

**2022 Special Commission of Inquiry
into LGBTIQ hate crimes**

**Before: The Commissioner,
The Honourable Justice John Sackar**

**At Level 2, 121 Macquarie Street,
Sydney, New South Wales**

On Monday, 20 February 2023 at 10.23am

(Day 23)

Mr Peter Gray SC	(Senior Counsel Assisting)
Ms Claire Palmer	(Counsel Assisting)
Mr Enzo Camporeale	(Director Legal)
Ms Caitlin Healey-Nash	(Senior Solicitor)

Also Present:

**Mr Mark Tedeschi KC with Mr Anders Mykkeltvedt for NSW
Police**

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray. I thought I would deal
2 with some housekeeping matters first.

3
4 Mr Tedeschi, I gather you are aware of the fact that
5 I'm about to hand a judgment down dealing with some
6 outstanding matters I think in relation to proposed witness
7 Mr Morgan, so if I publish those reasons, and then, as
8 I would apprehend it, I will make some orders which will
9 give effect to certain redactions that have taken or will
10 take place.

11
12 MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.

13
14 THE COMMISSIONER: Let me deal with that first. I publish
15 my reasons in the matter of Morgan.

16
17 I have a set of short minutes. I take it,
18 Mr Tedeschi, you will have seen the short minutes?

19
20 MR TEDESCHI: No, I haven't.

21
22 THE COMMISSIONER: Has Mr Mykkeltvedt seen the short
23 minutes?

24
25 MR TEDESCHI: My learned junior has seen them but there's
26 20 pages of annexures. We haven't had a chance to check
27 them against the various other documents.

28
29 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. What I will do is I will
30 publish my reasons and then I will come back to the short
31 minutes when you have had an opportunity to check the
32 proposed minutes of order, and at some point convenient to
33 all concerned, I will make those orders.

34
35 MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.

36
37 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. That's fine, thank you.

38
39 Yes, Mr Gray.

40
41 MR GRAY: Commissioner, in December, in the first part of
42 this second public hearing, there was a tender bundle which
43 was received into evidence as exhibit 6. I think at that
44 stage it had 10 volumes. Within those 10 were some
45 documents which, at that point, were not themselves
46 tendered. However, the position has now been reached,
47 after various redactions and other matters have been

1 attended to, that almost all of those documents in volumes
2 1 to 10 which were not previously tendered in December are
3 now tendered, and I understand that you, Commissioner, have
4 a list of those and that my learned friends have that list
5 as well.

6
7 THE COMMISSIONER: Right.

8
9 MR GRAY: So they should become part of exhibit 6.
10 Secondly, there are 24 of those documents, I believe in
11 all.

12
13 Then there are also four additional volumes to be
14 added to exhibit 6, namely, volumes 11 to 14. So I would
15 ask that they be added to exhibit 6, and that our learned
16 friends have those volumes.

17
18 There are two exceptions to what I have just said. At
19 tab 230 of, I think, volume 9, there is a statement of
20 Detective Sergeant Steven Page from 25 July 2002. That is
21 the statement of Sergeant Page which was tendered and
22 received into evidence in the Taradale inquests before
23 Deputy State Coroner Milledge in 2003. That statement will
24 be tendered in these proceedings, but not today, or at
25 least not this morning, as certain details of appropriate
26 non-publication orders or redactions are still yet to be
27 finalised, but I understand that that is likely to be
28 achieved probably during the course of the day.

29
30 Secondly, in the new volumes 11 to 14, there is
31 a document at tab 253 which is a statement of Steven Page
32 of this year, of 16 February 2023, and I don't tender it as
33 yet either because the same applies - namely, any necessary
34 non-publication orders or redaction arrangements are still
35 being finalised. But again, I understand that that will
36 not take long to arrive at finality.

37
38 THE COMMISSIONER: Very well.

39
40 MR GRAY: As I understand it, that means that we are ready
41 to move to the next witness, who is Mr Michael Willing.

42
43 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.

44
45 MR GRAY: I call Mr Willing.

46
47 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Willing, if you would come forward,

1 thank you.

2
3 **<MICHAEL JOHN WILLING, sworn:** [10.28am]

4
5 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I think I'm right in
6 saying that we will probably adopt a similar procedure to
7 last time, in other words, a member of the staff will,
8 I believe, assist Mr Willing in terms of availability of
9 hard copy documents so that he won't have to rely entirely
10 upon his own administrative skills or watching it on the
11 screen. So as documents are referred to, we will make sure
12 that a hard copy is placed in front of him.

13
14 MR TEDESCHI: Thank you.

15
16 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, yes. Thank you, Mr Gray.

17
18 **<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:**

19
20 MR GRAY: Q. Mr Willing, you have made a statement for
21 the purposes of the Special Commission dated 30 January
22 2023?

23 A. I have.

24
25 Q. And I take it the contents are true and correct?

26 A. Yes.

27
28 Q. And there are no changes that you wish to make or
29 additions?

30 A. No.

31
32 Q. You were Commissioner Homicide, from November 2011
33 to November 2017, I believe?

34 A. Commander Homicide, yes.

35
36 Q. I'm sorry, Commander Homicide. Indeed, I believe
37 I have seen somewhere that you were the longest serving
38 person in that role?

39 A. I believe so. The current incumbent might be getting
40 close, but yes.

41
42 Q. Now, your six-year period as Commander Homicide,
43 included many events which are relevant to the issues
44 surrounding gay hate crime, you recall?

45 A. Yes.

46
47 Q. Without being exhaustive, can I just list a few of

1 them now just to set the scene?
2 A. Sure.
3
4 Q. First of all, in June 2012, there was the second
5 inquest into the death of Scott Johnson?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. Before Deputy State Coroner Carmel Forbes?
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. And she returned an open finding, in contrast to the
12 finding of suicide that had been made in an initial inquest
13 back in, I think, 1989?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. Then secondly, in February 2013, there was a program
17 on ABC television called Australian Story, about Scott
18 Johnson?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. And that led, in ways that I will come to, to the
22 initiation of a strike force called Strike Force Macnamir?
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. Then also in 2013, a third event that I will be
26 dealing with, there was a wave of articles in the Sydney
27 Morning Herald, some by Paul Sheehan and some by Rick
28 Feneley, about what was said to be a wave of gay hate
29 deaths?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. In the period roughly from the mid 1970s to the 1990s?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. You'd recall that. And those articles - and I'm
36 paraphrasing for the sake of summary at the beginning -
37 were suggesting that there were as many as 80 such deaths
38 in that period?
39 A. Slightly more, but yes, that's right.
40
41 Q. In fact, a little more than 80, and they were
42 suggesting that as many as 30 of those might be regarded as
43 unsolved?
44 A. Correct.
45
46 Q. And then fourthly, in about 2013/2014, there was
47 a lengthy statement by Detective Chief Inspector Pamela

1 Young relating to the death of Scott Johnson that was
2 prepared?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. And you were aware of that at the time, I take it?
6 A. Yes, I was.
7
8 Q. And again, very much summarising, you would agree that
9 her statement suggested that the most likely explanation
10 for Scott Johnson's death was suicide?
11 A. I think she outlined her reasons or the evidence as
12 she saw it for the hypotheses of suicide, homicide and
13 misadventure.
14
15 Q. She did, but she seemed to put forward the view,
16 didn't she - and I will come to this - that, in her
17 opinion, the most likely of those was suicide?
18 A. I think she left the decision to the Coroner and
19 outlined, you know, what it was that she saw as the
20 evidence for each of those three.
21
22 Q. Yes, but to answer my question, her opinion, as
23 emerging from that statement, was that suicide was the most
24 likely?
25 A. I think that she has put each of those hypotheses to
26 the Coroner and let the Coroner make the decision. So you
27 can read what you can into that statement, but that's my
28 view of what she did.
29
30 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Mr Willing, you took the view that
31 she, what, equally treated various scenarios as equally
32 open?
33 A. As the evidence that she saw and presented to the
34 Coroner, yes.
35
36 Q. I see. And she didn't prefer or express any view, one
37 way or the other, as to which of those scenarios might be
38 more likely?
39 A. Not in my opinion.
40
41 Q. And you've read the statement, have you?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 MR GRAY: Q. Have you read it in relatively recent
45 times?
46 A. I've read the redacted version last night, which has
47 part thereof of what she put.

- 1
2 Q. I will come back to that in due course.
3 A. Sure.
4
5 Q. Anyway, the fifth event that I would suggest in your
6 time, among others, was that on 13 April 2015, then State
7 Coroner Barnes decided to hold a third Scott Johnson
8 inquest?
9 A. Yes, he opened the inquest, yes.
10
11 Q. Sixthly, on the same night, 13 April 2015, Detective
12 Chief Inspector Pamela Young was interviewed on the ABC
13 Lateline program?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. And among other things - you would recall this, I take
17 it - she defended the original 1988 Manly police
18 investigation into the death of Scott Johnson as not
19 flawed; remember that?
20 A. I'm not - I can't recall her using those words but
21 I assume she did, yes.
22
23 Q. And in the interview on Lateline, she expressed
24 a clear view, would you agree, that suicide was the most
25 likely explanation?
26 A. I can't recall the exact words that she used, but
27 I take it that yes, she did.
28
29 Q. And, among other things, she accused the Police
30 Minister of having kowtowed to Steve Johnson - that is, the
31 brother of Scott Johnson - in agreeing to reinvestigate the
32 death?
33 A. I recall that, yes.
34
35 Q. The seventh event, and I acknowledge that this is not
36 exhaustive, I'm simply putting these to you --
37 A. Sure.
38
39 Q. -- within a short time after that - that is, within
40 a short time after the Lateline broadcast - State Coroner
41 Barnes directed that Detective Chief Inspector Young be
42 removed from the Scott Johnson investigation?
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. And, eighthly, a few months later, in August 2015
46 Strike Force Parrabell was initiated?
47 A. Yes.

- 1
2 Q. And you would recall that that strike force was to
3 review the 80-odd or a bit more than 80 cases so as to
4 express a view as to whether they were gay hate related or
5 not?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. Ninthly, a couple of months after that again,
9 in October 2015, a strike force called Neiwand was set up?
10 A. Correct.
11
12 Q. And that one - and we will come to all of these - was
13 to reinvestigate three deaths from Bondi in the 1980s?
14 A. Correct.
15
16 Q. One of them in 1985, which was about three years
17 before Scott Johnson, and two of them in 1989, which was
18 the year after Scott Johnson?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. They being three deaths which had been the subject of
22 the Taradale inquest before Deputy State Coroner Milledge
23 in 2003?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. Then, tenthly - this is right, isn't it, given what we
27 have just briefly touched on - from the second half of 2015
28 through to the end of 2017, those three strike forces were
29 simultaneously under way - that is, Parrabell, from
30 about August 2015; correct?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. And it substantially finished by the end of 2017 and
34 the report was ultimately published in 2018?
35 A. Yes.
36
37 Q. Secondly, Macnamir, which was looking at the death of
38 Scott Johnson?
39 A. Yes, under the control of the Coroner by that point.
40
41 Q. Yes. So it was still going at the same time - that
42 is, from - it started earlier than this but, as at mid
43 2015, it was going along at the same time that Parrabell
44 was going along?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. And thirdly, Neiwand, from October, was also going

1 along from October '15, and it also came to an end at the
2 end of 2017?

3 A. Yes.

4

5 Q. Now, you point out in your statement, paragraphs 41 to
6 46, that you had a wide range of responsibilities as
7 Commander Homicide?

8 A. Yes, that's correct.

9

10 Q. No doubt that is true?

11 A. Yes.

12

13 Q. Nevertheless, however, all of those developments that
14 I have just briefly taken you to did happen between 2012
15 and late 2017 - that is, on your watch - didn't they?

16 A. The - I just - that's technically right. However,
17 I left the Homicide Squad physically in around April 2017
18 and didn't return to it.

19

20 Q. Who replaced you, if that's the word, in that period?

21 A. There was a relieving commander at the time, Detective
22 Acting Superintendent Jason Dickinson, and then he was
23 subsequently replaced by a substantive commander, it was
24 then Detective Superintendent Scott Cook.

25

26 Q. Thank you. If you remember, what were the dates? You
27 left in April?

28 A. I left, I think from my research in preparing for
29 this, 11 April in 2017, so I was taken offline by the new
30 Commissioner, Michael Fuller, and asked to prepare for and
31 then ultimately implement the recommendations arising from
32 the Lindt Cafe inquest.

33

34 I then was promoted to Assistant Commissioner and
35 Commander of the Counter Terrorism and Special Tactics
36 Command on 1 November 2017 and I was completely tied up
37 with that prior to --

38

39 Q. But in that period from April to November, first of
40 all, I think you said Superintendent - I may have the rank
41 wrong - Dickinson stepped in as Commander Homicide?

42 A. Yes, that's right.

43

44 Q. When did the next person succeed him as Commander
45 Homicide. I think you said that was Mr Cook, was it?

46 A. I don't know. Yeah, it was Detective Superintendent
47 Scott Cook, now Assistant Commissioner. It was late 2017.

1 I don't know the exact date.
2
3 Q. And was he then appointed permanently to the position?
4 A. Correct. He was.
5
6 Q. And is he still in the position?
7 A. No, he was later promoted to Assistant Commissioner in
8 another command, the Prosecutions Command. He is now
9 substantively the Commander of the State Intelligence
10 Command.
11
12 Q. I see. And somebody then succeeded him as Commander
13 Homicide?
14 A. Yes, that's right.
15
16 Q. Who was that?
17 A. Detective Superintendent Danny Doherty.
18
19 Q. Is he still in the position?
20 A. He is.
21
22 Q. That happened, when, 2018 or some other time?
23 A. Some time after. I don't know the exact time.
24
25 Q. All right. At any rate, accepting what you say about
26 you going, as you say, offline in April 2017 --
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. -- allowing for that, you were well aware of all of
30 those events that I've just taken you through briefly
31 during the course of those five or six years?
32 A. I was aware that they were ongoing, yes.
33
34 Q. And indeed, you had responsibility as Commander, at
35 least up to April, for every step taken by Homicide police
36 including the Unsolved Homicide Team?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. Just before I come to this period of six years or so
40 in some detail, I want to go back to the events of the
41 early 2000s, which is before you became Commander Homicide,
42 of course --
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. Namely, the events that led up to and then the hearing
46 of the Taradale inquests. You obviously are well aware of
47 what the Taradale operation was?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2
- 3 Q. And what the inquests were about?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5
- 6 Q. Now, again, in a slightly abbreviated form, you'd
- 7 accept that in 2001/2002 Detective Sergeant Steven Page was
- 8 in charge of Operation Taradale?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10
- 11 Q. And Taradale was originally to look at the deaths of
- 12 Ross Warren and John Russell in 1989, as well as an assault
- 13 on another man, David McMahon, also in 1989. Are you aware
- 14 of that?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16
- 17 Q. And pausing there, were you aware of these things at
- 18 the time? I appreciate you weren't Commander Homicide.
- 19 A. No, I wasn't, not at the time. Later on I learnt; you
- 20 know, when the issues that are at question, at hand, came
- 21 up, I learnt about the Strike Force Taradale and what it
- 22 did later on, some years later.
- 23
- 24 Q. "Later on" being when?
- 25 A. Years later when I had command of the Homicide Squad.
- 26
- 27 Q. Not until 2011 or later?
- 28 A. Yes, that would be right.
- 29
- 30 Q. So prior to then, about 2011, you were - I don't mean
- 31 this discourteously at all --
- 32 A. No, not at all.
- 33
- 34 Q. -- ignorant of the Taradale events?
- 35 A. Correct. I was aware that there had been an inquest,
- 36 but only in general terms amongst, you know, any other
- 37 inquests as a police officer that you hear about from time
- 38 to time, but not in detail at all.
- 39
- 40 Q. All right. Are you aware at least now that at a late
- 41 stage in Operation Taradale, when the brief of evidence was
- 42 otherwise completed and the matter had been for some time
- 43 under the direction of the Coroner's office, a third death
- 44 was added, namely, that of a man called Gilles Mattaini?
- 45 A. Yes. Yes.
- 46
- 47 Q. He had disappeared in September 1985?

- 1 A. Yes.
2
- 3 Q. And we will come to this, but you may recall - tell us
4 if you do - that at the heel of the hunt, as it were, in
5 the course of the Taradale operation, as a result of the
6 publicity, someone came forward from the public to say,
7 "Well, Mr Mattaini might be someone that should be looked
8 at in this context as well". Did you become aware of that?
9 A. I - not specifically, no.
10
- 11 Q. All right. At any rate, Operation Taradale culminated
12 in a lengthy inquest before Deputy State Coroner Milledge?
13 A. Mmm-hmm.
14
- 15 Q. The hearings occupied many days during the course of
16 2003?
17 A. Yes.
18
- 19 Q. The Commissioner of Police was represented throughout?
20 A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
21
- 22 Q. By counsel and solicitors?
23 A. Yes.
24
- 25 Q. And the final addresses of Counsel Assisting and of
26 counsel for the Commissioner of Police were in December
27 2004?
28 A. I - yes, I - assume that's right.
29
- 30 Q. You can assume that's right.
31 A. Yes.
32
- 33 Q. Thank you. And the findings of Deputy State Coroner
34 Milledge were handed down in March 2005?
35 A. Yes.
36
- 37 Q. Does that accord with your memory?
38 A. Yes.
39
- 40 Q. Could we go to findings of Deputy State Coroner
41 Milledge, please. It's in volume 6. If we turn to
42 tab 161 [SC0I.02751.00021_0001], you will see Coroner
43 Milledge's findings and recommendations?
44 A. Yes.
45
- 46 Q. I take it you have seen these before today?
47 A. I can't recall ever seeing them before.

- 1
2 Q. You have never seen them before?
3 A. I don't think I have.
4
5 Q. Right. What I want to take you to in particular at
6 the moment - and I accept what you say - is the concluding
7 parts of her findings.
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. Perhaps go to page 14.
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. You will see that at the top of the page, the first
14 sentence begins:
15
16 *Many of the Marks Park victims ...*
17
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. Just pausing there, I take it you are aware that the
21 focus of the Taradale inquiry and the location of the three
22 deaths of Mr Mattaini, Mr Warren and Mr Russell was at or
23 near Marks Park?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. Near Bondi?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. You are aware of that?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. So what Coroner Milledge says there at the top of
33 page 14 is:
34
35 *Many of the Marks Park victims that*
36 *reported to police told of hearing their*
37 *assailants threatening to throw them off*
38 *the cliff face.*
39
40 Do you see that?
41 A. Yes, I do.
42
43 Q. And you can assume, and no doubt you would infer
44 anyway from reading that, that before the Coroner had been
45 evidence from some victims of assault who hadn't been
46 killed and who were thus able to give some evidence?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. And then the Coroner goes on in the next sentence:

3
4 *There is no doubt that at the time of*
5 *Mr Warren's and Mr Mattaini's disappearance*
6 *and Mr Russell's death that this was*
7 *a Modus Operandi of some gay hate*
8 *assailants. This strongly supports the*
9 *probability that Mr Warren, Mr Mattaini and*
10 *Mr Russell met their deaths this way.*

11
12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes, I do.

14
15 Q. Appreciating that, as you say, you haven't actually
16 seen this before, nonetheless, were you aware, or did you
17 become aware at some point, that Deputy State Coroner
18 Milledge had expressed views to that effect?

19 A. Yes, I was - I was made aware.

20
21 Q. And two paragraphs down, her Honour says:

22
23 *I am comfortably satisfied that I can make*
24 *the finding of "foul play" in relation to*
25 *Mr Warren and Mr Russell, but I cannot make*
26 *a finding that Mr Mattaini met his death at*
27 *the hands of another person or persons.*
28 *The persons of interest that may have been*
29 *responsible for the deaths of Mr Warren and*
30 *Mr Russell would have been far too young at*
31 *the time of Mr Mattaini's disappearance*
32 *in August 1985.*

33
34 Do you see that?

35 A. I see it, yes.

36
37 Q. Now, are you learning that for the first time today or
38 were you generally aware of that?

39 A. Those words, yes.

40
41 Q. Apart from the precise words, were you aware that she
42 had made remarks to that effect?

43 A. I wasn't aware that she had made remarks to the effect
44 that the person - persons of interest may have been far too
45 young at the time of Mattaini's disappearance.

46
47 Q. You were not aware of that?

- 1 A. No. I accept that. Obviously she made it.
2
3 Q. The persons of interest --
4 A. Yep.
5
6 Q. -- that were, for the most part, the subject of a lot
7 of the evidence in Taradale, had been aged at the time -
8 that is, in 1989 - perhaps with some exceptions, mainly
9 between about 16 and 18 years of age, if you could just
10 accept that from me?
11 A. Yes, I accept that.
12
13 Q. Or maybe you know that. Do you know that?
14 A. I'm aware that there were a number of persons of
15 interest that were investigated, of around about that age,
16 at the time, yes.
17
18 Q. And so four years before that, in 1985, those people,
19 speaking a little generally, would have been only about 12
20 to 14?
21 A. Much younger, yes.
22
23 Q. And in that context, it's understandable, perhaps -
24 you may agree - that Coroner Milledge would say what she
25 has said there?
26 A. Yes, I understand that.
27
28 Q. And her Honour goes on in the next paragraph:
29
30 *I can however bring in a finding of "death"*
31 *for Mr Mattaini, but where and how he died*
32 *remains unknown although there is a strong*
33 *possibility that he died in similar*
34 *circumstances to the other men.*
35
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. Again, putting aside the precise words, were you aware
39 that she had made a finding and had made remarks along
40 those lines?
41 A. Yes, I was aware.
42
43 Q. Then the actual findings are then set out under the
44 heading "Findings"; do you see that?
45 A. Yes, I do.
46
47 Q. And in the case of Mr Warren - I won't read it all

- 1 out - she says:
2
3 *I am satisfied that the deceased was*
4 *a victim of homicide, perpetrated by person*
5 *or persons unknown.*
6
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. In the case of Mr Russell, she says:
10
11 *The cause of death is multiple injuries*
12 *sustained when he was thrown from the cliff*
13 *on to rocks by a person or persons unknown.*
14
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. And as to Mr Mattaini, the formal finding is:
18
19 *The cause and manner of his death remain*
20 *undetermined as the evidence before me does*
21 *not enable me to say.*
22
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. Now again, putting aside if need be the precise words,
26 were you aware, and if so from about when, that those were
27 the findings of --
28 A. Yes, I was aware, yes.
29
30 Q. From about when, though?
31 A. From around the time that Strike Force Macnamir
32 commenced. So during my time as the Commander of Homicide.
33
34 Q. That's, in round figures, around about February 2013?
35 A. Round about, yes.
36
37 Q. Her Honour then sets out some recommendations, you
38 will see, towards the bottom of that page?
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. Going over to the next page, page 15, the fourth
42 bullet point from the end is - that is, the fourth-bottom
43 recommendation is:
44
45 *Audit outstanding homicides and suspected*
46 *deaths to ensure investigations are active*
47 *and ongoing. Where investigations have*

1 *stalled these matters are to be referred to*
2 *the State Coroner for his consideration.*
3
4 Do you see that?
5 A. Sorry, what point was that again?
6
7 Q. Fourth from the bottom, on page 15.
8 A. Fourth from the bottom.
9
10 THE COMMISSIONER: It's actually fifth on mine.
11
12 THE WITNESS: Yes, but I do know the point.
13
14 MR GRAY: That's very interesting, I must say. It is
15 fourth on mine.
16
17 THE COMMISSIONER: There are two different prints of the
18 judgment by the looks of it.
19
20 MR GRAY: Q. At any rate, the one beginning "Audit
21 outstanding"?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. Were you aware of that recommendation, and, if so,
25 when?
26 A. No, I wasn't but I understand it.
27
28 Q. Have you ever been aware that some such recommendation
29 was made?
30 A. Not to my knowledge. Not to my recollection, I
31 should say.
32
33 Q. We will come to this in a bit more detail later --
34 A. Sure.
35
36 Q. -- but in about late 2015, as we have already
37 established, Strike Force Neiwand was set up?
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. And it was to look again at these three Bondi deaths?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. And its investigations - that is, Neiwand's
44 investigations - in fact stalled, did they not, at the end?
45 A. That's my understanding. I wasn't aware of the
46 outcome of Neiwand until I was preparing for this Inquiry.
47

- 1 Q. But you are now, though?
2 A. I am aware, yes.
3
4 Q. And you are aware - and I will come to this in detail,
5 but just speaking generally for the moment --
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. -- you are aware, then, that the Neiwand conclusions -
9 and I'm paraphrasing - were that each of these three cases
10 should be treated as inactive and not to be revived, as it
11 were, unless and until some new information came in?
12 A. That's the effect of it, yes. That's what I've read.
13
14 Q. That's another way of saying that the investigations
15 have stalled, isn't it?
16 A. Yes.
17
18 Q. Well, would this recommendation of Deputy State
19 Coroner Milledge indicate that that should have then been
20 referred to the State Coroner for his consideration?
21 A. If that recommendation was adopted by NSW Police, the
22 Commissioner at the time, yes.
23
24 Q. Do you know whether those recommendations were
25 adopted?
26 A. I don't.
27
28 Q. Does the Commissioner of Police have the prerogative
29 to simply not accept recommendations?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. How would we now establish - we, the Commission,
33 today - whether that recommendation was accepted?
34 A. You would have to make inquiries with the Commissioner
35 of Police and/or the Attorney General's office, because
36 recommendations were the subject of reporting back within
37 six months after being made to the Attorney General's
38 office.
39
40 Q. Thank you. Now, the Taradale investigation and the
41 Taradale inquest and the whole topic of gay hate murders
42 were the subject of a great deal of publicity around that
43 time, weren't they?
44 A. Yes, that's correct, yeah. As in, sorry, Mr Gray, the
45 time of the inquest or the time --
46
47 Q. Yes, in the early 2000s?

1 A. Yes, and I believe that's how I had a general
2 knowledge that they had taken place, yes.

3

4 Q. And when you became Commander Homicide, in November
5 2011, presumably one of the things you did among your many
6 other responsibilities was to familiarise yourself with the
7 Unsolved Homicide Team and get a briefing from them as to
8 what they were up to?

9 A. Yeah, that's right.

10

11 Q. Now, among other things, did you make any inquiries as
12 to whether any of these three deaths were then, as
13 at November 2011, the subject of any sort of further
14 investigation?

15 A. No, I didn't.

16

17 Q. Did anyone tell you whether they were or weren't or
18 tell you anything about them?

19 A. Not to my recollection.

20

21 Q. When you did take over as Commander Homicide, who was
22 the head of the Unsolved Homicide Team, assuming there is
23 such a person?

24 A. There were two investigation coordinators that were
25 assigned to the Unsolved Homicide Team. I can go through
26 the structure of the entire squad if you like, but there
27 were two, Detective Chief Inspector John Lehmann, and
28 around the same time, Detective Chief Inspector Pamela
29 Young was moved into that position.

30

31 Q. And what was the title you gave them? You said
32 they --

33 A. They were investigation coordinators.

34

35 Q. Coordinators. And then beneath them there were other
36 positions and the whole team?

37 A. Yes, so there were supervisors and investigators. So
38 if it assists the Commission, there were six homicide teams
39 that were active on-call teams, each led by an
40 investigation coordinator at the rank of detective
41 inspector or chief inspector. Below that, each of those,
42 were supervisors at the rank of detective sergeant, and
43 then constables.

44

45 The same applied to the Unsolved Homicide Team.
46 However, at the time that I took over homicide, there were
47 also three regional teams of four detectives, each led by

1 a detective sergeant. Over the course of time I caused
2 those teams to be centralised into the Unsolved Homicide
3 Team, about - I can't recall the exact time but it was
4 a couple of years after I took over.
5
6 Q. Thank you. Now, speaking from whatever knowledge you
7 have subsequently accumulated, and for the moment
8 regardless of when that occurred --
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. -- you are aware, I take it, that in the case of
12 Mr Mattaini, who disappeared in 1985 --
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. -- his disappearance was brought to the attention of
16 Operation Taradale almost at the end of its activities?
17 A. As you have outlined a short time ago.
18
19 Q. As I have outlined?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. But you are aware of that now, apart from me telling
23 you?
24 A. Yes, I am.
25
26 Q. Detective Page's very long statement for Taradale,
27 which is several hundred pages long and several hundred
28 annexures, is dated 25 July 2002.
29 A. I have never seen it but I'm assuming that's correct.
30
31 Q. Right. It deals entirely with matters pertaining to
32 the death of Mr Warren and the death of Mr Russell?
33 A. I'm assuming that's correct.
34
35 Q. You can accept that from me.
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. I think you did agree, though, that you were aware
39 that a member of the public, towards the end of Taradale's
40 activities, came forward and raised the matter of
41 Mr Mattaini?
42 A. As you have suggested a short time ago, yes.
43
44 Q. I did. But is that something you only know because
45 I have put it to you?
46 A. From recollection, yes.
47

- 1 Q. Well, assuming that is right, and I think you will
2 accept in due course that it is right --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4
- 5 Q. -- there was little opportunity for Taradale to take
6 any investigation very far between August 2002 and the
7 beginning of the hearings in early '03; you would agree?
- 8 A. Assuming that's correct, yes, that's right.
- 9
- 10 Q. Assuming that's correct. So any investigation by the
11 Unsolved Homicide Team years later, under Neiwand, would
12 have had to almost start from scratch, wouldn't it?
- 13 A. Accepting what you have said, yes.
- 14
- 15 Q. Now, in the briefings that you received from Detective
16 Lehmann and/or Detective Young when you took over as
17 Commander Homicide, did they go through with you anything
18 about the cases that they were or weren't investigating?
- 19 A. No. So what occurred was when I took over, I reviewed
20 all the existing progress reports relating to the ongoing
21 investigations that were happening at the time, and there
22 were dozens of them, and in terms of follow-up briefings,
23 I can't recall whether or not I spoke to each of the
24 investigation coordinators separately or together or - and
25 got a verbal briefing on particular matters or not.
- 26
- 27 Q. Okay. Now, appreciating that this may be a tough
28 question, if you received briefings on all the
29 investigations that were then on foot, I take it you didn't
30 receive a briefing on these three because no such
31 investigation was on foot?
- 32 A. That's correct.
- 33
- 34 Q. All right. Now, moving to another topic for the
35 moment.
- 36 A. Do I require this?
- 37
- 38 Q. You can give that back. Now, in June 2012, there was
39 the second Scott Johnson inquest?
- 40 A. Yes.
- 41
- 42 Q. Before Deputy State Coroner Forbes.
- 43 A. Yes.
- 44
- 45 Q. And you were aware of that at the time?
- 46 A. Not specifically but subsequently learnt of it, and
47 I subsequently spoke to her about it.

1
2 Q. To Coroner Forbes?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. Now, as we have established earlier, the original 1989
6 suicide finding was overturned?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. And instead there was an open finding.
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. You recall that. And do you recall that one reason
13 for that, in the Coroner's findings, related to the matters
14 that had come to be known about the Bondi deaths by reason
15 of the Taradale exercise?
16 A. I recall that information had been given to the
17 Coroner on behalf of the Johnson family, which included
18 those details. I don't know the specifics of it because at
19 the time, the Johnson matter wasn't under the purview of
20 the Homicide Squad or the Unsolved Homicide Squad at the
21 time. So hence when you asked me whether I was aware of
22 the inquest going on, I wasn't. There were inquests
23 occurring all the time.
24
25 Q. All right. Can I show you the findings of Deputy
26 State Coroner Forbes. I will just have them put in front
27 of you, and I have a copy for the Commissioner and copies
28 for my learned friends. They are redacted in the form that
29 I'm handing up in ways that I believe conform with other
30 arrangements that have been made with other documents.
31
32 MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, would you pardon me for
33 a moment whilst I consult with Counsel Assisting?
34
35 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
36
37 MR GRAY: Commissioner, my friend is concerned about the
38 sentence immediately before the first redaction referring
39 to the finding that was made in 1989. The reason for the
40 concern, as I understand it, is that the fact that such
41 a finding was made in 1989 might affect a potential juror
42 in the future.
43
44 THE COMMISSIONER: But there is no trial fixed at the
45 moment, is there?
46
47 MR TEDESCHI: Yes, there is.

1
2 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry? There is no trial fixed in
3 relation to anything.

4
5 MR TEDESCHI: There is no date fixed for trial.

6
7 THE COMMISSIONER: There is no date fixed for trial,
8 Mr Tedeschi - you correct me if I'm wrong. As a result of
9 the Court of Criminal Appeal's decision, an application -
10 as I understand it, and please this is only from my
11 understanding, I may be wrong - an application for special
12 leave has been filed by the Director of Public Prosecutions
13 to the High Court of Australia.

14
15 That question will involve a pure question of law as
16 to whether the Court of Criminal Appeal's ruling in
17 relation to Justice Wilson's dealing with the application
18 for the accused to withdraw his plea was the appropriate
19 test to be applied or not.

20
21 There is no question at the moment, as I understand
22 it, of any trial being fixed, at least in the very near
23 future (a) until the High Court resolves the question of
24 whether it will or will not grant leave; and then subject
25 to whether or not it grants leave, assuming it refuses
26 leave, then it goes back, as I understand it, for the
27 application of the test articulated by the Court of
28 Criminal Appeal. That would leave open another application
29 for leave to withdraw the plea.

30
31 Alternatively, if the High Court were to grant leave,
32 we all know that the High Court first hasn't fixed even the
33 application for leave and, secondly, if leave is granted,
34 generally speaking, many months follow before an appeal is
35 then listed for hearing, and then, sometimes, many months
36 before a decision is given. So at the moment there are
37 legal issues that need to be resolved, many of which are
38 substantial and many of which themselves may be the subject
39 of further appellate process, so it is nowhere near
40 a trial. And a jury would be --

41
42 MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I agree it is nowhere near
43 a trial.

44
45 THE COMMISSIONER: And a jury - excuse me, a jury, in any
46 event, any person who would serve on the jury, may well
47 remember events of recent times when a plea was entered.

1
2 The problem is, it's going to be a difficult trial,
3 but I cannot see how an historic finding of the Coroner in
4 1989 will ever intrude into the jury's decision one way or
5 the other. My own view is that it's not a matter of
6 practical reality.

7
8 MR TEDESCHI: It is entirely a matter for you,
9 Commissioner. We bring to your attention the fact that
10 placing on record a finding of a judicial officer of that
11 nature could potentially, if it was available on the
12 internet in the future --

13
14 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, along with the whole history,
15 Mr Tedeschi, of the accused's activity of much more recent
16 time. This is a matter of history. I accept that. But
17 you and I both know that the trial judge, if a trial ever
18 takes place in the near future, will be in total control of
19 the jury and, like it or lump it, the amount of publicity
20 surrounding this particular death is huge.

21
22 MR TEDESCHI: It is.

23
24 THE COMMISSIONER: That's the problem. So I'm against
25 you. Thank you.

26
27 MR GRAY: Q. Mr Willing, Coroner Forbes recounted what
28 the finding had been at the 1989 inquest. Do you see that
29 in that sentence?

30 A. Yes.

31
32 Q. And then after the redacted passage, her Honour goes
33 on:

34
35 *Since that inquest --*

36
37 that is, the 1989 one --

38
39 *further information has come to light about*
40 *a culture of violence against the gay*
41 *community in Sydney in the late 1980s. In*
42 *2005 a police operation named Taradale*
43 *uncovered that the deaths of three*
44 *homosexual men in Bondi in 1989 were as*
45 *a result of them being forced to their*
46 *deaths from cliffs at a gay beat.*
47

- 1 You see that's what the sentence says?
2 A. That's what she says, yes.
3
4 Q. She goes on:
5
6 *Mr Johnson was homosexual. It's now known*
7 *that the North Head of Manly near Blue Fish*
8 *Point where Mr Johnson's body was found was*
9 *a gay beat.*
10
11 Do you see that?
12 A. Yes, I do see that.
13
14 Q. Then she says:
15
16 *As a result of the further information, it*
17 *was considered appropriate to re-open the*
18 *Coroner's file and further investigate*
19 *Mr Johnson's death.*
20
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q.
24 *That investigation has not taken the case*
25 *any further. The information about the*
26 *deaths at Bondi has, however sown a seed of*
27 *doubt as to the positive finding of*
28 *suicide.*
29
30 Do you see that?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. She says:
34
35 *Suicide cannot be presumed.*
36
37 and so on. And then after the next redacted passage
38 her Honour says:
39
40 *In this case, the possibilities that*
41 *Mr Johnson was the victim of a gay hate*
42 *crime similar to those that occurred in*
43 *Bondi or that he fell are also available*
44 *explanations to the circumstances that*
45 *surrounded his death.*
46
47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. And then she says:

Accordingly --

she makes her finding and the finding is:

I find that the evidence adduced of Mr Johnson's death does not enable me to make a finding as to how he fell off the cliff and I make an open finding and refer his file to "Cold Cases" for further investigation in accordance with police procedures and protocols.

A. Yes.

Q. At some point did you become aware of these findings of Coroner Forbes?

A. In general terms. I have never seen the exact findings but in general terms, yes, I was aware that this had occurred.

Q. Were you aware, then, at least in general terms when you learnt what you did learn, that a reason for her Honour taking a view different from the 1989 Coroner's view was the information that had come to light through Taradale about the Bondi deaths?

A. Yes. Yes.

MR GRAY: First of all, I would tender that document, your Honour.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, what exhibit will it be?

MR GRAY: Now, I'm informed that the next exhibit would be 16; or alternatively, if it were to be added to exhibit 6, it's the next tab within exhibit 6, which would be 317.

THE COMMISSIONER: What about I make it tab 317?

MR GRAY: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's more convenient than having a separate piece of paper. So I will add that to volume 6 in due course, thank you.

- 1 MR GRAY: Thank you, Commissioner.
2
- 3 Q. So the upshot then, it seems, from the last sentence
4 on that page, is that the file was referred to what
5 her Honour called "Cold Cases" --
6 A. Which is the Unsolved Homicide Team.
7
- 8 Q. That was going to be my question. I assumed that's
9 the case?
10 A. I thought so.
11
- 12 Q. What was then to happen was further investigation in
13 accordance with police procedures and protocols, namely,
14 whatever the protocols of the Unsolved Homicide Team were;
15 is that right?
16 A. Yes.
17
- 18 Q. And so the case was going to go, then, to the Unsolved
19 Homicide Team, the two people at the head of which were
20 Mr Lehmann and Ms Young?
21 A. Yes.
22
- 23 Q. Now, correct me if I'm wrong, the Unsolved Homicide
24 Team had then some hundreds of cases on its books?
25 A. About 700.
26
- 27 Q. So Mr Johnson's case was going to be added to the
28 queue, as it were?
29 A. To the list; that's correct, yes.
30
- 31 Q. Now, in your statement - do you still have your
32 statement there?
33 A. I do. I've got a copy.
34
- 35 Q. If you could keep that with you all the time just as
36 a resource --
37 A. Sure.
38
- 39 Q. -- because we'll go back to it now and again?
40 A. Yes.
41
- 42 Q. At paragraph 31, you, having referred to Coroner
43 Forbes's findings that we've just looked at, say that in
44 late 2012 the UHT conducted what you call a prioritised
45 case screening review of the matter, in which it rated the
46 case solvability as zero.
47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. When did you become aware of that?

A. I was made aware of that, from recollection, during a telephone call from Detective Acting Superintendent Chris Olen to me when I was on annual leave, that coincided with an approach that the Johnson family had made to the Police Minister at the time, and was seeking to generate publicity around the case.

Q. Is that the phone call that you're referring to in paragraph 34?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. Okay. So back to 31, who was it, if you can tell us, who conducted the prioritised case screening review?

A. Detective Senior Constable Alicia Taylor, from the records that I have been shown in preparation for this.

Q. Would you agree - and we will come to this in a bit more detail as well - that in the light of everything that has transpired since late 2012 --

A. Yes.

Q. -- the assessment of zero solvability seems to have been incorrect?

A. On the face of it, yes, however, you need to understand the way - what they're assessing at the time, and that was, you know, the availability in general terms - and I think I refer to it at some point in my statement, but fresh forensic evidence, whether anything was available; whether or not there were, you know, new technologies that could be applied to advance the investigation; whether or not new investigative techniques since that, the time of the original investigation, could shed light; it also included things like the identification of persons of interest or relationship breakdown, et cetera, that could be used to advance the case.

Q. Apart from future developments in technology, unknown in 2012, most if not all of those factors could have been investigated in 2012, couldn't they?

A. Yes, except, you know, the availability of fresh forensic evidence would be something that would weigh heavily on an assessment, so whether exhibits --

Q. But how would it become available unless you went out and tried to get it?

- 1 A. If it wasn't available, therefore, it would impact on
2 the assessment rating.
3
- 4 Q. You mean if they didn't then immediately have it, they
5 would assess it as unsolvable without trying to get it?
6 A. Well, what is it that you are trying to get I guess is
7 my point, Mr Gray? The assessment is conducted in that
8 aspect on the availability of exhibits and what was there
9 and whether or not fresh forensic testing would adduce more
10 evidence. So the assessment is made on what was available
11 at the time.
12
- 13 Q. Anyway, that apparently was the assessment in late
14 2012, that the case solvability was zero. You tell us in
15 paragraph 31 that you were not involved in that review
16 yourself?
17 A. That's right.
18
- 19 Q. And so you have told us now that you think you learnt
20 of it during this phone call from Chris Olen a couple of
21 months later?
22 A. Yes, that's my recollection of it.
23
- 24 Q. Okay. Now, the assessment having been that the case
25 solvability was zero, presumably that meant that the
26 decision of the UHT was not to investigate the matter
27 further; is that right?
28 A. That's right.
29
- 30 Q. I wonder if you could be shown volume 14. Do you see
31 that's an email chain --
32 A. At what tab, sir?
33
- 34 Q. I beg your pardon. Tab 312 [NPL.3000.0014_0001]?
35 A. Yes.
36
- 37 Q. Now, the email chain starts on the bottom of the
38 second page with one from Christopher Olen to a Mr Cotter,
39 which is cc-ed to you and to Pamela Young; do you see that?
40 A. That's right, yes.
41
- 42 Q. On 7 February 2013?
43 A. Yes.
44
- 45 Q. What Mr Olen is recording and talking about - and
46 I won't read it all out but you take what time you need to
47 read this again - is the open finding of Coroner Forbes?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2
- 3 Q. The recommendation that that case go back to "Cold
4 Cases"?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6
- 7 Q. The family's dismay that John's unit had rated the
8 solvability as zero and declined to investigate - do you
9 see that?
- 10 A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
- 11
- 12 Q. John is John Lehmann, I take it?
- 13 A. John Lehmann, yes.
- 14
- 15 Q. Then he goes on - that is, Mr Olen goes on - about
16 various matters to do with what the family were doing.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18
- 19 Q. At the bottom of the page he says:
- 20
- 21 *John Lehmann has participated in an ABC*
22 *Australian Story to air this Monday night,*
23 *11 February ...*
- 24
- 25 A. Yes.
- 26
- 27 Q. He anticipates - next page - that --
- 28
- 29 *... the story will be critical of the*
30 *original investigation ... and also*
31 *potentially be critical of John Lehmann and*
32 *[the] UHT ...*
- 33
- 34 A. Yes.
- 35
- 36 Q. And without reading the rest of it in full, he says in
37 the second-last paragraph that you had rung him the
38 previous night about a possible meeting that might be
39 arranged the next week with Mr Glick, who was a person
40 assisting the Johnson family, you would recall?
- 41 A. Yes.
- 42
- 43 Q. And then the response to that email from Pamela Young
44 starts at the foot of the first page of this chain - do you
45 see that?
- 46 A. Yes, I do, "Morning all"? Yes.
- 47

1 Q. Sorry?

2 A. It begins "Morning all"?

3

4 Q. It begins "Morning all", yes. And she says:

5

6

7

8 *As I am the one who will actually be*

9 *dealing with the investigation and family*

10 *from here in I want to put on the record*

11 *that the decision not to proceed with*

12 *further active investigation was based on*

13 *two reviews conducted by the likes of ...*

14 various people - I assume they are all from the UHT, are
15 they, those three?

16 A. They were people that had worked at the Homicide Squad
17 over the years previously.

18

19 Q. And she says:

20

21 *... in addition to John Lehmann.*

22

23 So John Lehmann was involved --

24 A. Yeah.

25

26 Q. In the review apparently leading to a decision not to
27 have any further investigation; correct?

28 A. Yes, in light of - I'm assuming in light of that case
29 screening report, yes.

30

31 Q. Now, the response from Chris Olen is what I wanted to
32 ask you about. You are cc-ed on all these emails.

33 A. That's correct. I was on annual leave at the time,
34 yep, but I do recall.

35

36 Q. Well, what Chris Olen says, after telling Pamela Young
37 that he sensed her frustration and anger, is, in
38 particular, in the third paragraph:

39

40 *What are you going to say to the Minister*

41 *and the family next week after John Lehmann*

42 *in his soon to be broadcast National and*

43 *(International USA) interview, in which he*

44 *has indicated 'the case is open and a team*

45 *is working on it'?*

46

47 Do you see that?

- 1 A. Yes, I do.
2
- 3 Q. What are we to take from that? Does that mean that
4 although a decision had actually been made to investigate
5 no further, John Lehmann had said publicly that the case
6 was open and a team was working on it?
7 A. I take it that that's what he said in that interview.
8 I don't recall it at all.
9
- 10 Q. So if he did say that in his interview, he wasn't
11 telling the truth, was he?
12 A. Well, it was up to John - John Lehmann had the
13 authority to open an investigation and do it and conduct
14 inquiries, as the investigation coordinator. I can't
15 recall that occurring, but - and I can't recall him saying
16 that in the interview. I can't recall the interview, to be
17 honest. I never saw it.
18
- 19 Q. The question is really a simple one. You have agreed,
20 before I put this email to you, that indeed the decision
21 had been made not to investigate further because the
22 solvability was zero?
23 A. That's right, yes.
24
- 25 Q. And Pamela Young says, "Well, indeed, there was such
26 a decision not to proceed further, and that was based on,
27 among others, John Lehmann"?
28 A. That's what she says, but I don't know whether that's
29 right or not.
30
- 31 Q. I thought you agreed a minute ago that John Lehmann
32 was involved in the review that arrived at the "solvability
33 zero"?
34 A. He was the investigation coordinator so he would be
35 well aware of it.
36
- 37 Q. No, involved in the review, I think you agreed?
38 A. No, the review was conducted by Detective Senior
39 Constable Alicia Taylor, and as --
40
- 41 Q. Quite. And what I put to you was the correctness or
42 otherwise of what Pamela Young said, and you said it was
43 correct --
44 A. Yes.
45
- 46 Q. -- namely, that the decision not to proceed with
47 further active investigation was based on two reviews

1 conducted by the likes of - and I will read the names out
2 now - Mick Ashwood, Gary Jubelin and Glen Richardson, in
3 addition to John Lehmann?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. And I asked you if that was right and you said "Yes".
7 A. As - you asked me whether or not that's what was in
8 the email.
9
10 Q. No, I didn't ask you that.
11 A. Well, I've misinterpreted your question, Mr Gray, but
12 that's what's in the email.
13
14 Q. So are you saying you don't know whether that is right
15 or not?
16 A. That those - that there was a review conducted by
17 those people.
18
19 Q. Yes.
20 A. I don't know.
21
22 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Is that because you were on leave
23 again or what --
24 A. No, because that was before I joined the Homicide
25 Squad, if that occurred, if that review was done. I'm
26 certainly aware of the --
27
28 MR GRAY: Q. Mr Willing, it was not before you joined
29 the Homicide Squad at all.
30 A. What, that Mick Ashwood, Gary Jubelin and Glen
31 Richardson had conducted a review? Mick Ashwood was out of
32 the Police Force I think at the time of this email, so --
33
34 Q. Mr Willing, the case came to Unsolved Homicide
35 after June 2012.
36 A. That's right.
37
38 Q. That's the only time when any investigation - sorry,
39 any review occurred by the UHT?
40 A. That's my understanding.
41
42 Q. You were Commander Homicide?
43 A. That's right.
44
45 Q. John Lehmann was one of the two heads - I know that's
46 not quite the term --
47 A. Correct, yes.

