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THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I note you are here today, having previously indicated your requirement for leave. I think we gave you and others leave some time ago.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you, Mr Commissioner. I appear today with Mr Mykkeltveldt. Ms Richards has unfortunately had to go away for a family emergency but will be here later in the week.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr Gray.
MR MADDEN: Commissioner, could I announce my appearance with your leave. Madden, solicitor, and I appear for Sergeant Geoffrey Steer.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Madden. I think again we indicated by correspondence that leave was granted. Thank you so much.

MR MADDEN: Yes, you did, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, you would have received a letter from those instructing me on Friday which indicated that we wished to make oral submissions to you in relation to the material proposed to be tendered and evidence proposed to be called this week.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR TEDESCHI: With your permission, we would seek to do that early in the piece, this morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: By all means, I think it is important that if you are going to make those submissions you do so sooner rather than later. I agree.

What I might do is get Mr Gray just briefly to open this part of the hearing. He is cognisant of your desire. He will accommodate that, so we will get back to you fairly swiftly, I think.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: May I just ask you in advance - and it may or may not be relevant - Mr Crandell is here, is he?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, in uniform in the back of the room.
THE COMMISSIONER: He is welcome in uniform or not in uniform, so there you go.

Al1 right, yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Commissioner, this is the second of the public hearings of the Special Commission of Inquiry into LGBTIQ Hate Crimes. The Special Commission is inquiring into deaths suspected of being LGBTIQ hate crimes in the 40 -year period between 1970 and 2010.

By its Terms of Reference, the Special Commission is expressly required to have regard to a number of earlier reports, including the report and findings of Strike Force Parrabe11.

Strike Force Parrabell was a review by the NSW Police carried out between 2015 and 2018 of historical records relating to more than 80 deaths. Those deaths had occurred between 1976 and 2000 and by 2015 had been widely publicised as actually or possibly involving what might now be called anti-LGBTIQ bias.

The resulting Parrabell report in June 2018 was in two parts. The first part was the work of the police officers who carried out that historical paper review exercise, and the second part was a review by a team of academics retained by the NSW Police of the work of those police officers.

The Inquiry has also identified Strike Force Neiwand and Strike Force Macnamir as other relevant investigations conducted by NSW Police into possible homicides against LGBTIQ people during the relevant period, to which it is necessary to have regard as well.

Further, in light of the Inquiry's Terms of Reference, it is important for the Inquiry to have regard generally to the ways in which NSW Police have approached the matter of suspected hate or bias crimes, including the identification, investigation and recording of such crimes.

This second hearing will be conducted in two stages.
The first stage will commence today and will occupy some or
all of this week and next. The second stage will take place on dates to be fixed in February 2023.

It is expected that this public hearing will include evidence relating to, firstly, Strike Force Parrabell and its final report, including the methodologies used by the Parrabell police officers on the one hand and the academic team on the other; secondly, Strike Force Neiwand and Strike Force Macnamir, including the reasons for their establishment; and thirdly, changes in the approach of the NSW Police to the identification, investigation and recording of suspected hate or bias crimes, including the relevant history of the Bias Crime Unit as variously named and configured over the years.

On 20 September 2022 the Inquiry requested the NSW Police to provide witness statements from a number of police officers and from two of the academics who carried out the academic review of the work of the Parrabell police officers, and in due course such statements were provided.

It is anticipated that the following witnesses will be called to give oral evidence in this second hearing: firstly, Assistant Commissioner Anthony Crandell, who was the commander of Strike Force Parrabell and is the former NSW Police Corporate Sponsor for Sexuality, Gender Diversity and Intersex; secondly, Shobha Sharma, who is the Manager, Policy and Programs Team, Crime Prevention Command; thirdly, Sergeant Geoffrey Steer, formerly Hate Crime Coordinator and Bias Crime Coordinator and former team leader of the then Bias Crime Unit; and fourthly, Sergeant Ismail Kirgiz, who is the current Hate Crime Coordinator from the Engagement and Hate Crime Unit.

It is anticipated that the witnesses at the second stage of this hearing, in early 2023, will include Detective Sergeant Steven Morgan, Investigation Supervisor for Strike Force Neiwand, and Professors Derek Dalton and Willem de Lint, members of the Flinders University academic review team. There is also likely to be additional lay and expert evidence.

The four reports expressly referred to in the Terms of Reference, including the final report of Strike Force Parrabell, were received in evidence at the first public hearing of the Inquiry last month and are collectively exhibit 1. A tender bundle for the November hearing became
exhibit 2. For this hearing, I seek to have received into evidence the December tender bundle, which consists of 10 volumes in all, including two supplementary volumes. This tender bundle contains, in particular, firstly, a number of witness statements; secondly, various documents obtained by way of summons, mainly from the NSW Police and also from other sources; and, thirdly, various relevant publications, including academic articles and media reports.

There have been a series of requests in recent times by the NSW Police for certain material in the tender bundle to be redacted. The Inquiry has considered these requests and has made redactions such as to personal or sensitive information of witnesses and victims; the names of then juvenile offenders; phone numbers and email addresses of New South Wales police officers; information that could reveal confidential sources; and information that may prejudice ongoing investigations or criminal trials. The Inquiry has also applied pseudonyms to the names of persons such as unrelated victims, confidential witnesses and persons of interest.

The material in this tender bundle is directly relevant to the present hearing and also to the work of the Inquiry generally. I would suggest that it be received as exhibit 6. Commissioner, you may wish to do that now or you may wish to first hear what Mr Tedeschi has to say about the matters that he wishes to raise.

Before, Commissioner, you rule on that point, I should say one further thing before Mr Crandell is called, which is this: on 21 November at the opening of the November hearing, I sought to tender as part of exhibit 2 the statement of Stephen McCann, which was at tab 11 of exhibit 2, and two letters prepared by Stephen McCann dated 10 August 1991 and 15 April 1991, they being tabs 136 and 137 of exhibit 2 respectively.

At that time, Mr Mykkeltvedt, on behalf of the Commissioner of Police, sought additional time for his client to consider her position in relation to those documents. I can indicate that the tender of those three documents as part of exhibit 2 is no longer pressed. However, the statement of Stephen McCann dated 10 November 2022 and redacted versions of those two letters of 10 August 1991 and 15 April 1991 are now included in the December tender bundle which, as I say, might perhaps
become exhibit 6, at tabs 233, 233A and 233B.
As I say, I would propose that the December tender bundle would become exhibit 6 , and subject to the matters that my friend wishes to raise, I would call Mr Crandell.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Now, Mr Tedeschi, first, do you have any objection to me marking this as exhibit 6 before I hear you?

MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour, our submissions go to the relevance of many of those documents, so we would submit that you, Commissioner, should hear us first before admitting those documents into evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR TEDESCHI: We would also wish to have our instructing solicitor just quickly review those folders to make sure that the documents that are there are the versions that we have agreed to. We haven't had an opportunity to see the final volumes of documents and I don't think even my learned friend has had that opportunity, so we would just wish to check to make sure.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it probably doesn't make very much difference if you have some time to do that. It is better that you are not confused about the exercise, so by all means, take whatever time is necessary. What I will do is I will defer the exhibit 6 for two reasons: first, to let you, in the first instance, put whatever you are going to put on the relevance; and, second, to enable your solicitor to check that it is with the various redactions or whatever else has been agreed, by all means.

All right, Mr Tedeschi, let me understand what your position is.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we wish to make oral
submissions in support of the letter that was sent to you by the General Counsel of the NSW Police last Friday, 2 December. We would just like to check that you have received that letter?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have, thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: We are concerned that this Inquiry focus on
what are the real issues that have been raised for your consideration by the Terms of Reference from the Governor, and we wish to provide some assistance to you, Commissioner, by way of submissions on what we would suggest are the main focus of the evidence this week and next.

Commissioner, we suggest that the main focus of attention this week, and possibly into next week, seems to be on four distinct topics: firstly, the creation of the Bias Crime Unit, by whatever name, in the NSW Police Force and the criteria that were adopted by that unit for the characterisation of hate crimes, predominantly by Sergeant Steer; secondly, the creation of Operation Parrabell and its methodology; thirdly, the creation of Task Force Parrabe11 and its methodology; and fourth1y, the contract between the NSW Police and some academics from Flinders University to provide an independent review of Task Force Parrabell's report.

We submit to you, Commissioner, that the focus of these topics is outside the Terms of Reference that govern this Inquiry. We submit that it is apparent from the Terms of Reference and from the circumstances in which your Inquiry has been set up that those who advised the Governor do not wish for this Inquiry to be a review of the establishment or the methodology of past inquiries, and especially where those inquiries were not investigations into the manner and cause of death of members of LGBTIQ communities.

We suggest, in fact, it is quite the contrary. We respectfully submit that your Terms of Reference make it clear that you are to avoid unnecessary duplications and to have regard to - merely have regard to - the three previous inquiries that are in paragraph $C$ of the Terms of Reference.

That does not mean, we submit, that those who advised the Governor expect you to review the adequacy of those findings in those three reports.

