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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Commissioner, there are a number of parties in the hearing room today, some of whom, at least, have not been present before, I don't think, and they may wish to announce their appearances.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Yes, I'11 do that.
I note your appearance, Mr Tedeschi, with others, thank you.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
MR NAGLE: Thank you, Commissioner, my name is Nagle I appear for now retired Detective Chief Inspector Lehmann.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Nagle, you have 1 eave.

MR HUTCHINGS: Commissioner, my name is Hutchings, I appear on behalf of Mr Leggat.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hutchings. Leave is given.

MR GLISSAN: For Ms Young.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr G1issan. Again, leave is given, thank you.

MS BARNES: I appear for Penelope Brown.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Barnes. Again, leave is given, thank you.

MR GRAY: Commissioner, over the next two weeks, I wil1 cal1 evidence from a number of further witnesses in relation to Public Hearing 2 which, as you know, concerned, for the most part, three strike forces, Parrabel1, Macnamir and Neiwand, together with some of the history relating to the ways in which the NSW Police Force has generally approached questions of LGBTIQ bias crime or hate crime during the period under review.

Before I call the first of those witnesses, I need to outline how it has come about that the Inquiry has decided
to take this course.
In the first place, $I$ record that on 16 August this year, the Letters Patent establishing the Inquiry were amended so as to extend the reporting date from 30 August to 15 December 2023.

There were a number of reasons why it was considered that such an extension was needed. Among those were, firstly, the fact that in a large number of cases being considered by the Inquiry, the NSW Police Force belatedly produced, at virtually the last minute, in June 2023, significant additional quantities of documentary material, material much of which had been called for by summonses issued as long ago as May 2022, more than 12 months previous 1 y.

That belated production of documents in so many cases by the body which is the primary repository of documents, if not the only repository, in relation to the vast majority of all the cases under consideration by the Inquiry, meant that it was impossible to complete the work of the Inquiry by 30 August.

Those newly produced documents had to be reviewed; the analyses of many cases had to be reconsidered and reworked and further submissions prepared; in some cases, forensic testing had to be arranged and the results assessed.

These problems were the subject of a number of public hearings in June, July and August this year, some in relation to particular cases and some in connection with the Inquiry's consideration of NSW Police investigative practices generally.

The submissions of Counsel Assisting for the investigative practices hearing have recently been served on the police and are available on the Inquiry's website.

One matter that emerged strikingly from the investigative practices hearing was that since at least 2016, it has been well known within the Police Force that there are serious ongoing difficulties in locating documentary records and exhibits in unsolved cases. Internal NSW Police Force documents have recognised the potential impact of these difficulties on the ability to reinvestigate unsolved homicides.

One internal police document in recent years estimated that if the Unsolved Homicide Team continued to review cases at its then current rate, it would take 900 years for existing cases to be reviewed.

I note in passing that even as late as last week, in mid September, yet more belated documentary production was still being made by the NSW Police Force. That production of material last week, in that particular case, was in response to a summons issued in August 2022, more than a year ago.

In addition to those matters, although not directly a reason for the extension, the Inquiry has had to confront another set of issues arising from the approach taken by the NSW Police Force in relation to Public Hearing 2. To this I now turn.

Under the Special Commission of Inquiry Act, interested parties are not given the capacity to call witnesses of their own. Consistent with the Act, the Inquiry's Practice Guideline, which, if it is possible, might be brought up on the screen, Practice Guideline 1, has at all relevant times, since its publication on the Inquiry's website in early October 2022, included the following features, among others: at clause 20:

> All witnesses at a public hearing will be called by Counsel Assisting.

At clause 21:

> Any person authorised to appear at a hearing who wishes to have evidence of a witness or witnesses placed before the Commission is to notify Counsel Assisting of the names of such witnesses, and is to provide a signed statement of their expected evidence (if possible in the form of a statutory declaration) as soon as practicable.

At clause 23:
Counsel Assisting will determine whether or not to call the witness. An application
may be made directly to the Commissioner to call a witness only after the above procedure has been completed and Counsel Assisting has indicated that the witness wil7 not be called.

Those paragraphs, I think, are now visible on the screen for those who are following this via the live stream.

Notwithstanding those arrangements, both you, as Commissioner, and Counsel Assisting, are, of course, wel 1 aware that it may often be the NSW Police Force which has the best ability to identify appropriate witnesses to give evidence in relation to specific issues given the size of the Police Force, its close involvement with these issues over many years and its access to its own records and personne1.

The Inquiry has therefore sought the assistance of the NSW Police Force, both in identifying such witnesses and in preparing written statements from those witnesses. The Inquiry has done so in a variety of contexts, including in relation to Public Hearing 2.

On 20 September 2022, one year and a day ago, the Inquiry wrote to the police to request witness statements in relation to the public hearing that became this Public Hearing 2. The Inquiry requested statements from a number of named individuals, including: (a) as to Strike Force Parrabell and its methodology, Assistant Commissioner Tony Crandell, who was the senior officer who set up Strike Force Parrabell and wrote its final report; as to various topics relating to bias crime generally, including the Bias Crime Unit, Sergeant Geoffrey Steer; and, thirdly, as to Strike Force Neiwand and its methodology, Detective Sergeant Steve Morgan, who was the Investigation Supervisor and/or Detective Senior Constable Michael Chebl, who was the officer in charge.

The Inquiry sought these statements because, as far as it was aware, these individuals would be best placed to give evidence in relation to the matters outlined in that letter. Each of the requests for a statement from these officers of the NSW Police expressly noted that if a topic fell outside the knowledge of the officer nominated by the Inquiry, the police should provide a statement from whoever
was the appropriate officer to address that topic.
As to Strike Force Macnamir and its methodology, the Inquiry requested a statement from Mr Michael Willing by a letter dated 22 December 2022. Mr Wiliing had been the Commander Homicide from 2011 to 2017, a six-year period which encompassed virtually the whole duration of Strike Force Macnamir and also Strike Force Neiwand. He later rose to the rank of Deputy Commissioner of the NSW Police Force.

In response to the Inquiry's requests, the NSW Police duly provided statements from the following officers and staff: (a) as to Strike Force Parrabell and its methodology, Assistant Commissioner Crande11; (b) as to bias crime related topics, Ms Shobha Sharma and Sergeant Ismai 1 Kirgiz; (c) as to Strike Force Neiwand and its methodology, Detective Sergeant Morgan only, not Detective Senior Constable Chebl; and (d) as to Strike Force Macnamir and its methodology, Mr Willing.

No suggestion was made by the police that the persons providing those statements were not in a position to address all the topics raised or that statements should also be obtained from other persons. However, in early December 2022, at the outset of this Pub1ic Hearing 2, just before Assistant Commissioner Crandel 1 was to give oral evidence, the police advanced submissions to the effect that several of the topics which Assistant Commissioner Crandell had been asked to address in his statement and, indeed, had addressed, including both the creation of Strike Force Parrabel 1 and its methodology, were outside the Inquiry's Terms of Reference. In a judgment delivered on 6 December last year, you rejected those submissions.

As to Sergeant Steer, the police initially assisted him to complete his statement, but then, subsequentiy advised the Inquiry by a letter of 3 November last year that there was "potential for a conflict" between the interests of the Commissioner of Police and those of Sergeant Steer. Accordingly, that statement, in essentially unchanged terms, was, in fact, later provided by solicitors separately representing Sergeant Steer rather than by the NSW Police Force.

A11 of those witnesses - that is, Assistant

Commissioner Crande11, Sergeant Steer, Detective Sergeant Morgan and Mr Willing, along with a number of others, some 12 in all - gave oral evidence in Public Hearing 2 on a total of 18 days spread over December last year and February to May this year.

Thereafter, at what was taken to be the conclusion of the evidence in Public Hearing 2, Counse1 Assisting served comprehensive written submissions about that evidence, both on the police and on others who had been authorised to appear, including Mr Willing.

On 28 June 2023, the police and Mr Willing delivered their respective written submissions in reply. In those submissions, each of those parties raised an argument, for the first time, that you, as Commissioner, could not make findings at all in relation to some topics because they were said to fall outside the Inquiry's Terms of Reference. You ruled on that issue on 18 July this year, rejecting those contentions.

In those same reply submissions of 28 June, the NSW Police Force and Mr Willing also raised another contention, also for the first time, which is the one that has led to today's resumption of Public Hearing 2. That contention was that the Inquiry should have, but had not, obtained evidence from a total of more than 50 other individuals, nearly all of them current or former police officers or staff, and that the evidence of all those people was, so it was said, essential for various reasons. Again, it was asserted that as a consequence various findings or conclusions could not be made.

In some respects, the submissions went so far as to assert that the absence of evidence or submissions from such individuals amounted to a failure of procedural fairness.

As I explained a few minutes ago, under the Inquiry's Practice Guideline 1, if a party granted authorisation to appear at a public hearing, such as the NSW Police Force or Mr Willing, wishes a witness to be called, they are to raise that with Counsel Assisting and provide a statement from that witness. Neither the police nor Mr Willing did either of those things in respect of any of the witnesses whom they have now asserted to be essential. Instead, this argument was raised for the first time on 28 June 2023, at
which point the deadline for the Inquiry was still 30 August 2023.

The scale of the argument now advanced by the police and, to a lesser extent, by Mr Willing, is, on one view, very large indeed.

As to Strike Force Parrabell, it is asserted or suggested that evidence should have been adduced from all 16 officers who participated to any extent in the strike force, including but not limited to the three senior officers, namely, Messrs Middleton, Grace and Bignell.

As to bias crime, and in particular the Bias Crime Unit, it is asserted or suggested that evidence should have been adduced from one or more witnesses, not named or otherwise identified in the police submissions, about matters such as the following: firstly, the objectivity of Sergeant Steer and the accuracy of his evidence in relation to the restructuring of the Bias Crimes Unit in 2017 and his being forced out of the Bias Crimes Unit at that time; and, secondly, the reasons for the 2017 restructure from the perspective of "those actually responsible for it".

As to Strike Force Macnamir, which was instigated in February 2013 to look again at the death of Scott Johnson at North Head in 1988, it is asserted or suggested that evidence should have been adduced from, firstly, many of the officers who participated to any extent in the strike force during the whole of its existence from 2013 to 2017, including but not limited to the senior officers, namely, DCI Pamela Young and Detective Sergeant Penny Brown; and, secondly, all officers, total number not stated, who subsequently participated to any extent in Strike Force Welsford, being the later strike force which was set up in 2018 to reinvestigate the death of Scott Johnson. That followed the finding of Coroner Barnes in November 2017, at the third Scott Johnson inquest, that Scott Johnson's death had been a homicide.

As to Strike Force Neiwand, it is asserted or suggested that evidence should have been adduced not only from Detective Sergeant Morgan, who was the Investigation Supervisor with overall responsibility for the strike force, but also from all officers who participated to any extent in that strike force, including but not limited to, the officer designated as officer in charge, namely,

Detective Senior Constable Chebl.
In that particular regard, $I$ reiterate that in its 20 September 2022 letter, one year ago, the request made by the Inquiry was for a statement from Detective Sergeant Morgan and/or Detective Senior Constable Chebl.

The NSW Police chose only to provide a statement from Detective Sergeant Morgan, the Investigation Supervisor, and not to provide a statement from Detective Senior Constable Chebl, the Officer in Charge, either instead or as well. The Inquiry accordingly proceeded on the basis that in the view of the police, Detective Sergeant Morgan was the appropriate person to give comprehensive evidence about the work of Strike Force Neiwand.

No indication was given, either in correspondence, or in the statement of Detective Sergeant Morgan itself, that Detective Sergeant Morgan was in any respect unable to address the topics listed in the Inquiry's letter of 20 September 2022 or that his recollections or views were or might be in any way different from those of Detective Senior Constable Chebl, being the officer whom he had supervised.

In addition to those matters, the submissions on behalf of the NSW Police Force pointed to large numbers of other persons, not necessarily, or only, tied to one or more of the various strike forces I have mentioned. Their evidence was also said to be essential in relation to a wide range of topics. Nearly all of the individuals in respect of whom the NSW Police now submit either that they should have been called as witnesses or that they should be given notice of possible findings which may be "adverse to their interests", are serving or former police officers or other members of staff of the NSW Police.

Given the nature of these contentions advanced by the police in their submissions of 28 June, the Inquiry assumed that the police had provided to all such current or former police personnel the submissions of Counsel Assisting and had informed them of the views of the police, as found in their submissions, asserting the need for evidence or submissions from those individuals. However, contrary to the Inquiry's assumption in that regard, the police subsequently informed the Inquiry that with one exception, namely Mr Middleton, it had not done so.

Commissioner, it will be submitted in due course, if these submissions on behalf of the police and Mr Willing continue to be pressed as to whether these many individuals needed to be called, that the submissions are misconceived at best. Among the reasons why that is so are the terms of the Inquiry's 1etter of 20 September last year, the terms of Practice Guideline 1, and the investigative rather than adversarial nature of an Inquiry such as this one.

However, from a practical perspective, the Inquiry has taken the view that it would nevertheless take steps itself with a view to eliminating or at least minimising the need for such a debate.

With that in mind, once the extension of the Inquiry was granted on 30 August, the Inquiry has sought to ensure - I am sorry, once the Inquiry was extended or the announcement thereof was made on 16 August, the Inquiry has sought to ensure, as far as possible, that any of the individuals referred to in the submissions of the police, or Mr Willing, who wished to give evidence or to make a submission would be given every opportunity to do so.

In outline, the steps taken by the Inquiry and the results of those steps include the following: first, on 10 August, in anticipation of the extension being granted, the Inquiry wrote to the police.

In that letter, the Inquiry requested that the police provide statements by 1 September, being three weeks later, from nine of the individuals referred to in the submissions of the police and also from a witness or witnesses capable of addressing the bias crime related matters which I have mentioned. All nine of those individuals - and, as it turned out, a person later put forward in respect of the other matter - were current or former police officers.

No statements from any of those 10 witnesses were provided by the due date - namely, 1 September. Of the nine current or former police officers in question, the NSW Police have subsequently provided statements from three, namely, Messrs Middleton, Grace and Bignell, all of whose evidence relates to Strike Force Parrabell. An unsigned statement has also been provided by the police from an officer who addresses part of the bias crime related subjected matter to which the police submissions
also referred.
As to the other six current or former police officers from whom the Inquiry requested that statements be obtained by the police, the police eventually informed the Inquiry that it was not in a position to represent any of them because of the possibility of a "conflict of interest". The nature of such asserted possible conflict has not been disclosed.

The six current or former officers in question, three of them having risen to the rank of Detective Chief Inspector, are: Detective Chief Inspector Stewart Leggat; Detective Chief Inspector John Lehmann; Detective Chief Inspector Pamela Young; Detective Sergeant Penelope Brown; Detective Senior Constable Paul Rullo; and Detective Senior Constable Michael Chebl.

All of those individuals were involved to greater or lesser extent in either or both of Strike Force Macnamir and Strike Force Neiwand. Three of those individuals so far have subsequently provided witness statements to the Inquiry, assisted by their own lawyers. Two others have indicated that they intend to do so. One, former Detective Senior Constable Chebl, has indicated that, for various reasons, he does not intend to do so.

Secondly, although the Inquiry specifically did not request that the police provide statements from any of the more than 40 other individuals the subject of the submissions of the police or Mr Willing, the Inquiry's 10 August letter also notified the police that if it considered - that is, if the NSW Police Force considered that any of those additional individuals should also provide a statement to the Inquiry in relation to Public Hearing 2, then NSW Police should also provide such a statement by 1 September.

Again, no statements from any such individuals were received by the due date, 1 September. As of today's date, 21 September, such statements have now been received by the Inquiry via the police from five such persons.

Third, the Inquiry has itself written to approximately 40 of the individuals identified in the submissions of the police and Mr Willing, including all nine of those from whom the Inquiry had initially requested the police to
provide statements. In those letters, the Inquiry has explained the circumstances giving rise to the sending of such a letter, identified the relevant parts of the submissions affecting the person in question, and invited the person to make any statement or submission which they might wish to make.

Of those 40, 37 are present or former police officers or staff. Of those 37 , it appears, based on correspondence from the police, that the NSW Police Force only represents nine.

As at today, 21 September, of those 40,16 have not responded at a11; 11 have responded saying they have no wish to provide either a statement or submissions; 13 have responded by providing a statement or indicating that they wil1 provide a statement, nine of those under the auspices of the police and four provided directly by those individuals themselves. None has made a submission as yet. A11 such statements wil1 be tendered and received in evidence.

Given the circumstances $I$ have outiined, the Inquiry understands that those statements constitute the whole of the evidence which those witnesses or the police regard as necessary to put before the Inquiry.

A number of persons have specifically requested that they not be required at this stage to give oral evidence or further oral evidence. They include: firstly, Mr Willing; secondly, former Detective Senior Constable Chebl, the Officer in Charge of Strike Force Neiwand; and, third, former Detective Sergeant Bowditch, who was the officer in charge of the initial investigation into the death of Ross Warren at Bondi in 1989. I wil1, in due course, perhaps on Monday, tender a confidential bundle of material in relation to those requests.

In its letter of 10 August, the Inquiry stipulated that if the NSW Police considered that any witness for whom it provided a statement should also be called to give oral evidence, it should so inform Counsel Assisting. The police have not done so in respect of any such witness. The Inquiry, therefore, understands that the NSW Police does not seek to ask questions of those witnesses from whom it has provided statements.

Commissioner, I expect that that is sufficient for the moment to orient both you and those following this public hearing as to the reasons for this prolongation of Public Hearing 2.

So far as Strike Force Parrabell is concerned, as I have said, the police have provided written witness statements from three officers, Messrs Middleton, Grace and Bignell. No other person involved in Strike Force Parrabell has taken up the opportunity to provide a statement.

All three of those statements, as I have said, along with all other witness statements provided since 10 August, whether by the police or by any of the individuals in question, will be tendered and received in evidence.

I do not propose to call either Mr Middleton or Mr Grace to give oral evidence over and above their written statements. I do propose to ask Mr Bignell about some aspects of his witness statement and related matters, which I will do in just a moment.

Before I do that, firstly, I need to tender three new volumes, namely, volumes 17,18 and 19 , to be added to exhibit 6.

## EXHIBIT \#6 ADDITION OF VOLUMES 17, 18 AND 19 OF THE TENDER BUNDLE

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
MR GRAY: As to those three volumes, I note that a small number of documents will not be tendered this morning. They are the following: in volume 17, tabs 389, 390, 392 and 394. They are various emails and text messages sent by police officers to Pamela Young in April 2015. This follows an application last night by Ms Young's legal representatives for the redaction of those officers' names.

