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THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gray, I understand that Ms Alberici is here.

MR GRAY: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Can I just indicate to those who are present --

MR McARDLE: I will announce my appearance, your Honour. I appear for Ms Alberici. My name is McArdle.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr McArdle. Leave is granted.

Can I just indicate there has been a slight delay in beginning today's proceedings for reasons that will become apparent. Ms Alberici has to leave at 12.15 today on the dot, and so the time that everyone will have with her will be limited. Mr Gray will go first. Mr Tedeschi will follow. I then will ask Ms Brown's representative, if she has any questions. Mr Glissan will then go last today.

Ms Alberici has some time on Tuesday morning, via AVL. That has been arranged purely for the purposes of Mr Thangaraj, who can't be here this week. So that's the time frame for Ms Alberici.

At the moment, my understanding is that there is no other time available.

Yes, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: Commissioner, may I --
THE COMMISSIONER: Forgive me, I'm sorry to interrupt you.
MR McARDLE: May I make an application for a non-publication order on one of the paragraphs that haven't been mentioned on Ms Alberici's statement?

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know about that. We will deal with that in a moment.

Mr McArdle, I apologise to you. On Tuesday morning, after Mr Thangaraj asks any questions, I would give you, as it were, the last say, if you have any questions for Ms Alberici, prior to Mr Gray, if he has any questions.

MR McARDLE: I understand that, your Honour.
THE COMMISSIONER: I apologise for leaving you out. Have you discussed the non-publication order with anybody?

MR McARDLE: I have, your Honour. It is non-controversial, it is the identity of Ms Alberici's current place of employment, in paragraph 4.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have no problem with that. It falls in with a category of other matters which have been of similar subject. Mr McArdle, I don't know the precise details of the status of this statement at the moment, I don't know whether it is on the website. I understand it isn't.

I will make an order redacting those details, so can everyone please note, in this room now, that that detail will be redacted, and what ultimately goes up on the website will obviously have that redaction. Thank you.

MR McARDLE: I note also that there is already another order for redaction that has been made with respect to the statement, the identity of some uninvolved individuals.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that's fine. What I wil1 do, Mr McArdle, I will have an order prepared formally so that you know where you stand and everyone else does and I will sign that during the course of the morning.

MR McARDLE: Thank you very much.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: Commissioner, may $I$ first briefly address some housekeeping matters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Certain1y.
MR GRAY: There are some documents to be added to exhibit 6 - that is, the tender bundle in this hearing they are as follows: first of all, tabs 389, 390, 392 and 394. They are emails and text messages to Ms Young from various people. They were not tendered last week due to an application by Ms Young's lawyers for the redaction of certain matters and that application is no longer pressed.

Secondly, tab 476G, which is email correspondence between the Inquiry and the lawyers for Mr Willing.

Thirdly, tabs 520 and 520A, which are two statements from Detective Senior Constable Paul Rullo.

Fourth1y, tabs 521 and 521A, which are two statements from Pamela Young, and finally, tab 524, which is Ms Alberici's statement.

As we've just heard, there are some small redaction matters to be attended to in the case of that last one. Otherwise, the tender bundle has been updated with those documents and they wil1, subject to that matter just mentioned, be uploaded to the website. Non-publication orders have also been agreed in relation to these documents, I'm told, and $I$ hand up a short minute of order which I'm instructed has been agreed by the parties.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. I take it what you are giving me may not necessarily cover what Mr McArdle has just said.

MR GRAY: It won't cover what he has just said this morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. I wil1 do an additional order for those.

MR McARDLE: Thank you, your Honour.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I have made those orders, thank you.

MR GRAY: I call Ms Alberici.
<EMMA ALBERICI, sworn:
[9.52am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:
MR GRAY: Q. Ms Alberici, you have prepared a statement for the Commission in the last few days, in fact, on 25 September 2023 [SCOI.85817_0001]
A. Yes.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You were a journalist for nearly 30 years, from 1991
to 2020; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And no doubt acutely conscious of the need for accuracy when publicly reporting on matters?
A. Yes.
Q. And no doubt that same concern for accuracy would apply to your evidence before the Commission?
A. Indeed.
Q. Generally - and I'11 come to some of the detail of this, but generally - in the period leading up to the Lateline interviews in April 2015 involving Ms Young, was it ever your intention in any way to mislead or deceive the NSW Police, including the Police Media personne1?
A. No.
Q. Had you had dealings with any of the Police Media personnel previously at that time?
A. What do you mean?
Q. We11, did you know them? Had you had communications with them professionally, such as Georgie Wells or Ms McMahon or Strath Gordon?
A. Well, yes, generally speaking as a journalist you encounter police from time to time.
Q. So these were people that you had come across in your working 1 ife?
A. Yes.
Q. And had had some communications with about whatever matter in the past?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you have good relations with them - working relations?
A. I wasn't a police reporter, so I didn't have specific relations. It may have been incidental from time to time.
Q. In your statement - do you have it with you, by the way, your statement?
A. I do.
Q. On the third page, under the heading, "As to question 3" - do you have that? Have you found that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. I'll come to this in a little more detail, too, but you say there, in terms of Ms Young and the arrangements that were made in respect of these interviews in April 2015, you say:

> My memory is that she was not there to be a "leaker".

Do you see that? You just need to say "Yes" for the transcript?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you mean by that, and tell me one way or the other, that you thought she had approval from her superiors to give --

MR TEDESCHI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Why?
MR GRAY: Q. To give the sit-down Lateline interview and for it to be broadcast?

MR TEDESCHI: The relevance of what she thought.
THE COMMISSIONER: I think her understanding is relevant because she would have gained her understanding from some other facts, I presume. You may cross-examine her in due course, but no, I will allow it, thank you, Mr Tedeschi.

MR GRAY: Q. Do you remember the question or --
A. Do you mind --
Q. Sure. When you say your memory is that she was not there to be a "leaker", do you mean by that that you thought she had approval from her superiors to give the sit-down Lateline interview and for it to be broadcast?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you get that impression or that understanding from what she said to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And/or from something else or just from what she said to you?
A. From what - from what Pamela Young said?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, and - yes.
Q. I'11 come back to that. Briefly, it seems that you had known Ms Brown, Penny Brown, for reasons unconnected with her work as a police officer?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. For some time?
A. Mmm -hmm.
Q. And you had a high regard for her?
A. Very much so.
Q. Thank you. And is this right, that she, Ms Brown, at some point in early 2015, said that her boss, Ms Young, would like to talk to you about a case that she was working on?
A. Yes.
Q. And you and Ms Brown and Ms Young had 1 unch - and we have the date of this - in late January 2015. Do you remember that?
A. I can't remember the exact date, I thought it was February, but yes.
Q. Anyway, the three of you had 1 unch?
A. That's right.
Q. Did either Ms Young or Ms Brown tell you something about what it was they wanted to talk to you about, and, if so, what did they say - what did each of them say?
A. It was a long time ago, I can't remember chapter and verse what was said, but the crux of it was that they were looking for a trusted voice to do an interview about the circumstances of a case they were working on.
Q. Did they tell you at that point - they clearly did later, or someone did - something about what the case was or the nature of the topic?
A. Yes.
Q. What did they tell you, if you can recal1, just in general?
A. They had chosen to speak to me because $I$ wasn't involved with police, so $I$ wasn't a police reporter. That wasn't my background. So I didn't come with any preconceived idea about the story. And it was the story of a death off the cliffs at North Head.
Q. Then, it seems from records that we have - and perhaps you can confirm - that towards the end of February, someone, it seems Ms Young, but perhaps you could clarify for us if you remember, provided you with her very lengthy statement; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was it Ms Young or was it someone else?
A. It was Ms Young.
Q. Did she physically bring it to you somewhere?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Where was that? Where were you then working?
A. I recall it was at the $A B C$.
Q. She handed it to you?
A. Or handed it in to reception, but yes, I think she handed it to me.
Q. And what did she say, as you recall, about whether the statement was publicly available or whether it had to be handed to you confidentially or anything of that nature? A. My recollection is that it was a version that didn't have names in it, I think people were referred to by numbers or something like that.
Q. Persons of interest and suspects and so on?
A. I think so, yes, and I think that that version had been circulated to others, and Police Media had given her permission to give it to two journalists, and $I$ was - one from the $A B C$ and one from print was also going to receive it, because the police had determined that it was time for them to have a voice in this matter, publicly.
Q. That's your recollection of what she communicated to you at around the time she provided the statement?
A. Not only her. I had had some dealings on the phone with someone from Police Media.
Q. Do you mean at around the time of receiving the statement?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection of who that was?
A. I don't. It was a woman, but I can't remember who.
Q. So the female names that seem to be mentioned in emails and the like that the Commission has include Georgie Wells --
A. Well, Georgie Wells is a name I'm familiar with, because I think she was there for the longest amount of time that $I$ was reporting, so it's a name that's familiar. It could be her. But $I$ couldn't say with any clarity.
Q. And another name, female name, that crops up in some of the emails is Siobhan McMahon?
A. I can't remember.
Q. Wel1, whoever it was, what's your memory as to what was said by that person at around the time you were provided with the statement?
A. A11 I recal1 was that I'd had one or two conversations with Police Media where they had asked did I have everything I needed for the interview and could they help me with anything else? Did I need any more information?
Q. Yes. I'm just making sure I'm getting the timing right, though. Are you saying that conversations of that sort occurred as early as February when you received the statement or did that only happen later?
A. Oh, I think when I received the statement, there was a conversation just around, being a journalist who wants as much information as possible, could I have access to the one that had the names in it, which would be far more of interest to a journalist than one without the names in it. And there was some toing and froing about whether the court would allow that and --
Q. This was on the phone, was it, between you and someone at Police Media?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.
A. But my understanding was that would only be decided around the time of the Coroner or magistrate. I'm not
familiar with the proceedings but - yes.
Q. In your statement, you say - I'm looking at the second page of the statement under the heading "As to question 1", and in (c), you set out something of what Ms Young said to you about the case itself, about the death at North Head? A. $\quad \mathrm{mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And about general background to what she was talking about?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And then at (d) you say:

I observed Pamela to be aghast at this string-pulling. Pamela and her commanders
wanted the public to understand that there had been inappropriate interference by government in the affairs of police.

