0013.0952.  
11:20:15 20 RC34. If we can have a look at the first page of that.  
11:20:34 21 Part A is the Informer Registration Application form. That  
11:20:39 22 contains your details at the top in your handwriting I  
11:20:42 23 assume?---Yes.  
11:20:43 24  
11:20:45 25 And Ms Gobbo's details below and that form was signed by  
11:20:52 26 you on 13 May 99. That's the day after your first meeting  
11:20:59 27 with Ms Gobbo on the 12th, the previous day at the Emerald  
11:21:06 28 Hotel; is that correct?---Yes.  
11:21:07 29  
11:21:08 30 At that stage it was your understanding that she would be  
11:21:13 31 registered for the purposes of providing information into  
11:21:19 32 fraud and money laundering, correct?---Yes.  
11:21:22 33  
11:21:23 34 And if we move to the second page of the document we can  
11:21:31 35 see that part B is the part of the form that's filled out  
11:21:36 36 by your Sergeant, Mr Segrave, who gave evidence  
11:21:41 37 yesterday?---Yes.  
11:21:41 38  
11:21:42 39 That occurred on the 19th. In between the 13th and the  
11:21:48 40 19th there was a further meeting on the 17th, and I think  
11:21:51 41 that was at the Armadale meeting which went from about 20  
11:21:57 42 past 12 through to 4.15, and I think we've established  
11:22:03 43 yesterday that you received, or at least you got the idea  
11:22:06 44 that she was going to provide or was prepared to provide  
11:22:08 45 some more detailed information to you?---Yes.  
11:22:11 46  
11:22:12 47 Can I ask, do you know why the application wasn't made

11:22:19 1 subsequent to that meeting, that is the 17th, why wasn't it  
11:22:22 2 made immediately after that?---I'm interpreting your  
11:22:29 3 question as why did I make the application on the 13th, is  
11:22:33 4 that - - -

11:22:34 5  
11:22:34 6 No, no. Why was Part B not proceeded with immediately  
11:22:37 7 after that meeting?---I don't know.

11:22:39 8  
11:22:39 9 Okay. Are you able to recall the process of registering -  
11:22:47 10 was part B, that is the supervisor's tick off, if you like,  
11:22:57 11 done when a particular view had been reached about the  
11:22:59 12 reliability, veracity and so forth of the proposed  
11:23:03 13 informer?---Look, it's possible but from my recollection  
11:23:06 14 I've completed Part A and I don't recall having any part in  
11:23:12 15 any further part of that process.

11:23:14 16  
11:23:14 17 I take it you had discussions with Sergeant Segrave about  
11:23:19 18 the matters that he has referred to in his comments and  
11:23:23 19 recommendations, special considerations, et cetera?---It's  
11:23:27 20 possible but I don't recall seeing this part of the form.

11:23:36 21  
11:23:37 22 You don't?---No.

11:23:37 23  
11:23:37 24 I see. Ultimately you were the person who was handling  
11:23:40 25 her, if you like?---Yes.

11:23:42 26  
11:23:42 27 If we can use that description. Mr Segrave, would he be  
11:23:46 28 described as a controller?---Yes.

11:23:47 29  
11:23:47 30 He makes a number of comments about his view. I just want  
11:23:52 31 to ask you if you share the views, or did. "I recommend  
11:23:57 32 the registration of this informer. It's believed that the  
11:24:00 33 informer will be an ongoing source of information regarding  
11:24:04 34 money laundering and fraud activities as both credible and  
11:24:09 35 reputable". I assume?---I think that's what it means.

11:24:13 36  
11:24:14 37 Was it your understanding from the information that you'd  
11:24:18 38 received on the 12th, the 17th and the 19th that the  
11:24:25 39 expectation was that she would be an ongoing source of  
11:24:29 40 information?---I think we'd formed the view that she would  
11:24:33 41 be a source for this particular inquiry.

11:24:35 42  
11:24:38 43 If that's the case, that her information would be relevant  
11:24:44 44 only to this particular inquiry, could you explain why it's  
11:24:48 45 recorded that she would be an ongoing source of  
11:24:51 46 information?---I think that was with the context of ongoing  
11:24:55 47 for this particular inquiry.

11:24:56 1  
11:24:57 2 That's your understanding?---That's my understanding.  
11:24:58 3  
11:24:59 4 Have you had any discussions with Mr Segrave in recent  
11:25:02 5 times?---No, I haven't.  
11:25:04 6  
11:25:04 7 When was the last time you spoke to Mr Segrave prior to  
11:25:07 8 this hearing?---Probably when I left Victoria Police in  
11:25:12 9 2013.  
11:25:12 10  
11:25:13 11 Is that right? Okay, all right. The next line is that the  
11:25:26 12 informant has no known previous history of - can you read  
11:25:36 13 that? "Supplying information to law enforcement agencies".  
11:25:47 14 Was that your understanding at that time?---Yes. I think  
11:25:55 15 the only knowledge, as I can now recall based on my notes,  
11:26:00 16 is the only knowledge we had was that she was talking to  
11:26:06 17 the Drug Squad.  
11:26:07 18  
11:26:07 19 Right?---Who introduced her to us.  
11:26:09 20  
11:26:10 21 Yes?---But aside from that, that's my understanding.  
11:26:12 22  
11:26:14 23 I mean so far as that notation was concerned, certainly by  
11:26:21 24 the 19th you would have been aware that she'd been  
11:26:24 25 providing information to the Drug Squad?---Yes, as an  
11:26:28 26 unregistered informer.  
11:26:29 27  
11:26:30 28 As an unregistered informer. Did you ever take the view  
11:26:35 29 that - did you ever hold the view that she'd had a previous  
11:26:39 30 handler?---Not at that stage I don't think.  
11:26:45 31  
11:26:46 32 Look, you spoke to a Mr Millet on 15 February of this year.  
11:26:58 33 Do you recall speaking to him?---Vaguely, yes.  
11:27:01 34  
11:27:04 35 You told him in conversation that in the late 1990s he,  
11:27:12 36 you, were at the Asset Recovery Squad where he worked with  
11:27:18 37 Jim Coghlan who may have some records in relation to Gobbo.  
11:27:22 38 What you then stated was "he was contacted by her", one  
11:27:29 39 assumes Gobbo, "and she stated that her 'previous handler'  
11:27:33 40 was incompetent". Do you recall telling Mr Millet that on  
11:27:38 41 15 February 2019, this year?---I accept that that's an  
11:27:43 42 accurate record of the conversation but I don't actually  
11:27:48 43 recall saying it.  
11:27:49 44  
11:27:49 45 You don't recall saying it?---No.  
11:27:50 46  
11:27:51 47 Would it be fair to say that if that's what you told

11:27:53 1  
11:27:57 2  
11:27:59 3  
11:27:59 4  
11:28:02 5  
11:28:05 6  
11:28:08 7  
11:28:13 8  
11:28:18 9  
11:28:21 10  
11:28:26 11  
11:28:30 12  
11:28:34 13  
11:28:34 14  
11:28:39 15  
11:28:47 16  
11:28:52 17  
11:29:00 18  
11:29:04 19  
11:29:07 20  
11:29:12 21  
11:29:19 22  
11:29:19 23  
11:29:25 24  
11:29:30 25  
11:29:34 26  
11:29:37 27  
11:29:43 28  
11:29:46 29  
11:29:51 30  
11:29:56 31  
11:30:02 32  
11:30:06 33  
11:30:10 34  
11:30:13 35  
11:30:17 36  
11:30:24 37  
11:30:28 38  
11:30:31 39  
11:30:34 40  
11:30:36 41  
11:30:36 42  
11:30:42 43  
11:30:46 44  
11:30:48 45  
11:30:50 46  
11:30:50 47

Mr Millet on 15 February of this year it was your recollection at that stage - - - ?---Yes.

- - - that she'd had a previous handler who was incompetent?---Yes.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

11:30:53 1  
11:30:57 2 The point that you make, though, in relation to that  
11:31:02 3 attendance and that search, you recall later being  
11:31:07 4 contacted by Ms Gobbo who stated, "You have no idea what  
11:31:11 5 you've stumbled across"?---I have a recollection of that  
11:31:14 6 now, yes.  
11:31:15 7  
11:31:17 8 Could you pinpoint in time when that attendance was and  
11:31:23 9 when the conversation occurred, that is between you and  
11:31:26 10 Ms Gobbo?---I can't pinpoint it exactly but I think it was  
11:31:35 11 after I had finished dealing with her as a human source.  
11:31:39 12  
11:31:40 13 Right. I assume that would be after October of 99 or after  
11:31:48 14 early 2000, which - - - ?---I think so. I can't be  
11:31:52 15 certain.  
11:31:53 16  
11:31:53 17 Righto. Have you searched your diaries to see if you could  
11:31:56 18 find any reference to any information about that which  
11:31:59 19 might give you a reference in time?---Not for that purpose,  
11:32:02 20 no.  
11:32:02 21  
11:32:02 22 You haven't?---No.  
11:32:03 23  
11:32:05 24 I take it you have your diaries, that diaries are in  
11:32:11 25 existence?---Yes.  
11:32:12 26  
11:32:12 27 And these are the diaries which are held by Victoria  
11:32:14 28 Police?---That's right.  
11:32:15 29  
11:32:16 30 You've gone through your diaries with a view to providing  
11:32:22 31 evidence about the involvement of Ms Gobbo as a human  
11:32:27 32 source and your role in handling. Have you not gone  
11:32:32 33 further to look through those diaries to pinpoint that  
11:32:35 34 other information at this stage?---Not as yet.  
11:32:37 35  
11:32:38 36 Okay, all right. You also have a recollection, and in your  
11:33:02 37 earlier discussions that you had a meeting with Strawhorn,  
11:33:08 38 that is Wayne Strawhorn and a Drug Squad officer called  
11:33:13 39 Steve Paton from the Drug Squad at the Emerald Hotel. So  
11:33:18 40 you certainly recall initially having that meeting at the  
11:33:22 41 Drug Squad - I'm sorry, at the Emerald Hotel with members  
11:33:28 42 of the Drug Squad. Now your understanding is I take it  
11:33:31 43 that there was a meeting in which you in effect handed over  
11:33:37 44 Ms Gobbo to the Drug Squad, that is to officers Strawhorn,  
11:33:43 45 Paton and others, after you'd finished dealing with her; is  
11:33:49 46 that correct?---No, this is where my recollection is  
11:33:51 47 inaccurate.

11:33:52 1  
11:33:53 2 Right?---And this is where I seem to be conflating two  
11:33:56 3 separate issues into one.  
11:33:57 4  
11:33:57 5 Yes?---So my - initially, without referring to any of my  
11:34:03 6 notes, my recollection that I had, effectively the one and  
11:34:08 7 only recollection that I had of dealing with Ms Gobbo as  
11:34:13 8 some form of a human source, was a meeting at the Emerald  
11:34:18 9 Hotel with members of the Drug Squad. Without referring to  
11:34:20 10 my notes I could not remember exactly what that meeting was  
11:34:23 11 about.  
11:34:23 12  
11:34:23 13 Yes?---And whether the Drug Squad were introducing her to  
11:34:28 14 us at the Asset Recovery Squad or whether it was the  
11:34:32 15 reverse. Since I've reflected on my notes I now understand  
11:34:37 16 that it was the Drug Squad introducing her to us for the  
11:34:40 17 purposes of the fraud and money laundering investigation.  
11:34:43 18  
11:34:43 19 Right. You recall that back in about 2011 you swore an  
11:34:52 20 affidavit in relation to your association with  
11:34:55 21 Ms Gobbo?---Yes.  
11:34:55 22  
11:34:58 23 I take it you've seen that in recent times?---Yes.  
11:35:00 24  
11:35:00 25 I wonder if we could put up - or perhaps not for the  
11:35:05 26 moment. Let me just ask you this. Did you swear on that  
11:35:08 27 occasion that, "I believe that I met with" - at that stage  
11:35:17 28 she was called witness F - "on about six occasions. Given  
11:35:24 29 the passage of time the following is my best recollection.  
11:35:27 30 On every occasion that I would meet with her I would advise  
11:35:29 31 my supervisor and colleagues. I believe I had a colleague  
11:35:32 32 attend meetings with me or remain in the vicinity close by  
11:35:36 33 to observe the meetings. I only ever met witness F in  
11:35:40 34 public places during the day and during work hours. The  
11:35:43 35 only exception to this, as I recall, was when I attended a  
11:35:47 36 meeting with Detective Senior Sergeant Wayne Strawhorn and  
11:35:49 37 a few other members of the Drug Squad and Ms Gobbo. That  
11:35:53 38 meeting occurred later in the afternoon at the Emerald  
11:35:56 39 Hotel, South Melbourne". You recall that's what you put in  
11:36:01 40 your affidavit back in, I think it was about November  
11:36:05 41 2011?---Yes.  
11:36:05 42  
11:36:05 43 "I left that meeting with witness F (Ms Gobbo) continuing  
11:36:09 44 to talk to members from the Drug Squad about drug related  
11:36:12 45 matters. I left that meeting alone. As I recall, that  
11:36:15 46 meeting was effectively a hand-over from my perspective as  
11:36:20 47 witness F wanted to give information about high level drug



11:36:23 1 trafficking with potential corruption links that was well  
11:36:26 2 beyond my capability and remit as a detective at the Asset  
11:36:32 3 Recovery Squad". You go on and say, "I would have made  
11:36:35 4 notations in my official diary of all the meetings. I  
11:36:39 5 don't know where those official diaries are stored if they  
11:36:42 6 still exist. I believe also that if I had gathered any  
11:36:46 7 intelligence from the meeting I would submitted an  
11:36:47 8 information report". Now, to be fair to you, at that stage  
11:36:52 9 you swore that affidavit without the benefit of looking at  
11:36:57 10 your notes; is that correct?---Correct.

11:36:59 11  
11:37:00 12 And nonetheless in 2011, obviously I suppose still a decade  
11:37:09 13 after the events, that was your recollection at that stage,  
11:37:12 14 that there'd been a hand-over back to the Drug Squad,  
11:37:15 15 correct?---That was my recollection without referring to my  
11:37:18 16 notes.

11:37:18 17  
11:37:19 18 [REDACTED]  
11:37:28 19 [REDACTED]  
11:37:33 20 [REDACTED]  
11:37:39 21 [REDACTED]  
11:37:43 22 [REDACTED]  
11:37:44 23 [REDACTED]  
11:37:48 24 [REDACTED]  
11:37:52 25 [REDACTED]  
11:37:57 26 [REDACTED]  
11:38:01 27 [REDACTED]  
11:38:03 28 [REDACTED]  
11:38:03 29 [REDACTED]  
11:38:08 30 [REDACTED]  
11:38:13 31 [REDACTED]  
11:38:16 32 [REDACTED]  
11:38:19 33 [REDACTED]  
11:38:19 34 [REDACTED]  
11:38:22 35 [REDACTED]  
11:38:24 36 [REDACTED]  
11:38:25 37 [REDACTED]  
11:38:28 38 [REDACTED]  
11:38:28 39 [REDACTED]  
11:38:33 40 [REDACTED]  
11:38:36 41 [REDACTED]  
11:38:37 42 [REDACTED]  
11:38:40 43 [REDACTED]  
11:38:45 44 [REDACTED]  
11:38:51 45 [REDACTED]  
11:38:56 46 [REDACTED]  
11:38:59 47 [REDACTED]

11:39:03 1  
11:39:03 2  
11:39:08 3  
11:39:11 4  
11:39:12 5  
11:39:12 6  
11:39:15 7  
11:39:19 8  
11:39:22 9  
11:39:28 10  
11:39:32 11  
11:39:33 12  
11:39:34 13  
11:39:40 14  
11:39:46 15  
11:39:49 16  
11:39:55 17  
11:39:59 18  
11:40:02 19  
11:40:02 20  
11:40:11 21  
11:40:14 22  
11:40:15 23  
11:40:15 24  
11:40:21 25  
11:40:25 26  
11:40:27 27  
11:40:30 28  
11:40:33 29  
11:40:36 30  
11:40:36 31  
11:40:39 32  
11:40:42 33  
11:40:42 34  
11:40:44 35  
11:40:47 36  
11:40:47 37  
11:40:47 38  
11:40:51 39  
11:40:53 40  
11:40:54 41  
11:40:58 42  
11:41:02 43  
11:41:07 44  
11:41:10 45  
11:41:14 46  
11:41:17 47

And so that call, you think when she called you saying, in effect, that "you don't know what you've stumbled across" - - - ?---Yes.

- - - it may well be during that telephone call that you get the impression that she was intending to or was at that stage providing information to the Drug Squad about high level drug trafficking?---Yeah, I can't recall what her intention was she was conveying but I didn't engage with her any further on that.

Yes, okay. The impression that you got from your meeting at the Drug Squad - now assuming you're correct in the view that you have now that there was only one meeting and it occurred at the commencement, that she had, it appeared to you, an established connection/relationship with members of the Drug Squad?---I think - yes, that's my belief.

And was she - casting your mind back to that meeting, do you recall - you and Segrave go to the meeting, right?---Yes.

And when you get to the hotel was she already there with Strawhorn and others?---I really can't recall.

But what you do recall, certainly what you did recall is that you left alone?---That was my recollection over a decade later, which was incorrect.

But your recollection was that when you left she remained with members of the Drug Squad?---That was my recollection, yes.

Do you still think that that's the case?---I still think that's the case.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

11:41:17 1  
11:41:17 2 All right. In any event after you and Segrave left the  
11:41:21 3 initial meeting, she remained?---That's right.  
11:41:25 4  
11:41:26 5 Drinking alcohol, drinking with members of the Drug  
11:41:28 6 Squad?---I think we had a couple of alcoholic drinks.  
11:41:31 7  
11:41:31 8 And your understanding was that she was there and she was  
11:41:34 9 drinking alcoholic beverages with the Drug Squad?---Look, I  
11:41:39 10 can't say for sure but it's possible.  
11:41:41 11  
11:41:47 12 To be clear, do you say from looking at your notes now that  
11:41:50 13 there was only ever one meeting that you had with her at  
11:41:53 14 the Emerald Hotel?---Yes. Sorry, if I can just qualify,  
11:42:04 15 with the Drug Squad.  
11:42:05 16  
11:42:05 17 With the Drug Squad?---Yes. What I can't discount is some  
11:42:09 18 of the other meetings that Mr Segrave and I had with her in  
11:42:12 19 South Melbourne. I can't recall whether they were at the  
11:42:15 20 Emerald Hotel or at a café in South Melbourne.  
11:42:18 21  
11:42:18 22 It's clear that you didn't meet with her on every occasion  
11:42:21 23 with your Sergeant?---No, that's right.  
11:42:24 24  
11:42:24 25 There were occasions when you met with her alone?---There  
11:42:28 26 were two occasions when Mr Segrave wasn't with me as I  
11:42:32 27 understand it.  
11:42:33 28  
11:42:34 29 The meeting at Armadale was with Mr Segrave, that's 17  
11:42:40 30 May?---Yes.  
11:42:41 31  
11:42:41 32 Was that at a hotel in Armadale?---I can't recall.  
11:42:44 33  
11:42:47 34 I notice that on that occasion I think there was - that was  
11:42:51 35 the meeting from 12.20 to 4.15?---Right.  
11:42:54 36  
11:42:55 37 I think there was \$55 taken out of expenses for that  
11:43:01 38 meeting?---I don't recall that. I don't think - - -  
11:43:05 39  
11:43:05 40 If the notes - if your records reveal that there was \$55,  
11:43:12 41 would that indicate again that there might have been  
11:43:15 42 benches, alcoholic beverages consumed?---If that's in my  
11:43:19 43 diary then that money would have been expended and  
11:43:22 44 reimbursed but I don't recall that being the case.  
11:43:26 45  
11:43:26 46 All right. If we can put up VPL.0005.0037.0010. Can you  
11:43:48 47 just look at the, focus on the first quarter of the page.

11:43:55 1 You'll see that 12 May, "Intro to the informer by DS  
11:44:01 2 Strawhorn. General issues canvassed, nil information  
11:44:06 3 obtained". Diary log dot reference, \$50?---Yes.  
11:44:10 4  
11:44:11 5 Then 17 May - on this occasion it appears that she's got an  
11:44:19 6 informer number, although the registration at that stage  
11:44:23 7 hasn't been approved; is that correct?---That's my  
11:44:26 8 understanding, yes.  
11:44:27 9  
11:44:28 10 As we understand it when there's an application made then a  
11:44:33 11 registered informer number is given even prior to the  
11:44:36 12 approval; is that right?---I think it can be, yes.  
11:44:38 13  
11:44:39 14 Then we see in the expense column \$55 there?---I accept  
11:44:45 15 that obviously the \$55 has been paid. I have no  
11:44:49 16 recollection of it. I'm not sure that's noted in my diary.  
11:44:52 17 It might be in someone else's.  
11:44:53 18  
11:44:54 19 Do you know whose handwriting that is?---That's all  
11:44:58 20 Mr Segrave's writing.  
11:44:59 21  
11:44:59 22 All of it is?---Yes.  
11:45:00 23  
11:45:01 24 I tender that document.  
11:45:03 25  
11:45:04 26 COMMISSIONER: What date is that? Do we have a date?  
11:45:07 27  
11:45:08 28 MR WINNEKE: If we can scroll down. I think there are a  
11:45:10 29 number of entries and it finishes on 23 September 99. It's  
11:45:14 30 obviously a log which has been created between the first  
11:45:17 31 date on that, which is 28 April.  
11:45:23 32  
11:45:24 33 #EXHIBIT RC 58 - Informer management file activity log from  
11:45:30 34 28 April 1999 to 23/09/99.  
11:45:42 35  
11:45:42 36 That can be taken down, thanks very much. Can I just ask  
11:45:54 37 you a couple of questions about the registration. The  
11:46:05 38 registration process continued on the 19th. I wonder if we  
11:46:11 39 could have Exhibit 34 back up. If we go to the first  
11:46:20 40 page - I'm sorry, second page. Highlight the "Comments"  
11:46:25 41 section. At that stage you were certainly aware that  
11:46:50 42 Ms Gobbo was a barrister?---Yes.  
11:46:51 43  
11:46:53 44 And that there was certainly the expectation that she would  
11:46:59 45 provide valuable information to police?---For this  
11:47:04 46 investigation, yes.  
11:47:04 47

11:47:05 1 For this investigation. You understood that this  
11:47:09 2 investigation had followed on an arrest of a number of  
11:47:15 3 offenders by members of the Drug Squad?---I think, as I  
11:47:20 4 recall yesterday, we didn't really have much access to that  
11:47:23 5 information, to that context.

11:47:26 6  
11:47:26 7 I understand that but one assumes that your initial  
11:47:29 8 meetings with the Drug Squad members and you and Segrave  
11:47:36 9 were given sufficient information to get an idea about what  
11:47:39 10 the job was about, correct?---We would have been given some  
11:47:42 11 briefing and some context, yes, but I can't recall how much  
11:47:46 12 detail we were given.

11:47:47 13  
11:47:47 14 I understand that. You said yesterday that the expectation  
11:47:49 15 was that this sort of operation rolled on from the laying  
11:47:53 16 of charges against offenders?---That was most logical, yes.

11:47:59 17  
11:47:59 18 To get an idea about what your role was going to be you  
11:48:03 19 would need to be given sufficient information to get an  
11:48:06 20 understanding about the relevant matters, the relevant  
11:48:09 21 facts?---Well, yes, but sometimes these things can be quite  
11:48:14 22 tangential.

11:48:15 23  
11:48:16 24 Obviously it must have been of interest to you to know  
11:48:21 25 where the informer was going to be getting her information  
11:48:24 26 from?---Yes, I think that became known early on.

11:48:32 27  
11:48:33 28 It must have been known because it would be important for  
11:48:36 29 you to find out how she was getting information?---Yes.

11:48:39 30  
11:48:39 31 You'd want to know, for example, whether she was a  
11:48:42 32 participant in fraudulent activity?---Yes.

11:48:44 33  
11:48:44 34 And you would have asked her questions about that?---We  
11:48:48 35 would have asked questions to establish her degree of  
11:48:55 36 credibility.

11:48:55 37  
11:48:56 38 In order to establish where she's getting the information  
11:49:00 39 from you'd ask her, wouldn't you?---Yes.

11:49:04 40  
11:49:05 41 One assumes that for her to have the information she must  
11:49:09 42 have had some knowledge of the matters that she was telling  
11:49:12 43 you about?---Yes.

11:49:12 44  
11:49:13 45 And it would have been apparent to you that she was getting  
11:49:18 46 that knowledge because she was involved in one way or  
11:49:21 47 another in litigation involving these people?---Well my

11:49:27 1 recollection was because she had previously worked at the  
11:49:30 2 premises where the allegations related.  
11:49:35 3  
11:49:35 4 Are you talking about a solicitor's premises?---Yes.  
11:49:39 5  
11:49:42 6 Did you - I assume you would have asked her, for example,  
11:49:46 7 what connection she at that time with any of the people  
11:49:50 8 involved in this investigation?---My very vague  
11:49:57 9 recollection of this was this was all about her  
11:50:06 10 ex-employer.  
11:50:06 11  
11:50:07 12 Would you have asked her questions about, for example,  
11:50:11 13 whether she was acting for any of the people who were  
11:50:14 14 around this investigation?---I don't recall those  
11:50:23 15 conversations and I don't recall the names of people coming  
11:50:26 16 up until we started to further investigate this matter.  
11:50:31 17  
11:50:33 18 One would imagine, if you were conscientiously examining  
11:50:40 19 the information with an inquiring mind, you'd want to find  
11:50:48 20 out where the information was coming from?---Yes.  
11:50:51 21  
11:50:54 22 Would you have asked her questions to satisfy yourself that  
11:51:00 23 any information you got was reliable information?---Yes.  
11:51:05 24  
11:51:11 25 One assumes that you would be asking her, "Who told you the  
11:51:15 26 information", who provided the information?---Yeah, I'm  
11:51:19 27 assuming we would have gone through all those sorts of  
11:51:23 28 discussions.  
11:51:24 29  
11:51:24 30 All right. The fact that she was a legal practitioner, I  
11:51:32 31 suggest, was clearly significant to her use as an  
11:51:44 32 informer?---Well it was the link in the avenue into her  
11:51:50 33 ex-employer where the allegations were focused.  
11:51:52 34  
11:51:54 35 Did you understand that she was continuing to attend upon  
11:52:00 36 clients who were in custody who might have been a part of  
11:52:06 37 the broader investigation?---I don't recall having that  
11:52:10 38 understanding at the time.  
11:52:11 39  
11:52:12 40 Would you have asked questions of her to find out exactly  
11:52:17 41 what involvement she had in the general operation carried  
11:52:24 42 out by the Drug Squad?---I can't recall. All I can recall  
11:52:35 43 was her talking about her ex-employer.  
11:52:38 44  
11:52:38 45 Yes?---And that was the focus of our inquiry.  
11:52:41 46  
11:52:42 47 You also understood that she was providing information

11:52:44 1 about a Mr Reid?---That comes up in the information reports  
11:52:49 2 during the course of this, yes.  
11:52:51 3  
11:52:52 4 One assumes that on hearing about Mr Reid you would have  
11:52:59 5 asked her about him and what she knew about him?---Quite  
11:53:02 6 possibly.  
11:53:02 7  
11:53:02 8 You were aware that Mr Reid was a person who had been  
11:53:06 9 charged with a criminal offence?---I can't recall that.  
11:53:11 10  
11:53:12 11 You were aware that, because of discussions you had with  
11:53:15 12 her, that he was having to front at the court and the  
11:53:19 13 likely prospect of going to gaol?---Yes, I can see that in  
11:53:24 14 the information reports.  
11:53:25 15  
11:53:25 16 I take it you would have understood that Mr Reid had been  
11:53:29 17 charged with criminal offences?---He was facing a term of  
11:53:33 18 imprisonment, yes.  
11:53:34 19  
11:53:38 20 Were you aware that the solicitor about whom Ms Gobbo was  
11:53:45 21 providing information had been acting for Mr Reid?---Look,  
11:53:50 22 I can't recall that directly. I think I had a belief that  
11:53:54 23 he was a business associate but I can't recall if I had a  
11:53:57 24 clear understanding about whether there was an acting  
11:54:00 25 arrangement.  
11:54:00 26  
11:54:01 27 Did you find out what Mr Reid was charged with, why he was  
11:54:04 28 charged, why he was facing the prospect of going to  
11:54:11 29 gaol?---I can't recall but most likely, yes.  
11:54:14 30  
11:54:15 31 You understood that there was a suggestion that Mr Reid had  
11:54:23 32 apparently used the solicitor to launder money through his  
11:54:27 33 real estate agency, you understood that?---Yes.  
11:54:30 34  
11:54:31 35 And that there was a suggestion that the employer or the  
11:54:33 36 former employer was funding Reid's defence?---I don't  
11:54:39 37 recall that.  
11:54:39 38  
11:54:40 39 In any event whatever's in the information reports you  
11:54:43 40 would say would appear accurate?---Yes.  
11:54:46 41  
11:54:52 42 You understood that a legal practitioner had obligations to  
11:55:00 43 clients?---Yes.  
11:55:01 44  
11:55:03 45 I take it as a general proposition you understood that a  
11:55:08 46 lawyer has obligations not just to clients but also to the  
11:55:14 47 court?---Yes.

