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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Heath.
MS HEATH: Commissioner, I appear as Counsel Assisting.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR SHORT: Commissioner, Short, for the Commissioner of Police.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Now, Mr Short, I'm going to say something on the record about some submissions and some other matters. Again, I note your position and I just want you to pass on what I am about to say to others, but you will take a note of it now or you will get the transcript.

MR SHORT: Of course, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Now, what I am about to say concerns the investigative practices hearing. On 10 August 2023, the Inquiry wrote to NSW Police regarding those submissions and a timetable was fixed: Counsel Assisting to serve by 15 September; NSW Police by 29 September.

On 17 August, the police wrote to the Inquiry to complain that the timetable gave Counsel Assisting 4.5 weeks to draft and serve submissions and that they - that is, the police - would only have two weeks. Your client suggested that they be provided until 16 October to serve submissions.

On 5 September, the Inquiry wrote to the police and informed them of a further timetable variation: Counsel Assisting to serve by 15 September; NSW Police by 6 October.

On 29 September, police again wrote to the Inquiry seeking an extension to 13 October. They sought that on the basis that Public Hearing 2 overlapped with the time that the police had to prepare their submissions.

On 2 October, the Inquiry wrote to police and informed them that the timetable for submissions was again varied and that they had until 10am today to file those submissions, and the following was also included in the letter - and this is the message that is of some
significance, and the letter stated:

> Given the finite period in which the Inquiry must complete its work, no further extension would be granted to the provision of written submissions on behalf of the police.

However, at 8.26 pm on 9 October, the police again wrote to the Inquiry and stated that it would not be possible to file materials by 10am today, and, as I understand it, there is some suggestion that the Inquiry may receive material this evening.

Now, everyone has been labouring under difficulties in this Inquiry, and we accept unequivocally that some variations have been needed from time to time to accommodate various parties. Unlike a civil case, there is no capacity for any award of costs and there are few sanctions, but the sanctions may well bite hard.

Now, this is not the first time we have had difficulties with the police, but, leaving that to one side, there is a further problem that has arisen, Mr Short, and it is this - and correspondence has taken place between the relevant parties: in various submissions filed on behalf of the police, there appear to be references in footnotes to documents which have not been tendered in evidence. We think we are right about that. There are references to some academic articles and other matter.

This is unacceptable for any number of obvious reasons. If Mr Tedeschi was here, no doubt he would remind me about issues like procedural fairness, and it goes to the very heart of transparency, but, more to the point, it creates inefficiencies and it means that the Inquiry's staff both have to look for documents which have not been tendered in evidence and have not been put upfront so that the Inquiry can consider both their relevance and the weight of those materials. For example, in the case of some academic articles, are they being tendered just because they are interesting? Are they being tendered because they are meant to be taken as some sort of expert report or expert opinion? It is simply unacceptable.

The practice notes make it plain and obvious: if anybody wants material tendered, you notify the Inquiry,
the Inquiry then has a capacity to consider it. In most cases, it would not be a problem, given some reasonable opportunity on the part of everyone to consider it, but all I can indicate at the moment is that the police have to take on board these various footnotes.

Now, I think, as I have said, correspondence either has gone, or will go, drawing attention to at least 15 or more footnotes where this is relevant.

Now, the problem is that the Practice Guideline needs to be adhered to, and so it is not only going to bite with the current material; anything further that is being put forward by the police, if there are to be any materials that it wants to reference by way of footnote or says the Inquiry should take into account, then both commonsense and courtesy and the Practice Guidelines really suggest that it needs to be brought expressly to the Inquiry's attention so that we can give it the proper consideration.

Secondly, there might be other people who want to be heard on the issue. As you now know, there are individual police officers who, by reason of conflict, are not represented by your client or by your side. There may be other persons who may wish to be heard on those documents, so I go back to the point that has been made over and again about procedural fairness.

Now, therefore, it is obvious that because of the tight time frame that the Inquiry is under, and we are expending public resources - leave your resources to one side; we are responsible for the proper expenditure of public resources - so would you please inform your client that if the investigative practices material is not filed this evening or some time today, as it is suggested will happen, the failure to comply with that and other submissions may result in those submissions not being considered in full or, in some cases, at all, and it will be too late, after the event, for you to say, "We11, I'm sorry, we raised it in footnote $22^{\prime \prime}$ or "We raised it in some submission". This has to be, necessarily, a collaborative effort at this stage of this Inquiry.

Having said that, Mr Short, as I said, I don't expect you to respond, but would you please convey both those sentiments and, when you get the transcript, the detail.

MR SHORT: Yes, Commissioner, I have heard everything you have said and $I$ will pass that along.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you very much. Yes, Ms Heath.

MS HEATH: Thank you, Commissioner.
Commissioner, this is a hearing into the death of Mr Ernest Allan Head.

Can I commence by tendering a single volume of material that comprises the tender bundle in this matter.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS HEATH: I understand that we're up to exhibit 64.

## EXHIBIT \#64 TENDER BUNDLE IN RELATION TO THE DEATH OF ERNEST ALLAN HEAD

MS HEATH: Secondly, Commissioner, can $I$ hand up some short minutes in relation to orders that the parties seek be made pursuant to section 8 of the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act. These orders relate to various redactions sought to documents in the tender bundle and also to pseudonym orders for particular witnesses.

THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right. Pardon me one second.
MS HEATH: Commissioner, I understand they are by consent.
MR SHORT: That is so, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Short.
MS HEATH: And finally, Commissioner, I adopt the written submissions dated 9 October 2023, that I understand you have a copy of.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS HEATH: They have been prepared by Senior Counsel Assisting this Inquiry, Mr Emmett, as well as myself.

Commissioner, the death of Mr Head has been determined to fall within Category $B$ of this Inquiry's Terms of

Reference - that is, his death is an unsolved suspected hate crime death in New South Wales that occurred between 1970 and 2010, where the victim was a member of the LGBTIQ community and the death was the subject of a previous investigation by the NSW Police Force.

It is a case that was not identified or reviewed by Strike Force Parrabell.

Mr Head was killed in his apartment in Summer Hill on or about Thursday, 17 June 1976. He was the victim of a frenzied knife attack, suffering 35 stab wounds to the body and face.

Commissioner, Mr Head's case is one in which the investigations of this Inquiry have resulted in a substantial development. As I will come to submit, the available evidence now indicates the involvement of a known person, Mr Engin Simsek, in the death of Mr Head. Mr Simsek has never previously been connected to Mr Head's death, and I will come to address that evidence in due course.

Commissioner, at this point, I would like to ask for a photograph of Mr Head to be placed on the screen.

Mr Head was born in Penang, now Malaysia, in 1932. He was described by his brother as a quiet, private and good-natured man, who lived alone and was employed as a clerk with the Corporate Affairs Commission. One friend said that he was "soft hearted, kind" and "shy", and that he "took everything that was said to him seriously". Another friend described him as "always immaculate, shirts pressed, not a hair out of place, always spick and span".

Mr Head was a gay man. He had previously been in a three-year live-in relationship, and a diary was found in his flat containing contact details of a number of men with whom Mr Head had had previous sexual contact. Mr Head had disclosed his sexuality to his brother, albeit that the evidence suggests that Mr Head was not out in all contexts.

Commissioner, despite the efforts of this Inquiry, no living family members of Mr Head have been able to be located, and we would encourage any friends or family of Mr Head's that become aware of this hearing to contact the Inquiry.

Commissioner, I turn now to outiine the circumstances of Mr Head's death to the extent that they are known by this Inquiry.

Mr Head was last seen alive on 17 June 1976, when he attended the Bank Hotel in Newtown for a drink with a friend at approximately 5pm. After finishing drinks, the evidence suggests that he attended the Summer Hi11 TAB to place a bet, before returning to his flat in a block of apartments on Grosvenor Street in Summer Hill.

At about 7 pm , two of his neighbours, Ms Walsh and Mr Humphries, overheard Mr Head calling out from his flat. They heard words to the effect of, "Help me", and "Don't hurt me".

