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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Wood.
MR P WOOD: May it please you, Mr Commissioner, on this application, I appear for Mr Willing.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I think everyone else in the room is interested or not, as the case may be.
Mr Thangaraj is here.
Mr Glissan, can you just tell me, the application, as you know, in substance is for Mr Willing to be excused from giving any further evidence. What attitude have you got on that?

MR GLISSAN: We oppose that on the basis - well, I can tell your Honour now very briefly or --

THE COMMISSIONER: No, you oppose it. That's the first point. Ms Barnes?

MS BARNES: The same position - opposed.
THE COMMISSIONER: Counsel Assisting, Mr Gray?
MR GRAY: I will defer my position until I have heard what the reasons are.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right.
Mr Wood, there is an affidavit. You know that I've made some non-publication orders. I've directed - and I will just make sure - that there is no live streaming occurring. I've done that in order to minimise if somebody makes an error or says something untoward, then it won't be at least disseminated as widely as it might otherwise be.

MR WOOD: May I start with those orders? I don't know whether you have them close to hand.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't.
MR WOOD: On one reading of them - I'm sure this was not intentional - they may forbid me from making these submissions to you.

THE COMMISSIONER: It wasn't intended that that --

MR WOOD: I'm sure that wasn't intended.
THE COMMISSIONER: No.
MR WOOD: I don't want to walk into --
THE COMMISSIONER: I would have liked to have achieved that result, Mr Wood, but even I couldn't go that far.

MR WOOD: No, I didn't think that that was the intention behind it.

THE COMMISSIONER: If you want me to make it clear, there was no intention in order to prevent you or, for that matter, Mr Glissan, Ms Barnes or anyone else from making submissions about the matter. I will leave it, by the way, to counsel to deal with certain matters discreetly. I won't say any more than that.

MR WOOD: Having said that, I didn't propose to reveal the contents of the various documents I will take you to very briefly, for that very reason.

Perhaps I should commence by tendering the statement of Jonathan Milner of 29 September and the exhibit to that, which is JOM-1.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I will receive that and I will mark that exhibit 1 on this application.

EXHIBIT \#1 (ON THE APPLICATION) STATEMENT OF JONATHAN MILNER DATED 29 SEPTEMBER 2023 AND EXHIBIT JOM-1

MR WOOD: Have you had a chance to read that statement, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: I have read the statement, I have read all the annexures and I am on top of the materials. So, by all means, take the course you wish to take, but I am familiar with the materials.

MR WOOD: I will only take you to a few of the documents, and I think it is convenient to do it by reference to tab numbers.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR WOOD: There is a lot of uncontentious historical material in Mr Milner's statement, but could I go to tab 12 initially.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: Four pages into that tab, you will find a document dated 24 August 2023.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have read that, thank you.
MR WOOD: I invite your attention particularly to the paragraphs halfway down the page, that is, the second and third paragraphs, and then the material that appears in the following three paragraphs over the page.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: In particular, at about point 9 --
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have read that.
MR WOOD: -- which goes to the essence of the issue.
THE COMMISSIONER: Under the heading "Recommendations"?
MR WOOD: Yes, indeed.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, $I$ have read that.
MR WOOD: May I then take you to tab 13. Five pages into that tab, you wil1 find a document dated 13 July.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: That can be very quick1y read and understood.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: The consequence of that, your Honour, you wil1 find on the last page behind that same tab, in the document dated 7 August 2023.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: It is really the last paragraph of that that is significant.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have read that, thank you.
MR WOOD: Then, penultimately, can I take you to tab 25, the document dated 27 September 2023.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have read that.
MR WOOD: It's the last paragraph on the first page I would invite your attention to --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
MR WOOD: -- together with the following paragraph on the second page, and most particularly the statement that appears in the penultimate paragraph, beginning "Mr Willing".

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have read that.
MR WOOD: Finally, behind tab 26, you will find the document dated 29 September 2023.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: Could I invite your attention to the last paragraph on the first page, which again is specific in part to this Inquiry, and then over the page, the explanation is given of a number of factors, which your Honour will see starting at about point 7 on page 2 , and there is another one at about point 3 on page 3 ; and then concerning this Commission, you will see that in point 6 on page 3 .

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: And then the very strong conclusion you see on the next page --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR WOOD: -- concerning this Inquiry. This is in the context, of course, of Mr Willing having given evidence on three different occasions before the Commission and the particular topic or topics that have been renewed - and I will come back to those in due course.

As a matter of principle, we would say the approach to this application should be, first, if there is a reasonable, substantial or compelling reason to excuse or release Mr Willing revealed on the evidence, that should be the end of the inquiry. Whatever forensic and evidentiary fallout there is for Mr Willing or for other parties, including Ms Young, Ms Brown or Ms Alberici, can be dealt with, and should be dealt with, by way of submissions, and the fact-finding process, equally, from the Commission's point of view, should entertain whatever those submissions are and follow from them.

