

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:30:32 1 COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Tittensor.
15:30:38 2
15:30:39 3 MS TITTENSOR: Thanks, Commissioner. Mr Buick, at
15:30:41 4 paragraph 10 of your statement you refer to the murder of
15:30:50 5 [REDACTED]; is that right?---Yes.
6
15:30:52 7 And on [REDACTED] 2003 he was murdered outside of his home
15:30:56 8 in [REDACTED]?---That's right.
9
15:30:58 10 And [REDACTED] were arrested the same day?---Yes.
11
15:31:01 12 They later came to be known as [REDACTED] and
15:31:05 13 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
14
15:31:06 15 And they'd been captured on [REDACTED] committing the
15:31:10 16 murder?---That's right.
17
15:31:11 18 And you were in fact [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] when
15:31:14 19 that occurred?---That's right.
20
15:31:15 21 And is it the case that there was some build up to that and
15:31:20 22 it was known that something was going to happen and that's
15:31:23 23 why they were being [REDACTED] and you were in the room
15:31:28 24 [REDACTED] it at the time because there was some
15:31:31 25 knowledge that something was about to occur?---That's
15:31:33 26 right.
27
15:31:35 28 You were involved in the arrest of [REDACTED]?---Not the
15:31:39 29 arrest of. I believe they were arrested by [REDACTED] but I
15:31:44 30 came to be nominated as the member who would interview and
15:31:48 31 charge him.
32
15:31:50 33 You were appointed the informant for [REDACTED]?---Yes.
34
15:31:54 35 And he indicated reasonably quickly that he might have some
15:32:00 36 information of value?---Yes.
37
15:32:08 38 Detective Bateson was the informant for [REDACTED]?---Yes.
39
15:32:13 40 Was there any lead investigator overall for that murder or
15:32:19 41 - - - ?---Yes, Stuart Bateson.
42
15:32:21 43 So he sat over the top of the whole thing?---Yes.
44
15:32:24 45 But also took on the role of informant for [REDACTED] and
15:32:26 46 you had the role of informant for [REDACTED]?---Yes.
47

.29/10/19

8507

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:32:31 1 Did that change at any stage, were you taken off as
15:32:37 2 informant or did you remain informant?---No, I remained
15:32:42 3 informant but my active involvement dropped away along the
15:32:49 4 way.
5

15:32:52 6 On [REDACTED] 2003 Ms Gobbo made a professional visit to
15:33:01 7 [REDACTED], and if we can have a look at Ms Gobbo's court
15:33:10 8 book for that day, MIN.0001.0014.0940 at 1002 on the
15:33:23 9 left-hand side of the page. Just have a look at the
15:33:48 10 left-hand side of the page. You see that, that's the date
15:33:58 11 of [REDACTED] 2003, that's the day after the murder; is
15:34:05 12 that right?---Yes.
13

15:34:07 14 You'll see [REDACTED]'s name at the top there and a
15:34:12 15 conference occurring in the Melbourne [REDACTED]
15:34:16 16 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
17

15:34:17 18 Some various references there to Stuart Bateson, Homicide,
15:34:23 19 \$500, a mobile and some keys and so forth, some various
15:34:29 20 people, including his [REDACTED]?---Yes.
21

15:34:33 22 A reference to spare keys there and various other matters
15:34:40 23 down the list?---Yes.
24

15:34:42 25 Do you see that?---Yes.
26

15:34:47 27 It seems apparent that she took instructions from [REDACTED]
15:34:51 28 on that day?---Yes.
29

15:34:55 30 Purana were keeping track of who was representing who; is
15:35:01 31 that right?---Well, as an informant you would certainly be
15:35:07 32 aware of who was representing the people you were or had
15:35:12 33 charged.
34

15:35:13 35 Who was going on into the [REDACTED], who was on
15:35:16 36 telephone lists and that sort of matter?---I guess so.
37

15:35:21 38 Are you aware that later in [REDACTED] of 2006 that [REDACTED]
15:35:30 39 made a statement and effectively became [REDACTED] at that
15:35:35 40 point?---I'm not certain of the date but I don't dispute
15:35:37 41 that.
42

15:35:38 43 You're aware that at a point in time he made a statement
15:35:42 44 and became [REDACTED]?---Yes.
45

15:35:50 46 Did you become aware that when he made his statement he
15:35:53 47 alleged in his statement that Ms Gobbo had been involved in

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:35:56 1 providing a message to - involved in sort of passing on a
15:36:04 2 message to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]s from him about
15:36:08 3 [REDACTED] to his [REDACTED]?---I don't recall that. Is that
15:36:11 4 in his statement?
5

15:36:12 6 Yes, if I could perhaps bring up the - - - ?---I don't
15:36:15 7 dispute it so - - -
8

15:36:17 9 - - - the statement. It's VPL.0100.0001.4784. It's at
15:36:27 10 p.79, paragraphs 68 and 69 of that statement. This is
15:36:46 11 paragraphs 68 and 69 of [REDACTED] statement which we
15:36:50 12 understand was signed on [REDACTED] 2006. It reads, "While I
15:36:59 13 was at the [REDACTED] I was visited by my barrister
15:37:02 14 Nicola Gobbo. I asked her to pass on a message to [REDACTED] and
15:37:06 15 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] together and mentioned my
15:37:10 16 [REDACTED]. This action was referring to [REDACTED]
15:37:13 17 from [REDACTED] to go to [REDACTED] so [REDACTED] could be taken care of.
15:37:16 18 Nicola wrote a note and put it to the screen. Although I
15:37:20 19 don't remember the exact wording it said words to the
15:37:23 20 effect that she would be seeing them later that day. A
15:37:26 21 couple of days later I spoke to [REDACTED]. He was
15:37:29 22 actually at [REDACTED] address. During this call either [REDACTED]
15:37:32 23 [REDACTED] or him told me that he'd given [REDACTED] some [REDACTED]. I later
15:37:33 24 discovered that it was only [REDACTED]. I've not received any
15:37:38 25 more of the money promised". So it seems he's indicating
15:37:41 26 that Ms Gobbo is involving herself in passing messages so
15:37:46 27 that the murder money might be passed on to [REDACTED]
15:37:50 28 [REDACTED] pretty clear from that?---The murder money did you
15:37:55 29 say?
30

15:37:55 31 Yes. Or that money should be paid by [REDACTED] and
15:38:00 32 [REDACTED] to his [REDACTED] to take care of [REDACTED] presumably
15:38:06 33 whilst he's in custody?---Yes.
34

