

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

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO THE MANAGEMENT
OF POLICE INFORMANTS

Held in Melbourne, Victoria

On Tuesday, 16 April 2019

Led by Commissioner: The Honourable Margaret McMurdo AC

Also Present

Counsel Assisting: Mr C. Winneke QC
 Mr A. Woods
 Ms M. Tittensor


Counsel for Victoria Police Mr S. Holt QC

Counsel for State of Victoria Ms J. Whiting

Counsel for Nicola Gobbo Mr P. Collinson QC
 Mr R. Nathwani

Counsel for DPP/SPP Ms K. O'Gorman

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

10:08:43 1 COMMISSIONER: I understand it's necessary for me to
10:08:44 2 formally make some orders. Under s.26 of the *Inquiries Act*
10:08:50 3 2014 I order that the publication of information that may
10:08:53 4 enable the identity of the persons who are to give evidence
10:08:55 5 in today's proceedings to be identified is prohibited.
10:09:00 6
10:09:01 7 I further order that under s.24 *Inquiries Act* 2014 access
10:09:07 8 to the Inquiry is limited to legal representatives and
10:09:09 9 staff assisting the Royal Commission and parties with leave
10:09:13 10 to appear in the private hearing, that is the State of
10:09:16 11 Victoria, Victoria Police, Ms Nicola Gobbo, the Director of
10:09:20 12 Public Prosecutions and Office of Public Prosecutions and
10:09:22 13 their legal representatives. There is a non-publication
10:09:31 14 order in relation to the transcript. Proceedings are to be
10:09:34 15 recorded but not streamed. So I'd ask anyone who's not in
10:09:38 16 that category of persons to leave the hearing room at this
10:09:40 17 point and I direct that a copy of these orders be posted on
10:09:44 18 the hearing room door.
10:09:48 19
10:09:48 20 Could I take appearances, please.
10:09:51 21
10:09:52 22 MR WINNEKE: I appear to assist with Ms Tittensor and
10:09:54 23 Mr Woods.
10:09:54 24
10:09:54 25 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Winneke.
10:09:56 26
10:09:57 27 MR COLLINSON: If the Commissioner pleases I appear with
10:10:00 28 Mr Nathwani for Ms Gobbo.
10:10:02 29
10:10:02 30 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
10:10:04 31
10:10:05 32 MS O'GORMAN: If the Commission pleases I appear for the
10:10:07 33 Director of Public Prosecutions and the Office of Public
10:10:08 34 Prosecutions.
10:10:08 35
10:10:09 36 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Ms O'Gorman.
10:10:10 37
10:10:10 38 MR HOLT: If it please the Commissioner I appear for
10:10:13 39 Victoria Police.
10:10:13 40
10:10:13 41 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Holt.
10:10:13 42
10:10:17 43 MS WHITING: Commissioner, I appear for the State of
10:10:21 44 Victoria.
10:10:21 45
10:10:21 46 COMMISSIONER: Thank you Ms Whiting. 
10:10:28 47

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

1 MR WINNEKE: Yes, [REDACTED] we're calling, Commissioner, if
10:10:28 2 he's here. I gather he is. Yes.

10:10:30 3
10:10:31 4 COMMISSIONER: Are you ready to call him at this point?

10:10:34 5
10:10:34 6 MR WINNEKE: We are. Unless there's any matters that
10:10:36 7 anyone wishes to raise? I don't believe there is. [REDACTED]
10:10:39 8 is not represented as I understand it. We were provided
10:10:42 9 with a statement relatively late last night which was then
10:10:47 10 forwarded to the legal representatives of Victoria Police.
10:10:54 11 That statement has been examined for potential issues of
10:11:01 12 public interest immunity. It's been red boxed but that
10:11:04 13 won't hold us up this morning, Commissioner, because of the
10:11:07 14 non-publication orders.

10:11:09 15
10:11:10 16 COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right.

10:11:14 17
10:11:14 18 MR WINNEKE: I believe it's now been provided to all other
10:11:17 19 parties appearing this morning.

10:11:18 20
10:11:19 21 COMMISSIONER: In relation to one of the named people
10:11:21 22 that's red boxed, there's already a pseudonym in place?

10:11:26 23
10:11:27 24 MR WINNEKE: That's in relation to Kruger, is that correct,
10:11:30 25 Commissioner?

10:11:30 26
10:11:31 27 COMMISSIONER: Yes.

10:11:31 28
10:11:32 29 MR WINNEKE: I'm not altogether certain whether it's
10:11:35 30 necessary for that person to continue to be referred to by
10:11:38 31 the name of Kruger. As I understood it, the situation was
10:11:43 32 particularly acute because of the appearance of Mr Kruger
10:11:48 33 physically here at the Commission. The expectation is that
10:11:52 34 he's not going to be called again. That's the expectation,
10:11:54 35 not a guarantee. In that circumstance it may be
10:11:57 36 appropriate if he is referred to by his correct name,
10:12:02 37 although perhaps Mr Holt may have something else to say
10:12:07 38 about that.

10:12:07 39
10:12:08 40 MR HOLT: With respect, we agree. The position in relation
10:12:10 41 to that witness was concerned with the safety actually
10:12:12 42 physically at the hearing and also obviously any material
10:12:16 43 that might identify his present whereabouts. That was very
10:12:19 44 carefully protected. If it's not anticipated that he will
10:12:22 45 be a witness again then there's nothing preventing the
10:12:26 46 non-use, if I can put it that way, of that order from now
10:12:30 47 on. Perhaps we could - I think it may require amendment to

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

10:12:34 1 order 1B that the Commissioner made and I might just liaise
2 with our friends during the course of the day and see if we
10:12:39 3 can propose something that might be acceptable so that it
10:12:41 4 continues to protect his present whereabouts.

10:12:44 5
10:12:44 6 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Holt. Does that mean that the red
10:12:47 7 boxes need not be around his name?

10:12:49 8
10:12:50 9 MR HOLT: If you made those orders then, yes, that would
10:12:53 10 occur. There are I think two or three other substantive
10:12:58 11 PII issues in there too, probably uncontroversial. One I
10:13:01 12 would like the opportunity to get some further advice on.
10:13:03 13 Given the way in which matters are proceeding today that
10:13:06 14 ought not hold us up, and can I indicate we've provided
10:13:10 15 that red box version to our friends at the Bar table so
16 that they could prepare for cross-examination without being
10:13:14 17 held up.

10:13:14 18
10:13:14 19 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

10:13:15 20
10:13:16 21 MR COLLINSON: Commissioner, the only difficulty might be
10:13:20 22 we've reserved our position I believe with Mr Kruger and
10:13:23 23 there's at least therefore a possibility that we might seek
10:13:26 24 to have him recalled. We'll obviously seek to avoid that
10:13:29 25 if we can. I simply wanted to bring that to the
10:13:33 26 Commission's attention.

10:13:34 27
10:13:34 28 COMMISSIONER: In which case it might be better for the
10:13:36 29 time being to keep referring to him as Kruger?

10:13:40 30
10:13:40 31 MR COLLINSON: It's the safer course with respect.

10:13:42 32
10:13:42 33 MR HOLT: We're content with that. The alternative is that
10:13:46 34 if he were to be recalled it would be done by other means
35 rather than being physically present, but given that we've
10:13:50 36 already worked very hard at having the pseudonym used, it
10:13:50 37 might just be continued to be used until that position is
10:13:53 38 clearer, Commissioner.

10:13:53 39
10:13:54 40 COMMISSIONER: I think it's probably one of the least of
10:13:56 41 our PII concerns really, but thanks Mr Holt.

10:13:59 42
10:13:59 43 MR HOLT: Yes.

10:14:00 44
10:14:00 45 COMMISSIONER: Yes.

10:14:01 46
10:14:02 47 MR WINNEKE: [REDACTED] just being informed of the true name

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

10:14:05 1 of Mr Kruger if he doesn't know that already.
10:14:11 2
10:14:11 3 COMMISSIONER: Yes. So you're ready to call [REDACTED]?
4
10:14:14 5 MR WINNEKE: Yes, I am, and I do call [REDACTED].
10:14:16 6
10:14:16 7 COMMISSIONER: Mr [REDACTED] would you go into the witness box,
10:14:21 8 please. Oath or affirmation?---Oath.
10:14:24 9
10:14:24 10 Oath.
10:14:25 11
10:14:32 12 [REDACTED] sworn and examined:
10:14:39 13
10:14:39 14 COMMISSIONER: Yes, please be seated?---I prefer to stand.
10:14:42 15
10:14:42 16 You prefer to stand, okay. That's all right.
10:14:44 17
10:14:45 18 MR WINNEKE: You might just need to raise that microphone
10:14:47 19 towards you if you could. Good, thanks very much. Your
10:14:50 20 full name is?---[REDACTED]
10:14:53 21
10:14:56 22 We don't need to trouble you with your address but what's
10:14:58 23 your occupation these days?---Unemployed.
10:15:01 24
10:15:03 25 You were a member of Victoria Police?---Yes.
10:15:08 26
10:15:11 27 What was your rank when you retired from the Police
10:15:14 28 Force?---Sergeant.
10:15:17 29
10:15:19 30 Right. You retired from the Police Force in about what
10:15:23 31 year?---2011.
10:15:25 32
10:15:28 33 [REDACTED], you have made a statement which is I think about a
10:15:34 34 five or six page statement; is that correct?---That's
10:15:36 35 correct.
10:15:36 36
10:15:38 37 You've prepared that statement over a period of time
10:15:43 38 leading up to last night when it was finalised, or
10:15:47 39 yesterday; is that correct?---That's correct.
10:15:48 40
10:15:48 41 Do you have a copy of that statement there with you?---I
10:15:50 42 do.
10:15:51 43
10:15:54 44 Can you tell the Commissioner whether the content of that
10:15:57 45 statement, to the best of your knowledge, is true and
10:16:02 46 correct?---To the best of my knowledge, yes.
10:16:04 47

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

10:16:05 1 I tender that statement, Commissioner.
10:16:09 2
10:16:09 3 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10:16:09 4
10:16:15 5 #EXHIBIT RC74 - Statement of [REDACTED]
10:16:22 6
10:16:22 7 MR WINNEKE: Thank you, Commissioner. [REDACTED] you, I take
10:16:28 8 it, were spoken to by members of Victoria Police attached
10:16:33 9 to Operation Landow we understand in March, on or about 4
10:16:42 10 March of this year, is that correct?---Yes.
10:16:44 11
10:16:45 12 Two police officers, one by the name of Woltsche and one by
10:16:47 13 the name of Pattie, P-a-t-t-i-e; is that right?---Yes, I
10:16:55 14 remember Woltsche. I can't remember the other guy's name.
10:16:56 15
10:16:57 16 That was as a result of a communication where there was an
10:17:01 17 arrangement made for you to meet them; is that
10:17:03 18 right?---That's right.
10:17:03 19
10:17:04 20 And we understand that you met with them in the Melbourne
10:17:07 21 CBD?---Yes.
10:17:09 22
10:17:12 23 Was there a telephone call prior to that meeting in which
10:17:18 24 you had a discussion with police officers?---Yes - I'm not
10:17:28 25 100 per cent sure. Yeah, it must have been because we
10:17:33 26 arranged to meet him.
10:17:35 27
10:17:37 28 Was that the first time you'd spoken to any investigators
10:17:40 29 about the matters which are the subject of this Royal
10:17:45 30 Commission?---Yes.
10:17:45 31
10:17:47 32 Prior to that when was the last time you had spoken to any
10:17:51 33 police officers about the events that are referred to in
10:17:54 34 your statement?---I can't recall speaking to anyone about
10:18:03 35 it.
10:18:04 36
10:18:04 37 Okay. It appears from notes that we have you sent a text
10:18:17 38 message to Mr Woltsche on or about I think 13 March, that
10:18:20 39 is about nine-odd days after your meeting?---Yes.
10:18:24 40
10:18:24 41 And you referred to a person by the name of Bowden and you
10:18:31 42 suggested that the investigators should speak to Mr Bowden;
10:18:35 43 is that right?---Yeah, Mark Bowden, yep.
10:18:36 44
10:18:37 45 Mark Bowden. Then you had a telephone call with
10:18:41 46 Mr Woltsche a couple of days afterwards; is that
10:18:45 47 right?---Yes, I believe so.

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

10:18:46 1
10:18:46 2 You've got copies of Landow notes I take it?---Yes, do you
10:18:51 3 mind if I refer to them, sorry?
10:18:53 4
10:18:54 5 No, no problem at all?---Okay.
10:19:08 6
10:19:10 7 There were telephone conversations on 15 March and 20
10:19:13 8 March. Do you see those telephone communications?---Yes.
10:19:19 9
10:19:21 10 Are they the only telephone communications that you had
10:19:23 11 with investigators since this was first brought to your
10:19:27 12 attention?---Yes.
10:19:29 13
10:19:32 14 It appears that those are summaries of the communications
10:19:37 15 that you had with police officers or does that set out more
10:19:40 16 or less the extent of the information that you provided to
10:19:45 17 your recollection?---Yes, I'd say that's basically it.
10:19:53 18
10:19:53 19 Right. Over the telephone or in person did you provide
10:20:01 20 police officers with information about Nicola Gobbo as a
10:20:08 21 human source and your views as to whether or not she was
10:20:10 22 too overt in her desire to provide information to
10:20:13 23 police?---I had one personal meeting with Wayne Woltsche
10:20:20 24 and his offsider.
10:20:22 25
10:20:22 26 Yes?---And that was the extent of the information that I
10:20:26 27 provided to him.
10:20:28 28
10:20:28 29 Yes?---In relation to me saying anything about Gobbo, it
10:20:34 30 was only at that meeting.
10:20:36 31
10:20:37 32 Right?---Apart from saying, because I - yeah, because he
10:20:44 33 was, at one stage was asking me for further information and
10:20:48 34 I said I didn't have anything further to give him so maybe
10:20:51 35 he should contact the people that are in charge and speak
10:20:53 36 to them.
10:20:53 37
10:20:54 38 Right, okay. Look, the reason I ask you this is because
10:20:59 39 that we were provided with a document on or about 6 March
10:21:02 40 which says that you gave information in conversation to the
10:21:09 41 effect that she was too overt in her desire to provide
10:21:12 42 information. You also had concerns that she was a
10:21:16 43 solicitor and about inappropriate relationships with police
10:21:19 44 officers?---Yes.
10:21:20 45
10:21:20 46 And you also provided information that she held one pound
10:21:24 47 of amphetamine for a person by the name of Peter Reid, one

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

10:21:28 1 of the accused in Operation Carron. Now that doesn't find
10:21:32 2 its way into those notes of communications or conversations
10:21:37 3 in Landow but it's found its way into another document. Do
10:21:42 4 you recall when you provided that additional
10:21:44 5 information?--No, that information was given at that
10:21:48 6 meeting.
10:21:48 7
10:21:48 8 Right. But it just didn't find its way into those Landow
10:21:52 9 notes?---That's correct.
10:21:53 10
10:21:54 11 Right, okay. You provided that information to Mr Woltsche
10:21:59 12 and Officer Pattie; is that right?---That's right.
10:22:02 13
10:22:05 14 When were you provided with those police member veteran
10:22:08 15 contact notes?--A day ago I think.
10:22:12 16
10:22:12 17 A day ago?---Yeah.
10:22:14 18
10:22:14 19 Did you look at those and think to yourself, "Well that
10:22:18 20 doesn't include all of the information which I gave
10:22:20 21 police"?--I didn't even consider it.
10:22:22 22
10:22:22 23 Okay. Perhaps I'll put that document up just so it can be
10:22:28 24 identified. VPL.0005.0047.0234. [REDACTED] I wonder if you
10:23:11 25 can hand my instructing solicitor the notes you have in
10:23:15 26 front of you there so I could have a look at them?--Which
10:23:18 27 ones?
10:23:19 28
10:23:19 29 That Landow note there. Thanks very much. Yes, thanks
10:23:39 30 very much. They're the notes that you were provided with a
10:23:43 31 couple of days ago; is that right?---That's right.
10:23:45 32
10:23:45 33 I tender those, Commissioner.
10:23:48 34
10:23:49 35 #EXHIBIT RC75 - Notes.
10:23:54 36
10:23:54 37 COMMISSIONER: You were asked if - you agreed that they
10:23:59 38 were basically correct, those notes. Is there anything in
10:24:01 39 them that isn't correct? You've also told us they weren't
10:24:12 40 a complete record of everything that you told the
10:24:14 41 police?---No, no.
10:24:15 42
10:24:15 43 But everything that they have written down is correct?
10:24:21 44 Just take your time?--Okay, thank you. I've just got a
10:25:47 45 little bit of confusion going on in my head because
10:25:50 46 basically I've got what's said on 4 March was actually,
10:25:58 47 he's put it in the 20th March 2000 so that was actually - I

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

10:26:05 1 didn't tell him anything further related to Gobbo or any of
10:26:13 2 these - in relation to the diaries, that might have been
10:26:16 3 asked but the conversation about Mark Bowden at the Drug
10:26:21 4 Squad and - - -
10:26:21 5
10:26:22 6 COMMISSIONER: So that's dot point 2?---Yeah, and he told
10:26:26 7 Bowds that Gobbo was bad news and would not be a good
10:26:29 8 informer.
10:26:30 9
10:26:30 10 Dot point 3?---After what happened with Shane Cogley and
10:26:34 11 Graeme Sayce, that was all back I first time I spoke to
10:26:39 12 him.
10:26:40 13
10:26:40 14 And you're confident about that?---I'm pretty confident
10:26:43 15 that I didn't have a conversation with him on the telephone
10:26:46 16 about that kind of information.
10:26:47 17
10:26:48 18 So it's correct but it's not - you say that they've got the
10:26:52 19 time and circumstances wrong?---Yeah, I don't even remember
10:26:58 20 talking to him on the telephone at length. I think it was
10:27:01 21 like more of an SMS message.
10:27:08 22
10:27:08 23 MR WINNEKE: In terms of the actual content of what's in
10:27:12 24 the document though, aside from that do you say it's
10:27:15 25 inaccurate?---No.
10:27:16 26
10:27:16 27 It's incomplete because there was conversation over and
10:27:19 28 above that which hasn't been recorded?---That's right.
10:27:21 29
10:27:22 30 Okay, all right.
10:27:22 31
10:27:23 32 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
10:27:23 33
10:27:23 34 MR WINNEKE: I should say, Commissioner, I've got three
10:27:26 35 different versions of that document with different
10:27:29 36 redactions on it. It's perhaps not a matter of great
10:27:32 37 moment because we can deal with it in due course but - - -
10:27:36 38
10:27:36 39 MR HOLT: We were provided a zip file by the Commission
10:27:40 40 very helpfully a couple of days ago of the documents that
10:27:43 41 were to be used in this hearing and this isn't the version
10:27:47 42 that was in zip file as I'm instructed. There was a zip
10:27:49 43 folder that was given to us which was to be used today.
10:27:51 44 I'm not sure this is it. But it's not a problem for this
10:27:54 45 morning, we'll confirm and make sure that - - -
46
47 MR WINNEKE: Yes. As I understand it, Commissioner,

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

10:27:57 1 there's only - - -
10:27:57 2
10:27:58 3 COMMISSIONER: The one that's up on the screen is the one
10:28:00 4 that Mr Holt is content with?
10:28:04 5
10:28:05 6 MR HOLT: It's not the version that was supplied.
10:28:07 7
10:28:07 8 COMMISSIONER: All right.
10:28:08 9
10:28:08 10 MR WINNEKE: It may well be we've been provided with
10:28:11 11 another document which is VPL.0005.0035.0048. That may
10:28:22 12 well be - no, that's not the one. In any event, I don't
10:28:28 13 think it really matters because there's no suggestion that
10:28:31 14 there were two different versions of that document.
10:28:45 15
10:28:46 16 COMMISSIONER: Could we make sure we've tendered the right
10:28:48 17 one so that the witness is answering the questions about
10:28:50 18 the right document? I'd just like to have that clarified.
19
20 MR WINNEKE: I think the point's this, Commissioner: the
10:28:57 21 document is - - -
10:28:57 22
10:28:57 23 MR HOLT: This is the right document.
10:28:58 24
10:28:59 25 COMMISSIONER: The one that's been tendered is the right
10:29:01 26 document? Thank you.
10:29:02 27
10:29:03 28 MR WINNEKE: Perhaps we better be clear.
10:29:04 29
10:29:04 30 COMMISSIONER: And we better check that [REDACTED] document
10:29:07 31 is the same one.
10:29:08 32
10:29:09 33 MR WINNEKE: I'll ask my learned friend to confirm this,
10:29:11 34 that there was only ever one version of that document. The
10:29:14 35 different versions are different because they have
10:29:16 36 different black in different spots.
37
10:29:18 38 COMMISSIONER: Redactions.
10:29:18 39
10:29:19 40 MR HOLT: That's precisely so. There are not two versions
10:29:21 41 of the document.
10:29:21 42
10:29:22 43 COMMISSIONER: Okay. I think the witness is just a little
10:29:24 44 bit concerned. Mr Winneke, if you could just have a look
10:29:27 45 at the document he's got and just make sure that we're
10:29:30 46 talking about the same document.
10:29:33 47

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

10:29:34 1 MR WINNEKE: Yes. Yes, it's the same as this.
10:29:52 2
10:29:52 3 COMMISSIONER: Good, thank you.
10:29:54 4
10:29:56 5 MR WINNEKE: [REDACTED] without going into any details about
10:30:01 6 your medical history and so forth, I understand that
10:30:03 7 there's a medical practitioner who has your diaries; is
10:30:11 8 that correct?---Yes. I believed he did, I'm not 100 per
10:30:16 9 cent sure. I did give them to him at one stage, as I was
10:30:22 10 going through a court case, and I'm not sure whether he's
10:30:26 11 got them or not at the moment. I've asked him but
10:30:29 12 unfortunately he's very unwell.
10:30:30 13
10:30:32 14 Right. The diaries that you're referring to, are they the
10:30:36 15 original diaries, your original diaries that you had with
10:30:39 16 you, or are they copies?---No, they were original diaries,
10:30:45 17 police diaries.
10:30:46 18
10:30:46 19 How many diaries or how many separate books, if you like,
10:30:51 20 were there that you gave to your doctor?---I think there
10:30:57 21 were about two Victoria Police diaries and then there was
10:31:04 22 some notebooks that I kept as well.
10:31:08 23
10:31:09 24 Right. Did the diaries that you provided encompass the
10:31:15 25 entire period that you were in the Police Force?---No, no.
10:31:20 26
10:31:20 27 And do you recall which period they did encompass?---I
10:31:24 28 think it was around this time, around the time that I was
10:31:28 29 in the Drug Squad. Well, the only time that I was taking
10:31:32 30 diaries while I was in the - as a detective, so I think
10:31:35 31 there was a ten year period that I was a detective.
10:31:37 32
10:31:37 33 Yes?---So I would have had about four diaries.
10:31:41 34
10:31:42 35 Have you provided the name of the doctor to investigators
10:31:49 36 for Victoria Police?---Yes, I did.
10:31:51 37
10:31:52 38 And do you know whether any attempts have been made to get
10:31:55 39 a hold of those diaries? Clearly you've tried to get them;
10:32:02 40 is that right?---Yeah, I have actually. He's going through
10:32:05 41 chemotherapy this week so he's pretty - he's actually
10:32:08 42 dying, so.
10:32:09 43
10:32:09 44 Yes, all right. Do you think you'd be able to continue to
10:32:15 45 make efforts, allowing for that situation, but do you think
10:32:18 46 you'd be able to make continued efforts to get hold of
10:32:22 47 those diaries and provide them to the Royal Commission?---I

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

10:32:25 1 was making efforts to go and see his receptionist today.
10:32:29 2
10:32:29 3 Okay, all right. What you can say to the Commissioner is
10:32:33 4 you'll do so and if the diaries are there you'll provide
10:32:36 5 them to the Royal Commission; is that
10:32:38 6 correct?---Definitely.
10:32:38 7
10:32:39 8 Good, thanks very much.
10:32:42 9
10:32:42 10 COMMISSIONER: Is the medical practitioner in the city that
10:32:45 11 you were going to see him, in the CBD or not in the
10:32:51 12 CBD?---Yep, in Richmond.
10:32:52 13
10:32:53 14 MR HOLT: Can I say something, Commissioner? Enquiries
10:32:56 15 have been made by police. The receptionist, for perfectly
10:33:00 16 understandable reasons, won't confirm to police even that
10:33:02 17 the diaries are held and certainly won't provide them.
10:33:03 18
10:33:03 19 COMMISSIONER: Perhaps a Notice to Produce is the way to
10:33:05 20 go.
10:33:07 21
10:33:07 22 MR HOLT: That's what we were going to suggest.
10:33:10 23
10:33:11 24 MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, there has been a Notice to
10:33:12 25 Produce served upon [REDACTED] but in any event that's the
10:33:16 26 situation and he is the subject of a Notice to Produce and
10:33:19 27 he's given an indication he's going to make efforts to
10:33:22 28 provide them.
10:33:22 29
10:33:23 30 COMMISSIONER: Yes, sure. If he doesn't have success a
10:33:30 31 Notice to Produce might be the way to go.
10:33:33 32
10:33:33 33 MR WINNEKE: Upon the medical practitioner certainly, yes.
10:33:34 34 You joined the Police Force in 1986?---That's correct.
10:33:37 35
10:33:38 36 And you were engaged in various activities including
10:33:44 37 Detective Training School in 1992, correct?---Yes.
10:33:48 38
10:33:49 39 You were then transferred to the South Melbourne
10:33:57 40 CI?---That's right.
10:33:57 41
10:33:57 42 You remained there for about four years and then you were
10:34:00 43 transferred to the Drug Squad; is that correct?---That's
10:34:02 44 right.
10:34:02 45
10:34:02 46 In your statement you talk about a period of time in the
10:34:06 47 Drug Squad from 96 through to 99. You were transferred to

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

10:34:11 1 the Melbourne police station for two years commencing in 99
10:34:17 2 following your time in the Drug Squad; is that
10:34:20 3 right?---That's right.
10:34:20 4
10:34:20 5 You had a motor vehicle accident?---Yep.
10:34:23 6
10:34:23 7 You were demoted, I assume, no doubt arising out of the
10:34:27 8 circumstances of the motor vehicle accident; is that
10:34:30 9 right?---That's right.
10:34:30 10
10:34:30 11 Was there alcohol involved?---That's correct.
10:34:32 12
10:34:33 13 In any event, what were you demoted to, what was your
10:34:40 14 rank?---Back to the bottom, back to Constable.
10:34:43 15
10:34:43 16 Back to Constable. But then you bounced back and you were
10:34:48 17 a Sergeant in 2001 and you were transferred to St Kilda
10:34:53 18 Road Police Station; is that correct?---That's right.
10:34:54 19
10:34:58 20 You then did special duties - I'm just going through your
10:35:02 21 history in the Police Force, I'll come back to these in
10:35:07 22 some more detail, but just by way of an outline - 18 months
10:35:12 23 at St Kilda Road Police Station, then seconded to the Armed
10:35:15 24 Robbery Squad in 2003 back as a Detective
10:35:18 25 Sergeant?---That's right.
10:35:18 26
10:35:19 27 Upgraded to St Kilda Road as an Acting Senior
10:35:22 28 Sergeant?---Yep.
10:35:22 29
10:35:22 30 When was that?---I can't remember, it was maybe - - -
10:35:30 31
10:35:31 32 How long were you at the Armed Robbers for starting in
10:35:34 33 2003?---I don't think I was there that long. It was only
10:35:37 34 about three or six months.
10:35:38 35
10:35:45 36 Then you went to St Kilda Road?---Yeah, went back to
10:35:47 37 St Kilda Road.
10:35:48 38
10:35:48 39 In your statement you talk about, or having mentioned that
10:35:55 40 you go to St Kilda Road, then you moved to your retirement
10:35:59 41 and a health issue in 2011. What did you do between
10:36:03 42 St Kilda Road shortly after the Armed Robbery Squad period
10:36:12 43 in 2003 and your retirement in 2011, what were your
10:36:16 44 postings?---Stayed at St Kilda Road, still based at
10:36:20 45 St Kilda Road as a uniform Sergeant.
10:36:21 46
10:36:21 47 What were you doing there mainly in that period of

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

10:36:23 1 time?---Just a general duty Sergeant.
10:36:29 2
10:36:30 3 In uniform?---Yep.
10:36:31 4
10:36:33 5 I take it general duties basically means a police officer
10:36:43 6 who is in a van or in a police vehicle, is that right?
10:36:49 7 What sort of things were you doing in that
10:36:52 8 period?---Usually a uniform Sergeant does, just supervising
10:37:01 9 younger members, doing 251 shifts I think they were called
10:37:06 10 in those days, going out on the road like two to three
10:37:10 11 times a week either working night shift or just shift work.
10:37:15 12 But basically just being a supervisor.
10:37:18 13
10:37:18 14 A supervisor of uniform Constables, Senior Constables who
10:37:24 15 are out patrolling around Melbourne?---That's right.
10:37:27 16
10:37:28 17 Okay. You would go to scenes of incidents and take control
10:37:31 18 of those scenes, those sorts of things?---That's right.
10:37:34 19
10:37:35 20 I'll come back to this in due course but you also had an
10:37:41 21 involvement in the provision of information to
10:37:42 22 investigative task forces as well; is that right?---Yes.
10:37:45 23
10:37:46 24 Was that as a sideline to your duty as a uniform
10:37:51 25 Sergeant?---Just a policeman, so providing information,
10:37:56 26 just a normal part of duties.
10:38:01 27
10:38:02 28 We'll come back to that. In your period of time in the
10:38:06 29 Drug Squad from 96 to 98 who was your Sergeant during that
10:38:16 30 period from 96 through to 98/99?---I had different
10:38:39 31 Sergeants.
10:38:39 32
10:38:40 33 Right?---So do you want me to give you all the Sergeants'
10:38:47 34 names?
10:38:47 35
10:38:48 36 We know that one of them was Wayne Strawhorn?---No.
10:38:50 37
10:38:50 38 No?---No. Are you talking about Sergeants or Senior
10:38:55 39 Sergeants?
10:38:55 40
10:38:56 41 Why don't we start with Sergeants?---Okay. Sergeants were
10:39:05 42 Ian Jones.
10:39:06 43
10:39:06 44 Yes?---And - who else did I have - Graham Cleaves and
10:39:20 45 Graeme Sayce.
10:39:21 46
10:39:21 47 We understand there were three units in the Drug Squad; is