So if this material demonstrates a reasonable, a substantial or a compelling reason to excuse, which we say it does, then you do not need, we say, to be troubled any further by it.

You will remember that section 25 penalises a failure of a witness to attend pursuant no doubt to a summons but doesn't penalise it if there is a reasonable excuse. I am sure there is no question of power that you have to excuse or release a witness who has been summonsed, but section 25(1) gives a clue as to the basis upon which that power could properly be exercised, and the adjectival test there is whether there is a reasonable excuse.

If that submission is not accepted and you consider that some balancing exercise should take place to determine whether Mr Willing is excused or released, then that balancing exercise has to start with the evidentiary material directed towards supporting or demonstrating the excuse or the reason for the excuse.

You then have to take into account where the prospective issues are in the proceedings relevant to the evidence the Commission would like him to give or participants who have been given leave would wish him to give. In that context, we would submit that this focus on the area of the Lateline program, which there has been, clearly, in this round of the hearings, then that is a satellite, attached to a satellite, that is within - or not within the penumbra of the Terms of Reference, fully appreciating your ruling on the Terms of Reference, but even according to that ruling, it could not be considered to be the heartland of the Inquiry. It is a peripheral aspect that informs, according to your ruling, thinking on assessing what is in the heartland of terms (a) and (b) of
the Inquiry.
Perhaps more importantly is to balance up the forensic upsides and downsides from the relevant points of view of the participants in any debate on this. On one view of it, the most disadvantageous aspect of excusing him could rebound upon Mr Willing himself. That's a matter for final submissions and not something here I'm endeavouring to convince you, Commissioner, about one way or the other, but that is an available view.

Secondly, if one looks at it from the point of view of Ms Young or Ms Alberici or Ms Brown, then, again, on one view, they may be benefited by not having an evidentiary contradictor to their evidence on particular topics. True it is, and it cannot be forgotten, that these topics generally have been explored in great detail already by Counsel Assisting in the previous hearings, so you have the benefit of that, and clearly, together with the submissions on that, together they seem to have been the trigger for the calling of these three extra witnesses.

Now, all the parties, including Mr Willing, can continue in this Inquiry with submissions based upon what may be perceived to be an absence of perfection or completion of evidence. There is nothing unusual in inquiries, in tribunals or in courts to have evidentiary gaps, and hence we have a series of rules as to how you fill those in the fact-finding process and also in terms of restrictions upon or qualifications to the making of submissions.

Now, we say if you throw all those factors into the balance, there is only one conclusion that could be reached, and that is to excuse or release Mr Willing from the obligation under the summons. The potential prejudice to him is real and demonstrated by uncontradicted evidence.

The prejudice, if there is any, to others is far less compelling and can be dealt with in a customary way, and in circumstances where, at least up until the present time, the submissions by Counsel Assisting are in no way suggesting an adverse finding against any of my three opponents on this application, and the evidence that has been led by Counsel Assisting in relation to two of those opponents is not suggestive of a submission to make an adverse finding against them. So you could well take the
view that they are a marginal participant only in this debate. The more critical participant is Counsel Assisting, and that is to assist you in making the ultimate factual findings and conclusions to which this evidence may relate, and it is marginal at best.

Those are my submissions.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Now, two things, before the others say something. The submissions which have thus far been made in writing and expanded upon orally in relation to both Ms Young and Ms Brown have not been withdrawn. They are maintained. That's the first point, as far as I understand it.

Secondly, if I can take you, please, to tab 13 - and that's the report, one of the confidential documents without me announcing anything of the sort, in the middle of that page, you will see a sentence beginning "He is".

MR WOOD: The sentence beginning?
THE COMMISSIONER: "He is".
MR WOOD: Yes.


MR WOOD: That's the evidence.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR WOOD: But on that, I should have made it clearer that the content of this document really has force, the force of the other documents and what is said in them, and the connections between the two things.

THE COMMISSIONER: I realise that, but there is no evidence that the person who has produced the three reports has spoken to the person who produced this report, nor the

MR WOOD: No, only at the more general higher level that there was a reference.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Okay, thank you.
MR WOOD: And in relation to your first point, it remains true: those criticisms have been made and they have not been withdrawn.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Wood, that's very helpful. Mr G1issan?

MR GLISSAN: I will be very brief, if your Honour please. There is no challenge to the confidential material that has been provided, but a careful and close reading of it, in my respectful submission, suggests that it does not disclose a significant or material difference to the position in which Mr Willing finds himself now, to that in which he found himself when he gave evidence earlier in the Inquiry. When he previously gave evidence, he did so without apparent difficulty, and that that's a relevant factor to be taken into account.