15:38:11 35 That would indicate that Ms Gobbo is possibly involved in
15:38:16 36 some criminal activity?---I don't see that from reading
15:38:25 37 those two paragraphs necessarily.
38

15:38:28 39 You would have some concern, would you not, reading that in
15:38:33 40 [REDACTED] statement that she had been involved in passing
15:38:36 41 a message to other underworld figures that money should be
15:38:42 42 paid, this is a man who's just been taken into custody for
15:38:45 43 murder, he wants a message passed by Ms Gobbo to [REDACTED]
15:38:49 44 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to pay [REDACTED] some
15:38:53 45 money?---Sorry, is the question am I concerned about that?
46

15:38:57 47 If you had have known that you would be concerned that she

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:39:00 1 might be involved in criminal activity?---Oh, no. I
15:39:04 2 wouldn't necessarily view it as criminal activity. It
15:39:08 3 doesn't surprise me that people in custody pass messages on
15:39:15 4 to family and friends through their lawyer.
5
15:39:22 6 You'd be pretty concerned if a barrister was passing money
15:39:25 7 on to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to pay money
15:39:32 8 to - - -?---Passing money on did you say?
9
15:39:37 10 Sorry, passing a message to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
15:39:39 11 to pay money to the person in custody's [REDACTED] who's just
15:39:44 12 been arrested for murder?---If the money to be paid to
15:39:53 13 [REDACTED] is a payment for the murder he carried
15:39:59 14 out and Ms Gobbo was aware of that, then yes.
15
15:40:04 16 This at least raises the question of that, doesn't it?---It
15:40:07 17 may well.
18
15:40:13 19 It's apparent from Corrections' logs that Ms Gobbo goes
15:40:17 20 back and visits [REDACTED] a second time on [REDACTED] November,
15:40:21 21 again something Purana would likely have been aware
15:40:25 22 of?---Probably.
23
15:40:30 24 Then it appears around the same time she's involving
15:40:33 25 herself with the representation of [REDACTED]. Were you
15:40:38 26 aware of that at the time?---Not specifically. I don't
15:40:43 27 dispute that.
28
15:40:44 29 If we can go to her court book, the same we've previously
15:40:50 30 been on but for [REDACTED] November, which is at p.1008 on the
15:40:54 31 left-hand side of the page. I'll tender that initial court
15:41:03 32 book extract, Commissioner. It will need some edits.
33
15:41:08 34 COMMISSIONER: I think it's already been tendered I'm told.
15:41:12 35
15:41:12 36 MS TITTENSOR: It has.
37
15:41:13 38 COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 240.
15:41:14 39
15:41:15 40 MS TITTENSOR: I'm not sure that those two paragraphs from
15:41:17 41 that statement have yet been tendered so I'll tender those.
42
15:41:21 43 COMMISSIONER: Just those two paragraphs?
15:41:24 44
15:41:24 45 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, Commissioner.
46
15:41:26 47 COMMISSIONER: All right. That's the statement of [REDACTED]

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:41:33 1 [REDACTED] and the date?
15:41:35 2
15:41:35 3 MS TITTENSOR: [REDACTED] 2006.
15:41:38 4
15:42:00 5 COMMISSIONER: Does anything need to be redacted from that?
15:42:03 6
15:42:03 7 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Perhaps if it can be checked,
15:42:06 8 Commissioner.
9
15:42:07 10 COMMISSIONER: Let's check now, it's only two paragraphs.
15:42:15 11
15:42:16 12 MS TITTENSOR: It doesn't appear to need any edits,
15:42:19 13 Commissioner.
15:42:22 14
15:42:40 15 COMMISSIONER: It looks okay. Ms Argiropoulos?
15:42:41 16
15:42:42 17 MS ARGIROPOULOS: It looks okay. On a quick look at it it
18 just occurs that it's obviously a statement from a person
19 who we're otherwise not revealing publicly.
20
15:42:48 21 COMMISSIONER: I'll do an A and a B.
15:42:50 22
15:42:50 23 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Thank you, Commissioner.
15:42:52 24
15:42:52 25 #EXHIBIT RC637A - (Confidential) Paragraphs 68 and 69 from
15:42:30 26 the statement of [REDACTED] dated
15:42:40 27 [REDACTED] 06.
15:42:54 28
15:43:09 29 #EXHIBIT RC637B - (Redacted version.)
15:43:12 30
15:43:12 31 MS TITTENSOR: Just the left-hand side of the page, please.
15:43:28 32 Again, you'll see this is a page from Ms Gobbo's court book
15:43:34 33 dated [REDACTED] 2003?---Yes.
34
15:43:37 35 It has [REDACTED] name up the top?---Yes.
36
15:43:40 37 It has the details of [REDACTED]?---Yes.
38
15:43:43 39 Underneath that. Again, it appears to have what seems to
15:43:49 40 be some instructions from him, do you see that?---Yes.
41
15:43:55 42 It refers to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]?---Yes.
43
15:43:59 44 Further down. It refers to [REDACTED] also being
15:44:06 45 arrested?---Yes.
46
15:44:09 47 You became aware that she was representing [REDACTED] at

.29/10/19

8511

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:44:15 1 least by ██████████ 2003; is that right?---Yes, I have a
15:44:21 2 record of that.
3
15:44:22 4 So if you weren't aware at this stage that she'd visited
15:44:25 5 him in custody, you were certainly aware that she was
15:44:28 6 representing him as at ██████████?---Yes.
7
15:44:34 8 And that was because an application was being made in the
15:44:37 9 Magistrates' Court to interview ██████████ for the murders
15:44:41 10 that we've spoken about of ██████████ and ██████████ at ██████████
15:44:46 11 ██████████ --That's right.
12
15:44:56 13 If we go to page - I'll tender that extract if it hasn't
15:45:02 14 been tendered already.
15
15:45:03 16 COMMISSIONER: I don't think that specifically.
15:45:13 17
15:45:14 18 MR NATHWANI: Commissioner, I think a bundle was.
19
15:45:16 20 COMMISSIONER: We've been tendering individual extracts.
15:45:19 21
15:45:19 22 MR NATHWANI: I think we tendered a bundle, and I'll go and
15:45:23 23 check, of about six or seven relating to ██████████. I
15:45:30 24 think when Bateson was cross-examined the first time, so
15:45:30 25 I'll go back and check that. They have been redacted. And
15:45:32 26 of course the fact they're yellow goes to the issue of
15:45:36 27 privilege, which I know I've said before, isn't for
15:45:39 28 Ms Gobbo to waive but certainly for the people referred to.
29
15:45:43 30 COMMISSIONER: Yes. I'm told that's Exhibit 273, is the
15:45:51 31 diary and court books, unredacted and redacted, A and B.
15:45:58 32 But what has been done on a number of occasions is that
15:46:02 33 individual entries have been separately tendered and I
15:46:04 34 think that's what you were seeking to do, Ms Tittensor?
15:46:08 35
15:46:08 36 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, so that we can easily identify them.
37
15:46:11 38 COMMISSIONER: Yes, more easily identify the important ones
15:46:13 39 that are of significance and get them publicly available as
15:46:16 40 soon as possible.
15:46:17 41
15:46:18 42 #EXHIBIT RC638A - (Confidential) Court book entry of
15:46:24 43 ██████████ 03.
15:46:28 44
15:46:30 45 #EXHIBIT RC638B - (Redacted version.)
15:46:33 46
15:46:34 47 MS TITTENSOR: There was permission granted by the court