Secondly, in volume 19, tab 516 is a statement of an officer, who I will refer to as I446. In this case, this is pending the determination of a separate application for non-publication orders over that officer's name.

Thirdly, volume 19, tab 519. This is the statement of Penelope Brown, which was only received by the Inquiry
yesterday and thus only served on the parties late yesterday. The parties will have until midday tomorrow to consider whether any non-publication orders are necessary.

I anticipate that these matters will be resolved over the next few days, with the documents able to be tendered when we resume next Monday.

I cal1 Cameron Bigne11.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, before the witness is called, firstly, in relation to the tender, there is one other statement - I don't know whether it's included in the lot that have been tendered - it is from Sergeant Steer. We only got that at 10 o'clock last night.

THE COMMISSIONER: If it is not included, it wil1 be included, obviously.

MR TEDESCHI: I am told it is in the volumes. I have only had a chance to have a brief look at it this morning. Perhaps that might be reserved for the moment.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I didn't know that my friend was going to address you in the way that he has this morning. I had no notice of it whatsoever. I would wish to reserve the position of the Commissioner of Police to respond to the comments when $I$ have had a chance to look at the transcript of what Mr Gray has said this morning.

I note that you are not sitting tomorrow. I'm not available Monday and Tuesday next week. You are not sitting on Wednesday. So after today, my next appearance is not until Thursday. I don't know whether you, Commissioner, would want to perhaps briefly sit maybe 10 o'clock tomorrow morning or something of that nature it is a matter for you - or whether you would 1 ike to leave it until Thursday next week.

THE COMMISSIONER: I wil1 1eave it unti1 Thursday, thank you.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: That will give you more time to
obvious 1 y consider what you want to say and, yes, I wil1 give you that opportunity. But $I$ think at the moment, Mr Tedeschi, for a number of reasons $I$ won't explain, Thursday is probably the earliest $I$ can do that.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Commissioner, there is one matter that $I$ also need to do before we move on, which is to hand up a proposed order pursuant to section 8 of the Special Commission of Inquiry Act as to non-publication and related matters, about some of the documents and some of the matters referred to in the documents that have just been tendered. I understand this is agreed; the terms of this are agreed, I'm told.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is there any other party who needs to be privy to those? I mean, it may be at the behest of only the police, I don't know, but is there anybody else who needs to be privy to that order?

MR GRAY: I'm told that all other parties represented today have seen these. If I'm wrong about that, I will be told. That's what I'm instructed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can I just invite anyone, if you are ever in doubt about what is being said about non-publication orders, just make your position clear and we will ensure that it's rectified if there is any issue. All right. Thank you.

Yes, very well. I have made those orders, thank you.
MR GRAY: May it please you, Commissioner, I call Mr Bignell.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Mr Bignell, would you please come forward, thank you.
<CAMERON BIGNELL, sworn:
[10.43am]
<EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MR GRAY:
MR GRAY: Q. Mr Bignell, your name is Cameron Bignell?
A. It is.
Q. And you are a Detective Acting Sergeant in the

NSW Police?
A. I am, yes.
Q. And you have provided a statement [NPL.9000.0026.0007]
to the Inquiry dated 8 September 2023 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. They are.
Q. When were you first asked by anyone to provide your recollections about Strike Force Parrabell and its methodology?
A. I think it was in about August.
Q. This year?
A. Yes.
Q. So approximately a month ago?
A. Yes.
Q. Prior to that point in time, August this year, no-one had ever asked you, in connection with this Inquiry, for you to set out any recollections or understandings of how Strike Force Parrabe11 had undertaken its work?
A. Not specifically to that, no.
Q. What do you mean by that, "not specifically"?
A. I hadn't been asked to talk about how Parrabell was conducted prior to August.
Q. Are you aware that Assistant Commissioner Crandel1 gave a statement to the Inquiry in October last year?
A. I wasn't aware of the date but I'm aware he has given a statement, yes.
Q. We11, you can accept from me that it was in October last year, but putting aside the specific date, at the time he provided that statement, were you aware he was providing it?
A. No.
Q. No-one asked you - either he himself or anyone on his behalf - for your recollections about Strike Force Parrabe11?
A. Not at that time, no.
Q. Were you aware at the time that he gave some oral evidence in this witness box in December last year?
A. Yes.
Q. At around about that time, did anyone ask you for your recollections about anything to do with Strike Force Parrabel1?
A. No.
Q. In May this year, the Inquiry wrote a letter to police
seeking clarification of various matters to do with Strike Force Parrabell and the police wrote back in May this year. At that time, did anyone ask you for your recollections about Strike Force Parrabel1?
A. No.
Q. Do you have your statement [NPL.9000.0026.0007] with you?
A. I don't have it with me, no.
Q. I will just refer to you as Mr Bigne11, if you don't mind, just for the sake of brevity.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that now available to you?
A. It is, yes.
Q. At paragraph 24, you te11 us that on or around 30 August 2015, you were attached to Parrabel 1 on a full-time basis. That's correct?
A. Yes.
Q. For how long were you with Parrabe11 on a full-time basis or, indeed, at all? When did you finish, in other words?
A. Yeah, I completed my duties for Parrabe 11 when

I transferred to the Sex Crimes Squad in Apri1 2016.
Q. Does that mean --
A. I'm sorry, '17.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Seventeen.
Q. 2017. Does that mean for the entirety of that time, including the first four months or so of 2017, you were working full-time on Parrabell?
A. No. Towards the end of Parrabel1, which was the beginning of 2017, I wasn't working full-time on Parrabell.
Q. But you were still doing miscellaneous tasks?
A. Yes.
Q. I wil1 come back to some of those later, but apart from that, if $I$ may call it, run-out period, was the bulk of your work on Strike Force Parrabel 1 completed by about November or December 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. You tell us, while we are there on paragraph 24 , that you were not involved in the initial meetings or consultations that led up to the formation of Parrabe11? A. That's correct.
Q. Now, just on who was involved, you were full-time from 30 August 2015 unti1, 1et's say, early 2017; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Middleton and Mr Grace, although obviously involved in Parrabel1, were not full-time on Parrabe11, were they?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. I will come to this in a little bit more detail later, but in the broad, for most of the period, is it your evidence that they participated by coming to monthly meetings?
A. Their involvement was a little bit more than a monthly meeting but - yes.
Q. Let's just break it down for both of those. Their participation consisted of monthly meetings?
A. Yes.
Q. And, secondly, what else?
A. Wel1, Mr Grace was Investigations Manager at the time. He was effectively the supervisor of Strike Force Parrabel 1 above me, so he had more day-to-day dealings with the investigators and myself.
Q. By "day-to-day dealings" - like what?
A. Conversations, you know, checking in on us to make sure that we were okay, that we were doing what was required of us.
Q. And Mr Middleton?
A. A little less frequently, but also made those similar inquiries.
Q. Now, I understand from some of the material that is before us - I'm not sure if it's in your statement or not - that initially, apart from yourself, there were two other investigators, when it started?
A. From the onset, yeah, there was on1y I think myself and two others.
Q. And then that number increased over time, and so at various times there was a total, perhaps not all at the same time, but a total of 10 or 12 or 13 people who had spent some time working on Parrabel1; is that right?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. If you are able to tell us, what was the most working on Parrabel1 at any one moment, of the investigators?
A. I couldn't give you an exact number, but it was greater than, I'd say, eight.
Q. Were you all in the one room?
A. Yes.
Q. What were the logistical arrangements?
A. Yes, we were all in the one room. Within the

Surry Hills detectives office there was a strike force area that was allocated to us for the duration of Parrabell.
Q. Were Mr Middleton or Mr Grace in that room?
A. No.
Q. Were they in the same building?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in paragraph 28 you say you were never told and you never got the impression that Parrabell was established to obtain a particular result or outcome - and I won't read it all out but you see the rest of that paragraph?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware at the time of Parrabel 1 being started that there had been a considerable amount of media attention to what was said to have been up to 80 or more gay hate related deaths?
A. I wasn't aware of the media previous to my involvement
with Parrabell, no.
Q. Not at all?
A. No.
Q. You hadn't seen any of the articles of Rick Feneley in the Sydney Morning Herald?
A. I hadn't personally, no.
Q. You were unaware of the articles of Paul Sheehan in the Sydney Morning Herald?
A. Not prior to Parrabell, no.
Q. Well, not related to 80 or more gay hate murders of an historical nature - you were unaware of all that publicity? A. I had not seen any of those articles prior to my involvement in Strike Force Parrabell.
Q. Had anyone in the gay community where you might have mixed ever mentioned them?
A. No.
Q. I wonder if Mr Bignell could please briefly have the statement of Mr Grace [NPL.9000.0024.0012]. I just want to get some dates. All I'm doing at the moment, Mr Bignell, is just getting some dates straight. This is at tab 508 of the tender bundle. If we go to Mr Grace's statement at paragraph 47, first of all, have you seen this statement before?
A. I have read it, yes.
Q. No, but before today?
A. Yes.
Q. How long ago?
A. Last week.
Q. Did you read it after it had been finished or while it was being prepared?
A. After it had been finished.
Q. At paragraph 47, Mr Grace says he, Mr Grace, prepared the investigation plan in around May 2015. Do you see that?
A. Okay, yes.
Q. Is that right as far as you are aware?
A. I can't comment on that.
Q. Are you aware that it was he who prepared it?
A. Yes.
Q. And if he says he prepared it in May 2015, you are not
in any position to disagree?
A. No.
Q. You had no input into it?
A. No.
Q. Then at paragraph 48 , in relation to the induction package, he says that he also drafted that one - is that your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. And he says that he drafted that one in Apri1 2016 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Just, by the way, at the end of paragraph 47, where he's talking about the investigation plan, he says that his experience has been that investigation plans are not normally updated throughout an investigation. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you agree that, indeed, that was the case here, with Parrabel1 - the investigation $p l a n$ was not updated?
A. Yes, that's the case.
Q. And on the induction package, the same applies - it was never changed either, was it?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. And then, thirdly, the coordinating instructions, going to paragraph 49 of Mr Grace, he says that they were drafted in around October 2016. Do you agree with that?
A. If that's his recollection, then I've got no reason to disagree with that.
Q. And in the last sentence of the paragraph, he says they were ultimately drafted by him, Mr Grace?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. I do.
Q. According to him in paragraph 49, at least it seems to read as though "we" being himself, Mr Middleton and you, considered that a coordinating instructions document would be helpful, and that the instructions were formulated over a series of meetings. Now, did you have any part in talking about or drafting the coordinating instructions? A. I didn't, no.
Q. Now, still on some dates, if that folder could come back - I'm sorry, Mr Bigne11, I've got to put a few folders in front of you now and again. If we could have volume 3, please, and go to tab 64 [SCOI.74246_0001], you'11 see that on the front page there's an email from you to Mr Middleton and Mr Grace of 29 June 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. You pass on some information from Sergeant Steer about bias crime classifications and you tell Mr Middleton and Mr Grace that you are going to use four of the five classifications that Sergeant Steer had talked about?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree that - and I can come to other documents about this - indeed, at about that time, on or after 29 June 2016, the form of the bias crime - I will start again, the BCIF, the Bias Crime Indicators Form, was altered to reflect what appears in that email?
A. Yes, that is the case.
Q. And I think your evidence is - tell me if I'm wrong that your understanding is that the Bias Crime Indicators Form, BCIF, was in one form from the beginning up to that point, and then it changed to a second form reflecting this?
A. That is the first time that the form changed, yes.
Q. That's the first time that the form changed -- -
A. Yes.
Q. -- and it later changed a second time at a later time that I will come to?
A. The third time?
Q. To a third different form?
A. Yes, that is the case.
Q. Also in volume 3 at tab 68 [SCOI. 74312_0001], if you could turn to tab 68, halfway down the page, there is an email from you to Mr Middleton about an update of where the team was up to?
A. Yes.
Q. As at 7 September 2016 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And then at the top of the page, there is an email from Mr Middleton to Mr Crandell and another person, which includes this statement:

As discussed majority of team will be returning to their LACS as of the 10/9/2016.

Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Does that accord with your recollection that that's what happened?
A. It does, yes.
Q. So most of the investigators were gone from 10 September 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. And this email goes on to say that three indeed had already gone, for various reasons, and that two would be staying for an additional six weeks from 10 September. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. And Mr Middleton says there:

This should see the end of the documentary review process.
A. Yes.
Q. Does that all correspond with your own recollection that that's what was happening at that time?
A. It does, yes.
Q. So six weeks from 10 September is about 21 October, give or take?
A. Yes.
Q. So should we understand, then, that all of the investigators other than you were gone by about 21 October?
A. I can't give you the exact date, but yeah, it sounds about right.
Q. Something like that?
A. Yes.
Q. So if Mr Grace created the coordinating instructions in October 2016, as he says, then by the time he did that, either all the investigators were already gone or all but two were already gone; would you agree?
A. I do, yeah, there may be an error in the year of when those coordinating instructions may have been prepared by Mr Grace.
Q. What might that error be, do you think?
A. Well, seeing those dates, it's my recollection that that occurred around the end of 2016, that the investigators returned to their respective PACs or PDs, and the formation of those documents wouldn't have been necessary post the return of those --
Q. We11, we wil1 come to whether it might have been necessary or not, but at any rate, Mr Grace's evidence is that he drafted it in October 2016. I've just taken you to that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And if that's right, then at the time he did that, either all the investigators were gone or all but two were gone?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Now, in January 2017, if you turn to tab 83 in that folder [SCOI.74429_0001], on 19 January there was a meeting at which various people were present, including you and including Mr Crandell?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you tell us in your statement somewhere
that you've read these minutes, you don't actual1y recal1 the meeting?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. But you accept or you don't dispute the minutes?
A. I don't, no.
Q. It seems, we can see on the third page that, in the third sort of bullet point, there's a note that Mr Crandell suggested a change to the wording of the BCIF. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Or two changes, really, instead of "Not Bias Crime", it would be "No Evidence of a Bias Crime", and instead of "Bias Crime", it would be "Evidence of a Bias Crime".
A. Yes.
Q. That, I think you agree, led to the second change to the form resulting in the third version of the form?
A. Yes, that's the case.
Q. Now, if that was happening, as it evidently was, in January 2017 when all the investigators were well and truly gone, what was the effect, in your understanding, of that change?
A. It had no effect on any of the investigators, they'd already 1 eft.
Q. Clearly not. What about on you, for example?
A. It had minimal effect.
Q. Well, what was the nature of the effect, minimal or otherwise, if any?
A. It was just a better way of recording that bias crime indicator for each of the cases that had been reviewed.
Q. Better why?
A. I think it was more fair.
Q. Because?
A. Well, we're saying that there was no evidence or there was evidence of. In the review, there were cases where there was a lot of material to review, others not so much, and so in cases where there was no available evidence for us to review, it would be unfair to say that there was evidence or there wasn't evidence if we didn't have
anything to review.
Q. I see. That's your understanding of the essential rationale for that change?
A. Yes.
Q. I will come to this in a moment, but by that point, January 2017, in fact, some time before that, all the BCIFs had in fact been well and truly filled in and completed by yourself; is that right?
A. That's the case, yes.
Q. And so is all that happened after January 2017, in that respect, that the form of the question, if you like, was changed, but the form of the answers didn't change? A. From my understanding, no, none of the categories changed.
Q. We11, none of the --
A. Sorry, none of the classifications that had been made on each case changed.
Q. No, and none of the text that was populating the space for responses as to whether there was no evidence or the like - none of that text changed?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. You were in charge, I presume, of such matters?
A. Yes. So I'm not aware - I didn't change anything myse1f.
Q. Okay. Now, back to your statement, if we could, please [NPL.9000.0026.0007]. You te11 us in paragraph 2 that you're 34 years of age?
A. Yes.
Q. And so as at August 2015, when you started working on Parrabe11, you were 26 years of age?
A. I was, yes.
Q. In paragraph 11 you tel1 us that you became a sworn officer in May 2009?
A. I did, yes.
Q. When you were 20 ?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 20 subparagraph (b) you te11 us that you completed a police investigator course in 2012?
A. I did, yes.
Q. When you were about 22 or 23 ?
A. Sounds about right, yes.
Q. And then in paragraph 23 - in fact, before $I$ go to paragraph 23, in paragraph 18, you refer to your involvement in the LGBTIQ community, including in terms of your professional role, the fact that you are a Gay and Lesbian Liaison Officer. You talk about that in paragraph --
A. I do, yes.
Q. You tel1 us in paragraph 20 that you completed the Gay and Lesbian Liaison Officer course in 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, apart from doing that course, the Gay and Lesbian Liaison Officer course, did you have any background or training in bias crime?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did anybody else among the investigators?
A. No.
Q. Did Mr Middleton or Mr Grace?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Did anyone discuss with you whether it might have been good to have someone who did?
A. I didn't have those discussions, no.
Q. Did it occur to you that it might have been good to have someone who did?
A. I didn't think so, no.
Q. Why not?
A. Because what we were tasked to do in respect to reviewing the case file items and completing those indicator forms, I don't think that that experience or training was necessarily relevant to conduct that task.
Q. Wasn't the overall objective - and I'11 come to it in a bit more detail - to look at historic documentary holdings and form a view as to whether those holdings
indicated the possibility of a bias factor?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't think that someone with experience in bias crime might have had some particular expertise in that respect?
A. It may have but $I$ don't think it affected the way that we did Strike Force Parrabel 1.
Q. We11, it meant that every single person who was looking at this was someone who did not have any particular expertise in bias crime; is that right?
A. Effectively, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And you thought that was an advantage, did you?
A. I did not.