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

10:39:25 1 that correct?---That's right.
10:39:25 2
10:39:27 3 Which unit were you in?---I think originally I was in 1 and
10:39:34 4 then I got moved to 2.
10:39:37 5
10:39:37 6 Yes?---And, yeah, that's it.
10:39:42 7
10:39:42 8 So you were in 1 and 2?---Yep.
10:39:44 9
10:39:45 10 The Senior Sergeant in charge of Unit 1 was?---It changed.
10:39:59 11 I think it was Tom Kelleher from memory.
10:40:06 12
10:40:07 13 Right. Mr Bowden, was he a Senior Sergeant?---He was the
10:40:14 14 Senior Sergeant, yeah, my Senior Sergeant in charge of Unit
10:40:18 15 2.
10:40:18 16
10:40:18 17 Right. Did he remain the Senior Sergeant in charge of Unit
10:40:23 18 2 or was there a change over to another Senior
10:40:27 19 Sergeant?---No, he was the Senior Sergeant in Unit 2.
10:40:30 20
10:40:30 21 What about Mr Strawhorn?---I don't know what his position
10:40:39 22 was. He was a Sergeant and I think he was going - or an
10:40:44 23 Acting Senior Sergeant and then he became a Senior Sergeant
10:40:47 24 while he was at the, yeah, but I'm pretty sure he was like
10:40:54 25 upgraded as like an Acting Senior Sergeant but I don't know
10:40:57 26 where he actually was.
10:40:58 27
10:40:58 28 Was he ever in the same unit as you?---He was involved in
10:41:05 29 jobs that we were doing.
10:41:06 30
10:41:06 31 Yes?---And I don't know whether he was actually - he might
10:41:12 32 have actually been a Sergeant in Unit 2.
10:41:16 33
10:41:17 34 Right?---But I'm not sure whether he was a Sergeant or an
10:41:21 35 Acting Senior Sergeant.
10:41:22 36
10:41:22 37 All right. You say he was involved in jobs that you did.
10:41:25 38 In what way?---He was definitely involved in the jobs that
10:41:27 39 we were doing, or some.
10:41:28 40
10:41:28 41 In what way?---I think he was controlling some of the
10:41:41 42 informers that I had.
10:41:41 43
10:41:42 44 Yes?---I'm pretty sure he was - like I was a handler of
10:41:46 45 informers so he was - I know Bowden was a controller so he
10:41:54 46 may have been a controller at the same time.
10:41:56 47

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

10:41:57 1 Righto. How many handlers - sorry, how many informers did
10:42:02 2 you handle in your period in the Drug Squad in that
10:42:07 3 three-odd year period?---I'm pretty sure I had about, it
10:42:10 4 would have been maybe 15 registered informers and maybe - I
10:42:16 5 don't know how many unregistered informers I had, but I had
10:42:19 6 a few.
10:42:19 7
10:42:20 8 Were you quite experienced when it came to handling
10:42:23 9 informers?---I don't think many people had informers in
10:42:30 10 the - - -
10:42:30 11
10:42:31 12 You don't think many people had informers?---I don't think
10:42:33 13 there were many informers. I know that when I was in Unit
10:42:37 14 2 all the operations that were actually running at one time
10:42:41 15 were run by informers that I was controlling.
10:42:43 16
10:42:44 17 And so if most people didn't have many and you had 14, it
10:42:49 18 would follow, wouldn't it, that you had quite a bit of
10:42:52 19 experience out all of the people who you knew in the Drug
10:42:55 20 Squad with informers?---Yes.
10:42:56 21
10:42:59 22 Was there any reason why you handled so many informers?---I
10:43:07 23 don't know, people just liked giving me information. I
10:43:10 24 really have no idea.
10:43:11 25
10:43:12 26 All right. I'll come back to that again. You in your
10:43:19 27 statement indicate that you were aware of Nicola Gobbo and
10:43:27 28 in your statement you say that in or about July 98, whilst
10:43:30 29 a member of the Drug Squad, you were instructed to assist
10:43:34 30 Detective Senior Constable Kruger, we'll call him?---Yep.
10:43:37 31
10:43:37 32 In dealing with Nicola Gobbo who was a lawyer representing
10:43:42 33 a person by the name of Peter Reid?---That's right.
10:43:47 34
10:43:47 35 In your statement you also say that you had some knowledge
10:43:50 36 of Ms Gobbo. Did you know of her prior to being instructed
10:43:54 37 to assist Kruger with dealing with her?---I was aware of
10:44:01 38 her, yes.
10:44:02 39
10:44:02 40 And you say that she had a reputation, certainly at about
10:44:06 41 that time, you say that she had a reputation and she had a
10:44:11 42 reputation of socialising with Victoria Police members. If
10:44:15 43 you go to your statement you'll see it?---Okay, what did
10:44:28 44 you say? The reputation of going to nightclubs, yeah.
10:44:31 45
10:44:31 46 How did you first know about it?---The one thing that
10:44:40 47 police have, I mean not one thing, but it's pretty common

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

10:44:47 1 for police to know what solicitors are representing who or
10:44:54 2 who's involved with - because we're constantly going to
10:45:00 3 court so you see people.
10:45:01 4
10:45:02 5 Yes?---And, yeah, police gossip.
10:45:06 6
10:45:06 7 Police gossip?---Yep.
10:45:07 8
10:45:08 9 Do you know which police officers she socialised
10:45:15 10 with?---No.
10:45:15 11
10:45:16 12 You say that she had a reputation of going to nightclubs,
10:45:20 13 including the Tunnel Nightclub, socialising with VicPol
10:45:24 14 members and she was very friendly with police. That's
10:45:29 15 something that you were aware of back in 98 when you first
10:45:32 16 had to deal with her?---Yes.
10:45:33 17
10:45:36 18 You were aware of that through discussions with police
10:45:39 19 officers I assume?---Yes.
10:45:41 20
10:45:41 21 Did you deal with her ever yourself?---No.
10:45:45 22
10:45:47 23 Had you met her before the time that you met her as a
10:45:50 24 prospective informer?---No.
10:45:53 25
10:45:55 26 You knew that she socialised though with other police
10:45:58 27 officers nonetheless and that's through discussions that
10:46:02 28 you had with other members of the Drug Squad?---I don't
10:46:05 29 know whether it was Drug Squad.
10:46:06 30
10:46:07 31 Hey?---I said I don't know if specifically it was Drug
10:46:11 32 Squad.
10:46:11 33
10:46:11 34 You certainly were of the view when the suggestion was that
10:46:14 35 she should be registered, now we assume this was around
10:46:18 36 July of 1998, that she - one of the reasons why you thought
10:46:22 37 she shouldn't be registered was because you took the view
10:46:28 38 she had inappropriate relations with members of Victoria
10:46:32 39 Police?---No, he's taken that out of context.
10:46:34 40
10:46:34 41 Right. What do you say the situation is?---It related to,
10:46:37 42 the conversation I had with him was that, one, she was a
10:46:44 43 solicitor and, two, I got the impression that she was going
10:46:48 44 to be basically setting herself up to act inappropriately
10:46:54 45 with her clients.
10:46:56 46
10:46:56 47 In other words, acting for people and providing information

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

10:46:59 1 to Victoria Police about the people for whom she's
10:47:02 2 acting?---Yeah, that's the impression I got.
10:47:04 3
10:47:07 4 Yes, and - - - ?---In relation to inappropriate
10:47:10 5 relationships, I was talking about what I had heard as time
10:47:13 6 went on.
10:47:13 7
10:47:14 8 Right, okay. So you did come to - over time, and obviously
10:47:18 9 you seem to have some knowledge of Nicola Gobbo, over the
10:47:22 10 years you certainly came to the view that she had
10:47:24 11 inappropriate relationships with members of Victoria
10:47:28 12 Police?---Correct.
10:47:29 13
10:47:30 14 COMMISSIONER: So do I understand you to be saying
10:47:32 15 initially your reservation was because she was going to set
10:47:36 16 herself up to get information from clients in her role as a
10:47:41 17 solicitor and that was what you saw as
10:47:43 18 inappropriate?---Absolutely.
10:47:43 19
10:47:43 20 Thank you.
10:47:44 21
10:47:44 22 MR WINNEKE: Indeed, I think at one point you say she was
10:47:47 23 playing both sides. Were you concerned that she was
10:47:51 24 getting information from police and providing it to
10:47:55 25 clients?---That was the impression. I just got the
10:47:57 26 impression she wasn't a trustworthy person to speak to and
10:48:01 27 what we - what you spoke to her was going to just - like
10:48:01 28 the way that she was talking for me it was, one, she was
10:48:07 29 very open in her conversation with what she was telling us.
10:48:12 30 Two, was she was talking about, I can't recall whether she
10:48:17 31 said it was her employer or not, but he was another
10:48:21 32 solicitor.
10:48:22 33
10:48:23 34 Yes?---She identified him obviously. I don't know if I'm
10:48:26 35 supposed to name him.
10:48:27 36
10:48:27 37 You understood it to be her employer?---Well, I didn't know
10:48:33 38 who it was. It was - do I name him?
10:48:36 39
10:48:36 40 COMMISSIONER: You can, it's a closed hearing, so you
10:48:39 41 can?---Okay. She was talking about [REDACTED] and she
10:48:42 42 was basically saying that, from what I recall she was
10:48:49 43 talking about finances, she was talking about her client
10:48:56 44 Peter Reid, I believe that there was maybe a bail
10:48:59 45 application or something coming up and that we should be
10:49:03 46 looking at where the funds come from and [REDACTED]
10:49:08 47 trust accounts and, yeah, basically I was, yeah, highly

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

10:49:15 1 suspicious of her because she was - it was like she was
10:49:19 2 saying, "I'm going to work for you guys and I'm going to
10:49:22 3 provide you information", and I'm thinking how can you be
10:49:29 4 providing us information when you're actually - then I'm
10:49:32 5 thinking are you representing Peter Reid or was [REDACTED]
10:49:36 6 [REDACTED] representing him? Unfortunately I went there
10:49:39 7 with the idea that I'm getting information, not that I was
10:49:43 8 actually - should have actually been a little bit more
10:49:46 9 careful with her.

10:49:47 10
10:49:48 11 MR WINNEKE: All right. We're talking about the occasion
10:49:53 12 when you go meet her with Kruger?---That's right.

10:49:59 13
10:49:59 14 You'd been asked by Bowden to go meet her, that's your
10:50:04 15 recollection, with Kruger?---That's right. And I can't say
10:50:10 16 categorically it was just Bowden though, it may have been
10:50:13 17 Strawhorn as well.

10:50:14 18
10:50:14 19 Just about Strawhorn, you say that you can't really recall
10:50:17 20 what involvement he had in your unit but can you tell the
10:50:22 21 Commissioner what his involvement was or what his knowledge
10:50:25 22 was of matters that were going on within the Drug Squad.
10:50:29 23 Just paint a picture of Strawhorn in the Drug Squad at that
10:50:32 24 time?---He was a very hard worker and he was basically, he
10:50:39 25 was all over a lot of the stuff that was going on in the
10:50:42 26 Drug Squad. He - yeah, he always wanted to - he was either
10:50:50 27 a Sergeant or an Acting Senior Sergeant, I'm sorry but I
10:50:55 28 just can't recall which he was, but he was probably one of
10:50:59 29 the most experienced detectives at the Drug Squad so
10:51:02 30 obviously a lot of the other members, including Bowden and
10:51:09 31 other members would go to him for advice in relation to
10:51:13 32 operations that were going forward.

10:51:15 33
10:51:16 34 Yes. You say you had quite a number of informers in your
10:51:21 35 period there. Was it your understanding that he also knew
10:51:24 36 who those informers were and had sometimes contacted those
10:51:29 37 informers as well?---No, I don't think he'd ever go over
10:51:33 38 the top of me with dealing with informers but he would come
10:51:40 39 and meet some of the informers, yeah, definitely would. I
10:51:47 40 definitely remember him going to see some of the informers
10:51:50 41 and obviously with the informers, some of the informers
10:51:56 42 that I actually had whilst I was at the Drug Squad they
10:52:00 43 were cultivated as a result of jobs that we did. So as you
10:52:07 44 catch someone, most of the time you're always trying to
10:52:14 45 catch the next person.

10:52:15 46
10:52:15 47 Yes?---So the idea would be to get them to inform on the

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

10:52:19 1 person above them.
10:52:20 2
10:52:20 3 Righto. You understood, according to your statement, when
10:52:25 4 you went to meet with Gobbo your understanding was that she
10:52:30 5 was likely to become an informer, that was the purpose of
10:52:34 6 the meeting?---Yes, definitely.
10:52:36 7
10:52:36 8 And is that something that you understood because of
10:52:41 9 speaking to either Bowden and/or Strawhorn, or
10:52:48 10 Kruger?---Well no, I was - - -
10:52:49 11
10:52:49 12 I withdraw that. We should say Kruger. We'll fix it up.
10:52:59 13
10:52:59 14 COMMISSIONER: Before it's published on the website it will
10:53:02 15 be - PII issues will be taken care of?---Is my name
10:53:07 16 actually getting published on the website?
10:53:08 17
10:53:08 18 We can discuss that later?---With all due respect,
10:53:12 19 Commissioner, I'd prefer my name not to be published on the
10:53:16 20 website.
10:53:16 21
10:53:17 22 Okay, understood?---Thank you.
10:53:22 23
10:53:23 24 MR WINNEKE: Come back to that question. You understood
10:53:25 25 when you went to meet Gobbo?---Yes.
10:53:27 26
10:53:27 27 That she was going to become an informer. How did you get
10:53:31 28 that understanding?---Well that's why I was sent there.
10:53:40 29
10:53:41 30 That's the reason you were sent there?---Yes.
10:53:43 31
10:53:43 32 Because of a conversation with - - - ?---It would have been
10:53:46 33 Bowden or Strawhorn or both.
10:53:47 34
10:53:49 35 Did you know - - - ?---If I can clarify.
10:53:51 36
10:53:52 37 Yes?---Kruger, from my recollection, was from [REDACTED] He
10:53:56 38 didn't have any idea about speaking to informers, from my
10:54:04 39 knowledge.
10:54:05 40
10:54:05 41 Yes?---Here we have a person that is potentially going to
10:54:11 42 give information, a solicitor, and they want him to go and
10:54:18 43 speak to her. They told me to go and make sure that
10:54:23 44 everything was okay.
10:54:24 45
10:54:24 46 Yes, I follow that. In fact that comes through in your
10:54:27 47 statement. You say that he's from [REDACTED] and obviously

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

10:54:30 1 there's nothing wrong with people from [REDACTED] we know
10:54:32 2 that. But it may well be that in terms of dealing with
10:54:37 3 clever, manipulative, potentially difficult informers, it
10:54:43 4 was considered that you would be best to go there and make
10:54:48 5 sure things went smoothly; is that correct?---Yeah. Yes,
10:54:53 6 potentially. I don't know, that was - I don't know what's
10:54:57 7 going through their head.
10:54:58 8
10:54:58 9 Yes, I understand that. In any event, you talk about the
10:55:01 10 difficulties that they had had with an informer, registered
10:55:04 11 number possibly [REDACTED]?---Yep.
10:55:07 12
10:55:07 13 And I think in your notes you've referred to, the Landow
10:55:15 14 notes, you've referred to a problem they had with Graeme
10:55:19 15 Sayce and an another fellow by the name of Cogley. Is that
10:55:22 16 the one we were referring to?---That's right.
10:55:24 17
10:55:24 18 What were the problems there, what had occurred
10:55:27 19 there?---Yeah, basically an informer that was - he was
10:55:31 20 brought out of gaol and he was out of control and they let
10:55:36 21 him go.
10:55:37 22
10:55:38 23 All right. At the time that you went off to this meeting,
10:55:43 24 you knew about Operation Carron?---Yes.
10:55:47 25
10:55:47 26 You knew that a number of people had been charged,
10:55:51 27 correct?---Yes.
10:55:51 28
10:55:52 29 One of them was Reid obviously?---Yes.
10:55:55 30
10:55:55 31 The other one was Jackson?---I don't remember.
10:56:01 32
10:56:02 33 Darren Jackson, do you remember that?---Yeah, I remember
10:56:05 34 the name.
10:56:05 35
10:56:05 36 [REDACTED]
10:56:09 37
10:56:10 38 Do you accept that or do you recall that or not?---It's not
10:56:13 39 a massive, it's not something that comes out - I remember
10:56:16 40 Peter Reid and One Stop Real Estate shop, that's what I
10:56:22 41 remember.
10:56:22 42
10:56:23 43 You also understood that Nicola Gobbo worked for [REDACTED]
10:56:28 44 [REDACTED], the solicitor?---That's what I was believed,
10:56:30 45 yes.
10:56:30 46
10:56:30 47 And that he was acting for a number of these people?---Yes.

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

10:56:33 1
10:56:33 2 And the idea was that she would be registered as an
10:56:37 3 informer and potentially provide information about these
10:56:40 4 people for whom either she or her employer acted?---Yes.
10:56:45 5
10:56:46 6 And your reaction was, "Well how could this be"?---Yes.
10:56:51 7
10:56:52 8 As far as you were concerned that seemed to be a very
10:56:55 9 unusual situation?---Yeah, there was no other situation
10:57:00 10 like it that I'd encountered.
10:57:03 11
10:57:04 12 And indeed in your statement at one point you talk about
10:57:09 13 your understanding of fairly fundamental concepts such as
10:57:15 14 right to silence, the right of a person who's being
10:57:20 15 interviewed or is a suspect to speak to a solicitor,
10:57:24 16 correct?---Sorry, what's the question?
10:57:27 17
10:57:29 18 As a detective?---Yes.
10:57:31 19
10:57:31 20 You were aware that a person who was being - who was a
10:57:36 21 suspect had certain rights?---Correct.
10:57:38 22
10:57:38 23 One of which was a right to speak to a lawyer?---That's
10:57:42 24 right.
10:57:42 25
10:57:42 26 And speak to a lawyer confidentially?---Yes.
10:57:44 27
10:57:45 28 The right to silence, that is they didn't have to say
10:57:48 29 anything to police if they didn't want to?---Yes.
10:57:51 30
10:57:51 31 And you understood the expectation would be that the lawyer
10:57:58 32 who was speaking to the person would be acting in the best
10:58:02 33 interests of the client and wouldn't be telling police
10:58:06 34 everything that the client had told them?---Yes.
10:58:09 35
10:58:10 36 And that's why you considered that this arrangement was
10:58:13 37 extraordinary, as I - or this proposed arrangement?---Yes.
10:58:17 38
10:58:18 39 Yes, all right. I take it - did you consider that there
10:58:28 40 might be consequences, significant consequences if in
10:58:35 41 effect the client, and we're talking about Peter Reid, was
10:58:41 42 deprived of those rights by police getting information
10:58:44 43 through the back door?---Honestly, for me it's just - I
10:58:50 44 basically made a decision in relation to - that it was
10:58:55 45 wrong, told the bosses that it was wrong. That was it.
10:58:57 46
10:58:58 47 Yes, okay?---As in for making specific opinionated - I

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

10:59:03 1 didn't really go into it.
10:59:05 2
10:59:05 3 No, I follow that. I mean we're talking about particular
10:59:08 4 rights, but your gut reaction was that this is
10:59:12 5 wrong?---Yes.
10:59:12 6
10:59:13 7 Unethical?---Yes.
10:59:14 8
10:59:14 9 Unprofessional?---Yes.
10:59:16 10
10:59:18 11 You say you told the bosses about that. Did you tell the
10:59:22 12 bosses about that before the meeting or after the
10:59:25 13 meeting?---I wasn't actually aware of what was going on
10:59:31 14 until after the meeting, so yeah, I briefed, definitely
10:59:34 15 briefed Detective Senior Sergeant Mark Bowden after it.
10:59:38 16
10:59:38 17 Yes?---And he - yep. Do you want me to go further?
10:59:43 18
10:59:43 19 Yes, go for your life?---Okay. So I briefed Mark Bowden
10:59:47 20 after the meeting. We were actually busy with a lot of
10:59:56 21 other jobs at the time that I was actually involved in but
11:00:00 22 I said that this is something that we shouldn't be involved
11:00:03 23 in and basically he said that he would make sure that we
11:00:11 24 weren't involved in it.
11:00:13 25
11:00:13 26 "That we weren't involved"?---Yeah, basically it was going
11:00:16 27 to be - after this he had a conversation with other bosses
11:00:22 28 and I think she was introduced to someone else or
11:00:27 29 introduced to another police - - -
11:00:34 30
11:00:35 31 Agency?---Agency, yeah.
11:00:36 32
11:00:36 33 I'll come back to that. You immediately came to the view
11:00:41 34 after you sat down with Ms Gobbo that it wasn't
11:00:45 35 right?---Yes.
11:00:45 36
11:00:47 37 You can't recall exactly where the location was?---No.
11:00:51 38
11:00:51 39 I think Mr Bowden may recall it was at a café, do you know
11:00:57 40 whether that's right or not?---You're talking about the
11:00:59 41 person we don't talk about?
11:01:01 42
11:01:01 43 I'm sorry?---You're talking about the person you don't talk
11:01:05 44 about or are we talking about Bowden?
11:01:07 45
11:01:07 46 No, I'm talking about the meeting that you had with
11:01:11 47 Gobbo?---The first one?

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

11:01:12 1
11:01:12 2 The first one?---Yeah. The first one was with - I don't
11:01:18 3 know what they call him.
11:01:21 4
11:01:21 5 Kruger?---Kruger. So, yeah - sorry, I've lost my train of
11:01:25 6 thought.
11:01:25 7
11:01:25 8 Going back to the first meeting?---Yep.
11:01:27 9
11:01:29 10 Bowden was of the view that it might have been at a
11:01:32 11 café?---No, no.
11:01:33 12
11:01:33 13 He wasn't there?---Bowden wasn't there. He thinks that we
11:01:37 14 met at a - so, the person we don't talk about, he thinks
11:01:43 15 that we were at a café. I'm not sure, I recall going - - -
11:01:47 16
11:01:47 17 COMMISSIONER: Sorry, the person we don't talk about,
11:01:50 18 that's Kruger.
11:01:51 19
11:01:52 20 MR WINNEKE: That's Kruger. Just call him Kruger?---Okay.
11:01:56 21
11:01:56 22 We can talk about him, just use the name Kruger?---It just
11:02:00 23 confuses me because I remember him as his name.
11:02:02 24
11:02:03 25 COMMISSIONER: It is very confusing, [REDACTED] I know?---So
11:02:06 26 Kruger - what was the question?
11:02:09 27
11:02:09 28 The first meeting with Gobbo, the first meeting with Nicola
11:02:13 29 Gobbo. Just take your time, have a drink?---Okay.
11:02:16 30
11:02:17 31 First meeting with Nicola Gobbo and Kruger?---Okay. The
11:02:20 32 first meeting with Kruger and Gobbo was at a location that
11:02:24 33 I can't recall. I think it was a café but I don't recall
11:02:29 34 exactly where it was.
11:02:31 35
11:02:31 36 MR WINNEKE: What you say, "From the minute we sat down she
11:02:34 37 was basically telling us what she was going to do"?---Yeah.
11:02:37 38
11:02:37 39 What was she telling you?---She was saying, "I'm going to
11:02:40 40 do this. You know, I'm running this. I'm involved with
11:02:43 41 this guy and I can get you information about" - it was
11:02:48 42 [REDACTED] and my ears pricked up about [REDACTED] and I'm
11:02:53 43 thinking, "Okay, solicitor. Represents criminals, yep".
11:02:57 44 Then she said, she started talking about money and I'm
11:03:02 45 pretty sure Peter Reid was a substantial bail application
11:03:07 46 so she was going to give us information about where he was
11:03:12 47 getting the money from for his bail, or it was a either a

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

11:03:17 1 cash or surety that he was going - but then she started
11:03:21 2 talking about [REDACTED] and his trust accounts or - I don't
11:03:27 3 know, there was, yeah, there was some other accounts that
11:03:29 4 he had and the way that he could siphon money. She was
11:03:33 5 going to find out some more details about [REDACTED] and
11:03:38 6 basically she was talking about that she could get
11:03:42 7 information about his clients.

11:03:44 8
11:03:45 9 Right, okay. She said something about Peter Reid. She
11:03:48 10 also said that she'd been in possession of drugs?---Yeah,
11:03:53 11 that was when I thought to myself that she'd been in
11:03:56 12 possession of drugs, as in - and it was Peter Reid's drugs.
11:04:00 13 She'd been holding it at one occasion.

11:04:03 14
11:04:03 15 Do you recall how much drugs?---I remember being a bit
11:04:06 16 surprised because I thought to myself you're holding drugs?
11:04:11 17 It's like, so - - -

11:04:12 18
11:04:13 19 And did she say when it was? Was it about the time of the
11:04:17 20 meeting or was it before, significantly before?---I don't
11:04:20 21 remember exactly but all I remember is being like a bit,
11:04:25 22 okay, you're being in possession of drugs, and then I'm
11:04:30 23 thinking, I was looking at [REDACTED] or I recall thinking
11:04:33 24 to myself maybe there's something I don't know, they've
11:04:36 25 charged her. Because that's basically what happens
11:04:40 26 usually. You charge someone, they roll over and tell you
11:04:43 27 about something else. So - yep.

11:04:47 28
11:04:49 29 I think in your statement you say you recall her admitting
11:04:53 30 she'd been in possession of a large quantity of
11:04:56 31 drugs?---Yep. I don't remember exactly how much but I
11:04:59 32 remember it was like, it was something that just came to my
11:05:01 33 attention, I thought, "What?"

11:05:02 34
11:05:03 35 Did you ask Kruger whether she had been charged at any
11:05:06 36 stage?---Yeah, look, I'd only be making it up because I
11:05:11 37 don't remember.

11:05:11 38
11:05:15 39 Right. Was it discussed, the fact that she'd been holding
11:05:20 40 drugs with Bowden and/or Strawhorn?---Yeah, I said
11:05:25 41 something to, I definitely said something to either Bowden
11:05:32 42 or Strawhorn or both.

11:05:32 43
11:05:33 44 Did you ever speak to any more senior members of the Drug
11:05:36 45 Squad about this?---Not that I - - -

11:05:38 46
11:05:41 47 An Acting Inspector or anything like that?---No. I did - I

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

11:05:55 1 recall talking to a Commander actually about the informers
11:05:59 2 because he pulled me up one day because there was a lot of
11:06:05 3 stuff going on and he was talking to me about informers. I
11:06:10 4 don't remember if we said anything about Gobbo.
11:06:13 5
11:06:13 6 Was that when you were in the Drug Squad?---That's when I
11:06:15 7 was in the Drug Squad, yes.
11:06:16 8
11:06:17 9 You raised an issue with a Commander about informers, do
11:06:21 10 you recall who that was?---Lambert.
11:06:24 11
11:06:24 12 Lambert. Did you ever discuss Ms Gobbo with
11:06:32 13 Mr Lambert?---No. Well I don't know. I remember him just
11:06:35 14 asking me questions about informers.
11:06:37 15
11:06:37 16 All right. In any event, you took the view that if she'd
11:06:42 17 been in possession of drugs she should be charged with
11:06:45 18 being in possession of drugs?---That's right.
11:06:48 19
11:06:48 20 And indeed during the course of the meeting it became quite
11:06:51 21 tense at one stage; is that right?---When I say tense, it's
11:06:55 22 like it was more like uncomfortable as in I felt like the
11:07:01 23 odd man out.
11:07:02 24
11:07:02 25 You felt like the odd man out?---Yeah.
11:07:04 26
11:07:05 27 Because you were asking her a bit about why she's in
11:07:08 28 possession of drugs; is that right?---That's right.
11:07:10 29
11:07:13 30 What did she say?---I just remember her saying something to
11:07:19 31 the effect of gaining their confidence or - yeah, I don't
11:07:25 32 know.
11:07:25 33
11:07:26 34 Did that strike you as being odd, that she was in effect
11:07:28 35 talking about gaining confidence of people by holding
11:07:32 36 drugs?---Yes.
11:07:33 37
11:07:35 38 Were you aware that she herself had been charged previously
11:07:40 39 with being in possession of drugs?---No.
11:07:42 40
11:07:42 41 Were you aware that she'd had a relationship with someone
11:07:49 42 who'd been, or it was alleged that she'd been involved in a
11:07:53 43 relationship with someone who had been trafficking in
11:07:55 44 drugs?---No.
11:07:56 45
11:07:56 46 Did you know of a person by the name of Brian Wilson?---I
11:08:07 47 don't know whether it was the same Brian Wilson. I know

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

11:08:09 1 Brian Wilson but, no - - -
11:08:11 2
11:08:11 3 I'm not talking about a singer, we're talking about someone
11:08:17 4 who's involved in - - - ?---Maybe that's what's going
11:08:21 5 through my mind, sorry.
11:08:23 6
7 COMMISSIONER: It's not an uncommon name?---No.
8
11:08:24 9 Brian Wilson who trafficked in drugs, a security
11:08:27 10 guard?---No.
11:08:27 11
11:08:28 12 MR WINNEKE: Okay. Did you know Tim Argall?---Yes.
11:08:34 13
11:08:35 14 How did you know him?---Just through the Police Force.
11:08:39 15
11:08:40 16 Did you know that she had had a relationship with
11:08:47 17 him?---No.
11:08:47 18
11:08:49 19 Did you know that she had been an informer
11:08:55 20 previously?---No.
11:08:55 21
11:09:00 22 Did you know Trevor Ashton?---Yes.
11:09:02 23
11:09:03 24 How did you know him and when did you know him?---I knew
11:09:10 25 him through the job, I'd run into him from time to time.
11:09:14 26
11:09:15 27 Had you met him at this stage? Would you have known him
11:09:17 28 back in 98?---Yes, definitely.
11:09:22 29
11:09:23 30 You didn't ever discuss Nicola Gobbo with either Ashton or
11:09:28 31 Argall, did you?---Not that I can recall, no.
11:09:30 32
11:09:31 33 Did you know a person by the name of Steve Campbell?---Yes.
11:09:36 34
11:09:36 35 A police officer?---Which one?
11:09:38 36
11:09:41 37 Which one? Is there more than one Steve Campbell?---There
11:09:44 38 is.
11:09:45 39
11:09:45 40 Did you know one who had been in a relationship with Nicola
11:09:49 41 Gobbo?---I'd heard gossip.
11:09:54 42
11:09:54 43 At this time would you have been aware of gossip or
11:09:57 44 not?---I can't be 100 per cent sure.
11:09:59 45
11:10:00 46 Okay. You say in your statement that she mentioned the
11:10:08 47 name Gatt?---Yes.