Let me put that into this context: not only, as your Honour just pointed out to my learned friend, have the assertions that are made against Ms Young and Ms Brown not been withdrawn but maintained, but they were advanced today during cross-examination, which presumably was cross-examination on instructions taken by counsel then appearing for Mr Willing, and they amount to a very serious challenge and make very serious assertions against both of those ladies. There is a direct conflict in the evidentiary material as it sits at present.

What is ordinarily advanced is an opportunity to challenge and an opportunity to cross-examine as to those conflicting materials.

The question is, as my learned friend said, a forensic one, but it is a forensic one that needs to be determined in the context of the Commissioner's Inquiry on a basis of a plenary provision of procedural fairness.

If those submissions are to be maintained and not withdrawn, and, indeed, if Mr Willing seeks to continue to be represented by counsel and to cross-examine the remaining witness in this case, then there is a significant risk that the Commission might be seen to have failed to provide that plenary procedural fairness which we have seen thus far in the Inquiry provided by you, Commissioner, and
which we anticipate will continue.
That, put in the simplest of terms, is the reason that I rise to oppose the application, notwithstanding the force of the material that has been produced by my learned friend.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Ms Barnes?
MS BARNES: I echo those submissions as well, your Honour.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Mr Wood, is there anything you would like to say in response?

MR WOOD: May I take you to tab 26 to refute the first submission of my learned friend Mr G1issan, namely, there was no difference in his position when he gave evidence than his position now.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, I think on that point, I see the issue you are going to take me to.

MR WOOD: It is expressly addressed.
THE COMMISSIONER: I acknowledge that there is an additional stressor and, on one view, of some significance. I accept that.

MR WOOD: Yes. That same point is made in the previous report that is behind tab 25.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I follow that.
MR WOOD: The only other thing I would say, which is not strictly in reply, but it is not prejudicial to my learned friends, is, Commissioner, you made reference to
. That may not be consistent with the prohibition order in relation to - or the non-disclosure order in relation to the content.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I didn't name them, but I do need to clarify what the state of the evidence is so that I'm not mistaken.

MR WOOD: Indeed. My only --
THE COMMISSIONER: I certainly would have no intention in
referring to any matter in the judgment which would have the effect of disclosing any detail, but I just wanted to know the facts, that's all.

MR WOOD: I fully appreciate that and I'm not suggesting otherwise. My only suggestion was to suppress that part of the transcript, in case --

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm happy to make a non-publication order in relation to my question and your answer, but I'm going to proceed upon the basis, though, that the entirety of treatment is as disclosed in the material.

MR WOOD: Absolutely.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, okay.
MR WOOD: Otherwise I have no further submissions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you all. I will give judgment in the morning at 9.30.

Mr Tedeschi is not here. Mr Hodgetts, would you just inform Mr Tedeschi and others - and you won't need to be here if you don't want to be. Is that what you are rising to tell me, or are you standing because I was talking?

MR WOOD: I'm in your hands.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Well, keep standing, it looks good. Mr Hodgetts, I will deal with the other matter at 10, as planned, and I will give judgment on this matter in the morning at 9.30.

MR HODGETTS: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will adjourn, thank you.
AT 4.55PM THE SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY


6577:42, 6577:45, 6578:3
AT [1] - 6581:39
attached [1] - 6576:41
attend [1] - 6576:19
attention [3] -
6574:12, 6575:10, 6575:26
attitude [1] - 6572:12
August [2] - 6574:8, 6574:42
available [1] - 6577:10

| $\mathbf{B}$ |
| :---: |

balance [2] - 6577:3, 6577:34
balancing [2] -
6576:28, 6576:30
Barnes [4] - 6571:39, 6572:19, 6573:15, 6580:8
BARNES [2] 6572:21, 6580:10
based [1] - 6577:24
basis [4] - 6572:15, 6576:23, 6579:38, 6581:11
beginning [3] 6575:16, 6578:19, 6578:21
behind [4]-6573:11, 6574:41, 6575:21, 6580:30
benefit [1] - 6577:19
benefited [1] -
6577:14
best [1]-6578:5
between [1] - 6578:38
Bignell [1] - 6571:33
brief [1] - 6579:10
briefly [2]-6572:16, 6573:22
Brown [5] - 6571:39, 6576:7, 6577:13, 6578:12, 6579:23

| C |
| :--- |
| Caitlin $[1]-6571: 27$ |
| Cameron $[1]-6571: 33$ |
| Camporeale $[1]-$ |
| 6571:26 |
| cannot $[1]-6577: 16$ |
| careful $[1]-6579: 12$ |
| case $[3]-6572: 7$, |
| $6579: 44,6581: 7$ |
| certain $[1]-6573: 17$ |
| certainly $[1]-6580: 47$ |
| challenge $[3]-$ |