MR GRAY: Q. Now, in paragraph 23, you were talking about why you might have been asked to be involved. In 23(c) you describe your position as being one of the more senior investigators of the detectives at Surry Hills at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. You were aged 26 ; correct?
A. I was, yes.
Q. And you had been an attested officer for six years?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had done an investigator course three years earlier, in 2012?
A. I was also designated by that point.
Q. Sorry?
A. I'd also attained my designation by that point.
Q. What does that mean?
A. As a detective.
Q. True. And you did that - when was that? Just remind
me.
A. I received my designation in December 2013.
Q. So as a 26-year-old with a total of six years'
experience, having done about three years since achieving
the status of investigator, you were one of the more senior investigators there?
A. I was, yes.
Q. How junior were the rest of them?
A. Based on years of service, time in a fuli-time investigative capacity --
Q. Did they have less than six years' experience?
A. In terms of - are you asking within the Surry Hills detectives office or Strike Force Parrabel1, sorry?
Q. You said you were one of the more senior investigators of the 15 detectives at the Surry Hills PAC?
A. Yes.
Q. We11, of the other 14 , did they al 1 have 1 ess experience than you?
A. Not out of all of them, but there was - as I say,

I was one of the more senior investigators.
Q. Just help us with what that means.
A. I'm not saying I'm the most senior investigator in the entire Surry Hills detectives office.
Q. No, but when you say you're one of the more senior --
A. Yes.
Q. - or were one of the more senior, just break that down for us.
A. Yes. In terms of my service history, the time when I attained my designation and my experience within that particular office.
Q. So most of the others had less of all of those factors than you did?
A. Yes.
Q. How many of the investigators on Strike Force Parrabel1 were from the Surry Hills PAC?
A. Throughout Parrabe11, in its entirety, there were times when there were one or two that assisted with Strike Force Parrabe11, but the staffing of Parrabel 1 was taken from areas outside of Surry Hills.
Q. Oh, so only one or two from Surry Hills, throughout or --
A. At any given time, yes.
Q. I see. Thank you. Can $I$ just turn to the actual process now, in terms of what you and your fellow investigators actually did. Now, you deal with this at paragraphs 48 and following of your statement
[NPL.9000.0026.0007]. I wil1 come back to the siight1y separate topic of the constituent documents, but for the moment, I'm just looking mainly at what actually happened on the ground.
A. Yes.
Q. You tell us in 48 that there were three primary stages - first, the triage; second, the completion of the BCIF; and, thirdly, the assessment; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, as to the triage stage, you tell us, and I'm looking mainly at paragraphs 51 to 55 and so on, that one of the first things that needed to be done was to obtain the documents for the respective cases?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. Because, of course, this Parrabel1 exercise was an entirely paper-based review, wasn't it?
A. It was, yes.
Q. And so you needed to - is this right - obtain, as far as you could, all documentary records available about a particular case?
A. That was our intentions, yes.
Q. Now, you say the ways you went about this - I'm looking in paragraph 51 at the moment - were to first conduct a search of two computer systems, namely, e@gle.i and COPS?
A. Yes.
Q. And then, thirdly, to send a request to archives;
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for clarity, when you say "archives", who are we talking about?
A. The NSW Police archive section at that time.
Q. Of the government?
A. I believe my memory was, at that particular time, we were transitioning to the State repository, so we still had a section within the NSW Police that managed our archives.
Q. So you are talking about, at that point, archives within the NSW Police?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you say in the last sentence of that paragraph, that because e@gle.i and COPS postdated the relevant deaths, there was often only limited material on those computerised systems?
A. Yes.
Q. And the period you were looking at was 1976 to 2000 , I think?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And did both e@gle.i and COPS postdate 2000 ?
A. I can't give you the exact dates. I wasn't obviously in the Police Force around that time, but from my recollection, yes.
Q. So you say generally the information was collated from the hard copy archive material - that is, from one source, namely, the police hard copy archives?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 52 you talk about steps you took with the archives team. In paragraph 53 you add that if nothing came from archives, you would try the Coroners Court and you would try another computer system called TRIM?
A. Yes.
Q. If you can recal1, over the 1 ife of Parrabe11, did the Coroners Court or TRIM generate much of the material that you finished up dealing with?
A. The Coroners Court, I believe, was able to provide some information. TRIM wasn't very successful, no.
Q. In 54 you say that if the archives had extensive material, that suggested to you that the area commands must have successfully filed relevant material and therefore the archives possessed the full extent of the material. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Why do you think that follows?
A. It was my understanding that if we were able to access a brief of evidence in respect to if someone had been charged or, you know, a large volume of case file items pertaining to a particular investigation, that generally speaking, that would be the entirety of the files associated with that particular case.
Q. You say that was your understanding. But based on what?
A. It was, as I said, my understanding that, you know, within my role within the police, that if we were to file something, we would file everything, we wouldn't file in dribs and drabs.
Q. We11, that was what should happen?
A. It is, yes.
Q. But what made you think that in all these historical cases dating back to 1976 it had happened?
A. I suppose I, you know, was hopeful that that was al1 the material that was available to us.
Q. Does it follow from what I'm reading in paragraph 54 in particular, and from generally the other paragraphs in this area, that if archives turned out to have a decent amount of material, you looked no further and assumed that was all there was?
A. I can't recall if we made any other inquiries as process or due course. Obviously I know that every particular case, it was requested that archives do searches. Outside of that, I'm not a hundred per cent sure if other investigators conducted inquiries for every single case that they were reviewing out of process.
Q. Well, if they did, they did it off their own bat, admirable though that may be, but not according to any system that you were organising?
A. We11, we had had, obvious1y, cause to contact, say, the Coroners Court, access the TRIM system, what have you, so they were aware that there were other avenues that we could look at to acquire all of our case file items.
Q. We11, apart from the archives, e@gle.i, COPS, TRIM and the Coroners Court, were you aware of any other possibilities as to where documents might be located?
A. They were the areas that we were relying on to
retrieve those archives.
Q. Yes. Were you aware of any others?
A. There may be. I'm not aware personally.
Q. I wonder if we could have in volume 19 tab 522
[NPL.0100.0018.0001]. You may or may not have seen this, Mr Bigne11, so I wi11 ask you that first. It is
a document, you can see, dating from August 2016. You can see on the last page, it's prepared by Detective Chief Inspector Lehmann on 5 August 2016 - on the last page.
A. I'm on the last page, the signature of Mr Willing, is that - -
Q. Yes, but above that, there is a heading "Recommendation", "Forwarded for information and action", and then there is a signature of John Lehmann.
A. Sorry, what page within that document? I think it might be out of order in this folder.
Q. Is it? It would be page 5 .

THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps he could be assisted.
THE WITNESS: I think that page shouldn't be the first page. Yes, I have that now.

MR GRAY: Q. You see that Mr Lehmann prepared this document on 5 August 2016?
A. I do, yes.
Q. He was a Detective Chief Inspector in the Unsolved Homicide Team, and this, of course, is in the middle of your work on Strike Force Parrabe11?
A. It is.
Q. Just a year after it started, and six months or so before it finished?
A. Yes, that date would coincide with that.
Q. You can see that the heading - well, not the heading, but the issue at the top of the first page, is described as "Proposal for a project plan concerning locating, identification and reconciliation of exhibits relating to unsolved homicide cases"?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Take a moment to look at it, if you need to --
A. Yes, I've read the document --
Q. -- but, first of all, have you ever seen this before?
A. I have never seen this before.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. And no-one had ever drawn it to your attention?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Have a look at page 2 under the heading "Problem - 4". Do you see Mr Lehmann says there:

At the conclusion of original investigations that remain unsolved, the UHT experience has found that many briefs of evidence, case file documents and physical evidence exhibits were not archived and stored in the proper manner.

Was that something of which you had any awareness?
A. Sorry, what do you mean by that?
Q. Did you have any awareness that many briefs of evidence, case file documents and physical evidence exhibits were not archived and stored in the proper manner? A. We11, I couldn't comment. That's been my experience, I hadn't had a cause to, I suppose, go to historical matters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Does it follow that you were unaware of this fact?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: $Q$. Now, Mr Lehmann goes on - I won't read it a11 - to say in the next sentence, among other things:
.. case file boxes including exhibits --
he is talking about sometimes not all the time --
were not even recorded and archived, but left on shelves at various locations in
police premises or in some cases, left in non police premises with no records to indicate their movement or whereabouts.

I take it you had no awareness of any such problem?
A. No.
Q. He says:

In 2015 the NSWPF Records Repository at Stanmore closed...

And I think that was something you referred to a minute ago --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that you were aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. He says that:
... with the contents transferred to the State archives Depot at Kingswood or the Records Section at [police headquarters in] Parramatta.

Did you know that records had gone to those two separate places, Kingswood and Parramatta?
A. I didn't know the location but $I$ knew they were being transferred out of the NSW Police record-holding facility.
Q. One was the State archives depot and one was the records section. Mr Lehmann says that during that move, numerous exhibits were located amongst case file boxes having been improperly stored. I won't read the rest of it. Are you telling us that you had no awareness that these sorts of problems existed as at August 2016 ?
A. We weren't relying on exhibits for our review.
Q. I take that point. But part of what he is talking about concerns briefs of evidence and case file documents, doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you weren't aware of any of these sorts of problems?
A. Not personal1y, I hadn't encountered those problems.

Obvious 1 y I was aware that there had been some short-fallings with respect to NSW Police filing material. But I personally, prior to my involvement in Parrabel1, hadn't had cause to access historical records.
Q. Prior to Parrabel1?
A. Yes.
Q. But once you did start work on Parrabe11 and you were accessing historical records, did you have any awareness that these sorts of problems existed?
A. I suppose I was able to, you know, come to that conclusion, given that some of the requests weren't gleaning any records. So there was obviously some kind of issue with why they weren't available to us.
Q. Some of the requests to archives were met with the response that there were no records?
A. Yes.
Q. How many, out of the 80 -odd cases?
A. I can't recall a number.
Q. Five, 10, 20?
A. I can't recal1 the number.
Q. One?
A. There was more than one.
Q. Ten?
A. I can't recall the exact number.
Q. What did you do when archives said, "We don't have anything".
A. That's when we would obviously look at the Coroners Court or access the TRIM records to see if any of those case file records were still stored within the local PD.
Q. Sorry, you were speaking a little bit quickly. You would go to Coroners Court and TRIM, and where else did you say?
A. The TRIM system, sorry, I don't know what TRIM stands for, but that is a local record management system, so we could look at TRIM to see if a particular station had any records relating to a case that hadn't been transferred to the records section.
Q. You would approach the particular police station?
A. No. So our admin officers at Surry Hills had access to that system that, I believe, is a state-wide system within the NSW Police.
Q. So you would access whatever was on TRIM?
A. Yes.
Q. That might have come from a police station?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't go to any of the police stations themselves?
A. No.
Q. Either physically or by post or email or any other means?
A. No.
Q. In the next tab, 523, in volume 19 [SCOI. 85738_0001], there is a letter from NSW Police, Office of General Counsel, to this Special Commission dated 21 June this year. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Now, this is a letter in which the Office of General Counsel outlined the steps that are being taken by police in this Inquiry in 2022/2023, to try and find documents. So it's methods that are being adopted, as it were, now, just to orient you in time.

You'11 see towards the bottom of that page, the Office of General Counsel say that the people that they refer to as "our instructors", meaning relevant police officers, have, "as a matter of regularity, caused the following searches to be performed in relation to summonses"; do you see that?
A. Stil1 on the first page, sorry?
Q. Yes, about six 1 ines from the bottom, see the sentence beginning, "In providing those instructions"?
A. Oh, yes, I do.
Q. If you just read what the police say there. They have "caused the following searches to be performed". Are you in that space now?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Now, first of a11, they say that they review computer systems, and they list six in the item (a). Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. E@gle.i, EFIMS, security and shared drives, State

Crime Command databases, COPS and the Record Management
System; do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. In your case, you looked at eagle.i and you looked at COPS. Did you look at or attempt to find documents in EFIMS?
A. EFIMS, no.
Q. Secure and shared drives?
A. I didn't have access to those.
Q. State Crime Command databases?
A. I also didn't have access to that.
Q. The Record Management System?
A. That's TRIM.
Q. That's TRIM?
A. It's now called RMS - Record Management System.
Q. Secondly, under (b), we're told that as of now, the police also search police area commands, or they instruct police area commands to search their holdings, but you didn't do that?
A. No.
Q. (c), they undertake searches with Forensic Evidence \& Technical Services, known as FE\&TS. Did you do that?
A. No.
Q. I won't ask you about (d), which is concerned with exhibits. But (e), did you contact current or former police officers to try to find documents?
A. There was cause to contact a couple of officers, I can't recall their names off the top of my head, to get access to e@gle.i systems where there was case file items contained within them.
Q. Other than that, did you either habitually or ever
contact the relevant police officer who was involved in the investigation of a case to see if that officer could point you in the direction of documents and where they might be? A. No.
Q. Then (f), requests for archives, and you told us you did do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Department of Health, (g), did you approach them?
A. No.
Q. On reflection, given what you've said in paragraph 54 in particular --
A. Sorry, is my statement within this folder?
Q. Oh, no, we need the statement again now, sorry. [NPL.9000.0026.0007], and just taking you back to paragraph 54 of your statement --
A. Sorry, 54, was it?
Q. Fifty-four.
A. Yes.
Q. You're there saying that, as I understand you, if archives seemed to have a lot of material, you assumed that that's probably all there was?
A. I did, yes.
Q. On reflection, in the 1 ight of what $I$ have taken you to just now in Mr Lehmann's document, and in the Office of General Counse1 letter, do you think that it may be that you may not have obtained all documents in a particular case?
A. It could have been the case.
Q. Now, let's go to paragraph 56.

MR GRAY: I see the time, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I wil1 take a short break.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm about to say something which might anticipate what you are about to say. Why don't you let me say what I'm saying first, then you can say what you want
to say.
MR HUTCHINGS: Please.
THE COMMISSIONER: First of al1, thank you to every one of the counsel who announced their appearance this morning. I don't expect you to remain in the hearing room, except when you think it is necessary to do so, and you can take it from me that you remain or go according to your own other commitments.

The proceedings will, unless you are told otherwise, be 1 ive streamed, so you can watch them at your convenience. There will also be a transcript available at the end of each day, usually fairly promptly. If there are matters that you need to attend to that you want to attend to in correspondence, I am happy for your solicitors or for you to do it that way.

The only thing $I$ would ask, because it is a rather cosy environment here, is that if you are going to come back or you want to be here for some particular purpose or for a period, just let us know so that we can make sure that you have accommodation at a table or wherever.

Now, I will expect you here obviously when the relevant persons for whom you appear are here, but if you think there is some other issue that might affect their interests, just let us know that you want to come or you want to say something and we will facilitate that. But by al1 means, take it from me - don't leave just because I have said it - if you wish to be excused now any of you, or each of you, by a11 means do so. If I have anticipated or not, then please raise what you had in mind.

MR HUTCHINGS: Commissioner, you have anticipated absolutely what $I$ was going to raise.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. If your standing means that you are going to go somewhere else, then you, and anybody else for that matter, can be excused for the moment.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you, sir.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GLISSAN: I wil1 take up that invitation as well,

Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I won't take it the wrong way, Mr Glissan.

MR GLISSAN: Indeed not.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Q. Mr Bignell, do you have your statement [NPL.9000.0026.0007] there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. So can we just turn to 55 , just to clear this point away. With the two exceptions that you mention, to particular cases, for all other cases in the $80-\mathrm{plus}$, there was one investigator per case?
A. Generally speaking, yes.
Q. Now, in paragraph 56 , I just want to make sure I'm following what you are saying there. In any given case, the investigator for that case would review all the documents obtained?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you say he or she would extract anything that could be relevant to a determination of whether the incident featured anti-LGBTIQ bias.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you say "extract", do you mean cut and paste into a Word document or what do you mean?
A. No. So what would happen, if a product was uncovered during their review, whether it be a statement or a record
of interview, they would make a copy of that original
document and then upload that on to the e@gle.i system.
Q. So physically extract?
A. Yes.
Q. From the box, whatever it was?
A. Yes.
Q. Make a copy?
A. Yes.
Q. Upload that on to e@gle.i?
A. Yes.
Q. And then put the actual document back in the box?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. About five 1 ines in, you say:

When uploading the materials to e@gle.i, investigators were required to enter an overview of the document. ... [they] would note what they believed were key sections of the document that $I$ should direct my attention to during my review.

Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Does that mean this, that investigator $A$ looking at case $B$ has got 15 boxes, let's say, of material?
A. Yes.
Q. He or she goes through the 15 boxes and, in total, decides that 25 documents are worthy of extracting --
A. Yes.
Q. -- let's say. So they do what you've just described?
A. Yes.
Q. Upload it. Let's say they choose 25 - I'm making these numbers up - and there were 400 altogether?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So the other 375 just stay where they were?
A. The expectation is that they would review all documents available to them, but yes.
Q. No, of course, quite. They would review them all?
A. Yes.
Q. Choose the ones they thought were relevant?
A. Yes.
Q. Upload those?
A. Yes.
Q. And as to the ones that weren't relevant, they would just stay in their box and not be uploaded?
A. Yes.
Q. And then, as to the ones they do upload, they would also, on e@gle.i, give a kind of what you have called an overview of that document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what would the overview consist of?
A. Depending on what the document was, if it was, as I said earlier, a statement or a record of interview, they may direct me to a particular paragraph within that document, as an aide-memoire for me to go straight to that document, that may assist me with, you know, time management.
Q. Just jumping forward to paragraph 59 , you say, in about the fourth 1 ine of paragraph 59, that you always encouraged investigators to be over-inclusive with their upload - so that's right?
A. Yes.
Q. In other words, you were telling them, "If you think it even might be relevant, upload it"?
A. Yes.
Q. And then your impression was - I'm looking at paragraph 60 now - because you found they had often uploaded things which in your view were not actually very relevant, you formed the view that they had followed your instructions and had been over-inclusive?
A. Yes.
Q. But in terms of what they did not upload, am I right to understand that you yourself did not look at that material at all?
A. That is the case.
Q. So the choice of relevance was made by investigator $A$ about case B?
A. Yes.
Q. And investigator $A$ would, in the way you've just described, alert you to what that investigator thought was particularly noteworthy about the documents that were chosen to be uploaded?
A. Not necessarily alert me. I would see that on the e@gle.i system for my review.
Q. Well, in terms of the overview, they would alert you to something that you should be particularly interested in?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, 57 says:

Once all material has been reviewed, investigators would then prepare a summary or synopsis of the case.