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

11:10:11 1
11:10:11 2 G-a-t-t or similar?---Yes.
11:10:13 3
11:10:14 4 Do you know who that person was?---No. I just remember,
11:10:21 5 and again I really would like to have my notes, but I just
11:10:25 6 remember a name Gatt. I hope I'm not confusing it with
11:10:33 7 Wayne Gatt.
11:10:34 8
11:10:34 9 Do you know what the context was?---No.
11:10:36 10
11:10:36 11 You say that you came to the view that she was dishonest
11:10:42 12 and that she was in possession of drugs, she perhaps should
11:10:48 13 have been charged with a criminal offence of being in a
11:10:52 14 possession of a large quantity of drugs?---Yes.
11:10:54 15
11:10:54 16 You raised that, you say, with your senior officers,
11:10:59 17 including Strawhorn and Bowden?---Bowden.
11:11:03 18
11:11:03 19 Bowden rather. If I can for a moment jump forward. You
11:11:11 20 had dealings with people who knew of Ms Gobbo years down
11:11:14 21 the track, quite some years after this, do you remember
11:11:18 22 that?---Yes.
11:11:18 23
11:11:19 24 Do you ever mention to any of those people the information
11:11:22 25 that you had gleaned from your earlier dealings with
11:11:26 26 her?---I'm sorry, that's confusing, that question.
11:11:30 27
11:11:30 28 Sorry. If we come forward in time. Now you're dealing
11:11:34 29 with her around 98?---Yep.
11:11:36 30
11:11:36 31 Later on in 2005 going forward you had dealings with people
11:11:40 32 at Purana?---Yep.
11:11:41 33
11:11:41 34 In that context you knew that there were people at Purana
11:11:46 35 who were dealing with Gobbo; is that right?---That's right.
11:11:48 36
11:11:49 37 Did you ever discuss with any of those people your
11:11:53 38 misgivings about Ms Gobbo?---No, but in - if I can say
11:12:04 39 this, I knew that she was connected with some of the
11:12:08 40 criminals that were - my thoughts were she's still an
11:12:17 41 informer.
11:12:18 42
11:12:18 43 Yes?---So I can't tell anyone anything, as in I can't say,
11:12:22 44 "Oh, Nicola Gobbo's informing but I don't think she's doing
11:12:28 45 it appropriately", so what I did was say to the people that
11:12:37 46 I was giving the information, "Don't tell where the
11:12:41 47 information's come from because they might be able to

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

11:12:43 1 identify via me who the people are that I'm talking".
11:12:47 2
11:12:47 3 Right. That's the people who were giving you information
11:12:53 4 which you were providing to Purana; is that right?---Oh no,
11:12:56 5 I didn't mention to the informers that I was speaking to -
11:12:59 6 no.
11:12:59 7
11:13:00 8 No, no, I understand that. But you were saying that - you
11:13:03 9 were telling them certain things about Ms Gobbo, is that
11:13:07 10 right?
11:13:07 11
11:13:08 12 COMMISSIONER: No, I think there's a misunderstanding
11:13:10 13 here?---Yeah.
11:13:11 14
11:13:11 15 You were telling the police officers?---Police officers,
11:13:13 16 yeah.
11:13:13 17
11:13:14 18 Who were using - who you thought were using Nicola Gobbo as
11:13:20 19 an informer?---I was telling police, because what was
11:13:23 20 happening towards the height of Purana, Gobbo was - I had
11:13:30 21 information that Gobbo was very close to a lot of these
11:13:34 22 criminals that I was actually getting information about, so
11:13:38 23 I didn't want them to know who I was lest they can track it
11:13:45 24 back to who the informer was that I was getting information
11:13:49 25 from. That's the extent of it. As in telling police -
11:13:54 26 because I'm in a situation where I think maybe she's an
11:13:58 27 informer so I can't nominate her as in say her name, but I
11:14:03 28 can say there's solicitors, which is what I did say to
11:14:06 29 members of Purana.
11:14:08 30
11:14:09 31 As I understand it you said to members of Purana?---Yep.
11:14:15 32
11:14:15 33 Without mentioning Nicola Gobbo's name, if you're getting
11:14:19 34 information from solicitors don't pass - - - ?---No, no. I
11:14:22 35 said to - I warned them in relation to the reason why I was
11:14:27 36 giving information as an unregistered source. I said don't
11:14:32 37 tell anyone because I'm worried about some solicitors that
11:14:35 38 these people are talking to.
11:14:37 39
11:14:39 40 MR WINNEKE: All right. You understood she was acting for
11:14:41 41 some pretty heavy criminals involved in - the allegations
11:14:45 42 that they had been involved in murders?---That's right.
11:14:47 43
11:14:47 44 You didn't want those people to know that you were
11:14:50 45 providing information?---That's right.
11:14:52 46
11:14:52 47 I follow that. I'll come back to that but - - -

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

11:14:53 1
11:14:54 2 COMMISSIONER: Sorry, could I just clarify - so were you
11:14:56 3 concerned that information might go back to Nicola Gobbo
11:14:58 4 and that she might pass it on to some of the criminals she
11:15:01 5 was acting for?---Yes, because they were actually searching
11:15:05 6 at the time for who the informers were. It was very
11:15:07 7 prevalent amongst the conversation that was coming back via
11:15:14 8 the informers, they were looking for who the informers
11:15:16 9 were.
11:15:16 10
11:15:17 11 Thank you.
11:15:17 12
11:15:18 13 MR WINNEKE: Are we talking about the period of 2003 or
11:15:20 14 thereabouts when Mr Marshall was killed?---Yes.
11:15:22 15
11:15:22 16 I want to come back to that because I want to just focus a
11:15:26 17 little bit more about this, the meeting that you had, first
11:15:29 18 meeting that you had with Gobbo?---All right.
11:15:31 19
11:15:31 20 You indicate that as a matter of course there would be tape
11:15:36 21 recordings done of meetings with informers, that was
11:15:38 22 something that you did?---Yes.
11:15:40 23
11:15:41 24 Do you know whether a tape recording was taken of the
11:15:44 25 meeting with Ms Gobbo, the first meeting?---I was pretty -
11:15:49 26 I basically taped everyone, so.
11:15:53 27
11:15:53 28 So you believe that if you were told to go and speak to a
11:15:57 29 person who was potentially going to be an informer, you, as
11:16:00 30 an experienced person dealing with informers, would almost
11:16:04 31 certainly have taped the conversation?---Yeah, I always
11:16:06 32 taped everyone.
11:16:10 33
11:16:10 34 The tape would have been kept and put into a safe in the
11:16:13 35 Drug Squad?---That's right.
11:16:14 36
11:16:14 37 Did you ever see the tape again? Do you know what happened
11:16:16 38 with that tape?---No, I just kept - I kept - actually I had
11:16:26 39 so many tapes when I left the job I'm not even sure what
11:16:30 40 they did with them. I had four filing cabinets of tapes
11:16:35 41 and notes.
11:16:36 42
11:16:37 43 Right?---That were at St Kilda Road.
11:16:38 44
11:16:38 45 Right?---What the Police Force did with it I don't know.
11:16:41 46
11:16:41 47 I assume you wouldn't have taken notes of the meeting,

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

11:16:44 1 certainly at the time of the meeting, because that wouldn't
11:16:48 2 have been a sensible thing to do. But the meeting would
11:16:51 3 have been taped?---No, I would have taken notes as well.
11:16:55 4
11:16:55 5 You would have taken notes as well. Those notes would have
11:16:59 6 been taken in your diary or would they have been taken on a
11:17:01 7 piece of paper?---No, I was a bit stupid as in - like, I
11:17:05 8 suppose everyone, like everyone had their diaries but I
11:17:09 9 always carried a notebook and just wrote notes. So I
11:17:12 10 doubled up.
11:17:13 11
11:17:13 12 Again, what would you have done with those notes?---Well I
11:17:16 13 kept them.
11:17:17 14
11:17:18 15 What, kept in the Drug Squad?---No, no, with my own - it
11:17:22 16 was my own personal notebooks as in like I'd take notes.
11:17:26 17
11:17:27 18 Would these notes and so forth be with the doctor that
11:17:31 19 we've been talking about before?---Yeah, potentially.
11:17:41 20
11:17:41 21 COMMISSIONER: Just jumping back a little to when, after
11:17:45 22 that first meeting with Nicola Gobbo and you told your boss
11:17:49 23 Bowden that you didn't trust her and she'd be a terrible
11:17:54 24 informer?---Yes.
11:17:55 25
11:17:55 26 And you said, I think, that he spoke to his bosses about
11:17:59 27 it. Do you know - - - ?---Unfortunately I don't know what
11:18:03 28 they do after.
11:18:04 29
11:18:05 30 Okay, like he didn't tell you - - - ?---Basically I'm down
11:18:10 31 the bottom and I just tell him and I say, "This is what
32 happened".
33
11:18:13 34 Sure?---That's done. He's - there's a chain of command,
11:18:14 35 he'll go and tell an Inspector or maybe not.
11:18:18 36
11:18:19 37 Sure. I just wondered whether he told you which bosses he
11:18:22 38 spoke to or if you remembered that?---No, there was - again
11:18:27 39 it was very confusing because there was another four - like
11:18:28 40 you've got three to four Senior Sergeants and then there's
11:18:32 41 another four Inspectors and you don't know who they're
11:18:36 42 talking to.
11:18:36 43
11:18:36 44 You don't remember him telling you who he spoke to about
11:18:41 45 it?---I don't, Commissioner, sorry.
11:18:43 46
11:18:43 47 Thank you. Yes.

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

11:18:44 1
11:18:45 2 MR WINNEKE: Just coming back to your notes. You were
11:18:48 3 obviously involved in litigation of some sort and you gave
11:18:51 4 those notes to your doctor?---Yes.
11:18:53 5
11:18:54 6 Can you say when that was that you gave them to him?---Well
11:19:00 7 I went and lived overseas for five years, so.
11:19:04 8
11:19:05 9 I'm sorry, say that again?---I went and lived overseas for
11:19:08 10 five years after the Police Force.
11:19:10 11
11:19:10 12 I apologise. It was after that, was it, when you came back
11:19:13 13 to Australia?---No, maybe 2011. It might have been - yeah,
11:19:20 14 well I was back and forth. I don't know, I gave them to
11:19:23 15 him, having concerns about, yeah, just being - - -
11:19:26 16
11:19:26 17 The litigation was - - - ?---I was paranoid so, yeah, I
11:19:30 18 gave him notes. And, yeah, he was the only one I trusted,
11:19:35 19 so.
11:19:35 20
11:19:38 21 Did that litigation involve the period of time that you
11:19:40 22 were in the Police Force?---That's right.
11:19:41 23
11:19:41 24 And you saw this doctor, you gave him the notes to give him
11:19:45 25 a clear understanding of what sort of things were going in
11:19:48 26 the Police Force.
11:19:48 27
11:19:49 28 COMMISSIONER: I think he said it was because he was the
11:19:52 29 only person he trusted that he gave him the notes.
11:19:55 30
11:19:55 31 MR WINNEKE: I understand that. I follow. What was the
11:19:57 32 purpose of giving him the notes though?---Because I didn't
11:20:01 33 - I just wanted someone trustworthy to hold them.
11:20:05 34
11:20:05 35 It wasn't so as he could understand what was going on with
11:20:09 36 you, it was simply because you wanted someone you could
11:20:13 37 trust to hang on to these notes?---That's right.
11:20:16 38
11:20:17 39 Why was that? What was the concern that you had?---I
11:20:19 40 didn't want anyone else to read them.
11:20:21 41
11:20:25 42 Because?---Because they're my notes and what I write is
11:20:32 43 basically my - is, yeah, just for my recollection. I
11:20:37 44 didn't want anyone else to read them.
11:20:39 45
11:20:40 46 All right. You believe that there was an information
11:21:04 47 report, in fact in your statement you say that you believe

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

11:21:07 1 you lodged an information report about the meeting. I
11:21:13 2 wonder if you could have a look at this document, RC68.
11:21:26 3 Just have a read of that on the screen in front of
11:21:36 4 you?---Okay.
11:21:36 5
11:21:39 6 Just scroll through that, thanks?---How do I scroll through
11:21:44 7 it?
11:21:45 8
11:21:45 9 No, no, it's going to be scrolled through for you?---Okay.
11:21:48 10
11:21:48 11 You just need to have a look at it as it scrolls
11:21:54 12 through?---Okay. I don't know why I had to deal with the
11:22:09 13 information report.
11:22:10 14
11:22:10 15 Perhaps if we can just keep scrolling through so you can
11:22:14 16 read all of it?---Okay.
11:22:17 17
11:22:21 18 Just stop there. See it says "reporting member" and
11:22:24 19 obviously the name has been replaced with Kruger and we
11:22:30 20 know who that is. That seems to suggest that it's Kruger
11:22:33 21 who puts in the information report?---Yeah.
11:22:36 22
11:22:37 23 Do you say you're mistaken about whether you put the
11:22:42 24 information report in or whether Kruger put the information
11:22:45 25 report in?---I can't really - yeah, I don't know. He
11:22:50 26 should have put it in. It was his information.
11:22:52 27
11:22:52 28 You just need to - I'm sorry to do this, you just need to
11:22:56 29 speak into the microphone?---Sorry, it's so confusing.
11:23:14 30 Who's Kruger? Kruger's the - - -
11:23:18 31
11:23:19 32 Kruger?---Sorry, you did say his name. Okay, so he's
11:23:23 33 reporting to me. He's the one who signed it. Yeah, that's
11:23:26 34 him.
11:23:26 35
11:23:28 36 Would you both have done one or would it only have been
11:23:33 37 one?---It doesn't look like I've done one. The only reason
11:23:36 38 that I was confused about whether or not I'd submitted one
11:23:40 39 is because - - -
11:23:41 40
11:23:41 41 You'll need to speak in the microphone because I'm being
11:23:44 42 told they can't pick it up?---The only reason why I am
11:23:47 43 confused about this is because the investigator that came
11:23:52 44 out and saw me said that he had an information report that
11:23:57 45 I'd done so I have no idea what's - so.
11:24:01 46
11:24:02 47 The assumption was that you had done it but if it was done

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

11:24:05 1 by Kruger then that may well be the case?---Yes.
11:24:08 2
11:24:08 3 But you didn't do it. At the bottom it says it's been seen
11:24:13 4 by MJB?---Yeah, that's Mark Bowden.
11:24:16 5
11:24:17 6 Mark Bowden, righto. And that would be - also it says it's
11:24:21 7 approved by the team leader. Do you know who that is, 18 -
11:24:25 8 - - ?---That's his number.
11:24:27 9
11:24:27 10 That's Bowden's number, is it?---Yep, definitely.
11:24:31 11
11:24:32 12 What about the intelligence manager, 26622?---That's Sayle.
11:24:39 13 I don't know if I remember his number but I'm pretty sure
11:24:42 14 that was the - what do they call them - analyst.
11:24:45 15
11:24:46 16 I'm sorry?---He's an analyst.
11:24:48 17
11:24:48 18 What about the intelligence officer comment, 26158, who's
11:24:53 19 that?---?---Well I'm only assuming it's our friend Kruger.
11:24:59 20 But it's the person I can't name.
11:25:00 21
11:25:01 22 There are three numbers there, 26622, 26158 and then the
11:25:07 23 team leader 18887?---Okay, so best I can - you can tell me
11:25:16 24 who - I mean - - -
11:25:16 25
11:25:17 26 I can tell you this, that Kruger's number is [REDACTED], so it's
11:25:22 27 none of those?---Okay. Mine's [REDACTED], so it's not me.
11:25:28 28
11:25:28 29 There are three other officers there, no doubt it'll be
11:25:32 30 pretty easy to find those. But you can't recall who they
11:25:37 31 would be?---So, yeah, that's what - these are the - you've
11:25:38 32 got, basically when you're running jobs they go through -
11:25:44 33 you should do information reports on each job that you go
11:25:48 34 to and, yeah, then it goes through the analyst. The
11:25:53 35 analysts basically put it together so that you've sort of
11:25:56 36 got an understanding of what's happening. And also it's
11:25:58 37 for reporting to the Senior Sergeant so he's seen it, which
11:26:03 38 he usually just ticks and puts his number on it, and, yeah,
11:26:08 39 so that's about all I can tell you.
11:26:10 40
11:26:10 41 Okay. You say that, "The inspectors who were above my
11:26:18 42 Senior Sergeant in rank wanted to follow up the information
11:26:21 43 sheet provided" and you were asked to attend a second
11:26:24 44 meeting with Gobbo?---Yes.
11:26:26 45
11:26:26 46 Who were the Inspectors above your Senior Sergeants?---From
11:26:37 47 memory Fontana was there.

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

11:26:42 1
11:26:43 2 I'm sorry?---I think he's an Assistant Commissioner now,
11:26:48 3 Fontana.
11:26:49 4
11:26:49 5 Fontana. Did you speak to Fontana?---No, but I recall
11:26:57 6 there was a fairly like open meeting like when you're
11:27:00 7 discussing - because I think we called in some people from
11:27:06 8 another unit, whether it be the Asset Squad or the NCA.
11:27:10 9
11:27:10 10 Yes?---I'm not sure but there was - I recall a meeting with
11:27:19 11 the analysts and these other people and I don't know why -
11:27:22 12 it's a female, a female from another organisation.
11:27:26 13
11:27:26 14 I follow that. If we just go back to the previous page.
11:27:31 15 You see "investigator comment"? "Further contact to be
11:27:34 16 made with informer by Kruger. Kruger to liaise with
11:27:40 17 Detective Sergeant Karen Hynam of the NCA"?---Hynam, yeah.
11:27:44 18 I thought she was from Assets. There was - yeah, go on,
11:27:48 19 sorry, I won't confuse you.
11:27:49 20
11:27:50 21 Does that assist you in your recollection that there was to
11:27:54 22 be further contact made with her and also there was an
11:28:00 23 instruction to liaise with the NCA?---Yes.
11:28:03 24
11:28:05 25 You believed that that was coming from higher up, from the
11:28:09 26 likes of Fontana?---But not like say it was definitely
11:28:18 27 Fontana because I only know that when I was running the
11:28:22 28 other jobs that he was actually one of the Inspectors that
11:28:24 29 was in charge, it was Fontana and - I'm pretty sure McKoy
11:28:29 30 was there as well.
11:28:29 31
11:28:30 32 McKoy. What was the first name of Mr McKoy?---I just
11:28:35 33 remember him being called BJ. He was the Chief Inspector
11:28:38 34 there.
11:28:38 35
11:28:43 36 That's M-c-K-o-y, is it?---Sorry?
11:28:49 37
11:28:49 38 M-c-K-o-y, McKoy?---Yes.
11:28:53 39
11:28:58 40 You say that you were at a loss to understand why you were
11:29:01 41 asked to have a second meeting?---Yes.
11:29:03 42
11:29:04 43 And you were mistrustful and you were concerned about
11:29:09 44 particularly Ms Gobbo and you indicate in your statement
11:29:15 45 there'd been break-ins at the Drug Squad and so forth at
11:29:19 46 that time; is that right?---Yes.
11:29:20 47

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

11:29:26 1 Did you make your views known to the people who were
11:29:30 2 suggesting that you should have this second meeting?---Yes.
11:29:34 3
11:29:34 4 To whom did you make those views known?---Bowden.
5
11:29:41 6 You did have a further meeting with Ms Gobbo and you say
11:29:45 7 that there was a meeting in the main muster room of the
11:29:50 8 Drug Squad about Gobbo, I'm sorry?---Yeah, that was
11:29:56 9 potentially around this time.
11:29:58 10
11:30:00 11 And that was, is that the meeting that you, is that a
11:30:04 12 meeting with other members of, sorry, other organisations
11:30:09 13 such as - you can't recall but either Asset Recovery or
11:30:14 14 NCA?---Yes. There was a lot of interest in [REDACTED]
11:30:19 15
11:30:20 16 And do you think it might have been with someone by the
11:30:25 17 name of Hynam, Karen Hynam?---Yes, there was definitely - -
11:30:33 18 -
11:30:33 19
11:30:33 20 There's information elsewhere that we've got that suggests
11:30:36 21 that Hynam did meet or was introduced to an informer by DSC
11:30:43 22 Kruger and DSC [REDACTED]---Yes.
11:30:48 23
11:30:48 24 Is it possibly the case that you introduced Ms Gobbo to the
11:30:52 25 NCA?---Possibly.
11:30:55 26
11:30:55 27 Do you recall where that meeting might have taken
11:31:00 28 place?---That's a possibility because that's something
11:31:02 29 that's not in my memory.
11:31:04 30
11:31:04 31 So you don't recall that?---No.
11:31:06 32
11:31:12 33 In terms of the meeting in the muster room at the Drug
11:31:17 34 Squad?---Yes.
11:31:17 35
11:31:18 36 Can you tell the Commissioner as much as you can about that
11:31:21 37 meeting? Who was there, for example, to the best of your
11:31:30 38 recollection?---All I can explain is that I remember that
11:31:35 39 there was, the analysts I can remember from memory were
11:31:38 40 between unit 1 and unit 2 at one stage on their computers
11:31:43 41 so there were a group of - I mean there was, it's an open
11:31:50 42 muster room so, you know, we could be talking and any other
11:31:54 43 member of the Drug Squad can basically be listening to what
11:31:58 44 we're talking about. So it wasn't like a confidential
11:32:02 45 meeting, it was a meeting about Gobbo and what she was
11:32:05 46 going to do for the Police Force and, you know, obviously I
11:32:10 47 was also having my input in relation to her being a

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

11:32:14 1 solicitor and also I thought she was a - well, I thought
11:32:20 2 she was acting like a crook so, I didn't want - I was
11:32:27 3 putting my two bob's in, so.
11:32:31 4
11:32:31 5 Yes.
11:32:32 6
11:32:33 7 COMMISSIONER: Are you finished that document? Has that
11:32:35 8 already been tendered as Exhibit RC68?
11:32:39 9
11:32:40 10 MR WINNEKE: Yes, it has been.
11:32:41 11
11:32:41 12 COMMISSIONER: Can I just ask is there any reference to
11:32:44 13 [REDACTED] on that document?
11:32:45 14
11:32:45 15 MR WINNEKE: If we go to the first page.
16
17 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
18
11:32:50 19 MR WINNEKE: You'll see 21 July 1998 Kruger and [REDACTED] met
11:32:55 20 with an unregistered informant in relation to [REDACTED], I think
11:33:02 21 the reference [REDACTED] is a reference to [REDACTED]
11:33:05 22
11:33:05 23 COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
11:33:06 24
11:33:06 25 MR WINNEKE: That accords with your recollection I take it,
11:33:09 26 [REDACTED] ---Sorry?
11:33:11 27
11:33:12 28 Yes.
11:33:12 29
11:33:12 30 COMMISSIONER: You were asked if that accords with your
11:33:15 31 recollection?---May I have a look at the document?
11:33:18 32
11:33:19 33 Yes, of course?---You've got something across the middle of
11:33:23 34 it.
11:33:24 35
11:33:24 36 Under "information" it says, "On 21 July Kruger and [REDACTED] met
11:33:27 37 with" - - - ?---Yeah, yeah. May I just read the document,
11:33:32 38 please?
11:33:32 39
11:33:33 40 Yes, certainly?---Can you just go down a little bit just so
11:34:00 41 I can - yes, so it's basically what I remember.
11:34:09 42
11:34:09 43 Yes. Is that a convenient time to have a short break, give
11:34:11 44 the witness a short break?
11:34:14 45
11:34:14 46 MR WINNEKE: Yes.
11:34:42 47

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

11:34:42 1 COMMISSIONER: We'll have a ten minute break now.
11:34:45 2
11:34:47 3 (Short adjournment.)
11:51:24 4
11:51:25 5 COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Winneke.
11:51:25 6
11:51:26 7 MR WINNEKE: Thanks, Commissioner. Just whilst we've got
11:51:29 8 that information report in mind, Mr Holt and his
11:51:33 9 instructors have helpfully provided us with a couple of
11:51:35 10 names which might help jog your memory. If you have a look
11:51:38 11 at the number 26158 on the second page, that's it there.
11:51:47 12 That's a person by the name of Senior Constable Sayle, does
11:51:54 13 that?---Sayle, that's what I said.
11:51:56 14
11:51:56 15 You did too. He was an analyst, was he?---Yes.
11:51:59 16
11:52:00 17 The next one is a Senior Constable, that is 26622?---Yep,
11:52:09 18 got it.
11:52:09 19
11:52:09 20 Intelligence manager, Schoen Flynn S-c-h-o-e-n,
11:52:19 21 P-f-l?---U-g. Sorry.
11:52:22 22
11:52:23 23 Schoen Pflug?---Never heard of him.
11:52:27 24
11:52:27 25 Does that ring a bell?---Sayle was the analyst, definitely.
11:52:32 26
11:52:32 27 That meeting, and this might assist your recollection, and
11:52:41 28 this is RC67A, these are the notes of Mr Kruger - actually,
11:52:57 29 you don't need to put it up. I'll just read it to you.
11:53:03 30 "CBD. Met with Nicola Gobbo re Carron and others. IR
11:53:05 31 submitted. [REDACTED] present during the meeting" and that was a
11:53:09 32 meeting at 9.15 and then at 10.15, "Clear above. Gobbo
11:53:15 33 conveyed to MMC on her request". One assumes that's the
11:53:19 34 Melbourne Magistrates' Court?---Yep, I think so.
11:53:22 35
11:53:22 36 Do you recall that?---No.
11:53:23 37
11:53:25 38 Okay. Now, do you recall how long after that meeting -
11:53:32 39 firstly, did you meet with Gobbo again?---Um, I don't have
11:53:41 40 a recollection but I've spoken to - you know, I think, I
11:53:49 41 recall them telling me that I had to go and meet her again
11:53:52 42 but I just can't remember whether I did or not.
11:53:55 43
11:53:55 44 Okay. In your statement you say that there was this
11:54:00 45 meeting but it wasn't with Ms Gobbo, it was about Ms Gobbo
11:54:03 46 and it may well have been that that was with the NCA
11:54:08 47 officers, right?---Yes.

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

11:54:10 1
11:54:10 2 Was that unusual or usual that you'd have a meeting with
11:54:14 3 NCA officers?---Well, no, it's just that if something is -
11:54:26 4 we're the Drug Squad so we're investigating drugs, so I
11:54:31 5 think - - -
11:54:31 6
11:54:34 7 In a (indistinct) aspect of it, it would be?---We still may
11:54:35 8 have been involved in the investigation but if it's just
11:54:38 9 related to something like assets or finances which we don't
11:54:43 10 sort of follow up as much, then it would have been maybe
11:54:46 11 passed on to the - yes, and especially seeing it was a
11:54:51 12 solicitor, so that's why they were called.
11:54:56 13
11:54:56 14 Okay. It seemed to you to be an open meeting, there was
11:55:00 15 nothing secret about it, from your recollection of it, and
11:55:04 16 it was almost as if all of the people in the office knew
11:55:08 17 that Nicola Gobbo was providing information to
11:55:13 18 police?---Yeah, it was hardly confidential.
11:55:16 19
11:55:16 20 Is that your recollection, that the members of the Drug
11:55:19 21 Squad in the period that we talk about, 98 through to 99,
11:55:23 22 that it was common knowledge that she was speaking to
11:55:26 23 members of the Drug Squad?---Well, I'd be - well obviously,
11:55:39 24 like - I don't know what other people are thinking or what
11:55:42 25 other people know, I just know what I'm working on. I
11:55:45 26 don't know. It's possible that everyone could know
11:55:49 27 because, you know, as a result of having a meeting like
11:55:52 28 that especially where we're in an open area, not only are
11:55:59 29 you talking to the members in the unit, you've got an
11:56:04 30 outside body coming in listening, you've got people walking
11:56:08 31 past, you've got analysts. Yeah, no, so God knows who
11:56:14 32 knew, everyone could have known.
11:56:16 33
11:56:16 34 So that was unusual. Normally with an informer it wouldn't
11:56:19 35 be as open as that sort of situation, would it?---Well,
11:56:23 36 it's difficult to say that because when you have an
11:56:27 37 informer it's - for example, you catch someone, they're a
11:56:33 38 criminal, everyone knows you've been working on them and
11:56:39 39 then all of a sudden they're, you know, there's potential
11:56:45 40 for them to be giving information. It's what people can
11:56:48 41 assume. You don't advertise that people are informers but,
11:56:53 42 you know, it doesn't take too much to figure out who's
11:56:58 43 informing and who's not.
11:57:00 44
11:57:01 45 What you're saying is because of that meeting you felt that
11:57:08 46 other people would have known what she was doing but as to
11:57:12 47 whether or not you actually spoke to other people about

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

11:57:14 1 Ms Gobbo, the fact that she had been providing information
11:57:17 2 or wanted to provide information, do you say you can or
11:57:21 3 can't recollect that?---No, well I definitely, like I said
11:57:24 4 to you before, I definitely came back and was concerned in
11:57:28 5 relation to her giving evidence - not giving evidence,
11:57:31 6 giving information, and I spoke to Mark Bowden about it and
11:57:35 7 I'm pretty sure I spoke to Strawhorn about it because I
11:57:40 8 think Strawhorn was actually potentially took over,
11:57:43 9 introducing her to the other division. I don't recall
11:57:49 10 being, being the person that introduced her or, yeah.