6579:11, 6579:28, 6579:33
chance [1] - 6573:34
Chris [1] - 6571:42
circumstances [1] -
6577:41
Claire [1] - 6571:25
clarify [1] - 6580:42
clear [1] - 6573:13
clearer [1] - 6578:35
clearly [2]-6576:40, 6577:19
close [2] - 6572:38, 6579:12
clue [1] - 6576:23
commence [1] -
6573:24
Commission [5] -
6571:5, 6575:32, 6575:44, 6576:36, 6579:45
COMMISSION [1] -
6581:39
Commission's [1] 6576:9
COMMISSIONER [47]

- 6572:1, 6572:6,

6572:18, 6572:23,
6572:28, 6572:40,
6572:46, 6573:3,
6573:7, 6573:13,
6573:28, 6573:37,
6573:46, 6574:5,
6574:10, 6574:17,
6574:21, 6574:25,
6574:29, 6574:34,
6574:38, 6574:44, 6575:2, 6575:7, 6575:12, 6575:19, 6575:24, 6575:35, 6575:40, 6578:9, 6578:23, 6578:33, 6578:40, 6579:1, 6579:7, 6580:8 6580:12, 6580:20, 6580:25, 6580:32, 6580:41, 6580:47, 6581:9, 6581:16, 6581:20, 6581:30, 6581:37
Commissioner [7] -
6571:11, 6572:3,
6573:35, 6577:9,
6579:47, 6580:36,
6581:35
Commissioner's [1] 6579:38 compelling [3] 6576:3, 6576:14, 6577:40
completion [1] 6577:26
concerning [2] 6575:32, 6575:42 conclusion [2] 6575:37, 6577:34 conclusions [1] 6578:4
confidential [2] -
6578:17, 6579:11
conflict [1] - 6579:29
conflicting [1] 6579:34
connections [1] -
6578:38
consequence [1] -
6574:40
consider [1] - 6576:27
considered [1] -
6576:44
consistent [1] -
6580:37
content [2] - 6578:36, 6580:39
contents [1] - 6573:21
context [4] - 6575:43,
6576:38, 6579:21,
6579:38
continue [3] 6577:24, 6579:42, 6580:1
contradictor [1] 6577:15
convenient [1] -
6573:43
convince [1] - 6577:9
Counsel [7]-6571:24,
6571:25, 6572:23,
6577:18, 6577:42, 6577:45, 6578:2
counsel [3]-6573:17, 6579:26, 6579:43
course [3]-6573:39, 6575:43, 6575:46
courts [1] - 6577:27
crimes [1] - 6571:7
critical [1] - 6578:2
criticisms [1] - 6579:4
cross [4]-6579:25, 6579:26, 6579:33, 6579:43
cross-examination [2]
-6579:25, 6579:26
cross-examine [2] -
6579:33, 6579:43
customary [1] -
6577:40

