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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Commissioner, first of all, I note that yesterday there were some text messages produced by Ms Alberici, which I tendered. They have now been added to exhibit 6 as tab 525.

The parties have also agreed non-publication orders over the text messages, and I hand up a short minute of order, which is agreed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Secondly, Commissioner, the reason for the delayed start this morning is that at 20 past 9 this morning, a letter was received by the Inquiry from the Office of the General Counsel of the police raising two matters.

The first matter was this: it was asserted in the letter that some six documents, said to support Ms Wells's recollection of certain events, had not been tendered. They have been tendered and all five of them - sorry, five of the six of them are in the tender bundle already. There is a sixth one - there were six documents referred to in the letter. Five of them are already in the bundle. The sixth one, which was not in the bundle, was a letter over which the police had claimed legal professional privilege, and for that reason, it had not been included. However, that having been pointed out to the police in the last half hour or so, I understand that privilege is waived over that document and it can be added to the bundle.

The second matter raised in the letter is the question of documents produced to the Inquiry by the $A B C$. The police letter says this:

> It is unclear to the Commissioner whether all documents received from the $A B C$ have been tendered, though it is anticipated they have not. Accordingly, the
> Commissioner requests confirmation from the
> Inquiry that all documents received by the
> Inquiry from the $A B C$, including, but not
> limited to, communications sent to or from Ms Alberici, have been tendered and, if not, that the Inquiry provide those

## documents to the Commissioner at the

 earliest opportunity.As I say, that letter came in at 20 past 9 this morning.
Documents, of course, were summonsed by the Inquiry from the $A B C$ and some of them are in the tender bundle. In response to the letter now received from the police, the Inquiry will contact the $A B C$ and discuss the request that has been made by the police, and whatever appropriate steps emerge from that can be taken, it will be a matter in the end for you, Commissioner, as to whether the police are provided with every document that the ABC has provided to the Inquiry, which is the request that has been made.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. I note the request. I do know that some of the documents from the $A B C$ were said to be subject to journalist privilege and some were also objected to on the basis of disclosure of sources.

Mr Tedeschi, here we are yet again, belated materials being asked for, which you had all along; somebody at your side has obviously not carefully looked at what has happened.

Secondly, for the first time, although you knew that Ms Alberici was going to be giving some days ago, you ask for documents from the $A B C$ or to get access to the $A B C$.

It is a bit rich, frankly, given the resources that you have available to you, knowing fully well what is happening, that things aren't being put in a timely fashion, and it really is becoming quite disruptive. I have said this more than once. Now, we will do what we can, Mr Tedeschi, to facilitate it, but Ms Wells can be giving evidence at the moment and we will take it from there. Your request has been noted.

MR TEDESCHI: Might I respond to what Counsel Assisting has said, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
MR TEDESCHI: Firstly, I think that Counsel Assisting has misunderstood the letter. It was not suggested that all six documents have not been tendered. It's only one document that we were seeking to have tendered.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is not true. That is simply not true. The letter does suggest, doesn't it, that these documents are not in the tender bundle, doesn't it?

MR TEDESCHI: That's not what was intended by --
THE COMMISSIONER: I didn't say what was intended. What was in the letter says, "The documents aren't in and we want them in." Now, that is not accurate. So whoever drafted it, or whoever gave instructions for that to be drafted, I don't think checked the issue properly.

MR TEDESCHI: If that is the case, then we apologise for the misinterpretation. We're not suggesting that five of them haven't been included in the tender bundle; it was the sixth one.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Sure. The other one was always within your hands to disclose or not. Now, whoever wrote that letter, or whoever got instructions to write that letter, clearly didn't check what was fact and what was fiction. That is plainly obvious, really. Why don't you just accept it for once, Mr Tedeschi. There's been an error. Let's move on and get Ms Wells into the witness box?

MR TEDESCHI: Well, before we do that, we are concerned that there may be emails or other documents from the $A B C$ that relate to the evidence that was given by Ms Alberici.

THE COMMISSIONER: Emails to whom?
MR TEDESCHI: Emails to and from Ms Alberici obviously are
of the most relevance, but anything else that might affect or concern the evidence that she gave yesterday would be of relevance to us.

Normally, we would not be concerned, we would be confident that Counsel Assisting has referred to all the documents. But we are concerned --

THE COMMISSIONER: What raises your concern? What in particular raises your concern?

MR TEDESCHI: What raises our concern is the fact that back in April of this year, Ms Young provided a statement
to the police [sic] that was not disclosed.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I don't want to debate this issue with you now, all right? It's got nothing to do with Ms Young's statement, which arrived unsolicited. The material will emerge in due course. You do know that, at that time, the Inquiry had to complete its business. You also know from the Practice Note that the Inquiry is in control of the evidence it deploys. Now, let's get real about this. You don't know, you say, what could be in the ABC's interstices that might help.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Right. You saw yesterday on the screen, for example, an email that passed between Ms Alberici and somebody else, to which there were some redactions, which $I$ think was based on journalist privilege or source. You did see some emails yesterday concerning her contact with the police, one in particular that was put on the screen, that says that Ms Alberici spent up to an hour talking to people at the police. That's a document which has been in the tender bundle for a very long time. Not one request has come from your side, although that document has been given to you a long time ago, to ask for any additional documents.

MR TEDESCHI: We only got a statement very recently.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, you know and I know, as a litigator, you want contemporaneous documents. People can say all kinds of things that may or may not be verified or corroborated. You've had that document, which pinpointed one hour's conversation with someone from the police, whoever that person was. You saw it yesterday. You've seen it before. Not one request was made prior to yesterday. You didn't even ask Ms Alberici about the very document you had in your hands. So I'm just going to assume that we'11 give you what is able to be provided, but you can work on the basis for the moment what is in the tender bundle is what is relevant in relation to Lateline.

Now, as I said, people on the other side will take on board what you've said. Your comments are noted. There is no interest to hide or obstruct any position at all from the Inquiry's point of view. I'm directed to get to the truth of it and I will.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Correct. Thank you, Mr Tedeschi. Let's call Ms Wells, thank you.

MR GRAY: Commissioner, I should add two matters on reflection, having just taken instructions.

The first is to raise a general concern in, in effect, the opposite direction from the concern that my learned friend has been raising. This is not the first time that at the very last minute, for reasons no doubt that seem sensible to the party in question, suddenly, privilege is waived over a document which sudden1y, it is said, must be added to the tender bundle.

If there are other documents over which privilege has been claimed but which the police have in mind in due course requesting be added, I would ask that we be told that without delay.

The second matter is this: as I said when I read out the terms of the letter in terms of documents from the ABC, the actual request made by the letter of 20 past 9 this morning is that the Inquiry provide to the police all documents of whatever kind, unrestricted, provided by the $A B C$ to the Inquiry.

Now, I apprehend that the concern of the police surely is more restricted than that. It must be, I assume, documents relevant to Ms Alberici's evidence or to the Lateline topic or to matters that could be delineated in some way, and I would respectfully suggest that before we speak to the $A B C$ about this request, that the police today delineate with some degree of precision what it is they actually want.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I think that's entirely reasonable, first, in terms of what you really want.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: And what you need. And it seems to me, without me drafting it, that a very short communication should take place as soon as can be as to the categories of documents that you want and obviously then consideration
can be given to what you've already got and consideration can be given to what may already be in the hands of the Inquiry, and that wil1 short-circuit.

But if you are concerned, as $I$ can understand why, you want everything that passes between Ms Alberici and the police certainly, and you want internal material, I presume, on the $A B C$ and the production of the Lateline interview. But $I$ won't hold you to my words. You can just draft whatever you say you want.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we wil1 and you're quite correct. As I said earlier to you, Commissioner, what we are interested in is emails or documents to or from Ms Alberici or any other document relating to the Lateline interview. I'm content to put that in writing from my solicitors.

THE COMMISSIONER: Why don't you do it that way. I don't want to in any way, from what I've said, circumscribe what you may want. I will leave it to you and your side to put it in the terms that you want and then consideration can be given to what is already in the tender bundle. As I have said, I referred to one document, in particular, which obviously was on the screen yesterday, and goes to the very heart of the preparation. I am aware of other documents in the tender bundle, but if you put that in writing, then a prompt response will be forthcoming.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes. In answer to the first question by Counsel Assisting, I'm not aware of any other document which we seek to have included in a tender bundle that was the subject of a claim for privilege.

THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right.
MR TEDESCHI: It wil1 be obvious to you, Commissioner, that there were literally thousands of documents, including documents from Ashurst's solicitors, that needed to be reviewed by those that instruct us prior to production, and the exercise had to be done very urgently and it was an onerous exercise, so it might be, in relation to the document that has been requested to be added to the tender bundle this morning - it may well be that privilege should not have been claimed on that.

THE COMMISSIONER: It does seem to me, having seen it -

I find it hard to believe how anyone could sensibly have thought it would or should be covered by privilege. But leaving that to one side, why don't we just get on with it and Ms Wells can be called and we'll take it from there. Your request, the moment it is received, will be given prompt attention.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Yes, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: The Inquiry wil1 write briefly to my learned friend's instructors as wel1. A suggestion that will be made will be that the police should review all documents over which they have claimed privilege and form a view about all of them in that way.

Now, with those matters at least temporarily dealt with, I call Ms Wells.
<GEORGINA WELLS, affirmed:
[10.35am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:
MR GRAY: Q. Ms Wells, your name is Georgina Wells?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Wells, if you can move a ittte bit closer to the microphone, and speak as you can. Just in advance, some of the documents you'11 will get in hard copy, some might be on the screen, but you take your time when you are answering any questions. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR GRAY: Q. You have provided a statement to the Inquiry dated 4 September this year [NPL.9000.0027.0001]? A. That's correct.
Q. Are the contents of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 7 of your statement - do you have it with you?
A. No, I don't. Oh, here we go, yeah.
Q. Are you content to look at it on the screen or would you like a hard copy?

THE COMMISSIONER: Or you can have both. It's immaterial.
THE WITNESS: Sorry, I can't see paragraph 7. I can't see paragraph 7.

MR GRAY: Q. No, I know. I'm asking you would you like to have a hard copy?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. No, would you like to have a hard copy? Here it is.
A. Oh, that's fine. Sorry, you're quite hard to hear.
Q. As are you. I wonder if we could both speak up. If you turn to paragraph 7 --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- I'm looking at (b), you were a media supervisor for State Crime Command from 2011 to 2016 and then, looking at (a), a media supervisor in the Police Media Unit following on from that from April 2016 to March 2018. Do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. Now, what is the change involved there? Where does the Police Media Unit fit in relation to State Crime Command?
A. So for the entire time I was part of the Police Media Unit. However, from the dates of October 2011 to April 2016, I was focused specifically on State Crime Command, but I was still a member of the Police Media Unit.
Q. I see. So the Police Media Unit has a wider remit than just State Crime Command?
A. Very much so.
Q. At the time we are concerned with, which is the first few months of 2015, were you working in an office somewhere in the police world or were you working from home?
A. I was based in Parramatta at State Crime Command.
Q. And was Ms McMahon, with whom you shared the job which I'll come to in a second - also working from the same location?
A. When she was working for State Crime Command, yes. But she only worked for State Crime Command half the time. The other half of the time she was in the Police Media Unit in the Sydney city.
Q. I see. In the particular job that you had in 2015, which you have described as "media supervisor for State Crime Command", you were sharing that job with Ms McMahon; is that right?
A. That's correct. I was only a part-time officer. I'd just come back from maternity leave and was working part time.
Q. As I understand it, you worked Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday in the job and she worked Thursday, Friday in the job?
A. That's probably correct. It's a long time ago. I can't recall my exact days.
Q. I can show you some documents that have been produced and both you and she seem to agree on that. Is it consistent with your recollection that that's what happened?
A. It sounds - yes, I think I did work Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.
Q. I wonder if Ms Wells could have volume 16, please, and if we could turn to tab 383 [NPL.0147.0001.0012_0001]. This is a record of interview that Ms McMahon gave - I'm sorry, have you found 383 ?
A. It's a fair way through. I'm getting there. Yes.
Q. This is a record of interview that Ms McMahon gave to a solicitor from Ashurst --
A. I'm just going to get my glasses.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ on 24 Apri1 2015. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You also gave an interview with a solicitor from Ashurst at about the same time. You would remember that? A. That's correct.
Q. In the second paragraph on that page, the first page of tab 383, Ms McMahon, referred to as "SM", says:

My first knowledge of the matter was

> 8 Apri 7 2015. Georgie and I are job sharing at State Crime. She does Monday to Wednesday and I do Thursday/Friday. The 8 th was a Wednesday. On a Wednesday we normally do a handover by either email or over the phone where we talk about what $I$ need to know about over the next 2 days.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So you would agree that you were doing Monday to Wednesday and she was doing Thursday, Friday?
A. Yes.
Q. If we could go to your statement - just keep that folder with you if you would, because I'11 need to show you a few other documents in that folder, but if we could go to your statement [NPL.9000.0027.0001], in paragraph 10, you refer to 1 Apri1 2015, and you say you recal1 discussions with Pamela Young and Michael Willing about the third coronial inquest into the death of Scott Johnson. Do you see that?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, was that a discussion with Pamela Young and Michael Willing and you all together, three people, or was it more than one discussion with them separately?
A. I think it may have been more than one discussion but I can't recal1. It's quite a substantial amount of time ago.
Q. Sure. So it may have been a three-way conversation with all three of you or you may have spoken to Mr Willing separately from Ms Young?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, in the next sentence, you say:

I recall that during the conversation,
Pamela Young proposed to conduct
"backgrounders" with journalists from different publications.

And you go on to say some more things in that paragraph. Now, is it your evidence that this discussion or discussions on this day, 1 April 2015, was the first time
you heard any mention of the topic of Pamela Young speaking to journalists in any way about the Scott Johnson case?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could turn in that folder to tab 372, [NPL.0138.0002.3306] this is an email from you to Strath Gordon on 14 Apri 1 2015, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Lateline interview was the previous night, 13 Apri1, just to orient you. So you say to Strath Gordon, who was who in the hierarchy? Who was Strath Gordon?
A. He was the head of Public Affairs.
Q. Where does that fit in in relation to the Media Unit?
A. He was the head of the Public Affairs which included the Media Unit. He also was head of another - a number of other units within Public Affairs.
Q. And was he a police officer or a--
A. No.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ police staff member?
A. Staff member.
Q. What was his authority in relation to media matters by comparison with, for example, Mr Willing, who was then the Commander Homicide?
A. So he was the head of Public Affairs, so he needed to approve any strategies of this nature.
Q. In this email of 14 Apri1, tab 372 , in the second paragraph, you have an entry in relation to Wednesday, 1 Apri1; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say:

Discussion --
singular --
with... Mick Wil7ing \& ... Pamela Young about how to manage the media around the directions hearing ...

Does that indicate that there was just one discussion, ie,
with the two of them together, or does your use of the singular rather than plural in the word "discussion" have no particular significance?
A. As I said, I can't recall.
Q. At any rate, you say you knew the Johnson family had a copy of Pam Young's statement and were likely to approach the media, and you say:

We agreed on backgrounders with The
Australian (Dan Box) and ABC (Lorna Knowles) ...

Just pausing there, and I'll come to the rest in a second, "we" is the three of you, I take it - that is, you, Mr Willing and Ms Young?
A. I can assume so based on the notes here.
Q. Well, this is your account two weeks after the date in question, to your superior, so this was your best understanding at the time, presumably?
A. At the time, yes.
Q. So you say:

We --
apparently meaning the three of you:
agreed on backgrounders with The Australian (Dan Box) and ABC (Lorna Knowles)...

And you go on:
.. with the possibility of on record interviews if and when the statement was made public by the Coroner.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What was actually said, according to your recollection now, as to that latter topic, about the possibility of on the record interviews? Who said what about that?
A. So what do you mean? Can you rephrase your question, please?
Q. You've summarised it as "with the possibility of on record interviews" and so on. What did everyone actually say?
A. So I'm not quite sure what you're trying to ask.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Who was it? Who was it between yourself, Ms Young or Mr Willing who raised the possibility of on-record interviews?
A. I can't recall specifically who raised that, but this was about doing a backgrounder, not - there was the possibility of on-record. Any on-record interview would subsequently need to be considered and approved separately.