Ms Walsh described that there was fear in his voice, and that he called for help about five times. Ms Walsh said that she heard something being thrown around prior to the calling out.

Mr Humphries heard another male voice, and while he couldn't make out the conversation, it appeared that there was an argument going on in the flat.

Mr Humphries went out onto his balcony and called out to Mr Head. He tapped on Mr Head's kitchen window and received no response. Mr Humphries then went to Mr Head's front door. He overheard a conversation between two men. He believed that one of those voices belonged to Mr Head. The conversation was said to be in "quiet tones" that did not indicate that an argument was taking place any longer.

Mr Humphries knocked on the front door of Mr Head's apartment and asked if he was all right. A voice that he believed belonged to Mr Head replied through the door, "No, everything's all right. Would you go away." Mr Humphries returned to his own flat and heard nothing further.

Upon returning to his flat, Mr Humphries twice rang Mr Head's phone. He could hear the ringing from the neighbouring apartment but the phone wasn't answered. However, because Mr Head had sounded "calm" in his conversation through the door, Mr Humphries did not think that anything was wrong but, rather, assumed that Mr Head was embarrassed.

Two women who were in the apartment directly below Mr Head's unit also heard this incident. Ms Dreves heard "footsteps similar to a person running", followed by "a heavy scream". Ms Levendis described a "ye11" that "sounded like 'help '", followed by "a thump like a heavy object hitting something".

Both Ms Dreves and Ms Levendis reported hearing Mr Humphries knocking on the door shortly after the yelling, so we know, Commissioner, that they are describing hearing the same incident.

About one hour after this incident was heard, so at approximately 8pm, Mr Humphries and Ms Walsh were sitting in their 1 iving room watching television and heard the front door of Mr Head's apartment open. They heard a conversation which sounded like two men. Mr Humphries thought that one of the voices belonged to Mr Head and that the conversation was in a manner that "appeared to be normal". Mr Humphries assumed that the other person then left the flat.

Later that night, at about 10.30pm, Ms Levendis, one of the women who was downstairs, heard noises coming from the bedroom of Mr Head's unit. The noise was soft and unidentifiable, but gave her the impression that somebody was moving around the bedroom. She did not hear any other sounds before falling to sleep.

Commissioner, it is submitted that it is likely that the altercation overheard by Mr Head's neighbours was between Mr Head and a person or persons responsible for, or at least involved in, his death. Mr Head was never seen alive again, and the estimate of the time of death at autopsy was consistent with him having been killed that night or early the following morning. It seems entirely improbable that his death was unrelated to the interaction.

Mr Humphries reported hearing only two male voices, both at the time that he first heard the argument and at a later time when he heard the door open. He believed one of the voices belonged to Mr Head, and this would suggest a lone assailant. However, on that hypothesis, Mr Humphries must have been mistaken about hearing a person leaving the apartment.

Alternatively, if Mr Humphries was correct, that a person left the apartment at that point, this, combined with the knowledge that there was at least one living person who remained in the flat that night, would suggest the possibility of two people, in addition to Mr Head, being in the apartment at the time of the altercation.

Mr Head's body was discovered by friends approximately five days after this incident when concerns were raised for his welfare. As I have already said, he was stabbed 35 times to the face and body.

Commissioner, I propose to briefly set out the observations of the crime scene as well as the exhibits that were seized and the results of forensic testing at the time of the original investigation, and I note that the crime predated the era of DNA evidence, and police relied upon blood type analysis.

Mr Head's body was lying naked in the kitchen. There were a large number of blood smears and splashes throughout the apartment. A trail of blood spots led from the bedroom, down the hallway, and into the kitchen where his body was located. All the blood that was tested was found to be consistent with having originated from Mr Head, whose blood type occurred in only 1 per cent of the population.

On the kitchen wall above Mr Head's body were handprints in blood. The original fingerprint examiner was able to determine two palmprints of sufficient quality to be suitable for comparison purposes, and, Commissioner, I will have more to say about those handprints in due course.

In the bedroom, police located a handkerchief that was soaked with semen. Grouping analysis revealed that the semen was consistent with having originated both from Mr Head and from another individual with blood group 0. There was also semen on the penile and anal swabs that were taken from Mr Head post-mortem. All of this evidence, as well as Mr Head's state of undress, was consistent with Mr Head having had sexual intercourse only shortly prior to his death.

A number of cigarette butts were found in the apartment, including one on the floor of the bedroom and a number in an ashtray in the lounge room. These were
found to have saliva that originated from a group 0 individual. Commissioner, this may suggest that the cigarette butts were smoked by the same person whose semen was found on the handkerchief, although I note that the 0 blood type occurs frequently in the population, so care must be taken in drawing that inference.

Police identified that property had been stolen from the unit including a watch, a television, a cassette recorder, a transistor radio and some jewellery. Despite circulating flyers to various pawn shops in the local area, that property was never recovered.

There was no sign of forced entry into the unit, which suggests that Mr Head's assailant or assailants had been allowed into his unit.

The original police investigation was conducted by officers from the Ashfield Police Station, with the assistance of the Special Crime Squad. The investigation was a thorough one. Police pursued multiple lines of inquiry and interviewed over 100 people in relation to Mr Head's death, and I have set out at paragraph 16 of the written submissions a number of the lines of inquiry that police pursued.

Police seized and tested over 50 exhibits, including those that I have already mentioned, such as the semen-soaked handkerchief and the cigarette butts.

Police were, unsurprisingly, alive to the significance of the bloody handprints found above Mr Head's body. Throughout the investigation, a large number of fingerprints and palmprints were obtained from the witnesses that police spoke to. However, there were no matches to the bloody palmprints that were found.

Despite the scope of the original police investigation, no suspects or persons of interest emerged that were not subsequently excluded from the investigation.

A year and a half after Mr Head's death, on 16 December 1977, Coroner Nash found that Mr Head had "died from stab wounds of the chest and abdomen wilfully inflicted by a person or persons unknown".

Commissioner, I turn now to look at the more recent
examinations of Mr Head's case, commencing with reviews by the Unsolved Homicide Team. In March of 2002 and August of 2004, the fingerprint file in Mr Head's case was reviewed by the Unsolved Homicide Team. On both of those occasions, there was no match to any known person.

In 2005, Detective Inspector Jarrett from the Unsolved Homicide Team reviewed Mr Head's case. There are three points that should be noted from his review.

First, Detective Inspector Jarrett organised another review of the fingerprint file. The bloody palmprint was searched on the National Automated Fingerprint Identification System database. I will hereafter refer to that as the "NAFIS" database. Again, there was no match on that database.

Secondly, Detective Inspector Jarrett submitted a report recommending that the unidentified palmprint be sent to overseas jurisdictions for comparison. The evidence suggests that the palmprint was sent to at least Kuala Lumpur, New Zealand, Hong Kong and the United States, without success.

Commissioner, the third point that emerged from Detective Inspector Jarrett's review concerns the other exhibits that had been collected by police. Detective Inspector Jarrett recorded that police had located three labelled and sealed white envelopes, each of which indicated that they contained unfiltered cigarette butts. These white envelopes were sitting in a larger yellow envelope, and that was found on the hard copy of the brief. These cigarette butts had not been logged or stored as exhibits.

Detective Inspector Jarrett arranged for them to be properly logged and also conveyed to a laboratory for forensic testing. When the envelopes were opened, a matchstick was also located. Commissioner, I note that it was some, but not all, of the cigarette butts that had been initially seized by police that were located in those envelopes.

The forensic testing on the cigarette butts in 2005 was ultimately unsuccessful.

Of note, Detective Inspector Jarrett was unable to
locate any of the other exhibits that the original investigating police had seized, so, Commissioner, it would appear that at some point between 1976 and 2005 , those exhibits had been either lost or destroyed. I wil1 return to this point in due course.

Detective Inspector Jarrett ultimately concluded, fairly, that "no further investigative inquiries can reasonably be made without the fingerprint or possible DNA evidence being 1 inked to a particular person".