| D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { downsides [1] - } \\ & 6577: 4 \end{aligned}$ | F | $\begin{array}{r} \text { given }[3] \text { - } 6575: 29 \\ 6575: 43,6576: 37 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6576:45, 6577:1, } \\ & \text { 6577:24, 6579:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Darien [1] - 6571:38 | due [1] - 6575:46 | fact [2]-6576:9, | Glissan [5] - 6571:40, | 6579:38, 6579:47 |
| DATED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6573:32 | during [1] - 6579:25 | 6577:29 | 6572:10, 6573:15, | inquiry [1] - 6576:5 |
| dated [5] - 6574:8, |  | fact-finding [2] - | 6579:8, 6580:16 | INQUIRY [1] - 6581:39 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6574: 32,6574: 42, \\ & 6575: 5,6575: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $E$ | $\begin{gathered} 6576: 9,6577: 29 \\ \text { factor }[1]-6579: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GLISSAN } 22 \text { - } \\ & 6572: 15,6579: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { instructions [1] - } \\ & \text { 6579:26 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { deal [2] - } 6573: 17, \\ & 6581: 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { echo [1] - 6580:10 } \\ & \text { effect [1] - 6581:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { factors [2] - 6575:29, } \\ & 6577: 33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gray [2]-6571:24, } \\ & 6572: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intended [2] - } \\ & 6572: 46,6573: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| dealt [3]-6576:7, | Emma [1] - 6571:42 | facts [1] - 6581:3 | $\text { GRAY }_{[1]}-6572: 25$ | intention [3]- |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 6576:8, 6577:40 } \\ \text { debate }[2]-6577: 5, \end{gathered}$ | endeavouring [1] - | factual [1] - 6578:4 <br> failed [1] - 6579:45 | eat [1] - 657 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6573:10, } 6573 \\ & 6580: 47 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6578:2 | 6577:8 | failure [1] - 6576:18 | H | intentional [1] - |
| defer [1] - 6572:25 | entertain [1] - 6576:10 | fairness [2] - 6579:39, |  | 6572:43 |
| demonstrated [1] - | entirety [1] - 6581:11 | 6579:46 | halfway [1] - 6574:13 | interested [1] - 6572:7 |
| 6577:37 | Enzo [1] - 6571:26 | fallout [1] - 6576:6 | hand [1] - 6572:38 | invite [3]-6574:12, |
| demonstrates [1] - | equally [1] - 6576:9 | familiar [1] - 6573:40 | hands [1] - 6581:28 | 6575:10, 6575:26 |
| 6576:13 | error [1] - 6572:34 | far [5] - 6573:8, | happy [1] - 6581:9 | is" [2] - 6578:19, |
| demonstrating ${ }_{[1]}$ - | essence [1] - 6574:23 | 6577:39, 6578:10, | hate [1] - 6571:7 | 6578:23 |
| 6576:31 | evidence [15] - | 6578:13, 6579:47 | heading [1] - 6574:25 | issue [2]-6574:23, |
| detail [2] -6577:17, | 6572:12, 6575:43, | few [1] - 6573:42 | Healey [1] - 6571:27 | 6580:21 |
| 6581:2 | 6576:4, 6576:36, | fill [1] - 6577:29 | Healey-Nash [1] - | issues [1] - 6576:35 |
| Detective [4] - | 6577:15, 6577:26, | final [1] - 6577:7 | 6571:27 |  |
| 6571:32, 6571:33, | 6577:37, 6577:44, | finally [1] - 6575:21 | heard [1] - 6572:25 | J |
| 6571:39, 6571:41 | 6578:4, 6578:31, | findings [1] - 6578:4 | hearings [2] - |  |
| determine [1] - | 6578:41, 6579:16, | first [7] - 6572:18, | 6576:40, 6577:18 | Jim [1] - 6571:40 |
| 6576:28 | 6579:17, 6580:17, | 6575:9, 6575:27 | heartland [2] - | John [2] - 6571:12, |
| determined [1] - | 6580:42 | 6576:2, 6578:13, | 6576:45, 6576:47 | 6571:38 |
| 6579:37 | evidentiary [5] - | 6579:3, 6580:15 | helpful [1] - 6579:8 | JOM-1 [2] - 6573:26, |
| difference [2] - | 6576:5, 6576:30, | five [1] - 6574:31 | hence [1]-6577:28 | 6573:32 |
| $6579: 14,6580: 17$ | 6577:14, 6577:27, | focus [1] - 6576:38 | higher [1] - 6578:45 | Jonathan [1] - |
| different [1] - 6575:44 | 6579:30 | follow [2] - 6576:11, | himself [3] - 6577:7, | 6573:25 |
| difficulty [1] - 6579:18 | examination [2] - | 6580:32 | 6579:15, 6579:16 | JONATHAN ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| direct [1] - 6579:29 | 6579:25, 6579:26 | following [2] | historical [1] - 6574:1 | 6573:31 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { directed [2] - 6572:31, } \\ & 6576: 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { examine [2] - 6579:33, } \\ & 6579: 43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6574: 15,6575: 14 \\ \text { forbid }[1]-6572: 43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hodgetts [2] - } \\ & 6581: 23,6581: 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { judgment }[3]-6581: 1, \\ 6581: 20,6581: 32 \end{gathered}$ |
| Director [1] - 6571:26 <br> disadvantageous [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { excuse }[8]-6576: 3, \\ 6576: 14,6576: 20, \end{gathered}$ | force [3] - 6578:36, | HODGETTS [1] - <br> 6581:35 | July [1] - 6574:32 <br> Justice [1] - 6571:12 |
| disadvantageous [1] - 6577:6 | 6576:21, 6576:25, | 6580:4 | Honour [6] - 6572:16, |  |
| disclose [1] - 6579:13 | 6576:32, 6577:35 | 6577:3, 6579:36, | 6574:40, 6575:30, | K |
| disclosed [1] - | excused [2]-6572:11, 6576:29 | 6579:37 | 6579:10, 6579:22, 6580:10 | KC [2]-6571:31, |
| 6581:12 <br> disclosin | excusing [1] - 6577:6 | forgotten [1] 6577:16 | Honourable [1] - | 6571:40 |
| 6581:2 | exercise [2] - 6576:28, | four [1] - 6574:7 | 6571:12 | keep [1] - 6581:30 |
| disclosure [1] - | 6576:30 | friend [4] - 6579:22, | Hutchings [1] - | Ken [1]-6571:36 |
| 6580:39 | exercised [1] - | 6579:36, 6580:6, | 6571:37 |  |
| discreetly [1] - | 6576:24 | 6580:16 |  | L |
| 6573:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exhibit [2] - 6573:25, } \\ & 6573: 29 \end{aligned}$ | friends [1] - 6580:36 | I | ladies [1] - 6579:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { disseminated [1] - } \\ & 6572: 35 \end{aligned}$ | EXHIBIT [2] - 6573:31, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fully }[2]-6576: 42, \\ & 6581: 5 \end{aligned}$ | importantly [1] - | $\text { last }[4]-6574: 41$ |
| document [6] - | 6573:32 |  | 6577:3 | 6574:46, 6575:9, |
| 6574:8, 6574:32, | expanded [1] - | G | including [2] - 6576:7, | 6575:26 |
| $6574: 41,6575: 5$ | 6578:11 | G | 6577:23 | Lateline [1] - 6576:39 |
| 6575:22, 6578:36 | explanation [1] - | gaps [1] - 6577:28 | $\text { indeed }[3]-6574: 27 \text {, }$ | learned [5] - 6579:22, |
| documents [4] - | 6575:29 | general [1] - 6578:45 | 6579:42, 6580:45 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6579:36, 6580:5, } \\ & 6580: 16,6580: 35 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6573:21, 6573:42, | explored [1] - 6577:17 expressly [1] - | generally [1] - | inform [1] - 6581:24 <br> informs [1] - 6576:46 | least [2] - 6572:35, |
| 6578:17, 6578:37 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expressly [1] - } \\ & 6580: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 6577:17 | informs [1] - 6576:46 inquiries [1] - 6577:27 | 6577:41 |
| done [1] - 6572:33 doubt [1] - 6576:19 | extra [1] - 6577:21 | Geoffrey [1] - 6571:36 Georgina [1] - | Inquiry [9] - 6571:5, | leave [2] - 6573:16, |
| down [1] - 6574:13 |  |  | 6575:28, 6575:42, | 6576:37 |

