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THE COMMISSIONER: Before we recommence this morning, Mr Gray and Mr Tedeschi, there are a number of witnesses scheduled for this week. Some of them, indeed, many of them, are from interstate or overseas. We've got Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and the United States.

I'd like, if I can, both from you, Mr Gray, and from you, Mr Tedeschi, to get an idea of timing so that we can schedule, because next week, I'm scheduled to do other matters concerning the Inquiry and I would prefer not to eat into that time.

So we've got former Detective Page, then at the moment, I think, Associate Professor Derek Dalton, Professor Willem de Lint, Professor Asquith, Associate Professor Lovegrove, and then Martha Coakley from the United States. I think at the moment I'm scheduling her for Friday morning at about 9.30 , which works US time.

But can we just go back to each of them, Mr Gray, if you can just give me a very rough idea and then, in turn, Mr Tedeschi might be able to help, so that we know how I can schedule the week, because I have other matters. For example, tomorrow, I have to interrupt the public hearings to do a matter in private so I want to make sure I can achieve my objectives.

MR GRAY: Commissioner, with Mr Page, I would expect to be perhaps half an hour. With Dr Dalton, perhaps the better part of a day. With Dr de Lint, an hour or two. With each of Professors Lovegrove and Asquith an hour or perhaps a little more than an hour, and with Ms Coakley I would think less than an hour.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Mr Tedeschi, bearing in mind, as I've said, I want to do Ms Coakley on Friday morning - that's the best time for her in the United States time frame - can you just, if you can, give me an idea in relation to each of the other persons?

MR TEDESCHI: The present witness I think will be about half an hour. Sergeant Page, I would think a fairly similar time to Sergeant Morgan, which is about an hour, an hour and a half. Professor Dalton - Commissioner, as you know, there are two types of counsel, there are counsel who routinely underestimate the time they're going to take and counsel who are fairly accurate and I'm in the latter
category, but I suspect, with the greatest of respect to my friend, that he's in the former, so it might be that Dr Dalton takes longer than he thinks. I think I would be at most a couple of hours.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR TEDESCHI: But I would suggest to you, Commissioner, that because the American witness is overseas, perhaps that should be fixed and whatever --

THE COMMISSIONER: What I was intending to say, if I haven't made it clear, is that I am going to fix her for Friday morning so everyone knows at least that that Friday morning we will have her. We will come back to her in a minute. What about the Professor de Lint and the others?

MR TEDESCHI: It is very hard for me to estimate that but I would think again an hour to two for each of them.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. And Ms Coakley?
MR TEDESCHI: Again very difficult to assess. Probably an hour.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right. Just so that everyone knows, I'm going to try to finish all of that evidence this week. If we can't finish it this week, though, Mr Tedeschi, I'm going to proceed next Monday. I don't know whether that places you in any --

MR TEDESCHI: When you say you are going to proceed, with this hearing?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'm not going to down tools with this current group of witnesses only because they've been brought in from interstate and so on, and I don't want them to be sent home.

MR TEDESCHI: We're available.
THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, good. All right, thank you.
Mr Morgan, would you be kind enough, please, to come back into the witness box? Please take a seat, thank you.

Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
<STEVEN MORGAN, on former affirmation:
<EXAMINATION BY MR TEDESCHI CONTINUING:
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant, yesterday afternoon when we adjourned I was asking you questions in relation to Mr Russell?
A. Yes.
Q. And particularly I was asking you about the report of Dr Cala, which was at volume 6, tab 157 [SCOI.10386.00142_0001], and I think I brought to your attention his conclusions in his report, which are basically at page 3 of his report, if I can take you to that very briefly and just remind you of it?
A. Yes.
Q. In the second paragraph, the second line: I cannot exclude foul play.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q.

I am not aware if there was any evidence to support suicide. The blood alcohol level and the presence of other drugs are not detailed ... and would be of relevance ...
A. Yes.
Q. And the last sentence:

The possibility still exists that this man has met with foul play and might have been forcibly thrown off the cliff.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, could I take you, please, to his evidence at inquest, which is at volume 14, tab 327
[SCOI.02751.00152_0003]. He gave evidence at the inquest about a number of topics, his conclusions as to the possible cause of death, his reaction to being informed about the blood alcohol reading, which I think I took you to yesterday afternoon?
A. Yes.
Q. And also he was asked questions about both the hair and the jersey?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have that transcript in front of you?
A. No. Sorry, what tab was it?
Q. It's tab 327.
A. This folder doesn't appear to go that far. I've got 324B as the last tab in this.

MR TEDESCHI: If 327 could be made available to him.
Q. Could I take you to page 9, please.
A. Sorry, I'm just having some difficulties. Page 9?
Q. Page 9.
A. Yes, I have that document.
Q. At about 1 ine 40 he is asked:

Would a person just 7and flat or would there be some movement as a result of the fal 7 ...

And his answer was:

I think either is possible, I have to say of course $I$ haven't seen any or read any experiments of this sort of activity because it's clearly impossible to do [so]. But based on the description of people who are seen to fall and are later found deceased I think either are possible.

Then over the page, page 10 at 1 ine 9 , it was pointed out to him that his legs were facing towards the sea?
A. Yes.
Q. His head towards the cliff. Do you recall from the photographs whether he was face up or face down?
A. I thought he was on his side, left side.
Q. In fact, the majority of the injuries were on the 1eft-hand side.
A. Correct.
Q. Which caused Dr Cala to conclude that he must have actually hit the bottom of the cliff on his left-hand side?
A. Correct.
Q. And Dr Cala was asked some questions about whether it's unusual for a body at the bottom of the cliff to be found in that way with the legs towards the sea and the head towards the cliff?
A. Yes.
Q. And he said at line 9:

Yes. That's an unusual position, most people that are found around the Gap or North Head, around the cliffs of Sydney are not in that position. Their head is facing towards the ocean and their feet towards the cliff.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, people whose bodies are generally found at the Gap or at North Head, are they generally people who have committed suicide?
A. Correct.
Q. So is that a different scenario to the one that you favoured of misadventure?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. The top of the cliff above where the body was found, there were photographs that were taken of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe the area between the footpath and the edge of the cliff? Was that sloping downwards?
A. I believe it was, yes.
Q. And are you able to say how far there was on that sloping area between the footpath and the edge of the cliff?
A. Oh, I couldn't tell you that now, but I'm aware that the total fall was around about 12 metres, 12.1 - 12 metres or thereabouts.
Q. I'm interested more in the area at the top of the cliff?
A. Yes.
Q. There were some bushes there?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. They were the subject of the evidence from Crime Scene Officer Cameron?
A. Correct.
Q. Who went to the scene very early in the piece?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he go and inspect the cliff at the time the body was found, or later?
A. Yes - shortly after the body was found.
Q. Shortly after?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, going back to the evidence of Dr Cala at ine 41, the question he was asked is:

I mean is it conceivable that a person might have ended up that way by reason of accident, if those are the only facts known.

And of course the known facts are that he's referring - the questioner is referring to the position of the body?
A. Yes.
Q.

There are additional facts which I wil7 put to you, but if that's right?

And Dr Cala said:

I think that's unlikely. I couldn't say it's impossible but $I$ think it's unlikely, I think if somebody's affected by alcohol and they back over the cliff I'd still expect that they would fall and that their head would be closer to the ocean than in this case.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you assume from that answer that what Dr Cala was talking about was somebody who had fallen down with their head going out as they fall?
A. Yes, that would be my understanding of it.
Q. If somebody slipped on the sloping part of the ground between the path and the cliff so that their feet went first, that might account for why the feet were pointing out towards the sea?
A. I'm certainly not an expert, but it may well explain it.
Q. If you go, please, to page 12.
A. Yes.
Q. He provided an answer at line 11 about the hair. He said:

I think it's unlikely that it's just fallen out, I think it's more likely that it's been tugged out. If it's come from
Mr Russel7's head, there are a number of
explanations $I$ would think that might explain it, but it is unusual and to me tends to suggest that it came from the head of somebody else, perhaps.
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know if Dr Cala was aware that, in fact, there had been some injury to the scalp of Mr Russell in the vicinity of his hair?
A. At the time of giving this evidence I would imagine he would be aware of it but that's just - I can't say for definite.
Q. Then it's brought to his attention further down that page about the 0.255 level of alcohol?
A. Yes. It's originally recorded as 0.225 but then it's corrected over the next page.
Q. Corrected over the page and at line 9 he says:

I think it's a possibility that Mr Russell
may have met his death accidentally,
I can't exclude that possibility.
A. Correct.
Q. Then he's asked some questions about the jersey, which, as you have noted in previous answers, was slightly pulled up on the body?
A. Yes. I believe it was above the midriff.
Q. He was asked some questions further down that page about that and at line 26 he said this:

If somebody even fell accidentally I would expect that the jersey, it looks very loose in fact and would tend to be positioned over the beltiline of the jeans, I would expect. But it's not - it is quite a long way up his body and that again makes me wonder whether it's been actually forcibly retracted in some way by another person.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And then he's asked:

So at least an educated guess, perhaps I might be doing your opinion a disservice in that regard, it might be that there was something which occurred before his fall which occasioned his jumper to be in that position and accordingly it was in that position when he was found, would that be fair?

And he replied:

> Yes, I think that would be fair, but I certainly would not say that that would be the only explanation for the way that the sweater could end up in this position. Given the way that he's fallen it may be that when he's landed that the sweater has struck a bit of ledge of rock and it's been pulled up by that.
A. Yes.
Q. What Detective Cala [sic] didn't consider in that answer was the possibility that he may have impacted with either some ground or some rock or bushes or something on the way down --
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ as he's falling?
A. Yes.
Q. Later on he's asked some questions about the possibility of billowing as he's falling?
A. Yes.
Q. And whether that might have some effect on a loose sweater or jersey?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I take you to questions asked by Mr Saidi on page 17 - sorry, page 18 in relation to the jersey?
A. Yes.
Q. Line 35:

You would expect the clothing to have been pushed up prior to the actual point of impact itself, am I correct?

His answer is:

I guess it might have been, if you mean that the clothing, that red jersey might billow as a result of a vertical drop. If you're suggesting that and by the way that it might billow out from the deceased's body and then appear to be pulled up, in this photograph. That's a possible explanation.
A. Yes.
Q. So he seems to accept that possibility that it might have billowed. Then he's asked what the more probable scenario is, and at line 55 he says:

No $I$ don't really think $I$ can give an order
of probability, I'm just suggesting these
as possible explanations and I think any is
quite possible.
A. Yes.
Q. So would it be fair to say that, in your mind, you can consider very similar possibilities in terms of the jersey to what Dr Cala considered?
A. Yes.
Q. So there was a possibility that it had been affected by something on the way down?
A. Yes.
Q. Possibility it was affected when he landed at the bottom, the jersey?
A. That's possible, yeah.
Q. And a possibility that somebody might have iffted it up at the top?
A. Prior to the fall.
Q. Prior to the fall. All of those were possibilities?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in terms of his ultimate conclusion, could I take you to page 17. These are questions by Mr Saidi.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know which police officer was providing instructions to Mr Saidi during the inquest?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you know if Sergeant Page was in attendance at the inquest?
A. I would imagine he would have been but I don't know
that for certain.
Q. Could I take you to 1 ine 35 on page 17.
A. Yes.
Q. Sorry, I'11 start at 1ine 24:

So we've got this possibility then that Mr Russe 17 was indeed assaulted.

Answer, "Yes":

Hit to various parts of his body and 7 imbs and then pushed over the cliff, after the assault, that appears to be a possible scenario.

Answer, "Yes"?
A. I see that.
Q. You acknowledge that as a possibility?
A. It's possible.
Q. Then next question:

Or indeed it may be that he was assaulted and himself stumbled over the side of the cliff after or during the assault.

Answer, "Yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. That's also a possibility, do you acknowledge?
A. I acknowledge it's possible.
Q. Then:

They appear to be, looking at the injuries, the most probable scenarios, do they not, having regard to the injuries themselves?

Answer, "Yes".
A. That's what he said.
Q. Question:

If we accept them as the most probable scenario it would follow that any theory that he in fact came to fall over the cliff by himself as a result of being intoxicated could be discounted to a large extent, would you agree?

