2022 Special Commission of Inquiry into LGBTIQ hate crimes

Before: The Commissioner, The Honourable Justice John Sackar

At Level 2, 121 Macquarie Street, Sydney, New South Wales

On Friday, 9 June 2023 at 10.10am (Day 60)

Death of Waine Re: Ms Kathleen Heath Ms Caitlin Healey-Nash (A/Principal Solicitor) Mr Rhys Carvosso

(Counsel Assisting) (Solicitor)

Also Present:

Mr Aurhett Barrie for NSW Police (Re Waine)

.9/06/2023 (60)

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Ms Heath? 2 3 4 MS HEATH: Commissioner, I appear to assist. 5 6 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 7 8 MR BARRIE: Commissioner, my name is Barrie, B-A-R-R-I-E. 9 I appear for the Commissioner of Police. 10 THE COMMISSIONER: 11 Thank you. 12 13 Yes, Ms Heath? 14 15 MS HEATH: Commissioner, this is a documentary tender in relation to the death of Ms Wendy Waine. Before you, there 16 17 should be two volumes of material. A copy of the tender 18 material has been handed to Madam Associate for the purpose of tender. Commissioner, that will be exhibit 30. 19 20 **EXHIBIT #30 TENDER BUNDLE** 21 22 Commissioner, I also hand up short minutes of 23 MS HEATH: 24 These are in relation to the orders that the 25 parties seek the Commission make pursuant to section 8 of the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act. 26 These orders 27 relate to various redactions that are sought to documents in the tender bundle and pseudonym orders for particular 28 29 witnesses. 30 31 THE COMMISSIONER: I take it they're by consent, are they? 32 33 MR BARRIE: They are, Commissioner, yes. 34 Thank you. Yes, very well. 35 THE COMMISSIONER: I've made those orders, thank you. 36 37 Thank you, Commissioner. 38 MS HEATH: 39

40 41 Commissioner, the next document that I tender is a statement from the family of Ms Waine. That will be exhibit 31 and I will touch upon that in just a moment.

42 43 44

EXHIBIT #31 STATEMENT FROM THE FAMILY OF MS WAINE

45 46

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MS HEATH:

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28 29

30 31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

42

Finally, Commissioner, there is a copy of my written submissions of today's date. Those submissions set out in some detail the evidence pertaining to Ms Waine's I rely on those submissions, in addition to my oral submissions, which will be a summary only.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MS HEATH: Commissioner, I wish to commence by providing some background to Ms Wendy Waine, and there is a photograph that is appearing of her on the screen now.

Wendy Waine was a transgender woman and, by all accounts, a much-loved member of the LGBTIQ community in 1980s Sydney. She was a well-known entertainer and at the time of her death was performing at Pete's Beat on Oxford Street, a place considered one of the bastions of the drag scene in the 1980s.

The shows that she produced have been described as highly professional, extremely colourful and lavish, and Ms Waine's stage personality was described as dazzling. She was also a renowned costume designer and one obituary spoke about her producing some 400 costumes during the time that she worked at Pete's Beat for the many shows that she produced there.

I would like to read a short extract from one of the tributes to Ms Waine that was published after her death and it was said that on stage, as in real life, she gave all she had to offer. Humour, colour and an honest performance were her trademark. She took great pride in being a member of the gay community, an attitude which won her great respect and friendship from that community in general.

She was remembered as a generous friend and the type of person who would throw open her home at Christmas to make sure that those who otherwise would have spent the holiday alone had somewhere to be.

After her death, a memorial show was held at the Paddington Green Hotel in tribute to Ms Waine and it was described as a true entertainer's send-off.

One of the people who was at that tribute was Ms Waine's sister, Ms Betty Ernst, and I would like to start by acknowledging Ms Ernst, who is in the back of the

43 44 45

courtroom today.

Ms Ernst has provided a family statement to this Inquiry and we are very grateful for that statement. Her family statement echoes so many of the sentiments about the personal qualities of Ms Waine, her open-door policy, her humour and how well-liked and respected she was.

The statement touches not only upon the close relationship that Ms Ernst had with Ms Waine but also that Ms Waine had with Ms Ernst's children, who loved visiting during the school holidays, and in that vein, I would also like to acknowledge that there are other members of Ms Waine's family who are in these proceedings today. There is Jade, Jason, Ci-Anna and Jo-Anne, who are all present.

In her statement, Ms Ernst describes how devastating it has been not knowing why Ms Waine was killed and how she still misses her today, and I take this opportunity to express sincere condolences on behalf of the Inquiry to Ms Waine, Ms Waine's family and her friends.