THE COMMISSIONER: May I just interrupt so that I understand as we go. The Terms of Reference, you say, merely, in effect, direct me to note the contents of those reports and do no more?

MR TEDESCHI: Perhaps I could elaborate on that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Would you answer that question in the first instance: do they direct me to merely note the contents of those reports and do no more?

MR TEDESCHI: And not to investigate the adequacy --
THE COMMISSIONER: Is that to do no more? Mr Tedeschi, I'm just trying to understand the point.

MR TEDESCHI: The answer is yes, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so therefore I read them, I note the contents, and what do I then do? Am I bound by them? Do I just say they are interesting or what do I do with them?

MR TEDESCHI: Might I come to that in the course of my submissions?

THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
MR TEDESCHI: What we submit, Commissioner, is that paragraphs $A$ and $B$ of your Terms of Reference specifically direct you to inquire into the manner and cause of death in unsolved cases of suspected hate crime murders of persons who come within those categories of LGBTIQ communities.

Commissioner, we submit that the four topics that I have mentioned that are to be raised this week and into next week, and many of the documents foreshadowed to be tendered by counsel assisting, in no way assist you to determine the manner and cause of death of members of those communities, which we submit should be the entire focus of your Inquiry.

We submit that it is clear from the Terms of Reference that those who advised the Governor did not want you to write a history of the varying approaches and tactics of the NSW Police towards hate crimes. Neither did they wish you to conduct a review of whether those Flinders University professors were the right people to review Task Force Parrabell or whether their review was adequate or inadequate. Neither did they wish you to conduct a review of how the Hate Crime Unit or Operation Parrabell or Strike Force Parrabell came to be in existence and whether or not
their methodology was appropriate, or whether the criteria for designation of a crime as a hate crime were adequate or inadequate.

Now, Commissioner, we would refer you to the final report of the Gay and Transgender Hate Crimes Inquiry in the New South Wales Legislative Council Standing Committee on Social Issues that led to the creation of this present Inquiry. Recommendation 1 of that inquiry was:

That the NSW Government establish a judicial inquiry or other form of expert review to inquire into unsolved cases of suspected gay and transgender hate crime deaths.

At paragraph 2.92 of that report on page 21 , that inquiry, in their final report, said this:

> Over the course of the two inquiries, there have been mounting calls for a judicial inquiry to be established as the means by which unsolved cases of suspected gay hate crime, including those resulting in death, are reinvestigated.

Finally, Commissioner, could I take you to the committee's comments at page 34 in paragraphs 2.106 to 2.108 , in which that committee said:

The committee acknowledges the call of inquiry participants across both inquiries seeking the reinvestigation of all unsolved cases of suspected gay and transgender hate crime, including those resulting in death. In particular, the committee shares the hope inspired by the outcome of the --
and then there is a reference to a case --
that [investigation] will prove fruitful.
While the committee notes the suggestion that police investigations can proceed without a judicial inquiry, the committee is of the view that a judicial inquiry is the most appropriate avenue for pursuing
justice for victims of historical gay and transgender hate crimes. Particularly in light of the receding window of opportunity to obtain evidence from people who may have been involved, witnessed or have knowledge of those decades old crimes, the committee believes that the coercive powers of a judicial inquiry will assist in piecing together an accurate account of the crimes being investigated.

The committee therefore recommends that the NSW Government establish a judicial inquiry or other form of expert review to inquire into unsolved cases of suspected gay and transgender hate crimes deaths.

Following that, your Honour, the relevant minister, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the Hon David Elliott, published to that standing committee a letter dated 4 November 2021, in which was attached a chart in which the New South Wales Government responded to the various recommendations of the standing committee.

Recommendation 1, the one that recommended the establishment of a judicial inquiry, had this as the government's response:

Supported.
The NSW Government supports the establishment of a judicial inquiry or other form of expert review to inquire into unsolved cases of suspected gay and transgender hate crime deaths.

The impact of unsolved hate crimes on victims, survivors, their loved ones and family and friends is immeasurable. The evidence presented to the inquiry showed how the associated grief and trauma has affected the lives of so many. Solving these crimes and delivering justice can help in the healing process.

The NSW Police Force continues to actively seek new information from the community in relation to unsolved gay and transgender
hate crimes with mechanisms at its disposal including Crime Stoppers, which regularly makes appeals to the public in relation to unsolved cases. Government rewards have also provided assistance where appropriate in successfully bringing perpetrators before the courts. Consideration of rewards in consultation with families and loved ones of the victims forms part of the Unsolved Homicide Review process.

That was attached to a letter in which the minister said to the chair of that committee:

Please find attached the response of the NSW Government to the recommendations.

Now, Commissioner, we submit that that material which forms the basis for the Terms of Reference that were drafted by those who advised the government --

THE COMMISSIONER: And what relevance legally do you say the report, or recommendations of the parliamentary committee and/or the open letter of the minister, has in relation to the construction of the Terms of Reference? Do you say it is extraneous material, do you, as I would be if I were construing a statute --

MR TEDESCHI: Precisely.
THE COMMISSIONER: You put your hand towards me as if to acknowledge - no, I just want it for the transcript, what you are telling me is $I$ passed that exam. All right.

Now, tell me as a matter of law, Mr Tedeschi, in the context of construction of Terms of Reference unlike that of a statute and unlike the Interpretation Act of New South Wales, how it is that I construe the Terms of Reference by reference to extraneous remarks made by the minister, not with the Terms of Reference in front of him, nor the Parliament of New South Wales equally without the Terms of Reference in front of them. They were simply statements which were conforming to their own views in both cases and expressing support for the Inquiry, but they both pre-dated the actual Terms of Reference in this case, did they not?

MR TEDESCHI: They did indeed, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: So apart from support from various sections of the community, the parliament, and on the other hand the minister, would you be kind enough to answer my question precisely as a matter of law, what relevance do those statements have to do with the construction of the Terms of Reference?

MR TEDESCHI: What we submit, Commissioner, is that they assist you in understanding what we submit are the very clear words of the Terms of Reference itself, and they support our submissions on what those Terms of Reference mean.

THE COMMISSIONER: Insofar as the point you wish to make namely, that a principal focus of the Terms of Reference is clearly manner and cause of death - the issue for me this morning is whether that is the sole focus, and at some point no doubt you will come to the Terms of Reference, because I think it's that document which is the foundation stone of this Inquiry that needs to be looked at.

MR TEDESCHI: Indeed. Indeed, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I wonder if you would do that, subject of course to your own submissions, sooner rather than later.

MR TEDESCHI: What we submit, Commissioner, is that some of the material which your counsel assisting has indicated is going to be tendered this week, is going to be made available to the general public --

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, this is another point, then, is it?

MR TEDESCHI: There are really two points there, the relevance issue and also the issue of what should be made available to the public.

THE COMMISSIONER: But that's an entirely different point.
MR TEDESCHI: It is a totally different point.
THE COMMISSIONER: This is the first time I have heard in fact, would you just tell me, it hasn't been tendered yet but it no doubt will become an exhibit, in Ms Marsic -

I think it is Ms Marsic, isn't it, who is instructing you in her letter, would you be kind enough to tell me where in that letter she refers to her concerns, other than relevance, in material being made public?

MR TEDESCHI: In the letter that was --
THE COMMISSIONER: I took the letter to be, as it were, an early warning - I don't put that disrespectfully - of the essence and substance of your submission. I must say when I read it, apart from other matters to which a reference may be made, the first eight paragraphs appear to me to be directed to questions of relevance governing - and she helpfully refers to the relevant statute and the Terms of Reference. But I didn't see any note there about concern about these documents being available to members of the public.

MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour, paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 refer directly to our concerns about the limitations, the restrictions and the limitations on this Inquiry --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but no particular --
MR TEDESCHI: -- without identifying individual documents.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, you and your side know fully well the length of time over which we have been acquiring documents from your client and the efforts that both sides have made, I accept with goodwill, to try to remove any material at all that would jeopardise prosecutions.

You may also be aware that on 6 and 7 June this year I had a private hearing with representatives of your client for the very purpose of identifying those matters which may be the subject of outstanding prosecutions. There is no doubt that the Terms of Reference require me to avoid such problems and I think, unless you can point to a particular document that raises a particular problem, not just generic objections, you will find the Commission and its staff ready to accommodate your clients in relation to genuine and substantive complaints or concerns about confidentiality.

MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour, it is one thing - I am sorry, Mr Commissioner, it is one thing for your Inquiry, your
counsel, to obtain a whole host of documents with a view to finding those that are relevant to be tendered. It's another thing for your counsel to identify those documents which are going to be tendered, and another thing again to identify those documents that are going to be made public.

We only received a list of the tender bundle for this week --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi --
MR TEDESCHI: -- one week ago.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, please. If your concern today on behalf of the NSW Police is that you need more time to consider the content of any document, you will not have any opposition from the Commission, and indeed, the correspondence, some of which may be tendered or become public itself in due course, will indicate an iterative process between solicitors who are instructing Mr Gray, his counsel assisting him and others. There is no question that you won't be given time to select out those documents which you can justifiably indicate might indicate to the public, if they were released, something or other which should not be in the public interest out there.

MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour, our concern goes over and above that, and it is --

THE COMMISSIONER: What is it? It is just getting documents out there which are irrelevant. I understand that point.

MR TEDESCHI: We have two generic concerns on which we would wish to make submissions to you, Commissioner, today.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, you can, but you know what, I am entitled, having read the letter, to direct you to matters which are of concern to me.

MR TEDESCHI: Indeed.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, we have both been around long enough to know that that is a perfectly appropriate way to try to get to the heart of the problem. Please continue.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I hope to get to the heart of the problem in due course, and I should reiterate that we have two concerns, one of which is that much of the evidence to be led this week is irrelevant to the Terms of Reference; and our subsidiary concern, which is allied to that in a way, is that we are very concerned that even though there are a lot of documents that we don't have any specific objection to parts of them being redacted, because we have reached agreement with your counsel assisting, we have an overall concern about whether it is in the interests of the Inquiry for many of these documents to be placed in the public arena. So if I might address those two issues.

THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we submit that some of the material which your counsel assisting has indicated is going to be tendered this week, and is going to be made available to the general public, should be the subject of serious consideration by you prior to it being made publicly available. We refer in particular to the case summaries prepared by Task Force Parrabell, and there are some other case summaries in which there are detailed descriptions of the circumstances of 88 deaths and a summary of the police evidence that had been obtained as at that time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I hesitate always to interrupt counsel, but I don't know whether you are aware of this or not, but I understand - perhaps I have been misinformed - that the case summaries have been on your table, not yours personally, perhaps, for some time, and I understood, perhaps wrongly again, that any number of accommodations have already been made. Now, are you telling me this morning either (a) you are unaware of that process or (b) notwithstanding that process, you are now instructed by the Commissioner of Police NSW, today, to take objection, fresh objection, to all of the case summaries all over again?

MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour, it is more akin to the latter.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, when you say "more akin to the latter", what on earth does that mean?

MR TEDESCHI: What we are suggesting is not that we have
a technical legal objection to the material but that it may well run counter --

THE COMMISSIONER: But, Mr Tedeschi, I am really trying, obviously against a deadline of 30 June next year, to get this matter off and running in its various respects. What I am anxious to do is understand not so much in generic terms - that's important because you are instructed to put them - but a lot of the matters that you are now referring to will either die or not die in the detail. To say that both sides, as I understand it - and I may be misinformed have reached accommodation on certain of the case summaries, you come into the matter and you say, "No, but I think, notwithstanding the fact that we cannot really say that there is any problem in the existing case summaries, as a matter of prudence, seemliness, decency" - I don't know what it is - "we don't think you should make them public."

> I take it you have read Mr Gray's opening?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: I take it that you have read carefully the detail to which he went to in respect of a number of the cases - not all, but a number?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Do you say that that should now be, what, marked confidential?

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we understand that it is still the intention of counsel assisting to tender the Strike Force Parrabell report into those 88 cases, with the redactions --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I'm going to stop you again. We are going to proceed this way. Number 1, I will hear you on the generic complaint or submission that there are four topics that I can't look into. I am not going to spend the day with, if I may say so for my own part, general remarks without specificity about documents.

Now, I will hear particular arguments, if you wish, in due course - I think next week we have a hearing that is going to take place in relation to annexures to Mr Morgan's
affidavit. Now, as far as I'm concerned, I will give your side every opportunity, if accommodation can't be reached, to be heard on specific documents.

MR TEDESCHI: We would ask that the Parrabell report not be placed into the public arena in the meantime.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, please correct me if I'm wrong - would you please get instructions from those around you, and I could be wrong - my understanding is that the Parrabell report is a matter of public record and published and available on the internet as we speak.

MR TEDESCHI: Not the case summaries. I'm referring to the case summaries.

THE COMMISSIONER: You said "the Parrabel1 report".
MR TEDESCHI: I meant the case summaries.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will come back to the point I was at. As far as individual documents or categories of documents are concerned, I cannot deal with that and I will not deal with that generically. It's neither fair to your side or to anybody else, and particularly the public of New South Wales. If you want to make a generic submission and not descend into the detail, I will deal with it at a high level.

MR TEDESCHI: I'm ready to do that now, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: When you say "descend", what do you mean, Mr Tedeschi?

MR TEDESCHI: What we submit is that the case summaries prepared by Task Force Parrabel1 --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I will say it one more time. As present, anything that falls into a particular category, such as case summaries, names of informants, the usual categories of material that would more often than not be redacted - I don't say case summaries would - I will hear individual arguments aside. I'm anxious to get Mr Crandell into the witness box, if that's possible, and others. I will hear you on the generic concerns that you have in the first instance about the creation of the crime unit and the other matters, the four matters you have
identified.
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we are not seeking to suggest that the case summaries are not admissible before you. They are clearly --

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know whether you heard me, Mr Tedeschi. What I'm trying to do for efficiency purposes is simply to divide up, if it's possible, the arguments on the Bias Crime Unit, the Parrabell strike force, et cetera, et cetera, as topics for my investigation and deal with that issue.

I would then, of course, give you and your side every opportunity, over and above any accommodations that may have been made, if you want to say whatever you want to say today, tomorrow, the next day, about the particular documents, either as classes of documents or by reason of the particular detail in documents, but $I$ see that as being a different issue - that is, if I may put it this way, a case-by-case analysis of particular documents or case summaries, unless you say no case summary should go out for whatever reason. But if the four points that you have made are a discrete argument, I would prefer to get that done, have a look at the Terms of Reference and the provisions of the Act either today or whenever is convenient to you and Mr Gray. I will deal with other matters.

But what I suspect I will need - it is an old-fashioned term, Mr Tedeschi - I suspect I will need some further and better particulars; in other words, I will need you to state quite precisely in relation to classes of documents or particular documents by letter or otherwise, because letters don't seem to work in this case because there has been a bit of a moving feast about what is agreed and what is not agreed, but, that said, if you can let me know in court or by letter precisely what you wish to have excised or not in the public view, I will constitute a separate hearing for that purpose.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: If that is convenient, for example, if we were to deal with any additional documents for tender at some other point or later today, but I am anxious in the first instance, because of the form of the letter, to deal with the four main topics that you have outlined, and
unless you tell me it can't be done this way, it doesn't seem to me that it can't be done as a discrete issue. Either those matters do fall or they don't fall within my Terms of Reference.

If they do fall, then I would reserve unto you, of course, particular documents or particular concerns you might have about particular documents, but I think in the first instance, your main point, as I understood Ms Marsic's letter, was that $I$ can't look into the matters that you have articulated as the four areas, and I am anxious to deal with that as a preliminary point, as it were, or as a separate issue, and then, once I have done that, then that will set the scene for any further debate, perhaps.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, what we submit in relation to those four categories is that what was intended by those who advised the Governor in setting up your Inquiry was that you use the wide powers under the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act in an attempt to determine those deaths in which fresh evidence may eventually lead to prosecutions for murders of members of LGBTIQ communities.

We submit that it is clear from the Terms of Reference that this Inquiry is not meant to be a recitation or analysis or assessment of past events; rather, it is an opportunity for the future to elicit those cases in which further admissible evidence could lead to possible prosecutions.

Our submission is that what your Terms of Reference task your Inquiry to do is to locate those few cases - and it might be that ultimately they can be numbered on the fingers of one hand - from the, I think, 220 boxes of material that we have provided to your counsel assisting, to isolate those few cases that warrant further investigation and in which you, as Commissioner, may be able to use the coercive powers that are available to you to further those investigations to the point where either the police can conduct further investigations or where prosecutions can be commenced.

To put it another way, we submit that your Inquiry should inform the Governor whether or not there are other cases like the recent case that I won't mention the name of, because it is subject to a trial at this stage, in
which further investigations may result in the disclosure of additional evidence and the launching of prosecutions.

It may be that your Inquiry can identify cases in the following categories: firstly, locating some witnesses who have not been questioned before; secondly, locating some witnesses who may have been previously --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I am terribly sorry to do this again. What you are putting to me, if I may say so, is obvious from the terms of $A$ and $B$ of the Terms of Reference. Make no mistake about it, if your side of the Bar table thinks that we are not actively looking at those matters, and that's one of the reasons why we have asked your client, who, if I may say so with great respect, is probably in some respects the sole, if not the sole repository of relevant information concerning investigations done in the past, I don't need to be told what is bleeding obvious in $A$ and $B$. What $I$ do need to be told, if I may say so, sooner rather than later, with some precision, is as to why the four topics fall outside.

I put the point back to you again. If your preliminary argument is that my sole activity is $A$ and $B$, everything else is to be noted and nothing more, and therefore, for me to go into one or other of the four topics identified puts me outside my Terms of Reference, I understand that. What I would be assisted by is not what I know I can do and what you tell me now, if I may say so on a number of occasions, I can do. We are in furious agreement. I don't need to be told what I can investigate. What I need you to tell me is why I can't do one of the four topics. Do I make myself plain?

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, it is very plain, very clear.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, then, sooner rather than later can we get to the point?