Answer, "Yes"?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Question:

And when I say discounted, I'm talking about discounted in terms of probabilities.

Answer, "Yes".
So does it appear from those questions and answers that $\operatorname{Dr~Cala~is~advancing~the~theory~that~the~most~likely~}$ or most probable scenario, in his view, was the scenario that he was assaulted and stumbled over the side of the cliff either after or during the assault?
A. That appears to be where he's heading, yes.
Q. And correct me if I'm wrong, but that's not your view about the most probable cause of his death?
A. No.
Q. You will correct me if I'm wrong again. Your view is that most probable cause is that he fell due to misadventure due to the degree of intoxication?
A. That's my belief, yes.
Q. That was your belief during the time of Neiwand?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's still your belief to this day?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you were asked some questions by Counsel

Assisting, and it was suggested to you that the views advanced by Dr Duflou were almost identical to those of Dr Cala, and you agreed with that?
A. Largely, yes.
Q. I want to suggest to you that in fact Dr Duflou came to different conclusions and I want to come --

THE COMMISSIONER: Is this examination or cross-examination of your witness?

MR TEDESCHI: Oh, it's --
THE COMMISSIONER: If you're going to put to him that the concession he made should be withdrawn on the basis of your theory of the case, then I would have to permit Mr Gray to take him back, because that is putting a counter theory to the one that your own witness has accepted unequivocally, seemingly, in his evidence.

MR TEDESCHI: He has accepted it, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, then where do you go,
Mr Tedeschi? You may have your own theory, which I doubt in due course you would be hesitant in putting to me, but can you undermine your own witness, not only in this respect - and I won't go any further on that point - but can you really undermine your own witness by having him now seek to change a concession he made in circumstances where he wasn't under any pressure, as I observed, and he simply agreed with Counsel Assisting? How can you possibly come in now and say, "Well, upon reflection, given what I'm now saying to you, would you like to change your mind", without undermining his credit?

Now, you may want to do that for other reasons, and I wouldn't stop you, of course, if that's what you want to do.

MR TEDESCHI: What I understood his evidence to be - and I haven't got it directly in front of me - was that it was substantially similar, and what I wish to do is to go --

THE COMMISSIONER: But you want to put to him, as I understand it, that that concession was, what, ill considered?

MR TEDESCHI: I think what I wish to do is to clarify exactly what he meant when he said it was substantially similar.

THE COMMISSIONER: You tell me. I'11 have him go outside, perhaps.

Mr Morgan, would you just go outside for a moment?
THE WITNESS: Certainly.

## (The witness left the courtroom)

THE COMMISSIONER: First of all, let's have a look at what he did say, perhaps if you can take me to it.

MR TEDESCHI: Page 2258. Bear with me just for a moment.
THE COMMISSIONER: Which line?

MR TEDESCHI: I'm not seeking, Commissioner, to cross-examine him; I'm seeking to put the conclusions of Dr Cala to him to give him another - to give him an opportunity to say what he sees as being the similarities and the differences.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I know this is partly instinct, and perhaps even a modicum of experience on my part. It sounds like and tastes like you want to change his testimony from what he says. Now, I'm not going to apply strict rules here because this is not re-examination, but tell me the bit that you say you would like him to reflect upon and why?

MR TEDESCHI: At that page, 2258, he says - question:
So on that topic, the position of the body, his opinion, you would agree, is substantially the same as Dr Cala's ...

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, and he doesn't embrace the word "substantially", his own terminology, "it's very similar".

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Now, you want to go and, what, put to him that when he said it's very similar, he shouldn't have said that, he should have said, what, something else?

MR TEDESCHI: What I wish to do is to give him an opportunity to elaborate.

THE COMMISSIONER: But what opportunity comes out of the page as to why - you see, this is my problem. You've looked at it and you've come to the view that that concession perhaps was inappropriate or whatever it is that you want, and therefore you want to say to him, "Would you please have another look at this, and whilst you agree with Counsel Assisting it was very similar, having now heard what I've had to say, Mr Morgan, do you wish to change or clarify what you said?" Is that, in effect, what you want to do?

MR TEDESCHI: It comes very close to that.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. If you want to undermine
the credit of your own witness I'm certainly not going to stop you, because this is not a strict forensic environment, but it seems to me that if this was re-examination, it couldn't possibly pass muster for re-examination. There's nothing there. The witness has not embraced the phrase used or the characterisation used by the cross-examiner or the examiner. He said, "It's very similar". So he hasn't embraced "substantially the same". So why would I come away thinking that the witness has not given thought to the answer, rejected the characterisation that was put by Counsel Assisting, adopted his own, which is, I think, characteristically, or rather, should I say, qualitatively different, because "substantially the same" I would not think is identical to "very similar".

So you want to go back in and say, "Well, when you were asked whether it was substantially the same and you said it was very similar, what you really want to say, or perhaps I invite you to say, having now looked at Dr Cala again and Professor Duflou again, is that they weren't very similar at all." Now, if you want to do that, I'm not going to stop you, but it will have consequences, I expect. But by all means --

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, if I could take you to page 2260, he's read a section of what $I$ assume is Dr Duflou's evidence and report.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR TEDESCHI: Then he is asked a question, which I objected to but which you allowed. Commissioner, you said, "he can ask him to draw the conclusion or inference".

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Look, Mr Tedeschi, let's not waste any more time. I am not going to stop you, as I say; I just wanted to understand what you're trying to do.

MR TEDESCHI: I will attempt to do it in a non --
THE COMMISSIONER: No, Mr Tedeschi, it is not a traditional adversarial context and I'm not going to be strict about it. But when I come to review the evidence, especially concessions he has made and other concessions he has made, I will take a view or not, as the case may be, as to which is the more reliable evidence.

MR TEDESCHI: If the Commissioner pleases.
(The witness returned to the hearing room)
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Morgan, take a seat again, thank you. Yes, Mr Tedeschi.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant Morgan, can $I$ just remind you that $\operatorname{Dr}$ Cala's view, as expressed in the inquest, was that he favoured the probability of an assault and a fall as a consequence of that assault --
A. Yes.
Q. -- by the deceased, Mr Russel1?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I take you, please, to the report of Dr Duflou.
A. Sorry, whereabouts is that?
Q. That's at tab 171 [SCOI.10385.00060_0001].

THE COMMISSIONER: That's volume 6, isn't it?
MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I have that document.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. All right. Can I take you, please, to page 6 of 9 down the bottom.
A. Yes.
Q. Could I take you to answer 12(a), at the top of that page --
A. Yes.
Q. -- where he's asked for his opinion as to what the injuries and the position of the body suggest was the manner and cause of death.
A. Yes.
Q. He says, quite logically:

The injuries observed on the body are in my opinion indicative of a person having struck the ground following a fall from a height.
A. Yes.
Q. He then goes on to say this:

The pattern and distribution of the injuries, in my opinion, do not allow one to differentiate between an accidental fall, an intentional fall on the part of the deceased (ie with self-harm or suicidal intent) or a fall assisted in some way by one or more other persons.
A. Yes.
Q. Can I take you to the last paragraph on that page.

THE COMMISSIONER: Why don't you read the next sentence?
MR TEDESCHI: Q. The next sentence is:

The position of the body is somewhat unusual for an accidental or suicidal fall, in that the deceased likely faced towards the walkway when he commenced his fall. Much more commonly, in my experience, a person accidentally or suicidally falling would have been facing in the direction of the fall. However, I cannot exclude as entirely reasonable the possibility that the deceased was walking backwards at the time he fell (for example as a result of trying to move away from a person) --
A. Yes.
Q. --
or the possibility of the deceased having been pushed over the cliff face and falling backwards but landing face down as a result.
A. Yes.
Q. So is this what Dr Duflou appears to be saying, that he cannot distinguish between accident, intentional or being involved in an assault?
A. Yes. That appears to be what he's saying.
Q. That the position of the body is somewhat unusual, but it could result from him having, in effect, fallen backwards, down that slope at the top of the cliff?
A. Yes.
Q. In the manner that we've discussed previously?
A. Yes.
Q. At the bottom of that page, he says:

In conclusion $I$ am unable to provide an opinion, on the basis of the body location and the injuries, whether the deceased died of an accident, or as a result of suicide or the result of the action of another person or persons.
A. Correct.
Q. Then in terms of the position of the body on page 8, in the middle of the page, he says:

My answer to question (a) applies. In
summary, I am of the opinion it's possible for the deceased to have fallen backwards, ie facing towards land, or to have been pushed backwards while facing towards 7 and.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you were asked a number of questions by Counse1 Assisting about the differences and similarities between Dr Cala, in his report and in his evidence, and Dr Duflou? A. Yes.
Q. What do you say now about any difference or similarity that you perceived between the position of Dr Cala that he took ultimately at the inquest and the position of Dr Duflou in this report?
A. I would say that whilst there are some similarities there are also some differences in opinion.
Q. And what are those differences?
A. Wel1, it appears that Dr Cala definitely favoured assault as being the cause of death, whereas $I$ think

Dr Duflou's or Professor Duflou's theory is somewhat less than that. He considers it a possibility, but he also concedes that it could have been due to an accidental fall as well.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Mr Morgan, can I ask you this: in the course of your working with Mr Chebl, did you ever discuss or show Professor Duflou Dr Cala's evidence before Coroner Milledge?
A. I couldn't tell you that. I don't know, sir.
Q. You wouldn't know one way or the other?
A. No, I don't know one way or the other.
Q. Can you tell me now whether you were even aware of

Dr Cala's evidence before Coroner Milledge when you procured the report from Professor Duflou?
A. I believe I would have been, but I don't recall it.
Q. It would be commonsensical, though, wouldn't it, given the fact that Professor Duflou was never going to be cross-examined by anyone, to have shown him Dr Cala's answers to Mr Saidi at the inquest?
A. I probably would have shown those.
Q. But you have no recollection whether it was done or not?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And if it was done, you certainly didn't ask Professor Duflou, in the light of having read the transcript of Dr Cala, whether he continued to agree or disagree with anything Dr Cala had said?
A. No, I didn't - I didn't personally deal with Dr Duflou.
Q. No, but leaving aside whether you did or Chebl or somebody else did, the only piece of paper that you ever had from Professor Duflou was the 16 August 2017 opinion?
A. Sorry, what was that, sir?
Q. The only report that you ever had from

Professor Duflou, as I understand it, was his expert opinion dated August 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. And if he ever was shown Dr Cala's transcript - and
you don't know one way or the other - he certainly wasn't asked to descend into writing as to whether he maintained or disagreed or agreed with anything Dr Cala had said at the inquest in his evidence?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant, moving now to the inquest, could I take you to the submissions that were made by Counsel Assisting at volume 14, tab 323 [SCOI.02751.00159_0001]? I wi11 take you to page 5. A. Yes.
Q. At line 19, Counsel Assisting refers to the previous coronial inquest into Mr Russell's death and said:

Your Honour on 2 July 1990 the then State Coroner, or the Coroner, at the first inquest gave the following finding: "That
Mr Russell died of the effects of multiple injuries sustained then and there, when he fell from a cliff to the rocks below, but whether he fell accidentally or otherwise the evidence does not enable me to say."
A. Yes.
Q. Then he continues in his submission to Coroner Milledge:

The possibility your Honour of an accidental fall has to be considered, having regard to Mr Russel7's blood alcohol reading of .255 grams per 100 mils of blood. As to how he came to fall the evidence does not enable firm conclusions to be drawn other than to state that when he fell he was in the company of persons unknown.