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:46:36 1 that day to interview [REDACTED]; is that right?---Yes.
2
15:46:39 3 And whilst it wasn't during the formal interview process
15:46:46 4 when he was in custody [REDACTED] provided some information
15:46:49 5 in relation to the involvement of [REDACTED]; and [REDACTED]
15:46:51 6 [REDACTED] in the murders of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]; is that
15:46:55 7 right?---Yes.
8
15:46:56 9 He also provided information in relation to others involved
15:46:59 10 in organised crime, including Tony Mokbel?---I don't recall
15:47:04 11 that but I don't dispute that.
12
15:47:05 13 If that's something that Mr Bateson has said in his
15:47:08 14 statement. You wouldn't dispute it?---No.
15
15:47:15 16 Ms Gobbo was known to represent and associate with all of
15:47:18 17 those people?---Yes.
18
15:47:28 19 The following day at 10 am, [REDACTED] at 10 am, there was
15:47:35 20 a meeting that took place at Purana and if we could bring
15:47:39 21 up Exhibit RC312, please. These are the notes of Gavan
15:47:52 22 Ryan. I don't know if you're familiar with his
15:47:55 23 handwriting?---Not really.
24
15:48:00 25 You'll see halfway down the page there's a Friday [REDACTED]
15:48:05 26 [REDACTED] 2003?---Yes.
27
15:48:08 28 And he's on duty at 10 am re a Purana meeting?---Yes.
29
15:48:13 30 And it lists various people present at the meeting
15:48:16 31 including Allan Swindells, Ryan, Robertson, Trichias,
15:48:25 32 there's a shaded part and we know that person by the name
15:48:28 33 of Pearce?---Right.
34
15:48:31 35 There's Yvonne. Do you know who Yvonne was?---Yes.
36
15:48:36 37 Who was that?---Yvonne was either on the drug crew or the
15:48:39 38 assets crew on the other side of the floor.
39
15:48:42 40 There was someone who, whose name was Nichols?---Yes.
41
15:48:46 42 Is that a detective or analyst?---Analyst.
43
15:48:50 44 And Wilson?---Wilson was a Detective Sergeant from the
15:48:53 45 assets crew on the other side of the floor.
46
15:48:56 47 And then yourself as well?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
15:48:59 2 Is this a meeting - sorry, I might take you through a bit
15:49:06 3 more. There's a Task Force Purana crew list which we've
15:49:12 4 been provided, which I might just quickly show you.
15:49:17 5 VPL.0100.0045.0001, p.1. If we can just scroll briefly.
15:49:37 6 This seems to be a document which indicates the crew lists
15:49:42 7 at particular times, who's to say at what period during
15:49:47 8 2003 it was constructed, but do you see that?---Yes.
9
15:49:52 10 It indicates - sorry, if we can go back to 2003 - that
15:49:59 11 there was a tactical crew, a crew investigating Mallia, a
15:50:03 12 crew investigating Radev, one investigating is it
15:50:08 13 Thompson?---Willie Thompson.
14
15:50:10 15 One investigating Kallipolitis and then there's some
15:50:15 16 additional staff down the bottom?---Yes.
17
15:50:19 18 The Detective Sergeant of your crew seems to be Gerry
15:50:26 19 Clanchy?---Yes.
20
15:50:26 21 Was that the case from the beginning of the year, do you
15:50:29 22 recall now?---I don't dispute that, that may well have
15:50:31 23 been. I thought at the point in time Gerry went back to
15:50:35 24 Homicide but I'm not sure when.
25
15:50:37 26 We're not 100 percent sure at what stage during 2003 this
15:50:42 27 was the situation that existed. It doesn't seem yet that -
15:50:46 28 I don't think I see Detective Bateson's name in there yet.
15:50:57 29 If we scroll through that we see, we come to the 2004 list
15:51:03 30 and there seems to be some changes here and there?---Yes.
31
15:51:09 32 By 2004 it's got you as Detective Acting Sergeant?---Yes.
33
15:51:12 34 Of your crew. And then you see underneath that in relation
15:51:16 35 to the Moran/Barbaro/Marshall murders it's got Detective
15:51:21 36 Sergeant Bateson in charge of that one?---Yes.
37
15:51:26 38 I think that that continues through to 2009, perhaps I
15:51:31 39 won't take you right through that but I'll tender that
15:51:34 40 document, Commissioner.
15:51:36 41
15:51:37 42 #EXHIBIT RC639A - (Confidential) VPL.0100.0045.0001.
43
44 #EXHIBIT RC639B - (Redacted version.)
45
15:51:47 46 If we can go back to the Ryan notes, Exhibit 312 please.
15:51:55 47