Commissioner, this review was in 2005 , and it was the final review of Mr Head's death before this Inquiry. Mr Head's death was not reviewed by Strike Force Parrabe11.

Commissioner, I now turn to the recent developments that have occurred in the course of this Inquiry's review of Mr Head's case.

In Apri 1 of this year, the Inquiry requested that a further examination be conducted on the palmprints located above Mr Head's body.

Ms Reid, a Senior Crime Scene Officer and Fingerprint Expert, examined the photographs. Ms Reid identified three palmprints among the bloody marks, which she labelled $B(1)$, $B(2)$ and (B3) for ease of reference, and at this point, I will ask that the photograph of those palmprints be placed on the screen.

Commissioner, you may recall that $I$ earlier said that the original investigating police only identified two palmprints that were suitable for comparison. Ms Reid has explained that at the time of the original investigation, analysis of fingerprints was conducted by the use of a magnifying glass. Modern fingerprint analysis, by contrast, involves the digitisation and digital enhancement of fingerprints. This meant that print (B3), which was of poorer quality than prints $B(1)$ and $B(2)$, was able to be enhanced to the point that it was suitable for comparison.

Ms Reid searched the three palmprints against the NAFIS database. As a result of that search, print $B(1)$ was matched, for the first time, to a known person, Mr Engin Simsek. Ms Reid confirmed the match by a manual comparison.

Mr Simsek's record prints had been taken by police in 1980, and I will return to that timeline in due course.

I note that prints $B(2)$ and (B3) remain unidentified. However, Commissioner, it is important to note that those prints were unable to be compared to the record prints of Mr Simsek. In 1980, when Mr Simsek's prints were taken, police practice was only to capture the upper portion of the palm. Prints $B(2)$ and (B3) capture the lower portion of a palm. So, according1y, the fact that $B(2)$ and (B3) remain unidentified does not indicate that the prints belonged to a person other than Mr Simsek; it simply indicates the comparison cannot be undertaken.

Commissioner, the Inquiry also caused the retesting of the cigarette butts that had been located in 2005. On one of those cigarette butts, a weak partial DNA profile was obtained from an unknown individual. That profile was of such poor quality that it was not suitable to be uploaded onto the DNA database.

As no reference DNA profile is held for Mr Simsek, it could not be determined whether the profile on the cigarette butt belonged to him or to another person. The Inquiry was also unable to locate a sufficiently close living relative of Mr Simsek to provide a DNA profile for familial comparison, so that DNA profile remains unidentified.

Upon learning of the palmprint match, the Inquiry took steps to learn more about Mr Simsek. This included summonsing records about Mr Simsek and also holding a private hearing with a living relative of Mr Simsek, who ultimately provided a voluntary statement to this Inquiry that you will find at tab 76.

Commissioner, I take this moment to publicly express the Inquiry's gratitude to that person for their cooperation with this Inquiry.

What follows is a summary of the information that was able to be ascertained about Mr Simsek.

Mr Simsek was born in Turkey on [REDACTED] 1943.
On 31 May 1972, Mr Simsek emigrated to Australia, where some of his relatives were already residing.

Mr Simsek's arrival card into Australia listed a unit on Grosvenor Crescent, Summer Hill as his intended address, and you may recognise that as being the same street as Mr Head.

We know that Mr Simsek's relatives 1 ived at two addresses on Grosvenor Crescent, Summer Hill at various points between 1970 and 1972, although it cannot be pinpointed precisely where they were 1 iving in 1976. Both addresses on Grosvenor Crescent were less than a two-minute walk from Mr Head's apartment.

While Mr Simsek resided at other addresses, mostly in the Inner West areas of Sydney, he was reported to have resided with his relatives on Grosvenor Crescent for at least some periods of time. Whilst it is unknown precisely where he was living at the time of Mr Head's death, his connection with Grosvenor Crescent suggests an opportunity for Mr Simsek and Mr Head to have come into contact.

There are only scant records of Mr Simsek's life at around the time of Mr Head's death in 1976.

In 1975, Mr Simsek had commenced a de facto relationship with a woman, and in approximately 1979 he had a daughter. The Inquiry has been unable to locate these people due to a lack of details. Between 1976 and 1980, we know that Mr Simsek was working at a factory in Enfield, a suburb approximately 10 minutes from Summer Hill.

In August of 1980, Mr Simsek was convicted of an offence of "malicious injury", relating to an incident in July of that year in which Mr Simsek used a chair to smash a glass window and door and juke box at a shop in Enmore.

This was Mr Simsek's first offence in Australia, and it was the occasion on which police obtained Mr Simsek's fingerprints.

In September 1984, Mr Simsek was arrested in possession of a large quantity of heroin. A search of his residential premises revealed further quantities of heroin and cannabis. Mr Simsek was charged with offences of possessing and supplying a prohibited drug, and in December of 1985 he was convicted in respect of two counts of supplying a prohibited drug and sentenced to six years'
imprisonment.
He was released to parole on 9 July 1986. A report prepared immediately prior to his release described him as a "quiet and seemingly placid individual", noting it was "very difficult to assess [his] level of involvement in the distribution of heroin". Notes from an interview conducted with a relative prior to his release recorded that they characterised him as "a gentle and non-violent man whose involvement in the offences she found hard to explain". This relative further described that he had "great difficulty in talking about his feelings" and "[n]ever talks about his girlfriend or his daughter".

Commissioner, Mr Simsek's New South Wales criminal history contains no offences of violence against a person.

Mr Simsek was reported to be an alcoholic. His alcoholism ultimately caused him to become estranged from his family. It's unknown whether Mr Simsek was gay, bisexual or had sex with men. The Inquiry has not found any evidence of a prior relationship between Mr Simsek and Mr Head.

Mr Simsek departed from Australia on 13 August 1994.
Commissioner, it has been confirmed that Mr Simsek died by suicide on 6 May 1999 in Turkey. At tab 75 of the tender bundle is a newspaper article reporting on his death. The NSW Police Force also assisted the Inquiry with a request through Interpol and received confirmation from Turkish authorities of Mr Simsek's death.

Commissioner, as you would appreciate, the significance of Mr Simsek's death is that there can be no criminal proceedings brought against him in relation to Mr Head's death.

Commissioner, I seek to make submissions to you in relation to what the evidence indicates in relation to Mr Simsek's involvement in Mr Head's death.

It is submitted that the presence of Mr Simsek's palmprint in blood on the kitchen wall above Mr Head's body powerfully indicates that Mr Simsek was at least involved in the events surrounding Mr Head's death.

There can be no doubt that Mr Head was the victim of a violent and frenzied stabbing. Having regard to the position of the palmprint in close vicinity to Mr Head's naked body and surrounded by blood marks originating from Mr Head, it is submitted that the only reasonable inference is that the palmprint was deposited at, or shortly after, the time of Mr Head's killing.

However, much remains unknown about the precise circumstances of Mr Head's death. Among other things, it is impossible to know whether Mr Head was killed by a lone assailant or by more than one person. It is also impossible to know whether Mr Head was killed at the same time as the altercation heard by the neighbours or at some later time. For this reason, while the evidence is consistent with Mr Simsek being responsible for Mr Head's death, it cannot exclude other possibilities that arise on the evidence.

One other relevant circumstance over which uncertainty lingers is whether Mr Simsek had engaged in sexual intercourse with Mr Head prior to his death.

I have already drawn your attention, Commissioner, to the indicators of Mr Head and another person having engaged in sexual activity, including receptive anal intercourse, shortly prior to his death. The trail of blood spots from the bedroom, down the hallway, and into the kitchen is consistent with Mr Head being attacked first in the bedroom, with the attack then continuing into the kitchen where Mr Head's body was ultimately located.

One possibility, therefore, is that the perpetrator had sexual intercourse with Mr Head in the bedroom before embarking on a frenzied and panicked attack on him. Forensic analysis of the exhibits, including the penile and anal swabs, may have been able to shed some light on these circumstances, however, those exhibits have been lost.