Commissioner, I turn to describe the circumstances of Ms Waine's death so far as it can be obtained from the objective material. Ms Waine was found deceased at about midday on Tuesday, 30 April 1985 in her unit on Darlinghurst Road. She was found by a friend who became concerned when Ms Waine's friends realised that no-one had heard from her since that Sunday. Her body was naked and lying face-down on the floor at the side of the bed. She had been shot at close range from behind and also had bruising to the back of her head consistent with some blunt force trauma. Her front door had been left open and both the television and the heater were left running.

Commissioner, I have set out in my written submissions some detail about the information that is available as to Ms Waine's last known movements. I don't propose to go through that all orally. For the purpose of this summary, I note that the last confirmed sighting of Ms Waine was leaving a laneway named Premier Lane where she used to solicit as a sex worker. She was seen by another sex worker that night leaving that lane with a young man with medium-length brown hair and a tattoo on the back of his left hand.

Two friends of Ms Waine went to her house on the Monday but found that the door was slightly open and that no-one was responding to their knocks.

Commissioner, the post-mortem examination of Ms Waine's body is found at tab 3 of the tender bundle. It described the gunshot wounds that Ms Waine had suffered. There were three entrance wounds. The first was to the back of her neck; the second was on her upper back at the base of her neck; and the third was on her left hand.

Importantly, Commissioner, each entrance wound had a corresponding exit wound, so the significance of that is that no bullet remained lodged in Ms Waine's body.

The Inquiry sought the opinion of Dr Linda Iles, a forensic pathologist, to review the post-mortem report as well as photographs from the autopsy and the crime scene and provide further opinion as to how each gunshot may have been inflicted.

In relation to the bullet wound on Ms Waine's upper back, Dr Iles observed a distinct muzzle abrasion. This is consistent with the muzzle of a gun being held in close contact with the skin at the time of discharge.

The abrasion around the bullet wound on the back of Ms Waine's neck was less clear and that was likely because that was on the scalp where there was hair, but nonetheless, there was the outline of a recoil spring quard. So both of those bullets were shot at close range.

In relation to the wound on Ms Waine's hand, at the time of the original investigation, this was believed to have been a secondary wound, so that is, it was believed that Ms Waine's hand had been in line with the trajectory of one of the first two bullets. Dr Iles couldn't exclude that possibility, but she favoured the view that it was, in fact, caused by a third and separate bullet. So that is, in Dr Iles's opinion, Ms Waine was likely shot three times rather than twice.

 Commissioner, one of the remarkable features of Ms Waine's case is that no ballistic evidence was ever found at the scene. On the same day that Ms Waine's body was found, an officer attached to the Ballistics Unit completed what was said to be a thorough search of the

apartment. He found no spent bullets and no fired cartridges.

I might ask that tab 49 [SCOI.00014.00017] and page 3 be put on the screen. If it's scrolled down slightly so the paragraph starting with "From my examination" can be seen.

Commissioner, this, in effect, summarises the opinion of the police ballistics expert as to what occurred. In his opinion, the first shot was fired on the bed and a bullet was removed from the bedspread underneath where that shot was fired; that the second shot was on the floor and that a bullet was removed from the carpet; and that a search of the room was conducted and all cartridge casings were removed.

Commissioner, the removal of the ballistics evidence gives Ms Waine's death the hallmarks of a professional hit. It supports an inference that she was killed by a person who had knowledge of the value of ballistics evidence to investigators and, moreover, that whoever conducted the killing did so in a planned and methodical way, taking the time and care to search for and remove the evidence.

 One consequence of the lack of ballistics evidence is that it is impossible to know now the type, make, model or calibre of the firearm, or potentially firearms, that were used. The only knowledge is that which can be inferred from the bullet wounds themselves.

Unfortunately, as Dr Iles has noted in her review of the original autopsy report, there were no detailed measurements taken of those bullet wounds. At the time of the original investigation, a ballistics officer expressed the opinion that the bullets were consistent with a large calibre firearm, possibly a .45 calibre, so that is a firearm with a gun barrel 0.45 inches in diameter.

To test and further this opinion, the Inquiry engaged an independent ballistics expert, Mr Frank Lawton, to review the material. His report, which is dated 26 May 2023, is located at tab 81 [SCOI.00014.00017] of the brief.

 Mr Lawton commented that because skin stretches and contracts when hit by a bullet, it is difficult to estimate from the size of a bullet wound the calibre of the firearm.

However, in his opinion, the size of the bullet wounds were clearly larger than those expected from a .22 or .32 calibre firearm.

