

From: Craig Middleton
 To: willem.de.lint
 Cc: derek.dalton
 Subject: RE: FW: Ages of offenders [DLM=SensitiveLegal]
 Date: Thursday, 22 June 2017 16:46:05
 Attachments: [Crime of Parrishell 7 v9 view](#)
[38 RUSSELL.LAW](#)
[INDICATORS V3.WORDING 2.xlsx](#)

Dear Willem

To us 'cleared' and 'uncleared' is slightly ambiguous and open to differing interpretations. In the review we used the terms Solved, Unsolved. The below cases you mention are all on the **solved** list except (OLSEN, Case 56) that is on the **Unsolved** list. As to the cause of death, Parrishell was not really concerned with the cause of death except to say that we whether agreed on the original findings (suicide, drug overdose, misadventure). Obviously by the sheer nature of the Bias definition that we used, we would have difficulty reviewing a matter for bias if in fact it actually wasn't classified as a crime in the first instance (suicide, misadventure). In those matters you listed below (except OLSEN) - they are all matters that were originally determined that the cause of death did not involve a 'crime'. Logically then, it would be assumed that they would be categorised in the 'No Evidence of Bias Crime'. Of course there are some cases that the Coroner determined originally as 'open findings'. In other words the cause of death could not be determined and several possibilities exist. For example, The Comer may have ruled the cause of death as being caused by (1) a fall, (2) assaulted and subsequently fell off the cliff or (3) thrown from the cliff. The last two possibilities would be 'crimes'. The first is not and usually reflects a suicide. In these instances we still reviewed these matters for bias as there was a possibility that a crime had occurred.

So to answer your question "Could you confirm that these are the only cases that you currently have cleared by these terms?" - we actually didn't clear these cases using these terms. All we actually did was confirm the Coroners finding (which of course meant we reviewed the information) - was slot them into the 'solved' category and then mark them as "No Evidence of Bias Crime". In reality and technically - they probably should have been expunged from the list once they had been determined not to be a crime as they technically didn't come within the definition of a true 'Bias Crime'. We could have done what we did with the TRAVERS matter and mark them as 'not reviewed' - but of course the argument at the time was that we had to review the matters in order to confirm the Coroners findings. At present they remain in the list under 'Solved'.

I have checked our files - I believe the matters you have mentioned (except OLSEN) are all of the ones that fall into this area. I will recheck all of them again to double make sure.

Attached is the final spreadsheet of all our results. At the bottom of the 'TOTAL' tabard you will see the raw figures. The % are inclusive of all 88 cases. I sent this to Derek a couple of days ago so you should have a copy.

If there is anything else I can be of assistance with - just let me know.

Good luck I'm actually looking forward to reading the academic review.

Regards



Craig Middleton | Detective Chief Inspector
 Crime Manager | Surry Hills Local Area Command

From: Willem de Lint <willem.de.lint@flinders.edu.au>
 To: [REDACTED]
 Cc: Derek Dalton <derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au>
 Date: 21/06/2017 15:20
 Subject: FW: Ages of offenders [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Dear Craig,

Many thanks for all you have given us to clear up some questions.

I have a couple of questions that you may be able to answer quite quickly.

There are 6 cases that we need to categorise, on which you have notes indicating you have cleared these cases:

Rath - not suspicious
 Raye - suicide
 Wark - suicide
 Olsen - suicide
 Payne - misadventure
 Currie - misadventure

Could you confirm that these are the **only cases that you currently have cleared by these terms** and could you also give us the spreadsheet indicating your current totals for solved and unsolved cases?

Also, can you let me know what you believe your clearance rate is for the total list of cases? It sounds like you would eliminate these cases from both your solved and unsolved lists (if solved suggests that a crime is solved) and that the clearance rate would not use them in the denominator.

Kind regards

Willem

Willem de Lint
 Professor in Criminal Justice
 Flinders Law School
 Flinders University
 GPO Box 2100
 Adelaide 5001
 +61 8 8201 3673

From: Derek Dalton
 Sent: Tuesday, 6 June 2017 1:07 PM
 To: Willem de Lint
 Subject: FW: Ages of offenders [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

TWO NUMBERS FOR CRAIG

From: Craig N Middleton [REDACTED]
 Sent: Thursday, 25 May 2017 11:41 AM
 To: Derek Dalton <derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au>
 Subject: RE: Ages of offenders [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Hi Derek

Attached is the complete spreadsheet with DOB of offenders. Do you want their star signs as well? :) Good luck

I have also attached the completed review for RUSSELL (Taradai matter) only 2 more to go but they will be quicker. No surprises in the finding - SBC.