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, what we submit is that paragraphs $A$ and $B$ of your Terms of Reference specifically direct you and direct you solely to the manner and cause of death in various cases.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, okay, thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: It directs you in regard to that - namely,
the investigation of manner and cause of death - to have regard to the three previous inquiries that are referred to. It directs you, in conducting that inquiry - that inquiry being determining the manner and cause of death of certain persons - to look in an appropriate manner for evidence and information, including testimony from witnesses, in a way that avoids unnecessary duplication and minimises trauma to witnesses, and we would submit that should also apply to the families of deceased persons.

Paragraph E, to avoid prejudice to criminal investigations, including future criminal investigations --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I'm reading it with you and I must confess, this is not being read by me for the first time.

MR TEDESCHI: I am sure it is not. But what we respectfully submit is that there is nothing there --

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Tell me what work $F$ has to do, would you mind?

MR TEDESCHI: There is nothing there --
THE COMMISSIONER: Tell me what work $F$ has to do in the Terms of Reference.

MR TEDESCHI: That's precisely what I'm coming to, Commissioner. I was just about to come to F.

THE COMMISSIONER: Excellent.
MR TEDESCHI: $I$ have done $D$ and $E$ and $I$ 'm now coming to $F$.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: You are not required to inquire into a particular matter to the extent that you are satisfied that the matter has been sufficiently and appropriately dealt with or will be sufficiently and appropriately dealt with.

What we submit is that that requires you, Commissioner, to look at the evidence that has been obtained in particular matters that come within the categories and to determine whether or not the results of
inquiries to date warrant additional investigation either by your staff or by the Commissioner of Police.

THE COMMISSIONER: So you say, so that I understand the point, $F$ excludes me forming any satisfaction at all about the appropriateness and sufficiency of Parrabell?

MR TEDESCHI: It does not require you to --
THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not asking you about requirements. I would respectfully ask you --

MR TEDESCHI: I'm trying to answer your question.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm not sure. Just let me think out loud and then you tell me if my thoughts are erroneous.

Paragraph F says that I am not required - in other words, another view of that might be "not necessary" - to inquire into or continue into a particular matter, not defined, pretty broad, to the extent that I am satisfied that the matter has been or - and leaving "will be" - has been sufficiently and appropriately dealt with by another inquiry.

If you go back to C, I am asked, indeed, I am directed in conducting this Commission, to have regard to the findings of previous inquiries and reports, and I'm specifically directed to Parrabell.

Parrabell is one of a number of particular matters. So you tell me, if you will, as a matter of law, why and how I would reach a level of satisfaction if I am not entitled to investigate the methodology of a particular matter that I am asked to pay regard to?

MR TEDESCHI: Because, Commissioner, paragraph F states that you are not required to inquire into a particular matter to the extent that you are satisfied --

THE COMMISSIONER: Correct.
MR TEDESCHI: -- that the matter has been sufficiently and appropriately dealt with by another inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. So you tell me that the Terms of Reference are to be construed on this basis:

I must regard Parrabell as having been appropriate and sufficiently inquired into? In other words, I am not entitled to have a satisfaction in accordance with $F$ because I am told that Parrabell, by implication, because it's not express, is something about which I am not able to form a view, I have to accept, on the face of it, that the inquiry or that the report was both sufficient and appropriate; I must not go to it because the Terms of Reference restrict me from ever forming any views at all about the sufficiency or appropriateness of a particular matter, eg, the findings of Parrabell?

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner --
THE COMMISSIONER: Is that your construction?
MR TEDESCHI: No, it is not.
THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, well, tell me what it is you say.
MR TEDESCHI: What we submit is that if you combine paragraphs $C$ and $F$, that those advising the Governor do not want you to go into an analysis of whether or not Parrabell was well set up or well motivated or what its methodology was to look into it --

THE COMMISSIONER: So, put another way, I am not able to form any view as to whether Parrabell was appropriate or sufficient?

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, what you are being tasked with is to look at the evidence that has been obtained --

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you answer my question, please.
MR TEDESCHI: I'm attempting to do that.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't think you are, Mr Tedeschi. I put a direct question to you. I would like a response to assist me. If you are going to say in front of me today that I am not to inquire into Parrabell, then I need to understand in simple terms - or complex terms - do you say that $F$ precludes me from coming to any view or investigating whether Parrabell was a sufficient and appropriate outcome?

MR TEDESCHI: We submit that you, Commissioner, looking
at all of the Terms of Reference in their entirety, not just $F$ on its own but the whole of the Terms of Reference, would come to the conclusion that those who advised the Governor did not want you to inquire into the adequacy or inadequacy of Parrabell or the Standing Committee on Social Issues or the AIDS Council of NSW, but merely to have regard to the material which they have unearthed or summarised or produced and then for your Inquiry to determine whether there should be further inquiry --

THE COMMISSIONER: So to be relevant to the community of New South Wales, because Terms of Reference are a request or a direction by the executive for some person to provide information in the public interest, I have to, even if I thought, let's say, ACON got it wholly wrong in relation to their manner and cause cases, or I think that Parrabell's methodology was flawed, or that the parliamentary committee did not hear from A, B or C or questions weren't asked, I simply say, "Well, never mind, those inquiries remain warts and all, flawed. I read them, they are interesting, but they are bedside reading because I am not going to look at them." And am I entitled to express a view as to whether I think they were flawed inquiries?

MR TEDESCHI: We submit that's not what you are being tasked with.

THE COMMISSIONER: I am told really take as read, and does that mean that you will ultimately put to me some submission that I have to accept Parrabell's classification of a particular case?

MR TEDESCHI: Not at all; quite the contrary.
THE COMMISSIONER: So how do I investigate, if I may ask, whether or not to accept your submission ultimately that Parrabell's conclusion on case $X$ was appropriate unless I have a look at how they got to their conclusion?

MR TEDESCHI: Because your staff have been provided with 77,000 electronic documents and 220 boxes of documents with which to form a view whether, in any particular case, it warrants further investigation and whether or not further information --

THE COMMISSIONER: But isn't it relevant in the public
interest for me to look at the question of a publicly available report like Parrabell, and do you tell me that if I were to deign to disagree with any expression of opinion in that, I couldn't tell the public of New South Wales, "Police force of New South Wales looked at case X. They then had academics have a look at it as well, and they decided, for example, no evidence of bias crime." I've got to look at case X. Let's assume it's one of the unsolved cases. But do you say to me I can look at X but I must dare not say that the NSW Police were wrong in their attitude on case $X$ ? Is that what you are saying?

MR TEDESCHI: I'm not suggesting --
THE COMMISSIONER: Well then, how do I form a view as to whether I disagree or agree ultimately with Parrabell unless I understand how they went about their task and precisely what methodology they used?

MR TEDESCHI: With respect, the setting up and methodology is not the relevant information for you, Commissioner. The relevant information is the case summaries and the conclusions.

THE COMMISSIONER: But I'm not allowed to publish that but I can't publish those because that will be the second rung of the argument, so is --

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, is it possible for me to make submissions to you? Because I'm continually interrupted.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is entirely possible for you to make submissions. It is also appropriate that you answer direct questions. Now, you go on --

MR TEDESCHI: I'm attempting to answer questions but I'm not able to finish my answers.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, please proceed and finish the argument when it is convenient to do so. I will take a break probably about 11.30, but I don't need to take it then if you are mid flight. Of course I will continue. There is no clock in here, Mr Tedeschi. It is about 5 to 11. But don't rush, take all the time you need.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we are not suggesting that you can't disagree with Parrabell. What we are suggesting is
that --
THE COMMISSIONER: How would I disagree, with a Ouija board or a coin, or am I entitled to understand the reasoning process, and insofar as I am entitled to understand the reasoning process, am I not entitled to understand the methodology?

MR TEDESCHI: You have the underlying documentation that was used.

THE COMMISSIONER: What do you want me to do? You would prefer me, what, to do that all privately and then come out at some point and say "Well, on case X, Parrabell says this but I don't agree but I don't propose to tell the police, nor the public of New South Wales, why I disagree." Do you think that's what is intended in a public inquiry?

MR TEDESCHI: No. What we are suggesting, what we are submitting, is that with the assistance of your staff, your counsel and your staff, that you have access to the underlying material, and what the Governor hopes for you to do is to go through that material to decide for yourself whether or not it is a hate crime; to decide for yourself whether or not the investigation can be progressed further; to make a decision, if it is to be progressed further, whether that is to be done by you and those that assist you or whether it is to be given to the police to conduct. It's very similar to the task that is faced by a coroner in an inquest.

Mr Commissioner, the Terms of Reference paragraphs A and $B$ are identical to the terms in the Coroners Act that govern the conduct of an inquest. We submit that that provides really an irrefutable indication of the way in which the Governor wishes you to conduct this Inquiry; namely, to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant the prosecution of any person and whether - and for you --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I don't know whether you feel repetition makes the point better. We are, I will say it hopefully for the last time, in furious agreement about A and B. I don't think there is one thing you have said to me this morning so far that I would disagree with.

MR TEDESCHI: I think where we are in disagreement,

Commissioner, is that it is not a necessary part of that exercise and is not a task that accords with your Terms of Reference to go into past history and look at the way in which Parrabell was set up, the way in which it conducted itself, whether the --

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. So if that is right, I am entitled, am I, to ignore Parrabel1 entirely?