He also observed that the muzzle abrasion that, Commissioner, you will recall was observable on Ms Waine's back, was consistent with having been caused by an automatic pistol and he was able to exclude some models or makes of firearms based on the shape of that abrasion.

However, beyond these broad observations as to the nature of the firearm that was used, the absence of ballistics evidence makes it difficult to know more about the firearm.

At the time of the crime scene examination and at autopsy, a number of exhibits were retained and some were tested in the course of the original police investigation. Commissioner, at my written submissions paragraph 21, there's an outline of some of the exhibits that were taken.

If I could, for the purpose of oral submissions, jump to the most critical of these: hairs were found on the left hand of Ms Waine and at autopsy these hairs were retained for matching purposes. It does not appear from the material that the Inquiry has that these hairs were ever examined.

The Inquiry issued a summons to the NSW Police Force in an attempt to obtain the exhibits in this matter, but despite extensive searches, the whereabouts of the hairs and other exhibits is unknown. So, Commissioner, this is regrettably another case before this Inquiry where critical exhibits have been lost.

Mr Bruce, of the Forensic and Analytical Science Service, has provided a statement to the Inquiry to outline what testing could be conducted now, particularly in respect of the hairs. If there was cellular material at the root of the hair, autosome or DNA profiling would have been possible. If there was no cellular material, mitochondrial DNA sequencing would have been possible, and in either event, there would have been a possibility to compare any profile to the national DNA database.

The hairs on Ms Waine's hand may well have originated from the person involved in her homicide and the loss of

those exhibits was an avoidable loss of an opportunity to make progress in Ms Waine's case.

Commissioner, I now turn to examine the original police investigation into Ms Waine's death. I start by making these comments. The Inquiry summonsed the totality of the police records relating to Ms Waine's case. There was no assertion in this case by the NSW Police Force that any material was missing and these submissions proceed, as they must, on the footing that all police records relating to the death of Ms Waine have been produced to the Inquiry.

That being the case, the absence of some material from the police file is both striking and troubling. There were a number of theories that were pursued by police as to who killed Ms Waine and why. Each of these theories pointed to a different person of interest. However, as will become apparent throughout my submissions, the police investigation into Ms Waine's murder left many loose ends. There is ground for serious concern as to why various lines of inquiry were either not pursued at all or not pursued to finality.

Commissioner, you'll see at paragraph 41 of my written submissions a summary of the apparent deficiencies in the police investigation and I will come to each of those as I outline the various strands of the police investigation.

 This Inquiry has tried to tie some of those loose ends but the passage of time has proved of great hindrance. In many cases, the Inquiry has been told that records have been destroyed or that key persons of interest or key witnesses cannot be located, and the result of that is that, regrettably, we are today no closer to knowing the identity of Ms Waine's killer or, potentially, killers.

So what I propose to do, nonetheless, is set out five of the lines of inquiry or five of the theories in relation to how Ms Waine met her death and outline the nature of the police investigations and any steps that the Inquiry took to try and further those investigations. There will be no submission at the end that any one or other of those theories is the plausible or likely theory as to how Ms Waine was killed.

Commissioner, the first of those five theories relates to an association or relationship that Ms Waine had with a police officer. I will ask that tab 92 [SC01.82926_0001] be put on the screen.

Commissioner, this is an article from 13 June 1985, so not long after Ms Waine's death, and as this headline reveals, it was no particular secret at the time of Ms Waine's murder that there were rumours circulating that she had been in a relationship with a police officer.

This article refers to one such report, but as I've outlined in my written submissions, investigating police were, in fact, told by at least 13 witnesses that Ms Waine was in a relationship with a police officer. One witness recalls doing laundry for Ms Waine and washing a police shirt.

That can be taken down now.

Commissioner, at least four, and possibly five of these witnesses purported to have seen the police officer that Ms Waine was in a relationship with.

 Now, I've set out in my written submissions the accounts of each person, and it is acknowledged that some of the information that is provided is vague and also some of the witness accounts are inconsistent about the person who was seen. But it is noted that several of the witnesses said that Ms Waine referred to the officer as "David", with a surname that sounded like "Brown" or "Brawn" or "Bowen". Of course, it cannot necessarily be assumed that this is the real name of the person that Ms Waine was seeing.

Further, several witnesses said that this was an officer attached to the Darlinghurst Police Station.

Two witnesses described that the police officer had been "hassling" Ms Waine, and there is one witness account that is of particular note.

If I could ask that tab 62 [SC01.82924_0001] at page 85 be placed on the screen. Commissioner, this is a running sheet of an interview of a woman who has been given a pseudonym and I will refer to that person as "MR" in the course of my oral submissions.