MR GRAY: Q. We'11 come to that, but what I'm asking you about is when you summarised to Strath Gordon what happened on 1 Apri1 you say that you agreed on backgrounders that's one thing - and apparently - tell me if this is right - you agreed that it would be possible that there would be on-record interviews if and when the statement was made public; is that what was agreed?
A. That's correct. But I can't approve on-the-record interviews.
Q. I haven't asked you that. The three of you agreed that on-record interviews would be possible if and when the statement was made public; is that right?
A. That there was a possibility, not that they were possible.
Q. If you just 1 isten to the question, it will be quicker.

MR TEDESCHI: I object. She was answering the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't agree, Mr Tedeschi.
I'11 ask you to put it again, please, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Q. Did the three of you agree that if and when the statement was made public by the Coroner, there would be a possibility of on-record interviews?
A. That there would be a possibility, not that there would be.
Q. Yes. So if you could just confine yourself to the question, as I say, it will be faster. Thank you. Now, could you expand on that? You say you agreed on it. Who
raised it? What did you say? What did Mr Willing say? What did Ms Young say?
A. I can't recall.
Q. No recollection at all?
A. It's eight years ago.
Q. Yes. No recollection at all, none?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But you do agree that the possibility of an on-record interview was raised during the discussion between yourself, Mr Willing and Ms Young?
A. That's correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Back on your statement, paragraph 11, you say:

The purpose of the "backgrounders" was to provide an understanding to the reporters ...
et cetera, in the first sentence. And then second sentence:

We understood that the Coroner had released the statement to the family of Scott
Johnson and anticipated that it may be
provided to journalists ...
Now, when you say "we" there, does that mean you, Mr Willing and Ms Young?
A. I can assume so, yes.
Q. Well, you've written this statement, and you've written it about two weeks ago. Is that what you mean by "we"?
A. Well, yes. I would have been advised by Mr Willing and Ms Young, because I don't have any dealings with the Coroner.
Q. You say, "We understood", so that means that

Mr Willing, does it, and/or Ms Young, told you this, and that you took that to be right?
A. I took that to be understood. That's correct.
Q. Then you say:

> It was agreed that these "backgrounders" would be "off the record" ...
A. Yes.
Q. Do you mean by that that you were party to that agreement or that it was agreed between Mr Wiliing and Ms Young or what?
A. It was agreed between all three of us, and then it was subsequently approved by the Director of Public Affairs that it would be off-record or that they would be off-record.
Q. A bit later in that same paragraph you say the statement - that is, Pamela Young's statement -
... was at the time subject to a non-publication order.

Do you see that?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. Are you sure about that?
A. I believe that to be the case but $I$ don't directly seek those.
Q. No, no, I'm sure you don't, but if I suggested to you that, in fact, there was no non-publication order over the statement as at that time - that is, prior to 13 Apri1would you be able to comment one way or the other?
A. I may have been mistaken.
Q. Is the conversation referred to in paragraph 11 the same conversation as referred to in paragraph 10?
A. I don't know. I don't know if we had one conversation or several conversations, if $I$ had one conversation with al1 of them or several conversations with individuals.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And do I take it that of these conversations, you don't have any contemporaneous notes of them?
A. What was that, sorry?
Q. Of this conversation or conversations we're now
talking about, do $I$ take it you have no contemporaneous notes of your own of either the one or more conversations? A. I don't have any notes from when I worked with the police.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. If I were to suggest to you that, in terms of non-publication orders at the time, prior to 13 Apri1, there was no non-publication order in place in respect of the statement, but the police were making submissions to the Coroner in support of the making of such an order does that come back to mind?
A. That may be correct, yes.
Q. Do you have a recollection of being aware at this time - that is, the first half of Apri1 2015 - that the Coroner's office had, at some earlier time, supplied a copy of the statement to the lawyers for the Johnsons?
A. That's correct. It's in my statement.
Q. And were you aware that Ms Young, for her part, had provided a copy of the statement, redacted, to Emma Alberici?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Turn, if you would, to tab 347 in the bundle [NPL.0138.0001.0037]. This is the document which you describe, using inverted commas, as the "media strategy", in your statement. Do you remember that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You just need to answer yes or no for the transcript.
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Now, I'11 just go through that, if I may. You send that on Tuesday, 7 Apri1, to Mr Kerlatec and Mr Finch. Just tell us again, if you can remember, what their positions were?
A. They were detective chief superintendents within State Crime Command. One of them may have been acting as the commander at the time but $I$ can't recall.
Q. And you sent copies as well to Mr Monk, Mr Willing and Ms Young?
A. Correct.
Q. And who was Mr Monk?
A. He was a senior - he may have been acting as one of the detective chief inspectors at the time, because he wasn't normally involved in homicide matters.
Q. In this emai1, in the first paragraph, you refer to the directions hearing that was coming up the following week, on Monday, 13 April; you refer to the fact that the case was one of intense media interest. Do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. In the second paragraph, you say that
a non-publication order had been sought by Detective Chief Inspector Young. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. I suggest to you that that is actually correct - that that is the position.
A. That may well be and it may be that eight years later I've mistaken the two.
Q. Quite so. In the third paragraph, you say:
... we would like to provide a background briefing to the $A B C$ and The Australian prior to Monday so they can take a look at the report and have a chat to police about what's in it. The briefing would be for background information on7y and off the record.

Do you see that? And is that a reflection of the substance of the discussion or discussions that you had with Mr Willing and Ms Young on 1 April?
A. About giving background briefings for the ABC and Australian, yes, that's correct.
Q. And that they would be for background information on 1 y and off the record?
A. That's correct.
Q. A couple of 1 ines lower in that same paragraph you say this:

If and when the statement is made public, we would be happy to go on the record then, plus address any media requests from all

## media (including [a journalist from the

 Herald]).Is that right?
A. That's correct, but we would stil1 need to consider any requests as they came in.
Q. Well, it seems to read as though the moment the statement was made public "we" - and you'11 tell us in a minute who "we" is here - would be happy to go on the record then?
A. Absolutely, but a request would still need to be made and it would need to be considered.
Q. And who is "we" when you say "we would be happy to go on the record then"?
A. That's the collective "we" of the NSW Police.
Q. Well, you're sending this to two senior officers of the NSW Police, so "we" presumably is not those officers, because they're the ones being told, so who is "we"?
A. The police in general. So you would have a spokesperson, but "we" as in the police.
Q. If you turn to 367 in the bundle [NPL.1038.0002.2771], this is another email of yourse1f a week later, on 14 April to Mr Gordon, Mr Finch and Mr Kerlatec. So this is a day after the Lateline broadcast, and you say:

Last Tuesday, Pam Young indicated she would prefer to speak to Emma Alberici on background at $A B C$ rather than Lorna Know7es ...

Do you see that? You just need to answer.
A. Yes.
Q. So last Tuesday would be 7 Apri1?
A. Yes.
Q. So on the day that you sent the email about the strategy that we were just looking at, Pamela Young told you, did she, that she would rather speak to Emma Alberici rather than Lorna Knowles?
A. That would - yes.
Q. And she said that she would - she, Pamela Young would - contact Emma Alberici directly?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said that Mick Wiliing and you discussed briefly and agreed to that.
A. Yes.
Q. Al1 of that happening, $I$ take it, on the 7 th?
A. Yes, I can assume so.
Q. Now, in the second paragraph you say:

In discussing the backgrounders, we had spoken about the ability for Pam to go on the record if the Coroner made the statement public, but would consider any requests on the day.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, that's consistent with standard practice.
Q. And when it says "In discussing the backgrounders, we had spoken about the ability for Pam to go on the record", who's "we"?
A. I imagine it would be Pamela, Michael Willing and myself, but it may have also involved Strath, although I note that the email was to Strath.
Q. Then you go on to say in the same sentence - or I think it may be the next sentence, actually:

Pam had indicated that $A B C$ Lateline was doing a story ...

Now, when do you say - when do you mean that Pam had indicated that?
A. I don't know when that indication - I would assume that that would have been on the day of the --
Q. Sorry?
A. I'm assuming that would be on the 13 th.
Q. Do you mean that as of today, you don't have a precise recollection and that's, doing the best you can, what you think you must mean?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you say in the rest of that sentence:
... I was not aware of the actual interview until late yesterday --
ie, the 13th --
(as per my late addition to the media update)

I will come to that, but does that remain your recollection?
A. That's correct.
Q. So Pamela Young told you about Emma Alberici, you say, for the first time on 7 April?
A. That's correct.
Q. We know, and I'm sure you remember this, that Pamela Young told Siobhan McMahon that she did not want a Media Liaison Officer with her when she went for the backgrounder with Dan Box?
A. That's correct.
Q. What about Ms Alberici in that regard? In other words, did Pam Young say to you or to anyone else, to your knowledge, that she didn't want a Media Liaison Officer there either?
A. I don't recall, but that week I was quite ill.
Q. We'll come to that, but you answer is you don't recall; is that --
A. No.
Q. Now, I'11 move to Wednesday, 8 April, and start with tab 383 [NPL.0147.0001.0012_0001]. I showed you this 20 minutes ago. This is Ms McMahon's interview with
Ashurst. In that first paragraph attributed to "SM", she mentions the 8th was a Wednesday and how normally on a Wednesday you would do a handover by email or over the phone. I think you accepted that that's right?
A. Yes.
Q. Towards the bottom of that page, two paragraphs from the bottom, Ms McMahon says:

So on the 8th we did the handover over the phone. Georgie was sick

Do you see that?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. Does that accord with your recollection, namely, that although you were sick, you did the handover over the phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's turn to 384 [NPL.0147.0001.0001]. This is your own record of interview with Ashurst. On the second page, a bit below halfway on the page, the solicitor $S D$ asks you:

When did Pam indicate she preferred Emma
Alberici?
Do you see that line?
A. Yes.
Q. Your answer is:

I don't know when that was. I got sick on the Wednesday.

Now, the Wednesday was the 8th?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say:

I got sick on the Wednesday.
I just wanted to know, if you remember, did you go to work and then get sick and leave or did you just not go to work at all?
A. I can't recal1.
Q. If you, for al1 or part of the day, were not there, did that mean that Ms McMahon had to take over or that you just did your best from home?
A. I would have just done my best from home and hoped that the Media Unit could assist with anything that needed doing.
Q. A document has been produced this morning by the police, which $I$ should show you, if I could have this put
before the witness and a copy for you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. This is an email from you to Michael Willing on 8 April at 21 minutes past 8 in the morning. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It's sent from your phone. So would that tend to suggest that you were not at work?
A. That would suggest that is the case.
Q. You say:
... I'm off sick today but on the mobile.
Then you tell him something about Dan Box's story being on page 3, that is of The Australian, and you refer to some other things that are going to be done, and you had organised for Siobhan - that is, Siobhan McMahon - to sit in.
A. (Witness nods).

MR GRAY: I'm quite content for that document to be added to the tender bundle, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Where do you want it?
MR GRAY: It can go as just the next number, which would be 526 .

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: I think Mr Tedeschi said something; I didn't quite hear it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry?
MR TEDESCHI: Sorry, there should be the usual redactions over the email addresses.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right. That can be arranged. It won't be published until that occurs. Thank you.
Q. Can I just ask you this while Mr Gray is coming to the next point: where you say "Dan Box's story" today,
"page 3", "reinforces to me that we need to fill him in on the statement", does that mean that you thought that Mr Box's story was incomplete or inadequate in some way because he hadn't been given access to the statement? A. I don't recal1. I can't recall what the contents of his story were.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right.
MR GRAY: Q. In tab 372 [NPL.0138.0002.3306] which is your short email to Strath Gordon of 14 Apri1 summarising the events of the previous two weeks or so, you itemise something, a couple of things that happened on Tuesday, the 7th. Do you see that?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then you say:

Following this $I$ was off sick ...
So that means, does it, that you were sick and at home on the 8th, the Wednesday?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on Thursday, Friday, Siobhan McMahon would have been on the job, as it were, in the normal way?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let's turn to 351 , please. That's an email chain on 8 and 9 Apri1 [NPL.0138.0002.2959]. Can you see that the first one in the chain is the bottom one that starts about halfway down the page and it's from you to Pamela Young and it's copied to Mr Wiliing, Ms McMahon, Mr Kerlatec, Mr Finch, Mr Clifton, and it's sent at 1 minute to 4 pm on 8 Apri1?
A. Correct.
Q. And you tel1 Ms Young that you had spoken to Dan Box and he was "very keen to meet with you on Friday", et cetera, and you go into some details about how that was going to work? Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So you were, although sick, evidently, very
commendably, still sending emails on the 8th about this matter?
A. Correct.
Q. And making telephone calls about the matter?
A. Yes.
Q. From home, on your mobile phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Any calls with Emma Alberici?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Could have been?
A. I don't recall.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Do you deny that it could have happened?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Does that mean you can't deny it?
A. It means I can't remember.

MR GRAY: Q. Any calls with Mick Willing?
A. I can't recall.
Q. On that email chain, you having sent yours at 1 minute to 4 on the Wednesday, Siobhan McMahon responds, next one up, at 11 minutes past 3 , the next day, Thursday the 9 th, and asks you something about whether she needed to organise Lorna Knowles, and you then respond on Thursday, the 9th, a few minutes later, telling Siobhan that Pam Young had spoken directly with Emma Alberici from the ABC.
A. That's correct.
Q. To your knowledge, had Pamela Young been speaking to Emma Alberici about these matters for months?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Had you been speaking to Emma Alberici for months about this matter?
A. No.
Q. Had you spoken to Emma Alberici at all?
A. I may have spoken to her once in this week. I don't recall. But I'd never spoken to her before that.
Q. When you say "in this week", do you mean in this week that had Wednesday the 8th in the middle of it?
A. I may have contacted both Dan Box and Emma Alberici,
either on the Friday or the Monday, just to find out if they were doing stories. But that would have been the only contact that I'd had.
Q. And do you say - is this your evidence - that apart from possibly doing that, you had not previously spoken to Emma Alberici at all?
A. Not that I can --
Q. -- about this topic?
A. Not that I can recall. I don't believe I'd ever had any discussions with her prior, on this matter. Whether I had on any other matter, I don't think so. It would be quite unusual for the presenter of a program to contact me directly. They have producers.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Why is that? Why is that?
A. Because they have producers that do the engagement with Media Liaison Officers.
Q. Did you know who she was?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You don't recall whether you knew who Emma Alberici was in 2015?
A. I may have had to look her up, but we didn't do a lot of work with Lateline. It was not a program that we did a lot of day-to-day work with.

MR GRAY: Q. Let me move to Friday, the 10th. So Siobhan McMahon is at the desk, as it were, and you were presumably still at home sick?
A. I didn't work on Fridays.
Q. I know that, but you were still at home, sick?
A. I may have been.
Q. You're not sure, okay. So if we go to 351 again, she is in touch with you, as we have just seen, that is, Siobhan is, on the 9th, and you exchange emails about Emma Alberici - correct? On the 9th?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we turn to 353 [NPL.0138.0005.2627] this is an email chain on the 10th, on the Friday, and it starts at the bottom with Siobhan McMahon telling you that Pam Young had just called to request that she, Siobhan, not sit in on
her chat with Dan Box. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. She says, Siobhan says:

Pam wi 71 have another officer with her, (Penny Brown) and believes it will be "too much" to have an MLO in there as well. Mick Willing is OK with this course of action.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. She asks you whether, in effect, you have a different view from herself, which was that she had acquiesced, and you write back saying, in the middle of the page, on the 10th at 11.35:

You've done the right thing. The most we can do is offer, but just record it ...

So you're telling her she has done the appropriate thing? A. That's correct, to report it up the change and record it, because as a media officer you can't tell a senior detective, "No, you can't do that"; no authority to do so.
Q. I wanted to ask you about the point where you [sic] say:

Mick Willing is OK with this course of action.

You had spoken to Mick Willing, I take it, in order to know that?
A. I would assume so, based on the email.
Q. And if Mick Willing is okay with it, as it says here he was, as Commander Homicide, he would have the authority, would he, to approve such a thing?
A. That's correct.
Q. So that wouldn't need to go to Strath Gordon?
A. So Strath was advised, and I think I had advised Siobhan to let him know.
Q. I see that. But my question was: Mick Willing could
approve that himself; is that --
A. Wel1, Mick Willing had said he was okay with it.
Q. Yes.
A. So the backgrounder itself had already been approved.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But would you like to just listen to the question. The question is: if Mr Willing approved, that was the end of it, wasn't it? There was no-one else in the Media Department who needed to be consulted apart from as a courtesy?
A. We11, Strath could have stepped in if he chose to.
Q. I see. So Mr Willing had no authority to exercise that judgment on his own, did he?
A. We11, I think it's about making sure that people are aware.
Q. No, I'm not asking you what you think. No. No. I understand that. I think what you're being asked about I will let Mr Gray do it - is who had authority to do what, not what you think might be the best position or not. Perhaps Mr Gray can take over.