1
2 Q. -- of UHT?
3 A. Yes, yes.
4
5 Q. I will put it to you now: do you accept that the
6 decision, which you agree was made, not to investigate
7 Scott Johnson's case further because the solvability was
8 zero, was a decision participated in by John Lehmann?
9 A. It was a decision that he would have taken as the
10 investigation coordinator of the Unsolved Homicide Team
11 after reviewing the case screening record which was
12 completed by Detective Senior Constable Alicia Taylor.
13
14 Q. Okay, and the decision was no investigation because
15 zero solvability?
16 A. Correct.
17
18 Q. But it seems, according to Chris Olen, that what
19 Mr Lehmann said in an interview was that the case was open
20 and his team was working on it; correct?
21 A. That's - yes, that's what he says in the email.
22
23 Q. And my question is, if he did say that, that was
24 false, wasn't it?
25 A. That's correct.
26
27 MR GRAY: Thank you.
28
29 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a convenient point?
30
31 MR GRAY: It is, your Honour.
32
33 THE COMMISSIONER: I will take a short break now,
34 thank you.
35
36 **SHORT ADJOURNMENT**
37
38 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gray.
39
40 MR GRAY: Mr Willing, the folder I think, volume 14, can
41 come back for the moment.
42
43 THE WITNESS: No problem, thank you.
44
45 MR GRAY: Q. Could I just take you now to the phone call
46 with Detective Olen that you talk about in paragraph 34 and
47 following in your statement.

- 1 A. Yes.
2
- 3 Q. So he tells you, among other things, that there is
4 going to be an episode of Australian Story shortly about
5 the Johnson case?
6 A. Yes.
7
- 8 Q. And in 35 he expresses concern about how the Homicide
9 Squad might be depicted?
10 A. Yes.
11
- 12 Q. And so he suggests - this is at the top of your
13 page 8 - that perhaps two investigators from the UHT should
14 be allocated to the matter to review the issues raised by
15 the Johnson family?
16 A. Yes.
17
- 18 Q. So this is in the light of the upcoming Australian
19 Story program?
20 A. Yes.
21
- 22 Q. Then in paragraph 36, there is reference to a media
23 event with the Johnson family on 11 February, and later
24 that night, 11 February, the Australian Story episode goes
25 to air?
26 A. Yes.
27
- 28 Q. Now, in 37 you tell us that either that evening,
29 I suppose, or the next day, the 12th, someone tells you
30 that the Police Minister had contacted Steve Johnson and,
31 among other things, that the Police Minister wanted to hold
32 a meeting with the Johnson family?
33 A. Yes. That - I'm not sure of the exact dates of that,
34 but it was around that time. It might have been a couple
35 of days earlier but I think it was around that time.
36
- 37 Q. It was in the knowledge, though, that the Australian
38 Story either had just happened or was about to happen?
39 A. Yeah, it was - that's right, yes.
40
- 41 Q. You said that you were away on leave and so Detective
42 Olen would be there in your place?
43 A. Yes.
44
- 45 Q. And then that meeting, you tell us in paragraph 38,
46 did occur?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. And among those present, apart from the Police
3 Minister and the Johnson family and Detective Olen, was
4 Detective Pamela Young?
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. And then in 39, you say "around that time", but I take
8 it it's immediately following these events?
9 A. Yes, I think it was the next day, I think,
10 thereabouts.
11
12 Q. Within a day or two of the Australian Story program
13 and the meeting, Strike Force Macnamir is then initiated?
14 A. That's right, correct.
15
16 Q. Now, in paragraph 40 you say, and I want to make sure
17 I understand this, that you were aware and supportive of
18 the proposal to allocate a small number of staff to review
19 the issues. You are there referring to Mr Olen's
20 suggestion up in paragraph 35 that two investigators be
21 allocated to review?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. Then in paragraph 40 you go on to say that while you
25 were aware of that, you say that as to the formal
26 establishment of the strike force, being a different thing,
27 you only learnt of that when you returned from leave?
28 A. Yes, that's right, the mechanics around the
29 establishment of it, yes.
30
31 Q. So you say you did not have any direct involvement in
32 its establishment. So who did? Who did establish it?
33 A. It would be established by the Unsolved Homicide
34 Investigation Coordinator, which in this occasion is Pamela
35 Young, and endorsed by my - the officer relieving me, which
36 was Chris Olen, and then established formally by the
37 Director of the Serious Crime Directorate at the time.
38 That was the structure at the time. It doesn't exist
39 anymore. Which would be - I can't recall, my notes from -
40 my notes suggest it was John Kerlatec, who was relieving in
41 that position at the time.
42
43 Q. I'm not making a criticism here, but do you have some
44 notes?
45 A. I've got notes as a result of preparing and reading
46 different material and those sort of things. I'm quite
47 happy if you want to have a look at them.

1
2 Q. I might speak to Mr Tedeschi about that.
3 A. Sure.
4
5 Q. We might make some arrangements. Anyway, in
6 paragraph 40 you say:
7
8 *I did not have any direct involvement in*
9 *[the establishment of Macnamir].*
10
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. When you put in the word "direct" there, does that
14 mean you had some involvement in it?
15 A. No. I wasn't present at the time.
16
17 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. So does that mean that a strike
18 force could be established, as it was seemingly here,
19 without your knowledge or consent?
20 A. That's correct. That's --
21
22 Q. So your imprimatur was entirely unnecessary in terms
23 of the establishment of the strike force?
24 A. That's right, in relation to this --
25
26 Q. And/or the allocation of resources to it?
27 A. On this occasion because I was away on leave, that's
28 right.
29
30 Q. When you say "on this occasion" you were away on
31 leave, do these people in your absence or did these people
32 in your absence have the authority to establish the strike
33 force and allocate such resources as they thought was
34 necessary?
35 A. Yes.
36
37 Q. Okay.
38 A. Yes.
39
40 MR GRAY: Q. I wonder if Mr Willing could have volume 1,
41 please. And if you could turn to tab 8?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. According to the heading, these are the Terms of
45 Reference for Strike Force Macnamir?
46 A. Yes.
47

- 1 Q. If we look at the signature page, the third page, the
2 people that have signed it have signed it in the first few
3 days of April 2013?
4 A. That's correct, yes.
5
6 Q. Pamela Young is designated as Investigation
7 Supervisor?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. And Detective Sergeant Penelope Brown is designated
11 Officer in Charge?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Now, at a later stage which we will come to, but I'm
15 sure you would be aware, Pamela Young, for various reasons,
16 left Macnamir?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. And Penelope Brown stayed in Macnamir throughout?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. And, in effect - tell me if this is right - stepped up
23 to the role that Pamela Young had been in?
24 A. No. She was the officer in charge of it the entire
25 time. When Pamela Young left, the position of
26 investigation supervisor was taken out and there was
27 advice - that was with concurrence with the Coroner at the
28 time, and assistance and support was provided by another
29 investigation supervisor - sorry, investigation
30 coordinator, I should say, Detective Chief Inspector Jason
31 Dickinson.
32
33 Q. All right. Thank you. Then if you turn to tab 9,
34 [SCOI.82018] this is an email from the Office of the
35 General Counsel of the NSW Police?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. And it's informing this Special Commission of the
39 personnel who made up Strike Force Macnamir. Do you see
40 that towards the bottom of the page on the front page?
41 A. Yes, they are resources that are allocated to the
42 e@gle.i database for the inquiry.
43
44 Q. All right. Well, according to this document at tab 9,
45 Detective Superintendent Jason Dickinson was the
46 investigation supervisor, Pamela Young is said to be the
47 original OIC and Penelope Brown OIC, but for the reasons

1 that you have just explained, it sounds like that's not
2 exactly correct?

3 A. No, that's not right. That's - it's a structure,
4 a database structure, where titles are given to particular
5 roles, et cetera. So hence you've got a lot of resources
6 on there that may not have actively played a part, but they
7 are available, should they be required, as well.

8

9 Q. Accepting what you say, but just going on what is
10 stated in this email, among those in Strike Force Macnamir,
11 apart from Pamela Young and Penelope Brown, one of them was
12 Detective Chief Inspector Stewart Leggat?

13 A. Yes.

14

15 Q. Another one was Detective Sergeant Steven Morgan?

16 A. Yes.

17

18 Q. Then Detective Senior Constable Paul Rullo?

19 A. Yes.

20

21 Q. And then towards the bottom, Detective Senior
22 Constable Michael Chebl?

23 A. Yes.

24

25 Q. In your statement at paragraph 57 --

26 A. Yes.

27

28 Q. -- you set out individuals whom you describe as being
29 heavily involved in Macnamir and you list them; do you see
30 that?

31 A. Yes.

32

33 Q. Paragraph 58?

34 A. Yes, that's right.

35

36 Q. You don't mention Detective Sergeant Morgan in that;
37 is that because you overlooked him or because --

38 A. No, I think - so those resources can be allocated to
39 an investigation at any time. That could have happened
40 afterwards. From - I'm not sure whether or not Morgan, who
41 had come from the Southern Region Unsolved Homicide Team -
42 I'm not sure at the time when that was - that that team was
43 amalgamated into the Homicide Squad Unsolved Homicide Team.
44 I don't know whether he was even present at the Unsolved
45 Homicide Team then. He may have been but he may not have
46 been.

47

1 Those resources are a list covering virtually everyone
2 in the Unsolved Homicide Team from my recollection, that
3 are allocated, should they be required to conduct
4 inquiries. It's not a time - it's not a point in time
5 allocation. Those - you know, people can be added and
6 taken off inquiries, you know, throughout the course of the
7 conduct of those inquiries and decisions.

8
9 Q. I see. So without being nitpicking about it --

10 A. Yes.

11
12 Q. -- in the email at tab 9 --

13 A. Yep.

14
15 Q. -- which says unambiguously, at the bottom of the
16 first page, the strike force comprised the following
17 officers - and they're all listed --

18 A. Yes.

19
20 Q. -- we should understand that as being not entirely
21 accurate and that the real position is as you have just
22 described?

23 A. Yes. So that's correct. So there's a - again, just
24 to try and assist the Commission, the resourcing list can
25 include anyone who may have reason to be involved in the
26 strike force. They may not necessarily be, but if I, for
27 argument's sake, require somebody - I'm an investigator and
28 I require somebody to assist me who may not be formally
29 allocated, I might be able to - I might have them allocated
30 to the system so they've got access to the records. It's
31 a database. But from my recollection, those listed in
32 paragraph 58 of my statement were those most heavily
33 involved.

34
35 Q. All right. And then when you mention Jason Dickinson
36 as one of those most heavily involved or heavily
37 involved --

38 A. Yes.

39
40 Q. -- was that from the outset or from some later stage?

41 A. No, that was from when Pamela Young left Strike Force
42 Macnamir.

43
44 Q. And then in paragraph 60 you list people that you
45 would regard as not "heavily involved", but as available in
46 the way you have been describing it?

47 A. Yes, that's probably the best way of putting it, sir.

1
2 Q. Meanwhile if I can contextualise this
3 chronologically --
4 A. Sure.
5
6 Q. -- we're talking here about February 2013, that this
7 Strike Force Macnamir --
8 A. Was commenced?
9
10 Q. Yes, commencing.
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Meanwhile in October 2012, some four months or so
14 earlier, not long after the second Scott Johnson inquest,
15 the UHT had conducted a review, to some extent, of the
16 three Taradale cases; correct?
17 A. Correct, yes, Alicia Taylor, yes.
18
19 Q. And that's the document prepared by Detective Senior
20 Constable Alicia Taylor --
21 A. Correct, yes.
22
23 Q. -- on 25 October 2012?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. Were you aware of that exercise having been done by
27 Alicia Taylor at that time?
28 A. No.
29
30 Q. Were you involved in it at all?
31 A. No.
32
33 Q. Did you see her review - the document which I will
34 come to in a minute - did you see her review at the time?
35 A. No.
36
37 Q. When did you first see it?
38 A. Oh, I can't recall when that was.
39
40 Q. You refer to it in your statement at paragraph 66.
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. You say:
44
45 *I am aware ...*
46
47 that Alicia Taylor did this?

1 A. Yes.

2

3 Q. So can you help us with when you became aware of that?

4 A. I honestly don't know when. It would be part of -
5 subsequent to the formation of Macnamir, from recollection.
6 These reviews were being conducted regularly, and
7 I wouldn't necessarily be informed of their outcome, unless
8 there was a reason for it.

9

10 Q. All right. Could Mr Willing have volume 6, please,
11 and turn to tab 162, [NPL.0013.0001.0001].

12 A. Yes.

13

14 Q. I don't want to go on through the considerable detail
15 of this document but we see from the front page that - or,
16 rather, we see from I think almost the back page, the last
17 page, that Alicia Taylor seems to have completed this on
18 25 October 2012?

19 A. Yes.

20

21 Q. And there is a section below that that says,
22 "Coordinator's certification", which is blank?

23 A. Yes.

24

25 Q. Who was the coordinator, do you know?

26 A. That would have been either Detective Chief Inspector
27 John Lehmann or Pamela Young - probably John Lehmann.

28

29 Q. And the words that are there for that person to sign
30 up to include:

31

32 *I am satisfied that the reviewer has*
33 *accessed available documentation and agree*
34 *with their recommendations.*

35

36 A. Yes.

37

38 Q. Now, do you know whether John Lehmann ever in fact
39 signed this or --

40 A. I don't know.

41

42 MR GRAY: I might at least informally at this stage invite
43 my learned friend to get some instructions on that and if
44 there is a version of this document which is signed, then
45 it would be appreciated if it could be produced.

46

47 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Tedeschi, can I just leave

1 that to you to get instructions when you can?

2

3 MR TEDESCHI: Certainly.

4

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

6

7 MR GRAY: Q. As I say, I don't, at least for the moment,
8 want to take you through all the detail of this.

9 A. Sure.

10

11 Q. But it obviously is a review of the three cases,
12 Mr Warren, Mr Russell and Mr Mattaini. On page 8 and
13 following it deals with various people under the heading of
14 "Suspect/s"?

15 A. Yes.

16

17 Q. On page 13 and following there are summaries of
18 previous investigations in the cases of Warren and Russell?

19 A. Yes.

20

21 Q. At page 18 there is a section dealing with similar
22 incidents around Marks Park between June 1989 and July
23 1990?

24 A. Yes.

25

26 Q. Then on page 19, there is a short section on the
27 Mattaini investigation?

28 A. Yes.

29

30 Q. And you'll see that on the top of page 20, the second
31 paragraph:

32

33 *No initial missing persons report or*
34 *investigation was made ...*

35

36 At the time, that is, 1985, because of some sort of
37 miscommunication among those involved?

38 A. That's what it infers, yes.

39

40 Q. And then on 3 August 2002, somebody did report it by
41 way of a missing persons report?

42 A. Yes.

43

44 Q. And so the summary of the Mattaini investigation
45 reflecting that does not have much to say about any
46 previous investigation, because there had not been really
47 much of an investigation done in those circumstances?

- 1 A. Yes, as we discussed earlier, yes.
2
- 3 Q. Quite so. Then from page 20 onwards, there's more
4 material about suspects?
5 A. Yes.
6
- 7 Q. You see that?
8 A. Yes.
9
- 10 Q. And then on page 23 and following there is a long list
11 of people under the heading "Witnesses"?
12 A. Yes.
13
- 14 Q. And that takes us all the way over to page 33, where
15 we get recommendations?
16 A. Yes.
17
- 18 Q. And the reviewing officer, being Detective Senior
19 Constable Taylor, expresses the view that:
20
- 21 *The investigation into the death of Ross*
22 *Warren, John Russell and Gilles Mattaini,*
23 *was meticulously undertaken by an*
24 *experienced investigator, Detective*
25 *Sergeant [Steven] Page.*
26
- 27 Do you see that?
28 A. Yes.
29
- 30 Q. She goes on:
31
- 32 *It is apparent in the statement from the*
33 *officer in charge the investigation team*
34 *was highly motivated and every effort was*
35 *made to identify the person(s) responsible*
36 *for the homicides.*
37
- 38 A. Yes, she says that.
39
- 40 Q. She says that. In relation to Mattaini she says:
41
- 42 *In the absence of intelligence, witnesses*
43 *or forensic evidence there has been no*
44 *further investigative avenues established*
45 *for Gilles Mattaini.*
46
- 47 A. Yes.

- 1
2 Q. In the case of two paragraphs down, she says:
3
4 *At the time of the reinvestigation of the*
5 *homicides of Russell and Warren in 2001 --*
6
7 that being the Taradale work --
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. --
11
12 *there were significant links between the*
13 *suspects and their associates who had been*
14 *involved in numerous assault and robbery*
15 *offences in Marks Park, Tamarama and in the*
16 *Bondi area.*
17
18
19 Do you see that?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. She goes on to refer to people she calls the "main
23 suspects"?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. And then she says in bold at the bottom of that page:
27
28 *It is my recommendation, due to the passage*
29 *of time, separation of alliances and social*
30 *isolation of the suspects from each other*
31 *there exists an opportunity to engage the*
32 *persons of interest via an undercover*
33 *operation in relation to the murder of*
34 *Russell and Warren.*
35
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. That was her recommendation?
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. And she goes on to say:
42
43 *In the absence of any other forensic*
44 *evidence or direct admissions from*
45 *suspects, there can be no advancement*
46 *towards conviction in the matters of*
47 *Russell, Warren or Mattaini.*

1
2 Do you see that?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. And then after mentioning the fact that there has been
6 no reward yet offered, she says:
7
8 *Consideration of a reward may provide*
9 *further avenues to generate information in*
10 *conjunction with an undercover operation.*
11
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Now, it seems that somebody, probably Detective
15 Lehmann, you think, would have reviewed that document?
16 A. Yes.
17
18 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gray, your microphone has become
19 detached and I can't really hear you. I think you are
20 going to have it reattached.
21
22 MR GRAY: I'm going to have to seek assistance.
23
24 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I know.
25
26 MR GRAY: My apologies.
27
28 Q. So is this the case, that you simply don't know
29 whether John Lehmann in fact expressed agreement with these
30 recommendations or not?
31 A. I don't. I don't know.
32
33 Q. Now, the front page of this document, the cover page,
34 if I can call it that --
35 A. Yes.
36
37 Q. -- on about three or four lines down, says, "Date
38 created: 15 August 2013"; do you see that?
39 A. Sorry, on page 1; is that right, Mr Gray?
40
41 MR GRAY: Would your Honour just pardon me a second?
42
43 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
44
45 MR GRAY: Q. I will come back to that, Mr Willing.
46 A. Sure.
47

- 1 Q. Because it seems that a document that I have as part
2 of this annexure to your statement doesn't seem to have
3 made the tender bundle, but we will locate it and I will
4 come back to it.
- 5 A. Yep, no problem.
- 6
- 7 Q. While that's coming, I will just go back to 2013,
8 where we were with Macnamir having just got under way?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10
- 11 Q. In March 2013, there were the articles by Paul Sheehan
12 in the Sydney Morning Herald about the gay hate murders,
13 especially in the Eastern Suburbs - you remember those?
- 14 A. I recall the other ones more prominently but yes, I -
15 yes, that's correct.
- 16
- 17 Q. And in July 2013 there was a series of articles by
18 Rick Feneley --
- 19 A. Yes, I recall those.
- 20
- 21 Q. -- along broadly similar lines?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23
- 24 Q. Both of those sets of articles, the Sheehan ones and
25 the Feneley ones, focused on concerns in the gay community
26 about 80 or more gay hate murders in the '80s and '90s in
27 particular?
- 28 A. Yes.
- 29
- 30 Q. And on the further concern that up to 30 of these were
31 or might be thought to be unsolved; correct?
- 32 A. Yes.
- 33
- 34 Q. And it is fair to say that these articles caused some
35 considerable consternation within the police?
- 36 A. Certainly, yes. Certainly around, you know, State
37 Crime Command, which includes Homicide.
- 38
- 39 Q. Would you agree that there was a widely held view in
40 the police that the police needed to do something to
41 respond to this negative publicity, from the police
42 perspective, flowing from all these articles?
- 43 A. Look, on face value, yes, but in terms of what that
44 was, you know, can take a variety of forms.
- 45
- 46 Q. Sure. Well, it was at just this time, seemingly -
47 I want to put to you when this document is produced -

1 namely, in August 2013, that Mr Lehmann had before him
2 Alicia Taylor's October 2012 review of the Taradale cases.
3 I will just see if we're any closer to getting that.
4 A. Sure. Do I need this volume, Mr Gray?
5
6 Q. You've got there volume 6, is it?
7 A. I think so. Yes.
8
9 Q. You will need it, because in a minute --
10 A. Sorry, I'm just trying to create some space for
11 myself.
12
13 Q. Certainly. In a second we will be adding a document
14 to it.
15 A. Okay.
16
17 MR GRAY: I know this is slightly inconvenient,
18 your Honour, and suboptimal, but would your Honour mind
19 waiting for a minute or two until this document comes?
20
21 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly. Do you want me to go off
22 the Bench?
23
24 MR GRAY: Well, if your Honour pleases --
25
26 THE COMMISSIONER: Find out whether it is forthcoming - is
27 there anything else you can ask the witness in the
28 meantime?
29
30 MR GRAY: Well, it's just another topic then looms, and
31 I'd like to clear this up before I move on.
32
33 THE COMMISSIONER: No, that's all right. If it's only
34 going to be a minute or two.
35
36 MR GRAY: I hope it's only going to be a minute or two.
37
38 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, no particular pressure,
39 but I'd like to get the orders made at some point. If they
40 could be looked at perhaps during the afternoon so that
41 either late today or perhaps in the morning I can organise
42 the orders in relation to those.
43
44 MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
45
46 THE COMMISSIONER: Then if any outstanding matters need to
47 be dealt with, they can be dealt with then.

1
2 MR TEDESCHI: Certainly by tomorrow.

3
4 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you. I will just go
5 off the Bench for a few minutes until that is organised,
6 thank you.

7
8 **SHORT ADJOURNMENT**

9
10 MR GRAY: Thank you, Commissioner. The document has been
11 found. Could I ask Mr Willing to have a look at it and
12 could I hand it up to your Honour.

13
14 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.

15
16 MR GRAY: If it is convenient, Commissioner, could it be
17 added as the first page of tab 162 of volume 6.

18
19 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.

20
21 MR GRAY: Q. Now, you've got that in front of you now,
22 Mr Willing?

23 A. Yes.

24
25 Q. What I wanted to ask you briefly is this: about three
26 or four lines down, it says, "Date created: 15 August
27 2013"?

28 A. Yes.

29
30 Q. It says, "Created by Detective Chief Inspector John
31 Lehmann"?

32 A. Yes.

33
34 Q. And "Reviewed by Detective Sergeant Connie Tse"?

35 A. Yep.

36
37 Q. What does that tell us as you understand it?

38 A. This is an e@gle.i product record. That tells me that
39 this note or this product record, which is a part of the
40 e@gle.i database system, investigation database system, was
41 created by John Lehmann on that date, 15 August 2013, and
42 reviewed, which means accepted on the system, by Connie
43 Tse, who was part of the review team of Unsolved Homicide.

44
45 Q. Now, can we deduce from that that John Lehmann then
46 has, as coordinator --

47 A. Yes.

- 1
2 Q. -- on the last page, agreed with the recommendations
3 of --
4 A. No. What you can deduce from that is that John has
5 created the administrative record, which - the review is
6 attached to it. So whether he's signed it or not I don't
7 know. I'm assuming he did, to assist the Commission, but
8 I don't know, until you actually see who signed that
9 record, but - yeah.
10
11 Q. At any rate, he, John Lehmann, seems to have done
12 something, possibly to read the review and agree with it or
13 possibly not, on 15 August?
14 A. Well, he's entered the - he has administratively
15 entered that document on to the database, which you'll see
16 there the investigation says "Palace."
17
18 Q. Yes.
19 A. Palace was the overarching record system that we used
20 for Unsolved Homicide reviews, the database, basically.
21
22 Q. All right. Second question about this cover page,
23 just below halfway there is - see item 102, on the
24 left-hand side, just below halfway?
25 A. Yes.
26
27 Q. And it says the titles is:
28
29 *Review murders of Ross Warren and John*
30 *Russell (1989).*
31
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. It doesn't mention Mattaini but it does mention Warren
35 and Russell?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. It says that the date created was 29 June 2011;
39 allocated to Detective Sergeant Peter Costello; due date
40 31 August 2011; status "Completed". Does that tell us that
41 in 2011, Detective Sergeant Peter Costello had conducted
42 some sort of review?
43 A. No. So what that suggests, you will see the line
44 above it, "Tasks using this item as Background
45 Information"?
46
47 Q. Yes.

- 1 A. So that suggests to me that a task had been created,
2 a job, given to Peter Costello, who was part of the review
3 team of Unsolved Homicide, from recollection, to conduct
4 the case screening review at some point in time, the task
5 being created for him to do that in 2011, on 29 June, with
6 a date that it was expected to be done by 31 August of that
7 year. That didn't happen, obviously, it was done by Alicia
8 Taylor later on.
9
- 10 Q. Oh, I see.
11 A. Yes.
12
- 13 Q. So it's the precursor to the thing that Alicia Taylor
14 did?
15 A. Correct. And the number 102 would be, from my
16 recollection, a sequence of reviews that had to occur or
17 had occurred, and they were up to 102 at that point in
18 time.
19
- 20 Q. I see.
21 A. Yep. So you would infer that probably Detective
22 Sergeant Costello, sooner or later, asked Alicia Taylor to
23 do this?
24 A. I would assume so, yes.
25
- 26 Q. That has been added to tab 162. I'll move on. That
27 folder - that has been done. So, where I was getting to,
28 before that little hiatus, was that whatever John Lehmann
29 did on 15 August 2013 was a month or so after all these
30 articles by Rick Feneley?
31 A. Yes. Yes.
32
- 33 Q. And something else that happened in about the same
34 time, around August/October 2013, which you may or may not
35 know about and you can tell us, is that Sergeant Steer, of
36 the Bias Crimes Unit, initiated something called Operation
37 Parrabell?
38 A. Yes, yes.
39
- 40 Q. Not to be confused with the later Strike Force
41 Parrabell, and Mr Steer's or Sergeant Steer's idea
42 in August/October 2013 was that he would review the 80-odd
43 cases. Are you aware of that?
44 A. I am from reading the material provided to me to
45 prepare for this.
46
- 47 Q. But otherwise you hadn't known that?

1 A. No. No.
2
3 Q. All right. Now, the Special Commission has heard
4 evidence that Sergeant Steer and the Bias Crimes Unit
5 turned out to be not in a position to proceed with that
6 project due to lack of resources for that unit?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. But a couple of years later, in 2015, renamed Strike
10 Force Parrabell, such a review process did unfold, as you
11 know?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. I'll come to that. But back in 2013, and only a month
15 or so after 15 August when Mr Lehmann at least
16 administratively did something with Alicia Taylor's
17 report --
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. -- Mr Lehmann, Detective Chief Inspector Lehmann,
21 produced a document called an "Issues Paper", in which he
22 summarised the 30 cases which were being suggested to be
23 gay hate and unsolved. Do you remember that?
24 A. So what date was that, Mr Gray, that he produced it?
25
26 Q. 25 September 2013.
27 A. Oh, September, it's not August. Sorry, I thought you
28 said August. September, yes, that's right.
29
30 Q. If I did say August, let me correct myself. August
31 was the date when he did something administratively with
32 this Alicia Taylor review.
33 A. Correct, yes.
34
35 Q. And about a month after that, namely, on 25 September,
36 he produced his issues paper?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. Which I take it you are familiar with?
40 A. I am.
41
42 Q. And could Mr Willing have tab 2, please. Sorry,
43 volume 2.
44
45 THE COMMISSIONER: Did you say volume 2?
46
47 MR GRAY: Volume 2.

1
2 Q. If we turn to tab 47 [SC0I.74096], that's the issue
3 paper that Mr Lehmann produced?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. You have given some evidence about this in your
7 statement?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. Which basically speaks for itself, which I will come
11 to in part, from about paragraph 18 through to paragraph 29
12 or so.
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. Now, can we just have a look at some of what you say
16 there in those paragraphs. In 19 - no, I don't need to ask
17 you about 19. In 21 you say you became aware of the Rick
18 Feneley articles?
19 A. Oh, yes, sorry, in paragraph 21, yes.
20
21 Q. Paragraph 21, yes. In 23 you say that the decision to
22 conduct an assessment of the 30 unsolved matters in Sue
23 Thompson's list was made by Mr Lehmann and Ms Young
24 unilaterally --
25 A. Yes.
26
27 Q. -- ie, without reference to you, I take it?
28 A. Yeah, that's right.
29
30 Q. You say you weren't involved in that decision, but
31 once you became aware that they had taken it, you were
32 supportive of that assessment being conducted?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. How soon afterwards did you become aware that they
36 were doing that?
37 A. I can't recall how --
38
39 Q. Soon, though, or long afterwards?
40 A. Yeah, soon after - soon after they decided to --
41
42 Q. Then at paragraph 26 - I just wanted to make sure I'm
43 understanding what you're saying there - you say, among
44 other things, that you were concerned that there might be
45 as many as 30, but that possibility troubled you?
46 A. Yes. Yes, it did.
47

1 Q. Then you say - and I'm looking about six lines down
2 paragraph 26:

3
4 *If, for example, the review revealed*
5 *a previously unknown pattern of gay-hate*
6 *homicides, potentially involving*
7 *overlapping perpetrators who remained at*
8 *large, it may well have been appropriate*
9 *for particular matters to be afforded*
10 *a higher level of priority or resources ...*

11
12 A. Yes.

13
14 Q. But such a pattern was not unknown at all at that
15 point, was it? Such a pattern was all too well known?

16 A. By which you're referring to what, Mr Gray?

17
18 Q. The pattern of gay hate homicides, using your words,
19 potentially involving overlapping perpetrators who remained
20 at large. Isn't that the very thing that Coroner Milledge
21 had dealt with in the Taradale inquest?

22 A. That was specific to three deaths?

23
24 Q. Yes.

25 A. One of which she couldn't determine whether it was
26 a homicide, Mattaini, but this is in the context of
27 30 alleged unsolved gay hate homicides.

28
29 Q. Sure.

30 A. Outside of that context.

31
32 Q. True.

33 A. Obviously it included it, but that was what I was -
34 that's what I'm referring to.

35
36 Q. Were you aware at the time of the statements that had
37 been made way back in 1990 and 1991 by Sergeant Ingleby and
38 Sergeant McCann about these patterns of overlapping
39 perpetrators?

40 A. No, not - not from recollection.

41
42 Q. Are you aware of those now? Have you seen either
43 Sergeant Ingleby's statement from 1990 or the two McCann
44 statements of 1991?

45 A. No, not from recollection. I've been given thousands
46 of documents. I'm not sure whether or not I looked at them
47 or not. I don't think so.

1
2 Q. Would it come as a surprise to you to learn today,
3 then, would it, that as early as 1991, Sergeant McCann, and
4 to a lesser extent Sergeant Ingleby, were laying out in
5 some considerable detail, the existence of a pattern of gay
6 hate homicides, potentially involving overlapping
7 perpetrators, way beyond just the three Bondi ones?
8 A. I take that as given - as granted, if that's what you
9 are asserting.

10
11 Q. No, my question is would that come as a surprise to
12 you that that had been spelt out as long ago as 1990 and
13 1991?

14 A. That's a difficult question to answer Mr Gray, because
15 I don't know the context behind it, I don't know the
16 evidence behind it, I don't know those analysis.

17
18 Q. No, just those statements: would it come as
19 a surprise to you that in statements by those two men,
20 that's what they had done?

21 A. Gee, that's difficult. I could say no, it's not
22 a surprise, but I don't understand what - you know, what
23 was behind the reasoning. So if they've come to that
24 conclusion, they've come to that conclusion.

25
26 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Can I just ask a question?

27 A. Yes, Commissioner.

28
29 Q. What did you mean, or what do you mean in
30 paragraph 26, about an "unknown pattern of gay hate
31 homicides"? What precisely were you thinking of, that,
32 what, all 30 cases need to be connected, or that there
33 needed to be perpetrators who might be responsible for
34 five, ten, two, three?

35 A. All of them.

36
37 Q. Twenty-nine.

38 A. All of the above, Commissioner.

39
40 Q. So - well, you've been asked questions about the
41 possibility of the Bondi murders being part of a pattern.
42 That didn't occur to you at the time?

43 A. No.

44
45 Q. So unless there was a pattern detected, which
46 previously was unknown, these cases, in your view, should
47 not have been given any particular priority over the other

1 700 in the Unsolved Homicide list; is that right?

2 A. I think that's - I don't particularly exactly agree
3 with that, Commissioner.

4

5 Q. Well, I'm asking you what you mean when you say:

6

7 *Considered it important that cases be*
8 *investigated properly (alongside the other*
9 *unsolved 700 at the time).*

10

11 So am I interpreting what you are saying there, that unless
12 some unique feature were to emerge in relation to the
13 alleged gay hate homicides, they simply would be put back
14 in with the other 700?

15 A. That's correct unless there was something which caused
16 a need immediately to prevent something which was, you
17 know, another homicide occurring, if there was an active
18 group doing it and committing murders that we knew of at
19 the time. So it's a difficult question to answer given the
20 other cases that were currently on the database at the time
21 as well.

22

23 Q. But most of the other cases, correct me if I'm wrong,
24 or many of the other cases, would not have been subjected
25 to the coronial inquiries that we've been dealing with
26 here, though, surely?

27 A. Many, many were - sorry, subjected to coronial
28 inquiries.

29

30 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

31

32 MR GRAY: Q. Now, in paragraph 29 you say that - and
33 you've explained this this morning - Detective Young was
34 the investigation supervisor for Macnamir by this time,
35 yes.

36

37 Q. And she was also conducting this assessment of the
38 30 cases with Detective Lehmann --

39 A. Yes.

40

41 Q. -- at the same time?

42 A. Yes.

43

44 Q. You say:

45

46 *I cannot recall being directly involved in*
47 *the communications and/or cooperation*

1 *between others in ... Macnamir and those*
2 *conducting the assessment ...*

3
4 ie, Lehmann and Young; is that right?

5 A. Yes.

6
7 Q. You say:

8
9 *however I would expect that there would*
10 *have been general communication among those*
11 *involved in ... Macnamir, other members of*
12 *the UHT and those conducting the*
13 *assessment --*

14
15 ie, Young and Lehmann?

16 A. Yes.

17
18 Q. about these matters. So do you mean by that, among
19 other things, that you expect that the UHT generally, or
20 many people or some people in it, would have been talking
21 to Young and Lehmann about this review of the 30?

22 A. I expected that it would be a topic of conversation
23 amongst a small team, and that those who were inside the
24 Unsolved Homicide Team would have knowledge of it going on.

25
26 Q. Well, I've asked you this previously, and I will just
27 ask you again in this context: in the Macnamir
28 framework --

29 A. Yes.

30
31 Q. -- Pamela Young's preferred hypothesis was suicide,
32 wasn't it?

33 A. I think I've answered that. I think she lays out the
34 evidence for the Coroner for all three hypotheses.

35
36 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. So is it your understanding she
37 had no preferred case theory?

38 A. She thought - no, that's correct. She thought it was
39 undetermined, was - she could not determine.

40
41 Q. Okay, right.

42 A. Yes.

43
44 Q. And as far as you perceived her position, she was
45 entirely open minded about any one or more of the two or
46 three case theories? Totally open minded?

47 A. From my observations of her, yes.

1
2 MR GRAY: Q. Just looking at the assessment of the 30,
3 tab 47 [SCOI.74906.0001] - do you have that?
4 A. Sorry?
5
6 Q. Tab 47 of volume 2?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. Mr Lehmann has - it is under his name but you have
10 explained that it's actually the two of them that have done
11 this?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. So they start off identifying the background as being
15 the Feneley articles --
16 A. Yes.
17
18 Q. -- which in turn had been based in part upon
19 information from Sue Thompson?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. And they say that they obtained from Sue Thompson her
23 list of 80-odd cases?
24 A. Yes, I think John contacted her.
25
26 Q. And then they go on to set out their views about the
27 30 that are said to be unsolved?
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. And with several of them - if you see number 3, David
31 Williams; number 7, Peter Sheil, number 10, William Rudney,
32 so called, and number 14, Russell Payne - they weren't able
33 to locate any records?
34 A. That's correct. In the case of Scott Johnson, number
35 12, they say:
36
37 *There is no indication --*
38
39 Last few lines. I will go back a step, last few lines:
40
41 *Strike Force Macnamir is nearing finality*
42 *and a comprehensive report will be*
43 *submitted by [DCI] Young when it is*
44 *completed however, at this late stage of*
45 *the investigation there is no indication*
46 *that the deceased was subjected to "gay*
47 *hate" motivated violence causing his death*

1 or in any case, that he was murdered.

2

3 A. Yes.

4

5 Q. Do you still say that Detective Chief Inspector Young
6 had a purely neutral approach to which of the three
7 possibilities there were?

8 A. I do say that. I do say that. And she articulates
9 that in her statement, as far as I can see.

10

11 Q. We'll have a little bit of a look at that later.

12

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. So notwithstanding this document,
14 your view was that, at the date of it, Ms Young was still
15 entertaining murder as a possible scenario?

16

17 A. Yes.

18

19 MR GRAY: Q. Now, when we get to the summary, on the
20 second-last page of this document, they say - the two
21 authors, as we know them to be - that 27 cases were
22 reviewed. It's actually 26, I think, because four cases
23 they said they could find no records; is that right?

24

25 A. Yes, that's right.

26

27 Q. And indeed the fourth bullet point tells us that four
28 cases could not be found.

29

30 A. Yes, that's right.

31

32 Q. And the authors say:

33

34 *This would suggest --*

35

36 the fact that they couldn't find the records --

37

38 *that those cases were probably not*
39 *homicides or suspicious deaths.*

40

41 A. Yes, they say that, yes.

42

43 Q. Do you think that stands up as a matter of logic?

44

45 A. Probably not, given that they --

46

47 Q. Not remotely, does it?

48

49 A. Well - no.

50

51 Q. No. But would it suggest to you that the authors were
52 keen to play down the likelihood of homicide in relation to

1 these 30?

2 A. Well, I - "play down" is a strong term. I would
3 suggest they have made that assumption on the fact that
4 there were no records that they could find - I believe that
5 there were records subsequently found.

6
7 Q. Yes, records have been found subsequently but my
8 question is - mainly by this Commission --

9 A. I think you're inferring - the term "play down" is
10 something I don't agree with.

11
12 Q. They've put forward a frankly ludicrous theory that
13 their failure to find records meant that they probably
14 weren't homicides, haven't they?

15 A. Yes, they have.

16
17 Q. And what would be the point of doing that unless they
18 were trying to play down the number of homicides?

19 A. Well, the fact that there were no records available,
20 a possible explanation would be that they weren't
21 homicides, because generally, homicides have got, you know,
22 large briefs of evidence that are attached to them, you
23 know, they go to the Coroner or the Supreme Court.

24
25 Q. The more --

26 A. It would be easily found, I guess.

27
28 Q. The more straightforward and obvious possibility is
29 that they just hadn't managed to find the records, wasn't
30 it?

31 A. They hadn't - that's right, they hadn't found the
32 records.

33
34 Q. At any rate, on page 9, the last of the bullet points
35 at the top of the page, the authors say:

36
37 *Only 8 cases from the 30 were probable or*
38 *possible "gay hate" motivated murders ...*

39
40 A. Yes.

41
42 Q. And one of those is not Scott Johnson; correct?

43 A. That's - that's correct, I think, from recollection.

44
45 Q. They are saying Scott Johnson is not probable or even
46 possible as a gay hate motivated murder, aren't they?

47 A. They are saying that there is no evidence at that

1 point in time --
2
3 Q. No, they are saying 8 cases were probable or possible
4 gay hate motivated murders, and one of those eight is not
5 Scott Johnson?
6 A. That's correct.
7
8 Q. And they say that the eight "are on file at the
9 Unsolved Homicide Team with consideration for future
10 investigation"?
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Now, as at September 2013, was that true in respect of
14 those eight?
15 A. If you are - I need to have a look at what eight they
16 were, but I'm taking what you're saying on face value as
17 true.
18
19 Q. Well, I can take you to the eight if need be. Three
20 of them are the three Bondi ones but I can show you the
21 other five.
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. But what does the expression "with consideration for
25 further investigation" mean?
26 A. That they would be - they're sitting there on the
27 database, which was the Unsolved Homicide database, so
28 which lists, you know, those 700-odd cases, and then those
29 cases are subject to review and then decisions are made
30 whether to investigate them or reinvestigate, I should say,
31 those matters, based on reviews and those circumstances.
32
33 Q. So it means really that they are simply sitting in the
34 files or the database of the Unsolved Homicides along with
35 the other 700?
36 A. That's right.
37
38 Q. And sooner or later, when the ball ticks around, the
39 number will come up and that case will come up on to
40 someone's desk?
41 A. It would be reviewed, yes.
42
43 Q. So that's what's meant by "consideration for future
44 investigation"?
45 A. That's what I take it to mean, yes.
46
47 Q. Now, if we turn to the next tab, 48,

1 [NPL.0113.0001.0156], there is an issues paper by yourself.
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. Of 10 January 2014?
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. And it attaches the one we've just been looking at
8 from Mr Lehmann and in fact Pamela Young, as you have
9 explained?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. And so it seems from your handwritten note on the very
13 back of the attached copy of Mr Lehmann's document that you
14 had received his document by 28 September 2013.
15 A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
16
17 Q. And you say, as best I can read it:
18
19 *Further discussions with the journalist --*
20
21 that's Rick Feneley, I presume?
22 A. That's right, yes.
23
24 Q. --
25
26 *should be considered at an appropriate time*
27 *(in light of the [Strike Force] Macnamir*
28 *investigation) --*
29
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. --
33
34 *As previously discussed between the --*
35
36 A. Myself.
37
38 Q. --
39
40 *Commander Homicide and --*
41
42 What's the next bit?
43 A. "DCoP", so Deputy Commissioner.
44
45 Q. Now, looking at your issues paper, 10 January 2014 --
46 A. Yes.
47

- 1 Q. -- you are producing that because the Department of
2 Premier and Cabinet has asked for --
3 A. Advice.
4
- 5 Q. -- an update or some advice?
6 A. Yes.
7
- 8 Q. Having received a letter from Alex Greenwich MP?
9 A. Correct, yes.
10
- 11 Q. Who wants to know what's going on with the status of
12 investigations into these gay hate killings?
13 A. Yes.
14
- 15 Q. And you set those out in the three bullet points in
16 bold?
17 A. Yes.
18
- 19 Q. Now, in your answer to the question, "What is the
20 current status" and "Is it the view of the police that they
21 can be characterised as gay hate crimes", your answer
22 begins by referring to Mr Lehmann's issue paper?
23 A. Yes.
24
- 25 Q. And notes that that itself followed the articles in
26 the Herald, which are the Feneley articles, and then refers
27 to the family of Scott Johnson and --
28 A. Yes.
29
- 30 Q. -- what they were doing by way of media activity?
31 A. Yes.
32
- 33 Q. Then, after referring to the fact that this assessment
34 was done by both Lehmann and Young, you put the position
35 this way, and this is for an issues paper for the
36 Department of Premier and Cabinet:
37
- 38 *The assessment revealed that the suggestion*
39 *of 30 unsolved "gay hate" related murders*
40 *was and is gross exaggeration.*
41
- 42 A. Yes.
43
- 44 Q. That's the expression that Mr Lehmann and Ms Young
45 used, isn't it?
46 A. Correct.
47

- 1 Q. And you say in your paper:
2
3 *A total of only 8 cases of the 30 were*
4 *assessed as "probable" or "possible"*
5 *"gay-hate" motivated homicides ...*
6
- 7 A. Yes.
8
- 9 Q. So it's clear, isn't it, that you are endorsing the
10 view of Mr Lehmann and Ms Young?
11 A. Yes.
12
- 13 Q. Namely, that to say 30 was a gross exaggeration?
14 A. Yes.
15
- 16 Q. And that in fact, of the 30, only 8 were even possible
17 or probable gay hate?
18 A. Yes, at the time, yes.
19
- 20 Q. In the last couple of paragraphs of your issues paper,
21 on the third page, under the heading "Death of Scott
22 Johnson", you say that the Unsolved Homicide Team had
23 established Strike Force Macnamir in February 2013
24 following intense lobbying by members of the Johnson
25 family?
26 A. Yes.
27
- 28 Q. And was that intended to indicate that otherwise it
29 wouldn't have been established?
30 A. That's correct, yes.
31
- 32 Q. Indeed, the decision had been made not to investigate
33 it any further at all?
34 A. That's right, based on the case screening report.
35
- 36 Q. Then you say:
37
38 *Following extensive investigation for*
39 *almost a year where Strike Force Macnamir*
40 *investigators, who had been diverted from*
41 *other unsolved matters, have finalised*
42 *inquiries --*
43
44 with one exception --
45 A. Yes.
46
- 47 Q. Well, pausing there, why did you make the point to the

1 Department of Premier and Cabinet that Macnamir
2 investigators had been diverted from other unsolved
3 matters?

4 A. Because they were.

5

6 Q. And so what, though? What is that relevant to, in
7 this context?

8 A. Well, in the context of limited resources that are
9 available to the Unsolved Homicide Team, it was a small
10 team, there were 700 cases, odd cases, I can't recall the
11 exact number, but it was 700-odd cases that, you know, we
12 had to make decisions as to what to investigate and what
13 not to investigate. I thought it was a relevant issue at
14 the time, given the pressure on that team and the limited
15 resources they had.

16

17 Q. And does that mean - did you mean by that, then, that
18 if they hadn't been putting these resources into Johnson,
19 they'd have been investigating, for example, Russell and
20 Warren and Mattaini?

21 A. Oh, not specifically those matters but other
22 homicides, when --

23

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Can you name any others that you
25 say were not investigated as a result of the diversion of
26 resources?

27 A. I would have to, Commissioner, see the database at the
28 time, but there were 700 cases.

29

30 Q. Yes, but, look, the 700 cases were not then, nor are
31 they now, are they, day-to-day, subject to active
32 investigation?

33 A. No, of course not.

34

35 Q. Of course not. And the fact of the matter is, most
36 often, unless there's a break through, they simply collect
37 dust, don't they?

38 A. No. They're subject to a review process, or, as
39 Mr Gray says, the wheel turns around until the point where
40 they are reviewed and if there is - again, if there are
41 opportunities to test forensic exhibits, if there are
42 opportunities for relationship breakdowns, advances in
43 technology, they may be subject to reinvestigation.

44

45 Q. That's assuming exhibits can be retrieved, isn't it?

46 A. That's right, yes.

47

1 MR GRAY: Q. In the rest of that last paragraph you say,
2 as your view, that Macnamir investigators have not
3 discovered any evidence at all to confirm that Scott
4 Johnson was the victim of a homicide, let alone a gay-hate
5 murder?
6 A. That's right.
7
8 Q. And that was your view as well?
9 A. Yes, at the time, yes.
10
11 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And you say, do you, that even as
12 at the date 10 January 2014, you still thought Ms Young's
13 view was that murder was a viable option?
14 A. Yes. I do.
15
16 Q. Really?
17 A. Yes, I do.
18
19 MR GRAY: Q. In the absence of any evidence?
20 A. That's right. Because there were other inquiries that
21 were ongoing at the time. I was waiting for the Crime
22 Commission to come back to me with a review of whether or
23 not they felt that all avenues of inquiry --
24
25 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I'm not interested in the Crime
26 Commission --
27 A. Well --
28
29 Q. -- I'm interested in your understanding of Ms Young's
30 view, notwithstanding your view, seemingly quite directly
31 expressed, you nonetheless thought that, notwithstanding
32 your view and your appreciation of the lack of evidence,
33 she was still harbouring open as a viable case theory
34 murder?
35 A. Yes.
36
37 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
38
39 MR GRAY: Q. Now, at just about this time - that is,
40 late 2013, early 2014, Pamela Young had completed her very
41 lengthy statement for the Macnamir investigation; correct?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. You have annexed it to your statement?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. I want to ask you some questions about it.

