```
IN CAMERA PROCEEDINGS:
06:37:49
        1
06:37:49
                WITNESS: Could I just ask what time we are finishing?
06:37:50
06:37:53 4
                COMMISSIONER: We're finishing shortly after 3.30, so
06:37:53
                you're nearly there.
        6
06:37:56
       7
06:37:58
                MR WOODS:
                            Quite soon.
        8
        9
       10
                COMMISSIONER:
                                Quite soon, yes.
       11
                MR WOODS:
                            I should point out Mr Orman's practitioners have
06:37:58 12
06:38:02 13
                 leave to participate in the hearing.
06:38:04 14
06:38:04 15
                COMMISSIONER: Yes, they were mentioned in the order as
06:38:06 16
                being allowed to stay.
06:38:08 17
06:38:08 18
                MR WOODS:
                            Thank you. At paragraph 22 of your statement
                 you talk about the murder - I should say the reason we're
06:38:20 19
                 in closed session is I'm going to be asking questions about
06:38:26 20
                                          you know who those
06:38:31 21
                people are?---Yes.
06:38:36 22
06:38:36 23
06:38:37 24
                And some associated issues and they're subject to various
                suppression orders, so the Commission as a matter of course
06:38:41 25
                goes into private hearing for these matters.
                                                                That's what
06:38:44 26
06:38:47 27
                all the cloak and dagger is about?---Okay.
06:38:50 28
06:38:51 29
                You talk about the murder of
                                                               at paragraph
                22 of your statement. Do you recall that murder
06:38:57 30
                occurring? -- Yeah.
06:39:02 31
06:39:04 32
                Were you present that day in the Purana offices?---The
06:39:05 33
06:39:12 34
                 sequence is that I came in at 6 o'clock pm because we were
06:39:15 35
                working on another suspect.
06:39:17 36
                You'd started only about a month and a half before in
06:39:18 37
                September 03, that's right?---Yes, yes.
06:39:21 38
06:39:24 39
                Keep going?---This might take a while.
06:39:24 40
06:39:27 41
06:39:27 42
                That's all right?---Okay, I came in and I went to the
06:39:34 43
                listening device rooms, we would have
06:39:37 44
06:39:38 45
                Yes?---And it was clear that and were in a car and they
06:39:39 46
                were talking about waiting to see someone and it was
06:39:46 47
```

```
obvious they had guns and they had a police scanner.
        1
06:39:52
06:40:00 2
                So they could be heard using the scanner?---Yeah.
06:40:00
                knew something was up because they'd never done that
06:40:06 4
                before. The lead up to that is important in that they'd
06:40:11
                tried to source a clean car, what we call a clean car.
06:40:17 6
06:40:21 7
06:40:21 8
                Yes?---And that car was given to ■ and he went to put some
                fuel in it and noticed that
06:40:28 9
                wasn't working. Checked that and found the
                                                                       device
06:40:33 10
                in that car.
06:40:37 11
06:40:38 12
06:40:38 13
                Yes?---And we subsequently retrieved it, all that sort of
                stuff and so when I came in on the 25th of October I was
06:40:43 14
06:40:50 15
                surprised that they were talking about essentially killing
06:40:54 16
                someone when they were in scar. You know, it seemed
06:41:00 17
                extraordinary.
06:41:01 18
                Where they'd found a tracker?---No, this was - they got rid
06:41:01 19
                of the clean car, if I can put it that way, and now they
06:41:07 20
                were using s car which had a
                                                              listening
06:41:11 21
                device in it. So I asked where they were and they -
06:41:16 22
06:41:22 23
06:41:26 24
06:41:26 25
                 I should say the Commissioner is aware of the general
                events of that day through other witnesses?---Oh okay.
06:41:29 26
       27
                No, that's okay, it's still useful information.
06:41:32 28
06:41:36 29
                event what we understand to have been the case, and you can
                tell me if I'm wrong, is that
06:41:39 30
                                                                      but the
                LD continued?---Correct.
06:41:43 31
06:41:45 32
                Whilst a general location or area was known, the precise
06:41:45 33
                location wasn't known and the murder was heard but not
06:41:49 34
06:41:53 35
                observed and with great frustration it wasn't able to be
06:41:57 36
                stopped?---Correct.
06:41:58 37
                Prior to it?---Correct, yes.
06:41:59 38
06:42:00 39
                Quite shortly after and were both apprehended?---Yes.
06:42:01 40
06:42:08 41
                And they were brought into custody the same day?---Yes.
06:42:08 42
06:42:13 43
                You observed the interviews of both individuals, is that
06:42:17 44
06:42:23 45
                right?---I don't recall ■ being interviewed, he just
06:42:28 46
                carried on a treat so he was taken directly to another
                squad because he was screaming and carrying on.