MR GRAY: Q. Did Mr Wiliing have the authority to approve what Pamela Young was asking to do?
A. The authority was just in relation to the backgrounder, whether or not --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I'd ask you, please, to listen to the question and, in your own interests, would you please answer the question that's posed not the one that you pose for yourself. Would you please listen to the question again.

MR GRAY: $Q$. The topic is Ms Young telling Siobhan McMahon on the 10th that she doesn't want Siobhan McMahon to go with her to the discussion with Dan Box; right? A. Correct.
Q. That's the topic. And Siobhan McMahon tells you, "Mick Willing is OK with this course of action"; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. My question is: on the question of whether it was okay for Pamela Young to go to the Dan Box interview without a Media Liaison Officer, did Mick Willing have the
authority to approve that?
A. I guess so but there's no specific process or procedure that says that this level of person can approve that --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. No, do you fee1 that that answer you are giving is responsive to the question?

MR TEDESCHI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I have heard a number of witnesses give evidence and it has come to --

MR TEDESCHI: We say that it is responsive --
THE COMMISSIONER: I wil1 finish my sentence if I may. It has come to my attention that this witness sometimes inadvertently argues rather than answers. That's all I'm going to say.

> Put it again, please, Mr Gray, if you wil1.

MR GRAY: Q. Did Mick Willing have the authority to approve what Pamela Young had requested, namely, to go to the backgrounder with Dan Box without a Media Liaison Officer?
A. I can only assume so based on the fact that there was no specific policy in relation to this.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And what was your understanding, if any, as to whether he had authority to do so?
A. It's - it was a very unusual situation. It was --
Q. Look, nobody asked you whether it was usual or unusual. What happened clearly was this, wasn't it, that Mr Willing said it was okay, and you all abided by Mr Willing's direction or decision; isn't that the fact? A. You would assume so.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, al1 right.
MR GRAY: Q. Pamela Young did, in fact, do the backgrounder with Dan Box without a Media Liaison Officer present. You knew that at the time I presume?
A. Yes.
Q. And on the Friday, the 10 th, she also went to the $A B C$
and did an interview with Emma Alberici, again with no Media Liaison Officer present. Did you know that at the time?
A. No, I did not.
Q. When did you 1 earn that?
A. I don't think $I$ knew - I still don't know. You told me, I guess. I didn't know when Pamela had done a backgrounder with Emma Alberici.
Q. You're hearing this for the first time now, are you?
A. I know that Pamela had spoken to Emma Alberici at some stage during that week, but when that occurred I did not know.
Q. You say you didn't know when it occurred. Did you know that it did occur at some point?
A. I assumed it had occurred; it had been approved to occur.
Q. I see. What, given that it in fact happened on a Friday - you can take it from me that that's correct you --
A. Well, one of the emails indicates that Pam had spoken to Emma. I don't know whether that was in a backgrounder or a telephone conversation. I don't have that information.
Q. Just wait for the question. Assume, if you would, that Pamela Young did, in fact, go to the $A B C$ on the Friday afternoon, the 10th, and have an interview with Emma Alberici - just accept that from me - when, if ever, did you learn that that had happened?
A. I didn't learn that it had happened.
Q. Ever?
A. I guess I'm learning it today.
Q. That's my question. Have you only heard that for the first time today?
A. From my recollection, that's the case.
Q. You knew that a backgrounder with Emma Alberici had been approved?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you never inquire as to whether it happened?
A. I was very i11 that week.
Q. Is the answer no?
A. No, I don't believe I did.
Q. Did you assume it had happened?
A. My emails would suggest that I knew they had spoken.

But that was prior to --
Q. I didn't ask that. Did you assume --
A. -- the Friday.
Q. Sorry, Ms Wells, really. Since you didn't know that it happened, did you assume that it had happened?
A. Yes.
Q. So as of the Monday, a couple of days later, your state of mind was, was it, that you assumed that Ms Young had already done a backgrounder with Emma Alberici?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you. Now, let's move to 13 Apri1, the Monday. So about 12 noon or thereabouts, Coroner Barnes does order a third inquest. You remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. He also makes orders that a redacted version of the Pamela Young statement can be released. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Just interrupting, were you back at work on the Monday or still working from home?
A. I believe I was back at work.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Going back to the media strategy at tab 347 [NPL.0138.0001.0037] and looking at the third paragraph, the longest paragraph beginning "As such" - we looked at this a little while ago - in the second-1ast line, the media strategy says:

If and when the statement is made public,
we would be happy to go on the record then,
plus address any ... requests from all
media ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So as at about midday on 13 Apri1, the statement was made public, wasn't it; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So you were happy to go on the record at that point?
A. We were happy to consider any requests to go on the record, yes.
Q. We11, doesn't it say "we would be happy to go on the record then, plus address any media requests"; isn't that what it says?
A. It does.
Q. Is that what it means? Is that what the strategy was?
A. No, if you look at my previous emails, which you have, I specifically mention that we would need to consider requests again following the backgrounders.
Q. Well, why did you say in the media strategy two things that would happen if the statement was made public, one, "we would be happy to go on the record then, plus", secondly, "address any media requests"?
A. We would be happy to go on the record, but we would still need to consider requests case by case and discuss what - the substance of what we would be going on the record with would be.
Q. And where does it say that in the strategy?
A. It doesn't say that in the strategy but it would be understood.
Q. Why?
A. Because that's a part of the media policy.
Q. And would Mr Kerlatec and Mr Finch have known that?
A. Mr Kerlatec and Mr Finch - we would have spoken, as we11 as this, but it would have been on the understanding, as per normal procedure, that when we're ready to go on the record that we would consider requests at that time, which is consistent with what has been included in other emails.
Q. Now, at some point during the morning, you tell us in your statement, Mr Willing told you that he had authorised

Pamela Young to make a brief statement outside court? A. Correct.
Q. I had better just show you how you have expressed that in your statement [NPL.9000.0027.0001].

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Before you do, he had clear authority to authorise Ms Young to do that, in your understanding?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. So if we turn to paragraph 16 - this is the conversation that I was just asking you about - you say Mr Willing informed you on the morning of the 13th that he had had discussions with Pamela Young regarding a brief statement that could be made by her to media representatives outside the Coroners Court, following the directions hearing? Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That's still your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in your statement, based on that conversation, you understood that Mr Willing had authorised Ms Young to provide a "door-stop" statement to media representatives indicating that the police welcomed the inquest, should another inquest be ordered?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you say:

This was to be in the form of "grabs"; a short statement to the media that can be recorded and where questions are not generally taken.

Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So you understood, did you, that what Mr Willing had authorised, as referred to in this conversation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- was the making of a statement outside court, not
the answering of questions?
A. That's correct, or if there were answering questions, it was just using the short statement that had been agreed and nothing outside of that.
Q. In fact, Pamela Young called you, I understand, some little time later, and said that, actually, she did not do a door-stop statement outside court because the media had gone by the time she came out of the court?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you tel1 us that in paragraph 17 of your
statement. Now, I imagine you know that it seems that, as
a matter of fact, Pamela Young did give a statement or a door-stop outside the court. Do you know that?
A. I understand - I found out later, after the fact, a few days later, $I$ believe, that Pamela was filmed coming out of the court, so media were, in fact, there.
Q. Yes. But my question was: did you become aware that in fact she had made a statement and/or answered questions outside court on that day?
A. I think when $I$ received a phone call later that day to say that Pamela had spoken to the $A B C$, I assumed that she must have come across media after we'd had that
conversation and provided that door-stop.
Q. I see. You made that assumption?
A. I did.
Q. So that's what $I$ wanted to ask you, actually. So she tells you, at presumably some time after midday, early afternoon, that she did not do a door-stop statement outside court because the media had gone by the time she came out?
A. Correct.
Q. And that was your state of mind - that is, that was your belief as to the reality - thereafter on 13 Apri1; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Namely, that she had not given a statement or been interviewed outside the court. That's what you understood to be the case?
A. Yes.
Q. You then assisted in the issuing of a press release in the early afternoon?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I don't need to take you to this in any detai1, but if you turn to tab 356 [NPL.0138.0004.7162], and 357 [NPL.0138.0004.7162] and 358 [NPL.0138.0001.0106], there's a series of emails among various people, including you, about the issuing of a press release.
A. Yes.
Q. It seems to have been finalised and to have been issued by about maybe some time between about 12.30 and 1 , it would appear?
A. Yes.

MR GRAY: Is the Commission going to take a morning tea adjournment today?

THE COMMISSIONER: If that is convenient. Is that
a convenient point?
MR GRAY: Sure.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will take a short adjournment.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: Ms Wells, we'd got to the point where you had played a part in the issuing of the media release?
A. That's correct.
Q. In the early afternoon of the 13th?
A. Yes.
Q. Then at 4.35 you sent out a media update, which is at tab 361 [NPL.0138.0002.2947].
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have that? Yes. At 4.35 pm you were updating in relation to this topic, what the Coroner had done, and then, in the first bullet point, referred to the fact that the media release had gone out, and then in the second bullet point, you said:

> Last week, backgrounders were facilitated by [Ms Young] with Dan Box (Australian) and Emma Alberici (ABC TV) about the contents of the police statement.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So you were telling people on the 13th that Ms Young had done a backgrounder with Emma Alberici "last week"?
A. Yes.
Q. So that, presumably, was your understanding at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Then at 5 o'clock - and you mention this in your statement - or about 5 o'clock, you receive a phone call from Mr Willing?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 18 of your statement, you refer very briefly to this conversation, you say:

In the early evening of 13 April... I first became aware that Pamela Young would feature on Lateline when I received a phone call from Mr Willing prior to the airing of the Lateline interview.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. By the time we've looked at some documents, you may remember this more clearly, but as we sit here now, do you recall that, in fact, that was about 5 o'clock, that phone call?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't say in that first sentence what Mr Willing said. What did he say?
A. I don't remember.
Q. In preparing to give this statement that you've presented, did you look over your own previous notes and
the interview with Ashurst and so on?
A. Yes. So based on that, I know that he had told me that Pamela Young was appearing on Lateline, but I don't remember any specifics of that conversation other than that.
Q. Let's have a look at a couple of the things you wrote at about the time in question. Let's have at look at tab 384 [NPL.0147.0001.0001]. On the first page - this is your interview with Ashurst on 27 Apri1 2015 - in the third paragraph, which is you speaking, you are recorded as saying:

> I was told she was appearing a bit after
> $5 p m$ and I was stil7 shocked when I saw it.
> It was not what I was expecting. Pam
> contacted the Homicide Squad Commander.

That's Mr Wiliing, right?
A. Yes.
Q. --

He contacted me and said Pam had let him know she was on Lateline and that Steve Johnson also spoke.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you have a recollection as to what he actually said? In other words, did he say the words, "Pam told me she will be on Lateline", or do you recall him saying something else? What do you recall him saying?
A. I don't remember the exact words that were spoken during the conversation.
Q. And you say in this interview with Ashurst, straight after that, the next sentence:

I assumed it would be quick grabs only, along the 7 ines of the media release.
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you assume that?
A. Because that's all that had been approved, was for a door-stop with grabs to take place.
Q. But you knew, because Pamela Young had told you, that there had not been a door-stop, didn't you?
A. That's - at the time of that conversation, yes, which I think may have been early afternoon. So some hours had passed in between then.
Q. That's true. But nothing else had happened. She hadn't rung you up and said, "Oh, as a matter of fact, I did do a door-stop", had she?
A. No.
Q. So your state of knowledge was that she had not done a door-stop; correct?
A. But I assumed she would have done one later when $I$ had the conversation with Michael Wiliting.
Q. Why would you assume that, if she told you, as you've said she did, that when she came out of the court, all the media had gone?
A. That was at that time, earlier in the afternoon, but some hours had passed between when that conversation took place and when the conversation with Michael Willing took place. So to my mind, it would have occurred some time between those two conversations.
Q. With what media? Given that the media had gone, how would she have the chance to do a door-stop?
A. I assumed that they would have caught up with her 1ater on.
Q. So are you saying that from the moment Michael Wi11ing telephoned you, around about 5 o'clock, and said something to the effect that Pamela was going to be on Lateline, you, in your own mind, made an assumption that, contrary to what she had told you previously, at some later point she must have done a door-stop?
A. That's - yes, that's correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But the fact of the matter is, having told you she did not do a door-stop, the truth of it is, you didn't know one way or the other, in fact, what she had done?
A. That's correct. But I wouldn't have expected that she would have done anything --
Q. Did I ask you anything about your expectation?

I didn't, did I? You might be asked that by Mr Tedeschi in due course. One of the problems I'm having, frank1y, is that if you just answer the questions, it's better for you. Mr Tedeschi is taking careful note, with Mr Mykkeltvedt, of things that they want to ask you. You won't be stopped from saying anything you feel you should say. But, please, just keep it to the question that you're asked; okay? A. Okay.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. So down in paragraph 21 of your statement, in a slightly different context, you make a similar reference. You are actually addressing in paragraph 21 an email where Pamela Young makes reference to "hair and lippy" looking good. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say, albeit in that slightly different context:

I understood at the time --
I think you must mean "that that" --
... was a reference to the "grabs" which
I had assumed were provided outside the court after Pamela Young had indicated there were no media representatives at Court ...
A. Yes.
Q. Wouldn't the more natural, more obvious, more straightforward assumption to have made be not that some door-stop had happened at some point after Ms Young told you there wasn't a door-stop but, rather, that Ms Young had spoken to Lateline in some other way?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because all that had been approved was a door-stop.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Are you saying that Mr Willing could not, subsequent to your earlier understanding, approve something else?
A. I would think that he would have advised me, if he'd
approved something --
Q. But he didn't have to advise you, did he?
A. He would have always advised me --
Q. Did he have to advise you before taking steps of this sort? That's what I --

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, could I make a submission to you in the absence of the witness, please?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly. Do you want her to go outside?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, please.
THE COMMISSIONER: Would you go outside just for a short time, thank you?

## (The witness left the hearing room)

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, it may appear that the witness is finding the questioning by you particularly difficult, emotionally. She's feeling very fragile, and I anticipate that if there are continuing questions by you, she may be in a position where she is no longer able to give evidence.
So I would ask --
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I reject the suggestion that I am causing a witness, who you have called and have proofed and have conferenced and who has contemporaneous notes, is finding it difficult. My observation is, and if you're not observing the same thing, we're not in the same room. She is --

MR TEDESCHI: We11 --
THE COMMISSIONER: Please. I'11 finish, please. She is often causing the problem for herself by answering by answering back or by answering by giving an explanation. It's a common problem with many witnesses. For me to ask her to be direct is exactly what I'm entitled to do.

MR TEDESCHI: It's not so much --
THE COMMISSIONER: Now, I hear what you say, Mr Tedeschi, but I will not be told what $I$ can and cannot do.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I'm not attempting to do that. What I am asking you to do is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Is not ask any questions, if I want to be informed.

MR TEDESCHI: What I would suggest, Commissioner, if we are to complete her evidence today, which, hopefully, we will, is if you would take care with the tone of your questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Tedeschi. You may resume your seat. I will not be lectured by you about what I should and should not do. If you have an application to make, so be it. But that doesn't sound to me like an application which is intelligible. I take your point.

MR TEDESCHI: I'm attempting to assist the Commission.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I know you are, as always. Now, would you please resume your seat and let's get on with it. Thank you.

MR GRAY: Commissioner, I have been told that the Inquiry's witness assistance officer is with Ms Wells at the moment, who has requested a few extra minutes before resuming.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
(The witness returned to the hearing room)
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Wells, please sit down.

> Yes, Mr Gray?