- 1 A. Yes.
2
- 3 MR GRAY: Commissioner, the statement as it was attached
4 to Mr Willing's statement was entirely unredacted.
5 However, it seems that there were orders made in the
6 coronial proceedings, the effect of which was that a great
7 deal of it was redacted and should remain so. And so
8 a copy of the document with all those redactions is now
9 available.
10
- 11 Q. Do you now already have that, Mr Willing?
12 A. I was shown it - I read it last night but I don't have
13 a physical copy of it.
14
- 15 Q. We can give you a copy now.
16 A. Sure.
17
- 18 MR GRAY: And does the Commissioner have one?
19
- 20 THE COMMISSIONER: Does this catch you unawares,
21 Mr Tedeschi?
22
- 23 MR TEDESCHI: We had a version provided to us yesterday.
24
- 25 MR GRAY: Q. Obviously with the hundreds of pages that
26 are totally redacted, I'm not going to be asking you any
27 questions.
28 A. Sure.
29
- 30 Q. But on the front page we see that it has a date
31 20 November 2013?
32 A. Yes.
33
- 34 Q. On the very front page. And on the very back page,
35 the only thing that is not redacted are the signatures and
36 the date of signature, which is 13 July 2014.
37 A. Yes.
38
- 39 Q. Now without going through with you laboriously which
40 bits are redacted and which bits aren't, roughly 390 pages
41 out of 445 are totally redacted?
42 A. Yes.
43
- 44 Q. So one can see nothing at all?
45 A. I can see that, yes.
46
- 47 Q. But I want to ask you a couple of questions about two

1 or three of the sections that are only partially redacted?
2 A. Sure.
3
4 Q. And the first section, if you can turn to page 240,
5 which is about halfway through the 445 pages --
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. -- in fact, up to, I think, 1606, the entire thing has
9 been redacted with maybe one or two exceptions?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. At any rate, starting at 1607, for the next 25 pages
13 or so, what Pamela Young is doing largely is referring to
14 Operation Taradale and how it might relate to Macnamir?
15 A. Mmm-hmm.
16
17 Q. You would recall that - you have looked at this in the
18 last few days, I think?
19 A. I looked at it last night.
20
21 Q. Last night, yes. So, for example, at 1610 she says
22 "Deputy State Coroner Milledge held an inquest in 2005",
23 and she describes the context?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. And then 1615 and 1616, she devotes two paragraphs to
27 Mr Mattaini?
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. Or his case, really, I should say?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. And if you read through 1615, you will see that she
34 gives some emphasis to Mr Mattaini's mother having thought
35 it was possible that her son had suicided?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. And she does not mention the possibility of homicide
39 at all, does she?
40 A. That's right. Yes.
41
42 Q. When we get to 1619, Mr Warren, you can see the
43 summary there in that paragraph and the next couple of
44 paragraphs?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 MR GRAY: My friend wants this point to be made. I'm

1 happy to make it.
2
3 Q. What I asked you, and you agreed, about 1615 was that
4 she, Ms Young, didn't mention anything about the
5 possibility of homicide?
6 A. No, not in that paragraph, no.
7
8 Q. And as my friend perfectly accurately points out, in
9 1616, she does, however, note what Coroner Milledge found?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. Which was that there was a strong possibility of
13 homicide?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. So I accept that. In 1619 and following, she, Pamela
17 Young, is dealing with Mr Warren?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. And although at 1621 again she quotes from Coroner
21 Milledge, she, Pamela Young, notes the suicide possibility
22 but makes no mention of the homicide possibility?
23 A. Which paragraph is that, sorry, Mr Gray?
24
25 Q. 1619.
26 A. 1619, yes.
27
28 Q. She talks about him having felt a bit depressed and
29 could have slashed his wrists - so that's a reference to
30 a suicide possibility?
31 A. Yes, of course.
32
33 Q. But there's no reference to a homicide possibility;
34 correct?
35 A. That's correct.
36
37 Q. And then when we get to Russell at 1622 to 1625 --
38 A. Sorry, can I just --
39
40 Q. Yes.
41 A. But she does say in 1621, she again quotes the
42 Coroner's findings which relate directly to homicide.
43
44 Q. Yes, I took you to that at the beginning. I've
45 already taken you to that.
46 A. For Warren?
47

1 Q. That's for Warren, yes. And in the case of Russell
2 she does the same thing again, at 1625, she quotes the
3 Coroner's finding?
4 A. Yes, that's right.
5
6 Q. But in her own narrative, 1622 to 1624, she emphasises
7 the possibility of misadventure, doesn't she?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. As being more likely than homicide?
11
12 MR TEDESCHI: I object. Reading the document, she is
13 referring to previous investigations, not stating her own
14 view.
15
16 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it speaks for itself, I think, in
17 one way or the other.
18
19 MR GRAY: Q. Can you answer the question?
20
21 THE COMMISSIONER: But I will allow the question.
22
23 THE WITNESS: Sorry, can you repeat the question?
24
25 MR GRAY: Q. Yes. In her three paragraphs, 1622 to
26 1624, she refers to factors, whoever first expressed them,
27 that may have --
28 A. Related to misadventure.
29
30 Q. -- related to misadventure?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. But doesn't herself give any attention to the
34 possibility of homicide?
35 A. No.
36
37 Q. Apart from quoting Coroner Milledge?
38 A. Correct.
39
40 Q. Okay. Then she goes on in the next many paragraphs,
41 which I won't take you to generally speaking, to reported
42 assaults on gay men in the area, many of them?
43 A. Yes. Yes.
44
45 Q. And then at 1671 she refers to Taradale having, as she
46 puts it, reaffirmed known intelligence that in the late
47 '80s and early '90s groups were involved in multiple

1 unidentified assault and robbery offences in and around
2 Bondi and the city on a broad range of victims?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. That sounds like the sort of pattern that you refer to
6 in your statement as being previously not known, doesn't
7 it?
8 A. No, I - that relates to assaults. There is
9 a difference between an assault and a homicide, somebody
10 dying.
11
12 Q. I see.
13 A. As referenced in the Lehmann/Young report.
14
15 Q. Very good. All right. 1678, she quotes or refers to
16 some of the 2005 coronial findings?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. About Marks Park being a known area for brutal attacks
20 on homosexual males?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. I just wanted to ask you about two things in this
24 paragraph, 1678.
25 A. Yes.
26
27 Q. In the third --
28
29 THE COMMISSIONER: You are fading again, Mr Gray, and it
30 is 1 o'clock, so why don't we tog you up at 2?
31
32 MR GRAY: You can tog me up at 2.
33
34 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will adjourn until 2
35 o'clock. Thank you.
36
37 **LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT**
38
39 MR GRAY: Q. Mr Willing, do you still have Ms Young's
40 statement there?
41 A. I do.
42
43 Q. If you have paragraph 1679, which is on page 256,
44 Ms Young is there referring to the Mattaini case?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. I just want to ask you a couple of things about this

1 paragraph. Firstly, she says the 1989 knowledge of police
2 regarding Mattaini's 1985 disappearance was various things?
3 A. Yes.

4
5 Q. Do you see that?
6 A. Yes.

7
8 Q. But in fact in 1989, police had no knowledge of
9 Mattaini's disappearance at all, did they?
10 A. I'm not sure. That's probably correct.

11
12 Q. Well, there's an abundance of evidence in Taradale and
13 here that Mattaini's disappearance did not come to the
14 attention of the police until 2002.
15 A. Okay. I accept that.

16
17 Q. And so that's a mistake on the part of Pamela Young,
18 it would appear?
19 A. It would appear that way, yes.

20
21 Q. Having made that mistake, she says that the
22 knowledge - and let's assume she's actually referring to
23 when they did have the knowledge, which is 2002 --
24 A. Yes.

25
26 Q. -- was that he was a reported missing person with
27 positive evidence of suicidal ideation on two occasions.
28 Do you see that?
29 A. Yes.

30
31 Q. So she's highlighting the suicide possibility --
32 A. Yes, she is.

33
34 Q. -- with Mr Mattaini? And then two sentences down she
35 says:

36
37 *The 2005 coronial inquest was not able to*
38 *specify the place of his*
39 *disappearance/presumed death and did not*
40 *find that it resulted from gay-hate*
41 *violence in Marks Park.*

42
43 Do you see that?
44 A. Yes, I do.

45
46 Q. Now, if we go down to 1682 - and I took you to this
47 this morning in the Milledge findings, what Coroner

- 1 Milledge did in the case of Mattaini, you will recall, was
2 to bring in an open finding?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. But to say what appears at 1682, not as a finding but
6 as a statement that the Coroner made --
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. -- namely, that there was evidence which strongly
10 supported the probability that Mr Mattaini, who we are
11 talking about for the moment --
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. -- met his death at the hands of gay hate assailants.
15 Do you agree?
16 A. Yes. That's what she says, yes, there's a
17 probability, yes.
18
19 Q. Now, when Ms Young says in the last sentence in 1679
20 that the Coroner did not find that Mr Mattaini's death
21 resulted from gay hate violence, that perhaps is
22 technically true, in that the finding is one of an open
23 finding?
24 A. That's right.
25
26 Q. But it's not exactly fulsome in giving the reader an
27 account of what the Coroner did, is it?
28 A. Well, I would suggest it is, given that she includes
29 the statement by the Coroner at 1682.
30
31 Q. All right. That's your view. All right.
32 A. Sure.
33
34 Q. You wouldn't suggest that she was highlighting in 1679
35 the suicide theory rather than the gay hate violence
36 theory?
37 A. She certainly highlights suicide ideation in that
38 paragraph, yes. If you turn over to page 364 of this
39 statement, after a lot more redactions, and starting at
40 paragraph 2447 --
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. -- and I know you have told us you looked at this last
44 night?
45 A. That's correct.
46
47 Q. So hopefully I don't need to be very long on this, but

1 you will see that she introduces the subject of the July
2 2013 Rick Feneley articles.
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. And then at 2452 and 2453, she refers to the
6 suggestion of the 30 unsolved cases?
7 A. Sorry, 2453?
8
9 Q. Yes, and in fact starts a bit before that, but yes.
10 A. And she - yes.
11
12 Q. And then 2453 she says:
13
14 *The following is a summary of the*
15 *assessment done on [the 30] ...*
16
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. And then from 2454, and the names are redacted, she
20 starts with number 1 and it runs through the 30 --
21 A. It goes through the same as the report.
22
23 Q. It is the same 30, isn't it?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. As in the Lehmann issue paper and your issue paper, or
27 the Lehmann issue paper which is attached to your issue
28 paper?
29 A. Yes, correct, yes.
30
31 Q. And then accordingly, unsurprisingly no doubt, at
32 2512, she also repeats - this is on page 373 - the view
33 expressed in that issues paper --
34 A. Yes, she does.
35
36 Q. -- by herself and Lehmann, namely, that of the 30,
37 only eight were homicide with evidence or indication of gay
38 hate?
39 A. That's correct, yes.
40
41 Q. Then if we turn over to page 431, you will see - and
42 I interrupt myself, Commissioner, to make this next part
43 clear. The paragraph numbered 2878 is a heading, which is
44 "The Suicide Hypothesis".
45
46 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
47

1 MR GRAY: There is another heading at 2899, headed "The
2 Homicide Hypothesis", and Mr Willing has before him,
3 I hope, an unredacted set of pages.
4
5 THE WITNESS: No, I don't. I've got the redacted set.
6
7 MR GRAY: Q. No, but there are a few redactions of --
8 A. Oh, yes, of course.
9
10 Q. -- little bits, but largely the text is readable?
11 A. That's right, yes.
12
13 MR GRAY: But counsel for the Police has requested that
14 these pages, paragraphs 2878 to 2921, so about six pages,
15 or six or seven pages, at least for the moment not be shown
16 on the screen for the live streaming audience and not for
17 the moment be placed on the Inquiry's website, and at least
18 for the moment, that position is accepted. But I want to
19 ask Mr Willing some questions about the content of those
20 paragraphs nonetheless, and I will do so in a way that
21 accommodates --
22
23 THE WITNESS: Sure.
24
25 MR GRAY: -- the concern that has been raised.
26
27 MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, I might just indicate for your
28 benefit that we take the same position about broadcasting
29 of these questions as well. You have ruled that there is
30 a potential for trial but it is so far away that it
31 wouldn't potentially prejudice but we have concerns.
32
33 THE COMMISSIONER: I know you have concerns, Mr Tedeschi,
34 but for the reasons I have stated earlier this morning
35 I think at the moment what is extant is a complex legal
36 landscape without a jury trial imminent, and not likely to
37 be fixed in the near future, as I apprehend the position.
38
39 MR TEDESCHI: I would like to voice some other concerns.
40
41 THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry?
42
43 MR TEDESCHI: I would like to voice some other concerns,
44 Commissioner, but my concern is that by voicing these other
45 concerns I cause the problem that I wish to bring to your
46 attention by voicing those concerns.
47

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

2

3 MR TEDESCHI: Perhaps I can tell my learned friend first
4 what those concerns are.

5

6 THE COMMISSIONER: By all means. By all means.

7

8 MR GRAY: Commissioner, I am sorry to make this
9 suggestion, but it may be appropriate for you to rise for
10 a couple of minutes so that the concern that Mr Tedeschi
11 has just explained to me can be explained to you privately,
12 and then it may be that I can accommodate things in a
13 certain way. But it would be best if you understood what
14 was happening, really, rather than be guessing at what is
15 being said to me.

16

17 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will go off the Bench and
18 that can be raised. Thank you. I will adjourn shortly.

19

20 **SHORT ADJOURNMENT.**

21

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Please sit down.

23

24 I should just record that as a result of a discussion
25 which I have just had with Mr Gray SC and Mr Tedeschi KC,
26 I will invite you, Mr Gray, to move to another topic for
27 the short term and then we will revisit, as and when is
28 necessary, other matters in due course. Thank you.

29

30 MR GRAY: Q. Mr Willing, two months after your issues
31 paper of 10 January 2014, namely, in March 2014, you wrote
32 to the State Coroner, Mr Barnes?

33

A. That's right.

34

35 Q. You deal with that in paragraph 50 of your statement
36 and you annex the letter?

37

A. Yes.

38

39 Q. Which is I think in the tender bundle at --

40

A. I'm assuming I don't need this Mr Gray for the time
41 being, anyway?

42

43 Q. Do you have it there?

44

A. No, no. This particular bundle.

45

46 Q. Yes, that can go. It is I think volume 11, tab 252C
47 [SCOI.82369.0004_0001].

1 A. 252C? Oh, yes. Yes.
2
3 THE COMMISSIONER: I am sorry, did you say volume 11?
4
5 MR GRAY: Yes.
6
7 THE COMMISSIONER: And the tab?
8
9 MR GRAY: 252C.
10
11 THE COMMISSIONER: 252C, thank you. Thank you.
12
13 MR GRAY: Q. In that letter after recounting various
14 matters of history --
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. -- what you say on the second page, the third-last
18 paragraph, is that:
19
20 *I am of the view that given particular*
21 *circumstances surrounding this case coupled*
22 *with the interests and beliefs of the*
23 *Johnson family, that a further examination*
24 *of the circumstances surrounding the death*
25 *of Scott Johnson, in light of the*
26 *comprehensive investigations conducted by*
27 *the Homicide Squad Unsolved Homicide Team*
28 *via Strike Force Macnamir, would be in the*
29 *public interest.*
30
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. You conclude by saying:
34
35 *Accordingly.... I write to formally request*
36 *that your office conduct a further*
37 *examination of the circumstances ...*
38
39 Et cetera?
40 A. Yes.
41
42 Q. Now, in your statement at paragraph 50, you say that
43 the State Coroner granted your request. Do you see that?
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. Do you mean by that that he granted your request to
47 conduct a further examination?

- 1 A. That's right, yes. Not necessarily an inquest. He
2 could have reviewed the matter and decided one way or the
3 other what to do, but --
4
- 5 Q. Yes. So you're not putting forward that letter as
6 a request by you for an inquest?
7 A. No. It was for him to conduct an examination of it;
8 should he choose to conduct a further inquest, that was
9 a matter for him.
10
- 11 Q. Right. Because in fact, as I'm sure you recall,
12 between your letter of March 2014 and his ultimate
13 decision - his, Mr Barnes's ultimate decision - to hold
14 a third inquest, there were quite a number of intermediate
15 steps, weren't there?
16 A. Yes, but - could you clarify what they were?
17
- 18 Q. Yes. Well, among other things, there were written
19 submissions to Mr Barnes?
20 A. Yes, of course, yes.
21
- 22 Q. Both from Counsel Assisting and from counsel for the
23 Police?
24 A. Yes.
25
- 26 Q. And from counsel for the family, as to various issues,
27 including whether or not a third inquest should actually be
28 held?
29 A. Yes.
30
- 31 Q. You agree?
32 A. Yes.
33
- 34 Q. And on 13 April 2015, there was an oral argument in
35 court before Mr Barnes on those issues?
36 A. I assume that would be the case. I wasn't present.
37
- 38 Q. And in the submissions that were then put forward on
39 behalf of the Commissioner of Police, the position taken on
40 behalf of the Commissioner was, firstly, that the
41 Commissioner was definitely not making an application for
42 a third inquest; do you agree?
43 A. Yes, I haven't seen the submissions or - but I'm
44 taking what you're saying on face value.
45
- 46 Q. Well, pausing there, were you not involved in the
47 conduct of these proceedings, including this question about

1 whether or not there would be a third inquest?

2 A. I had some knowledge of it. I had some discussions
3 with counsel in general terms, but that was left to Pam
4 Young and Penelope Brown.

5

6 Q. Sorry, Pam Young?

7 A. And Penelope Brown. Penny Brown.

8

9 Q. All right. But the submission was made, I'm
10 suggesting to you, in quite unambiguous terms, that the
11 Commissioner of Police was definitely not making an
12 application for a third inquest, and I assume you know that
13 to be so?

14 A. I can't recall that, to be perfectly honest, but
15 I accept that that's the case.

16

17 Q. And the submissions for the Commissioner included that
18 it was the Johnson family who were actually making the
19 application for the third inquest. Does that sound right
20 to you?

21 A. That may have occurred down the track, yes.

22

23 Q. And that the Commissioner's position was that the
24 Commissioner would not oppose that application, but wished
25 to draw to the Coroner's attention a number of factors that
26 might indicate that a third inquest should not be held. Do
27 you remember that?

28 A. No, I don't.

29

30 Q. And one of those factors, I suggest, that was put
31 forward on behalf of the Commissioner, was that having
32 a third Johnson inquest would involve a diversion of UHT
33 resources away from other cases. Do you recall?

34 A. I don't recall any of those submissions. I wasn't
35 present.

36

37 Q. Do you recall that a second factor that was put
38 forward on behalf of the Commissioner was that all the work
39 that Macnamir had done to date indicated that it was
40 unlikely that a third inquest would reach any different
41 finding from the second one, ie, an open finding?

42 A. Right. I accept that.

43

44 Q. Thank you for accepting it, but are you saying --

45 A. I wasn't present.

46

47 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. When you say you were not present,

- 1 does that mean that you weren't privy to what Ms Young was
2 instructing counsel on behalf of the police to do?
3 A. Not in relation to that.
4
- 5 Q. Well, when you say "not in relation to that", did you
6 involve yourself at all in the position to be adopted
7 publicly by the police in relation to the application for
8 a third inquest or did you just take no interest in it at
9 all?
10 A. I didn't take no interest in it at all.
11
- 12 Q. Well, then, if you didn't take any interest in it, did
13 you take an interest in it?
14 A. Of course I did. I wrote to the Coroner in relation
15 to it.
16
- 17 Q. Of course you did. And as a result of your position
18 at the time, are you suggesting to me that you were not, at
19 the time, intimately aware of what Ms Young was going to
20 put to the court or instruct counsel to put to the court?
21 A. Yes.
22
- 23 Q. Does that mean you were, at the time, you think,
24 likely intimately aware of what Ms Young was going to
25 instruct counsel publicly to put?
26 A. No, I wasn't intimately aware of that.
27
- 28 Q. And was it something that you had no concern about,
29 something that you had no interest in, something that, in
30 respect of which your authority was not needed?
31 A. No, I had an interest in it. It would - it was
32 something that would involve a range of factors and a range
33 of views. The Commissioner of Police, General Counsel,
34 et cetera, were all having input into that position taken
35 by the Commissioner, so --
36
- 37 Q. What about your position, though? Was your position
38 irrelevant in the sense that could Ms Young put to counsel
39 to take a particular course without consultation with you?
40 A. She could.
41
- 42 Q. And did she?
43 A. Not from my understanding. I don't - I can't recall.
44 My position was that I thought that the Coroner should
45 conduct a further examination of the matter.
46
- 47 Q. And did you think a third inquest was important?

1 A. Yes, I did.

2

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray.

4

5 MR GRAY: Q. Did you know that these submissions were
6 being put by counsel for the Commissioner, including that
7 the Commissioner was not making an application for a third
8 inquest and that, although not opposing the Johnson
9 family's application for one, the Commissioner was
10 concerned about diversion of resources and felt that it was
11 unlikely that any different result would be reached? Did
12 you know that that was what was being put?

13 A. I can't specifically recall that.

14

15 Q. Well, when you say you can't specifically recall, what
16 does that mean?

17 A. I can't remember. I can't remember.

18

19 Q. You don't have any recollection at all?

20 A. I don't recall. I don't recall.

21

22 Q. All right. At any rate, on 13 April 2015 at the
23 conclusion of the oral argument on that day, the decision
24 of State Coroner Barnes was in fact not to accept
25 submissions to that effect by the Commissioner as to
26 diversion of resources or as to the unlikelihood of
27 a different result and, instead, to grant the application
28 for a third inquest; correct?

29 A. Correct.

30

31 Q. Now, I will just jump forward a couple of years to the
32 conclusion of the whole inquest proceedings, the third
33 inquest proceedings, which resulted in findings being
34 handed down by Coroner Barnes on 30 November 2017. You
35 follow me?

36 A. Yes.

37

38 Q. Now, I appreciate that by this time you had ceased to
39 be Commander Homicide?

40 A. Correct, yes.

41

42 Q. I understand that. But still, I assume you maintained
43 some interest at least professionally in what was
44 happening --

45 A. Yes.

46

47 Q. -- in the third Johnson inquest?

- 1 A. Yes, but not intimately.
2
- 3 Q. Well, not intimately, but down the scale from
4 intimately, what level of interest?
- 5 A. I had a general interest in it, but at the end of the
6 day when you leave a squad like the Homicide Squad, things
7 progress and investigations progress and the like and you
8 don't get yourself involved in them. I had a - you know,
9 a busy Counter Terrorism Command to run which took up the
10 majority of my time and interest. Of course, you know, the
11 outcome of the inquest was of interest to me given the
12 history of the matter and the fact that I had the squad for
13 a long period of time.
14
- 15 Q. And you had what for --
- 16 A. The squad. I had command of the Homicide Squad.
17
- 18 Q. Ah, the squad, thank you. Now, the final written
19 submissions for the parties were delivered, it seems, in
20 about October 2017. The decision was 30 November. Were
21 you aware of what was being submitted, or the thrust of it,
22 on the part of - on behalf of the Commissioner?
- 23 A. No, no, not by that point, given that I was - I had
24 gone, it would be a matter for the current Commander of
25 Homicide.
26
- 27 Q. So can I suggest to you that at the end of the third
28 inquest - that is, after all the evidence had concluded -
29 so in about October 2017, counsel for the Commissioner was
30 still making submissions to the Coroner to the effect that
31 although none of the three possibilities - suicide,
32 homicide, misadventure - could be positively ruled out --
- 33 A. Yes.
34
- 35 Q. -- nevertheless, firstly, suicide was the most likely,
36 and, secondly, a homicide finding was simply not open. Did
37 you know that?
- 38 A. No.
39
- 40 Q. And counsel for the Commissioner further submitted
41 in October 2017 not only that an open finding should be
42 made, but that thereafter the Coroner should not make any
43 further recommendations in relation to investigating the
44 death of Scott Johnson. Did you know that?
- 45 A. I can't recall that at all.
46
- 47 Q. So you didn't give instructions to make such

1 submissions?
2 A. Not from my recollection. I wasn't part of the
3 Homicide Squad, as I said.
4
5 Q. If those submissions were put - namely, the ones I've
6 just said --
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. -- would you - is that something that would surprise
10 you?
11
12 MR TEDESCHI: I object.
13
14 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
15
16 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I allow it, Mr Tedeschi. I allow
17 it.
18
19 THE WITNESS: It's difficult to answer because I wasn't
20 privy to the last few months of the investigation that was
21 being conducted, you know, under the guise of the Coroner
22 and on behalf of the Coroner. I would have thought, on
23 what I knew at the time, that an open finding would be
24 appropriate. That's my view.
25
26 MR GRAY: Q. That an open finding?
27 A. An open finding, yes.
28
29 Q. ie, not a finding involving homicide?
30 A. Or suicide, or - it would be undetermined.
31
32 Q. All right. Now, as we know, Coroner Barnes did not
33 make an open finding?
34 A. That's right, yes.
35
36 Q. You've seen his written findings, I presume?
37 A. Yes, I think it was in one of the tender bundles that
38 I was given.
39
40 Q. Yes. I wonder if Mr Willing could have volume 10,
41 please, and turn to tab 232 [SCOI.11064.00018_0001]
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. I don't want to take you to all the detail of this
45 either, but just to take you to some matters that
46 his Honour deals with at the end. Do you see
47 paragraph 242, page 46?

1 A. Yes, yes.
2
3 Q. He refers to three possibilities, which are set out in
4 that paragraph, and you're familiar with what those three
5 possibilities are?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. Then at 243 through to 247, he deals with the first of
9 those, namely, misadventure?
10 A. Mmm-hmm.
11
12 Q. And at 247 he says he thinks that's very unlikely; do
13 you see that?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. Then at 248 through to 258, he deals with the second
17 possibility; do you see that?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. And at 258 he expresses the view that that second
21 possibility is also very unlikely.
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. And at 259 to 270 he talks about the third
25 possibility, and at 270 he concludes that that one is very
26 likely. I'm sorry, I withdraw that. He concludes that
27 it's very likely that gay hate crimes were committed at
28 that location.
29 A. Yes.
30
31 Q. And then at 275, you can read what he said
32 there - that is, one --
33 A. Is more likely than the other one.
34
35 Q. -- is more likely than the other, something that he
36 can readily conclude?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. At 276 he says he's persuaded to the requisite
40 standard that Scott died as a result of a gay hate attack?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. And at 285, in the "Findings", the "Manner of death"
44 states:
45
46 *Mr Johnson fell from the cliff top as*
47 *a result of actual or threatened violence*

1 *by unidentified persons who attacked him*
2 *because they perceived him to be*
3 *homosexual.*

4
5 A. Yes.

6
7 Q. Now, at 284 - I won't read it out but if you can just
8 glance at that for yourself --

9 A. Yes.

10

11 Q. -- his Honour refers to the fact that there are
12 hundreds of other suspicious deaths awaiting investigation
13 and that there are finite resources?

14 A. Yes.

15

16 Q. You can see that?

17 A. Yes.

18

19 Q. And he says in the last sentence that he declines to
20 make any recommendation for the further investigation, in
21 effect, leaving it up to the police?

22 A. Yes, that's right.

23

24 Q. Do you have any awareness, just before I go on to
25 something more substantial, as to what the reaction of
26 Strike Force Macnamir members was to those findings?

27 A. Not specifically, but I would have thought they'd be
28 surprised.

29

30 Q. Surprised?

31 A. Yes.

32

33 Q. Upset?

34 A. I can't say. I don't know. I was surprised and
35 that's why I say that.

36

37 Q. If that volume could come back, and if Mr Willing
38 could briefly have volume 14, please. Could you turn to
39 tab 311 [NPL.0115.0002.8325_0001]. Do you see that's an
40 email chain, starting from Scott Cook at the bottom of the
41 page, asking Chris Olen:

42

43 *How are the police who did the*
44 *investigation going?*

45

46 A. Mmm-hmm, yes.

47

1 Q. I don't want to take you to all of the response, but
2 do you see that Mr Olen responds that he was there in the
3 court when the findings were read out and along with Penny
4 Brown and Detective Rowena Clancy?

5 A. Yes.

6
7 Q. And he says, Chris Olen says, among other things:
8
9 *... understandably both girls became pretty*
10 *upset thereafter.*

11
12 A. Yes.

13
14 Q. Now, I appreciate you weren't there.

15 A. Yes.

16
17 Q. And indeed were no longer Commander Homicide -
18 I understand those things. But why would a finding, in
19 your experience, of homicide upset police officers on
20 a strike force aimed at reinvestigating an unsolved
21 homicide?

22 A. That's a very difficult question for me to answer
23 other than, you know, Chris Olen makes reference to the
24 fact that both girls were stunned, so I take that to mean
25 surprised, by the outcome. They might be upset, they could
26 have been upset at that particular outcome. I don't know.
27 It's a matter for, you know, for them to answer, but it may
28 have been the fact that the whole lengthy investigation
29 over many years was over. But your assertion that they are
30 perhaps upset because of a homicide finding, you know,
31 makes sense.

32
33 Q. Well, it looks as though they were upset that the
34 homicide finding was reached as distinct from either an
35 open finding or one of the other two possibilities, doesn't
36 it?

37 A. That's right. That's the way it looks, yes.

38
39 Q. On could that be because they, and Macnamir generally,
40 were so heavily invested in one of those other alternatives
41 that the homicide alternative was unpalatable to them?

42 A. That could be one hypothesis, yes. However, taking
43 into account that, you know, from April 2015, the
44 investigation had been under the guise and direction of the
45 Coroner itself, I think he was responsible for, you know,
46 the lines of inquiry that were conducted from that time
47 onwards. So they may have had their own personal views

- 1 about it, but at the end of the day that was - you know, he
2 directed that investigation to that point.
3
- 4 Q. All right. I'll move on. That volume can come back,
5 volume 14. And if you still have the volume, or have it in
6 volume 10 I think it was, the one that has Coroner Barnes'
7 reasons, I'm just taking you back, it's in tab 232
8 [SCOI.11064.000.00018_0001]. Just briefly back to
9 paragraph 284 of the findings on page 51.
10 A. Yes.
11
- 12 Q. As I put to you and you agreed, the Coroner
13 essentially left it to the police to decide what further
14 investigation, if any, should happen?
15 A. Yes, that's correct.
16
- 17 Q. In fact, we know, don't we, even though you may or may
18 not have been involved, that in 2018 a new strike force was
19 set up --
20 A. That's right, yes.
21
- 22 Q. -- Strike Force Welsford --
23 A. Yes.
24
- 25 Q. -- to investigate the murder of Scott Johnson?
26 A. Yes.
27
- 28 Q. The lead investigator was Detective Chief Inspector
29 Peter Yeomans?
30 A. Yes.
31
- 32 Q. That led in 2020 to the arrest of a suspect who was
33 charged?
34 A. Yes.
35
- 36 Q. With murder?
37 A. Yes.
38
- 39 Q. The setting up of Welsford, of course, happened under
40 your successor as Commander Homicide, not under you?
41 A. That's correct, yes.
42
- 43 Q. And was that under Mr Dickinson or under --
44 A. 2018, that would have been Mr Cook?
45
- 46 Q. Cook?
47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. As it also happens, back in March 2017 there had also been a new Police Commissioner, Mr Fuller?

A. That's correct.

Q. He had replaced Mr Scipione in March 2017, Mr Scipione having been Commissioner since 2007?

A. Yes, that's right.

Q. In setting up Strike Force Welsford and investigating the death of Scott Johnson as a murder, the police were essentially following the path that flowed from the findings of Coroner Barnes, weren't they?

A. Yes, however, that also involved communication between the Johnson family and the new Commissioner as well.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. What do you mean by that?

A. So the Johnson family spoke to the new Commissioner about the ongoing investigation and asking for, from my understanding, a further investigation to be conducted or to continue, I should say.

Q. I'm not quite sure of the point you're making, though? The Coroner left it to the police, and I'm - I can't understand the point you are making.

A. So - okay. So, Commissioner, that matter could have sat back in the wheel, as Mr Gray put it, as part of Unsolved Homicide matters, for a considerable period of time, but the family of Scott Johnson spoke to the Commissioner and it was given, I guess, an emphasis for reinvestigation, and so Mr Yeomans was allocated, separate to the Homicide Squad, to conduct that further investigation.

Q. You are just stating that as a fact, rather than an implied criticism?

A. That's a fact, yes.

Q. And that's all you are doing?

A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR GRAY: Q. Are you saying that the only reason that Commander Cook and new Commissioner Fuller went down the path of setting up Strike Force Welsford was because the Johnson family put pressure on them?

1 A. I think Mr Fuller gave an undertaking to the family
2 that they would continue the investigation. I think that's
3 what --
4
5 Q. No, my question is --
6 A. No, I'm not saying what you have asserted just there.
7
8 Q. Well, what are you saying?
9 A. That they spoke to him. The Commissioner took a view
10 that the investigation needed to continue, and that is it.
11
12 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I still don't understand what it
13 is you are either putting expressly or impliedly. If you
14 are merely stating a narrative, if that's what you are
15 saying, thank you. But are you doing any more than that?
16 A. No.
17
18 Q. Are you intending to do any more than that?
19 A. No.
20
21 MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, the question previously that
22 was asked by Counsel Assisting was, was the decision to set
23 up the strike force, did that follow the decision of
24 Mr Barnes, the Coroner.
25
26 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
27
28 THE WITNESS: It was did it flow out of it?
29
30 THE COMMISSIONER: Just wait a minute. I'm sorry,
31 Mr Tedeschi's --
32
33 THE WITNESS: Sorry.
34
35 THE COMMISSIONER: Give Mr Tedeschi a go and then you have
36 a go.
37
38 MR TEDESCHI: My perception is that his answers are in
39 relation to that question.
40
41 THE WITNESS: Yes.
42
43 THE COMMISSIONER: I see, thank you. Yes, Mr Gray.
44
45 MR GRAY: Q. Well, I think the question was that in
46 setting up Strike Force Welsford and investigating the
47 death of Scott Johnson as a murder, the police were

1 essentially following the path that flowed from the
2 findings of the Coroner, namely, the ones that we just
3 looked at, namely, that Scott Johnson had died as a result
4 of gay hate violence?
5 A. Yes, yes.
6
7 Q. That's what Welsford was set up to do, to investigate
8 that line of inquiry, wasn't it?
9 A. That's my understanding, yes.
10
11 Q. And that was done under a new Homicide Commander and
12 a new Police Commissioner, wasn't it?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. Now, would you agree, generally speaking - just
16 generally speaking - that where a Coroner makes a finding,
17 the police ordinarily are subsequently bound by that
18 finding, unless somehow or other it's challenged?
19 A. "Bound"?
20
21 Q. Well, yes, bound. See if you can answer that first
22 and then I'll ask another question.
23
24 MR TEDESCHI: Is my friend asking whether they are bound
25 in terms of future investigations or - it's a bit unclear.
26
27 THE WITNESS: That's what I don't understand.
28
29 THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps make it a little clearer in
30 terms of what you intend him to address.
31
32 MR GRAY: Certainly, Commissioner.
33
34 Q. When a Coroner makes a finding, for example, that
35 a death is a homicide --
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. -- are the police at liberty to just proceed as though
39 that finding hasn't been made and treat it as not
40 a homicide?
41 A. No.
42
43 Q. So in that sense, at least, they're bound? I don't
44 mean any magic by the word "bound".
45 A. Yes, I know, I know. I just - I understand what
46 you're saying.
47

- 1 Q. You're agreeing with me at least in general?
2 A. Yes, I do.
3
- 4 Q. Okay. Now, in Strike Force Neiwand, which we'll come
5 to a little later, going against a Coroner's finding is
6 exactly what Neiwand did, isn't it?
7 A. From my reading of the documents I was provided for
8 this Inquiry, yes.
9
- 10 Q. Well, you knew that to be happening at the time
11 Neiwand was under way, didn't you?
12 A. No, I didn't.
13
- 14 Q. Would it be fair to say that you indeed had in mind
15 that that's what Neiwand would do?
16 A. No.
17
- 18 Q. So if Neiwand set about trying to undermine and
19 contradict the findings of Coroner Milledge, that wasn't
20 anything to do with you?
21 A. No, and I reject that. That was not the purpose of
22 Neiwand.
23
- 24 Q. So you say two things: (a) no such thing happened -
25 that is, no such attempt to contradict or undermine
26 happened?
27 A. Purposely, no.
28
- 29 Q. How do you know?
30 A. As in that wasn't the intent for why Neiwand was
31 established in the first place and what happened after --
32
- 33 Q. On your part, do you mean?
34 A. Sorry, that's correct, yes.
35
- 36 Q. So I will come to this shortly when we get there, are
37 you saying that, so far as your mindset was concerned --
38 A. Yes.
39
- 40 Q. -- when Neiwand was set up, it was simply to conduct
41 a genuine, open-ended investigation, let the cards fall
42 where they may?
43 A. Yes, with - yeah, there were a number of persons of
44 interest that had been identified, as we well know.
45
- 46 Q. Yes?
47 A. As a result of not just that inquest but the Macnamir

1 investigation. It was established to try and identify
2 a person or persons who may be responsible for those deaths
3 and bring them to justice, is what it was established for?
4

5 Q. Thank you. And when you're saying that, you're saying
6 that that was the reason in your mind that it was
7 established?
8 A. Yes, yes, that's right.
9

10 Q. We will come back to that, thank you.
11 A. Okay.
12

13 Q. Now, meanwhile, back on 13 April 2015 --
14 A. Yes.
15

16 Q. -- Coroner Barnes delivers the findings, the Macnamir
17 people are upset, it seems. But be that as it may, that
18 very night, 13 April 2015, there was the ABC Lateline
19 broadcast?
20 A. Can I just clarify something there, you said, Mr Gray?
21 The findings were on 30 November 2017. You're talking
22 about the opening of the inquest?
23

24 Q. I certainly am, thank you very much. I accept that
25 correction. Let me go back a step. You are quite right,
26 thank you. 13 April 2015, decision by Coroner Barnes to
27 hold a third inquest?
28 A. Yes.
29

30 Q. My apologies. That very night, 13 April, there is the
31 Lateline broadcast?
32 A. Yes.
33

34 Q. And it includes an interview with DCI Pamela Young?
35 A. Yes, it did.
36

37 Q. Recorded that very day?
38 A. I don't know when it was recorded.
39

40 Q. Okay. Now, you knew that Pamela Young was going to be
41 interviewed for Lateline, didn't you?
42 A. No. I knew that she would be - that she would have
43 a conversation with a journalist from the ABC, and also
44 another journalist, from The Australian, prior to that, on
45 background only, and I was unaware that that would - that
46 she would actually give a live interview or an interview, I
47 should say, that would be televised.

1
2 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. So do I understand it to say that
3 she didn't tell you that she was going on air that night?
4 A. No, no.
5
6 Q. And it came as a complete surprise to you --
7 A. I received a telephone call --
8
9 Q. Well, if you wouldn't mind me just finishing the
10 question, I'm so sorry.
11 A. Sorry.
12
13 Q. It must have come as a complete shock and a surprise
14 when you saw her face on the television, then, did it?
15 A. Yes, I received a telephone call saying that, "Pam is
16 on Lateline". I turned it on and saw her there.
17
18 Q. Well, to answer my question, did it come as a shock
19 and a surprise --
20 A. Yes, it did.
21
22 Q. -- to see her on the television?
23 A. Yes, it did.
24
25 Q. (a) she never asked your permission?
26 A. To go on television like that, no.
27
28 Q. Yes, correct. And (b) therefore you had no knowledge
29 that she was going on television?
30 A. Not like that, no.
31
32 Q. When you say "not like that", I'm so sorry, not at
33 all?
34 A. No, not on - not on television at all.
35
36 Q. All right. Your belief was that she was to have
37 a conversation or conversations with one or perhaps more
38 journalists?
39 A. Yes, yes.
40
41 Q. But you knew that much?
42 A. Yes, I did, yes.
43
44 MR GRAY: Q. But when you say "as background" do you
45 mean sort of off the record?
46 A. Yes, yes.
47

1 Q. So you say it would not be right to suggest that you
2 approved her going on Lateline?
3 A. No.
4
5 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Would it be false to suggest that?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 MR GRAY: Q. And would it be true or false to suggest
9 that you approved her going on Lateline as part of an
10 overall police media strategy?
11 A. No, not on Lateline. There was a strategy agreed to
12 for her to background two journalists who had interest in
13 the Macnamir investigation, and that was it. And that was
14 agreed to by a number of people.
15
16 Q. And did you have discussions with her before she spoke
17 to any journalist in any setting at all, as to the sorts of
18 things she would say, if asked?
19 A. In general terms, yes.
20
21 Q. Well, I'm just going to have you shown the transcript
22 of the Lateline program.
23 A. Do I need this, sir?
24
25 Q. No, you don't, thank you. That can come back.
26 A. Yes, Mr Gray?
27
28 Q. I think you told us a minute ago that, however it came
29 about, you in fact saw the Lateline broadcast?
30 A. Yes, I did, yes.
31
32 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. As a result of a phone call?
33 A. Yes, that's correct.
34
35 Q. So who rang you?
36 A. I can't recall. It might have been - I can't recall
37 who it was, Commissioner?
38
39 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
40
41 MR GRAY: Q. Now, before we get to the part involving
42 Pamela Young, do you see that the first part of the program
43 was largely questions and answers between Emma Alberici and
44 Steve Johnson?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. And top of page 2 of this transcript, Steve Johnson is

1 quoted as saying:

2

3

4

5

6

7

Do you see that?

8

A. Yes.

9

10 Q. And you knew that to be their concern?

11

A. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Q. And you see in the passage attributed to him, a bit below halfway on the page, that Steve Johnson's position, as stated, was that the family thought that Pamela Young felt it was important to reaffirm the police's original verdict?

A. I see that, yes.

20

21

Q. And then Emma Alberici says:

22

23

24

*26 years after Scott Johnson's death,
police remain of the view ...*

25

et cetera; do you see that?

26

A. Yes.

27

28

29

30

Q. Now, towards the bottom of page 3 we come to the part of the broadcast that involves Pamela Young?

31

32

33

34

35

Q. And I just want to run through a couple of the things that she says on this program. The first is at the bottom of that page, she's asked:

36

37

38

39

*Do you accept now that the initial
investigation into the death of Scott
Johnson back in 1988 was flawed?*

40

And her answer is:

41

42

43

44

*Not at all. It was to the standard of the
day.*

45

A. Yes.

46

47

Q. Did you agree with that?

1 A. I don't know whether or not it was. I don't know
2 enough. That was certainly a term that Pam - Pamela would
3 use, "standard of the day", I recall her saying that in
4 relation to the original investigation to me. I don't know
5 the detail, ins and outs, of that forensic, you know,
6 detail of what occurred in the first investigation to make
7 an assessment of that.

8
9 Q. Let me just ask you a couple of things about that
10 first investigation?

11 A. Yes.

12
13 Q. And if the answer is you don't know, then such is
14 life?

15 A. Sure.

16
17 Q. But it has been suggested from material that the
18 Special Commission has seen that the original investigation
19 in 1989 was over within a couple of days. Is that
20 consistent with your understanding?

21 A. No, I - my understanding was that the initial
22 investigation by general duties police might have taken
23 a couple of days and then Detective Doreen Cruickshank took
24 control of the investigation.

25
26 Q. And it also appears from material that the Special
27 Commission has that the conclusion of suicide that was
28 reached in 1989 was reached without any contact being made
29 with the family at all. Do you understand that to be
30 right?

31 A. I don't know.

32
33 Q. I won't read it out, but do you see at the bottom of
34 page 3, after the answer "Not at all, it was to the
35 standard of the day" --

36 A. Mmm-hmm.

37
38 Q. -- Pamela Young goes on to say:

39
40 *And there's still evidence and*
41 *information ...*

42
43 A. Yes.

44
45 Q.
46 *I haven't found anything that completely*
47 *eliminates that as a possibility.*

1
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q.
5 *In fact we've included some extra*
6 *information ...*
7
8 And I'm paraphrasing, "on that theme" - do you see that?
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. And then on the bottom of page 5, on that same theme,
12 do you see that she goes into some degree of detail at the
13 last five or six lines on that page about a certain
14 incident?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. And she compares that certain incident to what
18 happened at North Head?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. Going over to the first two lines on page 6 --
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. -- that seems to be Pamela Young pressing on the
25 Lateline audience the likelihood of a particular analysis,
26 doesn't it?
27 A. It could be, but I think if you - you know, the
28 question that's asked prior to that is around a witness
29 and his assertion
30
31 Q. I know, but that's what she nevertheless says. That's
32 what she nevertheless says, though, isn't it?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. Just for completeness on this, you can see about
36 halfway down page 6, a question from Emma Alberici
37 beginning, "Steve Johnson has told us"?
38 A. Mmm-hmm.
39
40 Q. And you can see Pamela Young's answer?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. So I am simply drawing your attention to the fact that
44 she also says that, which is consistent with some of the
45 things that you've been saying today?
46 A. Correct.
47

1 Q. Now, a third thing that Pamela Young said, on
2 a different topic, was in the middle of page 5, just above
3 halfway on page 5, in answer to a question from Emma
4 Alberici about the claim by the Johnson family that there
5 are at least 30 people whose deaths are unsolved,
6 et cetera?

7 A. Yes.

8

9 Q. You see Pamela Young, in the course of her answer to
10 that says:

11

12 *We --*

13

14 meaning the police --

15

16 *have eight from that list that are counted*
17 *as unsolved homicides, which are probable*
18 *or possible gay hate crimes - that's eight*
19 *over a number of years.*

20

21 Do you see that?

22 A. Yes, that's correct.

23

24 Q. She is there no doubt referencing the Lehmann/Young
25 issue paper --

26 A. Yes, I think so.

27

28 Q. -- and subsequent variations on that. And then on
29 page 6 in the middle of the first long answer by her,
30 beginning, "The fact that our relationship", do you see
31 that, just a few lines from the top?

32 A. Mmm-hmm, yes.

33

34 Q. She asserts that Mr Johnson - that is, Steve Johnson:

35

36 *... used influence, including I consider*
37 *influence on the Government to make the*
38 *death of Scott a priority in my office over*
39 *other jobs that we had.*

40

41 A. Yes, she says that.

42

43 Q. She says that. And Emma Alberici, on page 7, about 10
44 lines down, picks her up on that, do you see that - that
45 is, returns to that topic?

46 A. Yes, yes.

47

1 Q. And she asks - she, Emma Alberici, asks - Pamela Young
2 where does she think this influence of Steve Johnson over
3 the government comes from; do you see that?

4 A. Yes.

5
6 Q. And the answer involves Pamela Young referring to the
7 meeting in the Minister's office, which is obviously
8 a reference to the meeting of 11 February 2013, isn't it?

9 A. That's right, yes, that's right.

10
11 Q. And Pamela Young says she saw a lot of what she would
12 describe as kowtowing by the Minister and his staff as to
13 Steve Johnson?

14 A. Yes.

15
16 Q. She says she was amazed and incredulous?
17 A. Yes.

18
19 Q. And at the bottom of that page, having developed that
20 theme somewhat more in the rest of that answer, Emma
21 Alberici asks her:

22
23 *How did Steve Johnson manage a meeting of*
24 *that sort with the Police Minister?*

25
26 Do you see that?