06:42:37 47
```

```
06:42:39
                 Did you see any interaction between him and Nicola Gobbo
06:42:40 2
                 that day?---No.
06:42:42
06:42:43 4
                 Now tell me about ?--- was in a room with, I can't
06:42:45 5
                 remember who he was with, he was with two detectives and
06:42:49 6
                 speaking to them.
06:42:53 7
06:42:54 8
                 He was more, well he was calmer than had been, that's
06:42:55 9
                 fair to say?---Oh yeah, much calmer.
06:43:02 10
06:43:04 11
                 And he was looking like he might be prepared to talk but
06:43:05 12
06:43:09 13
                 was a bit reluctant, is that a fair description?---Oh yeah.
06:43:13 14
                 And he traced the famous initials on the table but didn't
06:43:14 15
06:43:20 16
                 say who it was, is that right?---Correct, yeah.
06:43:23 17
                 Did you watch all that occur?---Yeah.
06:43:23 18
06:43:25 19
06:43:25 20
                Was this on a remote screen or through a window?---It was
                 in the Homicide Squad interview rooms, which I was very
06:43:31 21
06:43:35 22
                 familiar with, there's a window where you can watch
                          It's where the video, there's an actual cameraman
06:43:37 23
                who works the camera in case they move around, and then you
06:43:42 24
                 can watch next to him. You can also watch it in the
06:43:46 25
                 kitchen from memory, the Homicide kitchen.
06:43:49 26
06:43:54 27
                 That indication and the drawing of Mr Williams' initials on
06:43:56 28
06:44:04 29
                 the table, I assume was a pretty significant or potentially
                 going to be a pretty significant break-through in relation
06:44:09 30
                 to the underworld killings?---Yeah, that was part of it.
06:44:13 31
                 There was also the phone call that made to Williams on
06:44:17 32
                 the way to shouse where they were cleaning where he
06:44:21 33
                 tells, makes a call and says, "That horse you told me
06:44:25 34
06:44:29 35
                 about, it was scratched", which was code for "I've done the
06:44:33 36
                 job".
06:44:33 37
                 You basically had and cold on this - - - ?---Yes, yes,
06:44:33 38
                 I don't know of any other case in Australia where we had a
06:44:41 39
                 listening device in a car when they do a hit.
06:44:45 40
06:44:47 41
                All of those factors together, given the significant
06:44:47 42
06:44:50 43
                 murders that had happened leading up to it, were together a
                 very significant break-through in stopping, hopefully, the
06:44:54 44
                 underworld killings?---Yeah, we knew - am I allowed to say
06:44:59 45
                 his name, the one he - - -
06:45:03 46
```

.09/08/19 4342

06:45:04 47

```
or ?---No, the letters he drew.
       1
06:45:04
06:45:09 2
                Yes, Carl Williams, you're allowed to say those?---We
06:45:09
                strongly suspected that he was involved as the procurer.
06:45:12 4
06:45:15 5
                Yes?---But you know suspecting and evidence are two
06:45:15 6
                different things.
06:45:19 7
06:45:20 8
                But there's some reluctance from at that stage and he's
06:45:20 9
                only drawing the initials on the table?---It's his family,
06:45:24 10
                that's what it comes down to.
06:45:32 11
06:45:34 12
06:45:34 13
                Can you explain that?---He's worried about his family.
                Williams is out. His family, he knows where his family
06:45:37 14
06:45:41 15
                lives, all that sort of stuff. The threats, the normal
06:45:45 16
                stuff that goes on in the underworld.
06:45:46 17
                Mr Bateson, was he in attendance on that day?---Yes, yep.
06:45:47 18
06:45:51 19
                You say at paragraph 24 that you believe Bateson would have
06:45:55 20
                 told you that Gobbo was acting for that particular
06:45:59 21
06:46:03 22
                 individual P---Yes, that's in early 2004.
06:46:05 23
06:46:09 24
                And were you concerned at that early stage about whether
06:46:14 25
                Ms Gobbo might have any conflicts in relation to firstly
                     ?---No.
06:46:20 26
06:46:21 27
06:46:23 28
                 Did you know that she'd been talking with
06:46:27 29
                following the murder?---No.
                                              I don't recall that.
06:46:33 30
                             If you knew that she'd been talking to
06:46:33 31
                at that stage wasn't assisting, as I understand it, but was
06:46:37 32
                 - sorry, if you knew she had had a discussion with , who
06:46:41 33
06:46:46 34
                wasn't assisting, and was now having a discussion with
06:46:50 35
                who was assisting, would that have caused you a concern
                about conflict?---He's assisting in that he's going CW,
06:46:54 36
06:46:59 37
                that's it. Does it concern me that she's talking to both?