Then in the next paragraph, Counsel Assisting, Mr Lakatos, referred to two particular pieces of the evidence in support of the proposition that when Mr Russell fell, he was in the company of persons unknown. At 1 ine 37 , he said
this:

> Your Honour there are two particular matters which support the conclusion of death by foul play. The first are the presence of the hairs, which I've already adverted to, and the second is the position of Mr Russel7's body when he was found at the base of the rocks.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do see that.
Q. Then he refers to the evidence of Dr Cala.
A. Yes.
Q. Then over the page at 1 ine 5 , Counsel Assisting said:

In my respectful submission the surrounding circumstances give rise to significant suspicions of foul play, whilst the evidence adduced does not permit the absolute exclusion of the proposition the death was occasioned accidentally. This possibility remains slight, the preponderance of the evidence being in support of a finding that death occurred by foul play, and that is the finding $I$ would invite your Honour to come to.
A. Yes.
Q. Her Honour, of course, came to the conclusion that this was a homicide?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, can I just indicate that having made that submission, her Honour actually immediately remarked:

Indeed, yes, I agree with that.
A. Yes.
Q. Does it appear from the Coroner's findings that the Coroner also substantially relied upon those same two pieces of evidence - namely, the position of the body and the presence of the hair?
A. Yes.
Q. During Neiwand, did you obtain some fresh evidence in relation to those two aspects that had been relied upon by Counsel Assisting and the Coroner?
A. Well, certainly there were opinions given in relation to the hair. However, all those, obviously because the hair exhibit itself had become lost back on or around 1989, they were purely looking at colour photographs to try and determine whether it was likely to have been Mr Russell's hair or somebody else's.
Q. But you had the fresh evidence of Dr Duflou?
A. Yes. That was in relation to the position of the body and the like, yes.
Q. And you had fresh evidence from Dr Moynham about the blood alcohol level - that it was unlikely to have been increased because of putrefaction of the body?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you also have some evidence from the senior forensic scientist Elizabeth Brooks about the hair on the back of Mr Russell's hand?
A. There was some evidence from a person in relation to the hair, yes.
Q. If we go to paragraph 123 of the summary in relation to Mr Russell, quoted from the report of forensic scientist Elizabeth Brooks - this is at tab 173 [SCOI.74882_0001].
A. Sorry, which page?
Q. Could I take you to page 32, where there is a heading "Hair sample".
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 125, the summary states that Strike Force Neiwand investigators met with Boehme, who was an AFP forensic biologist?
A. Yes.
Q. At the AFP office at Majura in the ACT?
A. Yes.
Q.

During this time, Boehme stated she conducted a review of a number of cases
from around Australia and found a number of examples where the victim of a homicide (where they sustained injuries to their head) had a bundle of their own displaced hair on or around their body.
A. Yes:
Q. And:

Boehme further stated that generally in homicides if an offender's hair is left in the crime scene it would generally be a single strand of hair rather than a bundle. Boehme also stated it's highly probable, as Russell had a 7.5 cm laceration to the back of his head, that the hair from around the wound would be displaced.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you consider that that material provided an explanation - a possible explanation for the hair?
A. It's possible.
Q. So bearing in mind - you have also referred to the evidence of Sergeant Cameron about, and I quote:

There was a small amount of damage to the vegetation. In my opinion, this could only have occurred if one person were to walk in that area.
A. Yes.
Q. So bearing in mind the additional material you had obtained from Dr Duflou and Dr Moynham, bearing in mind Elizabeth Brooks and Sergeant Cameron, did you consider that it was appropriate for Neiwand to reconsider the question of the manner and cause of death of Mr Russell, even though the Coroner had made a finding of probable homicide?
A. Yes.
Q. And apart from that evidence that I've referred to just now, you also had in mind the blood alcohol reading of 0.255 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, could I take you to the summary where --

THE COMMISSIONER: Before you do.
Q. I take it, Mr Morgan, you did take regard of what

Professor Duflou had said in every respect?
A. Yes.
Q. Why?
A. Because it was new evidence.
Q. But you also regarded he was high1y qualified to express the views he expressed?
A. Yes.
Q. One of the questions you asked him was in relation to the hairs, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Or did you forget that a moment ago when you agreed with Mr Tedeschi that his evidence seemingly was confined to the position of the body? Did you remember that you had asked him to express a view about the hair?
A. Well, when you say "you", sir --
Q. We11, and if not you, Mr Cheb1 - somebody --
A. Yes.
Q. -- I know that you had nothing to do with any of this, apparently, but in relation to Professor Duflou, did you participate in choosing him as an expert?
A. There were discussions along those lines.
Q. Wel1, does that mean "yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. If you would have a look, please, at his report, it is at tab 171 [SCOI.10385.00060_0001]. The very last question - I say "you", and forgive me if I'm nominating the wrong person, Mr Chebl or somebody - asked him was about the hair, and I take it you took into account his answer?
A. Yes. He said:
... it is relatively unlikely to have
originated from the head of the deceased although $I$ do not absolutely exclude this --
Q. Correct, he goes on to say that. But you did take into account that his view was that it was relatively unlikely, which was very similar to the view expressed by Dr Cala, wasn't it?
A. There were - there were similarities between the two.
Q. We11, on that point, did they not both say, in effect, that they thought it was unlikely, or relatively unlikely, to have come from the deceased's head? Couldn't be excluded because of the laceration, but it was relatively unlikely. Because the theory is, I suppose, whether he falls or is pushed, you can't explain, nobody can explain, why someone would be pulling their own hair out?
A. No, I certainly can't explain that. I'm not an expert.
Q. Okay. And as an experienced person, apparently, in the area of suicide, unless it's some extraordinary event, you would think it relatively unlikely, if someone was jumping, that at the same time they are puling their hair out?
A. Yes, it's - it would, I would think, be unlikely but not impossible.

THE COMMISSIONER: Not impossible. That's what Professor Duflou says. Thank you, Mr Morgan.

Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant, could I take you, please, to the last paragraph of the summary in relation to the death of John Russe11.
A. Yes.
Q. Paragraph 154 begins by saying:

In 2017, Forensic Pathologist Professor Duflou, stated that he was unable to provide an opinion on whether Russel 1 died due to an accident, suicide or homicide, based on the location of the body and injuries, which contrasts with that provided by Dr Cala.
A. Yes. I see that.
Q. The summary then goes on to say:

Dr Adine Boehme, Biology \& Forensics, was unable to provide an opinion in relation to the origins of the hairs depicted in the crime scene photographs.
A. Yes.
Q. Russel7's level of intoxication and related impairment may have also led to him falling from the cliff.
A. Yes.
Q. The walk way around Mackenzies Point (slight incline/decline) had no barriers and there was a steep drop from the cliff's edge.
A. Yes.
Q. Then he comes to a conclusion:

The available facts could support death by misadventure and/or homicide.
A. Correct.
Q. And then it recommends that the death should be reclassified as "undetermined", despite the finding of homicide by the Coroner?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that your view when this summary was done in 2017?
A. Yes. That was the consensus from Strike Force

Neiwand.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. I've got some further questions.
Q. In paragraph 153 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you say:

One of the photographs depicted loose hairs
on the rear of Russell's hand, which
Dr Cala claimed were not his.
Do you see that?
A. I do see that.
Q. And at the same time, you also knew that

Professor Duflou said it was relatively unlikely that they were the hairs of the deceased?
A. Yes.
Q. Those two factors alone would have pointed way away from accidental death, wouldn't they? If someone else's hair was there, it would indicate someone else was at the top of the cliff when this man fell?
A. I don't believe either of the forensic pathologists --
Q. Would you like to answer my question, though, please. I will give you a chance in a minute to clarify, if you need clarification. On the basis of your recording of what Dr Cala had to say and what you knew Professor Duflou said about the relative unlikelihood of it being the deceased's hair, those two opinions alone would support the presence of another person, wouldn't they?
A. That would do, yes.
Q. And that would trump any idea of accidental fall due to intoxication - not entirely but it would certainly bring into account a very real and tangible possibility contrary to that of intoxicated falling?
A. Of homicide.
Q. Of homicide. Well, it doesn't mean he wasn't drunk, but the fact is, the presence of someone else's hair on his hand wouldn't be there, that he'd picked it up in the afternoon at the pub having 12 or 15 middies and went up to the top of the cliff with the hair on the back of his head [sic]. That evidence alone was a viable alternative scenario which was contrary to accidental fall due to intoxication, wasn't it?
A. It appears to be, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. The Commissioner has suggested to you that homicide was a viable alternative based upon, predominantly, the presence of the hairs?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree with that now?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you agree that homicide was a viable alternative as a possibility - as a possible scenario?
A. Certainly a possibility, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Why did you disagree with the answer a moment ago, then?

Sorry, put it again, Mr Tedeschi, or perhaps I will put it for you
Q. Do you accept that on the basis of your recording of

Dr Cala's view of the hair being other than that of the deceased, which was accorded with the view of your
Professor Duflou - forgive my using that pronoun, but
Professor Duflou - who said "relatively unlikely" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- do you agree that homicide was a viable alternative?
A. It's a viable alternative.
Q. All right. But not one that you preferred?
A. No.
Q. So you rejected Professor Cala's view about the hair and its provenance, and you then rejected
Professor Duflou's view of the relative unlikelihood of it being the deceased's hair?
A. Well, neither of the medical experts, Commissioner, appeared absolute. They both considered that there were possibilities in the alternative.
Q. And the other possibility was, because of his metabolism, he could well have metabolised that amount of alcohol if he was used to drinking it regularly?
A. I think Professor Moynham negated that suggestion.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right.
Yes, all right, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Did Professor Moynham say that anybody would be affected to some degree by that amount of alcohol in their blood?
A. Yes. And he also gave a range, and obviously the range that was found in the blood level of Mr Russell was within that range for the size of Mr Russell and the amount that we know he had to drink that night.
Q. All right. Sergeant, Dr Cala was of one view, that he preferred the possibility of an assault and a fall?
A. Yes.
Q. Counsel Assisting was of the view that the finding should be, although you couldn't exclude misadventure, that it was more probably an assault?
A. Yes.
Q. The Coroner found that in all probability it was an assault?
A. Yes.
Q. You've stated your view, that is the one that was in that summary, that there are three possible alternatives, you can't distinguish between them?
A. Well, I don't believe it was suicide. I don't think there is any suggestion of suicides.
Q. Sorry, you are quite right. There are two possible alternatives, misadventure and an assault, and you don't prefer one over the other?
A. Personally, I do still feel it was misadventure. But I understand it's very subjective and I understand if others see it differently.
Q. Do you accept that other people might have different views to your own as to the probabilities in relation to those two possible scenarios?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Including the Coroner; correct? A. Yes. Well, clearly the Coroner found it was homicide.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. So your view now is the same as the view that was expressed in the summary?
A. Yes.
Q. And did anybody in the Police Force suggest to you at the time during Neiwand or prior to Neiwand that you should come to that view?
A. No.
Q. Did anybody suggest to you that you should seek to modify the findings of the Coroner?
A. No.
Q. Did you receive any direction or suggestion or any influence whatsoever to suggest what your findings in relation to the death of Mr Russell should be?
A. Definitely not.
Q. In particular, did you receive any sort of indication from then Superintendent Willing as to what the conclusion in relation to Mr Russell should be?
A. No.
Q. Or from Inspector Lehmann?
A. No.
Q. Once again, I ask you, did you gain any benefit or advantage in your career as a police officer by pursuing or exploring or advancing the hypothesis of misadventure in the case of Mr Russell?
A. Certainly not.
Q. Are you aware of any benefit or advantage that Sergeant Chebl got from advancing that proposition?
A. No, he did not.
Q. Moving away now from Mr Russell to some general
questions --
THE COMMISSIONER: Before you do.
Q. You have taken exception in a number of questions that I put to you with my using the term "yours" or "you"? A. Yes.
Q. But perhaps for the last time, can I proceed upon the basis that these summaries are views which you carefully
read and endorsed, otherwise you would never have accepted them?
A. As I explained, Commissioner, I think yesterday, clearly, it's been shown over the last three days --
Q. Mr Morgan, the mere fact that you have accepted in various questions and answers that there are defects, or whatever you might call them --
A. Yes.
Q. -- at the time these documents were produced by