27 A. Yes, I do.

28
29 Q. Her answer was:

30
31 *... well, to be frank, there was some panic*
32 *over the Australian Story that came out the*
33 *night before.*

34
35 A. Yes.

36
37 Q. And she goes on. Then, towards the end of that answer
38 on that page, she says:

39
40 *... others were very concerned that that --*

41
42 meaning the Australian Story --

43
44 *would be overly critical of the police.*
45 *So - one of those people apparently was the*
46 *minister, who rang my commander of the*
47 *homicide squad --*

- 1
2 that's you, is it?
3 A. Yes, it is.
4
5 Q. --
6
7 *and also rang the Johnson family and*
8 *arranged the meeting and gave them their*
9 *strike force, their priority over everyone*
10 *else's death.*
11
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Now, a couple of things about that. Now, this
15 is February 2013 when you've told us you were on leave; is
16 that right?
17 A. That's correct.
18
19 Q. But the Minister rang you?
20 A. No, his Chief of Staff rang me.
21
22 Q. Oh, I see. Not the Minister?
23 A. No.
24
25 Q. And what did the Chief of Staff say to you?
26 A. He said that, from recollection, that the Minister had
27 reached out to the Johnson family and wanted to conduct
28 a meeting and asked whether or not I'd attend. I told him
29 that I was on leave and that Chris Olen was relieving at
30 the time, and so he was going to speak to Olen and get him
31 to go along.
32
33 Q. Right. And Ms Young describes what the Minister did
34 as giving the Johnson family "their strike force, their
35 priority over everyone else's death".
36 A. Yes, she uses - yes, she describes it that way.
37
38 Q. Did you agree with that assessment?
39 A. Well, the Minister, you know, couldn't tell us to
40 establish a strike force in that way. I think as we've
41 already covered, Chris Olen was of the view that we needed
42 to allocate a couple of resources to it anyway. So it was
43 as a result of that meeting that the Strike Force Macnamir
44 was established.
45
46 Q. Ms Young goes on, on the top of the next page, that
47 she thought what the Minister did was absolutely improper?

- 1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. And wrong on every level?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. Did you agree with that?
7 A. She does say that, yes.
8
9 Q. No, did you agree with that?
10 A. I wasn't present at the meeting. I don't think that -
11 I don't think that - from what I - my understanding of what
12 occurred in the meeting, I don't think it was improper.
13
14 MR GRAY: I would tender that transcript, your Honour.
15 Perhaps it could become tab 318 of exhibit 6.
16
17 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right.
18
19 MR GRAY: Q. I need to ask you this, Mr Willing, before
20 I leave the Lateline topic. Had Pamela Young openly used
21 the term "kowtowing" to describe the Police Minister to you
22 in office on many occasions between February 2013 and April
23 2015?
24 A. She might have used that term talking to me privately
25 once or twice but I can't recall it being discussed in
26 those terms openly in the office.
27
28 Q. Do you agree that on her way to the ABC studio on
29 13 April --
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. -- she telephoned you --
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. -- and - you agree with that?
36 A. Yes, she did.
37
38 Q. What did she say?
39 A. "I'm about to go and speak to Emma Alberici." I
40 remember where I was. I think I was driving down the M7 at
41 the time when she called me. So my understanding was that
42 she was going to go and talk to her, as planned, the way
43 that she had the other journalist.
44
45 Q. So do you have any knowledge of her having actually
46 spoken to Emma Alberici in what you might call background
47 terms a few days earlier on 10 April?

1 A. I - I don't. I don't.
2
3 Q. Because on 13 April, she was in fact going to the
4 studio to participate in the interview that went --
5 A. I know that now.
6
7 Q. -- to air, wasn't she?
8 A. I know that now, yes.
9
10 Q. And didn't she, in that conversation with her on the
11 way to the ABC studio on 13 April, tell you that she was
12 likely to use the word "kowtowing" if she was asked about
13 the Police Minister?
14 A. She might have. I can't recall it.
15
16 Q. And did you respond with a laugh?
17 A. Well, it was something that - an expression that
18 I hadn't heard before, but I can't recall whether I did or
19 not. I might have.
20
21 Q. An expression you hadn't heard before?
22 A. Yes, that's right.
23
24 Q. I thought you told us that she had used it to you
25 privately several times previously?
26 A. After that meeting.
27
28 Q. After the February 2013 meeting?
29 A. Yes.
30
31 Q. Yes, and before the --
32 A. Sorry, after the - I took that to mean after the
33 interview that she gave on Lateline.
34
35 Q. Are you saying that she had never used the word
36 "kowtowing" in your hearing about the Police Minister until
37 after the ABC Lateline interview?
38 A. That's correct. That's correct.
39
40 Q. Is that a serious proposition?
41 A. Yeah, it is, and I thought you meant after the
42 interview that she gave on Lateline.
43
44 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. If she told you that afternoon as
45 you were driving down the M7 --
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. -- that she was going to be interviewed on television,
2 would you have stopped her --
3 A. Yes, absolutely.
4
5 Q. -- or told her not to do it?
6 A. She was not --
7
8 Q. Would you?
9 A. Yes, she was not allowed to do that.
10
11 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
12
13 MR GRAY: Q. All right. Now, in any event, Pamela
14 Young's Lateline interview quickly gave rise to a lot of
15 repercussions, didn't it?
16 A. Yes, it did, yes.
17
18 Q. One of them was another burst of publicity about the
19 Johnson case and gay hate crimes generally?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. Largely, perhaps not entirely but largely,
23 unfavourable to the police?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. And another, a second ramification, was a direction
27 from the State Coroner, Mr Barnes, that Pamela Young be
28 removed from the Scott Johnson investigation?
29 A. Yes.
30
31 Q. And that did in fact happen?
32 A. That did, yes.
33
34 Q. She was replaced by Detective Sergeant Penny Brown?
35 A. Yes, well, she - Penny Brown took primary carriage of
36 it, yes.
37
38 Q. Now, would it be fair to say that Pamela Young has
39 subsequently regarded you as having hung her out to dry --
40 A. Yes.
41
42 Q. -- following the Lateline interview?
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. And would you accept that such a view has some force?
46 A. In what context?
47

1 Q. Well, that she's got a point?
2 A. No, I --
3
4 Q. Would you accept that?
5 A. No. My understanding is that Pamela was not and
6 probably isn't happy with me for not publicly defending her
7 after she appeared on Lateline.
8
9 Q. Her view, as I understand it, seems to have been that
10 you had approved her giving this interview and then, when
11 it caused trouble, you ran a mile?
12 A. The approval was discussion that occurred or
13 a strategy that occurred involving the Deputy Commissioner
14 at the time, the head of police media, myself and others,
15 the head of State Crime Command. It was pretty
16 straightforward.
17
18 THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But you didn't say to her,
19 I presume, when you seemed to have authorised her to speak
20 to journalists plural --
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. -- I take it you didn't say to her, "For goodness
24 sake, Pamela, don't let them quote you"?
25 A. No, I can't recall that.
26
27 Q. But if what I understand to say is that the interview
28 on the television was a shock and a surprise --
29 A. Mmm.
30
31 Q. -- you must have expected, if you gave her authority
32 to speak to one or more journalists that it was likely she
33 would be quoted?
34 A. Of course, it was on background, that's right.
35
36 Q. Not just on background; how could you stop any
37 journalist writing a story if you authorised Ms Young to
38 speak to the journalist, unless you told her in advance,
39 "You're not permitted to say a word on behalf of
40 NSW Police. Just background them, but you're not going to
41 be quoted and you're not authorised to speak"; did you say
42 that to her?
43 A. I can't recall saying that to her.
44
45 Q. Would you have said that, do you think?
46 A. It would be something that I would say. These
47 interviews, as well, these background discussions, often

1 occurred with police media liaison officers present as
2 well. I believe I asked one to be present and Pam denied -
3 declined to have one present, as well.
4
5 Q. Sorry, are you suggesting now that you suggested she
6 go with some liaison person --
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. -- to the interview?
10 A. Correct.
11
12 Q. And she rejected that proposition?
13 A. That's right, yes.
14
15 Q. Well, why didn't you say "No, you're not going
16 anywhere. I'm just a bit concerned about this getting out
17 of control"?
18 A. Pamela was a - was an extremely experienced
19 investigator. She dealt with the media many, many, many
20 times throughout her career. It's not unusual for
21 detectives to talk to the media off the record. I had
22 confidence in her ability to handle any media situation.
23
24 Q. All right. So she rejects the idea of someone going
25 from the media liaison staff?
26 A. Yes.
27
28 Q. But you thought, and you thought you and she
29 understood, that whatever she was going to say was going to
30 be entirely off the record?
31 A. Correct.
32
33 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
34
35 MR GRAY: Q. Now, I don't need to pursue this topic any
36 further, at least for the moment, but I just mention that
37 in your statement you deal with this subject --
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. -- briefly, at least, at around about paragraph 53?
41 A. That's right, yes.
42
43 Q. And 54?
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. Now, I wanted to take you to 55, though, where you
47 say:

- 1
2 *Once the State Coroner had carriage of the*
3 *matter --*
4
5 that's the Scott Johnson matter --
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. --
9
10 *and following --*
11
12 what you call "the commencement of the inquest" --
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. -- which I understand, on 13 April 2015, in
16 particular, "Strike Force Macnamir inquiries continued
17 under his direction"?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. Now, are you saying to the Special Commission that not
21 only is that the case with this particular one, the Scott
22 Johnson one, but that that's the position generally, once
23 a Coroner steps in?
24 A. Opens an inquest.
25
26 Q. Yes.
27 A. Generally, yes.
28
29 Q. So once the Coroner decides that a death will be the
30 subject of an inquest, thereafter, the investigation is
31 directed by the Coroner and not the police; is that right?
32 A. Yes, you work for the Coroner. It's in the Act, yes.
33
34 Q. So that would apply, for example, to the Taradale
35 inquest conducted by Deputy State Coroner Milledge, would
36 it?
37 A. During the course of the conduct of the inquest, yes.
38
39 Q. Once the decision had been taken that there would be
40 such an inquest, thereafter, the direction of the
41 investigation is in the hands of the Coroner; is that
42 right?
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. Now, moving a little bit past April 2015 and moving on
46 to August 2015 --
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. -- as you perhaps recall, you may not recall the date,
3 but Strike Force Parrabell was instituted in or
4 around August 2015?
5 A. Yes. That's my understanding, yes.
6
7 Q. And you were aware of that at the time, I take it?
8 A. I - I can't recall specifically. I think it started -
9 it started around then but gained momentum later on. I was
10 briefed by Assistant Commissioner - well, Superintendent
11 Crandell at the time, months later.
12
13 Q. Just let me unpack that.
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. You were briefed by Mr Crandell when?
17 A. Months later.
18
19 Q. Months later than August?
20 A. Yes, yes.
21
22 Q. But without pinning you down, do you mean some time
23 towards the end of that year or --
24 A. I think it was 2016.
25
26 Q. You think it was early 2016?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. And his briefing consisted of some summary or outline
30 of what? What did he tell you?
31 A. I think I've got the date or something here, but -
32 that he wanted to conduct a review of the 88 cases or the -
33 you know, those cases that had been alluded to in the media
34 as being possible gay hate murders.
35
36 Q. And did he tell you or, whether he personally told you
37 or not, did you understand, that it was going to be a paper
38 review?
39 A. Yes, I understood it was. I recall the meeting I had
40 with him and Chris Olen was present and I think someone
41 else from his office but I'm not sure. He outlined that it
42 would be a paper review and that he wanted to get an
43 academic review conducted as well.
44
45 Q. Yes. And just to clarify - my clarification - when
46 I used the word "paper review" --
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. -- I mean, and I assume you also understood it this
3 way, that what Parrabell was going to do was not to
4 reinvestigate any of these cases?
5 A. That's right, yes.
6
7 Q. But to literally review whatever the paper holdings
8 were that the police either had or could gather from the
9 Coroner or whoever?
10 A. That was my understanding, yes.
11
12 Q. And to look at what documents were on the file or
13 could be gathered from whatever happened historically --
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. -- is that right, back in whenever it was, the 1970s
17 or the 1980s, whenever; correct?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. And from a review of the paper, form a view as to
21 whether the death in question was gay hate related?
22 A. Yes, that's my understanding.
23
24 Q. And you were aware of that format or methodology from
25 an early stage of Parrabell?
26 A. Yes, yes.
27
28 Q. Now, your own view, as we've seen today - I'll go back
29 a step. The Parrabell exercise was going to involve the
30 whole 88, or 86 as it turned out to be?
31 A. Yes, that's my understanding, yes.
32
33 Q. Which included within it the 30 said to be unsolved?
34 A. With the exception of the Taradale matters, yes.
35
36 Q. At that point?
37 A. At that point.
38
39 Q. Although that later changed.
40 A. Yes, that's right
41
42 Q. But with that small exception, the 88 included the 30?
43 A. Yes, yes.
44
45 Q. But with that exception, which I accept.
46 A. And the Scott Johnson matter, of course. Sorry, my
47 apologies.

1
2 Q. And the Scott Johnson matter, which by then was under
3 live investigation?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. Well, I will withdraw that question. The Scott
7 Johnson matter by then, August 2015, was the subject of the
8 coronial --
9 A. Correct.
10
11 Q. -- inquest proceedings?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. At least at an early stage?
15 A. Yes, yes.
16
17 Q. Now, your own view, as we've seen today, was already
18 formed as to the 30, wasn't it? In other words, only eight
19 of the 30 were even possibly or probably gay hate?
20 A. I accepted what was written in that report.
21
22 Q. Not only accepted but endorsed?
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. So your view was only eight of the 30 are gay hate?
26 A. That's what I thought, yes.
27
28 Q. And you knew that that was the view of Mr Lehmann and
29 Ms Young?
30 A. That's right, yes.
31
32 Q. And you knew that their view, which you also endorsed,
33 was that 30 was a gross exaggeration?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. Delete? And you knew that, in their view, one of the
37 80 - sorry, start again. You knew that, in their view,
38 which you also endorsed as at January 2014, one of the
39 cases in the 30 that was not among the eight was Scott
40 Johnson?
41 A. Only because it was before the Coroner, so --
42
43 Q. No, different. I may have expressed the question
44 badly.
45 A. Right. Okay.
46
47 Q. Putting the Coroner aside for one moment, the view

1 expressed by Mr Lehmann and Ms Young in their issue paper
2 was that there were only eight that could --
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. -- perhaps even possibly or probably be gay hate, of
6 the unsolved?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. And Scott Johnson wasn't one of those?
10 A. That's right. That's what they've --
11
12 Q. That was their view?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. Which you endorsed?
16 A. At that point in time, there was --
17
18 Q. That's right?
19 A. Yes, that's correct.
20
21 Q. Now given that that was your view, that of the 30 said
22 to be unsolved, in fact only eight were even possibly or
23 probably gay hate --
24 A. Mmm-hmm.
25
26 Q. -- did you talk to Mr Crandell about that view that
27 you held?
28 A. I can't recall talking to him about it at all.
29
30 Q. You were the Commander Homicide?
31 A. That's right.
32
33 Q. Wouldn't you have wanted Mr Crandell to know your
34 views and the views of homicide?
35 A. Yes, but I just can't recall the conversation.
36
37 Q. It's pretty unlikely that you didn't tell him, isn't
38 it?
39 A. Absolutely, but I can't recall the conversation, so --
40
41 Q. It's in fact highly likely that you did tell him,
42 isn't it?
43 A. I may well have but I just can't recall it, Mr Gray.
44
45 Q. I understand. You don't need to say it again. You've
46 said several times that you can't recall the conversation.
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. But you're agreeing with me that it's highly likely
3 that you would have told him --
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. -- your view and the view of Young and Lehmann?
7 A. I would have told him the outcome of that report, if
8 he didn't know it already. I'm assuming, but again I don't
9 recall it. I'm sorry for repeating it but I don't recall
10 it.
11
12 Q. What is your understanding as to what use he would
13 make or should have made of receiving that view from you?
14 A. My understanding was it would be irrelevant; he was
15 going to apply or, you know, Parrabell was going to apply
16 their own criteria to reviewing those matters.
17
18 Q. I see. I will come to the criteria in a second.
19 A. Sure.
20
21 Q. But just in your statement at paragraph 99 --
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. -- do you see in the second sentence you say:
25
26 *I otherwise recall that I was fully*
27 *supportive of the activities of Strike*
28 *Force Parrabell as I understood them --*
29
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. --
33
34 *which were to construct a structured*
35 *assessment of [the 88] ...*
36
37 et cetera?
38 A. That's right.
39
40 Q. You were fully supportive of Strike Force Parrabell
41 looking at the 88?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. Including the 30 with that couple of exceptions that
45 you mentioned?
46 A. Yes, sure.
47

1 Q. Would that be because you expected Parrabell to arrive
2 at the same conclusion that you and the Unsolved Homicide
3 Team had already arrived at?
4 A. No, how could I expect that? They were conducting
5 their own independent reviews. There was an academic
6 component to it, which I had no control over or - or
7 involvement in. I was supportive of it because I thought
8 it would provide answers to the community, on a topic that
9 had had a lot of media attention and it was quite, you
10 know - it was quite important to the community. So
11 I thought it was a good thing to do.
12
13 Q. All right. Why not simply release Mr Lehmann's issue
14 paper?
15 A. Who - to Crandell, or Parrabell?
16
17 Q. To the public, to the community?
18 A. That's an internal paper. That's not something that
19 occurs at all.
20
21 Q. Why not, though, if it was important that the
22 community know what the police thought?
23 A. That's something which is not normally - would not
24 normally occur. That was an internal document.
25
26 Q. So if the strike force counterfactually had arrived at
27 a result significantly different from the
28 Lehmann/Young/Willing view about the 30 --
29 A. Yes.
30
31 Q. -- you would be happy for the Parrabell results to be
32 made available to the public?
33 A. Well, that was the purpose of the review.
34
35 Q. But not the Lehmann/Young/Willing view?
36 A. That's right.
37
38 Q. Why?
39 A. Because that was an internal document that was
40 prepared as part of the internal processes inside the
41 Police Force, part of the Strike Force Macnamir
42 investigation. Ultimately it appeared before the Coroner,
43 or those outcomes, I should say.
44
45 Q. Well, it wasn't part of Strike Force Macnamir at all.
46 It was - your issues paper was a response to --
47 A. Oh, my issues paper, is that the one to Premier and

1 Cabinet; is that what you are talking to?
2
3 Q. Yes.
4 A. If that, that wasn't a matter for me to release to the
5 public.
6
7 Q. No, but the contents of it could have been released at
8 any time you chose in another format not being an issues
9 paper, couldn't it?
10 A. In relation - like a media interview, for argument's
11 sake?
12
13 Q. For argument's sake -- -
14 A. I could have.
15
16 Q. -- any number of means you could have done that?
17 A. I could have, yes.
18
19 Q. Because, as I say, if counterfactually Parrabell had
20 arrived at quite a different result about the 30 from your
21 result --
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. When I say "yours", I mean Lehmann/Young/you, the
25 public would have had the Parrabell view of the world but
26 not the very different view of the world in your issue
27 paper. How would that assist the public?
28 A. You are talking about the Premier and Cabinet paper;
29 is that right?
30
31 Q. The contents of it?
32 A. The contents of it.
33
34 Q. The assessment of the 30 cases?
35 A. I don't know how to answer that question, Mr Gray.
36
37 Q. All right. I might come back to that in a bit.
38 A. Sure.
39
40 Q. At any rate, surely you said to Mr Crandell, in the
41 course of being fully supportive of Parrabell --
42 A. Yep.
43
44 Q. -- that you fully expected him to come up with
45 a number something like eight in respect of the 30?
46 A. Not at all. I had no idea what the review would come
47 up with.

1
2 Q. Now, what did you know, either at a relatively early
3 stage, namely, the first few months of 2016 or, indeed,
4 later, about the methodology of Strike Force Parrabell?
5 A. Not much, other than that they were using a set of
6 indicators that I believe derived from the United States.
7
8 Q. Yes. Now, I wanted to ask you about that. Did you
9 know that they were particularly using the indicators as
10 embedded in a particular form called a Bias Crimes
11 Indicators Form?
12 A. No.
13
14 Q. Did you know that they were using a form at all?
15 A. No, I didn't know the way that they were conducting
16 the reviews at all.
17
18 Q. Well, as you say, the indicators or at least nine out
19 of the 10 of them had been derived from a United States
20 source. That was your understanding?
21 A. That was my understanding, yes.
22
23 Q. Which, on the evidence this Commission has, is
24 correct. But are you saying that you didn't know about the
25 form or the content of the form itself that the Parrabell
26 officers were using?
27 A. No, no.
28
29 Q. Well, so you weren't aware, then, that the form, which
30 they were using in assessing all these 80-plus cases,
31 contained embedded within it as relevant to whether
32 gay-hate bias or the like was involved --
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. -- the requirement of beyond reasonable doubt?
36 A. No, I didn't know.
37
38 Q. Well, have you ever seen the form, to this day?
39 A. I - I might have seen the forms as part of, you know,
40 all the various documents I've been given, but no, I have
41 no recollection of it.
42
43 Q. Well, let me - I won't take time on this --
44 A. Sure, show me.
45
46 Q. But if Mr Willing could just be briefly shown volume
47 13. This is just by way of example. Just by way of

1 example, Mr Willing.
2 A. Sure.
3
4 Q. I'm not suggesting the contents of this particular
5 form - that is, the answers - have any particular
6 significance at least for today.
7 A. Sure.
8
9 Q. But if you could turn to 265C - sorry, 266C
10 [NPL.0129.0001.0001_0001].
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Now, this is a Bias Crimes Indicators Review Form for
14 a particular deceased person.
15 A. Yes, yes.
16
17 Q. If you could just - I will take you through it, not
18 because I want you to look at the answers but because
19 I want you to look at the questions. Do you follow? First
20 of all, there is - do you see on the top of the second
21 page there's a heading "1. Differences"?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. And there's various content filled in. And then if
25 you turn over to the fourth page, at the end of that
26 material dealing with differences --
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. -- do you see there are then four what are called
30 indicators set out?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. And I will give you a moment to read this. Is it
34 still your best recollection that you have never seen one
35 of these forms before?
36 A. I think I've seen - these might have been or at least
37 some of them might have been provided in the tender bundle
38 that I was given in preparation for this, but yes, prior to
39 that, no.
40
41 Q. All right. Well, see there are four indicators?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. One being "Bias Crime"?
45 A. Mmm-hmm.
46
47 Q. The second one "Suspected Bias Crime"; the third one

1 "Not Bias Crime" --
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. -- and the fourth one, "Insufficient Information"?
5 A. Mmm-hmm.
6
7 Q. You will see that in the "Bias Crime" one, the
8 criterion, which I won't read out --
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. -- includes within it - that is, on the question of
12 whether the incident was wholly or partially motivated by
13 bias - the standard of proof, namely, beyond a reasonable
14 doubt. Do you see that?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. Now that, of course, as you know, is the criminal
18 standard?
19 A. Yes, it is, yes.
20
21 Q. Which, as you also know, is a high standard?
22 A. Yes, it is.
23
24 Q. Deliberately. And you will see that the second one,
25 "Suspected Bias Crime", has the same feature?
26 A. Yes.
27
28 Q. The third one doesn't, the "Not Bias Crime".
29 A. Yes.
30
31 Q. And the fourth one, "Insufficient Information",
32 unsurprisingly, also doesn't have it?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. Now, you can see that in that particular one - as
36 I say, I'm not stressing this one specifically --
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. -- the answer has been given "No" each time?
40 A. Yes - well, yes.
41
42 Q. For those four on that page?
43 A. Yes, of course.
44
45 Q. You can assume that - see the next page begins "2.
46 Comments, Written Statements, Gestures"?
47 A. Sorry, where was that?

1
2 Q. It's the fifth page, it has a heading right at the
3 top, "2. Comments, Written Statements, Gestures"?
4 A. Yes, yes.
5
6 Q. And then the same four indicators set out in the same
7 text?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. And you can assume that those so-called indicators are
11 set out in that identical text for the whole 10?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Now, what I'm asking you is this: if the Parrabell
15 criteria for evidence of bias crime --
16 A. Mmm-hmm.
17
18 Q. -- required that the presence of bias crime be
19 established beyond reasonable doubt, as the form
20 indicates --
21 A. Mmm.
22
23 Q. -- that would inevitably mean, especially given that
24 this was only a paper review, that very few cases on
25 a paper review would meet that criteria; do you agree?
26
27 MR TEDESCHI: I object.
28
29 THE COMMISSIONER: What's the objection?
30
31 MR TEDESCHI: Two bases, Commissioner. The first is he
32 has said quite clearly that he was not part of this, he
33 wasn't aware of it until it was provided to him as part of
34 the tender bundle.
35
36 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
37
38 MR TEDESCHI: So he is being asked his opinion as an
39 expert witness, in effect, and with respect, it's not
40 a matter for a witness like him to give expert evidence
41 about.
42
43 Secondly, the question that my friend has asked is
44 misleading because the first two categories refer to bias
45 crime. The first one, of course, requires beyond
46 reasonable doubt; the second one requires that it cannot be
47 proved beyond a reasonable doubt. So my learned friend's

1 question isn't properly based on the material that's in the
2 form.

3

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I'm going to allow it, Mr Tedeschi,
5 because if he's going to answer one way or the other,
6 whatever he's going to say, I may or may not find it
7 helpful. But I'm not going to stop him asking or, rather,
8 answering the question, so I will allow it.

9

10 MR TEDESCHI: If you please.

11

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, yes.

13

14 MR GRAY: Commissioner, I will withdraw that question and
15 ask a question applicable simply to the first criterion,
16 "Bias Crime"?

17

18 THE WITNESS: Sure, yes.

19

20 MR GRAY: Q. That requires, on its face, as we've just
21 read, the Parrabell officer only to say "Yes" if the
22 existence of bias crime - sorry, if the existence of
23 a motivation of bias is established beyond reasonable
24 doubt, doesn't it?

25 A. Yes.

26

27 Q. Now if that was the criterion for evidence of bias
28 crime beyond reasonable doubt that bias was --

29 A. Yes.

30

31 Q. -- visible on the paper record, that would inevitably
32 mean that very few cases on a paper review would meet that
33 criterion, wouldn't it?

34 A. Yes.

35

36 Q. That folder can be returned. The report of Strike
37 Force Parrabell, the actual final report, was eventually
38 released in June 2018. You may or may not know that date?

39 A. Yes, I recall that it was released.

40

41 Q. Of course, as we know, you were no longer Commander
42 Homicide, but presumably you were aware of its release and
43 no doubt had at least some interest in it in?

44 A. Yes, yes.

45

46 Q. And in the Parrabell report, do you recall - and I can
47 obviously put it in front of you - the strike force came to

1 the view that of the 88, or 86 as it turns out, cases on
2 the list, only 23 were unsolved not 30? Do you remember
3 that was their view?
4 A. Was - I don't recall that, but yes, I accept that,
5 yes.
6
7 Q. Just accept that for the moment.
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. So in their view the number that were unsolved as far
11 as they assessed things was 23 rather than 30?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Again, if you need me to show you the report, of
15 course, that will be done immediately --
16 A. Sure.
17
18 Q. -- but the Parrabell report said that of the 86, eight
19 were categorised as evidence of bias crime. Eight.
20
21 MR TEDESCHI: I object.
22
23 THE COMMISSIONER: What's the objection?
24
25 MR TEDESCHI: My friend is referring to the first
26 category. He should put it fairly and say "beyond
27 a reasonable doubt identified as bias crime"?
28
29 THE COMMISSIONER: If that's the complete context then
30 I don't think Mr Gray will have any difficulty with that.
31
32 MR GRAY: What I'm putting to the witness, perhaps my
33 friend didn't pick this up, was what the report said. The
34 report made no mention of "beyond reasonable doubt" at all,
35 as Mr Tedeschi knows.
36
37 Q. So I will ask the question - in fact, I will put the
38 report in front of you, if I may.
39
40 THE COMMISSIONER: Which volume is it?
41
42 THE WITNESS: Tab 2, Mr Gray?
43
44 MR GRAY: Q. I think so, yes. Thank you. Exhibit 1,
45 tab 2 [SC0I.02632_0001]. Have you ever actually seen the
46 report or had it in your hands before?
47 A. No.

1
2 Q. Well, I'll just orientate you slightly. The first 46
3 pages, up to and including page 46, are, in effect, the
4 report of the strike force - that is, of the police?
5 A. Yep.
6
7 Q. And then from 47 to the end, the balance is the
8 academic review?
9 A. Right.
10
11 Q. You follow? So I'm, for the moment, asking you about
12 the police section.
13 A. Yes, okay.
14
15 Q. Pages 1 to 46?
16 A. Yep.
17
18 Q. Now, after some introductory narrative and
19 explanations of one sort or another, we get to page 23,
20 heading "Findings". Do you see that?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. So they say:
24
25 *Of the 88 cases - 63 cases ... were solved;*
26 *23 cases ... remain unsolved; 2 cases ...*
27 *were not reviewed.*
28
29 I don't need to trouble you today with why two were not
30 reviewed.
31 A. Mmm-hmm.
32
33 Q. But at any rate, 23 of the in fact 86, they say, are
34 unsolved. Then on the next page, 24, the report says:
35
36 *Of the 86 cases that were reviewed --*
37
38 and I'm quoting --
39
40 *8 cases ... found evidence of bias*
41 *crime ...*
42
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. Nineteen were suspected bias crime?
46 A. Yes.
47

- 1 Q. And the remainder, which add up to 59 between them,
2 are either no evidence of bias crime or insufficient
3 information?
4 A. Yes.
5
- 6 Q. Now, that number, eight, is the same as the number
7 arrived at by Mr Lehmann and Ms Young and yourself back in
8 2013, isn't it?
9 A. What's that - just - that was the same number that
10 Lehmann and Young arrived at, endorsed by me.
11
- 12 Q. And endorsed by you, yes.
13 A. Yes.
14
- 15 Q. Is that just coincidence, do you think?
16 A. I think so.
17
- 18 Q. Or does it reflect, do you think, some communications
19 or coordination between Parrabell and the Unsolved Homicide
20 Team?
21 A. I don't think so at all.
22
- 23 Q. So if any such coordination occurred, it wasn't
24 anything that you were involved in?
25 A. No. That's correct.
26
- 27 Q. Did you, by the way, during this period, by which
28 I mean from late 2015 to let's say April 2017 when you left
29 Homicide --
30 A. Yes.
31
- 32 Q. -- have discussions with Mr Crandell about what
33 Parrabell was doing, the progress of its work?
34 A. That was - it was done independently of me. I think
35 I recall a couple of meetings that I had with him. One was
36 the first one where he gave me a briefing about what he
37 wanted to do and the academic review. I believe I attended
38 a meeting with Alex Greenwich at Parliament. I don't think
39 that Mr Crandell was with me. He might have met me there
40 at Parliament but I'm fairly confident I did that by myself
41 with Mr Greenwich. And then there was a meeting at the
42 Homicide Squad with Professor Dalton, I think from South
43 Australia, who was involved in the review.
44
- 45 Q. I won't tarry on that.
46 A. Sure.
47

- 1 Q. But since you've mentioned it --
2 A. Yes.
3
- 4 Q. -- what was the gist of the meeting you were involved
5 with where Dr Dalton was present?
6 A. It was an introduction to him.
7
- 8 Q. Was there anything of substance discussed?
9 A. Not that I can recall.
10
- 11 Q. In your presence?
12 A. There was a number of people present, yeah.
13
- 14 Q. Sorry?
15 A. There was a number of people present at the meeting
16 and it was an introduction. I think Mr Crandell had
17 emailed me saying that Dr Dalton or Professor Dalton was in
18 town, did I want to meet him, and I said yes.
19
- 20 Q. Now, during whatever discussions you had with
21 Mr Crandell in that period, 2015-2017, did you tell him
22 about anything about what Macnamir was doing?
23 A. I might have in general terms, that, you know, the
24 matter was before the Coroner or something like that, but
25 not in relation to detail. That's not something that
26 occurred with any of the homicide matters. They were kept
27 very much in-house.
28
- 29 Q. And did you tell him anything about what Neiwand was
30 doing?
31 A. Not that I can recall.
32
- 33 Q. Now, back to the Parrabell report.
34 A. Sure.
35
- 36 Q. It goes on to say on page 26 that of the 23 cases that
37 it regarded as remaining unsolved, none of them - zero -
38 were categorised as cases where there was evidence found of
39 bias crime. Do you see that?
40 A. Yes, I do see it.
41
- 42 Q. Five were categorised as suspected bias crimes, and
43 the other 18 were either no evidence of bias crime or
44 insufficient information.
45 A. Yes.
46
- 47 Q. Now, what I want to suggest to you is that those

1 obviously very low numbers --

2 A. Yes.

3

4 Q. -- of cases where there was evidence of bias crime
5 found - that is, eight out of 86 in total, and zero out of
6 23 for the unsolved ones - were almost inevitable given
7 the --

8 A. The criteria.

9

10 Q. -- requirement of beyond reasonable doubt in the form,
11 do you agree?

12 A. Yes, that makes perfect sense.

13

14 Q. Were you surprised at the very low numbers that
15 Parrabell came up with in terms of the number of cases
16 where they said there was evidence of bias crime - that is,
17 eight out of 86 and zero out of 23?

18 A. I can't recall those exact numbers but I knew that
19 they came up with a relatively low number of cases that
20 were suspected of being bias related.

21

22 Surprised? It's difficult to answer at the time.
23 I mean, I just don't know the way I felt at the time.
24 I might have - I might have been surprised or I might have
25 sort of - because I didn't know the criteria they were
26 using. I didn't know what was occurring. I didn't know
27 the impact of the academic review as well.

28

29 Q. All fair points, I hear those. But let me ask you
30 this, though: did it - that is, "it" being these low
31 numbers --

32 A. Yes.

33

34 Q. -- actually confirm your own view, long held, which
35 was that the claim of 30 unsolved bias crime cases was
36 a gross exaggeration?

37 A. It's - laid support for it, yes, certainly.

38

39 Q. It laid support then, as I think you're saying?

40 A. Yes.

41

42 Q. But you accept now --

43

44 MR TEDESCHI: I object.

45

46 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think Mr Gray has finished the
47 question, but what's the objection?

1
2 MR TEDESCHI: It was the previous question I'm objecting
3 to, or the line, rather.
4
5 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
6
7 MR TEDESCHI: My learned friend is suggesting to the
8 witness or he is asking the witness was he surprised at the
9 low numbers --
10
11 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12
13 MR TEDESCHI: -- in view of what he had previously
14 expressed to be possible exaggeration of 30 out of the 88
15 being gay hate crimes or suspected to be gay hate crimes.
16 But an analysis of the report shows that the finding was
17 that 27 out of the 88 were either beyond a reasonable doubt
18 gay hate crimes or suspected of being gay hate crimes. So
19 to put to him that the numbers confirmed his exaggerated
20 view is inaccurate.
21
22 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So you say, do you, as
23 I understand you, that 27 were either definitely gay hate
24 related or suspected gay hate related?
25
26 MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
27
28 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Mr Gray can take that on
29 board. He may or may not agree with that, I don't know.
30
31 MR GRAY: I'm happy to deal with it now so that we can
32 move on.
33
34 THE WITNESS: Sure.
35
36 MR GRAY: Q. If we go back to page 24, I did put the
37 component numbers to you but my friend wants to add
38 a couple of them together. Page 24?
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. So of the 86, says the report, eight found evidence of
42 bias crime, and 19 were categorised as suspected bias
43 crime?
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. And my friend is saying, as I understand it, well, if
47 you add 8 and 19 together, you get 27?

- 1 A. Yes.
2
- 3 Q. So 27 on that calculus are either actually bias crime
4 or suspected bias crime?
5 A. Yes.
6
- 7 Q. And there is no doubting that that's what you get when
8 you add 8 to 19. I would accept that.
9 A. I accept that.
10
- 11 Q. But in the light of that recognition, is there any
12 answer that you have given in the last 10 minutes that you
13 feel needs revision or correction?
14 A. No. I would say that those numbers are consistent -
15 broadly consistent with the findings of the Lehmann report,
16 in terms of less than - roughly a third, I guess.
17
- 18 Q. I don't want to go around this mulberry bush too often
19 but the Lehmann/Young document wasn't looking at the 86; it
20 was only looking at the 30?
21 A. No, I'm talking about roughly a third of those cases
22 they looked at.
23
- 24 Q. I will come back to that. But the Lehmann/Young was
25 looking at 30, they said of the 30, no more than eight,
26 possibly or probably gay hate?
27 A. Yes, that's right.
28
- 29 Q. That's right. And you agreed. This one, looking at -
30 I'll go back a step and I'll do it this way, actually.
31 A. Sure.
32
- 33 Q. On page 26. Looking at the 23, which is their
34 substitute for the 30, do you see - Parrabell's --
35 A. Yes, yes.
36
- 37 Q. -- revision of 30 down to 23 is unsolved?
38 A. Yes.
39
- 40 Q. Parrabell says zero bias crime, five suspected?
41 A. Yes.
42
- 43 Q. Now, that's even lower than eight out of 30, I think.
44 A. Yes.
45
- 46 Q. And did that come as a surprise to you?
47 A. Again I can't recall what I - I don't know whether

1 I've ever been told this detail, to be brutally honest, but
2 I - it doesn't surprise me. It's generally what I - what
3 I thought in terms of a rationale, like a comparison in
4 terms of a broad comparison.

5
6 Q. Again, as I say, I don't want to labour this
7 indefinitely, but when you say "generally" it accorded with
8 what you thought, what do you mean by that?

9 A. Well, roughly a third of the matters that Lehmann and
10 Young looked at, they came up with a conclusion that it was
11 possible or probable gay hate crime, including Mattaini.
12 This accords with roughly that. I mean, bear in mind that
13 four of the - of the 30 that they couldn't find records for
14 at the time - yeah, that's - that's - that's the way
15 I rationalise it in my mind.

16
17 Q. We can all do our arithmetic later and analyse that.

18 A. Sure.

19
20 Q. But that's your evidence?

21 A. Yes.

22
23 Q. Did you become aware, after the Parrabell report was
24 published, that many in the LGBTIQ community were dismayed
25 by these conclusions that I've just been taking you to?

26 A. In general terms over time, yes.

27
28 Q. And again, in general terms --

29 A. Yes.

30
31 Q. -- that dismay was one of the factors that led to the
32 Parliamentary Inquiry in 2018 to 2021, you'd agree?

33 A. Yes.

34
35 Q. The Parliamentary Inquiry as no doubt you know
36 recommended a judicial inquiry of some form?

37 A. Yes.

38
39 Q. And again, summarising somewhat, that has led in the
40 long run to the establishment of this Special Commission.
41 You understand that?

42 A. Yes, of course, yes.

43
44 Q. Now, of course, this Special Commission has particular
45 Terms of Reference by which it is bound - I don't know if
46 you know that?

47 A. Yes.

- 1
2 Q. And you're aware, then, that the Special Commission
3 has been specifically directed by the Terms of Reference to
4 consider, among other things, the report and findings of
5 Strike Force Parrabell?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. And one aspect of the report is the methodology used
9 by the strike force officers?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. Obviously enough. And another aspect is the
13 methodology used by the academic reviewers?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. Now, I'm just coming to Neiwand and I will use the
17 remaining five minutes, if that's convenient, Commissioner.
18
19 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly.
20
21 MR GRAY: And then we will need to rise for the day.
22
23 Q. Now, Neiwand was created in about October 2015?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. We have in the bundle, and I can show it to you, of
27 course, if you need reminding, in volume 1, tab 16, an
28 e@gle.i document, actually - perhaps I had better show it
29 to you. It is volume 1, which the witness needs. Volume
30 1, tab 16 [SC0I.76962.00001_0001]?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. So it's this document. Perhaps you could help us.
34 What do we call a document like this? What's the name for
35 this sort of document?
36 A. It's a - similar to the last document of this nature,
37 it's an administrative record on the e@gle.i system. This
38 is a record of what appears to be Terms of Reference that
39 have been accepted on to the system by Lehmann and Penny
40 Brown.
41
42 Q. All right. So I don't understand this to be
43 controversial, but so on 26 October 2015, or at least by
44 then --
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. -- Detective Lehmann had been appointed as

1 Investigation Supervisor for Neiwand?
2 A. He's accepted that administratively, that's the title
3 that's given to the person that accepts those records on
4 the system as of that date, and then you'll see, I think,
5 they've been modified by Brown on 7 December '15.
6
7 Q. Well, accepted by her on 7 December '15. Last --
8 A. Sorry, last modified on 26 October. Sorry, yeah,
9 you're correct.
10
11 Q. Yes. So are you saying, notwithstanding how that
12 document reads on its face, it doesn't mean that Lehmann
13 was the investigation supervisor or --
14 A. I think by virtue of his position as the Investigation
15 Coordinator, he would have had a supervisory role over the
16 top of it, yes. I think he was.
17
18 Q. Just keep that there for the moment.
19 A. Sure.
20
21 Q. But just look at your statement at paragraph 74.
22 A. Yep. That's right.
23
24 Q. You there say that you yourself were not directly
25 involved in the establishment of Neiwand but you endorsed
26 it occurring?
27 A. Yeah; that's correct.
28
29 Q. And you then give a little explanation in 75 as to how
30 strike forces are typically set up?
31 A. Yes, correct.
32
33 MR GRAY: Could, just in the last couple of minutes,
34 Mr Willing be shown volume 14, please.
35
36 Q. And turn to tab 291 [NPL.0015.0001.0009].
37 A. Yep.
38
39 Q. This is an issue paper, by the look of it, from
40 Detective Chief Inspector Olen dated 4 May 2016?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. And under the heading "Background" he says:
44
45 *In October 2015, Detective Superintendent*
46 *Willing requested the Unsolved Homicide*
47 *Team to re-investigate the ...*

1
2 And I'm summarising, Mattaini, Warren and Russell?
3 A. Yep, that's right.
4
5 Q. Well, is that correct?
6 A. Yes, I did. I've asked them to establish a strike
7 force and do it, but the mechanics of actually
8 administratively doing it wasn't - I didn't do that.
9
10 Q. So when you say in paragraph 74, "I was not directly
11 involved in the establishment of Strike Force Neiwand" --
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. -- is that really correct?
15 A. It's - it is.
16
17 Q. It seems you were the one who made the request that it
18 be set up?
19 A. I asked that it be set up and that - but there's an
20 administrative process to establish the strike force.
21 That's what I'm referring to.
22
23 Q. So you'd say that you asked for it to be set up?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. But that did not amount to you being involved in the -
27 directly involved in its establishment?
28 A. The actual resourcing of it and Terms of Reference and
29 all those sorts of things, that's right.
30
31 MR GRAY: Is that a convenient time?
32
33 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I will adjourn until 10am in the
34 morning. Thank you.
35
36 **AT 3.57PM THE SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY WAS ADJOURNED**
37 **TO TUESDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 2023 AT 10AM**
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	1669:13, 1670:29, 1671:15	1989 [1] - 1669:30	1685:40, 1686:31, 1693:2, 1718:8, 1719:15, 1720:22, 1721:28, 1740:8	232 [2] - 1702:41, 1706:7
'03 [1] - 1640:7	16 [5] - 1622:32, 1634:9, 1645:37, 1746:27, 1746:30	1990 [4] - 1662:23, 1673:37, 1673:43, 1674:12	2013/2014 [1] - 1624:46	24 [4] - 1622:10, 1739:34, 1743:36, 1743:38
'15 [3] - 1628:1, 1747:5, 1747:7	1606 [1] - 1687:8	1990s [1] - 1624:32	2014 [9] - 1681:4, 1681:45, 1685:12, 1685:40, 1686:36, 1695:31, 1697:12, 1728:38	240 [1] - 1687:4
'80s [2] - 1666:26, 1689:47	1607 [1] - 1687:12	1991 [4] - 1673:37, 1673:44, 1674:3, 1674:13		242 [1] - 1702:47
'90s [2] - 1666:26, 1689:47	161 [1] - 1631:42			243 [1] - 1703:8
'the [1] - 1650:44	1610 [1] - 1687:21			2447 [1] - 1692:40
	1615 [3] - 1687:26, 1687:33, 1688:3			2452 [1] - 1693:5
	1616 [2] - 1687:26, 1688:9			2453 [3] - 1693:5, 1693:7, 1693:12
	1619 [4] - 1687:42, 1688:16, 1688:25, 1688:26			2454 [1] - 1693:19
1	162 [3] - 1661:11, 1668:17, 1670:26	2 [15] - 1620:20, 1671:42, 1671:43, 1671:45, 1671:47, 1677:6, 1690:30, 1690:32, 1690:34, 1713:47, 1735:45, 1736:3, 1738:42, 1738:45, 1739:26	2015 [25] - 1626:6, 1626:11, 1626:45, 1627:9, 1627:27, 1627:30, 1627:43, 1636:36, 1671:9, 1697:34, 1700:22, 1705:43, 1711:13, 1711:18, 1711:26, 1720:23, 1725:15, 1725:45, 1725:46, 1726:4, 1728:7, 1740:28, 1746:23, 1746:43, 1747:45	247 [2] - 1703:8, 1703:12
1 [12] - 1622:2, 1628:36, 1656:40, 1665:39, 1690:30, 1693:20, 1734:21, 1738:44, 1739:15, 1746:27, 1746:29, 1746:30	1621 [2] - 1688:20, 1688:41	20 [5] - 1620:25, 1621:26, 1662:30, 1663:3, 1686:31	2015-2017 [1] - 1741:21	248 [1] - 1703:16
10 [15] - 1621:44, 1622:2, 1677:31, 1681:4, 1681:45, 1685:12, 1695:31, 1702:40, 1706:6, 1717:43, 1720:47, 1733:19, 1736:11, 1744:12	1622 [3] - 1688:37, 1689:6, 1689:25	2000s [2] - 1629:41, 1637:47	2016 [4] - 1726:24, 1726:26, 1733:3, 1747:40	25 [7] - 1622:20, 1639:28, 1660:23, 1661:18, 1671:26, 1671:35, 1687:12
10.23am [1] - 1620:25	1624 [2] - 1689:6, 1689:26	2001 [1] - 1664:5	2017 [18] - 1623:33, 1627:28, 1627:33, 1628:2, 1628:15, 1628:17, 1628:29, 1628:36, 1628:47, 1629:26, 1700:34, 1701:20, 1701:29, 1701:41, 1707:2, 1707:6, 1711:21, 1740:28	2512 [1] - 1693:32
10.28am [1] - 1623:3	1625 [2] - 1688:37, 1689:2	2001/2002 [1] - 1630:7		252C [4] - 1695:46, 1696:1, 1696:9, 1696:11
102 [3] - 1669:23, 1670:15, 1670:17	1671 [1] - 1689:45	2002 [6] - 1622:20, 1639:28, 1640:6, 1662:40, 1691:14, 1691:23		253 [1] - 1622:31
10am [1] - 1748:33	1678 [2] - 1690:15, 1690:24	2003 [3] - 1622:23, 1627:23, 1631:16		256 [1] - 1690:43
10AM [1] - 1748:37	1679 [3] - 1690:43, 1692:19, 1692:34	2004 [1] - 1631:27		258 [2] - 1703:16, 1703:20
11 [9] - 1622:14, 1622:30, 1628:29, 1649:23, 1654:23, 1654:24, 1695:46, 1696:3, 1718:8	1682 [3] - 1691:46, 1692:5, 1692:29	2005 [5] - 1631:34, 1643:42, 1687:22, 1690:16, 1691:37		259 [1] - 1703:24
12 [2] - 1634:19, 1677:35	18 [4] - 1634:9, 1662:21, 1672:11, 1741:43	2007 [1] - 1707:7		26 [9] - 1672:42, 1673:2, 1674:30, 1678:21, 1714:22, 1741:36, 1744:33, 1746:43, 1747:8
121 [1] - 1620:20	19 [6] - 1662:26, 1672:16, 1672:17, 1743:42, 1743:47, 1744:8	2011 [9] - 1623:32, 1630:27, 1630:30, 1638:5, 1638:13, 1669:38, 1669:40, 1669:41, 1670:5		265C [1] - 1734:9
12th [1] - 1654:29	1970s [2] - 1624:32, 1727:16	2012 [13] - 1624:4, 1628:14, 1640:38, 1646:44, 1647:21, 1647:40, 1647:41, 1648:14, 1652:35, 1660:13, 1660:23, 1661:18, 1667:2		266C [1] - 1734:9
13 [15] - 1626:6, 1626:11, 1662:17, 1686:36, 1697:34, 1700:22, 1711:13, 1711:18, 1711:26, 1711:30, 1720:29, 1721:3, 1721:11, 1725:15, 1733:47	1980s [3] - 1627:13, 1643:41, 1727:17	2013 [29] - 1624:16, 1624:25, 1635:34, 1648:42, 1657:3, 1660:6, 1665:38, 1666:7, 1666:11, 1666:17, 1667:1, 1668:27, 1668:41, 1670:29, 1670:34, 1670:42, 1671:14, 1671:26, 1680:13, 1681:14, 1683:23,		27 [5] - 1678:20, 1743:17, 1743:23, 1743:47, 1744:3
13 [15] - 1626:6, 1626:11, 1662:17, 1686:36, 1697:34, 1700:22, 1711:13, 1711:18, 1711:26, 1711:30, 1720:29, 1721:3, 1721:11, 1725:15, 1733:47	1985 [7] - 1627:16, 1630:47, 1633:32, 1634:18, 1639:12, 1662:36, 1691:2	2014 [1] - 1664:5		270 [2] - 1703:24, 1703:25
14 [11] - 1622:14, 1622:30, 1632:10, 1632:33, 1634:20, 1648:30, 1653:40, 1677:32, 1704:38, 1706:5, 1747:34	1988 [2] - 1626:17, 1714:38	2015-2017 [1] - 1741:21		275 [1] - 1703:31
15 [8] - 1635:41, 1636:7, 1665:38, 1668:26, 1668:41,	1989 [18] - 1624:13, 1627:17, 1630:12, 1630:13, 1634:8, 1641:5, 1641:39, 1641:41, 1643:4, 1643:28, 1643:37, 1643:44, 1645:26, 1662:22, 1691:1, 1691:8, 1715:19, 1715:28	2016 [6] - 1622:20, 1639:28, 1640:6, 1662:40, 1691:14, 1691:23		276 [1] - 1703:39
		2017 [1] - 1707:7		28 [1] - 1681:14
		2018 [6] - 1627:34, 1629:22, 1706:18, 1706:44, 1737:38, 1745:32		284 [2] - 1704:7, 1706:9
		2019 [1] - 1707:7		285 [1] - 1703:43
		2020 [1] - 1706:32		2878 [2] - 1693:43, 1694:14
		2021 [1] - 1745:32		2899 [1] - 1694:1
		2022 [1] - 1620:9		29 [4] - 1669:38, 1670:5, 1672:11, 1675:32
		2023 [4] - 1620:25, 1622:32, 1623:22, 1748:37		291 [1] - 1747:36
		21 [4] - 1672:17, 1672:19, 1672:21, 1748:37		2921 [1] - 1694:14
		23 [13] - 1620:27, 1663:10, 1672:21, 1738:2, 1738:11, 1739:19, 1739:26, 1739:33, 1741:36, 1742:6, 1742:17, 1744:33, 1744:37		
		230 [1] - 1622:19		
				3
				3 [4] - 1662:40, 1677:30, 1714:28,