MR TEDESCHI: No; quite the contrary.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR TEDESCHI: You are directed to have regard to Parrabe 11 by paragraph C

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR TEDESCHI: But we submit that whether Parrabe11 was wel1 set up or not wel1 set up, whether their methodology was good or not --

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, using your terminology, please give me what you say is the content of "have regard to".

MR TEDESCHI: The content that you would have regard to is - -

THE COMMISSIONER: No, not the content of what I look at; tell me what the words that you have just used, I am entitled to have regard to, tell me what that means in relation to Parrabell: what am I entitled to have regard to?

MR TEDESCHI: You, Commissioner, should have regard to those three previous inquiries and their reports.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, Mr Tedeschi, in relation to Parrabell, please tell me, assist me on behalf of the NSW Police Force - would you kindly tell me your terminology, in relation to Parrabell, what am I entitled to have regard to?

MR TEDESCHI: You are entitled to have regard to the report, including the case summaries of the final report of Strike Force Parrabell.

THE COMMISSIONER: Am I entitled to have any regard to how they came about their classifications?

MR TEDESCHI: We submit that's not relevant to your Inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. How would I then have regard to Parrabell in the sense of trying to make sense of whether I agreed with it or not, unless I tried to understand why they did what they did?

MR TEDESCHI: As I've already submitted to you, Commissioner, you have the primary source materials with which to form your own view --

THE COMMISSIONER: So I'm to have regard to Parrabell but I'm not to have regard to the way in which they formed their views?

MR TEDESCHI: That's why your Terms of Reference are structured in that way.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand. You are repeating yourself. So "have regard to", then without me being unfair, means read it and then privately come to a view about each of the individual cases that Parrabell looked at?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: So when I am told to have regard to Parrabell, in effect, it's note the fact that it occurred and leave it at that?

MR TEDESCHI: It may well assist you and those that --
THE COMMISSIONER: How do you think it would assist me, then, in relation to --

MR TEDESCHI: Assist you to have a summary of the case.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, how would Parrabell assist me if I didn't try to understand how they came about their views?

MR TEDESCHI: Because it is a ready reckoner summary of the case with which to assist you and those that assist you
in reviewing the material that formed the basis of each investigation.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR TEDESCHI: I don't think there is anything further I can submit in that regard.

THE COMMISSIONER: What I will do, then, Mr Tedeschi, is this: I will hear from Mr Gray and I will hear you in response. I will then form a view about this relevance issue as a discrete topic. I will then, as I have indicated, reserve unto your clients the desire, perhaps, to put specific - subject to me forming a view as to these four matters, if you want to put further and specific arguments in relation to particular documents, let's say, if that arises, both in terms of sensitivity, confidentiality, inappropriateness, whatever - and I'm not trying to be exclusive in the topics; in relation to Mr Morgan next week there are quite specific claims for confidentiality - but I would hear your client in respect of any or all outstanding matters, having heard this matter first.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a convenient course?
MR TEDESCHI: Yes, it is, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Commissioner, firstly, may I say the timing of this objection as to relevance is very late and on one view very surprising. I will come in a minute to some of the reasons why I say that. Firstly, may I turn to the Terms of Reference.

You as Commissioner are directed to do three things about $A$ and $B$. You are to inquire into them; you are to report; and you are to make recommendations.

Both A and B, referring to various categories of unsolved death, refer to the manner and cause of those deaths in a particular context, and the particular context is, in the case of A, potentially motivated by gay hate bias; and in the case of $B$, the language used is "suspected
hate crime deaths where the victim was a member of the LGBTIQ community".

Immediately, I submit, it is plain among other things that the task of the Special Commission is not simply a mirror of the task of a coroner because of the embedding into category $A$ and category $B$ of the gay hate bias factor.

May I briefly remind the Commission of what I said in my opening address on 2 November, more than a month ago, when I outlined what it was that the Special Commission would be doing. I stressed within the first few minutes that one of the reports that the Special Commission would be looking at was the Parrabell report.

A little later on I outlined what the methodology of the Parrabell report was - namely, and I'm summarising, that the strike force was a purely paper review of matters that had already been investigated by the police in the past; that there was no reinvestigation of any of those cases; and that the objective of the strike force was to look at the historical material and form an opinion as to whether a sexuality or gender bias or anti-gay bias or gay hate had been involved in any of those deaths.

I went on to explain that the methodology of the police officers comprising the strike force was to look at the historical material and then to fill out a form called a Bias Crime Indicators Form, which had been largely adapted from a United States document, and respond to 10 prompts or indicators in the form, and having done so, they were to assign the case to one of four possible descriptions - one, evidence of bias crime; two, suspected bias crime; three, no evidence of bias crime; or four, insufficient evidence to establish a bias crime.

That was the methodology of the police part of Parrabell, as I outlined in the opening on 2 November, and I went on to outline that in the case of the academic review, the Flinders academics, relevantly, the academics were provided with the completed Bias Crime Indicator Forms but not with the historical files or material on which those forms were based.

I went on to say that the academics did not use or rely upon the 10 bias crime indicators at all - indeed, they expressed reservations about the appropriateness of
that method and instead devised a set of concepts and definitions of their own.

Then when I addressed the Terms of Reference in the opening I made a number of points, one of which I will now make again in the context of this application, which is this - and perhaps in a way I started with this: the reference to "manner and cause" in A and B of the Terms of Reference is indeed a terminology found in the Coroners Act, but as I pointed out, this Inquiry is not a coronial inquiry, there are several fundamental differences. The first is, as I mentioned a moment ago, that the concept of "manner and cause" for this Inquiry, for this Special Commission, is specifically shaped by the Terms of Reference in particular ways which don't find a place in the Coroners Act.

The Terms of Reference tie this Inquiry to the concepts of gay hate bias, the words used in category A, and hate crime deaths, the words used in category B of LGBTIQ people. So analysis of whether such a connection as gay hate bias or hate crime was involved in relation to each of these deaths is central to the particular "manner and cause" task which is given to the Special Commission by the language of the Terms of Reference.

There is a second fundamental difference, among others, which is that a coroner is not bound by any strict time limit in undertaking whatever investigations and inquiries may be necessary, but this Special Commission is bound by a time limit, and it is a tight one - namely, 30 June next year.

Now, as to Strike Force Parrabell and the Parrabell report, Parrabell specifically considered whether there was a bias factor, anti-gay or hate crime or the like, in those 80 or more deaths. It used two different methodologies in doing so, as I have said, one methodology used by the police, and an entirely different methodology used by the academic review.

Those two methodologies produced the numerical results that are tabulated in various pie charts and graphs in the final report. So that question, the existence or otherwise of LGBTIQ-related bias, is central to the task of this Special Commission when inquiry into the manner and cause of deaths is under consideration. That is the very
question that Strike Force Parrabell and the Parrabell report examined. It did it by two different means, two different methodologies. So my first submission today is that the relevance of Parrabell and of its two separate methodologies to the task of this Special Commission in inquiring into the matters in Terms of Reference $A$ and $B$ is obvious from that brief outline alone.

But in addition, Terms of Reference F, in our submission, has a significance somewhat different from the significance attributed to it by my learned friend. Paragraph $F$ provides that you as Commissioner are not required to inquire or to continue to do so into a particular matter to the extent that you are satisfied that the matter, relevantly, has been sufficiently and appropriately dealt with by another inquiry.

I should perhaps make it clear that at this stage, subject to the evidence, of course, that will be given, counsel assisting consider that one matter of central relevance to the Terms of Reference, namely, the inquiry as to whether the Parrabell deaths were motivated by gay hate bias, may not have been sufficiently and appropriately dealt with by the inquiry constituted by Strike Force Parrabell and its academic review.

Now, in terms of the submissions today, my learned friend, of course, as he said, advances two sets of submissions, one, the oral submissions that he has made today, and the anterior submissions were the letter of 2 December - that is, Friday of last week - which was sent to the Special Commission, sent to you, indeed, or addressed to you as Commissioner, as a submission. I will need to say something in response to that written document as well as to what has been said today.

The submissions in writing deal with two main topics. The first is relevance and, to some extent, the public release of documents, which is largely what my friend has spoken about from the Bar table.

The second topic, the second main topic, which is addressed in the submission found in the letter of 2 December, concerned difficulties said to be being faced by the police in coping with the need to produce documents in response to summonses issued by the Inquiry. So I will need to respond to both of those, subject to your views,

Commissioner.

First of all, in order that the Commission has an understanding of how these issues have arisen, may $I$ hand up a folder of relevant documents. It is a slim folder comprising only five or six documents.

I may have inadvertently given your Honour the wrong one. If yours has a copy for someone else on the front of it - -

THE COMMISSIONER: It says "Copy for tender".

MR GRAY: There is another copy that says "Copy for Justice Sackar", so I perhaps should give you both of them.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR GRAY: The written submissions in the letter of 2 December are to be found at tab 5.

THE COMMISSIONER: Before you go any further, do you want to tender this - they're correspondence, I presume?