Mr Chebl, do you take responsibility for them or not?
A. I accept that I reviewed them.
Q. Do you take responsibility for them or not?
A. Well, clearly, sir, there are errors in there, of which I wasn't aware.
Q. No, Mr Morgan, I'm not being hard on you, I'm asking you a straightforward question: when you accepted these documents, does that not represent to the senior persons in the Police Force that you were taking full responsibility for these summaries and the terms of them?
A. I did take responsibility for them.
Q. Well "did"; but "do" is the point. Whether you have a view now which is the same or not, or different views or not, at the time these documents were prepared and you accepted them, you were taking, were you not, according to your superiors, full responsibility for the content of each of these summaries?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Yes, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Sergeant, as a result of the conclusions that were reached by Strike Force Neiwand and that were detailed in the three summaries that you have been questioned about?
A. Yes.
Q. To your mind at the time, were those findings or those conclusions intended by you or anybody else to play any role at all in relation to the investigation by Strike Force Macnamir into the death of Scott Johnson?
A. Certainly not.
Q. Are you aware whether the conclusions or the findings in the Neiwand summaries in fact, to your knowledge, had any effect or influence on the activities or the findings of Strike Force Macnamir into the death of Scott Johnson?
A. I'm totally unaware of any result.
Q. Could I take you, please, to volume 14, tab 285
[NPL.0115.0004.3512]?
A. Yes.
Q. This is an email that was brought to your attention by Counse1 Assisting?
A. It was.
Q. Dated 26 February 2016, from you to two members of your previous team that you were involved in, I think in the Southern Region?
A. Correct.
Q. And you were asked a number of questions about the sentence that reads as follows:

Apparently it is going to be a political and media-driven hot potato later this year ...
A. Yes.
Q.
... and the Boss wants to be able to say that his squad are further investigating the matter.
A. Yes.
Q. And you identified that "the Boss" was then Superintendent Mick Wiliing?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there anything in that email that suggests that Superintendent Willing wanted the Coroner's findings to be downgraded or changed?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything in that email to suggest that

Superintendent Willing wanted a cursory review or a cursory reinvestigation?
A. No.
Q. Of the Taradale matters?
A. No, there is not.
Q. Is there anything in that email to suggest that Superintendent Willing wanted Strike Force Taradale and/or Sergeant Page to be criticised?
A. No, there is not.
Q. Was it your understanding at that time that Superintendent Willing wanted a fulsome, proper, professional reinvestigation of the matters?
A. Yes.
Q. I ask you once again: was there any direction or suggestion from him as to what the findings should be?
A. No, there was no such direction.

MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, would you pardon me for a moment?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.
MR TEDESCHI: Yes, thank you very much.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I've got a matter I need to attend to in chambers. I gather the next witness is Mr Page. I will just go off the bench. Perhaps if I take the break now, Mr Tedeschi, that wouldn't inconvenience your side, I take it?

MR TEDESCHI: Not at all. Not at all.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I will take the break now and when we resume there will be Sergeant or former Police Officer Page. All right. I will adjourn.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: I gather Mr Morgan is still here. What I am going to do is excuse him, or formally excuse him, so I will do that. I haven't really completed what I meant to do, Mr Tedeschi. We've got, as you can imagine, other things to do. What I'11 do is I'11 allow Mr Morgan to go
and I'11 come back on in a few minutes. Al1 right.
Thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Gray.
MR GRAY: Your Honour, I call Stephen Page.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Page, wil1 you take an oath or an affirmation? It is a matter of indifference to me.

THE WITNESS: Oath, sir.
<STEPHEN PAGE, sworn:
[11.27am]

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Please sit down. Yes, Mr Gray.
<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:

MR GRAY: Q. Mr Page, you are a former Detective Sergeant of Police?
A. That's right.
Q. And you have made a statement in the Special

Commission dated 16 February 2023?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Do you have that statement with you?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Could Mr Page have his own statement, please. It is at tab 253 of volume 12, [SCOI. 82472_0001]. Now, Mr Page,
I think there is one correction that you need to make of
a minor nature at paragraph 62.
A. Sorry, just that tab number again, if I could, please?
Q. It is tab 253, I'm sorry.
A. Thank you. Yes.
Q. If you could turn to paragraph 62?
A. Yes.
Q. I think there's a correction you need to make there in that the paragraph number referred to in that first line should be 60 rather than 59 ; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You were the officer in charge of Operation Taradale back in 2001/2002?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. When you embarked upon that operation, what was your approach, in the sense did you approach it with a view that you only had one particular line of inquiry in mind, or did you have an open mind, or how would you describe to the Commissioner what your general approach was?
A. The investigation grew as we went along in relation to the deceased that we were looking at, but, you know, my role is to, you know, be objective, gather whatever information is available, put it in a brief of evidence and put it before the Coroner. So no focus on any particular inquiry - any particular line of inquiry.
Q. As your operation went on, one line of inquiry, among others, was the individuals and groups or gangs who it became clear were known to have been operating in the Bondi, Tamarama, Marks Park area in the late '80s and early '90s?
A. Yes.
Q. That awareness came from various sources, one of which was the work of Detective Sergeant McCann and others back at about that time, in the late '80s, early '90s?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you became aware of those reports or statements by, among others, Sergeant McCann and Sergeant Ingleby? A. Yes.
Q. And you pursued inquiries relating to that line of possibilities, among others?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you also, in the case of the three deaths or disappearances that you were ultimately looking at in Taradale - namely, the death of Mr Warren [sic] and the disappearances, as they were then known to be, of Mr Warren and Mr Mattaini - did you explore other possibilities
besides that of violence from individuals or gangs?
A. Absolutely. Had to, you know, keep an open mind and look at other options, so such as, you know, accident, suicide and the like.
Q. Now, the term "victimology" means approximately what, in your understanding?
A. Victimology's a study of the victim and trying to understand, you know, why them and why then. So you're doing a deep dive on them, and hopefully that study will point you towards an offender. You're looking at their associates, their work patterns, their habits, their financial, you know, state of affairs, medical matters as well, and you basically create a category list and you go through that and it helps you build a profile in relation to a person.
Q. Did Taradale, as you were participating in it and leading it, pursue those 1 ines of inquiry as wel1?
A. Absolutely. So speaking with, you know, family, friends, associates, workmates, partners, to form an opinion in relation to, you know, the deceased.
Q. Now, you've become aware, I think, around towards the end of last year, of the existence of Strike Force Neiwand? A. That's right.
Q. Until you were made aware of the existence of that strike force by the Special Commission, did you have any idea that it had existed?
A. No idea whatsoever.
Q. And you've now had the opportunity to read the three Neiwand summaries in respect of Messrs Mattaini, Warren and Russe11?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And you've given some evidence in your statement, at least in summary form, about some aspects of those three summaries?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, one of the accusations made in those three summaries, each of them, in fact, is that Taradale, and thus you yourself, relied on investigation confirmation bias. Do you remember noticing that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And Neiwand described "confirmation bias" as:

The tendency to bolster an hypothesis by seeking consistent evidence while disregarding inconsistent evidence.

Do you remember noticing that that's what Neiwand said confirmation bias was?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You and Taradale were said in each of these three summaries to have disregarded inconsistent evidence. Did you do that?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Elsewhere in I think all three of those summaries, but certainly two of them, the Neiwand summaries alleged that Taradale had been guilty of tunnel vision in focusing only on one line of inquiry. What do you say to that?
A. Absolutely false. The Taradale brief of evidence shows examinations in multiple areas including suicide and the like.
Q. I want to ask you some questions about the Mattaini case in particular, and in relation to Mr Mattaini's partner, Mr Musy. How did it come about that Mr Wyszynski and Mr Musy approached the police in about August 2002? What happened, as you understand it?
A. My understanding in relation to that, they approached us after seeing some material in the media in relation to investigations of deaths of gay men around Bondi. I can best describe it as a light bulb moment for them, and Mr Wyszynski reached out to police. I literally turned up at work and there was a note that he'd been in touch and I contacted him.
Q. Now, pausing there, on 25 July 2002, you had completed and signed off on your very long statement in Taradale you'd recall that?
A. That's right.
Q. Of some 250 or 280 pages, I think?
A. Yes.
Q. With about 280 -odd annexures. And that statement related to the cases of Warren and Russell and DM; is that
right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was just not long after that that Mr Wyszynski, and then Mr Musy, came to see the police; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. You have said that Mr Wyszynski actually came to the police station and left a note with, I assume, a telephone number?
A. I believe it was a phone contact with the police service.
Q. I see.
A. I'm not sure who it was that took the call. I can't I don't recall now. But I certainly had a note when
I arrived at work to contact him in relation to the matter.
Q. And did you then contact him?
A. Yes.
Q. And did he come in?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you take a statement from him?
A. Yes.
Q. And did he tell you that he was coming in because he'd been prompted by what he'd read in the media?
A. Yes.
Q. Among the things he told you, I take it, was that

Mr Musy had been Mr Mattaini's partner?
A. That was one of the things.
Q. And were you then given some telephone numbers or other means of contacting Mr Musy?
A. I don't recall exactly how I contacted Mr Musy, but I certainly did, and we made arrangements to meet.
Q. Now, he came in?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you may or may not remember this: the statement of Mr Musy, which is before the Commission, bears a date 3 August. In your own statement to the Milledge inquiry, you refer to having prepared a statement for Mr Musy on

14 August. Do you have a recollection now as to which of those dates is likely to be right?
A. With the passage of time I'm not sure but I would tend to err towards 3 August. I don't have access to systems but I can check - you know, it could be checked by working out when that statement was uploaded to the e@gle.i program.
Q. Well, according to the Mattaini summary produced by Neiwand, it was on 1 August that Mr Wyszynski made contact with the police, and is your recollection that you saw Mr Wyszynski and obtained a statement from him and saw Mr Musy and obtained a statement from him shortly after that approach?
A. Yes.
Q. In the case of Mr Musy, when he came in and you took a statement from him, how did that happen physically, logistically? What was the process?
A. I met him at - I met Mr Musy at Paddington Police Station. I had an office near the front counter. We both went into that - our work room. I sat down beside him and we had a computer in front of us. He was beside me looking at the computer.
Q. Do you mean to say that you asked him some questions and then typed his answers or what do you mean?
A. My normal process is I don't tend to get bogged down with writing notes or conversations outside of a statement because, you know, you can get lost in translation, you can forget to bring bits in or what have you. It's asking just engaging with the witness and typing as we go. At prior jobs to this one I used to send telegrams for Australia Post so I can type at pace, so as it's said it's pretty well typed.
Q. So you were a fast typist?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were sitting down at the computer screen typing as Mr Musy spoke?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was watching what you were typing, as you typed
it on the screen?
A. I believe so.
Q. I'm going to take you to the statement, Mr Musy's statement, which is in volume 6, tab 159 [SCOI.02744.00381_0001].
A. I have that.
Q. Do you have tab 159?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. As I mentioned, the date at the top of the page is 3 August 2002. That's the basis for the question I asked you a little while ago.
A. And I note the summary also says the same date.
Q. Yes, the cover summary at the front. Yes. Now, you have a memory, as you've just been explaining, of Mr Musy coming in and sitting next to you as you typed on the screen. In the third - sorry, in paragraph numbered 5, the second paragraph on page 2 , and then paragraph numbered 6, the third paragraph on that page, there are references to two suicide attempts by Mr Mattaini.
A. Yes.
Q. What's your recollection as to how it came about that those two paragraphs were included in the statement?
A. It would have been an open-ended question along the lines of, you know, "What can you tell me about any history of self-harm", and they were given to me in that order, and I know they're out of sequence in relation to when they've occurred but that's the order I would have been given it, open-ended - an open-ended question and just typed that statement as we discussed it.
Q. Did he say anything else to you in relation to suicide or suicidal thoughts on this occasion in the police station as you were typing on the screen, besides what appears in those paragraphs?
A. No.
Q. Did Mr Musy say to you on that occasion anything to the effect that Mr Mattaini had ever said that he preferred death to life?
A. No.
Q. Did Mr Musy say to you on that occasion anything to the effect that Mr Mattaini had ever said that if he were to commit suicide, he would do it in a way that his body would not be found?
A. No.
Q. If Mr Musy had said anything to that effect, would you have included that in your statement?
A. Oh, absolutely. Those statements, as far as I'm concerned, are almost show-stoppers. You've got to capture that, and they would have 1 anded in the statement.
Q. Now, I think you've had occasion to look again, or to look in recent times, at the transcript of what Mr Musy said before Coroner Milledge?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are aware that in his oral evidence, he did refer to Mr Mattaini at a particular point in time having had the outlook of preferring death to 1 ife?
A. Yes.
Q. But your evidence is that he had never said any such thing to you?
A. At the time of the taking of the statement, no.
Q. And subsequent1y?
A. No.
Q. Now, you're aware, aren't you, that the Neiwand summary in relation to Mr Mattaini accuses you of deliberately withholding important evidence from the Coroner?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that true?
A. No.
Q. What do you say about Neiwand not giving you any opportunity to respond to that accusation?
A. Look, as a matter of fairness, I should have been given the opportunity to respond. Whether I would have been 1 istened to is another thing.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. I think the report that $I$ read was certainly focused on being absolutely critical against Taradale. I don't think $I$ would have had a voice and $I$ don't think it would have been considered.
Q. As I've asked you already, there were many other
accusations against Taradale and you in these three summaries, including tunnel vision and confirmation bias and various other supposed errors and defects on the part of Taradale and/or yourself?
A. Yes.
Q. You are aware of that? And are you aware that Sergeant Morgan yesterday and in recent days has essentially acknowledged that all or most of the criticisms of you and Taradale by Neiwand were unwarranted? A. Yes.
Q. In the light of that acknowledgment by Sergeant Morgan, again, do you have a view about your having been given no opportunity to respond?
A. Look, I can't say any more than I have on that. I think - I don't think it would have been - would have added value from their end. It would have been disregarded.
Q. You are aware, I take it, from the evidence before this Commission in recent days, that these summaries have been published - that is, the three Neiwand summaries have been published - within the NSW Police Force to all of those with relevant access to e@gle.i?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are aware that the post operational assessment which contains many of the criticisms of you from the summaries, has been published as high as the Commander Homicide and the Director of Crime Operations and the Commander of State Crime Command?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your view or what do you say about those accusations, now apparently withdrawn, having been published in those various ways and to such high-ranking officers?
A. I think my reputation was, you know, absolutely professionally destroyed in those reports.
Q. And how does that make you feel?