Ultimately, while the bloody palmprint is consistent with Mr Simsek being responsible for Mr Head's death, the role that Mr Simsek played in relation to Mr Head's death remains unknown. In view of Mr Simsek's death, it is not now possible for him to answer any allegation that he was responsible for or otherwise involved in Mr Head's death.

Commissioner, having regard to what I have just
outlined, it is submitted that a finding is open that Mr Head died on or about 17 June 1976 in Summer Hil 11 from wilfully inflicted stab wounds of the chest and abdomen. You may also wish to observe that the evidence indicates the involvement of Mr Simsek in the death of Mr Head.

Commissioner, $I$ now turn to make submissions in respect of the police's investigation of Mr Head's death.

I have already observed that the original police investigation was thorough. There are two matters that I wish to make submissions on today. The first relates to the management of exhibits; the second relates to the need for regular reviews of unidentified fingerprints.

The principal concern raised in Mr Head's case, as in many other cases examined by this Inquiry, relates to the retention, preservation, storage and tracking of exhibits. As I have already explained, by 2005, the only exhibits that could be located by the Unsolved Homicide Team were some of the cigarette butts and a match.

The Inquiry issued a summons to the NSW Police Force in relation to the exhibits. The NSW Police Force confirmed that, despite extensive searches of multiple possible locations, no further exhibits could be found. So the position now, as in 2005, is that the majority of the exhibits are missing.

Significant forensic testing opportunities have been lost along with those exhibits. In particular, the semen on the penal and anal swabs and on the handkerchief, and the saliva on the remainder of the cigarette butts are high-yield DNA sources from which it is possible that a DNA profile could have been recovered.

DNA testing of exhibits may have assisted in confirming the identity of Mr Simsek, or shed 1 ight on other aspects of the circumstances of Mr Head's death, such as whether it was Mr Simsek or a third person who had sexual intercourse with Mr Head shortly prior to his death.

While DNA testing was not foreseeable in 1976, physical evidence was nonetheless important for the other kinds of testing that were available at that time. It should have been obvious, by reference to technology of the day, including blood typing technology, that at the very
least, the handkerchief should have been retained as evidence, if not also the cigarette butts and the human hair. It is submitted that the Inquiry can conclude that the loss of exhibits was not consistent with proper police practice, including judged by the standards of 1976.

Had Mr Simsek been alive, the loss of the exhibits might have seriously impaired the prospects of a successful prosecution against him.

Although the palmprint was sufficient to identify a person of interest, this does not detract from the observation that the loss of exhibits in Mr Head's case was unsatisfactory and has hampered the full reinvestigation of Mr Head's death.

Commissioner, returning to the question of the latent fingerprint, as I've noted, the police were in possession of Mr Simsek's record fingerprints since July of 1980, when he was arrested on the charge of malicious injury. Despite this, his fingerprints were not matched to the bloody palmprints until this year, 2023.

I have already noted that there were fingerprint reviews undertaken at the request of the Unsolved Homicide Team in 2002, 2004 and 2005, which failed to identify Mr Simsek.

Ms Reid, the fingerprint expert who reviewed the case, explained that the failure to match on these occasions was because of upgrades to the fingerprint searching algorithm used by the NSW Police Force between then and now. In particular, there was an upgrade to the fingerprint system in 2015 that would have resulted in a more accurate coding of Mr Simsek's record fingerprints.

Ms Reid states that when the palmprint was searched in March of 2023, the NAFIS system was "substantially more technically capable" than at the time of the previous reviews. So, accordingly, it would appear that the NSW Police Force did not have the technological capability at the time of the earlier reviews to identify Mr Simsek.

Commissioner, $I$ note that inquiries are still ongoing as to when that technology first became available in other jurisdictions.

There is, of course, the eight-year time gap between 2015, when there was an upgrade of the fingerprint system, and 2023. Ms Reid explains that, although the upgraded algorithm was available from 2015, the NAFIS database did not, and still does not, automatically re-search latent unidentified prints already on the database. Any search needs to be manually initiated by a fingerprint examiner.

As Mr Head's case reveals, forensic opportunities may be lost if no search of a latent fingerprint is initiated against existing record prints following upgrades in technology. Unidentified fingerprints need to be retested and re-examined at appropriate times.

It is submitted that the 2015 upgrade ought to have served as a prompt to the Unsolved Homicide Team to resubmit any unidentified latent fingerprints for re-examination. That observation may apply to other cases, both within and outside this Inquiry's Terms of Reference. Further upgrades to fingerprint comparison technology should similarly prompt a review by the Unsolved Homicide Team.

Commissioner, the last topic I wish to address you in relation to is whether there is any reason to suspect that Mr Head's death was the result of LGBTIQ bias.

The Inquiry sought the opinion of Dr Sullivan, a consultant forensic psychiatrist, to assess whether any aspects of the manner of Mr Head's death or the crime scene may indicate that the death was a consequence of an LGBTIQ hate crime. Dr Sullivan observed that "the nature and extent of injuries significantly exceed what is necessary to kill a person, and are consistent with an attack occurring in a frenzy, panic or overkill".

As I have already submitted, the available evidence supports there being a temporal proximity between Mr Head engaging in sexual activity and a subsequent frenzied attack. This temporal proximity raises the possibility that the attack was committed in response to, or as a result of, the sexual activity which just took place. This being the case, there is a distinct possibility that Mr Head's death was motivated by LGBTIQ bias, including, for example, being the product of disgust or anger at having participated in sexual intercourse with a man.

The theft of property from Mr Head's unit does not exclude the possibility of LGBTIQ bias. Dr Sullivan observed that it was impossible to determine whether theft was a primary or secondary motive. The nature and extent of the injuries goes well beyond what would be required to effect a robbery.

It is submitted that a binary distinction should not be drawn between a robbery and a bias crime, as this would fail to recognise the possibility that LGBTIQ bias may still be a factor in a property offence.

Having regard to the whole of the available evidence, it is submitted that there is objectively reason to suspect that the attack was motivated by LGBTIQ bias, either in whole or in part. However, without further information as to Mr Simsek's motivations or biases or the precise circumstances surrounding Mr Head's death, it is not possible to arrive at a more positive conclusion.