1715:34	1739:3, 1739:15	1624:41, 1627:3,	1744:8, 1744:9	1740:1, 1743:37,
3.57PM [1] - 1748:36	47 [4] - 1672:2,	1666:26, 1728:37	accepted [8] -	1743:47, 1744:8
30 [51] - 1623:21,	1677:3, 1677:6,	80-odd [3] - 1627:3,	1637:33, 1668:42,	added [8] - 1622:14,
1624:42, 1666:30,	1739:7	1670:42, 1677:23	1694:18, 1728:20,	1622:15, 1630:44,
1671:22, 1672:22,	48 [1] - 1680:47	80-plus [1] - 1733:30	1728:22, 1746:39,	1645:37, 1646:27,
1672:45, 1673:27,	<hr/> 5 <hr/>	86 [9] - 1727:30,	1747:2, 1747:7	1659:5, 1668:17,
1674:32, 1675:38,		1738:1, 1738:18,	accepting [4] -	1670:26
1676:21, 1677:2,		1739:33, 1739:36,	1629:25, 1640:13,	adding [1] - 1667:13
1677:27, 1679:1,	5 [3] - 1716:11,	1742:5, 1742:17,	1658:9, 1698:44	addition [2] - 1650:21,
1679:37, 1682:39,	1717:2, 1717:3	1743:41, 1744:19	accepts [1] - 1747:3	1652:3
1683:3, 1683:13,	50 [2] - 1695:35,	88 [9] - 1726:32,	access [1] - 1659:30	additional [1] -
1683:16, 1693:6,	1696:42	1727:30, 1727:42,	accessed [1] -	1622:13
1693:15, 1693:20,	51 [1] - 1706:9	1730:35, 1730:41,	1661:33	additions [1] -
1693:23, 1693:36,	53 [1] - 1724:40	1738:1, 1739:25,	accommodate [1] -	1623:29
1700:34, 1701:20,	54 [1] - 1724:43	1743:14, 1743:17	1695:12	address [1] - 1709:30
1711:21, 1717:5,	55 [1] - 1724:46	<hr/> 9 <hr/>	accommodates [1] -	addresses [1] -
1727:33, 1727:42,	57 [1] - 1658:25	9 [5] - 1622:19,	1694:21	1631:25
1728:18, 1728:19,	58 [2] - 1658:33,	1657:33, 1657:44,	accord [1] - 1631:37	adduce [1] - 1648:9
1728:25, 1728:33,	1659:32	1659:12, 1679:34	accordance [2] -	adduced [1] - 1645:8
1728:39, 1729:21,	59 [1] - 1740:1	99 [1] - 1730:21	1645:13, 1646:13	adjourn [3] - 1690:34,
1730:44, 1731:28,	<hr/> 6 <hr/>	<hr/> A <hr/>	accorded [1] - 1745:7	1695:18, 1748:33
1732:20, 1732:34,			according [3] -	administrative [4] -
1732:45, 1738:2,	6 [15] - 1621:43,		1653:18, 1656:44,	1623:10, 1669:5,
1738:11, 1742:35,	1622:9, 1622:14,	abbreviated [1] -	1657:44	1746:37, 1748:20
1743:14, 1744:20,	1622:15, 1631:41,	1630:6	accordingly [2] -	administratively [5] -
1744:25, 1744:34,	1645:37, 1645:38,	ABC [8] - 1624:17,	1645:4, 1693:31	1669:14, 1671:16,
1744:37, 1744:43,	1645:45, 1661:10,	1626:12, 1649:21,	accordingly... [1] -	1671:31, 1747:2,
1745:13	1667:6, 1668:17,	1711:18, 1711:43,	1696:35	1748:8
31 [5] - 1646:42,	1716:21, 1716:36,	1720:28, 1721:11,	accords [1] - 1745:12	admissions [1] -
1647:14, 1648:15,	1717:29, 1720:15	1721:37	account [2] - 1692:27,	1664:44
1669:40, 1670:6	60 [1] - 1659:44	ability [1] - 1724:22	1705:43	adopt [1] - 1623:6
311 [1] - 1704:39	63 [1] - 1739:25	able [4] - 1632:46,	accumulated [1] -	adopted [3] - 1637:21,
312 [1] - 1648:34	66 [1] - 1660:40	1659:29, 1677:32,	1639:7	1637:25, 1699:6
317 [2] - 1645:38,	<hr/> 7 <hr/>	1691:37	accurate [1] - 1659:21	advance [3] - 1647:32,
1645:40		absence [5] - 1656:31,	accurately [1] -	1647:37, 1723:38
318 [1] - 1720:15	7 [5] - 1648:42,	1656:32, 1663:42,	1688:8	advancement [1] -
33 [1] - 1663:14	1677:31, 1717:43,	1664:43, 1685:19	accused [2] - 1626:29,	1664:45
34 [2] - 1647:11,	1747:5, 1747:7	absolutely [3] -	1642:18	advances [1] -
1653:46	700 [8] - 1646:25,	1719:47, 1722:3,	1643:15	1684:42
35 [2] - 1654:8,	1675:1, 1675:9,	1729:39	accused's [1] -	advice [3] - 1657:27,
1655:20	1675:14, 1680:35,	abundance [1] -	1643:15	1682:3, 1682:5
36 [1] - 1654:22	1684:10, 1684:28,	1691:12	achieved [1] - 1622:28	affect [1] - 1641:41
364 [1] - 1692:38	1684:30	academic [6] -	acknowledge [1] -	afforded [1] - 1673:9
37 [1] - 1654:28	700-odd [2] - 1680:28,	1726:43, 1731:5,	1626:35	afternoon [2] -
373 [1] - 1693:32	1684:11	1739:8, 1740:37,	Act [1] - 1725:32	1667:40, 1721:44
38 [1] - 1654:45	74 [2] - 1747:21,	1742:27, 1746:13	Acting [2] - 1628:22,	afterwards [3] -
39 [1] - 1655:7	1748:10	accept [25] - 1630:7,	1647:4	1658:40, 1672:35,
390 [1] - 1686:40	75 [1] - 1747:29	1632:6, 1634:1,	active [6] - 1635:46,	1672:39
<hr/> 4 <hr/>	<hr/> 8 <hr/>	1634:10, 1634:11,	1638:39, 1650:11,	age [2] - 1634:9,
4 [1] - 1747:40		1637:29, 1639:35,	1651:47, 1675:17,	1634:15
40 [3] - 1655:16,	8 [10] - 1654:13,	1640:2, 1643:16,	1684:31	aged [1] - 1634:7
1655:24, 1656:6	1656:41, 1662:12,	1653:5, 1688:16,	actively [1] - 1658:6	ago [5] - 1639:17,
41 [1] - 1628:5	1679:37, 1680:3,	1691:15, 1698:15,	activities [3] -	1639:42, 1651:31,
431 [1] - 1693:41	1683:3, 1683:16,	1698:42, 1700:24,	1639:16, 1639:40,	1674:12, 1713:28
445 [2] - 1686:41,	1739:40, 1743:47,	1711:24, 1714:36,	1730:27	agree [27] - 1625:8,
1687:5	1744:8	1722:45, 1723:4,	activity [2] - 1643:15,	1626:24, 1634:24,
46 [5] - 1628:6,	80 [5] - 1624:37,	1727:45, 1738:4,	1682:30	1639:38, 1640:7,
1702:47, 1739:2,		1738:7, 1742:42,	actual [4] - 1634:43,	1642:42, 1647:19,
			1703:47, 1737:37,	1653:6, 1661:33,
			1748:28	1666:39, 1669:12,
			add [5] - 1645:45,	

1675:2, 1679:10,
1692:15, 1697:31,
1697:42, 1709:15,
1714:47, 1719:38,
1720:6, 1720:9,
1720:28, 1720:35,
1736:25, 1742:11,
1743:29, 1745:32
agreed [9] - 1651:19,
1651:31, 1651:37,
1669:2, 1688:3,
1706:12, 1713:11,
1713:14, 1744:29
agreeing [3] -
1626:31, 1710:1,
1730:2
agreement [1] -
1665:29
aimed [1] - 1705:20
air [4] - 1649:22,
1654:25, 1712:3,
1721:7
Alberici [9] - 1713:43,
1714:20, 1716:36,
1717:4, 1717:43,
1718:1, 1718:21,
1720:39, 1720:46
Alex [2] - 1682:8,
1740:38
Alicia [14] - 1647:16,
1651:39, 1653:12,
1660:17, 1660:20,
1660:27, 1660:47,
1661:17, 1667:2,
1670:7, 1670:13,
1670:22, 1671:16,
1671:32
alleged [2] - 1673:27,
1675:13
alliances [1] - 1664:29
allocate [3] - 1655:18,
1656:33, 1719:42
allocated [9] -
1654:14, 1655:21,
1657:41, 1658:38,
1659:3, 1659:29,
1669:39, 1707:31
allocation [2] -
1656:26, 1659:5
allow [5] - 1689:21,
1702:16, 1737:4,
1737:8
allowed [1] - 1722:9
allowing [1] - 1629:29
alluded [1] - 1726:33
almost [6] - 1622:1,
1639:16, 1640:12,
1661:16, 1683:39,
1742:6
alone [1] - 1685:4
alongside [1] - 1675:8
alternative [1] -
1705:41
alternatively [2] -
1642:31, 1645:37
alternatives [1] -
1705:40
amalgamated [1] -
1658:43
amazed [1] - 1718:16
amount [2] - 1643:19,
1748:26
analyse [1] - 1745:17
analysis [3] - 1674:16,
1716:25, 1743:16
Anders [1] - 1620:37
anger [1] - 1650:37
annex [1] - 1695:36
annexed [1] - 1685:44
annexure [1] - 1666:2
annexures [2] -
1621:26, 1639:28
annual [2] - 1647:5,
1650:33
answer [27] - 1625:22,
1674:14, 1675:19,
1682:19, 1682:21,
1689:19, 1702:19,
1705:22, 1705:27,
1709:21, 1712:18,
1714:40, 1715:13,
1715:34, 1716:40,
1717:3, 1717:9,
1717:29, 1718:6,
1718:20, 1718:29,
1718:37, 1732:35,
1735:39, 1737:5,
1742:22, 1744:12
answered [1] -
1676:33
answering [1] -
1737:8
answers [5] - 1708:38,
1713:43, 1731:8,
1734:5, 1734:18
anticipates [1] -
1649:27
anyway [6] - 1626:5,
1632:44, 1648:13,
1656:5, 1695:41,
1719:42
apart [6] - 1633:41,
1639:22, 1647:39,
1655:2, 1658:11,
1689:37
apologies [3] -
1665:26, 1711:30,
1727:47
apparent [1] - 1663:32
Appeal [1] - 1642:28
appeal [1] - 1642:34
Appeals [2] - 1642:9,
1642:16
appear [2] - 1691:18,
1691:19
appeared [2] - 1723:7,
1731:42
appellate [1] -
1642:39
applicable [1] -
1737:15
application [14] -
1642:9, 1642:11,
1642:17, 1642:27,
1642:28, 1642:33,
1697:41, 1698:12,
1698:19, 1698:24,
1699:7, 1700:7,
1700:9, 1700:27
applied [3] - 1638:45,
1642:19, 1647:32
applies [1] - 1622:33
apply [3] - 1725:34,
1730:15
appointed [2] -
1629:3, 1746:47
appreciate [3] -
1630:18, 1700:38,
1705:14
appreciated [1] -
1661:45
appreciating [2] -
1633:15, 1640:27
appreciation [1] -
1685:32
apprehend [2] -
1621:8, 1694:37
approach [2] - 1647:6,
1678:6
appropriate [7] -
1622:25, 1642:18,
1644:17, 1673:8,
1681:26, 1695:9,
1702:24
approval [1] - 1723:12
approved [3] - 1713:2,
1713:9, 1723:10
April [24] - 1626:6,
1626:11, 1628:17,
1628:27, 1628:29,
1628:39, 1629:26,
1629:35, 1657:3,
1697:34, 1700:22,
1705:43, 1711:13,
1711:18, 1711:26,
1711:30, 1720:22,
1720:29, 1720:47,
1721:3, 1721:11,
1725:15, 1725:45,
1740:28
area [3] - 1664:16,
1689:42, 1690:19
argument [2] -
1697:34, 1700:23
argument's [3] -
1659:27, 1732:10,
1732:13
arising [1] - 1628:31
arithmetic [1] -
1745:17
arranged [2] -
1649:39, 1719:8
arrangements [3] -
1622:34, 1641:30,
1656:5
arrest [1] - 1706:32
arrive [2] - 1622:36,
1731:1
arrived [6] - 1651:32,
1731:3, 1731:26,
1732:20, 1740:7,
1740:10
articles [13] - 1624:26,
1624:35, 1666:11,
1666:17, 1666:24,
1666:34, 1666:42,
1670:30, 1672:18,
1677:15, 1682:25,
1682:26, 1693:2
articulated [1] -
1642:27
articulates [1] -
1678:8
Ashwood [3] - 1652:2,
1652:30, 1652:31
aside [3] - 1634:38,
1635:25, 1728:47
aspect [3] - 1648:8,
1746:8, 1746:12
assailants [3] -
1632:37, 1633:8,
1692:14
assault [5] - 1630:12,
1632:45, 1664:14,
1690:1, 1690:9
assaults [2] - 1689:42,
1690:8
asserted [1] - 1708:6
asserting [1] - 1674:9
assertion [2] -
1705:29, 1716:29
asserts [1] - 1717:34
assess [1] - 1648:5
assessed [2] - 1683:4,
1738:11
assessing [2] -
1647:27, 1733:30
assessment [20] -
1647:24, 1647:44,
1648:2, 1648:7,
1648:10, 1648:13,
1648:24, 1672:22,
1672:32, 1675:37,
1676:2, 1676:13,
1677:2, 1682:33,
1682:38, 1693:15,
1715:7, 1719:38,
1730:35, 1732:34
assigned [1] -
1638:25
assist [5] - 1623:8,
1659:24, 1659:28,
1669:7, 1732:27
assistance [2] -
1657:28, 1665:22
Assistant [4] -
1628:34, 1628:47,
1629:7, 1726:10
Assisting [6] -
1620:30, 1620:31,
1631:25, 1641:33,
1697:22, 1708:22
assisting [1] -
1649:40
assists [1] - 1638:38
associates [1] -
1664:13
assume [13] -
1626:21, 1631:28,
1631:30, 1632:43,
1650:14, 1670:24,
1691:22, 1697:36,
1698:12, 1700:42,
1727:2, 1735:45,
1736:10
assumed [1] - 1646:8
assuming [12] -
1638:22, 1639:29,
1639:33, 1640:1,
1640:8, 1640:10,
1642:25, 1650:28,
1669:7, 1684:45,
1695:40, 1730:8
assumption [1] -
1679:3
AT [2] - 1748:36,
1748:37
attached [5] - 1669:6,
1679:22, 1681:13,
1686:3, 1693:27
attaches [1] - 1681:7
attack [1] - 1703:40
attacked [1] - 1704:1
attacks [1] - 1690:19
attempt [1] - 1710:25
attend [1] - 1719:28
attended [2] - 1622:1,
1740:37
attention [8] -
1639:15, 1643:9,

- 1689:33, 1691:14,
1694:46, 1698:25,
1716:43, 1731:9
Attorney [2] -
1637:35, 1637:37
attributed [1] -
1714:13
audience [2] -
1694:16, 1716:25
audit [2] - 1635:45,
1636:20
August [22] - 1626:45,
1627:30, 1633:32,
1640:6, 1662:40,
1665:38, 1667:1,
1668:26, 1668:41,
1669:13, 1669:40,
1670:6, 1670:29,
1671:15, 1671:27,
1671:28, 1671:30,
1725:46, 1726:4,
1726:19, 1728:7
August/October [2] -
1670:34, 1670:42
Australia [2] -
1642:13, 1740:43
Australian [10] -
1624:17, 1649:22,
1654:4, 1654:18,
1654:24, 1654:37,
1655:12, 1711:44,
1718:32, 1718:42
authorised [3] -
1723:19, 1723:37,
1723:41
authority [4] -
1651:13, 1656:32,
1699:30, 1723:31
authors [4] - 1678:20,
1678:29, 1678:46,
1679:35
availability [4] -
1623:8, 1647:28,
1647:42, 1648:8
available [13] -
1643:11, 1644:43,
1647:31, 1647:46,
1648:1, 1648:10,
1658:7, 1659:45,
1661:33, 1679:19,
1684:9, 1686:9,
1731:32
avenues [3] - 1663:44,
1665:9, 1685:23
awaiting [1] - 1704:12
aware [65] - 1621:4,
1625:5, 1629:29,
1629:32, 1629:46,
1630:13, 1630:17,
1630:35, 1630:40,
1631:8, 1632:20,
1632:29, 1633:16,
1633:17, 1633:19,
1633:38, 1633:41,
1633:43, 1633:47,
1634:14, 1634:38,
1634:41, 1635:26,
1635:28, 1636:24,
1636:28, 1636:45,
1637:2, 1637:4,
1637:8, 1639:11,
1639:22, 1639:38,
1640:45, 1641:21,
1645:18, 1645:21,
1645:24, 1647:2,
1647:3, 1651:35,
1652:26, 1655:17,
1655:25, 1657:15,
1660:26, 1660:45,
1661:3, 1670:43,
1672:17, 1672:31,
1672:35, 1673:36,
1673:42, 1699:19,
1699:24, 1699:26,
1701:21, 1726:7,
1727:24, 1733:29,
1736:33, 1737:42,
1745:23, 1746:2
awareness [1] -
1704:24
-
- B**
-
- Background** [1] -
1669:44
background [10] -
1677:14, 1711:45,
1712:44, 1713:12,
1720:46, 1723:34,
1723:36, 1723:40,
1723:47, 1747:43
badly [1] - 1728:44
balance [1] - 1739:7
ball [1] - 1680:38
Barnes [13] - 1626:7,
1626:41, 1695:32,
1697:19, 1697:35,
1700:24, 1700:34,
1702:32, 1707:13,
1708:24, 1711:16,
1711:26, 1722:27
Barnes' [1] - 1706:6
Barnes's [1] - 1697:13
based [7] - 1650:11,
1651:26, 1651:47,
1677:18, 1680:31,
1683:34, 1737:1
bases [1] - 1736:31
bear [1] - 1745:12
beat [2] - 1643:46,
1644:9
became [6] - 1629:41,
1638:4, 1661:3,
1672:17, 1672:31,
1705:9
become [10] - 1622:9,
1631:8, 1633:17,
1645:18, 1647:2,
1647:46, 1665:18,
1672:35, 1720:15,
1745:23
beg [1] - 1648:34
beginning [6] -
1624:36, 1636:20,
1640:7, 1688:44,
1716:37, 1717:30
begins [5] - 1632:14,
1650:2, 1650:4,
1682:22, 1735:45
behalf [9] - 1641:17,
1697:39, 1697:40,
1698:31, 1698:38,
1699:2, 1701:22,
1702:22, 1723:39
behind [3] - 1674:15,
1674:16, 1674:23
belief [1] - 1712:36
beliefs [1] - 1696:22
below [5] - 1638:41,
1661:21, 1669:23,
1669:24, 1714:14
Bench [3] - 1667:22,
1668:5, 1695:17
beneath [1] - 1638:35
benefit [1] - 1694:28
best [4] - 1659:47,
1681:17, 1695:13,
1734:34
better [1] - 1746:28
between [14] -
1628:14, 1634:9,
1640:6, 1662:22,
1664:12, 1676:1,
1681:34, 1690:9,
1697:12, 1707:14,
1713:43, 1720:22,
1740:1, 1740:19
beyond [12] - 1674:7,
1733:35, 1735:13,
1736:19, 1736:45,
1736:47, 1737:23,
1737:28, 1738:26,
1738:34, 1742:10,
1743:17
Bias [10] - 1670:36,
1671:4, 1733:10,
1734:13, 1734:44,
1734:47, 1735:1,
1735:7, 1735:25,
1735:28
bias [27] - 1733:32,
1735:13, 1736:15,
1736:18, 1736:44,
1737:16, 1737:22,
1737:23, 1737:27,
1737:28, 1738:19,
1738:27, 1739:40,
1739:45, 1740:2,
1741:39, 1741:42,
1741:43, 1742:4,
1742:16, 1742:20,
1742:35, 1743:42,
1744:3, 1744:4,
1744:40
bit [12] - 1627:3,
1636:33, 1647:19,
1678:11, 1681:42,
1688:28, 1693:9,
1709:25, 1714:13,
1724:16, 1725:45,
1732:37
bits [3] - 1686:40,
1694:10
blank [1] - 1661:22
Blue [1] - 1644:7
board [1] - 1743:29
body [1] - 1644:8
bold [2] - 1664:26,
1682:16
Bondi [13] - 1627:13,
1632:26, 1636:40,
1641:14, 1643:44,
1644:26, 1644:43,
1645:28, 1664:16,
1674:7, 1674:41,
1680:20, 1690:2
books [1] - 1646:24
bottom [16] - 1635:38,
1635:42, 1636:7,
1636:8, 1648:37,
1649:19, 1657:40,
1658:21, 1659:15,
1664:26, 1704:40,
1714:28, 1714:33,
1715:33, 1716:11,
1718:19
bound [6] - 1709:17,
1709:19, 1709:21,
1709:24, 1709:43,
1745:45
bound" [1] - 1709:44
break [2] - 1653:33,
1684:36
breakdown [1] -
1647:36
breakdowns [1] -
1684:42
brief [1] - 1630:41
briefed [2] - 1726:10,
1726:16
briefing [5] - 1638:7,
1640:25, 1640:30,
1726:29, 1740:36
briefings [3] -
1640:15, 1640:22,
1640:28
briefly [8] - 1627:27,
1628:14, 1629:30,
1668:25, 1704:38,
1706:8, 1724:40,
1733:46
briefs [1] - 1679:22
bring [5] - 1634:30,
1643:9, 1692:2,
1694:45, 1711:3
broad [2] - 1690:2,
1745:4
broadcast [6] -
1626:40, 1650:42,
1711:19, 1711:31,
1713:29, 1714:29
broadcasting [1] -
1694:28
broadly [2] - 1666:21,
1744:15
brother [1] - 1626:31
brought [1] - 1639:15
Brown [12] - 1657:10,
1657:19, 1657:47,
1658:11, 1698:4,
1698:7, 1705:4,
1722:34, 1722:35,
1746:40, 1747:5
brutal [1] - 1690:19
brutally [1] - 1745:1
bullet [4] - 1635:42,
1678:25, 1679:34,
1682:15
bundle [7] - 1621:42,
1666:3, 1695:39,
1695:44, 1734:37,
1736:34, 1746:26
bundles [1] - 1702:37
burst [1] - 1722:18
bush [1] - 1744:18
busy [1] - 1701:9
BY [1] - 1623:18
-
- C**
-
- Cabinet** [5] - 1682:2,
1682:36, 1684:1,
1732:1, 1732:28
Cafe [1] - 1628:32
Caitlin [1] - 1620:33
calculus [1] - 1744:3
Camporeale [1] -
1620:32
cannot [5] - 1633:25,
1643:3, 1644:35,

1675:46, 1736:46
cards [1] - 1710:41
career [1] - 1724:20
Carmel [1] - 1624:8
carriage [2] - 1722:35, 1725:2
case [43] - 1634:47, 1635:9, 1639:11, 1644:24, 1644:40, 1646:9, 1646:18, 1646:27, 1646:45, 1646:46, 1647:8, 1647:15, 1647:37, 1648:14, 1648:24, 1649:3, 1650:28, 1650:44, 1651:5, 1652:34, 1653:7, 1653:11, 1653:19, 1654:5, 1664:2, 1665:28, 1670:4, 1676:37, 1676:46, 1677:34, 1678:1, 1680:39, 1683:34, 1685:33, 1687:30, 1689:1, 1690:44, 1692:1, 1696:21, 1697:36, 1698:15, 1722:19, 1725:21
Cases [3] - 1645:12, 1646:5, 1649:4
cases [56] - 1627:3, 1637:9, 1640:18, 1646:24, 1660:16, 1662:11, 1662:18, 1667:2, 1670:43, 1671:22, 1674:32, 1674:46, 1675:7, 1675:20, 1675:23, 1675:24, 1675:38, 1677:23, 1678:20, 1678:21, 1678:26, 1678:35, 1679:37, 1680:3, 1680:28, 1680:29, 1683:3, 1684:10, 1684:11, 1684:28, 1684:30, 1693:6, 1698:33, 1726:32, 1726:33, 1727:4, 1728:39, 1732:34, 1733:30, 1736:24, 1737:32, 1738:1, 1739:25, 1739:26, 1739:36, 1739:40, 1741:36, 1741:38, 1742:4, 1742:15, 1742:19, 1742:35, 1744:21
catch [1] - 1686:20
categories [1] - 1736:44
categorised [4] - 1738:19, 1741:38, 1741:42, 1743:42
category [1] - 1738:26
caused [4] - 1639:1, 1666:34, 1675:15, 1723:11
causing [1] - 1677:47
cc [2] - 1648:39, 1650:32
cc-ed [2] - 1648:39, 1650:32
ceased [1] - 1700:38
centralised [1] - 1639:2
certain [5] - 1621:9, 1622:25, 1695:13, 1716:13, 1716:17
certainly [16] - 1641:35, 1652:26, 1662:3, 1666:36, 1667:13, 1667:21, 1668:2, 1668:14, 1668:19, 1692:37, 1709:32, 1711:24, 1715:2, 1742:37, 1746:19
certification [1] - 1661:22
cetera [7] - 1647:37, 1658:5, 1696:39, 1699:34, 1714:25, 1717:6, 1730:37
chain [4] - 1648:31, 1648:37, 1649:44, 1704:40
challenged [1] - 1709:18
chance [1] - 1621:26
changed [1] - 1727:39
changes [1] - 1623:28
characterised [1] - 1682:21
Charge [1] - 1657:11
charge [3] - 1630:8, 1657:24, 1663:33
charged [1] - 1706:33
Chebl [1] - 1658:22
check [2] - 1621:26, 1621:31
chief [1] - 1638:41
Chief [15] - 1624:47, 1626:12, 1626:41, 1638:27, 1638:28, 1657:30, 1658:12, 1661:26, 1668:30, 1671:20, 1678:5, 1706:28, 1719:20, 1719:25, 1747:40
choose [1] - 1697:8
chose [1] - 1732:8
Chris [12] - 1647:4, 1648:20, 1650:31, 1650:36, 1653:18, 1655:36, 1704:41, 1705:7, 1705:23, 1719:29, 1719:41, 1726:40
Christopher [1] - 1648:38
chronologically [1] - 1660:3
circumstances [7] - 1634:34, 1644:44, 1662:47, 1680:31, 1696:21, 1696:24, 1696:37
city [1] - 1690:2
claim [2] - 1717:4, 1742:35
Claire [1] - 1620:31
Clancy [1] - 1705:4
clarification [1] - 1726:45
clarify [3] - 1697:16, 1711:20, 1726:45
clear [4] - 1626:24, 1667:31, 1683:9, 1693:43
clearer [1] - 1709:29
clearly [1] - 1736:32
cliff [4] - 1632:38, 1635:12, 1645:11, 1703:46
cliffs [1] - 1643:46
close [1] - 1623:40
closer [1] - 1667:3
coincided [1] - 1647:5
coincidence [1] - 1740:15
Cold [3] - 1645:12, 1646:5, 1649:3
collect [1] - 1684:36
comfortably [1] - 1633:23
coming [2] - 1666:7, 1746:16
Command [6] - 1628:36, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1666:37, 1701:9, 1723:15
command [3] - 1629:8, 1630:25, 1701:16
commander [5] - 1623:34, 1623:36, 1628:21, 1628:23, 1718:46
Commander [24] - 1623:42, 1628:7, 1628:35, 1628:41, 1628:44, 1629:9, 1629:12, 1629:34, 1629:41, 1630:18, 1635:32, 1638:4, 1638:21, 1640:17, 1652:42, 1681:40, 1700:39, 1701:24, 1705:17, 1706:40, 1707:45, 1709:11, 1729:30, 1737:41
commenced [2] - 1635:32, 1660:8
commencement [1] - 1725:12
commencing [1] - 1660:10
comments [2] - 1735:46, 1736:3
COMMISSION [1] - 1748:36
Commission [18] - 1620:9, 1623:21, 1637:32, 1638:38, 1657:38, 1659:24, 1669:7, 1671:3, 1679:8, 1685:22, 1685:26, 1715:18, 1715:27, 1725:20, 1733:23, 1745:40, 1745:44, 1746:2
Commissioner [66] - 1620:15, 1621:41, 1622:3, 1623:32, 1628:30, 1628:34, 1628:47, 1629:7, 1631:19, 1631:26, 1637:22, 1637:28, 1637:34, 1641:27, 1641:32, 1641:37, 1642:42, 1643:9, 1646:1, 1668:10, 1668:16, 1674:27, 1674:38, 1675:3, 1681:43, 1684:27, 1686:3, 1686:18, 1693:42, 1694:27, 1694:44, 1695:8, 1697:39, 1697:40, 1697:41, 1698:11, 1698:17, 1698:24, 1698:31, 1698:38, 1699:33, 1699:35, 1700:6, 1700:7, 1700:9, 1700:25, 1701:22, 1701:29, 1701:40, 1707:3, 1707:7, 1707:15, 1707:18, 1707:26, 1707:30, 1707:45, 1708:9, 1708:21, 1709:12, 1709:32, 1713:37, 1723:13, 1726:10, 1736:31, 1737:14, 1746:17
COMMISSIONER [100] - 1621:1, 1621:14, 1621:22, 1621:29, 1621:37, 1622:7, 1622:38, 1622:43, 1622:47, 1623:5, 1623:16, 1625:30, 1636:10, 1636:17, 1641:35, 1641:44, 1642:2, 1642:7, 1642:45, 1643:14, 1643:24, 1643:34, 1645:40, 1645:44, 1652:22, 1653:29, 1653:33, 1653:38, 1656:17, 1661:47, 1662:5, 1665:18, 1665:24, 1665:43, 1667:21, 1667:26, 1667:33, 1667:38, 1667:46, 1668:4, 1668:14, 1668:19, 1671:45, 1674:26, 1675:30, 1676:36, 1678:13, 1684:24, 1685:11, 1685:25, 1685:37, 1686:20, 1689:16, 1689:21, 1690:29, 1690:34, 1693:46, 1694:33, 1694:41, 1695:1, 1695:6, 1695:17, 1695:22, 1696:3, 1696:7, 1696:11, 1698:47, 1700:3, 1702:16, 1707:17, 1707:42, 1708:12, 1708:26, 1708:30, 1708:35, 1708:43, 1709:29, 1712:2, 1713:5, 1713:32, 1713:39, 1720:17, 1721:44, 1722:11, 1723:18, 1724:33, 1736:29, 1736:36, 1737:4, 1737:12, 1738:23, 1738:29, 1738:40, 1742:46, 1743:5, 1743:11, 1743:22, 1743:28, 1746:19, 1748:33
Commissioner's [1] - 1698:23
committed [1] - 1703:27
committing [1] -

1675:18
communication [2] -
 1676:10, 1707:14
communications [2] -
 1675:47, 1740:18
community [7] -
 1643:41, 1666:25,
 1731:8, 1731:10,
 1731:17, 1731:22,
 1745:24
compares [1] -
 1716:17
comparison [2] -
 1745:3, 1745:4
complete [3] - 1712:6,
 1712:13, 1738:29
completed [5] -
 1630:42, 1653:12,
 1661:17, 1677:44,
 1685:40
Completed" [1] -
 1669:40
completely [2] -
 1628:36, 1715:46
completeness [1] -
 1716:35
complex [1] - 1694:35
component [2] -
 1731:6, 1743:37
comprehensive [2] -
 1677:42, 1696:26
comprised [1] -
 1659:16
concern [8] - 1641:40,
 1654:8, 1666:30,
 1694:25, 1694:44,
 1695:10, 1699:28,
 1714:10
concerned [7] -
 1621:33, 1641:37,
 1672:44, 1700:10,
 1710:37, 1718:40,
 1724:16
concerns [8] -
 1666:25, 1694:31,
 1694:33, 1694:39,
 1694:43, 1694:45,
 1694:46, 1695:4
conclude [2] -
 1696:33, 1703:36
concluded [1] -
 1701:28
concludes [2] -
 1703:25, 1703:26
concluding [1] -
 1632:6
conclusion [7] -
 1674:24, 1700:23,
 1700:32, 1715:27,
 1731:2, 1745:10
conclusions [2] -
 1637:8, 1745:25
concurrence [1] -
 1657:27
conduct [16] -
 1651:13, 1659:3,
 1659:7, 1670:3,
 1672:22, 1696:36,
 1696:47, 1697:7,
 1697:8, 1697:47,
 1699:45, 1707:32,
 1710:40, 1719:27,
 1725:37, 1726:32
conducted [18] -
 1646:44, 1647:15,
 1648:7, 1650:12,
 1651:38, 1652:1,
 1652:16, 1652:31,
 1660:15, 1661:6,
 1669:41, 1672:32,
 1696:26, 1702:21,
 1705:46, 1707:20,
 1725:35, 1726:43
conducting [5] -
 1675:37, 1676:2,
 1676:12, 1731:4,
 1733:15
confidence [1] -
 1724:22
confident [1] -
 1740:40
confirm [2] - 1685:3,
 1742:34
confirmed [1] -
 1743:19
conform [1] - 1641:29
confused [1] -
 1670:40
conjunction [1] -
 1665:10
connected [1] -
 1674:32
Connie [2] - 1668:34,
 1668:42
consent [1] - 1656:19
consider [2] -
 1717:36, 1746:4
considerable [4] -
 1661:14, 1666:35,
 1674:5, 1707:28
consideration [6] -
 1636:2, 1637:20,
 1665:8, 1680:9,
 1680:24, 1680:43
considered [3] -
 1644:17, 1675:7,
 1681:26
consisted [1] -
 1726:29
consistent [4] -
 1715:20, 1716:44,
 1744:14, 1744:15
Constable [7] -
 1647:16, 1651:39,
 1653:12, 1658:18,
 1658:22, 1660:20,
 1663:19
constables [1] -
 1638:43
consternation [1] -
 1666:35
construct [1] -
 1730:34
consult [1] - 1641:33
consultation [1] -
 1699:39
contact [1] - 1715:28
contacted [2] -
 1654:30, 1677:24
contained [1] -
 1733:31
content [3] - 1694:19,
 1733:25, 1734:24
contents [5] -
 1623:25, 1732:7,
 1732:31, 1732:32,
 1734:4
context [11] - 1631:8,
 1634:23, 1673:26,
 1673:30, 1674:15,
 1676:27, 1684:7,
 1684:8, 1687:23,
 1722:46, 1738:29
contextualise [1] -
 1660:2
continue [3] -
 1707:21, 1708:2,
 1708:10
continued [1] -
 1725:16
contradict [2] -
 1710:19, 1710:25
contrast [1] - 1624:11
control [5] - 1627:39,
 1643:18, 1715:24,
 1724:17, 1731:6
controversial [1] -
 1746:43
convenient [6] -
 1621:32, 1645:44,
 1653:29, 1668:16,
 1746:17, 1748:31
conversation [7] -
 1676:22, 1711:43,
 1712:37, 1721:10,
 1729:35, 1729:39,
 1729:46
conversations [1] -
 1712:37
conviction [1] -
 1664:46
Cook [7] - 1628:24,
 1628:45, 1628:47,
 1704:40, 1706:44,
 1706:46, 1707:45
cooperation [1] -
 1675:47
coordination [2] -
 1740:19, 1740:23
coordinator [7] -
 1638:40, 1651:14,
 1651:34, 1653:10,
 1657:30, 1661:25,
 1668:46
Coordinator [2] -
 1655:34, 1747:15
coordinator's [1] -
 1661:22
coordinators [4] -
 1638:24, 1638:33,
 1638:35, 1640:24
copies [1] - 1641:27
copy [8] - 1623:9,
 1623:12, 1641:27,
 1646:33, 1681:13,
 1686:8, 1686:13,
 1686:15
Coroner [80] -
 1622:23, 1624:8,
 1625:18, 1625:26,
 1625:34, 1626:7,
 1626:40, 1627:22,
 1627:39, 1631:12,
 1631:33, 1631:40,
 1631:42, 1632:32,
 1632:44, 1633:2,
 1633:17, 1634:24,
 1636:2, 1637:19,
 1637:20, 1640:42,
 1641:2, 1641:17,
 1641:26, 1643:3,
 1643:27, 1645:19,
 1646:42, 1648:47,
 1657:27, 1673:20,
 1676:34, 1679:23,
 1687:22, 1688:9,
 1688:20, 1689:37,
 1691:47, 1692:6,
 1692:20, 1692:27,
 1692:29, 1695:32,
 1696:43, 1699:14,
 1699:44, 1700:24,
 1700:34, 1701:30,
 1701:42, 1702:21,
 1702:22, 1702:32,
 1705:45, 1706:6,
 1706:12, 1707:13,
 1707:24, 1708:24,
 1709:2, 1709:16,
 1709:34, 1710:19,
 1711:16, 1711:26,
 1722:27, 1725:2,
 1725:23, 1725:29,
 1725:31, 1725:32,
 1725:35, 1725:41,
 1727:9, 1728:41,
 1728:47, 1731:42,
 1741:24
Coroner's [8] -
 1630:43, 1641:13,
 1644:18, 1645:26,
 1688:42, 1689:3,
 1698:25, 1710:5
coronial [6] - 1675:25,
 1675:27, 1686:6,
 1690:16, 1691:37,
 1728:8
correct [83] - 1623:25,
 1624:44, 1627:10,
 1627:14, 1627:30,
 1628:8, 1629:4,
 1630:35, 1637:44,
 1639:29, 1639:33,
 1640:8, 1640:10,
 1640:32, 1642:8,
 1646:23, 1646:29,
 1647:12, 1650:27,
 1650:33, 1651:43,
 1652:47, 1653:16,
 1653:20, 1653:25,
 1655:14, 1656:20,
 1657:4, 1658:2,
 1659:23, 1660:16,
 1660:17, 1660:21,
 1666:15, 1666:31,
 1670:15, 1671:30,
 1671:33, 1675:15,
 1675:23, 1676:38,
 1677:34, 1679:42,
 1679:43, 1680:6,
 1681:15, 1682:9,
 1682:46, 1683:30,
 1685:41, 1688:34,
 1688:35, 1689:38,
 1691:10, 1692:45,
 1693:29, 1693:39,
 1700:28, 1700:29,
 1700:40, 1706:15,
 1706:41, 1707:4,
 1710:34, 1712:28,
 1713:33, 1716:46,
 1717:22, 1719:17,
 1721:38, 1724:10,
 1724:31, 1727:17,
 1728:9, 1729:19,
 1733:24, 1740:25,
 1747:9, 1747:27,
 1747:31, 1748:5,
 1748:14
correction [2] -
 1711:25, 1744:13

correctness [1] - 1651:41
Costello [4] - 1669:39, 1669:41, 1670:2, 1670:22
cotter [1] - 1648:38
counsel [13] - 1631:22, 1631:26, 1694:13, 1697:22, 1697:26, 1698:3, 1699:2, 1699:20, 1699:25, 1699:38, 1700:6, 1701:29, 1701:40
Counsel [8] - 1620:30, 1620:31, 1631:25, 1641:33, 1657:35, 1697:22, 1699:33, 1708:22
counted [1] - 1717:16
Counter [2] - 1628:35, 1701:9
counterfactually [2] - 1731:26, 1732:19
couple [21] - 1627:8, 1639:4, 1648:20, 1654:34, 1671:9, 1683:20, 1686:47, 1687:43, 1690:47, 1695:10, 1700:31, 1714:32, 1715:9, 1715:19, 1715:23, 1719:14, 1719:42, 1730:44, 1740:35, 1743:38, 1747:33
coupled [1] - 1696:21
course [34] - 1622:28, 1626:2, 1629:31, 1629:42, 1631:5, 1631:15, 1639:1, 1640:2, 1645:46, 1659:6, 1684:33, 1684:35, 1688:31, 1694:8, 1695:28, 1697:20, 1699:14, 1699:17, 1699:39, 1701:10, 1706:39, 1717:9, 1723:34, 1725:37, 1727:46, 1732:41, 1735:17, 1735:43, 1736:45, 1737:41, 1738:15, 1745:42, 1745:44, 1746:27
Court [8] - 1642:9, 1642:13, 1642:16, 1642:23, 1642:27, 1642:31, 1642:32, 1679:23
court [4] - 1697:35, 1699:20, 1705:3
cover [2] - 1665:33, 1669:22
covered [1] - 1719:41
covering [1] - 1659:1
Crandell [10] - 1726:11, 1726:16, 1729:26, 1729:33, 1731:15, 1732:40, 1740:32, 1740:39, 1741:16, 1741:21
create [1] - 1667:10
created [9] - 1665:38, 1668:26, 1668:30, 1668:41, 1669:5, 1669:38, 1670:1, 1670:5, 1746:23
Crime [11] - 1655:37, 1666:37, 1685:21, 1685:25, 1723:15, 1734:44, 1734:47, 1735:1, 1735:7, 1735:25, 1737:16
crime [23] - 1623:44, 1644:42, 1736:15, 1736:18, 1736:45, 1737:22, 1737:28, 1738:19, 1738:27, 1739:41, 1739:45, 1740:2, 1741:39, 1741:43, 1742:4, 1742:16, 1742:35, 1743:42, 1743:43, 1744:3, 1744:4, 1744:40, 1745:11
Crime" [1] - 1735:28
Crimes [4] - 1670:36, 1671:4, 1733:10, 1734:13
crimes [10] - 1620:11, 1682:21, 1703:27, 1717:18, 1722:19, 1741:42, 1743:15, 1743:18
criminal [1] - 1735:17
Criminal [3] - 1642:9, 1642:16, 1642:28
criteria [6] - 1730:16, 1730:18, 1736:15, 1736:25, 1742:8, 1742:25
criterion [4] - 1735:8, 1737:15, 1737:27, 1737:33
critical [3] - 1649:29, 1649:31, 1718:44
criticism [2] - 1655:43, 1707:36
Cruikshank [1] - 1715:23
culminated [1] - 1631:11
culture [1] - 1643:40
current [3] - 1623:39, 1682:20, 1701:24