11:55:15 1  
11:55:16 2 That might be dealing with the clients?---Yes.  
11:55:19 3  
11:55:19 4 You understand that now?---Yes.  
11:55:21 5  
11:55:21 6 And I assume you would have understood that back  
11:55:24 7 then?---Probably not as clearly as I understand now, but I  
11:55:27 8 would have had an understanding.  
11:55:28 9  
11:55:28 10 You would have had a general understanding?---Yes.  
11:55:30 11  
11:55:30 12 And that applies not to any information that the lawyer  
11:55:33 13 received from their clients?---I would have, yes.  
11:55:36 14  
11:55:36 15 And not just current clients but former clients?---Yes.  
11:55:39 16  
11:55:44 17 So all of that means that you were aware that it was  
11:55:47 18 important, the fact that she was a legal practitioner and  
11:55:50 19 she was providing information, is it either about people  
11:55:58 20 for whom she was acting or her former firm was acting gave  
11:56:03 21 rise to the possibility that these obligations might have  
11:56:05 22 come into play?---I think the possibility was there, yes.  
11:56:09 23  
11:56:13 24 Is it something that you discussed with Mr Segrave?---I  
11:56:20 25 think we - I can't recall any specific discussions but  
11:56:24 26 there were a number of discussions throughout this  
11:56:26 27 investigation.  
11:56:26 28  
11:56:26 29 I understand that. Clearly it's not noted in any comments  
11:56:34 30 and recommendations, is it?---No.  
11:56:35 31  
11:56:36 32 Is it the case that you had access to the solicitor that we  
11:56:39 33 talked about yesterday at this time, the time of  
11:56:43 34 registration?---Yes.  
11:56:44 35  
11:56:46 36 Do you say you did or didn't speak to that solicitor or any  
11:56:51 37 solicitor about the possible ramifications of registering a  
11:56:57 38 legal practitioner?---I think my diary indicates that I  
11:57:00 39 spoke to him before we registered her.  
11:57:02 40  
11:57:02 41 Yes?---But I can't recall the exact terms of that  
11:57:05 42 conversation.  
11:57:06 43  
11:57:06 44 Do you think it - - -  
11:57:07 45  
11:57:08 46 COMMISSIONER: This is the solicitor who was the former  
11:57:10 47 employer?



11:57:12 1  
11:57:12 2 MR WINNEKE: No, no. Perhaps I'll be clearer. I can't  
11:57:16 3 recall his name. I'm talking about the solicitor who was  
11:57:22 4 employed by the Asset Recovery Squad, Mr Jeans.  
11:57:25 5  
11:57:26 6 COMMISSIONER: Mr Jeans?---That's right.  
11:57:27 7  
11:57:30 8 MR WINNEKE: You spoke generally, that's you and Segrave,  
11:57:34 9 spoke to him generally about this particular job. As to  
11:57:40 10 whether or not you spoke to him about legal ramifications  
11:57:43 11 of registering a legal practitioner, do you know?---I can't  
11:57:47 12 recall.  
11:57:47 13  
11:57:47 14 Is it likely you didn't?---Given the sensitivities of this  
11:57:53 15 job I'd be surprised if we didn't have discussions about  
11:57:59 16 this issue.  
11:58:00 17  
11:58:01 18 About the fact that you were registering a legal  
11:58:03 19 practitioner. So you'd be surprised if you didn't raise it  
11:58:08 20 with Mr Jeans?---And Mr Curran.  
11:58:15 21  
11:58:15 22 So you believe that you raised it with Jeans and Curran,  
11:58:21 23 correct?---As I said, I can't recall. I think I ought to  
11:58:25 24 have or should have.  
11:58:25 25  
11:58:26 26 Yes?---And I'd be surprised at myself if I didn't.  
11:58:30 27  
11:58:30 28 All right. Do you think you would have raised it or it  
11:58:33 29 would have been raised with Acting Superintendent  
11:58:38 30 Sheridan?---I don't know.  
11:58:40 31  
11:58:41 32 All right?---I didn't have any further part, as I can  
11:58:46 33 recall, to play in the registration process apart from  
11:58:51 34 completing the form.  
11:58:52 35  
11:58:53 36 If we move to Part C of the application. We move down to  
11:59:00 37 Part C. We've got Sheridan, Acting Superintendent Major  
11:59:10 38 Fraud Group. If we can just keep going down. Again,  
11:59:15 39 fraud, money laundering. Is that your handwriting  
11:59:18 40 there?---No, it's not.  
11:59:18 41  
11:59:19 42 Okay, keep going down. That's signed off on 27 May 99 at  
11:59:26 43 the central registry and there's a name where it's said  
11:59:30 44 it's added by Thomas, do you know who that is?---I think it  
11:59:40 45 might have been a Superintendent who may have had  
11:59:44 46 responsibility for the actual registering.  
11:59:46 47

11:59:48 1 But you don't know anything about that?---No.  
11:59:49 2  
11:59:50 3 And you wouldn't have been involved in that part of  
11:59:52 4 it?---No.  
11:59:52 5  
11:59:53 6 If we can just come down from the top. Did you know then  
11:59:59 7 the process whereby the Acting Superintendent would have  
12:00:02 8 come to have signed that document? If we can scroll down  
12:00:06 9 to the top of - that page, please. Yes. Do you know what  
12:00:11 10 the process is or did you know then was with respect to the  
12:00:17 11 local register details?---All I can recall was the form  
12:00:20 12 needed to be filled out and supporting documentation  
12:00:24 13 provided and then it went through the chain of command.  
12:00:27 14  
12:00:29 15 Some of the supporting documentation included LEAP checks  
12:00:34 16 on Ms Gobbo's antecedents; is that right?---Yes.  
12:00:42 17  
12:00:43 18 If we keep going down the bottom. Further. Keep going.  
12:00:46 19 We see there that on 13 May 99 one assumes that you've done  
12:00:54 20 the LEAP check, Senior Constable Pope, and the charges were  
12:00:59 21 possess amphetamine, possess cannabis, et cetera, use and  
12:01:04 22 possess amphetamine and cannabis. You clearly established  
12:01:07 23 that on 13 May, that she had those priors?---Yes.  
12:01:10 24  
12:01:12 25 Would you have asked her questions about that?---I can't  
12:01:18 26 recall if we asked her questions or if she volunteered her  
12:01:21 27 version of events.  
12:01:22 28  
12:01:25 29 There's no notation of any version of events anywhere that  
12:01:28 30 we can see, is there?---No.  
12:01:30 31  
12:01:36 32 Was there a practise of communicating with any other legal  
12:01:41 33 - sorry, any other police officers who might have had an  
12:01:44 34 involvement in a person who's going to be registered as an  
12:01:50 35 informer to find out a little bit more about the background  
12:01:54 36 and history?---You could. That would have been an option.  
12:01:57 37  
12:01:58 38 You could do it in a way that didn't indicate what the  
12:02:01 39 purpose of it was, I assume. As a member of police you  
12:02:05 40 could ring up and say, "Look, I've just got a couple of  
12:02:08 41 questions about this matter" and you wouldn't need to  
12:02:10 42 reveal the fact that you were proposing to register the  
12:02:13 43 person as an informer, or would that not matter?---You  
12:02:19 44 probably wouldn't want to disclose that you were about to  
12:02:22 45 register them as an informer, but you could make some broad  
12:02:27 46 inquiries.  
12:02:27 47

12:02:27 1 And if you contacted the informant and asked those sort of  
12:02:32 2 general questions, the degree of cooperation between  
12:02:35 3 members of the police would be such that that officer would  
12:02:38 4 give you an understanding generally of what it would be  
12:02:41 5 about without pressing you as the reasons why I  
12:02:46 6 assume?---Generally, yes.  
12:02:47 7  
12:02:48 8 Generally. And that wouldn't be an usual thing to  
12:02:52 9 do?---No.  
12:02:52 10  
12:02:53 11 Indeed, it might well be a prudent thing to do,  
12:02:57 12 particularly if registering a person who's a registered  
12:03:01 13 legal practitioner in somewhat unusual  
12:03:04 14 circumstances?---Probably.  
12:03:04 15  
12:03:05 16 All right, okay. Would it have been - would you have or  
12:03:27 17 Segrave have spoken to the Drug Squad members to find out  
12:03:32 18 from them what you could about the informer and the  
12:03:37 19 veracity or their views about the informer, is that  
12:03:40 20 something that you would have done?---I think that's where  
12:03:42 21 we took our direction from because it was obviously more  
12:03:45 22 recent.  
12:03:46 23  
12:03:51 24 I take it from what you're saying is that you got nothing  
12:03:54 25 from the Drug Squad which suggested that she wouldn't be a  
12:03:59 26 useful and reliable informant?---Look, I don't recall  
12:04:03 27 anything clearly but I think I've seen one piece of paper  
12:04:07 28 in recent weeks which just says "trust issues".  
12:04:12 29  
12:04:12 30 Yes, trust issues. When you say you've seen that piece of  
12:04:16 31 paper, in your examination of documents leading to you  
12:04:20 32 making a statement; is that right?---Yes.  
12:04:22 33  
12:04:22 34 Where did you see that document?---I can't recall. I think  
12:04:26 35 it's a note by someone in the Drug Squad.  
12:04:27 36  
12:04:30 37 Was that a detective by the name of Lim?---I can't recall  
12:04:37 38 if it was him or Strawhorn or Kruger.  
12:04:39 39  
12:04:40 40 Do you say that you've seen that document as you've perused  
12:04:46 41 documents in preparation for the statement, but did you  
12:04:50 42 know that at the time, that there were trust issues?---I  
12:04:54 43 can't recall.  
12:04:54 44  
12:04:55 45 Had you been told by members of the Drug Squad that you  
12:04:58 46 should be careful about this person, there are trust  
12:05:01 47 issues, you might have been more wary yourself?---It

12:05:08 1 depends on what the trust issues were.  
12:05:10 2  
12:05:11 3 Yes?---Whether it was directed at her and her behaviour or  
12:05:16 4 her intentions and motivations or the quality of her  
12:05:20 5 information.  
12:05:20 6  
12:05:27 7 Clearly those would be relevant matters that you'd consider  
12:05:30 8 and you'd want to have that information at the time?---I  
12:05:34 9 don't recall anything at the time clearly that prevented us  
12:05:37 10 from progressing as we did.  
12:05:39 11  
12:05:44 12 Just finally, by way of the final process with respect to  
12:05:49 13 the application, if we could put up VPL.0005.0037.0009.  
12:06:03 14 That appears to be Part D of the application for  
12:06:09 15 registration, the document that was tendered as RC34, it  
12:06:14 16 contained only parts A to C. This appears to be the last  
12:06:19 17 part of it?---Yes.  
12:06:20 18  
12:06:20 19 And that nominates you as the handler, a co-handler being  
12:06:27 20 Kira Olney and the nominated controller as  
12:06:33 21 Mr Segrave?---Yes.  
12:06:33 22  
12:06:33 23 And that's signed off by Mr Sheridan on 26 May 99?---Yes.  
12:06:40 24  
12:06:40 25 I tender that perhaps as RC34B.  
12:06:46 26  
12:06:46 27 COMMISSIONER: All right then.  
12:06:47 28  
12:06:47 29 MR WINNEKE: Or it could be - - -  
12:06:50 30  
12:06:52 31 #EXHIBIT RC34B - Informer Registration Application Part D.  
12:07:01 32  
12:07:02 33 Can I ask whether you believe that you would have made it  
12:07:08 34 known to Ms Gobbo was she was being registered as an  
12:07:12 35 informer?---I can't recall whether we did or didn't.  
12:07:17 36  
12:07:19 37 Are you able to recall whether there was a practice at the  
12:07:22 38 time of informing persons if they were to be registered or  
12:07:28 39 not?---I don't know whether that was a common practice or  
12:07:33 40 not.  
12:07:33 41  
12:07:33 42 At that stage you hadn't registered too many  
12:07:36 43 informers?---No, I hadn't.  
12:07:37 44  
12:07:38 45 Do you know whether there was any guideline or instruction  
12:07:41 46 given about that or not?---No, not that I can recall.  
12:07:45 47

12:07:51 1 Do you believe that you would have had a conversation with  
12:07:54 2 Ms Gobbo along these lines, "Ms Gobbo, I understand that  
12:08:01 3 you're a legal practitioner. We do not want to know any  
12:08:04 4 information that's confidential or information that may  
12:08:07 5 well be in breach of legal professional privilege". Would  
12:08:10 6 you have had that sort of conversation with her or not?---I  
12:08:14 7 can't recall having that sort of conversation with her.  
12:08:15 8  
12:08:16 9 Is it the likelihood that there wasn't that sort of a  
12:08:19 10 conversation?---I don't think it would have been structured  
12:08:22 11 in such a way.  
12:08:23 12  
12:08:24 13 No, all right. Do you know whether there was any process  
12:08:27 14 whereby in effect the role was identified or the ambit of  
12:08:32 15 her role was outlined by way of making it clear what she  
12:08:40 16 could and could not do as an informer?---I can see in one  
12:08:46 17 of the information reports we had a discussion with her  
12:08:48 18 about what she was prepared to do.  
12:08:51 19  
12:08:51 20 Yes?---And, as I have said, my recollection purely is that  
12:08:57 21 this was focused on her ex-employer.  
12:09:00 22  
12:09:15 23 On 20 May there was a discussion that you had with  
12:09:22 24 Mr Strawhorn and it's set out in an information report, I  
12:09:30 25 think it's RC37 but I don't suggest it be put up at this  
12:09:41 26 stage. In the information report it says that you spoke to  
12:09:47 27 Detective Senior Sergeant Wayne Strawhorn at the Drug Squad  
12:09:51 28 - "he informed me that there were two people who were both  
12:09:55 29 registered as informers of his" - and they would be  
12:10:02 30 probably in a position to assist you in your investigation  
12:10:07 31 and you asked him to arrange a meeting with both of them as  
12:10:14 32 soon as possible and you also asked him about his knowledge  
12:10:17 33 of any documents which the NCA may have regarding either  
12:10:23 34 the person who was the subject of your investigation or  
12:10:26 35 Peter Reid. Are you able to recall how you came to the  
12:10:32 36 view that the NCA may have had information about either of  
12:10:36 37 those people?---I can't recall how I formed that view.  
12:10:40 38  
12:10:55 39 Do you recall having a discussion with Ms Gobbo about  
12:10:59 40 whether or not she had been providing information to the  
12:11:02 41 NCA?---I don't recall that discussion.  
12:11:05 42  
12:11:16 43 Indeed, on 26 May 99 you spoke to a Detective Sergeant  
12:11:25 44 Hynam from the NCA and you had a discussion regarding Peter  
12:11:31 45 Reid, do you recall that?---I can see the information  
12:11:35 46 report relating to that.  
12:11:36 47

12:11:53 1 Detective Sergeant Hynam also stated they had been  
12:11:57 2 introduced to an informer by Detective Senior Constable  
12:12:01 3 Kruger, Detective Senior Constable Lim at the Drug Squad  
12:12:05 4 and the informer had told them the exact same information  
12:12:09 5 which is outlined in previous information reports for this  
12:12:12 6 job and the NCA were going to execute a number of warrants  
12:12:22 7 under their Act to obtain banking documents and there were  
12:12:26 8 apparently a number of IRs and briefing papers regarding  
12:12:31 9 the NCA's inquiries. At that stage it was, for reasons  
12:12:37 10 unknown to Detective Sergeant Hynam, the NCA investigations  
12:12:44 11 had been put on ice, if you like, or put on hold,  
12:12:48 12 correct?---It seems that way, yes.  
12:12:49 13  
12:12:49 14 You understood that your informer, or you took the view  
12:12:53 15 that your informer was the same informer who was providing  
12:12:58 16 information to the NCA?---It looks like I reached that  
12:13:02 17 conclusion.  
12:13:02 18  
12:13:03 19 Is that something that you asked Ms Gobbo about?---Most  
12:13:09 20 likely. I don't recall but most likely.  
12:13:11 21  
12:13:12 22 Okay, all right. I take it, given your answer, you  
12:13:19 23 wouldn't be able to say whether or not she told you or what  
12:13:22 24 she told you about that?---No, I can't recall.  
12:13:25 25  
12:14:10 26 Can I ask you about an information report of 27 May 99.  
12:14:24 27  
12:14:25 28 COMMISSIONER: RC39 I think.  
12:14:26 29  
12:14:27 30 MR WINNEKE: RC39. I wonder if that could be put up. Do  
12:14:41 31 you see that?---Yes.  
12:14:41 32  
12:14:44 33 27 May you received an email from Ms Gobbo related to law  
12:14:49 34 notes about constitutionalism and attached to the email was  
12:14:57 35 a request to get together soon for a meeting. And you say  
12:15:00 36 you returned the email with an acknowledgement of receiving  
12:15:03 37 it and informing her that you'd be in contact within a few  
12:15:08 38 days to arrange a meeting. I take it this was - were you  
12:15:12 39 studying law at this stage?---That's right.  
12:15:14 40  
12:15:14 41 Were you doing constitutional law?---It was my first year  
12:15:19 42 of my part-time law degree.  
12:15:21 43  
12:15:21 44 A fairly dry subject and no doubt you were keen for some  
12:15:24 45 assistance, I suppose?---I think it obviously came up in  
12:15:27 46 conversation as we were trying to develop some form of  
12:15:32 47 rapport and I'd suggest she probably made the offer of

12:15:35 1 assistance.  
12:15:35 2  
12:15:36 3 You were aware that she was going to send you the notes I  
12:15:38 4 take it?---Well, I can't recall. I obviously gave her my  
12:15:42 5 email address, so.  
12:15:43 6  
12:15:43 7 Yes, okay. Is that something that you would usually do  
12:15:47 8 with an informer?---Well, I hadn't had too many informers  
12:15:52 9 before and I hadn't had any previously who were solicitors.  
12:15:56 10  
12:15:57 11 No, all right. In any event you got the notes and you made  
12:16:00 12 a note of it?---That's right.  
12:16:01 13  
12:16:07 14 I think subsequently you got some more notes. I think if  
12:16:11 15 we go to RC41. You got another email from her and there  
12:16:19 16 were more law notes attached for your personal use and  
12:16:25 17 there were no other messages and you didn't respond. Do  
12:16:32 18 you recall what those notes were?---No, I don't.  
12:16:34 19  
12:16:34 20 Were they any good, the constitutional notes, did they  
12:16:37 21 provide you with any assistance?---I can't recall. It was  
12:16:41 22 one of my favourite subjects, I must say, but I can't  
12:16:45 23 recall whether the notes were any good or not.  
12:16:47 24  
12:16:48 25 All right. You had a number of discussions with Detective  
12:17:07 26 Sergeant Hynam, I think, of the NCA?---Yes.  
12:17:09 27  
12:17:27 28 Your diary notes that you left a message - I'm sorry, that  
12:17:33 29 you received the law notes on 31 May 99, you left a message  
12:17:43 30 on 2 June for Ms Gobbo; is that correct?---I accept what my  
12:17:58 31 diary says.  
12:17:59 32  
12:18:00 33 All right. I think you've recorded that in your statement.  
12:18:02 34 Do you recall what that would have been about?---No, I  
12:18:05 35 don't.  
12:18:05 36  
12:18:13 37 You had a discussion with Ms Gobbo on 3 June 99?---Yes.  
12:18:24 38  
12:18:25 39 Was that in person or on the telephone?---I'd have to have  
12:18:30 40 a look at my notes.  
12:18:31 41  
12:18:31 42 All right?---I would suggest it would be on the telephone.  
12:18:36 43  
12:18:36 44 Yes?---If it just says "spoke to" it generally refers to a  
12:18:42 45 telephone conversation.  
12:18:43 46  
12:18:43 47 It's RC42. That's the - - -?---Telephone conversation.

12:18:56 1  
12:19:12 2 There was a discussion about her need to peruse 30 discs to  
12:19:20 3 locate the one with the information regarding the former  
12:19:22 4 employer on it, it would take some time and probably be  
12:19:27 5 ready in the next two weeks?---Yes.  
12:19:31 6  
12:19:32 7 Did you understand how she was going to access those  
12:19:38 8 discs?---No, I can't recall.  
12:19:41 9  
12:19:42 10 Would you have asked her?---Yes, I'm sure we would have had  
12:19:47 11 a discussion about it.  
12:19:49 12  
12:19:49 13 All right. And there was a discussion - the effect of the  
12:19:57 14 discussion was it would take some time and she'd probably  
12:19:59 15 be able to do it in the next two weeks. Can I ask you why  
12:20:06 16 it was necessary to arrange a meeting with her the  
12:20:09 17 following day?---I can't recall.  
12:20:10 18  
12:20:14 19 Right?---I don't think that meeting proceeded.  
12:20:23 20  
12:20:27 21 If we go to RC43?---It did.  
12:20:34 22  
12:20:34 23 It did proceed. You met her with Detective Sergeant  
12:20:38 24 Segrave?---Right.  
12:20:39 25  
12:20:40 26 You discussed her providing the computer disc which she has  
12:20:46 27 which contains information regarding the former employer.  
12:20:49 28 "She stated that she would be in a position to locate the  
12:20:53 29 disc over the weekend. She would give us a call the next  
12:20:56 30 week to make a time to get together and obtain it." And  
12:21:00 31 she had nothing further to add?---M'mm.  
12:21:02 32  
12:21:09 33 Is there - can you think of any reason why you would need  
12:21:14 34 to meet her in circumstances where you'd been provided with  
12:21:18 35 information the previous day that it would take her a  
12:21:22 36 number of days to get that information?---I can't recall  
12:21:27 37 how that's come about.  
12:21:28 38  
12:21:30 39 Do you know where that meeting took place?---I can't  
12:21:38 40 recall.  
12:21:38 41  
12:21:48 42 Just excuse me. I wonder if this document could be put up.  
12:22:29 43 I believe it's redacted. VPL.0005.0007.0200-R. Could you  
12:22:59 44 just have a look that and read that for a moment?  
12:23:02 45  
12:23:03 46 COMMISSIONER: Is that a new exhibit?  
12:23:05 47



12:23:05 1 MR WINNEKE: It hasn't been exhibited, Commissioner.  
12:23:08 2  
12:23:08 3 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.  
12:23:10 4  
12:23:11 5 MR WINNEKE: You'll recall that in a previous discussion  
12:23:14 6 you'd had with Mr Strawhorn he said that he could introduce  
12:23:18 7 you to two of his informers?---Yes.  
12:23:23 8  
12:23:24 9 And that was on 20 May that discussion had taken  
12:23:26 10 place?---Yes.  
12:23:27 11  
12:23:32 12 On 27 May, following upon that offer, you had a meeting  
12:23:42 13 with Segrave and one of the people who Mr Strawhorn had  
12:23:48 14 suggested that you meet with, correct?---Yes. It seems  
12:23:53 15 that way, yes.  
12:23:54 16  
12:24:00 17 There was a discussion about whether or not he could  
12:24:07 18 provide any information; is that correct?---Yes.  
12:24:11 19  
12:24:19 20 And the information that he provided at the very least  
12:24:22 21 related to Peter Reid?---I think some of it, yes.  
12:24:31 22  
12:24:34 23 And concerned alleged unlawful conduct on the part of  
12:24:40 24 Mr Reid?---Yes.  
12:24:44 25  
12:24:49 26 Did you at that stage know that Ms Gobbo had previously -  
12:24:54 27 I'm sorry, that the firm that Ms Gobbo had previously  
12:24:58 28 worked for acted for Mr Reid?---I don't recall having that  
12:25:04 29 understanding.  
12:25:04 30  
12:25:06 31 Okay. Whether or not you had that understanding then you  
12:25:11 32 simply don't know because you can't recall now?---I just  
12:25:14 33 can't recall.  
12:25:14 34  
12:25:17 35 I tender that, Commissioner.  
12:25:20 36  
12:25:21 37 #EXHIBIT RC59 - Information report dated 29/05/99.  
12:25:46 38  
12:25:59 39 I wonder if you could put up, please, VPL.0005.0007.0207-R.  
12:26:16 40  
12:26:17 41 COMMISSIONER: It's a new document, Mr Winneke?  
12:26:18 42  
12:26:18 43 MR WINNEKE: It's a new document, Commissioner.  
12:26:20 44  
12:26:21 45 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Winneke.  
12:26:23 46  
12:26:24 47 MR WINNEKE: Again, harking back to the conversation that

12:26:27 1 you'd had with Mr Strawhorn on 20 May, the offer to  
12:26:33 2 introduce you to two of his informers, does that indicate  
12:26:40 3 that on 3 June 99 you and Segrave met with Strawhorn and  
12:26:49 4 another person in South Melbourne?---Yes.  
12:26:52 5  
12:26:56 6 That person told you about his dealings with  
12:27:04 7 Mr Reid?---Yes.  
12:27:05 8  
12:27:07 9 And the former employer, which included laundering money  
12:27:10 10 through a company?---Yes.  
12:27:13 11  
12:27:13 12 And then there was an arrangement to meet that informer  
12:27:17 13 some time the following week?---That's right.  
12:27:19 14  
12:27:21 15 I tender that document, Commissioner.  
12:27:26 16  
17  
12:27:31 18 #EXHIBIT RC60 - Information report dated 14/06/99.  
12:27:39 19  
12:27:47 20 MR WINNEKE: On 9 June there was a telephone conversation  
12:27:50 21 that you had with Ms Gobbo and there was an arrangement to  
12:27:55 22 meet in a number of days. RC44, if that could be put  
12:28:07 23 up?---Yes.  
12:28:11 24  
12:28:19 25 Then there was a meeting on 11 June - I withdraw that. On  
12:28:29 26 Friday 11 June you received a call from Ms Gobbo - this is  
12:28:33 27 RC45, if that could be put up. You received a telephone  
12:28:48 28 call from her. She stated that her commitments for the  
12:28:52 29 morning had gone longer than expected and that she would  
12:28:55 30 like to postpone until Monday 14 June, and you informed her  
12:28:58 31 that you could meet her for lunch on 14 June. She said to  
12:29:02 32 you that she'd been invited to lunch by Peter Reid on  
12:29:06 33 Saturday and that she would tell you about that meeting  
12:29:10 34 when you met on the Monday, correct?---Yes.  
12:29:18 35  
12:29:18 36 Then the next information report relates to 14 June, RC46,  
12:29:23 37 if that could be put up. Indeed, that meeting did go ahead  
12:29:32 38 on the 14th. Was that a luncheon meeting?---I can't  
12:29:37 39 recall.  
12:29:37 40  
12:29:38 41 It was a meeting where other police officers were present  
12:29:44 42 but not immediately at the table with you and Ms Gobbo,  
12:29:49 43 would that be reasonable?---That's my interpretation, yes.  
12:29:52 44  
12:29:52 45 And she provided you with a computer disc and she stated  
12:29:57 46 that she didn't have lunch with Reid on Saturday but she'd  
12:30:01 47 been invited to have dinner with him later in the week