Do you see that there?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, when you say "Pamela and her commanders", who, to your knowledge, were you referring to by the expression "her commanders"?
A. Mick Willing, which I understood at the time was her boss.
Q. Is that because Pamela Young told you that?
A. I also spoke to him.
Q. Before the interviews?
A. Yes.
Q. If you can tell us - I'll go to that straight away approximately how long, before the interviews, if you remember, and, secondly, what was said?
A. I don't remember, but I remember Pamela or Penny giving me the number and I - calling him and having discussions about his views on the matter.
Q. And what were his views on the matters as they --
A. They were consistent with Penny and Pam.
Q. In what sense?
A. In the sense that this case was being prioritised over
the 700 or so other unsolved cases in New South Wales, in a way that was unusual.
Q. Did he, Mick Willing, say to you in these conversations before the interviews, something else that you say Ms Young said to you, namely, that he wanted the interview to go ahead and for her to say those things on television?
A. Oh, I don't think he specifically said anything about what he wanted her to say on television, but the understanding was he was supportive of her and, in fact, encouraging, I would have thought, of her appearance on Lateline.
Q. So - I just want to be clear - are you saying that in these conversations with Mick Willing prior to the Lateline interview that did ultimately go to air, he knew - do you say - in his conversations with you, that there was going to be a sit-down interview which would go to air?
A. Yes.
Q. Were your discussions with him on that basis?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he say anything to the effect that no, Ms Young was only authorised to give a backgrounding briefing off the record and she wasn't authorised to give a public interview?
A. No.
Q. Stil1 on (d) in your statement at the bottom of that page, you say:
... Pamela wanted the broader public to understand how unusual it was for a case to be thoroughly investigated three times ...

And so on. So that's among the things she said to you?
A. Mmm.
Q. Did Mr Willing say also something to that effect to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said to Ms Young:

OK - -
I'm looking at (e):
... but you know how good people can get burned. You will be taking a big risk.

And she said, "I know".
A. Mmm.
Q. What was the big risk that you thought she would be taking?
A. Well, she was raising her head above the parapet and this was a case - I didn't know anything about this case, but the more I read about it, there'd been a lot ventilated by the family, and others, of the deceased, and if she was putting a different version of the police's involvement, that she would cop a lot of flak for that.
Q. And do you mean that you thought she might cop a lot of flak from the police or from the political sphere?
A. I didn't expect it to be from police because she was representing police. She was one of the most senior detectives in the State. I thought from others, yeah.
Q. From politicians, do you mean?
A. And others, such as the family, who were very angry about police behaviour.
Q. In (h), on the next page, you say, in terms of having met Ms Young:

> She was prepared to sacrifice her career
> (which to that time had been nothing but outstandingly successful) on a point of significant principle.

Do you see that?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
Q. Why did you think that what she was doing might involve her sacrificing her career?
A. Oh, I think that's more in hindsight. I don't think she would have known at the time that it would have cost her career.
Q. But did you at the time have in your mind that it might result in the sacrifice of her career?
A. No.
Q. And that's partly because, I take it, as you say lower down that page, under the heading "As to question 3", you thought she was not there to be a leaker but, rather, was indeed, speaking in a way that the police wanted her to speak?
A. Yes. As I say, she was one of the most senior police in the State.
Q. So can I just look more closely, then, briefly, at your answer to question 3 --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- which we are on. After saying that you thought or your memory is that she wasn't there to be a leaker, you say:

She wanted to be a whistle blower on behalf of her colleagues ...
"Her colleagues" being the police, do you mean?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Now, you say:

She was going to brief [you] on the circumstances (which she did) and then [you] would record an interview (which [you] did).

And the briefing, $I$ think is this right, took place, in effect, in perhaps three ways, firstly the initial lunch; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Then, secondly, there were two interviews in Apri1there was one on Friday, the 10th, which was recorded but was not the one that went to air. Do you remember that? A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And I think there was a conversation, is this right, I think in the coffee shop, before that recorded interview at the $A B C$ ?
A. I don't remember that.
Q. But part of the - tell me if this is right - briefing
or backgrounding consisted of that interview on the Friday afternoon?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you would record an interview, and that, of course - I say "of course" - I understand was the one on the Monday afternoon, much of which did go to air that night?
A. It would have been Monday evening, not in the afternoon.
Q. Yes, I'11 come to the timing. Late afternoon, early evening?
A. It would have been the evening.
Q. Okay. Now, then you say:

I should stress that she made it clear to me that she thought of herself as protecting the legitimacy of the police conduct in this matter, against the convenient blame shifting by politicians.

Now, is that something that she said to you rather than just your impression?
A. Oh, in a round-about way, not using those exact words, but it was what $I$ deduced from --
Q. From what she said?
A. From what she said and what had occurred.
Q. And you say:

Not only had she not "gone rogue" --
and I'11 come back to that expression --
she was defending the police ...
A. That's right.
Q. And in terms of your conversation with Mr Wiliing prior to the Lateline interview, did he say anything to you to the effect that she was, by giving this interview, defending the police and that he was in favour of it?
A. Yes.

MR GRAY: I wonder if Ms Alberici could please have volume 16, tab 348 [SCOI.82992_0001].

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Ms Alberici, you' 11 have a hard copy. Not always, but sometimes the document you'11 be looking at will also be on the screen.
A. Oh, okay.
Q. If that's more convenient, so, for example, in this case, you'11 see that the document that is at the hard copy is on the screen. It's a matter for you which you choose to look at.
A. Okay.

MR GRAY: Q. So this is an email, we11, the main on that I want to look at is an email from you, presumably, I suppose, to the two people whose names appear at the top, but - do you see it says, "On 8 Apri1 Emma Alberici wrote"? A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. So it's an email from you, I suppose, to the people whose names appear at the top, but somebody within the ABC anyway?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're explaining to them on 8 Apri1, as I see it, the position that had been reached in relation to arrangements for the proposed Lateline program on this topic; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You say that you have an exclusive interview with the head of Homicide, Pamela Young. You say a couple of 1 ines down:

On Monday, the State Coroner will order a third inquest ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So your understanding, I take it, was that when the Coroner announced his decision, which was going to be on the Monday, the 13th, the expectation was, even though he hadn't yet announced it, that he would, in fact, order a third inquest?
A. That's right.
Q. What was your understanding, let's say on 8 April that is, prior to the Coroner's announcement - as to the status of Pamela Young's lengthy statement? That is, was it publicly available or not publicly available?
A. It wasn't on the public record, but certain people had been given access to it, including myself and a newspaper reporter and the family of the deceased, and I imagine legal representatives or other people, on the express understanding that we weren't to report on it until after the decision of the Coroner.
Q. And did you have any knowledge one way or the other as to whether there were already in place some orders of the Coroner as to restriction of publication, or the like, of the statement?
A. I can't remember. I knew that I wasn't going to report on it until after that day.
Q. A couple of lines below that, you say:

Pamela Young is prepared to say that this family, given its wealth, has had too much influence...

And so on.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You say you've had a copy of the 500 -page report, which you've nearly finished reading. You say:

The document proves that the family has twisted facts and made stuff up...

Is that your view or something Pamela Young said to you?
A. That was my view.
Q. Do you now have any recollection of what that's
a reference to?
A. Yes.
Q. The twisting of facts or making stuff up?
A. Yes.
Q. And what's that?
A. It's several things.
Q. Could you tell us?
A. Well, I had actually read the 500 pages of evidence and facts - these were not opinions, these were facts and the basis upon which police do their investigations.
Things like the family saying that no person had ever suicided naked, for instance, and yet there had been academic reports quoted in the report to show, $I$ think it was, 15 per cent of suicides are naked. Things like that, that surprised me, because on the public record, information that had been disseminated by the family would say things that, when $I$ read this report and the documentary evidence surrounding it and the references to academic reports and others, that was inconsistent with what had been in the public arena disseminated by the Johnson family.
Q. I'11 move on, because we have only finite time.
A. Just things like that.
Q. Yes, thank you.
A. And another one was that no-one had ever suicided from that general area, but in reading the report, $I$ think - and I could be wrong because I'm testing my memory from eight years ago - I think it was 20 or something people had left suicide notes, had actually been proven to be suicides from that general area. So all those sort of things had surprised me when I'd read the report.
Q. I'11 just move on because of the time. In the next sentence, two sentences on, actually, you say:

Police are still convinced it was suicide ...

Now, when you say "police" there, are you referring to Ms Young or are you referring to Ms Young and others? A. I think I was just referring to what $I$ had gleaned from the report. No-one had specifically said that to me but it was what $I$ gleaned from reading the report.
Q. And what you gleaned from reading the report was that the police view, as found in the report, was that it was suicide?
A. It just seemed the facts tended to weigh in that direction.
Q. Then, next sentence, you say this, and this is what

I wanted to ask you about in particular:

> Police have asked me if it's ok for The Australian to be given an interview Monday with Pamela Young also. I have spent the past hour in conversation with them all and have had them agree that the Australian can't publish until Tuesday.