What was that, a Word document or something else?
A. No, it was on e@gle.i. It was basically, given I wasn't aware of each case in intricate detail, having reviewed the material, they would be in a better position to tell me, you know, who the victim was, potentially who the offenders were, where it happened, when it happened, so it was an overview in time, date, place and who was the involved parties.
Q. Then that exercise by the investigator, doing what you've just described, wasn't something that they were doing in terms of filling in the BCIF; it was simply a stand-alone summary or synopsis on e@gle.i?
A. There was obviously elements of that information that I could use to complete the BCIFs, but yes, that is the case.
Q. That you could use? I'11 come to what you did, but in terms of what they did --
A. Yes.
Q. -- they were not filling in the form BCIF at all?
A. That was not their role, no.
Q. So you say in 58 that when commencing on Parrabe11, investigators were given a copy of the BCIF and they were expected to familiarise themselves with the 10 indicators and what type of material could be responsive to each of them?
A. Yes.
Q. When you say they were expected to familiarise themselves, did somebody, such as yourself or someone else, give them a kind of explanation or introduction to what they were supposed to do with the BCIF?
A. Well, there was no need for them to do anything
necessarily with the BCIF other than use it as an aide-memoire for them to do their reviews.
Q. What did you say, if anything, to any of them about what the point of the BCIF was?
A. So I would explain, obviously, that my role is to use that data that they had extracted from the case file items to complete that BCIF. As it says, I'd ask them to
familiarise themselves with those 10 categories within the BCIF. We would have some broader discussions in respect of what those certain materials may look like, whether it be crime scene photos, records of interview, witness statements, you know, material to that effect, that they should pay particular attention to try and locate.
Q. So is this right, that they were meant to look at the BCIF and thus get an idea of what sorts of things in due course you might need to do in your role?
A. I would ask them to familiarise themselves with each of those points within the 10 indicators and then they would obviously have to form their own opinion based on what material, based on the review of the available case file items, would be relevant to me to populate that form.
Q. Sure. But all they did was decide this document could be relevant?
A. Yes.
Q. That document could be relevant?
A. Yes.
Q. A11 these documents are not relevant?
A. Yes.
Q. And as I've said, I think you've agreed already, as to all the ones that they, rightly or wrongly, thought were not relevant, you never saw them?
A. No.
Q. Now, when you say in paragraph 58 that they were given a copy of the BCIF, I take it that means, does it, that they were given a copy of whatever BCIF was then in force?
A. Yes.
Q. So up to June 2016, they were given the first version of the BCIF?
A. That would have been the case, yes.
Q. And then after June 2016, they were given the second version of the BCIF?
A. My recollection is that when the second BCIF was formulated, they were made aware that there had been changes and that was made available to them, yes.
Q. So they weren't actually given it - it wasn't given to them?
A. I don't think I physically printed out a new copy and handed it to them. I made them aware of where it was available to them. Obviously, if they wanted to print a copy of it to have with them, they were able to, but I didn't personally hand them a copy of that form.
Q. What did you tell them what the differences were?
A. I believe I told them that we had changed the classifications but the 10 indicators had remained the same.
Q. Did you tel1 them that the concept of beyond reasonable doubt had been introduced?
A. I didn't tell them that, no.
Q. Why not?
A. Wel1, it wasn't necessarily going to change the way that they were conducting their duties within Parrabell.
Q. Because the only person who needed to turn his mind to the question of beyond reasonable doubt was you; is that right - in completing the BCIF?
A. More or less, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And is that another way of saying that, in effect, apart from choosing documents for you to consider, in effect, what they did was create a narrative or a timeline identifying the relevant participants in the narrative?
A. Sorry, can you rephrase that question?
Q. What they did for you was not only select the documents they thought were relevant to the case, but do I understand by the term "overview", which was used a moment or two ago, that they prepared, did they, or put up on e@gle.i, some sort of narrative or timeline, a chronology or identifying those persons who they thought were relevant participants in the events?
A. No, they didn't do that.
Q. We11, what did they do?
A. So the overview - are you asking about the overview or the extraction or review of material?
Q. I understand the extraction, they extracted documents. Just tell me what the overview comprised, then.
A. Yes. The overview was basic information in respect to who the victim was, if there was offenders identified, they would give me those names, the location that the incident occurred.
Q. And dates?
A. And the dates.
Q. So that was it?
A. More or less, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Now, in 59 you say that the process of extracting relevant material was a collaborative one between you and the investigators, you worked in a common area and there were many informal discussions with investigators often running specific documents past you. So that's correct; you stand by that?
A. Yeah, discussions were had during that process, yes.
Q. Sure. But given that there were $80-\mathrm{pl}$ us cases --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is this right, that the investigators from time to time would have a discussion with you where they would say, "Look, here's a document, I'm not really sure whether it's necessary to be included in what I'm giving to you or not", and you'd have a discussion about that particular document? A. From time to time, yes.
Q. We11, how often did that happen?
A. I couldn't tell you an exact time. It happened, you know, infrequently, I'd say.
Q. Infrequently?
A. Yes.
Q. So by and large, they just made these decisions - I'm
not criticising this - by and large, they just made these decisions themselves?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you already said, and you make this point in your statement towards the end of paragraph 60, because you've had the impression that they were doing what you wanted, which was to be over-inclusive, you didn't go back to the original file yourself to check whether something else should have been included that they had not included? A. I did not do that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And nor, as far as you were concerned, did either Mr Grace or Mr Middleton?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. So when we come to the BCIF completion, which gets to paragraph 61 of your statement, as I understand it - tell me if this is right - what you're telling us is that you yourself alone filled out all the BCIFs?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say in paragraph 61 that you populated the BCIF having reviewed whatever extracted material from the files the investigators had chosen?
A. Yes.
Q. And by "populate the BCIF", we mean - and I'll come to an example in a little while - the BCIF has two columns, as you will recall, there are sort of questions or prompts on the left?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there's a box on the right for something to be inserted?
A. Yes.
Q. So you, in the case of all 80 -plus, were the person who chose what text to insert in all those boxes?
A. I was, yes.
Q. In paragraph 62, you say that following the change from the first to the second form, which is the June 2016 period --
A. Yes.
Q. --
... all cases which had used the original
form were subsequently re-reviewed and
a copy of the updated BCIF was populated.
Now, when you say "all cases which had used the original form were subsequently re-reviewed", do you mean by you or do you mean by the original investigators?
A. No, it was re-reviewed by me and then put before the review panel.
Q. We'11 come to the review panel, but the expression "subsequently re-reviewed" means re-reviewed by you?
A. Yes.
Q. Not sent back to the investigators again?
A. No.
Q. So the form changes, and among other things - and we'11 come to this - introduces the term "beyond reasonable doubt", and you then look at the BCIF again with those different terminology here and there?
A. Yes.
Q. And you decide what, if any, changes to the previous text that you had slotted in needed to be made?
A. Yes.
Q. Then in paragraph 63 you say that at the conclusion of Parrabe11, al1 cases were reviewed against the same version of the BCIF. Now, by that, you mean reviewed by you?
A. At the conclusion, yes, all cases contained within Strike Force Parrabell had been reviewed by me on the second form.
Q. And then when there was a second change to it, thus generating the third form from January 2017, did you then go back and, yourself, personally make other changes to the BCIFs?
A. No. No.
Q. So in terms of the third version, post January 2017 version, which is the one that appears in the coordinating - the one that appears in the Parrabel1
report --
A. Yes.
Q. -- did you actually review anything or did you just simply move the text across to the new form?
A. I didn't do either.
Q. What did you do?
A. I completed al1 my reviews on the second form. It's
my understanding that the transferring of text from the second to the third form was done by someone else.
Q. Who do you understand that was?
A. Mr Grace.
Q. And is your understanding that he's just simply - it may not have been technically simple but that he has simply moved it from document 1 to document 2 unchanged?
A. Document 2 to document 3, yes.
Q. Picking up that language, from document 2 to document

3?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And did he tel 1 you that?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Turning to the third phase of the Parrabel 1 exercise as you have outlined, namely, the review process, and this starts at paragraph 64 of your statement, you had monthly meetings, or approximately monthly meetings, with Mr Middleton and Mr Grace to discuss the BCIF forms?
A. Yes.
Q. In that paragraph 64, when you refer to the "recently completed BCIF forms", you obviously mean recently completed by you personally?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you say:

The associated material myself and the team had found ...

What does that mean?
A. So "associated material", so that was all the case file items that had been extracted and uploaded on to the e@gle.i system and the information or the material that I had relied on to complete those BCIFs.
Q. So are you telling us that for any given case, when there was a monthly meeting to discuss that case, Mr Middleton and Mr Grace would have both the BCIF form as filled in by you and everything that was on e@gle.i about that case?
A. Yes.
Q. Would they have it literally or would they have it in the sense that it was available to them if they wanted to look at it?
A. I would bring the hard copies - the copies that had been made by the investigators, I had them in folders for each of the cases. Generally speaking, I would bring them with me to those meetings if we had to refer back to any of that material as part of that review process.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And do I take it that the hard copies of those materials, as far as you're aware, unless the particular person had accessed that before, were given to them for the first time at the case review meetings? A. No. Mr Grace reviewed all those products electronically on e@gle.i and approved those products on e@gle.i. So once something is entered, it's submitted and then it has to be approved. In terms of Mr Middleton's review of those available documents, I'm not too sure what he - if he did that prior to those meetings. I know that Mr Grace had.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. When you just used the word "approved" in that answer, what does that mean in that context?
A. So it's within the e@gle.i system, as I said, if someone puts a product on to the e@gle.i system, it goes on as "entered". Once they are happy with the contents of that and the attachments are correct, they will submit that, and that will be submitted and forwarded through to a reviewer. Once it is reviewed, it is accepted.
Q. But in the case of Mr Grace accepting it, as far as you know, he was only seeing what the investigator had chosen to extract?
A. He was accepting the products that were uploaded on to e@gle.i by that investigator, which would have been the ones that they had chosen to extract from the case file notes, yes.
Q. So the concept of "approving" in this context meant that he was noting that he had seen what the investigator had chosen to extract?
A. So I think "approving" is the wrong term. I'm referring to terminology as part of the e@gle.i system, that changes a product to accepted, once someone reviews that product, and it's accepted as being, you know, the contents are more or less what it should be, in terms of spelling or grammar and there is an attachment to that product.
Q. But what it doesn't mean, though, I take it from everything you've said so far, is that Mr Grace was somehow checking whether what the investigator had chosen to include was the correct choice?
A. No, I don't think that's necessarily the case. Mr Grace, being the investigations manager, his role on e@gle.i was to review the products that were put on there and accept them for the purpose of categorising them on the e@gle.i system.
Q. Quite.
A. So it was a more procedural process.
Q. That's what I thought.
A. Yes.
Q. So Mr Grace, as far as you knew, just like yourself, only ever saw, in terms of the historical documentary record, what the investigator had chosen as being in the investigator's mind relevant?
A. Yes.
Q. But you think that in the case of Mr Grace, for these monthly meetings, he did look at all of those documents as chosen by the investigator, as well as your completed BCIF? A. I can't make that assumption but I'd imagine he would have.
Q. I see. Thank you for that. You, in fact, don't know; you just are inclined to assume that he may well have done? A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 64 you say that at these month1y meetings, the three of you - I'11 come to Mr Crandell and Ms Braw - would come to what you call "an ultimate determination of anti-LGBTIQ bias". I'm reading from paragraph 64.
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Crande11 and Jacqueline Braw sat in on these meetings occasional1y - how often?
A. I can't give you an exact figure. More than one, I'd say less than five.
Q. Less than five out of 14 or so?
A. More or less, yes.
Q. Fifteen, maybe?
A. Yes.
Q. I see. You say in paragraph 65 that apart from these monthly review meetings, you don't recall having any other regular meetings with either Mr Middleton or Mr Grace?
A. There was no other scheduled meetings with the two of them.
Q. No. So any other meetings, is this right, were, as it were, chance meetings if you bumped into each other?
A. Effectively, yes.
Q. Now, in 66 you say that in the monthly review meetings, you would provide Mr Middleton and Mr Grace with a synopsis. Was that a synopsis that you had prepared or the one that the investigator had prepared?
A. No, so the synopsis of the case can be found on the last page of the BCIF.
Q. So you wrote that?
A. Yes.
Q. So that the synopsis is actually part of the text that you had included in the BCIF?
A. Yes.
Q. You would take them through - I'm reading from paragraph 66 - each part of the BCIF form and the relevant evidence "I had included" - what do you mean by that?
A. So that was the copies of the case file items that had
been extracted. So if there was something that $I$ needed to draw their attention to within a particular product, whether it be a statement or a record of interview, I had that available to me in those meetings.
Q. I'm sorry, Commissioner and Mr Bignel1, I just lost my point of reference for something. Now, in paragraph 67 you say that the three of you acted as a pane1, you each reviewed the materials for each case, and again, just for clarity, you mean that you certainly reviewed the materials that the investigator had chosen?
A. Yes.
Q. You have the impression that Mr Grace may well have done as well?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't know whether Mr Middleton did or not?
A. I would assume he would have but I can't be sure.

I wasn't sitting with him whilst he reviewed that material.
Q. Quite so. But you did bring hard copies of those very materials to the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. And in some cases - but $I$ assume not al1 - some of the documents in those hard copies were looked at in the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 68 you talk about how the meetings were approached with open minds, and you a11 brought your different life experiences, professional knowledge and skills. What was the actual methodology at these meetings other than discussing back and forth? What criteria or markers did you have in mind?
A. We relied on the BCIFs, the indicators and then the final classifications that were made for each of the cases as a general sense, but we would rely on the available information, the three of us having reviewed that information and determining whether or not we could come to an agreement on the most appropriate classification for that case.
Q. We11, I'11 come to an example in a second, almost immediately after this next couple of questions, but the BCIF forms, as you know, have the 10 indicators --
A. Yes.
Q. -- with space for responses, and then more or 1 ess at the end - and there are the four different categories each time for the 10 indicators?
A. Yes.
Q. And then at the end, there's a kind of overal 1
section?
A. Yes.
Q. Where there's an overall classification, in effect, taking into account all 10 indicators; correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, in these monthly meetings, were the three of you discussing possible changes to the text that you had chosen to insert in respect of the 10 indicators or were you discussing what to say in respect of the overall classification at the end?
A. So generally speaking, I would take a completed form to those meetings, so $I$ had populated all the information in each of the available sections.
Q. Including the 1 ast one?
A. Yes.
Q. It would be reviewed by the three of us, or more so by Mr Grace and Mr Middleton, they would review the information that $I$ had already inputted into that prior to the meeting. There was quite often suggestions to changes within how $I$ had worded certain things, or text.
Q. Throughout - that is --
A. During that review.
Q. No, no, but both in respect of the text inserted for the 10 indicators and at the end or only at the end?
A. Generally speaking, more the end, final synopsis.

Sometimes there were some minor changes that were made within each of the 10 subcategories, I suppose, but more often than not, if any changes were suggested, it would be to that final synopsis.
Q. Let's just take one example, if we get volume 13, please, tab 266, in fact, within tab 266, there are a number of subcategories, $A, B, C$ and so on?
A. Yes.
Q. I will just take the first one as an example. It happens to be the one at 266E [NPL.0129.0001.0034_0001]. Do you see that? "Robert John Maclean"?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not focusing on Mr Maclean's case specifically, but simply as an example of how you did this --
A. Sure.
Q. So there's a description on the front page. That's the sort of synopsis, if you like, that I assume you wrote?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there are the 10 indicators, the first one being "Differences"?
A. Yes.
Q. The prompts on the left and the comment on the right?
A. Yes.
Q. So all the comments have been written by you?
A. Yes.
Q. And the same applies for al1 10 indicators all the way over through to the very last page?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on the last page - and this is typical of all
of them, I'm sure you would agree - there's a heading "General Comment"?
A. Yes.
Q. So you wrote that?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there's a heading "Summary of Findings"?
A. Yes.
Q. And you wrote that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this particular one, it says "Indicator: Bias Crime"?
A. Yes.
Q. So that was the categorisation in this particular case?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. Now, you would typically take to these monthly meetings a form fully completed like this one, including under "General Comment" and under "Summary of Findings"? A. Yes.
Q. Including your choice, for the moment, before it was reviewed?
A. Yes.
Q. Of what the overall answer would be, "Bias Crime" or "Not Bias Crime" or "Insufficient Information"?
A. I would, yes.
Q. You would have all of that for them to look at?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in terms of that final decision, the summary of findings and the indicator, were any changes made to any of your opinions?
A. Yes.
Q. Out of the $80-\mathrm{pl}$ us, how many?
A. I couldn't tell you how many.
Q. Many or not many?
A. No, not really, no.
Q. Not many?
A. No.
Q. A handful?
A. Yeah, I'd say so, yes.
Q. And were any changes made to the text in respect of indicators 1 to 10 in any of these cases?
A. There were a few changes. I can't remember if it was context or, you know, spelling or grammatical issues but more often than not, no.
Q. So more often than not, no, and where there were changes, they were, as I understand you, pretty minor; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So a11 in a11, apart from a handful, what you put forward was actually accepted?
A. More often than not, yes.
Q. Well, apart from a handful, I think you said?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I just want to ask you a couple of questions about some evidence that has been given earlier in the hearing. Could we have volume 1, tab 4 [SCOI.76961_0001]. That is Mr Crandel1's statement to the Inquiry, the one that I mentioned to you, from October last year? A. Yes.
Q. Just turn to paragraph 36 would you, please. Have you seen this before, by the way, Mr Crandel1's statement?
A. I have read the statement, yes.
Q. When was that?
A. Last week.
Q. But not prior to that?
A. No.
Q. Do you see in paragraph 36, Mr Crandel 1 says that in the time following some incidents in 2013, he became aware of a number of articles and media publications concerning 88 historical deaths, and so on?
A. I do, yes.
Q. This is under the heading of "Establishment of 'Strike Force Parrabe11'"?
A. Yes.
Q. In 37 he talks about his understanding of what Sue Thompson had done in terms of preparing a inst?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in 38 he says that given the community interest in the 88 deaths and his observations of Operation Parrabel1, he decided, in effect, to start Strike Force Parrabe11. I'm paraphrasing. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is it still your evidence that you, for your part, were not aware that articles and media publications
and community interest played any part in why Parrabe11 was initiated?