11:57:54 11
11:57:54 12 You say that you had a meeting with Mr Bowden and you asked
11:58:01 13 him if he could recall Gobbo. He said he wasn't clear but
11:58:05 14 he had a recollection of having one meeting with her and
11:58:09 15 telling her, "We weren't having anything further to do with
11:58:13 16 her"?---When it's said like that, like we didn't go and
11:58:18 17 say, "We're not talking to you any more" blah blah. It
11:58:22 18 would have been basically explained that - because I know
11:58:24 19 that we didn't want to deal with her because as a result of
11:58:26 20 the conversation I had with Bowden he agreed, and so did
11:58:30 21 Strawhorn, that she was potentially a problem.

11:58:35 22
11:58:35 23 The view was taken that she'd be dealing with another
11:58:39 24 department, whether it be Asset Recovery or National Crime
11:58:43 25 Authority?---That's right.

11:58:44 26
11:58:44 27 In effect what you say in your statement is that's what
11:58:47 28 Bowden said to you but do you have the same recollection or
11:58:52 29 not?---Yeah, I have the same recollection, yes.

11:58:54 30
11:58:54 31 Do you know that Strawhorn took Ms Gobbo [REDACTED]
11:59:03 32 [REDACTED] who Ms Gobbo was acting for to
11:59:12 33 [REDACTED], do you know anything about that?---No.

11:59:16 34
11:59:16 35 Did you know that Mr Strawhorn continued to have dealings
11:59:19 36 with Ms Gobbo?---I thought he was just giving her to the
11:59:23 37 other - but yeah, that's up to him, he's the Senior
11:59:28 38 Sergeant.

11:59:28 39
11:59:28 40 I understand that but you didn't know about that?---No.

11:59:31 41
11:59:32 42 Do you know that [REDACTED] by the name of
11:59:35 43 [REDACTED] one of the people who had been [REDACTED]
11:59:39 44 [REDACTED]?---Yes, I didn't know whether she [REDACTED] -

11:59:43 45 - -
11:59:43 46 [REDACTED]?-- [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] yeah, I'm not sure.
11:59:43 47

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

11:59:46 1
11:59:47 2 Do you know that [REDACTED] himself [REDACTED]
11:59:52 3 Victoria Police?---No.
11:59:54 4
11:59:54 5 That he had become [REDACTED], he subsequently [REDACTED]
11:59:59 6 [REDACTED], did you know that?---No.
12:00:01 7
12:00:05 8 Did you ever speak to any police officers after this period
12:00:11 9 of time but in the period that you were at the Drug Squad,
12:00:14 10 about Ms Gobbo and what she was doing?---Um, I can't
12:00:22 11 remember saying anything, no.
12:00:24 12
12:00:29 13 What you do say in your statement, the last time you spoke,
12:00:33 14 had anything to do with her was when she was handed over to
12:00:41 15 whatever the organisation was, as far as you concerned you
12:00:44 16 didn't know, but nonetheless after that it was quite openly
12:00:48 17 talked about at the station and it was common knowledge
12:00:50 18 that she was working with police, that's what you've said
12:00:54 19 in your statement, that's your recollection, is it?---Yeah,
12:00:57 20 yes.
12:00:57 21
12:00:57 22 Which police?---Sorry?
12:01:01 23
12:01:01 24 Well, let me just read out what you say in your
12:01:05 25 statement?---Okay.
12:01:06 26
12:01:07 27 "This was the last time I had anything personally to do
12:01:11 28 with her", have a look at your statement, it's the third
12:01:15 29 page. Just before the heading, "Training"?---Okay, so
12:01:25 30 where are we? Just before training?
12:01:26 31
12:01:27 32 Just read that paragraph?---"This was the last time I had
12:01:30 33 anything personally to do with her. Having said that it
12:01:33 34 was quite openly talked about at the station and it was
12:01:36 35 common knowledge that she was working with the police. I
12:01:39 36 didn't believe she ever stopped."
12:01:41 37
12:01:41 38 "I would have expected she would continue to make
12:01:47 39 deals"?---Yes.
12:01:47 40
12:01:48 41 It was quite openly spoken of at the police station, that
12:01:52 42 is at the Drug Squad, is that right?---Yes, I was
12:01:55 43 complaining about her not being charged.
12:01:57 44
12:01:57 45 Say that again?---Well I thought she's a solicitor, why
12:02:01 46 isn't she being charged with the drug offences she was
12:02:05 47 involved in.

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

12:02:05 1
12:02:06 2 That was the subject of discussion that you had with other
12:02:09 3 members of the Drug Squad?---Yes.
12:02:11 4
12:02:11 5 Do you recall any of the police officers, any of the
12:02:14 6 members of the Drug Squad you spoke to about her?---No.
12:02:23 7 I'd like to say I can remember but I can't.
12:02:26 8
12:02:26 9 You said earlier that you learned over time of
12:02:30 10 inappropriate relations that she had with police?---Yes.
12:02:35 11
12:02:35 12 Which police did you believe she had inappropriate
12:02:39 13 relations with?---There was - isn't gossip, it's a person
12:02:54 14 who actually told me but I can't remember who it was, but
12:02:58 15 it was someone at Brighton uniform he complained about his
12:03:03 16 Senior Sergeant, Shields, he complained about him having an
12:03:08 17 inappropriate relationship with her.
12:03:10 18
12:03:11 19 Shields?---Shields.
12:03:12 20
12:03:12 21 Richard Shields?---I believe so.
12:03:15 22
12:03:15 23 There was a complaint by a member at the Brighton uniform,
12:03:20 24 what was his name?---I can't remember who it was. He'll
12:03:23 25 remember.
12:03:23 26
12:03:23 27 Does the name start with ■?---You'll have to ask him - I
12:03:31 28 don't remember who it was. I know, the reason why I know
12:03:34 29 who it is is because he was, it was at, his brother used to
12:03:42 30 train at the same gym as me and I can't remember what, what
12:03:46 31 the conversation was, but yeah, it was pretty - - -
12:03:49 32
12:03:49 33 The brother of the uniform officer at Brighton?---Yep, he
12:03:52 34 spoke to me directly though this policeman, he said he was
12:03:56 35 having problems with a Senior Sergeant at Brighton uniform.
12:04:02 36
12:04:02 37 This was Shields?---Allegedly. I'll put it allegedly.
12:04:05 38
12:04:06 39 Who was having a relationship with her?---Yeah.
12:04:08 40
12:04:08 41 When was this?---It must have been mid-2000s. I better not
12:04:27 42 lock myself in, I'm not sure but it was when I was back in
12:04:31 43 uniform.
12:04:31 44
12:04:32 45 At that stage were you providing information to Purana
12:04:36 46 detectives?---Um, I don't know, I'm not sure.
12:04:39 47

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

12:04:39 1 Do you think you might have provided information about
12:04:42 2 that?---No. Definitely not. I advised him to go to ESD.
12:04:48 3
12:04:50 4 The brother or the actual officer?---The actual officer.
12:04:52 5
12:04:56 6 And at that stage he was a Senior Detective at Brighton, is
12:04:59 7 that right?---I thought he was just a uniform senior
12:05:05 8 connie.
12:05:06 9
12:05:07 10 Did you take the view that after you ceased having dealings
12:05:14 11 with her that she continued to provide information to
12:05:17 12 police about her clients?---I have no doubt.
12:05:20 13
12:05:27 14 I've just been given a name. Was it John Brown?---Yeah, it
12:05:35 15 was actually.
12:05:35 16
12:05:35 17 Yes?---Yes.
12:05:36 18
12:05:37 19 I've got all this information. That's correct and the
12:05:39 20 officer was Shields?---Yep.
12:05:42 21
12:05:42 22 That is the officer with whom she was having the
12:05:46 23 relationship. You say that you had no doubt that she
12:05:50 24 continued to provide information to police about her
12:05:53 25 clients?---Yes.
12:05:53 26
12:05:54 27 Was that because of something that you had seen or
12:05:58 28 heard?---Yeah, I just - information that she was, that I
12:06:04 29 suspected that she was still involved. It wasn't something
12:06:08 30 that I actually paid attention to but I was weary of.
12:06:12 31
12:06:12 32 Was this when you were in the Drug Squad?---No, it was when
12:06:15 33 I was out of the Drug Squad giving information.
12:06:18 34
12:06:19 35 In the period that you were in the Drug Squad up to 99 did
12:06:23 36 you take the view that she was still providing information
12:06:26 37 to the Drug Squad or other members of the police about her
12:06:30 38 clients?---If you're asking me now, I think when I finished
12:06:33 39 dealing with her it was like, not my concern, so I didn't
12:06:38 40 really think about her, but if I think about it now, yeah,
12:06:42 41 I would have assumed she was continuing to - - -
12:06:44 42
12:06:44 43 That's based on assumption. Can I ask you this?---Yep.
12:06:50 44
12:06:51 45 Can you recall being involved in any investigations in
12:06:53 46 which people were charged, any at all, aside from
12:06:57 47 Carron?---Yep.

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

12:06:58 1
12:06:58 2 In which she was acting for one or other of the people who
12:07:02 3 had been charged?---No. No, I can't recall one, no.
12:07:07 4
12:07:07 5 Do you say there wasn't or is it something you simply can't
12:07:11 6 bring to mind?---Well it doesn't come to memory, no.
12:07:15 7
12:07:16 8 COMMISSIONER: Do you remember being involved in any
12:07:18 9 investigations where the charges had been based on
12:07:23 10 information that Nicola Gobbo had provided?---No.
12:07:26 11
12:07:26 12 Thank you.
12:07:28 13
12:07:31 14 MR WINNEKE: In your statement you say, "I don't believe
12:07:33 15 she ever stopped providing information, I would have
12:07:35 16 expected she continued to make deals"?---Yes.
12:07:39 17
12:07:39 18 What sort of deals are you talking about?---Maybe that's
12:07:45 19 the wrong word to use but just - well, even to this day I'm
12:07:51 20 not quite sure why she was giving information about
12:07:57 21 [REDACTED] and Reid, so there was - I didn't have any
12:08:03 22 idea why she was giving information so I don't know - when
12:08:07 23 I say deals, I suspected that when she was sitting down
12:08:10 24 with us she was going to work for the police.
12:08:15 25
12:08:15 26 Yes, okay.
12:08:16 27
12:08:17 28 COMMISSIONER: Was it your experience that generally when
12:08:19 29 informers provided information they wanted something in
12:08:22 30 return?---Yeah, the majority of times dealing with
12:08:31 31 informers they were either charged, they didn't - very
12:08:36 32 rarely do people come to you to give information out of the
12:08:40 33 goodness of their heart, they've always got something
12:08:44 34 that's in their mind why they're giving information. In
12:08:49 35 her case I didn't know why she was giving information but I
12:08:53 36 assumed she was not doing it for the right reasons. But
12:09:00 37 that was my opinion, Commissioner.
12:09:04 38
12:09:05 39 MR WINNEKE: You assume she was doing it for the right
12:09:07 40 reasons.
12:09:08 41
12:09:08 42 COMMISSIONER: Didn't think she was doing it.
12:09:10 43
12:09:10 44 MR WINNEKE: I apologise.
12:09:10 45
12:09:12 46 COMMISSIONER: Did not think she was doing it for the right
12:09:15 47 reasons.

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

12:09:15 1
12:09:16 2 MR WINNEKE: For her own benefit do you think?---Yes.
12:09:18 3
12:09:18 4 And did it occur to you what she was trying to achieve for
12:09:22 5 her own benefit?---I didn't know what she was up to. She
12:09:28 6 was - I didn't have a good impression of her so I can't say
12:09:33 7 because I - - -
12:09:35 8
12:09:35 9 COMMISSIONER: Did you apprehend it may have been because
12:09:38 10 she wasn't being charged for possession of these drugs that
12:09:41 11 you've mentioned?---No. It was the way - it was her manner
12:09:46 12 and the way that she was, the way she was just - I mean I
12:09:51 13 thought this is her employer, one, and then this is her
12:09:55 14 client and she wanted to talk about the client and then she
12:09:58 15 wanted to talk about her boss's clients and I thought this
12:10:02 16 is unusual for me, or it's, it's one of a kind.
12:10:06 17
12:10:06 18 Were you concerned that she might want to give information
12:10:09 19 back to her criminal clients?---Yeah, definitely.
12:10:14 20
12:10:15 21 About police and police investigations?---Yes.
22
12:10:17 23 Right, thank you.
12:10:17 24
12:10:19 25 MR WINNEKE: In your statement, the statement is quite a
12:10:23 26 long statement. Over what period of time did you make that
12:10:28 27 statement?---How long did it take me? It took me a while.
12:10:47 28 I don't know. How many hours are you asking it took me?
12:10:52 29
12:10:52 30 No, over how many days. Had you commenced making that
12:10:56 31 statement some time ago?---As soon as I got a text from or
12:11:00 32 - yeah, I got a text from Wayne Woltsche telling me,
12:11:06 33 "You've got to make a statement" it's like, "Oh" - so then
12:11:06 34 I started thinking about it.
12:11:08 35
12:11:08 36 When did you get that text?---You know more than me, I
12:11:12 37 can't - I haven't got the text in front of me but it was
12:11:15 38 more than a week ago. I mean you were chasing me when I
12:11:18 39 was in [REDACTED]
12:11:19 40
12:11:20 41 Who have you provided that statement to, which different
12:11:23 42 people have you provided that statement to?---What are you
12:11:25 43 suggesting?
12:11:26 44
12:11:26 45 No, no, I'm just asking you, you provided it to - - -?---To
12:11:31 46 you.
12:11:31 47

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

12:11:31 1 - - - to the Royal Commission yesterday, had you provided
12:11:35 2 it to any other people beforehand?--No, definitely not.
12:11:38 3 To the solicitor that assisted me make it - to clarify it
12:11:45 4 yesterday.
12:11:45 5
12:11:46 6 You haven't provided it to any other solicitor before
12:11:48 7 that?---Definitely not.
12:11:50 8
12:11:50 9 Okay, all right. Thanks very much. You talk about the
12:11:54 10 training and you received all the education with respect to
12:11:58 11 administration of caution rights under 464 of the Crimes
12:12:02 12 Act?---That's right.
12:12:03 13
12:12:03 14 You know about the obligations of disclosure to an accused
12:12:07 15 person?---Yes.
12:12:10 16
12:12:11 17 Is that for the purposes of telling an accused person all
12:12:17 18 of the information that the police have at their disposal
12:12:22 19 to prosecute them?---Yes.
12:12:25 20
12:12:25 21 And also any information that might be of assistance to the
12:12:28 22 accused person that might undermine the police case?---Yes.
12:12:32 23
12:12:32 24 In other words, open disclosure to the accused person about
12:12:37 25 information that the police have?---Yes.
12:12:40 26
12:12:40 27 Right?---Yep.
12:12:41 28
12:12:41 29 And that's something that you were taught about?---Yes.
12:12:43 30
12:12:46 31 Do you think it would be important that if an accused
12:12:49 32 person was charged with an offence and the person who was
12:12:54 33 representing them had been providing information to the
12:12:57 34 police, do you think that that would be something that
12:13:00 35 should be disclosed to the accused person?---Yes. It's
12:13:07 36 highly irregular.
12:13:08 37
12:13:09 38 Highly irregular?---So.
12:13:11 39
12:13:11 40 Do you agree that that's something that should be made
12:13:14 41 known to the accused person?---Yes.
12:13:16 42
12:13:18 43 You also talk about the right of an accused person to a
12:13:21 44 legal practitioner, et cetera, we've discussed that
12:13:25 45 before?---Yep.
12:13:25 46
12:13:25 47 Are these sorts of things the things that most operational

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

12:13:31 1 police officers would be aware of in your view?---Yes,
12:13:33 2 definitely.
12:13:34 3
12:14:05 4 COMMISSIONER: Could I ask you this, did you know a police
12:14:09 5 officer Pope?---Yes.
12:14:12 6
12:14:12 7 And how did you know him?---I think he was, from memory he
12:14:20 8 was one of the ones that came to that meeting that we had
12:14:26 9 with Gobbo.
12:14:29 10
12:14:29 11 So you think he was there with Kruger?---No.
12:14:34 12
12:14:34 13 At the first meeting?---Not the first meeting, from when
12:14:38 14 Karen Hynam came. I recall him from there.
12:14:44 15
12:14:45 16 Were you ever present when Pope and Nicola Gobbo met
12:14:51 17 socially?---No.
12:14:52 18
12:14:53 19 Never drinking in a hotel with them?---No.
12:14:55 20
12:14:55 21 Thank you. Thanks Mr Winneke.
12:15:03 22
12:15:03 23 MR WINNEKE: You mentioned that you left the Drug Squad in
12:15:06 24 99?---Yes.
12:15:07 25
12:15:09 26 Is it the case that that was around [REDACTED], there was a
12:15:13 27 disciplinary hearing at which point you were demoted, is
12:15:17 28 that about right, [REDACTED] of 99?---Yeah, I remember it pretty
12:15:21 29 well.
12:15:21 30
12:15:21 31 And do you recall the date that you left the Drug
12:15:25 32 Squad?---That day.
12:15:26 33
12:15:27 34 On or about 9 [REDACTED] 99?---Yep.
12:15:30 35
12:15:41 36 You certainly didn't go to any meeting on or about 12 April
12:15:46 37 at the Emerald Hotel with - I'm sorry, 12 May where
12:15:53 38 Ms Gobbo was introduced to - - - ?---What year was that 12
12:15:58 39 April - - -
12:15:59 40
12:15:59 41 12 May I think there was a meeting?---What year?
12:16:02 42
12:16:03 43 99?---No, definitely gone well and truly.
12:16:06 44
12:16:06 45 Definitely gone the previous month?---I'd say so, yeah.
12:16:10 46
12:16:10 47 Did you know Jeff Pope?---Just knew of him, not personally.

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

12:16:15 1
12:16:16 2 Had you had any dealings with the Asset Recovery Squad when
12:16:19 3 you were in the Drug Squad?---Yeah, I had a bit to do with
12:16:22 4 the NCA and the Asset Recovery, or the assets, whatever
12:16:25 5 they were called, I can't remember exactly what they were
12:16:29 6 called.
12:16:29 7
12:16:29 8 Did you have any lawyers in the Drug Squad who you could
12:16:32 9 speak to if you needed legal advice?---No. I didn't speak
12:16:37 10 to the lawyers.
12:16:38 11
12:16:39 12 No, I'm not suggesting that you needed to, but was there -
12:16:43 13 if there was any issue that members of the Drug Squad
12:16:46 14 needed to seek legal advice about as to the legality of
12:16:51 15 what you were doing, do you follow what I'm saying?---Yeah.
12:16:54 16 The only time that I would speak to, would speak to the
12:16:57 17 members if I had a query in relation to a brief I was
12:17:01 18 submitting then I would get advice from the OPP.
12:17:04 19
12:17:06 20 And how would you get that advice, would you simply contact
12:17:15 21 the OPP?---Depending on whether or not we were dealing with
12:17:18 22 the OPP we could, you know, if you knew somebody you could
12:17:21 23 speak to them or I'd just send a copy of a brief to them or
12:17:25 24 a query and they'd answer it that way.
12:17:28 25
12:17:29 26 Do you recall in your time in the Drug Squad if there was
12:17:32 27 an issue as to disclosure about perhaps an informer that
12:17:37 28 you had, was that something that sometimes came up, the
12:17:41 29 issue of public interest immunity?---Sorry, I'm just trying
12:17:53 30 to think, it's a long time ago. No, not that I can recall.
12:18:08 31
12:18:09 32 If you're running informers and have obtained information
12:18:15 33 from informers, one assumes you've kept notes, because you
12:18:21 34 say you've kept notes about your meetings, there are tapes
12:18:26 35 and so forth?---Yep.
12:18:27 36
12:18:27 37 If you're involved in putting together a brief there would
12:18:31 38 often be requests for pre hearing disclosure I
12:18:36 39 assume?---Yes.
12:18:37 40
12:18:37 41 What would be the situation if there was a question as to
12:18:40 42 whether you should or shouldn't hand over material, what
12:18:43 43 happened then?---I don't remember actually having any
12:18:54 44 dramas with the informers that I was using.
12:18:58 45
12:18:59 46 Right. So you don't have any recollection at any time ever
12:19:05 47 having a discussion with Bowden about whether you needed to

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

12:19:09 1 hand over material?---No.
12:19:14 2
12:19:16 3 Was the view taken that if there was material which related
12:19:21 4 to an informer, it simply wouldn't be handed over because
12:19:25 5 that was the subject of PII?---I don't really - I don't
12:19:35 6 recall. I just can't remember.
12:19:37 7
12:19:37 8 Can I ask you about your later years in the second part of
12:19:43 9 your statement you say that, "As years past Gobbo became
12:19:47 10 more active in representing high profile criminals"?---Yes.
12:19:51 11
12:19:51 12 You say, "I heard from fellow police officers as well as
12:19:55 13 informers that she was even more involved with her clients
12:19:58 14 both personally and intimately whilst still being involved
12:20:03 15 with the police"?---Yes.
12:20:04 16
12:20:05 17 You heard from fellow police officers, correct?---Yes.
12:20:07 18
12:20:07 19 And who were they?---I can't remember.
12:20:11 20
12:20:11 21 Well, in what - do you recall the context in which you
12:20:15 22 might have heard this?---I'm sorry, I can't remember.
12:20:32 23
12:20:33 24 You do say you had discussions with police officers about
12:20:37 25 the fact that she was involved with her clients personally
12:20:41 26 and intimately?---Yes.
12:20:43 27
12:20:44 28 So does that indicate that you'd heard from police officers
12:20:47 29 that she had intimate relations with clients?---No, I'd
12:20:53 30 heard from informers.
12:20:54 31
12:20:54 32 From informers?---Yeah.
12:20:55 33
12:20:56 34 And what did you hear? What had you heard?---That she was
12:20:59 35 intimately involved with a few of the criminals.
12:21:02 36
12:21:03 37 And which criminals?---Um, the ones that she was
12:21:08 38 representing.
12:21:09 39
12:21:09 40 Do you recall any names?---No.
12:21:17 41
12:21:17 42 Who was she representing at the time that you heard these
12:21:22 43 things?---Well she was representing Mokbel and - who else
12:21:35 44 was there? The Mokbels.
45
12:21:50 46 Right?---Yeah, that's - - -
12:21:51 47

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

12:21:51 1 Did you know another person by the name of Ahmed?---No.
12:21:57 2
12:21:59 3 Azzam or Adam Ahmed, did you ever know that name?---No.
12:22:03 4
12:22:03 5 So the only names that you can think of are Mokbel or
12:22:07 6 Mokbels, is that right?---Yeah, there was - I think both
12:22:12 7 the Mokbels were allegedly intimately involved with her as
12:22:15 8 well.
12:22:15 9
12:22:16 10 Do you say that's something you heard from police officers
12:22:18 11 or informers that you had?---Yeah, I know definitely
12:22:22 12 informers, possibly police officers but I can't be 100 per
12:22:26 13 cent sure.
12:22:26 14
12:22:27 15 If I asked you the name of police officers who told or gave
12:22:32 16 you that information you'd say you can't recall?---Um,
12:22:43 17 yeah, I'd only assume which ones told me. I know that
12:22:47 18 police did tell me but I can't recall exactly who it was.
12:22:51 19
12:22:51 20 If I asked you what period of time we're talking about are
12:22:55 21 you able to recall that?---Well it's after I left the Drug
12:23:01 22 Squad so it would have been around 2000, mid-2000s.
12:23:04 23
12:23:04 24 If I asked you the names of the informers who gave the
12:23:08 25 information, you might not want to say but would you be
12:23:14 26 prepared to write them down on a piece of paper?---I had a
12:23:18 27 number of informers at that time so, yeah, I'd be confused
12:23:22 28 about which ones actually gave me the specific information.
12:23:25 29
12:23:25 30 If I ask you to write down the names of the informers that
12:23:29 31 you had would you be prepared to do so?
12:23:32 32
12:23:33 33 COMMISSIONER: Those that might have told you this
12:23:35 34 information?---I can't - if I name informers then it's
12:23:45 35 like, I'm just endangering the informers' lives and I'm not
12:23:49 36 100 per cent sure which ones told me what.
12:23:53 37
12:23:53 38 MR WINNEKE: How many informers did you have?---I had a
12:23:56 39 lot.
12:23:56 40
12:23:56 41 I'm talking about the period of time after you left the
12:23:59 42 Drug Squad?---There was a lot of people that were willing
12:24:03 43 to pass on information, especially when Purana was going.
12:24:09 44
12:24:10 45 If I can focus on that period. We're talking about the
12:24:15 46 period when the gangland killings were occurring, is that
12:24:18 47 right?---Yes.

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

12:24:19 1
12:24:19 2 You had information that you were able to provide to Purana
12:24:23 3 at that time?---Yeah, I was contacted and - actually, I
12:24:27 4 wasn't sourcing it at that time. I worked with Detective -
12:24:31 5 if I can make it clear, I was working with Detective Senior
12:24:35 6 Constable Pearce-O at the Drug Squad. When he went to
12:24:38 7 Purana I was trying to assist him with his, in Purana, but
12:24:46 8 then I was contacted by John O'Connor and John O'Connor
12:24:53 9 asked me if I could assist [REDACTED] Fiona Lavery.
12:24:59 10
12:24:59 11 And where was she?---She was at Purana, and he said that
12:25:05 12 she wasn't, didn't have any previous experience with these
12:25:09 13 people so can you please find out some information in
12:25:14 14 relation to - so I did.
12:25:17 15
12:25:17 16 Can I ask you why they would have approached you for that
12:25:20 17 information?---Because I can find things - I don't know
12:25:26 18 why. My whole life in the Police Force I had a lot of
12:25:29 19 people that would trust me and tell me, give me information
12:25:37 20 that was important to some of these operations, so.
12:25:40 21
12:25:41 22 And they knew you had contacts with these people?---Yes.
12:25:45 23
12:25:45 24 How many of these people and what was their - without at
12:25:49 25 this stage telling us names, what area, what sort of
12:25:55 26 information were they able to provide?---Fairly specific
12:26:00 27 information.
12:26:00 28
12:26:01 29 Concerning what?---The shootings that were going on at the
12:26:07 30 time.
12:26:08 31
12:26:10 32 And which shootings in particular? We've mentioned Michael
12:26:14 33 Marshall before, is that one of them?---Yeah, that was the
12:26:19 34 one that I gave - that was when I first started dealing
12:26:23 35 with Fiona Lavery.
12:26:25 36
12:26:27 37 What was the reason why you had that information or how did
12:26:33 38 you come to have the information?---I didn't have the
12:26:35 39 information. Like I said John O'Connor rang me up said can
12:26:40 40 you help - I think it's [REDACTED] Fiona Lavery,
12:26:45 41 she's just started at Purana Task Force. I said yep, I'll
12:26:51 42 make some inquiries.
12:26:53 43
12:26:54 44 What information were you able to provide about the, for
12:26:58 45 example, the Marshall matter?---They didn't know who he was
12:27:07 46 so the background that I gave to them was specific and
12:27:11 47 related to what he was potentially involved in.

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

12:27:15 1
12:27:16 2 Right. In relation to drug trafficking?---Yes.
12:27:18 3
12:27:19 4 It's been reported that you were involved as a [REDACTED] of
12:27:24 5 a company which was a [REDACTED] company, [REDACTED],
12:27:29 6 was it in connection with that?---No, that's - no,
12:27:31 7 definitely not.
12:27:33 8
12:27:33 9 Did that, that had nothing to do with any information that
12:27:37 10 you were able to get?---Absolutely not.
12:27:40 11
12:27:43 12 You were concerned that if the informers, the people who
12:27:57 13 were providing information to you, passed that information
12:28:00 14 on to Ms Gobbo you could be at risk?---Well the informers
12:28:05 15 because they'd be looking around to see who potentially is
12:28:10 16 giving information.
12:28:11 17
12:28:12 18 Right. And you clearly didn't want Ms Gobbo to know that
12:28:15 19 you were involved in providing information to
12:28:19 20 Purana?---Yes.
12:28:19 21
12:28:21 22 Were those informers, the people who were providing you
12:28:24 23 with the information, were they registered or
12:28:27 24 unregistered?---Um, I think unregistered at that stage.
12:28:32 25
12:28:33 26 Did Mr O'Connor or Lavery know whether they were registered
12:28:37 27 or not?---No, well the only reason I spoke to Lavery was
12:28:44 28 because I said to her, I said, "I do not want my name on
12:28:47 29 any of the information reports because you've potentially
12:28:53 30 got leaks via solicitors or other unauthorised people".
12:29:01 31
12:29:01 32 Right. I mean did you regard yourself as the informer or
12:29:08 33 the people who were providing you with the information as
12:29:11 34 the informers or both?---Well in that case it was sort of a
12:29:15 35 double up I suppose, but I was the policeman, so - but yeah
12:29:21 36 you could say I was the informer.
12:29:22 37
12:29:23 38 Did the people from whom you were getting the information
12:29:25 39 know that you were passing that information on to
12:29:30 40 Purana?---Um, I didn't - I don't know whether I would -
12:29:41 41 well if they give me information they know I'm a policeman,
12:29:46 42 the trouble is I'm going to tell them. I didn't say, "I'm
12:29:49 43 rushing off to Purana now, I'm going to tell them
12:29:54 44 everything you've told me".
12:29:55 45
12:29:55 46 The expectation was that you were conveying information to
12:30:02 47 the people who were carrying out the investigations?---Yes.