Now, first of all, when you say "Police have asked me if it's ok for The Australian to be given an interview", who were you referring to when you say "police"?
A. Well, that's Police Media. That's who makes those decisions.
Q. And, again, do you have any recollection of who that was?
A. No. I remember it was a woman and I imagine it was Georgie Wells because her name is the one that is familiar to me but $I$ can't say for sure, I can't really remember.
Q. So at least by then you understood - perhaps you had understood earlier - that someone from The Australian either had been given the report or was going to be given the report?
A. That's right.
Q. And you say you spent an hour in conversation with "them al1"; that's Police Media people, is it "them all"? A. And I think, you know, the superiors - probably Mick Willing, just on and off the phone, to just check things and, you know, to your point earlier, we're very big on accuracy and getting things right and you want to make sure that you're doing so.
Q. So were those conversations with the media people and with Mick Willing on about 8 April, over an hour, on the topic of Ms Young giving an interview, not a backgrounder but an interview, that would be broadcast?
A. Yes. I mean, we were a TV show, so you would have to broadcast an interview for it to have impact.
Q. Did either anyone from Police Media or Mr Willing say anything to the effect that Ms Young's interview with you was off the record and not to be broadcast?
A. No.
Q. Did the conversations proceed on the open basis that it was indeed going to be broadcast?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. May $I$ just ask this question. At the time, Ms Alberici, how long had you been the Lateline anchor, do you recall?
A. Yes.
Q. This is Apri1 2015, so rough1y how long before that?
A. Three and a half years.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. You say at the bottom of this emai1, bottom of that page, that you are going to prepare a package, you wil1 get an interview with Steve Johnson and Dan G1ick and some grabbing from John Agius, and then you say:

We wil7 then have a studio interview with Pamela Young which will be explosive. She will also say that \$\$millions have been wasted by the state ...
et cetera. You are telling that to your $A B C$ colleagues here?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. But was there any reference in your conversations on that day with the media people or with Mr Willing to the concept of the interview being likely to be explosive? A. I don't think $I$ would have used that kind of flourish with police.
Q. No?
A. But there was an understanding that this would be the first - this would have been the first time that police would have commented publicly about the case.
Q. Do you mean "and so it would likely" --
A. So it would be explosive regardless because nothing had ever been said by them against quite a lot of heat they had been receiving from the family.
Q. Now, at the very end of the email, on the next second page, you say:

> Unti 1 I've got Steve Johnson in the can we cannot 7 et anyone know we have an interview with Pame7a Young. If the Johnson family finds out, they're un7ikely to cooperate...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is that subject matter about keeping quiet to the Johnsons about already having Pamela Young on board for an interview - was that topic something discussed between you and the Police Media or Mr Willing?
A. No. That would have - no.
Q. There would have been no particular reason to do that?
A. No reason to, no.
Q. But should we infer from that last sentence or so, or two sentences, that your view - and you tell us either way - was that what Ms Young was saying and what you understood Mr Willing to agree with was a point of view that needed to be made public?
A. Yes.
Q. And that in order to ensure that you had Mr Johnson on the program, you would not tell the Johnsons that you had Ms Young about to give a police version?
A. Correct.
Q. Briefly, the first interview, the one on the Friday afternoon, it's in tab 342 [NPL.2017.0004.0549_0001] of that folder. It's quite lengthy, but do you remember this one on the Friday afternoon, whether it was video-recorded or just audio-recorded or was it in the studio, or what happened?
A. I think it was video-recorded.
Q. What was the purpose of this one on the Friday afternoon?
A. My recollection is that Pamela Young had not done media before and she was a little nervous and wanted to do a kind of dry run, I suppose.
Q. Al1 right. And Penny Brown, I think, was there with her in the studio, or with her and you when this happened? A. I can't recal1 but possibly - possibly, yes.
Q. I'll just take you to a couple - it's apparent on the transcript that she, Penny Young [sic], does say a couple of things here and there?
A. Okay.
Q. I just wanted to take you to three bits of this briefly, you will see the pages are numbered down the bottom. At page 2, at about line 32, you ask Ms Young:

What's your personal opinion about what happened to Scott Johnson?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And a few lines down, starting about line 42, she said - I'm not reading it all:
... my personal view --
A. No, she - oh, sorry, yes.
Q. In the third line.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm just not reading it out for the sake of the time but you please take your time to read it all:
... my personal view --
and then she ends up saying on the top of the next page:

> .. I am swayed, personally, that the current finding, the open finding, could move a bit more towards suicide again.

Do you see that?
A. But she also says, but she probably thinks the most appropriate finding is what currently exists, which is an open finding.
Q. Quite so.
A. Mmm.
Q. But you then say:

Can I just help you a bit here, because it
feels to me 7 ike you're struggling ...
And so on. By all means, you take the time to read all of it, I don't mean to hurry you through all of this, but at the bottom of that page --
A. Sorry, I'm just laughing because it looks like I fixed her hair. I was trying to work out what that was in reference to.
Q. And at line 40 you say:

But I want the detail that you think it was --
and Pamela Young says:
-- we would sway more towards homicide suicide. Suicide.

And you say:

```
... I think that you might just want to say
that - that your personal view is that it's
most likely to be suicide ...
```

And at 1 ine 8 , on page 4 , she says:
... that is such a controversial statement.
$I$ want to say $I$ believe, it's my true
belief, but it's going to be so
controversial, once it gets out there.
et cetera.
A. Yes. What page are we on now?
Q. Page 4 --
A. Oh, sorry, yes.
Q. -- about 1 ine 8 or so. And then if we turn over to page 7 , after there are some more conversations between you and Ms Young about how to go about an interview like this --
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- you have, in effect, a second go at this topic at line 14 on page 7. You say:

So what do you think, personally?
Personally, what do you think happened to Scott Johnson?

And the answer this time is:
I think there's a real possibility that Scott did actually suicide.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. That's a second pass at the topic. Then if we go over to page 11 at 1 ine 39 , you say:

So let's try that again.
And this is, in effect, a third pass at the same question:
So what do you personally think happened to Scott Johnson?

Answer:
I believe that Scott may well have suicided. We have a lot more information and evidence that supports that, that hasn't been available before...

And she goes on, and she finishes up on the next page, page 12, using the expression "distinct possibility", in relation to suicide?
A. Mmm.
Q. Now, all I'm taking you to those passages for is to ask you this: was your understanding that her view actually was that it was probably a suicide? That was what you thought she thought?
A. No, that's what I thought the evidence weighed towards.
Q. But you seem to have asked her questions to the effect of encouraging her to say that that was her view because you thought it was her view, in those questions that I've just taken you to?
A. Well, this was someone who'd been investigating for three years and produced 500 pages of evidence that had been gathered.
Q. Yes, quite. And in those three separate goes at the question, "What do you think happened?", and she gives various variations of suggesting suicide, were you trying to get her to say that? It seems to be --
A. I was trying to get her to say what she believed.
Q. And you thought she believed that it was suicide?
A. We11, she says that.
Q. Thank you. Now, generally speaking - and I think this appears from what you have said already - you understood that she was upset, or concerned, at least, that in her view, the Minister had effectively required that the Johnson case jump the queue?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Now, I have the impression - tell me if it is right or wrong - that you were inclined to agree with that yourself?
A. I wasn't in any - I wasn't qualified to have a view either way. I was new to the case. But I did understand from research that it was the first time since Azaria Chamberlain that three cases in the whole of Australia that one case had ever gone to three inquests in Australian history.
Q. Just turn briefly, if you would, to tab 354 [SCOI.82991_0001]. This is an email from you to someone at the $A B C$. The ultimate topic, it is just a question of an expense, but in the main long paragraph in the middle, you tell that person:

> I have an exclusive (explosive) interview with the Detective Chief Inspector who led the reinvestigation ...

And you say in the next line:

> She has said (we taped yesterday under embargo) that this family has used their wealth and position to improper7y influence the NSW judiciary.

When you say, "We taped yesterday under embargo", what does that mean?
A. That we can't publish.
Q. Was that because you were waiting for the Coroner's announcement on the Monday?
A. The Coroner, correct, and because the content - the things that $I$ knew that were the basis of questioning and conversation were not in the public domain and that $I$ had expressly agreed not to make them public until after that day.
Q. When the Monday interview takes place, we know that Ms Young says, in the course of that interview - and it goes to air in due course - that she thought the Minister kowtowed to Steve Johnson; you remember that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Now, she says that on the Monday, but had she said that, or something close to it, prior to the Monday, eg, on the Friday or in your earlier discussions?
A. I can't remember.
Q. In this same emai1, this one at 354 at the end of that longest paragraph, you say:

Steve J --
Steve Johnson --
doesn't know that I've also developed
a strong relationship with police involved in this matter.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
Q. What did you mean by "strong relationship with police involved"?
A. That I had been discussing the case at length with them for some months.
Q. "Them" being who?
A. Oh, Mick Willing, Police Media, Penny Brown, Pamela Young.
Q. Coming to 13 Apri1, the Monday, the Coroner makes his decision, it seems, about late morning or thereabouts, at the Glebe court?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And he does order a third inquest, and he does allow
publication, I think in a partly redacted form, of the lengthy statement. You knew all of that happened on that day?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, were you there at the G1ebe court?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a large media contingent in attendance?
A. I think so. Yes.
Q. After the decision was announced, Ms Young, I gather, gave a short interview with you outside, known as a door-stop in some quarters; is that right?
A. No.
Q. Did you have an interview with Ms Young outside the court?
A. I don't think so.
Q. We11, just have a look at tab 343
[NPL.2017.0004.0588]. This is, it seems, an interview between Ms Young and someone, it says "Interviewer" -A. It would have been a press conference type of arrangement where lots of reporters ask questions, maybe?
Q. We11, my first question is: did you yourself do what's known as a door-stop or any kind of interview with her outside the court that day?
A. I don't think so. It wouldn't - I mean, as the Lateline host, that wasn't the sort of thing that I did. I would have been there for research purposes and to listen, but my job is in the studio, not outside a Coroners Court.
Q. Do you remember speaking to Pamela Young at all that day at the Glebe court?
A. No. I don't remember.
Q. On the $A B C$ news that night, there is a report, and, in fact, I'11 show it to you, it is at tab 362B [SCOI.47473_0001].
A. Sorry, where am I going?
Q. I'm just going to orient you.
A. Oh, sorry.
Q. This is a transcript of part of the $A B C$ news bulletin that night.