                It's up to them.
06:47:04 38
06:47:06 39
                What about as things moved on though?---Isn't it up to them
06:47:06 40
                who they have as their choice barrister or solicitor?
06:47:12 41
06:47:16 42
                me.
06:47:16 43
                Provided those individuals know that there is a conflict,
06:47:17 44
                what if they are not told, the police would have some
06:47:19 45
06:47:23 46
                obligation to make sure there wasn't a conflict?---I don't
                know of any obligation on us to - how can we tell a crook
06:47:25 47
```

```
who to have as his lawyer? I've never done that.
       1
06:47:29
06:47:34 2
                We might be at cross-purposes. I'm talking about the
        3
06:47:34
                situation where the crook doesn't know that their lawyer
06:47:37 4
                has a conflict of interest but the police do know?---Yeah.
06:47:39 5
06:47:45 6
06:47:45 7
                And the lawyer's not telling them?---I don't know if she is
06:47:49 8
                or isn't, so how am I - - -
06:47:51 9
                Let's just deal with the hypothetical very briefly before
06:47:51 10
                we adjourn. You say that in that situation the police have
06:47:55 11
06:47:59 12
                no obligation to make sure that the wheels of justice are
06:48:03 13
                 running properly? They can just sit there and watch the
                conflict occur?---That's the lawyers know the conflict, not
06:48:07 14
                us, so they have to, they have to make the judgment not - -
06:48:11 15
06:48:15 16
06:48:15 17
                 If the lawyer is not doing it and you know they have a
06:48:15 18
                conflict, you know they're conflicted, you know the client
06:48:18 19
                doesn't know, you don't just stand back, do you?---You
06:48:21 20
                 could potentially tell the lawyer who would most likely
06:48:24 21
06:48:28 22
                 tell you where to go in very explicit terms. That's what
06:48:33 23
                happens, you know, when you're dealing with people like
                this.
06:48:36 24
06:48:36 25
                Are you aware of situations where the police have taken
06:48:38 26
06:48:42 27
                active steps to make sure that lawyers aren't acting for
                particular clients because of conflicts? Are you aware of
06:48:47 28
06:48:50 29
                that occurring?---No, I can't recall anything like that.
06:48:52 30
06:48:53 31
                You're aware that in 2003 the police went to the DPP to
                stop Gobbo acting for Mr Hodson?---No. Was that Purana?
06:48:57 32
06:49:04 33
                No, I'm just asking, I'm talking about Victoria
06:49:05 34
                Police?---Okay. No, I'm not aware of that.
06:49:08 35
06:49:11 36
                So you've never taken any role in identifying or doing
06:49:11 37
06:49:15 38
                 anything about a particular conflict of interest a lawyer
06:49:19 39
                might have, is that right?---Yeah.
06:49:21 40
                That's because it's not the police's remit as far as you're
06:49:21 41
                concerned?---The way I look upon it, lawyers know if
06:49:25 42
                they've got a conflict or not and they self-police as I
06:49:27 43
                understand it. So I would be told where to go in most
06:49:31 44
06:49:37 45
                explicit terms by some of these people if I suggested - - -
06:49:41 46
                Moving out of the hypothetical and looking at Ms Gobbo in
06:49:41 47
```

```
particular though where she was giving information in
        1
06:49:45
                 relation to clients of hers?---Yes.
06:49:47 2
06:49:49
                 That's a slightly different situation?---Yes, that is.
06:49:49 4
06:49:51
                 In that situation where you know she's not telling the
06:49:51 6
                 clients, would you feel an obligation to do something about
06:49:54 7
06:49:57 8
                 it then?---Possibly, yeah.
06:49:59 9
                 They're not getting a fair deal, are they, if their own
06:50:01 10
                 lawyer is giving information?---It depends. If you're
06:50:04 11
                 talking - are you talking and here or it's a
06:50:09 12
06:50:14 13
                 hypothetical?
06:50:14 14
06:50:14 15
                 I'm now talking, we were talking completely hypothetical
06:50:19 16
                 about a lawyer, now we're talking about Nicola Gobbo but
                 still in general about her not being - you were saying a
06:50:21 17
                 lawyer can't be told by the police who they can and can't
06:50:25 18
                 act for but I'm now talking about a lawyer who is an active
06:50:29 19
06:50:34 20
                 human source who is providing information about her own
                 clients?---Yeah.
06:50:37 21
06:50:37 22
                 Not your regular lawyer?---Yep.
06:50:38 23
06:50:39 24
06:50:39 25
                 It's a lawyer who is actively providing information about
                 her own clients, who clearly has a conflict of interest and
06:50:42 26
06:50:46 27
                 clearly isn't telling her clients about that conflict of
06:50:49 28
                 interest?---Yeah.