12:30:05 1 before he was to be sentenced in the County Court,  
12:30:10 2 right?---Yes.  
12:30:10 3  
12:30:11 4 And she said that the judge who was due to sentence Reid  
12:30:15 5 has expressed concern about the negotiated sentence which  
12:30:21 6 Ms Gobbo's former employer and the OPP have set and may be  
12:30:27 7 sentencing Reid to a term of imprisonment. You informed  
12:30:32 8 her that after you'd studied the documents you'd contact  
12:30:36 9 her some time next week, correct?---Yes.  
12:30:38 10  
12:30:38 11 It was clear enough to you that at the very least the  
12:30:43 12 solicitor was negotiating on behalf of Mr Reid with the OPP  
12:30:51 13 because there was a reference to that?---It seems that way,  
12:30:54 14 yes.  
12:30:54 15  
12:31:00 16 Did you have any discussions with Ms Gobbo about whether  
12:31:02 17 she was involved in any of the proceedings, either  
12:31:10 18 concerning Reid or peripheral to Reid?---No, not that I  
12:31:14 19 recall, no.  
12:31:14 20  
12:31:24 21 But you did understand that she was certainly meeting with  
12:31:30 22 Mr Reid?---Yes, I think my understanding was she had an  
12:31:35 23 association with Mr Reid.  
12:31:39 24  
12:31:43 25 Do you know whether or not she had visited Mr Reid in  
12:31:46 26 custody in 1997 and 98?---No, I don't recall knowing that.  
12:31:52 27  
12:31:52 28 And then she visited him in custody on 23 June 99, did you  
12:31:58 29 know about that?---I don't recall knowing about that.  
12:32:02 30  
12:32:02 31 Would you have asked her about the contact that she'd had  
12:32:06 32 with Mr Reid and the context of the contact that she'd  
12:32:12 33 had?---It's possible but I can't recall.  
12:32:14 34  
12:32:17 35 If we can go to Exhibit 47. You received a telephone call  
12:32:32 36 the following day from Ms Gobbo and she told you that Reid  
12:32:40 37 was being sentenced on the next day, 16 June, and he's  
12:32:46 38 having an all night party that night and he's going  
12:32:49 39 straight to court and she'd been invited. She also raised  
12:32:58 40 in the same conversation a question of whether or not there  
12:33:04 41 could be consent obtained to a variation of a restraining  
12:33:07 42 order on a property in [REDACTED] owned by her client,  
12:33:15 43 right?---Yes.  
12:33:15 44  
12:33:22 45 And did you ask her what the issue was with respect to that  
12:33:26 46 restraining order?---I can't recall the conversation.  
12:33:34 47

12:33:41 1 In effect, what she was doing was asking you if you could  
12:33:44 2 intervene on behalf of a client of hers?---She was asking  
12:33:49 3 if I could ascertain if the informant in the matter would  
12:33:53 4 seek, would consent to a variation of a restraining order.  
12:33:56 5  
12:33:57 6 In relation to a client of hers?---Yes.  
12:33:59 7  
12:34:00 8 Concerning a property in [REDACTED]?---Yes.  
12:34:02 9  
12:34:06 10 This is an area where the Asset Recovery Squad has an  
12:34:11 11 involvement, that is restraining orders?---Yes.  
12:34:13 12  
12:34:14 13 The Asset Recovery Squad has the capacity to go to I think  
12:34:19 14 a division of the OPP and say, "Look, we need a restraining  
12:34:22 15 order on this property", for whatever reason, "it might be  
12:34:26 16 tainted or proceeds of crime"?---Yes.  
12:34:27 17  
12:34:28 18 And to ask that the Office of Public Prosecutions appear in  
12:34:32 19 effect for you to make that application?---That's right.  
12:34:36 20  
12:34:37 21 With a view to that property or that asset being restrained  
12:34:44 22 so as it can't be dealt with pending any further  
12:34:49 23 order?---Correct.  
12:34:49 24  
12:34:50 25 That's your understanding?---Yes.  
12:34:51 26  
12:34:52 27 You understood that she had a client and that client owned  
12:34:57 28 a property which was the subject of such an order?---Yes.  
12:35:00 29  
12:35:09 30 You said to her that you would speak to the informant in  
12:35:12 31 relation to the matter?---Yes.  
12:35:14 32  
12:35:14 33 And get back to her. Did you speak to the informant?---My  
12:35:19 34 understanding is I did, yes.  
12:35:20 35  
12:35:22 36 Why did you speak to the informer?---The informant?  
12:35:27 37  
12:35:27 38 I withdraw that. Why did you speak to the informant?---I  
12:35:31 39 assume I, on the back of this phone call I assume that I  
12:35:35 40 spoke to them about their view on whether there would be  
12:35:40 41 any option of any variations.  
12:35:43 42  
12:35:44 43 Right. Ordinarily the process would be that the lawyer  
12:35:55 44 would speak directly to the informant or directly to the  
12:36:00 45 OPP with a view to discussing any changes that might be  
12:36:04 46 made or any relaxation of the order, that'd be the  
12:36:10 47 appropriate way of going about it?---That would be a way to

12:36:13 1 go about it, yes.  
12:36:14 2  
12:36:16 3 It would not be appropriate to do a sort of a back door  
12:36:19 4 approach, that is an informer, who happens to be a lawyer,  
12:36:24 5 going to the handler and then going through that approach  
12:36:26 6 to the informant, that wouldn't be the appropriate way of  
12:36:29 7 going about it I assume you'd accept?---I accept I think  
12:36:32 8 she was testing the relationship.  
12:36:33 9  
12:36:40 10 There really would have been no need for you at all to go  
12:36:44 11 to the informant because you would have said to yourself,  
12:36:46 12 "It's just not something I would entertain doing"?---I  
12:36:54 13 could see I had two options. It was either to speak to the  
12:36:54 14 informant or to say to her, "Here's the informant's number,  
12:36:59 15 you speak to the informant".  
12:37:00 16  
12:37:00 17 That might have been the appropriate way of going about  
12:37:04 18 it?---It could have been. She probably didn't have any  
12:37:08 19 knowledge of the informant or who the informant was or any  
12:37:13 20 - or have previously known the informant, so she's, I  
12:37:17 21 think, clearly tried to come to me because I'm the person  
12:37:20 22 in the Asset Recovery Squad that she has some form of  
12:37:24 23 contact with.  
12:37:25 24  
12:37:26 25 The reality is she would have known, assuming she's  
12:37:31 26 representing a person, she'd know who the informant is, one  
12:37:37 27 assumes?---One assumes.  
12:37:38 28  
12:37:38 29 Or if she didn't she could find out?---Yes.  
12:37:41 30  
12:37:41 31 If she's got the restraining order, there'd be names on it,  
12:37:44 32 she could contact either Mr Raimondo at the OPP or the  
12:37:50 33 informant?---Yes.  
12:37:50 34  
12:37:51 35 What she was, I suggest, seeking to do was use her  
12:37:55 36 relationship with you to see if she could get a favour, it  
12:38:00 37 would seem?---Yes, that's what I'm saying, I think she was  
12:38:02 38 testing the relationship.  
12:38:03 39  
12:38:04 40 And indeed you did go to this person to see if you could  
12:38:10 41 pass it on, pass on the request I would have thought?---I  
12:38:13 42 did have a discussion with them.  
12:38:15 43  
12:38:15 44 Do you recall the discussion?---No, I don't.  
12:38:17 45  
12:38:25 46 Do you know whether that [REDACTED] property was in some way  
12:38:28 47 connected with the proceedings that had been initiated by

12:38:35 1 the Drug Squad and which you were otherwise looking  
12:38:39 2 into?---I don't think so. I don't think so.  
12:38:42 3  
12:38:42 4 You don't think so?---No. I don't recall clearly enough  
12:38:47 5 but I don't think that was the case.  
12:38:48 6  
12:38:50 7 Do you understand that there had been reference to a  
12:38:59 8 property in [REDACTED] in previous information reports that  
12:39:03 9 you'd - - - ?---Yes, yes. About a transfer of title.  
12:39:09 10  
12:39:09 11 Yes?---About a transfer of a title of a property in  
12:39:12 12 [REDACTED] to satisfy a debt of some sort is my recollection.  
12:39:15 13  
12:39:16 14 RC59, there was a discussion in relation to a block of land  
12:39:19 15 which one of the informers owns outright in [REDACTED] and to  
12:39:24 16 which the documentation relates. "It appears on the face  
12:39:30 17 of it that there are no criminal offences apparent"?---I  
12:39:40 18 don't recall that property ever being the subject of a  
12:39:43 19 restraining order, or there's no note to that effect, I'm  
12:39:43 20 sorry.  
12:39:43 21  
12:39:44 22 You would say, "Look, I don't know whether it was the same  
12:39:47 23 property or not"?---Look, I can't recall. I don't think  
12:39:49 24 it's the same property.  
12:39:51 25  
12:40:10 26 In any event, you called her the following day and you told  
12:40:14 27 her that you had spoken to the informant regarding the  
12:40:18 28 block of land and that "we were not in a position to  
12:40:23 29 consent to a variation and that if she wanted to apply for  
12:40:27 30 a variation then we would be opposing that application.  
12:40:31 31 She said that she will pursue the issue through the  
12:40:35 32 appropriate person", being Phil Raimondo at the  
12:40:40 33 OPP?---That's correct.  
12:40:40 34  
12:40:41 35 And she told you on that day about the sentence that  
12:40:45 36 Mr Reid had received?---Yes.  
12:40:50 37  
12:41:01 38 Were there any further dealings that you can recall having  
12:41:04 39 with her in the period immediately after that or  
12:41:11 40 not?---After looking at my notes my recollection is I met  
12:41:15 41 with her very briefly on 1 October.  
12:41:17 42  
12:41:18 43 Right. You had a number of discussions with her, according  
12:41:29 44 to your official diary, this is paragraph 21 of your  
12:41:32 45 statement, on 30 June, 2 August, 6 September and 23  
12:41:38 46 September 1999. Your official diary records that you had  
12:41:45 47 telephone conversations with Ms Gobbo on those occasions;

12:41:48 1 is that right?---Yes.  
12:41:48 2  
12:41:51 3 Do you know what those conversations related to?---I can't  
12:41:58 4 recall. My assumption would be to this inquiry.  
12:42:08 5  
12:42:08 6 COMMISSIONER: Sorry, your assumption would be to this  
12:42:11 7 inquiry?---I'm sorry, to the investigation that we were  
12:42:14 8 managing.  
12:42:15 9  
12:42:15 10 MR WINNEKE: All right. I wonder if you could have a look  
12:42:24 11 at this document. Could you explain what that document  
12:42:43 12 is?---It's what we used to call an investigation log.  
12:42:51 13  
12:42:52 14 That's a log of actions, comments, et cetera, concerning an  
12:43:01 15 investigation?---M'mm.  
12:43:03 16  
12:43:03 17 And it's an Asset Recovery Squad investigation log. It's  
12:43:08 18 got a job number on the right-hand side, although it  
12:43:12 19 doesn't seem to be that there's any job number on that  
12:43:15 20 document; is that right?---Not that I can see, no.  
12:43:21 21  
12:43:22 22 And it records comments in the centre of the three columns  
12:43:32 23 about what activity you were engaged in, what  
12:43:36 24 investigation, communications, et cetera, et cetera?---Yes.  
12:43:38 25  
12:43:38 26 Is that filled out on an action by action basis, so for  
12:43:47 27 example if on 28 April something occurs do you then fill  
12:43:50 28 out that document on that day or is it done later on, do  
12:43:55 29 you know?---It's really done when you get the opportunity  
12:43:57 30 to do it.  
12:43:58 31  
12:43:58 32 Which is part of the job of paperwork that you've got to  
12:44:01 33 create when you're investigating; is that right?---Yes,  
12:44:04 34 when you're doing these sorts of investigations you're  
12:44:07 35 managing your day book, your diary, the investigation log  
12:44:10 36 and information reports.  
12:44:10 37  
12:44:11 38 All right. We have everything, all the notes save for the  
12:44:16 39 document we discussed yesterday which you couldn't  
12:44:19 40 find?---Yes.  
12:44:19 41  
12:44:23 42 It does appear that there are no entries in that  
12:44:28 43 investigation log subsequent to 23 June?---Yes.  
12:44:32 44  
12:44:44 45 I wonder if RC59 - if the activity log can be put up - no,  
12:45:02 46 it's not RC59. It's that document there. It's been  
12:45:15 47 exhibited. If we go to the second page of that and just

12:45:29 1 highlight - - -  
12:45:30 2  
12:45:30 3 COMMISSIONER: Has this already been tendered?  
12:45:34 4  
12:45:34 5 MR WINNEKE: It has been tendered. RC58.  
12:45:37 6  
12:45:38 7 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.  
12:45:39 8  
12:45:40 9 MR WINNEKE: We can perhaps highlight that. I was asking  
12:45:49 10 you about contact after 15 June. It seems that you've made  
12:45:52 11 a note that on 16 June you left a message for Ms Gobbo.  
12:46:00 12 Then you spoke to her on 30 June on the phone?---Yes.  
12:46:08 13  
12:46:11 14 There's no reference to 2 August but on 6 September there's  
12:46:14 15 a record that you received a phone call from Ms Gobbo and  
12:46:19 16 there was a general conversation but of nil value?---Yes.  
12:46:22 17  
12:46:23 18 23 September 99 you spoke to Ms Gobbo via the telephone and  
12:46:31 19 there's no reference to anything received, whether it was  
12:46:36 20 of any value or not?---Yes.  
12:46:37 21  
12:46:40 22 If there was any value in the discussion it would have  
12:46:43 23 been, one assumes, recorded in the investigation log or  
12:46:48 24 your notes?---Or the information report.  
12:46:52 25  
12:46:53 26 Or the information reports. Now if there's no information  
12:46:56 27 reports it would follow, I suppose, that there was nothing  
12:47:00 28 of any consequence in those communications?---Yes.  
12:47:03 29  
12:47:03 30 These conversations appear to have been at the tail end of  
12:47:09 31 this investigation and nothing further of any value seems  
12:47:13 32 to have arisen certainly subsequent to 15 June and there  
12:47:17 33 are no information reports - I'm sorry, yes, 16 June, and -  
12:47:22 34 aside from 1 October 99?---That's right.  
12:47:27 35  
12:47:28 36 Is that correct?---Yes.  
12:47:28 37  
12:47:30 38 On 1 October 99 there was a final meeting, is that right?  
12:47:43 39 RC49, if we can put that up. "After a number of  
12:47:52 40 preliminary phone calls I met with Ms Gobbo on Friday 1  
12:47:55 41 October. She didn't have any new information. She was  
12:47:58 42 mainly interested in how the investigation was progressing.  
12:48:00 43 She stated that her former employer moved into the new  
12:48:04 44 office. She's in regular contact with him and being  
12:48:07 45 briefed by him on a regular basis." Then there was a  
12:48:11 46 discussion about the investigation progressing slowly and  
12:48:14 47 you were awaiting the outcome of the Lambert trial in the



12:48:18 1 County Court. Do you recall what that was about, the  
12:48:21 2 Lambert trial?---No, I don't.  
12:48:23 3  
12:48:25 4 In any event that's the last information report?---That's  
12:48:28 5 right.  
12:48:28 6  
12:48:31 7 Do you recall having any meetings at all with Ms Gobbo as  
12:48:38 8 an informer after that meeting?---No.  
12:48:41 9  
12:49:10 10 The situation with respect to your diary is that - perhaps  
12:49:17 11 before I go there. Do you recall with that last meeting  
12:49:35 12 whether you wanted to see if there was any more information  
12:49:40 13 that she had or was it a meeting that she initiated, do you  
12:49:44 14 recall that? What you say is, "After a number of  
12:49:50 15 preliminary phone calls I met" - - - ?---I think the  
12:49:55 16 preliminary phone calls were referring to the ones you've  
12:49:58 17 already highlighted.  
12:50:00 18  
12:50:00 19 Yes. Do you recall whether you were initiating those phone  
12:50:03 20 calls or she was?---Could have been - - -  
12:50:06 21  
12:50:06 22 What was the situation?---It could have been either way. I  
12:50:09 23 think - well I think I can safely assume from the  
12:50:14 24 documentation that the investigation was fizzling out by  
12:50:17 25 this stage.  
12:50:18 26  
12:50:18 27 Yes?---And we were either looking to see if there was  
12:50:23 28 anything else or if we were going to finish it up.  
12:50:26 29  
12:50:26 30 Okay. Certainly by that stage - I take it you'd engaged in  
12:50:29 31 other investigations, had you, to determine whether or not  
12:50:37 32 it was conceivable that charges could be laid?---For this  
12:50:41 33 matter?  
12:50:41 34  
12:50:41 35 Yes?---We'd certainly been considering all the information  
12:50:45 36 as it had been coming in and conducting relevant inquiries  
12:50:48 37 and investigations.  
12:50:49 38  
12:50:53 39 Ultimately the former employer was not interviewed?---No.  
12:50:58 40  
12:50:58 41 He certainly wasn't charged?---No.  
12:51:00 42  
12:51:01 43 You didn't get enough information to establish or to enable  
12:51:06 44 you to bring him in and ask him questions?---Correct.  
12:51:09 45  
12:51:18 46 Ultimately there was an action on the part of Mr Segrave to  
12:51:26 47 change her status from active to inactive and that is she

12:51:33 1 be deregistered. Was that made known to you?---I can't  
12:51:37 2 recall.  
12:51:37 3  
12:51:37 4 Were you aware that her status was changed, in effect she  
12:51:40 5 was decommissioned as an informer?---Look, I can't recall  
12:51:47 6 with any clarity at all.  
12:51:49 7  
12:51:50 8 Right?---I can make an assumption that the job was fizzling  
12:51:54 9 out and we were looking to wrap it up.  
12:51:57 10  
12:51:57 11 Yes?---So that's part of that process.  
12:52:02 12  
12:52:06 13 In terms of wrapping it up, was there a formal process  
12:52:09 14 that's engaged in to wrap it up? How do you do that?---You  
12:52:15 15 generally would finalise the file.  
12:52:18 16  
12:52:19 17 Yes?---So you might put a report on the file as to how it  
12:52:24 18 was - as to how this investigation was concluded. Not  
12:52:31 19 always, but generally.  
12:52:32 20  
12:52:37 21 You handed your diary to Detective Senior Sergeant Curran  
12:52:44 22 for an audit regarding Ms Gobbo?---Yes.  
12:52:50 23  
12:52:50 24 Why did you do that?---Upon his request would be my  
12:52:54 25 recollection. I think that was part of a relatively  
12:52:57 26 standard practice.  
12:52:57 27  
12:52:58 28 Right. Were you part of the process or were you involved  
12:53:05 29 in the process of winding the operation up in the sense of  
12:53:11 30 the auditing process if you like?---I wouldn't have been  
12:53:13 31 involved in the auditing process, no.  
12:53:15 32  
12:53:18 33 So, what, you simply hand over your diary and that's it, is  
12:53:21 34 it?---That's right. That's my recollection.  
12:53:23 35  
12:53:26 36 All right?---I think it would be cross-referenced with  
12:53:30 37 information reports, expenditure and other things that may  
12:53:35 38 have occurred.  
12:53:35 39  
12:53:35 40 You believe that in May of 2000 you referred the matter to  
12:53:40 41 the legal Ombudsman?---I think ultimately that's how we  
12:53:44 42 ended up finalising this investigation.  
12:53:46 43  
12:53:49 44 Yes?---Was that there were no charges laid, no prospect of  
12:53:54 45 charges, but I think my diary indicates after some meetings  
12:54:00 46 with Mr Curran we decided to provide a report to the legal  
12:54:05 47 Ombudsman.

12:54:06 1  
12:54:06 2 What did you tell Mr Curran?---I can't recall.  
12:54:13 3  
12:54:13 4 Did you tell Mr Curran anything about Ms Gobbo as to  
12:54:16 5 whether or not she was a useful source or a reliable  
12:54:21 6 source?---Well I had a number of meetings with Mr Curran  
12:54:27 7 throughout the investigation.  
12:54:28 8  
12:54:28 9 Right. In the wash up did you form a view as to whether or  
12:54:32 10 not she was a useful or reliable source?---I can't recall  
12:54:36 11 conversations specifically about her with him.  
12:54:40 12  
12:54:41 13 I'm just asking you about your impression?---Oh, sorry, my  
12:54:45 14 impression?  
12:54:46 15  
12:54:46 16 Yes?---Look, you know, my recollection was the information  
12:54:53 17 that she provided didn't obviously result in any criminal  
12:54:58 18 charges.  
12:54:58 19  
12:54:58 20 Yes?---She was reliable in terms of attending meetings and  
12:55:07 21 providing, trying to provide information where she had  
12:55:11 22 access to that.  
12:55:12 23  
12:55:12 24 Yes?---But my recollection was she was also someone  
12:55:18 25 difficult to keep focused.  
12:55:20 26  
12:55:20 27 In what respect?---She would talk an awful lot about a  
12:55:23 28 whole range of things.  
12:55:24 29  
12:55:25 30 Yes. Is there a process or was there a process whereby  
12:55:30 31 those views could be expressed or set down in some sort of  
12:55:34 32 file?---Not that I recall.  
12:55:35 33  
12:55:36 34 Recorded somewhere so as other people in the future might  
12:55:39 35 be able to have recourse to them?---Not that I can recall  
12:55:43 36 for informers, no.  
12:55:44 37  
12:55:46 38 Where was the information - I mean aside from the documents  
12:55:50 39 that we've seen, the logs, the notes and the diaries and so  
12:55:58 40 forth, the information reports, at that stage was there any  
12:56:03 41 central intelligence system whereby this sort of  
12:56:06 42 information could be recorded and accessed at a later  
12:56:10 43 time?---Well my understanding is the information reports  
12:56:14 44 went into an intelligence database but I don't know, I  
12:56:19 45 don't think that was a centralised intelligence database  
12:56:23 46 but I can't be certain.  
12:56:24 47

12:56:24 1 Ultimately your view at the end of it was, I think you were  
12:56:28 2 saying, she had a whole lot of information and she told you  
12:56:32 3 a lot of things?--M'mm.  
12:56:34 4  
12:56:34 5 Some of which would enable you to pursue lines of inquiries  
12:56:41 6 but others, what, were really scuttlebutt or of no  
12:56:46 7 particular value at all?---Yeah, I think, you know, my  
12:56:50 8 recollection is lots of discussion about criminals, high  
12:56:53 9 profile crimes, police, policing, football, politics, a  
12:56:59 10 whole range of different topics were covered.  
12:57:01 11  
12:57:01 12 What about police and policing, do you have any  
12:57:04 13 recollection about those sorts of things that she  
12:57:07 14 mentioned?---I think it was just one of those - you know,  
12:57:12 15 "Who do you know? Who have you had dealings with?", and  
12:57:15 16 those sorts of things.  
12:57:17 17  
12:57:17 18 Right. Do you have any particular recollections of any  
12:57:23 19 police officers who she knew who she'd had dealings  
12:57:26 20 with?---No.  
12:57:26 21  
12:57:27 22 I assume she had mentioned to you particular names of  
12:57:32 23 particular police officers with whom she'd had  
12:57:35 24 dealings?---Yeah, I'm sure there was discussions about a  
12:57:39 25 whole range of people but I can't recall any specifics.  
12:57:41 26  
12:57:41 27 All right. Were these discussions occurring in the context  
12:57:44 28 of meetings that you had with Segrave?---Yes.  
12:57:48 29  
12:57:48 30 And her?---Yes.  
12:57:49 31  
12:57:49 32 Meetings that you had with her on your own?---I only had  
12:57:54 33 only the one with her on my own.  
12:57:58 34  
12:57:58 35 Only one or two?---Oh sorry, the second-last meeting I met  
12:58:02 36 with her on my own with two other members nearby.  
12:58:05 37  
12:58:06 38 Yes?---So technically, yes, I was discussing with her on my  
12:58:10 39 own and then the last one on 1 October.  
12:58:13 40  
12:58:13 41 Were there any recordings made at all to your  
12:58:17 42 recollection?---No, not that I can recall.  
12:58:19 43  
12:58:20 44 Was she - when she mentioned names of police officers did  
12:58:25 45 she mention any names of Drug Squad police officers with  
12:58:29 46 whom she was associating?---I mean clearly I knew she was  
12:58:35 47 associated with or had some association with Mr Strawhorn.

12:58:37 1  
12:58:37 2 Yes?---And a couple of others but, look, there may well  
12:58:41 3 have been, I can't remember.  
12:58:42 4  
12:58:42 5 You can't recall any other particular names of police  
12:58:45 6 officers whom she mentioned?---No, I can't.  
12:58:47 7  
12:58:48 8 All right. In your statement you say that you recall - and  
12:58:58 9 you've given evidence already about the event which  
12:59:01 10 occurred subsequent in 2000 where you attended the  
12:59:06 11 execution of a search warrant at a particular house?---Yes.  
12:59:09 12  
12:59:09 13 Had you been asked to attend on that occasion?---Yes.  
12:59:11 14  
12:59:11 15 By Mr Strawhorn?---Yes. I don't recall if that was  
12:59:20 16 specifically a request directly to me or if it was a  
12:59:23 17 request just into the Squad and I happened to be one of the  
12:59:26 18 people available to attend.  
12:59:26 19  
12:59:27 20 The conversation that you had with her - did she ring you  
12:59:32 21 about that, where you mentioned that she said words to the  
12:59:35 22 effect "you've got no idea what you've stumbled  
12:59:40 23 across"?---I certainly don't recall meeting her about that  
12:59:42 24 so my assumption is that it was a phone call.  
12:59:46 25  
12:59:50 26 Did you ask her how she knew that you had been involved in  
12:59:53 27 this?---No, I can't recall.  
13:00:01 28  
13:00:03 29 Well you certainly hadn't told her?---No. She was aware  
13:00:06 30 that I had been at the premises.  
13:00:07 31  
13:00:07 32 And she hadn't been there when you were there?---No.  
13:00:10 33  
13:00:11 34 So clearly it could only have come from information  
13:00:14 35 provided to her by someone who was at the address I  
13:00:19 36 assume?---I guess so, yes.  
13:00:20 37  
13:00:21 38 Are you able to recall aside from Mr Strawhorn who else was  
13:00:24 39 at the address?---By the time we got there I think there  
13:00:28 40 was only two or three Drug Squad members left.  
13:00:32 41  
13:00:32 42 Yes?---I think one of them was Mr Paton, I can't remember.  
13:00:36 43  
13:00:37 44 Steve Paton, Wayne Strawhorn, the other one you can't  
13:00:39 45 recall?---I can't recall.  
13:00:40 46  
13:00:40 47 The likelihood is that - I assume it occurred to you that

13:00:44 1 one or other of those officers, or the third officer whose  
13:00:48 2 name you can't recall, had conveyed the information to you,  
13:00:51 3 to Ms Gobbo, that you'd been there?---It seems that way.  
13:00:57 4  
13:00:58 5 Did you ask her when she said "you've got no idea what  
13:01:04 6 you've stumbled across", did you ask her what she  
13:01:08 7 meant?---Look, I don't recall really the specifics of the  
13:01:11 8 investigation. It was just an odd - sorry, the specifics  
13:01:14 9 of the conversation - it was just an odd conversation and  
13:01:22 10 there are references to, you know, much bigger things  
13:01:25 11 around this job and potential corruption and I said - my  
13:01:32 12 recollection is I said, "We're focusing on the assets and  
13:01:38 13 that's what we're focusing on. Other matters need to be  
13:01:41 14 directed elsewhere".  
13:01:43 15  
13:01:43 16 Did you pass that information on to anyone else to your  
13:01:46 17 recollection?---I don't have any specific recollection of  
13:01:50 18 exactly what I did with it.  
13:01:53 19  
13:01:54 20 One assumes if she's talking about corruption she's talking  
13:01:58 21 about police corruption?---Yes.  
13:01:59 22  
13:02:00 23 I mean you thought the job looked strange, it was a neat  
13:02:03 24 and tidy place?---Yes.  
13:02:09 25  
13:02:10 26 It didn't look normal to you?---Yes.  
13:02:12 27  
13:02:13 28 Do you believe you passed it on to ESD, for example?---I  
13:02:16 29 can't recall if I did. I can't recall. I think I would  
13:02:17 30 have had a conversation with the members at the Drug Squad  
13:02:18 31 about it.  
13:02:18 32  
13:02:19 33 Which members do you think you might have discussed it  
13:02:21 34 with?---Probably with Mr Strawhorn. Just to alert him to  
13:02:25 35 the fact that this could be a much bigger job.  
13:02:28 36  
13:02:28 37 Was she suggesting, for example, that if something wasn't  
13:02:35 38 quite right with it that perhaps Mr Strawhorn might have  
13:02:39 39 been doing something wrong, was that the gist of the  
13:02:42 40 conversation?---I don't recall forming that view at the  
13:02:44 41 time.  
13:02:44 42  
13:02:44 43 That was certainly conceivable I suppose, wasn't it?---It  
13:02:47 44 was a possibility.  
13:02:48 45  
13:02:48 46 Did you know at that stage that there were any suspicions  
13:02:52 47 or rumours circulating around Mr Strawhorn?---No.