MR TEDESCHI: I object. Relevance.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will allow it.
MR GRAY: Q. You are allowed to answer that question.
A. It feels like I wasted a lot of time with Taradale. A lot of the gains that we had along the way were almost for nothing.
Q. And apart from the impact of this on you, what's your reaction in terms of what it means for the families?
A. That was my big concern. I - you know, I've got broad shoulders, I'11 cop it. But my main concern was it seemed strategic. I was pushed out of the way so that there could be a free swing at the families - or more the deceased, I should say.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can I just interrupt, Mr Gray.
Q. Mr Page, apart from yourself, who were the other police officers assisting you on Taradale?
A. Oh, sir, there was probably 12 at various stages.
Q. Would you be able to name some of them or all of them?
A. Graham Nicholas, Brad Dagg. They're the main supporters that $I$ had with Taradale.
Q. And was the group of 12 with you most of the time or did they come and go?
A. Most of the time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Yesterday, Sergeant Morgan gave some evidence particularly about the investigation into John Russel1 originally, the 1989 investigation. And I think you're aware that, in his view, that 1989 investigation, led by Plain Clothes Constable Dunbar was, in Sergeant Morgan's words, "to the standard of the day". Are you aware that he said that?
A. Yes.
Q. What's your own response to that or your own view about that 1989 investigation?
A. I've got a different view, and no disrespect to Constable Dunbar, but $I$ think she was very junior, and my experience as a junior detective in the late 1980s is whenever it appeared you had a suspicious death, you would be supported by much more senior police officers. They would take the lead.
Q. In this instance, the presence of the hairs on the
back of Mr Russell's hand immediately alerted, or should have alerted, those investigating the matter to at least the possibility of foul play?
A. Yes.
Q. That's your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you saying that as soon as that factor was recognised, somebody more senior than Detective Senior Constable, or Detective Constable, rather, Dunbar, should have been brought in, or would have been brought in, in your experience?
A. Probably go back one step. I think she was even a plain clothes constable, hadn't even done the detectives course.
Q. You are quite right. Plain clothes is the appellation, that's right.
A. And, yeah, my personal view and my experience is with similar - you know, with suspicious matters, is that a more senior police officer would take the lead role.
Q. Had that happened, or in any event, what else comes to your mind as steps that should have been taken or could have been taken in 1989 but were not?
A. I think the disappearance of Ross Warren was known at the time of the death of John Russell, and shortly after, we had the assault of DM, you know, in reasonable close proximity. There should have been alarm bells that there was a problem with assaults on gay men in that era in that area, and I think also the evidence of Sergeant Ingleby at the Coroner's Court certainly suggested that it was prevalent and well known to police.
Q. Now, as to the hairs, there was a suggestion yesterday that DNA technology or the use of DNA testing had not come in in New South Wales, at least, as at this time, 1989.
What can you tell us in that regard?
A. That's true. It wasn't commonly used. Any - I think at that stage, in the early stages, samples had to be flown I think even to the UK to get tested. It was very expensive. But for volume offences, there was other avenues available. So we used to be able to get hair tested and it would - if the - you know, the follicles were attached, you could get blood groups, as an example, of the owner of the hair.
Q. Was that something called PGM testing?
A. That was part of the process on those scientists, but that was - they would give you, you know, some data in relation to the characteristics of that hair sample.
Q. And one thing that could be established, if you had the follicles, would be the blood type?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would tell you or it would be likely to tel 1 you whether the hair was from the deceased person or not? A. Yes.
Q. It's your recollection, is it, that as at this time, 1989, DNA testing had begun to be used elsewhere, for example, in the UK?
A. I - just in my readings $I$ - certain1y in the 1ate '80s overseas it was starting to be used.
Q. And was it a development which, in Sydney, it was anticipated would be coming our way some time in the future?
A. I think everyone, you know, certainly in law enforcement, with investigators, we knew it was - we knew it was an emerging technology that was coming, probably similar to us today knowing that $A I$ is just around the corner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can I just interrupt again, I'm sorry.
Q. Mr Page, something more fundamental. If the hair had been available, first, a direct comparison could have been made between its colour and texture as against that of the deceased; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, secondly, it could have been checked to see whether it had come from the deceased's head as part of a laceration?
A. Absolutely.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: I have nothing further, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Tedeschi.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR TEDESCHI:

MR TEDESCHI: Q. Mr Page, you were asked some questions by Counse1 Assisting about the disappearance and presumed death of Mr Mattaini.
A. Yes.
Q. I would like to ask you some questions about that.

You are aware, I take it, from papers that have been provided to you by those assisting this Inquiry that there was an investigator's note that was created during the course of the Neiwand strike force?
A. Yes.
Q. About a conversation between Mr Musy and Detective Sergeant Chebl?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to look at that in recent times?
A. In the last weeks, yes, certainly.

MR TEDESCHI: Perhaps if that could be made available to him, tab 167A in volume 6,[SCOI.10389.00042_0001].

THE WITNESS: I have that document in front of me.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. Can I take you to page 4. The last paragraph on that page says this:

Musy stated throughout his relationship with Mattaini he found him to be comfortable with death and would speak open7y about dying on his own accord rather than naturally. Musy elaborated on this by saying, following Mattaini's --
and then he talks about his two suicide attempts. If that
was in fact what Mr Musy said to Sergeant Chebl, do you accept that it appears to be Musy saying something that happened during the course of his relationship with Mr Mattaini, accepting it at face value?

MR GRAY: I object, your Honour. The document speaks for itself. Mr Page's interpretation of it will not add anything.

THE COMMISSIONER: That may be, but I'11 allow Mr Tedeschi to ask the question, and if it's shown later that it's contextually inappropriate, then no doubt I'11 have that pointed out to me. Yes, Mr Tedeschi.

MR TEDESCHI: Q. If you accept that at face value and accept that that's what Musy said, whether he did or didn't I'm not putting to you, but what I'm suggesting to you is that if you accept that at face value, it would appear, just from this entry, that what Mr Musy has said is that he was speaking about suicide during their relationship?
A. That's right.
Q. That, of course, was different to the material that you had from Mr Musy?
A. Yes.
Q. What you had gleaned from Mr Musy was that any suicidal ideation had occurred well before their relationship?
A. That's right.
Q. But if you accept at face value this as being accurate, it would appear to be some different information about suicidal ideation to what you had?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, if the Neiwand investigators accepted this evidence, it could provide some additional evidence of suicide?
A. Yes.
Q. Supporting suicide?
A. Yes.
Q. At the inquest, do you recall that Mr Musy had given evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to read his evidence at the inquest in recent times?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Do you agree that Mr Musy gave evidence that there had been some relationship problems between himself and Mr Mattaini in recent times?
A. Yes.
Q. Including their intimate relations?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you accept that there was some evidence from

Mr Musy at the inquest that Mr Mattaini was worried to some extent about his visa situation in Australia?
A. That's right.
Q. It is correct, isn't it, that there was no evidence at al1 about the place and the time of Mr Mattaini's death?
A. That's right.
Q. Mr Mattaini was not a man who was known to go to gay beats?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you agree that the evidence as to his - the very meagre evidence as to his last sighting had him in the northern part of Bondi heading in a northerly direction away from Marks Park?
A. Yes.
Q. Taradale had conducted extensive investigations into a lot of persons of interest?
A. That's right.
Q. I think - correct me if I'm wrong - you had, in fact, monitored or listened to or considered something like 17,000 phone calls?
A. Yes.
Q. But none of them had provided any link between gangs or gay hate - members of gay hate gangs to the disappearance of Mr Mattaini?
A. None that met a standard for prosecution, no.
Q. It was clear, wasn't it, from Mr Musy's contact with Taradale, that he had immediately, on being informed about Mr Mattaini's disappearance, concluded that his partner had suicided?
A. I don't know whether it was immediately but that was one of the - the conclusion that he came to, that he believed it to be suicide.
Q. Can I suggest that he told you that he had been so
overcome by emotion when he heard about the disappearance that he had basically been under the effect of prescription drugs for some weeks and had not taken part in any inquiries about Mr Mattaini himself but left it to other friends?
A. That's right.
Q. Because he believed that Mr Mattaini must have committed suicide?
A. Yes.
Q. And he believed that Mr Mattaini must have committed suicide from 1985 unti1 2002 when he had contact with
Taradale?
A. Yes.
Q. It would appear as though the other family members, in particular Mr Mattaini's mother, had accepted that he must have committed suicide?
A. Yes.
Q. At the inquest, were you present during the whole of the inquest?
A. Most of it, yes.
Q. The Counse1 Assisting was a Mr Lakatos?
A. That's right.
Q. I think he took silk very shortly after this inquiry?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And then a couple of years later became a District Court judge?
A. That's right.
Q. The police service was represented by Mr Saidi?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you provide ongoing assistance to Mr Saidi during the course of the inquiry?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recal1 that at the inquest in relation to

Mr Mattaini, the submission that was made by Counsel Assisting was this:

The manner and cause of the death of

Mr Mattaini and Mr Warren remain unknown.
On the present state of the evidence your Honour it is submitted that
your Honour should bring in an open finding in relation to the deaths of Mr Mattaini and Mr Warren.
A. That's right.
Q. Do you agree that that submission was a perfectly reasonable submission for Counsel Assisting to make based upon the evidence that was then available?
A. Yes.
Q. Of course, the Coroner came to what might be called a stronger conclusion, that she thought that it was likely that he was --

THE COMMISSIONER: We11, Mr Tedeschi, that is not accurate. She made a finding and, in the context of the finding, she made some comments - that is a more accurate way of putting the position.

MR TEDESCHI: It is more accurate.
THE COMMISSIONER: And you are, I thought, addressing the finding, and the finding, it seems to me, is on all fours with the submission made, wasn't it?