MR described that on one occasion in October

or November 1984 - I will ask that be scrolled down so it can be followed - she was at Ms Waine's apartment and a police officer who had been hassling her entered. Ms Waine picked up the telephone to call Internal Affairs. When she did this, the police officer hit her in the face and then went into the kitchen where he broke a glass. Eventually the argument was calmed.

MR added that she had seen this police officer in a police truck in Darlinghurst.

10 11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

> Now, I wish to be clear when making this submission that there is no evidence at this time that could link any police officer who Ms Waine may or may not have been in a relationship with to her murder. However, it was undoubtedly a matter of some importance that a police officer, who may have had access to a firearm and knowledge about ballistics, was reported to have both been in a relationship with Ms Waine and acting violently towards her.

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

29

30

Commissioner, I ask that that now be scrolled down, and you'll see in the final paragraph there that, in this police note, it's recorded that MR identified the photograph of a particular police officer as being the person that she saw.

27 28

Now, of significant concern, there is no statement that has been taken from the witness MR, and there is no documentation about the photo identification process or the photograph that she was apparently shown.

31 32 33

34

35

36 37

Commissioner, the Inquiry has now summonsed material relating to the person apparently identified by MR, and I'll just note at this time that records would indicate that he was a person with fair hair and green eyes. note that he was not attached to the Darlinghurst Police Station.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44

45

Commissioner, I then wish to take you to the interview with a witness who's been given a pseudonym and who I will refer to as "CS". At tab 26 [SC0I.00014.00012_0001] there is a statement from CS. I'll ask that that be scrolled to paragraph 7. CS claimed to have met David from the Darlinghurst Police Station on two occasions. She provided a description to police, and it is as follows:

I would describe him as a male, about 33 years of age, possibly of Greek or Italian origin, well built, dark short hair but not close cropped.

So I note that it is very different to the description of the person whose photograph was identified by MR.

I then turn to tab 62 [SC01.82924_0001] at page 84. So that was a statement taken from the witness CS, but there is further an interview with the witness CS. That was tab 62, when that's available, and at page 84, which is the previous page.

 Now, witness CS was shown the photograph that was identified by witness MR and she said that this was definitely not the policeman, David, who she had seen and with whom Ms Waine was having an affair.

What is not indicated in this particular police note was whether CS was shown other possible photographs that may have helped identify the police officer that she saw.

Commissioner, I will next ask that tab 47 [SC01.00014.00008_0001] be placed on the screen. This is a coronial statement by the officer in charge at the time of the coronial inquest, who was Detective Sergeant McCann, although I note that Detective Sergeant McCann was not, throughout the investigation, the officer in charge.

I will ask that it be scrolled to paragraph 10 of that statement. That paragraph deals with inquiries made about policemen named David. What is noted towards the end, the final lines, is that that constable was questioned and it was established that he had never been attached to the Darlinghurst Police, nor that he had been in any police truck in that area, therefore, it is felt that this line of inquiry has been exhausted. That's referring to the officer that was identified by witness MR.

 Now, the Inquiry has not been able to locate any contemporaneous record of that officer being questioned, including in the material summonsed in relation to the officer identified by MR. What is submitted here, Commissioner, is that to call this line of inquiry "exhausted" may have overstated the position. As I've mentioned, there are no records that would indicate that

CS was shown other photographs to help identify the officer that she may have been speaking about, nor, indeed, any of the other witnesses who said that, at some point, they saw this police officer.

There were also other details about the apparent police officer who Ms Waine was seeing that emerge from the various witness accounts, including his rank, his station, where he was residing, apparent injuries that he sustained and cars that he may have driven. All of these features could have been used to identify police officers matching the descriptions given by witnesses, and at least on the material available to the Inquiry, there are no records to indicate that those sorts of checks were conducted. So it's submitted that further steps should have been taken to exhaust this line of inquiry.

That can be now taken down.

Commissioner, I've already referred to some of the records that have been summonsed by this Inquiry in an attempt to now, some more than 30 years down the track, further develop this line of inquiry, and I wish to mention one additional step.

 The Inquiry received information as to the name of a person who was suspected at the time of being the person said to be a police officer who witnesses identified as being in a relationship with Ms Waine, and this person was summonsed to a private hearing before the Inquiry.

The content of that private hearing is and will remain confidential and will be the subject of the confidential part of the report of this Inquiry. However, it is considered appropriate to state, on the basis of the evidence obtained, that that person was not considered to be the person who was in a relationship with Ms Waine, nor a person of interest in relation to Ms Waine's death.