THE COMMISSIONER: At 7 pm .
MR GRAY: Q. The 7 o'clock television $A B C$ news.
A. Right, yes.
Q. And so "JP" is Juanita Phillips, and so she is the newsreader?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. And "EA" is yourself?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So Juanita Phillips introduces the story, you can see at the first five lines?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And she says:

Lateline's Emma Alberici reports.
And then there's - I can show you this on the screen if need be.
A. Yes, that's fine, I can see.
Q. You can see. No, I mean there's footage, as this is happening.
A. That's okay.
Q. And so you're, in effect, the journalist --
A. Yes.
Q. - - to whom the newsreader has thrown for the story on the news.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, there's film of Ms Young and Ms Brown walking I'm not sure whether it's to the court or from the court, but it's near the court, anyway - and there doesn't seem to be anybody else around as this film shows them walking. Do you have any knowledge about when that filming took place? A. Probably would have been them walking in to the building or out of the building.
Q. But were you involved in the arrangements for this
filming?
A. Well, now that you're showing me this, I would have done the piece for the 7 pm news because $I$ was there and because I was familiar with the case, and it's a very typical way that cameramen operate. They work out who's important to the case and make sure they get footage of them so that we can report it.
Q. The reason $I$ 'm asking is that, as $I$ say, as they're walking along on the film - I'll show it to you - there doesn't seem to be anyone else there, and I'm wondering, was this filming of them done quite some time before everyone else milling around?
A. It would have just been them walking in or out of the court. It's a very standard way cameramen achieve footage of people that are involved in cases.
Q. Was there any arrangement between you and Ms Young such that she would wait until after the rest of the media were gone and only then would she emerge and give an interview to you or the ABC?
A. No. Not at the court, no.
Q. No such arrangement?
A. No. We had an arrangement for an exclusive in the studio but not - I mean, no, not at the court.
Q. I should say that in Ms Young's statement
[SCOI.85816_0001], that we've received in the last week or so, she does say - I will just need to get your response at paragraph 117:

> I gave a door stop interview to
> Emma Alberici at the court house.

And she refers to that transcript that $I$ just showed you a minute ago, which just said "Interviewer".
A. This one?
Q. No, not this one. This is the news that night?
A. Oh.
Q. But a moment ago $I$ showed you a transcript of a door-stop with someone, it doesn't say it was you.
A. I mean, look, it might have been me. I just don't recal1. I would have thought that - I mean, when you're doing a door-stop outside a court, whatever journalist is
there participates - whoever is there participates.
Q. I see.
A. So I may have been the only - I doubt very much I was the only one there.
Q. Right. So it may have been you, you can't remember?
A. No, I can't remember. I was there, but whether I was the only one there $I$ don't recal1. It was a big news story. I doubt $I$ was the only one there.
Q. Was there any discussion between you and anyone from Police Media on or prior to the Monday, 13 Apri1, about what would happen at the court or outside the court in terms of an interview on the spot?
A. No, not that I recal1 - not about whether there would be an interview on the spot. I mean, that's just - my recollection is the Johnson family also did a door-stop and answered questions from people. It's just a standard thing that people do when they leave a hearing.
Q. Moving now to later in the afternoon or perhaps evening when the actual interview which did go to air was recorded, could you turn to tab 355 [SCOI.82683_0001]. So this is some emails or texts between you and people at the ABC about timing for when Ms Young would come.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And it looks as though, as we go from bottom to top, by 10.14 , people were looking at it perhaps coming to fruition at about 5 o'clock, according to this email, anyway. Do you see that?
A. Yeah, that's in the morning. Yes.
Q. Sure. And then if we go to 359 [SCOI. 82641_0001] and these are not emails involving you but they're emails involving other $A B C$ people --
A. Mmm-hmm .
Q. -- in the middle of the page, this is at 4.09pm,

Mr Drew tells Ms Fiori that Pamela Young will be arriving at 4.30 for a 5 o'clock pre-record?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And at the top of the page, a few minutes later, 4.16, he says:

> She's been here several times so knows where to go ...

So doing the best you can, do you think the interview took place at about 5 or do you think it might have been later?
A. I can't remember. A11 I can say is that we did our pre-recorded interviews to accommodate the 7.30 Report, who we shared a studio with, and so we were often bumped around, depending on when they needed the studio as well.
Q. In that $A B C$ news item at 7 o'clock, that $I$ just briefly showed you, Ms Phillips, Juanita Phillips --

THE COMMISSIONER: You haven't showed her the footage.
MR GRAY: No, I had better do that now.
THE COMMISSIONER: I think so, so that she can reorientate herself.

MR GRAY: Q. Ms Phillips says, "There is going to be an exclusive tonight on Lateline"?
A. Yeah.
Q. I'11 show it to you, but does that suggest that the interview, since that's what she says on the news at 7 , must have taken place by then, by 7 ?
A. No, it doesn't - it doesn't mean that.
Q. I see.
A. If there's an intention you are going to have an exclusive - often, our interviews were live. So we would still say "There's an exclusive interview tonight", but we haven't done it yet.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Does it mean, though, from what you said a moment ago, that more likely than not, it would have been done before 7.30?
A. Or otherwise it's done at 8, after the show. So we just always had to juggle in around whatever their - so if they - so what would sometimes happen is they would have a pre-recorded interview that had to be done at 5 , in which case we got bumped to after. We tried to do it earlier so that we had time to edit.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.

MR GRAY: I wonder if the excerpt from the $A B C$ news could be played. It's exhibit 6, tab 362A [SCOI.47474_0001]. Here we are.
Q. So this is the extract, Ms Alberici.
(Excerpt of $A B C$ evening news played)
MR GRAY: Q. You saw that, in part of that footage, there were scenes of quite a few people milling around outside the court?
A. Mmm.
Q. But when the footage was shown of Ms Young and Ms Brown walking along, there was no-one else there -no-one else to be seen. Does that suggest that it happened some considerable time after everyone else had left? A. It looks like they're leaving the court.
Q. Yes, it does. And there's no-one else there, and my question is: to your knowledge, was that footage filmed at a time well after everyone else had left?
A. I don't know - I don't remember. It's just really standard that the cameraman would have waited to - they may have been in there for a little bit longer. I don't know. The cameraman would have waited for them because they would have known they were germane to the case and we needed footage of them.
Q. I want to show you some contentions that have been advanced on behalf of Mr Willing and get your reaction to them. If we could have Mr Willing's written submissions, please. These are submissions on behalf of Mr Willing to this Inquiry [SCOI.84210_0001]. At paragraph 5, you see that the contention is made that:

## Ms Young knew that she needed --

In fact, I'11 go back to the start of 5. In paragraph 4 the assertion is made that Ms Young lost all objectivity. A. Sorry, where is this?
Q. Paragraph 4. This is the contention by Mr Wiling, that Ms Young lost all objectivity. Do you see that in paragraph 4?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in 5 -

MR McARDLE: Just a procedural matter, your Honour. We can't see this. I'm not seeing it at all. It was given to us this morning but it would be helpful if it was on the screen.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, okay, that's fine. I thought the materials had been circulated but if they haven't, that's fine.

MR GRAY: They have been circulated, including these submissions.

THE COMMISSIONER: You came into it recently, I know, Mr McArdle.

MR McARDLE: Yes, within hours, not within days --
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm happy to - no, no, hang on a minute. Nobody is criticising anybody. The material has been on the website for some time. I acknowledge you are recently in the matter. Nobody is criticising anybody, and I'm not suggesting that you should have done anything. I'm just saying the materials have been on the website for some time, that's al1.

MR McARDLE: It would be of assistance if we could see it on the screen now.

THE COMMISSIONER: We wil1 faci1itate that, of course.
MR GRAY: I think that is happening as we speak. The reason $I$ was pressing on is that $I$ am conscious of Ms Alberici's time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sure,
MR GRAY: Q. While it is coming, I'11 proceed.
A. Sure.
Q. You have it in front of you?
A. Yeah.
Q. You see that in paragraph 4 the assertion is made that Pamela Young lost all objectivity?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in paragraph 5, this assertion is made:

This loss of objectivity caused Ms Young to devise and execute a strategy to publicly air her grievances. Ms Young knew that she needed an ally, and she chose her offsider, Ms Brown, to assist her. Ms Young and Ms Brown then deliberately concealed their plan from everyone at NSW Police, including Mr Willing.

Now, what can you tell us, if anything, about that, from your knowledge?
A. Not true.
Q. To your knowledge, was the fact that Ms Young was giving an interview to be broadcast on Lateline concealed from anyone at NSW Police, including Mr Willing?
A. No. The contrary. It was encouraged.
Q. At paragraph 7, Mr Willing's submissions say:

Ms Young kept her strategy secret to avoid NSW Police taking steps to stop the interview going to air. She knew that her planned interview required approval from ... Police, and she knew that... Police would never have approved what she wanted to say had she disclosed her intentions.