MR TEDESCHI: I will correct that.
Q. The finding was that it was an open finding?
A. In relation to Mr Mattaini?
Q. In relation to Mr Mattaini?
A. Yes.
Q. But she found or she noted that he may have been the victim of a gay hate crime like the other two?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you agree that, based upon the evidence that was available, that if one accepted the additional material that I've brought to your attention in the investigator's note, that was an important piece of evidence if it was correctly recorded?
A. Yes.
Q. And it would point more towards suicide than towards gay hate crime or accident?
A. That's right, if it was correctly recorded.
Q. And can I suggest to you that it's based upon an acceptance of that material that it was a rational and acceptable conclusion to conclude that Mr Mattaini may well have taken his own life rather than met with foul play? A. If that material was accepted, yes.
Q. So is it a situation where different minds may have different opinions about the same evidence?
A. Yes .
Q. And is it quite common in such cases, where there are - particularly where there's no body that is found, so there's a lack of forensic evidence, that different police officers might have different opinions about the likely cause of death?
A. That can happen, yes.
Q. And do you agree that the Mattaini disappearance is one of those cases, where different minds may legitimately have different views?
A. I agree with that.
Q. In relation to Mr Warren, that was also a case where no body was located?
A. Yes.
Q. Therefore there was no crime scene analysis that was done, in any event?
A. That's right.
Q. This was a case where I think a Detective Bowditch conducted the initial investigation?
A. That's right.
Q. And that was the subject of really serious criticism
by Coroner Milledge?
A. Yes.
Q. Although there was no body located, Mr Warren's car and his keys had been found in the vicinity of Marks Park? A. Yes.
Q. Which made it probably more likely than not that he had disappeared in the vicinity of Marks Park?
A. That was my conclusion.
Q. At the inquest in relation to Mr Warren, the same submission was made by Counsel Assisting, namely, this:

In my submission your Honour, the situation so far as the evidence discloses is that the manner and cause of the deaths of Mr Mattaini and Mr Warren remain unknown. As I have said there are real suspicions that they met their deaths by foul play and by being the subject of gay hate attacks, however there is no reliable evidence that this conclusion can firmly be drawn.

That was the submission made by Mr Lakatos?
A. Yes.
Q. In your view, was that a perfectly reasonable and acceptable and logical submission to make based upon the evidence that was then available?
A. Perfectly fair submission but I wasn't aligned with the opinion in relation to Warren.
Q. So you had a different opinion in relation to

Mr Warren?
A. Yes.
Q. Different to Counsel Assisting?
A. Yes.
Q. The final concluding submission made by Mr Lakatos was:

On the present state of the evidence your Honour it is submitted that
your Honour should bring in an open finding in relation to the deaths of Mr Mattaini --
A. Yes.
Q. --
and Mr Warren.

Is it that you held a different opinion at the time? A. At the time, I believed Warren was a victim of homicide - personally, I - Mr Lakatos was certainly entitled to put forward what he put forward, but my personal view was differing in relation to Warren.
Q. And once again, is it a situation where different minds may legitimately place different emphasis on parts of the evidence and come to different conclusions or different possibilities or probabilities?
A. Yes.
Q. In relation to Mr Warren, were you aware that he had some photographs in his home of two men whom it would appear he was interested in in a romantic sense?
A. Yes.
Q. And that he had been rejected by them?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you also know that he had failed to obtain employment with a major television network?
A. I wasn't aware that he'd failed to obtain employment that wasn't shared with me along the way. But I knew that he was pursuing employment with a major network.
Q. And are you aware that since Taradale, it's been suggested that he may have been concerned about having been exposed to HIV?
A. I've read that. I don't know that to be true.
Q. If those were accepted as being true, those three aspects, they would be relevant to a consideration of manner and cause of death?
A. I wouldn't suggest the employment aspect would, you know, be a major consideration in relation to, say, a suicide theory. It's possible, but not probable, in my mind, and in relation to HIV, I don't know what his mind set was at that time, so --
Q. But if you accept for the moment that those things were made available to Neiwand, do you accept that they were relevant considerations for the members of Neiwand to take into account in formulating their view? A. Yes.
Q. And do you accept, again, that in relation to those facts and the other facts that were available to Taradale, that minds may legitimately differ?
A. Minds can differ but $I$ don't believe the material that I've read was sufficient to sway me away from anything other than murder for Warren.
Q. But do you accept that other police officers may legitimately have come to a different conclusion and favoured the possibility of death by some other means? A. They may well have.
Q. And that's just because, in a case like this, where there's no body and there was an inadequate investigation to begin with, it's very hard to come up with any definitive answer at all?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Coroner might have one view, Counsel Assisting might have one view, the police might have another view some people might focus on some pieces of evidence, other people might think that that's not important?
A. That's right.
Q. You get a lot of differences of opinion in such cases because of the inherent uncertainties in the actual cause of death?
A. That's right.
Q. Going to Mr Russell, this, of course, was a case where the body had been found at the base of the cliff?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you've noted, there was some hair found in the vicinity of his hand. It wasn't clutched in his hand, was it?
A. That's right.
Q. It was actually on top of his hand; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you tell from the photographs - because that's all you had, the photographs, wasn't it?
A. That's right.
Q. Could you tell from the photographs whether it was adhering to his hand because of any blood, or some other
reason, why it was stuck to his hand?
A. I couldn't tell, no.
Q. So you couldn't see any blood in the vicinity of the hairs?
A. That's right.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. It was the police who took the photographs, was it?
A. That's right, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Mr Tedeschi.
MR TEDESCHI: Q. And of course, the loss of the hairs is inexcusable?
A. It is.
Q. Whether DNA was available or not, as you've said, there were other tests that could have been done at that time, including, as the Commissioner has mentioned, comparing the colour and the appearance and the shape and the texture of the hair with his own hair so that if it was different it would strongly suggest that there was somebody else involved?
A. That's right. That could have been done at the scene.
Q. And I think you made inquiries and found that you could not determine who was responsible for the loss of the hairs; is that right?
A. I made inquiries but Sergeant McCann made inquiries a decade before me and he also couldn't locate the hair.
Q. Were you able to locate who was responsible for the loss of the hair?
A. No.
Q. When the Coroner came to consider the case of Russe11, there were two particular facts that were important to her in relation to her findings, as stated in her findings, and do you agree that that was the hair that had been found --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the hairs that had been found? And the position of the body?
A. Yes.
Q. And Dr Cala had given evidence about the position of
the body suggesting that, for him, he thought it was more likely that he'd been the victim of an assault rather than a fall?
A. That's right.
Q. There was no consideration at all that Mr Russel1 may have committed suicide, was there?
A. No.
Q. He was perfectly happy in his life; it was not a consideration?
A. I found no evidence of, you know, a suggestion of suicide whatsoever.
Q. And Counsel Assisting made this submission to the Coroner, and I quote:

In my respectful submission the surrounding circumstances give rise to significant suspicions of foul play, whilst the evidence adduced does not permit the absolute exclusion of the proposition the death was occasioned accidentally. This possibility remains slight, the preponderance of the evidence being in support of a finding that death occurred by foul play, and that is the finding $I$ would invite your Honour to come to.
A. Yes.
Q. And in the transcript at that point, her Honour immediately added:

Indeed, yes, I agree with that.

Was that your view at the time?
A. That's my recollection.
Q. Are you aware from the papers that you've been shown that the members of Strike Force Neiwand obtained some fresh evidence in relation to those two pieces of evidence? A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware that particularly in relation to the blood alcohol reading of .255 , that Dr Moynham expressed the view that he did not think that the blood alcohol level
would have significantly increased after death?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware that $\operatorname{Dr}$ Duflou had given evidence to basically say that, in his view, the position of the body did not allow him to differentiate between either accidental fall or a fall assisted by another person?
A. He did say that.
Q. Do you agree that that's a difference in emphasis between $\operatorname{Dr}$ Cala and $\operatorname{Dr}$ Duflou?
A. On that one single point, yes.
Q. Yes. That Dr Cala says he prefers the view that there was an assault and a fall, whereas Dr Duflou says, in essence, he can't distinguish between a misadventure fall and a fall following from an assault?
A. That's right.
Q. So that there's a difference in emphasis there, do you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. You were aware that there was a senior forensic scientist, Elizabeth Brooks, who was of the view that the hair found on the back of Mr Russell's hand could have come from the deceased's own scalp?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware of whether there was a laceration on the scalp of the deceased?
A. Yes, we had post-mortem notes.
Q. So he did have a laceration?
A. I - just going back through my recent readings, yeah, I believe so.
Q. So bearing in mind the evidence from the forensic scientist that the hair could have come from the deceased's own scalp, Dr Moynham's evidence that the deceased likely had that high level of blood alcohol at the time of his death, and the evidence of Dr Duflou, do you agree that, again, minds may differ in terms of the emphasis as to which of those possibilities may have been the likely cause of death?
A. I agree that minds may differ but I believe there should have been more to the decision-making in relation to
what happened to John Russel1. Dr Duflou made a number of other points which tended to corroborate Dr Cala. I think taking that all into account, there might have been a different view.
Q. Al1 right. In relation to Dr Duflou, his report refers to the hairs?
A. Yes.
Q. He says he thinks it's unlikely it came from himself, but he couldn't exclude that possibility?
A. That's right.
Q. And I think Dr Cala had also given evidence about the jersey which was worn by the deceased which was up around his upper torso?
A. Yes.
Q. And Dr Duflou, in his report, said that that could have been caused either during the fall or at the base of the fall, he was unable to say?
A. That's right.
Q. Bearing all of that in mind, do you accept that minds may differ and that some minds might legitimately prefer the view that it was an accidental fall?
A. Minds may differ, but I'm - I have my own opinion in relation to it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi, I'm sorry to do this, but you have not - no criticism necessarily, but if you read Professor Duflou in its entirety on the hairs, you will see that it's a little bit more than "relatively unlikely".
Matter for you. I will read, just so that you are assisted by what I'm thinking about --

MR TEDESCHI: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: He says:

> Relatively unlikely that it originated from the head of the deceased although I don't absolutely exclude the possibility given the laceration. Taking into account that the deceased very likely moved very little if at all following the impact with the ground, it would follow that it is unlikely
that the deceased would have been able to touch his head with his left arm given the position of that arm under his trunk.

You have omitted that every time you've referred to Professor Duflou's material. That is, in fact, a stronger view procured by Neiwand than indeed Dr Cala.

MR TEDESCHI: I accept that, Commissioner.
Q. Mr Page, you've heard the full account about the hair from Dr Duflou?
A. Yes.
Q. The latter part of what the Commissioner read to you relates to the unlikelihood of the deceased having, in effect, ripped out his own hair at the base of the cliff. Do you acknowledge that there's always a possibility that, at the top of the cliff, as he was falling from whatever cause, it might have resulted in a laceration and him having his own hair in his - the vicinity of his hand?
A. Anything is possible but I would consider that un1ikely.
Q. Al1 right. Your preference in relation to Mr Russel 1
is that he was the victim of a homicide?
A. Yes.
Q. That was, I think, the preference of Counse1

Assisting?
A. Yes.
Q. It was certainly the preference of Mr Saidi, counsel representing the police?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was certainly the finding by her Honour?
A. Yes.
Q. But you accept that in the 1 ight of the additional evidence obtained by those who were in Strike Force Neiwand, that they might have a different view?
A. They may have a different view.
Q. Do you agree that if you approach different people with the same evidence, they might, quite legitimately and professionally, have a different view about the same
evidence in relation to this sort of material?
A. That can happen, yes.

MR TEDESCHI: Your Honour, would you pardon me for a moment?

THE COMMISSIONER: Certain1y.
MR TEDESCHI: Thank you. Nothing further.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Page, that concludes your evidence. I can thank you very much and excuse you from further attendance. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioner.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

MR GRAY: Commissioner, the next witness would be Dr Derek Dalton.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. I think Dr Dalton is in fact in the hearing room, so if he comes forward and we wil1 get sorted.
<DEREK DALTON, sworn:
[12.26pm]
THE COMMISSIONER: Please take a seat. A couple of things, Professor, you may not be familiar with the procedure. Mr Gray will ask you some questions. Those assisting him will put hard copies of documents in front of you. They will also come up on the screen. Whatever your preferred method of - they may not always come up on the screen, I should say, but most likely they will. Whatever your preferred method of taking on board the detail, please follow, and thank you.