D

Dalton [4] - 1740:42, 1741:5, 1741:17
Danny [1] - 1629:17
database [12] - 1657:42, 1658:4, 1659:31, 1668:40, 1669:15, 1669:20, 1675:20, 1680:27, 1680:34, 1684:27
Date [1] - 1665:37
date [19] - 1629:1, 1642:5, 1642:7, 1668:26, 1668:41, 1669:38, 1669:39, 1670:6, 1671:24, 1671:31, 1678:14, 1685:12, 1686:30, 1686:36, 1698:39, 1726:2, 1726:31, 1737:38, 1747:4
dated [3] - 1623:21, 1639:28, 1747:40
dates [2] - 1628:26, 1654:33
David [2] - 1630:13, 1677:30
day-to-day [1] - 1684:31
days [7] - 1631:15, 1654:35, 1657:3, 1687:18, 1715:19, 1715:23, 1720:47
DCI [2] - 1677:43, 1711:34
DCoP [1] - 1681:43
deal [7] - 1621:1, 1621:14, 1637:42, 1686:7, 1695:35, 1724:37, 1743:31
dealing [8] - 1621:5, 1624:26, 1642:17, 1650:8, 1662:21, 1675:25, 1688:17, 1734:26
deals [5] - 1639:31, 1662:13, 1702:46, 1703:8, 1703:16
dealt [4] - 1667:47, 1673:21, 1724:19
death [36] - 1624:5, 1625:1, 1625:10, 1626:18, 1626:32, 1627:37, 1630:43, 1633:6, 1633:26, 1634:30, 1635:11, 1635:19, 1639:32, 1643:20, 1644:19, 1644:45, 1645:9, 1663:21, 1677:47, 1683:21, 1691:39, 1692:14, 1692:20, 1696:24, 1701:44, 1703:43, 1707:11, 1708:47, 1709:35, 1714:22, 1714:37, 1717:38, 1719:10, 1725:29, 1727:21
death" [1] - 1719:35
deaths [21] - 1624:29, 1624:37, 1627:13, 1627:21, 1630:11, 1632:22, 1633:10, 1633:29, 1635:46, 1636:40, 1638:12, 1641:14, 1643:43, 1643:46, 1644:26, 1645:28, 1673:22, 1678:36, 1704:12, 1711:2, 1717:5
deceased [3] - 1635:3, 1677:46, 1734:14
December [5] - 1621:41, 1622:2, 1631:26, 1747:5, 1747:7
decide [1] - 1706:13
decided [3] - 1626:7, 1672:40, 1697:2
decides [1] - 1725:29
decision [27] - 1625:18, 1625:26, 1642:9, 1642:36, 1643:4, 1648:26, 1650:10, 1650:26, 1651:4, 1651:20, 1651:26, 1651:46, 1653:6, 1653:8, 1653:9, 1653:14, 1672:21, 1672:30, 1683:32, 1697:13, 1700:23, 1701:20, 1708:22, 1708:23, 1711:26, 1725:39
decisions [3] - 1659:7, 1680:29, 1684:12
declined [2] - 1649:8, 1724:3
declines [1] - 1704:19
deduce [2] - 1668:45, 1669:4
defended [1] - 1626:17
defending [1] - 1723:6
definitely [3] - 1697:41, 1698:11, 1743:23
degree [1] - 1716:12
delete [1] - 1728:36
deliberately [1] - 1735:24
delivered [1] - 1701:19
delivers [1] - 1711:16
denied [1] - 1724:2
Department [3] - 1682:1, 1682:36, 1684:1
depicted [1] - 1654:9
depressed [1] - 1688:28
Deputy [14] - 1622:23, 1624:8, 1627:22, 1631:12, 1631:33, 1631:40, 1633:17, 1637:18, 1640:42, 1641:25, 1681:43, 1687:22, 1723:13, 1725:35
derived [2] - 1733:6, 1733:19
describe [3] - 1658:28, 1718:12, 1720:21
described [1] - 1659:22
describes [3] - 1687:23, 1719:33, 1719:36
describing [1] - 1659:46
designated [2] - 1657:6, 1657:10
desk [1] - 1680:40
detached [1] - 1665:19
detail [14] - 1629:40, 1630:38, 1636:33, 1637:4, 1647:20, 1661:14, 1662:8, 1674:5, 1702:44, 1715:5, 1715:6, 1716:12, 1741:25, 1745:1
details [2] - 1622:25, 1641:18
detected [1] - 1674:45
detective [3] - 1638:40, 1638:42, 1639:1
Detective [51] - 1622:20, 1624:47,

- 1626:11, 1626:41, 1628:21, 1628:24, 1628:46, 1629:17, 1630:7, 1638:27, 1638:28, 1639:26, 1640:15, 1640:16, 1647:4, 1647:16, 1651:38, 1653:12, 1653:46, 1654:41, 1655:3, 1655:4, 1657:10, 1657:30, 1657:45, 1658:12, 1658:15, 1658:18, 1658:21, 1658:36, 1660:19, 1661:26, 1663:18, 1663:24, 1665:14, 1668:30, 1668:34, 1669:39, 1669:41, 1670:21, 1671:20, 1675:33, 1675:38, 1678:5, 1705:4, 1706:28, 1715:23, 1722:34, 1746:47, 1747:40, 1747:45
- detectives** [2] - 1638:47, 1724:21
- determine** [2] - 1673:25, 1676:39
- developed** [1] - 1718:19
- developments** [2] - 1628:13, 1647:39
- devotes** [1] - 1687:26
- Dickinson** [6] - 1628:22, 1628:41, 1657:31, 1657:45, 1659:35, 1706:43
- died** [4] - 1634:31, 1634:33, 1703:40, 1709:3
- difference** [1] - 1690:9
- differences** [2] - 1734:21, 1734:26
- different** [12] - 1636:17, 1645:26, 1655:26, 1655:46, 1698:40, 1700:11, 1700:27, 1717:2, 1728:43, 1731:27, 1732:20, 1732:26
- difficult** [7] - 1643:2, 1674:14, 1674:21, 1675:19, 1702:19, 1705:22, 1742:22
- difficulty** [1] - 1738:30
- direct** [4] - 1655:31, 1656:8, 1656:13, 1664:44
- directed** [4] - 1626:41, 1706:2, 1725:31, 1746:3
- direction** [5] - 1630:43, 1705:44, 1722:26, 1725:17, 1725:40
- directly** [6] - 1675:46, 1685:30, 1688:42, 1747:24, 1748:10, 1748:27
- Director** [3] - 1620:32, 1642:12, 1655:37
- Directorate** [1] - 1655:37
- disappearance** [7] - 1633:5, 1633:31, 1633:45, 1639:15, 1691:2, 1691:9, 1691:13
- disappearance/ presumed** [1] - 1691:39
- disappeared** [2] - 1630:47, 1639:12
- discourteously** [1] - 1630:31
- discovered** [1] - 1685:3
- discussed** [4] - 1663:1, 1681:34, 1720:25, 1741:8
- discussion** [2] - 1695:24, 1723:12
- discussions** [6] - 1681:19, 1698:2, 1713:16, 1723:47, 1740:32, 1741:20
- dismay** [2] - 1649:7, 1745:31
- dismayed** [1] - 1745:24
- distinct** [1] - 1705:34
- diversion** [4] - 1684:25, 1698:32, 1700:10, 1700:26
- diverted** [2] - 1683:40, 1684:2
- document** [31] - 1622:31, 1645:31, 1657:44, 1660:19, 1660:33, 1661:15, 1661:44, 1665:15, 1665:33, 1666:1, 1666:47, 1667:13, 1667:19, 1668:10, 1669:15, 1671:21, 1678:13, 1678:19, 1681:13, 1681:14, 1686:8, 1689:12, 1731:24, 1731:39, 1744:19, 1746:28, 1746:33, 1746:34, 1746:35, 1746:36, 1747:12
- documentation** [1] - 1661:33
- documents** [11] - 1621:27, 1621:45, 1622:1, 1622:10, 1623:9, 1623:11, 1641:30, 1673:46, 1710:7, 1727:12, 1733:40
- Doherty** [1] - 1629:17
- done** [16] - 1652:25, 1660:26, 1662:47, 1669:11, 1670:6, 1670:7, 1670:27, 1674:20, 1677:10, 1682:34, 1693:15, 1698:39, 1709:11, 1732:16, 1738:15, 1740:34
- Doreen** [1] - 1715:23
- doubt** [19] - 1628:10, 1632:43, 1633:4, 1644:27, 1693:31, 1717:24, 1733:35, 1735:14, 1736:19, 1736:46, 1736:47, 1737:24, 1737:28, 1737:43, 1738:27, 1738:34, 1742:10, 1743:17, 1745:35
- doubting** [1] - 1744:7
- down** [24] - 1621:5, 1631:34, 1633:21, 1664:2, 1665:37, 1668:26, 1673:1, 1678:47, 1679:2, 1679:9, 1679:18, 1691:34, 1691:46, 1695:22, 1698:21, 1700:34, 1701:3, 1707:45, 1716:36, 1717:44, 1720:40, 1721:45, 1726:22, 1744:37
- dozens** [1] - 1640:22
- Dr** [2] - 1741:5, 1741:17
- draw** [1] - 1698:25
- drawing** [1] - 1716:43
- driving** [2] - 1720:40, 1721:45
- dry** [1] - 1722:39
- due** [7] - 1626:2, 1640:2, 1645:46, 1664:28, 1669:39, 1671:6, 1695:28
- during** [10] - 1622:28, 1629:31, 1631:15, 1635:32, 1647:3, 1648:20, 1667:40, 1725:37, 1740:27, 1741:20
- dust** [1] - 1684:37
- duties** [1] - 1715:22
- dying** [1] - 1690:10
-
- E**
-
- e@gle.i** [5] - 1657:42, 1668:38, 1668:40, 1746:28, 1746:37
- early** [10] - 1629:41, 1637:47, 1640:7, 1674:3, 1685:40, 1689:47, 1726:26, 1727:25, 1728:14, 1733:2
- easily** [1] - 1679:26
- Eastern** [1] - 1666:13
- ed** [2] - 1648:39, 1650:32
- effect** [12] - 1621:9, 1633:18, 1633:42, 1633:43, 1637:12, 1657:22, 1686:6, 1700:25, 1701:30, 1704:21, 1736:39, 1739:3
- effort** [1] - 1663:34
- eight** [22] - 1680:4, 1680:8, 1680:14, 1680:15, 1680:19, 1693:37, 1717:16, 1717:18, 1728:18, 1728:25, 1728:39, 1729:2, 1729:22, 1732:45, 1738:18, 1738:19, 1740:6, 1742:5, 1742:17, 1743:41, 1744:25, 1744:43
- eighthly** [1] - 1626:45
- either** [16] - 1622:33, 1654:28, 1654:38, 1661:26, 1667:41, 1673:42, 1702:45, 1705:34, 1708:13, 1727:8, 1733:2, 1740:2, 1741:43, 1743:17, 1743:23, 1744:3
- eliminates** [1] - 1715:47
- email** [12] - 1648:31, 1648:37, 1649:43, 1651:20, 1652:8, 1652:12, 1652:32, 1653:21, 1657:34, 1658:10, 1659:12, 1704:40
- emailed** [1] - 1741:17
- emails** [1] - 1650:32
- embedded** [2] - 1733:10, 1733:31
- emerge** [1] - 1675:12
- emerging** [1] - 1625:23
- Emma** [9] - 1713:43, 1714:20, 1716:36, 1717:3, 1717:43, 1718:1, 1718:20, 1720:39, 1720:46
- emphasis** [2] - 1687:34, 1707:30
- emphases** [1] - 1689:6
- enable** [2] - 1635:21, 1645:9
- end** [16] - 1627:28, 1627:33, 1628:1, 1628:2, 1635:42, 1636:44, 1639:16, 1639:39, 1701:5, 1701:27, 1702:46, 1706:1, 1718:37, 1726:23, 1734:25, 1739:7
- ended** [1] - 1710:41
- endorsed** [8] - 1655:35, 1728:22, 1728:32, 1728:38, 1729:15, 1740:10, 1740:12, 1747:25
- endorsing** [1] - 1683:9
- engage** [1] - 1664:31
- ensure** [1] - 1635:46
- entered** [3] - 1642:47, 1669:14, 1669:15
- entertaining** [1] - 1678:15
- entire** [3] - 1638:26, 1657:24, 1687:8
- entirely** [9] - 1623:9, 1639:31, 1643:8, 1656:22, 1659:20, 1676:45, 1686:4, 1722:22, 1724:30
- Enzo** [1] - 1620:32
- episode** [2] - 1654:4, 1654:24
- equally** [2] - 1625:31
- especially** [2] - 1666:13, 1736:23
- essentially** [3] - 1706:13, 1707:12, 1709:1

- establish** [6] - 1637:32, 1655:32, 1656:32, 1719:40, 1748:6, 1748:20
- established** [15] - 1636:37, 1641:5, 1655:33, 1655:36, 1656:18, 1663:44, 1683:23, 1683:29, 1710:31, 1711:1, 1711:3, 1711:7, 1719:44, 1736:19, 1737:23
- establishment** [9] - 1655:26, 1655:29, 1655:32, 1656:9, 1656:23, 1745:40, 1747:25, 1748:11, 1748:27
- et** [7] - 1647:37, 1658:5, 1696:39, 1699:34, 1714:25, 1717:6, 1730:37
- evening** [1] - 1654:28
- event** [6] - 1624:25, 1626:5, 1626:35, 1642:46, 1654:23, 1722:13
- events** [7] - 1623:43, 1629:30, 1629:40, 1629:45, 1630:34, 1642:47, 1655:8
- eventually** [1] - 1737:37
- evidence** [46] - 1621:43, 1622:22, 1625:11, 1625:20, 1625:33, 1630:41, 1632:45, 1632:46, 1634:7, 1635:20, 1645:8, 1647:30, 1647:43, 1648:10, 1663:43, 1664:44, 1671:4, 1672:6, 1674:16, 1676:34, 1679:22, 1679:47, 1685:3, 1685:19, 1685:32, 1691:12, 1691:27, 1692:9, 1693:37, 1701:28, 1714:4, 1714:5, 1715:40, 1733:23, 1736:15, 1736:40, 1737:27, 1738:19, 1739:40, 1740:2, 1741:38, 1741:43, 1742:4, 1742:16, 1743:41, 1745:20
- exact** [8] - 1626:26, 1629:1, 1629:23, 1639:3, 1645:20, 1654:33, 1684:11, 1742:18
- exactly** [4] - 1658:2, 1675:2, 1692:26, 1710:6
- exaggerated** [1] - 1743:19
- exaggeration** [5] - 1682:40, 1683:13, 1728:33, 1742:36, 1743:14
- examination** [5] - 1696:23, 1696:37, 1696:47, 1697:7, 1699:45
- example** [7] - 1673:4, 1684:19, 1687:21, 1709:34, 1725:34, 1733:47, 1734:1
- except** [1] - 1647:42
- exception** [4] - 1683:44, 1727:34, 1727:42, 1727:45
- exceptions** [4] - 1622:18, 1634:8, 1687:9, 1730:44
- excuse** [1] - 1642:45
- exercise** [3] - 1641:15, 1660:26, 1727:29
- exhaustive** [2] - 1623:47, 1626:36
- exhibit** [10] - 1621:43, 1622:9, 1622:14, 1622:15, 1645:34, 1645:36, 1645:37, 1645:38, 1720:15, 1738:44
- exhibits** [4] - 1647:44, 1648:8, 1684:41, 1684:45
- exist** [1] - 1655:38
- existence** [3] - 1674:5, 1737:22
- existing** [1] - 1640:20
- exists** [1] - 1664:31
- expect** [3] - 1676:9, 1676:19, 1731:4
- expected** [5] - 1670:6, 1676:22, 1723:31, 1731:1, 1732:44
- experience** [1] - 1705:19
- experienced** [2] - 1663:24, 1724:18
- expert** [2] - 1736:39, 1736:40
- explained** [6] - 1658:1, 1675:33, 1677:10, 1681:9, 1695:11
- explanation** [4] - 1625:9, 1626:25, 1679:20, 1747:29
- explanations** [2] - 1644:44, 1739:19
- express** [2] - 1625:36, 1627:4
- expressed** [9] - 1626:23, 1633:18, 1665:29, 1685:31, 1689:26, 1693:33, 1728:43, 1729:1, 1743:14
- expresses** [3] - 1654:8, 1663:19, 1703:20
- expression** [4] - 1680:24, 1682:44, 1721:17, 1721:21
- expressly** [1] - 1708:13
- extant** [1] - 1694:35
- extensive** [1] - 1683:38
- extent** [2] - 1660:15, 1674:4
- extra** [1] - 1716:5
- extremely** [1] - 1724:18
-
- F**
-
- face** [8] - 1632:38, 1647:26, 1666:43, 1680:16, 1697:44, 1712:14, 1737:20, 1747:12
- fact** [37] - 1621:4, 1624:41, 1636:44, 1641:40, 1643:9, 1661:38, 1665:5, 1665:29, 1678:33, 1679:3, 1679:19, 1681:8, 1682:33, 1683:16, 1684:35, 1687:8, 1691:8, 1693:9, 1697:11, 1700:24, 1701:12, 1704:11, 1705:24, 1705:28, 1706:17, 1707:35, 1707:37, 1713:29, 1716:5, 1716:43, 1717:30, 1721:3, 1722:31, 1729:22, 1729:41, 1738:37, 1739:33
- factor** [1] - 1698:37
- factors** [6] - 1647:40, 1689:26, 1698:25, 1698:30, 1699:32, 1745:31
- fading** [1] - 1690:29
- failure** [1] - 1679:13
- fair** [4] - 1666:34, 1710:14, 1722:38, 1742:29
- fairly** [2] - 1738:26, 1740:40
- fall** [1] - 1710:41
- false** [3] - 1653:24, 1713:5, 1713:8
- familiar** [2] - 1671:39, 1703:4
- familiarise** [1] - 1638:6
- family** [26] - 1641:17, 1647:6, 1649:16, 1649:40, 1650:8, 1650:41, 1654:15, 1654:23, 1654:32, 1655:3, 1682:27, 1683:25, 1696:23, 1697:26, 1698:18, 1707:15, 1707:18, 1707:29, 1707:47, 1708:1, 1714:15, 1715:29, 1717:4, 1719:7, 1719:27, 1719:34
- family's** [2] - 1649:7, 1700:9
- far** [8] - 1633:30, 1633:44, 1640:6, 1676:44, 1678:9, 1694:30, 1710:37, 1738:10
- feature** [2] - 1675:12, 1735:25
- February** [14] - 1620:25, 1622:32, 1624:16, 1635:34, 1648:42, 1649:23, 1654:23, 1654:24, 1660:6, 1683:23, 1718:8, 1719:15, 1720:22, 1721:28
- FEBRUARY** [1] - 1748:37
- fell** [3] - 1644:43, 1645:10, 1703:46
- felt** [5] - 1685:23, 1688:28, 1700:10, 1714:16, 1742:23
- Feneley** [9] - 1624:28, 1666:18, 1666:25, 1670:30, 1672:18, 1677:15, 1681:21, 1682:26, 1693:2
- few** [14] - 1623:47, 1626:45, 1657:2, 1668:5, 1677:39, 1687:18, 1694:7, 1702:20, 1717:31, 1720:47, 1733:3, 1736:24, 1737:32
- fifth** [3] - 1626:5, 1636:10, 1736:2
- figures** [1] - 1635:34
- file** [5] - 1644:18, 1645:12, 1646:4, 1680:8, 1727:12
- filed** [1] - 1642:12
- files** [1] - 1680:34
- filled** [1] - 1734:24
- final** [3] - 1631:25, 1701:18, 1737:37
- finalised** [3] - 1622:27, 1622:35, 1683:41
- finality** [2] - 1622:36, 1677:41
- Findings** [1] - 1703:43
- findings** [27] - 1631:33, 1631:40, 1631:43, 1632:7, 1634:43, 1634:44, 1635:27, 1641:13, 1641:25, 1645:18, 1645:21, 1646:43, 1688:42, 1690:16, 1691:47, 1700:33, 1702:36, 1704:26, 1705:3, 1706:9, 1707:13, 1709:2, 1710:19, 1711:16, 1711:21, 1744:15, 1746:4
- findings"** [1] - 1739:20
- fine** [1] - 1621:37
- finished** [2] - 1627:33, 1742:46
- finishing** [1] - 1712:9
- finite** [1] - 1704:13
- first** [36] - 1621:2, 1621:14, 1621:41, 1624:4, 1628:39, 1632:13, 1633:37, 1641:38, 1642:32, 1645:31, 1649:44, 1657:2, 1659:16, 1660:37, 1668:17, 1687:4, 1689:26, 1695:3, 1703:8, 1709:21, 1710:31, 1713:42, 1714:33, 1715:6, 1715:10, 1716:21, 1717:29, 1733:3, 1734:19,

- 1736:31, 1736:44,
1736:45, 1737:15,
1738:25, 1739:2,
1740:36
firstly [3] - 1691:1,
1697:40, 1701:35
Fish [1] - 1644:7
five [7] - 1629:31,
1674:34, 1680:21,
1716:13, 1741:42,
1744:40, 1746:17
fixed [7] - 1641:44,
1642:2, 1642:5,
1642:7, 1642:22,
1642:32, 1694:37
flawed [2] - 1626:19,
1714:38
flow [1] - 1708:28
flowed [2] - 1707:12,
1709:1
flowing [1] - 1666:42
focus [1] - 1632:21
focused [1] - 1666:25
folder [3] - 1653:40,
1670:27, 1737:36
follow [6] - 1640:22,
1642:34, 1700:35,
1708:23, 1734:19,
1739:11
follow-up [1] -
1640:22
followed [1] - 1682:25
following [14] -
1653:47, 1655:8,
1659:16, 1662:13,
1662:17, 1663:10,
1683:24, 1683:38,
1688:16, 1693:14,
1707:12, 1709:1,
1722:42, 1725:10
foot [3] - 1640:29,
1640:31, 1649:44
Forbes [7] - 1624:8,
1640:42, 1641:2,
1641:26, 1643:27,
1645:19, 1648:47
Forbes's [1] - 1646:43
force [22] - 1624:22,
1627:2, 1627:9,
1655:26, 1656:18,
1656:23, 1656:33,
1659:16, 1659:26,
1705:20, 1706:18,
1708:23, 1719:9,
1719:34, 1719:40,
1722:45, 1731:26,
1737:47, 1739:4,
1746:9, 1748:7,
1748:20
Force [37] - 1624:22,
1626:46, 1630:21,
1635:31, 1636:37,
1652:32, 1655:13,
1656:45, 1657:39,
1658:10, 1659:41,
1660:7, 1670:40,
1671:10, 1677:41,
1681:27, 1683:23,
1683:39, 1696:28,
1704:26, 1706:22,
1707:10, 1707:46,
1708:46, 1710:4,
1719:43, 1725:16,
1726:3, 1730:28,
1730:40, 1731:41,
1731:45, 1733:4,
1737:37, 1746:5,
1748:11
forced [1] - 1643:45
forces [2] - 1627:28,
1747:30
forensic [7] - 1647:30,
1647:43, 1648:9,
1663:43, 1664:43,
1684:41, 1715:5
Form [2] - 1733:11,
1734:13
form [14] - 1630:6,
1641:28, 1727:20,
1733:10, 1733:14,
1733:25, 1733:29,
1733:38, 1734:5,
1736:19, 1737:2,
1742:10, 1745:36
formal [2] - 1635:17,
1655:25
formally [3] - 1655:36,
1659:28, 1696:35
format [2] - 1727:24,
1732:8
formation [1] - 1661:5
formed [1] - 1728:18
forms [3] - 1666:44,
1733:39, 1734:35
forthcoming [1] -
1667:26
forward [10] -
1622:47, 1625:15,
1631:6, 1639:40,
1679:12, 1697:5,
1697:38, 1698:31,
1698:38, 1700:31
foul [1] - 1633:24
four [13] - 1622:13,
1634:18, 1638:47,
1660:13, 1665:37,
1668:26, 1678:21,
1678:25, 1734:29,
1734:41, 1735:42,
1736:6, 1745:13
fourth [9] - 1635:41,
1635:42, 1636:7,
1636:8, 1636:15,
1678:25, 1734:25,
1735:4, 1735:31
fourth-bottom [1] -
1635:42
fourthly [1] - 1624:46
framework [1] -
1676:28
frank [1] - 1718:31
frankly [1] - 1679:12
fresh [3] - 1647:30,
1647:42, 1648:9
friend [12] - 1641:37,
1661:43, 1687:47,
1688:8, 1695:3,
1709:24, 1736:43,
1738:25, 1738:33,
1743:7, 1743:37,
1743:46
friend's [1] - 1736:47
friends [3] - 1622:4,
1622:16, 1641:28
front [10] - 1623:12,
1641:26, 1657:40,
1661:15, 1665:33,
1668:21, 1686:30,
1686:34, 1737:47,
1738:38
frustration [1] -
1650:37
full [1] - 1649:36
Fuller [4] - 1628:30,
1707:3, 1707:45,
1708:1
fully [4] - 1730:26,
1730:40, 1732:41,
1732:44
fulsome [1] - 1692:26
future [9] - 1641:42,
1642:23, 1643:12,
1643:18, 1647:39,
1680:9, 1680:43,
1694:37, 1709:25
-
- G**
-
- gained** [1] - 1726:9
Gary [2] - 1652:2,
1652:30
gather [2] - 1621:4,
1727:8
gathered [1] - 1727:13
gay [55] - 1623:44,
1624:28, 1627:4,
1633:7, 1637:41,
1643:40, 1643:46,
1644:9, 1644:41,
1666:12, 1666:25,
1666:26, 1671:23,
1673:5, 1673:18,
1673:27, 1674:5,
1674:30, 1675:13,
1677:46, 1679:38,
1679:46, 1680:4,
1682:12, 1682:21,
1682:39, 1683:5,
1683:17, 1685:4,
1689:42, 1691:40,
1692:14, 1692:21,
1692:35, 1693:37,
1703:27, 1703:40,
1709:4, 1717:18,
1722:19, 1726:34,
1727:21, 1728:19,
1728:25, 1729:5,
1729:23, 1733:32,
1743:15, 1743:18,
1743:23, 1743:24,
1744:26, 1745:11
gay-hate [5] - 1673:5,
1683:5, 1685:4,
1691:40, 1733:32
gee [1] - 1674:21
General [2] - 1657:35,
1699:33
general [15] - 1630:36,
1638:1, 1645:20,
1645:21, 1645:24,
1647:28, 1676:10,
1698:3, 1701:5,
1710:1, 1713:19,
1715:22, 1741:23,
1745:26, 1745:28
General's [2] -
1637:35, 1637:37
generally [15] -
1633:38, 1634:19,
1637:5, 1642:34,
1676:19, 1679:21,
1689:41, 1705:39,
1709:15, 1709:16,
1722:19, 1725:22,
1725:27, 1745:2,
1745:7
generate [2] - 1647:7,
1665:9
genuine [1] - 1710:41
Gestures [2] -
1735:46, 1736:3
Gilles [3] - 1630:44,
1663:22, 1663:45
girls [2] - 1705:9,
1705:24
gist [1] - 1741:4
given [26] - 1627:26,
1641:16, 1642:36,
1658:4, 1670:2,
1672:6, 1673:45,
1674:8, 1674:47,
1675:19, 1678:41,
1684:14, 1692:28,
1696:20, 1701:11,
1701:23, 1702:38,
1707:30, 1729:21,
1733:40, 1734:38,
1735:39, 1736:23,
1742:6, 1744:12,
1747:3
glance [1] - 1704:8
Glen [2] - 1652:2,
1652:30
Glick [1] - 1649:39
goodness [1] -
1723:23
Government [1] -
1717:37
government [1] -
1718:3
grant [3] - 1642:24,
1642:31, 1700:27
granted [4] - 1642:33,
1674:8, 1696:43,
1696:46
grants [1] - 1642:25
Gray [31] - 1620:30,
1621:1, 1621:39,
1623:16, 1637:44,
1648:7, 1652:11,
1653:38, 1665:18,
1665:39, 1667:4,
1671:24, 1673:16,
1674:14, 1684:39,
1688:23, 1690:29,
1695:25, 1695:26,
1695:40, 1700:3,
1707:27, 1708:43,
1711:20, 1713:26,
1729:43, 1732:35,
1738:30, 1738:42,
1742:46, 1743:28
GRAY [79] - 1621:41,
1622:9, 1622:40,
1622:45, 1623:18,
1623:20, 1625:44,
1636:14, 1636:20,
1641:37, 1643:27,
1645:31, 1645:36,
1645:42, 1646:1,
1652:28, 1653:27,
1653:31, 1653:40,
1653:45, 1656:40,
1661:42, 1662:7,
1665:22, 1665:26,
1665:41, 1665:45,
1667:17, 1667:24,
1667:30, 1667:36,
1668:10, 1668:16,
1668:21, 1671:47,

1675:32, 1677:2, 1678:18, 1685:1, 1685:19, 1685:39, 1686:3, 1686:18, 1686:25, 1687:47, 1689:19, 1689:25, 1690:32, 1690:39, 1694:1, 1694:7, 1694:13, 1694:25, 1695:8, 1695:30, 1696:5, 1696:9, 1696:13, 1700:5, 1702:26, 1707:44, 1708:45, 1709:32, 1712:44, 1713:8, 1713:41, 1720:14, 1720:19, 1722:13, 1724:35, 1737:14, 1737:20, 1738:32, 1738:44, 1743:31, 1743:36, 1746:21, 1747:33, 1748:31	1688:1, 1723:6, 1731:31, 1743:31	1705:40	1652:29, 1652:34, 1652:42, 1653:10, 1654:8, 1655:33, 1658:41, 1658:43, 1658:45, 1659:2, 1668:43, 1669:20, 1670:3, 1675:1, 1676:24, 1680:9, 1680:27, 1681:40, 1683:22, 1684:9, 1694:2, 1696:27, 1700:39, 1701:6, 1701:16, 1701:25, 1702:3, 1705:17, 1706:40, 1707:28, 1707:32, 1709:11, 1729:30, 1731:2, 1737:42, 1740:19, 1740:29, 1740:42, 1747:46	1645:25, 1645:32, 1646:5, 1653:31, 1665:41, 1667:18, 1667:24, 1668:12, 1702:46, 1704:11, 1720:14
great [2] - 1637:42, 1686:6	harbouring [1] - 1685:33	heel [1] - 1631:4	Herald [2] - 1624:27, 1666:12	Honourable [1] - 1620:16
Greenwich [3] - 1682:8, 1740:38, 1740:41	hard [2] - 1623:9, 1623:12	held [6] - 1666:39, 1687:22, 1697:28, 1698:26, 1729:27, 1742:34	help [2] - 1661:3, 1746:33	hope [2] - 1667:36, 1694:3
gross [4] - 1682:40, 1683:13, 1728:33, 1742:36	hate [51] - 1620:11, 1623:44, 1624:28, 1627:4, 1633:7, 1637:41, 1644:41, 1666:12, 1666:26, 1671:23, 1673:5, 1673:18, 1673:27, 1674:6, 1674:30, 1675:13, 1677:47, 1679:38, 1679:46, 1680:4, 1682:12, 1682:21, 1682:39, 1683:5, 1683:17, 1685:4, 1691:40, 1692:14, 1692:21, 1692:35, 1693:38, 1703:27, 1703:40, 1709:4, 1717:18, 1722:19, 1726:34, 1727:21, 1728:19, 1728:25, 1729:5, 1729:23, 1733:32, 1743:15, 1743:18, 1743:23, 1743:24, 1744:26, 1745:11	herald [1] - 1682:26	helpful [1] - 1737:7	hopefully [1] - 1692:47
group [1] - 1675:18	Head [2] - 1644:7, 1716:18	herself [2] - 1689:33, 1693:36	hence [2] - 1641:21, 1658:5	house [1] - 1741:27
groups [1] - 1689:47	head [4] - 1638:22, 1646:19, 1723:14, 1723:15	hiatus [1] - 1670:28	Herald [2] - 1624:27, 1666:12	housekeeping [1] - 1621:2
guess [4] - 1648:6, 1679:26, 1707:30, 1744:16	headed [1] - 1694:1	high [1] - 1735:21	herald [1] - 1682:26	huge [1] - 1643:20
guessing [1] - 1695:14	heading [11] - 1634:44, 1656:44, 1662:13, 1663:11, 1683:21, 1693:43, 1694:1, 1734:21, 1736:2, 1739:20, 1747:43	High [4] - 1642:13, 1642:23, 1642:31, 1642:32	herself [2] - 1689:33, 1693:36	hundred [2] - 1639:27
guise [2] - 1702:21, 1705:44	heads [1] - 1652:45	highly [3] - 1663:34, 1729:41, 1730:2	hiatus [1] - 1670:28	hundreds [3] - 1646:24, 1686:25, 1704:12
<hr/> H <hr/>	Healey [1] - 1620:33	historical [1] - 1643:3	hiatus [1] - 1670:28	hung [1] - 1722:39
half [1] - 1627:27	Healey-Nash [1] - 1620:33	historically [1] - 1727:13	high [1] - 1735:21	hunt [1] - 1631:4
halfway [6] - 1669:23, 1669:24, 1687:5, 1714:14, 1716:36, 1717:3	hear [3] - 1630:37, 1665:19, 1742:29	history [4] - 1643:14, 1643:16, 1696:14, 1701:12	highlights [1] - 1692:37	hypotheses [3] - 1625:12, 1625:25, 1676:34
hand [4] - 1621:5, 1630:20, 1668:12, 1669:24	heard [3] - 1671:3, 1721:18, 1721:21	hmm [14] - 1631:13, 1631:20, 1649:10, 1687:15, 1703:10, 1704:46, 1715:36, 1716:38, 1717:32, 1729:24, 1734:45, 1735:5, 1736:16, 1739:31	highly [3] - 1663:34, 1729:41, 1730:2	hypothesis [2] - 1676:31, 1705:42
handed [2] - 1631:34, 1700:34	hearing [5] - 1621:42, 1629:45, 1632:36, 1642:35, 1721:36	hold [4] - 1626:7, 1654:31, 1697:13, 1711:27	historical [1] - 1643:3	Hypothesis [1] - 1694:2
handing [1] - 1641:29	hearings [2] - 1631:15, 1640:7	holdings [1] - 1727:7	historically [1] - 1727:13	Hypothesis" [1] - 1693:44
handle [1] - 1724:22	heavily [7] - 1647:44, 1658:29, 1659:32, 1659:36, 1659:45,	Homicide [68] - 1623:32, 1623:42, 1628:17, 1628:41, 1628:45, 1629:13, 1629:35, 1629:36, 1629:41, 1630:25, 1638:4, 1638:7, 1638:21, 1638:22, 1638:25, 1638:45, 1639:2, 1640:11, 1640:17, 1641:20, 1646:6, 1646:14, 1646:19, 1646:23, 1650:16, 1652:24,	historically [1] - 1727:13	<hr/> I <hr/>
hands [4] - 1633:27, 1692:14, 1725:41, 1738:46			history [4] - 1643:14, 1643:16, 1696:14, 1701:12	idea [3] - 1670:41, 1724:24, 1732:46
handwritten [1] - 1681:12			hmm [14] - 1631:13, 1631:20, 1649:10, 1687:15, 1703:10, 1704:46, 1715:36, 1716:38, 1717:32, 1729:24, 1734:45, 1735:5, 1736:16, 1739:31	ideation [2] - 1691:27, 1692:37
happy [5] - 1655:47,			hold [4] - 1626:7, 1654:31, 1697:13, 1711:27	identical [1] - 1736:11
			holdings [1] - 1727:7	identification [1] - 1647:35
			Homicide [68] - 1623:32, 1623:42, 1628:17, 1628:41, 1628:45, 1629:13, 1629:35, 1629:36, 1629:41, 1630:25, 1638:4, 1638:7, 1638:21, 1638:22, 1638:25, 1638:45, 1639:2, 1640:11, 1640:17, 1641:20, 1646:6, 1646:14, 1646:19, 1646:23, 1650:16, 1652:24,	identified [2] - 1710:44, 1738:27
			homicide [37] - 1623:34, 1623:36, 1625:12, 1628:7, 1630:18, 1635:4, 1635:32, 1638:38, 1638:46, 1666:37, 1673:26, 1675:17, 1678:47, 1685:4, 1687:38, 1688:5, 1688:13, 1688:22, 1688:33, 1688:42, 1689:10, 1689:34, 1690:9, 1693:37, 1701:32, 1701:36, 1702:29, 1705:19, 1705:21, 1705:30, 1705:34, 1705:41, 1709:35, 1709:40, 1718:47, 1729:34, 1741:26	identify [2] - 1663:35, 1711:1
			homicides [17] - 1635:45, 1663:36, 1664:5, 1673:6, 1673:18, 1673:27, 1674:6, 1674:31, 1675:13, 1678:36, 1679:14, 1679:18, 1679:21, 1683:5, 1684:22, 1717:17	identifying [1] - 1677:14
			Homicides [1] - 1680:34	ignorant [1] - 1630:34
			homosexual [4] - 1643:44, 1644:6, 1690:20, 1704:3	immediately [5] - 1641:38, 1648:4, 1655:8, 1675:16, 1738:15
			honest [3] - 1651:17, 1698:14, 1745:1	imminent [1] - 1694:36
			honestly [1] - 1661:4	impact [2] - 1648:1, 1742:27
			Honour [17] - 1633:21, 1634:28, 1635:37, 1643:32, 1644:38,	implement [1] - 1628:31
				implied [1] - 1707:36
				impliedly [1] - 1708:13

important [5] - 1675:7, 1699:47, 1714:16, 1731:10, 1731:21	1733:6, 1733:9, 1733:18, 1734:30, 1734:41, 1736:6, 1736:10	1698:40, 1699:8, 1699:47, 1700:8, 1700:28, 1700:32, 1700:33, 1700:47, 1701:11, 1701:28, 1710:47, 1711:22, 1711:27, 1725:12, 1725:24, 1725:30, 1725:35, 1725:37, 1725:40, 1728:11	intend [1] - 1709:30	investigate [13] - 1644:18, 1648:26, 1649:8, 1651:4, 1651:21, 1653:6, 1680:30, 1683:32, 1684:12, 1684:13, 1706:25, 1709:7, 1747:47
imprimatur [1] - 1656:22	Indicators [2] - 1733:11, 1734:13	1701:11, 1701:28, 1710:47, 1711:22, 1711:27, 1725:12, 1725:24, 1725:30, 1725:35, 1725:37, 1725:40, 1728:11	intended [1] - 1683:28	investigated [4] - 1634:15, 1647:41, 1675:8, 1684:25
improper [2] - 1719:47, 1720:12	Individuals [1] - 1658:28	inquiries [5] - 1622:22, 1629:46, 1630:3, 1630:37, 1641:22	intending [1] - 1708:18	investigating [5] - 1640:18, 1684:19, 1701:43, 1707:10, 1708:46
in-house [1] - 1741:27	inevitable [1] - 1742:6	inquiry [5] - 1620:9, 1636:46, 1710:8, 1745:32, 1745:35	intense [1] - 1683:24	investigation [79] - 1626:18, 1626:42, 1637:40, 1638:14, 1638:24, 1638:33, 1638:40, 1640:6, 1640:10, 1640:24, 1640:31, 1644:24, 1645:13, 1646:12, 1647:33, 1647:34, 1649:30, 1650:8, 1650:11, 1650:27, 1651:13, 1651:14, 1651:34, 1651:47, 1652:38, 1653:10, 1653:14, 1657:26, 1657:29, 1657:46, 1658:39, 1662:27, 1662:34, 1662:44, 1662:46, 1662:47, 1663:21, 1663:33, 1668:40, 1669:16, 1675:34, 1677:45, 1680:10, 1680:25, 1680:44, 1681:28, 1683:38, 1684:32, 1685:41, 1702:20, 1704:12, 1704:20, 1704:44, 1705:28, 1705:44, 1706:2, 1706:14, 1707:19, 1707:20, 1707:33, 1708:2, 1708:10, 1710:41, 1711:1, 1713:13, 1714:37, 1715:4, 1715:6, 1715:10, 1715:18, 1715:22, 1715:24, 1722:28, 1725:30, 1725:41, 1728:3, 1731:42, 1747:13
inaccurate [1] - 1743:20	inevitably [2] - 1736:23, 1737:31	INQUIRY [1] - 1748:36	intent [1] - 1710:30	investigations [13] - 1635:46, 1635:47,
inactive [1] - 1637:10	infer [2] - 1632:43, 1670:21	inquiry [6] - 1632:21, 1657:42, 1685:23, 1705:46, 1709:8, 1745:36	interest [21] - 1633:28, 1633:44, 1634:3, 1634:15, 1647:36, 1664:32, 1696:29, 1699:8, 1699:10, 1699:12, 1699:13, 1699:29, 1699:31, 1700:43, 1701:4, 1701:5, 1701:10, 1701:11, 1710:44, 1713:12, 1737:43	
incident [3] - 1716:14, 1716:17, 1735:12	inferring [1] - 1679:9	insider [2] - 1676:23, 1731:40	interested [2] - 1685:25, 1685:29	
incidents [1] - 1662:22	infers [1] - 1662:38	inspector [2] - 1638:41	interesting [1] - 1636:14	
include [2] - 1659:25, 1661:30	influence [3] - 1717:36, 1717:37, 1718:2	Inspector [13] - 1624:47, 1626:12, 1626:41, 1638:27, 1638:28, 1657:30, 1658:12, 1661:26, 1668:30, 1671:20, 1678:5, 1706:28, 1747:40	interests [1] - 1696:22	
included [8] - 1623:43, 1641:17, 1647:35, 1673:33, 1698:17, 1716:5, 1727:33, 1727:42	informally [1] - 1661:42	insufficient [2] - 1740:2, 1741:44	intermediate [1] - 1697:14	
includes [4] - 1666:37, 1692:28, 1711:34, 1735:11	Information [3] - 1669:45, 1735:4, 1735:31	intelligent [1] - 1629:9	international [1] - 1650:43	
including [8] - 1629:36, 1697:27, 1697:47, 1700:6, 1717:36, 1730:44, 1739:3, 1745:11	information [12] - 1637:11, 1641:16, 1643:39, 1644:16, 1644:25, 1645:27, 1665:9, 1677:19, 1715:41, 1716:6, 1740:3, 1741:44	intelligences [2] - 1663:42, 1689:46	internets [1] - 1643:12	
inconvenient [1] - 1667:17	informed [2] - 1645:36, 1661:7		interpreting [1] - 1675:11	
incorrect [1] - 1647:25	informing [1] - 1657:38		interrupt [1] - 1693:42	
incredulous [1] - 1718:16	ingleby [2] - 1673:37, 1674:4		interview [20] - 1626:23, 1650:43, 1651:7, 1651:10, 1651:16, 1653:19, 1711:34, 1711:46, 1721:4, 1721:33, 1721:37, 1721:42, 1722:14, 1722:42, 1723:10, 1723:27, 1724:9, 1732:10	
incumbent [1] - 1623:39	ingleby's [1] - 1673:43		interviewed [3] - 1626:12, 1711:41, 1722:1	
indeed [9] - 1623:36, 1629:34, 1651:20, 1651:25, 1678:25, 1683:32, 1705:17, 1710:14, 1733:3	initial [4] - 1624:12, 1662:33, 1714:36, 1715:21		interviews [1] - 1723:47	
indefinitely [1] - 1745:7	initiated [3] - 1626:46, 1655:13, 1670:36		intimately [6] - 1699:19, 1699:24, 1699:26, 1701:1, 1701:3, 1701:4	
independent [1] - 1731:5	initiation [1] - 1624:22		introduces [1] - 1693:1	
independently [1] - 1740:34	injuries [1] - 1635:11		introduction [2] - 1741:6, 1741:16	
indicate [4] - 1637:19, 1683:28, 1694:27, 1698:26	input [1] - 1699:34		introductory [1] - 1739:18	
indicated [2] - 1650:44, 1698:39	inquest [49] - 1624:5, 1624:12, 1626:8, 1626:9, 1627:22, 1628:32, 1630:35, 1631:12, 1637:41, 1637:45, 1640:39, 1641:22, 1643:28, 1643:35, 1660:14, 1673:21, 1687:22, 1691:37, 1697:1, 1697:6, 1697:8, 1697:14, 1697:27, 1697:42, 1698:1, 1698:12, 1698:19, 1698:26, 1698:32,		intrude [1] - 1643:4	
indicates [1] - 1736:20	input [1] - 1699:34		invested [1] - 1705:40	
indication [3] - 1677:37, 1677:45, 1693:37	inquest [49] - 1624:5, 1624:12, 1626:8, 1626:9, 1627:22, 1628:32, 1630:35, 1631:12, 1637:41, 1637:45, 1640:39, 1641:22, 1643:28, 1643:35, 1660:14, 1673:21, 1687:22, 1691:37, 1697:1, 1697:6, 1697:8, 1697:14, 1697:27, 1697:42, 1698:1, 1698:12, 1698:19, 1698:26, 1698:32,			
indicators [7] -				

- 1636:43, 1636:44,
1637:14, 1640:21,
1640:29, 1662:18,
1682:12, 1689:13,
1696:26, 1701:7,
1709:25
investigative [2] -
1647:33, 1663:44
investigator [4] -
1659:27, 1663:24,
1706:28, 1724:19
investigators [6] -
1638:37, 1654:13,
1655:20, 1683:40,
1684:2, 1685:2
invite [2] - 1661:42,
1695:26
involve [5] - 1642:15,
1698:32, 1699:6,
1699:32, 1727:29
involved [29] -
1648:15, 1650:23,
1651:32, 1651:37,
1658:29, 1659:25,
1659:33, 1659:36,
1659:37, 1659:45,
1660:30, 1662:37,
1664:14, 1672:30,
1675:46, 1676:11,
1689:47, 1697:46,
1701:8, 1706:18,
1707:14, 1733:32,
1740:24, 1740:43,
1741:4, 1747:25,
1748:11, 1748:26,
1748:27
involvement [4] -
1655:31, 1656:8,
1656:14, 1731:7
involves [2] - 1714:29,
1718:6
involving [6] - 1673:6,
1673:19, 1674:6,
1702:29, 1713:41,
1723:13
irrelevant [2] -
1699:38, 1730:14
isolation [1] - 1664:30
issue [12] - 1672:2,
1682:22, 1684:13,
1693:26, 1693:27,
1717:25, 1729:1,
1731:13, 1732:26,
1747:39
issues [17] - 1623:43,
1630:20, 1642:37,
1654:14, 1655:19,
1671:36, 1681:1,
1681:45, 1682:35,
1683:20, 1693:33,
1695:30, 1697:26,
1697:35, 1731:46,
1731:47, 1732:8
issues [1] - 1671:21
it [1] - 1650:45
item [2] - 1669:23,
1669:44
itself [5] - 1672:10,
1682:25, 1689:16,
1705:45, 1733:25
-
- J**
-
- January** [6] - 1623:21,
1681:4, 1681:45,
1685:12, 1695:31,
1728:38
Jason [4] - 1628:22,
1657:30, 1657:45,
1659:35
job [1] - 1670:2
jobs [1] - 1717:39
John [33] - 1620:16,
1630:12, 1638:27,
1649:12, 1649:13,
1649:21, 1649:31,
1650:21, 1650:23,
1650:41, 1651:5,
1651:12, 1651:27,
1651:31, 1652:3,
1652:45, 1653:8,
1655:40, 1661:27,
1661:38, 1663:22,
1665:29, 1668:30,
1668:41, 1668:45,
1669:4, 1669:11,
1669:29, 1670:28,
1677:24
JOHN [1] - 1623:3
John's [1] - 1649:7
Johnson [72] - 1624:5,
1624:18, 1625:1,
1626:7, 1626:18,
1626:30, 1626:31,
1626:42, 1627:17,
1627:18, 1627:38,
1640:39, 1641:17,
1641:19, 1644:6,
1644:41, 1647:6,
1649:40, 1654:5,
1654:15, 1654:23,
1654:30, 1654:32,
1655:3, 1660:14,
1677:34, 1679:42,
1679:45, 1680:5,
1682:27, 1683:22,
1683:24, 1684:18,
1685:4, 1696:23,
1696:25, 1698:18,
1698:32, 1700:8,
1700:47, 1701:44,
1703:46, 1706:25,
1707:11, 1707:15,
1707:18, 1707:29,
1707:47, 1708:47,
1709:3, 1713:44,
1713:47, 1714:38,
1716:37, 1717:4,
1717:34, 1718:2,
1718:13, 1718:23,
1719:7, 1719:27,
1719:34, 1722:19,
1722:28, 1725:5,
1725:22, 1727:46,
1728:2, 1728:7,
1728:40, 1729:9
Johnson's [8] -
1625:10, 1644:8,
1644:19, 1645:9,
1646:27, 1653:7,
1714:14, 1714:22
joined [2] - 1652:24,
1652:28
journalist [7] -
1681:19, 1711:43,
1711:44, 1713:17,
1720:43, 1723:37,
1723:38
journalists [4] -
1712:38, 1713:12,
1723:20, 1723:32
Jubelin [2] - 1652:2,
1652:30
judge [1] - 1643:17
judgment [2] - 1621:5,
1636:18
judicial [2] - 1643:10,
1745:36
July [6] - 1622:20,
1639:28, 1662:22,
1666:17, 1686:36,
1693:1
jump [1] - 1700:31
June [7] - 1624:4,
1640:38, 1652:35,
1662:22, 1669:38,
1670:5, 1737:38
junior [1] - 1621:25
juror [1] - 1641:41
jury [6] - 1642:40,
1642:45, 1642:46,
1643:19, 1694:36
jury's [1] - 1643:4
justice [1] - 1711:3
Justice [2] - 1620:16,
1642:17
-
- K**
-
- KC** [2] - 1620:37,
1695:25
keen [1] - 1678:47
keep [2] - 1646:35,
1747:18
kept [1] - 1741:26
Kerlatec [1] - 1655:40
killed [1] - 1632:46
killings [1] - 1682:12
knowledge [13] -
1636:30, 1638:2,
1639:6, 1654:37,
1656:19, 1676:24,
1691:1, 1691:8,
1691:22, 1691:23,
1698:2, 1712:28,
1720:45
known [7] - 1641:14,
1644:6, 1670:47,
1673:15, 1689:46,
1690:6, 1690:19
knows [1] - 1738:35
kowtowed [1] -
1626:30
kowtowing [4] -
1718:12, 1720:21,
1721:12, 1721:36
-
- L**
-
- laboriously** [1] -
1686:39
labour [1] - 1745:6
lack [2] - 1671:6,
1685:32
laid [2] - 1742:37,
1742:39
landscape [1] -
1694:36
large [3] - 1673:8,
1673:20, 1679:22
largely [5] - 1687:13,
1694:10, 1713:43,
1722:22
Last [1] - 1677:39
last [26] - 1623:7,
1625:46, 1646:3,
1649:37, 1661:16,
1669:2, 1677:39,
1678:19, 1679:34,
1683:20, 1685:1,
1686:12, 1687:18,
1687:19, 1687:21,
1692:19, 1692:43,
1696:17, 1702:20,
1704:19, 1716:13,
1744:12, 1746:36,
1747:7, 1747:8,
1747:33
late [13] - 1628:15,
1628:47, 1630:40,
1636:36, 1643:41,
1646:44, 1647:21,
1648:13, 1667:41,
1677:44, 1685:40,
1689:46, 1740:28
Lateline [19] -
1626:13, 1626:23,
1626:40, 1711:18,
1711:31, 1711:41,
1713:2, 1713:9,
1713:11, 1713:22,
1713:29, 1716:25,
1720:20, 1721:33,
1721:37, 1721:42,
1722:14, 1722:42,
1723:7
Lateline" [1] - 1712:16
laugh [1] - 1721:16
law [1] - 1642:15
laying [1] - 1674:4
lays [1] - 1676:33
lead [1] - 1706:28
leading [1] - 1650:26
learn [2] - 1645:25,
1674:2
learned [8] - 1621:25,
1622:4, 1622:15,
1641:28, 1661:43,
1695:3, 1736:47,
1743:7
learning [1] - 1633:37
learnt [6] - 1630:19,
1630:21, 1640:46,
1645:25, 1648:19,
1655:27
least [22] - 1622:25,
1629:35, 1630:40,
1642:22, 1645:24,
1661:42, 1662:7,
1671:15, 1694:15,
1694:17, 1700:43,
1709:43, 1710:1,
1717:5, 1724:36,
1724:40, 1728:14,
1733:18, 1734:6,
1734:36, 1737:43,
1746:43
leave [21] - 1642:12,
1642:24, 1642:25,
1642:26, 1642:28,
1642:29, 1642:31,
1642:33, 1647:5,
1650:33, 1652:22,
1654:41, 1655:27,
1656:27, 1656:31,
1661:47, 1701:6,
1719:15, 1719:29,
1720:20
leaving [1] - 1704:21
led [7] - 1624:21,