MR GRAY: Q. Ms Wells, on your statement, just in that paragraph 21 that we were on, you say in the last sentence or so that the thought of Pamela Young having a sit-down studio interview did not cross your mind. Do you see that? A. Yes.
Q. Is that the evidence that you stand by today?
A. Absolutely. No reason to believe that was the case.
Q. After Mr Willing had this conversation with you at
about 5 o'clock - oh, before I go to that, sorry, in paragraph 18 of your statement, about halfway down that paragraph, or beginning on the third line, you say after receiving the call from Mr Willing you advised Strath Gordon and others regarding Pamela Young's expected appearance on Lateline.
A. Yes.
Q. You say that the Coroner's decision about the Scott Johnson third inquest was considered a high-profile matter, so it would not be unusual for Lateline to feature a door-stop interview, if that was the only kind of media engagement available. Is that right?
A. Yes. That was my belief.
Q. Now, just on that, you were familiar with Lateline, were you?
A. As I indicated earlier, it's not a program that we had a lot of dealings with.
Q. So how do you know what would be unusual or usual for Lateline to do?
A. Because any program, if they have a story and there's only grabs available, that's what they would go with, if it's a story that they otherwise would like to cover.
Q. So when you've said in your statement that it would not be unusual for Lateline to do something, we should understand that as meaning it would not be unusual for a media program to do something, should we?
A. Correct.
Q. Rather than applying to Lateline?
A. Correct.
Q. I think you were asked this earlier this morning: had you ever heard of Emma Alberici or Lateline?
A. I probably had, but I can't remember specifically.
Q. You know what Lateline was - that is, a major $A B C$
current affairs program --
A. Yes.
Q. -- about 10 o'clock at night --
A. Yes.
Q. -- about the major stories of the day?
A. Yes.
Q. And that she was the anchor, the presenter at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. So you say in that paragraph, 18, you considered that the approved media strategy was being followed and Lateline would only feature the authorised door-stop interview?
A. Yes.
Q. In doing that, you made the assumption in your own mind that she must have done the door-stop interview, even though, at an earlier part of the day, she'd told you she hadn't?
A. That's correct.
Q. I see. So you advised Strath Gordon - and could we go to tab 374 [NPL.0138.0004.5545] pleas. Did you advise Strath Gordon by phone?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Tab 374 is some notes made by Strath Gordon, and it's an email to himself of 21 Apri1, "Notes on Pam Young matter"; do you see that? That's the heading?
A. Sorry?
Q. It's at tab 374 .
A. Yes.
Q. You can see from the heading that it's an email from Strath Gordon to himself?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's headed "Notes on Pam Young matter" - do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Dated 21 April?
A. Yes.
Q. The first topic that he records is that Siobhan had told him at some point - not specified here - that Pam had excluded her from the Dan Box briefing?
A. Yes.
Q. And he says that he, Strath Gordon, spoke with

Mick Willing and had indicated that while he was unhappy with that, he would not intervene. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then he says:

The previously agreed media strategy involved back grounding Dan and [the] ABC reporter and then if we needed to provide comment on the Coroners decision we could do that in the day.

What do you understand that to be a reference to, "we could do that in the day"?
A. That we would need to receive a subsequent request to do a formal interview and then we could consider it.
Q. A couple of paragraphs down, he records that subsequently, Pam Young decided Emma Alberici would be her background target and not the other $A B C$ news reporter. And then the paragraph $I$ want to ask you about is the next one. Strath Gordon says:

On the day of the inquest [there was] no further discussion on media other than [Pamela Young] telling Georgie that she had done no media because they had all left by the time she came out.

Do you see that?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Then Strath Gordon says:

However at five pm that day [Pam Young] informed [Michae7 Willing] that she had done the studio interview with no mention of the content nor any mention of the door-stop exclusive she gave Emma which was on the $A B C$ TV news that night.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the way Strath Gordon was informed of what Pamela Young had told Mr Willing was that you passed it on to Strath Gordon; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. According to Strath Gordon, what was passed on to him was that Pam Young had told Mick Willing that she had done the studio interview, isn't it, that's what he has written? A. That's what's written.
Q. Is that what you told him?
A. No, because I had no idea a studio interview had been done until $I$ saw it that night.
Q. So would you suggest, then, that Strath Gordon's note of what you must have told him as to what Pam Young had told Mr Willing is wrong?
A. It could be. I don't know. I haven't seen this note before today.
Q. Thank you for that. What I thought we had established was that whatever Strath Gordon was told about what Mick Willing told you came from you telling Strath Gordon; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So he is setting out there his account of what he understood, having spoken to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And his understanding, according to what he has written, is that what Pamela Young told Mr Willing was that she had done a studio interview. Do you see that?
A. I did not - I can see that, yes.
Q. Pausing there, you can see that's what he has written?
A. I can see that that's written there, yes.
Q. One obvious reason for him doing that is that that is indeed what you told him?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Do you say that prior to this last few moments, no-one from the police has ever drawn your attention to Mr Gordon's note?
A. I - I have not seen this one before.
Q. Is that another way of saying that prior to Mr Gray asking you to look at it a moment ago, nobody had ever shown you this from the police?
A. Not that I've noticed. It may have been in documents that $I$ somehow missed, but $I$ have not seen this before.

MR GRAY: Q. Now that your memory has been directed to it, just focusing on the actual conversation that this is talking about, namely, the one between Mick Willing and you --
A. Yes.
Q. -- where he rings you up, what's your recollection as to whether Mick Willing said that Pamela Young had told him that she had done an interview or that Pamela Young had told him she was going to do an interview?
A. I can't remember. I am assuming, based on my media update that $I$ provided, that the interview had already happened.
Q. That's an assumption you're making now, do you mean?
A. But based on the media update that I sent to the senior officers.
Q. Yes, that's what $I$ thought. You're making that assumption now - and I'm not criticising this --
A. Mmm.
Q. You're making that assumption now as I'm asking you these questions --
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad-$ based on the media update?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But you say - I think you said this - that you don't actually remember precisely what Mick Willing said?
A. I don't remember the specific words, no.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Is Mr Gordon an experienced media person?
A. Yes.
Q. How long has he been, as far as you know or understand, associated in the Media Department of the police? How long has he worked there?
A. Oh, I don't recall when he started but he started after I started.
Q. I'm so sorry, he --
A. He started after I started.
Q. Is he your superior, in the sense that was he the head of the media?
A. He's the head of Public Affairs; that's correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. I'm sorry, I should have asked you this before, but when did you - you're not still with the NSW Police, are you?
A. No.
Q. When did you cease to be with the police?
A. 2018.
Q. Was Mr Gordon still there then, if you know?
A. I think so. But $I$ can't remember exactly, but I think he was.
Q. At tab 362 [NPL.0138.0002.3238] there's the first of two updates that you circulated. You can see that it's at 18:18 - that is to say, 18 minutes past 6 in the evening? A. Yes.
Q. I'm sorry, this is the second of two updates, I beg your pardon. I took you to the first one previously?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a second one at 18 minutes past 6 , and you te11 the recipients:

In addition to the media update re:
[Strike Force] Macnamir, Det Ch Inspector Pam Young spoke to Emma Alberici from ABC Lateline on camera today. The reporter also spoke with Steve Johnson. Both are to appear on tonight's Lateline.
A. Yes.
Q. You say, do you, that when you circulated the update in those terms and said that Pam Young had spoken to Emma Alberici from Lateline on camera, you were referring in your mind to what you assumed must have been a door-stop? A. Correct.
Q. And you assumed the door-stop must have been filmed?
A. Yes. Yes, it generally would be.
Q. Then if we could turn to tab 384 again
[NPL.0147.0001.0001] and could you turn to page 3. At the top of that page, you answer a question from the Ashurst lawyer saying that you didn't speak to Pam Young on the Monday until 1 unchtime, that after the directions hearing you spoke by phone about the media release, and she said that by the time she came out, the media had all 1eft, "because we had spoken about a door-stop"; do you see that?
And then the question is:

## Was there an express conversation regarding

the terms of door-stop?
And your answer was:

> Mick Willing had that conversation
> regarding the door-stop. I didn't speak to her until afterwards. She said the media had left. Then she asked whether Dan Box was doing a story. She said Lateline was doing a story. I assumed it was based on the backgrounder on7y.

Is that still your evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Just bear with me one second, please. On page 3 - I'm sorry, that is the relevant page, $I$ just need to find yes, a bit lower down on that same page, in the next answer from you, you say:

> I didn't know she had spoken to Lateline until I received a call from Mick Willing at $5 p m$.

When you say there, "I didn't know she had spoken to Lateline" until the call from Mick Willing --
A. Yes.
Q. -- does that tell us that Mick Willing must have told you that she had spoken to Lateline?
A. Yes, I believe Mick Willing had told me that she was going to be on Lateline that night.
Q. No, different question. Did Mick Wiliing tell you, as your answer seems to indicate, that she had spoken to Lateline?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, speaking to Lateline is something different from doing a door-stop outside the court, isn't it?
A. I would have assumed that Lateline would be outside the court for the door-stop.
Q. Did you mean that you had in mind that there had been a door-stop with lots of media present or just the $A B C$ ?
A. Whoever was there. Pamela had already said that there were no media outside the court earlier, so in my mind, it could have been highly possible that only Lateline had come along later and then Pam had facilitated that door-stop, just for Lateline.
Q. So in the next answer down - sorry, in that same answer you say:
... I thought it was just snippets. I sent an emai 7 to everyone but didn't make big deal because thought it would just be grabs.
A. Correct.
Q. And that's because of the answers you've been giving just now?
A. Yes.
Q. You then say you were shocked when you saw Lateline.
A. Yes.
Q. She was in the studio. Then you say:
... because $I$ was expecting it to just be a backgrounder.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The backgrounder is something different from the door-stop, isn't it?
A. Yes. So I expected that, given the statement had now been released and made public by the Coroner, that the
content of the story would be based on the information within the statement, which is what the backgrounder had been provided to do, provide understanding of what was in the statement.
Q. So is this right, you thought that she must have, after all, done a door-stop --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and that, when she did do this assumed door-stop, what she must have said must have been derived from what would have been in the backgrounder?
A. No. No. A11 that was supposed to be discussed at the door-stop were 1 ines that are consistent with the media release.
Q. Yes.
A. In terms of the media reporting what they want to out of the statement, which had been made public, it's a matter for them, and the backgrounder had been provided to give them an understanding of what's in the statement.
Q. Yes, I thought so. That's why I'm asking you, in relation to that answer that you give, when you say "when it started $I$ was shocked she was in the studio because I was expecting it to just be a backgrounder", I thought your evidence was that you were expecting it to be the door-stop?
A. I was expecting the content of the story to be based on the information that had been provided in the backgrounder --
Q. No, no, you are not quite, I don't think - we may be at cross-purposes. I'm not asking you about what you thought the Lateline story would be about. I'm asking what you thought Pam Young's participation in the broadcast was going to be. I thought you had told us that you expected it was going to be some grabs from the door-stop?
A. Correct.
Q. But here you seem to be saying that you were expecting it to be a backgrounder, which is a different thing?
A. I was expecting the story to be the content of the backgrounder.
Q. I see. So when you say "because I was expecting it to just be a backgrounder", you mean the whole ABC Lateline
program, do you?
A. No, no. And I believe if you look at the next sentence in that interview, I was asked, "Using the backgrounder as an interview?" And I have confirmed no, that's not what $I$ meant. Any interview that $I$ was anticipating was just to be in terms of the grabs that I thought had been provided. However, the broader story would not just use the grabs; it would also use information from the statement, which is what had been discussed at the backgrounder. But that wouldn't be attributed in an interview to Pam Young. That would be a matter for the ABC to be reporting what is in the statement.
Q. A11 right, then. Let's go to that answer that you have just referred to. You say in that answer, after saying, "No, I was expecting grabs", you say:

The backgrounder was off the record. Pam and I discussed it previously and she asked "once the statement is released does the backgrounder become on the record?"

And you said:
No, there needs to be a separate interview'.

Do you stand by that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Ms Young has put on a statement - have you been shown Ms Young's statement?
A. I have seen it, yes.
Q. And you're aware that she says that that conversation never occurred?
A. It would have occurred because I would have --
Q. No, my question is: are you aware that she says --
A. I'm aware that she --
Q. -- that that conversation never occurred?
A. -- said that, yes.
Q. You are aware of that?
A. I'm aware of that.
Q. And you reject that, do you?
A. I do.
Q. When do you say that conversation happened?
A. That conversation would have happened at the time we were discussing and putting in place the backgrounder. So back on - around 1 Apri1.
Q. As early as that; is that right?
A. Yes, in relation to the backgrounder.
Q. Then at tab 363 [NPL.0138.0005.1813] you sent an email, just a couple of minutes after your updated update, at 19 minutes past 6 , to Rory 0 'Connor, do you see that, saying --
A. Yes.
Q. --

Pam Young is expected to be on Lateline tonight.
A. Yes.
Q. Remind me who he is?
A. He was a Media Liaison Officer in the Media Unit who was working the afternoon/late shift.
Q. Now, 40 minutes later, the $A B C$ news comes on, 7 o'clock?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you watch it?
A. I don't remember.
Q. You don't remember whether you watched the news that night?
A. I can't. It's eight years ago.
Q. It was eight years ago, but you've been preparing to give evidence about these very topics in the last week or two, I assume?
A. Yes, but I can't remember. I have - at the time, I had a toddler, so it's very, very possible I did not watch the news that night.
Q. Was it part of your responsibilities - I'm just asking
because I don't know - holding the media position that you did, to watch programs about which you had been giving advice or participating in discussions about media strategies and so on?
A. No, not necessarily. We had people in the Media Unit who would monitor the news that night, because I can't work 24/7 hours a day.
Q. No, you can't do that. Anyway, you can't te11 us whether you watched the news or not?
A. I can't remember.
Q. The Commission has seen an extract from the news in the last few days, and there is footage of Pamela Young and Penny Brown walking along the street outside the Coroners Court, and there is footage of Pamela Young saying a few things to camera, perhaps outside the court, although that is not necessarily clear. When did you become aware that such footage existed, that Pamela Young had been shown on the news in that way?
A. I can't remember specifically. I did - I can remember in terms of the different evidence that $I$ 've had a look at, that Strath made reference to it in an email, that he had seen footage of Pamela and Penny being shown on the news, but $I$ can't specifically remember.
Q. Let's turn to tab 364 [NPL.0138.0001.0042] this was an email or a text actually - I'11 start again. You can see that it's actually, this very document, an email from Pamela Young to herself. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. But the heading is "Texts Mick Willing and Georgie Wel1s"?
A. Yes.
Q. And it would seem that these are texts passing between you and Mick Willing, on the one hand, and you and Pamela Young, on the other hand?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember those texts?
A. I do remember those texts.
Q. Okay. So Pamela Young tells you and Mick Willing:

In case you missed it the $A B C$ news coverage

> was balanced with a reference to an exclusive tonight on Lateline.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if you remember, approximately when did you get that text?
A. It would have been, I think, between 5 pm, when Mick Willing had told me that she had spoken to Lateline, and when it aired, later that night.
Q. It does seem, doesn't it, it must have been either during or perhaps after the ABC 7 o'clock news? That's what she's referring to?
A. Yes.
Q. So it's either between 7 and 7.30 , or even after 7.30 but before Lateline?
A. Yes.
Q. So she tells you that there's reference in the news to an "exclusive tonight on Lateline", and you say:

Thanks Pam, look forward to seeing it.
Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you say that although she refers to an "exclusive" on Lateline, you thought she was still referring to the door-stop?
A. Absolutely.
Q. How would that be exclusive?
A. Well, if all the media had already left and then she'd managed to speak to Lateline and they were the only ones she spoke to, then no other media would have those same grabs.
Q. I see. So that's a sort of additional part of the assumption that you made?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. You referred a moment ago to Mr Gordon. Is he someone whose judgment you trust?
A. Yes.
Q. And is he a person, from your observation, who is accurate in detailed matters?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. There is an email at tab 365
[NPL0138.0004.5579] from Rory $0^{\prime}$ Connor to various people at 6 minutes to 8 on that night, and down the bottom of that page, there's a reference to the Johnson case, and at the end of that paragraph about the Johnson case, this appears:

Det Insp Pamela Young from the Homicide Squad welcomed the Inquest. She will be on ABC Lateline tonight.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see that on the night or at some subsequent time?
A. I may have but I'm not sure.
Q. I don't think your name is on the addressees, so I'm not suggesting you did, I'm just asking whether you've seen it or whether you played any part in it?
A. No, I wouldn't have been - I wasn't working in the Media Unit that night.
Q. Did you, in fact, watch the Lateline program that night, as you --
A. I did.
Q. And what was your reaction?
A. I was shocked.
Q. And why is that?
A. Because Pamela was sitting in the studio and I was not expecting for her to be in the studio.
Q. So your evidence is that until you saw the Lateline program, you had no idea that she had done or might have done a sit-down interview?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you contact anybody that night, having watched the
program and been shocked?
A. No, I was in shock. I went straight to bed and said, "This will be tomorrow's issue."
Q. Did anyone contact you?
A. If they did, I didn't hear it. I don't believe so.
Q. Let's go to the next day, which is the Tuesday, the 14th, starting with tab 367 [NPL.0138.0002.2771]. This is an email chain that finishes up with you. It starts down the bottom of the page with an email from Kenneth Finch late on the evening of the night before, the 13th, at about 20 past 10 . Do you see that at the bottom of the page?
A. Yes.
Q. Kenneth Finch is asking:

So - the question is who organised -
and approved Pam Young's interview with Emma Alberici? What was the purpose of it?