.29/10/19

8514

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:51:56 1 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Sorry, Commissioner, Exhibit 639 will be
15:52:01 2 need an A and B, there's at least one that has a pseudonym.
3
15:52:05 4 COMMISSIONER: A and B, sure.
15:52:10 5
15:52:11 6 MS TITTENSOR: And if we can scroll through to the second
15:52:13 7 page. You'll see here what appears to be discussed at this
15:52:17 8 meeting. It says, "Tactical. Four LDs to be inserted.
15:52:27 9 Veniamin quiet on phone". Do you see that?---Yes.
10
15:52:33 11 It has a T. Do you understand that that might mean target,
15:52:37 12 T?---I don't know, sorry, what that means in Gavan's
15:52:42 13 writing.
14
15:52:43 15 Well in the context of this document, as you're looking at
15:52:47 16 it, might that mean T, target, Gobbo, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and
15:52:52 17 then another dash underneath there with [REDACTED]
15:52:57 18 name?---It may well.
19
15:52:58 20 It's got a line, a curvy line from Gobbo's name, "Wanted to
15:53:03 21 see [REDACTED] ASAP after [REDACTED] visit"?---Yes.
22
15:53:09 23 That seems to correspond with [REDACTED] assertion that he
15:53:16 24 wanted a message passed to [REDACTED] and perhaps [REDACTED] ---I can
15:53:21 25 see the relationship.
15:53:21 26
15:53:21 27 "Visited [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], a PM", we think that that
15:53:33 28 might mean Port Melbourne, is that right?---Possibly.
15:53:35 29
15:53:36 30 "Calls seem to be social." It's got, "Gobbo, [REDACTED] -
15:53:42 31 [REDACTED]"?---Yes.
32
15:53:44 33 And then SPU, that's the Special Projects Unit. Is that
15:53:54 34 the unit in charge of intercepting telephone calls?---Yes.
35
36 And "ESD re calls being pulled re lawyer/client privilege".
37 Do yo see that?---Yes.
38
15:54:04 39 We understand it's the case back then that there were a
15:54:07 40 limited number of lines that were available at SPU upon
15:54:11 41 which calls could be intercepted?---Yes.
42
15:54:14 43 And there was an overflow that ESD had that it would
15:54:18 44 provide to Purana if it wasn't using them all?---Yes.
45
15:54:24 46 Do you recall it being discussed that calls involving
15:54:29 47 Ms Gobbo may not be - may not attract lawyer/client

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:54:34 1 privilege and that there was some wont to review those
15:54:43 2 calls?---I don't recall that conversation, or those
15:54:46 3 conversations. I certainly don't dispute that a lot of
15:54:49 4 calls involving Nicola Gobbo were largely social. But my
15:54:57 5 experience was that the monitors who would listen to the
15:55:00 6 calls before investigators would err on the side of caution
15:55:04 7 and pull those calls and investigators wouldn't see them.
8
15:55:07 9 What this seems to indicate is that there was perhaps a
15:55:11 10 desire on the part of Purana, given that it seems to be a
15:55:17 11 social relationship involving Gobbo, that those calls be
15:55:21 12 reviewed perhaps to see that they don't, whether or not
15:55:24 13 they do legitimately attract lawyer/client privilege, do
15:55:29 14 you accept that?---I can't make that assertion from those
15:55:34 15 two lines.
16
15:55:36 17 Well there seems to be a discussion that's being had the
15:55:42 18 day after [REDACTED] has given some information to Purana
15:55:48 19 involving Mokbel, involving Williams, involving [REDACTED]
15:55:51 20 perhaps, of this nature, indicating that Ms Gobbo has gone
15:55:58 21 straight to [REDACTED] after seeing [REDACTED] perhaps in
15:56:01 22 custody and there's a discussion about lawyer/client
15:56:05 23 privilege, calls that are held within the SPU at ESD.
15:56:11 24 Would there be any other reason to have such a conversation
15:56:15 25 other than questioning whether "we can get our hands on
15:56:19 26 these calls"?---I'm sorry, I don't see that in there. I
15:56:25 27 see it as an observation that SPU and ESD are pulling calls
15:56:31 28 because of lawyer/client privilege, which is what they're
15:56:37 29 supposed to do.
30
15:56:38 31 There's a line a couple above that, "The calls seem to be
15:56:41 32 social"?---Yes.
33
15:56:42 34 There'd be no reason to be having this conversation within
15:56:48 35 Purana if Purana didn't want to see if they could get their
15:56:51 36 hands on this calls, would there be?---It's a reasonable
15:56:56 37 consideration. It's a reasonable consideration. If a call
15:57:00 38 is entirely social it ought not be pulled for lawyer/client
15:57:04 39 privilege.
40
15:57:05 41 And that was something that Purana were exploring at that
15:57:09 42 stage? Ms Gobbo may not be providing legal advice in some
15:57:12 43 of these calls, "They might be of value intelligence-wise
15:57:17 44 to us"?---That may well have been the subject of
15:57:21 45 conversation, I don't recall that.
46
15:57:27 47 If Purana were to go down that line would they have gotten

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

15:57:32 1 legal advice?---I'm not sure.
2
15:57:42 3 Do you recall at any stage whether Purana reviewed calls
15:57:49 4 belonging to any lawyer?---As in targeting the lawyer?
5
15:57:55 6 Well, as in targeting the lawyer or the person that they
15:57:58 7 were speaking with, either or?---No.
8
15:58:05 9 I'm not limiting that to Ms Gobbo but at any stage was
15:58:08 10 there any review of telephone calls between any person and
15:58:14 11 a lawyer?---Well sometimes calls that the monitors listened
15:58:24 12 to that would slip through, would slip through because it's
15:58:30 13 clearly a social call. It's not apparent to the monitor
15:58:33 14 that it is in any way a lawyer/client conversation. So,
15:58:37 15 you know, certainly I'm aware of calls such as that.
16
15:58:44 17 On those occasions they've slipped through but has there
15:58:47 18 been any effort gone to to review calls involving any
15:58:52 19 lawyer and any other person?---No, no. Of course the
15:59:01 20 majority of these calls these people are in custody so
15:59:04 21 they're prison calls on the Arunta system and they're
15:59:08 22 pulled by Corrections before they get to investigators.
23
15:59:13 24 But people that aren't in custody, if they're on bail, if
15:59:16 25 they're on parole or - - -?---Yes.
26
15:59:19 27 - - - any other matter, they might - if they're captured
15:59:26 28 they'll be captured on a system that's run by the
15:59:29 29 police?---That's right.
30
15:59:30 31 Do you recall Ms Gobbo being regarded as a suspect by
15:59:34 32 Purana around this time?---I don't recall Nicola Gobbo
15:59:45 33 being regarded as a suspect in the way that we were
15:59:49 34 targeting the people behind the murders. I had a personal
15:59:54 35 view that Nicola Gobbo was entrenched in these criminal
16:00:01 36 networks but she wasn't being targeted by Purana as such.
16:00:07 37 We were focusing on solving the homicides, not on policing
16:00:15 38 the conduct of her, Zarah Garde-Wilson, Condello, Defteros.
39
16:00:26 40 If we can move on to p.3 of that document. Do you see
16:00:38 41 there up the top there's references to IRs generated with a
16:00:43 42 dash to phone calls?---Yes, I see that.
43
16:00:48 44 And being up to speed with the IRs and then below that
16:00:55 45 there's some dashes?---Yes.
46
16:00:58 47 There's a reference there in the shaded portion to [REDACTED]