Yes, Mr Gray.
THE WITNESS: The screen will be good. Just a matter of to get things right, and I respect your deference, I'm not a professor, I'm an associate professor.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm so sorry.
THE WITNESS: And indeed, having left the university I guess I could even be formally addressed just as
"Doctor".
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you, Doctor.
<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY:
MR GRAY: Q. Doctor, you along with Dr de Lint and Dr Tyson were the team of three academic reviewers of the work of Strike Force Parrabell?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You'11 recall, I take it, that the strike force itself - that is, the police officers who constituted the police side of Strike Force Parrabell - embarked upon the task of looking at what turned out to be I think 85 cases of deaths in a period between 1976 and 2000; is that right?
A. Yeah, to the best of my recollection. I'm not entirely sure about the precision of the number 85. It started at 88. There were various cases excluded as things went on, Scott Johnson being one, because it went - was before the Coroner. So - but to the best of my ability, 85 seems to be correct.
Q. Yes. Well, as you say, there had been media publicity about a number which was 88?
A. Sure.
Q. And indeed, there was a list in existence?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. One of perhaps a number of lists, but there was a list that did have 88 names on it. And it was that list of 88 which were going to be reviewed by Strike Force Parrabell, but for, in the case of one or two or three, for whatever reason, those cases weren't looked at and the number was slightly less than 88 ?
A. Very fair assertion.
Q. Pardon?
A. Very fair, yes.
Q. Thank you, yes. Now, you were aware at all times, I take it, that the exercise that Strike Force Parrabell that is, the police - were going to embark upon was a review on the papers in respect of those cases?
A. Yes.
Q. That is, they were not going to reinvestigate any of them?
A. Correct.
Q. They were going to assemble the historical paper material available in respect of any given case and they were going to look at what the papers showed?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. And so they only had available to them whatever historical documents there were in any given case to look at?
A. My understanding is what they had available were whatever was in their cardboard Homicide file boxes. Other legal extraneous material from Coroners Courts or from other task force or strike forces. I couldn't with any degree of clarity specify in terms of what police had at their disposal, what was in or out.
Q. Didn't you understand, though, that what the police were attempting to do was to assemble from where they could, be it their own police files or the Coroner's files, as you say, or perhaps, in some cases, elsewhere, whatever there was by way of paper record about the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the objective of Strike Force Parrabell - that is, the police officers - was to form a view, based on whatever had been written in the documents generated in those earlier times, as to whether there was a bias factor involved?
A. Yes, that sounds correct.
Q. Now, the way they went about it, as you know, was by using a particular - or included the use of a particular form, the Bias Crime Indicator Review Form?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. That form, do you recall, included within it

10 indicators, so called?
A. Yes.
Q. Nine of the indicators had come from a United States document?
A. I thought all of them, from memory, had come from the United States instrument.
Q. Well, we'11 come to that. Assume for the moment that nine of them had come from the United States, and the tenth had been generated by the NSW Police themselves. I'11 take you to the material that demonstrates that.
A. Sure.
Q. Just assume that. But the form had in it more than the 10 indicators, didn't it?
A. We11, it had a - from memory, it had a case summary of sorts at the start, and the sections with the descriptors. As to what else it had, you'd have to put it to me and I'11 see if I can remember.
Q. A11 right. We11, I'11 come to that. First of al1, could Dr Dalton please have volume 1, and if you'd turn to tab 15 [SCOI.75071_0001]
A. Mmm-hmm. That doesn't open very easily.
Q. Have you found tab 15?
A. Tab 15, yes.
Q. Do you see that's the document described as "Coordinating Instructions"?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's a document you have seen before?
A. Six or so years ago, yes.
Q. And starting at page 4 , and through to the second-1ast page, is the blank "Bias Crime Indicator Form"?
A. Seven?
Q. Pardon?
A. What are you asking me? I don't understand what you are asking me.
Q. Do you see that on pages 4 and following the blank or a blank Bias Crime Indicator Form?
A. Sure. It runs to, what, right through to 13 or so.
Q. That's right. So at the bottom of page 2 of this document --
A. Mmm-hmm .
Q. -- on the last paragraph, the statement is made:
[The strike force] has been established to
review these previously reported deaths of persons between 1976 and 2000 to determine if a sexuality or gender bias was a contributing factor.

That's right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what you understood the police to be doing?
A. Looking at it now, with the passage of time, the term "sexuality or gender bias" is so general that $I$ was given to understand from memory that, actually, there was more precision to it, that we were looking to see whether the crimes could be classified as hate crimes. That's a more general sort of term, isn't it, "sexuality or gender"?
Q. You've had this "Coordinating Instructions" document, or you had it at the time, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. So you read it, I suppose?
A. Definitely.
Q. So you saw that that's what it said?
A. It strikes - the problem is, you know, a background sort of document is a background document. Once you're in discussions with the police, et cetera, it - this I certainly was - the task was certainly more specific than this generic "sexuality or gender bias", although I guess because - there were no cases, from memory, involving -
it's - I'm - the task that I feel we were doing is, I wil1 have to say, a little bit more specific than this general descriptor.
Q. Tell us what you think they were doing, the police?
A. Reviewing - as far as I could tell, they were reviewing the cases for evidence or an indicator of gay hate bias.
Q. So at the top of page 3 there's a heading "Mission"; do you see that?
A. Pardon?
Q. Do you see the heading "Mission" on the top of page 3 ?
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. The "Mission" is said to be:

To conduct a review of [police] holdings in relation to potential gay hate crimes resulting in death.
A. Yes.
Q. So the expression "gay hate crimes" is used in that sentence.
A. That strikes more of a chord with me in terms of what I was doing than the previous phrase.
Q. The second sentence:

This review will relate to police investigations conducted between 1970s to 2000.

And then third sentence:
The purpose of the review is to determine if an anti-gay bias was involved in any of the deaths.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. That's clear enough, isn't it?
A. Very clear, it seems to me.
Q. Whether or not there was an anti-gay bias involved.
A. Yes.
Q. Under the heading "Execution", the police say:

Investigators wil7 commence a systematic review of the [police] case file holdings to identify if there is evidence indicative of bias crime.

So this is a different expression, "bias crime"?
A. Yeah, the problem is "bias crime", "gay hate crime", "anti-gay bias"; they tend to get used as synonyms to a certain degree.
Q. And are you saying that you yourself thought that the actual task was not any of the other synonyms but only "gay
hate"?
A. I feel like you're trying to corner me. No, certainly it wasn't so broad as to just look at sexuality or gender, it was certainly to look at whether they - there was anti-gay bias, gay hate - I'd be comfortable with those two terms.
Q. Under the heading "Execution", the second paragraph, there is a definition of "Bias Crime Indicators", which it is attributed to the Massachusetts model. Do you see that? A. Yes.
Q. And the definition of "Bias Crime Indicators" given is:

Objective facts, circumstances or patterns attending a criminal act or acts, which, standing alone or in conjunction with other facts or circumstances suggest that the offender's actions were motivated, in whole or in part, by any form of bias.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is that a definition of a Bias Crime Indicator that you agreed with?
A. Yes, as a - as a generic, because there are different types of bias crimes, as a generic descriptor, "any form of bias" seems to make sense, but of course in the cases we were looking at, they were more heavily calibrated towards gay hate as opposed to, I don't know, hatred of Musiims or hatred of whatever other category you might want to put to me.
Q. The definition is relating to bias generally, as we can see?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And the point that I want to direct your attention to in particular is that the definition includes, as part of the concept, factors that suggest that the offender's actions were motivated in whole or in part by any form of bias.
A. Yes.
Q. That is, there would be an indication of a bias crime if there was a factor that may have contributed to the
crime, even though it may not have been the only contributor? That's what, in whole or in part, it's getting at; do you agree?
A. In part - yes, that certainly is what this definition says.
Q. Now, the second-bottom paragraph - well, I'll go to the paragraph - I'll go through all of them. The paragraph immediately below that points out that Parrabell was only going to review matters that have already been investigated.
A. Yes.
Q. You knew that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. There's an indication of what the holdings would be namely, things like witness statements, crime scene evidence, records of interview, contemporaneous police notes, et cetera?
A. Yes.
Q. Then the next paragraph says that there won't be a reinvestigation the primary focus of the bias crime review would be, and I'm quoting:
... in determining whether any of the identified deaths were in fact motivated by an anti-gay bias, rather than identifying and prosecuting offenders.

You understood that to be what Parrabell was doing?
A. Can you put that to me again, please?
Q. Can you read it, as I'm reading it out to you from the page in front of you?
A. Well, I was trying to read it there.
Q. If you prefer the screen, by all means. The assertion in this document is that the proposed bias crime review would have as its primary focus determining whether any of the identified deaths were in fact motivated by an anti-gay bias.
A. Yes.
Q. So that required, did it, the police officers to form a view as to whether the motivation of the perpetrator had
an anti-gay factor?
A. Yes.
Q. The next paragraph says that the review would use
a list of Bias Crime Indicators, being indicators published by the US Department of Justice?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. The next sentence says:

These indicators assist investigators in systematically determining if a bias was a motivating factor in the incident leading to the death.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The paragraph concludes:

These indicators are used by the [NSW Police] Bias Crime Unit.
A. Yes.
Q. Then what appears is that investigators, meaning Parrabel1 investigators, have created the form, have created the Bias Crime Indicators Review Form - do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And according to this document, the form was the one that runs through starting from the bottom of page 4 for the next 10 pages or so. And what is pointed out at the top of page 4 is that among what is included in the form are not just the 10 indicators, but what is described in the top 1 ine of page 4 as "four possible findings". Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the findings are - the alternative findings are:

1, "Bias Crime"; 2, "Suspected Bias Crime"; 3, "Not Bias Crime"; 4, "Insufficient Information"; agreed?
A. Yes.
Q. And so, for example, on page 5 , which is the blank form, with reference to the first indicator, which is
"Differences", those four possible findings are set out one after the other with a box to the right of them to be filled in "Yes", or "No".
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you see with "Bias Crime", the top one, the first one, what is required of the police officer doing this work, according to this form, is to tick yes or no to this:

Sufficient evidence/information exists to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the incident was either wholly or partially motivated by bias towards one of the protected categories and constitutes a criminal offence.

Do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. So the criterion that had to be answered yes or no had embedded within it the concept of beyond reasonable doubt?
A. Yes .
Q. Which is a high standard in the criminal law, as you know?
A. Absolutely. Absolutely.
Q. And the topic was - the topic to which beyond reasonable doubt was being applied was - whether information or evidence existed to prove that the incident was wholly or partially motivated by bias; agreed?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, would you agree that the introduction of the standard of the criminal law "beyond a reasonable doubt" necessarily meant that, on a paper review, there would be many cases where it would be impossible to reach satisfaction to the criminal standard that there was evidence existing to prove such a thing, from the papers?
A. In terms of what they were doing?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I guess that's - you're right. "Beyond reasonable doubt" is certainly a very high standard.
Q. Very high standard, and it's being applied to not the
commission of a crime but whether or not evidence existed on these papers. They were only able to say "yes" to bias crime if whatever was written in the historic papers proved bias beyond a reasonable doubt. That's a very high standard, isn't it?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And would you agree that necessarily, just speaking in the broad, that was going to mean that not many cases would get a "yes" in the context of a paper review like this one, for that option, bias crime?
A. If they were certainly to tether it to the "beyond a reasonable doubt", yes, that would - I guess I'd say yes.
Q. Thank you.
A. But could I elaborate?
Q. Do.
A. I'm not entirely sure, despite - this is the thing the text here, that a lot of the detectives doing this actually did hold their determination to that very high standard.
Q. And why do you say that?
A. Just from very vague, crude, big brush stroke memories of some of the conversations we had.
Q. Well, give us an example of a memory or two in that regard?
A. No, I can't, they're such big brush strokes that I can't, but I - but I do recall having fruitful discussions that - that they certainly - that some of the cases that they determined - I can't even remember the numbers - must surely have, in a way, transcended that particularly high standard as is written.
Q. Are you aware that the Bias Crime Indicator Form that the officers used changed part way through their exercise?
A. No.
Q. So is it your understanding - and this is not a criticism - is it your understanding that this form, as it appears in front of you in the document we're looking at, was always the form they used, from the beginning to the end?
A. Couldn't say. The only thing I recognised about it was its crude length, shape. The categories and
subheadings were obviously familiar in terms of the crude order, in terms of differences, et cetera. But in terms of the minutiae, in terms of the bullet points and the text, I no longer have my copies in my possession so I would have to speculate as to whether this was an earlier version, a later version, I couldn't say with any degree of clarity.
Q. I'm not asking you to speculate. I'm asking you whether you ever knew that they had started off with a form in one format with one set of components, and partway through their task, they changed to this form?
A. I thought you'd already asked me that question and I answered.
Q. Well, you don't seem to have answered, as I understand it. But did you know that to be so? The answer is no, is it?
A. Put the question to me again, please.
Q. Did you know that there was a change partway through the police exercise?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Right. So did you assume that this was always the one from the beginning?