That's his question and then the next morning, the next email is from Strath Gordon at 7.24am, and when he answers Kenneth Finch he ccs you, among others. Do you see that one?
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. And I assume because he ccs you, you then, about half an hour later, fill out, from your perspective, a little bit more detail, in effect, for Mr Finch; is that right? A. Yes.
Q. At 368 [NPL.3000.0009.0669_0001] a little later in the morning, about another hour and a bit later, at 18 minutes past 9, you send an email from Mick Willing's computer to Ms Vaughan and others. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Ms Vaughan had a position with the Commissioner of Police; is that right?
A. Yes. She was the Commissioner's media adviser.
Q. When you sent this emai1, and you sent it from Mick

Willing's computer, who was in the room?
A. I think it was Mick Willing and I.
Q. Just the two of you?
A. Yes.
Q. Who had come up with the lines that you set out there under the heading - under the introductory words "Some 1ines"?
A. I can't remember the specifics, but $I$ am assuming that we collaborated on those and came up with those together.
Q. You and Mick Willing?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the catalyst for that? Why were the two of you coming up with 1 ines to be used? Was that your own idea, you or he, or had somebody else asked you to come up with 1 ines?
A. I can't recall the specifics but we had a very contentious unapproved interview that had aired on Lateline so we needed to start working on a strategy to deal with that.
Q. When you say "very contentious", who had told you it was very contentious?
A. I was able to make my own views that it was contentious, based on the content of what was said.
Q. In particular, what?
A. Criticism of a Minister.
Q. Criticism of the Minister?
A. And information said about the family.
Q. What did you have in mind there?
A. I think there was criticism of the family as well.
Q. By Ms Young?
A. That's correct.
Q. The words that you and Mick Willing came up with in the first paragraph are:
... Pam Young did express some personal views during last night's interview, but the majority of points she raised are contained within her statement provided to the Coroner.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the contentious parts were not in her statement to the Coroner, were they?
A. Correct.
Q. Why did you express these 1 ines in that way, omitting reference to what might be called the elephant in the room?
A. I think everyone knew about the elephant in the room in any case.
Q. But these were lines, I take it, to be published by way of a press release or the like, were they?
A. No, no. These were lines for discussion with the Commissioner's media adviser.
Q. Yes, with what intention in mind in the end, for the lines to be published in some way?
A. They were the starting point for discussion on what we would publish.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And it was done, was it, to your understanding, for the purposes in part of supporting Ms Young?
A. It was done to respond to the media.
Q. I wonder if you'd do me the courtesy of answering my question: was it done in part, the terms that were used, in order to support Ms Young?
A. I'm not sure if "support" would be the correct word.
Q. What would you call it?
A. I don't know.
Q. We11, you say her "personal views during last night's interview":
..., but the majority of points she raised are contained within her statement provided to the Coroner.
A. Yes.
Q. Wel1, weren't you supporting her by saying that the thrust of or many of the points, if not much of what she said, was already in her statement to the Coroner?
A. Again I can only say these were starting points for
discussion with the Commissioner's adviser.
Q. All right. So you can't tell me one way or the other whether your intention here was to support Ms Young?
A. It was not my level of authority to decide whether or not to support Ms Young.
Q. But you did what Mr Willing asked you to do, namely, type up the words that you and he talked about?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you.
MR GRAY: $Q$. You said in the course of one of those answers just now that - and I'm not quoting you precisely something to the effect that by this time, 9.18 , the media were already wanting answers or wanting responses?
A. I don't know if we'd started receiving inquiries or not but with something like this, you would proactively go in and start working on how you would respond, because they were bound to come, if they hadn't started already.
Q. And what you expected or anticipated, as it turned out correctly, was that the media would want to know, what did the police have to say about what Pamela Young had said on Lateline?
A. Yes.
Q. And in particular, they would want to know - and I'm putting this to you as a question - they would want to know, you anticipated, did the police support what Ms Young had said in her criticisms of the Minister and criticisms of the family? That's what you anticipated?
A. We anticipated that but we would not have said that we support those personal views.
Q. No, just one question at the time. That's what you anticipated the media would want to know?
A. Yes.
Q. And in anticipating that that's what the media would want to know, what you and Mr Willing came up with was:
[Detective] Young did express some personal views during last night's interview, but the majority of points she raised are contained within her statement provided to
the Coroner.
Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, given what you anticipated was the real likely thrust of the media's interest, that was a form of words that played down the real problem and tried to present Ms Young in as favourable a 1 ight as possible, wasn't it? A. I guess you could say that, yes.
Q. Is part of the reason for that that, as you understood it, Mr Willing did not have a problem with what Ms Young had said?
A. No, I don't think that's the case. I think we were very concerned about what had been said, both myself and Mr Willing and, in fact, Strath Gordon and other people involved. We were very concerned.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But the rest of the email that you're being asked about, in effect, was a glowing reference of Ms Young, wasn't it? Just have a look at it:

- Pam is an experienced and talented detective ... 16 of those in homicide.
- [She] has led an extensive and methodical
two year investigation ...
- during that time ...

Et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.
Now, it is a glowing reference for Ms Young, isn't it, by saying that she's a top detective, she knows everything she's talking about in relation to this matter, and the majority of what she's said is already in her statement, which is part of the record. Isn't that, overall, a reference in favour of Ms Young?
A. You could come to that conclusion, yes.
Q. Beg your pardon?
A. You could come to that conclusion, yes.
Q. Well, would you, though, come to that conclusion, not objectively, wasn't that the purpose of you and Mr Willing - I don't associate you entirely, but there's nothing here that's critical of Ms Young at all, is there? A. There were other considerations --
Q. No, look, please, there may be other considerations, I'm just simply asking you, on the face of this document, which you typed, Mr Willing tells you that's what you're going to do. There's nothing critical in that email of Ms Young really at all, is there?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Did Mr Willing tell you by 9.18am that he had spoken to Ms Young?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you ask him if he had spoken to Ms Young?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you speak to Ms Young?
A. I don't think so.
Q. To your knowledge, had Mr Willing, by this time,
9.18am, been in communication with the Commissioner's office, for example, through Ms Vaughan or otherwise?
A. I would assume so.
Q. Did he tell you what the Commissioner's view was as conveyed to him?
A. Not that I remember.
Q. If we turn to tab 370 [NPL.0138.0002.6715] this is an email chain a little later that morning, and it starts at the bottom, as they do. The first one is from Michael Willing to Ms Vaughan, and copied to various others including yourself, and this is at 12.49 on the 14 th, so about three and a half hours later?
A. Yes.
Q. This time, Michael Willing says:

Z --
that's Ms Vaughan--:
$Z$ and Strath, below words for consideration. I am happy to own the comment subject to the Commissioner's view.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. This time, the words are different. The first paragraph says that Pamela Young is:
... an experienced officer who, along with
her team, have worked hard on this case and conducted an outstanding investigation.

But then the second paragraph says:
Perhaps some of her comments (on Lateline) were inopportune in light of the Coroner's decision yesterday ...
et cetera. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, what was the chain of events that led to this second form of words being generated?
A. As I mentioned earlier, the initial words that were put together and sent to Zdenka were put together as talking points for discussion to determine what the statement would be. So $I$ can't remember the specifics of what happened between 9.18 and when this emai 1 was sent, but there would have been some back and forth on the language and what would be included in that, and this is what has eventuated out of that.
Q. Right. Wel1, speaking bluntly, the first form of words, as you've agreed, was essentially a glowing reference in praise of Pamela Young; correct? I think you just agreed with that?
A. Yes.
Q. This form of words, however, moves a long way away from that and says that some of her comments were perhaps inopportune?
A. Yes.
Q. Which is a very different angle, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, whose idea was the change of angle?
A. I believe it was a discussion between the Commissioner and Zdenka Vaughan, between Mick Wiliing and Zdenka

Vaughan, between discussions with myself and Mick Willing and Zdenka Vaughan. So it would have been discussions by all of those people.
Q. And were you party to those discussions?
A. I don't think I was probably party to all of those discussions. I certainly wasn't party to any conversations between the Commissioner and the Commissioner's adviser, and there may well have been discussions between Mick Willing and Zdenka as well. And I note also that this email from Mick Willing to Zdenka and Strath is not from Mick Willing and I. It's what he has sent directly.
Q. Yes. Well, did you play a part in the drafting of these words that include the word "inopportune"?
A. I may well have. As I said, there would have been discussions going back and forth, some of which I would have been a part of, but not necessarily all.
Q. Mick Willing would have consulted you, wouldn't he, on --
A. Not necessarily.
Q. -- what would be the best form of words?
A. This had gone beyond me. It was now with the Commissioner's media adviser. And so I had taken a back step to this, because this was now being dealt with at a more senior level.
Q. The response that comes back from Strath Gordon is to say that, "I am fine with that, Mick". He makes a couple of other comments, and then you say, because you then respond to Strath and Zdenka:

Will amend.
And you say:
Once the Commissioner has approved the
wording ... shall I respond to Rick
Feneley ...
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the approach from Rick Feneley is the tab before, 369 [NPL.3000.0004.0742_0001]. Do you see that? Rick

Feneley sends an email to Zdenka at 12.03 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And he asks essentially the very sort of questions that you and I discussed a few minutes ago that you were anticipating; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. "Was the Commissioner aware that a DCI was going to accuse the Minister of improper conduct"; "Does the Commissioner own or disown the statement", et cetera.
A. Mmm.
Q. So that's the very kind of inquiry from the media that you anticipated?
A. Yes.
Q. And that comes in at 12.03?
A. Yes.
Q. And the words that we see that are generated - before I go to that, the email from Feneley to Zdenka is then sent by Zdenka Vaughan to Mr Willing and you and others at 12.05. Do you see that at the top of the page?
A. Yes.
Q. And then we find at the bottom of tab 370 [NPL.0138.0002.6715], the emai1 that I started with, at 12. 49,40 minutes after Zdenka has said to Mick Wiliing, "Mick, calling you now"?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, did Zdenka call Mick in your presence?
A. As I said, there were some discussions where all three of us were part of, and then there would have been discussions with Mick and Zdenka directly. But I can't recall which ones $I$ was a part of and which ones I was not.
Q. By the time this email of 12.49 , at the bottom of the first page of tab 370, was sent, you were aware, I take it, that the Commissioner wanted something to be said that was not simply supportive of Pamela Young but took the different angle that eventually was taken?
A. Yes.
Q. And that seems to have happened, does it, between
12.03 and 12.49?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Mick Willing say to you, "Commissioner Scipione has decided that he has to cut Ms Young loose"?
A. No, I don't recall any conversations to that effect.
Q. Tab 371 [NPL.0138.0002.6717] seems to be the kind of finishing line of this sequence of events, where you send an email to Rick Feneley, with cos to Strath Gordon and Mick Willing and Zdenka Vaughan, saying:

Hi Rick,
This statement can be attributed to
[Mr Wil7ing] ...
And then it is in the form of the previous email.
A. (Witness nods).
Q. What did Mr Willing tell you about what the Commissioner had said to him about what needed to be said?
A. I don't know if the Commissioner and Mick Wiliing did speak that day.
Q. Wel1, what did Mick Willing tel1 you about what someone from the Commissioner's office, such as Ms Vaughan, had said about what the Commissioner wanted?
A. As I said, there were various discussions throughout the day about the content of the statement. I can't recall the specifics of those, but we went from the original discussion points to what ended up being in the statement but, as I said, I had taken a bit of a back step to it all because it was being dealt with at a more executive level.

MR GRAY: I only have a couple of minutes to go, I think. I see it is a few minutes to one, but $I$ think $I$ can probably finish --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think it is advantageous that you finish and then - unless my clock is wrong, you have five minutes anyway.

MR GRAY: Yes.
Q. Ms Wells, are you aware that Ms Alberici has put on a statement before the Inquiry about these matters?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you read it?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that she gave some oral evidence yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. And has somebody told you, or have you been able to read, what she said?
A. I have been told what she spoke about.
Q. Yes, but you haven't actually seen the transcript?
A. No.
Q. But somebody has told you essentially the nature of what she said yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. So one of the things she said - and for the moment I won't go into chapter and verse, but in general - was that from as early as February 2015, when she received the Pamela Young statement from Pamela Young, she was in communication with the Police Media personnel. You are aware she says that?
A. I'm aware she said that, yes.
Q. What do you say in response to that?
A. It certainly wasn't with me, and I don't think it was with Strath because he would have advised me, and there's no-one else within the Media Unit that really would have had oversight of this matter to be having those discussions.
Q. Let's just get that clear. Potentially, theoretically, if it happened, it could have been with you - in terms of who would have known something about it, there would be you?
A. It would be me, but I didn't have any discussions.
Q. I understand. Just one thing at a time. It could be Siobhan McMahon?
A. Possibly.
Q. It could be Strath Gordon?
A. Yes.
Q. Anyone else - that is, from Police Media, that was
anything to do with this Lateline topic?
A. No, not that I recal1.
Q. So if it happened, it had to be one of those three; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say it wasn't you?
A. It wasn't me.
Q. Then, in terms of the lead-up to the Lateline interview that in fact happened on 13 Apri1, Ms Alberici has said that she had a number of telephone conversations with people from the Police Media section. What do you say to that?
A. As I indicated earlier in the day, $I$ believe $I$ may have had one conversation with Emma Alberici, in which I was trying to find out if Lateline was doing a story. It would have been a very brief conversation. And that's the only time that I would have spoken to her.
Q. Could we turn to tab 348 in the bundle [SCOI.82992_0001] this is an emai1 on 8 Apri1, Wednesday. You can see about six 1 ines from the top that it is from Emma Alberici - it is not quite clear to whom, but it says that Emma Alberici wrote this at 10.57am on 8 Apri1. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you been shown this document before today, before right now?
A. I believe I looked at it yesterday.
Q. Are you aware that Ms Alberici gave some evidence about it yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, 8 April was the Wednesday when you were sick and at home?
A. Correct.
Q. And we have established that although sick and at home, you were making calls and taking calls and sending emails, at least to some extent?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see that Ms Alberici says in the middle of
this email, on this page, tab 348, about four 1 ines from the top of what is not redacted, to whoever she is writing to:

We also have an exclusive interview with the head of Homicide at NSW Police Pamela Young ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then about ten lines below that, so about seven or eight lines from the bottom, can you see there is a sentence that begins:

Police have asked me if it's ok for The Australian to be given an interview Monday with Pamela Young also.
A. Yes.
Q. Was that you who did that?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Then she says:

I have spent the past hour in conversation with them all and have had them agree that the Australian can't publish until Tuesday.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And she said in evidence yesterday that the references to "them all" was a reference to Police Media personnel. Do you have a recollection of telephone calls with Emma Alberici on 8 April?
A. No, and any telephone call that I had ever had with Emma Alberici probably lasted an entirety of 30 seconds, not an hour.
Q. According to her evidence - and I just need to put this to you for your response - she had numerous calls over the course of that hour, back and forth. What do you say about that?
A. They weren't with me.
Q. Let me just take you to a couple of passages from her transcript of yesterday. At 6229 of the transcript, over to 6230 , she said that at about the time that Pamela Young provided her with the statement, which was February, she had some dealings on the phone with someone from Police Media, a woman. Now, you say if that happened, it wasn't with you?
A. No.
Q. And no-one told you, such as Siobhan McMahon or anyone else, that she had had such a conversation?
A. No, and Siobhan would have told me if she had had that conversation.
Q. Ms Alberici said at 6230 that at around that time, she:
... 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?