MR GRAY: I was just going to outline what's in it. The written submissions are at tab 5. At tab 1 is the summons issued on 25 August - that is, nearly three and a half months ago - to the Commissioner of Police to produce documents relevant to Parrabel1 and other matters.

At tab 2 is a letter of 20 December from the solicitor assisting the Commission to the Office of the General Counsel for the police requesting witness statements from various witnesses concerning, inter alia, Parrabel1.

The third letter, which is at tab 3, is the letter from Ms Marsic, general counsel for the police, of 18 October 2022, which raised matters similar to the second topic that $I$ mentioned as being raised in the letter of Friday, 2 December, concerning resourcing of the police and difficulties in complying with summonses; and the document at tab 4 is the response by the Special Commission solicitor to that letter, which is dated 21 October.

The final document at tab 6 , which $I$ have included in case it is relevant to the question of the publication or public availability of some documents, is a schedule of
redactions which have been made to the tender bundle that I earlier suggested might become exhibit 6.

I will deal with this briefly, as I know that both you, Commissioner, and our learned friends have seen all of this material.

The summons at tab 1 , which was summons 12 to the police, required, as you see, Commissioner, on page 2, first of all documents relating to Strike Force Parrabell, including coordinating instructions, Terms of Reference and the like; and number 5 , documents evidencing or referring to the methodology, protocols and/or arrangements pursuant to which the Strike Force Parrabell team was to carry out its work; at number 9 , documents evidencing the history of the selection and use of the Bias Crimes Indicator Form.

Then below item 10 there are documents sought in relation to the academic review of Parrabell, including at 12(iii), the methodology, protocols and arrangements pursuant to which the Strike Force Parrabell team and the Flinders team were to carry out their tasks; then over the page, on page 4, documents relating to Strike Force Macnamir and Strike Force Neiwand.

At tab 2 is the letter of 20 September, where the Commission sought statements from various witnesses including, in the case of Assistant Commissioner Crandell, a statement dealing with - your Honour sees the headings on page 2 - "Prejudice Related Crime Data Collection Project", the "Bias Crime Co-ordinator and Bias Crime Unit"; on page 3, the "Engagement and Hate Crime Unit", and on page 4, "Operation Parrabell", including its coordinating instructions and Terms of Reference, and Strike Force Parrabell, including its coordinating instructions and Terms of Reference; and at 26:

The reasons for the decision to obtain an academic analysis ...

At 27:
The procedures by which Flinders ... personnel came to be selected...

And 28 :

The methodology, protocols and arrangements pursuant to which.
(a) the Strike Force [team and]
(b) the Flinders ... team were to, and/or
did, carry out their ... tasks.
Then the Commission sought a statement from Professor de Lint and/or Professor Dalton, the academic reviewers, and among the topics they were asked to address, number 4 was the methodology, protocols and arrangements pursuant to which the strike force and Flinders carried out their tasks.

Then there was sought a statement from Sergeant Steer in relation to the history and development of the Bias Crime Coordinator position and the Bias Crime Unit and Bias Crime Standard Operating Procedures and the like.

Now, that generated statements from the police as requested, in which Mr Crandell and Professors de Lint and Dalton and Sergeant Steer did address all of those topics at some length and annexed documents relating to those very topics - the methodologies and protocols by which Parrabell was constituted and by which it carried out its task. So in a sense, part of what seems to be happening today is that the police are, in effect, objecting as irrelevant to material which they themselves have put forward in statements and in annexures to statements, but be that as it may.

That is in a nutshell why I said at the outset that it is a little surprising that an objection as to relevance be taken on the Friday before this hearing, when these topics have been the subject of a summons issued on 25 August, have been the subject of many, many documents, possibly hundreds, I'm not sure, possibly thousands, which have been produced in response to that summons, and which have been the subject of statements produced by the police, including a statement by Mr Crandell, who is here to give evidence today, and yet, on Friday afternoon before this hearing, a letter comes in, namely, the letter of Friday, 2 December, to say that there is an objection of some description to the relevance of more or less all of this material - at least that is seemingly how one is to read the letter of 2 December at tab 5 of this bundle.

May I make some particular responses to that letter,
because there is no written response, it having only been received on Friday afternoon.

The first proposition seems to be that there is some restriction on what is admissible by reason of the provisions of section 9(2) and 9(3) of the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act. In our respectful submission, that is not the effect of section 9 .

Section 9(2) provides that you are only to receive evidence that appears to relate to a matter specified in the Commission - presumably in the Terms of Reference. So the criterion is "appears to relate". Section 9(3) says that you are only to receive as evidence, or permit to be given in evidence, a matter that, in your opinion, would be likely to be admissible in evidence in civil proceedings.

Now, that, in some respects perhaps, brings into play the rules governing the admissibility of evidence in civil proceedings. However, the rules governing the admissibility of evidence in civil proceedings necessarily presuppose adversarial proceedings in which issues are joined either on pleadings or in some other way. As to what any such civil proceedings might be in the context of section 9(3) of the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act may be a little obscure, but in any event, in our submission, the submission advanced in paragraph 1 of the letter of 2 December does not result in any constraint on your capacity to receive the evidence that is now under discussion.

There doesn't seem to be a claim of a public interest immunity kind over any of this material. The objection seems simply to the relevance.

Now, the suggestion in paragraph 3 of the letter is that paragraph C of the Terms of Reference should be read as indicating that you should not go over the same material or conduct the same inquiries that have already been done by the previous inquiries listed in paragraph C - namely, for present purpose relevantly, the Parrabell report. But in fact, in our submission, paragraph C of the Terms of Reference has almost the opposite effect: you are directed to have regard to not only the report but the report and findings of Strike Force Parrabell.

Paragraphs $C$ and $F$, when read together, are to the
effect that you are positively directed to have regard to the report and findings of Strike Force Parrabell.

Paragraph F is a carve-out not necessarily applicable to $C$, one might have thought, but in any event, not applicable here - that is, you are not required to inquire into a matter if you are satisfied that it has already been adequately or sufficiently and appropriately dealt with by another inquiry. As I have said, at this stage, subject to the evidence, the position of counsel assisting is that that may well not be so in the case of the Parrabell report.

I should perhaps say something about paragraph 4 in addition to what I have already said on this topic. Because the Parrabell exercise was directed to whether certain deaths had a gay hate bias factor, then, in our submission, it is obvious that understanding Parrabell's methodology will assist the Commission to understand that very question, whether a particular death was affected by a gay hate bias factor.

Paragraphs 5 and 6 go more to, as I read them, the question of public availability of material rather than relevance. If the argument in paragraph 5 were to be accepted, it would presumably mean that you would be unable to publicly inquire or report into any deaths except those that the police regard as solved, which would be an obviously pointless investigation. Because the submission in 5 seems to involve the concept that if an inquiry in the context of this Commission touched upon what might be potential future investigations, ie, of unsolved cases, then you should not proceed in that way, that would make a nonsense of the Terms of Reference altogether.

As to paragraph 6, as I believe has been sorted out in the considerable volume of correspondence in the last week or two on this topic, and subject to any final refinement of that, the Inquiry is not proposing to publish any information about specific investigations, picking up the terms of paragraph 6, of suspected hate crimes or about informers or police methodology that is not already in the public domain.

Paragraph 7 talks about section 65 of the current Coroners Act, that of 2009, which of course is not of much relevance, one might surmise, to the Taradale inquest in

2003/2004/2005. Reference is then made to section 34 of the Coroners Act which was in force at the time, namely, the Coroners Act 1980. But, Commissioner, it is worth noting that in the course of the Taradale inquest, in connection with the lengthy statement of Sergeant Page, which was received into evidence, and which is one of the documents I surmise to which the submission is now being made about relevance and/or public availability is directed, Deputy State Coroner Milledge said of the Page statement:

The document is now part of the exhibit and if anyone wanted to look at it, they can.

That was said on 31 March 2003 at transcript page 56 of that day. The Commissioner of Police was represented by counsel at that inquest, who took no objection to the tender of the Page statement or to the remarks of Coroner Milledge that I have just quoted.

Then in paragraph 8 of the letter of 2 December there is a submission that refers to the fact that some topics may have been ventilated in a published book and the suggestion is that that is different somehow to a disclosure of the same fact in a police document. The logic of that submission somewhat escapes us, it must be said. If something is in the public domain, it is in the public domain.

Now, briefly on paragraphs 9 and 10 of the letter, paragraph 9 refers to the concern about publication of the direct work phone numbers and email addresses of members of the police. The assertion is made that I had said that I was going to tender material in a way that would result in the publication of those matters and I am then said to have resiled from this position. That is not a correct account of how this matter has developed. I said in correspondence through the solicitor assisting the Commission that those matters would not be redacted unless police provided evidence to support such a redaction being made. Evidence was supplied and the redactions were then agreed to. It is appropriate, in my submission, that requests for redactions be supported by evidence, and that is what was done.

As to paragraph 10, again referring to work phone numbers and email addresses of serving police officers,
this seems to be moot, as we understand it, as the Inquiry does not propose to publish those matters.