I further note that the gun that this officer was issued was inconsistent with the muzzle abrasion on Ms Waine's skin. So accordingly, the position as of today is that the identity of the police officer, if any, who was in a relationship with Ms Waine, remains unknown.

Commissioner, that was the first line of inquiry which I wish to refer to. I turn now to the second line of

inquiry in relation to who may have killed Ms Waine.

In addition to Ms Waine being rumoured to be in a relationship with a police officer, other witnesses described that she was "keeping company" with a security guard who worked for MSS Security. Much like a police officer, a security guard was likely to have access to firearms and also to have an understanding of ballistics.

Now, of significance was that a neighbour of Ms Waine who resided in the same building as her on Darlinghurst Road saw an MSS Security guard walk into her building on either the Sunday or the Monday of Ms Waine's death. Now, regrettably, his statement is not clear as to whether it was the Sunday or the Monday. If it was the Sunday, it would be a sighting of very little significance given that Ms Waine was later seen early on Monday morning. However, if it was on the Monday, that would be a sighting of some considerable significance.

Now, in this case, police did ultimately identify and interview a security officer who provided a signed statement in which he accounted for his movements over the night of Ms Waine's death. He also stated that he had access to a firearm through work but that it had been signed back in to MSS Security over the relevant time frame.

Commissioner, I don't propose to go through that statement in any detail orally, but what I will comment on is that there is a lack of information before this Inquiry that would show that any of the people that were nominated by this person to be an alibi witness - none of them were spoken to; there were no records sought from MSS Security to confirm whether or not his account of having signed his pistol in were correct; there were no records sought from MSS Security as to whether his employment schedule matched what he claimed; and the neighbour who saw an MSS Security officer enter the building was never shown a photograph of this person.

Now, the Inquiry sought to take some of those steps by issuing summonses to MSS Security and other agents that might have had information about access to firearms, however, it was determined that because of the passage of time, those records were destroyed and we are now unable to confirm those accounts.

1 2 3

46 that sh 47 MF that

Further, Commissioner, an attempt was made to find the neighbour who saw the MSS Security officer, and that person is now deceased. So again, the opportunity to test that security officer's account has now been lost.

That was the second of the lines of inquiry. Turning to the third line of inquiry as to who may have killed Ms Waine, on 5 January 1986 two police officers from the Darlinghurst Police Station interviewed a man named Danny Robert Shakespeare.

Commissioner, I will ask that tab 45 [SC01.10034.00009_0001] be put on the screen. This is a copy of that interview, and you will see that the question is asked:

Do you have any knowledge of who murdered Wendy Wayne [sic]?

And the answer was "Yes". In this typed interview, Mr Shakespeare claimed to have known Ms Waine through a woman, who has been provided a pseudonym and who I'll refer to as "MF".

Now, he claimed - that is, Mr Shakespeare claimed - that MF had made a detailed confession to him as to her involvement in the murder of Ms Waine. According to Mr Shakespeare, MF told him about the background to the dispute which motivated Ms Waine's murder.

Now, I will set this out. This is Mr Shakespeare's account of what Ms MF had said. MF was involved in the sale of heroin. MF had been staying at Ms Waine's apartment and while there, she and another sex worker, known only as "Sammy" were bagging heroin to sell.

When Ms Waine came home and saw what they were doing, an argument started. MF said that she would get rid of the heroin and she went to make a phone call, but when she returned, both Sammy and the drugs were gone.

The following day, MF found out that Ms Waine had flushed the drugs. MF told Ms Waine that she needed to pay back the money, being some \$500 or \$600, and Ms Waine said that she wasn't going to. Ms Waine also apparently told MF that she knew who MF was selling drugs for and that if

MF didn't leave her alone, she would "drop them".

Now, Mr Shakespeare would later reveal that MF was apparently selling drugs for Neddy Smith, who is, of course, a notorious Sydney underworld figure. MF believed that she had no choice, that either Wendy copped it or that she would cop it.

So Mr Shakespeare went on and said that MF described the manner of Ms Waine's murder. So again, this is Mr Shakespeare's account of what MF had said.

Apparently, MF and a man named Ian waited across the road from Ms Waine's apartment. A third man, whose name is unknown, acted as a customer and picked up Ms Waine and took her back to her apartment. MF and Ian waited for 10 to 15 minutes before entering the apartment, went inside, MF pushed her to the ground while Ian shot her. MF grabbed her belongings and left. Ian stayed at the flat, because "he was going to make sure that no-one knew how or what she was shot with." The three of the offenders then reconvened and got rid of the gun.