What do you say about that?
A. I may have had that conversation, but it wouldn't have been in relation to an interview; it may have been in relation to the backgrounder.
Q. At page 6246 - just to orient you on this, if you have stil1 got the tab open there - have you got the tab open in your folder, Emma Alberici's email?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. I won't take time on it, but at one point in her evidence yesterday she referred to the fact that she recorded, I think perhaps in another email, that she had developed a strong relationship with police involved in this matter. That's what Ms Alberici says. I asked her:

What did you mean by "strong relationship with police involved"?

And she said, at 6246:
That $I$ had been discussing the case at length with them for some months.

I asked:
"Them" being who?
Her answer was:
Oh, Mick Willing, Police Media, Penny Brown, Pamela Young.

So Ms Alberici's evidence was that she had been discussing the case, the Johnson case, with Police Media for months. What do you say about that?
A. No.
Q. As at April, this is?
A. No, I don't think that's the case. Certainly not with me.
Q. And then at 6254 she gave evidence that, so far as she was aware, Mr Willing and one or more people from the Media Unit were fully aware that the interview with Pamela Young was going to go to air. What do you say to that?
A. No. As I said, I was not aware that a sit-down studio interview had taken place until I saw it at 10 o'clock that night.

MR GRAY: Yes. Those are my questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. I will adjourn until after 2. Now, just before we do that, Ms Barnes, first of all, do you have any questions?

MS BARNES: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Glissan?
MR GLISSAN: I will, your Honour, yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. You will go next.
Mr Tedeschi will follow. We will need to complete this witness today. Is there any difficulty, you see, in that regard, Mr Glissan?

MR GLISSAN: Not so far as I'm concerned.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi?

MR TEDESCHI: I will finish today.
THE COMMISSIONER: Good. Thank you. I will adjourn, then, until slightly after 2 o'clock.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Glissan?
<EXAMINATION BY MR GLISSAN:
MR GLISSAN: Q. Ms Wells, my name is Glissan and I appear in the interests of Pamela Young. I want to ask you just some few questions. Do you remember that, I think it was the day after this Lateline interview had occurred, you sent an email to Strath Gordon about what had happened?
A. Yes.
Q. And set out a short chronology?
A. Yes.
Q. In that email - it is at tab 372 [NPL.0138.0002.3306],
if it's required, Commissioner, but I don't propose to go
to it in detail - you began by saying:
As requested, please find a brief chronology regarding the Scott Johnson matter. Apologies if my memory is hazy on some things but I was completely bedridden last [Wednesday] and [Thursday].

So even at the immediate aftermath, you had some memory problems about what had occurred; is that right?
A. No, I wouldn't say "memory problems". I have outlined what my recollections of what had happened were.
Q. But you did say, did you not, that you were hazy about some things?
A. We11, anything that might have happened on the Wednesday and Thursday, when I wasn't, in fact, working.
Q. All right. And so, the next time - well, let me ask you this: you weren't trying to distance yourself from it even at that stage, were you?
A. No.
Q. Within a fortnight, you had been to and been interviewed by two 1 awyers at Ashurst about the matter? A. Yes.
Q. And so may we take it reasonably that your memory then was more clear about what had occurred than when you made your statement in the last week or so?
A. Yes.
Q. In relation to that, at the early part, as we understand your evidence, of your involvement, you had sent an email to a group of people about what was proposed in relation to the statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Tab 347 [NPL.0138.0001.0037], and in that, one of the people who had been copied in to it was Bradley Monk?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that Bradley Monk was in the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police?
A. He may have been. I can't remember.
Q. You don't remember. So you don't remember whether or not at that stage he was in Nick Kaldas's office?
A. I don't remember, no.
Q. Thank you. In that, one of the things you said was and this is your drafting --

If and when the statement is made public, we would be happy to go on the record then ...
A. Yes.
Q. Just to put that even more clearly, the following day, on 8 April, you send a further email to Pamela Young, tab 351 [NPL.0138.0002.2959], talking about the Dan Box backgrounding information, and in that you confirmed to her that any background information was to be used only if or when the statement was made public by the Coroner?
A. Yes.
Q. So your understanding was at that stage that when the Coroner made a determination, that the material in her statement was to be made public, you were prepared - that's
to say Police Media was prepared - "to go on the record", to use your words?
A. To do interviews but, as I said earlier, they would stil1 be subject to further discussion and approval.
Q. We11, that's not quite right, is it? Because if I then take you to your statement to Ashurst at tab 384 [NPL.0147.0001.0001], there are a number of things that come out of that interview that $I$ want to ask you about. At the foot of the first page of that - do you have it there?
A. Yes.
Q. One of the things you were asked, and in respect of which you gave an answer, was about going on the record, and you said, at the bottom of page 1:

The possibility of going on the record afterwards.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you talk about you assume a DCI would understand that to mean you can't sit down and do a 20-minute interview with Lateline?
A. Correct.
Q. But you go on to say police at superintendent level and up can do it without express permission?
A. Yes.
Q. So that was one rank above Detective Chief Inspector Young as she then was?
A. Yes.
Q. And, of course, the one person who could have done it was the Commander of Homicide, Mr Willing?
A. That's correct.
Q. And of course, you would agree - because it is consistent with the evidence you gave the Commissioner earlier today - that he could have approved her doing it? A. No. He could not have approved her doing it. That would have needed to go to the Commander of Public Affairs as wel1.
Q. You do agree, though, don't you, that the fact of the matter is that either there was a misunderstanding about that or there was some error in Police Media about it? Is that not right?
A. I don't believe there was a misunderstanding.

MR TEDESCHI: I object
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, I can't hear who objected.
MR TEDESCHI: I'm sorry, I objected.
THE COMMISSIONER: To what?
MR GLISSAN: It has been answered, your Honour.
MR TEDESCHI: A misunderstanding by her, a misunderstanding by someone else?

THE COMMISSIONER: Fair enough. No, fair enough.
MR GLISSAN: I understand.
THE COMMISSIONER: You clear it up, Mr G1issan.
MR GLISSAN: I wil1.
Q. I mean an understanding by both you and by Ms Young?
A. No. I think that would be a very long stretch.
Q. Well, she said it was approved - you told Ashurst that?
A. The backgrounder was approved; that's correct.
Q. She said there was a misunderstanding as to what was approved?
A. I don't --

MR TEDESCHI: I object. Sorry, who said? Somebody at Ashurst? Ms Young?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I'm assuming Mr G1issan is referring to this person's interview with Ashurst.

And I think, in fairness, though, Mr G1issan, could you just refer --

MR GLISSAN: Your Honour, let there be no doubt about what I'm putting.
Q. You said, in the interview with Ashurst, referring to Pamela Young:

Briefly last week. She said there was a bit of a misunderstanding regarding what was approved. She says it was approved.
A. Sorry, could you repeat where in the statement that was?
Q. Yes, at the very top of page 2 --

THE COMMISSIONER: That's at 384 , is it?
MR GLISSAN: Tab 384. [NPL.0147.0001.0001_0001]
THE WITNESS: So that's after the interview had taken place, by the look of it.

MR GLISSAN: Q. Yes, after the interview had taken place.
A. I don't believe that there was a misunderstanding.

I cannot understand how there could have been
a misunderstanding.
Q. But you yourself said you had not been clear in your dealings with her about it, didn't you?
A. But she's also a very experienced senior detective. I shouldn't need to be clear.
Q. But she had done these things before?
A. A11 that was approved was a backgrounder.
Q. Well, let us test that with what you said to Ashurst. You said, three or four questions further on in relation to what was discussed on the 1st:

There was no discussion that we would need to get approval ... those were assumptions on my part.

You said - that's right, isn't it? That's in your statement?
A. Yes, that was a --
Q. You said - please. You said:

I never specifically said you need to come back and get approval.

That's right, isn't it?
A. That's what it says.
Q. You said:

That was approved with possibility of on the record 7 ater.
A. Later, yes.
Q. And you said later in the interview, page 3 at about the middle of the page:

Pam and I discussed it previously and she asked, "once the statement is released does the backgrounder become on the record?" I said "no, there needs to be a separate interview".
A. That's correct. The backgrounder.
Q. And so it's wrong to say that you were expecting her interview on Lateline merely to be grabs, because that was the backgrounder, wasn't it?
A. The backgrounder was not the grabs, no.
Q. And you took the view, strongly, that there needed to be a separate interview?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so when you learned, as you did, that she was going to be on Lateline, as was made clear to you - and I will come to that in a moment - it must have been clear to you that that was for the purpose of the separate interview?
A. I was of the belief that a door-stop in the form of grabs had been conducted outside the court and that was what is - what I was expecting to see on Lateline that night.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Now, I wonder if you would be kind
enough to answer the question, please.
MR GLISSAN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. You knew, didn't you, that what was contemplated was the separate interview that was the follow-up, when you were going to go on the record?
A. I don't understand. Do you mean the door-stop interview or the sit-down interview?
Q. The fact is, what had been in your original email was an indication that when the Coroner released the statement, you were happy to go on the record?
A. Subject to further discussions, yes.
Q. Where is there any expression in that email of yours "subject to further discussions"? Please look at it if you need. There isn't, is there?
A. No.
Q. No. So the fact is, what had been conveyed to everybody up the chain, to the level of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, was that once the Coroner had released the statement, you were happy to go on the record?
A. That's correct.
Q. The only person who was capable of going on the record and providing detail about the quality of the investigation and the extent to which there had been any interference by the Johnson family was Detective Chief Inspector Young?
A. No. No-one would have been approved to provide that context.
Q. I didn't ask you whether they'd been approved.

I asked you whether you were aware of anybody else who was competent to provide that information?
A. No.
Q. And the answer is no, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. It was Detective Chief Inspector Young's baby, for want of a better word? She was the investigator. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. So that right at the beginning, there is effectively, an acknowledgment that once the Coroner
releases the statement, you, as the relevant person in Police Media were happy to go on the record?
A. No, I can't go on the record.
Q. No, not you personally but you were happy for police to go on the record?
A. I can't approve that either.
Q. But you see, it had already been approved, hadn't it, because this had gone up the chain all the way to Nick Kaldas's office?
A. As a backgrounder.
Q. The Coroner had, on the morning of the 10th, released the redacted statement of Detective Chief Inspector Young, so that the trigger for going on the record had been pulled?
A. On the --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think you mean the morning of the 13th, don't you?

MR GLISSAN: I'm sorry, the 13th. I'm sorry, your Honour. Dates are not something I'm - yes, I'm sorry. I apologise for that.
Q. But that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. So the trigger had been pulled, you were ready to go on the record and the appropriate person was Young?
A. With approval.
Q. Yes, thank you. I think you've said that before.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And as I have understood your evidence, you could not have given approval one way or the other; is that right?
A. No, I was not authorised to give approval for interviews.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
MR GLISSAN: Q. What did you mean, then, when you refer in the statement that you made to Ashurst, when you said, in relation to a subsequent conversation --

MR TEDESCHI: Page, please?
MR GLISSAN: Page 2, from about line 12, I suppose:
That if we had requests as a result of the statement being released ...

You went on to say:
There was no discussion that we would need to get approval...

What did you mean when you said:
I never specifically said you need to come back and get approval.
A. I don't - I don't recall the specifics of that.
Q. Well, this was your recollection within two weeks of the event, and you have no recollection now at all; is that right?
A. I am very sure that those conversations were had but, in this statement, it's obviously a little bit confused, because I say one thing at the top of that page and another thing at the bottom of the page. But to my memory, we did discuss going on the record afterwards, and that separate approval would need to be sought.
Q. You do say, though:

We didn't go into that specifically. It was very brief. I let her know there was a misunderstanding.

That's the next question and answer.
A. Is that in relation to discussions on the day or in the backgrounder?

MR TEDESCHI: That should be made clear, that it was subsequent conversations after the interview.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I think, in fairness, you should just take a moment and read it yourself. It's your recollection, not Mr Tedeschi's, nor mine, nor Mr Glissan's. So, rather, it is the question you have just posed a moment ago, as one you should answer yourself,

I think. So why don't you just take a moment, read it, and then, I'11 ask Mr G1issan to put the question again and then you can answer it.

MR GLISSAN: Certain1y, your Honour.
THE WITNESS: Can you please repeat your question?
MR GLISSAN: Q. Yes, it's page 2, from the first $10 n g$ answer of yours "That if we had requests", and for the next 101 ines, down to the words "misunderstanding".
A. Sorry, the "misunderstanding" is at the top of page 2.
Q. I'11 read it to you so that there can be no misunderstanding between us . You said:

## That if we had requests as a result of the

 statement being released we would look at those at the time. There was no discussion that we would need to get approval etc, those were assumptions on my part. I never specifically said you need to come back and get approval. That was approved with possibility of on the record later.You were then asked:

```
        In subsequent conversations did she --
that being Pamela Young --
    think she had free reign [sic]?
```

Answer:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { We didn't go into that specifically. It } \\
& \text { was very brief. I let her know there was } \\
& \text { a misunderstanding. }
\end{aligned}
$$

A. Yes. So what was your question, sorry?
Q. And that was right, wasn't it?
A. That we had discussed that there was
a misunderstanding, yes.
Q. And you had never specifically said that she needed to come back and get approval?
A. In relation to this conversation, yes.
Q. Thank you. And, of course, the document that was shown to you this morning in relation to Dan Box, which is now I understand tab 526 [NPL.2017.0001.0150], related to Pam and, inter alia, you say to Mr Willing:

Have a chat to Pam for her availability this week and once Nick Kaldas has been briefed I'm happy to organise those chats with Dan as well as Lorna from the $A B C$.
A. Correct. I can't find that document. I don't have a 526. But --
Q. No, no.
A. -- I know which email you are referring to.
Q. If I have inaccurately read it, I'm sure somebody wil1 correct me. So the fact of the matter was that you were sick and had some days off, and you left the running of this aspect of the matter to Siobhan?
A. Correct.
Q. One of the things that you said in relation to this backgrounding issue is to be found halfway down page 3 , if you'11 go back to this for a moment. "When you saw the Lateline, were you shocked", is the question. Do you see that question asked of you?
A. Yes.
Q. You said:

When it started $I$ was shocked she was in the studio because $I$ was expecting it to just to be a backgrounder.

How long had you been in media at this stage?
A. How long have $I$ worked in media?
Q. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
A. Some years.
Q. And you knew that Lateline was a late-night news television program?
A. Correct.
Q. So where would the backgrounder have been?
A. I explained this earlier. That would have been in relation to the content of the story - what was in the statement $I$ was anticipating would be the content of the story.
Q. But that would not have involved Ms Young at all.