That's what I wanted to say about relevance. There is this second topic, which starts in the letter of 2 December at paragraph 11 and goes through to really the end of the letter at paragraph 17. Various assertions, some of them very serious, are made. The assertion bound up in paragraphs 11 and 12 is that because many summonses have been issued - and this appears in paragraph 14 as well because many summonses have been issued requiring the production of documents by the police, considerable police resources have had to be devoted to answering those summonses and producing the documents.

But the submission which is of a serious nature for today is the one in paragraph 12, which asserts that apparently because the police have had to answer these summonses, approximately 12 investigations and reviews by the Unsolved Homicide Team have had to be placed on hold. Then there is reference to more resources having had to be obtained by the police, to the engagement of senior and junior counsel and in some respects a private law firm, and the letter does not ultimately seem to result in an application or a submission except that in paragraph 17 the police ask for consideration by you and Commission staff concerning resourcing implications.

Now, the answer to that series of propositions is essentially the answer that the solicitor assisting the Commission provided to an earlier letter from the police raising similar concerns. That earlier letter is at tab 3 of the bundle. It is the letter of 18 October. It raises similar concerns of a resourcing nature, not peculiar to the Parrabell summons but referring to 31 summonses which had been issued up to that point, one of which was, indeed, the Parrabell summons, summons 12.

In paragraph 6 of that letter, there again was the assertion that the need to comply with the summonses had resulted in the stalling of live investigations and reviews, and in paragraph 9 , the police requested of you as Commissioner that:
... if it is possible, a petition to Government be made for funding to be
allocated to the NSW Police Force to
increase staffing levels available to the [Unsolved Homicide Team] ...

The reply to that letter came three days later, and it is at tab 4. That letter at tab 4, which I won't labour, does, however, place some of this correspondence in context. In the letter at tab 4 on page 2, the point is made, and I adopt this as my submission today, near the top of the page:

> Obviously the primary source of
> information, in relation to every one of the historical deaths falling within both
> Category A and category B, is the material
> held by the NSW Police Force... It is the [police] that investigated the deaths...
> created and/or gathered all the records
> relating to the deaths and the investigations, and [it is the police] that retains control of that material.

Two paragraphs down, the point was made, and I must with some regret make it again in the light of the 2 December letter:

In respect of many of the summonses
production by the [police] has been late and/or incomplete.

There follows a table, some seven or eight or nine pages long, which tabulates the degree to which production under the various summonses has variously been late and/or incomplete or both.

In the case of summons 12, which starts at the bottom of page 5, it was issued on 25 August, the date for production was 8 September, and as we see in the right-hand column, the police at that point, 21 October, had produced 33 volumes of material in tranches, and the tranches had been listed, and one sees immediately that all of the tranches were after 8 September and they were continuing through to the eighth tranche, which was 21 October, which was about six weeks late, and I believe I am right to say that more has been produced since.

Now, I am making those observations not to be nitpicking, because it is a lot of material and no doubt it
has taken time for it to be collated and produced, but this Inquiry has a time limit. You are required to carry out all the inquiring work necessary, including all the investigative work necessary, and to deliver your report to the Governor and to the Cabinet by 30 June next year, and it is incumbent upon this Special Commission to obtain material from those who have it as quickly as can be done.

It must have been obvious to the police from the moment the Terms of Reference were published, which was in April this year, that Parrabell would be one of the matters that you would be looking into, and also obvious that as the overwhelmingly dominant source of material relevant to the Inquiry as a whole, summonses would inevitably be issued for a great amount of documentation. If the police have chosen not to resource themselves sufficiently to meet those requirements, that is not a problem which can be laid at the door of the Special Commission.

At page 11 of this letter in tab 4, the solicitor assisting the Commission described the concern of the Commissioner about these delays, about inadequacies in the mode of production, and at page 13, the last page of the letter, the solicitor assisting the Commission made the point that it is entirely a matter for the Commissioner of Police to determine how resources are deployed within the police force and whether additional resources are needed and to make any request to the relevant minister for additional funding if that is necessary.

As to paragraph 6 of Ms Marsic's letter, which is the paragraph asserting that the effect of the demands for documents or the requirements for the production of documents was the stalling of live investigations and reviews being conducted by the Unsolved Homicide Team, the response of the solicitor assisting the Commission was that such an allegation:

> ... is completely inappropriate, is flatly rejected, and should be withdrawn. If any such impact on the work of the UHT [the Unsolved Homicide Team] has occurred, that is entirely attributab7e to resourcing decisions taken, or not taken, by the NSW [Police Force].

Now, in the next paragraph, there is one other matter which I will advert to and adopt in relation to today. That is that as stated in the last sentence of that paragraph, at no point - and this remains true today - has the NSW Police Force objected to the production of any of the material called for by any of these summonses or advanced any suggestion - and this remains true today that the material sought was not properly called for.

That applies to summons 12, which concerns Strike Force Parrabell, as much as to all of the other summonses. Hence the surprise when, on Friday afternoon of last week, an objection is now taken to the relevance of more or less all of the documents relating to Strike Force Parrabell. It is an objection which, in our respectful submission, the Commission should refuse.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, would it assist if I took a short break before you responded?

MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Let's say I resume about 12.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: It is quarter to now. I will just adjourn briefly.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MR GRAY: Commissioner, just before my learned friend replies, there are two matters that I omitted to mention no, three. The first is that there was a submission made that the recommendations of the parliamentary committee should play a part, perhaps analogously with the use of extraneous materials in connection with a statute, in construing the Terms of Reference. In our submission, that proposition should be rejected. Firstly, as you pointed out, Commissioner, the recommendations pre-dated the Terms of Reference. But, secondly, the recommendations were those of a particular parliamentary committee. A different body, namely, the Governor in Council, some considerable time later, framed and decided upon the Terms of Reference.

The second matter is that my friend ultimately said
this, as I noted it, in answer to your question, Commissioner, "What is it that I am entitled to have regard to in relation to Parrabell?" And the answer as I noted it was: "You are entitled to have regard to the final report of Strike Force Parrabell and the case summaries."

Now, two things about that. The case summaries are not - I stress not - part of the Parrabell report. Indeed, the report very notably does not disclose the views of either the strike force officers or the academics about any of the particular 88 cases. Secondly, that being so, if all you, as Commissioner, are entitled to do in having regard to Parrabell is to read the report by itself, that would, in our submission, be of almost no use whatsoever in considering manner and cause of any of the 80 or more deaths. That's the second matter.

The third matter is that I would tender that little folder of materials.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will mark it an exhibit on the application, perhaps $I$ will mark it exhibit 1 on the application or on the submissions this morning on Terms of Reference, thank you.

## EXHIBIT \#1 ON THE SUBMISSIONS ON TERMS OF REFERENCE FOLDER OF MATERIALS MARKED "BUNDLE OF MATERIAL RE RELEVANCE"

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, very briefly in response to the submissions of my learned friend, we submit that it is one thing for summonses to be issued which are very wide-ranging and which go perhaps even well beyond the Terms of Reference in order to define the material that is eventually going to be tendered, and it would not have been appropriate for us at that early stage to suggest this is not material that should be produced to you, you shouldn't look at it, we shouldn't have to produce it because it goes beyond your Terms of Reference. We submit that at that stage, at the summons stage, this Inquiry is entitled to take a very wide view. But when it comes to the process of tendering, it is then that the Terms of Reference should very clearly define what is admissible and what is not admissible.

My learned friend took you to the terms of certain sections in the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act and in particular section 9. I don't really understand the
submission that was made but it was suggested that there is some latitude to be given to the Inquiry in terms of subsection (3) that evidence is only to be received by the Commissioner if it would be likely to be admissible in evidence in civil proceedings, and that somehow, because there are no parties and no pleadings, that that means that somehow the restrictions as to relevance in the Evidence Act don't apply.

THE COMMISSIONER: But what would you determine - relevant as to what if there are no pleadings? The most obvious source is clearly the Terms of Reference.

MR TEDESCHI: Exactly.
THE COMMISSIONER: I accept that, but it is couched in terms of a piece of legislation which was intended, after '83, to govern whatever the government or executive thought it required information upon, and so therefore I accept the Terms of Reference are clearly relevant.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: But other than that, words such as "as far as practicable", and in subsection (2) "appears to relate to a matter", certainly they don't say sections 55 or 56, or whatever, of the Evidence Act shall govern the acceptance of evidence; nor do they say, I accept, "There shall be no rules of evidence", so it is a hybrid position which is no doubt governed or rather brought into play for the purposes of giving some measure of protection clearly to persons whose reputations or whatever it may be may be the subject of public view, so that there is a sifting process of some sort, and it's not just a free for all. So there is a limitation.

But the language is rather liberal in the sense of what does "as far as practicable" mean or "would be likely" - they are not words which are mandatory; they are words which clearly give the investigator a room to move over and above pure questions of relevance in a civil case. Relevance in a civil case, as we have discussed, would be pleadings. Here, I accept Terms of Reference. But as everybody knows, Terms of Reference are generally not - and this one is an example of it - pleaded out with the specificity of a statement of claim or a statement of defence.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, we don't disagree with that analysis. We concede that it is a hybrid situation. We agree that the Terms of Reference are the benchmark upon which admissibility should be determined. We agree that there is a certain flexibility on the interpretation of that. So I don't really think we are in disagreement with what you have said.