MR TEDESCHI: I object. That was not what he was asked previously. He was asked whether he had knowledge of media references to such matters. He wasn't asked about whether Parrabe11 was set up because of that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you. Break it up, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: I'm happy to clarify that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right.
MR GRAY: Q. I asked you some questions this morning about whether you were aware of media articles and interest about the 88 deaths?
A. You did, yes.
Q. And you said no?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. When Parrabe11 was set up in 2015 , did you have any awareness that a factor in Mr Crandell's setting it up was to respond to the media publicity about those deaths?
A. Not prior to my involvement in Parrabe11. Post my involvement, yes.
Q. How long post?
A. Quite soon.
Q. Almost immediately?
A. Yes.
Q. So once you started at Parrabel1, you were aware that a reason for undertaking the Parrabel1 exercise was to respond to the media attention on these 88 deaths?
A. One of, yes.
Q. And did Mr Crandell say so?
A. Oh, I can't recall who it came from.
Q. Did it come from someone within Parrabe1 $1 ?$
A. It would have been either Mr Crandell or Mr Grace or Mr Middleton.
Q. And did any of them say whether they thought the
articles were accurate or inaccurate?
A. I can't recall any of the specifics of those conversations.
Q. I'm sorry, I just didn't hear you.
A. I can't recall the specifics of those conversations.
Q. Maybe not the specifics, but did any of them say anything to the effect that these articles were wrong and that "we should do something about it"?
A. I don't recall anyone giving me their opinion on those articles.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Leaving the media to one side, were you aware of any allegations from the LGBTIQ community that there were deaths, unsolved homicides, that needed to be looked at or had not been looked at adequately, historically?
A. Prior to my involvement in Parrabell the only case

I was aware of was Scott Johnson, but none of the others.
Q. So the answer to my question is apart from

Scott Johnson, you weren't aware of any concerns on the part of the LGBTIQ community about unsolved deaths?
A. No, it didn't form part of my involvement within the community, either professionally or socially.
Q. And what involvement with the community did you have?
A. Well, as I explained earlier, I was, you know, in my early 20s. We certainly weren't discussing, you know, the gay hate crimes that had occurred in the '70s or '80s.
Q. It was old news?
A. Well, it didn't necessarily affect me personally at that time so it wasn't something that I was discussing with my circle of friends.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Okay. Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. In paragraph 41, Mr Crandell says that he held a number of initial planning meetings with various persons to discuss the objectives of Parrabell in around early 2015, and you can read the rest of paragraph 41. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. He says in 42 that these meetings were attended by

Mr Middleton and others, such as Mr Grace and yourself. Now, I think I understand from your evidence this morning that that is actually not correct?
A. I wasn't involved in any meetings post the end of August 2015 - sorry, pre August 2015.
Q. Pre August 2015?
A. Yes, sorry.
Q. So no criticism necessarily of Mr Crandell, but to say there that you were in these meetings happens to be wrong? A. Yes.
Q. Then if you just turn to paragraph 85, there Mr Crandell gives an outline of the methodology of Parrabe11. Just break that down. He says, in the second 1 ine, "obtain all available documents", so you would agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then a couple of 1 ines down "allocate an examination of each case to one or more officers within the Strike Force", and you would agree with that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. And then he says "form a view as to whether each case had any evidence of 'bias'". He doesn't say who did that, but would you say it was the investigator who did that or that it was you who did that?
A. No, it was me.
Q. And the fourth thing is "complete a BCIRF sheet", it's clear from your evidence today that it was you who did that?
A. That was the case, yes.
Q. And then, fifth1y, "ensure that al1 material was uploaded on to e@gle.i", and you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in 86, he says:

For the purposes of the examination of each case, all police holdings were identified and sourced from other entities, such as the State Coroner.

Now, in the light of your evidence this morning, would you say that that may be an overstatement?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. And if you read 87 to yourse1f - could you just tel 1
us if you agree that, in the broad, you agree with $87 ?$
A. I'm sorry, what was the question in respect to that?
Q. Do you agree with what is contained in 87?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. What do you not necessarily agree with?
A. If a case had been originally deemed as suspicious or a suicide, it didn't mean that there wasn't any available case file items for us to review. Quite often than not there was material available for us. So as a general summary of those cases, no, I don't agree that that's the case.
Q. Do you agree that the material discovered ranged from nothing at all in some cases to masses of archived boxes in other cases?
A. Yes.
Q. Just stil1 on Mr Crande11 - do we have the transcript in hard copy? If I can just ask for it to be brought up on the screen, I can show you on the screen, just a couple of answers that Mr Crandel 1 gave. He was asked questions for probably a couple of days about this. I'm only going to take you to about two questions, which is certainly not the whole of what he said.

At page 726 , if we just start at 1 ine 12 - in fact, start at line 2, actually. I just want to ask you about the three questions and answers that are here. You'11 see that the questions, which $I$ was asking, contain within them the idea that it was the investigators who actually filled out the forms - that was the understanding of some people, including me, at the time?
A. Okay.
Q. And obviously from the evidence you've given this morning, that understanding is not correct?
A. No, that was not correct.
Q. So at 1 ine 2, I have asked Mr Crande1 1 about the investigators, and suggested that their entire activity was
to read whatever paper existed, take the form in their left hand or right, fill it out, and then form their own view at the end as to whether or not they thought there was a bias crime. His answer was:

There was a little bit more in terms of governance for that. I don't think it was a case of just the investigators filling out a document.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Then my next question was:

No, I'm not suggesting that's all they did. What I said [to you] was they read the files, whatever the files consisted of, they filled out the forms --
"they" the investigators --
by largely setting out a narrative of what they believed had occurred ... and then [they] formed a view based upon that exercise as to whether they thought there had been bias or no bias ...

And he answered "Yes". Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. It's clear, isn't it, from your evidence today that, in fact, that answer is wrong: the investigators didn't do those things at all?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. You did those things?
A. I did.
Q. The investigators read the file, certainly?
A. They did, yes.
Q. But in terms of filling out the forms and forming a view about bias or no bias, that was you?
A. That was, yes.
Q. Then at 1 ine 24 , $I$ said - I was trying to establish
what the exercise was, I said:

> Please correct me if I'm wrong - was that of the kind of what I have outlined: they read the files, they filled out the forms and they formed a view... as to whether or not they thought at that stage there was or was not evidence of bias.

The answer was:
Yes. And those thoughts ... the position that they came to would be under the review by more senior detectives, so that was the governance that $I$ had in place.

Now that is wrong, isn't it?
A. To a degree, yes.
Q. It was not the governance that he had in place, was it?
A. No.
Q. The governance that he had in place was the one you've described this morning.
A. Yes.
Q. Whereby all the investigators actually did - no criticism of them - was to make decisions as to what to put before you as, in their opinion, relevant from all the material they had assembled?
A. Yes.
Q. Everything else from there-on in, filling out the form and forming a view about bias or not, was you?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. Now, did Mr Crandell, to your knowledge, know that or not?
A. I'm not too sure.
Q. That's all I need to ask about that for the moment.

I want to turn now back to your statement
[NPL.9000.0026.0012], at about paragraph 34 and following, where you talk about the constituent documents. You tell us in 34 that you yourself were not involved in the development of any of the four documents, the Terms of

Reference, the investigation pl an, the induction package or the coordinating instructions?
A. That is the case, yes.
Q. And you say that, to your knowledge, they were drafted by Mr Grace, and indeed that's what he says?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in 35 you say you recall reading them when they were first made available to you. Just unpacking that, the investigation plan, it seems, had been drafted in May 2015, and you came on board in August/September 2015, so it was already in existence, according to Mr Grace. Were you given the investigation plan when you started?
A. Yes, the investigation plan - so in respect to what documents were made available to me from the very onset, I don't know the specifics of those, but there was an amount of documents that were provided to me from the onset, that I familiarised myself with, one of them obviously being the first BCIF and, yeah, I familiarised myself with that. I can't recall specifics of the other documents that were made available to me.
Q. We know from Mr Grace that both the induction package and the coordinating instructions didn't come into existence until well into 2016 ?
A. Yes.
Q. So you obviously weren't given them --
A. No.
Q. -- in August 2015?
A. Yes.
Q. But you think you were probably given the investigation plan and probably given the first version of the BCIF?
A. Yes.
Q. And were they given to you or you were told, "They're on e@gle.i"?
A. No, my memory is that they were hard copies.
Q. Did anyone, Mr Crandell or Mr Grace or Mr Middleton, give you any kind of introduction or explanation, orally, I mean, about those documents or about what Parrabell was going to do with them?
A. I don't recal1 anyone telling me what Parrabel 1 was going to do with them, I was obviously asked to familiarise myself with them and I was given a verbal introduction as to what we were hoping to achieve as a result of Strike Force Parrabe11.
Q. By whom?
A. By Mr Grace and Mr Middleton from the onset and I believe at some point Mr Crandell as well spoke with me.
Q. But in terms of the documents then available, the investigation plan and the first version of BCIF, did any of them say anything to you about those documents?
A. I can't recall specifically.
Q. Does that mean that your recollection is probably not?
A. They would have referred to those documents, I would imagine, given that they were prepared for the commencement of Strike Force Parrabel1 and so there would have been certain inferences made in those documents as to what they were expecting me to do, given an investigation plan outlines what the expectations are of a particular strike force.
Q. Let's just go to the three documents in particular. The first is the investigation plan. We need volume 1 , tab 14 [SCOI.74385_0001]. So this is familiar to you, I presume, and on the last page under Mr Grace's name, it does bear a date of May 2015.
A. Yes.
Q. Although a different date for Mr Middleton. So on the first page, there is the "Background", which I don't need to take time with. Then "Situation", then "Mission", then "Execution", and under the "Execution", what appears is that Parrabe11 was to review "previous1y reported deaths" in the relevant times:
... to determine if a sexuality or gender bias was a contributing factor

Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so when we go to "Investigative Outcomes" on the bottom of the next page, the four categories that were contained in the investigation plan are set out there in
those four bullet points?
A. Yes.
Q. "There is evidence that sexuality or other bias was involved". That's the first one?
A. Yes.
Q. "It appears likely" is the second one; "It appears unlikely" is the third; "There is no evidence" is the fourth. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. And all of them refer to "sexuality or other bias"?
A. Yes.
Q. At the top of that same page, page 3 , in the first bullet point, there is reference to the "attached Bias Crimes Identification Form", ie, an attached BCIF?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, it's not attached to this document in your tab 14, but your recollection is that you did get a BCIF at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was consistent, wasn't it, in the sense that it used the 1 anguage as appears at the bottom of page 3 of this investigation plan?
A. Oh, I actually can't recall what the first form had as the indicators.
Q. Okay. I'11 come to that, then. For the moment, though, on this document, what $I$ want to take you to is on page 2 under the main heading "Execution", and then under the heading "Tactical" - do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. It says:

Investigators will systematically review the ... case file holdings to identify existing evidence indicative of any bias crime.

Now, is that accurate in your mind?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. Why is that?
A. Well, the role of the investigators was to review the available information and extract any information that would be relevant to me completing the BCIF, in my opinion.
Q. And then on the top of page 3 , the first bullet point, the investigation plan says:

Investigators will commence a physical
review of these files to determine if any
Bias Crime Indicators exist.
Now, that's not accurate either, is it?
A. Well, that a little more so, in that, as I said, they were provided a copy with the BCIF, whatever one was being used at that particular time, asked to familiarise themselves with that document and extract data that - or information, sorry, that they thought I could use to populate that form. So I think, as a general sense, it's more accurate than the last point.
Q. And what about the second bullet point on that page, which says:

Investigators will use an evidence based approach to complete the Bias Crimes Identification Form. This form will assist investigators in determining, based on the available evidence, whether Bias Crime Indicators exist.

Is that accurate?
A. Well, I suppose it's saying "investigators", as a plural. Me as also an investigator, I did that.
Q. What doesn't seem to appear is the notion of triage by the investigators followed by somebody else, namely you, actually doing the BCIF and the determination of bias or not bias - that doesn't seem to be there?
A. That doesn't, no.
Q. Did you, nevertheless, understand from the outset that that was, in fact, what was going to happen?
A. I can't recall if I was told I was required to
complete all those BCIFs, but obviously I got that sense, that that was my role, hence why I completed all of those BCIFs as part of my role within Parrabell.
Q. So somebody told you that, in fact, the person who was going to complete the BCIFs in every single case was just you, and it was just you who was going to form a view about bias or no bias, not the investigators - someone told you that, did they?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And who was that?
A. I can't recal1.
Q. And somebody told the investigators that, too, that that was the limit of their involvement?
A. I told them that.
Q. You told them that?
A. Yes.
Q. Under the heading "Resources", there is a description "Senior Investigator" - one of those - and two "Investigators". Now, does the expression "Senior Investigator" there cover, in fact, your role or was it covering someone else's role?
A. No, I'd say that would be my role.
Q. And so that the senior investigator's role is said to be to review each investigation from a bias crime perspective and to draw conclusions based upon the review. So did someone tell you that what that meant was that you, as the senior investigator, were the person who was actually going to complete the BCIF?
A. As I said, I imagine there was a conversation had from the infancy of Strike Force Parrabel 1 and my involvement in Strike Force Parrabell, where I was told what my role would be, and that's what $I$ set out to do throughout Parrabel 1.
Q. So far as you knew, who was given the investigation plan? You were given it - who else was given it?
A. I don't know.
Q. And I think you agreed earlier this morning that this particular document, the investigation plan, never changed? A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. Then could we have volume 2, tab 59 [SCOI.77317_0001]. So this is the induction package, and you will see at the bottom of it that it says "Published Apri1 2016"?
A. Yes.
Q. Which is consistent with what Mr Grace says?
A. Yes.
Q. And you received this at about that time?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in your paragraph 37 - I'm just going back a bit slightly in your statement - when you are talking about the investigation plan, you say:

I recall that the Investigation Plan was available as part of an administrative package of documents available to all officers working on ... Parrabel 1.
A. Yes.
Q. And you have said something similar a little while ago?
A. Yes.
Q. And at this stage - that is, when you started in August 2015 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the administrative package presumably consisted of the investigation plan only, did it?
A. And the BCIF, yes.
Q. And the BCIF - so two. And you say:

I did not feel the need regularly to refer
to the Investigation Plan during the course
of ... Parrabe7 7 as $I$ was comfortable that
I understood my role ...
So did you ever, in fact, go back and look at it?
A. No, I don't recall that I did.
Q. And in paragraph 39 , talking now about the induction package, you say:

While I recall seeing the Induction Package once it had been drafted, I did not refer back to it on a regular basis [either] ...
A. That is the case.
Q. Did you ever actually refer back to it?
A. I read it once it was created but I don't think I went back to it, no.
Q. You say at the end of 39 that you don't recall providing it to the investigators either?
A. Not me personally, no.
Q. Not personally, but you point out that it was on e@gle.i, was it, or somewhere?
A. I can't recall if it was on e@gle.i or if it was on our shared drive that we were utilising.
Q. Available electronically, anyway?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Now, just looking at it - this is in tab 59 of volume 2 - in this one, there is an actual Bias Crime Indicator Form embedded in it starting on page 4, do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. I will just come to one or two details of that. At the bottom of page 3, there are the four findings set out as the four possible findings that could be made, and you may notice that they are the same four as were in the investigation plan?
A. Yes.
Q. "There is evidence that sexuality or other bias", et cetera?
A. Yes.
Q. All the same. Now, when we go to the embedded BCIF so take, for example, on page 4 under the first indicator, "Differences", there are actually only three, aren't there, not four, possible findings?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you notice that at the time?
A. No, I didn't, actually.
Q. Did anyone mention to you that there was some sort of inconsistency between page 3 and the actual form?
A. No.
Q. And did anyone tel 1 you what was meant by the expression "It appears likely", or "It appears unlikely" what kind of criterion or standard was meant by that? A. No.
Q. You just had to use your commonsense or work it out?
A. More or less, yes.
Q. Work it out for yourself, really?
A. Yes.
Q. And what about the expression "There is evidence" what, in your mind, given that you were the one using this form at that time, did you understand you needed to be satisfied of in order to say "There is evidence of bias"? A. It was a pretty big threshold to meet to class something as having evidence of bias, so $I$ was certain1y very mindful of that in conducting my review and completing those forms. Again, it went to the review panel and the three of us had to make that determination, and we all had to come to the same decision, to classify something at the end as being as a result of bias.
Q. Sure, but just breaking that down, when you get to the review panel, there are the 10 indicators?
A. Yes.
Q. With their four findings each?
A. Yes.
Q. And there is also the conclusionary overall categorisation at the end?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you said earlier that, with a handful of exceptions, the conclusions that you had arrived at remained unchanged?
A. Yes.
Q. So you said that the first one, "There is evidence", was, I think your expression was a moment ago, a pretty high threshold or something like that?
A. Of course.
Q. And why is that "of course"?
A. Well, in respect to classifying something as almost definitively being as a result - that death being as a result of a bias towards them, I certainly wanted to be sure that $I$ was making the right decision.
Q. So you took the first possible finding, "There is evidence that sexuality or other bias was involved", as meaning, in your mind, you had to be satisfied that sexuality or other bias, on the materials available, was clearly established?
A. Yes.
Q. And that meant, didn't it, that inevitably, given the nature of the paper review, very few cases would meet that criteria?
A. From my memory, I can't recall the final findings in respect to what number of each case was classified, but there wasn't a great volume of cases that were given that classification, no.
Q. No, it was a very low number?
A. Yes.
Q. I don't need to take time with you on that, because we have the records.
A. Of course.
Q. But my question to you is not so much what did happen, which, as you say is correct, but inevitably, if that was the view you took - and I'm not criticising it - of this very high threshold for the first finding, it meant that, inevitably, not many cases would meet that threshold?
A. Effectively, yes.
Q. Later on - and I will come to this - that first indicator, in a later form, had added to it the words "beyond reasonable doubt; remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your mind, did that make it even a higher threshold?
A. Yes.
Q. So it was even more difficult for a case to be given that categorisation once "beyond reasonable doubt" was added?
A. No, not necessarily. I think adding that - you know,
when we're documenting our findings, obviously, we were having to be satisfied that we were classifying a case beyond a reasonable doubt. We weren't, you know, putting our own spin on things; we weren't - what's the word I can use? - it wasn't our thoughts, we had to have something in front of us to suggest that that was the actual case; it wasn't just our gut feeling, "Oh, that person was killed as a result of bias". We had to have something in front of us that enabled us to come to that determination beyond a reasonable doubt.
Q. We may be slightly at cross-purposes. You said very fairly a little while ago that even before "beyond reasonable doubt" was added, when it was just simply "There is evidence", you regarded that as a high threshold?
A. For me personally, the addition of the "beyond reasonable doubt" didn't change how I conducted the way I determined that classification.
Q. So in your mind, it was a high threshold throughout, from beginning to end?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And you agree, therefore, that at all times, before and after "beyond reasonable doubt" was added, not many cases would meet that threshold?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a convenient time, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: Yes, it is.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, before we rise, there is a letter dated 15 September 2023 that went to Ms Garaty about a matter. It may be that you are not aware of the contents of that letter. I will have a copy provided to you and those at the Bar table, if you are not aware of it. It raises a matter of some concern to me, as Commissioner, and to this Inquiry.

A response was sought by $10 a m$ today. I don't want a substantive response at 2 o'clock but, as a courtesy, in the event that there has been some oversight and somebody has just fallen between the cracks, could I just be given the courtesy of when I might expect a response to that letter? I don't propose to talk about it now, or the contents of it, but I will have a copy provided so that you
can just at least, as a courtesy, update me at 2 o'clock as to when a substantive response might be achieved.

If you are not familiar with the contents - and I'm assuming for the moment you may not be - I'd like to know, because it does raise a matter of some concern.