That would have been background material of when the statement had been provided?
A. That's correct. But I anticipated that --
Q. But you knew that she was going to be on Lateline?
A. I did.
Q. So it couldn't have been the backgrounder, could it?
A. I anticipated that the show would feature both content that had been gleaned through - from the statement, which had been discussed in the backgrounder, as well as an interview that $I$ thought was a door-stop outside the court.
Q. How does that fit with your statement in the next sentence:

> Pam and I discussed it previous $7 y$ and she asked, "once the statement is released does
> the backgrounder become on the record?"
> I said "no, there needs to be a separate interview".
A. The discussions in the backgrounder cannot be used as the interview, because that was background and off the record. However, the statement was made public and the content of the statement is what can go on record in terms of the program discussing the content of the statement.
Q. We11, then, you knew that she was going to appear on Lateline that evening?
A. Correct.
Q. You had learned that as early as the middle of the afternoon?
A. Approximately 5 pm I believe it was.
Q. 4.35, I think, if we look at the emails at tab 361 [NPL.0138.0002.2947]. By 6.18, it was quite apparent that there was going to be an appearance by Ms Young on Lateline?
A. Correct.
Q. And you sent an email in relation to that, tab 362 [NPL.0138.0002.3238], which included Mr Kerlatec and Mr Finch, Bradley Monk from the Deputy Commissioner of Police's office as well, and you talked about the fact that you knew that Pam Young spoke to Emma Alberici from Lateline "on camera today"?
A. Correct.
Q. By a minute or so later, you copied Rory $0^{\prime}$ Connor and said she was expected to be "on Lateline tonight re Scott Johnson"?
A. Yes.
Q. You say that was still this 1 imited idea that you had that it wasn't to be a subsequent interview but just a door-stop?
A. Correct.
Q. Senior police officers don't need to get permission to do door-stops, do they?
A. Not inspectors, no.
Q. No. They do it all the time?
A. But it depends on the case, what the matter is.
Q. The general rule is that a detective inspector or above, including a detective chief inspector, can do a door-stop and do a quick grab for the media?
A. Yeah.
Q. This was completely different, wasn't it?
A. Grabs outside the court --
Q. This was an appearance on Lateline?
A. Yeah. Grabs outside the court was fine.
Q. But this was an appearance on Lateline, a television news program. Had you been concerned, it was perfectly open to you to speak to Mr Willing, who was her commander, or to whatever his name is, Mr Gordon, and say, "This is inappropriate. Stop it."
A. I had no idea there was a studio interview happening to - I had no reason to be concerned.
Q. So your answer is yes, it would have been possible,
had you been concerned, but you were not concerned? A. I did not think that there was a sit-down interview taking place.
Q. You had had conversations, because you've given evidence about it, with Mr Willing about what was going to happen on Lateline?
A. We had a very short conversation. I can't remember the specifics of it. However, it was along the 1 ines of "Pam is appearing on Lateline tonight".
Q. Was anything raised with you by him, that he was concerned that something might be introduced?
A. No. There was nothing that I recall that concerned me. If there had been --
Q. So there was nothing --
A. -- I would have looked for more.
Q. Sorry. So, so far as you were concerned, your position was, this was nothing more than the grabs that might have turned up from a door-stop interview?
A. Yes.
Q. A door-stop interview that you had been told hadn't taken place?
A. I did not expect there to have been a sit-down interview, but as I indicated earlier, that conversation was in the middle of the day. There were some hours between that and when $I$ found out that an interview had taken place.
Q. You have told us you may or may not have seen the $A B C$ news?
A. That's correct.
Q. Had you seen the $A B C$ news, would the fact that there was a direct reference to an interview with Ms Young have alerted you to the risk there might be a problem?
A. No, because I'd already been told that Pamela had spoken to the $A B C$.
Q. You wrote something to the effect, or received something from Pamela Young, before the thing went to air, somewhere around the time of the ABC news, in which she said, "Hair and lippy look good too"?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that not suggest to you that she might have been in make-up for a television appearance?
A. No.
Q. You do agree that there was, if there was any
suggestion that this was not something that had approva1, time in which to prevent it going to air?
A. If I had known at 5pm that it was a sit-down interview that was taking place, or had taken place, then $I$ could have reported that up the chain to determine what the next steps were. Certainly had we known the content of that interview, we would have spoken, reached out to Lateline to see if there was any way that we could stop that going to air.

MR GLISSAN: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Tedeschi?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR TEDESCHI:

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Ms Wells, did you know that in 1ate January 2015, Pamela Young and Penny Brown had had a meeting with Emma Alberici in which Pamela Young had offered a copy of her statement to Emma Alberici?
A. No.
Q. Had you known of that, what steps would you have taken?
A. I would have reported that to my superiors and I certainly wouldn't have agreed with doing a backgrounder to provide advice about the content of the statement, because the content of the statement was already known.
Q. Had you known about it, would you have committed your views to writing?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. To your superiors?
A. Yes, to Strath Gordon.
Q. Did you know that in February of 2015, Pame1a Young had actually provided a copy of her statement to Emma Alberici?
A. No, I did not know.
Q. Had you known, what would you have done?
A. Again, I would have reported that up to my superiors.
Q. Is that the sort of thing that in your experience would have required some approval by Pamela Young?
A. Yes.
Q. At that stage, what's your view about whether or not that approval would have been given?
A. I think that far out from the matter going to the Coroner, no, it would not have been approved.
Q. Did you know that well before the interview on

13 April, perhaps even some months before, Pamela Young had agreed to do a studio interview with Emma Alberici?
A. No.
Q. Had you known, what would you have done?
A. Again, I would have reported that up to my superiors.
Q. If you had reported up to your superiors that a chief inspector was proposing to do an in-studio interview about a matter such as the Johnson matter, what, in your view, was likely to have been the reaction?
A. I think it probably would have been prevented from going ahead. There would have been an order for it not to proceed.
Q. Why?
A. Because of the risks in talking about a matter that the Coroner had yet to consider.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can $I$ just interrupt and ask this, if I may.
Q. You have been asked a series of questions, you may be asked some more, about approval. In this area, I take it you said to me a few minutes ago, you would not have been able to approve - whilst you might have disapproved personally, you wouldn't have been able to approve any of the things that Mr Tedeschi is asking you about?
A. That's correct.
Q. So all you would have done, in each case, if you were concerned, was to report it up the chain and then that would be a matter for, presumably, discussion and approval or not approva1?
A. Yes, and as part of that, I may also provide my views.
Q. Certainly, if they were listened to, then they would be, if not, so be it?
A. Correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Ms Wells, were you aware that on
Friday, 10 Apri1, Pamela Young had done a preparatory recorded sit-down interview in the studio with Emma Alberici?
A. No.
Q. Had you been told about that, what would you have done?
A. Again, I would have reported that up to my superiors.
Q. And what do you think the reaction of your superiors is likely to have been?
A. I think we would have collectively tried to find out what the content of the interview was and probably worked with Lateline to see if there was any way we could stop that interview going ahead.
Q. You have said in evidence, in answer to questions from Counsel Assisting, that you worked very closely with Strath Gordon and also with Siobhan McMahon?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have a relationship of trust with those two people?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you regularly exchange information that you had obtained with them and them with you?
A. That's correct. With Strath Gordon, it was probably more so $I$ would provide him with information. Due to his senior level, he would be discussing things that $I$ would necessarily not be privy to.
Q. If either Strath Gordon or Siobhan Herbert [sic] had been given any of the information that $I$ have just related to you about the meeting in late January, the statement
in February, the agreement to do a studio interview early in the piece and the preparatory interview on 10 Apri1 - if either of them had been told that, would you expect that
they would have notified you?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Why?
A. Because $I$ was the media officer that was managing that from a media perspective, and we had a policy of being open and transparent with each other on matters like that, any matters that are potentially contentious or high profile.
Q. If Superintendent Mick Willing had been given any of that information, in your view, would he have discussed it with you?
A. I believe he would have, yes.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because we had a very good working relationship on media issues where $I$ would let him know if I became aware of things, he would let me know if he became aware of things, and we would regularly discuss strategy and how we might approach things.
Q. As a Media Liaison Officer, which you were, have you ever attended a studio interview with a television station assisting a police officer?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. On how many occasions would you have done that?
A. In studio, probably a handful, but I've also done a lot of on-scene interviews at different locations with A Current Affair, 60 Minutes, different programs 1 ike that.
Q. And what's the role of the Media Liaison Officer in that context?
A. It's twofold. One is to, I guess, just be across what's being discussed and making sure that it aligns with preparation work that had been done; and then, if there is anything of concern, also just stepping in and providing some advice that perhaps the interview is straying into territory that we shouldn't be talking about and could we perhaps redo the questions or look at a different approach.
Q. Do Media Liaison Officers also from time to time attend off-the-record backgrounder interviews?
A. Correct.
Q. What's the role of the Media Liaison Officer there?
A. Again, much the same, to take a record and be across
what is being discussed, and then also, if it is straying into areas that it shouldn't be, being able to step in and have a discussion with both parties, or one of the parties, to say that this is perhaps going somewhere that it shouldn't.
Q. Have you had an experience, other than the one that you have told us about in evidence with Ms Young, of a police officer requesting to have an interview with a journalist without the presence of a Media Liaison Officer?
A. Not that I can recall directly, no.
Q. Is it for that reason that you were concerned when you heard about the request that had been made by Pamela Young? A. I was concerned, but by the same token, we couldn't say no. All we could do was report that up to our superiors for them to consider the next steps.
Q. And what you advised Siobhan McMahon, when you were told about that request, was to, in effect, put it on the record and let her superior know; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was that an established procedure?
A. Yes. So anything was always recorded, like that - put on the record. We kept notebooks that we would take notes and keep things like that, and then obviously, when you're letting people know, you do it in email so there's a record in email as well.
Q. Now, you have told us that you have attended a handful of studio interviews with police officers. Are they much less common than backgrounders?
A. Yes. Yes. Oh, no, they're probably about the same. There's probably more studio interviews. But backgrounders don't take place that often, because generally, you're not
really talking to media unless you're talking about
something that is current and on the record. So
backgrounders are something that are only considered occasionally.
Q. Before doing a studio interview, what are the procedures that your Media Unit goes through with the officer who is going to do the interview?
A. So I'll take it one step earlier. So prior to speaking with the officer, you'd have a chat to the
producer to find out what sort of questions that they would be asking; could we expect that they might go off those questions and ask any surprises, because sometimes they, you know - obviously you don't want surprises, but try and find out as much about what's going to be discussed as possible. You would then go and sit down with a police officer who is conducting the interview and go through, I guess, the specifics of what may be asked and what the answers might be.
Q. What's the benefit of that?
A. So the person who's giving the interview is prepared and knows what they can talk about and what they should not talk about.
Q. Yes.
A. And then you may also do some role play and throw in some questions that you were not anticipating in there, just to see how prepared they were for taking questions that were outside of what we were anticipating.
Q. This, of course, is completely apart from the approval process?
A. This would only take place after the approval had been granted.
Q. Are there any documentary requirements in the Police Force for these steps to be taken? Is there a Police Media protocol of some sort that --
A. We do have a Police Media policy, which outlines at what level different police officers can undertake different things, and then it's, I guess, spe1t out, you know, "You need to work with the Media Unit on those."

In terms of those steps that I've just outlined, I don't think they're specifically documented in a policy, but they're well known to all that work in the Media Unit and to senior officers as wel1.
Q. Would it be more known to senior officers because they are the ones that are going to be doing the interviewing?
A. That's correct.
Q. You have read a transcript of the interview conducted by Pamela Young on Lateline?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you told us that you watched it when it was broadcast?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. If you had done a practice session with Pamela Young prior to that interview, which parts of it would you have advised her not to do?

MR GLISSAN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: I really don't need this, Mr Tedeschi. It speaks for itself, doesn't it? Why do I need the evidence about what she should have been advised not to do or do, and the underlying assumption is that someone was bound to take Ms Wells's advice? There is no evidence that she had approval or was in a position of such seniority that she could --

MR TEDESCHI: I could rephrase the question to make it more relevant.
Q. Had you had such a session with Pamela Young and had she told you that she was going to make a criticism about the Minister kowtowing to the family, what would have been your reaction?

MR GLISSAN: I object to that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Again, it's not really her role, is it? You haven't estab1ished --

MR TEDESCHI: We would submit that it explains why --
THE COMMISSIONER: No, it might explain it but --
MR TEDESCHI: -- why Pamela Young didn't want to have a Media Liaison Officer --

THE COMMISSIONER: You can put that to Ms Young, if you wish, in due course. I don't want this person speculating a11 afternoon about what she may or may not have done had she known. Her evidence is she didn't know, full stop. That's what she says. There's no suggestion she did know any of the detail of what Ms Young said on the program.

MR TEDESCHI: If the Commission pleases.
Q. You've been asked questions about off-the-record interviews and on-the-record interviews. We understand the difference. You have explained it. What is required by the Police Media Unit for an off-the-record interview to be become on the record?
A. It would need --

MR GLISSAN: I object to that as wel1, Commissioner. (a), I don't understand the question the way it is expressed --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think I know what he is getting at, but I will allow it, Mr G1issan, thank you.

MR GLISSAN: As your Honour pleases.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: So a backgrounder is approved to take place and it is completely off the record with no comments discussed in that backgrounder to be attributed to police. For it to become an on-the-record interview, it would need to be considered again, and given that this was quite a high profile matter, it would have required consideration, most likely by Strath Gordon as the Commander of Public Affairs.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Would it have required any other steps to be taken apart from approval?
A. It would definitely - I don't think that a sit-down interview with Lateline would have been approved in any case.

MR GLISSAN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it really wasn't responsive, but there has been a fair bit of that.
Q. But leaving aside Mr Strath Gordon, if such a situation arose, you would fully expect, would you, the relevant senior police officer to be intimately involved with what was going on?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this case, it would be Mr Willing?
A. Did you say Mr Willing?
Q. Willing; in this case, it would have been Mr Wiling?
A. To approve it or do the interview?
Q. No, I didn't ask you about approva1. You're talking you're being asked questions about the process of - and you mentioned Strath Gordon would be involved. All I'm asking you is does it also mean that in collaboration, with or without him, you would have a senior police officer relevantly concerned, in this case, Mr Wiliing?
A. Yes, it most likely, for this, would have gone higher and it would have gone to the Commander of State Crime Command.
Q. You're speculating, aren't you, and I understand that, but at least Mr Willing would be involved?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Yes?
MR TEDESCHI: Q. The approval for the backgrounder was given by whom?
A. Was by Strath Gordon, in collaboration with the Commander of State Crime Command, who I think at the time was Ken Finch. Both John Kerlatec and Ken Finch were aware as well 1 and had approved that backgrounder.
Q. Were you aware that Deputy Commissioner of Police Nick Kaldas had also been consulted?
A. Yes. So that was the role of Strath Gordon, to do that consultation, $I$ believe.
Q. And in your view, in order for permission to be given for an on-the-record interview about that same case, would it require approval at the same level?
A. For a sit-down interview, yes.
Q. So it would have required somebody to go as high as the Deputy Commissioner of Police for approval to be given for such an interview?
A. Most definitely for awareness but most likely also approva1.
Q. Is that because this was a high profile matter, perhaps one of the highest profile matters at the time? A. It was a very high profile matter, yes.
Q. After the interview was broadcast - Counse1 Assisting showed you some email exchanges between you and various
other people about, firstly, suggested 1 ines, do you remember --
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ that you discussed with Mr Wiliing?
A. Yes.
Q. Were those discussions a form of attempted damage control for the situation that had arisen overnight?

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think that's appropriate. You're putting words into the witness's mouth. You're not asking a question at all, and you know how sensitive this area is. I don't find - I really don't find it helpful when you put words into a witness's mouth.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, my learned friend repeatedly asked leading questions of that kind.

THE COMMISSIONER: He asked the question, so did I, as to whether the terms of that email were supportive. Now, if you want to turn it around and say was it damage control, you're putting words in her mouth. But if she agrees to it, then it may trivialise much of what she has otherwise said, but go ahead. You go ahead.

MR TEDESCHI: I will rephrase the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, go ahead, by al 1 means.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Those 1 ines of response, you have told the Inquiry that they were for discussion purposes?
A. That's correct.
Q. Between you and Mr Wiliing?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it involve possible discussion about those lines with others as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there any benefit for the NSW Police Force at that stage, in your view, in severely criticising Pamela Young for doing the interview?
A. No, because there was - that could have impacted the entire matter going before the Coroner.
Q. So what was your view at that time about the best approach to be taken to the situation that had arisen because of the in-studio interview and what had been said in it?
A. The police had to distance themselves from the personal comments, the ones that we discussed earlier about the Minister and the family. The police, as a Police Force, had to distance themselves from those comments, but stil1 support that this was a thorough investigation undertaken by a very experienced detective.
Q. Now, it has been pointed out to you in questions by Counsel Assisting that the first version, the lines that were discussed between you and Mr Willing, were rather positive about Pamela Young, whereas the eventual 1 ine that was issued to the media contained a statement that what she had said was in some respects inopportune?
A. Correct.
Q. And it was pointed out to you by Counsel Assisting that that was a more negative approach to Pamela Young; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. What was your view at that time about where the correct approach was?

THE COMMISSIONER: Why do I need to know, over and above what the police actually issued --

MR TEDESCHI: I withdraw the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: -- whether her view was the same or different?

MR TEDESCHI: I withdraw the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Were there differences of opinion between different people about where that 1 ine should be drawn, as to what position should be taken vis-a-vis Pamela Young?
A. As I said this morning, whilst $I$ was in the initial discussions, there were subsequent discussions that took place without me, to my belief, so how the specifics of it came to that, I don't think $I$ was necessarily part of all
of those discussions, and that would have come through the discussions between Zdenka and Michael Willing directiy, and I'm not sure whether Strath Gordon and the Commissioner were involved in those discussions. I don't want to assume.
Q. And you were merely notified about the eventual release?
A. Yes, and then it was my role to provide that to any media who were asking for it.
Q. You were asked a number of questions by Mr Giissan about your interview at Ashurst lawyers in which you mentioned several times about a misunderstanding, and perhaps $I$ might take you to that interview on page 2 , tab 384 [NPL.0147.0001.0001_0001], at the top of the page.
A. Yes.
Q.

Briefly last week. She said there was a bit of a misunderstanding regarding what was approved. She says it was approved. She is not a stupid person. She wouldn't take that as approved.