13:02:55 1  
13:02:56 2  
13:03:03 3  
13:03:10 4  
13:03:13 5  
13:03:18 6  
13:03:18 7  
13:03:19 8  
13:03:21 9  
13:03:25 10  
13:03:26 11  
13:03:27 12  
13:03:27 13  
13:03:29 14  
13:04:06 15  
13:04:08 16  
13:04:08 17  
13:04:20 18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

We now know that Mr Strawhorn was involved in criminal activities, certainly subsequently, but there was nothing that you knew about it at that stage?---No. I had no reason to suspect anything at all about him or any of his members.

Did you make a note, do you believe, of the conversation with Ms Gobbo?---No, I don't think I did.

I note the time.

COMMISSIONER: Yes, it's after 1 o'clock. We'll adjourn now until 2 o'clock, thank you.

<(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

14:01:57 1  
14:02:01 2  
14:02:01 3  
14:02:02 4  
14:02:04 5  
14:02:10 6  
14:02:11 7  
14:02:14 8  
14:02:21 9  
14:02:26 10  
14:02:28 11  
14:02:32 12  
14:02:33 13  
14:02:40 14  
14:02:44 15  
14:02:51 16  
14:02:57 17  
14:03:00 18  
14:03:00 19  
14:03:02 20  
14:03:12 21  
14:03:15 22  
14:03:15 23  
14:03:19 24  
14:03:25 25  
14:03:31 26  
14:03:34 27  
14:03:39 28  
14:03:42 29  
14:03:45 30  
14:03:50 31  
14:03:51 32  
14:03:58 33  
14:03:58 34  
14:03:59 35  
14:04:06 36  
14:04:09 37  
14:04:15 38  
14:04:16 39  
14:04:16 40  
14:04:19 41  
14:04:24 42  
14:04:27 43  
14:04:31 44  
14:04:34 45  
14:04:38 46  
14:04:39 47

UPON RESUMING AT 2.01 PM:

COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Winneke.

<JEFFREY POPE, recalled:

MR WINNEKE: Mr Pope, the last time that you say that you met Ms Gobbo was an accidental meeting, is that correct? An accidental meeting, incidental or - - - ?---This is the last time - yes, that's right. It was an accidental meeting in the Melbourne court precinct.

And you believed that it was some time in 99, maybe 2000 or later than that do you think?---It certainly wasn't later than 2000 because at the end of 2000 I relocated to Canberra so it was I think either late 1999 or 2000. I recall running a number of committals and trials during that period.

Right. You studied - did you study law at Latrobe starting in 99 you say?---Yes.

Did you do it by correspondence?---Once I moved to Canberra I had to, my recollection is I deferred a couple of semesters, I think I might have done one subject by correspondence through another university, and then I resumed my law degree when I returned to Melbourne in 2003.

So you're quite confident that it was prior to going to Canberra that this meeting occurred?---Yes.

And you had a coffee with her in the Metropolitan Hotel?---Yes.

And she stated she was travelling to Hawaii on a business class flight?---My recollection was she was going overseas to the US, I think Hawaii, I think she was travelling business class.

And she stated that she was lonely and she would take anyone with her and you stated that you weren't comfortable with that and then you left and that was the last time that you saw her. That's a version of the meeting you gave when you were spoken to by Paul Millet on 15 February of this year, is that correct?---Yes, that was a summation of that, of that contact with her, yes.



14:04:40 1 There's a more fulsome description of that meeting in your  
14:04:45 2 affidavit that we've referred to previously and you say  
14:05:04 3 that you met her, and this is at paragraph I think 5 of  
14:05:10 4 your affidavit. Perhaps this could be put up,  
14:05:18 5 VPL.0002.0002.0067. Go to the second page, p.2, paragraph  
14:05:31 6 5. That was your recollection in 2011 and you believe the  
14:05:41 7 conversation occurred near the Metropolitan Hotel in  
14:05:44 8 William Street. It was very different to previous meetings  
14:05:47 9 and very different to any conversation that you'd had with  
14:05:51 10 any other prospective informants. She talked about the  
14:05:57 11 fact that she was becoming successful, getting lots of high  
14:06:01 12 profile cases, earning lots of money but it wasn't making  
14:06:06 13 her happy. She was about to book or booked a holiday to  
14:06:09 14 the US, was travelling alone, she said she would pay for  
14:06:13 15 all the expenses of another person to have the right  
14:06:16 16 companion to go with her and she wasn't looking forward to  
14:06:20 17 a holiday on her own. You recall there was discussion  
14:06:24 18 about your age. Do you recall how old you were then?---I  
14:06:28 19 turned 30 in February of 2000.  
14:06:30 20  
14:06:32 21 So that may well have been discussed and she was curious  
14:06:36 22 whether the purpose of life becomes more meaningful after  
14:06:40 23 you turn 30 years and at the end of the conversation she  
14:06:44 24 asked whether the relationship was ever likely to develop  
14:06:47 25 into something more personal and you said no, you were  
14:06:52 26 happily married and that was the end of the  
14:06:55 27 conversation?---That's correct.  
14:06:56 28  
14:06:59 29 The situation is, isn't it, that in about November 2011 she  
14:07:08 30 made an allegation - late October 2011 she made an  
14:07:16 31 allegation that for a number of months she'd had a sexual  
14:07:20 32 relationship with you on and off, you understand  
14:07:22 33 that?---Yes.  
14:07:22 34  
14:07:25 35 When that allegation arose what was your position within  
14:07:29 36 Victoria Police Force?---Assistant Commissioner in charge  
14:07:32 37 of the Intelligence and Covert Support area.  
14:07:35 38  
14:07:35 39 Did you have any involvement at that point in matters  
14:07:41 40 concerning Ms Gobbo?---Well I was managing the Covert  
14:07:47 41 Services Division and within the Covert Services Division  
14:07:50 42 there were business units such as the Source Development  
14:07:54 43 Unit who had responsibilities with Ms Gobbo.  
14:07:57 44  
14:07:59 45 You had come back to Victoria Police from the Australian  
14:08:03 46 Crime Commission, is that right?---That's right, in 2001  
14:08:06 47 and 2 I was at the Australian Bureau of Criminal

14:08:10 1 Intelligence in Canberra, then in January 2003 that became  
14:08:14 2 the Australian Crime Commission.  
14:08:16 3  
14:08:17 4 Yes?---I briefly came back to Victoria Police when my  
14:08:21 5 secondment concluded. I don't have the exact dates with me  
14:08:26 6 but I was back with Victoria Police I think for  
14:08:30 7 approximately six months in - sorry, that's in 2004, I'm  
14:08:37 8 sorry.  
14:08:37 9  
14:08:38 10 Yes?---So back to Melbourne 2003, stayed with the  
14:08:43 11 Australian Crime Commission for 2003, then I think in early  
14:08:48 12 2004 my secondment finished, I came back to Victoria Police  
14:08:53 13 as a Sergeant and then I resigned from Victoria Police in I  
14:09:00 14 think November 2004.  
14:09:03 15  
14:09:04 16 Right?---And then went back to the Australian Crime  
14:09:07 17 Commission as a General Manager of Intelligence.  
14:09:11 18  
14:09:11 19 When did you come back to Victoria Police?---It was I think  
14:09:17 20 the last week of September, 2009.  
14:09:19 21  
14:09:19 22 Was it your understanding when you came back you may well  
14:09:22 23 be dealing with matters concerning Ms Gobbo in your  
14:09:28 24 role?---Yes.  
14:09:28 25  
14:09:29 26 Without going into details at this stage, there were  
14:09:32 27 significant issues at that stage insofar as the Victoria  
14:09:39 28 Police's management of Ms Gobbo in one way or  
14:09:43 29 another?---Yes.  
14:09:44 30  
14:09:49 31 The allegation arose from a conversation that had been  
14:09:53 32 recorded between Ms Gobbo and two police officers,  
14:09:58 33 Detective Senior Sergeant Buick and Detective Sergeant  
14:10:02 34 Labusque?---I understand that, yes.  
14:10:05 35  
14:10:06 36 You swore an affidavit because that allegation was brought  
14:10:11 37 to your attention as I understand it, is that right?---Yes,  
14:10:14 38 it was.  
14:10:14 39  
14:10:14 40 And the affidavit that I've been referring to on a couple  
14:10:19 41 of occasions this morning and just recently, was that  
14:10:23 42 affidavit in response to that allegation?---Yes, it was.  
14:10:25 43  
14:10:26 44 And in that affidavit you effectively denied that  
14:10:30 45 allegation?---Fully, yes.  
14:10:31 46  
14:10:32 47 Fully, all right. I wonder if we could just put that

14:10:36 1 affidavit up, it's VPL.0002.0002 - that's the  
14:10:45 2 affidavit?---Yes, it is.  
14:10:45 3  
14:10:48 4 At that stage you hadn't seen the specific allegations that  
14:10:52 5 had been made, is that right?---Correct.  
14:10:54 6  
14:10:55 7 All right. What you say, again briefly, is that when you  
14:11:11 8 came back to Victoria Police, knowing that you would be  
14:11:14 9 dealing with matters broadly concerning Ms Gobbo, you made  
14:11:19 10 declarations to Victoria Police members about your previous  
14:11:24 11 involvement with Ms Gobbo?---Yes, where I thought that was  
14:11:27 12 appropriate, yes.  
14:11:28 13  
14:11:29 14 Obviously you say those declarations didn't involve any  
14:11:34 15 suggestion of an inappropriate or a sexual relationship  
14:11:36 16 with Ms Gobbo because you say that didn't occur?---That's  
14:11:40 17 correct.  
14:11:40 18  
14:11:40 19 Who were the police officers, do you recall who you made  
14:11:43 20 those declarations to?---I remember having discussions with  
14:11:49 21 Simon Overland, Ken Jones, Tony Biggin, Finn McCrae, I  
14:11:59 22 think Paul Sheridan, I think there was a range of people  
14:12:02 23 that I made aware of my previous dealings with Ms Gobbo.  
14:12:05 24  
14:12:06 25 Do you believe that they were recorded, those  
14:12:10 26 declarations?---I'm not sure.  
14:12:12 27  
14:12:13 28 Ultimately you said in your affidavit that the allegations  
14:12:15 29 made by Ms Gobbo were completely false?---That's correct.  
14:12:19 30  
14:12:20 31 And you welcomed an investigation?---That's correct.  
14:12:22 32  
14:12:22 33 I tender that affidavit.  
14:12:24 34  
14:12:25 35  
14:12:25 36 #EXHIBIT RC61 - Affidavit.  
14:12:31 37  
14:12:31 38 Could I also tender, Commissioner - perhaps if we could put  
14:12:37 39 up VPL.0002.0002.0072. Have you seen that document?---For  
14:12:51 40 the first time a couple of weeks ago.  
14:12:52 41  
14:12:53 42 That's a transcript of the conversation that I was  
14:12:56 43 referring to?---Yes, I understand.  
14:12:58 44  
14:13:01 45 You've read that, you say, for the first time a couple of  
14:13:04 46 weeks ago?---Yes.  
14:13:05 47

14:13:05 1 I tender that.  
14:13:06 2  
14:13:08 3  
14:13:08 4 #EXHIBIT RC62 - Transcript of conversation.  
14:13:15 5  
14:13:15 6 Could I also tender notes of conversations, and I'm not too  
14:13:23 7 sure whether there's a VPL number. Perhaps whilst we're  
14:13:51 8 dealing with that, for the sake of completeness, could we  
14:13:55 9 put up on the screen the diary, redacted diary of Mr Pope,  
14:14:05 10 VPL.0005.0007.0164. That I take it is your handwriting in  
14:14:21 11 that diary, is that correct?---Yes.  
14:14:23 12  
14:14:23 13 And it goes through to I think p.186. If we can just  
14:14:33 14 scroll - again, that's p.117 of your diary?---Yes.  
14:14:42 15  
14:14:43 16 I tender that diary from 164 through to 186.  
14:14:49 17  
14:14:50 18  
14:14:52 19 #EXHIBIT RC63 - Diary pp.164-186.  
14:15:01 20  
14:15:01 21 Perhaps I can tender that after it's found and we can move  
14:15:05 22 on with the next witness. I have no further - look one  
14:15:09 23 final thing. There's been evidence that in or about July  
14:15:15 24 of 1995 a Mr Arthur, who was a police officer in the DSGA  
14:15:25 25 group in about that time, handed over to you Ms Gobbo as an  
14:15:30 26 informer at a time when he and his group were moving from  
14:15:38 27 the offices in Russell Street down to the Victoria Police  
14:15:43 28 Centre in Flinders Street and handed to you Ms Gobbo  
14:15:48 29 because you were remaining in the, either going to Carlton  
14:15:52 30 or remaining in the DSG in any event. What do you say to  
14:15:57 31 that?---No, my recollection, and I think we went through  
14:16:01 32 this point yesterday, is that I was in uniform at that  
14:16:04 33 stage and I was working at Richmond police station. I have  
14:16:09 34 absolutely no recollection of what Mr Arthur is referring  
14:16:12 35 to.  
14:16:12 36  
14:16:13 37 Yes, all right. Yes, thanks very much.  
14:16:19 38  
14:16:19 39 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Collinson.  
14:16:21 40  
41 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR COLLINSON:  
42  
14:16:22 43 If the Commissioner pleases just a few questions about the  
14:16:26 44 affidavit that Mr Pope swore in 2011.  
14:16:33 45  
14:16:33 46 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Do you want to get that up on the  
14:16:36 47 screen?

14:16:36 1  
14:16:37 2 MR COLLINSON: Can I first ask to be brought up on the  
14:16:40 3 screen RC62, which is VPL.0002.0002.007.  
14:16:53 4  
14:16:53 5 COMMISSIONER: Yes.  
14:16:56 6  
14:17:05 7 MR COLLINSON: I'll read it out again, it's VPL.0002 - - -  
14:17:10 8  
14:17:10 9 COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 62 if that's a help.  
14:17:12 10  
14:17:12 11 MR COLLINSON: Yes it's RC62. I'll start the number again  
14:17:17 12 VPL.0002.0002.0072. It's not the document presently shown,  
14:17:44 13 it's the interview note - - -  
14:17:46 14  
14:17:46 15 COMMISSIONER: It's up now.  
14:17:47 16  
14:17:47 17 MR COLLINSON: Yes, I see. Now your evidence, Mr Pope, is  
14:17:52 18 you didn't see this note when you were preparing your  
14:17:57 19 affidavit back in 2011?---Correct.  
14:18:00 20  
14:18:03 21 Did you ask to see it?---No.  
14:18:05 22  
14:18:07 23 But you've read it recently?---I think a couple of weeks  
14:18:11 24 ago was the first time I saw it.  
14:18:13 25  
14:18:13 26 You'll see that Ms Gobbo is recorded in the first  
14:18:17 27 paragraph, about eight lines down, she says, "I'll tell you  
14:18:20 28 something that PII doesn't know just as a skerrick of  
14:18:24 29 information that you'll laugh at. Do you know who the  
14:18:28 30 Assistant Commissioner was who I only found after the event  
14:18:31 31 who was overseeing my handling when I was being looked  
14:18:35 32 after Petra? Was Jeff Pope for a while, wasn't it?" Then  
14:18:40 33 further down Ms Gobbo makes the observation about point  
14:18:45 34 five of the page, "Would think it was appropriate if I had  
14:18:50 35 a sexual relationship with you that you looked after that  
14:18:53 36 committee. How's that for (inaudible) for you. Have a  
14:18:55 37 look at Boris's face. I wish I take a photo of that".  
14:18:59 38 Then further at about point seven of the page after saying  
14:19:02 39 "I'm telling the truth" she says, "On and off for a few  
14:19:06 40 months", speaking of this relationship. And then she says  
14:19:09 41 at the end of that paragraph, "Then I saw him being you on  
14:19:13 42 TV and I went, I said to my sister, oh my God". And then  
14:19:17 43 over the page, going to the next page, at about point two  
14:19:21 44 of the page, "I just think it is hilarious, isn't that  
14:19:25 45 inappropriate? Can you imagine the complaint I could make  
14:19:29 46 about that? I bet you he hasn't declared it". Now, do you  
14:19:34 47 agree that Ms Gobbo seems to be raising her observations

14:19:40 1 about this affair she says occurred with you as merely  
14:19:44 2 incidental to the matters she's speaking to the police  
14:19:48 3 officers about?---Could be.  
14:19:53 4  
14:19:58 5 And - - - ?---I notice it's part of a 31 minute  
14:20:02 6 conversation.  
14:20:02 7  
14:20:03 8 Who was it that raised with you an issue arising from this  
14:20:10 9 evidence given by Ms Gobbo?---My recollection is it was  
14:20:16 10 raised at the steering committee meeting for I think the  
14:20:21 11 Driver Task Force at that stage which was on the following  
14:20:23 12 Monday.  
14:20:24 13  
14:20:26 14 And the end result of the issue being raised I think is  
14:20:30 15 that you were required to leave the steering committee?---I  
14:20:37 16 offered to step down from the steering committee whilst an  
14:20:41 17 investigation was on foot.  
14:20:43 18  
14:20:43 19 Yes, and then after the investigation was concluded, wasn't  
14:20:47 20 the internal recommendation that you should have no further  
14:20:50 21 role on the steering committee?---I can't recall.  
14:20:55 22  
14:20:56 23 If the operator could bring up, please, this document,  
14:21:01 24 VPL.0002.0002.0063. Now, is this a document you've seen  
14:21:18 25 recently, Mr Pope?---No, I haven't.  
14:21:19 26  
14:21:21 27 You'll see, if one goes to the next page, that it includes  
14:21:28 28 a communication from a Mr Shaun Le Grand, Assistant  
14:21:35 29 Victorian Government Solicitor, do you see his reference at  
14:21:39 30 the foot of that email?---Yes.  
14:21:40 31  
14:21:41 32 Do you recall his name?---I've met Shaun once or twice for  
14:21:46 33 other matters.  
14:21:46 34  
14:21:47 35 Do you know that he gave advice in relation to this issue  
14:21:50 36 raised by Ms Gobbo?---No, I've never seen any part of the  
14:21:54 37 investigation file on this matter.  
14:21:55 38  
14:21:55 39 I see. If I could direct your attention please to the last  
14:22:00 40 paragraph on that second page, do you see it begins, "In  
14:22:03 41 the circumstances"?---Yes.  
14:22:04 42  
14:22:06 43 And continuing, "We recommend that the issue of potential  
14:22:09 44 or possible conflict be managed. To that end it would be  
14:22:14 45 sufficient if member C", and that's a reference to you I  
14:22:18 46 believe, "Has no further role in the steering committee and  
14:22:21 47 any further decision making involving the source. It seems

14:22:24 1 that has already occurred". Now, you said earlier you  
14:22:30 2 didn't recommend or you didn't recollect, sorry, being  
14:22:34 3 required to leave the steering committee after this issue  
14:22:38 4 was raised by Ms Gobbo?---I don't recall anyone asking me  
14:22:41 5 to leave the steering committee. I offered upfront as soon  
14:22:44 6 as the allegation was made that I would step aside from the  
14:22:47 7 steering committee whilst an investigation was on foot.

14:22:49 8  
14:22:50 9 Yes. Was it your idea to do an affidavit in relation to  
14:22:54 10 this matter or were you asked to do that  
14:22:57 11 affidavit?---Again, my recollection is that I offered to do  
14:23:00 12 the affidavit.

14:23:01 13  
14:23:01 14 Yes. Now, I want to be clear for your benefit, Mr Pope, I  
14:23:06 15 don't mean to suggest that there was any kind of express  
14:23:11 16 finding that Ms Gobbo's recollection was to be preferred to  
14:23:16 17 yours on this question and that's shown by the first two  
14:23:22 18 paragraphs on this page where some of the reasoning of  
14:23:25 19 Mr Le Grand is set out. But while I've got the document I  
14:23:30 20 might seek to tender that document if the Commissioner  
14:23:33 21 pleases.

14:23:33 22  
14:23:34 23 MR HOLT: Commissioner, no difficulty with that, it will  
14:23:36 24 need to be reviewed. Everyone will see there's a yellow  
14:23:41 25 box on it. That is a claim for legal professional  
14:23:43 26 privilege that needs to be assessed. I'm happy for it to  
14:23:46 27 be tendered but if it could not go up on the website until  
28 we've had a chance to discuss that with our learned friends  
14:23:50 29 I'd be grateful.

14:23:50 30  
14:23:51 31 COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right we'll tender it on that basis  
14:23:53 32 for the time being. Should it be marked for identification  
14:24:01 33 really?

14:24:02 34  
14:24:04 35 MR HOLT: Yes, if it could be marked for identification,  
14:24:08 36 I'd be grateful. We'll resolve that issue.

14:24:15 37  
14:24:15 38  
14:24:15 39 #EXHIBIT RC2 - (Marked for identification.)

14:24:20 40  
14:24:21 41 MR COLLINSON: Could I ask Mr Pope's affidavit be brought  
14:24:24 42 up, it's VPL.0002.0002.0067. If the operator could go to  
14:24:30 43 the second page and blow up paragraph 5. Can I ask you a  
14:24:39 44 couple of questions about this paragraph, Mr Pope. When  
14:24:44 45 you say you met Ms Gobbo, as you describe in the precincts  
14:24:52 46 of the Melbourne Magistrates' Court, how long was it since  
14:24:56 47 you had last seen her or spoken to her?---As I recall it

14:25:01 1 had been a little while.

14:25:03 2

14:25:03 3 By that do you mean upwards of a year?---Look it's very  
14:25:10 4 difficult to recollect, it would certainly be a number of  
14:25:13 5 months, if not many months, but I can't say if it would be  
14:25:17 6 longer than 12 months.

14:25:19 7

14:25:25 8 If someone like Ms Gobbo has not seen you for quite a long  
14:25:31 9 time, don't you think it would be very odd that she would  
14:25:36 10 directly raise with you at a meeting, well a meeting at the  
14:25:41 11 Metropolitan Hotel, that she wondered whether the  
14:25:45 12 relationship was likely to develop into something more  
14:25:49 13 personal?---I certainly found it odd, yes.

14:25:52 14

14:25:57 15 You've given evidence about a number of your other  
14:26:00 16 interactions with Ms Gobbo and I think it's fair to say,  
14:26:03 17 isn't it, that for most of these interactions primarily in  
14:26:07 18 1999 and 2000 you don't really have any recollection about  
14:26:10 19 the detail of them?---No, not really.

14:26:13 20

14:26:13 21 And yet for this particular meeting, Mr Pope, there's quite  
14:26:18 22 a lot of detail in the recollection, isn't there?---Well  
14:26:23 23 this discussion stuck out in my mind.

14:26:25 24

14:26:26 25 You don't mention anything about a business class airfare  
14:26:30 26 in this particular recollection in paragraph 5, do  
14:26:35 27 you?---No.

14:26:36 28

14:26:37 29 And yet I think when you were - I haven't seen the document  
14:26:41 30 but when you were providing your initial response to  
14:26:45 31 queries from Task Force Landow you spoke of a business  
14:26:49 32 class airfare in that conversation, didn't you?---I think I  
14:26:52 33 did, yes.

14:26:53 34

14:26:53 35 So that's a recollection that's come to you more recently  
14:26:56 36 thinking about it some more, is it?---That's a vague  
14:27:00 37 recollection that I've got, yes.

14:27:02 38

14:27:03 39 When do you say this meeting at the Metropolitan Hotel  
14:27:07 40 would have occurred? I realise you can't be that specific  
14:27:10 41 but can you remember which year, for example?---Well I  
14:27:15 42 think it was 2000 because I recall the conversation about  
14:27:19 43 my age and as I said I turned 30 in February 2000. So I  
14:27:27 44 can only go by somewhere around about my birthday and prior  
14:27:32 45 to her overseas travel, whenever that was.

14:27:36 46

14:27:38 47 And you had - I take it you didn't keep any kind of note of



14:27:42 1 that conversation?---No, I didn't.  
14:27:43 2  
14:27:44 3 And you were recollecting it some 11 years later when you  
14:27:49 4 did this affidavit on 2 November 2011?---I was recalling  
14:27:54 5 all of my interactions with her 11 years later in this  
14:27:58 6 affidavit.  
14:27:59 7  
14:28:00 8 Yes. And you were able to recollect the kind of detail we  
14:28:04 9 see in paragraph 5, were you, that Ms Gobbo said at this  
14:28:10 10 time she was becoming very successful and was getting lots  
14:28:15 11 of high profile cases?---Yes, it's a conversation that  
14:28:19 12 stood out.  
14:28:19 13  
14:28:20 14 But you see Ms Gobbo had only gone to the Bar in November  
14:28:24 15 1998, so at this stage of her career in 2000, even going to  
14:28:30 16 the very end of 2000, she hadn't worked on any high profile  
14:28:35 17 cases, what do you say to that?---I can only reflect what  
14:28:39 18 my recollection of the conversation was.  
14:28:41 19  
14:28:42 20 And rather than earning lots of money she was doing lots of  
14:28:46 21 Legal Aid work, I suggest?---I can only reflect my  
14:28:51 22 recollection of the conversation.  
14:28:52 23  
14:28:56 24 Now, if the operator could go, please, to paragraph 8. I'm  
14:29:06 25 sorry, paragraph 9. Do you see that you say there,  
14:29:14 26 Mr Pope, that when you began in your return role, so to  
14:29:21 27 speak, as Assistant Commissioner Intelligence and Covert  
14:29:27 28 Support you declared the nature of your relationship with  
14:29:30 29 Ms Gobbo as detailed above to, among others, Superintendent  
14:29:35 30 Biggin?---Yes.  
14:29:36 31  
14:29:39 32 So you told Superintendent Biggin, did you, about the  
14:29:43 33 details of your meeting with Ms Gobbo at the Metropolitan  
14:29:49 34 Hotel?---I think that's slightly clumsy language on my  
14:29:53 35 behalf. I was declaring to Superintendent Biggin the  
14:29:58 36 dealings that I'd had with Ms Gobbo predominantly either as  
14:30:03 37 a - I couldn't recall at that stage whether I'd registered  
14:30:06 38 her or not, but predominantly as an informer.  
14:30:10 39  
14:30:10 40 So you didn't say anything at all to Superintendent Biggin  
14:30:13 41 about the meeting at the Metropolitan Hotel?---I can't  
14:30:18 42 recall specifically if I did or not.  
14:30:20 43  
14:30:20 44 When you say you made disclosure to Superintendent Biggin,  
14:30:24 45 do you mean it was oral?---Yes.  
14:30:27 46  
14:30:32 47 So if you didn't mention the meeting at the Metropolitan

14:30:36 1 Hotel what is it that you did disclose?---I think broadly I  
14:30:41 2 disclosed to a number of people, um, that I'd had dealings  
14:30:46 3 with Ms Gobbo in 1999 to 2000 as a registered or an  
14:30:50 4 unregistered informer where we had met on about half a  
14:30:55 5 dozen occasions on a matter relating to potential fraud and  
14:30:59 6 money laundering and in addition to that, you know, there'd  
14:31:04 7 been phone calls and that was probably the broad overview  
14:31:09 8 of the declaration.  
14:31:10 9

14:31:13 10 So the disclosures you made were nothing like as specific  
14:31:20 11 as the information in paragraphs 4 through to 5 of this  
14:31:24 12 affidavit?--Well the disclosures that I made that I refer  
14:31:27 13 to in this affidavit preceded the allegation of a sexual  
14:31:32 14 relationship in 2011.  
14:31:35 15

14:31:35 16 So likewise if one goes over to paragraph 10 where you talk  
14:31:40 17 about a conversation with Sir Ken Jones, the Deputy  
14:31:45 18 Commissioner, where you say "as detailed above"?---Yes.  
14:31:48 19

14:31:49 20 You mean it in the same way, no mention was made of this  
14:31:53 21 Metropolitan Hotel meeting?---I didn't mention the  
14:31:56 22 Metropolitan Hotel meeting to anyone at that point because  
14:31:59 23 it was of really very little significance because no  
14:32:04 24 allegation of a relationship had been raised in my first  
14:32:07 25 two years as Assistant Commissioner.  
14:32:09 26