According to MF, the murder was organised by Neddy Smith and Ms Waine was murdered because she "knew too much".

Now, I pause here to note that some aspects of this account are consistent with the objective circumstances known about Ms Waine's death, however, a media review conducted by this Inquiry discloses that, at the time that Mr Shakespeare was giving this interview, many of the circumstances about Ms Waine's death were public knowledge and all the relevant circumstances including that the ballistic evidence was missing.

Now, at question 24 of the statement, it was asked:

Are you prepared to attend Court and give evidence in this matter?

And Mr Shakespeare apparently said "Yes". Despite this, there is no evidence that any statement was ever taken from Mr Shakespeare.

Now, nearly six months after the interview with Mr Shakespeare, on 30 June 1986, investigating police

spoke to another witness, who has been given a pseudonym and who I will refer to as "SR". Now, that is at tab 35 $[SC01.10040.00044_0001]$ of the brief.

Now, I won't go through this in great detail. SR said that she had a conversation with Mr Shakespeare and, in broad terms, SR's account is consistent with what Mr Shakespeare had told police. So, namely, that MF was involved in the killing of Ms Waine, that Ms Waine was killed because of an argument over a quantity of heroin that Ms Waine had flushed down the toilet, and that the heroin had come through Neddy Smith.

However, Commissioner, there are other quite notable discrepancies between Mr Shakespeare's account in his record of interview and the version attributed to him by SR. so details such as the street value of the heroin.

Commissioner, it is submitted that SR's whole account must be treated by this Commission with great caution. It's second-hand hearsay and it's of a very imprecise and speculative nature. Commissioner, I would invite you at a later time to read that interview in its full. It is sometimes ambiguous, difficult to follow and not altogether clear.

 Nonetheless, police were now in possession of two versions from Mr Shakespeare where he provided information about the murder of Ms Waine, said to have come through the person MF.

Commissioner, looking at Mr Shakespeare's versions today, there is serious reason to doubt his credibility and the veracity of his accusations. Mr Shakespeare has a long public history as a conman and a liar. He has been comprehensively and repeatedly discredited as a witness of truth.

Commissioner, I will take you to two examples that indicate the view of judicial officers about his credibility. The first is that Mr Shakespeare was a key prosecution witness in the case against Mr Garry Nye for the murder of a Mr Roy Thurgar. Mr Nye was acquitted and after his acquittal he successfully sued the State of New South Wales for malicious prosecution. Justice O'Keefe, in his judgment, described Mr Shakespeare as an "obvious liar" and said that his account was "so shot through with

recantations, contradictions, discrepancies and like indications of untrustworthiness as to be ludicrous", and that he was "making a good deal of his story up as he went along."

The second example is in 1996, when Mr Shakespeare gave evidence before the New South Wales Coroner that he had witnessed a police officer murder the notorious hitman Christopher Dale Flannery. Mr Shakespeare's account was thoroughly discredited.

 In his findings as to the death of Mr Flannery, Coroner Greg Glass commented that Mr Shakespeare "displayed an extraordinary ability to stand his ground, to persistently lie under oath with a straight face". His evidence was described as a "systematic and calculated attempt by him to mislead police, coronial investigators, Counsel Assisting, the court and even his own legal advisers on a grand scale", and Mr Shakespeare would later plead guilty to a charge of making a knowingly false accusation against Mr Davidson.

So, Commissioner, accordingly, with the benefit of these two findings, both in circumstances where Mr Shakespeare has made allegations of information about another murder, the Inquiry would not place great weight on the account given by Mr Shakespeare.

 However, what is less clear from the material is whether Mr Shakespeare's unreliability and his untruthfulness would have been known to investigating police in 1986. So the two instances that I took you to, Commissioner, were from the 1990s, and at the time, while Mr Shakespeare had convictions for violent property offences such as robbery and demanding money with menaces, he did not yet have any convictions for dishonesty. So it is unknown to what extent police were aware of his dishonesty.

The central feature of Mr Shakespeare's version was that MF had some involvement in the murder of Ms Waine and knew who it was that, in fact, shot the gun. There is no evidence on the material available that police made any attempt to locate or to interview MF or to otherwise investigate the claims that were made by Mr Shakespeare, and the failure to do so remains unexplained.

I might ask that tab 39 [SC01.10040.00041_0001] be put Commissioner, this is a running sheet that has been prepared by a police officer, and if you scroll to the bottom of that page, you'll see that it was prepared in 1991, so that is some five years after the investigation and Mr Shakespeare's allegations.