And then about five or six questions further down, you said:

> There was no discussion that we would need to get approval... those were assumptions on my part. I never specifically said you need to come back and get approval. That was approved with possibility of on the record later.

And then two answers further down you say:

> I let her know there was
> a misunderstanding.

Now, could you tel1 us, as best you can recollect, what was your actual conversation with Ms Young about this misunderstanding? Firstly, when did it take place in relation to the interview?
A. I don't think it was too soon after, I didn't speak to Pam immediately after, and then, when I did, I think it was very brief, and I think it was her that initially said it
was a misunderstanding. And I must have agreed to it that it was a misunderstanding. However, I believe that's a very, very long - I just don't understand how that could have been misunderstood.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I can't understand just what you've said, so would you forgive me. What was the misunderstanding that you were referring to in this interview?
A. So Pamela was of the belief that she had approval to do the Lateline interview, and had indicated that it was a misunderstanding.
Q. Sorry, you didn't have any misunderstanding, though, did you?
A. I was of the view that there was no approval granted for the interview.
Q. However, you did say candidly to the solicitors that the question of approval had not been expressly discussed?
A. In terms of --
Q. No, I will ask you again: would you answer the question. The approval process was not discussed. You made assumptions about it?
A. Correct.
Q. But there was no - as I understand, you told the solicitors that whilst you assumed there would be an approval process, the question of approval was not the subject of express discussion between you all?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Is this the situation, as far as you were aware, that in your presence, nobody specifically said, or explicitly said, to Pamela Young, "Once the statement is on the record, we need to go back and get another approval in order for you to go on the record and do a studio interview"; is that right?
A. To my recollection, yes.
Q. So why do you say now that it was obvious that further approval was needed?
A. Because all that had been approved was a backgrounder, and certainly to do a sit-down interview, that would need
to be discussed, there would need to be preparation, there would have been a range of different steps put in place before that happened, and the media policy was quite specific that sit-down interviews did require that approval and a sit-down interview had never been discussed.
Q. Is that something that would be known to a detective chief inspector, in your view?
A. Absolutely --

THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, really, now look, Mr Tedeschi, you can ask me to draw inferences, you can ask Ms Young about it. I really don't want people speculating what they think, at their level, somebody in the chief inspectors how many of those in the Police Force I wouldn't know - are you talking about the Homicide Unit? Are you talking about - I don't know. So I'm not helped by that sort of speculation.

MR TEDESCHI: If the Commissioner pleases.
Q. To your knowledge, had there been any approval given for a sit-down studio interview the previous Friday, 10 April?
A. No.
Q. Could I take you, please, to the emails that you have been shown by Counsel Assisting. The first one is tab 347. [NPL.0138.0001.0037]. It is dated 7 Apri1, 2 o'clock in the afternoon. In the third paragraph - have you got that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. In the third paragraph, you have written to a whole lot of people, including Pamela Young:

> As such, we would like to provide a background briefing to the $A B C$ and The Australian prior to Monday so they can take a look at the report and have a chat to police about what's in it. The briefing would be for background information only and off the record.

Would you have written that if you knew that Pamela Young was going to do an in-studio interview, if you had known at that stage?
A. No.
Q. Did Pamela Young ever get back to you and say, "We11, look, hold on, I know you've written about just a background, off-the-record interview, but as I understand it, I'm going to do an on-the-record interview if the Coroner makes the statement available"?
A. No.
Q. The next one is tab 526 [NPL.2017.0001.0150]. On the following day, 8 April--

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, 526? Yes, sorry.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. This is again from you, this time to Mr Willing:
... Nick Kaldas has been briefed I'm happy to organise those chats with Dan as well as Lorna from $A B C$.

At that time, did you view that what was going to happen, so far as the $A B C$ was concerned, was the same as what was going to happen to Dan Box?
A. Yes.
Q. Namely, a backgrounder?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. The next one - sorry, I don't have a tab number. Tab 351 [NPL.0138.0002.2959]). At the bottom of the page, you've written to Pamela Young that you've spoken to Dan Box:
... he's very keen to meet with you on Friday. He has agreed to the discussion being off the record and for background purposes on7y...

Did Pamela Young ever get back to you and say, "Yes, that's what we've agreed to with Dan Box but with the ABC it's going to be different"?
A. No.
Q. Next one, tab 352 [NPL.0138.0004.7178], on 10 Apri1,
at the top of the page, this is from Siobhan McMahon to a number of people, including yourself:

As you're probably aware Dan Box from "The Australian" is coming to State Crime today for an off the record backgrounder with ... Pam Young ... in relation to the Scott Johnson matter.

And then at the end of that paragraph:
This statement is the subject of the back grounder with Dan Box.

And then in the third paragraph, Ms McMahon has recorded the fact that Pamela Young doesn't want to have a Media Liaison Officer present, and what she has written is, in the last two lines of the third paragraph:

Det Insp Young added her decision is also designed to protect me (or any MLO) from possible repercussions over her comments.

Did that raise your concerns about possible repercussions for an MLO?
A. I believe that this email came when I was quite ill so I'm not sure --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Ms Wells, can I just ask you again, would you be so kind as to answer the question instead of going off at a tangent. You were asked the question, purely and simply: did it raise concerns? Is the answer yes or no?
A. I can't remember.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. What was your situation at that time?
A. I was very 111 with the flu.
Q. Is it possible that you didn't read it carefully enough and missed that?
A. I'm not sure if I even read it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But in any event, you understood that Mr Willing had been alerted to the request, or whatever it was, by Ms Young and was content for there to
be no Media Liaison Officer present? A. Yes.
Q. So, in a sense, it was off your plate. Once Mr Willing had expressed his view, you need not have worried about it any further?
A. I was not at work that day.
Q. I understand that, but what I'm saying is once somebody like Mr Willing had said it was okay, Mr Gordon says, "Okay, I'm happy to go along with it", that was the end of it, wasn't it?
A. Yes.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Could I take you next to tab 358,
13 Apri1, at 2.15 in the afternoon. This, of course, is after the Coroner had ordered the third inquest. There's an email from you to Pamela Young, it says:

> Pam and Mick --

It refers to both of them --
I've spoken to Dan Box, and he is unsure
yet whether there will be a story in
tomorrow's paper, but he is grateful for
the backgrounder as he says it has
certainly given some perspective to the matter ...

And then the last line of the email:
We've had no requests at this time.
At that stage, were you still of the view that what had been given or done with Dan Box was the same as what was going to be done with the $A B C$ ?
A. Yes, I believe this was the day that the - yes, this was the day. So, yes, at that stage I still thought that the $A B C$ only had the same as what Dan Box had had.
Q. And then following that is a press release.
A. Yes.
Q. Were you involved in that being issued?
A. No. That's a Sydney Morning Herald story written by Rick Feneley.
Q. This mail at 2.15 was to Pamela Young?
A. Yes.
Q. And it clearly indicated that Dan Box had only been given a backgrounder?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Pamela Young respond to that and say anything about her doing more than a backgrounder?
A. No.
Q. Could I take you next to tab 361, [NPL.0138.0002.2947], which is a media update at 4.35pm?
A. Yes.
Q. That was sent to a lot of police officers. Was that a standard email each working day?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the purpose of the media update?
A. The media update was to advise the police executive and a range of senior officers within State Crime Command, as well as the Media Unit, what the key issues of the day had been, what requests had come in, what actions I had undertaken in relation to the media, any media releases that had been issued and any media statements that were provided to the media.
Q. And how often per day was such a media update given?
A. It was at the end of each day.
Q. And this one was issued by you?
A. Yes, I believe it was. Yes.
Q. And in that, you have recorded in relation to Strike Force Macnamir, on the first page --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I don't want to be rude, but what is the point of asking a question that speaks for itself from the very document? The document hasn't been contested. Nobody suggests this didn't go out.

MR TEDESCHI: I'm just bringing it to her attention and then I'll ask --

THE COMMISSIONER: But she has had it brought to her
attention --

MR TEDESCHI: I will ask her a question.
THE COMMISSIONER: -- and if she hasn't, then you should have done so. But she doesn't deal with it in a way - nor is it controversial. I'm really asking myself what are you doing by asking her to agree furiously with what she has written and in respect of which there is no controversy?

MR TEDESCHI: I will ask her the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: What question?
MR TEDESCHI: We11, I wil1 ask it now.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, you tel 1 me what you want to ask her.

MR TEDESCHI: What I want to ask her is, what she has on that first page, in the column on the second dot point note - if she believed that that was accurate at the time --

THE COMMISSIONER: There's no suggestion she didn't, but you tell me why you need to get it from her.

MR TEDESCHI: -- and what would have been the consequences if she had really known.

THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, really? You mean really really or really known?

MR TEDESCHI: If she had known that Pamela Young was going to --

THE COMMISSIONER: It's simpler to let you do it, Mr Tedeschi, even though it really is bordering on the trivia, because there is no controversy about these matters. I don't know what you think you are doing, whether it is emphasis, I don't know.

MR TEDESCHI: It is not emphasis, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: We11, then what is that you want - she is not in a position to say one --

MR TEDESCHI: What it is is that some evidence has been given to suggest that this witness knew perfectly well that an in-studio interview would be given.

THE COMMISSIONER: And what does she say in response to that? She didn't. So you are going to ask her every time she writes something, was she ever aware of it. She has said she wasn't. It is a matter for me whether I accept that, ultimately. But the question is, why keep asking her the same questions?

MR TEDESCHI: Would you allow me please to ask the question?

THE COMMISSIONER: It is going to be quicker, I agree. Keep going for another minute, then you'11 stop.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Ms Wells, do you see the last dot point note about a backgrounder facilitated by Pam Young with Dan Box and Emma Alberici?
A. Yes.
Q. Of course, we know that several hours later that night, an in-studio interview was broadcast on national television?
A. Yes.
Q. Had you known --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I don't know where some of these ideas come from, but evidence from the Bar table I think it's usually called in the political terms a Dorothy Dixer. You either know what she is going to say or not. I presume you do. But you ask her this question and then would you please bring this topic to an end because there is not much controversy. I want to deal with matters which are controversial.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, I will.
Q. Had you known that she was going to do a studio interview, what would have been the consequences for you of that entry?
A. It would have been incorrect and I probably would have gotten into a bit of strife about it.
Q. Could I take you to tab 362 [NPL.0138.0002.3238], also
an email from you to a whole lot of senior officers, that same night, but later on, 6.18 pm , "Both are to appear on Lateline tonight". You've explained that you understood that to be the door-stop interview?
A. Yes.
Q. What would have been the reaction if it had been disclosed later that you knew that, in fact, she was going to do a studio interview?
A. I would have been reprimanded. I could have - to know something like that and not report it up, when we had a very stringent, "no surprises" policy, it would not have been good for me career wise.
Q. Could I take you to tab 372 [NPL.0138.0002.3306]. You set out a chronology there - this is the day following the interview --
A. Yes.
Q. You have been asked about the last paragraph. In the
last couple of sentences you have recorded:
DCI Young did indicate $A B C$ were doing
a story but $I$ was not aware an interview had been conducted until Det Supt Willing was advised by DCI Young about 5pm. No issues of concern were raised at the time.

Could you explain why no issues of concern were raised at the time?
A. I believe it was quite a short conversation, Pamela had rang Mick Willing to --

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, I won't allow this. This is her - she can talk about her concerns. If you are asking her to explain something else, then how can she do that?

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Could you explain why no issues of concern were raised by you at that time?

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Or were raised for you? A. Mick Willing did not raise any issues of concern and --
Q. And so, therefore, you were not concerned because he didn't tell you any more than what you record here; is that right?
A. That's correct. But he was a very transparent person --
Q. Please, now, really, did I ask you - did anyone ask you - whether Mr Willing was transparent or not?
A. No.
Q. No. So the position is this: whatever Mr Wiliing said to you raised no concerns on your part?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Did it appear to you, during your conversation with Mr Willing at about 5 pm , that he was aware of anything more than --

THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, no, Mr Tedeschi, I'm sorry, you are now asking her to read his mind? I'm not permitting it, really.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Did Mr Willing say to you, during that conversation at about 5pm, anything about Pamela Young doing an in-studio interview or an on the record interview? A. He said that he - he said that she'd spoken to Emma Alberici on camera, as indicated in my statement that I or the email that $I$ provided later to the senior police. But it was not mentioned that it was a studio interview and he raised no issues of concern.
Q. And your concerns were not aroused?
A. No.
Q. The media release that was issued on 13 Apri1, that was obviously on the record?
A. Yes.
Q. Who had given approval for that?
A. I believe that had been approved by Mick Wiliing. It should say at the bottom of the media release. Sorry, I don't have the tab number here, but it would normally say at the bottom of the media release who has approved it.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, that completes my questioning of Ms Wells.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Anything arising?

MR GLISSAN: There is one matter, your Honour, just before my friend goes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr G1issan, you can go first.
MR GLISSAN: It is just that there was reference by the witness during the course of my learned friend's examination to some notebooks. To the extent that it is appropriate for me to do it, I call for those notebooks.

THE COMMISSIONER: We have summonsed these things. I will take that on board, Mr Glissan. I don't know whether notebooks have been asked for.
Q. Did you indicate during an answer a moment or two ago that you kept notebooks of your conversations or notes of your conversations with various people?
A. I kept a general notebook for work that I no longer have. A11 my notebooks were archived. However, the week that I was home, sick, I believe in one of my statements here it actually indicates that because $I$ was at home and didn't have my notebook, that there were no notes taken during those times.
Q. So $I$ presume as a result of being previously alerted to this issue, and no doubt for perhaps the Ms Dawson exercise, you have exhausted what records exist, and your belief at the moment is that there are no notes that you took - -
A. No.
Q. -- in the time that you were off sick?
A. That's correct.
Q. Or, if you did, you don't have them?
A. That's correct.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:

MR GRAY: Q. Mr Tedeschi invited you to agree that, at the time, there was something called a Police Media policy? A. Correct.
Q. Did that change from year to year, was there one in place, in force, at 2015 that had changed, or that has changed since?
A. I don't know. I no longer work for the police so I don't know if it has changed.
Q. But you knew of it in 2015, did you, the Police Media policy?
A. I used the Police Media policy, yes.

MR GRAY: I ask through you, Commissioner, that we be provided with the --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think the simple course is a summons might be prepared and if there is such a document, it can be produced.

MR GRAY: Very good.
Q. Secondly, at the beginning of Mr Tedeschi's questions this afternoon he asked a number of questions of you about whether, if you had known certain things, would you have reported them to your superiors?
A. Yes.
Q. Remember questions about that? And you answered yes, you would have. Who did you mean by your "superiors"?
A. So I would have reported it up to two 1 ines. One would have been up to the Police Media Unit manager and also the head of Public Affairs, Strath Gordon; and then I would have advised internally within State Crime Command, reported up via - to the Commander of State Crime Command.
Q. Who was that?
A. I think it was Ken Finch. He was acting as the commander. It may have been John Kerlatec. I'm not sure who was in which position.
Q. But when you used the expression your "superiors", you meant not just Strath Gordon in the media world but also Mr Finch or Mr Kerlatec in the actual police world?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you. The third and final thing, when Mr Wiling rang you at 5 o'clock, or thereabouts, on 13 April, did he
say to you: (a) that Pamela Young was going to be on Lateline; or (b) that Pamela Young had spoken to Emma Alberici in particular?
A. My notes here indicate --
Q. No, no, never mind what your notes indicate. What is your memory?
A. I don't remember.

MR GRAY: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you. I wi11 excuse you, Ms Wells, from further attendance. Thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: Can I just deal with one or two housekeeping matters.

Ms Alberici will be in New South Wales on Tuesday morning, so the AVL will be 9am Eastern Standard Time. Secondly, she will be followed by Ms Brown, and if I can just alert everyone concerned, or not concerned, as the case may be, there is some correspondence coming out this afternoon, if it hasn't already come out, about an application that will be made at 4 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon. You will be given a brief understanding of that, and I would like to know, as soon as possible, whether and who wishes to participate in that application. That's al1 I need to know from the point of view of management of time. There will be a number of procedural questions that may arise. I will deal with those as an when the materials are provided.

Once $I$ know who is or wishes to be or participate in that application, then $I$ will take the view as to who should get copies of whatever it is that is filed in support of it.

A11 right. Thank you. I wil1 adjourn, then, unti1 9 o'clock only Tuesday morning
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