- 1629:45, 1638:39,
1638:47, 1706:32,
1745:31, 1745:39
left [12] - 1625:18,
1628:17, 1628:27,
1628:28, 1657:16,
1657:25, 1659:41,
1669:24, 1698:3,
1706:13, 1707:24,
1740:28
left-hand [1] - 1669:24
Legal [1] - 1620:32
legal [2] - 1642:37,
1694:35
Leggat [1] - 1658:12
Lehmann [56] -
1638:27, 1640:16,
1646:20, 1649:12,
1649:13, 1649:21,
1649:31, 1650:21,
1650:23, 1650:41,
1651:5, 1651:12,
1651:27, 1651:31,
1652:3, 1652:45,
1653:8, 1653:19,
1661:27, 1661:38,
1665:15, 1665:29,
1667:1, 1668:31,
1668:41, 1668:45,
1669:11, 1670:28,
1671:15, 1671:20,
1672:3, 1672:23,
1675:38, 1676:4,
1676:15, 1676:21,
1677:9, 1681:8,
1682:34, 1682:44,
1683:10, 1693:26,
1693:27, 1693:36,
1728:28, 1729:1,
1730:6, 1740:7,
1740:10, 1744:15,
1745:9, 1746:39,
1746:47, 1747:12
lehmann's [1] -
1731:13
Lehmann's [2] -
1681:13, 1682:22
Lehmann/Young [4] -
1690:13, 1717:24,
1744:19, 1744:24
**Lehmann/Young/
Willing** [2] - 1731:28,
1731:35
**Lehmann/Young/
you** [1] - 1732:24
lengthy [4] - 1624:47,
1631:12, 1685:41,
1705:28
less [1] - 1744:16
lesser [1] - 1674:4
letter [5] - 1682:8,
1695:36, 1696:13,
1697:5, 1697:12
Level [1] - 1620:20
level [3] - 1673:10,
1701:4, 1720:3
LGBTIQ [2] - 1620:11,
1745:24
liaison [3] - 1724:1,
1724:6, 1724:25
liberty [1] - 1709:38
life [1] - 1715:14
light [10] - 1643:39,
1645:27, 1647:20,
1647:35, 1650:28,
1654:18, 1681:27,
1696:25, 1744:11
likelihood [2] -
1678:47, 1716:25
likely [18] - 1622:27,
1625:9, 1625:17,
1625:24, 1625:38,
1626:25, 1689:10,
1694:36, 1699:24,
1701:35, 1703:26,
1703:27, 1703:33,
1703:35, 1721:12,
1723:32, 1729:41,
1730:2
limited [2] - 1684:8,
1684:14
Lindt [1] - 1628:32
line [3] - 1669:43,
1709:8, 1743:3
lines [12] - 1634:40,
1665:37, 1666:21,
1668:26, 1673:1,
1677:39, 1705:46,
1716:13, 1716:21,
1717:31, 1717:44
links [1] - 1664:12
list [14] - 1622:4,
1623:47, 1646:29,
1658:29, 1659:1,
1659:24, 1659:44,
1663:10, 1672:23,
1675:1, 1677:23,
1717:16, 1738:2
listed [3] - 1642:35,
1659:17, 1659:31
lists [1] - 1680:28
literally [1] - 1727:7
live [3] - 1694:16,
1711:46, 1728:3
lobbying [1] - 1683:24
locate [2] - 1666:3,
1677:33
location [2] - 1632:21,
1703:28
logic [1] - 1678:40
longest [1] - 1623:37
look [15] - 1630:11,
1636:40, 1655:47,
1657:1, 1666:43,
1668:11, 1672:15,
1678:11, 1680:15,
1684:30, 1727:12,
1734:18, 1734:19,
1747:21, 1747:39
looked [10] - 1631:7,
1646:43, 1667:40,
1673:46, 1687:17,
1687:19, 1692:43,
1709:3, 1744:22,
1745:10
looking [12] - 1627:37,
1673:1, 1677:2,
1681:7, 1681:45,
1714:4, 1730:41,
1744:19, 1744:20,
1744:25, 1744:29,
1744:33
looks [3] - 1636:18,
1705:33, 1705:37
looms [1] - 1667:30
low [5] - 1742:1,
1742:14, 1742:19,
1742:30, 1743:9
lower [1] - 1744:43
ludicrous [1] -
1679:12
lump [1] - 1643:19
-
- M**
-
- M7** [2] - 1720:40,
1721:45
Macnamir [38] -
1624:22, 1627:37,
1635:31, 1655:13,
1656:45, 1657:16,
1657:19, 1657:39,
1658:10, 1658:29,
1659:42, 1660:7,
1661:5, 1666:8,
1675:34, 1676:1,
1676:11, 1676:27,
1677:41, 1681:27,
1683:23, 1683:39,
1684:1, 1685:2,
1685:41, 1687:14,
1696:28, 1698:39,
1704:26, 1705:39,
1710:47, 1711:16,
1713:13, 1719:43,
1725:16, 1731:41,
1731:45, 1741:22
Macnamir [1] -
1656:9
Macquarie [1] -
1620:20
magic [1] - 1709:44
main [1] - 1664:22
maintained [1] -
1700:42
majority [1] - 1701:10
males [1] - 1690:20
man [2] - 1630:13,
1630:44
manage [1] - 1718:23
managed [1] -
1679:29
Manly [2] - 1626:17,
1644:7
manner [1] - 1635:19
Manner [1] - 1703:43
March [6] - 1631:34,
1666:11, 1695:31,
1697:12, 1707:2,
1707:6
Mark [1] - 1620:37
Marks [7] - 1632:16,
1632:23, 1632:35,
1662:22, 1664:15,
1690:19, 1691:41
material [7] - 1655:46,
1663:4, 1670:44,
1715:17, 1715:26,
1734:26, 1737:1
Mattaini [26] -
1630:44, 1631:7,
1632:22, 1633:9,
1633:26, 1634:31,
1635:17, 1639:12,
1639:41, 1662:12,
1662:27, 1662:44,
1663:22, 1663:40,
1663:45, 1664:47,
1669:34, 1673:26,
1684:20, 1687:27,
1690:44, 1691:34,
1692:1, 1692:10,
1745:11, 1748:2
Mattaini's [8] - 1633:5,
1633:31, 1633:45,
1687:34, 1691:2,
1691:9, 1691:13,
1692:20
matter [27] - 1621:15,
1630:42, 1639:40,
1641:19, 1643:5,
1643:8, 1643:16,
1646:45, 1648:26,
1654:14, 1678:40,
1684:35, 1697:2,
1697:9, 1699:45,
1701:12, 1701:24,
1705:27, 1707:26,
1725:3, 1725:5,
1727:46, 1728:2,
1728:7, 1732:4,
1736:40, 1741:24
matters [25] - 1621:2,
1621:6, 1621:47,
1636:1, 1639:31,
1640:25, 1641:13,
1649:16, 1664:46,
1667:46, 1672:22,
1673:9, 1676:18,
1680:31, 1683:41,
1684:3, 1684:21,
1695:28, 1696:14,
1702:45, 1707:28,
1727:34, 1730:16,
1741:26, 1745:9
McCann [3] - 1673:38,
1673:43, 1683:3
McMahon [1] -
1630:13
mean [33] - 1630:30,
1648:4, 1651:3,
1656:14, 1656:17,
1674:29, 1675:5,
1676:18, 1680:25,
1680:45, 1684:17,
1696:46, 1699:1,
1699:23, 1700:16,
1705:24, 1707:17,
1709:44, 1710:33,
1712:45, 1721:32,
1726:22, 1727:2,
1732:24, 1736:23,
1737:32, 1740:28,
1742:23, 1745:8,
1745:12, 1747:12
meaning [2] -
1717:14, 1718:42
means [6] - 1622:40,
1668:42, 1680:33,
1695:6, 1732:16
meant [4] - 1648:25,
1679:13, 1680:43,
1721:41
meantime [1] -
1667:28
meanwhile [3] -
1660:2, 1660:13,
1711:13
mechanics [2] -
1655:28, 1748:7
media [12] - 1654:22,
1682:30, 1713:10,
1723:14, 1724:1,
1724:19, 1724:21,
1724:22, 1724:25,
1726:33, 1731:9,
1732:10
meet [3] - 1736:25,
1737:32, 1741:18
meeting [19] -

1649:38, 1654:32, 1654:45, 1655:13, 1718:7, 1718:8, 1718:23, 1719:8, 1719:28, 1719:43, 1720:10, 1720:12, 1721:26, 1721:28, 1726:39, 1740:38, 1740:41, 1741:4, 1741:15	1713:36, 1715:22, 1720:24, 1720:46, 1721:14, 1721:19, 1732:37, 1733:39, 1734:36, 1734:37, 1740:39, 1741:23, 1742:24	misleading [1] - 1736:44	motivated [7] - 1663:34, 1677:47, 1679:38, 1679:46, 1680:4, 1683:5, 1735:12	1632:26, 1642:22, 1642:39, 1642:42, 1643:18, 1644:7, 1694:37
meetings [1] - 1740:35	mile [1] - 1723:11	missing [3] - 1662:33, 1662:41, 1691:26	motivation [1] - 1737:23	nearing [1] - 1677:41
member [2] - 1623:7, 1639:39	Milledge [18] - 1622:23, 1627:22, 1631:12, 1631:34, 1631:41, 1632:32, 1633:18, 1634:24, 1637:19, 1673:20, 1687:22, 1688:9, 1688:21, 1689:37, 1691:47, 1692:1, 1710:19, 1725:35	mistake [2] - 1691:17, 1691:21	move [6] - 1622:41, 1667:31, 1670:26, 1695:26, 1706:4, 1743:32	necessarily [3] - 1659:26, 1661:7, 1697:1
members [3] - 1676:11, 1683:24, 1704:26	Milledge's [1] - 1631:43	mmm-hmm [13] - 1631:13, 1631:20, 1649:10, 1687:15, 1703:10, 1704:46, 1715:36, 1716:38, 1729:24, 1734:45, 1735:5, 1736:16, 1739:31	MP [1] - 1682:8	necessary [3] - 1622:33, 1656:34, 1695:28
memory [1] - 1631:37	mind [6] - 1667:18, 1710:14, 1711:6, 1712:9, 1745:12, 1745:15	Mmm-hmm [1] - 1717:32	mulberry [1] - 1744:18	need [22] - 1635:25, 1642:37, 1647:26, 1648:46, 1667:4, 1667:9, 1667:46, 1672:16, 1674:32, 1675:16, 1680:15, 1680:19, 1692:47, 1695:40, 1713:23, 1720:19, 1724:35, 1729:45, 1738:14, 1739:29, 1746:21, 1746:27
men [4] - 1634:34, 1643:44, 1674:19, 1689:42	mindset [1] - 1710:37	modified [2] - 1747:5, 1747:8	multiple [2] - 1635:11, 1689:47	needed [5] - 1666:40, 1674:33, 1699:30, 1708:10, 1719:41
mention [9] - 1658:36, 1659:35, 1669:34, 1687:38, 1688:4, 1688:22, 1724:36, 1738:34	mine [2] - 1636:10, 1636:15	Modus [1] - 1633:7	murder [10] - 1664:33, 1678:15, 1679:46, 1685:5, 1685:13, 1685:34, 1706:25, 1706:36, 1707:11, 1708:47	needs [2] - 1744:13, 1746:29
mentioned [2] - 1730:45, 1741:1	Minister [17] - 1626:30, 1647:7, 1650:40, 1654:30, 1654:31, 1655:3, 1718:12, 1718:24, 1719:19, 1719:22, 1719:26, 1719:33, 1719:39, 1719:47, 1720:21, 1721:13, 1721:36	moment [21] - 1632:6, 1637:5, 1639:7, 1640:35, 1641:33, 1641:45, 1642:21, 1642:36, 1653:41, 1662:7, 1692:11, 1694:15, 1694:17, 1694:18, 1694:35, 1724:36, 1728:47, 1734:33, 1738:7, 1739:11, 1747:18	murdered [1] - 1678:1	negative [1] - 1666:41
mentioning [1] - 1665:5	mindset [1] - 1710:37	momentum [1] - 1726:9	murders [10] - 1637:41, 1666:12, 1666:26, 1669:29, 1674:41, 1675:18, 1679:38, 1680:4, 1682:39, 1726:34	Neiwand [20] - 1627:9, 1627:47, 1636:37, 1636:46, 1637:8, 1640:11, 1710:4, 1710:6, 1710:11, 1710:15, 1710:18, 1710:22, 1710:30, 1710:40, 1741:29, 1746:16, 1746:23, 1747:1, 1747:25, 1748:11
merely [1] - 1708:14	Minister's [1] - 1718:46	Monday [2] - 1620:25, 1649:22	must [3] - 1636:14, 1712:13, 1723:31	Neiwand's [1] - 1636:43
met [4] - 1633:10, 1633:26, 1692:14, 1740:39	minute [8] - 1651:31, 1660:34, 1667:9, 1667:19, 1667:34, 1667:36, 1708:30, 1713:28	month [3] - 1670:29, 1671:14, 1671:35	Mykkeltvedt [2] - 1620:37, 1621:22	neutral [1] - 1678:6
methodology [4] - 1727:24, 1733:4, 1746:8, 1746:13	minutes [10] - 1621:17, 1621:18, 1621:23, 1621:31, 1621:32, 1668:5, 1695:10, 1744:12, 1746:17, 1747:33	months [13] - 1626:45, 1627:8, 1637:37, 1642:34, 1642:35, 1648:21, 1660:13, 1695:30, 1702:20, 1726:11, 1726:17, 1726:19, 1733:3	name [3] - 1677:9, 1684:24, 1746:34	never [7] - 1632:2, 1639:29, 1645:20, 1651:17, 1712:25, 1721:35, 1734:34
meticulously [1] - 1663:23	misadventure [6] - 1625:13, 1689:7, 1689:28, 1689:30, 1701:32, 1703:9	morning [5] - 1621:7, 1621:15, 1658:15, 1658:36, 1658:40	named [1] - 1643:42	nevertheless [4] - 1628:13, 1701:35, 1716:31, 1716:32
Michael [3] - 1622:41, 1628:30, 1658:22	miscommunication [1] - 1662:37	Morning [2] - 1624:27, 1666:12	namely [18] - 1622:14, 1622:33, 1629:45, 1630:44, 1646:13, 1651:46, 1667:1, 1671:35, 1683:13, 1692:9, 1693:36, 1695:31, 1702:5, 1703:9, 1709:2, 1709:3, 1733:3, 1735:13	New [1] - 1620:21
MICHAEL [1] - 1623:3	misinterpreted [1] - 1652:11	month [3] - 1670:29, 1671:14, 1671:35	names [2] - 1652:1, 1693:19	new [12] - 1622:30, 1628:29, 1637:11, 1647:31, 1647:33, 1706:18, 1707:3, 1707:15, 1707:18, 1707:45, 1709:11, 1709:12
Mick [3] - 1652:2, 1652:30, 1652:31		months [13] - 1626:45, 1627:8, 1637:37, 1642:34, 1642:35, 1648:21, 1660:13, 1695:30, 1702:20, 1726:11, 1726:17, 1726:19, 1733:3	Nash [1] - 1620:33	next [22] - 1622:41, 1628:44, 1633:2,
microphone [1] - 1665:18		morning [9] - 1622:25, 1649:46, 1650:2, 1650:4, 1667:41, 1675:33, 1691:47, 1694:34, 1748:34	National [1] - 1650:42	
mid [2] - 1624:32, 1627:42		most [11] - 1625:9, 1625:17, 1625:23, 1626:24, 1634:6, 1647:40, 1659:32, 1659:36, 1675:23, 1684:35, 1701:35	nature [2] - 1643:11, 1746:36	
middle [2] - 1717:2, 1717:29		mother [1] - 1687:34	near [8] - 1632:23,	
might [35] - 1623:39, 1624:42, 1625:37, 1631:7, 1641:41, 1649:38, 1654:9, 1654:34, 1656:2, 1656:5, 1659:29, 1661:42, 1666:31, 1672:44, 1674:33, 1687:14, 1694:27, 1698:26, 1705:25,				

N

- 1634:28, 1635:41,
1644:37, 1645:36,
1645:38, 1649:27,
1649:39, 1650:41,
1654:29, 1655:9,
1680:47, 1681:42,
1687:12, 1687:43,
1689:40, 1693:42,
1719:46, 1735:45,
1739:34
night [13] - 1625:46,
1626:11, 1649:22,
1649:38, 1654:24,
1686:12, 1687:19,
1687:21, 1692:44,
1711:18, 1711:30,
1712:3, 1718:33
nine [2] - 1674:37,
1733:18
nineteen [1] - 1739:45
ninthly [1] - 1627:8
nitpicking [1] - 1659:9
non [2] - 1622:26,
1622:34
non-publication [2] -
1622:26, 1622:34
none [2] - 1701:31,
1741:37
nonetheless [3] -
1633:16, 1685:31,
1694:20
normally [2] -
1731:23, 1731:24
North [2] - 1644:7,
1716:18
note [3] - 1668:39,
1681:12, 1688:9
notes [6] - 1655:39,
1655:40, 1655:44,
1655:45, 1682:25,
1688:21
nothing [1] - 1686:44
notwithstanding [4] -
1678:13, 1685:30,
1685:31, 1747:11
November [10] -
1623:32, 1623:33,
1628:36, 1628:39,
1638:4, 1638:13,
1686:31, 1700:34,
1701:20, 1711:21
nowhere [2] -
1642:39, 1642:42
NPL.0013.0001.0001
[1] - 1661:11
NPL.0015.0001.0009
[1] - 1747:36
NPL.0113.0001.0156
[1] - 1681:1
NPL.0115.0002.8325
_0001] [1] - 1704:39
NPL.0129.0001.0001
_0001] [1] - 1734:10
NPL.3000.0014_0001
[1] - 1648:34
NSW [4] - 1620:37,
1637:21, 1657:35,
1723:40
number [27] -
1634:14, 1655:18,
1670:15, 1677:30,
1677:31, 1677:32,
1677:34, 1679:18,
1680:39, 1684:11,
1693:20, 1697:14,
1698:25, 1710:43,
1713:14, 1717:19,
1732:16, 1732:45,
1738:10, 1740:6,
1740:9, 1741:12,
1741:15, 1742:15,
1742:19
numbered [1] -
1693:43
numbers [8] - 1742:1,
1742:14, 1742:18,
1742:31, 1743:9,
1743:19, 1743:37,
1744:14
numerous [1] -
1664:14
-
- O**
-
- o'clock** [2] - 1690:30,
1690:35
object [5] - 1689:12,
1702:12, 1736:27,
1738:21, 1742:44
objecting [1] - 1743:2
objection [3] -
1736:29, 1738:23,
1742:47
observations [1] -
1676:47
obtained [1] - 1677:22
obvious [1] - 1679:28
obviously [10] -
1629:46, 1634:1,
1662:11, 1670:7,
1673:33, 1686:25,
1718:7, 1737:47,
1742:1, 1746:12
occasion [3] -
1655:34, 1656:27,
1656:30
occasions [2] -
1691:27, 1720:22
occupied [1] -
1631:15
occur [4] - 1654:46,
1670:16, 1674:42,
1731:24
occurred [15] -
1639:8, 1640:19,
1644:42, 1645:22,
1652:25, 1652:39,
1670:17, 1698:21,
1715:6, 1720:12,
1723:12, 1723:13,
1724:1, 1740:23,
1741:26
occurring [5] -
1641:23, 1651:15,
1675:17, 1742:26,
1747:26
occurs [1] - 1731:19
October [14] - 1627:9,
1627:47, 1628:1,
1660:13, 1660:23,
1661:18, 1667:2,
1701:20, 1701:29,
1701:41, 1746:23,
1746:43, 1747:8,
1747:45
odd [1] - 1684:10
OF [1] - 1748:36
offences [2] -
1664:15, 1690:1
offered [1] - 1665:6
office [9] - 1630:43,
1637:35, 1637:38,
1696:36, 1717:38,
1718:7, 1720:22,
1720:26, 1726:41
Office [1] - 1657:34
officer [7] - 1630:37,
1643:10, 1655:35,
1657:24, 1663:18,
1663:33, 1737:21
Officer [1] - 1657:11
officers [5] - 1659:17,
1705:19, 1724:1,
1733:26, 1746:9
offline [2] - 1628:29,
1629:26
often [3] - 1684:36,
1723:47, 1744:18
OIC [2] - 1657:47
Olen [21] - 1647:5,
1648:20, 1648:38,
1648:45, 1649:15,
1650:31, 1650:36,
1653:18, 1653:46,
1654:42, 1655:3,
1655:36, 1704:41,
1705:2, 1705:7,
1705:23, 1719:29,
1719:30, 1719:41,
1726:40, 1747:40
Olen's [1] - 1655:19
on-call [1] - 1638:39
once [5] - 1672:31,
1720:25, 1725:22,
1725:29, 1725:39
Once [1] - 1725:2
one [72] - 1625:36,
1627:12, 1627:16,
1636:20, 1638:5,
1641:12, 1643:4,
1643:37, 1648:38,
1650:7, 1651:19,
1652:45, 1658:11,
1658:15, 1659:36,
1673:25, 1676:45,
1679:42, 1680:4,
1681:7, 1683:44,
1686:18, 1686:44,
1687:9, 1689:17,
1692:22, 1697:2,
1698:30, 1698:41,
1700:9, 1702:37,
1703:25, 1703:32,
1703:33, 1705:35,
1705:40, 1705:42,
1706:6, 1712:37,
1718:45, 1722:18,
1723:32, 1724:2,
1724:3, 1725:21,
1725:22, 1728:36,
1728:38, 1728:47,
1729:9, 1731:47,
1734:34, 1734:44,
1734:47, 1735:4,
1735:7, 1735:24,
1735:28, 1735:31,
1735:35, 1735:36,
1736:45, 1736:46,
1737:5, 1739:19,
1740:35, 1740:36,
1744:29, 1745:31,
1746:8, 1748:17
ones [8] - 1666:14,
1666:24, 1666:25,
1674:7, 1680:20,
1702:5, 1709:2,
1742:6
ongoing [5] - 1629:32,
1635:47, 1640:20,
1685:21, 1707:19
onwards [2] - 1663:3,
1705:47
open [25] - 1624:11,
1625:32, 1641:9,
1642:28, 1644:17,
1645:11, 1648:47,
1650:44, 1651:6,
1651:13, 1653:19,
1676:45, 1676:46,
1685:33, 1692:2,
1692:22, 1698:41,
1701:36, 1701:41,
1702:23, 1702:26,
1702:27, 1702:33,
1705:35, 1710:41
open-ended [1] -
1710:41
opened [1] - 1626:9
opening [1] - 1711:22
openly [2] - 1720:20,
1720:26
opens [1] - 1725:24
Operandi [1] - 1633:7
operation [5] -
1629:47, 1631:5,
1643:42, 1664:33,
1665:10
Operation [6] -
1630:8, 1630:41,
1631:11, 1639:16,
1670:36, 1687:14
opinion [4] - 1625:17,
1625:22, 1625:39,
1736:38
opportunities [2] -
1684:41, 1684:42
opportunity [3] -
1621:31, 1640:5,
1664:31
oppose [1] - 1698:24
opposing [1] - 1700:8
option [1] - 1685:13
oral [2] - 1697:34,
1700:23
order [1] - 1621:32
orders [7] - 1621:8,
1621:33, 1622:26,
1622:34, 1667:39,
1667:42, 1686:5
ordinarily [1] -
1709:17
organise [1] - 1667:41
organised [1] - 1668:5
orientate [1] - 1739:2
original [8] - 1626:17,
1641:5, 1647:34,
1649:30, 1657:47,
1714:16, 1715:4,
1715:18
originally [1] -
1630:11
otherwise [5] -
1630:42, 1651:42,
1670:47, 1683:28,
1730:26
outcome [6] -
1636:46, 1661:7,
1701:11, 1705:25,
1705:26, 1730:7
outcomes [1] -

- 1731:43
outline [1] - 1726:29
outlined [5] - 1625:11, 1625:19, 1639:17, 1639:19, 1726:41
outs [1] - 1715:5
outset [1] - 1659:40
outside [1] - 1673:30
outstanding [4] - 1621:6, 1635:45, 1636:21, 1667:46
overall [1] - 1713:10
overarching [1] - 1669:19
overlapping [4] - 1673:7, 1673:19, 1673:38, 1674:6
overlooked [1] - 1658:37
overly [1] - 1718:44
overturned [1] - 1641:6
own [10] - 1623:10, 1643:5, 1689:6, 1689:13, 1705:47, 1727:28, 1728:17, 1730:16, 1731:5, 1742:34
-
- P**
-
- Page** [5] - 1622:20, 1622:21, 1622:31, 1630:7, 1663:25
page [80] - 1632:10, 1632:13, 1632:33, 1635:38, 1635:41, 1636:7, 1646:4, 1648:38, 1649:19, 1649:27, 1649:44, 1654:13, 1657:1, 1657:40, 1659:16, 1661:15, 1661:16, 1661:17, 1662:12, 1662:17, 1662:21, 1662:26, 1662:30, 1663:3, 1663:10, 1663:14, 1664:26, 1665:33, 1665:39, 1668:17, 1669:2, 1669:22, 1678:19, 1679:34, 1679:35, 1683:21, 1686:30, 1686:34, 1687:4, 1690:43, 1692:38, 1693:32, 1693:41, 1696:17, 1702:47, 1704:41, 1706:9, 1713:47, 1714:14, 1714:28, 1714:34, 1715:34, 1716:11, 1716:13, 1716:21, 1716:36, 1717:2, 1717:3, 1717:29, 1717:43, 1718:19, 1718:38, 1719:46, 1734:21, 1734:25, 1735:42, 1735:45, 1736:2, 1739:3, 1739:19, 1739:34, 1741:36, 1743:36, 1743:38, 1744:33
Page's [1] - 1639:26
pages [12] - 1621:26, 1639:27, 1686:25, 1686:40, 1687:5, 1687:12, 1694:3, 1694:14, 1694:15, 1739:3, 1739:15
palace [2] - 1669:16, 1669:19
Palmer [1] - 1620:31
Pam [5] - 1698:3, 1698:6, 1712:15, 1715:2, 1724:2
Pamela [46] - 1624:47, 1626:12, 1638:28, 1648:39, 1649:43, 1650:36, 1651:25, 1651:42, 1655:4, 1655:34, 1657:6, 1657:15, 1657:23, 1657:25, 1657:46, 1658:11, 1659:41, 1661:27, 1676:31, 1681:8, 1685:40, 1687:13, 1688:16, 1688:21, 1691:17, 1711:34, 1711:40, 1713:42, 1714:15, 1714:29, 1715:2, 1715:38, 1716:24, 1716:40, 1717:1, 1717:9, 1718:1, 1718:6, 1718:11, 1720:20, 1722:13, 1722:27, 1722:38, 1723:5, 1723:24, 1724:18
panic [1] - 1718:31
Paper [1] - 1671:21
paper [34] - 1645:45, 1671:36, 1672:3, 1681:1, 1681:45, 1682:22, 1682:35, 1683:1, 1683:20, 1693:26, 1693:27, 1693:28, 1693:33, 1695:31, 1717:25, 1726:37, 1726:42, 1726:46, 1727:7, 1727:20, 1729:1, 1731:14, 1731:18, 1731:46, 1731:47, 1732:9, 1732:27, 1732:28, 1736:24, 1736:25, 1737:31, 1737:32, 1747:39
paragraph [47] - 1634:28, 1646:42, 1647:11, 1648:15, 1649:37, 1650:38, 1653:46, 1654:22, 1654:45, 1655:16, 1655:20, 1655:24, 1656:6, 1658:25, 1658:33, 1659:32, 1659:44, 1660:40, 1662:31, 1672:11, 1672:19, 1672:21, 1672:42, 1673:2, 1674:30, 1675:32, 1685:1, 1687:43, 1688:6, 1688:23, 1690:24, 1690:43, 1691:1, 1692:38, 1692:40, 1693:43, 1695:35, 1696:18, 1696:42, 1702:47, 1703:4, 1706:9, 1724:40, 1730:21, 1747:21, 1748:10
paragraphs [11] - 1628:5, 1633:21, 1664:2, 1672:16, 1683:20, 1687:26, 1687:44, 1689:25, 1689:40, 1694:14, 1694:20
paraphrasing [3] - 1624:36, 1637:9, 1716:8
pardon [3] - 1641:32, 1648:34, 1665:41
Park [7] - 1632:16, 1632:23, 1632:35, 1662:22, 1664:15, 1690:19, 1691:41
Parliament [2] - 1740:38, 1740:40
Parliamentary [2] - 1745:32, 1745:35
Parrabell [33] - 1626:46, 1627:29, 1627:43, 1670:37, 1670:41, 1671:10, 1726:3, 1727:3, 1727:25, 1727:29, 1730:15, 1730:28, 1730:40, 1731:1, 1731:15, 1731:31, 1732:19, 1732:25, 1732:41, 1733:4, 1733:25, 1736:14, 1737:21, 1737:37, 1737:46, 1738:18, 1740:19, 1740:33, 1741:33, 1742:15, 1744:40, 1745:23, 1746:5
Parrabell's [1] - 1744:34
part [29] - 1621:41, 1622:9, 1625:47, 1634:6, 1658:6, 1661:4, 1666:1, 1668:39, 1668:43, 1670:2, 1672:11, 1674:41, 1677:18, 1691:17, 1693:42, 1701:22, 1702:2, 1707:27, 1710:33, 1713:9, 1713:41, 1713:42, 1714:28, 1731:40, 1731:41, 1731:45, 1733:39, 1736:32, 1736:33
partially [2] - 1687:1, 1735:12
participate [1] - 1721:4
participated [2] - 1649:21, 1653:8
particular [22] - 1632:5, 1640:25, 1643:20, 1650:38, 1658:4, 1666:27, 1667:38, 1673:9, 1674:47, 1695:44, 1696:20, 1699:39, 1705:26, 1716:25, 1725:16, 1725:21, 1733:10, 1734:4, 1734:5, 1734:14, 1735:35, 1745:44
particularly [2] - 1675:2, 1733:9
parties [1] - 1701:19
parts [1] - 1632:7
passage [4] - 1643:32, 1644:37, 1664:28, 1714:13
past [1] - 1725:45
path [3] - 1707:12, 1707:46, 1709:1
pattern [9] - 1673:5, 1673:14, 1673:15, 1673:18, 1674:5, 1674:30, 1674:41, 1674:45, 1690:5
patterns [1] - 1673:38
Paul [3] - 1624:27, 1658:18, 1666:11
pausing [4] - 1630:17, 1632:20, 1683:47, 1697:46
Payne [1] - 1677:32
Penelope [6] - 1657:10, 1657:19, 1657:47, 1658:11, 1698:4, 1698:7
penny [1] - 1698:7
Penny [4] - 1705:3, 1722:34, 1722:35, 1746:39
people [21] - 1634:18, 1646:19, 1650:14, 1650:16, 1652:17, 1656:31, 1657:2, 1659:5, 1659:44, 1662:13, 1663:11, 1664:22, 1676:20, 1711:17, 1713:14, 1717:5, 1718:45, 1741:12, 1741:15
perceived [2] - 1676:44, 1704:2
perception [1] - 1708:38
perfect [1] - 1742:12
perfectly [2] - 1688:8, 1698:14
perhaps [18] - 1632:10, 1634:8, 1634:23, 1654:13, 1667:40, 1667:41, 1692:21, 1695:3, 1705:30, 1709:29, 1712:37, 1720:15, 1722:22, 1726:2, 1729:5, 1738:32, 1746:28, 1746:33
period [10] - 1623:42, 1624:32, 1624:38, 1628:20, 1628:39, 1629:39, 1701:13, 1707:28, 1740:27, 1741:21
permanently [1] - 1629:3
permission [1] - 1712:25
permitted [1] - 1723:39
perpetrated [1] - 1635:4
perpetrators [5] - 1673:7, 1673:19, 1673:39, 1674:7, 1674:33

person ^[15] - 1623:38, 1628:44, 1633:27, 1633:44, 1635:4, 1635:13, 1638:23, 1642:46, 1649:39, 1661:29, 1691:26, 1711:2, 1724:6, 1734:14, 1747:3	1628:5, 1633:17, 1635:42, 1636:5, 1636:12, 1645:18, 1647:29, 1648:7, 1653:29, 1659:4, 1667:39, 1670:4, 1670:17, 1673:15, 1678:25, 1679:17, 1680:1, 1683:47, 1684:39, 1687:47, 1701:23, 1706:2, 1707:23, 1707:25, 1723:1, 1727:36, 1727:37, 1729:16	1694:28, 1694:37, 1697:39, 1698:23, 1699:6, 1699:17, 1699:34, 1699:37, 1699:44, 1714:14, 1725:22, 1747:14	prepare ^[2] - 1628:30, 1670:45	1633:9, 1692:10, 1692:17
person(s) ^[1] - 1663:35	1680:1, 1683:47, 1684:39, 1687:47, 1701:23, 1706:2, 1707:23, 1707:25, 1723:1, 1727:36, 1727:37, 1729:16	positions ^[1] - 1638:36	prepared ^[3] - 1625:2, 1660:19, 1731:40	probable ^[7] - 1679:37, 1679:45, 1680:3, 1683:4, 1683:17, 1717:17, 1745:11
personal ^[1] - 1705:47	1680:1, 1683:47, 1684:39, 1687:47, 1701:23, 1706:2, 1707:23, 1707:25, 1723:1, 1727:36, 1727:37, 1729:16	positive ^[2] - 1644:27, 1691:27	preparing ^[3] - 1628:28, 1636:46, 1655:45	problem ^[5] - 1643:2, 1643:24, 1653:43, 1666:5, 1694:45
personally ^[1] - 1726:36	1680:1, 1683:47, 1684:39, 1687:47, 1701:23, 1706:2, 1707:23, 1707:25, 1723:1, 1727:36, 1727:37, 1729:16	possibilities ^[6] - 1644:40, 1678:7, 1701:31, 1703:3, 1703:5, 1705:35	presence ^[2] - 1736:18, 1741:11	proceedure ^[1] - 1623:6
personnel ^[1] - 1657:39	1680:1, 1683:47, 1684:39, 1687:47, 1701:23, 1706:2, 1707:23, 1707:25, 1723:1, 1727:36, 1727:37, 1729:16	possibility ^[18] - 1634:33, 1672:45, 1674:41, 1679:28, 1687:38, 1688:5, 1688:12, 1688:21, 1688:22, 1688:30, 1688:33, 1689:7, 1689:34, 1691:31, 1703:17, 1703:21, 1703:25, 1715:47	present ^[15] - 1655:2, 1656:15, 1658:44, 1697:36, 1698:35, 1698:45, 1698:47, 1720:10, 1724:1, 1724:2, 1724:3, 1726:40, 1741:5, 1741:12, 1741:15	proceedures ^[2] - 1645:14, 1646:13
persons ^[14] - 1633:27, 1633:28, 1633:44, 1634:3, 1634:14, 1635:5, 1635:13, 1647:36, 1662:33, 1662:41, 1664:32, 1704:1, 1710:43, 1711:2	Point ^[1] - 1644:8	possible ^[13] - 1649:38, 1678:15, 1679:20, 1679:38, 1679:46, 1680:3, 1683:4, 1683:16, 1687:35, 1717:18, 1726:34, 1743:14, 1745:11	Present ^[1] - 1620:35	proceedings ^[6] - 1622:24, 1686:6, 1697:47, 1700:32, 1700:33, 1728:11
perspective ^[1] - 1666:42	points ^[4] - 1679:34, 1682:15, 1688:8, 1742:29	possibly ^[6] - 1669:12, 1669:13, 1728:19, 1729:5, 1729:22, 1744:26	presented ^[1] - 1625:33	process ^[4] - 1642:39, 1671:10, 1684:38, 1748:20
persuaded ^[1] - 1703:39	police ^[40] - 1626:17, 1629:35, 1630:37, 1632:36, 1643:42, 1645:13, 1646:13, 1666:35, 1666:40, 1666:41, 1682:20, 1691:1, 1691:8, 1691:14, 1699:2, 1699:7, 1704:21, 1704:43, 1705:19, 1706:13, 1707:11, 1707:24, 1708:47, 1709:17, 1709:38, 1713:10, 1714:3, 1714:23, 1715:22, 1717:14, 1718:44, 1722:23, 1723:14, 1724:1, 1725:31, 1727:8, 1731:22, 1739:4, 1739:12	potential ^[2] - 1641:41, 1694:30	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	processes ^[1] - 1731:40
pertaining ^[1] - 1639:31	Police ^[26] - 1620:38, 1626:29, 1631:19, 1631:26, 1637:21, 1637:28, 1637:35, 1647:6, 1652:32, 1654:30, 1654:31, 1655:2, 1657:35, 1694:13, 1697:23, 1697:39, 1698:11, 1699:33, 1707:3, 1709:12, 1718:24, 1720:21, 1721:13, 1721:36, 1723:40, 1731:41	potentially ^[6] - 1643:11, 1649:31, 1673:6, 1673:19, 1674:6, 1694:31	pressure ^[3] - 1667:38, 1684:14, 1707:47	produced ^[6] - 1661:45, 1666:47, 1671:21, 1671:24, 1671:36, 1672:3
Peter ^[6] - 1620:30, 1669:39, 1669:41, 1670:2, 1677:31, 1706:29	police's ^[1] - 1714:16	practical ^[1] - 1643:6	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	producing ^[1] - 1682:1
phone ^[4] - 1647:10, 1648:20, 1653:45, 1713:32	position ^[25] - 1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	precise ^[3] - 1633:41, 1634:38, 1635:25	presented ^[1] - 1625:33	product ^[2] - 1668:38, 1668:39
physical ^[1] - 1686:13	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	precisely ^[1] - 1674:31	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	professionally ^[1] - 1700:43
physically ^[1] - 1628:17	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	precursor ^[1] - 1670:13	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	Professor ^[2] - 1740:42, 1741:17
pick ^[1] - 1738:33	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	prefer ^[1] - 1625:36	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	program ^[7] - 1624:16, 1626:13, 1654:19, 1655:12, 1713:22, 1713:42, 1714:33
picks ^[1] - 1717:44	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	preferred ^[2] - 1676:31, 1676:37	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	progress ^[4] - 1640:20, 1701:7, 1740:33
piece ^[1] - 1645:45	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	prejudice ^[1] - 1694:31	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	project ^[1] - 1671:6
pinning ^[1] - 1726:22	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	Premier ^[5] - 1682:2, 1682:36, 1684:1, 1731:47, 1732:28	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	prominently ^[1] - 1666:14
place ^[6] - 1621:10, 1638:2, 1643:18, 1654:42, 1691:38, 1710:31	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,	preparation ^[2] - 1647:17, 1734:38	pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	promoted ^[2] - 1628:34, 1629:7
placed ^[2] - 1623:12, 1694:17	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	proof ^[1] - 1735:13
placing ^[1] - 1643:10	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	properly ^[2] - 1675:8, 1737:1
planned ^[1] - 1720:42	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	proposal ^[1] - 1655:18
play ^[5] - 1633:24, 1678:47, 1679:2, 1679:9, 1679:18	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	proposed ^[2] - 1621:6, 1621:32
played ^[1] - 1658:6	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	proposition ^[2] - 1721:40, 1724:12
plea ^[3] - 1642:18, 1642:29, 1642:47	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	Prosecutions ^[2] - 1629:8, 1642:12
pleases ^[1] - 1667:24	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	protocols ^[3] -
plural ^[1] - 1723:20	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	
point ^[31] - 1621:32, 1621:45, 1627:39,	1621:46, 1629:3, 1629:6, 1629:19, 1638:29, 1655:41, 1657:25, 1659:21, 1671:5, 1676:44, 1682:34, 1694:18,		pressing ^[1] - 1716:24	

1645:14, 1646:13,
1646:14
proved [1] - 1736:47
provide [2] - 1665:8,
1731:8
provided [6] -
1657:28, 1670:44,
1686:23, 1710:7,
1734:37, 1736:33
Public [1] - 1642:12
public [9] - 1621:42,
1631:6, 1639:39,
1696:29, 1731:17,
1731:32, 1732:5,
1732:25, 1732:27
publication [2] -
1622:26, 1622:34
publicity [6] - 1631:6,
1637:42, 1643:19,
1647:7, 1666:41,
1722:18
publicly [4] - 1651:5,
1699:7, 1699:25,
1723:6
publish [3] - 1621:7,
1621:14, 1621:30
published [2] -
1627:34, 1745:24
pure [1] - 1642:15
purely [1] - 1678:6
purpose [2] - 1710:21,
1731:33
purposely [1] -
1710:27
purposes [1] -
1623:21
pursue [1] - 1724:35
purview [1] - 1641:19
put [32] - 1625:15,
1625:25, 1625:47,
1639:45, 1641:26,
1650:9, 1651:20,
1651:41, 1653:5,
1656:13, 1666:47,
1675:13, 1679:12,
1682:34, 1697:38,
1698:30, 1698:37,
1699:20, 1699:25,
1699:38, 1700:6,
1700:12, 1702:5,
1706:12, 1707:27,
1707:47, 1737:47,
1738:26, 1738:37,
1743:19, 1743:36
puts [1] - 1689:46
putting [9] - 1626:36,
1634:38, 1635:25,
1659:47, 1684:18,
1697:5, 1708:13,
1728:47, 1738:32

Q

questions [8] -
1674:40, 1685:47,
1686:27, 1686:47,
1694:19, 1694:29,
1713:43, 1734:19
queue [1] - 1646:28
quickly [1] - 1722:14
quite [13] - 1651:41,
1652:46, 1655:46,
1663:3, 1685:30,
1697:14, 1698:10,
1707:23, 1711:25,
1731:9, 1731:10,
1732:20, 1736:32
quote [1] - 1723:24
quoted [3] - 1714:1,
1723:33, 1723:41
quotes [4] - 1688:20,
1688:41, 1689:2,
1690:15
quoting [2] - 1689:37,
1739:38

R

raised [4] - 1639:40,
1654:14, 1694:25,
1695:18
ramification [1] -
1722:26
ran [1] - 1723:11
rang [5] - 1713:35,
1718:46, 1719:7,
1719:19, 1719:20
range [4] - 1628:6,
1690:2, 1699:32
rank [3] - 1628:40,
1638:40, 1638:42
rate [9] - 1629:25,
1631:11, 1636:20,
1669:11, 1679:34,
1687:12, 1700:22,
1732:40, 1739:33
rated [2] - 1646:45,
1649:7
rather [7] - 1661:16,
1692:35, 1695:14,
1707:35, 1737:7,
1738:11, 1743:3
rating [1] - 1648:2
rationale [1] - 1745:3
rationalise [1] -
1745:15
re [2] - 1644:17,
1747:47
re-investigate [1] -
1747:47
re-open [1] - 1644:17

reach [1] - 1698:40
reached [6] - 1621:46,
1700:11, 1705:34,
1715:28, 1719:27
reaction [1] - 1704:25
read [20] - 1625:27,
1625:41, 1625:44,
1625:46, 1634:47,
1637:12, 1648:46,
1648:47, 1652:1,
1669:12, 1681:17,
1686:12, 1687:33,
1703:31, 1704:7,
1705:3, 1715:33,
1734:33, 1735:8,
1737:21
readable [1] - 1694:10
reader [1] - 1692:26
readily [1] - 1703:36
reading [6] - 1632:44,
1649:36, 1655:45,
1670:44, 1689:12,
1710:7
reads [1] - 1747:12
ready [1] - 1622:40
reaffirm [1] - 1714:16
reaffirmed [1] -
1689:46
real [1] - 1659:21
reality [1] - 1643:6
really [8] - 1651:19,
1662:46, 1665:19,
1680:33, 1685:16,
1687:30, 1695:14,
1748:14
reason [8] - 1641:12,
1641:14, 1641:39,
1645:25, 1659:25,
1661:8, 1707:44,
1711:6
reasonable [11] -
1733:35, 1735:13,
1736:19, 1736:46,
1736:47, 1737:23,
1737:28, 1738:27,
1738:34, 1742:10,
1743:17
reasoning [1] -
1674:23
reasons [8] - 1621:7,
1621:15, 1621:30,
1625:11, 1657:15,
1657:47, 1694:34,
1706:7
reattached [1] -
1665:20
receive [1] - 1640:30
received [8] - 1621:43,
1622:22, 1640:15,
1640:28, 1681:14,