Commissioner, those are the submissions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR SHORT: The Commissioner of Police seeks to reserve her position and rely on written submissions.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr Short. Thank you, Ms Heath. I will now adjourn, thank you.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6877:21, 6879:34, } \\ & 6887: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { labelled [2] - 6886:29, } \\ & 6887: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { locate }[3]-6887: 1 \text {, } \\ & 6888: 25,6889: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6886:39 } \\ & \text { material [5] - 6878:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nature [2] - 6894:32, } \\ & 6895: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { involved }[3]-6883: 34, \\ 6890: 45,6891: 45 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { laboratory [1] - } \\ & 6886: 37 \end{aligned}$ | located [10] - 6881:45, 6884:24, 6884:35, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6878:47, 6879:13, } \\ & \text { 6879:34, 6880:13 } \end{aligned}$ | natured [1] - 6881:29 necessarily [1] - |
| involvement [5] - | labouring [1] - | 6886:28, 6886:39, | materials [3] - | 6879:41 |
| 6881:18, 6890:6, | 6878:15 | 6886:41, 6887:22, | 6878:11, 6878:40, | necessary [1] - |
| 6890:10, 6890:41, | lack [1] - 6889:27 | 6888:16, 6891:31, | 6879:14 | 6894:33 |
| 892:5 | large [3] - 6884:21, | 6892:20 | Mathew [1] - 6876:34 | need [2] - 6892:13, |
| involves [1] - 6887:37 | 6885:33, 6889:42 | locations [1] - | matter [2]-6878:30, | 6894:12 |
| issue [1] - 6879:22 | larger [1] - 6886:31 | 6892:26 | 6880:13 | needed [1] - 6878:17 |
| issued [1] - 6892:23 | last [2] - 6882:6, | Lockery [1] - 6876:29 | matters [2] - 6877:13, | needs [3] -6879:11, |
| issues [1] - 6878:34 | 6894:24 | logged [2] - 6886:33, | 6892:11 | 6879:18, 6894:7 |
|  | late [1] - 6879:39 | 6886:37 | me" [1] - 6882:16 | neighbouring [1] - |
| J | latent [4]-6893:17, | Ione [2]-6883:44, | means [1] - 6878:36 | 6882:43 |
|  | 6894:5, 6894:10, | 6891:11 | meant [2] - 6878:43, | neighbours [3] - |
| Jarrett [7] - 6886:7 | 6894:17 | look [2]-6878:37, | 6887:38 | 6882:13, 6883:32, |
| 6886:11, 6886:18, | learn [1] - 6888:31 | 6885:47 | member [1] - 6881:3 | 6891:14 |
| 6886:28, 6886:36, | learning [1] - 6888:30 | loss [3] - 6893:4, | members [1] - | never [3] - 6881:20, |
| 6886:47, 6887:7 | least [7] - 6879:8, | 6893:7, 6893:13 | 6881:44 | 6883:34, 6885:12 |
| Jarrett's [1] - 6886:26 | 6883:34, 6884:3, | lost [4] - 6887:4, | men [4] - 6881:38, | New [4] - 6876:19, |
| jewellery [1] - 6885:10 | 6886:21, 6889:16, | 6891:38, 6892:31, | 6882:30, 6883:18, | 6881:2, 6886:22, |
| John [1] - 6876:14 | 6890:45, 6893:1 | 6894:10 | 6890:21 | 6890:15 |
| judged [1] - 6893:5 | leave [1] - 6879:31 | lounge [1] - 6884:47 | mentioned [1] - | newspaper [1] - |
| juke [1] - 6889:34 | leaving [2] - 6878:23, | lower [1] - 6888:9 | 6885:28 | 6890:29 |
| July [3] - 6889:33, | 6883:45 | Lumpur [1] - 6886:22 | message [1] - 6877:47 | Newtown [1] - 6882:7 |
| 6890:3, 6893:19 | led [1] - 6884:22 | lying [1] - 6884:20 | might [2] - 6879:21, | night [3]-6883:24, |
| June [3] - 6881:11, | left [2] - 6883:22, |  | 6893:8 | 6883:37, 6884:4 |
| 6882:6, 6892:2 | 6884:2 | M | minute [1] - 6889:10 | noise [1] - 6883:26 |
| jurisdictions [2]- | Legal [1] - 6876:28 |  | minutes [2] - 6880:23, | noises [1] - 6883:25 |
| 6886:20, 6893:46 | less [1] - 6889:10 | Macquarie [1] - | 6889:29 | non [1] - 6890:9 |
| Justice [1] - 6876:14 | letter [2] - 6877:47, | 6876:18 | missing [1] - 6892:28 | non-violent [1] - |


| 6890:9 | 6895:33 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { nonetheless [1] - } \\ & \text { 6892:44 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { offence [3] - 6889:32, } \\ 6889: 37,6895: 11 \end{gathered}$ |
| normal" [1] - 6883:21 | offences [3] - |
| note [9] - 6877:14, | 6889:44, 6890:10, |
| 6877:15, 6884:16, | 6890:16 |
| 6885:4, 6886:39, | Officer [1] - 6887:24 |
| 6886:47, 6888:4, 6888.5, 6893:44 | officers [2] - 6879:23, |
| 6888:5, 6893:44 |  |
| noted [3] - 6886:9, | one [17] - 6878:23, 6879.31 6880.29 |
| 6893:18, 6893:24 | 6879:31, 6880:29, |
| notes [2] - 6878:46, 6890:7 | 6881:15, 6881:30, |
| 6890:7 | 6882:31, 6883:14, |
| nothing [1] - 6882:39 <br> notify [1] - 6878:47 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6883:19, 6883:24, } \\ & \text { 6883:42, 6884:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| noting [1] - 6890:5 | 6884:46, 6885:21, |
| NSW [10] - 6876:34, | 6888:16, 6891:12, |
| 6877:22, 6877:24, | 6891:20, 6891:33 |
| 6877:35, 6881:5, | ongoing [1] - 6893:44 |
| 6890:30, 6892:23, | open [3] - 6883:17, |
| 6892:24, 6893:32, | 6883:42, 6892:1 |
| 6893:41 | opened [1] - 6886:38 |
| number [7] - 6878:32, | opinion [2] - 6878:44, |
| 6881:38, 6884:21, | 6894:28 |
| 6884:45, 6884:47, | opportunities [2] - |
| 6885:24, 6885:33 | 6892:30, 6894:9 |
|  | opportunity [2] - |
| 0 | 6879:3, 6889:18 |
|  | orders [3] - 6880:23, |
| object [1] - 6883:7 | 6880:25, 6880:27 |
| objectively [1] - | organised [1] - |
| 6895:14 | 6886:11 |
| observation [2] - | original [8]-6884:16, |
| 6893:13, 6894:18 | 6884:29, 6885:18, |
| observations [1] - | 6885:38, 6887:1, |
| 6884:14 | 6887:32, 6887:34, |
| observe [1] - 6892:4 | 6892:10 |
| observed [3] - | originated [3] - |
| 6892:10, 6894:32, | 6884:25, 6884:37, |
| 6895:3 | 6885:1 |
| obtained [3] - | originating [1] - |
| 6885:34, 6888:18, | 6891:4 |
| 6889:38 | otherwise [1] - |
| obvious [4] - 6878:32, | 6891:45 |
| 6878:46, 6879:29, | ought [1] - 6894:15 |
| 6892:46 | outline [1] - 6882:2 |
| occasion [1] - | outlined [1] - 6892:1 |
| 6889:38 | outside [1] - 6894:19 |
| occasions [2] - | overheard [3] - |
| 6886:4, 6893:30 | 6882:14, 6882:30, |
| occurred [3] - 6881:2, | 6883:32 |
| 6884:26, 6887:17 | overkill" [1] - 6894:35 |
| occurring [1] - | overlapped [1] - |
| 6894:35 | 6877:40 |
| occurs [1] - 6885:5 | overseas [1] - 6886:20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { October [7]-6876:22, } \\ \text { 6877:30, 6877:36, } \end{gathered}$ | own [1] - 6882:39 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6877:39, 6877:43, } \\ & 6878: 9,6880: 38 \end{aligned}$ | P |
| OF [2] - 6880:19, | palm [2] - 6888:9, |

6888:10
palmprint $[10]-$
6886:12, 6886:19, 6886:21, 6888:30,
6890:44, 6891:3,
6891:6, 6891:40,
6893:11, 6893:37
palmprints [9] -
6884:30, 6885:34,
6885:36, 6887:21,
6887:26, 6887:28,
6887:33, 6887:42,
6893:22
panic [1]-6894:35
panicked [1] -
6891:35
paragraph [1] -
6885:23
pardon [1] - 6880:29
parole [1] - 6890:3
Parrabell [2] - 6881:8, 6887:14
part [2] - 6879:3,
6895:16
partial [1] - 6888:17
participated [1] -
6894:46
particular [4] -
6880:27, 6887:10,
6892:31, 6893:33
parties [3] - 6878:18,
6878:26, 6880:23
pass [2]-6877:14,
6880:2
pawn [1] - 6885:11
penal [1] - 6892:32
Penang [1] - 6881:27
penile [2]-6884:39,
6891:36
people [4]-6879:21,
6884:5, 6885:22,
6889:27
per [1] - 6884:26
period [1] - 6878:3
periods [1] - 6889:16
perpetrator [1] -
6891:33
person [20]-6881:19,
6883:4, 6883:21,
6883:33, 6883:45,
6884:2, 6884:4,
6885:3, 6885:45, 6886:5, 6887:44,
6888:12, 6888:24, 6888:38, 6890:16,
6891:12, 6891:25,
6892:40, 6893:12, 6894:34
person" [1] - 6887:10
persons [4] - 6879:25,