It doesn't arise at this stage, but if you were to conclude that there was the possibility of criminal proceedings, then there are much stricter requirements in terms of publicity under subsection (4), but that doesn't arise now.

THE COMMISSIONER: It doesn't arise now and it may arise in terms of the mode of hearing or investigation - I accept that.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes. Regarding the timing of this application, we respectfully submit that it was only when we received the list of tender bundle, which I think was either early last week or the week before, we, within a few days, sought to have a hearing, a directions hearing before you, Commissioner, last week on Wednesday, which ended up being cancelled for reasons that --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, let me just correct the record. That directions hearing - and please correct me if I'm wrong - was not to determine these general questions of relevance; it was dedicated to determining what were then extant, as I understood it, concerns about the contents of the particular documents.

MR TEDESCHI: Indeed. It was about --
THE COMMISSIONER: And that went away largely because again, correct me if I am wrong - there appeared to be a moment where truce broke out, but then truce was only in existence for a short time and other matters were then raised.

MR TEDESCHI: I just wish to place before you, Commissioner, that it was our intention to raise it with you then, prior to this week.

THE COMMISSIONER: If it was an intention to raise
relevance at that hearing, you had every opportunity to say, "Hang on, we were/are concerned about particular documents, but there's a bigger issue here and we need to have" - nothing turns on it in my view very much because you would say to me, and there would be some justification, if I don't have jurisdiction, I don't have jurisdiction. I understand the point.

MR TEDESCHI: In terms of what my learned friend said to you by way of an interpretation of paragraphs $A$ and $B$ of your Terms of Reference, his submission amounted to this: that the relevance of the Parrabell report to paragraphs A and B of your Terms of Reference are obvious. He didn't really advance any reasons why it's obvious --

THE COMMISSIONER: Because it's pretty obvious to any person accessing the internet and interested in Parrabell that it purports to descend to a degree of specificity about a connection, if any, between gay hate or gay bias and a particular series of homicides or whatever they were. That's precisely what A and B ask me to do. Now, A is Parrabell; B, as your clients would well appreciate, was a blank cheque. It has been an area which has required a great deal of effort on our part to try to identify how many cases fit into category B. But it is pretty obvious, isn't it, that both were looking at, if not identical, issues of causation so similar that it really would defy an attempt to distinguish it?

MR TEDESCHI: There is a difference, Commissioner, that Task Force Parrabell as opposed to Operation Parrabell was not an investigation into any crimes. It was a summary of the available evidence and then a determination or attempted determination of whether or not it was a hate crime or might be a hate crime. So it was an exercise not in - it wasn't even an exercise in attempting to find cases that might be suitable for reinvestigation. It was a categorisation exercise more than anything and, in that respect, it's different to Operation Parrabel1, which commenced as an exercise in reinvestigation and it was immediately realised by Sergeant Steer that there were so many matters that would require reinvestigation it might take five years for the resources that he had available then to be able to conduct such an exercise.

We respectfully submit that the exercise that you, Commissioner, face is such that the 12 months indicates
that - well, it is an onerous task merely for you and your staff to review those investigations and make a decision whether any of those warrant reinvestigation, and if so, where.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't need to be told how onerous my task is, Mr Tedeschi, I'm fully aware of that.

MR TEDESCHI: What we submit is that that is another indication that your task does not include a review of the analysis of the methodology or the setting up of --

THE COMMISSIONER: The opposite argument to that, Mr Tedeschi, is that the Terms of Reference were quite specific in those matters that I am directed to look at. "Directed" means, whatever else I may look at, I am directed to look at, amongst other things, Parrabell.

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Now, that's the short-back-and-sides approach: namely, you are not moving into a universe which is untethered in any way, shape or form. The universe you go into, the executive, is that which is to be informed in particular by three things, amongst other things that you might look at. I agree that it is a limitation, but it is quite a specific direction.

MR TEDESCHI: And the direction is that you are --
THE COMMISSIONER: I understand what you --
MR TEDESCHI: -- to take them into account, not to --
THE COMMISSIONER: No, take into account, tick the box, say, "Thank you very much, nicely written, well done, beautifully presented", and there you go. I understand.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, in relation to the final submissions that were made by counsel assisting you about delays and lateness of production of documents, there are 11 police officers who have been given the task of finding the material that has been included in the summonses, getting them into their possession from State Archives, making them available to your Inquiry, and then commensurate with that has been the task of documents being identified by your counsel that need to be analysed by
police for possible redactions and then analysed also by counsel assisting the police. The whole task has been a very, very involved one, a very laborious one. We submit that it has been an immense task for the police to perform and they have performed it as best they possibly can with the resources that they have available.

They have requested delays for the production of documents and for redactions to be provided, which generally have been agreed to by counsel assisting, but it is not every police officer who can decide what documents have to be produced or should be produced and what redactions should be made. It requires a certain seniority in the police force to be able to give instructions to the legal officers that assist the police as to whether redactions should be made and to request those. So we submit that the criticisms made in the letters from those who assist you are unjustified and don't take into account the real requirements that have been placed on the police force.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Mr Tedeschi, it goes without saying that I fully understand and appreciate the efforts which your clients have been legally obliged to undertake, because when I have issued a summons, in each and every case, the summons has been issued on a considered basis.

I regret to say that Ms Marsic, who appears to be the author of at least two of the letters, has made assertions which I will publicly reject here and now. On two occasions she has said expressly that my issuing summonses has distracted police from police work which they would otherwise be undertaking.

Now, if you are going to put that to me, or she is going to put that to me in a letter, I suggest that she thinks carefully about precisely what it is she is saying.

Every summons I have issued, I have exercised a discretion to do so. Not one complaint was made. The reason Mr Gray made the point he made was that if, in truth - if, in truth - the resources of the NSW Police were so slim or unappreciated, in terms of the quantum, then you should have come to me sooner and you should have asked for time or something else. But to accuse this Commission of either wittingly or even unwittingly deliberately
interrupting the proper police work in relation to unsolved homicides is frankly unacceptable. If it is intended to put pressure on this Commission, it's not going to work. If it is intended to be offensive, it worked, because it is offensive and, if I may say so, last time it happened I was very concerned about the tenor of the suggestion, because I asked myself, what on earth am I being told this for? Is it being suggested, as it were, anxious to wound but afraid to strike? Is it being suggested that I have unreasonably issued summonses? If so, nobody's stood up in a courtroom, nobody's stood up before me and said, "You are interrupting the serious police work that is undertaken."

Now, I regard both of her assertions in that regard as entirely without foundation, because I don't actually know what it is she is intending for me to understand by them.

I have asked for an apology once before. Quite frankly, I am just happy to dismiss the allegation as a misguided and misconceived assertion by someone who may well have entirely underestimated the resources the NSW Police need to perform the tasks, and if your people did not appreciate from the very outset that of the 23 or 30 unsolved cases, and however many I would identify in category $B$, your clients would not be one of the principal, if not the principal, repositories of information, then they did not read the Terms of Reference from on or about the middle of April 2022.

So if your persons did not sit down and think to themselves, either when you were retained or before you were retained, what could this likely lead to in terms of the documentation - and they must have appreciated that your clients were the sole repository, in most cases; but for coroners, perhaps hospitals and some other third parties of lesser significance, that your clients were the sole repositories of these documents, and this is nothing to do with Parrabell - of course it is to do partly with Parrabell, that's one aspect of all these unsolved crimes, and much of the documentation that has been forthcoming is in relation to some of these unsolved crimes. I have seen the documents. In some unsolved cases there are boxes and boxes and boxes. Who else would the Commission have got them from but your client?

So to twice now accuse me, or the Commission, as it were - I don't know precisely what it is that Ms Marsic has
intended by --
MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour --

THE COMMISSIONER: No, let me finish. I do not know precisely what Ms Marsic is intending by suggesting that what I have done in some way or other has interrupted proper police inquiries or proper police solution of crimes. That is rejected, Mr Tedeschi. I don't take very much interest in such submissions at the moment. I have too much to do. Both of them were inappropriately made and should not have been made. The appropriate person to speak to was your Commissioner or the relevant minister or to come up here and say, "We can't answer this because we need more time because we need police officers who know what they are looking for", but it wasn't done. And that's part of the problem with the delay, because I don't think your client is entitled to make those assertions, not having asked for an indulgence on that basis and having provided evidence that people are being distracted from their day-to-day police operations.

I am going to reserve the decision on this question of those four categories. I will try to give you a judgment later today. I may or may not be able to abide by that. If I can't, I will certainly let you know. In fact, it is 20 past 12 now. So as not to inconvenience you or your team, Mr Tedeschi, I will say that I will give judgment on this question at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Then we can deal with other matters, and would you kindly make Mr Crandell available, please, in the event that $I$ determine that he wil1 give evidence.
Thank you. I will adjourn.
AT 12.22PM THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY WAS ADJOURNED TO TUESDAY, 6 DECEMBER 2022 AT 10.00AM
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