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

12:30:05 1
12:30:06 2 We're talking about, firstly, the killing of
12:30:10 3 Marshall?---H'mm.
12:30:11 4
12:30:11 5 And you were able to provide information to police about
12:30:15 6 people who had been involved in that - - - ?---Um - - -
12:30:21 7
12:30:21 8 - - - killing?---No. I go - I'm not sure exactly the
12:30:30 9 information that I gave but it was something to, it was
12:30:34 10 basically, um - yeah, I think you'll have to ask Fiona
12:30:44 11 Lavery what I told her because I can't remember.
12:30:46 12
12:30:47 13 Did you know at that stage that Ms Gobbo was acting for one
12:30:50 14 of the suspects in that or at least a person who was a
12:30:53 15 suspect for that killing?---Yeah, I knew she was acting,
12:31:01 16 acting for - - -
12:31:01 17
12:31:01 18 Who was she acting for to your knowledge?---I thought she
12:31:07 19 was acting for the guy that had been involved in [REDACTED]
12:31:12 20 [REDACTED]. Again, I can't really remember, I shouldn't say
12:31:17 21 that.
12:31:17 22
12:31:17 23 Was that - - -
12:31:25 24
12:31:25 25 MR HOLT: Can I just approach my learned friend?
26
12:31:27 27 (Discussion at Bar table.)
12:31:49 28
12:31:49 29 MR WINNEKE: What was your concern about information
12:31:53 30 getting to Ms Gobbo?---At that stage my concern was
12:32:13 31 basically I didn't know what she'd do if she found out, if
12:32:19 32 she got the information.
12:32:22 33
12:32:24 34 You were concerned that she was in effect playing both
12:32:29 35 sides?---Correct.
12:32:30 36
12:32:30 37 You understood that she had a relationship with
12:32:33 38 police?---Yes.
12:32:34 39
12:32:35 40 Which police at that stage - I'm talking about around the
12:32:39 41 time of Marshall's killing?
12:32:42 42
12:32:42 43 COMMISSIONER: What sort of relation are you talking about?
12:32:44 44
12:32:45 45 MR WINNEKE: Are you talking about a personal
12:32:47 46 relationship?---Honestly I don't know. All I know is that
12:32:51 47 she was in that, in the group and it was well-known that

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

12:32:55 1 she was in that group.
12:32:57 2
12:32:57 3 Which group?---As in she was in with both sides of the
12:33:01 4 fence, she was in with Mokbel and - well, the Mokbel group
12:33:06 5 and then there was the other group being the Benji and - -
12:33:14 6 -
12:33:14 7
12:33:15 8 Veniamin?---Veniamin, sorry, Veniamin and what's the other
12:33:20 9 bloke's name - I've forgotten his name. Veniamin's group
12:33:30 10 and - so, yeah, they were all - - -
12:33:33 11
12:33:34 12 Williams?---Williams, that's right, yep.
12:33:37 13
12:33:38 14 Right?---So I didn't know what was, it was very complex the
12:33:41 15 whole situation because basically at that time I was
12:33:44 16 getting information. I knew Gobbo was involved in it.
12:33:51 17
12:33:51 18 You knew Gobbo was involved in it?---I knew Gobbo was
12:33:55 19 involved in these people's lives intimately.
12:33:58 20
12:33:58 21 Right. So the people that you've just mentioned?---Yes.
12:34:01 22
12:34:02 23 Right?---And then I also, and then I'm trying to give
12:34:07 24 information to the Purana Task Force without - because they
12:34:12 25 were all paranoid at this stage because there were more
12:34:16 26 than one informer.
12:34:17 27
12:34:17 28 In your statement you say, "I knew that Gobbo was
12:34:20 29 representing a number of criminals", they're the ones we
12:34:23 30 have spoken about, "being investigated"?---Yep.
12:34:25 31
12:34:25 32 "And that she had continued to maintain an intimate
12:34:29 33 connection with Victoria Police"?---Yes.
12:34:30 34
12:34:31 35 That's what you say in your statement?---Yep.
12:34:32 36
12:34:33 37 You've told us about the criminals. Now what about the
12:34:38 38 Victoria Police members who she had an intimate connection
12:34:41 39 with, what did you know there?---That's what I'm saying
12:34:47 40 with Shields, and that concerned me enormously.
12:34:51 41
12:34:52 42 Are you talking about people such as Paul Dale?---No, I
12:34:56 43 don't know - I don't know what the circumstances with Dale
12:35:00 44 were.
12:35:01 45
12:35:02 46 Right. You were concerned about this and you were speaking
12:35:06 47 to members of Purana?---Correct.

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

12:35:08 1
12:35:09 2 Did you convey to the members of Purana, that is Pearce-O
12:35:13 3 and to Lavery, that you were concerned about
12:35:16 4 Ms Gobbo?---No.
12:35:17 5
12:35:17 6 Why not?---Well if she's an informer then I'm not going to
12:35:22 7 be saying anything.
12:35:23 8
12:35:24 9 Did you think that she was informing to Lavery or Pearce-O
12:35:27 10 and/or for Purana?---It wasn't my business. My business
12:35:31 11 was to provide them with information and not take
12:35:33 12 information from them.
12:35:34 13
12:35:34 14 I understand that, but you didn't want your position to be
12:35:37 15 compromised and you didn't want Ms Gobbo to know that you'd
12:35:41 16 been providing information, correct?---Correct.
12:35:44 17
12:35:44 18 How did you protect yourself?---Exactly that way. I said,
12:35:49 19 "Please put me down as an unregistered source".
12:35:52 20
12:35:52 21 And how could you be confident that if she was providing
12:35:56 22 information to Purana it wasn't going to come back, it
12:35:59 23 wasn't going to get to her?---I wasn't so confident.
12:36:06 24
12:36:09 25 And you say that you didn't ever say to Pearce-O or Lavery,
12:36:13 26 "Please don't let Gobbo know this"?---Yes.
12:36:17 27
12:36:18 28 Did you ever discuss Gobbo with anyone at Purana?---Pearce-O
12:36:24 29 was at the Drug Squad so he would have known Gobbo.
12:36:28 30
12:36:28 31 Did you ever discuss it with Pearce-O ?---No.
12:36:30 32
12:36:31 33 Who did you believe she was informing to?---I didn't know
12:36:41 34 and I wasn't trying to find out.
12:36:45 35
12:36:45 36 You talk about your knowledge that she had an intimate
12:36:48 37 connection with police, where did you get that knowledge
12:36:50 38 from? How did you get that knowledge?---Well, obviously
12:36:55 39 I've explained to you that I've been told by police as in,
12:37:01 40 and I've identified one, so there's - obviously I've spoken
12:37:06 41 to other people because it was, it's of my recollection
12:37:09 42 that I knew she was still involved with the police. I
12:37:13 43 don't know exactly who told me but I was concerned in
12:37:19 44 relation to, and so were other members because there was
12:37:26 45 talk about Gobbo.
12:37:28 46
12:37:28 47 Between whom?---I think it sort of gets to the point like

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

12:37:35 1 when we reach around where Marshall gets killed and I
12:37:40 2 provide that information to Purana and then, and at that
12:37:45 3 stage the SOG were involved and they were concerned about
12:37:49 4 Gobbo.
12:37:51 5
12:37:51 6 So you understood that SOG members were concerned about
12:37:55 7 her?---Yes.
12:37:56 8
12:37:56 9 From your discussions with SOG?---Yes.
12:37:59 10
12:37:59 11 Who?---I spoke to Dean McGrath.
12:38:10 12
12:38:11 13 Dean McGrath?---Unfortunately he's passed away.
12:38:15 14
12:38:15 15 Anyone else?---I did speak to other members but I can't
12:38:19 16 remember exactly who else.
12:38:20 17
12:38:21 18 People in Dean McGrath's team?---Um - - -
12:38:29 19
12:38:29 20 Can you explain the context of how it came to be that you
12:38:32 21 spoke to McGrath about your concern?---Well I was concerned
12:38:35 22 for him in particular and other members because I was aware
12:38:40 23 that Mokbel was making inquiries in relation to where the
12:38:43 24 [REDACTED] were.
12:38:47 25
12:38:47 26 How did you get that information?---From informers
12:38:55 27 basically so, but they already knew that. The SOG had
12:39:01 28 actually been threatened and I believe members of Purana
12:39:05 29 had been threatened as well. So I may have even had a
12:39:10 30 conversation with the members of Purana, I'm not 100 per
12:39:15 31 cent sure.
12:39:15 32
12:39:16 33 Your concern was that Ms Gobbo was passing that information
12:39:18 34 on?---Well, I didn't know who was passing the information
12:39:24 35 on. No, you've got me wrong. I said that there were
12:39:29 36 threats against the SOG, there were - the information that
12:39:37 37 I ascertained was that they were [REDACTED],
12:39:40 38 or who the informers were in relation to the shootings,
12:39:46 39 because they knew there was an informer. What's the thing
12:39:54 40 I'm trying to get, I'm sorry - my mind's everywhere.
12:39:58 41
12:39:58 42 Take your time?---There was - so, yeah, and then, yeah,
12:40:03 43 then there was a concern because there'd been a threat to
12:40:06 44 the SOG. What happened then? I'm just trying to get my
12:40:14 45 head around - it was, it's convoluted, the whole episode,
12:40:21 46 so.
12:40:21 47

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

12:40:22 1 What you've said in your statement is, "I was mindful of
12:40:25 2 Gobbo's close relationship with criminals and police and
12:40:29 3 found the whole situation to be very messy and difficult to
12:40:34 4 navigate"---Yes.
5
12:40:35 6 That sums up your situation?---That's right, yes.
12:40:37 7
12:40:37 8 You were getting information from informers?---Yeah.
12:40:39 9
12:40:39 10 And some of that information concerned Ms Gobbo's
12:40:42 11 involvement, is that right?---Yes, that's right.
12:40:44 12
12:40:45 13 And can you tell us the names of informers or write it down
12:40:50 14 who gave you information about Ms Gobbo?---No, I can't.
12:40:56 15
12:40:56 16 You don't want to or you can't?---Well, I can remember some
12:41:00 17 informers but I know exactly - you're asking for
12:41:04 18 information that was coming in a long time ago and I'm not
12:41:10 19 exactly sure who was giving me the information.
12:41:13 20
12:41:13 21 But that was concerning information that Ms Gobbo was
12:41:16 22 involved in potentially criminal activities,
12:41:21 23 correct?---Correct.
12:41:22 24
12:41:22 25 Did you convey that information to any police
12:41:27 26 officers?---No.
12:41:28 27
12:41:28 28 Why not?---Because they already knew.
12:41:31 29
12:41:31 30 How did you know they already knew?---Because they told me.
12:41:34 31
12:41:34 32 Who told you?---Members from the SOG.
12:41:38 33
12:41:38 34 And they told you - this is McGrath and others who you
12:41:42 35 can't recall?---Yeah.
12:41:44 36
12:41:44 37 Told you that police knew that Ms Gobbo was involved in
12:41:50 38 these sorts of activities about trying to [REDACTED],
12:41:54 39 for example, the [REDACTED], is that
12:41:57 40 right?---Correct.
12:41:57 41
12:41:59 42 And would you have recorded this information in your
12:42:01 43 diaries or your notes?---I don't know. Maybe. Because
12:42:14 44 you've got to realise I've gone from - I'm not a Detective
12:42:18 45 any more so I'm not taking notes consistently. I possibly
12:42:23 46 may have written it in my day book but I don't know.
12:42:26 47

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

12:42:26 1 Did you keep diaries? You mentioned before - - - ?---Day
12:42:32 2 books. Sorry, we didn't have diaries in those days as a
12:42:38 3 uniform Sergeant.
12:42:38 4
12:42:39 5 As detectives you did?---Yep.
6
12:42:40 7 But not as a uniform Sergeant?---Correct.
12:42:43 8
12:42:43 9 You indicated that you provided these records to the doctor
12:42:47 10 because he was the only person you were confident would
12:42:51 11 keep them safe?---Yes.
12:42:52 12
12:42:53 13 Because there was information in those I assume which is
12:42:56 14 particularly, potentially could come back to bite you or
12:43:01 15 harm you if other people knew about that
12:43:04 16 information?---Correct.
12:43:04 17
12:43:05 18 Would it be fair to say that this is the sort of
12:43:08 19 information that you might have recorded?---Yes, possibly.
12:43:14 20
12:43:25 21 Now, you indicated a concern that you had about Gobbo's
12:43:38 22 access to your information in relation to the Marshall
12:43:45 23 murder, right?---Yes.
12:43:47 24
12:43:50 25 And your concerns were reinforced when Gavan Ryan requested
12:43:55 26 a meeting with you?---That's right.
12:43:57 27
12:44:00 28 Did he simply contact you and indicate that he wanted to
12:44:03 29 speak to you?---Yes.
12:44:05 30
12:44:05 31 And you say he basically demanded to know who your informer
12:44:09 32 was?---It was the only reason for the meeting. It wasn't
12:44:12 33 to pat me on the back.
12:44:14 34
12:44:14 35 No. And did you provide him with - - - ?---No.
12:44:17 36
12:44:17 37 - - - any names?---No.
12:44:18 38
12:44:23 39 As far as you were concerned you were supposed to be an
12:44:27 40 unregistered source?---That's right.
12:44:31 41
12:44:31 42 But you were concerned about the breaches of
12:44:36 43 confidentiality within the Purana Task Force, is that
12:44:41 44 right?---Yes.
12:44:42 45
12:44:48 46 You say that this wasn't the first time that Purana
12:44:51 47 detectives have tried to pressure you into forcing an

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

12:44:56 1 informer into making a statement?---That's right.
12:44:58 2
12:44:58 3 Was it your understanding that Ryan wanted you to give him
12:45:02 4 the name of your informer so as that person could make a
12:45:06 5 statement and be a witness?---Yes.
12:45:08 6
12:45:09 7 Is that what he said to you?---It was - well, actually, no,
12:45:14 8 it was either he wanted me to give him the name of the
12:45:20 9 person so that they could continue to liaise with them and
12:45:24 10 get further information off him. He didn't say to make a
12:45:27 11 statement or anything because he didn't get past, "What's
12:45:31 12 your informer's name?"
12:45:32 13
12:45:33 14 You simply point blank said, "I'm not going to tell
12:45:37 15 you"?---Correct.
12:45:38 16
12:45:38 17 Were there any consequences to you as a result of that or
12:45:41 18 not?---No.
12:45:42 19
12:45:43 20 How long after the murder of Marshall was that? We know he
12:45:49 21 was killed on 25 October 2003?---I think he was knocking on
12:45:53 22 my door the next day or the day after.
12:45:56 23
12:45:57 24 Right. Had you been providing information to Purana
12:46:00 25 detectives before Marshall was killed?---Yes.
12:46:03 26
12:46:03 27 About what, an earlier murder? Moran?---No, there was - it
12:46:17 28 was basically a, what was it? A CEO of a company had been
12:46:26 29 stood over and basically they wanted him to make a
12:46:33 30 statement.
12:46:34 31
12:46:40 32 You say that this wasn't the first time the detectives had
12:46:44 33 tried to pressure you, was that the earlier
12:46:45 34 occasion?---That's what I'm talking about, when they tried
12:46:49 35 to get me to get him to make a statement.
12:46:52 36
12:46:52 37 Did that person have anything to say to you about
12:46:56 38 Ms Gobbo?---No.
12:46:57 39
12:46:57 40 How many different informers of yours do you believe
12:47:05 41 provided you with information about Ms Gobbo?---I can't
12:47:14 42 say.
12:47:15 43
12:47:15 44 Was it more than one?---That's what I'm saying, I can't
12:47:20 45 say. I could say one, two maybe. I'm not sure how many
12:47:24 46 told me.
12:47:25 47

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

12:47:25 1 At least one anyway?---Yes.
12:47:28 2
12:47:30 3 Standing there now you can't recall the name of that person
12:47:33 4 who gave you information about Ms Gobbo?---No.
12:47:37 5
12:47:41 6 Are you able to say whether that person also provided
12:47:44 7 information that you were able to give to Purana detectives
12:47:47 8 about any particular murder?---Sorry?
12:47:50 9
12:47:51 10 The same person that you're talking about, did that person
12:47:54 11 also - - - ?---I don't know because I can't remember which
12:47:57 12 person that was.
12:47:58 13
12:47:59 14 All right. Were you aware of any police policies about the
12:48:20 15 management of informers at around that time in 2003?---Yes.
12:48:25 16
12:48:26 17 What was your understanding of the position around October
12:48:31 18 of 2003?---You were supposed to register them and have a
12:48:40 19 handler and a controller and advise your supervising
12:48:48 20 officer. That's all I can recall.
12:48:50 21
12:48:50 22 Yet you say, for example, Lavery and Pearce-O were quite
12:48:54 23 prepared to deal with you in a way which didn't conform
12:48:59 24 with that guideline?---Yes.
12:49:00 25
12:49:01 26 Was that ever discussed?---No.
12:49:09 27
12:49:12 28 Did you understand or was it recognised that the way that
12:49:17 29 this was proceeding was not in accordance with
12:49:22 30 guidelines?---Sorry, I've got to get my head round that
12:49:28 31 one, what was - - -
12:49:29 32
12:49:29 33 You were providing information as an unregistered
12:49:32 34 source?---Yes.
12:49:32 35
12:49:32 36 People were providing information to you as unregistered
12:49:36 37 sources?---Yes.
12:49:37 38
12:49:37 39 And you were giving information to Purana detectives,
12:49:40 40 right?---Yep.
12:49:40 41
12:49:40 42 No one was registered?---Yes.
12:49:42 43
12:49:42 44 As being a source of information?---Yes.
12:49:45 45
12:49:46 46 You understood that that was contrary to guidelines at that
12:49:49 47 stage?---Yes.

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

12:49:50 1
12:49:51 2 And I take it it would have been within the knowledge of
12:49:54 3 the people to whom you were speaking, that is Pearce-O ,
12:49:58 4 Lavery and others, those two?---Yes.
12:50:00 5
12:50:00 6 That it was contrary to guidelines?---Yes.
12:50:03 7
12:50:04 8 And nonetheless that relationship continued?---Yes.
12:50:10 9
12:50:10 10 Over what period of time did you provide information to
12:50:15 11 Purana detectives? We're now talking about October 2003
12:50:21 12 Marshall was killed, how long after that were you providing
12:50:26 13 information to Purana?---As long as I could. I don't
12:50:32 14 exactly know the date I stopped giving information to them
12:50:36 15 but I would suggest that if I wasn't giving information
12:50:39 16 directly to Lavery, I was giving information to the
12:50:44 17 Homicide Squad or - - -
12:50:45 18
12:50:46 19 Who did you speak to at the Homicide Squad?---When you're
12:50:51 20 talking about informers?
12:50:55 21
12:50:55 22 Hey?---When you're talking about informers?
12:50:57 23
12:50:57 24 No. When were you providing information to the Homicide
12:51:01 25 Squad either with or without informers or from - -
12:51:04 26 -?---Consistently throughout my career.
12:51:06 27
12:51:07 28 But I'm talking about the period subsequent to say
12:51:12 29 2002?---I gave information in relation to the Hodsons, in
12:51:18 30 relation - - -
12:51:19 31
12:51:19 32 What information did you provide about that?---I think
12:51:22 33 you'll have to pull up the information report, I can't
12:51:25 34 remember what I put in it.
12:51:27 35
12:51:30 36 Do you say you can't recall there now what information you
12:51:33 37 were able to provide about the Hodson murders, you can't
12:51:36 38 recall?---No, I can't recall - no, I can't recall
12:51:39 39 specifically. I think I nominated who was the person who
12:51:43 40 was involved in the shooting.
12:51:44 41
12:51:45 42 Who did you nominate that to?---I'm pretty sure, I'm pretty
12:51:52 43 sure I was submitting, we have information reports, so
12:51:54 44 there's like the information report goes through the,
12:51:58 45 through the system.
12:52:00 46
12:52:01 47 You prepared an information report?---I'm pretty sure I

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

12:52:04 1 prepared an information report.
12:52:05 2
12:52:06 3 And provided it to the Homicide Squad?---Pretty sure it
12:52:09 4 went to the Homicide Squad.
12:52:11 5
12:52:12 6 Was that Mr Davey at that time?---Mr Who?
12:52:17 7
12:52:18 8 Mr Bezzina or Cameron Davey?---I don't know you'll have to
12:52:23 9 look and - I can't remember, I've submitted so many
12:52:26 10 information reports, mate.
12:52:27 11
12:52:27 12 Did it have anything to do with Ms Gobbo?---No.
12:52:31 13
12:52:31 14 No?---But you're asking about informers and stuff, that's
12:52:34 15 what I was explaining.
12:52:36 16
12:52:36 17 Okay, all right. You say that as offenders, you say this
12:52:47 18 in your statement, "Around the time I was aware" and you
12:52:51 19 mentioned the death threats to the SOGs?---Yeah.
12:52:55 20
12:52:55 21 And further, "As offenders agreed to give information
12:52:58 22 members from the SOG were [REDACTED]
12:53:02 23 [REDACTED] not to tell Nicola Gobbo anything"?---Yep.
12:53:05 24
12:53:05 25 Where did you get that information from?---I don't remember
12:53:24 26 everyone that told me but people told me but - - -
12:53:29 27
12:53:30 28 We're talking about members of the SOG I assume?---Yeah.
12:53:33 29
12:53:35 30 And McGrath, for example, was telling you that he was
12:53:39 31 telling [REDACTED] not to tell Nicola
12:53:42 32 Gobbo anything?---No, no, it was coming from the top.
12:53:44 33
12:53:44 34 That was coming from the top?---Yep.
12:53:46 35
12:53:46 36 How did it get to you though?---Because SOG members told
12:53:52 37 me, including Dean.
12:53:53 38
12:53:53 39 And who was at the top?---^{Police Officer} [REDACTED] I think his name is.
12:54:01 40
12:54:02 41 Can I ask you the context in which these conversations
12:54:05 42 arose? Why was it that Gobbo was coming up in discussions
12:54:09 43 with you and SOG members and the fact that people were
12:54:13 44 being told not to say anything to her?---Because there was,
12:54:16 45 like I said there was concerns that they were going to go
12:54:20 46 after [REDACTED] that had - were [REDACTED]
12:54:25 47 the people that were charged with the Purana offences,

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

12:54:29 1 whichever ones they may be.
12:54:32 2
12:54:33 3 The only particular names you can mention are, you can
12:54:36 4 think of are McGrath, amongst other members of the
12:54:40 5 SOG?---Yes.
12:54:41 6
12:54:41 7 Right, okay. You say that, "Gobbo has made the landscape
12:54:50 8 forgiving information incredibly difficult", can you
12:54:53 9 explain that?---Well, here I am providing information and
12:54:58 10 wondering who's talking to informers, namely Nicola Gobbo,
12:55:07 11 and how much information she's sending back to the other
12:55:12 12 side.
12:55:13 13
12:55:13 14 That's what you mean, is it, when you say that in your
12:55:15 15 statement?---Correct.
12:55:16 16
12:55:22 17 Thanks very much.
12:55:24 18
12:55:24 19 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Winneke. Mr Collinson.
12:55:26 20
 21
 22
12:55:29 23 MR COLLINSON: Yes, I have about 25 minutes. I don't know
12:55:31 24 whether it is more convenient to break now and then start
12:55:34 25 immediately after lunch.
12:55:35 26
12:55:35 27 COMMISSIONER: We do have limited time this afternoon, so
12:55:38 28 perhaps we can make a start now.
12:55:40 29
12:55:41 30 MR COLLINSON: Yes.
12:55:41 31
12:55:41 32 COMMISSIONER: Mr Winneke, how long will the next witness
12:55:45 33 be?
12:55:46 34
12:55:46 35 MR WINNEKE: I imagine not too long judging from
12:55:50 36 information I've been provided, I don't think he'll go for
12:55:54 37 too long.
12:55:55 38
12:55:55 39 COMMISSIONER: I can't sit much beyond 3.30 this afternoon.
12:56:00 40
12:56:01 41 MR WINNEKE: Depending how much questioning my learned
12:56:03 42 friends have I would imagine we'd get through it.
12:56:06 43
12:56:06 44 COMMISSIONER: Perhaps if we make a start, Mr Collinson.
12:56:08 45
12:56:09 46 MR COLLINSON: Thank you.
12:56:13 47

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

1 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR COLLINSON:
2

12:56:14 3 Perhaps, Commissioner, you can tell me when to stop. Can
12:56:18 4 the operator please bring up Exhibit RC75. Now you'll see
12:56:28 5 those, [REDACTED], on the screen - or this particular
12:56:32 6 document?---Yep.

12:56:33 7
12:56:34 8 When was the first time you saw this document?---Yesterday.
12:56:39 9 Can I put on my glasses?

12:56:41 10
12:56:41 11 Yes, of course?---Yeah, no, yesterday.

12:56:45 12
12:56:45 13 You'll see it records that you initially had a meeting with
12:56:56 14 representatives Woltsche and Pattie on 4 March 2019 in the
12:57:00 15 CBD?---Yep.

12:57:01 16
12:57:02 17 And do you recollect that meeting?---Yes.

12:57:03 18
12:57:04 19 And how long did that meeting go for?---Don't know, maybe
12:57:19 20 an hour.

12:57:22 21
12:57:22 22 You did the best you could, didn't you, in the course of
12:57:25 23 that meeting to give your - - - ?---Sorry, I don't need my
12:57:31 24 glasses. He's just made it big.

12:57:34 25
12:57:34 26 COMMISSIONER: I'm not sure whether we actually tendered
12:57:36 27 that as RC75, did we?

12:57:39 28
12:57:40 29 MR COLLINSON: I think we did.

12:57:41 30
12:57:41 31 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

12:57:42 32
12:57:45 33 MR COLLINSON: I'll repeat the question, sorry [REDACTED] You
12:57:47 34 met with these police officers for an hour and you did your
12:57:51 35 best in the course of that meeting to give your best
12:57:54 36 recollection of your contact with Ms Gobbo, in particular
12:57:58 37 around about 1998 when you attended that meeting with
12:58:03 38 Mr Kruger?---Yeah, I think Woltsche softened me up a bit
12:58:09 39 before I started talking basically.

12:58:13 40
12:58:14 41 Softened you up in what way?---As in he was talking to me
12:58:16 42 about - because I know him so we were just talking.

12:58:19 43
12:58:19 44 Yes. In the ensuing hour you did your best to give your
12:58:24 45 recollection about what happened in the course of this
12:58:28 46 meeting you attended with Ms Gobbo and Mr Kruger?---That's
12:58:34 47 right.

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

12:58:34 1
12:58:35 2 And the best you could come up with on that occasion was
12:58:39 3 the information in these dot points or do you say to the
12:58:43 4 Commissioner that you provided more information than what
12:58:45 5 is set out here?---Yeah, I think there's more. I think if
12:58:49 6 you go down to the bottom I think he's put - yeah, that
12:58:57 7 was, that was in the first thing. I don't think that was
12:58:59 8 in the second. I doubt very much it was - yeah.
12:59:03 9
12:59:03 10 This is the only meeting you've had with officers Woltsche
12:59:07 11 and Pattie, isn't it?---Correct. That's the 4th of the
12:59:11 12 3rd, and that's the 20th of the 3rd. I don't believe that
12:59:14 13 I told him that when I was there the first time, not - I
12:59:18 14 don't recall telling him via the telephone.
12:59:20 15
12:59:21 16 Yes. You gave evidence about that earlier. If one goes
12:59:25 17 over the page to .0235, your evidence earlier as I
12:59:33 18 recollect it was that the information under the heading 20
12:59:35 19 March 2019 and those three dot points, you thought that you
12:59:40 20 provided that information in the meeting rather than on the
12:59:43 21 telephone?---Correct.
12:59:44 22
12:59:47 23 Are you able to explain why then it would be recorded under
12:59:53 24 the heading 20 March 2019 as information provided on the
12:59:57 25 telephone when you in fact provided that in a meeting?---I
13:00:01 26 have no idea, you'll have to ask the person who wrote the
13:00:04 27 document.
13:00:05 28
13:00:05 29 In any event, the three dot points under the heading 20
13:00:09 30 March 2019 don't provide a lot of detail, do they, about
13:00:17 31 your attendance at that meeting with Ms Gobbo on - the date
13:00:25 32 was 21 July 1998?---Sorry, what's the question?
13:00:32 33
13:00:32 34 The information in the three dot points doesn't provide a
13:00:36 35 great deal of information, does it, about what you
13:00:39 36 recollected about what was said at the meeting of 21 July
13:00:42 37 1998?---Sorry, I'm not understanding what you're saying.
13:00:53 38
13:00:54 39 All you say in the second dot point you say that the police
13:01:01 40 officers should speak to Mr Bowden, do you see that?---Yep,
13:01:04 41 yep.
13:01:04 42
13:01:05 43 And did you suggest that because you thought Mr Bowden
13:01:09 44 would have a greater recollection about these matters than
13:01:11 45 you?---Actually more - yeah, more or less he's the bloke in
13:01:16 46 charge of it so he's supposed to - yeah, so he'd know what
13:01:23 47 I told him I suppose.