led [1] - 6577:45
Legal [1] - 6571:26
Leggat [1] - 6571:37
Lehmann [1] 6571:38
less [1] - 6577:39
level [1] - 6578:45
Level [1] - 6571:16
LGBTIQ ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6571:7
Linda [1] - 6571:39
live [1] - 6572:32
looks [2] - 6577:12, 6581:31

| $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- |
| Macquarie $[1]$ - |
| $6571: 16$ |
| Madden $[1]-6571: 36$ |
| maintained $[3]$ - |

6578:13, 6579:24, 6579:41
marginal [2] - 6578:1, 6578:5
mark [1] - 6573:29
Mark [1] - 6571:31 material [9]-6574:2,
6574:14, 6576:13, 6576:31, 6579:11, 6579:14, 6579:30, 6580:5, 6581:12
materials [3] -
6573:38, 6573:40, 6579:34
Mathew [1] - 6571:32
matter [7]-6573:15,
6573:16, 6576:1,
6577:7, 6581:1,
6581:31, 6581:32
matters [1] - 6573:17
Matthew [1] - 6571:37
McArdle [1] - 6571:42
means [1] - 6573:39
Michael [1] - 6571:35
middle [1] - 6578:18
might [2]-6572:35, 6579:45
Milner [1] - 6573:25
MILNER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6573:32
Milner's [1] - 6574:2
minimise ${ }_{[1]}$ -
6572:33
mistaken [1] - 6580:43
morning [2] - 6581:21, 6581:33
most [2] - 6575:15, 6577:6
Murugan [1] - 6571:35
Mykkeltvedt[1] 6571:31

| N | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Nagle }[1]-6571: 38 \\ \text { name }[1]-6580: 41 \\ \text { namely }[1]-6580: 16 \\ \text { Nash }[1]-6571: 27 \\ \text { need }[3]-6576: 15, \\ 6580: 41,6581: 24 \\ \text { needs }[1]-6579: 37 \end{gathered}$ | ```page [12]-6574:13, 6574:15, 6574:41, 6575:9, 6575:15, 6575:27, 6575:28, 6575:30, 6575:31, 6575:33, 6575:38, 6578:19``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { New }[1]-6571: 17 \\ & \text { next }[1]-6575: 38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pages [2] - 6574:7, } \\ & 6574: 31 \end{aligned}$ |
| non [3]-6572:31, 6580:39, 6581:9 | Palmer [1] - 6571:25 Pamela [1] - 6571:40 |
| non-disclosure [1] 6580:39 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { paragraph [5] - } \\ & 6574: 46,6575: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { non-publication [2] - } \\ 6572: 31,6581: 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6575: 14,6575: 16, \\ & 6575: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| nothing [1] - 6577:26 | paragraphs [3] - |
| notwithstanding [1] - 6580:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6574:13, 6574:14, } \\ & 6574: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| NSW [1] - 6571:32 <br> number [1] - 6575:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { part [2] - 6575:28, } \\ & 6581: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| numbers [1] - 6573:44 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { participant [2]- } \\ & 6578: 1,6578: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { participants [2] - } \\ & 6576: 37,6577: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| obligation [1] - | particular [3] - |
| 6577:36 | 6574:19, 6575:45, |
| occasions [1] - | 6577:15 |
| 6575:44 | particularly [2] - |
| occurring [1] - | 6574:12, 6575:15 |
| 6572:33 | parties [2]-6576:6, |
| October [1] - 6571:20 | 6577:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OF [2] - } 6573: 31, \\ & 6581: 39 \end{aligned}$ | Paul [1] - 6571:41 penalise [1]-6576:20 |
| ON [1] - 6573:31 | penalises [1] - |
| one [11]-6572:42, | 6576:18 |
| 6575:31, 6577:5, | Penelope [1] - |
| 6577:9, 6577:12, | 6571:39 |
| 6577:13, 6577:34, | penultimate [1] - |
| 6578:17, 6579:37, | 6575:16 |
| 6580:26 | penultimately [1] - |
| opponents [2] - | 6575:4 |
| 6577:44, 6577:46 | penumbra [1] - |
| opportunity [2] - | 6576:42 |
| 6579:32, 6579:33 | perceived [1] - |
| oppose [3] - 6572:15, | 6577:25 |
| 6572:18, 6580:4 | perfection [1] - |
| opposed [1] - 6572:21 | 6577:25 |
| orally [1] - 6578:11 | perhaps [2]-6573:24, |
| order [5] - 6572:33, | 6577:3 |
| 6573:14, 6580:38, | peripheral [1] - |
| 6580:39, 6581:10 | 6576:45 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { orders [2] - 6572:31, } \\ & 6572: 37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { person [2] - 6578:41, } \\ & 6578: 42 \end{aligned}$ |
| ordinarily [1] - | Peter [2] - 6571:24, |
| 6579:32 | 6571:43 |
| otherwise [3] - | place [1] - 6576:28 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6572: 35,6581: 6, \\ & 6581: 18 \end{aligned}$ | planned [1] - 6581:32 <br> plenary [2]-6579:39, |