What can you tell us about that?
A. It's not true.
Q. So far as you are aware, were the police that you've mentioned - namely, Mr Willing and one or more people from the Media Unit - fully aware that the interview was going to go to air?
A. Yes. They were seeking to assist me, to ensure $I$ had everything $I$ needed and was furnished with anything else that might aid my questioning and full understanding of the police behaviour and involvement.
Q. If you could turn to paragraph 43?
A. Forty-three?
Q. Forty-three, yes. Perhaps $I$ won't take time reading
it all out but if you could read 43 to yourself, and then, having read that, could you now read paragraph 44?
A. Yes, I've read that.
Q. For that matter, could you read 45? Now, have you read, 43,44 and 45 ?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. First of al1, as to 43 , and picking up 44 , which says that, according to the submission, you knew all these things yourself, did you know that the senior police hierarchy would not support her forthright - Ms Young's forthright positions? I'm looking at 43(a).
A. No.
Q. Your understanding, as I've understood you this morning, is that Ms Young thought the senior police hierarchy would support her forthright positions?
A. We11, I thought so.
Q. And that's what you thought from your conversations with her?
A. And also from my conversations with Police Media and with Mick Willing. There was no suggestion to me whatsoever, and it remains my recollection there was no contention, there was no - you know, it was all very harmonious between them and they were all acting in accordance with what eventually happened.
Q. So as to $43(b)$, where it's asserted that Ms Young was "only authorised to speak off the record for backgrounding purposes", what do you say about that?
A. I'm a television presenter. There is no utility in a backgrounding. I work in television. It requires a camera being pointed at someone and them speaking and it going being broadcast on the television.
Q. And as to the question of authorisation, which paragraph (b) is going to, being a ittle repetitive, I realise, but is it your understanding, was it your understanding, that she was indeed authorised to speak on the record?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your understanding that $43(c)$ is incorrect?
A. Yes.
Q. And that $43(\mathrm{~d})$ was incorrect?
A. I can't say to all the hierarchy. I'm pretty sure Mike Gallacher wouldn't have been very happy. But for those whose authority - you know, who had the authority to say yes or no to an interview, well, yes, they were aware.
Q. According to $43(e)$, Ms Young knew, and you also knew, that she had to organise the interview discreetly and that she could only trust Penny Brown and no-one else. What do you say about that?
A. Well, that's patently not true.
Q. Then could I show you some of the submissions made orally for Mr Willing, if we get the transcript, page 4427 [TRA.0063.0001]. This is a transcript of submissions made on behalf of Mr Willing orally in this Inquiry in June this year. I'11 just take you to a couple of passages. Do you have page 4427?
A. Oh, yes, sorry.
Q. Thank you. Now, if you read - I won't read it al1 out, but from 1 ine 15 through to, say, 44 , just read that to yourself.
A. Where do you want me to read until?
Q. Down to about the bottom of that page.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, you've just read it a11, and I'm asking you the question on the footing that you've just read all of that, but the suggestion seems to be - is this your understanding - that there had been a preconceived arrangement whereby you would wait until all the rest of the media had gone and then have an interview with Pamela Young outside the court. You've just read that. Is that what happened?
A. No. That would not happen, and I don't recal1 it happening, and indeed, it's likely that the cameraman asked a question after $I$ was gone, because if there was no-one around, chances are I probably wasn't around. I'd probably gone back to the studio. There's a lot to prepare for a show like Lateline, and this wasn't the only thing on the show and I would have had lots to do back in the studio, and it was not unusual to say to the cameraman, "Wait for them to come out. They look like this and that. Get some footage of them and point the camera at them if they've got anything to say."
Q. But at any rate, no arrangement made between you and Ms Young for you and she to plan an interview between the two of you on the basis that you'd wait until everyone else had gone?
A. Well, no, and as you can see there, it was less than 10 seconds, what was put on air. No.
Q. Now, could you then, at the next page, 4428 , just read from line 4 down to 1 ine 25 . The Commissioner, of course, is the Commissioner who is sitting on the bench today.
Mr Thangaraj is counsel for Mr Wiliing. Turn over if you need to --
A. Yes, I get the gist, yes.
Q. You see there that it was counsel for Mr Wilining who adopted the 1 anguage that Ms Young had gone rogue. Do you see that?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. You just need to answer for the transcript.
A. Oh, sorry, yes.
Q. Thank you. So in your statement, you talk about that expression, about it being said by or on behalf of Mr Willing that Ms Young had gone rogue. You can see where Mr Willing's counsel does indeed use that expression. And your evidence, I gather from your statement, is that when Mr Willing spoke to you - and I'11 come to that in a second - he did not claim that Ms Young had gone rogue at a11?
A. Quite the opposite.
Q. Indeed - well, we'11 come to what he, in fact, said on your account. But just while I'm on this transcript, if you just turn to 4438, again, if you could read to yourself from 1 ine 27 through to about halfway down the next page, 4439.
A. You want me to read 339 as well?
Q. About hal fway down -
A. Sorry, 39, yeah
Q. Start from line --
A. Yes, 27, and then I go over to 39 .
Q. Then go over about halfway down the next page. Okay,
now, you have read that?
A. I have read that.
Q. What I want to ask you is: you can see that the submission on behalf of Mr Willing involves, looking at 4439 line 7 in particular, implicating Ms Penny Brown in the deception. You saw that?
A. In the alleged deception.
Q. What, based on your own knowledge of your discussions with Ms Young, Ms Brown and Mr Willing and the Police Media Unit, do you say about whether Ms Brown was involved in deceiving anybody in relation to these interviews?
A. I just think it's an outrageous assertion.
Q. Just two more things, Ms Alberici. Back to your statement --
A. I might just add, I found them both to be thorough and dedicated detectives. And that's the kind of reporting Lateline was known for, being thorough, and that's why I was taken by it. So the idea that we would be involved in some kind of deception is ridiculous.
Q. I'm just checking that I've asked you about things in your statement that I need to, I think I probably have. Two last things. After the interview and after the Lateline broadcast had actually gone to air - oh, first of all, do you know what time was Lateline on at that time? A. Oh, it sounds like it was still on at - it would have still been on at 10.30. At some point it went on to 9.30 . But Juanita said "10.30 tonight", so I'm going to take her word for it.
Q. So the program goes for three-quarters of an hour or an hour or so, on the evening?
A. I think it was 35 minutes, or something like that.
Q. Now, after the broadcast, either late that night or in the days following, did anyone from the police - and I'll come to Mr Willing in particular, but putting aside Mr Willing at the moment - contact you about the broadcast? A. Oh, I can't remember, but I did have conversations with police.
Q. Do you remember with whom?
A. Subsequently did have conversations with Mick Willing.
Q. Yes, and I wi 11 ask you about those, but anyone else that you remember?
A. I would have had conversations with Pamela Young.
Q. What about others (a) from the Media Unit - did anyone from the Media Unit contact you?
A. I think I would have had conversations with them but I can't recal1, because $I$ then went on to report about the coronial inquest.
Q. And indeed, the next night there was an interview on Lateline with Mr Gallacher?
A. That's right.
Q. So at any time in the days or weeks after those two interviews, did anyone from the police contact you to say either that they agreed with Pamela Young or they agreed with Mr Gallacher or indeed anything at all about those programs?
A. I can just remember the general vibe, which was that, you know, what we had reported was accurate, in terms of those who were involved and their general perspectives on the matter.
Q. When you say "the general vibe", do you mean the general vibe from police personnel who contacted you after the show?
A. To the extent that $I$ had those conversations, but I don't remember.
Q. Now, turning to Mr Wiliing --
A. I don't remember anything controversial.
Q. Turning to Mr Willing in particular, in your statement [SCOI.85817_0001] at paragraph 8 - sorry, when you were answering question 8 , on the second-last page of your statement, under the heading "As to question 8 ", question 8 was asking you about communications between you and Mr Willing either before or after the program?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And you say in your statement:

He --
Mr Willing --
encouraged Ms Young to do the interview, and he presumably liaised with Police Media. I spoke to him in preparation for the interviews both before and after.

Now, that's correct, is it?
A. Yes.
Q. Both before and after?
A. Yes.
Q. And in terms of before, you've already given some answers about this this morning, so I don't need you to repeat them, but in terms of before, were there any communications or conversations with Mr Wiliing before the program that you haven't mentioned so far?
A. Not that $I$ recall specifically.
Q. And in terms of after, you refer to one particular meeting at North Sydney, after Ms Young lost her job in 2017. Does that indeed mean that this conversation occurred in 2017 or 1ater?
A. Yes, but I've subsequently found other text messages to indicate that I'd been talking to Mick Willing in 2016 around the time of the coronial inquest.
Q. Yes. Now, in your statement, you say that you had text messages between Mick Willing and yourself, but at the time of your statement you couldn't find them, they had disappeared?
A. And they've remarkably reappeared on my phone.
Q. That's phones for you, I suppose.
A. Mmm.
Q. But at any rate, the bundle that you have in your hand of print-outs, are you saying that those are all the text messages between you and Mr Willing that you have ever had? A. Pretty much. I think I go back to the substantive we were, you know, "How was your Christmas", "Can we catch up for a conversation?" He suggests we catch up for coffee in North Sydney near where his office is, and we subsequently did, and then some messages after that.

But I've also found a reference in 2016 to a conversation I'd had with Mick Willing that also goes to his general view on the matters.

MR GRAY: I think everybody has these, do they?
MR TEDESCHI: No.
MR GRAY: I'11 just interrupt myself, if I may, Commissioner, so that you, and everyone, understand at least what $I$ understand to be the position.
Q. Ms Alberici, you found these messages, and/or they reappeared on your phone this morning or late last night?
A. Yesterday, yes.
Q. And you've printed them out, or they have been printed out this morning?
A. Mmm.
Q. And in the bundle that you have in front of you?

MR GRAY: I think everybody has now been provided with those. I'm told that police do not want these placed on the screen, at least as yet. I have no difficulty with that.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right.
MR GRAY: I will need to tender them, so I would do so and they can be marked confidential or not for publication or the like for the moment.

THE COMMISSIONER: I wil1 just make a non-publication order, I think, and we can deal with formalities after that.

MR GRAY: Q. That having been done, Ms Alberici, is the one you were just about to mention the one that --

MR GRAY: In fact, do you have a copy, Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: I do, yes, I have a copy. I think I do, anyway.

THE WITNESS: Would it be helpful to just provide a ittte bit of context?

MR GRAY: Q. Yes, it would, thank you.
A. So we know there's going to be a third inquest. As
a journalist, you want to provide as comprehensive a report as you can for the public to understand the background, and so on. So I produced some online articles about the story. And so I was in constant contact with Police Media, with Mick Willing, to try to make sure that what we were reporting was accurately, you know, founded on the information in the police investigation report. And so in 2016, December 2016 must have been the beginning of the hearing or something, because then that's when I'm looking to publish, because it's in the public consciousness, must have been around the start of it.