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:01:04 1 [REDACTED] a [REDACTED], possibly being [REDACTED]'s car and doing
16:01:10 2 an x-ray of the car?---Yes.
3
16:01:13 4 And included in the same dash point immediately below that
16:01:19 5 is a reference to Ms Gobbo and something again at 8 pm,
16:01:23 6 possibly Port Melbourne?---Yes.
7
16:01:31 8 There seems to be an association there, understood by those
16:01:37 9 at this meeting, between [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and Gobbo
16:01:42 10 somehow, can you recall what that was?---No, sorry.
11
16:01:53 12 That document's already been tendered, Commissioner, so
16:01:56 13 I'll move on to the next one. If we can go to Exhibit
16:02:01 14 RC472, please. See this is an application for
16:02:12 15 assistance?---Yes.
16
16:02:14 17 It's by - you'll see the case officer name, that's the case
16:02:18 18 officer we know as Pearce?---Yes.
19
16:02:22 20 It says then of the Homicide Squad and he's submitted an
16:02:26 21 application for assistance to the Crime Surveillance Unit
16:02:29 22 to target Ms Gobbo in relation to the offence of
16:02:33 23 murder?---Yes.
24
16:02:35 25 If we move to p.2 of that document. It refers to Ms Gobbo
16:02:49 26 being a barrister who acts for Tony Mokbel and many other
16:02:54 27 high-profile criminals?---Yes.
28
16:02:56 29 Including recently Lewis Moran, which resulted in a threat
16:03:00 30 to her welfare from Veniamin on behalf of Williams?---Yes.
31
16:03:04 32 It refers to Gobbo's relationship with [REDACTED] and
16:03:08 33 [REDACTED] being more than just professional?---Yes.
34
16:03:12 35 It refers to her regularly spending leisure time with both
16:03:17 36 or either of those men at gyms and in cafés, et
16:03:23 37 cetera?---Yes.
38
16:03:26 39 This is the type of information I think you were referring
16:03:30 40 to in your statement at paragraph 9; is that right?---Yes,
16:03:35 41 and as described just a moment ago, entrenched.
42
16:03:42 43 It refers to her arranging to meet at times of developments
16:03:50 44 in Homicide and Drug Squad investigations and to her drug
16:03:55 45 offending back in 1993?---Sorry, my statement or the
16:03:58 46 document?
47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:03:58 1 Sorry, moving back from your statement to the document.
 16:04:02 2 You'll see there that the document refers to her seemingly
 16:04:07 3 arranging to meet, it's referring to - - -?---Oh yes.
 4
 16:04:16 5 - - - [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at times of developments in
 16:04:20 6 Homicide and Drug Squad investigations?---Yes.
 7
 16:04:22 8 And referring to her prior drug offending back in
 16:04:28 9 1993?---Yes.
 10
 16:04:29 11 Now if we move to p.3. It indicates the nature of the
 16:04:33 12 assistance that's been requested and the requester wants
 16:04:39 13 photos and videos of the target, Ms Gobbo, meeting with
 16:04:42 14 [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. It wants to identify her
 16:04:48 15 residential address, her vehicles and her other
 16:04:51 16 associates?---Yes.
 17
 16:04:53 18 Do you see that?---Yes.
 19
 16:04:54 20 She's suspected of assisting [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in
 16:04:59 21 their drug trafficking activities and providing those
 16:05:03 22 persons with information about the activities of other
 16:05:06 23 criminals in relation to the murders of [REDACTED],
 16:05:09 24 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]?---Yes.
 25
 16:05:16 26 The document itself contains the date of 2 July, although
 16:05:22 27 you note there that the details refer to the [REDACTED]
 16:05:25 28 murder which didn't happen until [REDACTED] 2003. So it
 16:05:31 29 seems as though that document is filled out at some point
 16:05:36 30 after [REDACTED] 2003?---Yes.
 31
 16:05:43 32 It seems to correspond with Mr Ryan's notes, perhaps with
 16:05:49 33 that discussion about - with the T, which I suggest might
 16:05:55 34 mean target, with Ms Gobbo's name, with [REDACTED]'s name, [REDACTED]
 16:06:02 35 [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and those people?---It may well.
 36
 16:06:05 37 It seems to be an indication, a further indication that
 16:06:07 38 Ms Gobbo is being viewed by Purana at that stage as a
 16:06:13 39 target?---It may well have been the case. I mean it was my
 16:06:16 40 view, I'm not sure what the T stands for, but it may well
 16:06:20 41 be the case.
 42
 16:06:31 43 Earlier this year there was a chronology of member diaries
 16:06:36 44 put together by Mr Bateson and various members of the
 16:06:41 45 Purana crew, you're aware of that?---Yes.
 46
 16:06:43 47 Your entries are included?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
16:06:46 2 As well as Bateson's, Hatt's, L'Estrange and
16:06:56 3 Kerley's?---Yes.
4
16:06:56 5 Is there any reason for those particular people to have
16:07:00 6 been included in that series of - or that chronology?---I
16:07:04 7 didn't request the chronology and I didn't distribute the
16:07:07 8 chronology to be populated, so I'm not sure.
9
16:07:13 10 You were given a version of the chronology to update with
16:07:15 11 your own records; is that right?---That's right. I was
16:07:18 12 given the initial version that Stuart Bateson had compiled
16:07:22 13 from his note review. I populated my - the sections I
16:07:29 14 gleaned from my notes and forwarded it back to Stuart.
15
16:07:37 16 Am I to understand that other members did likewise?---It
16:07:41 17 seems so, yes.
18
16:07:43 19 Did you each receive a copy of the end result?---I have
16:07:46 20 since. I've got a copy here.
21
16:07:47 22 What did you understand was the purpose of that
16:07:50 23 document?---I'm not certain precisely. As I say, it was
16:07:56 24 initiated by Stuart. I believe he sought approval to do
16:08:02 25 that and did so.
26
16:08:05 27 Was it to make disclosure by way of police notes by that
16:08:14 28 chronology to save the trouble of having to disclose all
16:08:19 29 your day books or diary notes otherwise?---Oh no, I don't
16:08:23 30 think that's the case. I think it was an opportunity to
16:08:26 31 pull together the various disparate groups of notes and day
16:08:32 32 books into one document that was relevant to the Royal
16:08:33 33 Commission.
34
16:08:36 35 Do you know why it was limited to the people that were
16:08:39 36 included, the six of you?---No.
37
16:08:44 38 Is there anything that sort of relates to the six of you
16:08:47 39 that you could think of?---Well collectively our
16:08:54 40 involvement - the other members were all members of I think
16:08:58 41 Stuart Bateson's crew and I was sort of a de facto member
16:09:01 42 of the crew because I had charged [REDACTED] I think
16:09:09 43 that's the essence of it. And other relevant people had
16:09:13 44 left the organisation by then, Swindells perhaps, Ryan
16:09:18 45 might have been contributors had they been still in
16:09:22 46 Victoria Police but they're not.
47