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

13:01:26 1
13:01:26 2 But he didn't attend the meeting of course, did he?---No,
13:01:31 3 he didn't but he - not that meeting.
13:01:36 4
13:01:36 5 Then the third dot point under that heading, it records you
13:01:42 6 telling Mr Bowden that Gobbo was bad news and would not be
13:01:46 7 a good informer?---That's right.
13:01:48 8
13:01:48 9 And then the next dot point you - - - ?---He's an informer
13:01:51 10 so I wouldn't put his name.
13:01:54 11
13:01:55 12 Yes. In the fourth dot point where you refer to [REDACTED]
13:02:01 13 [REDACTED]?---He's an informer, I wouldn't be mentioning that.
13:02:05 14
13:02:05 15 Are you saying you didn't give this information to - -
13:02:07 16 -?---I did, but I just feel very uncomfortable that his
13:02:12 17 name is being mentioned in this forum.
13:02:15 18
13:02:16 19 Just leaving aside that you're uncomfortable about that, my
13:02:21 20 question is: did you mention that name, [REDACTED], to
13:02:26 21 these officers Woltsche and Pattie?---Yes.
13:02:29 22
13:02:33 23 But there's nothing else at least in this record of the
13:02:39 24 information you provided to the police officers about what
13:02:42 25 was said about the meeting of 28 July 1998, is there?---No.
13:02:51 26
13:02:51 27 There's very little detail?---Yes.
13:02:54 28
13:02:55 29 The distinction I'm drawing, [REDACTED] is when we see your
13:03:01 30 statement?---Yes.
13:03:02 31
13:03:02 32 That you sent along?---Yes.
13:03:04 33
13:03:04 34 Recently, there's a great deal of information, isn't there,
13:03:08 35 about detailed statements made by Ms Gobbo at this
13:03:15 36 meeting?---Yes.
13:03:16 37
13:03:17 38 MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, I don't know whether my learned
13:03:20 39 friend appreciates, I put to the witness some information
13:03:23 40 that didn't find its way into the Landow notes earlier on.
13:03:29 41 I don't know whether it's correct if it's being put that
13:03:33 42 that was the only information that he provided.
13:03:36 43
13:03:37 44 MR COLLINSON: Would you excuse me one moment,
13:03:41 45 Commissioner?
13:03:41 46
13:03:42 47 COMMISSIONER: Sure. Just on that, the fourth dot point

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

13:03:45 1 under the heading of 20 March, it's recorded he was a
13:03:51 2 lunatic and she was going to be a problem. He was a
13:03:57 3 lunatic, is that - - - ?---That's the name that's
13:03:59 4 mentioned, yep.
13:03:59 5
13:04:00 6 Who does "he" relate to?---That's the other informer.
7
13:04:03 8 Is that Sayce or is it [REDACTED]?---It's [REDACTED]
9
13:04:07 10 It's [REDACTED] is the lunatic, is that who you're talking
13:04:11 11 about there?---That's correct, yes.
13:04:13 12
13:04:18 13 MR COLLINSON: Commissioner, my friend has shown me a
13:04:19 14 document. I think I do need to consider that over lunch if
13:04:23 15 convenient.
13:04:23 16
13:04:23 17 COMMISSIONER: We'll adjourn now. We might resume a little
13:04:26 18 earlier, say 10 to 2. 1.50 thank you.
19
13:05:07 20 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
13:05:07 21
13:05:07 22 LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT
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

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

13:52:29 1 UPON RESUMING AT 1.50 PM:
13:52:34 2
3 COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Collinson.
4
13:52:34 5 MR COLLINSON: Thank you Commissioner.
13:52:37 6
13:52:42 7 [REDACTED] recalled:
13:52:45 8
13:52:46 9 MR COLLINSON: Mr [REDACTED] if you're ready for some questions.
13:52:48 10 We had up on the screen Exhibit RC75?---Yes.
13:52:52 11
13:52:53 12 Perhaps that could be brought up again. I was asking you
13:52:59 13 some questions about your interaction with officers
13:53:04 14 Woltsche and Pattie and I think you said before lunch that
13:53:08 15 you thought your meeting in the CBD would have been about
13:53:13 16 an hour?---Yes.
13:53:14 17
13:53:18 18 And you'll see that this is a note that's been prepared
13:53:22 19 recording at least some of the things that you said in this
13:53:25 20 meeting in the CBD?---Yes.
13:53:26 21
13:53:27 22 That's what it purports to be. Do you see that?---Yeah,
13:53:32 23 I've got it.
13:53:33 24
13:53:34 25 Is there anything in that note under the heading "4 March
13:53:39 26 2019" that you would say was wrong in terms of information
13:53:44 27 that you say you didn't in fact provide to officers
13:53:48 28 Woltsche and Pattie?---I didn't say that. I didn't say I
13:54:07 29 was more a experienced member of the Drug Squad.
13:54:08 30
13:54:08 31 I'm sorry, could you say that again, please?---I didn't say
13:54:09 32 that, I think they just assumed it, was a more experienced
13:54:13 33 at the Drug Squad especially in relation to - - -
13:54:15 34
13:54:16 35 Which dot point are you addressing?---The third dot point.
13:54:20 36
13:54:20 37 Yes, I see. That's not something you said to those
13:54:23 38 officers?---No, it isn't.
13:54:25 39
13:54:26 40 [REDACTED] apart from the meeting you had with those officers
13:54:32 41 and the telephone calls, have you met with anybody else
13:54:38 42 from Victoria Police in relation to your recollections, in
13:54:44 43 particular, about this meeting with Ms Gobbo on 21 July
13:54:49 44 1998?---Not specifically met anyone.
13:54:57 45
13:54:57 46 I meant have you discussed with anybody in the last few
13:55:00 47 months your recollection of what happened at that meeting

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

13:55:05 1 other than the discussion you had with Mr Woltsche and
13:55:10 2 Ms Pattie?---Yeah, I've - I did meet, I had a coffee with
13:55:14 3 Mark Bowden.
13:55:15 4
13:55:15 5 You had a conversation with him?---Yep.
13:55:17 6
13:55:17 7 When was that?---I'm not sure.
13:55:21 8
13:55:21 9 A few months ago?---Yeah, it's a while.
13:55:24 10
13:55:25 11 Where did that meeting - did you meet with
13:55:29 12 Mr Bowden?---Yeah, there's a few members that catch up and
13:55:32 13 have a talk basically, ex-members.
13:55:36 14
13:55:36 15 Was it at a pub or where did it occur?---No, we're not
13:55:40 16 always going to the pub. A coffee shop, we drink - - -
13:55:45 17
13:55:45 18 A coffee shop?---Yep.
13:55:46 19
13:55:47 20 What, say six weeks ago, a month ago or what?---I'm not
13:55:51 21 exactly sure.
13:55:51 22
13:55:52 23 You can't give any definition at all to when this meeting
13:55:56 24 with Mr Bowden and others might have occurred?---No,
13:55:59 25 because I didn't - - -
13:56:00 26
13:56:00 27 Was it this year?---Yeah, it was this year. I didn't
13:56:03 28 organise to meet up with Mark Bowden if that's what you're
13:56:07 29 saying.
13:56:08 30
13:56:08 31 It was sort of an annual get together?---No, no, no,
13:56:12 32 there's just a few people that have got a few issues, so we
13:56:14 33 all sort of - you know sometimes people ring me and say
13:56:16 34 come and say hello to this bloke or - so that's what we do.
13:56:20 35
13:56:20 36 But apart from this interaction with Mr Bowden and others,
13:56:24 37 is that it in terms of anybody you've spoken to at Victoria
13:56:28 38 Police about your recollection of this meeting?---I had
13:56:44 39 some - went and had some legal advice, so went to speak to
13:56:50 40 some solicitors.
13:56:51 41
13:56:52 42 What was the name - what's the name of those solicitors, or
13:57:00 43 the name of the solicitor you dealt with?---Okay. I spoke
13:57:04 44 to Tony Hargreaves.
13:57:06 45
13:57:06 46 Yes?---And I spoke to Brendan Kelly and I've spoken to
13:57:14 47 Felipe Tellez.

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

13:57:18 1
13:57:19 2 Are they all separate occasions that you've met with those
13:57:24 3 three solicitors?---Yes.
13:57:25 4
13:57:26 5 And did one or more of them assist you in the preparation
13:57:31 6 of your witness statement?---One of them did, yes.
13:57:34 7
13:57:34 8 Which one was that?---Felipe Tellez.
13:57:37 9
13:57:39 10 Did he in fact do the drafting of it and then you okayed
13:57:44 11 it?---Nope. I drafted it, he helped me with my craziness.
13:57:54 12 You know, I had problems putting things together so he had
13:57:57 13 to help me.
13:57:58 14
13:57:59 15 [REDACTED] going back then to this meeting you had with
13:58:04 16 Mr Woltsche and Ms Pattie on 4 March 2019?---Yep.
13:58:07 17
13:58:09 18 Did you say to them that you thought at the time that
13:58:15 19 Ms Gobbo's relationships with certain police officers was
13:58:18 20 inappropriate?---Um - - -
13:58:25 21
13:58:25 22 Just for clarity, I'm asking you whether you told
13:58:30 23 Mr Woltsche and Ms Pattie that at this meeting in the
13:58:33 24 CBD?---Yeah, I did.
13:58:34 25
13:58:34 26 Sorry, you did say that?---I did say that.
13:58:36 27
13:58:36 28 Did you say to them that Ms Gobbo had admitted that she was
13:58:42 29 in possession of drugs that belonged to Mr Reid, did you
13:58:46 30 say that to them at this meeting in the CBD?---Yes, I
13:58:53 31 believe I did.
13:58:53 32
13:58:59 33 Your recollection is that Ms Gobbo made that admission in
13:59:04 34 the course of this meeting that you held with her along
13:59:06 35 with Mr Kruger?---Yes.
13:59:07 36
13:59:10 37 Can I ask, please, that the operator bring up Exhibit RC8.
13:59:17 38
13:59:18 39 COMMISSIONER: Yes. If you can give the number that would
13:59:31 40 be helpful I think.
13:59:34 41
13:59:34 42 MR COLLINSON: It's a statement, Commissioner, so I don't
13:59:37 43 think it has .doc ID references on it, at least that I'm
13:59:41 44 aware of but I might be wrong. It's RC8. It's Assistant
13:59:54 45 Commissioner's Paterson's statement. It does have a
13:59:58 46 number, it's VPL.0014.0005.0001. Just to put you in the
14:00:08 47 picture, [REDACTED]?---Yes.

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

14:00:09 1
14:00:10 2 This is a statement of another witness, Assistant
14:00:16 3 Commissioner Paterson, and I presume you know who he
14:00:18 4 is?---No.
14:00:18 5
14:00:19 6 That doesn't matter. He in his statement, [REDACTED] gives
14:00:24 7 evidence about certain interactions between Victoria Police
14:00:29 8 and Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
14:00:31 9
14:00:32 10 And I would ask the operator, please, to go to paragraph
14:00:37 11 3.39. I'm afraid I don't have the .doc ID page for that.
14:00:51 12 I'm sorry, it's page numbered 11, that is the page number.
14:00:57 13
14:00:57 14 COMMISSIONER: It's up there now.
14:01:00 15
14:01:00 16 MR COLLINSON: You'll appreciate, [REDACTED] that Assistant
14:01:06 17 Commissioner Paterson wasn't at this meeting between you
14:01:07 18 and Mr Kruger and Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
14:01:10 19
14:01:11 20 But he has set out here his statement of what happened
14:01:16 21 based in part upon what's said to be information provided
14:01:19 22 by you. Do you understand what I'm putting to you?---Yes,
14:01:26 23 sort of, yep.
14:01:27 24
14:01:27 25 Just have a quick read of paragraph 3.39, please. Not out
14:01:32 26 loud, just peruse it?---Yep.
14:02:06 27
14:02:06 28 Right. Do you see in the second-last sentence, [REDACTED]
14:02:12 29 there's a statement, and this is five lines - well it's the
14:02:22 30 seventh line down?---Yes.
14:02:25 31
14:02:25 32 Do you see a sentence beginning, "DSC [REDACTED] also
14:02:30 33 recalls"?---Yes.
14:02:30 34
14:02:30 35 It says, "Also recalls being aware that Ms Gobbo was in
14:02:34 36 possession of drugs that belonged to Mr Reid but he is not
14:02:37 37 able to recall if he was told that at the meeting or how he
14:02:40 38 became aware of that information". Do you see that?---Yep.
14:02:44 39
14:02:48 40 That suggests, doesn't it, [REDACTED] that you told the police
14:02:53 41 officers from Task Force Landow, Mr Woltsche and Ms Pattie,
14:02:58 42 at this meeting in the CBD, that you couldn't recollect
14:03:03 43 Ms Gobbo admitting that she was in possession of drugs that
14:03:06 44 belonged to Mr Reid. Do you agree that's at least what the
14:03:12 45 sentence suggests you told those officers?---Yep.
14:03:14 46
14:03:20 47 You've said a moment ago that you believe that Ms Gobbo

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

14:03:27 1 made an admission to that effect at this meeting, do you
14:03:31 2 recall that evidence?---Yes.
14:03:32 3
14:03:32 4 That evidence was wrong, wasn't it?---No.
14:03:34 5
14:03:35 6 Are you saying to the Commissioner that you now recollect
14:03:39 7 that Ms Gobbo made an express statement in this meeting
14:03:43 8 that she was in possession of drugs that belonged to
14:03:45 9 Mr Reid?---That's what I recall.
14:03:47 10
14:03:49 11 Well do you accept that you didn't tell the police officers
14:03:54 12 Woltsche and Pattie that when you met with them in the CBD
14:03:59 13 on 4 March this year?---No.
14:04:01 14
14:04:01 15 You think you did?---I think I did.
14:04:03 16
14:04:04 17 And they just got it wrong, did they, in transcribing what
14:04:09 18 you said into this paragraph, is that your
14:04:13 19 evidence?---Yeah, I've said that they've got some stuff
14:04:15 20 wrong.
14:04:15 21
14:04:17 22 Now going up higher in this same paragraph, do you see six
14:04:22 23 lines down (c), "He thought that her relationships with
14:04:26 24 some officers was inappropriate"?---Yep.
14:04:29 25
14:04:30 26 Is that something that you believed to be the case when you
14:04:36 27 met with Ms Gobbo on 21 July 1998?---No.
14:04:42 28
14:04:48 29 Well, didn't you say to officers Woltsche and Pattie when
14:04:55 30 you met with them in the CBD that at the time of the
14:04:58 31 meeting with Ms Gobbo on 21 July 1998 you had a concern
14:05:03 32 about her relationships with some officers not being
14:05:06 33 appropriate or being inappropriate?---No. That's a summary
14:05:10 34 of what I said. It was basically - they were asking me
14:05:13 35 about the whole period of time that I had anything and I
14:05:17 36 said that was later on that I said that.
14:05:20 37
14:05:20 38 Yes, I see. Can I ask the operator, please, to bring up
14:05:25 39 Exhibit RC74 and go to the second page.
14:05:31 40
14:05:31 41 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
14:05:36 42
14:05:36 43 MR COLLINSON: We don't have numbered paragraphs, [REDACTED]
14:05:38 44 but if you go down to the fourth paragraph do you see it
14:05:42 45 says, "She said something about her client Peter
14:05:45 46 Reid"?---Yep.
14:05:45 47

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

14:05:46 1 "She said that she had been holding his drugs so I asked
14:05:51 2 her why she was doing that"?---Yep.
14:05:53 3
14:05:53 4 "And she responded words to the effect that she was making
14:05:56 5 herself trustworthy"?---Yes.
14:05:59 6
14:05:59 7 This meeting with Ms Gobbo and Mr Kruger occurred 21 years
14:06:03 8 ago, didn't it?---Yes.
14:06:05 9
14:06:07 10 And do you say to the Commissioner that you've got this
14:06:09 11 level of recollection, do you?---Yes.
14:06:13 12
14:06:18 13 Do you see that you say in this paragraph in the fourth
14:06:22 14 line, "I remember thinking that she must have been charged
14:06:25 15 by Kruger"?---Yes.
14:06:28 16
14:06:30 17 Kruger didn't say that I take it?---No.
14:06:32 18
14:06:33 19 And Gobbo did not say that?---No.
14:06:36 20
14:06:37 21 And I think you then continue, "And now she was going to
14:06:42 22 cooperate and give information for a lighter sentence". So
14:06:46 23 you drew the conclusion, I take it, at this meeting that
14:06:49 24 Ms Gobbo had been presently charged in relation to
14:06:55 25 possession of drugs and in order to obtain a benefit for
14:07:00 26 herself she was going to cooperate by meeting with the
14:07:04 27 police and providing this information?---Well I didn't know
14:07:08 28 why she - why she was giving information. That's what I
14:07:11 29 said.
14:07:11 30
14:07:11 31 Yes?---I said this is just me making an assumption.
14:07:15 32
14:07:16 33 True. But you're saying to the Commissioner, are you, that
14:07:19 34 at the time, 21 years ago on 21 July 1998, you had an
14:07:24 35 assumption in your mind that she was cooperating to get a
14:07:28 36 lighter sentence from these drug charges?---Yes,
14:07:31 37 potentially, yep.
14:07:32 38
14:07:34 39 If the operator could go back, please, to Exhibit RC8,
14:07:43 40 which is the statement of Assistant Commissioner Paterson.
14:07:52 41 I can give the number again if someone can help me. It's
14:07:56 42 back, is it? Assistant Commissioner Paterson gives
14:08:06 43 evidence about the dealings between Ms Gobbo and Victoria
14:08:12 44 Police over a number of years, do you follow that,
14:08:14 45 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
14:08:15 46
14:08:16 47 And if I could ask the operator to go to the page numbered

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

14:08:19 1 7. Do you see that there's a heading "1993 Operation
14:08:33 2 Yak"?---Yep.
14:08:34 3
14:08:36 4 It begins in paragraph 3.7, and I won't read out all of
14:08:40 5 this, but on 3 September 1993 Ms Gobbo first had contact
14:08:44 6 with Victoria Police. There was a police execution of a
14:08:49 7 search warrant, [REDACTED] you can see at a house occupied by
14:08:55 8 Ms Gobbo and another person, her then de facto partner
14:09:02 9 Mr Brian Wilson?---Yep.
14:09:04 10
14:09:04 11 Over the page on page numbered 8?---Yep.
14:09:08 12
14:09:08 13 There is a reference, 3.13, "On 29 November 1993 Ms Gobbo
14:09:14 14 pleaded guilty to her drug charges. She received a bond
14:09:17 15 without the recording of a conviction"?---Yep.
14:09:19 16
14:09:20 17 What I want to suggest to you is that you've mixed up in
14:09:23 18 your mind your recollection about Ms Gobbo being in
14:09:28 19 possession of drugs owned by Mr Peter Reid with Ms Gobbo's
14:09:35 20 earlier conviction as referred to in Assistant Commissioner
14:09:41 21 Paterson's statement, is that possible?---Well I agree with
14:09:43 22 you that I can mix things up in my mind but I didn't
14:09:46 23 actually know about that so how could I mix it up?
14:09:49 24
14:09:49 25 Well, perhaps you have a fragment of recollection, I
14:09:53 26 suggest, that Ms Gobbo mentioned that she'd had a past
14:09:57 27 conviction for possession of drugs?---No, definitely not.
14:10:01 28
14:10:02 29 It would be quite an important thing, I suggest, wouldn't
14:10:04 30 it - - - ?---Absolutely. I would remember that.
14:10:06 31
14:10:06 32 I haven't finished the question yet?---Sorry.
14:10:08 33
14:10:09 34 It would be quite an important thing, wouldn't it, to
14:10:11 35 record by one of the two police officers meeting with
14:10:15 36 Ms Gobbo that she'd made this fairly striking admission
14:10:19 37 that she had or was presently in possession of drugs for
14:10:25 38 one of the accused, Mr Reid?---Yes.
14:10:28 39
14:10:28 40 So you'd expect it to be recorded contemporaneously in
14:10:33 41 either an information report or perhaps the notebook of
14:10:39 42 Mr Kruger or perhaps your notebook?---Yes.
14:10:44 43
14:10:45 44 We haven't seen your notebook and we've heard your evidence
14:10:49 45 about where it may be. I can say to you, [REDACTED] that
14:10:56 46 nowhere in Mr Kruger's notebook, referring to this meeting,
14:11:01 47 is there any mention of Ms Gobbo holding drugs for Mr Reid

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

14:11:05 1 or any of the other three accused. Does that surprise you
14:11:09 2 in light of your evidence?---No.
14:11:12 3
14:11:13 4 Why doesn't it surprise you?---It's just police being lazy
14:11:27 5 I suppose.
14:11:29 6
14:11:30 7 Isn't the other possibility that your recollection is
14:11:32 8 faulty?---No.
14:11:33 9
14:11:37 10 Well, you were a very experienced police officer at the
14:11:42 11 time of this meeting. Can the Commissioner be confident
14:11:46 12 that if your notebook comes to light you will have recorded
14:11:50 13 this admission by Ms Gobbo?---No.
14:11:52 14
14:11:52 15 Are you saying to the Commissioner that it may not be
14:11:55 16 recorded in that notebook?---Correct.
14:11:58 17
14:11:59 18 Why wouldn't you record it?---Because I was sent there to
14:12:02 19 assess an informer and I wouldn't - well potentially, yeah,
14:12:10 20 maybe I did put it in there. I don't know.
14:12:12 21
14:12:12 22 Can the operator please bring up RC68, which is
14:12:19 23 VPL.0005.0022.0031. This is this information report and
14:12:25 24 you made reference to an information report in your
14:12:28 25 statement, didn't you? You said in your statement that you
14:12:34 26 believed you drafted that document?---Yes.
14:12:39 27
14:12:41 28 We certainly know that that recollection was erroneous,
14:12:44 29 don't we?---Yes.
14:12:46 30
14:12:47 31 Because it's plain, isn't it, that the document was drafted
14:12:49 32 by Mr Kruger?---Yes.
14:12:51 33
14:12:56 34 So he was pretty inexperienced, was he, but he was
14:13:00 35 nonetheless competent to prepare this information
14:13:03 36 report?---Yes.
14:13:03 37
14:13:06 38 You're aware, aren't you, that nowhere in this document is
14:13:10 39 any reference made to this information provided by Ms Gobbo
14:13:14 40 that she was in possession or had been in possession of
14:13:17 41 drugs for Mr Reid, is there?---Yes.
14:13:20 42
14:13:21 43 You agree with that?---I agree with you.
14:13:23 44
14:13:25 45 Do you agree that if that information had been conveyed by
14:13:29 46 Ms Gobbo at this meeting a competent police officer would
14:13:33 47 have recorded it under the heading "information"?---Yes.

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

14:13:37 1
14:13:38 2 And your only explanation for its absence, as I understand
14:13:42 3 it, is sloppiness or sloppy police work?---Yes.
14:13:47 4
14:13:49 5 Under this heading "information" you'll see in the first
14:13:53 6 paragraph, if you can read it, ██████████ "On 21 July 1998
14:14:00 7 Kruger and ██████ met with an unregistered informer in
14:14:02 8 relation to" - and we know that's a reference to ██████████
14:14:07 9 do you see that?---Yes.
14:14:08 10
14:14:09 11 It continues in the next paragraph, "Information was in
14:14:13 12 relation to ██████████ suspected involvement in money
14:14:19 13 laundering"?---Yes.
14:14:20 14
14:14:20 15 And then various items are listed there. Number 1 refers
14:14:27 16 to the properties put up as surety for Mr Peter Reid, do
14:14:31 17 you see that?---Yes.
14:14:32 18
14:14:33 19 Number 2, that ██████████ is believed to be funding or
14:14:36 20 financing Reid's defence in relation to Carron?---Yes.
14:14:40 21
14:14:42 22 Numbers 3, 4 and 5 have got nothing to do with the charges
14:14:49 23 against Reid and his co-accused though, do they?---No.
14:14:52 24
14:14:54 25 And the next paragraph where it says, "Information that all
14:14:59 26 conveyancing for ██████████ was done by his secretary",
14:15:03 27 I'm sure some solicitors would be guilty of that, that's
14:15:08 28 got nothing to do with Operation Carron, does it? I'm
14:15:11 29 sorry, it has nothing to do with Reid?---Can I just
14:15:14 30 actually clarify what you're talking about?
14:15:18 31
14:15:19 32 Do you see after - - - ?---Yeah, I've got you. Sorry.
14:15:21 33
14:15:25 34 It says about "Informer stated that all conveyancing", et
14:15:27 35 cetera?---Yes.
14:15:28 36
14:15:31 37 Then in the final paragraph: "Informer stated it is
14:15:33 38 believed that ██████████ assists in laundering money by
14:15:36 39 purchasing properties for cash and then refinancing to make
14:15:39 40 the properties legitimate"?---Yes.
14:15:41 41
14:15:41 42 That has nothing to do with Reid and his co-accused, does
14:15:44 43 it? Perhaps I should amend that. It might embrace them
14:15:50 44 but it's a wider proposition than Reid and his
14:15:52 45 co-accused?---Yeah.
14:15:59 46
14:15:59 47 What I want to suggest to you is that it's plain from this

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

14:16:03 1 information report, isn't it, that the purpose of Ms Gobbo
14:16:07 2 in approaching Victoria Police was to inform on
14:16:11 3 [REDACTED], do you accept that?---No.
14:16:19 4
14:16:22 5 Do you at least accept that the primary purpose as revealed
14:16:25 6 in this document of Ms Gobbo in approaching Victoria Police
14:16:28 7 is to inform on [REDACTED]?---But she's mentioning Reid
14:16:43 8 as well.
14:16:43 9
14:16:44 10 Yes. Mr Reid's being mentioned, I suggest, incidentally to
14:16:49 11 the alleged money laundering activities of [REDACTED],
14:16:53 12 isn't he?---I don't think incidentally. That's your
14:16:56 13 opinion. She's talking about Peter Reid as well.
14
14:17:01 15 No information is being conveyed - - -
14:17:01 16
14:17:01 17 COMMISSIONER: Mr Collinson, to be fair to the witness it
14:17:03 18 does say it's about funding - isn't it about Reid's bail
14:17:07 19 application?
14:17:09 20
14:17:09 21 MR COLLINSON: Yes. Well it's a question of - the document
14:17:15 22 speaks for itself and I won't take it any further but I
14:17:19 23 hear what the Commissioner says.
14:17:21 24
14:17:21 25 Can I ask the operator, please, to go back to - before
14:17:25 26 I go back to your statement and before we leave this
14:17:27 27 document, you seem to suggest in your statement, [REDACTED]
14:17:34 28 that following this meeting you at least had discussions
14:17:40 29 with Mr Bowden and Detective Sergeant Strawhorn and told
14:17:46 30 them, as I understand it, that you thought the police,
14:17:52 31 Victoria Police should not use Ms Gobbo as an
14:17:55 32 informant?---Yes.
14:17:55 33
14:17:56 34 And did you recollect that Mr Kruger agreed with you?---I
14:18:06 35 don't remember.
14:18:07 36
14:18:08 37 You don't recollect?---Yeah.
14:18:09 38
14:18:11 39 Then you say that persons higher up in the Police Force
14:18:17 40 overruled the views, you say, of Mr Bowden and Mr Strawhorn
14:18:22 41 that they didn't want to use Ms Gobbo?---Well it's the
14:18:26 42 impression I got from the Senior Sergeant Mark Bowden.
14:18:31 43
14:18:32 44 But do you see at the foot of this investigator report that
14:18:35 45 the comment recorded and attributed to - well it's a
14:18:38 46 comment by Mr Kruger?---Yep.
14:18:40 47

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

14:18:40 1 "Further contact to be made with informer by Kruger." That
14:18:46 2 indicates, doesn't it, that Mr Kruger at least understands
14:18:50 3 that contact with Ms Gobbo in relation to the information
14:18:55 4 she's to provide is going to continue?---Yes.
14:18:59 5
14:19:01 6 Isn't that right?---Yes, definitely.
14:19:03 7
14:19:03 8 And indeed it did, didn't it? There were further
14:19:07 9 investigatory activities of [REDACTED] in relation to
14:19:11 10 these allegations of money laundering, weren't
14:19:14 11 there?---Yes.
14:19:14 12
14:19:14 13 In the last line you'll see, of this document, "Kruger to
14:19:18 14 liaise with Detective Sergeant Karen Hynam of the National
14:19:24 15 Crime Authority"?---Yes.
14:19:24 16
14:19:25 17 And you've given evidence that that contact was in fact
14:19:28 18 made?---Yes.
14:19:28 19
14:19:43 20 Go to the top of the document. Do you see under the
14:19:48 21 "contact summary" section it says opposite "information
14:19:54 22 accuracy possibly true"?---Yes.
14:19:57 23
14:19:57 24 Did you agree with that assessment?---In relation to
14:20:03 25 everything or - - -
14:20:04 26
14:20:05 27 I assume that what - perhaps I should ask a preliminary
14:20:09 28 question. Is the line item in "information accuracy"
14:20:15 29 intended to record the police officer's view as to the
14:20:18 30 accuracy of the information being provided by the
14:20:21 31 informant?---I don't remember.
14:20:25 32
14:20:26 33 Does that seem likely to you?---Well it's just the opinion
14:20:30 34 of the policeman I suppose.
14:20:32 35
14:20:33 36 Did you disagree - well, assuming Mr Kruger thought that
14:20:38 37 the information provided by Ms Gobbo was possibly true, did
14:20:42 38 you disagree with that at the time?---I had made an opinion
14:20:50 39 in relation to Ms Gobbo that in relation to the information
14:20:55 40 I didn't know whether it was true or not.
14:20:57 41
14:20:57 42 Yes?---I'm not going to jump to conclusions just because of
14:21:03 43 the first time I'd met with someone she's given us
14:21:07 44 information that obviously is going to be investigated, so
14:21:10 45 "possibly true" would be a good thing to say.
14:21:14 46
14:21:14 47 It does say, I should point out, because I don't want to

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

14:21:18 1 hide it, that "source reliability" is the next line item up
14:21:21 2 and it says "unknown". But above that do you see, [REDACTED]
14:21:26 3 it says, "Source self-interest warning"?---Yep.

14:21:29 4
14:21:29 5 And that, I suggest, is a line item that's required because
14:21:37 6 many informers are themselves either charged or guilty of
14:21:40 7 some particular offence and they're trading cooperation
14:21:45 8 with the police in order to get a lighter sentence and in
14:21:48 9 that regard it's police practice to give them an
14:21:52 10 appropriate warning?---I don't recall that being the way I
14:21:57 11 would look at it but that's Mr Kruger, so you'll have to
14:22:02 12 ask him because he's the one that put "no".

14:22:05 13
14:22:06 14 If Ms Gobbo was saying in the course of this meeting that
14:22:10 15 she either held or was currently in possession of drugs for
14:22:14 16 Mr Reid, that would potentially be a criminal offence by
14:22:16 17 Ms Gobbo, wouldn't it?---Yes.

14:22:18 18
14:22:19 19 And in those circumstances wouldn't it have been
14:22:21 20 appropriate for the two police officers, you and Mr Kruger,
14:22:24 21 to give her a warning?---Like you said, it's a long time
14:22:33 22 ago and I'm making an assessment at the time. I don't know
14:22:39 23 what - like, it wouldn't have been a warning, I wanted to
14:22:44 24 charge her.