So these text messages to Clare, she is the editor of the online part of the ABC that I was writing for, and so she's come back to me, I'm gathering from this, just asking - she'd come back - she'd obviously emailed me, or something, some questions that she needed answered based on something I'd written for the online. From what I recall, I wrote a feature piece based on the report. And then I've written in here:

Just spoke to commander of homicide Mick
Willing to confirm it ok to use his quote re "outstanding work" --
referring to the investigation --

> he doesn't want to be quoted on this but he said his hope was that all the "rubbish" disseminated by the family is finally put to rest with Scott.

Which I think was important to demonstrate that he was on the same page as Pamela Young, in terms of his general feeling about the way the family had depicted the investigation.
Q. Okay. Let me just break this down a little bit. You are quite right that you wrote quite a lengthy piece on the $A B C$ online. I don't think I need to take you to it, but it is dated 12 December 2016.
A. Then this would have been - we constantly did updates, and, you know, added or took things out or fixed things up or, you know, amended a timeline here or a something there. So these things online, unlike newspapers, you can constantly update them.
Q. Perhaps I'd better show it to you just for the avoidance of doubt so you can confirm. It is in volume 8 . It's tab 224 [SCOI. 82079_0001]. This is a print-out of it - -
A. Yes.
Q. -- obviously, Ms Alberici, but at any rate you see it says on the front page, "Posted" 12 December, "Updated" 3 January"?
A. Yes. And these text messages that I was referring to are the 11 th, which seems consistent - the day before.
Q. Al1 right. Now, what $I$ want to break down, though, is there's a conversation between you and Mick Willing at the coffee shop in North Sydney?
A. That's after this.
Q. After this. So in 2017 or so?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. But prior to that, back in the immediate aftermath of the program in about Apri1 2015, was there any communication between you and Mr Willing at that stage? A. I think there would have been maybe phone calls or I don't have it in text message form, but there would have been phone calls.
Q. You say there "would have been". Do you remember any?
A. Oh, yes, I remember that $I$ was in contact with him and I think that it's consistent with, when you see the texts and the tone of "How was your Christmas", it's not like I've never met him before or we've never spoken before.
Q. And in those phone calls in the period not long after the broadcast in April 2015, what was he saying? Was he expressing positive views about the broadcast or negative views about the broadcast or - tell us what he was saying to you?
A. I can't remember, to tell you the honest truth. But, you know, if I take myself back there, it wasn't - it wasn't - in the immediate aftermath, there was no feeling that she'd done anything wrong. I mean, it was clear that it was newsworthy, it had made it into the newspapers the next day. What she had - the way she had framed her answers were pretty sensationa1. But the idea that she'd done something, you know, "wrong", was not the vibe.
Q. Right. Now, turning, then, to the conversation at the coffee shop, which you do mention specifically in your statement [SCOI.85817_0001] - so I'm looking at your statement the second-1ast page - you quote him as saying things like:

> I am so sorry about what happened to Pam. I wanted her to do the interview so that the general public could see that we were not homophobic and not negligent and that Johnson family were insufferable.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
Q. Now, without holding you to that verbatim, is that your recollection of the thrust of what he said to you? A. Yes, and $I$ was happy to find this text message from 2016 where I say to my online editor that Mick Willing has just said to me that he hopes that this puts all the "rubbish" disseminated by the family to rest. So it's consistent with my recollection about how he was feeling very much in the same way as Pamela Young had articulated.
Q. And you also say, in the last part of your answer to question 8 , that Mr Willing also said:

I thought that once it was public, and the
scandalous misdirection of investigation
resources was exposed, the political
pressure would stop.
Is that your recollection of --
A. Pretty - that was the tenor and the general feet, yes. And I recal1 - and it's obvious from the text message where he says, "I'm sorry to have taken up so much of your time" - my recollection is that $I$ was there for more than two hours where he was expressing his regret and guilt over what had happened to Pamela Young.
Q. One of the parts of the interview which was, as you put it, "newsworthy", was Ms Young describing the Police Minister as having kowtowed to the Johnsons?
A. Mmm-hmm .
Q. You recal1 that?
A. Yes.
Q. In your conversations with Mr Willing, either before the program or after the program, was there any reference to Ms Young being likely to say that, before, or to having said it, after?
A. I don't remember. I don't - I mean, it wasn't something that had been rehearsed, but $I$ don't remember discussing it specifically.

MR GRAY: Yes, those are my questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Yes, Mr Tedeschi?
MR TEDESCHI: Would the Commissioner like to take the morning tea adjournment?

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not taking one. I'm sorry, it's only that Ms Alberici has to get away at 12.15, and unless somebody wants a break - do you need a break at the moment?

THE WITNESS: No, I'm okay.
THE COMMISSIONER: If you need a break, Mr Tedeschi, I'm happy.

Mr McArdle, I wonder if you could just accommodate Mr Tedeschi.

MR McARDLE: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Thank you.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR TEDESCHI:

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Ms Alberici, you had a lot of discussion with Pamela Young about her views --

MR McARDLE: Would it be appropriate for my friend to tel 1 the witness who he represents?

THE COMMISSIONER: We11, it would be. Thank you, Mr McArdle.

Mr Tedeschi, if you haven't gleaned already, represents the NSW Police --

THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

THE COMMISSIONER: -- in this Inquiry. I apologise, Mr Tedeschi and Mr McArdle.

MR TEDESCHI: I don't represent all the police. I represent the Police Commissioner and certain named police officers - not Mr Willing.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Ms Alberici, you had a number of discussions with Pamela Young about her view about the Scott Johnson case. Did you form the opinion that she genuinely considered that the evidence available at the time of your interview with her did not enable a definitive conclusion to be reached between the possible alternatives of homicide, suicide and misadventure?
A. Correct.
Q. She expressed to you her preference for a possible version of suicide at that time for varying reasons, and she explained that view to you?
A. "Preference" is an interesting word. I wouldn't use "preference."
Q. We11, perhaps an inclination towards a finding of suicide?
A. Based on the evidence perhaps.
Q. Based on the evidence available at that time?
A. Mmm.
Q. But was it clear to you that she had an open mind about the possibility of the other possible findings of homicide and misadventure?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Was it clear to you that at the time of your conversations with her in 2015, that she was frustrated because she'd put an enormous amount of work into investigating the case, and she had prepared a statement of over 400 pages, and that she had been unable to definitively determine which of those three possible causes was the real cause of Scott Johnson's death?
A. I don't - I wouldn't categorise it as "frustrated". I found her to be quite remarkable in her very, kind of, dispassionate approach to the case and I think - I think to the extent that there was frustration, it felt there was
nothing new had emerged, and yet, you know, more than two years of police resources and time had gone into it.
Q. Her frustration was that she felt that after the extensive reinvestigation that she'd done, that the inquest was unlikely to elicit any new evidence to be able to determine which of those three possible alternatives --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- was the correct one?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. Did she complain to you at any time that anyone had pressured her into favouring a suicide theory?
A. No.
Q. Did she complain to you at any time that anybody had encouraged her to minimise the possibility of the death of Scott Johnson being a gay hate murder?
A. No.
Q. Did she appear to you to genuinely leave open the possibility that evidence may yet emerge in the future pointing to a homicide?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it appear to you that she considered that the actions of the Minister around the time of the announcement of the third inquest - that she considered that to be interference by the Minister that was not appropriate?
A. It wasn't the time of the announcement of the inquest; it was the time of the announcement of a third investigation being opened, which coincided with a report on the ABC for the Australian Story program in 2012, as I understand it. That's when the case was reopened again to another investigation.
Q. But did it appear to you that she was of the opinion that then Minister Gallacher had, in effect, inappropriately interfered in the course of the police investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. There is an email from you, $I$ don't have the
tab number, I'm sorry, but it is dated 30 January 2015, [SCOI.82662_0001] (tab 345) in which you sought approval for payment of a bil1 for a 1 unch with Pamela Young and
another person, and you say in that emai1:

> I took two senior NSW Police Detectives, (Pamela Young and [someone whose name is deleted]) out to 7 unch today.

Does that suggest that that was the first time that you met with Pamela Young?
A. Correct.
Q. You were asked some questions by Counse1 Assisting about an email dated Saturday, 11 Apri1 2015, from you to Bruce Belsham and Lisa Whitby, who I presume are ABC. In that email tab 354 [SCOI.82991_0001] you said this:

I have an exclusive (explosive) interview with the Detective Chief Inspector who led the reinvestigation of the case. She has said (we taped yesterday under embargo) that this family has used their wealth and position to improperly influence the NSW judiciary.

That sums up, does it not, the view that Pamela Young had expressed to you about the influence of the Minister?
A. Correct.
Q. Towards the end of that paragraph, you say this:

Pamela Young is frustrated by the multimillions of dollars likely to be spent on the third coronial inquest (which will be announced Monday) when there is unequivocally no new evidence to uncover. I know this because she (extremely confidentially) gave me a copy of her 500 page report 8 weeks ago \& I've read it all. There's much more to the story.

Do you recal1 that in email?
A. What was the date of that email?
Q. That's on Saturday, 11 Apri1.
A. Oh, okay.
Q. Now, is it true that she gave you her 500-page report about eight weeks prior to this email?
A. Well, that would be consistent with after the 1 unch. She gave it to me after the 1 unch. Not at the 1 unch, some time after that.
Q. And that would be in early February?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it true that she gave it to you on an extremely confidential basis?
A. Yes.
Q. When you said that she gave it to you extremely confidentially, did that mean that there were no other people in the police, or did she tell that you there were no other people in the police who knew that she had given it to you at that time?
A. No, no. That - no. It was just confidential, as in, you know, not - other journalists didn't have it and it wasn't generally being circulated in the public. And as I understood it, you know, we were going to have to wait for the judge, the Coroner, rather, to determine whether we could make it publicly - you know, we could report publicly on it.
Q. In your statement to this Inquiry, you say this on the third page, paragraph (g), towards the top of the page I'm sorry, paragraph (h):

I met Ms Young as arranged in 2015.
That's a reference to your first meeting, I take it?
A. Yes.
Q.