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6883:33, 6885:39, } \\ & \text { 6885:45 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6895:26 } \\ & \text { positive }[1]-6895: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { phone [2] - 6882:42, } \\ & 6882: 43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { possessing [1] - } \\ & 6889: 45 \end{aligned}$ |
| photograph [2] - | possession [2] - |
| 6881:25, 6887:28 | 6889:42, 6893:18 |
| photographs [1] - | possibilities [1] - |
| 6887:25 | 6891:17 |
| physical [1] - 6892:44 | possibility [6] |
| pinpointed [1] - | 6884:5, 6891:33, |
| 6889:9 | 6894:40, 6894:43, |
| place [5] - 6878:25, | 6895:2, 6895:10 |
| 6881:34, 6882:10, | possible [6] - |
| 6882:33, 6894:42 | 6878:11, 6887:9, |
| placed [2]-6881:25, | 6891:44, 6892:26, |
| 6887:29 | 6892:34, 6895:19 |
| placid [1] - 6890:5 | post [1] - 6884:40 |
| plain [1] - 6878:46 | post-mortem [1] - |
| played [1] - 6891:42 | 6884:40 |
| point [9]-6878:35, | powerfully [1] - |
| 6879:26, 6881:24, | 6890:45 |
| 6884:2, 6886:25, | practice [4] - 6878:46, |
| 6887:3, 6887:5, | 6879:17, 6888:8 |
| 6887:27, 6887:40 | 6893:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { points [2] - 6886:9, } \\ & 6889: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Practice [1] - 6879:11 practices [2] - |
| Police [13] - 6876:34, | 6877:21, 6879:34 |
| 777:8, 6877:22 | precise [2] - 6891:9, |
| 6877:24, 6877:35, | 6895:17 |
| 6881:5, 6885:19, | precisely [2] - 6889:9, |
| 6890:30, 6892:23, | 6889:16 |
| 6892:24, 6893:32, | predated [1] - 6884:17 |
| 6893:41, 6895:25 | premises [1] - |
| police [34]-6877:26, | 6889:43 |
| 6877:29, 6877:33, | prepare [1] - 6877:41 |
| 6877:38, 6877:41, | prepared [2] - |
| 6877:43, 6878:7, | 6880:43, 6890:4 |
| 6878:9, 6878:23, | presence [1] - |
| 6878:27, 6879:4, | 6890:43 |
| 6879:14, 6879:23, | Present [1] - 6876:32 |
| 6884:17, 6884:35, | preservation [1] |
| 6885:8, 6885:18, | 6892:18 |
| 6885:21, 6885:25, | pressed [1] - 6881:34 |
| 6885:27, 6885:31, | previous [3] - 6881:4, |
| 6885:35, 6885:38, | 6881:39, 6893:39 |
| 6886:27, 6886:28, | previously [2] - |
| 6886:41, 6887:2, | 6881:20, 6881:36 |
| 6887:32, 6888:1, | primary [1] - 6895:4 |
| 6888:8, 6889:38, | Principal [1] - 6876:29 |
| 6892:10, 6893:4, | principal [1] - 6892:16 |
| 203:18 | print [2]-6887:38, |
| police's [1] - 6892:8 | 6887:43 |
| poor [1] - 6888:19 | prints [10]-6887:39, |
| poorer [1] - 6887:39 | 6888:1, 6888:4, |
| population [2]- | 6888:6, 6888:7, |
| 6884:26, 6885:5 | 6888:9, 6888:11, |
| portion [2] - 6888:8, | 6894:6, 6894:11 |
| 88:9 | private [2]-6881:28, |
| position [4]-6877:14, | 6888:33 |
| 6891:3, 6892:27, | problem [3] - 6878:24, |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6879:2, 6879:11 } \\ & \text { procedural }{ }_{[2]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6884:9, 6892:16 } \\ \text { raises [1] - 6894:40 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6887:25, 6887:33, } \\ & \text { 6887:42, 6887:45, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6889:43 } \\ & \text { residing [1] }-6888: 47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { scene [2] - } 6884: 14, \\ & 6894: 30 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6878:34, 6879:27 | rang [1] - 6882:41 | 6893:29, 6893:37, | resources [3] - | scope [1] - 6885:38 |
| proceedings [1] - | rather [1] - 6882:46 | 6894:3 | 6879:31, 6879:33 | scream" [1] - 6883:5 |
| 6890:36 | re [3]-6894:5, | reinvestigation [1] - | respect [2] - 6889:46, | screen [2] - 6881:25, |
| product [1] - 6894:45 | 6894:13, 6894:18 | 893:1 | 6892:8 | 6887:29 |
| profile [7]-6888:17, | re-examination [1] - | relate [1] - 6880:25 | respond [1] - 6879:45 | sealed [1] - 6886:29 |
| 6888:18, 6888:22, | 6894:18 | relates [3]-6892:12, | response [2] - | search [5] - 6887:43, |
| 6888:23, 6888:26, | re-examined [1] - | 6892:13, 6892:17 | 6882:29, 6894:41 | 6889:42, 6894:5, |
| 6888:27, 6892:35 | 6894:13 | relating [1] - 6889:32 | responsible [5] - | 6894:6, 6894:10 |
| prohibited [2] - | re-search [1] - 6894:5 | RELATION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 6879:32, 6883:33, | searched [3] - |
| 6889:45, 6889:47 | really [1] -6879:17 | 6880:19 | 6891:16, 6891:41, | 6886:13, 6887:42, |
| prompt [2]-6894:16, | reason [4]-6879:23, | relation [8] - 6880:23, | 6891:45 | 6893:37 |
| 6894:21 | 6891:15, 6894:25, | 6885:22, 6890:36, | resubmit [1] - 6894:17 | searches [1] - 6892:25 |
| proper [3]-6879:19, | 6895:14 | 6890:40, 6891:42, | result [4]-6879:37, | searching [1] - |
| 6879:32, 6893:4 | reasonable [2] - | 6892:24, 6894:25 | 6887:43, 6894:26, | 6893:31 |
| properly [1] - 6886:37 | 6879:2, 6891:5 | relationship [3] - | 6894:42 | second [2] - 6880:29, |
| property [4]-6885:8, | reasonably [1] - | 6881:37, 6889:25, | resulted [2] -6881:16, | 6892:13 |
| 6885:12, 6895:1, | 6887:9 | 6890:22 | 6893:34 | secondary [1] - |
| 6895:11 | reasons [1] - 6878:33 | relative [4] - 6888:26, | results [1] - 6884:15 | 6895:4 |
| propose [1] - 6884:13 | receive [1] - 6878:13 | 6888:33, 6890:8, | retained [1] - 6893:1 | secondly [3] - |
| prosecution [1] - | received [2] - 6882:29, | 6890:11 | retention [1] - 6892:18 | 6879:21, 6880:22, |
| 6893:9 | 6890:31 | relatives [3] - 6888:47, | retested [1] - 6894:12 | 6886:18 |
| prospects [1] - 6893:8 | recent [2]-6885:47, | 6889:6, 6889:15 | retesting [1] - 6888:15 | section [1] - 6880:24 |
| provide [1] - 6888:26 | 6887:16 | release [2] - 6890:4, | return [2] - 6887:4, | seek [2]-6880:23, |
| provided [2] - | receptive [1] - | 6890:8 | 6888:2 | 6890:39 |
| 6877:30, 6888:34 | 6891:26 | released [1] - 6890:3 | returned [1] - 6882:39 | seeking [1] - 6877:39 |
| provision [1] - 6878:5 | recognise [2] - | relevance [1] - | returning [3] - | seeks [1] - 6895:25 |
| proximity [2] - | 6889:3, 6895:10 | 6878:39 | 6882:10, 6882:41, | seemingly [1] - 6890:5 |
| 6894:38, 6894:40 | recommending [1] - | relevant [3] - 6878:26, | 6893:17 | seized [4] - 6884:15, |
| pseudonym [1] - | 6886:19 | 6879:9, 6891:20 | revealed [2] - 6884:36, | 6885:27, 6886:41, |
| 6880:27 | record [6] - 6877:13, | relied [1] - 6884:17 | 6889:43 | 6887:2 |
| psychiatrist [1] - | 6888:1, 6888:6, | rely [1] - 6895:26 | reveals [1] - 6894:9 | semen [6] - 6884:36, |
| 6894:29 | 6893:19, 6893:35, | remain [2]-6888:4, | review [7]-6886:9, | 6884:37, 6884:39, |
| public [2] - 6879:31, | 6894:11 | 6888:11 | 6886:12, 6886:26, | 6885:3, 6885:29, |
| 6879:33 | recorded [2] - | remainder [1] | 6887:12, 6887:13, | 6892:31 |
| Public [1] - 6877:40 | 6886:28, 6890:8 | 6892:33 | 6887:17, 6894:21 | semen-soaked [1] - |
| publicly [1] - 6888:37 | recorder [1] - 6885:10 | remained [1] - 6884:4 | reviewed [5] -6881:7, | 6885:29 |
| purposes [1] - | records [2] - 6888:32, | remains [3]-6888:27, | 6886:3, 6886:8, | Senior [3]-6876:30, |
| 6884:31 | 6889:21 | 6891:9, 6891:43 | 6887:14, 6893:29 | 6880:43, 6887:24 |
| pursuant [1] - 6880:24 | recovered [2] | remind [1] - 6878:33 | reviews [5] - 6886:1, | sent [2]-6886:20, |
| pursued [2] - 6885:21, | 6885:12, 6892:35 | replied [1] - 6882:37 | 6892:14, 6893:25, | 6886:21 |
| 6885:25 | REDACTED [1] - | report [3] - 6878:44, | 6893:40, 6893:42 | sentenced [1] - |
| put [2] - 6878:38, | 6888:44 | 6886:19, 6890:3 | ringing [1] - 6882:42 | 6889:47 |
| 6879:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { redactions [1] - } \\ & 6880: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported }[4]-6883: 9 \text {, } \\ 6883: 40,6889: 14 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | robbery [2] - 6895:6, $6895 \cdot 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sentiments [1] - } \\ & 6879: 46 \end{aligned}$ |
| Q | refer [1]-6886:14 | 6890:18 | role [1] - 6891:42 | September [6] - |
|  | reference [4] - | reporting [1] - | room [2] - 6883:16, | 6877:24, 6877:33, |
| quality [3] - 6884:30, | 6879:15, 6887:27, | 6890:29 | 6884:47 | 6877:35, 6877:38, |
| 6887:39, 6888:19 | 6888:22, 6892:46 | represented [1] - | running [1] - 6883:4 | 6889:41 |
| quantities [1] | Reference [2]- | 6879:24 |  | seriously [1] - 6893:8 |
| 889:43 | 6881:1, 6894:19 | request [2] - 6890:31, | S | seriously" [1] - |
| quantity [1] - 6889:42 | references [2] - | 6893:25 |  | 6881:32 |
| quiet [3] - 6881:28, | 6878:27, 6878:30 | requested [1] - | Sackar [1] - 6876:14 | serve [4] - 6877:23, |
| 6882:32, 6890:5 | regard [3] - 6891:2, | 6887:20 | saliva [2]-6885:1, | 6877:28, 6877:30, |
|  | 6891:47, 6895:13 | required [1] - 6895: |  | 6877:35 |
| R | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regaraing } \\ & \text { 6877:22 } \end{aligned}$ | resided [2] - 6889:13, | 6878:20 | set [2] - 6884:13, |
| radio [1] - 6885:10 | regular [1] - 6892:14 | 6889:15 | scant [1] - 6889:21 | 6885:23 |
| raised [4] - 6879:40, | Reid [8] - 6887:24, | residential [1] - | Scene [1] - 6887:24 | sex [1] - 6890:21 |