14:32:09 27 Wherever it says "as detailed above" in these paragraphs,  
14:32:13 28 including paragraphs 11 and 13, we can exclude from that,  
14:32:18 29 can we, the Metropolitan Hotel meeting?---Yes, though I  
14:32:22 30 can't specifically remember if I made much mention of that,  
14:32:26 31 but I certainly - what I'm generally referring to is my  
14:32:30 32 dealings with her as an informer.  
14:32:33 33

14:32:38 34 Wouldn't it have been relevant to - in paragraph 10 do you  
14:32:53 35 see in the last sentence you say, "We both agreed that  
14:32:57 36 there was no issue or conflict of interest"?---Yes.  
14:33:00 37

14:33:01 38 Now, in order for you to make full disclosure to Sir Ken  
14:33:09 39 Jones, wouldn't it have been relevant to disclose that  
14:33:14 40 Nicola Gobbo made a sexual advance to you at this meeting  
14:33:19 41 at the Metropolitan Hotel?--Well now with the knowledge of  
14:33:25 42 her allegation that I had a sexual relationship with her,  
14:33:28 43 then that certainly brings it into much greater  
14:33:32 44 significance but I think at the time I pretty well just  
14:33:37 45 brushed it off as a fairly insignificant issue.  
14:33:42 46

14:33:42 47 On your version of events you were going to assume a role

14:33:47 1 in a committee that - well what function did it have, this  
14:33:52 2 committee in respect of Ms Gobbo?---The committee was over  
14:33:59 3 sighting an investigation in which she was a likely or  
14:34:02 4 possible witness.  
14:34:05 5  
14:34:06 6 And wouldn't it have been relevant to have disclosed that  
14:34:11 7 she made that kind of advance on an earlier occasion?---I  
14:34:15 8 disclosed what I thought what was relevant which was my  
14:34:22 9 previous dealings with her as an informer.  
14:34:24 10  
14:34:24 11 Did you have a drink with Ms Gobbo at the Metropolitan  
14:34:26 12 Hotel on that occasion?---No, my recollection is it was  
14:34:28 13 during the day and it was a cup of coffee.  
14:34:31 14  
14:34:31 15 You have got that level of specificity to your  
14:34:34 16 recollection, do you?---I remember sitting - it was whilst  
14:34:38 17 I was in the court precinct, so it was during business  
14:34:42 18 hours.  
14:34:42 19  
14:34:42 20 When you swore this affidavit you didn't want to give up  
14:34:45 21 your position, did you, on the steering committee?---I  
14:34:53 22 voluntarily stood down from the steering committee.  
14:34:57 23  
14:34:57 24 Yes, I'm asking a different question. When you swore the  
14:35:00 25 affidavit I suggest to you you did not at that point want  
14:35:03 26 to give up your position on the steering committee?---That  
14:35:06 27 wasn't the focus or the purpose of the affidavit. The  
14:35:10 28 purpose of my affidavit was to clearly refute the  
14:35:14 29 allegation.  
14:35:16 30  
14:35:16 31 But didn't it go through a process of consideration  
14:35:19 32 internally within Victoria Police as to whether you should  
14:35:23 33 step down from that role or not?---All I understood was  
14:35:28 34 that an investigation was underway and I welcomed that  
14:35:32 35 investigation.  
14:35:32 36  
14:35:33 37 But you knew what the purpose of the investigation was,  
14:35:36 38 wasn't it, which was to see whether or not you should  
14:35:39 39 continue in your role on the steering committee?---I think  
14:35:42 40 that was one element of the investigation.  
14:35:46 41  
14:35:47 42 Did you leave employment with Victoria Police shortly after  
14:35:50 43 these events?---No, not shortly after, probably, um, 20  
14:35:58 44 months after.  
14:35:59 45  
14:35:59 46 I see?---Nearly two years.  
14:36:03 47

14:36:05 1  
14:36:09 2  
14:36:15 3  
14:36:19 4  
14:36:21 5  
14:36:22 6  
14:36:24 7  
14:36:25 8  
14:36:26 9  
14:36:30 10  
14:36:33 11  
14:36:39 12  
14:36:42 13  
14:36:42 14  
14:36:43 15  
14:36:49 16  
14:36:55 17  
14:37:01 18  
14:37:03 19  
14:37:05 20  
14:37:08 21  
14:37:09 22  
14:37:10 23  
14:37:18 24  
14:37:23 25  
14:37:28 26  
14:37:32 27  
14:37:32 28  
14:37:33 29  
14:37:36 30  
14:37:41 31  
14:37:43 32  
14:37:43 33  
14:37:46 34  
14:37:50 35  
14:37:54 36  
14:37:54 37  
14:37:58 38  
14:38:04 39  
14:38:04 40  
14:38:09 41  
14:38:14 42  
14:38:15 43  
14:38:17 44  
14:38:21 45  
14:38:24 46  
14:38:27 47

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Did Ms Gobbo convey what she conveyed to you, as you describe in paragraph 25 of your statement, by telephone or in a meeting?---I can't really recall. I really can't recall. I think it might have been by telephone but I can't recall.

Why didn't you mention that discussion with Ms Gobbo when you were doing this affidavit back in 2011?---It's a recollection that I've had since I've been reflecting on these matters in preparation for this inquiry.

But you didn't recollect it when you did this affidavit?---No, I didn't.

Can the operator please go to paragraph 4 of the affidavit. You say in that paragraph that you met with Ms Gobbo on about six occasions and, "On every occasion that I would meet with her I would advise my supervisor and colleagues"?---Yes.

Did you advise your supervisor and colleagues about the meeting you had with her at the Metropolitan Hotel?---I can't recall.

I think you didn't, did you? You'd remember that, wouldn't you?---I can't recall if I went back to the office and said I just had a coffee with her.

Isn't the proper procedure for this kind of matter to include it in an information report?---Not necessarily, no.

That's the course you took with the events whereby Ms Gobbo sent you some law study notes?---Yes, when she was a registered informer.

So you didn't think it was your duty to put it down in an information report, this particular discussion you had with her?---I think I classify this more as just a social contact.

14:38:28 1  
14:38:28 2 Did you ever do the fraud investigator's report - I'm  
14:38:32 3 sorry, course at Latrobe University?---No, I didn't.  
14:38:35 4  
14:38:36 5 You didn't do subjects in that course?---No, I didn't.  
14:38:39 6  
14:38:44 7 COMMISSIONER: You didn't lecture in that course, you  
14:38:46 8 didn't give any lectures or tutorials or anything of that  
14:38:49 9 nature?---No, I didn't.  
14:38:51 10  
14:38:51 11 MR COLLINSON: Did you ever encounter Ms Gobbo out at  
14:38:54 12 Latrobe University?---No, I didn't.  
14:38:56 13  
14:38:57 14 Now, can I ask the operator to go to another document now,  
14:39:03 15 please. It's VPL.0005.0007.0194. You were taken to this  
14:39:22 16 document earlier today, Mr Pope. It's one of the  
14:39:28 17 information reports. Am I right to say - yes, this is  
14:39:42 18 reflecting information conveyed to you by Ms Gobbo, isn't  
14:39:48 19 it, this report?---Yes.  
14:39:55 20  
14:39:57 21 Now, in the second paragraph it says, "On this occasion the  
14:40:03 22 informer was more prepared to talk about specific  
14:40:07 23 incidents"?---Yes.  
14:40:08 24  
14:40:12 25 What I want to suggest to you is that - well, that implies,  
14:40:17 26 doesn't it, that on the earlier occasion or occasions prior  
14:40:20 27 to this event on 17 May Ms Gobbo was not prepared to talk  
14:40:27 28 about specific incidents in the way she does here?---I  
14:40:33 29 think the first meeting there was no real information  
14:40:36 30 provided and we were just undertaking the introduction and  
14:40:41 31 the handover and then trying to establish the rapport.  
14:40:47 32  
14:40:47 33 Yes, but what I want to suggest to you is that the language  
14:40:51 34 "more prepared to talk about specific incidents" suggests  
14:40:55 35 that Ms Gobbo was reluctant to do so on the earlier  
14:40:59 36 occasions, do you agree or disagree with that?---I think it  
14:41:03 37 took a little while - I agree that that's an inference  
14:41:06 38 that's appropriate.  
14:41:07 39  
14:41:07 40 So that accords, does that accord approximately with your  
14:41:10 41 recollection, that Ms Gobbo was a little reluctant in the  
14:41:14 42 early stages of your interaction with her to inform about  
14:41:20 43 the person the subject of this investigation?---I'm not  
14:41:24 44 sure I'd say reluctant. I think it just took a meeting or  
14:41:29 45 two to establish the rapport and the trust.  
14:41:34 46  
14:41:34 47 Yes. And it's fair to say, isn't it, that you sought to

14:41:39 1 set her mind at ease in that regard and encourage her to  
14:41:43 2 inform on that person?---I don't specifically recall the  
14:41:53 3 way in which the conversations went but I don't think I  
14:41:59 4 needed to really encourage her greatly.  
14:42:02 5  
14:42:02 6 It might be said that Ms Gobbo wanted to speak generally.  
14:42:06 7 She might be said to be a communicative person?---Yes.  
14:42:09 8  
14:42:10 9 But I think you've agreed, haven't you, initially she was  
14:42:14 10 reluctant to give specific information about the person the  
14:42:17 11 subject of this investigation?---I think it took a meeting  
14:42:20 12 or two to warm up to myself and Mr Segrave.  
14:42:25 13  
14:42:26 14 And what did you say to warm Ms Gobbo up?---I've no  
14:42:29 15 recollection.  
14:42:30 16  
14:42:30 17 I mean are there police protocols or procedures to  
14:42:34 18 encourage informers to be forthcoming?---No, not that I can  
14:42:38 19 recall.  
14:42:43 20  
14:42:43 21 I won't press that question. Did Ms Gobbo ever say  
14:43:06 22 anything to you about feeling any pressure to be an  
14:43:12 23 informer from the police?---Not that I can recall.  
14:43:16 24  
14:43:19 25 Did she ever raise issues about the conduct of Mr Strawhorn  
14:43:24 26 of the Drug Squad in that regard, that he was placing some  
14:43:28 27 pressure on her?---Not that I can recall.  
14:43:31 28  
14:43:32 29 Do you have any recollection about a letter being sent at  
14:43:37 30 one stage by Ms Gobbo's then employer to the Drug Squad  
14:43:44 31 complaining about pressure being placed upon  
14:43:48 32 Ms Gobbo?---No, I don't have any recollection of that.  
14:43:50 33  
14:43:59 34 In your diary notes there's a number of references to  
14:44:04 35 meeting Ms Gobbo, sometimes with Mr Segrave, possibly  
14:44:09 36 sometimes not, at South Melbourne. I suggest to you that  
14:44:12 37 that's always a reference to the Emerald Hotel, isn't  
14:44:16 38 it?---I can't recall where all those meetings occurred,  
14:44:20 39 I've got a vague recollection that some meetings were in a  
14:44:23 40 hotel and some meetings were in a café but I can't recall.  
14:44:27 41  
14:44:27 42 But do you mean - you don't mean, do you, that you have a  
14:44:31 43 specific recollection that the café you've got in mind was  
14:44:34 44 a café in South Melbourne?---I really can't - the only  
14:44:38 45 clear recollection I have is a very, is that one meeting in  
14:44:42 46 the late afternoon with the Drug Squad at the Emerald  
14:44:45 47 Hotel. The other meetings I don't really have a very clear

14:44:49 1 recollection about.  
14:44:49 2  
14:44:49 3 The reason the meeting occurred at the Emerald Hotel I  
14:44:53 4 suggest is that that's where Victoria Police regularly went  
14:44:56 5 to for drinking amongst colleagues?---Well that may well be  
14:45:01 6 the case but I think that was, that was the suggestion of  
14:45:05 7 the Drug Squad as to where we should meet them that  
14:45:09 8 afternoon.  
14:45:10 9  
14:45:10 10 Do you accept it's at least probable that references to  
14:45:14 11 South Melbourne in your notes are likely referring to the  
14:45:16 12 Emerald Hotel?---They could be.  
14:45:18 13  
14:45:19 14 No further questions.  
14:45:20 15  
14:45:20 16 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Collinson.  
14:45:21 17  
14:45:22 18 MR HOLT: Commissioner, can I raise a timing issue in  
14:45:24 19 relation to the next witness? The Commission will recall  
14:45:27 20 that witness has a pseudonym of Kruger and you will recall  
21 the reasons for that that are to light. I'm told by our  
14:45:34 22 learned friend counsel assisting that his evidence will  
14:45:35 23 take about an hour and a half. I'm conscious we are at  
14:45:39 24 quarter to 3. He has particular travel arrangements and  
14:45:42 25 particular other arrangements which the Commission will be  
14:45:46 26 aware of which mean that it really can only work if his  
14:45:50 27 evidence goes through in one hit. And so to that end we  
14:45:53 28 could respectfully see whether it might be possible,  
14:45:53 29 depending how long our learned friend Mr Chettle might be,  
14:45:56 30 to interpose him to permit him to complete that evidence  
14:45:59 31 this afternoon.  
14:45:59 32  
14:46:00 33 COMMISSIONER: Right. I don't think we're going to be much  
14:46:02 34 longer with this witness. As I understood it this witness  
14:46:08 35 may be recalled for discussions about a later period that  
14:46:12 36 certainly relates to up to 2000, so I don't know whether  
14:46:14 37 you'd have any questions at all.  
14:46:16 38  
14:46:16 39 MR CHETTLE: I certainly do, Commissioner.  
14:46:17 40  
14:46:17 41 COMMISSIONER: You do. You'll be a while, will you?  
14:46:20 42  
14:46:20 43 MR CHETTLE: Yes. I would anticipate at a guess between  
14:46:24 44 half an hour and an hour.  
14:46:26 45  
14:46:26 46 COMMISSIONER: That's going to be the rest of the day  
14:46:36 47 really by the time Mr Thangaraj has re-examined.

14:46:37 1  
2 MR THANGARAJ: Commissioner, just on that issue.  
3  
4 COMMISSIONER: Yes.  
5  
14:46:38 6 MR THANGARAJ: From what my friend said I suspect he's  
14:46:38 7 going to attempt to ask questions about 2000 onwards.  
14:46:44 8  
14:46:44 9 COMMISSIONER: I've just asked him that and he said this is  
14:46:45 10 pre-2000.  
14:46:46 11  
14:46:47 12 MR CHETTLE: No, Commissioner. The topic's been raised  
14:46:49 13 this afternoon by everybody but me, but there is material  
14:46:53 14 in relation to 2009 onwards that I want to ask this witness  
14:46:56 15 about. I understand he will be coming back but it is  
14:47:00 16 important for my clients to get some framework in relation  
14:47:05 17 to issues that I'll be raising with the Commission.  
14:47:07 18  
19 MR THANGARAJ: That's why I wanted to raise it,  
14:47:08 20 Commissioner, because I'll be objecting to that for a  
14:47:11 21 number of reasons. Whenever the Commission's ready for me  
14:47:11 22 to deal with that issue I will, but that might affect the  
14:47:13 23 timing question.  
14:47:13 24  
14:47:13 25 COMMISSIONER: It does. It does. It seems if we are to  
14:47:17 26 have any hope of finishing Mr Kruger's evidence we would  
14:47:20 27 have to interpose him now.  
14:47:22 28  
14:47:23 29 MR CHETTLE: I'm happy for that to occur but it means  
14:47:26 30 Mr Pope's got to come back. Commissioner, we've had  
14:47:28 31 questions asked - - -  
14:47:28 32  
14:47:28 33 COMMISSIONER: I gather that's less - inconvenient as that  
14:47:31 34 is I gather it's less inconvenient than if Mr Kruger has to  
14:47:36 35 come back.  
14:47:37 36  
14:47:37 37 MR THANGARAJ: We've assumed that Mr Pope is coming back.  
38  
39 COMMISSIONER: Yes, he is coming back.  
40  
14:47:39 41 MR THANGARAJ: And we're proposing to prepare a statement  
14:47:43 42 in relation to the next period for the Commission's next  
14:47:44 43 hearing sittings and we anticipated, because he has not  
14:47:47 44 prepared that material, we have not read that material.  
14:47:50 45 With respect it is not appropriate Mr Chettle goes into  
14:47:53 46 those areas today. I don't have any questions at this  
14:47:55 47 stage to ask him.



14:47:56 1  
14:47:57 2 COMMISSIONER: Okay.  
14:47:57 3  
14:47:57 4 MR THANGARAJ: So it could be that he could be finished for  
14:48:00 5 today and we come back at the next sittings and my friend  
14:48:03 6 can ask those questions at that time when it would be more  
14:48:06 7 appropriate with respect.  
14:48:07 8  
14:48:07 9 COMMISSIONER: Mr Winneke, how soon could - and Mr Holt,  
14:48:12 10 this probably effects your submissions more than anyone,  
14:48:15 11 how soon could Victoria Police provide the further  
14:48:18 12 information that's needed to properly examine Mr Pope about  
14:48:22 13 the next period?  
14:48:24 14  
14:48:25 15 MR WINNEKE: How soon can Victoria Police provide it?  
14:48:28 16  
14:48:28 17 COMMISSIONER: Yes, that material.  
14:48:29 18  
14:48:30 19 MR WINNEKE: We've been asking for material from Victoria  
14:48:33 20 Police for some time.  
14:48:33 21  
14:48:34 22 COMMISSIONER: That's what I'm asking because we have to  
14:48:34 23 have that material before there's any point in getting him  
14:48:36 24 back.  
14:48:36 25  
14:48:37 26 MR WINNEKE: I understand Mr Chettle's problem is he wants  
14:48:41 27 to ask some questions in effect to set the scene for his  
14:48:44 28 purposes. I don't know how long that's going to take.  
14:48:47 29  
14:48:47 30 COMMISSIONER: He says an hour or so.  
14:48:50 31  
14:48:51 32 MR WINNEKE: That would seem to me to be going further than  
14:48:53 33 questions would need to set the scene, but if Mr Chettle  
14:48:56 34 needs an hour and a half for that purpose it would seem to  
14:49:01 35 me to be perhaps going too far. It depends on what he is  
14:49:06 36 seeking to do. Ultimately Mr Pope has prepared a statement  
14:49:10 37 in relation to this earlier period, yes that latter  
14:49:13 38 period's been touched on largely - - -  
14:49:13 39  
14:49:13 40 COMMISSIONER: Mr Chettle can limit himself to half an  
14:49:16 41 hour. Can you do that, Mr Chettle?  
14:49:18 42  
14:49:18 43 MR CHETTLE: I said half an hour to an hour, Commissioner,  
14:49:21 44 I think I can. I certainly never said an hour and a half.  
14:49:23 45  
14:49:23 46 COMMISSIONER: If you could be as brief as possible bearing  
14:49:26 47 in mind what's been said and that Mr Pope will be coming

14:49:30 1 back later in the Commission hearing and we are trying to  
14:49:33 2 get Mr Kruger dealt with.  
14:49:37 3  
14:49:37 4 MR CHETTLE: I understand, Commissioner, but I've been  
14:49:40 5 sitting here for two days waiting to ask Mr Pope some  
14:49:44 6 questions and now I find I'm getting shut down which I  
14:49:45 7 submit is somewhat unfair.  
8  
14:49:48 9 COMMISSIONER: But you're not going to be shut down  
14:49:50 10 forever.  
14:49:50 11  
14:49:51 12 MR CHETTLE: I would like this witness's unvarnished  
14:49:54 13 evidence in relation to his recollection about some general  
14:49:57 14 matters. I'm not going to be going into detail that  
14:50:01 15 everyone needs to prepare.  
14:50:04 16  
14:50:04 17 COMMISSIONER: The court reporters have indicated they're  
14:50:08 18 prepared and willing to sit until 5 o'clock but it's  
14:50:08 19 unreasonable for them to sit beyond that time. So I'll let  
14:50:12 20 you start your cross-examination and could you try and be  
14:50:16 21 as brief as possible.  
14:50:17 22  
14:50:17 23 MR CHETTLE: I will, Commissioner, I will.  
14:50:18 24  
25 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR CHETTLE:  
26  
14:50:19 27 Mr Pope, when you went back to the Police Force you said it  
14:50:22 28 was in September 2009?---Yes.  
14:50:24 29  
14:50:24 30 What position did you go back to?---Assistant Commissioner  
14:50:27 31 of Intelligence and Covert Support.  
14:50:29 32  
14:50:29 33 So you were overseeing the SDU at that stage?---Yes.  
14:50:33 34  
14:50:34 35 And at that stage Gobbo had ceased to be an informer to the  
14:50:40 36 SDU, is that right?---That's my understanding.  
14:50:42 37  
14:50:43 38 And at that stage her involvement with Victoria Police was  
14:50:47 39 to do with effectively Paul Dale.  
14:50:50 40  
14:50:50 41 MR THANGARAJ: Commissioner, I'm sorry, but the problem has  
14:50:52 42 been exposed by my friend's submission to the Commission  
14:50:55 43 about unvarnished evidence. That's the problem. We've  
14:50:59 44 already seen difficulties with recollections without access  
14:51:01 45 to documents. With respect, as a matter of fairness to him  
14:51:05 46 and reliable evidence for this Commission he needs to see  
14:51:07 47 all the relevant material, turn his mind to the issue - - -

14:51:10 1  
14:51:11 2 COMMISSIONER: He's an experienced police officer, I'm sure  
14:51:13 3 he knows how to answer questions in cross-examination. He  
14:51:17 4 can say he doesn't recall, he can say "I need to look at my  
14:51:21 5 notes", he can say, "My best recollection is this but I  
14:51:24 6 really would need to" - he knows how to answer questions.  
14:51:28 7 Yes Mr Chettle.  
14:51:29 8  
14:51:30 9 MR CHETTLE: Thank you. Petra and Driver were to do with  
14:51:32 10 Dale, weren't they?---Yes, that's my recollection.  
14:51:37 11  
14:51:39 12 Did you know that she was providing information to Victoria  
14:51:43 13 Police after you joined?---I can't specifically recall.  
14:51:49 14  
14:51:49 15 You couldn't recall. In your affidavit that you've been  
14:51:54 16 taken to you make reference to a conversation with  
14:51:56 17 Mr Biggin?---Yes.  
14:51:57 18  
14:51:58 19 Was that the first of the disclosures you made of your  
14:52:03 20 prior dealings with Gobbo?---Would have been certainly, if  
14:52:07 21 not the first, one of the most early ones I would have  
14:52:11 22 thought.  
14:52:11 23  
14:52:12 24 Why would you tell Mr Biggin?---He was a Superintendent in  
14:52:17 25 my division.  
14:52:18 26  
14:52:18 27 But Gobbo's no longer being run by him, is she?---My  
14:52:23 28 recollection was he was the Superintendent for the Covert  
14:52:30 29 Services Division.  
14:52:30 30  
14:52:31 31 You tell him you made a disclosure of the fact that she had  
14:52:35 32 been an informant of yours back in the 90s?---Words to that  
14:52:42 33 effect, yes.  
14:52:42 34  
14:52:43 35 There's a difference between telling him of the allegations  
14:52:46 36 she made about having a sexual affair with you and telling  
14:52:52 37 him about your prior informant dealings with her, isn't  
14:52:58 38 there?---Yes, but as I said earlier, at the time of making  
14:53:02 39 the declaration of her being an informer I wasn't aware of  
14:53:11 40 any alleged relationship.  
14:53:12 41  
14:53:13 42 I suggest the first time you made any declaration to  
14:53:16 43 Mr Biggin in relation to your prior involvement with Gobbo  
14:53:18 44 at all was after she made the allegation about you being  
14:53:23 45 involved in a sexual affair with her?---I don't think  
14:53:27 46 that's the case.  
14:53:27 47

14:53:28 1 And that you told him that she'd made the allegation and it  
14:53:31 2 was false, that was the first time you made any disclosure  
14:53:34 3 at all to him?---No, I don't think that's the case.  
14:53:37 4  
14:53:38 5 That's his recollection, he's got it wrong, has he?---It  
14:53:44 6 doesn't accord with your recollection.  
14:53:46 7  
14:53:46 8 Doesn't accord with yours, all right. Clearly if her  
14:53:49 9 allegation was right in relation to you having been  
14:53:52 10 involved with her sexually, you would have been in a  
14:53:56 11 dreadful conflict of position, wouldn't you?---If a sexual  
14:54:03 12 relationship had ever occurred?  
14:54:04 13  
14:54:04 14 If it had, that's the question?---I would never ever have  
14:54:07 15 come back to Victoria Police.  
14:54:08 16  
14:54:08 17 Answer my question though, you would be in a position of  
14:54:12 18 conflict, gross conflict if her allegations were true,  
14:54:15 19 wouldn't you?---Would have been a conflict, yes.  
14:54:17 20  
14:54:18 21 Did you sit at any time on a committee or part of the  
14:54:23 22 Victoria Police that determined what compensation or reward  
14:54:26 23 would be paid to Ms Gobbo?---No, I didn't.  
14:54:28 24  
14:54:28 25 Did you ever have any need to obtain records in relation to  
14:54:34 26 her service for the purposes of an assessment for a  
14:54:38 27 reward?---No.  
14:54:38 28  
14:54:39 29 Were you aware that there was an inquiry in relation to,  
14:54:43 30 put it this way, a rewards committee in place to look at  
14:54:47 31 her?---I don't recall that.  
14:54:51 32  
14:54:51 33 So you would have had no reason to access her file and her  
14:54:56 34 documents of what occurred prior to you coming to, back to  
14:55:01 35 the Police Force in 2009?---I can't recall whether I may  
14:55:12 36 have or not. Whether I was being briefed around what had  
14:55:19 37 occurred with her whilst I'd been away from Victoria  
14:55:22 38 Police, but I don't have any specific recollection of  
14:55:25 39 accessing a file or not.  
14:55:26 40  
14:55:26 41 Did you have anything to do with setting up the Comrie  
14:55:30 42 report, the inquiry by Mr Comrie?---I spoke to Deputy  
14:55:37 43 Commissioner Ashton and Chief Commissioner Lay about the  
14:55:40 44 Comrie report.  
14:55:41 45  
14:55:42 46 No, that was before it was commissioned?---Yes.  
14:55:45 47

14:55:45 1 So you were part of effectively the decision to instigate  
14:55:51 2 that report?---Yes.  
14:55:52 3  
14:55:56 4 And I take it your diaries, when they come through, will  
14:55:59 5 have the details of that. I'm not going to push you on the  
14:56:03 6 details now, but in general that will be in your diary, in  
14:56:07 7 your notes?---I'm not sure what records there will be  
14:56:10 8 around that.  
14:56:10 9  
14:56:11 10 You also presided over a committee, a steering committee,  
14:56:16 11 that produced the covert services review of 2012, did you  
14:56:23 12 not?---Yes.  
14:56:24 13  
14:56:24 14 That effectively occurred in conjunction with the Comrie  
14:56:27 15 report, did it not?---I think the timings coincided.  
14:56:31 16  
14:56:31 17 The timings coincided. No doubt you spoke to members of  
14:56:38 18 the SDU before you instigated the Comrie report and the  
14:56:43 19 covert services review?---I can't recall if it was me  
14:56:48 20 personally or whether it was the Superintendent or the  
14:56:52 21 Inspector.  
14:56:53 22  
14:56:53 23 You would expect someone to?---I think someone did.  
14:57:00 24  
14:57:10 25 On 13 August of 2012 did you go to the HSMU safe and remove  
14:57:18 26 the files that were stored therein in relation to Nicola  
14:57:23 27 Gobbo, 3838 as she was then?---I never had access to the  
14:57:28 28 Human Source Management Unit or the safe.  
14:57:29 29  
14:57:30 30 There will be evidence that a Senior Sergeant was asked to  
14:57:37 31 source material from HSMU in relation to a reward  
14:57:42 32 application for Ms Gobbo, that he went to the safe and  
14:57:45 33 there found an envelope with the marking, "All HSMU files  
14:57:50 34 re 3838 have been taken into possession by AC Pope". Do  
14:57:57 35 you know anything about that?---No, I don't.  
14:57:58 36  
14:58:01 37 If that be the case, you're involved with Gobbo's files not  
14:58:12 38 terribly long after she makes the allegation - - -  
14:58:16 39  
14:58:16 40 COMMISSIONER: Mr Chettle, he's denied it, so you're making  
14:58:19 41 a comment. Let's move on.  
14:58:21 42  
14:58:21 43 MR CHETTLE: You're saying it didn't happen, you didn't  
14:58:23 44 take those documents?---I had no access to the safe or to  
14:58:26 45 the Human Source Management Unit.  
14:58:28 46  
14:58:29 47 Or did you direct someone to get them for you?---I'd need