.29/10/19

8520

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:09:27 1 One of the entries in that chronology on 15 November 2003
16:09:33 2 reads, "CW threatens to kill Detective Bateson and his
16:09:39 3 girlfriend"?---Yes.
4
16:09:41 5 CW being Carl Williams?---Yes.
6
16:09:44 7 You recall that event?---Not specifically but I certainly
16:09:48 8 recall it was quite a significant time.
9
16:09:55 10 It's a pretty serious event if a detective is being
16:10:00 11 threatened by someone suspected of committing a number of
16:10:03 12 murders?---Very serious.
13
16:10:06 14 And it's something which Purana would have taken
16:10:11 15 significant awareness of?---Yes.
16
16:10:14 17 And the proceedings surrounding that?---Yes.
18
16:10:19 19 Something of significant discussion within the
16:10:25 20 office?---Probably.
21
16:10:34 22 If we can have a look at Ms Gobbo's court book for 17
16:10:38 23 November, it's the same document, p.1012 on the left-hand
16:10:42 24 side of the page. Or it might be 1022, I might have the
16:10:51 25 number wrong. I might have the number wrong. It should be
16:11:19 26 1022. You'll see that there. Carl Williams was arrested
16:11:35 27 for that threat to kill, that's right?---Yes.
28
16:11:42 29 It's apparent from Ms Gobbo's court book that she confers
16:11:47 30 with him in the Custody Centre?---Yes.
31
16:11:51 32 She's listed there, the two - or seemingly two charges
16:11:56 33 against him, the threat to kill Bateson and a threat to
16:11:59 34 kill it says there "Bateson's Mrs"?---Yes.
35
16:12:03 36 And she takes instructions from Carl Williams in relation
16:12:06 37 to what he said that was about?---Yes.
38
16:12:17 39 Purana would have been very aware that she visited Carl
16:12:20 40 Williams at that stage, that she was representing
16:12:23 41 him?---Probably.
42
16:12:28 43 It indicates in that note that Mr Williams was saying it
16:12:34 44 was a practical joke?---I see that.
45
16:12:39 46 That Bateson had spoken to him, Carl Williams, at the
16:12:44 47 Homicide Squad, and we certainly know that he did that back

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:12:46 1 in at least June of 2003?---Yes.
2
16:12:53 3 He says further down the page that Bateson had baited him
16:12:57 4 at [REDACTED] filing hearing saying that, "I'll be seeing
16:13:01 5 you soon", or something to that effect?---I see that.
6
16:13:06 7 There's a reference to [REDACTED] being at a particular unit
16:13:11 8 in prison and trying to cheer him up?---I see that.
9
16:13:18 10 Do you recall the nature of the threat, was it something
16:13:23 11 recording over the phone of Mr Williams talking to [REDACTED]
16:13:27 12 [REDACTED]?---I don't recall, sorry, I wasn't involved in that
16:13:29 13 investigation.
14
16:13:39 15 I tender that entry, Commissioner.
16:13:42 16
16:13:45 17 #EXHIBIT RC640A - (Confidential) entry in Nicola Gobbo's
16:13:50 18 day book [REDACTED] 03.
16:14:00 19
16:14:00 20 #EXHIBIT RC640B - (Redacted version.)
16:14:02 21
16:14:02 22 And just having a look at some of the other entries in
16:14:04 23 that, it's apparent that he's providing her with possible
16:14:07 24 instructions in relation to a bail application, talking
16:14:10 25 about possible employment that he has, no real priors and
16:14:13 26 those kinds of things?---Yeah, I see that.
27
16:14:26 28 If we can go to an Operation Purana update which is dated 8
16:14:34 29 December 2003. It's VPL.0100.0012.0040. Is this a
16:15:11 30 familiar type of document to you?---Not really.
31
16:15:14 32 Are you aware that updates were provided, or Purana updates
16:15:18 33 were provided from time to time?---No doubt.
34
16:15:20 35 Sorry?---I've got no doubt they were.
36
16:15:23 37 Were they provided just to the squads? It's addressed
16:15:28 38 there to the Commander of State Crime Squads?---That's
16:15:32 39 right.
40
16:15:33 41 From Acting Sergeant Mark Nichols?---Yes.
42
16:15:36 43 Is this something that would have been distributed to the
16:15:39 44 whole squad so everyone knew what was going on?---It may
16:15:45 45 well have been. I don't recall seeing one of these but it
16:15:47 46 may have been. I would think it would be an accumulation
16:15:51 47 of the discussions in team or squad meetings.

.29/10/19

8522

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
16:15:56 2 Yes?---And Mark Nichols, who's an analyst, would compile
16:16:04 3 that, collate it and then it would be forwarded up the
16:16:07 4 chain to the Commander.
5
16:16:09 6 So it's likely that the types of information contained
16:16:11 7 within these documents would have been known to people that
16:16:14 8 were attending those meetings regularly within Purana
16:16:16 9 anyway?---Yes, that would be a source of the information
16:16:19 10 but there would have been sources also from the various
16:16:24 11 forms of surveillance that were being conducted.
12
16:16:30 13 So you see indicated there the third arrow down, that by
16:16:34 14 this stage Carl Williams had been bailed with a surety at
16:16:38 15 \$50,000 with threats to kill a Purana member?---Yes.
16
16:16:41 17 And the day before Williams' daughter's christening on 7
16:16:47 18 December 2003 celebrations involving various people at the
16:16:53 19 Crown?---Yes.
20
16:16:53 21 Including criminal identities, Tony/Milad Mokbel, [REDACTED]
16:16:58 22 [REDACTED] Veniamin and others?---Yes.
23
16:17:00 24 And also present being Ms Gobbo?---And Theo Magazis.
25
16:17:07 26 And Theo Magazis as legal reps?---Yes.
27
16:17:11 28 And had a representative from Four Corners there?---Yes.
29
16:17:16 30 And that Purana's analytical cell were present in the [REDACTED]
16:17:20 31 [REDACTED] containing [REDACTED] of all
16:17:24 32 the guests?---Yes.
33
16:17:30 34 That was for building up intelligence again?---Yes.
35
16:17:37 36 So again there seems to be some interest in the fact that
16:17:42 37 Ms Gobbo was associating with those people?---Yes, some
16:17:52 38 observation.
39
16:17:53 40 Sorry?---I'd put it more accurately as some observation.
16:17:57 41 I'm not sure I'd see the interest in there, but certainly
16:18:01 42 it's an observation she's present, among others.
43
16:18:03 44 Yes. She seems by this stage to be a target of
16:18:07 45 Purana?---Yes.
46
16:18:15 47 Perhaps if we can take that down for now. I'll tender that