sexual [9] - 6881:39, 6884:42, 6891:21, 6891:26, 6891:34, 6892:41, 6894:39 6894:42, 6894:46 sexuality [1] - 6881:40 shed [2]-6891:37, 6892:38
shirts [1] - 6881:33
shop [1] - 6889:34
shops [1] - 6885:11
short [2]-6878:24, 6880:23
Short [6] - 6876:34, 6877:7, 6877:12, 6879:44, 6880:35, 6895:30
shortly [5] - 6883:10, 6884:42, 6891:6, 6891:27, 6892:41
shy [1] - 6881:31
side [3] - 6878:24, 6879:24, 6879:32
sign [1] - 6885:14
significance $[3]$ 6878:1, 6885:31, 6890:35
significant [1] 6892:30
significantly [1] 6894:33
similar [1] - 6883:4
similarly [1] - 6894:21
simply [2] - 6878:44, 6888:12
Simsek [37]-6881:19, 6881:20, 6887:45, 6888:7, 6888:12, 6888:22, 6888:26, 6888:31, 6888:32, 6888:33, 6888:42, 6888:44, 6888:46, 6889:13, 6889:19, 6889:24, 6889:28, 6889:31, 6889:33, 6889:41, 6889:44, 6890:18, 6890:20, 6890:22, 6890:25, 6890:27, 6890:45, 6891:16, 6891:21, 6891:41, 6891:42, 6892:5, 6892:38, 6892:40, 6893:7, 6893:27, 6893:42

## Simsek's [16] -

 6888:1, 6888:7, 6889:1, 6889:6, 6889:21, 6889:37, 6889:38, 6890:15, 6890:32, 6890:35,6890:41, 6890:43, 6882:11
6891:43, 6893:19,
6893:35, 6895:17
single [1] - 6880:12
sitting [2] - 6883:15, 6886:31
six [1] - 6889:47
sleep [1] - 6883:29
smash [1] - 6889:34
smears [1] - 6884:21
smoked [1] - 6885:3
soaked [2] - 6884:36, 6885:29
soft [2] - 6881:31, 6883:26
Solicitor [2]-6876:29, 6876:30
something" [1] 6883:7
sorry [1] - 6879:40
sort [1] - 6878:43
sought [3] - 6877:39, 6880:26, 6894:28
sounded [3] 6882:44, 6883:6, 6883:18
sounds [1] - 6883:29
sources [1] - 6892:34
South [3] - 6876:19,
6881:2, 6890:15
span" [1] - 6881:34
SPECIAL [1] - 6895:33
Special [3] - 6876:7,
6880:24, 6885:20
spick [1] - 6881:34
splashes [1] - 6884:21
spots [2] - 6884:22, 6891:27
Squad [1] - 6885:20
stab [3]-6881:12,
6885:44, 6892:3
stabbed [1] - 6884:10
stabbing [1] - 6891:2
staff [1] - 6878:37
stage [1] - 6879:42
standards [1] - 6893:5
state [1] - 6884:41
statement [1] -
6888:34
States [1] - 6886:22
states [1] - 6893:37
Station [1] - 6885:19
steps [1] - 6888:31
still [3] - 6893:44,
6894:5, 6895:11
stolen [1] - 6885:8
storage [1] - 6892:18
stored [1] - 6886:33
Street [2] - 6876:18,
street $[1]-6889: 3$
Strike [2] - 6881:8, 6887:14
subject [1] - 6881:4 submission" [1] 6879:41
submissions [18] 6877:13, 6877:22,
6877:28, 6877:31,
6877:41, 6877:44,
6877:46, 6878:6,
6878:26, 6879:37,
6880:38, 6885:24,
6890:39, 6892:7,
6892:12, 6895:21, 6895:26
submit [1] - 6881:17 submitted [10] -
6883:31, 6886:18,
6890:43, 6891:5,
6892:1, 6893:3,
6894:15, 6894:37,
6895:8, 6895:14
subsequent [1] 6894:39
subsequently [1] 6885:40
substantial [1] 6881:17
substantially [1] 6893:38
suburb [1] - 6889:29
success [1] - 6886:23
successful [1] 6893:8
suffering [1] - 6881:12
sufficient [2] -
6884:30, 6893:11
sufficiently [1] 6888:25
suggest [4]-6879:17, 6883:43, 6884:4, 6885:2
suggested [2] 6877:30, 6879:35
suggestion [1] 6878:12
suggests [5] -
6881:41, 6882:9,
6885:15, 6886:21,
6889:18
suicide [1] - 6890:28
suitable [4]-6884:31, 6887:33, 6887:40, 6888:19
Sullivan [3] - 6894:28, 6894:32, 6895:2 summary [1] 6888:41