14:58:32 1 to refer to my notes but my broad recollection is that all  
14:58:39 2 files and documents relating to 3838 were to be stored in a  
14:58:47 3 secure safe in Superintendent Sheridan's office, which was  
14:58:51 4 also secure.  
14:58:54 5  
14:58:54 6 I won't push you for details at this stage. On the Comrie  
14:58:58 7 report, was a decision made to conduct that review on the  
14:59:04 8 papers, as it were, without any reference to  
14:59:10 9 witnesses?---The Comrie report was conducted, the Comrie  
14:59:14 10 review was conducted in a way that Mr Comrie wanted to  
14:59:18 11 undertake that review is my recollection.  
14:59:20 12  
14:59:21 13 He wasn't given any direction by you or anybody else to  
14:59:26 14 your knowledge as to the way that review would be  
14:59:30 15 conducted?---Not that I can recall.  
14:59:31 16  
14:59:50 17 The committee that produced the covert services review  
14:59:54 18 document, are you aware of the document I mean?---Broadly.  
14:59:58 19  
14:59:58 20 I'm not going to take you to any detail but the committee  
15:00:02 21 was chaired by yourself?---Yes.  
15:00:04 22  
15:00:05 23 And there were other members of that committee?---Yes.  
15:00:08 24  
15:00:08 25 Do you remember who they were?---No, I don't.  
15:00:11 26  
15:00:12 27 Do you recall if Superintendent Biggin was on that  
15:00:18 28 committee?---Most likely.  
15:00:19 29  
15:00:20 30 Sheridan?---Most likely.  
15:00:21 31  
15:00:21 32 And Mr Paterson?---Yes, most likely.  
15:00:25 33  
15:00:25 34 Do you remember that committee meeting and discussing the  
15:00:30 35 issues that were ultimately dealt with in that  
15:00:35 36 review?---I'm sure it did but I can't remember.  
15:00:37 37  
15:00:38 38 You're sure they did have meetings?---I think so.  
15:00:41 39  
15:00:41 40 The effect of that meeting was to recommend the immediate  
15:00:46 41 closure of that, of that review was to recommend the  
15:00:49 42 immediate closure of SDU, wasn't it?---I can't recall.  
15:00:53 43  
15:00:53 44 You can't recall. I mean you shut the unit down, didn't  
15:00:58 45 you? Weren't you responsible for the decision to shut the  
15:01:01 46 unit down?---It was an organisational decision.  
15:01:04 47

15:01:04 1 Nothing to do with you?---I was part of the decision-making  
15:01:08 2 process.  
15:01:08 3  
15:01:08 4 You recommended it in your report, didn't you?---I put  
15:01:11 5 forward that recommendation to the Deputy and the Chief  
15:01:14 6 Commissioner.  
15:01:14 7  
15:01:14 8 That was a report that was discussed by all members of the  
15:01:18 9 committee before the report was published?---I can't recall  
15:01:21 10 the sequence of events there.  
15:01:22 11  
15:01:22 12 It wouldn't be a unilateral decision by you, would it?---It  
15:01:26 13 wasn't my own decision.  
15:01:28 14  
15:01:29 15 Mr Paterson involved in it?---I can't remember.  
15:01:31 16  
15:01:32 17 Mr Sheridan - you would expect if they were on the  
15:01:34 18 committee they would have been, wouldn't you?---I certainly  
15:01:37 19 expect there was a good understanding about what was  
15:01:41 20 occurring.  
15:01:42 21  
15:01:42 22 So the answer is yes, you would expect they would have  
15:01:45 23 known what was happening?---I would think so.  
15:01:47 24  
15:01:47 25 It would be a complete shock to you if they knew nothing  
15:01:51 26 about it?---That's not my recollection.  
15:01:53 27  
15:01:53 28 You're the man that told Mr Sheridan that the unit was  
15:01:57 29 being closed, weren't you? I apologise. I said Sheridan,  
15:02:04 30 withdraw that. You were the one who told Mr Biggin that  
15:02:08 31 the unit was being closed?---I can't remember.  
15:02:10 32  
15:02:10 33 You told him ten minutes before the matter was going to  
15:02:15 34 take effect, didn't you, on the day. Don't remember?---I  
15:02:19 35 can't remember that.  
15:02:20 36  
15:02:21 37 He asked you why and you said corruption issues, didn't  
15:02:24 38 you?---I can't remember that.  
15:02:25 39  
15:02:25 40 There was certainly no suggestion of corruption, was  
15:02:27 41 there?---I can't recall this conversation.  
15:02:29 42  
15:02:29 43 Let me ask you a question, there was no suggestion of  
15:02:32 44 corruption amongst the SDU members?---Not in the Comrie  
15:02:42 45 report, no.  
15:02:42 46  
15:02:43 47 Or by you. To your knowledge?---There were other issues

15:02:48 1 with the Source Development Unit that had occurred.  
15:02:51 2  
15:02:51 3 The question I just asked, was there any issue of  
15:02:55 4 corruption as far as you were concerned?---Not at that  
15:02:59 5 point.  
15:03:00 6  
15:03:00 7 And so it would, to say it would be a misstatement of the  
15:03:03 8 reason for the closure of the unit, wouldn't it, if that's  
15:03:07 9 what you said?---I can't recall saying that.  
15:03:09 10  
15:03:09 11 I know, but if you did say it it would be wrong.  
15:03:13 12  
15:03:14 13 MR THANGARAJ: I object.  
15:03:14 14  
15:03:15 15 MR CHETTLE: You're not denying saying it, are you?---I do  
15:03:19 16 not recall saying, using those words.  
15:03:20 17  
15:03:21 18 COMMISSIONER: He can't say anything more than that. I  
15:03:24 19 think you've pushed that far enough, thanks Mr Chettle.  
15:03:27 20  
15:03:28 21 MR CHETTLE: Thank you, Commissioner. Can the witness be  
15:03:31 22 handed the list of pseudonyms, please.  
15:03:36 23  
15:03:36 24 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Is there an exhibit copy? Thank you.  
15:03:50 25 Are you familiar with the list of pseudonyms, that names  
15:03:54 26 aren't to be mentioned in these proceedings, the real names  
15:03:59 27 and the pseudonyms next to them have been given  
15:04:01 28 instead?---Okay, thank you.  
29  
15:04:02 30 If you could use the pseudonyms instead of real names  
15:04:06 31 please?---Yes.  
15:04:07 32  
15:04:08 33 MR CHETTLE: The real names are on the left, the pseudonyms  
15:04:10 34 on the right, do you follow?---Yes.  
15:04:12 35  
15:04:12 36 You had meetings from time to time with Senior Sergeant  
15:04:16 37 Jones, did you not?---Yes. Conversations.  
15:04:21 38  
15:04:21 39 Conversations, that's probably a better word. You had  
15:04:24 40 conversations from time to time with Senior Sergeant  
15:04:35 41 Currie? Fourth from the bottom?---Possibly.  
15:04:38 42  
15:04:39 43 You know the men I'm talking about? You don't know  
15:04:44 44 him?---I'm trying to recall.  
15:04:45 45  
15:04:47 46 Stick with Jones.  
15:04:48 47



15:04:48 1 MR THANGARAJ: Commissioner, could I have a copy of this so  
15:04:50 2 I know who we are talking about?  
15:04:53 3  
15:04:53 4 COMMISSIONER: Certainly. Are we able to provide  
15:04:55 5 Mr Thangaraj?  
15:04:58 6  
15:04:58 7 MR CHETTLE: I've just handed him a copy. Just deal with  
15:05:01 8 Jones, do you know who I'm talking about, Mr Jones?---Yes.  
15:05:04 9  
15:05:04 10 He effectively was the senior operator, if I can call it  
15:05:07 11 that, of the SDU at the relevant time, was he not?---Yes.  
15:05:11 12  
15:05:12 13 Did you ever disclose to him your prior involvement with  
15:05:18 14 Gobbo?---I can't recall.  
15:05:21 15  
15:05:23 16 Did you ever have any discussion with him about closing  
15:05:26 17 down the unit?---Um, I'm - I can't recall.  
15:05:35 18  
15:05:35 19 Again, I don't want to push you for detail until you get  
15:05:38 20 your diaries, but what meetings and discussions you had  
15:05:42 21 would be in your diaries?---Possibly.  
15:05:44 22  
15:05:44 23 Possibly. Do you recall when you left the Police Force,  
15:05:56 24 what date it was?---I can't recall the exact date, no.  
15:06:01 25  
15:06:01 26 What year it was?  
15:06:03 27  
15:06:03 28 COMMISSIONER: You mean the last time?  
15:06:04 29  
15:06:05 30 MR CHETTLE: When you left finally, yes?---I think it was  
15:06:07 31 early July 2013.  
15:06:11 32  
15:06:12 33 Were you on a contract at that stage, a contracted  
15:06:15 34 member?---I was on a contract.  
15:06:17 35  
15:06:17 36 Had that contract finished?---No, it hadn't.  
15:06:20 37  
15:06:28 38 Finally, if I can just go back to your affidavit.  
15:06:45 39  
15:06:46 40 COMMISSIONER: Is this the 2011 affidavit?  
15:06:48 41  
15:06:49 42 MR CHETTLE: Yes, Commissioner.  
15:06:51 43  
15:06:51 44 COMMISSIONER: That's RC61.  
15:06:54 45  
15:06:57 46 MR CHETTLE: The discussion that you have you'd say with  
15:07:00 47 Mr Biggin is in paragraph 9 of that document?---Yes.

15:07:05 1  
15:07:11 2 Do I take it from that paragraph that that conversation,  
15:07:15 3 according to you occurred at a weekly management  
15:07:20 4 meeting?---My recollection was the context of the  
15:07:28 5 discussions occurred with, around weekly management  
15:07:33 6 meetings, either at the meeting or in the margins of the  
15:07:36 7 meeting, and that I had - - -  
15:07:37 8  
15:07:38 9 Do you remember talking to Biggin about it?---I've got a  
15:07:41 10 vague recollection of talking to them about it.  
15:07:44 11  
15:07:45 12 A vague recollection. Even though your statement says,  
15:07:48 13 "When I began my substantive role I declared the nature of  
15:07:51 14 my relationship to Biggin", do you see that?---Yes.  
15:07:55 15  
15:07:55 16 MR THANGARAJ: This is a 2011 statement.  
15:07:57 17  
15:07:57 18 COMMISSIONER: Yes.  
15:08:00 19  
15:08:00 20 MR CHETTLE: That is a declaration that you made some -  
15:08:05 21 obviously shortly after September 2009, according to  
15:08:09 22 you?---That's right.  
15:08:11 23  
15:08:13 24 Do you remember now where it was and who was present when  
15:08:16 25 you said it?---No, I don't.  
15:08:18 26  
15:08:22 27 Would it be contained in any minutes of any such  
15:08:25 28 meeting?---No - well I'm not certain but I don't think so.  
15:08:30 29  
15:08:36 30 In relation to any of your discussion - when did you have  
15:08:38 31 the conversation with Sir Ken Jones or the declaration to  
15:08:42 32 him?---Around the time I was invited to join the Petra  
15:08:48 33 steering committee.  
15:08:49 34  
15:08:49 35 When was that, do you know?---No, I can't remember.  
15:08:52 36  
15:08:53 37 But that would be subsequent to your conversation with  
15:08:55 38 Biggin?---I think it probably was.  
15:08:58 39  
15:09:02 40 And does it follow that even subsequent to those two  
15:09:06 41 declarations you had the conversation with Finn McCrae  
15:09:10 42 that's referred to in paragraph 11?---I think that's  
15:09:13 43 correct.  
15:09:13 44  
15:09:22 45 Did you advise Mr Ashton or Mr Comrie of your prior  
15:09:31 46 involvement with Gobbo when commissioning the Comrie  
15:09:38 47 report?---Certainly had disclosed this with Mr Ashton,

15:09:44 1 certainly.  
15:09:44 2  
15:09:45 3 When?---I think on a number of occasions.  
4  
15:09:48 5 Is there any reference to that disclosure to Mr Ashton in  
15:09:52 6 your affidavit?---Not in this affidavit, no.  
15:09:56 7  
15:09:59 8 COMMISSIONER: Did the nature of that disclosure include  
15:10:03 9 the Hawaii trip, the conversation about the Hawaii  
15:10:09 10 trip?---It will probably depend on the timing of the  
15:10:12 11 disclosure to Mr Ashton as to - - -  
15:10:16 12  
15:10:17 13 If it were pre 2011?---That's right, if it was pre 2011  
15:10:22 14 then probably not.  
15:10:23 15  
15:10:23 16 Thank you.  
15:10:24 17  
15:10:26 18 MR CHETTLE: Thank you Commissioner, I'll ask no more  
15:10:29 19 questions at this stage.  
15:10:30 20  
15:10:30 21 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. So the witness can be excused.  
15:10:33 22  
15:10:34 23 MR THANGARAJ: I just have one question.  
15:10:36 24  
15:10:36 25 COMMISSIONER: You told me you weren't going to ask any  
15:10:40 26 questions.  
15:10:41 27  
28 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR THANGARAJ:  
29  
15:10:42 30 Can you tell us why it is that you finally left the  
15:10:46 31 police?---Um, look there was a range of reasons as to why I  
15:10:51 32 left Victoria Police. I went to NCA International Business  
15:10:59 33 School in March 2012 for a month which was a significant  
15:11:04 34 career changing moment for me and I knew when I left NCA  
15:11:12 35 business school that I wanted to pursue different  
15:11:14 36 challenges in the second half of my career. I was also  
15:11:20 37 working, I was not just the Assistant Commissioner for  
15:11:24 38 Intelligence and Covert Support but I was also the Chief  
15:11:28 39 Information Officer for the last two years in Victoria  
15:11:30 40 Police, I was effectively doing two jobs and working quite  
15:11:35 41 extraordinary hours. That was having a detrimental effect  
15:11:40 42 on a neurological disorder that I've been trying to manage  
15:11:45 43 for 20 years and I had a few serious falls at the time.  
15:11:51 44 And I promised myself and my wife that it was time, it was  
15:11:56 45 time for me to seek different opportunities and different  
15:11:59 46 challenges that were less taxing in terms of hours because  
15:12:04 47 I was working quite extraordinary hours. So I applied, I

15:12:10 1 started to look at external positions, I applied for a  
15:12:14 2 position with the Australian Electoral Commission I think  
15:12:17 3 in about February 2013. I think I was interviewed in March  
15:12:22 4 2013 and that was a statutory appointment so that had to go  
15:12:29 5 through a range of processes, including Cabinet approval  
15:12:34 6 and Executive Council approval and then I was appointed to  
15:12:38 7 that position in early July 2013. When I left my last week  
15:12:49 8 of Victoria Police it was a very casual affair at my  
15:12:54 9 request, because I was diagnosed with bladder cancer in my  
15:12:59 10 last week at Victoria Police, and then I made the  
15:13:02 11 transition across to the Australian Electoral Commission.

15:13:06 12  
15:13:06 13 Nothing further.

15:13:08 14  
15:13:08 15 COMMISSIONER: Mr Winneke.

15:13:10 16  
17 <RE-EXAMINED BY MR WINNEKE:

18  
15:13:11 19 Just one matter. Were you approached to come back to  
15:13:12 20 Victoria Police in 2009?---No, I wasn't approached. It was  
15:13:17 21 a position that was advertised and I applied for it.

15:13:19 22  
15:13:20 23 To whom did you apply?---It was just a normal process. Um,  
15:13:27 24 the selection committee was Simon Overland, Keiran Walsh,  
15:13:33 25 Ken Jones and an external lady who I think was a CEO of a  
15:13:41 26 council somewhere here in Melbourne.

15:13:43 27  
15:13:43 28 Did you know then that the position that you were coming  
15:13:45 29 back to was going to involve the management of  
15:13:50 30 Ms Gobbo?---I had a very high expectation that that was  
15:13:52 31 going to be the case.

15:13:53 32  
15:13:54 33 Did you make a declaration to that committee?---I don't  
15:13:56 34 recall making a declaration at the committee but I recall  
15:14:00 35 having discussions after that process.

15:14:03 36  
15:14:03 37 With whom?---My recollection is I had a discussion with the  
15:14:06 38 Chief Commissioner that I had previously had dealings with  
15:14:09 39 her.

15:14:09 40  
15:14:10 41 Yes, thanks very much.

15:14:11 42  
15:14:11 43 COMMISSIONER: Who was the Chief Commissioner at the  
15:14:13 44 time?---Mr Overland.

15:14:16 45  
15:14:18 46 Yes. So as I understand it Mr Pope is free to go now but  
15:14:22 47 will be needed again later in the work of this Commission?

15:14:27 1  
15:14:28 2 MR WINNEKE: That's correct, Commissioner.  
15:14:29 3  
15:14:29 4 COMMISSIONER: We don't yet know when that will be?  
5  
15:14:32 6 MR WINNEKE: Not yet, no. But I would imagine that it  
15:14:37 7 would be certainly not in the next couple of weeks.  
15:14:39 8  
15:14:39 9 COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right then. Thanks Mr Pope.  
15:14:41 10 You're free to go on that understanding?---Thank you.  
11  
15:14:45 12 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)  
15:14:46 13  
15:14:46 14 COMMISSIONER: All right then, we now have Mr Kruger.  
15:14:51 15  
15:14:52 16 MR HOLT: My understanding, Commissioner, is that the  
15:14:53 17 proposal is that the live stream will be turned off while  
15:14:59 18 he is sworn under his actual name and then the live stream  
15:15:06 19 will be turned on not showing his face.  
15:15:09 20  
15:15:10 21 COMMISSIONER: All right then. I direct that the live  
15:15:13 22 stream is turned off as the witness is sworn and not turned  
23 on again until I so direct. A copy of my order should be  
15:15:22 24 posted on the door of hearing room.  
15:15:22 25  
15:15:23 26 MR CHETTLE: Commissioner, can you excuse us from further  
15:15:31 27 attendance, we have no interest in this witness?  
28  
29 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Chettle.  
30  
15:15:33 31 MR CHETTLE: Thank you.  
15:15:33 32  
15:15:34 33 MR HOLT: Can I confirm the live stream is now off,  
15:15:37 34 Commissioner, while the witness is coming into court?  
35  
36 COMMISSIONER: It's now off.  
37  
15:15:39 38 (IN CAMERA PROCEEDINGS FOLLOW)  
15:15:45 39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

15:15:54 1  
15:15:55 2  
15:15:55 3  
15:15:59 4  
15:16:03 5  
15:16:03 6  
15:16:05 7  
15:16:12 8  
15:16:12 9  
15:16:16 10  
15:16:29 11  
15:16:31 12  
15:16:31 13  
15:16:32 14  
15:16:32 15  
15:16:38 16  
15:16:38 17  
15:16:38 18  
15:16:45 19  
15:16:50 20  
15:16:54 21  
15:16:56 22  
15:17:00 23  
15:17:00 24  
15:17:01 25  
15:17:01 26  
15:17:01 27  
15:17:06 28  
15:17:08 29  
15:17:10 30  
15:17:20 31  
15:17:21 32  
15:17:27 33  
15:17:30 34  
15:17:40 35  
15:17:46 36  
15:17:46 37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47



15:17:49 1 UPON RESUMING IN OPEN COURT:  
15:17:52 2  
15:17:52 3 COMMISSIONER: And the courtroom is open to the public.  
15:18:00 4 Yes, Ms Tittensor.  
15:18:02 5  
15:18:03 6 MS TITTENSOR: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr Kruger, you  
15:18:05 7 entered the - I'm jumping the gun.  
15:18:12 8  
15:18:12 9 COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Holt.  
15:18:13 10  
15:18:14 11 MR HOLT: Mr Kruger, for present purposes do you see a copy  
15:18:16 12 of your statement in front of you?---Yes.  
15:18:18 13  
15:18:18 14 You understand that you're going to be referred to both in  
15:18:21 15 the statement and in the course of your evidence by the  
15:18:23 16 name Kruger?---Yes.  
15:18:24 17  
15:18:25 18 The statement thought that you have there is dated 28 March  
15:18:27 19 2019?---That's correct.  
15:18:29 20  
15:18:29 21 And do you confirm that the content of your statement is  
15:18:32 22 true and correct?---Yes.  
15:18:33 23  
15:18:33 24 Thank you, I tender the statement, Commissioner.  
15:18:35 25  
15:18:37 26  
15:18:37 27 #EXHIBIT RC64 - Statement of Kruger.  
15:18:45 28  
15:18:45 29 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Tittensor.  
15:18:47 30  
31 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MS TITTENSOR:  
32  
15:18:48 33 Mr Kruger, you entered the Academy in October of 88, is  
15:18:53 34 that right?---That's correct.  
15:18:53 35  
15:18:54 36 And you thereafter had a number of placements before in  
15:19:00 37 1997 you applied for and obtained a position as a Detective  
15:19:04 38 Senior Constable at the Drug Squad?---Yes.  
15:19:05 39  
15:19:06 40 The following year, so by that stage although you had a  
15:19:09 41 position of Detective Senior Constable you hadn't done  
15:19:12 42 Detective training yet?---No.  
15:19:13 43  
15:19:13 44 Is that the case?---That's correct.  
15:19:14 45  
15:19:14 46 So you did some effectively on the job training?---Yes.  
15:19:18 47

15:19:18 1 And then you went and did Detective Training School the  
15:19:21 2 following year?---Yes.  
15:19:22 3  
15:19:22 4 How long does that course go for?---At that time it was  
15:19:27 5 three months continual.  
15:19:29 6  
15:19:29 7 Is that full time?---Yes.  
15:19:30 8  
15:19:30 9 And do you know over what months of 1998 you did  
15:19:38 10 that?---No. No, I don't. It may have commenced in April  
15:19:45 11 of 98, I'm not - - -  
15:19:48 12  
15:19:48 13 In any case you were at the Drug Squad until some time in  
15:19:52 14 2000 before you obtained a Detective position at a local  
15:19:56 15 Criminal Investigation Unit?---Yes.  
15:19:58 16  
15:19:58 17 And thereafter you obtained other promotions within  
15:20:01 18 Victoria Police?---Yes, that's correct.  
15:20:02 19  
15:20:04 20 Part of the training you've indicated in your statement  
15:20:06 21 that you've undertaken is human source management  
15:20:10 22 training?---Yes.  
15:20:11 23  
15:20:12 24 [REDACTED] ---Yes.  
15:20:13 25  
15:20:14 26 Do you know [REDACTED] they go?---Last I knew they went to,  
15:20:21 27 [REDACTED]  
15:20:22 28  
15:20:23 29 When did you do that training?-- [REDACTED] maybe 2010. Can  
15:20:32 30 I refer to my statement?  
15:20:33 31  
15:20:33 32 Certainly?---Just because it was during a period where I  
15:20:36 33 was a uniform Sergeant. It would have been 2009, 2010,  
15:20:46 34 about there.  
15:20:46 35  
15:20:46 36 Do you know when you did [REDACTED] ---My understanding  
15:20:50 37 is [REDACTED] an [REDACTED] course and [REDACTED] maybe - - -  
15:20:56 38  
15:20:56 39 Some time after the Internet was invented and around the  
15:21:00 40 Victoria Police?---Yes. And [REDACTED] was an [REDACTED]  
15:21:07 41 course and that was, look it may be a couple of years  
15:21:10 42 before I did the [REDACTED]  
15:21:11 43  
15:21:12 44 The [REDACTED] you said you did in 2009 or 2010?---Yes, I  
15:21:16 45 think so, yes.  
15:21:17 46  
15:21:18 47 Was there any training in that course about human sources



15:21:21 1 that might have legal obligations of confidentiality or  
15:21:25 2 privilege at that stage?---Not that I recall.  
15:21:27 3  
15:21:28 4 Have you done any further training since then?---No.  
15:21:31 5  
15:21:32 6 Has there been - sorry, when did you, you've resigned from  
15:21:37 7 the police now?---I finished with the Police Force in 2016.  
15:21:41 8  
15:21:41 9 Up until that point in time was there any general training  
15:21:45 10 given to members of Victoria Police about human sources or  
15:21:50 11 unregistered informers that they might come into contact  
15:21:54 12 with, with legal obligations of confidentiality or  
15:21:58 13 privilege?---No, not that I know of.  
15:21:59 14  
15:22:00 15 I take you back to your time in the Drug Squad in  
15:22:03 16 97?---Yes.  
15:22:03 17  
15:22:03 18 That was, as you have said, your first posting as a  
15:22:07 19 Detective?---Yes.  
15:22:07 20  
15:22:07 21 Where was the Drug Squad physically located?---412 St Kilda  
15:22:12 22 Road.  
15:22:12 23  
15:22:12 24 Who was the Inspector there?---Chief Inspector was John  
15:22:19 25 McCoy and there were three inspectors.  
15:22:22 26  
15:22:22 27 Do you know who they were?---Um, I could probably recall  
15:22:28 28 one or two. I think there was a number that went through.  
15:22:33 29 Two I can remember Steve Fontana, he was an Inspector there  
15:22:38 30 at one stage and Greg Baud and there was a George Cooney as  
15:22:44 31 well.  
15:22:44 32  
15:22:44 33 Do you know who the Superintendent was there or - -  
15:22:47 34 -?---No, I don't because I would have, it was a stage I  
15:22:51 35 think when Chief Inspector, there was no longer that Chief  
15:22:56 36 Inspector rank, so that Chief Inspector being McCoy may  
15:23:00 37 have held that position as such where now there would be a  
15:23:05 38 Superintendent.  
15:23:05 39  
15:23:05 40 How was the Drug Squad structured, how many units were  
15:23:10 41 there?---There were three units, each unit had a Detective  
15:23:16 42 Senior Sergeant and then a number of crews made up of  
15:23:19 43 Sergeants and Senior Constables.  
15:23:19 44  
15:23:20 45 Do you know how many were in each crew?---Per crew,  
15:23:24 46 normally a Sergeant and three or four.  
15:23:26 47

1 So one Senior Sergeant, one Sergeant and three or four  
15:23:28 2 Senior Constables?---Sorry, one Senior Sergeant, maybe  
15:23:30 3 three or four Sergeants and each Sergeant would have three  
15:23:34 4 or four Senior Constables underneath them.  
15:23:37 5  
15:23:37 6 So reasonable sized crews?---Yes.  
15:23:39 7  
15:23:39 8 Who was the Senior Sergeant of your crew?---When I first  
15:23:42 9 started it was Mark Bowden.  
15:23:47 10  
15:23:47 11 And do you know who the Senior Sergeants were of the other  
15:23:52 12 crews?---Um, surname Barker was one of them, I don't know -  
15:23:58 13 I can't remember his first name, and - no, I don't know the  
15:24:06 14 third one.  
15:24:06 15  
15:24:06 16 Was Wayne Strawhorn one of the Senior Sergeants?---No, not  
15:24:09 17 when I started.  
15:24:10 18  
15:24:10 19 Did he come along as one of the Senior Sergeants?---He was  
15:24:13 20 there as a Sergeant of a crew when I started and he was  
15:24:18 21 promoted into Mark Bowden's position when Mark took vacancy  
15:24:24 22 elsewhere.  
15:24:24 23  
15:24:24 24 Do you know at what stage he was promoted into that  
15:24:27 25 position?---I don't exactly but if we take into account  
15:24:31 26 that I was only there for a short period of time, so it's  
15:24:34 27 somewhere, I would - I'd only be hazarding a guess to say  
15:24:40 28 mid 98 or something along those lines. I'd only be  
15:24:44 29 hazarding a guess.  
15:24:44 30  
15:24:45 31 Wayne Strawhorn before he was promoted Detective Sergeant,  
15:24:49 32 was he in your crew?---No, he was in my unit but not in my  
15:24:54 33 crew.  
15:24:54 34  
15:24:57 35 You were involved in an operation which went under the name  
15:25:00 36 of Operation Carron?---Correct.  
15:25:03 37  
15:25:03 38 In 1997?---Yes, yep.  
15:25:05 39  
15:25:05 40 That was, that targeted a syndicate trafficking heroin and  
15:25:11 41 perhaps cocaine interstate?---Definitely heroin, I don't  
15:25:15 42 recall the cocaine.  
15:25:16 43  
15:25:17 44 And it involved a number of interstate and national law  
15:25:22 45 enforcement agencies?---Yes.  
15:25:23 46  
15:25:27 47 In your notes in this case, have you seen some conversation

15:25:32 1 notes in relation to some conversations that you've had  
15:25:35 2 this year with members of Victoria Police?---Yes, yes, I  
15:25:39 3 have seen them, yes.  
15:25:40 4  
15:25:40 5 Perhaps if I could ask now, and I'll get you to identify  
15:25:44 6 those, VPL.0005.0035.0013. If they could be brought up.  
15:26:01 7 Sorry, that should have been redacted, the copy that I have  
15:26:06 8 has been more fully redacted than that. In any case you  
15:26:09 9 saw those flash up on the screen?---Briefly, it wasn't  
15:26:15 10 really in focus.  
15:26:16 11  
15:26:16 12 COMMISSIONER: Have you got a copy? You can have mine if  
15:26:19 13 you need it.  
15:26:22 14  
15:26:22 15 MS TITTENSOR: I think Mr Winneke will have a copy,  
15:26:23 16 Commissioner.  
15:26:23 17  
15:26:26 18 MR HOLT: If the live stream can be edited. It's not on  
15:26:29 19 the screen. Thank you, I'm grateful.  
15:26:39 20  
15:26:39 21 MS TITTENSOR: You've seen a copy of those notes, is that  
15:26:42 22 right?---I believe I was shown these yesterday, yes.  
15:26:49 23  
15:26:50 24 And you've had a chance before now to read through  
15:26:54 25 those?---Yes.  
15:26:55 26  
15:26:55 27 Is there anything - do you agree with the contents of those  
15:26:59 28 notes?---Yes.  
15:27:00 29  
15:27:02 30 It contains the effect of the conversation that you had  
15:27:04 31 with a Mr Walsh who rang you on 12 February and a meeting  
15:27:11 32 that you had on 5 March with Walsh and Patty?---Yes.  
15:27:17 33  
15:27:19 34 I'll tender those notes, Your Honour.  
15:27:21 35  
15:27:22 36  
15:27:23 37 #EXHIBIT RC65 - Notes.  
15:27:27 38  
15:27:28 39 COMMISSIONER: Do you want the hard copy tendered or are we  
15:27:31 40 going to have a redacted copy shortly?  
15:27:33 41  
15:27:33 42 MS TITTENSOR: There should be a redacted copy somewhere in  
15:27:36 43 the system. Perhaps there's an underscore R version of  
15:27:40 44 those notes in any case - - -  
15:27:42 45  
15:27:43 46 COMMISSIONER: In any case, RC65.  
15:27:46 47

15:27:46 1  
15:27:49 2  
15:27:54 3  
15:27:54 4  
15:28:12 5  
15:28:21 6  
15:28:29 7  
15:28:33 8  
15:28:33 9  
15:28:33 10  
15:28:36 11  
15:28:40 12  
15:28:44 13  
15:28:44 14  
15:28:49 15  
15:28:52 16  
15:28:56 17  
15:28:57 18  
15:28:57 19  
15:29:01 20  
15:29:07 21  
15:29:12 22  
15:29:16 23  
15:29:29 24  
25  
15:29:13 26  
27  
15:29:26 28  
15:29:26 29  
15:29:27 30  
15:29:27 31  
15:29:32 32  
15:29:37 33  
15:29:41 34  
15:29:45 35  
15:29:45 36  
15:29:48 37  
15:29:52 38  
15:29:53 39  
15:29:53 40  
15:29:57 41  
15:29:57 42  
15:30:00 43  
15:30:01 44  
15:30:06 45  
15:30:10 46  
15:30:12 47

MS TITTENSOR: Yes. Were you also, have you also been shown a copy of an Operation Carron final report?---No.