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:18:22 1 document, Commissioner.
16:18:24 2
16:18:24 3 #EXHIBIT RC641A - (Confidential) Operation Purana update
16:18:27 4 from Acting Sergeant Mark Nichols
16:18:32 5 8/12/03.
16:18:34 6
16:18:35 7 #EXHIBIT RC641B - (Redacted version.)
8
16:18:38 9 I think you mentioned before, but at some point there was
16:18:41 10 an MDID crew attached to Purana?---That's right.
11
16:18:47 12 That was because it was very apparent that there was a
16:18:49 13 connection between the gangland killings and the commercial
16:18:52 14 drug trade?---Yes.
15
16:18:57 16 Despite the fact that it had its own drug crew did there
16:19:02 17 continue to be a sharing of intelligence between Purana and
16:19:06 18 the MDID?---Or the crew that were within Purana, yes.
19
16:19:10 20 But there was also the MDID separately?---Yes.
21
16:19:16 22 And the MDID itself would clearly have an interest in the
16:19:20 23 drug activities of Williams and Mokbel and others?---No
16:19:24 24 doubt.
25
16:19:25 26 Was there a sharing of information between Purana and the
16:19:29 27 MDID?---I assume so.
28
16:19:33 29 Do you know about that?---No, I don't, sorry. I imagine
16:19:36 30 that would have been - the conduit into Purana would have
16:19:43 31 been our embedded MDID team.
32
16:19:51 33 If we go to Exhibit RC473, please. This is a Task Force
16:20:07 34 Purana request dated 15 December 2003 in relation to a
16:20:16 35 subject - a person by the name of Daniel Hutchinson?---Yes.
36
16:20:28 37 He'd been charged with some serious drug offending back on
16:20:32 38 20 December 2003?---Yes.
39
16:20:34 40 I think when I mistakenly pulled up a page of Ms Gobbo's
16:20:38 41 book before it came up with instructions in her court book
16:20:42 42 in relation to seeing him back around that period of
16:20:45 43 time?---I didn't catch it, sorry.
44
16:20:46 45 You may or may not have seen that. You'll see at number 3
16:20:56 46 that Hutchinson has been linked to persons of interest
16:20:59 47 identified by Purana Task Force?---Yes.

.29/10/19

8524

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
16:21:00 2 Do you know who that was?---No, I didn't know of his
16:21:03 3 background. I became aware of his association with
16:21:08 4 probably - probably more so with [REDACTED] than [REDACTED]
16:21:14 5 direct.
6
16:21:15 7 Perhaps if we can go to Ms Gobbo's court book. It's at
16:21:22 8 p.1029 I think. You'll see at the top of the page there 20
16:22:17 9 November 2003, it's got "Hutchy arrested"?---Yes.
10
16:22:20 11 Then over the other side of the page, "Danny Hutchy,
16:22:27 12 Custody Centre" and some details there?---Yes.
13
16:22:34 14 Naming a number of people there. Further down the page,
16:22:39 15 "Charged with two times trafficking ecstasy and speed
16:22:42 16 possession", and so forth?---Yes.
17
16:22:44 18 Allegations being March to November 2003?---Yes.
19
16:22:47 20 If we go over to the next page, please. If we go over to
16:22:58 21 the next page, please. There are references there about
16:23:04 22 halfway down the page to a number of police members?---Yes.
23
16:23:08 24 Marty Robinson being one?---Yes.
25
16:23:11 26 And there's another member there, I think we might have a
16:23:14 27 pseudonym for him so I won't mention it, and it's got
16:23:18 28 brackets there with questions "re [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
16:23:23 29 [REDACTED]"?---Yes.
30
16:23:24 31 There's another mention to [REDACTED] and various things
16:23:31 32 emanating from that, including "go on holiday [REDACTED]"
16:23:35 33 and "spoken about a lot on the phones"?---Yes.
34
16:23:46 35 If we can take it off zoom, please. You'll see over the
16:23:50 36 other side of the page there's some concern there about
16:23:54 37 "[REDACTED] will talk easy, [REDACTED] will rat easy" and
16:24:00 38 Purana being there first thing?---I see that.
39
16:24:06 40 If we go back to the - I might tender that exhibit,
16:24:12 41 Commissioner.
42
16:24:14 43 COMMISSIONER: Which one?
16:24:17 44
16:24:17 45 MS TITTENSOR: Sorry, the court book.
16:24:19 46
16:24:20 47 #EXHIBIT RC642A - (Confidential) Court book, Nicola Gobbo

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:24:22 1 20/11/03.
16:24:28 2
16:24:30 3 #EXHIBIT RC642B - (Redacted version.)
4
16:24:33 5 There are two double sets of pages I think relevant to
16:24:36 6 that. If we can return to Exhibit 473 please. You'll see
16:24:50 7 there in the fourth paragraph it indicates that on 12
16:24:55 8 December 2003 Hutchinson had made a call to his solicitor,
16:25:00 9 Ms Nicola Gobbo, utilising a prison telephone.
16:25:04 10 "Intelligence holdings held by the Purana Task Force
16:25:06 11 suggest that a current Task Force Purana target was present
16:25:10 12 at Gobbo's office at the time the call was received and the
16:25:13 13 target subsequently had a direct telephone conversation
16:25:16 14 with Hutchinson. Call records obtained indicate that a
16:25:21 15 call to Gobbo's office was made by Hutchinson during the
16:25:24 16 detected time period." It goes on to request that
16:25:34 17 telephone calls made by Hutchinson in the future whilst
16:25:37 18 incarcerated be monitored to detect any unauthorised
16:25:42 19 telephone contact with diverse others utilising Ms Gobbo's
16:25:46 20 telephone and to ascertain if this is a method of
16:25:49 21 communicating illegal activities that's previously gone
16:25:52 22 undetected?---Yes, I see that.
23
16:25:54 24 There seems to be some concern that Ms Gobbo was using her
16:25:57 25 LPP phone privileges to enable information to be
16:26:03 26 disseminated; is that right?---She among quite a number of
16:26:09 27 lawyers who were representing people that Purana were
16:26:13 28 interested in were utilising their lawyers to make phone
16:26:17 29 calls to people that would come to the offices of the
16:26:20 30 lawyer for private conversations, to talk business about
16:26:23 31 their various activities. It was quite routine.
32
16:26:28 33 You recall that specifically around this time there was
16:26:31 34 concern that Ms Gobbo was facilitating that unauthorised
16:26:35 35 contact?---No, I wasn't involved in the drug investigations
16:26:37 36 at all.
37
16:26:38 38 Do you recall those concerns though about - - - ?---As I
16:26:41 39 said, it was fairly routine.
40
16:26:43 41 It seems as though [REDACTED] - sorry, [REDACTED] had
16:26:50 42 some involvement with [REDACTED] and he was a target of
16:26:57 43 Purana at the time?---[REDACTED] was a target?
44
16:27:01 45 [REDACTED] was a target at the time?---December 15th, yes,
16:27:09 46 I'm sure he was.
47