6579:46
point [11]-6572:19,
6574:19, 6575:30,
6575:31, 6575:33,
6576:10, 6577:12,
6578:13, 6579:3,
6580:20, 6580:29
pointed [1] - 6579:22
points [1] - 6577:4
Police [1] - 6571:32
position [5] - 6572:21,
6572:25, 6579:14, 6580:17, 6580:18
potential [1] - 6577:36
power [2] - 6576:21,
6576:24
prejudice [2] -
6577:36, 6577:39
prejudicial [1] 6580:35
Present [1] - 6571:29
present [2] - 6577:41,
6579:30
presumably [1] -
6579:25
prevent [1]-6573:14
previous [2] -
6577:18, 6580:29
previously [1] -
6579:17
Principal [1] - 6571:27
principle [1] - 6576:1
procedural [2]-
6579:39, 6579:46
proceed [1] - 6581:11
proceedings [1] -
6576:35
process [2]-6576:9,
6577:29
produced [3] -
6578:41, 6578:42, 6580:5
program [1]-6576:39
prohibition [1] -
6580:38
properly [1] - 6576:24
propose [1] - 6573:20
prospective [1] 6576:35
provide [1] - 6579:46 provided [2] -
6579:12, 6579:47
provision [1] -
6579:39
publication [2] -
6572:31, 6581:9
pursuant [1]-6576:19
put [2]-6579:21, 6580:3

6579:43
respectful [1] 6579:13
response [1] 6580:13 restrictions [1] 6577:30
result [1] - 6573:8 reveal [1] - 6573:20 revealed [1] - 6576:4 rise [1] - 6580:4 rising [1] - 6581:25 risk [1] - 6579:45 room [1] - 6572:7 round [1] - 6576:40 rules [1] - 6577:28 ruling [3] - 6576:43, 6576:44, 6576:46
Rullo [1] - 6571:41
Russell [1] - 6571:41
$\frac{\mathbf{S}}{\text { Sackar }_{[1]}-6571: 12}$ S

Sackar [1] - 6571:12 satellite [2]-6576:41
SC [2] - 6571:24, 6571:35
second [2] - 6574:13, 6575:15
secondly [2] -
6577:12, 6578:16
section [2] - 6576:18, 6576:23
see [5] - 6575:30, 6575:32, 6575:37, 6578:19, 6580:20
seeks [1] - 6579:42
seem [1] - 6577:20
Senior [1] - 6571:24
sentence [2] 6578:19, 6578:21
September [3] 6573:25, 6575:5, 6575:22
SEPTEMBER ${ }_{[1]}$ 6573:32
Sergeant [5] -
6571:33, 6571:36,
6571:39, 6571:41
series [1] - 6577:28
serious [2]-6579:27, 6579:28
Short [1] - 6571:32
significance [1] 6580:26
significant [3] -
6574:47, 6579:14, 6579:44
simplest [1] - 6580:3
sits [1] - 6579:30