14:22:45 25
14:22:46 26 If she'd made that admission and you would have wanted to
14:22:50 27 charge her wouldn't you have recommended to your superior,
14:22:53 28 either Bowden or - - - ?---I did.

14:22:55 29
14:22:56 30 Strawhorn?---I did.

14:22:57 31
14:22:57 32 That she be charged?---Yeah.

14:22:59 33
14:22:59 34 You don't say that in your witness statement, do you?---No,
14:23:03 35 I don't.

14:23:03 36
14:23:03 37 Let's bring that up again. It's Exhibit RC74. Accepting
14:23:19 38 from me that you don't say in this witness statement that
14:23:22 39 you wanted to bring charges against Ms Gobbo for drug
14:23:28 40 possession and in fact suggested that, are you able to
14:23:33 41 explain why that's not in your statement? I think the
14:23:42 42 place to look is towards the bottom of the second page
14:23:45 43 where you talk about your discussions with Mr Bowden and
14:23:49 44 Mr Strawhorn, last paragraph?---Yep.

14:23:53 45
14:23:55 46 You don't say there, do you, that you recommended - - -
14:23:59 47 ?---No.

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

14:23:59 1 - - - that Ms Gobbo be charged?---Yeah, I did say - well,
14:24:04 2 no, I haven't said it.
14:24:06 3
14:24:07 4 Wouldn't it have been relevant to superiors to know whether
14:24:12 5 or not to continue to utilise Ms Gobbo, or to utilise her
14:24:16 6 at all as an informer, that she was making admissions about
14:24:20 7 criminal activity, like being in possession of
14:24:25 8 drugs?---Yes.
14:24:25 9
14:24:29 10 And is it your evidence to the Commissioner that you told
14:24:31 11 your superiors about that?---Yes.
14:24:33 12
14:24:34 13 But you don't refer to it in your statement?---Missed it
14:24:38 14 out, sorry.
14:24:39 15
14:24:50 16 You say in your evidence in response to questions asked by
14:24:57 17 Mr Winneke before lunch that you don't recollect having a
14:25:00 18 second meeting with Ms Gobbo, do you remember that
14:25:03 19 evidence?---Yes.
14:25:05 20
14:25:06 21 I think I'll just read it out but in the original contact
14:25:10 22 report that reflects things that you are claimed to have
14:25:16 23 said to Woltsche and Pattie?---Yep.
14:25:20 24
14:25:20 25 It's said that in the conversation by telephone on 15 March
14:25:25 26 2009, and it's the fourth dot point, that you recall that
14:25:29 27 you may have had a couple of meetings with Gobbo?---Yes.
14:25:33 28
14:25:36 29 So your recollection on 15 March of this year was that you
14:25:40 30 might have had more than one meeting with Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
14:25:43 31
14:25:44 32 But you now say in your statement, or at least in your
14:25:50 33 evidence this morning, that you didn't have a second
14:25:52 34 meeting with Ms Gobbo?---No, I didn't - I don't recall
14:25:56 35 saying that. If anything it's I am not sure whether or not
14:26:03 36 there was a second meeting.
14:26:04 37
14:26:04 38 Is that your present recollection, that one may have
14:26:07 39 occurred but you're not sure?---Yes.
14:26:09 40
14:26:13 41 What makes you think there was a second meeting? Can you
14:26:17 42 give any evidence at Commissioner as to where that meeting
14:26:20 43 might have occurred or who attended?---That's what I said
14:26:24 44 in relation to, when I spoke to Mark Bowden, he recalls a
14:26:27 45 meeting with her.
14:26:29 46
14:26:29 47 Being a meeting at which you attended?---Yes. I don't

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

14:26:36 1 recall it. He said that we had a meeting with her.
14:26:39 2
14:26:41 3 Right. I take it Mr Bowden said this to you at this catch
14:26:46 4 up that occurred some time earlier this year?---Yes.
14:26:49 5
14:26:49 6 And he said to you that his recollection was that at some
14:26:52 7 point he had a meeting with Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
14:26:55 8
14:26:56 9 And you were in attendance?---Yes.
14:26:57 10
14:26:58 11 And you're quite sure about that recollection?---What he
14:27:01 12 said, yes. Me meeting her for the second time, not 100 per
14:27:07 13 cent sure.
14:27:08 14
14:27:08 15 Did you ask Mr Bowden to jog your memory a little bit as to
14:27:14 16 where this meeting might have occurred?---No, not at all.
14:27:16 17 I was just - just I wanted to know if he remembered her and
14:27:23 18 the dealings that we'd had with her.
14:27:26 19
14:27:30 20 No further questions.
14:27:32 21
14:27:33 22 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Collinson.
23
24 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR HOLT:
25
14:27:37 26 Briefly if I may, Your Honour. [REDACTED] when you were being
14:27:41 27 asked questions earlier by our learned friend Mr Winneke
14:27:44 28 you were asked about the other cases that you were involved
14:27:47 29 in as a Drug Squad member in particular where Ms Gobbo
14:27:53 30 might have been involved as counsel or as lawyer in any
14:27:58 31 event, do you remember being asked that question?---Yes, I
14:28:01 32 do.
14:28:01 33
14:28:01 34 I think your answer was you don't recall, which is not
14:28:05 35 surprising given the passage of time?---Yes.
14:28:07 36
14:28:08 37 Can I suggest one name to you and see whether that rings
14:28:11 38 any bells or not, and, please, if it doesn't just say so,
14:28:13 39 but do you recall being the informant, that is the police
14:28:15 40 officer in charge of the investigation, in respect of a
14:28:17 41 person called John Anthony Farrell?---Tony Farrell.
14:28:25 42
14:28:26 43 Yes. John Anthony Farrell, so it may well have been a Tony
14:28:34 44 Farrell?---Yes.
14:28:35 45
14:28:36 46 There are records that indicate and can I be, in fairness
14:28:36 47 to you, clear they only indicate this, they don't

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

14:28:36 1 necessarily indicate this, they don't necessarily show it
14:28:40 2 beyond any shadow of a doubt, that Ms Gobbo may have acted
14:28:41 3 for Mr Farrell. Do you recall that case and any
14:28:44 4 involvement that she may have had?---Yeah, Operation
14:28:48 5 Orboist but I don't recall her being involved in it.
14:28:50 6
14:28:51 7 So you have no recollection of Ms Gobbo being involved in
14:28:54 8 the case in any capacity at all?---No.
14:28:56 9
14:28:57 10 Thank you. Those are the only questions, Commissioner.
14:28:59 11
14:28:59 12 COMMISSIONER: Could I just clarify that. You don't have
14:29:03 13 any recollection, is it possible she was and you just don't
14:29:07 14 recall it or would you say - - - ?---Commissioner, I don't
14:29:09 15 remember it. I remember Operation Orboist, Tony Farrell.
14:29:13 16 I don't remember the representing solicitor.
14:29:15 17
14:29:15 18 Thank you.
14:29:17 19
14:29:17 20 MR HOLT: Thank you Commissioner.
14:29:20 21
14:29:21 22 COMMISSIONER: Ms O'Gorman, did you have any questions?
14:29:24 23
14:29:24 24 MS O'GORMAN: No, thank you, Commissioner.
14:29:25 25
14:29:26 26 COMMISSIONER: Ms Whiting, any questions?
27
14:29:28 28 MS WHITING: No, Commissioner.
14:29:30 29
14:29:30 30 COMMISSIONER: Anything by way of re-examination?
31
32 <RE-EXAMINED BY MR WINNEKE:
33
14:29:34 34 The lead up to that meeting which we now know was on 21
14:29:38 35 July 1998?---Yes.
14:29:39 36
14:29:43 37 Do you have a recollection of how long before that meeting
14:29:48 38 you were asked to participate in it?---No.
14:29:56 39
14:29:57 40 Had you had any dealings with Kruger before that time to
14:30:04 41 your recollection?---Minimal. He was in the same unit but,
14:30:11 42 yeah, I hadn't worked with him specifically from memory.
14:30:15 43
14:30:16 44 I take it you had a - implicitly you've suggested you had a
14:30:20 45 particular view about his, well, perhaps greenness for want
14:30:27 46 of another expression in his role?---I don't want to give
14:30:33 47 him a rating. I mean he just wasn't - he'd only just

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

14:30:36 1 arrived from memory.
14:30:37 2
14:30:38 3 Yes?---And he'd come from the country.
14:30:41 4
14:30:41 5 You were asked questions about the notation in the
14:30:44 6 information report. Obviously the information report, it
14:30:48 7 now appears, wasn't yours?---Yes.
14:30:50 8
14:30:50 9 I understand that. There was a reference to information -
14:30:51 10 - - ?---Can I just make a comment in relation to that so
14:30:55 11 you understand?
14:30:55 12
14:30:56 13 Yes?---My confusion with that was because what's his name,
14:31:04 14 Inspector Woltsche actually rang me and said he had an IR
14:31:09 15 that I could read and he suggested it was mine. So I
14:31:11 16 assumed that it was mine.
14:31:13 17
14:31:13 18 All right. As to whether or not the information that she
14:31:17 19 was providing was accurate or inaccurate, that wasn't
14:31:20 20 something - or was that something that you were able to say
14:31:23 21 or not at that time or immediately afterwards?---No.
14:31:27 22
14:31:28 23 Was that what you were concerned about though?---Her
14:31:37 24 information?
14:31:39 25
14:31:39 26 Yes, whether it was accurate or otherwise?---It was one of
14:31:41 27 the parts - the information wasn't a problem, it was more
14:31:43 28 in relation to her, her position.
14:31:45 29
14:31:46 30 Okay. Was it your understanding after the meeting that
14:31:55 31 another agency would deal with her, not the Drug
14:32:01 32 Squad?---Yes, but I didn't know how long it would take for
14:32:07 33 that to take place, whether or not we were going to
14:32:10 34 continue to deal with her or Kruger was going to continue
14:32:14 35 to deal with her.
14:32:15 36
14:32:16 37 All right. Yes, thanks very much. I wonder if the witness
14:32:24 38 could be excused.
14:32:24 39
14:32:24 40 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thanks very much, [REDACTED] Before you
14:32:27 41 go, two things. Sometimes when you were asked about these
14:32:31 42 things that happened so long ago you remember things later
14:32:34 43 on, so if you remember anything later that you think could
14:32:37 44 be of assistance to the Commission could I ask you to
14:32:42 45 contact the Commission and let them know?---Surely,
14:32:47 46 Commissioner.
14:32:47 47

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

14:32:47 1 The other thing is I understand that the Commission is
14:32:50 2 issuing a Notice to Produce in respect of your documents
14:32:52 3 that are with your doctor. That's right, Mr Winneke, isn't
14:32:54 4 it?

14:32:55 5
14:32:55 6 MR WINNEKE: Yes, it is, Commissioner.

14:32:57 7
14:32:57 8 COMMISSIONER: If you could go and see if you can get them
14:33:01 9 yourself and, if you do, could you produce them in
14:33:04 10 accordance with your Notice to Produce to the Commission as
14:33:08 11 soon as you have them?---Yes, certainly Commissioner.

14:33:10 12
14:33:11 13 Thank you [REDACTED] You're free to go.

14:33:13 14
15 (Witness excused.)

16
14:33:16 17 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)

14:33:16 18
14:33:16 19 MR WINNEKE: Thank you Commissioner. I call Mark James
14:33:18 20 Bowden.

14:33:23 21
14:33:24 22 MR HOLT: I appear for Mr Bowden, Commissioner.

14:33:26 23
14:33:26 24 COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. Mr Bowden, just enter the
14:33:45 25 witness box if you wouldn't mind. Oath or
14:33:49 26 affirmation?---Oath.

14:33:50 27
14:33:51 28 <MARK JAMES BOWDEN, sworn and examined:

14:34:08 29
14:34:09 30 COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Holt.

14:34:10 31
14:34:10 32 MR HOLT: Thank you Commissioner. Your full name is Mark
14:34:12 33 James Bowden?---That's correct.

14:34:14 34
14:34:14 35 You're now a retired member of Victoria Police?---Yes, I
14:34:19 36 am.

14:34:19 37
14:34:22 38 For the purposes of the preparation of this hearing have
14:34:24 39 you prepared a statement?---I have.

14:34:26 40
14:34:26 41 Is there a copy of that statement there in front of
14:34:29 42 you?---Yes, there is.

14:34:30 43
14:34:30 44 Commissioner, for reference it's VPL.0014.0014.0001. There
14:34:38 45 are no redactions.

14:34:39 46
14:34:40 47 COMMISSIONER: Yes.

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

14:34:41 1
14:34:41 2 MR HOLT: Could I ask you just before you confirm the
14:34:45 3 correctness of that statement, could you go through please
14:34:47 4 to paragraph 5 on the first page, do you see that?---Yes.
14:34:50 5
14:34:50 6 You've noted there joining Victoria Police in February 1975
14:34:53 7 and I think there might be a typographical error in the
14:34:56 8 next sentence, "I graduated from the Academy in July 1995".
14:35:01 9 Ought that read 1975?---Yes.
14:35:03 10
14:35:04 11 Thank you. Commissioner, would you prefer if the witness
14:35:09 12 made the amendment on the document he has and then that can
14:35:12 13 be tendered?
14:35:13 14
14:35:13 15 COMMISSIONER: Certainly. Do you have a pen with
14:35:15 16 you?---No, I don't.
14:35:15 17
14:35:16 18 We'll give you one. If you could just make the amendment
14:35:18 19 and initial it.
14:35:20 20
14:35:22 21 MR HOLT: Other than that correction, do you confirm that
14:35:26 22 the contents of your statement are true and correct to the
14:35:28 23 best of your knowledge and belief?---Yes, I believe they
14:35:31 24 are.
14:35:31 25
14:35:31 26 I tender that statement, Commissioner.
14:35:33 27
14:35:34 28 #EXHIBIT RC77 - Statement of Mark Bowden.
14:35:38 29
14:35:38 30 COMMISSIONER: Perhaps we'll leave it with the witness for
14:35:40 31 the time being because he might want to refer to it when
14:35:44 32 he's being questioned.
14:35:44 33
14:35:45 34 MR HOLT: Thank you Commissioner.
14:35:45 35
14:35:46 36 COMMISSIONER: There should be two copies. Do you have two
14:35:47 37 copies of that?---I have another copy, yes.
14:35:49 38
14:35:49 39 We'll tender that one as RC77 then thanks.
14:35:52 40
14:35:53 41 MR HOLT: Just very briefly, you note in paragraph 3 of
14:35:57 42 your statement your understanding that Victoria Police has
14:36:00 43 not been able to locate your diary or day books from the
14:36:03 44 particular period of time that we're interested in,
14:36:05 45 1998?---That's correct.
14:36:06 46
14:36:06 47 Have you also had the opportunity and taken it to look at

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

14:36:08 1 your own personal holdings to see you if have your
14:36:13 2 diaries?---Yes, I have, yes.
14:36:14 3
14:36:14 4 What was the result of that?---I don't have any holdings at
14:36:17 5 all.
14:36:17 6
14:36:17 7 Thank you Commissioner.
14:36:18 8
14:36:18 9 COMMISSIONER: Mr Winneke.
10
11 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR WINNEKE:
12
14:36:24 13 Mr Bowden, you were spoken to by members of Victoria Police
14:36:33 14 investigating on behalf of - in response to the Royal
14:36:40 15 Commission. When were you first spoken to by police
14:36:43 16 officers about these matters?---I think probably two weeks
14:36:47 17 ago, maybe three.
14:36:51 18
14:36:53 19 There's a note that we've got - have you been provided with
14:36:57 20 what has been described as Police Member Veteran
14:37:00 21 Contact?---I have read it. I haven't got it with me.
14:37:02 22
14:37:02 23 You haven't got it with you. Was the contact that you had
14:37:09 24 with the investigators a telephone call on 2 April?---That
14:37:15 25 would be about right.
14:37:16 26
14:37:16 27 Have you had any face-to-face meetings at all or not?---No.
14:37:19 28
14:37:20 29 Who did you speak to, Wayne Woltsche?---Wayne Woltsche,
14:37:27 30 yes.
14:37:27 31
14:37:28 32 And subsequent to that you've contacted or you've been told
14:37:36 33 or advised to contact Corrs solicitors; is that
14:37:40 34 right?---Yes.
14:37:41 35
14:37:41 36 As a consequence of that contact you've made the statement
14:37:45 37 that's just been tendered, is that right, the three page
14:37:50 38 statement?---That's correct.
14:37:51 39
14:37:54 40 You were in the Drug Squad for a period of time, relatively
14:38:02 41 short period of time about 20 years after you first came to
14:38:05 42 Victoria Police from 96 through to 98, September 98; is
14:38:15 43 that right?---Correct.
14:38:15 44
14:38:15 45 I take it those times were established because of records
14:38:22 46 that you hold or - - - ?---Yes.
14:38:24 47

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

14:38:25 1 - - - records that Victoria Police - - - ?---No, I've got
14:38:30 2 them.
14:38:30 3
14:38:30 4 What documents do you have in relation to your time in the
14:38:33 5 Police Force?---I've got my Certificate of Merit which I've
14:38:37 6 got on the working stations and times when I was at various
14:38:41 7 places.
14:38:41 8
14:38:42 9 That sets out where you were at various times?---Yes.
14:38:44 10
14:38:44 11 Okay. You went to the Drug Squad as a Detective Senior
14:38:49 12 Sergeant?---Correct.
14:38:50 13
14:38:51 14 And do you recall which unit in the Drug Squad you were in
14:38:57 15 charge of?---The Clandestine Laboratory Unit.
14:39:02 16
14:39:02 17 The Clandestine Laboratory Unit. Who was in that Unit? Do
14:39:11 18 you recall your Sergeant in that Unit?---No, I had seven
14:39:16 19 Sergeants, seven Sergeants and 35 men.
14:39:18 20
14:39:20 21 Seven Sergeants and 35 men. That was Unit 2, was it, in
14:39:26 22 the Drug Squad?---Unit 2, yes.
14:39:27 23
14:39:28 24 Was Detective Sergeant Strawhorn one of the Sergeants who
14:39:31 25 was in your unit?---Yes.
14:39:32 26
14:39:33 27 Do you recall the names of any of the other
14:39:36 28 Sergeants?---Cleeves, Fagan, Rozenes, various others,
14:39:47 29 Harnetti, Harnett, yep.
14:39:50 30
14:39:51 31 Okay. Was your role - I take it your role as a Detective
14:40:01 32 Senior Sergeant wasn't to act as an informant in terms of
14:40:07 33 any briefs?---No.
14:40:08 34
14:40:08 35 What was your role? Can you explain to the Commission what
14:40:12 36 your function was in that position?---I used to oversee the
14:40:18 37 jobs, probably plan and organise, lead the jobs and control
14:40:28 38 what was happening.
14:40:29 39
14:40:29 40 Yes?---So I'd have - I would have seven crews reporting to
14:40:36 41 me. Each crew is probably carrying ten jobs so I was sort
14:40:41 42 of overseeing maybe 70 or 80 jobs.
14:40:43 43
14:40:44 44 Yes, okay. Did you have a role in your position with
14:40:48 45 respect to informers?---No.
14:40:51 46
14:40:53 47 Did you ever have to speak to any of the people under you

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

14:40:57 1 about informers?---No, not that I recall really. I suppose
14:41:04 2 my role was probably 60/40. I was 60 per cent behind a
14:41:10 3 desk, 40 per cent in the field and I dealt with informers
14:41:15 4 with members through that.
14:41:15 5
14:41:15 6 So if there was an informer involved in a particular job
14:41:20 7 you might or might not have knowledge of it, would
14:41:23 8 you?---Oh no, I'd have knowledge.
14:41:24 9
14:41:25 10 So if there was an informer who was providing information
14:41:28 11 to one of your teams, it's something that you, as a
14:41:31 12 Detective Senior Sergeant, would have to be aware
14:41:36 13 of?---Sorry?
14:41:37 14
14:41:37 15 You'd have to be aware of that? As a matter of course you
14:41:40 16 would be aware?---Yeah, as I was reviewing the
14:41:43 17 investigation the informer was referred to.
14:41:44 18
14:41:48 19 Would you be consulted by your Sergeants or your Detective
14:41:56 20 Senior Constables about the informers and about their roles
14:41:59 21 in the operations?---Yes.
14:42:01 22
14:42:02 23 What sort of things might they ask you about, with respect
14:42:07 24 to informers I'm talking about?---Well no, they wouldn't
14:42:12 25 ask me about the informer. What they would say is relying
14:42:17 26 on this information from the informer B, B1, A1.
14:42:20 27
14:42:20 28 You'd know who the informer was?---No, no. Nine times out
14:42:25 29 of ten, no.
14:42:26 30
14:42:26 31 On some occasions you would?---Limited.
14:42:28 32
14:42:31 33 All right, okay?---It was, to expand on that, I suppose
14:42:39 34 sometimes you knew it was above my level and you just
14:42:45 35 didn't ask.
14:42:46 36
14:42:47 37 It would be unusual, wouldn't it, for you to actually go
14:42:50 38 and have an independent meeting with an informer?---I would
14:42:54 39 probably only in a supervisory role.
14:42:57 40
14:42:57 41 How often would you have gone and had meetings with
14:42:59 42 informers in a supervisory role at the Drug Squad?---I
14:43:04 43 couldn't hazard a guess. Well I will have a guess. I'll
14:43:08 44 just say maybe six.
14:43:09 45
14:43:10 46 Maybe six?---Yep.
14:43:11 47

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

14:43:12 1 What would be the need for you to go along as a Detective
14:43:16 2 Senior Sergeant to speak to or to supervise an
14:43:20 3 informer?---Just supervise, exactly that. Supervise.
14:43:23 4
14:43:24 5 Normally an informer would be dealt with by a handler and a
14:43:28 6 controller?---Not necessarily.
14:43:29 7
14:43:30 8 Can you explain what - - - ?---There was a difference in
14:43:34 9 informers. You had your informers that were properly
14:43:38 10 registered and recorded and you had your other informers
14:43:42 11 who just wanted to casually inform.
14:43:46 12
14:43:46 13 What I'm trying to get to is why would it be that a Senior
14:43:51 14 Sergeant would go and speak to an informer?---It was just
14:43:53 15 my style of leadership, I wanted to be involved.
14:43:57 16
14:43:57 17 Okay?---Just as a sort of supervision issue.
14:44:03 18
14:44:05 19 You were aware, I take it, of Operation Carron, one of the
14:44:10 20 operations that was being carried on by your
14:44:14 21 unit?---Operation names elude me.
14:44:17 22
14:44:19 23 I wonder if we could put up RC66. Just have a look at that
14:44:33 24 screen there in front of you. This is what's called a
14:44:37 25 final report about an operation which was a multiphase
14:44:45 26 national investigation targeting a heroin and cocaine
14:44:48 27 trafficking group headed by a person by the name of
14:44:51 28 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
14:44:52 29
14:44:56 30 It had two identified partners, Mosut and Peter Cecil Reid.
14:45:06 31 I take it you recall those names in that operation?---No, I
32 don't recall.
33
14:45:10 34 You don't?---I don't recall Mosut, I don't recall Carron,
14:45:11 35 but I do know Peter Reid.
14:45:13 36
14:45:14 37 How do you know Peter Reid?---I don't know whether it was
14:45:17 38 this job or not but he was a person we charged.
14:45:19 39
14:45:20 40 Did you know what his occupation was?---No.
14:45:22 41
14:45:23 42 Did you know he was a real estate agent?---Oh, yes, he was.
14:45:28 43
14:45:28 44 You did know that?---We're talking about - how long ago are
14:45:34 45 we talking here?
14:45:35 46
14:45:36 47 Right. If we go down the page we see that there were a

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

14:45:39 1 number of investigators, there was a person by the name of
14:45:44 2 Stephen Martin; is that right?---Yes.
14:45:48 3
14:45:49 4 Did you know him?---Yes.
14:45:50 5
14:45:52 6 How well did you know him?---He worked at the crew.
14:45:55 7
14:45:55 8 He was a Detective Acting Sergeant, a senior investigator,
14:46:00 9 right?---Yes.
14:46:01 10
14:46:05 11 We see Steve Paton?---Yes.
14:46:07 12
14:46:08 13 Do you recall him?---Yes.
14:46:09 14
14:46:10 15 A Delacy?---Yes.
14:46:11 16
14:46:12 17 [REDACTED]---Yep.
14:46:13 18
14:46:15 19 Who obviously you know?---Yes.
14:46:16 20
14:46:18 21 There are a couple of blanks, one of them we do know is a
14:46:24 22 person by the name of - who's been given the name Kruger.
14:46:28 23 Do you know who we mean when we say Kruger?---Yeah, I do
14:46:32 24 now.
14:46:32 25
14:46:32 26 The other one's a fellow by the name of Pearce-O'. Do you
14:46:37 27 know Pearce-O ?---Yes.
14:46:38 28
14:46:38 29 He's no longer with us, I take it, is that right, or - -
14:46:43 30 -?--Rob Bartlett's not.
14:46:44 31
14:46:44 32 I apologise, I apologise. Pearce-O' is, I'm sorry about
14:46:47 33 that. I'm sorry to Pearce-O'. And although Strawhorn
14:46:57 34 isn't listed as one of the investigators would it be fair
14:47:01 35 to say that he was a Sergeant within your Unit who had a
14:47:06 36 fairly active involvement in many operations, including
14:47:09 37 this one?---Wouldn't have a clue about this one.
14:47:12 38
14:47:13 39 You don't have a clue?---No.
14:47:14 40
14:47:15 41 Okay, all right. Did you know what Mr Reid's involvement
14:47:23 42 was in this operation?---No, I don't recall.
14:47:25 43
14:47:25 44 You don't recall now. You would have known, I take it,
14:47:29 45 back then?---I would have been all over it back then.
14:47:32 46
14:47:32 47 You would have been all over it back then?---I suppose so,

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

14:47:36 1 yeah.
14:47:36 2
14:47:39 3 Can I ask you about your knowledge now of Ms Gobbo's
14:47:50 4 involvement with the members of this investigative team.
14:47:57 5 Do you have any understanding that she had been involved in
14:48:00 6 this operation?---No, I have no knowledge of that
14:48:07 7 whatsoever.
14:48:07 8
14:48:12 9 Do you recall having a discussion with anyone at around
14:48:16 10 this time about Ms Gobbo?---No.
14:48:19 11
14:48:21 12 You've got no knowledge of Ms Gobbo providing information
14:48:24 13 or assistance to Victoria Police, right? Is that
14:48:29 14 right?---Sorry?
14:48:30 15
14:48:30 16 You've got no knowledge now about Ms Gobbo providing
14:48:33 17 information to members of Victoria Police?---In relation to
14:48:35 18 this?
14:48:36 19
14:48:36 20 Yes?---No.
14:48:37 21
14:48:38 22 All right. Did you know whether she represented people who
14:48:42 23 were charged by the Drug Squad?---No, I don't know.
14:48:44 24
14:48:45 25 Looking back now you can't recall whether or not she ever
14:48:48 26 represented anyone ever charged by the Drug Squad?---No.
14:48:51 27
14:48:51 28 No recollection at all?---No.
14:48:53 29
14:48:55 30 Right. You've got a recollection of attending a meeting at
14:49:07 31 a café with her though, don't you?---Yes.
14:49:09 32
14:49:10 33 What was the purpose of that meeting?---I can't recall.
14:49:12 34
14:49:13 35 No recollection at all?---No.
14:49:14 36
14:49:15 37 How did you end up being in the café with Ms Gobbo?---I, I
14:49:21 38 have no independent recall as such. I was told by [REDACTED]
14:49:25 39 [REDACTED] three weeks ago that I had met Gobbo, I wasn't aware of
14:49:29 40 that until then. I then - he said, "Yes, we met her at a
14:49:35 41 café" and I said, okay. So my recollection from then is
14:49:41 42 once I lent my mind to that, yes, I think I probably did
14:49:45 43 meet her. I thought I was with Rob Bartlett and [REDACTED]
14:49:49 44 tells me that wasn't the case, I was with him and Kruger.
14:49:53 45
14:49:54 46 Do you remember a Mr Kruger?---Do I remember him?
14:49:57 47

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

14:49:57 1 Yes?---Yes, yes. Kruger.
14:50:01 2
14:50:01 3 What you say is, "I have a limited independent recollection
14:50:04 4 of attending a meeting at a café with Ms Gobbo at some
14:50:09 5 stage while I was at the Drug Squad". Is that limited
14:50:12 6 independent recollection triggered by your discussion with
14:50:17 7 [REDACTED]---Yes.
14:50:18 8
14:50:25 9 You say in your statement, "I spoke to [REDACTED] a couple
14:50:28 10 of weeks ago. I catch up with [REDACTED] and other former
14:50:32 11 colleagues once a year. [REDACTED] told me that he recalled
14:50:35 12 that in 96 or 97 while we were both with the Drug Squad we
14:50:39 13 met with Ms Gobbo with another Detective", and you've said
14 14 Kruger, "At cafe in inner Melbourne to discuss the
14:50:46 15 possibility of her providing information to Victoria
14:50:48 16 Police". Does that trigger your recollection?---Once [REDACTED]
14:50:59 17 said that I thought about it, I thought okay, I do remember
14:51:02 18 having a meeting. I can only assume it was her. What
14:51:06 19 concerns me is I thought it was with Rob Bartlett and my
14:51:10 20 only consideration there would be am I cross-referencing
14:51:13 21 that with another meeting? But I'm thinking to myself it
14:51:17 22 must have been with Ms Gobbo.
14:51:19 23
14:51:23 24 If we assume that she was - did you know
14:51:32 25 [REDACTED]?---Did I know him?
14:51:34 26
14:51:34 27 Yes?---Not personally.
14:51:36 28
14:51:36 29 Did you know of him?---Yes.
14:51:37 30
14:51:39 31 Now looking back, what do you believe your understanding
14:51:43 32 was of him back then, was it as a solicitor who acted for
14:51:49 33 people charged by the Drug Squad?---He must have. I don't
14:51:52 34 have any specific recall of that.
14:51:53 35
14:51:56 36 Are you able to say to the Commissioner why it would be
14:51:59 37 that you would have gone to a meeting with [REDACTED] possibly
14:52:08 38 and Ms Gobbo, can you enlighten the Commission at
14:52:13 39 all?---No. It must have been a drug-related meeting.
14:52:16 40
14:52:21 41 I wonder if the witness could have a look at RC68.
14:52:27 42
14:52:27 43 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
14:52:32 44
14:52:33 45 MR WINNEKE: Just have a quick read of that. Have you seen
14:52:40 46 that document recently?---I've never seen it before in my
14:52:46 47 life I don't think.