Perhaps I'll bring that up. That's VPL.0005.0007.0135. It should be a redacted copy or a dash R version of that if there is one. Yes. Is that something that looks familiar to you?---I don't know if it's my eyes, I have very little chance of being able to read anything.

I'm not suggesting you wrote it because if we scroll to the last page it will indicate that it's been written by Steven Martin?---Okay. I don't recall seeing that.

In any case I might just for the purposes of what I'm doing, and it might assist your recollection in any case as to that operation, in the notes that I've just provided to you?---Yes.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

15:30:18 1  
15:30:22 2  
15:30:24 3  
15:30:27 4  
15:30:34 5  
15:30:37 6  
15:30:41 7  
15:30:42 8  
15:30:43 9  
15:30:52 10  
15:30:57 11  
15:31:02 12  
15:31:02 13  
15:31:05 14  
15:31:09 15  
15:31:10 16  
15:31:11 17  
15:31:17 18  
15:31:21 19  
15:31:25 20  
15:31:32 21  
15:31:34 22  
15:31:35 23  
15:31:38 24  
15:31:39 25  
15:31:42 26  
15:31:46 27  
15:31:47 28  
15:31:47 29  
15:31:51 30  
15:31:53 31  
15:31:54 32  
15:32:00 33  
15:32:02 34  
15:32:02 35  
15:32:06 36  
15:32:16 37  
15:32:19 38  
15:32:19 39  
15:32:19 40  
15:32:21 41  
15:32:21 42  
15:32:23 43  
15:32:24 44  
15:32:27 45  
15:32:27 46  
15:32:29 47

[REDACTED]



15:34:36 1 In relation to these matters. Do you have any recollection  
15:34:39 2 about that?---No, I don't.  
15:34:40 3  
15:34:42 4 Do you know who was the informant in relation to  
15:34:46 5 Arnautovic?---No. No, I don't know his name.  
15:34:49 6  
15:34:49 7 Was there someone on your team or within the Drug Squad  
15:34:52 8 called Kelly Juric or Juhic?---I do know that name but he  
15:34:59 9 was definitely not on our unit.  
15:35:01 10  
15:35:02 11 Do you know if he was within the Drug Squad but in a  
15:35:04 12 different name?---Yeah, I wouldn't know him if he wasn't  
15:35:07 13 there, so he was definitely in the Drug Squad but  
15:35:10 14 definitely not on our unit.  
15:35:11 15  
15:35:11 16 Might there have been a number of cross-over operations  
15:35:14 17 between Drug Squads?---It's possible.  
15:35:16 18  
15:35:16 19 Between units I should say?---Yeah, it's possible.  
15:35:19 20 Absolutely.  
15:35:19 21  
15:35:20 22 Now the statement that you've provided to the Commission  
15:35:23 23 effectively contains a chronology of your dealings with  
15:35:26 24 Ms Gobbo; is that right?---That's correct.  
15:35:28 25  
15:35:29 26 In relation to most of those - sorry, I should say the  
15:35:35 27 chronology you've gotten by way of looking at your diary to  
15:35:39 28 see whenever you've had contact with her?---Yes.  
15:35:41 29  
15:35:43 30 In the notes that I've taken you to and that have been  
15:35:47 31 tendered already?---Yep.  
15:35:48 32  
15:35:48 33 You've given a more general recollection of your events at  
15:35:52 34 the time without the aid of your diary; is that  
15:35:54 35 right?---That's right.  
15:35:54 36  
15:35:55 37 So whilst in your statement you say, "I effectively don't  
15:36:00 38 remember that meeting on that particular day" and you say  
15:36:06 39 that in relation to most of the events?---Yes.  
15:36:08 40  
15:36:08 41 You do still have a general recollection of your  
15:36:11 42 relationship with Ms Gobbo throughout that period of  
15:36:13 43 time?---Yes, absolutely.  
15:36:14 44  
15:36:17 45 I've referred to your diary and I might just bring that up.  
15:36:23 46 VPL.0005.0007.0140-R, if there is - if we just scroll  
15:36:48 47 through so I'll get you to recognise your handwriting. Do

15:36:54 1 you recognise that to be your diary?---Yes.  
15:36:57 2  
15:37:01 3 I'll tender that, Your Honour, and effectively you've been  
15:37:04 4 through those records to help you make your statement; is  
15:37:08 5 that right?---That's correct.  
15:37:08 6  
15:37:09 7 Do you know who initially went through your diary looking  
15:37:12 8 for the various things, was that you or was that someone  
15:37:15 9 else?---No, that would have been - I'm going to forget the  
15:37:18 10 operation.  
15:37:18 11  
15:37:19 12 Landow?---Landow, that's it, yes.  
15:37:21 13  
15:37:21 14 So it was not you that decided what to redact?---No.  
15:37:28 15  
15:37:34 16 MS TITTENSOR: If I could quickly get the operator to also  
15:37:37 17 bring up VPL.0005.0020.0036 and just scroll up. We'll just  
15:37:56 18 scroll through that. I understand that at some later stage  
15:37:59 19 there were some extra parts of your diary that were  
15:38:02 20 discovered with relevant entries and provided to the  
15:38:05 21 Commission?---Okay.  
15:38:06 22  
15:38:06 23 Do you recognise that as your diary?---Yeah, that's  
15:38:09 24 correct.  
15:38:09 25  
15:38:10 26 I'll tender that. Perhaps it can be an A and a B under the  
15:38:13 27 same.  
15:38:14 28  
15:38:14 29 COMMISSIONER: Yes.  
15:38:15 30  
15:38:16 31 #EXHIBIT RC67A - Kruger diary notes.  
15:38:20 32  
15:38:21 33 #EXHIBIT RC67B - Kruger diary notes.  
15:38:24 34  
15:38:25 35 MS TITTENSOR: Can I ask in terms of your practice at the  
15:38:27 36 time, did you keep a day book?---I did.  
15:38:29 37  
15:38:30 38 Do you know what became of your day book?---No, I don't.  
15:38:33 39  
15:38:33 40 When you left the Drug Squad and you went off a regional  
15:38:36 41 CIU do you know what you did with it then?---I don't. I  
15:38:41 42 don't know where they are, no.  
15:38:42 43  
15:38:43 44 Is a day book something that you generally keep?---You  
15:38:47 45 would for a certain period of time but not something I'd  
15:38:50 46 keep forever because of the diary notes, especially around  
15:38:56 47 this period, would nearly be, apart from an odd number



15:39:00 1 written in the day book, these diary notes at this time  
15:39:08 2 would have nearly been exclusive to the duties performed  
15:39:10 3 during the day.  
15:39:11 4  
15:39:11 5 Your statement and your diary records the first contact you  
15:39:15 6 had with Ms Gobbo on 11 November 1997?---Yes.  
15:39:19 7  
15:39:19 8 Do you have any recollection of that?---No independent  
15:39:23 9 recollection, no.  
15:39:23 10  
15:39:24 11 Mr Paterson in his evidence to the Commission indicated  
15:39:29 12 that you first spoke to Ms Gobbo on the day of the arrests,  
15:39:34 13 which we understand to be 18 November 97. Do you have any  
15:39:38 14 idea where he might have come to that understanding?---No.  
15:39:40 15  
15:39:41 16 It might just be a mistake on his part?---Could be a  
15:39:44 17 mistake on my part, yeah.  
15:39:46 18  
15:39:47 19 Following that time, following your first contact in  
15:39:49 20 December 97, you had a number of contacts with Ms Gobbo  
15:39:53 21 that essentially related to serving bits and pieces of the  
15:39:56 22 brief on her?---That's correct.  
15:39:57 23  
15:39:57 24 And it was not all ready and packaged up at one time; is  
15:40:05 25 that right?---That's right.  
15:40:05 26  
15:40:05 27 So that necessitated you meeting her on a number of  
15:40:08 28 occasions?---Yes.  
15:40:09 29  
15:40:10 30 To deliver bits and pieces?---Yep.  
15:40:12 31  
15:40:12 32 Was it in her office or was it at other places?---I have  
15:40:16 33 one, and this is prior to obviously being shown my diary, I  
15:40:22 34 only ever had one recollection of attending her office.  
15:40:25 35 Now that would appear that's not the case according to my  
15:40:28 36 diary. The one recollection I had of attending her office  
15:40:35 37 was serving what I thought was the majority of the brief of  
15:40:38 38 evidence in some blue folders.  
15:40:39 39  
15:40:39 40 And she, what, complimented you on the putting together of  
15:40:43 41 the brief?---Unbeknownst to me apparently sometimes hand-up  
15:40:49 42 briefs of that size are served differently.  
15:40:51 43  
15:40:52 44 What is it that sticks out in your mind about that  
15:40:55 45 episode?---Just her comment that in the past she'd known  
15:41:02 46 them to be - sorry, briefs of evidence of that size,  
15:41:05 47 because it did contain a number of volumes, and they would

15:41:08 1 be served in like your A4 paper box as opposed to be bound,  
15:41:12 2 or being bound and quite clear to follow.  
15:41:14 3  
15:41:15 4 Mr Paterson's statement indicates that there was some  
15:41:19 5 dealings between Mr Strawhorn and Ms Gobbo at various  
15:41:26 6 times. Do you know what that was about?---No, no.  
15:41:28 7  
15:41:40 8 Over time, and consequent upon your meeting with Ms Gobbo,  
15:41:46 9 you built up quite a friendly rapport; is that right?---I  
15:41:50 10 did, yeah, a good rapport with Ms Gobbo.  
15:41:52 11  
15:41:53 12 Were you meeting or would you have a coffee when you met  
15:41:56 13 her or anything like that?---No, I can't recall ever having  
15:41:59 14 a coffee with her. Every time I met her it was either -  
15:42:03 15 well, just referring to this, it'd either be in relation to  
15:42:07 16 serving documents or would be chance meetings or there's a  
15:42:12 17 notation in here from my diary where there's a prearranged  
15:42:16 18 meeting with myself, someone else and her.  
15:42:18 19  
15:42:19 20 We get to a stage in about mid-1998?---Yep.  
15:42:24 21  
15:42:24 22 And your diary records a number of conversations by  
15:42:29 23 phone?---Yes.  
15:42:30 24  
15:42:30 25 In relation to arranging a meeting with her?---Yes.  
15:42:33 26  
15:42:34 27 That's on 14, 17 and 20 July?---Yep.  
15:42:37 28  
15:42:38 29 1998?---Yep.  
15:42:39 30  
15:42:40 31 Do you recall those conversations and making those  
15:42:44 32 arrangements with her?---No, I don't.  
15:42:46 33  
15:42:48 34 Given what occurred after that you must have been, you must  
15:42:53 35 have had some knowledge at the time about what she wanted  
15:42:55 36 to speak to you about?---Given what occurred after that -  
15:42:59 37 sorry, just so I'm - - -  
15:43:01 38  
15:43:01 39 The very next meeting on 21 July you meet with her with  
15:43:06 40 Mr Lim?---Chris Lim, yep.  
41  
15:43:06 42 For a particular purpose?---Yes.  
15:43:07 43  
15:43:07 44 You must have had some prior knowledge about what that was  
15:43:12 45 about?---Yes.  
15:43:12 46  
15:43:12 47 What's your recollection of what that prior knowledge

15:43:15 1 was?---Yep. So I've been obviously trying to think when  
15:43:17 2 this come up because it had to have come up prior, because  
15:43:20 3 then when you take into account the information report  
15:43:23 4 that's (indistinct) submitted.  
15:43:25 5  
15:43:25 6 Yes?---So it would have been at some stage that concerns  
15:43:28 7 were raised by her to me about what she believed was, maybe  
15:43:34 8 criminal practice within the organisation she worked for  
15:43:39 9 would be the best way to describe it.  
15:43:41 10  
15:43:41 11 Do you recall whether that conversation with her was had in  
15:43:44 12 person or was it over the phone?---I think that one was in  
15:43:48 13 person because it would have been a case of - it would have  
15:43:55 14 been a case of me advising that it's not my specialised  
15:44:00 15 area or, you know, along those lines, or "I will go back  
15:44:03 16 and seek advice before we go any further with this".  
15:44:06 17  
15:44:06 18 We have a note in your statement at paragraph 15?---Yes.  
15:44:08 19  
15:44:08 20 And your note in your diary refers to meeting her to serve  
15:44:13 21 further statements on 16 June 98?---Yes.  
15:44:15 22  
15:44:15 23 And then we get that series of phone calls on 14, 17 and 20  
15:44:20 24 July, so the following month, about a month later?---Yep.  
15:44:23 25  
15:44:25 26 Do you say that conversation you had with her would have  
15:44:30 27 been a month prior to those telephone conversations or  
15:44:32 28 would it have been a bit shorter than that?---No, it could  
15:44:36 29 have been, could have been that long, yeah.  
15:44:38 30  
15:44:39 31 So you would have known when she started calling you to  
15:44:42 32 have this meeting what it was going to be about?---I would  
15:44:44 33 think so, yes.  
15:44:45 34  
15:44:46 35 By that stage had you had some conversations with people  
15:44:49 36 back at the office about what to do?---I definitely would  
15:44:55 37 have, yeah.  
15:44:56 38  
15:44:57 39 Who would you have had those conversations with?---I  
15:45:01 40 distinctly remember having a conversation with Wayne  
15:45:03 41 Strawhorn about it.  
15:45:04 42  
15:45:04 43 Why was that?---I'm not sure whether he was in charge at  
15:45:07 44 that stage, and he would have been the most experienced  
15:45:10 45 detective that I knew there and I would have no doubt told  
15:45:16 46 him the information I had received and in order to seek  
15:45:20 47 advice, yeah, I would have - - -

15:45:22 1  
15:45:23 2 If he wasn't the person in charge, if it was still - - -  
15:45:26 3 ?---Mark Bowden.  
15:45:27 4  
15:45:27 5 - - - Mark Bowden, would you have spoken to both of them or  
15:45:31 6 just gone to Mark Bowden?---I'm not sure. I'm not sure  
15:45:34 7 that - if Mark Bowden wasn't there, whether I didn't speak  
15:45:38 8 to him but I can clearly recollect speaking to Wayne  
15:45:42 9 Strawhorn about it.  
15:45:42 10  
15:45:43 11 You recollect speaking to Wayne Strawhorn?---Yeah.  
15:45:46 12  
15:45:46 13 Did you speak to anyone else in the Drug Squad?---There  
15:45:48 14 would have been obviously leading, because of that meeting,  
15:45:51 15 someone was with me so that person at some stage would have  
15:45:56 16 been told about it, yeah.  
15:45:56 17  
15:45:57 18 So it wasn't - it didn't become a deep, dark secret in the  
15:46:02 19 Drug Squad that "this defence lawyer was wanting to provide  
15:46:06 20 us with some information"?---I can't comment on that  
15:46:11 21 because it definitely wasn't anything that was publicised,  
15:46:15 22 if that makes sense. It would have been a case of, "I've  
15:46:20 23 got information, what do I do with this information?" Go  
15:46:25 24 and tell someone superior to me and someone that's dealt  
15:46:28 25 with in this area before, what do we do from here?  
15:46:32 26  
15:46:32 27 This was prior to you actually having the meeting to assess  
15:46:35 28 her; is that right?---Yes, I think so.  
15:46:38 29  
15:46:38 30 The purpose of then having the meeting was to take someone  
15:46:41 31 with you so you could assess her to see if you should sign  
15:46:44 32 her up as a registered informer?---No. I'm assuming, I've  
15:46:52 33 not even remembered Chris Lim, any involvement at all until  
15:46:58 34 I read my diary, so - - -  
15:46:59 35  
15:47:00 36 Did you have any experience with informers before  
15:47:05 37 this?---No.  
15:47:05 38  
15:47:06 39 Was this your first experience with a potential  
15:47:08 40 informer?---I definitely had people give me information  
15:47:13 41 before, but one-off information that you had extracted as a  
15:47:19 42 result of investigation, so not someone that's volunteered  
15:47:27 43 information.  
15:47:27 44  
15:47:27 45 So you'd not registered anyone before?---No.  
15:47:30 46  
15:47:30 47 Do you know if Mr Lim had some experience with

15:47:34 1 informers?---I can't say, I don't know.  
15:47:37 2  
15:47:38 3 If he's indicated to members of Landow that he was more  
15:47:44 4 experienced, was one of the more experienced members at the  
15:47:48 5 Drug Squad in relation to the management of informers, you  
15:47:50 6 wouldn't dispute that?---Absolutely not.  
15:47:53 7  
15:47:53 8 Might that be why he was sent along with you?---That was my  
15:47:57 9 assumption as to someone, you know, with experience in that  
15:48:00 10 area, that they would come along to assess the value of  
15:48:03 11 that information.  
15:48:05 12  
15:48:05 13 Do you recall there being some surprise by yourself or by  
15:48:12 14 anyone else that there was this qualified lawyer wanting to  
15:48:17 15 provide the police with information?---No.  
15:48:19 16  
15:48:21 17 You don't recall any surprise about that?---No.  
15:48:23 18  
15:48:26 19 You apprehend now that you're the first person, after she  
15:48:31 20 was a qualified lawyer, at least that the Commission is  
15:48:37 21 aware of, you're the first policeman at least she went to  
15:48:42 22 to provide information?---Am I aware of that?  
15:48:46 23  
15:48:47 24 Yes?---Only from you saying it then.  
15:48:48 25  
15:48:54 26 You went along to the meeting with Ms Gobbo on 21 July 98;  
15:49:04 27 is that right?---Yes.  
15:49:04 28  
15:49:05 29 You met her, your diary indicates you met her in the  
15:49:11 30 CBD?---Yeah.  
15:49:12 31  
15:49:12 32 With Mr Lim?---Yes.  
15:49:14 33  
15:49:14 34 And it indicates "re Carron and others"?---Yes.  
15:49:18 35  
15:49:22 36 If you're meeting her re Carron, that indicates in relation  
15:49:29 37 - she wanted to speak to you in relation to that operation  
15:49:31 38 or people involved in that operation?---Yeah, or it could  
15:49:34 39 have been - yeah, there would have obviously been some  
15:49:39 40 discussion about the Carron brief I would imagine and the  
15:49:44 41 others, I would say, and again assuming through what the  
15:49:49 42 eventual IR was submitted out, the others would have  
15:49:53 43 referred to that information that she was giving about  
15:49:56 44 possible deceptions.  
15:49:57 45  
15:49:59 46 Does that in itself indicate that there is some conflict  
15:50:05 47 potentially involved in this relationship with Ms Gobbo,

15:50:08 1 that she's speaking to you on the one hand in relation to  
15:50:12 2 clients that are represented by her law firm?---Yep.  
15:50:15 3  
15:50:15 4 And then also the boss of her law firm essentially?---Yeah.  
15:50:21 5  
15:50:22 6 And that the information that she's providing to you about  
15:50:24 7 the boss of her law firm involves money laundering with one  
15:50:29 8 of the clients?---I didn't see an issue with it at the  
15:50:33 9 time.  
15:50:33 10  
15:50:35 11 Do you know if anyone else saw an issue with it at the  
15:50:37 12 time?---Not to my knowledge.  
15:50:38 13  
15:50:45 14 If we can put up the information report on the screen, it's  
15:50:49 15 VPL.0005.0022.0331. I might tender that, Commissioner,  
15:51:10 16 before I forget.  
15:51:12 17  
15:51:13 18 #EXHIBIT RC68 - Information report dated 21/07/98.  
15:51:22 19  
15:51:22 20 It looks slightly different in terms of the font that's  
15:51:26 21 used than the form we originally received it in before it's  
15:51:30 22 been redacted but I'm assured that it's the same  
15:51:34 23 content?---Yes.  
15:51:35 24  
15:51:36 25 There's a coding up the top of HDIR0176, right up the  
15:51:43 26 top?---Yep.  
15:51:43 27  
15:51:45 28 Is that a particular form or code that was used back in the  
15:51:50 29 Drug Squad?---Not that I remember. I can only - maybe IR  
15:51:56 30 refers to an information report and it's information report  
15:51:59 31 number 176, but I don't know what the HD refers to.  
15:52:03 32  
15:52:03 33 If we go down - sorry, further up. There's an address unit  
15:52:13 34 2, or the number 2 unit?---Yes.  
15:52:16 35  
15:52:17 36 That's the unit you were in?---Yes.  
15:52:18 37  
15:52:21 38 Underneath that there's a "source self-interest warning" -  
15:52:23 39 --Yes.  
15:52:24 40  
15:52:24 41 And it says "no"?---Yes.  
15:52:26 42  
15:52:26 43 What is that about?---No idea. Sorry, no, I probably  
15:52:30 44 didn't know what that meant at the time I'm guessing. But  
15:52:33 45 "source self-interest warning"?  
15:52:34 46  
15:52:35 47 Would that be something to do with being worried about

15:52:38 1 whether a potential source might have an interest in the  
15:52:43 2 outcome of what they're talking to you about?---It could be  
15:52:46 3 read that way but it could also - I'm just trying to think,  
15:52:50 4 source self-interest warning? Yeah, I'm not 100 per cent  
15:53:00 5 sure where that - - -  
15:53:01 6  
15:53:01 7 There's a source reliability and at that stage  
15:53:04 8 unknown?---Yes.  
15:53:04 9  
15:53:04 10 And then we go further down. There's an evaluation rating  
15:53:08 11 and it's got F3?---Yes.  
15:53:09 12  
15:53:09 13 Do you have any idea what that means?---Likely a scale as  
15:53:16 14 to known, along the lines of known to the source, but not  
15:53:24 15 corroborated or something like that, and had the source  
15:53:26 16 been used before and basically a very simple scale of how  
15:53:31 17 you rated the - how the information report was rated.  
15:53:36 18  
15:53:37 19 If we move further along this is a meeting with the  
15:53:40 20 unregistered informer re, and the blanked out bit was her  
15:53:44 21 employer's name, you can take that from me?---Yeah, yeah.  
15:53:48 22  
15:53:50 23 This is a document that you compiled yourself at the  
15:53:52 24 time?---Apparently so, yes.  
15:53:54 25  
15:53:56 26 And the information that she provided essentially related  
15:53:59 27 to her employer's suspected involvement in money laundering  
15:54:02 28 and she told you various areas of his dealings that ought  
15:54:06 29 to be looked into?---Yeah, I don't recall this information  
15:54:10 30 report, but I've read it, it's got my name on it, so I'm  
15:54:13 31 going to I must have done it and that's what it says in  
15:54:17 32 there, yeah.  
15:54:18 33  
15:54:18 34 Included in that information report there's at least one,  
15:54:21 35 maybe two references to Peter Reid under - if you look at  
15:54:25 36 number 1, it's property's put up as surety for Peter Reid  
15:54:32 37 who was arrested during Operation Carron?---Yes.  
15:54:35 38  
15:54:38 39 Under number 2, "the employer is believed to be funding or  
15:54:44 40 financing Reid's defence re Carron"?---Yes.  
41  
15:54:44 42 "As Reid is important to him"?---Yes.  
15:54:45 43  
15:54:46 44 Was there any comprehension at that stage that there might  
15:54:49 45 be some conflict in the evidence that she's  
15:54:53 46 providing?---Not by me, no.  
15:54:54 47

15:54:54 1 Was it raised by anyone else?---Not to my knowledge.  
15:54:56 2  
15:54:57 3 There's a bit of detail in this information report?---Yes.  
15:55:00 4  
15:55:01 5 You clearly didn't go back to the office and write it all  
15:55:04 6 by memory?---Yeah, it would have been - has it got the date  
15:55:08 7 that it's submitted?  
15:55:09 8  
15:55:11 9 Can't tell if it's submitted on the same date but do you  
15:55:15 10 recall - - - ?---See up the top there you've got 21 July  
15:55:19 11 98, that would be the submission date. Then you've got  
15:55:21 12 date information received. So this one would have  
15:55:23 13 been - - -  
15:55:23 14  
15:55:24 15 All by memory, would you have taken notes in your - - -  
15:55:27 16 ?---Quite possibly but it would be contemporaneous, yeah.  
15:55:30 17  
15:55:31 18 Whatever notes you took, we know they're not in your diary.  
15:55:37 19 Might you have taken them - - - ?---Or they could have been  
15:55:39 20 Chris Lim's, Chris Lim could have been taking notes and the  
15:55:40 21 IR was formed from that, I'm not sure.  
15:55:44 22  
15:55:44 23 Would you have audio recorded her?---No.  
15:55:46 24  
15:55:47 25 If we go further down, you've got some investigator  
15:55:52 26 comments at the bottom?---Yeah.  
15:55:55 27  
15:55:55 28 And you indicate, the first one there is further contact to  
15:55:59 29 be made with the informer by you?---Yeah.  
15:56:01 30  
15:56:01 31 And that you were to liaise with [REDACTED]  
15:56:06 32 [REDACTED] at the NCA?---Yes.  
15:56:09 33  
15:56:09 34 How did you know of the name [REDACTED]  
15:56:13 35 [REDACTED] ---I've got no idea. I don't remember who that is.  
15:56:17 36 I don't remember ever meeting someone by that name.  
15:56:20 37  
15:56:20 38 Is that potentially someone who you were referred to by  
15:56:23 39 Detective Strawhorn?---I don't know who that is and I don't  
15:56:26 40 know how I ever got that name.  
15:56:28 41  
15:56:29 42 That's not something - this is under a different heading of  
15:56:32 43 "investigator comment"; is that right?---Yeah, yeah.  
15:56:35 44  
15:56:36 45 The material above that is - - -?---Information.  
15:56:39 46  
15:56:39 47 Essentially the information that you were provided?---Yes.