.29/10/19

8526

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:27:26 1 If we can go to the Purana update, VPL.0100.0012.0051.
16:27:37 2 This is a Purana update of 9 February 2004. Can you see
16:27:47 3 that there?---I do.
4
16:27:53 5 If we can go to p.2 of that document. I've got a note to
16:28:07 6 myself the fifth arrow down. No. There being a reference
16:28:20 7 to Operation Doca. Perhaps if we can just scroll through
16:28:25 8 until we - perhaps if we can scroll through the document,
16:28:32 9 please. No, the other way. There it is, down the bottom
16:28:42 10 there. There's an Operation Doca. Do you understand that
16:28:46 11 Operation Doca stood for disruption of criminal
16:28:53 12 activity?---I don't recall that but I don't dispute that.
13
16:28:55 14 If we can just scroll a little bit further. It notes there
16:29:00 15 that each crew will be responsible for speaking to persons
16:29:03 16 of interest to keep pressure on main target?---Yes.
17
16:29:09 18 If we can just keep scrolling, thanks. We might have to
16:29:29 19 come back to that. The analytical cell according - it may
16:29:43 20 be in this document or it may be in another document, I
16:29:47 21 might have the wrong one - indicated that Operation Doca
16:29:50 22 was an operation that had been created by the analytical
16:29:53 23 cell and was a database of names that had been created in
16:29:56 24 consultation with investigation crews and that the strategy
16:30:00 25 was to speak to those people regularly and keep pressure on
16:30:04 26 main targets and the strategy used to speak to each person
16:30:09 27 would vary depending on each person of interest and that
16:30:11 28 there were approximately 70 people so far. Do you recall
16:30:17 29 that being the case within Purana?---I don't recall that
16:30:24 30 specifically. I'm certainly aware that Purana's intent was
16:30:27 31 to saturate and to disrupt, that we had a lot of difficulty
16:30:32 32 infiltrating and breaking down the criminal networks and
16:30:36 33 there were a lot of killings going on, so disruption and
16:30:41 34 pressure were certainly tactics that Purana were using at
16:30:45 35 the time.
36
16:30:46 37 Do you recall there being a database of names being built
16:30:48 38 by the analytical cell in consultation with investigation
16:30:52 39 crews?---That's routine.
40
16:30:57 41 Would Ms Gobbo have been one of those persons of
16:30:59 42 interest?---I would think so.
43
16:31:05 44 What type of information would have been kept in relation
16:31:08 45 to that database?---Information gleaned from telephone
16:31:15 46 intercepts, surveillance, physical surveillance, electronic
16:31:18 47 surveillance, information reports, human sources,

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:31:23 1 witnesses. Any form of intelligence you can think of would
16:31:27 2 go into a database like Doca.
3
16:31:32 4 If we go through this document it indicates the names of a
16:31:39 5 number of operations, Operation Droyle, relating to
16:31:44 6 [REDACTED] as well as
16:31:46 7 George and Carl Williams. It refers to Operation Ellison
16:31:53 8 involving a Jason Haykel and constant contact with people
16:31:57 9 of interest to Purana investigators, including Tony Mokbel
16:32:01 10 and Carl Williams and Veniamin and Roberta Williams and
16:32:07 11 Adam Ahmed?---Yes.
12
16:32:08 13 And Purana investigators believing that Ahmed was one of
16:32:12 14 the sources supplying Haykel [REDACTED] with ecstasy
16:32:17 15 prior to his arrest?---Yes.
16
16:32:20 17 It refers to Ahmed, you see there, is a well-known drug
16:32:24 18 dealer who is currently out on bail as a result of
16:32:27 19 Operation Gallop?---Yes.
20
16:32:30 21 And that the MDID are targeting him?---Yes.
22
16:32:35 23 These were all people on Purana's radar as at February
16:32:39 24 2004?---Yes.
25
16:32:44 26 I note the time, Commissioner.
27
16:32:45 28 COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right. Have you finished - do you
16:32:47 29 want to tender that document or not finished with it yet?
16:32:50 30
16:32:51 31 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, I'll tender the document, thanks,
16:32:52 32 Commissioner.
16:32:52 33
16:32:53 34 COMMISSIONER: What do I call it?
16:32:55 35
16:32:55 36 MS TITTENSOR: It's a Purana update dated 9 February 2004.
16:33:06 37 I do know it's the fifth arrow down on the first page which
16:33:11 38 describes what Operation Doca was.
16:33:13 39
16:33:14 40 #EXHIBIT RC643A - (Confidential) Purana update dated
16:33:29 41 9/2/04.
16:33:32 42
16:33:33 43 #EXHIBIT RC643B - (Redacted version.)
44
16:33:38 45 COMMISSIONER: Do we want to tender that further statement
16:33:40 46 of Sandy White?
16:33:41 47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

16:33:41 1 MR CHETTLE: I do. I'll formally tender it, Commissioner,
16:33:45 2 in response to the matter that you raised.
3
16:33:50 4 COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right. Sandy White's other
16:33:51 5 statements, what exhibit number are they, please?
16:34:01 6
16:34:02 7 MR CHETTLE: We won't tender it, yet. I'll have him sign
16:34:07 8 it.
9
16:34:08 10 COMMISSIONER: That's true, it hasn't been signed.
11
12 MR CHETTLE: No, I'll have him sign it.
13
16:34:09 14 COMMISSIONER: When we get it signed tomorrow, or whenever
16:34:12 15 you're going to tender it, it'll be part of Exhibit 275.
16:34:16 16
16:34:17 17 MR CHETTLE: Thank you.
18
16:34:17 19 COMMISSIONER: We'll adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow.
16:34:45 20
16:34:45 21 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
16:34:46 22
16:34:48 23 ADJOURNED UNTIL WEDNESDAY 30 OCTOBER 2019
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47