A11 right. I wil1 adjourn until 2.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I understand that a letter from Ms Marsic was sent about 10 minutes ago in response to the Inquiry's 1etter.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I noted it. Thank you very much. It will be dealt with at some later point, thank you.

Yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Q. Mr Bigne11, do you still have the induction package there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. I was just, I think, part way through, just drawing to your attention this contrast, that on page 3 , in the description of what is called "Execution", it's stated that four findings are available, and they are set out on the bottom of the page?
A. Yes.
Q. Whereas in the BCIF, which follows, which starts on the next page, embedded into the induction package itself, there are only three?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you said this morning - correct me if I'm wrong - that you actually hadn't noticed that before?
A. No, I hadn't.
Q. Now, the first version of the BCIF, as you have explained this morning, had four possible findings?
A. I honestly can't recall the specifics of that first form.
Q. We looked at the investigation plan this morning -A. Yes.
Q. -- which sets out four findings, and they are actually the same as the ones at the bottom of page 3 , in the induction package. We don't seem to have an example of the actual original BCIF --
A. Okay.
Q. -- but the investigation pl an says there were those four findings available. So, catching up with where we were --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the induction package, the same four findings appear on page 3, but only three of them appear in the embedded example of the BCIF. So my question is: was there another version of the BCIF floating around which actually looked like this one, that only had three indicators, or, sorry, three possibly findings, not four?
A. I'm not too sure if there was one that postdated Parrabell that was toyed with by Mr Middleton or Mr Grace.
Q. Predated, do you mean?
A. Potentially, yes. But in respect to the ones that I used, no.
Q. All right. In respect of the ones you used, they all had four possible findings?
A. Again, I can't recall exactly what the indicators were of the original form that I first started with.
Q. I didn't catch that.
A. So the very first form that I started with in August, beginning of September, I can't recall exactly what the indicators looked like for that form.
Q. Okay. I'm going to come to this later but maybe since we're on it, I'll ask you now. You've given some evidence about how you populated the BCIF form with text, in the way you explained this morning?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've given evidence that you're aware of at least three versions of the form?
A. Yes.
Q. A first, a second and a third, and in each of the second and the third, there were some changes to, as it were, the questions or the indicators or the prompts? A. No, well, in terms of the prompts, they didn't change.
Q. Correct. Not the prompts, but the findings did?
A. I want to be careful with how I answer this. The indicators for each of the prompts on each of the 10 different points, that changed. And in respect to how the final decision was made, that correlated with whatever the indicators were at that time.
Q. We'd better make sure about the terminology we're using. Look at page 4 of this example?
A. Yes.
Q. It may be an imperfect example. But the 10 indicators begin with number 1, which is "Differences"; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So there are only 10 of those, and the tenth of them is "Level of Violence".
A. Yes.
Q. That's what you mean by the --
A. Yes, so they didn't change.
Q. They did not change, indeed. And the prompts didn't change either?
A. No.
Q. But, somewhat unhelpfully, looking at page 4, above the three lines beginning with "There is evidence", and so on, the word "Indicators" appears again, which is not really what's coming, is it: they are not the indicators, they are the available findings, aren't they?
A. Yes.
Q. So what I'm putting to you is that what actually changed from form to form was the available findings, even though they're called here "Indicators".
A. Yes.
Q. That's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, what $I$ want to ask you is this: notwithstanding
the changes to the available findings from version 1 to version 2 and from version 2 to 3 , did any of the text that you had written originally, on version 1, change as a result of any changes to available findings in version 2 or version 3 ?
A. From version 2 to version 3, I believe no. I didn't make any changes. When we re-reviewed the cases that had been done on the first form for the purpose of the second form, there were some changes that were made.
Q. "We" being who?
A. Sorry, so we reviewed them as a collective, in respect to Mr Middleton, Mr Grace and myself.
Q. Yes?
A. We re-reviewed the already completed forms.
Q. Version 1?
A. From version 1. And as a result of that re-review, comparing them to the new form and what was required of us in the new form to populate that appropriately, there were some changes required.
Q. And what scale of changes? I don't mean 1 iterally, how many, but a lot or not very many or --
A. No, not very many.
Q. And was the nature of those changes in your mind at least significant or relatively minor?
A. No, relatively minor. It was just more in wording it more appropriately to align with the indicator that was the most appropriate with the second form.
Q. And were those few minor changes that you just mentioned confined to the 10 indicators, the text of the 10 indicators, or did they also include some changes to the concluding final parts?
A. From my memory, it had no bearing on the actual prompts; it was just the final indicators.
Q. So the text comprising, in effect, the responses to the prompts, never changed from beginning to end?
A. Not to my memory, no.
Q. Regardless of any changes to the form?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there any discussion among you and Mr Middleton and Mr Grace as to whether perhaps there needed to be because the form had changed?
A. Not to my knowledge or memory.
Q. Just still on the induction package, if we turn over to page 10, after the embedded BCIF, do you see in this document, which dates from Apri1 2016 after you had been going for about eight months, Detective Inspector Middleton is described as the "Crime Manager", and his role is supervision and review of BCIFs?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Grace is described as "OIC", and his role is to review e@gle.i and completed BCIFs?
A. Yes.
Q. "Case Officer" is what you're called, and your role is said to be managing and accounting for the investigative process and to be responsible for completing the BCIFs?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that, of course, is accurate, according to what you have told us today?
A. Yes.
Q. And spells out accurately what, indeed, did happen; is that right?
A. That's the case, yes.
Q. And "Investigators", their role, according to this form, is to:

Review case files with a view to identifying evidence that is relevant to Bias Crime.

And on your evidence this morning, that also is more or less accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. On the next page, page 11, under the heading "Coordinating Instructions" - and pausing there, the coordinating instructions themselves had not come into existence yet, as we established this morning, but under that heading in this document, the induction package, the fifth bullet point says, "The Case Officer", being you,
"wil1 complete the Bias Crime Indicator Forms". So that was clear enough?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if we move to the coordinating instructions themselves, which are back in volume 1, at tab 15 [SCOI.75071_0001] on page 13, after the embedded 1ater version of the BCIF, Mr Crandell has been added, at the top of the tree, as the Commander. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The Crime Manager, being Mr Middleton, is now said to be someone who would account for the investigative process and be part of the final review team. And the Investigations Manager, being Mr Grace, was to review e@gle.i and be part of the final review team?
A. Yes.
Q. And you, as Case Officer, although I'm not sure if you are actually identified by name in this one, but Case Officer was indeed your role?
A. Yes.
Q.
... is responsible for completing final Bias Crime Indicator Forms ...

So on these coordinating instructions, although you're not named and although it's rather brief, it is apparent, once one reads it carefully, that only you were going to be completing the BCIFs?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you stil1 have your statement [NPH.9000.0026.0007] as wel1?
A. Yes.
Q. At paragraph 40 - in fact, just before $I$ move on to that, which is the coordinating instructions, one more question on paragraph 39 about the induction package. You say there that you did not refer back to it - the induction package - on a regular basis?
A. That's correct.
Q. It was only created in Apri1 2016, by which time you had been under way for about eight months?
A. Yes.
Q. So did you refer back to it at all?
A. The induction package, as I recall, wasn't created for me; it was created for the new investigators that were coming on board to assist.
Q. So does that mean the answer is "no", you did not refer to it at all?
A. I did not.
Q. On paragraph 40 , turning to the coordinating instructions, you also say there in about the fourth line:

I did not refer back to [them] on a regular basis.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. They only came into existence, according to Mr Grace, in October 2016, when you were virtually finished the work that you were doing; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So not only did you not refer back to them on a regular basis, would it be right to say that you didn't refer to them at all?
A. Effectively, yes.
Q. You also say:

I do not recall providing it to the investigators, but it was readily available to them ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. But as we established this morning, either all of them were already gone, or there were only two left at that point; you agree?
A. I do.
Q. So it wasn't readily available to any investigators other than possibly two, who still remained?
A. Yes.
Q. The other investigators never saw it?
A. Potentially, no.
Q. Just briefly on the document itself, on page 3 , at the bottom of the page, it is stated that investigators have created the BCIF - do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Now, in fact, we know that it was Mr Grace. But then there is some sort of detail given in the rest of that paragraph as to how the BCIF is completed, and an example is given about an offender:
... if the offender is recorded in police files as associating with persons known to have assaulted young gay men, then the investigator may mark Bias Crimes Indicator 4 ... as being relevant.

Now, as I understand your evidence this morning, that would not happen at al1?
A. It wouldn't have.
Q. Did not happen at a11. That's not what the investigators were to do at a11?
A. That was the case.
Q. So the coordinating instructions are wrong in that respect?
A. Effectively, yes.
Q. At the top of page 4, the findings as at the date of the coordinating instructions are set out, and there are changes to the wording of those four findings. Are you conscious of them as you look at them now? Can you see -A. Yes.
Q. "Sufficient evidence/information" has been inserted and the words "beyond reasonable doubt" have been inserted? A. I can see that.
Q. But your evidence, as I understand it, is that - and I'm paraphrasing - that really that made no difference to the way you went about your job?
A. No.
Q. And it certain1y made no difference to anything that
the investigators might ever have done, because they never saw it?
A. In my opinion, no.
Q. Now, in terms of the findings, the beyond reasonable doubt standard is referred to in the first two, "Bias Crime" and "Suspected Bias Crime" - you can see that?
A. Yes.
Q. But then in the paragraph below, it says:

At the conclusion of each case review, an overall conclusion will be made referring to each relevant indicator and the relevant evidence.

And so on?
A. Yes.
Q. And we know from the form that, indeed, the form does provide for that. But that paragraph concludes in the last 1ine:

Al7 conclusions in relation to the role of bias are made on the balance of probabilities.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Which is, of course, the lower civil standard?
A. Yes.
Q. So in your mind, how was that sequence to work? The findings were to be made on the high threshold of the criminal standard, but then, when you were assessing the overall situation, you would drop down to the lower civil standard. How did that work, in your mind.
A. Wel1, as I said earlier, in my mind I was applying the higher standard to my review and to my initial
determination with respect to what indicator $I$ thought was most appropriate to classify a particular case, in respect to the review panel that was conducted after I completed the Bias Crime Indicator Form, in respect to what decision the three of us would come to as a collective, it was my
understanding that we were looking at a more higher standard in respect to beyond reasonable doubt to determine what the most appropriate indicator was for that case.
Q. Now, just breaking that down, in terms of the 10 indicators, that's where we find, as to two of them, the expression "beyond reasonable doubt"?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've given your evidence about how you approached that?
A. Yes.
Q. But in the concluding part of the form, which in this example, in this document, is on page 13, a "Genera1 Comment" and the "Summary of Findings" actually, as it turns out, you populated that with text as well when you did all of these, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. True it is that everything you wrote was later looked at by the review panel of three?
A. Yes.
Q. But at the time you populated the final sections, the "General Comment" and the - one is called "General
Comment", and one is called "Summary of Findings", at the end of the form?
A. Yes.
Q. When you, for your part, before it got to the review pane1, put the text in there and made a call yourself as to what the appropriate finding was, were you doing that, at that point in your work, by reference to beyond reasonable doubt or by reference to balance of probabilities?
A. Me personally, I was applying the beyond reasonable doubt approach to my final comments.
Q. And I think you told us this morning that - correct me if I'm wrong - as to those final sections, "Summary of Findings", and the overall categorisation, did you say that none of them were ever changed after the review process or that a small handful were?
A. No, some were.
Q. A handful?
A. Yes.
Q. So you had arrived at those classifications by reference, at least in your mind, to the high standard of beyond reasonable doubt?
A. Yes.
Q. And almost none of them were changed?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the Bias Crime Indicator Form, just turning to your statement at paragraph 41 - I think we have more or less covered this, I won't take too much time on this, but at 42 you say there were three versions that you were aware of?
A. Yes.
Q. You say at 44 that the first version you were aware of was in the investigation plan, and I've been through with you the investigation pl an, and in 45 you say the second version - you talk about the second version, and that's the one that came into play after 29 June 2016, when Mr Steer made his presentation?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Just on 45, at the bottom of that paragraph when you say, "I recall that all cases were reviewed using this version" - that is, the second version --
A. Yes.
Q. -- do you mean reviewed by you?
A. Yeah, so I used that second form to conduct my review of al1 cases.
Q. Yes. So that those that had been completed by you in the form of the first version --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you then did what, once the second version came into play?
A. So I transferred the data over to the new form and then, as a collective, in respect to Mr Middleton, Mr Grace and me, re-reviewed it to determine the classification most appropriate on the second form.
Q. I may have asked you this already, I think I did, but were any changes made?
A. Some, yes.
Q. In order of magnitude, how many?
A. I can't recall, I'm sorry.
Q. A small number?
A. From memory, yes. It wasn't a great change.
Q. And then the third BCIF - this is paragraph 46 - is the one that came into play after January 2017 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the meeting that we looked at this morning.

And then you say as to that one, in the fourth line:
Al1 cases were ultimately reviewed on the basis of the BCIF in the final report.

Now again, does that mean reviewed by you?
A. No.
Q. What does it mean?
A. So after the creation of the third Bias Crime Indicator Form, as I said earlier, Mr Grace transferred all the data over to that form with that updated indicator or indicators. The reviews had already been conducted by me, they'd already been assessed by the review panel, and it was populating those forms, the third form, with the data already available to Mr Grace.
Q. So I'm not being critical but really it wasn't a review at all?
A. No.
Q. It was just a mechanical moving of text from one document to another?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. In 47, you say that you didn't think the difference between the various constituent documents had any material impact on Parrabell. That's your view?
A. It is, yes.
Q. You say:

I do not believe the investigators were greatly influenced by the constituent documents.

And from your evidence today, that almost inevitably must be so, would you agree?
A. That is my opinion, yes.
Q. The constituent documents, to the extent that they ever saw them, don't seem to have, as far as you know, played much part in anything they did?
A. To my knowledge and my opinion, no.
Q. Now, you say in the fourth 1 ine:

Whilst they --
that is the constituent documents --
were available to the team, investigators
largely relied on verbal briefings and instructions from me.

What were the verbal briefings and instructions that you gave them?
A. So upon commencement with Parrabel1 as an investigator, I would provide them with the most up to date version of the Bias Crime Indicator Form, depending on what one was available to us at that time, and we would run through that form.

Depending on when they came in to the investigation, I would suggest that they have a look at e@gle.i and have a look at what some of the other investigators had done, previous to their involvement, to see what documents were coming to light as part of the earlier reviews.

I obviously encouraged them to ask questions if they had any concerns with what was expected of them or during their process of reviewing material to come to me and ask. It was, you know, a general introduction that $I$ would give them, "Here is a Bias Crime Indicator Form, this is what we're doing, this is what we're endeavouring to do as a result of the review in respect to a completed Bias Crime Indicator Form. If you have any questions, please ask me."
Q. Given that some of the language in some of the constituent documents included terms like "gay hate", "gay bias", and numerous others, "sexuality related bias", and quite a few other expressions of that kind --
A. Yes.
Q. -- did you give them any explanation or path forward by which they were to know what was meant by all of those terms?
A. No, not necessarily. I suppose I made the assumption they were serving members of the NSW Police Force and had some sort of broader knowledge of what each of those terms meant to them.
Q. Would there be a difference between a sexuality bias and a gender bias, for example, in your mind?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you explain that to the investigators?
A. No. I made the assumption that it was quite straightforward and that they would be able to draw that inference or difference.
Q. What's the difference, then, in your mind?
A. In my mind, if it's a bias based on gender, there's an assigned gender that the bias is being made upon. If it's sexuality related, it's what they identify in terms of their sexuality, or their perceived sexuality.
Q. What about whether bias could be present even though some other factor may also have been present, like robbery, for example, what did you tell them about that?
A. Sorry, what - could you repeat that?
Q. There are some cases, as I'm sure you know, where the victim, the deceased, may, on one view, have been the victim of a bias related crime, but also might have been robbed. In other words, there might have been a robbery motive involved, there might also have been a gay bias related motive involved. What did you tell the investigators about that situation where there were two factors potentially involved?
A. I don't recal 1 any specific conversations $I$ had with the investigators to draw any differences with those.
Q. Did you understand, or, to your knowledge, did they understand, that if there was a robbery motive, then that ruled out a bias motive?
A. I suppose the role of the investigators was if they were able to find documentation that went to prove a motive, one way, shape or form, whether it be a robbery
or as a result of a bias, to whatever degree, that they would include that in the documents provided to me for my review.
Q. If there was bias, they would include it, even though there might have been something else as well?
A. I'd hope so, yes.
Q. You would hope that that's what they did?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever have that discussion, though?
A. There were a couple of cases where robbery appeared to be the motivation behind it, so I do recall that there were, at times, discussions around, "Hey, what do you think of this motive", you know, "This is what they've offered up in a record of interview", so yes, I do recall a couple of discussions around that.
Q. So if the likelihood, in the investigator's view or your view, was that it was more likely robbery, although both could have been present, does that mean that it was ruled out as a possible bias case?
A. I'm not too sure.
Q. You are not too sure?
A. Well, I would have to look at a specific case to comment on that.
Q. No, I'm just asking at a general leve1, what was the approach to be taken in that situation?
A. If we had firm information to suggest that an offender had conducted or committed a robbery on a victim, as
a result of that robbery, the person was now deceased, then
I'd make a pretty good assumption that it wasn't as
a result of bias.
Q. And that's what the investigators did too, as far as you know?
A. We11, they didn't have to make that decision --

MR TEDESCHI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry?
MR GRAY: There was an objection, I believe.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, my friend is confusing the two roles that have been very clearly explained by this witness - collecting of information in the form of documents, and then he made the assessment in terms of --

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Let me clarify it this way.
Q. So far as the investigators were concerned, then, is what you're really saying is that you did not believe, nor did you expect them to turn their minds to the existence of bias or not?
A. That wasn't their role, no.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. That was not their role, so I didn't ask them to do that.
Q. So their role was basically to pick out any documents at all that they thought might be relevant to the deceased's - to the homicide, or alleged homicide?
A. Yes.
Q. And not address their minds to any particular factor?
A. I suppose they would have, as general course, but their role was not to offer up that information in respect to completing a Bias Crime Indicator Form.
Q. So it was to bring to your attention anything at all that they thought relevant or irrelevant might go to the circumstances in which the person becomes deceased? A. Yes, to establish motive. To establish motive.
Q. You say "to establish motive". What did you expect them to do in relation to a quest for documents that might go to motive, then?
A. If there was any information that offered up a suggestion of motive, then it would be included.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR GRAY: Q. Could we turn, please, to volume 16 , tab 386 [SCOI. 83388_0001]. Now, this is a letter, Mr Bignell, which you may very well not have seen. It's from the Office of the General Counsel for the police to this Inquiry on 19 May this year. It was a response to
a letter from the Inquiry seeking some clarification about various aspects of Parrabe11. I asked you this morning whether anybody asked you about your recollections of Parrabel1 at about that time, and you said, "No"?
A. That's my memory, yes.
Q. Okay. I just want to take you to a couple of things in this letter to see whether you agree that they are right?
A. Okay.
Q. On page 2, under the heading "The Evidence of AC Crandel1", it's stated that officers from Strike Force Parrabell applied an intuitive synthesis methodology in assessing each case. Is that right in your view? What can you tell us about that?
A. So I think the officers, in terms of the investigators that were conducting the review, they didn't have to apply any kind of thought process in respect of making a determination of each of the cases, so no, I don't think that's the most accurate way of recording that.
Q. In the next paragraph, the letter says:

> Investigators ... in Parrabel 1 conducted a thorough review of the materials held by [the police], applied police methodology (as applicable at the time ... ) and then formed a view regarding the existence (or otherwise) of bias crimes by reference to the BCIF template. Any conclusions reached by an investigator were subject to assessment by senior officers before a final conclusion was reached.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Now, that's not really an accurate account of what happened, is it?
A. We11, I suppose it depends what we're referring to as "investigators". I was an investigator on Strike Force Parrabel1, so that could have been referring to my role, and the senior officers, Mr Grace and Mr Middleton, were both senior to me, so $I$ was still an investigator on Strike Force Parrabe11.
Q. So if we treated the paragraph as including you in the word "investigators" in the first sentence and then as, in the second sentence, you being the only investigator referred to in the words "an investigator", then you could make it right?
A. You could, yes.
Q. But if you read it more naturally, it's not right, is it?
A. No.