15:56:40 1  
15:56:41 2 And this is something that you say, essentially what the  
15:56:43 3 next steps are?---Yes.  
15:56:44 4  
15:56:45 5 The first one was you'll make further contact with the  
15:56:47 6 informer?---Yep.  
15:56:48 7  
15:56:48 8 The next one is, "I'm going to go and liaise with the  
15:56:52 9 NCA"?---M'mm.  
15:56:53 10  
15:56:53 11 Do you recall if you did that?---No, I don't recall.  
15:56:56 12  
15:56:56 13 Do you recall if Ms Gobbo was handed over or introduced to  
15:57:02 14 anyone at the NCA?---No, I don't.  
15:57:05 15  
15:57:05 16 If she was, was it by you?---Not to my knowledge.  
15:57:08 17  
15:57:12 18 We've got a later information report authored by a  
15:57:18 19 Mr Pope?---Yes.  
15:57:19 20  
15:57:19 21 Our previous witness, who indicates that he was told by  
15:57:24 22 Detective Hynam at the NCA that an informer had been  
15:57:31 23 introduced to her by you and Mr Lim and he inferred that  
15:57:39 24 that informer was Ms Gobbo?---So I'll just repeat - I  
15:57:45 25 haven't seen that. I'll repeat that back to you. Hynam is  
15:57:49 26 saying that - - -  
15:57:50 27  
15:57:50 28 Hynam says that Kruger - if that can be struck- that Kruger  
15:57:57 29 and -  
30  
31 MR HOLT: I'm sorry, can I just ensure that that's being  
32 done? That comment was just, that's a name that needs to  
33 be struck from the record if the Commissioner please.  
34  
35 COMMISSIONER: The name.  
36  
15:58:15 37 MS TITTENSOR: It's slightly confusing, Mr Kruger. The IR  
15:58:20 38 suggests that Hynam from the NCA?---Yes.  
15:58:28 39  
15:58:28 40 Told Pope that Kruger - I've done it again.  
41  
42 COMMISSIONER: Strike that again, thanks.  
43  
15:58:36 44 MS TITTENSOR: Pardon me, sorry. That Kruger - - -  
45  
15:58:46 46 COMMISSIONER: Just wait until it's removed, yes. Hynam  
15:58:47 47 from the NCA- are we ready to go? Yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

15:58:49 MS TITTENSOR: Hynam from the NCA told Mr Pope that Kruger,  
15:58:50 yourself, and Lim had introduced an informer to Hynam and  
15:58:57 that that informer had essentially provided the same  
15:59:00 information as Mr Pope was getting and thus he inferred it  
15:59:05 was Ms Gobbo?---I don't recall ever - I was surprised the  
15:59:13 first time I saw Chris Lim involved, so that would surprise  
15:59:17 me even more if you're saying Chris Lim and myself  
15:59:20 introduced Gobbo to Hynam. I don't recall that ever  
15:59:23 happening.

15:59:23  
15:59:24 Might it have been - if anyone did the introduction to the  
15:59:27 NCA, might it have been Mr Strawhorn?---I don't recall any  
15:59:31 introduction to anybody else.

15:59:32 Do you recall there being interaction between Ms Gobbo and  
15:59:35 Mr Strawhorn following this period of time?---No.

15:59:38 Do you recall whether around this period of time you  
15:59:41 conducted any criminal history check on Ms Gobbo?---Some -  
15:59:44 I'm not saying I didn't, I may have. I may have. There's  
15:59:51 some reason I know or can recall, and whether it was  
15:59:55 volunteered by her or told to me by someone else, that she  
16:00:02 had a minor possession charge in the past.

16:00:05 The other person you hypothesise in your statement that you  
16:00:06 were told that information from was Mr Strawhorn?---Yeah.

16:00:11 Is that right?---Yeah.

16:00:14 Is it your recollection that you were having discussions  
16:00:15 about this topic of Ms Gobbo providing this information  
16:00:18 about her employer with Mr Strawhorn throughout this  
16:00:23 period?---Highly possible.

16:00:26 Is it your recollection you were having discussions with  
16:00:28 him?---I remember at least once talking to Wayne Strawhorn  
16:00:30 about it.

16:00:33 Your statement also indicates that you have a memory of  
16:00:35 there being some kind of issue between Mr Lim and  
16:00:38 Ms Gobbo?---Yes.

16:00:41 That one or both of them had reservations about the other  
16:00:43 one?---Yeah.

16:00:45 And is that impression that you have, was that formed at

16:00:56 1 this single meeting?---From my recollection, yes.  
16:00:58 2  
16:01:03 3 When your statement was taken were you filled in on the  
16:01:06 4 reservations that Mr Lim has expressed about  
16:01:09 5 Ms Gobbo?---No.  
16:01:10 6  
16:01:13 7 We're told that Mr Lim recalls having a number of concerns  
16:01:17 8 in relation to Ms Gobbo, the first - or one of them being  
16:01:21 9 that she was a solicitor, the fact that she was a  
16:01:24 10 solicitor. Do you recall that being raised?---No.  
16:01:27 11  
16:01:27 12 As an issue?---No.  
16:01:28 13  
16:01:28 14 At all?---No.  
16:01:29 15  
16:01:29 16 She wasn't registered following this; is that right?---No.  
16:01:33 17  
16:01:34 18 And the introduction that was ultimately made of her to the  
16:01:38 19 Asset Recovery Squad was not for quite a while after  
16:01:43 20 this?---Yeah, yeah, according to these, yes.  
16:01:46 21  
16:01:46 22 This was July, she wasn't introduced until May the  
16:01:50 23 following year?---Yep.  
16:01:51 24  
16:01:52 25 So a decision was made she oughtn't be registered at that  
16:01:55 26 stage; is that right?---She, sorry?  
16:01:57 27  
16:01:57 28 A decision was made at least that she shouldn't be  
16:01:59 29 registered?---I don't know whether it was - no, I can't say  
16:02:04 30 that's the case. It was probably more, be a case of a  
16:02:11 31 decision was made that this information is irrelevant to  
16:02:17 32 our scope of work. Yeah, I'm not sure about - I don't know  
16:02:25 33 how to answer that.  
16:02:26 34  
16:02:26 35 Was there any advice sought about the appropriateness of  
16:02:30 36 speaking and obtaining information from Ms Gobbo,  
16:02:35 37 especially in circumstances where it related to a client  
16:02:39 38 her firm was representing?---Not that I recall.  
16:02:41 39  
16:02:44 40 Mr Lim also recalls that she was too overt in her desire to  
16:02:49 41 provide information to the police. Do you recall having  
16:02:55 42 any - sorry, do you agree with that assessment?---I don't  
16:03:01 43 know how you would be too overt because the information,  
16:03:04 44 the only information I ever obtained from her related to  
16:03:08 45 those issues I would believe in that IR and I don't know  
16:03:12 46 how that's overt.  
16:03:13 47

16:03:13 1 Was she keen?---No, no.  
16:03:17 2  
16:03:17 3 Was she being pressured in any way to provide the  
16:03:21 4 information?---No.  
16:03:21 5  
16:03:21 6 She was doing it of her own accord?---Yes.  
16:03:24 7  
16:03:24 8 He also recalls that her relationships with some officers  
16:03:29 9 was inappropriate, do you agree with that statement?---I  
16:03:38 10 don't, no. No, I don't agree with it because I never saw  
16:03:43 11 that.  
16:03:43 12  
16:03:44 13 Was there any discussion about her relationships with any  
16:03:52 14 other police that you know about?---No.  
16:03:54 15  
16:03:55 16 Do you know of anyone - did you know of anyone over at the  
16:04:01 17 Embona Task Force that she knew in St Kilda?---No.  
16:04:03 18  
16:04:07 19 Did the Drug Squad members frequent the Emerald Hotel in  
16:04:11 20 South Melbourne, was that - - - ?---No, not to my  
16:04:15 21 knowledge.  
16:04:15 22  
16:04:15 23 Was there a particular place that they went to  
16:04:18 24 socialise?---There was only the one name of a place I can  
16:04:30 25 remember and that was called The Some Place Else Bar. I  
16:04:36 26 can't even tell you where it is. It's in the CBD  
16:04:39 27 somewhere. I know that because I'd been there two or three  
16:04:42 28 times with a group from work.  
16:04:43 29  
16:04:44 30 Detective Lim also recalls being aware, and he can't  
16:04:48 31 remember how he was aware, or came to the understanding,  
16:04:52 32 that Ms Gobbo had been in possession of drugs belonging to  
16:04:55 33 Mr Reid at around this time. Do you recall being aware of  
16:04:59 34 anything like that?---No.  
16:05:00 35  
16:05:08 36 You would agree that all of those things would weigh upon a  
16:05:11 37 decision about whether it's appropriate to receive  
16:05:14 38 information from a person?---In hindsight, yes.  
16:05:20 39  
16:05:45 40 Do you recall following that meeting with her and with  
16:05:51 41 Detective Lim having further contact with Ms Gobbo?---The  
16:05:59 42 only unassisted memory I have about it is I would have run  
16:06:07 43 into her, I recall at least once running into her in the  
16:06:10 44 court precinct, and once I saw her at a hotel, the same  
16:06:15 45 hotel I was at, and then I don't recall any other specific  
16:06:19 46 meetings or run-ins.  
16:06:21 47

16:06:22 1 Do you recall if she was involved in any other cases where  
16:06:26 2 other Drug Squad members were the informants?---No.  
16:06:29 3  
16:06:31 4 You don't say that she wasn't, you just say you don't have  
16:06:33 5 a memory of it?---I don't know. No, I don't know.  
16:06:37 6  
16:06:38 7 Were you the informant in any of her other cases to your  
16:06:44 8 memory?---No.  
16:06:44 9  
16:06:45 10 We understand there was some committal proceedings for at  
16:06:48 11 least four of those charged in September of 1998. Do you  
16:06:54 12 recall attending court for those proceedings?---No, I  
16:06:57 13 don't.  
16:06:57 14  
16:06:58 15 You recall there were meetings with the OPP, things of that  
16:07:02 16 nature?---According to my diary, that's correct.  
16:07:04 17  
16:07:05 18 You've just got no memory of any of that?---No, no.  
16:07:08 19  
16:07:12 20 We understand that Ms Gobbo, during that period of time in  
16:07:17 21 any case, would have been possibly away doing the reader's  
16:07:22 22 course to become a barrister, so leaving the solicitor life  
16:07:26 23 behind her and becoming a barrister. Do you recall her  
16:07:29 24 still being involved in these cases later on?---No, I  
16:07:36 25 don't, sorry.  
16:07:36 26  
16:07:38 27 Your diary indicates that you were having contact with her  
16:07:41 28 nevertheless regarding at least one of the cases following  
16:07:44 29 that time?---Yes.  
16:07:45 30  
16:07:49 31 I think you've referred to those in your statement; is that  
16:07:53 32 right?---Yep.  
16:07:53 33  
16:07:59 34 There's an entry in Mr Strawhorn's diary on 22 March 1999  
16:08:03 35 of him meeting Ms Gobbo, do you know what that was  
16:08:08 36 about?---Sorry, 22 March?  
16:08:10 37  
16:08:10 38 Yes?---No idea.  
16:08:15 39  
16:08:16 40 Do you say you've just got no memory of him having any  
16:08:19 41 cause to have any contact with Ms Gobbo during this period  
16:08:22 42 of time?---I'm saying if he had contact with Ms Gobbo that  
16:08:27 43 I don't recall that - and I knew about it, I don't recall  
16:08:31 44 that.  
16:08:31 45  
16:08:33 46 The Commission's heard evidence that on 27 April there was  
16:08:36 47 some contact made with Detective Pope at the Asset Recovery

16:08:43 1 Squad and that was the initial stages of the handing over  
16:08:46 2 of Ms Gobbo?---Yep.  
16:08:47 3  
16:08:48 4 Is it your evidence that you went straight to Pope because  
16:08:52 5 you knew of him through some previous dealings?---No.  
16:08:55 6  
16:08:57 7 There's some indication in the conversation you've had with  
16:08:59 8 the police that you knew Detective Pope through a Peter  
16:09:05 9 Doody?---Yes.  
16:09:06 10  
16:09:08 11 Was it just a fluke that you came across, that Detective  
16:09:11 12 Pope was the officer that was - - - ?---I don't even recall  
16:09:15 13 it was me that arranged that meeting with Asset Recovery,  
16:09:18 14 so - and I'd only ever met Jeff Pope once before at a  
16:09:24 15 social function, would have been years before I would have  
16:09:27 16 thought.  
16:09:27 17  
16:09:28 18 You go along to or you have a briefing with Pope and  
16:09:33 19 Segrave from the Asset Recovery Squad in relation to these  
16:09:37 20 allegations that Ms Gobbo makes?---Okay.  
16:09:40 21  
16:09:40 22 Do you understand that?---Yep, yep.  
16:09:41 23  
16:09:42 24 It's you and Mr Strawhorn that are present giving them the  
16:09:45 25 briefing?---Okay.  
16:09:46 26  
16:09:46 27 What's your recollection of how Mr Strawhorn came to be  
16:09:50 28 involved in this, handing her over?---No, I don't. I can  
16:09:54 29 only assume that maybe at that time Wayne was then the  
16:09:58 30 Senior Sergeant. I don't know why.  
16:10:02 31  
16:10:02 32 Do you recall what information you told them about?---No.  
16:10:06 33  
16:10:08 34 Would you have told them about the nature of Operation  
16:10:11 35 Carron and how you became involved?---Possible, but not  
16:10:20 36 probable. I would say it's more a case of it would have  
16:10:25 37 been a discussion about that IR.  
16:10:26 38  
16:10:26 39 And the IR related to allegations against her  
16:10:30 40 employer?---Yes.  
16:10:30 41  
16:10:30 42 But it also involved Mr Reid who'd been arrested during  
16:10:34 43 Operation Carron?---Yep.  
16:10:35 44  
16:10:35 45 And Mr Reid, who was being represented by the  
16:10:40 46 employer?---Yeah.  
16:10:40 47

16:10:40 1 And previously by her?---Yes.  
16:10:41 2  
16:10:42 3 And the allegation was essentially that Mr Reid was  
16:10:44 4 involved with the employer in the money laundering?---Yeah,  
16:10:49 5 you could take it that far but I don't think that's what  
16:10:51 6 the IR says. I think the IR talks more about the employer  
16:10:56 7 being involved in money laundering and using that client.  
16:10:59 8  
16:10:59 9 Because of his real estate, using the real estate agency  
16:11:03 10 and the property transactions to effect the money  
16:11:07 11 laundering?---Yep.  
16:11:08 12  
16:11:09 13 And that's similar conduct to what was being alleged in the  
16:11:12 14 course of the drug operation; is that right?---No. No, I  
16:11:16 15 don't think so.  
16:11:16 16  
16:11:16 17 You think it was different?---Yeah, I don't recall  
16:11:19 18 any - - -  
16:11:19 19  
16:11:19 20 Was his real estate agent business being used in the course  
16:11:24 21 of the drug operation?---Not that I ever recall, no.  
16:11:27 22  
16:11:35 23 There's some further contacts between you and Pope  
16:11:43 24 following the hand-over or prior to the actual hand-over or  
16:11:46 25 the introduction of Ms Gobbo. Do you recall any of  
16:11:49 26 those?---No, I don't.  
16:11:50 27  
16:11:58 28 Do you recall the actual introduction?---No.  
16:12:00 29  
16:12:05 30 It appears, putting together everyone's diaries, that  
16:12:10 31 you're all together, the five of you, yourself,  
16:12:14 32 Mr Strawhorn, Segrave, Pope and Ms Gobbo for at least a two  
16:12:18 33 hour period at the Emerald Hotel?---Okay.  
16:12:21 34  
16:12:21 35 You have no recollection of that at all?---I don't even  
16:12:24 36 know where the Emerald Hotel is.  
16:12:28 37  
16:12:28 38 In South Melbourne?---Where? Sorry, no, I don't have a  
16:12:33 39 recollect of that at all.  
16:12:34 40  
16:12:34 41 That would have been the first event of its kind for  
16:12:38 42 you?---Yeah.  
16:12:39 43  
16:12:39 44 Handing over a - - - ?---Yeah, it would have.  
16:12:42 45  
16:12:43 46 - - - an informer to the Asset Recovery Squad?---That's a  
47 fair point.

1  
16:12:46 2  
3  
16:12:47 4  
16:12:49 5  
16:12:49 6  
16:12:49 7  
16:12:51 8  
16:12:52 9  
16:12:55 10  
16:12:57 11  
16:13:00 12  
16:13:02 13  
16:13:10 14  
16:13:14 15  
16:13:18 16  
16:13:19 17  
16:13:22 18  
16:13:25 19  
16:13:29 20  
16:13:33 21  
16:13:34 22  
16:13:38 23  
16:13:43 24  
16:13:52 25  
16:13:56 26  
16:14:13 27  
16:14:14 28  
16:14:18 29  
16:14:22 30  
16:14:23 31  
16:14:26 32  
16:14:31 33  
16:14:37 34  
16:14:37 35  
16:14:40 36  
16:14:43 37  
16:14:44 38  
16:14:45 39  
16:14:49 40  
16:14:50 41  
16:14:51 42  
16:15:02 43  
16:15:07 44  
16:15:07 45  
16:15:07 46  
16:15:08 47

[REDACTED]

Were you the informant in about mid-2008 in a case of Madigan? Do you remember a case of Madigan?---First name?

I don't have it to hand but I understand that Ms Gobbo also appeared in that case, do you recall that at all?---At Mildura Magistrates' Court?

I think I might have remembered that. I think it might have been in the CBD when you were at the Drug Squad?---2008?

Sorry, not 2008. 1998, sorry?---No.

No?---No.

Nothing further. Thanks Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER: Mr Collinson?

MR COLLINSON: No questions.



16:15:09 1  
16:15:10 2 COMMISSIONER: Mr Holt?  
16:15:11 3  
16:15:11 4 MR HOLT: No questions, thank you, Commissioner.  
16:15:12 5  
16:15:13 6 COMMISSIONER: Mr Kruger can be excused?  
16:15:18 7  
16:15:18 8 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, Commissioner. Subject to the PII  
16:15:22 9 issues that were raised with the Commission this morning,  
16:15:26 10 there might be some need to recall this witness to clarify  
16:15:29 11 some aspects of those matters.  
16:15:31 12  
16:15:31 13 COMMISSIONER: At least for the time being, Mr Kruger,  
16:15:33 14 you're free to go?---Thank you Commissioner.  
16:15:36 15  
16:15:38 16 Have you got anything there that you shouldn't take with  
16:15:40 17 you? Is that all your material?---No, some of this I'll  
16:15:45 18 leave.  
16:15:46 19  
16:15:46 20 There may have been an exhibit tendered. Thank you.  
16:15:50 21  
16:15:50 22 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)  
23  
16:15:52 24 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Ms Tittensor. Yes Mr Holt.  
16:15:54 25  
16:15:57 26 MR HOLT: Commissioner, I'm instructed to make an  
16:15:58 27 application for non-publication of a particular piece of  
16:16:02 28 evidence that was given today. I wonder if we might do  
16:16:03 29 that in closed court? It's in the nature of - - -  
16:16:03 30  
16:16:03 31 COMMISSIONER: Before that happens I think there are  
16:16:05 32 documents to tender, aren't there?  
16:16:06 33  
16:16:07 34 MR WOODS: We're just tendering a few documents, that's  
16:16:10 35 correct, Commissioner. Mr John Blayney is no longer  
16:16:13 36 required, at least for this part of the hearing. We  
16:16:15 37 understand that he's going to provide - he has provided a  
16:16:18 38 statement which I'm going to tender and he's going to  
16:16:21 39 provide another one in relation to the later years. His  
16:16:23 40 statement, which I seek to tender, is VPL.0014.0010.0001.  
16:16:36 41  
16:16:36 42 COMMISSIONER: That will be RC69.  
16:16:40 43  
16:16:40 44 #EXHIBIT RC69 - Statement of John Blayney.  
16:16:43 45  
16:16:44 46 MR WOODS: Yes. Together with that is a document entitled  
16:16:46 47 Operation Progress Report. That's a document, the contents

16:16:48 1 of which were put to a few witnesses which contained that  
16:16:52 2 phrase "loose cannon", and that is VPL.0005.0007.0122.  
16:17:04 3  
16:17:05 4 #EXHIBIT RC70 - Progress Report re Operation Scorn.  
16:17:08 5  
16:17:08 6 COMMISSIONER: How would you explain Operation Progress  
16:17:11 7 Report?  
16:17:12 8  
16:17:13 9 MR WOODS: Operation Progress Report in relation to  
16:17:14 10 Operation Scorn I should say.  
16:17:15 11  
16:17:20 12 COMMISSIONER: Operation Progress Report re Operation  
16:17:21 13 Scorn, is that right or Progress Report re Operation Scorn>  
16:17:21 14  
16:17:22 15 MR WOODS: That's correct.  
16:17:22 16  
16:17:23 17 COMMISSIONER: Progress report re Operation Scorn.  
16:17:26 18  
16:17:26 19 MR WOODS: The next is Operation Landow notes regarding  
16:17:31 20 contact with Mr Blayney, and that's similar to the other  
16:17:35 21 documents the Commission's seen in relation to the other  
16:17:37 22 witnesses. That's VPL.0005.0031.0004.  
16:17:49 23  
16:17:49 24 COMMISSIONER: Describe that document again?  
16:17:51 25  
16:17:52 26 MR WOODS: Operation Landow notes regarding contact with  
16:17:54 27 Mr Blayney.  
16:17:57 28  
16:17:57 29 #EXHIBIT RC71 - Operation Landow notes re Blayney.  
16:18:05 30  
16:18:06 31 MR WOODS: Lastly, in relation to - there's two other  
16:18:07 32 things to tender but lastly in relation to Mr Blayney.  
16:18:08 33 We've asked for his diary and day books in relation to this  
16:18:11 34 period. We're told there's no relevant entries in relation  
16:18:15 35 to this period but there might be in relation to the later  
16:18:17 36 period, so we'll find out about those down the track. The  
16:18:21 37 last two documents are statement of Kiera Olney, again  
16:18:27 38 another witness not required to appear, which is  
16:18:34 39 VPL.0014.0001.0001.  
16:18:40 40  
16:18:40 41 #EXHIBIT RC72 - Statement of Kiera Olney.  
16:18:45 42  
16:18:45 43 MR WOODS: Finally, the statement of Mark Woolfe. That is  
16:18:52 44 VPL.0014.0003.  
16:19:02 45  
16:19:06 46 #EXHIBIT RC73 - Statement of Mark Woolfe.  
16:19:09 47

16:19:10 1  
16:19:15 2  
16:19:16 3  
16:19:16 4  
16:19:22 5  
16:19:25 6  
16:19:26 7  
16:19:28 8  
16:19:31 9  
16:19:33 10  
16:19:34 11  
16:19:37 12  
16:19:41 13  
16:19:41 14  
16:19:44 15  
16:19:45 16  
16:19:45 17  
16:19:47 18  
16:19:49 19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

MR WOODS: The last number was .0001.

COMMISSIONER: Thanks, Mr Woods. So you're asking the court be closed for a submission as to a non-publication order of part of the last witness's evidence.

MR HOLT: No, the previous witness's evidence, Mr Pope. It shouldn't take long, Commissioner. Because of what I need to say it should be done without the live stream on.

COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right. Live stream will stop. Is there anyone in the courtroom who should be excluded?

MR HOLT: There is no one in the courtroom who should be excluded.

COMMISSIONER: The hearing room is closed for the purposes of this submission.

(IN CAMERA HEARING FOLLOWS)

1  
16:19:56 2  
16:19:56 3  
16:19:59 4  
16:19:59 5  
16:20:00 6  
16:20:01 7  
16:20:06 8  
16:20:15 9  
16:20:23 10  
16:20:25 11  
16:20:26 12  
16:20:28 13  
16:20:29 14  
16:20:29 15  
16:20:32 16  
16:20:36 17  
16:20:44 18  
16:20:48 19  
16:20:48 20  
16:20:52 21  
16:20:56 22  
16:20:58 23  
16:21:00 24  
16:21:02 25  
16:21:06 26  
16:21:11 27  
16:21:17 28  
16:21:52 29  
16:21:52 30  
16:21:54 31  
16:21:56 32  
16:21:56 33  
34  
16:22:04 35  
16:22:05 36  
16:22:09 37  
16:22:13 38  
16:22:18 39  
16:22:21 40  
16:22:26 41  
16:22:26 42  
16:22:28 43  
16:22:32 44  
16:22:36 45  
16:22:39 46  
16:22:42 47



16:22:42 1  
16:22:43 2  
16:22:43 3  
16:22:44 4  
16:22:46 5  
16:22:49 6  
16:22:55 7  
16:22:56 8  
16:22:59 9  
16:23:00 10  
16:23:02 11  
16:23:05 12  
16:23:09 13  
16:23:09 14  
16:23:11 15  
16:23:14 16  
16:23:17 17  
16:23:19 18  
16:23:22 19  
16:23:25 20  
16:23:29 21  
16:23:35 22  
16:23:38 23  
16:23:40 24  
16:23:42 25  
16:23:45 26  
16:23:45 27  
16:23:45 28  
16:23:47 29  
16:23:48 30  
16:23:50 31  
16:23:53 32  
16:24:03 33  
16:24:07 34  
16:24:13 35  
16:24:18 36  
16:24:22 37  
16:24:22 38  
16:24:24 39  
16:24:25 40  
16:24:26 41  
16:24:26 42  
16:24:31 43  
16:24:37 44  
16:24:41 45  
16:24:44 46  
16:24:45 47



16:24:45 1  
16:24:46 2  
16:24:49 3  
16:24:52 4  
16:24:53 5  
16:24:53 6  
16:24:54 7  
16:24:54 8  
16:24:58 9  
16:25:06 10  
16:25:11 11  
16:25:13 12  
16:25:14 13  
16:25:17 14  
16:25:19 15  
16:25:19 16  
16:25:21 17  
16:25:21 18  
16:25:23 19  
16:25:28 20  
16:25:31 21  
16:25:33 22  
16:25:33 23  
16:25:38 24  
16:25:38 25  
16:25:39 26  
16:25:41 27  
16:25:42 28  
16:25:44 29  
16:25:48 30  
31  
32  
33  
16:25:49 34  
16:25:51 35  
16:25:53 36  
16:25:53 37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47



16:25:54 1  
16:25:54 2  
16:26:01 3  
16:26:05 4  
16:26:10 5  
16:26:13 6  
16:26:18 7  
16:26:22 8  
16:26:23 9  
16:26:26 10  
16:26:28 11  
16:26:30 12  
16:26:33 13  
16:26:35 14  
16:26:35 15  
16:26:36 16  
16:26:36 17  
16:26:41 18  
16:26:45 19  
16:26:50 20  
16:26:50 21  
22  
23  
24  
16:26:51 25  
16:27:35 26  
16:27:45 27  
16:27:46 28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

UPON RESUMING IN OPEN COURT:

COMMISSIONER: This part can be streamed. Is that too late to get what Mr Winneke has said or should he repeat it? Repeat it. Mr Winneke, if you wouldn't mind a bit of action replay there in repeating what you've just said. I think I asked you if that was the end of the evidence to be - - -

MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, that's the end of the evidence concerning the period from 97 through to 2000. There won't be any further evidence at this stage for the next couple of weeks.

COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR WINNEKE: But when we have arranged for the next hearings, and as soon as that's done, there'll be notices put up on the Commission's website.

COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.

MR WINNEKE: If it please the Commission.

COMMISSIONER: All right. Adjourn the Commission hearings to a date to be fixed.

ADJOURNED TO A DATE TO BE FIXED