1682:8, 1712:7,
1712:15
receiving [1] -
1730:13
recent [3] - 1625:44,
1642:47, 1643:15
recognition [1] -
1744:11
recollection [18] -
1636:30, 1638:19,
1639:46, 1647:3,
1648:22, 1659:2,
1659:31, 1661:5,
1670:3, 1670:16,
1673:40, 1673:45,
1679:43, 1700:19,
1702:2, 1719:26,
1733:41, 1734:34
recommendation [10]
- 1635:43, 1636:24,
1636:28, 1637:18,
1637:21, 1637:33,
1649:3, 1664:28,
1664:38, 1704:20
recommendations
[11] - 1628:31,
1631:43, 1635:37,
1637:24, 1637:29,
1637:36, 1661:34,
1663:15, 1665:30,
1669:2, 1701:43
recommended [1] -
1745:36
record [15] - 1643:10,
1650:9, 1653:11,
1668:38, 1668:39,
1669:5, 1669:9,
1669:19, 1695:24,
1712:45, 1724:21,
1724:30, 1737:31,
1746:37, 1746:38
recorded [2] -
1711:37, 1711:38
recording [1] -
1648:45
records [14] -
1647:17, 1659:30,
1677:33, 1678:22,
1678:33, 1679:4,
1679:5, 1679:7,
1679:13, 1679:19,
1679:29, 1679:32,
1745:13, 1747:3
recounted [1] -
1643:27
recounting [1] -
1696:13
redacted [13] -
1625:46, 1641:28,
1643:32, 1644:37,

1686:7, 1686:26,
1686:35, 1686:40,
1686:41, 1687:1,
1687:9, 1693:19,
1694:5
redaction [2] -
1622:34, 1641:38
redactions [6] -
1621:9, 1621:47,
1622:26, 1686:8,
1746:3, 1694:7
refer [6] - 1645:11,
1647:29, 1660:40,
1664:22, 1690:5,
1736:44
Reference [5] -
1656:45, 1745:45,
1746:3, 1746:38,
1748:28
reference [6] -
1654:22, 1672:27,
1688:29, 1688:33,
1705:23, 1718:8
referenced [1] -
1690:13
referencing [1] -
1717:24
referred [5] - 1623:11,
1636:1, 1637:20,
1646:4, 1646:42
referring [14] -
1641:38, 1647:10,
1655:19, 1673:16,
1673:34, 1682:22,
1682:33, 1687:13,
1689:13, 1690:44,
1691:22, 1718:6,
1738:25, 1748:21
refers [7] - 1682:26,
1689:26, 1689:45,
1690:15, 1693:5,
1703:3, 1704:11
reflect [1] - 1740:18
reflecting [1] -
1662:45
refuses [1] - 1642:25
regard [1] - 1659:45
regarded [3] -
1624:42, 1722:39,
1741:37
regarding [1] - 1691:2
regardless [1] -
1639:8
Region [1] - 1658:41
regional [1] - 1638:47
regularly [1] - 1661:6
reinvestigate [4] -
1626:31, 1627:13,
1680:30, 1727:4
reinvestigating [1] -

- 1705:20
reinvestigation [3] - 1664:4, 1684:43, 1707:31
reject [1] - 1710:21
rejected [1] - 1724:12
rejects [1] - 1724:24
relate [2] - 1687:14, 1688:42
related [9] - 1627:4, 1641:13, 1682:39, 1689:28, 1689:30, 1727:21, 1742:20, 1743:24
relates [1] - 1690:8
relating [2] - 1625:1, 1640:20
relation [19] - 1621:6, 1633:24, 1642:3, 1642:17, 1656:24, 1663:40, 1664:33, 1667:42, 1675:12, 1678:47, 1699:3, 1699:5, 1699:7, 1699:14, 1701:43, 1708:39, 1715:4, 1732:10, 1741:25
relationship [3] - 1647:36, 1684:42, 1717:30
relatively [3] - 1625:44, 1733:2, 1742:19
release [3] - 1731:13, 1732:4, 1737:42
released [3] - 1732:7, 1737:38, 1737:39
relevant [4] - 1623:43, 1684:6, 1684:13, 1733:31
relieving [4] - 1628:21, 1655:35, 1655:40, 1719:29
rely [1] - 1623:9
remain [4] - 1635:19, 1686:7, 1714:23, 1739:26
remainder [1] - 1740:1
remained [2] - 1673:7, 1673:19
remaining [2] - 1741:37, 1746:17
remains [1] - 1634:32
remarks [3] - 1633:42, 1633:43, 1634:39
remember [10] - 1626:19, 1628:26, 1642:47, 1666:13, 1671:23, 1698:27, 1700:17, 1720:40, 1738:2
reminding [1] - 1746:27
remotely [1] - 1678:43
removed [2] - 1626:42, 1722:28
renamed [1] - 1671:9
repeat [1] - 1689:23
repeating [1] - 1730:9
repeats [1] - 1693:32
repercussions [1] - 1722:15
replaced [4] - 1628:20, 1628:23, 1707:6, 1722:34
report [30] - 1627:34, 1650:29, 1662:33, 1662:40, 1662:41, 1671:17, 1677:42, 1683:34, 1690:13, 1693:21, 1728:20, 1730:7, 1737:36, 1737:37, 1737:46, 1738:14, 1738:18, 1738:33, 1738:34, 1738:38, 1738:46, 1739:4, 1739:34, 1741:33, 1743:16, 1743:41, 1744:15, 1745:23, 1746:4, 1746:8
reported [3] - 1632:36, 1689:41, 1691:26
reporting [1] - 1637:36
reports [1] - 1640:20
represented [1] - 1631:19
request [5] - 1696:35, 1696:43, 1696:46, 1697:6, 1748:17
requested [2] - 1694:13, 1747:46
require [3] - 1640:36, 1659:27, 1659:28
required [3] - 1658:7, 1659:3, 1736:18
requirement [2] - 1733:35, 1742:10
requires [3] - 1736:45, 1736:46, 1737:20
requisite [1] - 1703:39
research [1] - 1628:28
resolved [1] - 1642:37
resolves [1] - 1642:23
resource [1] - 1646:36
resources [17] - 1656:26, 1656:33, 1657:41, 1658:5, 1658:38, 1659:1, 1671:6, 1673:10, 1684:8, 1684:15, 1684:18, 1684:26, 1698:33, 1700:10, 1700:26, 1704:13, 1719:42
resourcing [2] - 1659:24, 1748:28
respect [4] - 1680:13, 1699:30, 1732:45, 1736:39
respond [2] - 1666:41, 1721:16
responds [1] - 1705:2
response [4] - 1649:43, 1650:31, 1705:1, 1731:46
responsibilities [2] - 1628:6, 1638:6
responsibility [1] - 1629:34
responsible [5] - 1633:29, 1663:35, 1674:33, 1705:45, 1711:2
rest [3] - 1649:36, 1685:1, 1718:20
result [19] - 1631:5, 1642:8, 1643:45, 1644:16, 1655:45, 1684:25, 1695:24, 1699:17, 1700:11, 1700:27, 1703:40, 1703:47, 1709:3, 1710:47, 1713:32, 1719:43, 1731:27, 1732:20, 1732:21
resulted [3] - 1691:40, 1692:21, 1700:33
results [1] - 1731:31
retrieved [1] - 1684:45
return [1] - 1628:18
returned [3] - 1624:11, 1655:27, 1737:36
returns [1] - 1717:45
revealed [2] - 1673:4, 1682:38
Review [1] - 1734:13
review [5] [1] - 1627:3, 1646:45, 1647:15, 1648:15, 1650:26, 1651:32, 1651:37, 1651:38, 1652:16, 1652:25, 1652:31, 1652:39, 1654:14, 1655:18, 1655:21, 1660:15, 1660:33, 1660:34, 1662:11, 1667:2, 1668:43, 1669:5, 1669:12, 1669:29, 1669:42, 1670:2, 1670:4, 1670:42, 1671:10, 1671:32, 1673:4, 1676:21, 1680:29, 1684:38, 1685:22, 1726:32, 1726:38, 1726:42, 1726:43, 1726:46, 1727:7, 1727:20, 1731:33, 1732:46, 1736:24, 1736:25, 1737:32, 1739:8, 1740:37, 1740:43, 1742:27
reviewed [1] [1] - 1640:19, 1665:15, 1668:34, 1668:42, 1678:21, 1680:41, 1684:40, 1697:2, 1739:27, 1739:30, 1739:36
reviewer [1] - 1661:32
reviewers [1] - 1746:13
reviewing [3] - 1653:11, 1663:18, 1730:16
reviews [8] - 1650:12, 1651:47, 1661:6, 1669:20, 1670:16, 1680:31, 1731:5, 1733:16
revision [2] - 1744:13, 1744:37
revisit [1] - 1695:27
revived [1] - 1637:10
reward [2] - 1665:6, 1665:8
Richardson [2] - 1652:2, 1652:31
Rick [6] - 1624:27, 1666:18, 1670:30, 1672:17, 1681:21, 1693:2
rise [3] - 1695:9, 1722:14, 1746:21
robbery [2] - 1664:14, 1690:1
rocks [1] - 1635:13
role [3] - 1623:38, 1657:23, 1747:15
roles [1] - 1658:5
Ross [3] - 1630:12, 1663:21, 1669:29
roughly [6] - 1624:32, 1686:40, 1744:16, 1744:21, 1745:9, 1745:12
round [2] - 1635:34, 1635:35
Rowena [1] - 1705:4
Rudney [1] - 1677:31
ruled [2] - 1694:29, 1701:32
ruling [1] - 1642:16
Rullo [1] - 1658:18
run [3] - 1701:9, 1714:32, 1745:40
rung [1] - 1649:37
runs [1] - 1693:20
Russell [20] - 1630:12, 1632:22, 1633:10, 1633:25, 1633:30, 1635:9, 1639:32, 1662:12, 1662:18, 1663:22, 1664:5, 1664:34, 1664:47, 1669:30, 1669:35, 1677:32, 1684:19, 1688:37, 1689:1, 1748:2
Russell's [1] - 1633:6
-
- ## S
-
- Sackar** [1] - 1620:16
sake [5] - 1624:36, 1659:27, 1723:24, 1732:11, 1732:13
sat [1] - 1707:27
satisfied [3] - 1633:23, 1635:3, 1661:32
saw [8] - 1625:12, 1625:19, 1625:33, 1651:17, 1712:14, 1712:16, 1713:29, 1718:11
SC [2] - 1620:30, 1695:25
scale [1] - 1701:3
scenario [1] - 1678:15
scenarios [2] - 1625:31, 1625:37
scene [1] - 1624:1
Scipione [2] - 1707:6
SCOI.02632_0001 [1] [1] - 1738:45
SCOI.02751.00021_0001 [1] - 1631:42
SCOI.11064.000.00018_0001 [1] [1] - 1706:8
SCOI.11064.00018_0001 [1] - 1702:41
SCOI.74096 [1] - 1672:2
SCOI.74906.0001 [1] [1] - 1677:3
SCOI.76962.00001_

0001 [1] - 1746:30
SCOI.82018 [1] - 1657:34
SCOI.82369.0004_0001 [1] - 1695:47
Scott [43] - 1624:5, 1624:17, 1625:1, 1625:10, 1626:7, 1626:18, 1626:31, 1626:42, 1627:17, 1627:18, 1627:38, 1628:24, 1628:47, 1640:39, 1653:7, 1660:14, 1677:34, 1679:42, 1679:45, 1680:5, 1682:27, 1683:21, 1685:3, 1696:25, 1701:44, 1703:40, 1704:40, 1706:25, 1707:11, 1707:29, 1708:47, 1709:3, 1714:22, 1714:37, 1717:38, 1722:28, 1725:5, 1725:21, 1727:46, 1728:2, 1728:6, 1728:39, 1729:9
scratch [1] - 1640:12
screen [2] - 1623:11, 1694:16
screening [6] - 1646:45, 1647:15, 1650:29, 1653:11, 1670:4, 1683:34
second [24] - 1621:42, 1624:4, 1627:27, 1640:39, 1648:38, 1649:37, 1660:14, 1662:30, 1665:41, 1667:13, 1669:22, 1678:19, 1696:17, 1698:37, 1698:41, 1703:16, 1703:20, 1722:26, 1730:18, 1730:24, 1734:20, 1734:47, 1735:24, 1736:46
second-last [2] - 1649:37, 1678:19
secondly [7] - 1622:10, 1622:30, 1624:16, 1627:37, 1642:33, 1701:36, 1736:43
section [5] - 1661:21, 1662:21, 1662:26, 1687:4, 1739:12
sections [1] - 1687:1
see [99] - 1625:36, 1629:12, 1631:42, 1632:13, 1632:40, 1633:12, 1633:34, 1633:35, 1634:44, 1635:38, 1636:4, 1643:3, 1643:28, 1644:1, 1644:11, 1644:12, 1644:30, 1648:30, 1648:39, 1649:9, 1649:45, 1650:47, 1657:39, 1658:29, 1659:9, 1660:33, 1660:34, 1660:37, 1661:15, 1661:16, 1662:30, 1663:7, 1663:27, 1664:19, 1665:2, 1665:38, 1667:3, 1669:8, 1669:15, 1669:23, 1669:43, 1670:10, 1670:20, 1677:30, 1678:9, 1684:27, 1686:30, 1686:44, 1686:45, 1687:33, 1687:42, 1690:12, 1691:5, 1691:28, 1691:43, 1693:1, 1693:41, 1696:43, 1702:46, 1703:13, 1703:17, 1704:16, 1704:39, 1705:2, 1708:43, 1709:21, 1712:22, 1713:42, 1714:7, 1714:13, 1714:18, 1714:25, 1715:33, 1716:8, 1716:12, 1716:35, 1716:40, 1717:9, 1717:21, 1717:30, 1717:44, 1718:3, 1718:26, 1719:22, 1730:18, 1730:24, 1734:20, 1734:29, 1734:41, 1735:7, 1735:14, 1735:24, 1735:35, 1735:45, 1739:20, 1741:39, 1741:40, 1744:34, 1747:4
seed [1] - 1644:26
seeing [1] - 1631:47
seek [1] - 1665:22
seeking [1] - 1647:7
seem [1] - 1666:2
seemingly [3] - 1656:18, 1666:46, 1685:30
Senior [9] - 1620:30, 1620:33, 1647:16, 1651:38, 1653:12, 1658:18, 1658:21, 1660:19, 1663:18
sense [4] - 1699:38, 1705:31, 1709:43, 1742:12
sensed [1] - 1650:37
sentence [9] - 1632:14, 1633:2, 1641:38, 1643:29, 1644:1, 1646:3, 1692:19, 1704:19, 1730:24
sentences [1] - 1691:34
separate [2] - 1645:45, 1707:31
separately [1] - 1640:24
separation [1] - 1664:29
September [7] - 1630:47, 1671:26, 1671:27, 1671:28, 1671:35, 1680:13, 1681:14
sequence [1] - 1670:16
sergeant [2] - 1638:42, 1639:1
Sergeant [20] - 1622:20, 1622:21, 1630:7, 1657:10, 1658:15, 1658:36, 1663:25, 1668:34, 1669:39, 1669:41, 1670:22, 1670:35, 1670:41, 1671:4, 1673:37, 1673:38, 1673:43, 1674:3, 1674:4, 1722:34
series [1] - 1666:17
serious [1] - 1721:40
Serious [1] - 1655:37
serve [1] - 1642:46
servicing [1] - 1623:37
set [24] - 1621:17, 1624:1, 1627:9, 1634:43, 1636:37, 1658:28, 1677:26, 1682:15, 1694:3, 1694:5, 1703:3, 1706:19, 1708:22, 1709:7, 1710:18, 1710:40, 1733:5, 1734:30, 1736:6, 1736:11, 1747:30, 1748:18, 1748:19, 1748:23
sets [2] - 1635:37, 1666:24
setting [5] - 1706:39, 1707:10, 1707:46, 1708:46, 1713:17
seven [1] - 1694:15
seventh [1] - 1626:35
several [5] - 1639:27, 1677:30, 1721:25, 1729:46
shed [1] - 1647:35
Sheehan [3] - 1624:27, 1666:11, 1666:24
Sheil [1] - 1677:31
shock [3] - 1712:13, 1712:18, 1723:28
short [11] - 1621:17, 1621:18, 1621:22, 1621:30, 1626:39, 1626:40, 1639:17, 1639:42, 1653:33, 1662:26, 1695:27
shortly [3] - 1654:4, 1695:18, 1710:36
show [6] - 1641:25, 1680:20, 1733:44, 1738:14, 1746:26, 1746:28
shown [7] - 1647:17, 1648:30, 1686:12, 1694:15, 1713:21, 1733:46, 1747:34
shows [1] - 1743:16
side [1] - 1669:24
sign [1] - 1661:29
signature [2] - 1657:1, 1686:36
signatures [1] - 1686:35
signed [6] - 1657:2, 1661:39, 1661:44, 1669:6, 1669:8
significance [1] - 1734:6
significant [1] - 1664:12
significantly [1] - 1731:27
similar [6] - 1623:6, 1634:33, 1644:42, 1662:21, 1666:21, 1746:36
simple [1] - 1651:19
simply [11] - 1626:36, 1637:29, 1665:28, 1675:13, 1680:33, 1684:36, 1701:36, 1710:40, 1716:43, 1731:13, 1737:15
simultaneously [1] - 1627:29
sit [1] - 1695:22
sitting [2] - 1680:26, 1680:33
situation [1] - 1724:22
six [9] - 1623:42, 1629:31, 1629:39, 1637:37, 1638:38, 1673:1, 1694:14, 1694:15, 1716:13
six-year [1] - 1623:42
sixthly [1] - 1626:11
skills [1] - 1623:10
slashed [1] - 1688:29
slightly [4] - 1624:39, 1630:6, 1667:17, 1739:2
small [4] - 1655:18, 1676:23, 1684:9, 1727:42
so-called [1] - 1736:10
social [1] - 1664:29
Solicitor [1] - 1620:33
solicitors [1] - 1631:22
solvability [9] - 1646:46, 1647:24, 1648:14, 1648:25, 1649:8, 1651:22, 1651:32, 1653:7, 1653:15
solved [1] - 1739:25
someone [5] - 1631:6, 1631:7, 1654:29, 1724:24, 1726:40
sometimes [1] - 1642:35
somewhat [2] - 1718:20, 1745:39
somewhere [1] - 1623:37
son [1] - 1687:35
soon [5] - 1650:42, 1672:35, 1672:39, 1672:40
sooner [2] - 1670:22, 1680:38
sorry [41] - 1623:36, 1636:5, 1637:44, 1642:2, 1650:1, 1652:38, 1657:29, 1665:39, 1667:10, 1671:27, 1671:42, 1672:19, 1675:27, 1677:4, 1688:23, 1688:38, 1689:23, 1693:7, 1694:41, 1695:8, 1696:3, 1698:6, 1702:14, 1703:26, 1708:30, 1708:33, 1710:34,

1712:10, 1712:11,
1712:32, 1721:32,
1724:5, 1727:46,
1728:37, 1730:9,
1734:9, 1735:47,
1737:22, 1741:14,
1747:8
sort^[10] - 1638:13,
1655:46, 1662:36,
1669:42, 1690:5,
1712:45, 1718:24,
1739:19, 1742:25,
1746:35
sorts^[2] - 1713:17,
1748:29
sound^[1] - 1698:19
sounds^[2] - 1658:1,
1690:5
source^[1] - 1733:20
South^[2] - 1620:21,
1740:42
Southern^[1] -
1658:41
sown^[1] - 1644:26
space^[1] - 1667:10
speaking^[7] -
1634:19, 1637:5,
1639:6, 1642:34,
1689:41, 1709:15,
1709:16
speaks^[2] - 1672:10,
1689:16
special^[1] - 1642:11
SPECIAL^[1] - 1748:36
Special^[11] - 1620:9,
1623:21, 1628:35,
1657:38, 1671:3,
1715:18, 1715:26,
1725:20, 1745:40,
1745:44, 1746:2
specific^[1] - 1673:22
specifically^[9] -
1631:9, 1640:46,
1684:21, 1700:13,
1700:15, 1704:27,
1726:8, 1735:36,
1746:3
specifics^[1] - 1641:18
specify^[1] - 1691:38
spelt^[1] - 1674:12
spend^[1] - 1714:3
spoken^[1] - 1720:46
Squad^[15] - 1628:17,
1630:25, 1641:20,
1650:16, 1652:25,
1652:29, 1654:9,
1658:43, 1696:27,
1701:6, 1701:16,
1702:3, 1707:32,
1740:42
squad^[6] - 1638:26,
1701:6, 1701:12,
1701:16, 1701:18,
1718:47
Staff^[2] - 1719:20,
1719:25
staff^[4] - 1623:7,
1655:18, 1718:12,
1724:25
stage^[9] - 1621:44,
1630:41, 1657:14,
1659:40, 1661:42,
1677:44, 1727:25,
1728:14, 1733:3
stalled^[3] - 1636:1,
1636:44, 1637:15
standard^[7] -
1703:40, 1714:42,
1715:3, 1715:35,
1735:13, 1735:18,
1735:21
stands^[1] - 1678:40
start^[3] - 1640:12,
1677:14, 1728:37
started^[3] - 1627:42,
1726:8, 1726:9
starting^[3] - 1687:12,
1692:39, 1704:40
starts^[4] - 1648:37,
1649:44, 1693:9,
1693:20
State^[24] - 1622:23,
1624:8, 1626:6,
1626:40, 1627:22,
1629:9, 1631:12,
1631:33, 1631:40,
1633:17, 1636:2,
1637:18, 1637:20,
1640:42, 1641:26,
1666:36, 1687:22,
1695:32, 1696:43,
1700:24, 1722:27,
1723:15, 1725:2,
1725:35
statement^[38] -
1622:19, 1622:21,
1622:23, 1622:31,
1623:20, 1624:47,
1625:9, 1625:23,
1625:27, 1625:41,
1628:5, 1639:26,
1646:31, 1646:32,
1647:29, 1653:47,
1658:25, 1659:32,
1660:40, 1663:32,
1666:2, 1672:7,
1673:43, 1678:9,
1685:41, 1685:44,
1686:3, 1686:4,
1690:6, 1690:40,
1692:6, 1692:29,
1692:39, 1695:35,
1696:42, 1724:37,
1730:21, 1747:21
Statements^[2] -
1735:46, 1736:3
statements^[4] -
1673:36, 1673:44,
1674:18, 1674:19
states^[1] - 1703:44
States^[2] - 1733:6,
1733:19
stating^[3] - 1689:13,
1707:35, 1708:14
status^[3] - 1669:40,
1682:11, 1682:20
stayed^[1] - 1657:19
Steer^[2] - 1670:35,
1671:4
Steer's^[2] - 1670:41
step^[5] - 1629:35,
1677:39, 1711:25,
1727:29, 1744:30
stepped^[2] - 1628:41,
1657:22
steps^[2] - 1697:15,
1725:23
Steve^[10] - 1626:30,
1654:30, 1713:44,
1713:47, 1714:14,
1716:37, 1717:34,
1718:2, 1718:13,
1718:23
Steven^[5] - 1622:20,
1622:31, 1630:7,
1658:15, 1663:25
Stewart^[1] - 1658:12
still^[17] - 1622:26,
1622:34, 1627:41,
1629:6, 1629:19,
1646:31, 1678:5,
1678:14, 1685:12,
1685:33, 1690:39,
1700:42, 1701:30,
1706:5, 1708:12,
1715:40, 1734:34
stop^[2] - 1723:36,
1737:7
stopped^[1] - 1722:2
Story^[6] - 1649:22,
1654:4, 1654:24,
1655:12, 1718:32,
1718:42
story^[5] - 1624:17,
1649:29, 1654:19,
1654:38, 1723:37
straightforward^[2] -
1679:28, 1723:16
strategy^[3] - 1713:10,
1713:11, 1723:13
streaming^[1] -
1694:16
Street^[1] - 1620:20
stressing^[1] -
1735:36
strike^[23] - 1624:22,
1627:2, 1627:9,
1627:28, 1655:26,
1656:17, 1656:23,
1656:32, 1659:16,
1659:26, 1705:20,
1706:18, 1708:23,
1719:9, 1719:34,
1719:40, 1731:26,
1737:47, 1739:4,
1746:9, 1747:30,
1748:6, 1748:20
Strike^[35] - 1624:22,
1626:46, 1630:21,
1635:31, 1636:37,
1655:13, 1656:45,
1657:39, 1658:10,
1659:41, 1660:7,
1670:40, 1671:9,
1677:41, 1681:27,
1683:23, 1683:39,
1696:28, 1704:26,
1706:22, 1707:10,
1707:46, 1708:46,
1710:4, 1719:43,
1725:16, 1726:3,
1730:27, 1730:40,
1731:41, 1731:45,
1733:4, 1737:36,
1746:5, 1748:11
strong^[3] - 1634:32,
1679:2, 1688:12
strongly^[2] - 1633:8,
1692:9
structure^[4] -
1638:26, 1655:38,
1658:3, 1658:4
structured^[1] -
1730:34
studio^[3] - 1720:28,
1721:4, 1721:11
stunned^[1] - 1705:24
subject^[15] - 1627:21,
1634:6, 1637:36,
1637:42, 1638:13,
1642:24, 1642:38,
1680:29, 1684:31,
1684:38, 1684:43,
1693:1, 1724:37,
1725:30, 1728:7
subjected^[3] -
1675:24, 1675:27,
1677:46
submission^[1] -
1698:9
submissions^[11] -
1697:19, 1697:38,
1697:43, 1698:17,
1698:34, 1700:5,
1700:25, 1701:19,
1701:30, 1702:1,
1702:5
submitted^[3] -
1677:43, 1701:21,
1701:40
suboptimal^[1] -
1667:18
subsequent^[2] -
1661:5, 1717:28
subsequently^[8] -
1628:23, 1639:7,
1640:46, 1640:47,
1679:5, 1679:7,
1709:17, 1722:39
substance^[1] -
1741:8
substantial^[2] -
1642:38, 1704:25
substantially^[1] -
1627:33
substantive^[1] -
1628:23
substantively^[1] -
1629:9
substitute^[1] -
1744:34
Suburbs^[1] - 1666:13
succeed^[1] - 1628:44
succeeded^[1] -
1629:12
successor^[1] -
1706:40
Sue^[3] - 1672:22,
1677:19, 1677:22
suggest^[13] - 1626:5,
1655:40, 1678:31,
1678:46, 1679:3,
1692:28, 1692:34,
1698:30, 1701:27,
1713:1, 1713:5,
1713:8, 1741:47
suggested^[5] -
1625:9, 1639:42,
1671:22, 1715:17,
1724:5
suggesting^[7] -
1624:37, 1624:42,
1698:10, 1699:18,
1724:5, 1734:4,
1743:7
suggestion^[4] -
1655:20, 1682:38,
1693:6, 1695:9
suggests^[3] -
1654:12, 1669:43,

1670:1	1744:46, 1745:2	1664:15	technology [2] -	1745:45, 1746:3,
suicidal [1] - 1691:27	surprised [8] -	Taradale [30] -	1647:39, 1684:43	1746:38, 1748:28
suicide [20] - 1624:12,	1704:28, 1704:30,	1622:22, 1627:22,	Tedeschi [17] -	terms [23] - 1623:8,
1625:10, 1625:12,	1704:34, 1705:25,	1629:46, 1629:47,	1620:37, 1621:4,	1630:36, 1640:22,
1625:17, 1625:23,	1742:14, 1742:22,	1630:8, 1630:11,	1621:18, 1623:5,	1645:20, 1645:21,
1626:24, 1641:6,	1742:24, 1743:8	1630:21, 1630:34,	1642:8, 1643:15,	1645:24, 1647:28,
1644:28, 1644:35,	surrounded [1] -	1630:41, 1631:5,	1656:2, 1661:47,	1656:22, 1666:43,
1676:31, 1688:21,	1644:45	1631:11, 1632:21,	1667:38, 1686:21,	1698:3, 1698:10,
1688:30, 1691:31,	surrounding [4] -	1634:7, 1637:40,	1694:33, 1695:10,	1709:25, 1709:30,
1692:35, 1692:37,	1623:44, 1643:20,	1637:41, 1639:16,	1695:25, 1702:16,	1713:19, 1720:26,
1701:31, 1701:35,	1696:21, 1696:24	1639:26, 1640:5,	1708:35, 1737:4,	1720:47, 1741:23,
1702:30, 1714:4,	suspect [1] - 1706:32	1641:15, 1643:42,	1738:35	1742:15, 1744:16,
1715:27	suspect/s [1] -	1645:27, 1660:16,	TEDESCHI [35] -	1745:3, 1745:4,
Suicide [1] - 1693:44	1662:14	1664:7, 1667:2,	1621:12, 1621:20,	1745:26, 1745:28
suicided [1] - 1687:35	Suspected [2] -	1673:21, 1687:14,	1621:25, 1621:35,	Terrorism [2] -
summaries [1] -	1734:47, 1735:25	1689:45, 1691:12,	1623:14, 1641:32,	1628:35, 1701:9
1662:17	suspected [10] -	1725:34, 1727:34	1641:47, 1642:5,	test [3] - 1642:19,
summarised [1] -	1635:45, 1739:45,	Taradale's [1] -	1642:42, 1643:8,	1642:27, 1684:41
1671:22	1741:42, 1742:20,	1639:39	1643:22, 1662:3,	testing [1] - 1648:9
summarising [3] -	1743:15, 1743:18,	tarry [1] - 1740:45	1667:44, 1668:2,	text [3] - 1694:10,
1625:8, 1745:39,	1743:24, 1743:42,	task [2] - 1670:1,	1686:23, 1689:12,	1736:7, 1736:11
1748:2	1744:4, 1744:40	1670:4	1694:27, 1694:39,	theme [3] - 1716:8,
summary [6] -	suspects [5] - 1663:4,	tasks [1] - 1669:44	1694:43, 1695:3,	1716:11, 1718:20
1624:36, 1662:44,	1664:13, 1664:23,	Taylor [13] - 1647:16,	1702:12, 1708:21,	themselves [2] -
1678:18, 1687:43,	1664:30, 1664:45	1651:39, 1653:12,	1708:38, 1709:24,	1621:45, 1642:38
1693:14, 1726:29	suspicious [2] -	1660:17, 1660:20,	1736:27, 1736:31,	theories [1] - 1676:46
Superintendent [9] -	1678:36, 1704:12	1660:27, 1660:47,	1736:38, 1737:10,	theory [5] - 1676:37,
1628:22, 1628:24,	sustained [1] -	1661:17, 1663:19,	1738:21, 1738:25,	1679:12, 1685:33,
1628:40, 1628:46,	1635:12	1670:8, 1670:13,	1742:44, 1743:2,	1692:35, 1692:36
1629:17, 1647:4,	sworn [1] - 1623:3	1670:22, 1671:32	1743:7, 1743:13,	thereabouts [1] -
1657:45, 1726:10,	Sydney [4] - 1620:21,	Taylor's [2] - 1667:2,	1743:26	1655:10
1747:45	1624:26, 1643:41,	1671:16	Tedeschi's [1] -	thereafter [4] -
Supervisor [2] -	1666:12	Team [24] - 1629:36,	1708:31	1701:42, 1705:10,
1657:7, 1747:1	system [8] - 1659:30,	1638:7, 1638:22,	telephone [3] -	1725:30, 1725:40
supervisor [5] -	1668:40, 1668:42,	1638:25, 1638:45,	1647:4, 1712:7,	therefore [2] - 1648:1,
1657:26, 1657:29,	1669:19, 1746:37,	1639:3, 1640:11,	1712:15	1712:28
1657:46, 1675:34,	1746:39, 1747:4	1646:6, 1646:14,	telephoned [1] -	thereof [1] - 1625:47
1747:13		1646:19, 1646:24,	1720:32	they have [2] - 1679:3,
supervisors [2] -	T	1653:10, 1658:41,	televised [1] - 1711:47	1679:15
1638:37, 1638:42	tab [30] - 1622:19,	1658:43, 1658:45,	television [8] -	they've [6] - 1659:30,
supervisory [1] -	1622:31, 1631:42,	1659:2, 1676:24,	1624:17, 1712:14,	1674:23, 1674:24,
1747:15	1645:38, 1645:40,	1680:9, 1683:22,	1712:22, 1712:26,	1679:12, 1729:10,
support [3] - 1657:28,	1648:32, 1648:34,	1684:9, 1696:27,	1712:29, 1712:34,	1747:5
1742:37, 1742:39	1656:41, 1657:33,	1731:3, 1740:20,	1722:1, 1723:28	thinking [1] - 1674:31
supported [1] -	1657:44, 1659:12,	1747:47	ten [1] - 1674:34	thinks [1] - 1703:12
1692:10	1661:11, 1668:17,	team [11] - 1638:36,	tender [9] - 1621:42,	third [32] - 1624:25,
supportive [6] -	1670:26, 1671:42,	1650:44, 1651:6,	1622:32, 1645:31,	1626:7, 1630:43,
1655:17, 1672:32,	1672:2, 1677:3,	1653:20, 1658:42,	1666:3, 1695:39,	1650:38, 1657:1,
1730:27, 1730:40,	1677:6, 1680:47,	1663:33, 1668:43,	1702:37, 1720:14,	1683:21, 1690:27,
1731:7, 1732:41	1695:46, 1696:7,	1670:3, 1676:23,	1734:37, 1736:34	1696:17, 1697:14,
supports [1] - 1633:8	1702:41, 1704:39,	1684:10, 1684:14	tendered [5] -	1697:27, 1697:42,
suppose [1] - 1654:29	1706:7, 1720:15,	teams [4] - 1638:38,	1621:46, 1622:2,	1698:1, 1698:12,
Supreme [1] - 1679:23	1738:42, 1738:45,	1638:39, 1638:47,	1622:3, 1622:21,	1698:19, 1698:26,
surely [2] - 1675:26,	1746:27, 1746:30,	1639:2	1622:24	1698:32, 1698:40,
1732:40	1747:36	technically [2] -	tenthly [1] - 1627:26	1699:8, 1699:47,
surprise [11] - 1674:2,	Tactics [1] - 1628:35	1628:16, 1692:22	term [7] - 1652:46,	1700:7, 1700:28,
1674:11, 1674:19,	talks [2] - 1688:28,	techniques [1] -	1679:2, 1679:9,	1700:32, 1700:47,
1674:22, 1702:9,	1703:24	1647:33	1695:27, 1715:2,	1701:27, 1703:24,
1712:6, 1712:13,	Tamarama [1] -	technologies [1] -	1720:21, 1720:24	1711:27, 1717:1,
1712:19, 1723:28,		1647:32	Terms [5] - 1656:44,	1734:47, 1735:28,

1744:16, 1744:21, 1745:9	1715:23, 1721:32, 1722:35	turn [15] - 1631:41, 1656:41, 1657:33, 1661:11, 1672:2, 1677:18, 1680:47, 1687:4, 1692:38, 1693:41, 1702:41, 1704:38, 1734:9, 1734:25, 1747:36	under [22] - 1627:29, 1627:39, 1630:43, 1634:43, 1640:11, 1641:19, 1662:13, 1663:11, 1666:8, 1677:9, 1683:21, 1702:21, 1705:44, 1706:39, 1706:40, 1706:43, 1709:11, 1710:11, 1725:17, 1728:2, 1747:43	unnecessary [1] - 1656:22
third-last [1] - 1696:17	top [12] - 1632:13, 1632:32, 1654:12, 1662:30, 1679:35, 1703:46, 1713:47, 1717:31, 1719:46, 1734:20, 1736:3, 1747:16	turned [3] - 1671:5, 1712:16, 1727:30	undercover [2] - 1664:32, 1665:10	unpack [1] - 1726:13
thirdly [1] - 1627:47	topic [10] - 1637:41, 1640:34, 1667:30, 1676:22, 1695:26, 1717:2, 1717:45, 1720:20, 1724:35, 1731:8	turns [2] - 1684:39, 1738:1	undermine [2] - 1710:18, 1710:25	unpalatable [1] - 1705:41
Thompson [2] - 1677:19, 1677:22	total [3] - 1643:18, 1683:3, 1742:5	twenty [1] - 1674:37	understandable [1] - 1634:23	unredacted [2] - 1686:4, 1694:3
Thompson's [1] - 1672:23	totally [3] - 1676:46, 1686:26, 1686:41	twenty-nine [1] - 1674:37	understandably [1] - 1705:9	unsolvable [1] - 1648:5
thousands [1] - 1673:45	touched [1] - 1627:27	twice [1] - 1720:25	understood [5] - 1695:13, 1724:29, 1726:39, 1727:2, 1730:28	unsolved [25] - 1624:43, 1666:31, 1671:23, 1672:22, 1673:27, 1675:9, 1677:27, 1682:39, 1683:41, 1684:2, 1693:6, 1705:20, 1717:5, 1717:17, 1727:33, 1729:6, 1729:22, 1738:2, 1738:10, 1739:26, 1739:34, 1741:37, 1742:6, 1742:35, 1744:37
threatened [1] - 1703:47	tough [1] - 1640:27	two [37] - 1622:18, 1627:17, 1633:21, 1636:17, 1638:24, 1638:27, 1646:19, 1650:12, 1651:47, 1652:45, 1654:13, 1655:12, 1655:20, 1664:2, 1667:19, 1667:34, 1667:36, 1673:43, 1674:19, 1674:34, 1676:45, 1677:10, 1678:19, 1686:47, 1687:9, 1687:26, 1690:23, 1691:27, 1691:34, 1695:30, 1705:35, 1710:24, 1713:12, 1716:21, 1736:31, 1736:44, 1739:29	undertaken [1] - 1663:23	unsolved [34] - 1629:36, 1638:7, 1638:22, 1638:25, 1638:45, 1639:2, 1640:11, 1641:20, 1646:6, 1646:14, 1646:18, 1646:23, 1652:34, 1653:10, 1655:33, 1658:41, 1658:43, 1658:44, 1659:2, 1668:43, 1669:20, 1670:3, 1675:1, 1676:24, 1680:9, 1680:27, 1680:34, 1683:22, 1684:9, 1696:27, 1707:28, 1731:2, 1740:19, 1747:46
threatening [1] - 1632:37	towards [8] - 1635:38, 1639:39, 1657:40, 1658:21, 1664:46, 1714:28, 1718:37, 1726:23	typically [1] - 1747:30	undertaking [1] - 1708:1	unfavourable [1] - 1722:23
three [31] - 1625:20, 1627:13, 1627:16, 1627:21, 1627:28, 1632:21, 1636:40, 1637:9, 1638:12, 1638:47, 1640:30, 1643:43, 1650:15, 1660:16, 1662:11, 1665:37, 1668:25, 1673:22, 1674:7, 1674:34, 1676:34, 1676:46, 1678:6, 1680:19, 1680:20, 1682:15, 1687:1, 1689:25, 1701:31, 1703:3, 1703:4	toward [1] - 1741:18		undetermined [3] - 1635:20, 1676:39, 1702:30	unfold [1] - 1671:10
throughout [4] - 1631:19, 1657:19, 1659:6, 1724:20	track [1] - 1698:21		unidentified [2] - 1690:1, 1704:1	unilateral [1] - 1672:24
throw [1] - 1632:37	transcript [3] - 1713:21, 1713:47, 1720:14		unilaterally [1] - 1672:24	unique [1] - 1675:12
thrown [1] - 1635:12	transpired [1] - 1647:21		unit [2] - 1649:7, 1671:6	unit [2] - 1670:36, 1671:4
thrust [1] - 1701:21	treat [1] - 1709:39		United [2] - 1733:6, 1733:19	Unit [2] - 1670:36, 1671:4
ticks [1] - 1680:38	treated [2] - 1625:31, 1637:10		unknown [8] - 1634:32, 1635:5, 1635:13, 1647:39, 1673:5, 1673:14, 1674:30, 1674:46	unless [10] - 1637:11, 1647:46, 1661:7, 1674:45, 1675:11, 1675:15, 1679:17, 1684:36, 1709:18, 1723:38
tied [1] - 1628:36	trial [12] - 1641:44, 1642:2, 1642:5, 1642:7, 1642:22, 1642:40, 1642:43, 1643:2, 1643:17, 1694:30, 1694:36		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	unlikely [1] - 1700:26
time [1] - 1675:9	tried [1] - 1647:47		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	unlikely [5] - 1698:40, 1700:11, 1703:12, 1703:21, 1729:37
title [2] - 1638:31, 1747:2	trouble [2] - 1723:11, 1739:29		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
titles [2] - 1658:4, 1669:27	troubled [1] - 1672:45		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
TO [1] - 1748:37	true [7] - 1623:25, 1628:10, 1673:32, 1680:13, 1680:17, 1692:22, 1713:8		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
today [11] - 1622:24, 1631:46, 1633:37, 1637:33, 1667:41, 1674:2, 1716:45, 1727:28, 1728:17, 1734:6, 1739:29	truth [1] - 1651:11		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
tog [2] - 1690:30, 1690:32	try [2] - 1659:24, 1711:1		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
together [3] - 1640:24, 1743:38, 1743:47	trying [5] - 1648:5, 1648:6, 1667:10, 1679:18, 1710:18		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
tomorrow [1] - 1668:2	Tse [2] - 1668:34, 1668:43		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	
took [12] - 1625:30, 1638:46, 1639:4, 1640:16, 1640:19, 1688:44, 1691:46, 1701:9, 1708:9,	TUESDAY [1] - 1748:37		unambiguously [1] - 1659:15	

U

UHT [11] - 1646:44,
1648:26, 1649:32,
1650:14, 1652:39,
1653:2, 1654:13,
1660:15, 1676:12,
1676:19, 1698:32

ultimate [2] - 1697:12,
1697:13

ultimately [3] -
1627:34, 1628:31,
1731:42

unambiguous [1] -
1698:10

unambiguously [1] -
1659:15

unaware [1] - 1711:45

unawares [1] -
1686:20

unclear [1] - 1709:25

uncovered [1] -
1643:43

1709:7, 1710:40,
1717:44, 1732:44,
1732:47, 1738:33,
1739:3, 1740:1,
1742:15, 1742:19,
1745:10, 1747:30,
1748:18, 1748:19,
1748:23

upcoming [1] -

1654:18

update [1] - 1682:5

upset [8] - 1704:33,

1705:10, 1705:19,

1705:25, 1705:26,

1705:30, 1705:33,

1711:17

upshot [1] - 1646:3

USA [1] - 1650:43

uses [1] - 1719:36

V

value [3] - 1666:43,

1680:16, 1697:44

variations [1] -

1717:28

variety [1] - 1666:44

various [12] - 1621:27,

1621:47, 1625:31,

1649:16, 1650:14,

1657:15, 1662:13,

1691:2, 1696:13,

1697:26, 1733:40,

1734:24

verbal [1] - 1640:25

verdict [1] - 1714:17

version [3] - 1625:46,

1661:44, 1686:23

via [2] - 1664:32,

1696:28

viable [2] - 1685:13,

1685:33

victim [3] - 1635:4,

1644:41, 1685:4

victims [4] - 1632:16,

1632:35, 1632:45,

1690:2

view [57] - 1625:15,

1625:28, 1625:30,

1625:36, 1626:24,

1627:4, 1643:5,

1645:26, 1663:19,

1666:39, 1674:46,

1678:14, 1682:20,

1683:10, 1685:2,

1685:8, 1685:13,

1685:30, 1685:32,

1689:14, 1692:31,

1693:32, 1696:20,

1702:24, 1703:20,

1708:9, 1714:23,

1719:41, 1722:45,

1723:9, 1727:20,

1727:28, 1728:17,

1728:25, 1728:28,

1728:32, 1728:36,

1728:37, 1728:47,

1729:12, 1729:21,

1729:26, 1730:6,

1730:13, 1731:28,

1731:35, 1732:25,

1732:26, 1738:1,

1738:3, 1738:10,

1742:34, 1743:13,

1743:20

views [6] - 1633:18,

1677:26, 1699:33,

1705:47, 1729:34

violence [8] - 1643:40,

1677:47, 1691:41,

1692:21, 1692:35,

1703:47, 1709:4,

1714:5

virtually [1] - 1659:1

virtue [1] - 1747:14

visible [1] - 1737:31

voice [2] - 1694:39,

1694:43

voicing [2] - 1694:44,

1694:46

volume [29] - 1622:19,

1631:41, 1645:45,

1648:30, 1653:40,

1656:40, 1661:10,

1667:4, 1667:6,

1668:17, 1671:43,

1671:45, 1671:47,

1677:6, 1695:46,

1696:3, 1702:40,

1704:37, 1704:38,

1706:4, 1706:5,

1706:6, 1733:46,

1738:40, 1746:27,

1746:29, 1747:34

volumes [6] - 1621:44,

1622:1, 1622:13,

1622:14, 1622:16,

1622:30

W

wait [1] - 1708:30

waiting [2] - 1667:19,

1685:21

Wales [1] - 1620:21

wants [3] - 1682:11,

1687:47, 1743:37

Warren [21] - 1630:12,

1632:22, 1633:9,

1633:25, 1633:29,

1634:47, 1639:32,

1662:12, 1662:18,

1663:22, 1664:5,

1664:34, 1664:47,

1669:29, 1669:34,

1684:20, 1687:42,

1688:17, 1688:46,

1689:1, 1748:2

Warren's [1] - 1633:5

watch [1] - 1628:15

watching [1] -

1623:10

wave [2] - 1624:26,

1624:28

ways [2] - 1624:21,

1641:29

website [1] - 1694:17

week [2] - 1649:39,

1650:41

weigh [1] - 1647:43

well" [1] - 1631:8

Welsford [6] -

1706:22, 1706:39,

1707:10, 1707:46,

1708:46, 1709:7

wheel [2] - 1684:39,

1707:27

whilst [1] - 1641:33

whole [7] - 1637:41,

1638:36, 1643:14,

1700:32, 1705:28,

1727:30, 1736:11

wholly [1] - 1735:12

wide [1] - 1628:6

widely [1] - 1666:39

William [1] - 1677:31

Williams [1] - 1677:31

Willing [28] - 1622:41,

1622:45, 1622:47,

1623:8, 1623:20,

1625:30, 1643:27,

1652:28, 1652:34,

1653:40, 1656:40,

1661:10, 1665:45,

1668:11, 1668:22,

1671:42, 1686:11,

1690:39, 1694:2,

1694:19, 1695:30,

1702:40, 1704:37,

1720:19, 1733:46,

1734:1, 1747:34,

1747:46

WILLING [1] - 1623:3

willing's [1] - 1686:4

Wilson's [1] - 1642:17

wish [2] - 1623:28,

1694:45

wished [1] - 1698:24

withdraw [5] -

1642:18, 1642:29,

1703:26, 1728:6,

1737:14

witness [10] - 1621:6,

1622:41, 1667:27,

1716:28, 1736:39,

1736:40, 1738:32,

1743:8, 1746:29

WITNESS [14] -

1636:12, 1653:43,

1689:23, 1694:5,

1694:23, 1702:14,

1702:19, 1708:28,

1708:33, 1708:41,

1709:27, 1737:18,

1738:42, 1743:34

witnesses [2] -

1663:11, 1663:42

wonder [3] - 1648:30,

1656:40, 1702:40

word [7] - 1628:20,

1656:13, 1709:44,

1721:12, 1721:35,

1723:39, 1726:46

words [10] - 1623:7,

1626:20, 1626:26,

1633:39, 1633:41,

1634:38, 1635:25,

1661:29, 1673:18,

1728:18

world [2] - 1732:25,

1732:26

wrists [1] - 1688:29

write [1] - 1696:35

writing [1] - 1723:37

Written [2] - 1735:46,

1736:3

written [4] - 1697:18,

1701:18, 1702:36,

1728:20

wrote [2] - 1695:31,

1699:14

Y

year [6] - 1622:32,

1623:42, 1627:18,

1670:7, 1683:39,

1726:23

years [15] - 1627:16,

1629:31, 1629:39,

1630:22, 1630:25,

1634:9, 1634:18,

1639:4, 1640:11,

1650:17, 1671:9,

1700:31, 1705:29,

1714:22, 1717:19

Yeomans [2] -

1706:29, 1707:31

Yes" [1] - 1652:6

yesterday [1] -

1686:23

young [4] - 1633:30,

1633:45, 1672:23,

1723:37

Young [69] - 1625:1,

1626:12, 1626:41,

1638:29, 1640:16,