MR TEDESCHI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Why?
MR GRAY: I press it.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, why?
MR TEDESCHI: It is asking the witness to interpret what is meant by a letter from a legal officer.

THE COMMISSIONER: It has come on the basis of, apparently, instructions, if so, from whom; secondly, I'm meant to rely upon it presumably as an accurate description of what occurred. I'd like to know what the true position is, so I'm going to allow it, thank you.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, the first question was in relation to the first paragraph, "a larger collaborative process through which officers from Strike Force Parrabel 1 applied an intuitive synthesis methodology".

THE COMMISSIONER: Who devised that phrase, by the way, and what does it mean?

MR TEDESCHI: And the questioning by Counsel Assisting was interpreted by the witness as only applying to the officers who were doing the triage process. Now, he wasn't taken --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I don't know whether we've been in the same room today or not, but as far as I'm concerned, I've heard evidence today which would suggest that that kind of process wasn't undertaken by the officers who were collecting documents out of boxes. However, on the face of this letter, it could be interpreted that way.

MR TEDESCHI: Could I make my submission to you, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you going to tell me what somebody intended by this letter, are you?

MR TEDESCHI: No. What I'm suggesting is that this officer should be given an opportunity to respond to the suggestion that a larger collaborative process involving officers from Parrabel1, using an intuitive synthesis methodology in assessing each case, was engaged in by those officers who conducted the review. He has been asked about the officers who conducted the triage. He hasn't been asked about those other officers.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, first of al1, Mr Gray is entitled to ask the questions he is going to ask. As always, I will give you an opportunity to ask any questions you think need to be clarified. So what is your problem?

MR TEDESCHI: My problem is that --
THE COMMISSIONER: You think it's unfair at the moment, do you?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, it is.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Let's work on the basis, Mr Gray, that you either accommodate what Mr Tedeschi has said or you don't. It is a matter for you. I will allow Mr Tedeschi to explore the matter if he feels, for some reason, there is some unfairness. I personally do not observe or detect any unfairness, but on the assumption Mr Tedeschi is right, why don't you do what you want to do and I'11 let him do what he wants to do.

MR GRAY: Q. Mr Bigne11, 1et's go back to the second paragraph under that heading. It says:

> Investigators in ... Parrabe 17 conducted a thorough review of the materials ... and then formed a view ...

Now, apart from you, in respect of whom that would be a true statement, it's not true of any other investigator, is it?
A. It's not.
Q. So to say that investigators formed a view regarding the existence or otherwise of bias crimes by reference to the BCIF template, apart from you, who did indeed do that, it is quite untrue in relation to all the other investigators, isn't it?
A. It is.
Q. Now, on the first paragraph that my friend is anxious about, I did ask you whether you thought that was right, and you said you didn't think it was, but let's go through it again. The sentence - the paragraph asserts:

The use of BCIFs by ... Parrabell was one element of a larger collaborative process through which officers from ... Parrabel 1 applied an intuitive synthesis methodology in assessing each case. While BCIFs were an important tool ... they were only one element ...

Now, does that paragraph, in particular the first sentence, apply with any accuracy in your mind to anything that the investigators did?
A. No.
Q. What does it mean, in your mind, if anything, in relation to what the three-person review panel did?
A. I think it's more relevant to what Mr Grace, Mr Middleton and myself did.
Q. And what does it mean, that the BCIF was part of a larger collaborative process? What was the larger collaborative process?
A. I suppose our review meetings.
Q. And would you say that what happened in the meetings was an intuitive synthesis methodology?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. What do you think "intuitive synthesis methodology" means?
A. To me, that doesn't - you know, it doesn't reflect what actually happened in those review meetings when we were properly - or when we were assessing the available information. It wasn't based on intuition, it was based on the available evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Can I ask you this: insofar as you can understand it, what do you think is meant by "intuitive synthesis methodology"?
A. I actually have no idea.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. On page 3 of the letter under the heading "D. The different versions of the BCIF", in the third paragraph, it says:
... at all material times, members of
[Strike Force] Parrabell used a BCIF in a substantively similar way ...

Do you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. How did the investigators use the BCIF?
A. So the 10 indicators, or prompts, did not change.

They relied on them the whole time.
Q. Sure. But how did they use them in a substantively similar way to the way you used them and the review panel used them?
A. So they were required to extract information from the case file items that would best be applied to each of those prompts for me to then populate them when I was completing those forms.
Q. So you say the investigators used the BCIF in that sense?
A. Yes.
Q. Then the letter says:

The use of the BCIF was informed by discussions between members
of ... Parrabel 1 and regular exchanges
between junior and senior members of the team.

Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And "regular exchanges between junior and senior
members", would you understand that to be between the investigators and yourself or what?
A. In that context, yes.
Q. Were the investigators, here apparently described as the "junior" members, having regular exchanges with Mr Middleton or Mr Grace?
A. No.
Q. Only with you?
A. Yes.
Q. On page 4, under the heading "Form 3", towards the bottom of the page - now, the expression "Form 3" is a reference to what we've been calling, and you've been calling, the second version of the BCIF?
A. Yes
Q. In the third paragraph from the bottom, the letter says:

We are instructed that the senior officers of ... Parrabell considered that the amendments ... between Form 2 and Form 3--
ie, between the first version and the second version --
were such that it was appropriate for officers of ... Parrabell to revisit cases that had been assessed.
"Officers" plural:
Specifically, for each case that had been previously assessed, the case was returned to the investigation team, and the investigation team was required to re-review and reassess the case in accordance with Form 3.

That's quite wrong, isn't it, on your account?
A. Yes, that did not happen.
Q. It's simply false; that simply did not happen, did it?
A. It did not happen.
Q. All right. Back to your statement
[NPL.9000.0026.0007] now, in paragraph 70, you tell us that you had no involvement in the selection or appointment of the academic review team?
A. That is the case.
Q. In paragraph 72, you say that in the course of a meeting with $\operatorname{Dr}$ de Lint and $\operatorname{Dr}$ Dalton, when they travelled to Sydney to meet the team - which I believe was October 2016 - you say in the course of that meeting you discussed the BCIF form and explained the methodology for completing those forms to ensure that the academic review team was familiar with "our" process?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell them that, actually, you were the only person that filled out the forms?
A. I think that, yeah, that inference was made.
Q. Sorry?
A. I'm quite certain that that inference was made during that meeting, that $I$ was the one that was completing all those Bias Crime Indicator Forms.
Q. So if they had the impression that the various investigators were themselves completing the forms, you couldn't assist with how they might have thought that? A. I'm quite certain that I made it clear that I was completing all of those Bias Crime Indicator Forms to the academic team during that meeting.
Q. Now, just a couple of final things. Firstly, I'm not sure if it is in that volume but it might be, I'd just like you to look at Mr Middleton's statement briefly. [NPL.9000.0029.0001] in paragraph 60, if you could just go to that?
A. I have that.
Q. He is talking about form 3, which, as previously understood, is the second version of the form?
A. Sorry, what are we suggesting form 3 is?
Q. Form 3, as I understand it, is the one that came into existence after Sergeant Steer's presentation in June, in other words, it's the second version of the form?
A. Okay, right.
Q. And he says in paragraph 60:

Due to the material amendments made between Form 2 and Form 3 --
ie, the first version and second version -... cases that had been reviewed in accordance with Form 2 --
that is, the first version -were subsequently returned to investigators to re-assess and if necessary, re-review in accordance with Form 3.

Now, that's not correct, is it?
A. Well, it was returned to me to reassess. So as an investigator, I did do that reassessment.
Q. Yes, correct. It was returned to you to do something?
A. Yes.
Q. Not to "the investigators"?
A. I was an investigator, so, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes, but you were the person solely who took responsibility for that review; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MR GRAY: Q. Mr Middleton says:
I was not involved in tasking the investigators --
plural --
to complete these reassessments.
Now, the investigators, plural, did not complete the reassessments, did they?
A. They did not.
Q. You did?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, just in paragraph 68, he is talking about the
review process, that's the three-person pane1, and in 68(2) he says:

In preparation of the panel meeting, I would review any completed BCIF that was to be assessed by the panel.

And your understanding is that that's correct?
A. If he did that, yes.
Q. He says:

I also reviewed progress reports sent to me
by DSC Bignell ahead of the meeting.
Now, what is that, as you understand it?
A. They were emails sent just giving him an update on how we were progressing, how many cases had been reviewed, how many were still to be reviewed.
Q. I see. But not - I see, progress reports in the overall sense of how the whole project was travelling?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Now, he doesn't say, and I think this is consistent with your understanding, that he looked at the underpinning material itself, that is, the documents that had been extracted by the investigators. Is that your understanding?
A. Potentially not.
Q. Pardon?
A. Yeah, I'm not sure if he did or not.
Q. I see. Now, lastly, just some questions about Mr Grace's statement, which is also in that folder [NPL.9000.0024.0012]. I just want to ask you about a couple of paragraphs. First of all, 31(c). He is dealing with the three-stage process that you also have talked about, and in 31(c) he is at the review stage, by the review panel of three people. He says:

The review ... was the process of reviewing the compiled BCIF which, following the triage process, contained the facts which were determined relevant by the investigating officers ...

And you would agree with that, I think?
A. Yes.
Q. Then:
... to make a determination on whether bias
was relevant and, if so, what category of bias ...

So that's what the review panel was doing?
A. Yes.
Q. Then he says this:

The review team --
being the three of you --
approached this task on the basis that there would be sufficient detail in the BCIFs to determine whether there were facts which would provide evidence as to whether or not a bias crime existed.

Now, my question is this: as you understand it, did the three-person team not look at the underlying totality of the material at all, but only look at the content of the BCIFs that you had completed?
A. As I said, so I reviewed the material that was extracted.
Q. Of course, certain1y.
A. Mr Grace had cause to review that material that was on e@gle.i as part --
Q. "Had cause to", what do you mean?
A. Sorry?
Q. You said, "had cause to"?
A. In respect to his role on the e@gle.i system, he would review that data with it was entered, to change that to the status of "accepted". In doing that, I would imagine that he would have reviewed or read that material.
Q. The extracts?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. In relation to Mr Middleton, I can't comment whether or not he did read that material or not.
Q. Thank you. Then turn to paragraph 43. He says:

On joining ... Parrabel7, ... new officers would have received the Induction Package ...

Prior to April 2016, new officers coming in could not have received the induction package, obviously?
A. Pre April 2016, that was the expansion of Strike Force Parrabell, when there were I think up to 10 new officers that became available to us --
Q. In about April?
A. Yes, it was around that time. It was later on, and that's when that induction package was created to coincide with the call for more investigators to come on board to assist with that review process. That was when they were provided that information.
Q. And I think you've covered this already but he says they "would have received it". Your evidence is that they did receive it or that you assumed they did, or what?
A. I assume they did. I can't recall physically handing that to them. I don't know if Mr Grace did. It was available to them. There was a document or a folder within our shared drive that had all those constituent documents available to them. As I said, I can't recall physically printing it out and handing it to each of those investigators but I'm aware that it was available to them.
Q. He says that they would have been provided a briefing by you. Did that happen?
A. Yes.
Q. And more often than not, he would also have provided an introduction to the goals of the strike force. Did that happen?
A. Of course. He introduced himself to them, they were coming to board to assist us with the review so --
Q. Sure. But apart from that courteous introductory aspect, did he, in any meetings that you were present, give
them any substantive or serious discussion about what the actual job was?
A. He would have given them an overview of what was required and why they were here, or there, rather. You know, in terms of how formal that was, it was more, you know, the niceties of "You're here, this is what we're hoping to achieve, this is how we're going to do it." I certainly don't recall him sitting everyone down and, you know, hard and fast rules, "This is what's going to happen, this is how we're going to do it."
Q. In 53, if we could go to that, he is talking about the BCIF evolving over time, and you have explained that, from version 1 to version 2 to version 3 , and in the last sentence, second-1ast 1 ine, he says:

The triage team were made aware of amendments to the BCIF form through updates to the constituent documents and by way of verbal discussions.

Now, they weren't made aware of anything by updates to the constituent documents, were they?
A. So Mr Grace was responsible for creating those constituent documents and updating them as Parrabel1 progressed.
Q. No, no, we've been through this.
A. Yes.
Q. They were never updated. You agreed with this before. The constituent documents are the investigation plan , the induction package --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- and the coordinating instructions, which you have given evidence today were never changed?
A. I didn't provide them to them.
Q. No, no, pausing there. Given that they were never changed, nothing was conveyed to the triage team by updates to them, since they didn't change; you would agree?
A. Sorry, I'm struggling to understand what you are asking me.
Q. I can see there is a problem. His sentence says that the triage team were made aware of amendments to the

BCIF --
A. Yes.
Q. -- by two methods: one, updates to the constituent documents; and, two, verbal discussions?
A. Yes.
Q. Focusing on updates to the constituent documents, what I'm reminding you of is that you have given evidence that there were no updates to the constituent documents; they never changed?
A. It is my understanding that the actual BCIF forms, in my opinion, is a constituent document.
Q. That may be a way of looking at things, but he is, in this statement, talking about the constituent documents as being the three I have referred to.
A. Well, that's Mr Grace's recollection of how things happened.
Q. Yes, but you know that that's not right, don't you, because they were not updated?
A. Effectively, yes.
Q. Are you agreeing with me?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, were they made aware of amendments to the BCIF form by way of verbal discussions?
A. Yes.
Q. By you or someone else?
A. Yes, by me.
Q. And why?
A. Well, if a new BCIF form was created, in respect to the first and the second form, I made them all aware of the update and they were provided a copy --
Q. And what difference did it make to their work?
A. Well, it was more general discussion, "This has happened, this has come from our preliminary reviews. We need to change that form. Here is a copy of the updated form for your reference." Referred to that accordingly. It didn't change the way they did things, in that the indicators didn't change or the --
Q. And did you explain to them what the reason for the changes was?
A. I could only imagine there was a general discussion as to why that occurred.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And are you saying what you can distinctly recall, what you believe most likely happened?
A. I recall having a conversation, post that meeting, where a decision was made after we met with Sergeant Steer and he gave that presentation, with the investigators, about the changes to the Bias Crime Indicators form. I do recall a conversation occurring.
Q. And did you explain to them what you were doing and what they were expected to do?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Paragraph 65 talks about your presence in both the triage team and the review team. Now, technically, if we were being detailed - you weren't doing the triage, were you?
A. No.
Q. But $I$ don't want to take time on that. But he says that allowed the senior team input into the triage process, and he says:
... to ensure that the triage team were accurately and effectively populating the BCIFs with all relevant material.

Now, that's not what they were doing, were they?
A. No.
Q. A11 they were doing was extracting material, some of which you chose, according to your assessment, needed to go into the BCIF, and some didn't?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 66 he gives two examples of his looking at what he calls "source material". One example concerns records of interview. He says that where there had been a record of interview, he would usually discuss that with you and usually review that record of interview document
himself. Is that your recollection?
A. So, again, that would be generally a document someone would bring to the review panel, those kind of documents, that we could look at and assess as a collective.
Q. So do you recall him raising records of interview?
A. Yes.
Q. And what about coronial reports, which he goes on to talk about in that paragraph? Did he, to your knowledge, review coronial reports, if they were indicated on the BCIF?
A. Yes. It was my understanding that Mr Grace reviewed al1 documents that were included on the e@gle.i system.
Q. Thank you. And I think finally, in 67, the next paragraph, he says each of Mr Middleton, yourself and himself would read the BCIF for each case to be reviewed in the meeting, as well as any particularly pertinent documents. What do you understand him to be referring to there?
A. So whilst I was completing the BCIFs, I would often make reference in those forms with a reference number, and that would refer back to the product on the e@gle.i. So if it was a statement, I would put the statement number, so that would allow them to then go to e@gle.i, if they saw fit, to look at that particular document that $I$ was referring to in completing that indicator form.
Q. And that, such a document, would in any event be brought by you to the meeting in hard copy?
A. I would generally bring all documents, not just the ones that $I$ referred to in completing those Bias Crime Indicator Forms, but $I$ suppose the pertinent documents, that is the ones I'm directly referring to in completing those indicator forms.
Q. Sorry, when you say you would generally bring all documents, you mean even those that the investigator had not extracted?
A. No, no, no. Sorry. So if an investigator - upon completing their review, they would put all the documents that they deemed relevant on e@gle.i. They would be then put into a folder for that particular case. I would bring that whole folder.

MR GRAY: I thought that's what you meant. Thank you.

Those are my questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, might I have a 10-minute adjournment to consult with the witness?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, if you feel unable to continue now, by all means, certainly.