Solicitor ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6571:27
sort [1] - 6578:18
South [1] - 6571:17
SPECIAL [1] - 6581:39
Special [1] - 6571:5
specific [1] - 6575:27
spoken [1] - 6578:42
standing [2]-
6581:26, 6581:30
start [2] - 6572:37, 6576:30
starting [1] - 6575:30
state [1]-6580:42 statement [5] 6573:24, 6573:34, 6573:37, 6574:2, 6575:15
STATEMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ 6573:31
Steer [1]-6571:36
Stephen [1] - 6571:41
Stewart [1] - 6571:37
streaming [1] 6572:32
Street [1] - 6571:16
stressor [1] - 6580:26
strictly [1] - 6580:35
strong [1] - 6575:37
submission [4] 6576:27, 6577:46, 6579:13, 6580:16 submissions [14]6572:44, 6573:16, 6576:8, 6576:10, 6577:8, 6577:19, 6577:24, 6577:31, 6577:42, 6578:7, 6578:10, 6579:41, 6580:10, 6581:18
submit [1] - 6576:38
substance [1] 6572:11
substantial [2] 6576:3, 6576:14
suggesting [2] 6577:43, 6581:5
suggestion [1] 6581:6
suggestive [1] 6577:46
suggests [1] 6579:13
summons [2] 6576:19, 6577:36
summonsed [1] 6576:22
supporting [1] 6576:31
suppress [1] - 6581:6
Sydney [1] - 6571:17

T

| tab [11]-6573:44, |
| :--- |
| $6574: 2,6574: 7$, |
| $6574: 31,6574: 32$, |
| $6574: 41,6575: 4$, |
| $6575: 21,6578: 16$, |
| $6580: 15,6580: 30$ |
| Taylor [1] - 6571:33 |
| Tedeschi [3] - |
| $6571: 31,6581: 23$, |
| $6581: 24$ |
| tendering [1] - |
| $6573: 24$ |

Terms [2] - 6576:42, 6576:43
terms [3]-6576:47, 6577:29, 6580:3
test [1] - 6576:24
Thangaraj [2] -
6571:35, 6572:8
they have [1] - 6579:4
thinking [1] - 6576:46
third [1]-6574:14
three [5] - 6574:15, 6575:44, 6577:21, 6577:43, 6578:41
throw [1] - 6577:33
today [1] - 6579:24
together [3]-6575:14, 6577:19, 6577:20
top [1] - 6573:38
topic [1] - 6575:45
topics [3]-6575:45, 6577:15, 6577:16
towards [1] - 6576:31
transcript [1] - 6581:7
treatment [1] 6581:12
tribunals [1] - 6577:27
trigger [1] - 6577:20
troubled [1] - 6576:15
true [2]-6577:15, 6579:4
Tuesday [1] - 6571:20
two [3] - 6577:45,
6578:9, 6578:38

| $\mathbf{U}$ |
| :--- |
| ultimate [1] - 6578:3 |
| uncontentious [1] - |
| 6574:1 |
| uncontradicted [1] - |
| 6577:37 |
| under [2] - 6574:25, |
| 6577:36 |
| understood [1] - |
| 6574:36 |
| untoward [1] - |

6572:34
unusual [1] - 6577:26
up [2] - 6577:3,
6577:41
upsides [1] - 6577:4

| $\mathbf{V}$ |  | $\mathbf{Y}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| various $[1]-6573: 21$ |  |  |
| view $[8]-6576: 10$, |  | Young $[5]-6571: 40$, <br> $6576: 7,6577: 13$, <br> $6577: 4,6577: 5$, <br> $6577: 10,6577: 12$, <br> $6577: 14,6578: 1$, <br> $6580: 26$ |
|  |  |  |
| $658: 12,6579: 23$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |

6580:23, 6580:29, 6580:34, 6580:45, 6581:5, 6581:14, 6581:18, 6581:28 writing [1] - 6578:11

| W |
| :--- |
| Wentin |

Wales [1] - 6571:17
walk [1] - 6573:5
Wells [1] - 6571:34
widely [1] - 6572:35
Willing [14] - 6571:35,
6571:43, 6572:4,
6572:11, 6575:43,
6576:4, 6576:6,
6576:29, 6577:7,
6577:23, 6577:35,
6579:15, 6579:27,
6579:42
Willing" [1] - 6575:17
wish [2]-6573:39,
6576:37
withdrawn [4] -
6578:12, 6579:5,
6579:24, 6579:42
witness [3] - 6576:19,
6576:22, 6579:44
witnesses [1] -
6577:21
Wood [6] - 6571:43,
6572:1, 6572:30, 6573:8, 6579:7, 6580:12
WOOD [41] - 6572:3,
6572:37, 6572:42, 6573:1, 6573:5, 6573:10, 6573:20, 6573:34, 6573:42, 6574:1, 6574:7, 6574:12, 6574:19, 6574:23, 6574:27, 6574:31, 6574:36, 6574:40, 6574:46, 6575:4, 6575:9, 6575:14, 6575:21, 6575:26, 6575:37, 6575:42, 6578:21, 6578:25, 6578:31, 6578:35, 6578:45, 6579:3, 6580:15,