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

14:52:47 1
14:52:47 2 We'll just wait and see. Can we scroll down. What does
14:53:05 3 that look like to you?---It's an IR report, is it?
14:53:11 4
14:53:11 5 An IR report. You've seen plenty of those I take
14:53:15 6 it?---Yes.
14:53:15 7
14:53:15 8 If we scroll right down we see at the bottom against the
14:53:20 9 word "comment", just before we get to the end of the
14:53:23 10 report, "Seen by MJB"?---Yes.
14:53:26 11
14:53:27 12 Which might suggest that you've seen it before?---Yes.
14:53:32 13
14:53:33 14 And that wouldn't be surprising, would it?---No.
14:53:36 15
14:53:36 16 So you would, as the Detective Senior Sergeant, be looking
14:53:43 17 at information reports, would you, that had been - -
14:53:48 18 -?---Come across my computer, yes.
14:53:49 19
14:53:49 20 Would you be shown every information report that's produced
14:53:53 21 in relation to a Drug Squad operation?---Probably not.
14:53:59 22
14:53:59 23 But if there was a suggestion that a practising, a legal
14:54:11 24 practitioner was to provide information, that would be a
14:54:15 25 matter of some significance, wouldn't it?---No, I disagree
14:54:20 26 to be honest with you. I disagree.
14:54:23 27
14:54:24 28 Do you say that in your time in the Police Force you would
14:54:27 29 have had defence barristers or solicitors providing you
14:54:33 30 with information about clients?---No, not really, but you
14:54:37 31 know, a lot of things are said and done, a lot of things
14:54:40 32 are said but what's actually done is completely different,
14:54:44 33 so.
14:54:44 34
14:54:44 35 Can you explain that. What do you mean?---Well, a lot of
14:54:49 36 informers will, you know, to be blunt, promise the world
14:54:54 37 and deliver nothing. So you take it like a grain of salt
14:54:58 38 at times, you know.
14:54:59 39
14:55:01 40 Do you understand that the evidence is that at this time in
14:55:08 41 July of 1998 there was a person, Nicola Gobbo, who was not
14:55:14 42 only willing but apparently wanting to provide information
14:55:17 43 to Victoria Police. She at that stage was a legal
14:55:23 44 practitioner employed by a solicitor who was acting for a
14:55:26 45 number of clients who were the target of an operation that
14:55:30 46 your Drug Squad was engaged in?---Yes, but I don't
14:55:35 47 understand what you're saying exactly, sorry. I don't -

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

14:55:40 1 no, I don't really get it.
14:55:41 2
14:55:42 3 Okay?---Because all I'm doing is overseeing something or
14:55:48 4 other and just saying, "I've noted that" and that's about
14:55:48 5 it.
14:55:49 6
7 I understand that?---Okay.
8
14:55:49 9 I'm not asking for actual recollections, I'm just asking
14:55:53 10 you for your impressions on this. Here's a solicitor,
14:55:58 11 okay, a young legal practitioner employed by a solicitor
14:56:05 12 who acts for clients the Drug Squad charges, right. He's
14:56:10 13 acting for four people who are the subject, who are the
14:56:12 14 target of an operation by your Squad, right. Do you accept
14:56:16 15 that?---Well I didn't - I better read this again.
14:56:23 16
14:56:25 17 You haven't been shown this by Victoria Police in
14:56:28 18 preparation for your statement.
14:56:29 19
14:56:30 20 MR HOLT: I should indicate it has been made very, very
14:56:33 21 clear by Victoria Police to the Commission that in the
14:56:35 22 taking of statements we are to ensure that the witnesses
14:56:38 23 are not contaminated by others or by others' documents.
14:56:40 24 This is not this witness's document. It is entirely proper
14:56:42 25 that it hasn't been shown to him, that's the reason why.
14:56:45 26 And if the Commission wishes us to take a different
14:56:49 27 approach we will but we've taken the view on the basis of
14:56:53 28 the correspondence that we've received that we are to be
14:56:55 29 extraordinarily cautious on those issues.
14:56:57 30
14:56:57 31 MR WINNEKE: All right. Have a read of it. I'll just give
14:57:15 32 you some assistance. Under the blacks with 26(1)?---Yeah.
14:57:20 33
14:57:21 34 Is the word [REDACTED]?---Okay.
14:57:33 35
14:57:34 36 Can we scroll that down. And you've read that. So what
14:57:54 37 that appears to be is an information report following a
14:57:57 38 meeting between Kruger, [REDACTED] and Nicola Gobbo. Nicola
14:58:04 39 Gobbo's wanting to provide information about her employer
14:58:09 40 and a person who is the target of Operation Carron,
14:58:15 41 Mr Reid, who you've said you're aware of, right?---Yes, but
14:58:20 42 does it say here that it was Gobbo?
14:58:25 43
14:58:25 44 No, it doesn't. It says an unregistered informer?---Right.
14:58:30 45
14:58:31 46 Right.
14:58:35 47

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

14:58:35 1 COMMISSIONER: It's common ground it was Nicola
14:58:40 2 Gobbo?---There you go, that's been the stumbling block
14:58:43 3 then. I didn't know that.
14:58:44 4
14:58:45 5 MR WINNEKE: Right. Do you say you would have known who it
14:58:47 6 was then?---When?
14:58:49 7
14:58:50 8 In 1998 - - - ?---No, I wouldn't have had a clue.
14:58:53 9
14:58:53 10 I'm sorry?---I wouldn't have had a clue.
14:58:56 11
14:58:56 12 You wouldn't have been, when that was across your desk you
14:58:59 13 say that you wouldn't have had a clue who was the
14:59:02 14 unregistered informer?---Yes, that's correct, I wouldn't
14:59:07 15 have known.
14:59:08 16
14:59:09 17 But aren't you saying that you have limited independent
14:59:12 18 recollection of attending a meeting at about this time,
14:59:15 19 let's say shortly after this, with Ms Gobbo?---I don't even
14:59:19 20 know when the meeting was.
14:59:20 21
14:59:26 22 The fact that it was a solicitor representing one of the
14:59:31 23 people who were the subject of the operation, would you
14:59:34 24 have made yourself aware of that or not?---No, no.
14:59:37 25
14:59:37 26 I'm sorry?---No.
14:59:39 27
14:59:39 28 You wouldn't have?---No.
14:59:40 29
14:59:42 30 All right.
14:59:52 31
14:59:52 32 COMMISSIONER: Could I just clarify with you, do you
14:59:54 33 actually now, after having the conversation with [REDACTED]
14:59:58 34 and refreshing your memory, do you have any recollection
15:00:01 35 that you did meet Nicola Gobbo at a meeting around about
15:00:04 36 this time or are you still uncertain?---I'm still
15:00:07 37 uncertain. I'm trying to put it all together and I still
38 struggle to work out whether I did or didn't.
39
15:00:11 40 I understand?---But obviously we did because [REDACTED] told me
15:00:17 41 we did so that's how I'm going backwards and forwards.
15:00:18 42
15:00:18 43 But from your recollection yourself, even with being
15:00:21 44 reminded of it by [REDACTED], you still have no independent
15:00:24 45 recollection?---No.
15:00:25 46
15:00:25 47 You can't be sure whether you did or not?---That's exactly

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

15:00:28 1 it.
15:00:28 2
15:00:29 3 You're prepared to accept his statement you were there but
15:00:31 4 you don't have any recollection of it?---No, I don't.
15:00:33 5
15:00:33 6 I understand.
15:00:35 7
15:00:35 8 MR WINNEKE: I take it you know [REDACTED] clearly, he's a fellow
15:00:41 9 that went to the same school as you I think, obviously a
15:00:45 10 bit later, you understand that?---Yes.
15:00:49 11
15:00:49 12 He was a police officer who worked under you?---He did.
15:00:56 13
15:00:56 14 A good police officer?---I thought he was Australia's best
15:01:00 15 Drug Squad officer actually.
15:01:01 16
15:01:01 17 You did, did you?---Yes.
15:01:04 18
15:01:04 19 Why do you say that?---He was just very good at what he
15:01:07 20 did.
15:01:07 21
15:01:07 22 In what way?---He was a very good investigator, yeah.
15:01:10 23
15:01:17 24 He had a knack, it seems, of getting information, that's
15:01:22 25 what he's told us, do you accept that?---Yes.
15:01:25 26
15:01:25 27 People seemed to like giving him information?---Correct.
15:01:29 28
15:01:29 29 He was a bit of a bloodhound, would that be a fair
15:01:32 30 description of him?---He was a very good investigator, yes.
15:01:36 31
15:01:39 32 He goes to see, he says he was tasked to go and see Gobbo
15:01:44 33 with Mr Kruger, in effect the two of them to go down and
15:01:52 34 assess her, see what she was like. He says that either you
15:01:57 35 and/or Strawhorn asked him to do so?---It wasn't me.
15:02:00 36
15:02:00 37 It wasn't you?---(Witness shakes head.)
15:02:06 38
15:02:07 39 But what he considered was that having seen her, that he
15:02:12 40 took the view that it was entirely inappropriate to be
15:02:16 41 getting information from a solicitor about her clients and
15:02:23 42 he went back and he told you and Strawhorn about his views.
15:02:29 43 Now, do you say you recall that or not?---No, I don't
15:02:34 44 recall that.
15:02:35 45
15:02:37 46 If that's what he said to you would you accept
15:02:41 47 it?---Definitely.

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

15:02:43 1
15:02:43 2 I mean if he took the view that as far as he was concerned
15:02:47 3 it was inappropriate for police to be gathering information
15:02:50 4 in that way, you would accept it, would you?---No, I don't
15:02:54 5 know that he - you know, you're embellishing that a tad
15:02:59 6 because you're saying that he told me that it was
15:03:01 7 inappropriate and what you're saying is I would agree with
15:03:05 8 that, that's not the case at all.
15:03:07 9
15:03:07 10 What do you recall then?---I don't recall anything.
15:03:11 11
15:03:12 12 If he said to you that it was inappropriate would you say,
15:03:15 13 "Well look, no, he wouldn't have told me that"?---But I
15:03:20 14 don't know what he told me.
15:03:21 15
15:03:21 16 You can't recall?---No.
15:03:22 17
15:03:23 18 If he said to this Royal Commission that he went and spoke
15:03:27 19 to his superior officers, you and Strawhorn, and said that
15:03:32 20 it wasn't right for us to be getting information from her,
15:03:35 21 what do you say, would you - - - ?---If he said that, you
15:03:39 22 know, that would be correct.
15:03:42 23
15:03:50 24 Did you keep your diaries after you left the Police
15:03:55 25 Force?---No.
15:03:57 26
15:03:57 27 What happened to them?---Handed it in.
15:04:00 28
15:04:00 29 To who?---Who would know? Administration.
15:04:05 30
15:04:05 31 You handed your diaries which you kept as a Detective back
15:04:09 32 to the Police Force?---As I recall you couldn't get a diary
15:04:14 33 unless you gave your other one back, so.
15:04:17 34
15:04:17 35 So your understanding was that you didn't keep your
15:04:20 36 official diaries, they would have been handed back to
15:04:24 37 police? Yes, okay. Just excuse me.
15:04:31 38
15:04:31 39 COMMISSIONER: Do you have any recollection of seeing
15:04:34 40 Nicola Gobbo socialising with police at all?---No.
15:04:38 41
15:04:38 42 Thank you.
15:04:40 43
15:04:40 44 MR WINNEKE: Do you recall ever meeting her at all?---No.
15:04:43 45
15:04:43 46 Do you recall ever seeing her at all?---No.
15:04:46 47

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

15:04:46 1 Did you know what she looked like?---No.
15:04:49 2
15:04:58 3 Do you know a person by the name of Tim Argall?---No.
15:05:07 4
15:05:09 5 Trevor Ashton?---No.
15:05:10 6
15:05:12 7 No?---(Witness shakes head.)
15:05:14 8
15:05:15 9 Steven Campbell?---No.
15:05:17 10
15:05:17 11 Never heard of him, a police officer by the name of Steven
15:05:22 12 Campbell?---I might know Steve Campbell.
15:05:25 13
15:05:25 14 You might know him?---It's a reasonably familiar name put
15:05:28 15 it that way.
15:05:29 16
15:05:29 17 Familiar name but do you know who he is?---No, no idea.
15:05:33 18
15:05:34 19 What about Jeff Pope, do you know Jeff Pope?---No.
15:05:37 20
15:05:38 21 Did you ever have anything to do with the Asset Recovery
15:05:41 22 Squad, the Major Fraud Group as a member of the Drug
15:05:45 23 Squad?---No. Not that I recall. I wouldn't have thought
15:05:49 24 so.
15:05:49 25
15:05:49 26 Did you ever liaise with the National Crime Authority in
15:05:53 27 your capacity as a Detective Senior Sergeant of the Drug
15:05:57 28 Squad?---I would have done, yes.
15:05:59 29
15:05:59 30 Did you know a person by the name of Karen Hynam?---I know
15:06:03 31 the name.
15:06:04 32
15:06:05 33 Do you know her?---No, I know the name. I just saw it on
15:06:11 34 the IR.
15:06:11 35
15:06:11 36 I'm sorry?---I just saw it on the IR.
15:06:15 37
15:06:16 38 On the IR, right. Thanks very much.
39
15:06:25 40 COMMISSIONER: Mr Nathwani.
15:06:27 41
42 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR NATHWANI:
43
15:06:30 44 Mr Bowden, just dealing with contact firstly with [REDACTED]
15:06:34 45 You say in the veteran contact sheet you caught up with
15:06:39 46 [REDACTED] about a week before the meeting, so I think some
15:06:44 47 time the end of March?---I thought it was maybe the middle

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

15:06:48 1 of March.
15:06:49 2
15:06:49 3 About a month ago?---Yeah, I think so.
15:06:52 4
15:06:52 5 You also comment that you catch up with a few others once a
15:06:56 6 year. Are they other members of the Drug Squad?---No.
15:06:59 7
15:06:59 8 So just [REDACTED] from the Drug Squad?---No, I've caught up
15:07:04 9 with - over the years, I've been retired now a long time,
15:07:08 10 and I catch up with lots of ex members of the Police Force.
15:07:12 11
15:07:12 12 When was the first time in those discussions with [REDACTED] or
15:07:16 13 with anyone else that you first discussed Nicola Gobbo or
15:07:20 14 3838?---Three weeks ago or whatever.
15:07:23 15
15:07:23 16 Notwithstanding all the media attention to Nicola Gobbo and
15:07:27 17 3838, the first time it crossed your mind was when [REDACTED]
15:07:32 18 mentioned it?---Yeah.
15:07:33 19
15:07:33 20 And at that time were you aware that [REDACTED] had been
15:07:35 21 contacted by Task Force Landow?---I don't think he had
15:07:43 22 been, had he?
15:07:45 23
15:07:45 24 As far as the discussions you had with him, can you help
15:07:49 25 us, was it merely discussing any contact you'd had with
15:07:52 26 her?---I can tell you just about what happened. We met for
15:07:56 27 coffee, there was four or five of us there and he said, "Do
15:07:59 28 you know, mate, we had contact with Ms Gobbo" and I said,
15:08:04 29 "Really?" He said, "Yeah, yeah, back 96, 98".
15:08:09 30
15:08:09 31 Who were the other people there?---Paul Broady and Peter
15:08:14 32 Harvey.
15:08:14 33
15:08:14 34 You said four or five others, that's four. Fair enough.
15:08:18 35 Sorry, I'm terrible with maths. And what else did you
15:08:24 36 discuss?---I said "really", and he said, "Jesus Bowds,
15:08:28 37 you're hopeless, you don't remember anything these days".
15:08:33 38 I said, "I'm sorry mate, I'm shot to bits".
15:08:35 39
15:08:36 40 Is there any reason why you're shot to bits, I see there's
15:08:39 41 a reference to - - - ?---I prefer not to discuss my medical
15:08:42 42 conditions.
15:08:42 43
15:08:43 44 All I ask is, is it a medical condition that adversely
15:08:44 45 effects your memory?---Yes.
15:08:46 46
15:08:46 47 I understand. I'm trying to refresh your memory and I'm

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

15:08:53 1 sure you'll say you can't remember if you can't. The first
15:08:57 2 time you met with Gobbo was early February 1998, does that
15:09:01 3 ring any bells with you?---No.
15:09:02 4
15:09:03 5 I'll try and help you. The only other person present with
15:09:05 6 you and Ms Gobbo was Kruger. Do you recall any meetings
15:09:10 7 where there was you, Gobbo and Kruger?---No.
15:09:14 8
15:09:15 9 Around that time you, the Drug Squad, were particularly
15:09:20 10 interested in [REDACTED]?---(Witness nods.)
15:09:24 11
15:09:24 12 Do you remember that, do you remember a focus on [REDACTED]
15:09:27 13 in particular because he represented quite a lot of the
15:09:29 14 criminals charged with serious drug trafficking?---No.
15:09:34 15
15:09:34 16 I'm trying to jog your memory about what was said at that
15:09:39 17 meeting. Do you recall either you or Kruger saying to
15:09:42 18 Ms Gobbo that [REDACTED] was a crook and he should be in
15:09:46 19 gaol?---No.
15:09:48 20
15:09:49 21 Or alternatively if he wasn't going to be in gaol he
15:09:52 22 shouldn't be practising law?---No.
15:09:55 23
15:10:00 24 Did you ask Ms Gobbo if she was aware of [REDACTED]
15:10:04 25 dealings at all, criminal dealings?---Did I ask her?
15:10:09 26
15:10:10 27 You or Kruger say to her in effect, "Are you aware of the
15:10:13 28 criminality [REDACTED] up to? Are you
15:10:18 29 involved"?---Obviously not. I don't even remember the
15:10:22 30 meeting so I don't remember that. And I know you're trying
15:10:24 31 to prompt my memory but - - -
15:10:25 32
15:10:25 33 I am, I'm going to carry on?---Okay.
15:10:25 34
15:10:26 35 I'm going to take you to some other particular bits. Did
15:10:29 36 you say to her her name had been mentioned or was involved
15:10:32 37 in recordings, TIs?---No, I didn't.
15:10:37 38
15:10:39 39 But mentioned a reference to the DPP or does the name Leon
15:10:44 40 Parker mean anything to you?---I know Leon Parker.
15:10:46 41
15:10:46 42 Who is Leon Parker?---He used to be with the OPP, he used
15:10:50 43 to handle the drug briefs.
15:10:52 44
15:10:52 45 Did you tell her that Leon Parker had mentioned her name,
15:10:55 46 Nicola Gobbo, when you met with her?---I don't recall.
15:10:59 47

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

15:11:00 1 Kruger, did he say anything of that sort?---I don't recall.
15:11:03 2
15:11:04 3 Did one of you say to her that mud sticks and she should
15:11:10 4 get a raincoat soon?---I don't recall.
15:11:12 5
15:11:12 6 Did you say to Ms Gobbo there was an ongoing investigation
15:11:15 7 and it may implicate her?---I don't recall.
15:11:18 8
15:11:20 9 Did you tell her, and were you putting pressure on her
15:11:24 10 saying, "We would be happy to protect you if you provide us
15:11:28 11 assistance"?---I don't recall.
15:11:30 12
15:11:31 13 Did you or Kruger say to her, "No one will believe you,
15:11:36 14 Ms Gobbo, that you either didn't know about what [REDACTED]
15:11:40 15 was up to or that you should have known what [REDACTED] was
15:11:44 16 up to"?---Did I say?
15:11:46 17
15:11:46 18 You or Kruger?---No. No, I don't recall.
15:11:48 19
15:11:48 20 Did one of you mention that you were well aware of the fact
15:11:52 21 she had a prior criminal history, the 93 drugs
15:11:57 22 possession?---Don't recall.
15:11:58 23
15:11:58 24 Do you recall a meeting where either you, Kruger or both of
15:12:03 25 you put pressure on her to give information about
15:12:07 26 [REDACTED]?---Is this a different meeting now?
15:12:09 27
15:12:09 28 No, same meeting?---Same meeting. No, I don't recall.
15:12:12 29
15:12:13 30 Surely that may explain why, and I'll tell you in fairness
15:12:17 31 to you, [REDACTED] has given evidence that you should really be
15:12:22 32 allowed to deal with it, saying that you then asked him to
15:12:26 33 attend on Gobbo on 21 July with Kruger?---Sorry, I?
15:12:32 34
15:12:33 35 That you?---Yes, what.
15:12:34 36
15:12:35 37 I can read a part of his statement to you. "Detective
15:12:44 38 Senior Sergeant Mark Bowden informed me that he wanted me
15:12:47 39 to assist Kruger because Gobbo was likely to become an
15:12:50 40 informant. Kruger transferred from [REDACTED] to the Drug
15:12:53 41 Squad and Senior Sergeant Bowden was concerned that after
15:12:58 42 registering informer [REDACTED], this number may be wrong, it
15:13:01 43 needs to be confirmed, the said informer had not been
15:13:03 44 controlled effectively". So trying to jog your memory, was
15:13:09 45 there an informer by the name of - it was referred to - can
15:13:15 46 I just show him on a piece of paper? Just show him so he
15:13:21 47 can try and jog his memory? There's resistance. Do you

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

15:13:55 1 recall a conversation with [REDACTED] back in, around July 98
15:14:07 2 where you had been concerned that a different informer had
15:14:11 3 effectively gone off the rails and as such you wanted [REDACTED]
15:14:16 4 to meet Gobbo to make sure the same didn't happen here?---I
15:14:23 5 don't recall the conversation. It's 25 years, 24 years
15:14:28 6 ago.

15:14:28 7
15:14:29 8 Because if we bring up the contact sheet, it's RC68.

15:14:44 9
15:14:44 10 COMMISSIONER: The information report, isn't it?

15:14:46 11
15:14:46 12 MR NATHWANI: The information report, exactly. If we pull
15:14:48 13 this up, we can see it's 21 July at the top. If we scroll
15:14:52 14 down, all the way to the bottom please, the second page, as
15:14:58 15 you can see at the bottom it's approved by team leader,
15:15:02 16 18887 is your number, is that right?---Correct.

15:15:05 17
15:15:05 18 Then we see the comment "seen by MJB" which is you. A day
15:15:13 19 after in effect that meeting between Gobbo, Kruger and [REDACTED]
15:15:20 20 you were being provided the content of that meeting, do you
15:15:24 21 agree with that? As we can see the meeting is on 21 July
15:15:30 22 and then you're provided the details on 22 July. Do you
15:15:34 23 see that?---I better have a look at it again. So what
15:15:40 24 you're saying is this is - - -

15:15:41 25
15:15:41 26 Meeting we see at the top, 21 July 98?---Yep.

15:15:45 27
15:15:45 28 We see approved by you 22 July 98, you've got that?---Yep.

15:15:50 29
15:15:50 30 So within a day you're being provided the
15:15:53 31 information?---Yep.

15:15:53 32
15:15:53 33 And obviously you've given evidence that you don't believe
15:15:56 34 you knew who the informer was?---No, I don't think so, no.

15:16:00 35
15:16:01 36 Had there been, and I'm asking about the practices employed
15:16:05 37 by you and your unit at the time, if there had been a
15:16:11 38 meeting with an informer and the informer had said in
15:16:16 39 effect, "I'm holding drugs for someone else", would you
15:16:18 40 expect that to have been included in the IR?---If the
15:16:24 41 informer - - -

15:16:25 42
15:16:26 43 Say, for example, let's say Gobbo said to [REDACTED] "I am
15:16:31 44 holding drugs or have held drugs for a criminal", would you
15:16:34 45 expect that to be in the IR for you to reveal later?---[REDACTED]
15:16:38 46 said - - -
15:16:39 47

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

15:16:39 1 Let's say Gobbo says to [REDACTED] "I'm holding drugs or have
15:16:45 2 held drugs"?---She's holding drugs.
3
15:16:46 4 Yes?---For?
15:16:46 5
15:16:47 6 It doesn't matter who.
15:16:48 7
15:16:48 8 COMMISSIONER: For a client?---Okay.
15:16:52 9
15:16:52 10 MR NATHWANI: Would you expect that to appear on the
15:16:56 11 information report?---Probably not. It may or may not.
15:16:58 12
15:16:59 13 It may or may not?---Yes.
15:17:00 14
15:17:01 15 Scrolling up then to the top, please. We see at the top
15:17:07 16 there it says, "Contact summary, information source Kruger,
15:17:10 17 address number 2, contact source self-interest warning", it
15:17:16 18 says "no". Now that entry "source self-interest warning",
15:17:21 19 that's a reference, isn't it, to whether or not the source,
15:17:26 20 Gobbo, has any self-interest in providing the information
15:17:30 21 she has, in other words, whether she's holding drugs or
15:17:34 22 wants her immunity from prosecution or the like, do you
15:17:38 23 agree?---I wouldn't know.
15:17:39 24
15:17:39 25 You're the one reviewing these documents, what do they
15:17:43 26 mean?---I'm reviewing the contents, I'm not too sure of the
15:17:46 27 - - -
15:17:46 28
15:17:46 29 I'm asking generally what does source self-interest warning
15:17:52 30 mean?---I've got no idea.
15:17:53 31
15:17:53 32 Well you must review a number of these and probably filter
15:17:55 33 them out?---There'd be hundreds of them. I don't know what
15:17:57 34 that's about.
15:17:57 35
15:17:58 36 That's another thing you can't help us with?---I don't know
15:18:02 37 what it means.
15:18:03 38
15:18:04 39 After this do you agree that you handed over Ms Gobbo to
15:18:10 40 Strawhorn?---No. No, that can't be right because I would
15:18:17 41 remember that.
15:18:17 42
15:18:18 43 Do you ever remember telling Strawhorn that Gobbo was a
15:18:21 44 registered informant?---No.
15:18:23 45
15:18:23 46 Didn't happen or you can't remember?---I can't - I don't
15:18:26 47 recall. I don't - I didn't even know Gobbo was a

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

15:18:31 1 registered informer.
15:18:32 2
15:18:35 3 Again in fairness to you we may hear from Mr Strawhorn in
15:18:37 4 due course, and it's for you to be allowed to comment on
15:18:39 5 it, in his contact sheets with Landow he indicates that you
15:18:44 6 told him at one point, "Bowden mentioned to him on one
15:18:47 7 occasion that Gobbo was registered by Kruger". Do you have
15:18:54 8 any recollection of telling him - - - ?---No, I don't.
15:18:56 9
15:19:00 10 Ms Gobbo was then in contact, as we've heard, with Karen
15:19:07 11 Hynam from the NCA. Do you know any of these other names
15:19:10 12 from the NCA, Ian Tate?---No.
15:19:13 13
15:19:13 14 Never heard of him? Steven Hamilton?---No.
15:19:16 15
15:19:28 16 Again, dealing with [REDACTED] just to conclude, when you met
15:19:34 17 up with [REDACTED], am I right in understanding it was him who
15:19:38 18 jogged your memory about meeting Ms Gobbo?---Yeah, not that
15:19:44 19 he jogged me, he didn't, um, jog my memory so much as to
15:19:48 20 say we had met her, and I said righto. Some time after
15:19:54 21 that I was thinking about it I thought righto, obviously I
15:20:00 22 have met her.
15:20:00 23
15:20:01 24 Just reading to you something he said, to be fair to you,
15:20:05 25 do you recall after meeting Ms Gobbo telling [REDACTED] that
15:20:13 26 you wouldn't be using Gobbo as a source?---I don't remember
15:20:17 27 saying that.
15:20:17 28
15:20:17 29 Again, didn't happen or can't remember?---I don't remember.
15:20:21 30
15:20:21 31 Understood. All right, thank you.
15:20:23 32
15:20:24 33 COMMISSIONER: Ms O'Gorman anything?
15:20:25 34
15:20:26 35 MS O'GORMAN: No questions.
15:20:27 36
15:20:28 37 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Holt?
15:20:31 38
15:20:31 39 MR HOLT: It's my witness, Your Honour.
40
15:20:32 41 COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, of course it is your witness.
15:20:32 42
15:20:33 43 MS WHITING: No questions.
44
15:20:35 45 COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Holt?
15:20:36 46
15:20:37 47 MR HOLT: No questions, thank you Commissioner.

.16/04/19

1055

BOWDEN XXN - IN CAMERA

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

15:20:37 1
15:20:38 2 COMMISSIONER: Anything by way of re-examination?
15:20:39 3
15:20:39 4 MR WINNEKE: No, Commissioner.
15:20:40 5
15:20:40 6 COMMISSIONER: Thanks very much Mr Bowden, you're free to
15:20:42 7 go.
8
9 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
10
15:20:43 11 Mr Winneke, you weren't going to tender that statement
15:20:45 12 of the witness, the Jeans?
15:20:49 13
15:20:50 14 MR WINNEKE: Yes, I tender the statement of Roger Newell
15:20:55 15 Jeans, statement dated 11 April 2019.
15:20:59 16
15:21:02 17 COMMISSIONER: And that statement can be publicly released?
15:21:05 18
15:21:06 19 MR WINNEKE: Yes, it can.
15:21:11 20
15:21:12 21 #EXHIBIT RC78 - Statement of Roger Newell Jeans.
15:21:17 22
15:21:18 23 COMMISSIONER: That can be published on the website. And
15:21:20 24 that's it for today?
15:21:22 25
15:21:22 26 MR WINNEKE: That's it for today, Your Honour.
15:21:24 27
15:21:24 28 COMMISSIONER: All right. Adjourn the Commission hearings
15:21:26 29 to a date to be fixed.
15:22:00 30
31 ADJOURNED TO A DATE TO BE FIXED
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47