06:50:49 29
06:50:50 30
                 Would you have an obligation in those circumstances to do
                 something about it?---I think the SDU would.
06:50:53 31
06:50:54 32
                 It would be the SDU's role?---Yeah.
06:50:55 33
06:50:57 34
06:50:59 35
                 Even though Purana is the receiver of the information?---I
06:51:01 36
                 don't get a list of every client that every barrister
06:51:05 37
                 represents, you know, you don't, you don't know.
                 big assumption - if I could just finish.
06:51:09 38
06:51:11 39
                 Go ahead?---It is a big assumption to suggest that I know
06:51:11 40
                 who is representing who about every case that we dealt
06:51:14 41
                 with.
06:51:17 42
06:51:17 43
                 Let's just take Tony Mokbel. It was well-known prior to
06:51:18 44
                 Ms Gobbo's registration that she had and continued to act
06:51:22 45
06:51:26 46
                 for Tony Mokbel, that was known to you?---Um, continued up
                 till when?
06:51:33 47
```

```
1
06:51:34
                When she was registered Ms Gobbo was acting for Tony
06:51:35 2
                 Mokbel. His trials were happening in early 2006?---I'm
        3
06:51:39
06:51:43 4
                 trying to get my sequence.
06:51:44 5
06:51:45 6
                Yes.
                       Sure?---When did he flee? I think it was 06.
06:51:48 7
                 March 2006?---Yes. So she would have been, yes.
06:51:49 8
06:51:53 9
06:51:53 10
                 But what I'm saving is that her representation of Tony
                 Mokbel was a matter that was known to you in September 2005
06:51:56 11
                 because he was actively being prosecuted by Purana at the
06:52:03 12
06:52:07 13
                 time?---I don't know - I know he was, I know we were - if I
                 could just say I know we were investigating him, but I
06:52:14 14
06:52:17 15
                 don't know if the courts, I don't know had we charged him
                with anything at that point.
06:52:22 16
06:52:24 17
                 COMMISSIONER:
                                We might have to continue this conversation.
06:52:24 18
06:52:26 19
06:52:26 20
                 MR WOODS: We might have to.
06:52:27 21
06:52:28 22
                WITNESS:
                           I'm getting confused.
06:52:29 23
                 COMMISSIONER: We'll adjourn now but I understand you would
06:52:30 24
                 like to go to a funeral on Tuesday morning?---That's
06:52:32 25
06:52:35 26
                 correct, yes.
06:52:36 27
                 So we have another witness who isn't going to the funeral,
06:52:36 28
                 a police officer using the pseudonym Paige, is that right,
06:52:43 29
                 who we will start with Tuesday morning at 9.30?
06:52:52 30
       31
       32
                 MR WOODS: Yes.
       33
                 COMMISSIONER: We'll start with him at 9.30. We expect to
06:52:55 34
                 finish with him perhaps by lunchtime?
06:52:56 35
       36
                 MR WOODS:
       37
                            Yes, we do.
       38
06:52:58 39
                 COMMISSIONER: So you would like to continue with this
                 witness in the afternoon.
06:53:01 40
                                             Is that okay for you to come
                 back in the afternoon?---Yeah, yeah.
06:53:03 41
06:53:05 42
                 Not before 2 o'clock?---Yeah, that's okay.
06:53:05 43
                                                               Roughly how
                 long after that because I'll make some other arrangements
06:53:09 44
06:53:13 45
                 if it's possible.
06:53:13 46
                 Yes, yes, yes. Probably wouldn't be more than a day and a
06:53:14 47
```

```
half at the most, would it? Tuesday and Wednesday at the
06:53:19 1
                 most, even with cross-examination?
06:53:22 2
         3
06:53:24
06:53:25 4
                 MR WOODS: For Mr Ryan?
06:53:26 5
                 COMMISSIONER: Yes, for Mr Ryan, Tuesday afternoon and
06:53:26 6
06:53:28 7
                 Wednesday.
06:53:29 8
                 MR WOODS:
                            I hope to be finished on Tuesday afternoon I
06:53:30 9
                 think, it would depend on cross-examination?---That's okay.
06:53:32 10
06:53:35 11
                 Tuesday, possibly Wednesday?---Both are okay.
06:53:35 12
06:53:37 13
                 Tuesday afternoon, possibly Wednesday. We'll adjourn now
06:53:37 14
06:53:41 15
                 until 9.30 on Tuesday.
       16
                 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
06:54:07 17
06:54:07 18
                 ADJOURNED UNTIL TUESDAY 13 AUGUST 2019
06:54:07 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
```