Regards



Craig Middleton | Detective Chief Inspector
 Crime Manager | Surry Hills Local Area Command

From: Derek Dalton <derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au>
 To: Craig N Middleton [REDACTED]
 Date: 22/05/2017 16:31
 Subject: RE: Ages of offenders [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Hi Craig,

Sorry for late reply.

OK. We need the first two categories. I appreciate that FOR CATEGORY 2 they are "theoretically innocent" and I am still arguing WITH Willem that this will skewer data (but says that if police think they are guilty and took brief to court that's good enough for him. Who would have thought a Policing Professor could be so inclusive.)

We may just have to carefully explain inclusion of ages of those charged with an explanatory caveat.

Last category would be a ridiculous inclusion.....to problematic so ignore.

Cheers

(At least we chopped one category from the list)

DD

- 1) DOB of those persons who were arrested/charged and convicted? YES PLEASE
- 2) arrested/charged and acquitted (theoretically this would make them innocent YES PLEASE
- 3) and also the DOB of suspects/involved persons (not arrested/charged)? NO

From: Craig N Middleton [redacted]
 Sent: Monday, 22 May 2017 12:01 PM
 To: Derek Dalton <derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au>
 Subject: Re: Ages of offenders [XLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Hi Derek

Sorry I was out of the office all last week with some courses/training. Back this week. Im happy to work through your spreadsheet and see what I can do. It will take some time though as in most of the cases I will have to troll through the original files for the offenders DOBs. Just curious though, do you want DOB of those persons who were arrested/charged and convicted?, arrested/charged and acquitted (theoretically this would make them innocent), and also the DOB of suspects/involved persons (not arrested/charged). You can see my point? DOB of offenders? is a rather loose term - as you can see offenders can be broken into 3 differing categories. Or do you want the DOB of all offenders charged/suspected or acquitted? Just trying to save myself some work.

Cheers



Craig Middleton | Detective Chief Inspector
 Crime Manager | Surry Hills Local Area Command



From: Derek Dalton <derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au>
 To: Craig N Middleton [redacted]
 Date: 12/05/2017 17:34
 Subject: Ages of offenders

Hi Craig,

I hope you have a great weekend (You may have already departed office, I am doing so myself in 5 mins.)

Willem has convinced me that we need to include the age of the offenders in our analysis. Quite a lot of the literature makes references to ages and "age differences"/ disparity etc.

It's a bit of pain, but I think we need to do it. I can hear the chorus of critics asking "why not note R?" if we neglect to do it.

I have attached a working EXCEL sheet with ages of offenders in it (for as many cases as I could determine).

Not sure how to work out the rest (the missing ones).

In some cases I have written juveniles or twenties - but for calculation purposes we need precise ages.

Maybe the best you can do is supply birth dates of offenders and I can then - go to relevant file - determine crime date - and work out age from that.

I appreciated that this may take some time. So be it.

Thanks

PS: We have a 12,000 word draft and are 90% done. Soon you will (as an entire organisation) have a draft report to read.

Thanks

Derek

PS: I wish I could bill ACORN for all the hours I wasted reading their files. ☹

PS: There are a few coding mistakes in the EXCEL as we have yet to triple check it for accuracy.

Dr Derek Dalton

Associate Professor
 School of Law, Flinders University,
 GPO Box 2100,
 SA 5001
 Australia
 +61 8 8201 5285
 CRICOS Provider Number: 00114A

Consultation hours **Thurs 12-1** and **Friday 11-12**

 All mail is subject to content scanning for possible violation of NSW Police Force policy, including the Email and Internet Policy and Guidelines. All NSW Police Force employees are required to familiarise themselves with these policies, available on the NSW Police Force Intranet.

 This email and any attachments may be confidential and contain privileged information. It is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this communication. Confidentiality or privilege are not waived or lost by reason of the mistaken delivery to you. If you have received this message in error, please delete and notify the sender.

 All mail is subject to content scanning for possible violation of NSW Police Force policy, including the Email and Internet Policy and Guidelines. All NSW Police Force employees are required to familiarise themselves with these policies, available on the NSW Police Force Intranet.

This email and any attachments may be confidential and contain privileged information. It is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this communication. Confidentiality or privilege are not waived or lost by reason of the mistaken delivery to you. If you have received this message in error, please delete and notify the sender.

All mail is subject to content scanning for possible violation of NSW Police Force policy, including the Email and Internet Policy and Guidelines. All NSW Police Force employees are required to familiarise themselves with these policies, available on the NSW Police Force Intranet.

(See attached file: Copy of Parrabell 7 v2.xlsx)(See attached file: 36 RUSSELL.docx)(See attached file: INDICATORS Y3 20062017.xlsx)