MR TEDESCHI: I should be ready very shortly.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. We will
adjourn.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you, Commissioner.
<EXAMINATION BY MR TEDESCHI:
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant, you were asked some questions by Counsel Assisting about one category of finding, "Bias Crime", that contained the term "beyond a reasonable doubt", did "beyond a reasonable doubt" play a role in any of the other three categories of findings?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. In relation to the second category, which was in the penultimate version, of "Suspected Bias Crime", the category referred to "evidence or information that exists that the incident may have been motivated by bias, that the incident cannot be proved beyond a reasonable doubt that it was either wholly or partially motivated by bias and constitutes a criminal offence" - what was the standard of proof, if any, that applied to that category?
A. We still endeavoured to apply the highest standard, but if there was any other suggestion that, you know, took away from the element of bias, then obviously it was bumped down to the suspected bias. So I suppose we did apply a balance of probabilities approach to anything less than a definitive beyond reasonable doubt bias crime.
Q. You were asked some questions by Counsel Assisting about a case in which there was both a possible element of
robbery and a possible element of bias or hate crime. Can I give you a scenario that applied to quite a few of the cases, of the case where a person has been murdered and it would appear from the material that during the course of an attack on that person, the person has been robbed, so that there's a possible element of robbery. Would the existence of that possible element of robbery exclude any possibility of a bias crime against a person who is in the LGBTIQ communities?
A. It wouldn't exclude it, no.
Q. So how would you deal with a situation where there was the possibility of both elements?
A. It would have been likely assessed as a suspected bias crime.
Q. Even though there might have been a robbery?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, were you asked some questions about a letter that was sent from the Office of the General Counsel of the NSW Police to this Inquiry, dated 19 May this year, and you were directed to page 2 under the heading "C. The evidence of $A C$ Crandell". The first paragraph was read to you, which reads as follows:

> The use of BCIFs by [Strike Force]
> Parrabell was one element of a larger collaborative process through which officers from [Strike Force] Parrabel1 applied an intuitive synthesis methodology in assessing each case.

What do you understand to have been the larger collaborative process of Strike Force Parrabell?
A. So the review of the available documentation, the completion of the Bias Crime Indicator Form and the review panel coming to the ultimate decision in respect to what the most appropriate indicator was for each case.
Q. And as you have explained to this Inquiry, that collaborative process did involve those three persons on the review panel having access to the BCIF forms?
A. Yes.
Q. When you yourself were writing up the BCIF forms, did you in each case come to an initial conclusion yourself as
to which category of finding that each particular case, in your view, should be categorised as?
A. I did, yes.
Q. And was that an initial view on your part, subject to discussion with the review panel?
A. It was, yes.
Q. Was the final decision made by the review panel?
A. It was.
Q. How did you come to your initial conclusions about each case based upon the evidence? Was there some sort of counting done or was there some sort of allocation of priorities given to any of the 10 indicative factors in the BCIF form? How did you do it? How did you come to a conclusion?
A. There was no, you know if a number of indicators were met, then it would fall within a particular category; it was looking at all the information as a whole and holistically to see, you know, where it would best fall. Obviously there was, in different cases, certain information that pointed more in one direction than the other, and we would assess all available information to make a determination. But there was no, you know, if one was met and one wasn't, then it would fall within a category; it was looking at every single case in its entirety based on what was available to us.
Q. So each case was looked at as an individual case on its own?
A. Yes.
Q. There was no formula for looking at particular parts of the case or particular categories of evidence?
A. No.
Q. And the paragraph then goes on to say:

While BCIFs were an important tool in this process, they were only one element of it.

Is that correct?
A. To a degree, yes.
Q. And in the second --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Sorry, did you say "to a degree"? A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. What were the other elements of the process?
A. Well, the review or the triage process, the completion of the Bias Crime Indicator Form, and then the review pane1.
Q. And you've also said that at least in terms of Detective Grace, he had access to the underlying documents on e@gle.i as well?
A. Him and Mr Middleton both had access to those documents.
Q. Now, the second paragraph that was read to you says this:

Investigators in Strike Force Parrabell -on7y --

Now, by "investigators", if you understand that to mean the members of Strike Force Parrabel1 --
conducted a thorough review of the materials held by NSW Police Force --
is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. --
applied police methodology (as applicable
at the time ... ) and then formed a view
regarding the existence (or otherwise) of
bias crimes by reference to the BCIF
template.
What do you say about that?
A. The members of Strike Force Parrabell did do that.
Q.

Any conclusions reached by an
investigator --

The term of "investigator", if you apply that to mean a member of Strike Force Parrabe11:

Any conclusions reached by an investigator were subject to assessment by senior officers before a final conclusion was reached.

Was that the case?
A. It was, yes.
Q. And in what sense?
A. In that every person that was a member of Strike Force Parrabe11 undertook a process, obviously everyone had different roles but as a whole, Strike Force Parrabell members came to that - or did that as described there.
Q. Now, prior to giving evidence here today, have you had an opportunity to read the submissions that were made, I think back in June of this year, by Counsel Assisting in relation to Public Hearing 2?
A. I have, yes.
Q. What would you say to the suggestion that the purpose of Strike Force Parrabell was to refute the suggestion that there had been a significant number of gay hate motivated homicides?
A. I disagree with that.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. That wasn't the ultimate goal of Strike Force Parrabe 11.
Q. What was the ultimate goal?
A. To review each of the names on that 1 ist of 88 and to make a determination whether or not that person's death was a result of a bias.
Q. What do you say to the suggestion that the purpose of Strike Force Parrabel1 was to show that the claim of 88 gay hate murders, 30 of them unsolved, was an exaggeration?
A. No. That was not the intention of Strike Force Parrabe 11.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. It was never portrayed to me that there was an exaggeration of gay hate crimes and that my purpose was to,
you know, dispute that. It was to, again, look at all those names, all those deaths, and to make the determination.
Q. What do you say to the suggestion that the purpose of Strike Force Parrabell was to refute the suggestion that the NSW Police had not adequately investigated gay hate crimes?
A. No, that wasn't the role of Strike Force Parrabel 1.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, could I just ask this question - I'm not going to stop you - but I'm just wondering why all this wasn't dealt with in Mr Bignell's statement. You seem to have this pre-prepared, but I don't understand why it's now coming out, as it were - it's not really re-examination, it's sort of examination-in-chief, so why do we need to second-guess every time these statements come in, because you often ask questions which you either must know the answer to or, alternatively, they have been discussed. I'm interested to save some time.

MR TEDESCHI: Wel1 --
THE COMMISSIONER: No, I'11 finish, if I may.
You were obviously prepared to ask these questions. I'm just wanting to know why it wasn't put up-front. Could you tell me that?

MR TEDESCHI: I think it impliedly was included in the --
THE COMMISSIONER: Implied1y? Where?
MR TEDESCHI: I will come to that. My next set of questions is going to be about a part of his statement in - -

THE COMMISSIONER: But I'm interested in his evidence, not in your gloss. So what I really want to know is, whoever prepared his statement, given the time frames, why it wasn't done fulsomely. If you anticipated all along asking Mr Bignell for his personal view as a junior police officer at the time, aged 26, what his views might have been about Counsel Assisting's submissions, either I take note of it or I don't, but I'm just wondering why you wouldn't come up-front with it.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I was of the view that it was incumbent upon Counsel Assisting, having made those submissions, to put those questions to the witness, in fairness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Because it's a procedural fairness issue, is it?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes. I was surprised that it hadn't been put.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see. Were you surprised? We11, I must confess that that might be of some interest, Mr Tedeschi, but it might also come as no surprise that I may not necessarily be interested in the person who did not formulate Parrabell in the first place. But, anyway, your answer is you don't have one, you're just doing it now because it is helpful to me, is it?

MR TEDESCHI: I'm doing it because I expected Counse1 Assisting to do it and he hasn't.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see. So it's a criticism of Counsel Assisting, is it?

MR TEDESCHI: I would have thought that Counsel Assisting, having made those submissions, would have been obliged by the normal rules of procedural fairness to put it to the witness --

THE COMMISSIONER: And tel1 me if you wil1, though -MR TEDESCHI: -- if he is to maintain those submissions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course, and I do understand that, and no doubt you are well familiar with them. But I'm just understanding why one of the most junior people in the Parrabell process would be able to comment usefully on the purpose of Parrabe11. I just wonder why that would be so. But please go on. You go on. Let's not waste any more time. You go on.

MR TEDESCHI: I can answer that question, if you wish.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, I'd prefer to you get on with it, if you wish.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant, what do you say to the suggestion that the purpose of Strike Force Parrabel 1 was to assert that the true position was that only a small proportion of the 88 cases that were investigated by Parrabe1 1 were, in fact, gay hate murders, and that the number of those that were unsolved was much less than $30 ?$
A. No, I disagree with that.
Q. Could I take you now very briefly to your statement [NPL.9000.0026.0007] at paragraph 68, if that could be brought up?
A. Yes, I have that.
Q. Paragraph 68 reads - it is about the meetings of the review panel:

> The meetings were approached with open minds and with a focus on achieving the correct identification of whether anti-LGBTIQ bias affected the relevant case. We capitalised on each other's different life experiences, professional knowledge and skills throughout our discussions. These meetings were often full of robust discussion as we sought to challenge both our own and each other's way of thinking to reach the most appropriate categorisation for each case.

Is that stil1, to this day, your genuine view about what those discussions entailed?
A. It is, yes.
Q. You say in paragraph 69:
$I$ do not recal7 any instances where $I$ felt pressured to change my opinion on the designation of a case, that my opinion had been unfairly shut down, or that I had disagreed with the final designation selected.

Is that stil1 your view?
A. It is, yes.
Q. At any stage, did anybody seek to convince you to minimise the incidence of gay hate crime?
A. They did not.
Q. At any time during your involvement in Parrabell, did anyone suggest to you that you should seek to minimise the incidence of gay hate crime?
A. No.
Q. At any time during your involvement in the strike force, did anybody tell you or suggest to you that the incidence of gay hate crime was exaggerated or overblown?
A. They did not.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Mr Bignell, can I just ask you this, before any further questions, if any, are asked of you. Were you asked to participate in Parrabell or were you told you were going to do it?
A. It was put to me that it would be a good opportunity. I don't know if I necessarily had a choice in the matter but I obviously accepted the offer, nonetheless.
Q. And did anyone tell you, and if so, who, why you were doing what you were doing?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. When you say "not necessarily", did anyone say to you, "I'd like to you do this, Cameron, because ..."? Apart from being a good career opportunity, did anyone ask you or tell you what it was they had in mind that you should do?
A. No, they didn't tell me what the outcome needed to be.
Q. No, no, I'm not talking about outcome. Did they tell you why you were being asked to review some 80 -odd cases? A. Well, the Terms of Reference explained to me what was required of me in doing that review.
Q. I didn't ask you that, Mr Bignell, I just wonder if you would address yourself to my question. Did anyone tell you why you were being asked to address the 88 or whatever it was cases?
A. No.
Q. So, without me being disrespectful, it was, in a case of, "This is a really good career opportunity. You're going to do it", but you were never explained what it was or why it was you were asked to do these cases, or why
these particular cases; is that right or not?
A. I was told what we were hoping to achieve by doing the review. I wasn't told --
Q. I'11 come to that in a minute.
A. -- "This is why we are doing it."
Q. I'11 come to that in a minute, but $I$ take it from what you have just said, nobody told you why you were being asked to do the review or these particular cases?

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, with respect, the question is ambiguous --

THE COMMISSIONER: No, we11, you sit down, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Whether you're asking why it was him --
THE COMMISSIONER: You can ask in a moment. You sit down, please. I'11 ask --

MR TEDESCHI: It is an ambiguous question.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, please, do me the courtesy. I won't stop you, I don't think I have done so yet. Please.
Q. Did anyone explain to you why you were doing the review or, in particular, these cases?
A. No.
Q. And it was put to you on the basis that it would be a career enhancing opportunity?
A. Yes.
Q. But you never asked "Why these cases?" "Where did they come from?" or "How come we're looking at these particular cases"?
A. I was made aware where the cases came from.
Q. And what were you told and by whom?
A. I don't know who exactly told me, if it was Mr Grace or Mr Middleton, that the list, the 88 names, had been developed previously by Sue Thompson.
Q. I see.
A. Yes.
Q. And did you understand the allegations that Ms Thompson had been making in relation to the cases?
A. Not previous to my involvement with Parrabel1, no.
Q. But after Parrabe11, did you read anything Ms Thompson had written to inform yourself what created her interest in these cases?
A. Yes.
Q. And what view did you form about that?
A. It was my opinion that some of the suggestions that were being made by Ms Thompson were incorrect.
Q. Leaving aside whether they were correct or incorrect, did you understand what she was asserting?
A. Yes.
Q. And which was what?
A. That the police hadn't done a good enough job in respect to their response to investigating those deaths. There was a number of suggestions that she was making, but that was the main one.
Q. And you believed that you were doing a review of those cases in order, what, to deal with her allegations?
A. No, I was doing that review to determine whether or not those deaths were a result of a bias, particularly a gay bias.
Q. Yes, but, in effect, to deal with whether or not her allegations were correct or not?
A. To a degree, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, is there anything you would like to ask?

MR TEDESCHI: Q. You have told the Commissioner that you didn't know about the Sue Thompson list before you became involved in Parrabell?
A. I didn't, no.
Q. And what were you told about that list when you first became involved in Parrabel1?
A. That there was a 1 ist in existence containing 88 names of men, that it was being asserted that they died as a result of a bias, and it was - basically it was suggested
that they were all murdered or died because of a bias.
Q. Bias against LGBTIQ members?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you have any preconceived view about those 88 deaths when you first started at Parrabe11?
A. No.
Q. I might be corrected but I think the Commissioner was asking you if you had any idea why you were chosen to do the particular task that you did.
A. Only based on what I've said in the statement.

I don't know if that is entirely the case. That was my opinion as to why $I$ was chosen to be involved in Strike Force Parrabe11.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray.
<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:
MR GRAY: Q. Mr Bigne11, so that I get this straight, soon after you started at Parrabel1, somebody told you that "We're doing this because there's a Sue Thompson list of 88"?
A. At the time I was told about Parrabell $I$ was made aware of that list.
Q. Who told you that?
A. It was either Mr Middleton or Mr Grace.
Q. And did they say, whoever it was, "This list of 88 looks good to us, let's just confirm it", or did they say, "We think this 1 ist of 88 is a bit exaggerated", or did they say anything about why it was being reviewed at all?
A. I believe I was told that the 88 - or the suggestion that those 88 names, that there was a suggestion that they were all murdered or killed because of an LGBTIQ bias towards them, and I was told that we were going to be conducting a review of each of those 88 names, just of those 88 names, to determine whether or not they were a victim of an LGBTIQ bias.
Q. And why was that going to be done, according to what you were told? Why review it at all?
A. I don't know.
Q. Was it to prove it wrong or was it to prove it right or was it for some other reason that is not obvious?
A. I don't know why the Strike Force Parrabe11 came about. As I said, I was made aware of it in August 2015 and it was put to me that $I$ would be involved in that. As to why it came out - or came about prior to that, I do not know.
Q. So you knew by the time this had been made known to you, the Sue Thompson list --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you knew that it 1 isted 88 deaths; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew that, according to what you were told, it was being suggested that a11 88 of them had a gay hate bias factor in them?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew - I think from something you said earlier today - or you were told, that the suggestion was being made, whether by Sue Thompson or someone else, that in some or all of those cases, the police had not sufficiently investigated them?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say, do you, that given that that was the appreciation of the 1 ist of 88 that was abroad, you just have no idea why the police wanted to check the list themselves and review them?
A. Not definitively, no. I can draw certain assumptions as to why --
Q. What would you draw?
A. -- but I don't know.
Q. What would you draw?
A. That there was --

MR TEDESCHI: I object on relevance.
MR GRAY: I press it.
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry?

MR TEDESCHI: I object on relevance.
THE COMMISSIONER: I think it is relevant, Mr Tedeschi, thank you. Yes.

MR GRAY: Q. Not so much what would you draw, what did you draw?
A. That the list of 88 names that was out there, that was in the community, was, in fact, being, I suppose, advocated that it was, you know, a short-falling of police, that all of those people died as a result of a gay bias, and so, you know, there's an issue within the State of New South Wales of gay bias, and that we needed to look at each of those cases and make a determination whether or not that was the case.
Q. Because there was a view inside the police that those accusations were wrong?
A. I suppose, yes.
Q. That's what you knew, didn't you?
A. That's my opinion, yes.
Q. You knew that the police thought that the accusations, whether by Sue Thompson or anyone else, that there were 88, that these 88 were gay bias deaths and that the police hadn't investigated them properly, were wrong?
A. I think the view was that no-one had actually looked at that list. The list had been formed by Ms Thompson and then no-one had gone away and had a proper look at each of those names to make a proper determination.
Q. The view - and I will put this again - that you understood to be held in the police, including in Parrabell officers, Mr Middleton, Mr Grace, Mr Crandell, was that the accusations by Ms Thompson, or whoever, about the list of 88, were exaggerated or wrong, and that this review was designed to set out the true position?
A. I disagree with the fact it was saying that it was exaggerated or wrong. It was that no-one had actually looked at each of those deaths individually to make a proper determination.
Q. Are you saying that those who spoke to you, Mr Middleton or Mr Grace, or anyone else, were entirely neutral and thought that the accusations by Ms Thompson or
others might have been perfectly true and, if so, then so be it?
A. I know for myself that the information that was provided to me from the onset of Parrabel1, there would have been no issue if every one of those 88 deaths had been returned as being a victim of gay bias. It wouldn't have been an issue if that was my findings.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes, but the point is that the view held by you, I suggest, at the very least, was that Ms Thompson's allegations were suspect?
A. No. It was that we hadn't properly looked at each of those names.
Q. Did you think they had a basis in truth or did you think they were suspect?
A. I didn't have any opinion on that iist.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see, okay.
MR GRAY: Q. And according to you, you detected no impression or opinion among any of the others you were working with; they were just a complete blank slate, were they?
A. Mr Crande11, Mr Middleton and Mr Grace did not offer any opinion as to that list to me.
Q. No suggestion as to whether they thought the list might have been exaggerated or wrong in any way?
A. As I said, I was told that the intentions of Strike Force Parrabel 1 was to look at each of those 88 names and make a determination whether or not they were a victim of bias.

MR GRAY: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Bigne11, thank you very much for your assistance.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, the time for you to respond, if you still wish to do so, to what Mr Gray said this morning, wil1 be 9.30 next Thursday morning. We've got a fair bit on our plate that day and I will have to limit you to about half an hour.

MR TEDESCHI: That's fine.
THE COMMISSIONER: I can't imagine that you would need much more time.

MR TEDESCHI: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right. We will make it your response at 9.30 next Thursday, and I will adjourn otherwise. Thank you very much

AT 3.54PM THE SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY WAS ADJOURNED TO MONDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2023 AT 10AM
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