If we scroll back to the narrative, what it records is that MF was spoken to at Kings Cross on 26 January 1986 that is, after Mr Shakespeare's statements. the interviewing officer did not realise that she was a suspect in the murder and only recorded the details as a matter of course.

Attached to this running sheet is an intelligence report which records simply a routine interaction between police and MF. So this running sheet would suggest that someone as at 26 January 1986 considered MF a suspect in the matter, and yet this is the only record of any consideration being given to speaking to MF.

Commissioner, I will return to tab 47 [SC01.00014.00008 0001] which is the statement that was provided to the Coroner in this matter, and I'll go to paragraph 11 of this statement.

The first thing I note is that there is no mention in this statement of the alleged confession by MF or indeed any of the claims that were made by Mr Shakespeare or SR. Now, at paragraph 11 it is said that extensive media coverage was given to the murder and consequently a number of lines of information were received, however, nothing of any constructive value has come to light.

Now, it may well be the case that police, perhaps not unreasonably, considered that Mr Shakespeare's evidence was of no constructive value, knowing what we now do about However, the submission, Commissioner, is Mr Shakespeare. that Mr Shakespeare's credibility was properly a matter to be considered by the Coroner, and in any event, the real issue was what MF might have said in response to these allegations, and a Coroner could have taken steps to summons MF as a witness.

43 44 45

46 47

Commissioner, the Inquiry has made extensive efforts to ascertain the whereabouts of MF and in the statement of Mr Carvosso, which is in the brief, the number of summonses

that have been sent in relation to MF are set out. has included summonses to the Registry of Births, Deaths & Marriages in every state and territory of Australia; the Police Forces of every state and territory; the Department of Housing; the Department of Health; the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; and staff members of the Inquiry went to the last reported address of MF.

1

The upshot of those investigations is that they were unsuccessful and that the last confirmed record of MF was in May 1986 in relation to petty charges. Since then. there is no reliable record of her anywhere in Australia. So this is a case where a key witness and possibly person of interest now cannot be located and we have been unable to advance this line of inquiry.

Commissioner, I turn now to the fourth of the lines of inquiry, and this one can be dealt with in a shorter On 1 May 1985, so, Commissioner, that was the day after Ms Waine's body was discovered, Alan Baskin, who was a journalist at 2UE radio station, received a call from an unknown person. This person had a male voice and told Mr Baskin that he was from the Coven of Mercy for Fate.

The next day, on 2 May 1985, Mr Goulden, from the Gay Counselling Service of New South Wales, received a recorded telephone message, again this was from a person with a male voice who claimed to be from the Coven of Mercy for Fate.

Now, that recorded telephone message stated:

We have got Wendy and you're going to pay. This is the Coven of Mercy for Fate.

And in the first call, Commissioner, to the radio station, the person stated:

We got Wendy and hope to get all Sydney This is a public announcement.

So there were two calls by a person or persons claiming to be from the Coven of Mercy for Fate claiming responsibility for Ms Waine's murder and, further, making threats towards other members of the LGBTIQ community.

44 45 46

47

43

Now, the material produced to the Inquiry by the NSW Police Force contains no indication that any steps were taken to request call records or otherwise identify the caller or callers who made those phone calls. The Inquiry's own investigations have not uncovered any information about a group or an organisation called the Coven of Mercy for Fate.

Commissioner, other than those phone calls, there is no evidence to substantiate any link between Ms Waine's death and an unidentified coven, and it may well be that the unknown caller or possibly callers were opportunistically and somewhat sadistically taking advantage of Ms Waine's murder to sow fear amongst the LGBTIQ community. But at this stage there is no knowledge as to who that person was.

But I take this moment now to acknowledge here the fear and distress that Ms Waine's murder undoubtedly would have caused amongst her friends and other members of the LGBTIQ community.

Commissioner, the fifth and the final line of inquiry involves a fingerprint match that was made in July of 1989 to a fingerprint that was found in Ms Waine's unit.

Now, July of 1989 is about four years after the death of Ms Waine, and the fingerprint match was made after a person, who has been given a pseudonym, had a criminal conviction that lead their fingerprints being uploaded into the NSW Police database.

Now, the fingerprint was said to have been on a phone that was located in Ms Waine's apartment, however, the precise location of that fingerprint cannot be ascertained from the materials that have been provided to the Inquiry.

 The police file does not contain any statement from the crime scene officer who examined Ms Waine's unit for fingerprints. It is unknown where the telephone itself was located within the unit, or where on the telephone the fingerprint was placed. It's also unknown if there are other unidentified fingerprints that were found at the time. There is a dearth of information in this respect.