She was prepared to sacrifice her career
(which to that time has been nothing but
outstandingly successful) on a point of
significant principle.
Did she say that to you?
A. No. I think, as I've mentioned earlier, that's me writing today rather than expressing what $I$ was thinking back then.
Q. Was it your impression that she was prepared to sacrifice her career on a point of significant principle? A. Not back then. She didn't by any stretch of the
imagination think this was going to cost her career back then.
Q. But when did it appear to you that she was prepared to sacrifice her career on a point of significant principle?
A. Oh, after - when she decided to leave police.
Q. By then, of course, al1 he11 had broken 1oose?
A. Correct.
Q. What $I$ want to suggest to you is that when you say in your statement, "she was prepared to sacrifice her career on a point of significant principle", what you're expressing there is that she was prepared to sacrifice her career prior to the interview --
A. No.
Q. -- by giving the interview --
A. No.
Q. -- in a way that might prejudice her career?
A. No, that's not what I meant.
Q. You see, once she'd done the interview, her career was already on the 1 ine, wasn't it?
A. Yes, but it was my understanding that the, you know, senior people in police were pretty upset that she was going to leave the force. I did a story - I didn't print the story but $I$ did some research to do a story about her more broadly, afterwards, and so I spoke to many senior police about her and her stellar career up until that point.
Q. What $I$ want to suggest to you is that when you say in your statement, "I met Ms Young as arranged in 2015. She was prepared to sacrifice her career ... on a point of significant principle", that you were referring to her stance up until and during her in-studio interview with you on 13 Apri1 2015?
A. No. I meant subsequent to that.
Q. You also say in your statement further down that page, under the heading, "As to question 3":

My memory is that she was not there to be a
"7eaker". She wanted to be a whistle
blower on behalf of her colleagues.
A. Mmm.
Q. You also say in that same paragraph:
... she thought of herself as protecting the legitimacy of the police conduct in this matter, against the convenient blame shifting by politicians.

And:
... she was defending the police, and the correctness of its conduct on behalf of victims.

I want to suggest to you that she presented to you prior to the interview as being a lone whistleblower, prepared to put her career on the line to protect the legitimacy of her investigation that she had done. What do you say to that? A. I just say that's - that's not true and it seems quite absurd. She was involved in other much bigger cases than this. She wouldn't have sacrificed her career knowingly.
Q. Did Pamela Young tell you that she had only been given permission by her superiors for a formal door-stop interview at the court?
A. No.
Q. Did she tell you that she had not been given permission to do a full studio interview?
A. No.
Q. Did she tell you that she had no permission to criticise her Minister?
A. No.
Q. Did she tell you that she had no permission to pre-empt the findings of the third inquest by expressing her own views publicly about the case?
A. No.
Q. Did she tell you that she had not informed her superiors about when she gave you a copy of her statement in February?
A. No.
Q. Did you warn her of a risk to her job by giving the interview?
A. Not specifically to her job, but just anyone who raises their voice is likely to be, you know - is likely to face a lot of public criticism, whether that be from interested parties or social media or - it comes at some personal cost.
Q. Have you ever before in your journalistic career had a police officer speak about a Police Minister in the way that she did?
A. I wasn't in the habit of doing police stories, so no.
Q. Had you ever had a public servant speak about their Minister in that way before?
A. Not that I can recal1.
Q. Are you aware that there's an obligation on public servants to support the Government of the day?
A. Generally speaking, yes.
Q. And not to criticise their Minister publicly on matters of policy?
A. Substantively that would be correct, unless the Minister is doing something wrong, in which case we expect public servants to speak up.
Q. Did you know that it was contrary to all established protocols for a public servant such as Pamela Young to criticise --

MR GLISSAN: Commissioner, I object to this for this reason: police officers, as $I$ understand it, are independently appointed and are not public servants. What public servants may or may not be permitted to do is irrelevant.

THE COMMISSIONER: I take your point, Mr Giissan. Given the time and given your presence I'm going to let Mr Tedeschi finish up, but $I$ take the point you make.

Keep going, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Did you know that it was contrary to established protocols for public sector employees to criticise their Minister in the way that Ms Young did?
A. That it's - what, sorry? That --

THE COMMISSIONER: He has changed the definition from "public servant" to "public sector employees", and if that makes any difference to your answer, please address it if you can.

THE WITNESS: You're just asking me if I knew that it was inappropriate or -- -

MR TEDESCHI: Q. It was inappropriate and against protocols for public sector employees?
A. I would think it depends on the circumstances.
Q. In any of your interviews with Pamela Young was there a Police Media person present?
A. Not present.
Q. Did Pamela Young tell you that she had asked for Police Media personnel not to be present during her interviews with you?
A. No. And, in fact, it's my recollection that that could have occurred had I or Pamela Young required it, such was the general demeanour of Police Media, as I recall, being, you know, very helpful and wanting to assist our interviews.
Q. What do you say to the suggestion that when you spoke to Police Media in relation to Pamela Young in April 2015, that it was only about a backgrounding interview for her to give you?
A. Well, I say that's not true because they also knew I had the report, so they knew it was more than backgrounding. And backgrounding to what, if you're not doing an interview, when you're a TV reporter?

MR TEDESCHI: Pardon me, Commissioner.
Q. At any time prior to April 2015, what do you say to the suggestion that in your contact with Police Media personnel, that they spoke to you only about Pamela Young doing backgrounding?
A. That's not true.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr Nagle?

> MR NAGLE: Commissioner I know I had no questions but it is more something out of fairness to the witness, a proposition put to her during her evidence, which wil1 only take 30 seconds, if you will allow it.
> THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not going to stop 30 seconds but I don't presentiy see Mr Lehmann's interests in this matter, but you take 30 seconds.
> MR NAGLE: It is more to assist you, Commissioner.
> THE COMMISSIONER: I can assist myself, Mr Nagle. But if it is to assist me genuinely, then 30 seconds is fine.
> <EXAMINATION BY MR NAGLE:

MR NAGLE: Q. Ms Alberici, my name is --
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr McArdle?
MR McARDLE: May I ask for the same procedural protocol --
MR NAGLE: I'm about to do that.
Q. My name is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me --
MR NAGLE: Sorry.
THE COMMISSIONER: -- could you just be quiet for a moment. I'm sorry, I did ask you to do it, so I should apologise to you.

Mr Nagle, who is on his feet at the moment, appears for Mr Lehmann, a former senior police officer. You may or may not know of Mr Lehmann. But if you do, Mr Nagle appears for him, thank you.

MR NAGLE: Q. Ms Alberici, you were asked a question about who may not have been happy just after the interview in senior police hierarchy, you recall that, and do you recall your answer was something like you presume Mick Gallacher may not have been happy about it. Do you remember saying that?
A. Mmm-hmm .
Q. Is what you actually meant whoever was in the Minister's office at the time ought not have been happy about it, because, of course, Police Minister Gallacher had stepped aside a year before as a result of Operation Spicer?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what you meant?
A. Yes.

MR NAGLE: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Nagle. I think I suggested Ms Barnes, if you had any questions.

MS BARNES: No questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Just for your benefit, Ms Barnes appears for Ms Brown.

A11 right. Mr G1issan?
MR GLISSAN: Commissioner, I'm in a situation - my name is G1issan and I appear for Penelope Young.

THE WITNESS: Pame1a Young.
MR GLISSAN: Pamela Young, I'm sorry.
Commissioner, I'm in this position: I understand that there is an application that those representing Mr Wiliing might want to ask this lady some questions. I would prefer to defer any questions $I$ have until after those have been asked, if I may, so that $I$ don't make an application for, as it were, a second bite.

THE COMMISSIONER: We11, the problem with that is that you are here for Ms Young.

MR GLISSAN: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: I have arranged the order on the basis, I thought logically, that the person who had most interests in challenging this witness would be Mr Willing.

MR GLISSAN: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I would adhere to that. If you have a further application to make as a result of something from left field, I will deal with it on Tuesday.

MR GLISSAN: Thank you, Commissioner, I am content with that. Subject to that, I have no questions for Ms Alberici.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you. That brings us to the end today.

Mr McArdle, I'm going to reserve your position until Tuesday.

MR McARDLE: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Alberici, thank you very much for being available this morning. I understand arrangements are going to be made for you to tune in, as it were, at half past 9 on Tuesday morning via AVL.

At the moment, there will be Mr Murugan Thangaraj of senior counsel. He represents Mr Willing. I do not know to what extent he will ask you questions - sorry, I said 9.30. I mean 9 , because of the arrangements for Dayijght Savings Time over the weekend. Perhaps when I go off the Bench, you make sure that whatever time we have arranged with you suits you and your family.

He may ask you some questions on Tuesday morning. Mr Gray may or may not ask you any further questions and it may be that some other application is made by Ms Young's counse1. I wil1 deal with that on Tuesday. Again, thank you very much for being here this morning.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: I wil1 now adjourn unti1 2pm this afternoon, Mr Tedeschi?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Tedeschi.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you, Commissioner.
Commissioner, on 21 September, Counsel Assisting made some additional opening remarks addressing two issues, firstly, the production of historical materials relating to cases identified within paragraph (a) of the Terms of Reference; and, secondly, matters relating to the need for interested parties to be afforded the opportunity to respond to potential adverse findings and the need for additional witnesses to be called.

The first of those issues will be dealt with in our further submissions in relation to the investigative practices hearings. For present purposes, it's sufficient to record that the Commissioner of Police accepts that there have been significant issues in relation to the location of documentary material relating to historical cases. Those issues highlight the failings of previous practices, in decades past, for the storage and the recording of old police files.

The Unsolved Homicide Team has encountered difficulties in reinvestigating some cases because of those previous practices, whereby, for example, old files were kept in a variety of places, including at police stations not obviously connected with the relevant case. This made it difficult, in some cases, for the UHT to locate files or to be sure that they had complete files.