Summer [7]-6881:10,
6882:9, 6882:11,
6889:2, 6889:7,
6889:29, 6892:2
summons [1] -
6892:23
summonsing [1] -
6888:32
supplying [2] 6889:45, 6889:47
supports [1] - 6894:38
surrounded [1] 6891:4
surrounding [2] 6890:46, 6895:18
suspect [2] - 6894:25, 6895:14
suspected [1] -
6881:1
suspects [1] - 6885:39
swabs [3] - 6884:39,
6891:37, 6892:32
Sydney [2] - 6876:19, 6889:14
system [3] - 6893:33,
6893:38, 6894:2
System [1] - 6886:14

| $\mathbf{T}$ |
| :---: |
| TAB $_{[1]}-6882: 9$ |
| tab [2] $-6888: 35$, |
| 6890:28 |

talks [1] - 6890:13
tapped [1] - 6882:28
Team [7]-6886:2,
6886:4, 6886:8,
6892:20, 6893:26,
6894:16, 6894:22
technically [1] 6893:39
technological [1] 6893:41
technology [5] -
6892:46, 6892:47,
6893:45, 6894:12,
6894:20
Tedeschi [1] - 6878:33
television [2]6883:16, 6885:9
temporal [2] 6894:38, 6894:40
tender [3]-6880:13,
6880:26, 6890:29
TENDER[1] - 6880:19
tendered [5] -
6878:28, 6878:38,
6878:41, 6878:42,
6878:47
tendering [1] -

6880:12
Terms [2] - 6880:47, 6894:19
tested [2] - 6884:24, 6885:27
testing [7] - 6884:15,
6886:38, 6886:44
6892:30, 6892:37,
6892:43, 6892:45
theft [2]-6895:1,
6895:3
therefore [2] -
6879:29, 6891:33
they have [1] 6880:43
third [2]-6886:25, 6892:40
thorough [2] 6885:21, 6892:11
three [5] - 6881:37, 6886:8, 6886:28, 6887:25, 6887:42
three-year [1] -
6881:37
throughout [2] 6884:21, 6885:33
thrown [1] - 6882:20
thump [1] - 6883:6
Thursday [1] -
6881:11
tight [1] - 6879:30
timeline [1] - 6888:2
timetable [4] -
6877:23, 6877:27,
6877:34, 6877:44
TO [1] - 6880:19
today [4] - 6877:45, 6878:11, 6879:35, 6892:12
tones [1]-6882:32
took [3] - 6881:32,
6888:30, 6894:42
topic [1] - 6894:24
tracking [1] - 6892:18
trail [2]-6884:22, 6891:27
transcript [2] 6877:16, 6879:46
transistor [1] 6885:10
transparency [1] 6878:35
Tuesday [1] - 6876:22
Turkey [2] - 6888:44, 6890:28
Turkish [1] - 6890:32
turn [4] - 6882:2, 6885:47, 6887:16,
6892:7
twice [1] - 6882:41

| two [13] - 6877:29, | 6892:20, 6893:25, | 6883:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6882:13, 6882:30, | 6894:16, 6894:21 | weak [1] - 6888:17 |
| 6883:2, 6883:18, | unsolved [1] - 6881:1 | weeks [2]-6877:28, |
| 6883:40, 6884:5, | unsuccessful [1] - | 6877:29 |
| 6884:30, 6887:32, | 6886:45 | weight [1] - 6878:40 |
| 6889:6, 6889:10, | unsurprisingly [1] - | welfare [1] - 6884:10 |
| 6889:46, 6892:11 | 6885:31 | West [1] - 6889:14 |
| two-minute [1] - | up [2] - 6880:17, | whilst [1]-6889:16 |
| 6889:10 | 6880:22 | white [2]-6886:29, |
| type [3] - 6884:18, | upfront [1] - 6878:38 | 6886:31 |
| 6884:26, 6885:5 | upgrade [3] - 6893:33, | whole [2] - 6895:13, |
| typing [1] - 6892:47 | 6894:2, 6894:15 | 6895:16 |
|  | upgraded [1] - 6894:3 | wilfully [2] - 6885:44, |
| U | upgrades [3] - | 6892:3 |
|  | 6893:31, 6894:11, | window [2] - 6882:28, |
| ultimately [6] - | 6894:20 | 6889:34 |
| 6886:45, 6887:7, | uploaded [1] - | wish [4]-6879:25, |
| 6888:34, 6890:19, | 6888:19 | 6892:4, 6892:12, |
| 6891:31, 6891:40 | upper [1] - 6888:8 | 6894:24 |
| unable [4]-6886:47, |  | witnesses [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6888:6, 6888:25, } \\ & \text { 6889:26 } \end{aligned}$ | V | 6880:27, 6885:35 |
| unacceptable [2] - | variation [1] - 6877:34 | women [2]-6883:2, |
| 6878:32, 6878:44 | variations [1] - | 6883:25 |
| uncertainty [1] - | 6878:17 | words [1] - 6882:15 |
| 6891:20 | varied [1] - 6877:44 | wounds [3] - 6881:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { under [2] - 6878:15, } \\ & 6879: 30 \end{aligned}$ | various [6] - 6878:18, <br> 6878.26, 6879.5 | 6885:44, 6892:3 |
| undertaken [2] - | 6880:25, $085 \cdot 11$ | written [4] - 6878:6, |
| $6888: 13,6893: 25$ | 6889:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 6880: 37,6885: 24, \\ & 6895: 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| undress [1] - 6884:41 | vicinity [1] - 6891:3 | wrote [6]-6877:22, |
| unequivocally [1] 6878:16 | victim [3] - 6881:3, | $6877: 26,6877: 33,$ |
| unfiltered [1] - | view [1] - 6891:43 | 6877:38, 6877:43, 6878:10 |
| 6886:30 | violence [1] - 6890:16 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unidentifiable [1] - } \\ & 6883: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { violent }[2]-6890: 9, \\ & 6891: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Y |
| unidentified [8] - | voice [3] - 6882:18, | year [6] - 6881:37, |
| 6886:19, 6888:4, | 6882:23, 6882:36 | 6885:42, 6887:20, |
| 6888:11, 6888:28, | voices [4]-6882:31, | 6889:33, 6893:22, |
| 6892:14, 6894:6, | 6883:19, 6883:40, | 6894:1 |
| 6894:12, 6894:17 | 6883:43 | years' [1] - 6889:47 |
| unit [7] - 6883:3, | volume [1] - 6880:12 | yell [1] - 6883:5 |
| 6883:26, 6885:9, | voluntary [1] - | yelling [1] - 6883:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6885: 14,6885: 16 \\ & 6889: 1,6895: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 6888:34 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yellow }[1]-6886: 31 \\ & \text { yield }[1]-6892: 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| United [1] - 6886:22 | W | [1] 6892.34 |
| unknown [5] - |  | Z |
| 6888:18, 6889:16, | Wales [3] - 6876:19, |  |
| 6890:20, 6891:9, | 6881:2, 6890:15 | Zealand [1] - 6886:22 |
| 6891:43 | walk [1] - 6889:11 |  |
| unknown" [1] - | wall [2]-6884:28, |  |
| 6885:45 | 6890:44 |  |
| unlike [1] - 6878:18 | Walsh [4]-6882:13, |  |
| unrelated [1] - | 6882:18, 6882:19, |  |
| 6883:38 | 6883:15 |  |
| unsatisfactory [1] - 6893:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wants [2] - } 6878: 47, \\ & 6879: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Unsolved [7] - 6886:2, | watch [1] - 6885:9 |  |
| 6886:4, 6886:7, | watching [1] - |  |