 Now, the match was to a man who, as I have said, has been given a pseudonym and who I will refer to as "MG". MG was interviewed by police in January of 1991. So by that time, that was a year and a half after the fingerprint

match had been made.

MG admitted to knowing Ms Waine. He admitted to having engaged her services as a sex worker in 1984, and initially he denied ever having gone to her premises. However, when he was confronted with the evidence that his fingerprint was located in her unit, he said that he had been to her apartment when it had been occupied by another sex worker, a woman named Ms Rupe.

 Now, there is some reason to consider that this explanation might be plausible because the evidence suggests that Ms Waine had only moved into the apartment in about November of 1984, and prior to that time there is evidence that the unit was frequently being used for sex work.

 However, again, from the investigative file, it does not appear that any inquiries were made at all to verify MG's account. Most notably, police never sought to contact the sex worker that MG said that he had known, and to confirm her association with MG, and the Inquiry has confirmed that Ms Rupe is now deceased.

Further, the lack of information that we have as to where the fingerprint was located makes it very difficult, forensically, to test the plausibility of whether his fingerprint could have persisted on the telephone from, at the latest, November 1984, until the time of Ms Waine's death. So again, the lack of information stands as an impediment to advancing this line of inquiry further.

So, Commissioner, that concludes what I wish to say about the five lines of inquiry or five theories that were pursued, to greater or lesser extent, by police at the time of the original investigation.

I will briefly comment upon the history of this case with relation to the Unsolved Homicide Team. The Unsolved Homicide Team has provided to the Inquiry two case review documents in relation to Ms Waine. Now, these documents were said to have been prepared by participants in a homicide course at the Goulburn Police Academy in 2004.

 Now, notably, each of these case screening forms contains extensive recommendations for reopening the investigation and further investigative steps that could be

taken. Many of those steps parallel what I have suggested in my submissions today, including interviewing MF or confirming the alibi of the security guard that Ms Waine had been in a relationship with. However, there has never been a reinvestigation into the death of Ms Waine by the Unsolved Homicide Team.

I have set out in my written submissions some of the correspondence and steps that the Inquiry took to try to understand what function, if any, reviews that were prepared by participants in a homicide course were to play in the context of the Unsolved Homicide Team's operations, and the answer, Commissioner, is that that still has not been satisfactorily explained.

 I also make the following comment: in one of the review documents produced in 2004, there is a comment that there were fired bullets that were retained as exhibits. Of course, this would seem to completely contradict the information in the investigative file that no bullets were found either lodged in Ms Waine's body or recovered from the crime scene. Now, that, of course, caused considerable confusion. There was correspondence between the Inquiry and the Police Force. The position appears to be, as set out earlier, that no bullets or casings were ever located or retained, but again, there's no explanation as to how it came to be that that notation was included in a review document prepared for or by the Unsolved Homicide Team.

So, Commissioner, the circumstances of Ms Waine's death leave no doubt that she was a victim of homicide. However, despite the multitude of theories about who killed Ms Waine, none can be put any higher than a theory.

 It is submitted that the original finding at the coronial inquest remains appropriate - and that is that Ms Waine died on 29 April 1985 of the effects of bullet wounds of the neck and thorax, inflicted there and then by a person or persons unknown.

 Commissioner, I conclude by considering whether Ms Waine's case was one of LGBTIQ bias. As outlined at the opening of my submissions, Ms Waine was a prominent and visible member of the LGBTIQ community. Widespread hostility to members of that community, including transgender persons, gives rise to a realistic possibility that her murder involved LGBTIQ hate, and the anonymous

caller that claimed responsibility for Ms Waine's murder and threatening further violence against the LGBTIQ community may provide some evidence about that hostility and fear that existed at the time. So while the identity of Ms Waine's killer or killers remains unknown, the possibility of LGBTIQ bias or hate motivating her murder cannot be excluded.

However, although that cannot be excluded, there are features of her murder to which I have taken this Inquiry, Commissioner, including the large calibre firearm that was used and the removal of the ballistics evidence, that bears all the hallmarks of a professional hit rather than a hate crime. So ultimately, there is no sufficient basis for a conclusion as to whether or not Ms Waine's murder involved LGBTIQ bias.

So, Commissioner, those are my submissions in relation to Ms Waine's death.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Do you wish to say anything at this stage?

MR BARRIE: The Commissioner of Police wishes to reserve her position.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you. I will await the submissions from the police and I will report on this in due course.

Can I just also extend on my behalf and on behalf of all members of the Inquiry to the family here today, Betty and the other members of the family, our sincere condolences for your loss, and thank you very much for attending. I will now adjourn, thank you.