The same problem has meant that, despite repeated and sustained efforts to locate all of the files that the Inquiry has called for in a timely way, some records have unexpectedly emerged long after they were sought by the Inquiry and long after extensive searches were made for them.

The late production of this small proportion of documents sought by the Inquiry was despite the sustained efforts by those who are assisting us, both lawyers and police, to locate all of the relevant files.

Regarding the second set of issues mentioned by Counsel Assisting, the primary issue concerns the obligations of procedural fairness. We do not accept that we had an obligation to notify persons that we did not represent of potential adverse findings in the submissions
of Counsel Assisting.
Counsel Assisting's submission that the Commissioner of Police should have brought this issue to the attention of the Inquiry should not be accepted. We submit that the obligation to alert a person entitled to be heard falls upon the decision-maker and not upon other persons granted leave to appear at an Inquiry. An Inquiry is not able to absolve itself of the requirement to afford procedural fairness to persons who have an appropriate interest in the proceedings.

It was only when we received Counsel Assisting's submissions in June this year that we became aware of the full import of the potential adverse findings proposed by Counsel Assisting. As responsible lawyers, acting in the best traditions of the Bar and the legal profession generally, we brought to the attention of this Inquiry our concerns that people the subject of those suggested findings were entitled to be heard and that there were a number of significant witnesses who had not been called and whose evidence was critical to significant proposed findings.

Until we heard Counsel Assisting's opening remarks last week, it appeared to us that the Inquiry had accepted that the additional steps suggested were, in fact, required to appropriately afford procedural fairness.

Numerous people have now been given notice of potential adverse findings and a number of significant witnesses have subsequently been called to provide statements and to give evidence about matters that had been raised in the submissions of Counsel Assisting.

We note that in some important aspects, those additional witnesses have contradicted the earlier submissions of Counsel Assisting, a point to which I will return shortly.

We considered it necessary to raise these issues not only in the interests of my principal client, the Commissioner of Police, and the other police whom we represent, but also in order to prevent this Inquiry from falling into error and running the risk of an application to have the Inquiry's work disrupted or its recommendations and findings impugned.

We suggest that had certain of the findings advanced by Counsel Assisting been made by the Inquiry without these additional steps, in the absence of those remedial steps to afford procedural fairness, those findings could have constituted a denial of natural justice and been liable to be quashed.

Of the persons identified in the written submissions filed on behalf of the Commissioner of Police as persons who had not been afforded procedural fairness, most of them are no longer employed by the NSW Police Force.

We have always clearly advised the Inquiry of the limited group of persons whom we represent in accordance with your Practice Guideline 1. Indeed, we're not able to represent persons before the Inquiry in the absence of an express grant of leave. At no stage did we give any indication that we represent all current and/or former employees of the NSW Police Force. Indeed, we could not sensibly have done so, either as a matter of practicality or as a matter of law, having regard to the potential for conflicts of interest between different current and former NSW Police Force employees.

Indeed, Practice Guideline 1 expresses at paragraph 14 the Inquiry's preference that each person seeking to appear have separate and independent representation. The Practice Guideline requires an assurance that no conflict of interest is anticipated if more than one person is to be represented by a given legal team, together with an undertaking to inform the Inquiry immediately upon recognising that a conflict has arisen.

The suggestion that Counsel Assisting assumed that the Commissioner of Police would notify the relevant witnesses of matters that were in their interest is wholly inconsistent with the Inquiry's published Practice Guidelines. No such assumption was communicated to us.

To the extent that such an assumption was held, it was, we submit, at odds with the published Practice Guideline and contrary to all established principle.

The scope of Inquiry is defined by the Inquiry itself, subject only to its Terms of Reference. It is not for the legal representatives of a party to predict the precise
submissions that Counsel Assisting is likely to make and to notify any persons potentially affected by such criticisms.

Counsel Assisting ought to have identified the relevant affected persons and notified them of their interest and right to be heard well before 7 June. It ought to have been obvious to Counsel Assisting that criticisms of the type advanced by them could not be propounded in the absence of appropriate steps to afford procedural fairness. The failure to do so has resulted in a large number of people now being notified of their potential interest and some of those persons have sought to be represented and to have evidence adduced.

Some of those persons who have now been afforded the opportunity to appear and be represented have contradicted the submissions made by Counsel Assisting, including by rejecting propositions that Counsel Assisting made regarding the witnesses' purported objectives and motivations.

In the absence of the steps that we suggested to afford procedural fairness, a real risk would have arisen that some of those parties could, and quite possibly would, have sought to have any findings against them reviewed in the Supreme Court.

The only people able to call a witness to give evidence before the Inquiry are yourself, Commissioner, and Counsel Assisting.

Counsel Assisting is the only person in a position to identify the precise areas he or she wishes to explore in evidence, the way they wish to explore those areas and the extent to which statements provided to the Inquiry adequately address the issues that Counsel Assisting considers should be addressed.

Pursuant to the requests issued in September and December last year, we provided various statements to the Inquiry. At no stage did Counsel Assisting indicate that those statements did not adequately address the relevant issues in a manner that would allow the Inquiry to explore those issues in the way that the Inquiry wished to explore them. It was only on receipt of Counsel Assisting's submissions that it became apparent that various suggested findings were in the absence of some of
the principal witnesses who had not been called to give evidence.

Those witnesses included: the officers who actually reviewed the files in connection with Strike Force Parrabell; the officer in charge of Strike Force Neiwand; Detective Chief Inspector Lehmann; Detective Sergeant Penny Brown - Lehmann and Brown, of course, for both of them, their conduct was the subject of detailed exploration in a variety of respects in the submissions of Counsel Assisting. It also includes former Detective Chief Inspector Pamela Young, who was the investigation supervisor for Strike Force Macnamir, whose conduct and views were the subject of very detailed considerations in Counsel Assisting's submissions.

We have subsequently learned that the Inquiry had, in fact, sought and obtained a statement from Pamela Young in April of this year. The existence of that statement was not disclosed to the parties to the Inquiry until the resumption of the present hearing block. We suggest that that omission is inexplicable and, because, in some respects, Pamela Young's statement is contradictory of Counsel Assisting's submissions, we suggest that the parties have been deprived of relevant material in support of their positions in their previous submissions. And of course, there are other witnesses that $I$ won't detail.

It must have been apparent to Counsel Assisting that each of those witnesses, including particularly Ms Young, from whom the Inquiry had actually obtained a statement, were of fundamental importance to the matters the subject of serious submissions by Counsel Assisting.

Our propositions concerning particular persons who had not been called, not only concern procedural fairness, but also the availability of particular findings. The absence of a key witness can prevent the making of findings in relation to matters to which that witness's evidence would have been critical.

We submit that the evidence called in the current tranche departs in many significant respects from the submissions of Counsel Assisting, so that Counsel Assisting will no doubt be seeking an opportunity to revisit those submissions.

Were it not for the steps taken by the Inquiry to address the procedural fairness concerns and the need to call witnesses of central importance to particular findings advanced by Counsel Assisting, this Inquiry would have been denied some critical evidence and would have carried the risk of certain of its findings potentially being struck down.

In Counsel Assisting's address on the 21 st of this month, he was critical of the Commissioner of Police for the submissions made on those two issues, in part, blaming the NSW Police Force for the need for an extension of the Inquiry's reporting deadline as a result of those submissions, because of the need for further hearings to take place. We respectfully submit that that criticism was unfair and unfounded and should be rejected by this Inquiry. Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: Two comments only at this stage. First, my learned friend just asserted that the Inquiry had sought and obtained a statement from Ms Young in Apri1 this year. That is not correct. Ms Young volunteered a statement at that time without the Commission having sought one from her. At the time she did so, in Apri1, the dead1ine for the Inquiry to complete its work and provide its report to Parliament was still 30 June.

Secondly, just at the tail end of his remarks a moment ago my learned friend asserted that in my remarks on 21 June [sic], I had blamed his client, the Commissioner of Police, for the need for an extension as a result of the submissions made by him and those assisting him in relation to various witnesses who had not been called. I made no such submission. May it please you.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Mr Tedeschi, I would bring this matter or this aspect of the matter to an end for the moment. I don't wish to say anything more than that. But I should say that all of the matters that you have raised will, of course, be dealt with in the ultimate report by me and I'11 hear, no doubt, from the parties in the near time in written material otherwise, so $I$ will deal with that in due course.

The witness tomorrow is due at 10am, I think. Now,

I know that - at 1east, I don't believe Mr Thangaraj wil1 be here tomorrow.

MR TEDESCHI: No, I don't understand. I think there are two witnesses tomorrow, aren't there?

THE COMMISSIONER: No, there is only one.
MR TEDESCHI: Georgie We11s and Penny Brown?
THE COMMISSIONER: No. I understood - and I don't think I'm wrong - that an email had gone around indicating that Ms Brown won't come until Tuesday.

MR TEDESCHI: I think that's probably right.
THE COMMISSIONER: So tomorrow is only Ms Wells. But what I will do tomorrow, I will announce this tomorrow morning in everyone's presence, I will follow the same format. In other words, she is, in effect, the witness that you proposed, so you will go last, as it were, prior to any further questions that Mr Gray may have. I will work out the order of batting precisely in the morning, but in broad terms, that's what will happen. I don't know how long she wil1 be but I would anticipate she won't take the whole day. Mr Gray, do you have any --

MR GRAY: I would not have thought she would take the whole day.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. We will aim to finish her tomorrow, whatever be the case. I've got a private hearing tomorrow afternoon, as I do shortly, this afternoon, but we wil1 finish her tomorrow. Is there any need to start earlier than 10?

MR GRAY: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. We wil1 start her at 10 o'clock and we wil1 finish her tomorrow but, broadly speaking, I wil1 take that order of questions, and I wil1 just clarify that for everyone's presence in the morning, when, if he is here, Mr Nagle, and Mr G1issan and others are here. Thank you. I will now adjourn.
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