MR TEDESCHI: I object.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah.
MR TEDESCHI: The question is unclear.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't know that he has, but if he wasn't aware --
Q. Dr Dalton, you've indicated you weren't aware that there was a change. Assuming for the moment that there was a change in the form, and I take it from that you wouldn't be able to say one way or the other whether you always thought the form was in this form or some other form?
A. That seems fair.
Q. Well, does it follow for perhaps other reasons that you may not have focused from time to time on the precise form that was being used?
A. Yeah, that seems fair, because one - I think I assumed it wouldn't have changed because they were - yeah, I would
have seen no reason to presume that, all of a sudden, the instrument would have changed.
Q. Al1 right. And as you presently sit here, I take it, you have no independent recollection of it having been brought to your attention that the form changed in some way or other?
A. The fact that the form has changed is only an idea that has been put to me today. I have had no idea prior to walking into this room that the form had changed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
MR GRAY: Could Dr Dalton have exhibit 1, tab 2 [SCOI.02362_0001], which is the Parrabe11 report itse1f.
Q. Would you turn to tab 2. This is the actual final report which contains the police section in the first 46 pages and then the Flinders section in the balance?
A. Yeah, could I make a point about this report, if --

THE COMMISSIONER: Just wait a moment, perhaps if you answer the questions, you won't be stopped from saying whatever you would like to say, but let's follow the sequence first.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
MR GRAY: Q. You remember, I imagine, that the first part of the report was the part written by the police?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. And then the second part, starting at page 47 , is the part written by the Flinders academics, including you?
A. Yes.
Q. An appendix to the F1inders report, or the F1inders part of the report, was the form, the Bias Crime Indicators Review Form, starting at page 121?
A. Yes, a blank copy, yes.
Q. A blank copy, quite.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. So that is the form that you were saying in your final report was the form which the police used?
A. Hmm, no, the question for me is at some stage I must -
we must have been furnished with - I think we were furnished with a couple of versions of a blank form. To the extent that $I$ attached it, cut and pasting, was it a PDF or was it a Word version of the document, certainly my memory is because - I'm not that clear, actually, but I can't remember whether - I think we attached to the end of our report, my sense is that it's not as though, in assembling their Strike Force Parrabell report, that they have put it in at the back, but I have no strong memory, to be honest, of that, if you follow my logic. I can't remember - I guess what I'm saying to be clear is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. No, I don't think you're being asked to recall something at the moment. I think you're being asked to just, if you like, make an assumption that what is on the screen is the document or the start of the document that appears at the end of your report --
A. Yes, okay.
Q. -- in the final Parrabell. So if you just make that assumption for the moment --
A. Mmm-hmm, that's it, okay.
Q. -- and then Mr Gray will ask you some questions.

MR GRAY: Q. That form that you've appended as appendix $B$ to your report, seems to be a form in the same form as the one I've been asking you about from the Coordinating Instructions.
A. "In the same form" meaning they loosely kind of resemble each other?
Q. No, not that they loosely kind of resemble each other, but that they're the same?
A. No, I couldn't say. I couldn't say. Because you'd have to point out to me what the differences are, et cetera.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Dr Dalton, please, it's being put to you quite directly that there are no differences, that the form that is appendix $B$ to your report is identical in every respect, as I understand it, to the document you have been shown a few moments ago by Mr Gray. Now, if you're not happy with making that assumption, maybe he can take a different course. If you're happy to make that assumption, then, please, work on the basis that the document he showed you a few moments ago, which included
the phrase "beyond reasonable doubt", is identical to the form which is now on the screen and which was appendix $B$ to your report or annexure $B$ to your report - just make that assumption.
A. Well, I'm struggling to make the assumption for two reasons, because you put it to me that at some stage during the course of this process, that the police changed their instrument.
Q. Correct, but what he's putting to you presently notwithstanding the fact that no doubt he will get to the changed document - is that the document that he has currently asked to be put on the screen, and which is on the screen, was, first of all, annexure B to your final Parrabell report; secondly, that is in identical form, if you would be kind enough to make that assumption, to the document he showed you a few moments ago. Leave aside whatever changes may have otherwise occurred.
A. I guess if you use the term "assumption", yes.

MR GRAY: Q. Okay. Now, just to perhaps seek some further clarification of this, can I ask you what material you, the academic team, were given?
A. To do the review?
Q. Yes.
A. We were given, to be very precise, three copies of some folders, so they were numbered 1,2 and 3 . Each version of - or suite of documents was two folders roughly of this size (indicating), and so I had one copy, Professor de Lint had another, and Dr Tyson took delivery, I can't recall whether I sent it. I think it might have come to me originally, or whether the police sent it to her directly, but we had three copies of the folders.
Q. Have a look at page 57 of the report?
A. Mmm-hmm. Sure. I will read it off the screen. That might be easier, thank you.
Q. I'm directing your attention to the footnote on page 57 ?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Footnote 12. Which refers to the voluminous nature of the case file data. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Your report says in this footnote:

The two large case folders provided to each academic team member contained approximately 1700 pages.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, as I understand it, but correct me if this is not right, those 1700 pages consisted of the completed, filled-in Bias Crime Indicator Review Forms for the 85 or so cases?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, very roughly - I'm sure this is not and obviously isn't precisely accurate - if the forms were about 20 pages long when filled in, times 85 , it gets us to 1700 . Is that what you had, 85 completed Bias Crime Indicator Forms?
A. Yes, eventually, some were provided later in the piece.
Q. Sure. But that's the totality of what you had, you had nothing else, is what I'm asking?
A. Only at the start of the process, they provided -

I think there was some information about Strike Force
Taradale; there was some PowerPoint slides about the police Bias Crime Unit, supplementary material, I guess you could call it.
Q. Okay, fair enough.
A. But principally, yes, two folders each.
Q. But so far as the 85 cases are concerned themselves --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- what you had was the 85 completed Bias Crime Indicator Review Forms?
A. Yes, that's my recollection.
Q. And nothing else about the cases?
A. No, apart from - I mean, the Bias Crime Indicator Form, which I don't recall that well today, had the case summary at the start.
Q. Yes, it was filled in - in each case, it had been populated with text in all the blanks, and there were 85 of those, adding up to about 1700 pages?
A. Yes.

MR GRAY: Is that a convenient time?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I will adjourn until 2 o'clock, thank you.

## LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, please come back, Dr Dalton, thank you. Please take a seat. Yes, thank you, Mr Gray.

MR GRAY: Q. Could Dr Dalton have volume 1 again, please, tab 15 [SCOI.75071_0001]. Tab 15, if you could turn to that, please, Dr Dalton. This is the "Coordinating Instructions" that I was asking you about before lunch. A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Just on page 3 do you see in the footnote down the bottom about indicators 1 to 9 having come from the United States and indicator 10 having been developed in New South Wales? Does that ring a bell now that you see that?
A. I don't understand what you mean by "ring a bell".
Q. Well, this morning you said you thought all 10 had come from the United States but you can see that the tenth came from New South Wales?
A. It has been six years, so whilst at the time I think I would have been - but now it does ring a bell.
Q. That's all I asked. Thank you. Now, on the next page, page 4, I was taking you through those four alternative findings that were available, the first one being "Bias Crime", and that it was the one that had a requirement of "beyond reasonable doubt" included within it? Do you remember I asked you some questions about that? You just need to answer for the transcript - just say yes or --
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Now, the second possible finding is "Suspected Bias Crime"; do you see that?
A. $M m m-h m m$.
Q. You can read it for yourself, but as you understand it, was the proposition being explained that where there was some evidence or information that the incident may have
been motivated by bias, but that could not be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, then the case would need to be relegated to the second category of "Suspected Bias Crime"? A. Yes.
Q. Then the third alternative or optional finding is "Not a Bias Crime", and you can see that there, what the officers were required to do was to nominate that as the appropriate category, if the incident has been determined as either not motivated by bias towards a protected group, or, although bias motivation is in evidence, it does not relate to a protected group?
A. Yes.
Q. So in that one, there's no standard of proof offered; it doesn't say that it has to be beyond reasonable doubt or indeed any other criteria?
A. No, it doesn't.
Q. Did you notice that as you looked at it?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You don't recall whether you did or not?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And then the fourth one is "Insufficient Information", meaning insufficient information has been recorded, back in the day, to make a determination one way or the other about bias; agreed?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in --

THE COMMISSIONER: Can I just interrupt, I am sorry, Mr Gray.
Q. Doctor, in the penultimate, where it talked about "protected group", first, what did you understand by that, and, secondly, would that have made a difference pre or post 1984 in New South Wales?
A. I don't have my notes anymore and I don't recall what - I don't recall the definition or the specificities. I had lots of handwritten notes, lots of material, most of which I haven't seen for six years, so I don't recall.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.

MR GRAY: Q. Could Dr Dalton have exhibit 1 again, tab 2 [SCOI.02632_0001], being the Parrabe11 report itself.
Could you turn in tab 2, being the report, to page 65, please. This is in the academic section of the Parrabell report.
A. Sure.
Q. Do you see there's a heading towards the bottom of that page, "iii. Strike Force Parrabell: mandate and method"?
A. Yes.
Q. I don't know if this helps you or not, Doctor, it may not, but there is a screen right next to you, to your right?
A. This one's pretty --
Q. You use whichever one you like.
A. This one's okay, yeah.
Q. In that paragraph, you and your fellow authors refer to these Coordinating Instructions, don't they, that I've just been taking you through?
A. Yes.
Q. And on the next page, 66, you set out quite understandably that - and I'm looking at the fifth line:
... the mandate was explicitly not an investigation of all homicides in that
period to determine which may have been anti-gay bias. It was narrower.

Namely, it was restricted to the 88 in the list?
A. Yes.
Q. You then quote from the Coordinating Instructions in that indented passage there, beginning:

The proposed bias crime review ...
Correct, you are quoting from the Coordinating Instructions?
A. Yes.
Q. And at page 67, there's a heading "Scoring the cases"?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And you say that a team of detectives, fluctuating between 6 and 10 over the period, reviewed and scored each case. That's correct, is it? They gave numbers, or scoring numbers, did they, in the form?
A. Can you just - where's the word "scored" - you said?
Q. There is the heading, "Scoring the cases" and then the first sentence says --
A. Yeah, I think scoring - from memory - "scoring the cases" is --
Q. -- that the detectives reviewed each case?
A. "Scoring the cases" I think is Professor de Lint's language. He uses this term "scoring". It's not a term I would have ever sort of just naturally used.
Q. But we're talking here about what the detectives did, not what you and Professor de Lint did. Are you saying there that the detectives engaged in a scoring process?
A. Well, I don't want to get into semantics, but what do you mean by "scoring"?
Q. I'm asking you, what do you mean by "scoring"? It's your document.
A. We11, it's my document but $I$ have to relate to what they told me they did. My understanding is they read the case material that they had and they used the Bias Crime Indicator Form, they would occasionally tick it, type notes, et cetera, do various things with it, and, as a result of that, determine the cases.
Q. So not scoring in the sense of attributing numbers or scores in the way that word is usually understood; is that right?
A. I think that's right, yes.
Q. You say then at the paragraph below that that they used the Bias Crime Indicators Review Form, and you set out the fact that the form, you say, comprised 10 bias indicators. It actually contained 10 bias indicators as well as other components, didn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say on page 68 that indicators 1 to 9 were derived from the American document, and that indicator 10 was developed by the New South Wales Bias Crime Unit - so
you're aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you set out the four findings that are in the form that I've been taking you through - the ones that are in bold on your pages 68 and 69, "Evidence of Bias Crime";
"Suspected Bias Crime"; "No Evidence of Bias Crime",
"Insufficient Information"?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, you say in the next paragraph:

The detectives scored each case using the [independent] indicators ...

But are we to understand by that you don't mean a scoring of any numerical kind, but a kind of arriving at a view?
A. Yeah, I think, to use this phrase, "arriving at
a view", would be more accurate.
Q. In terms of how they arrived at the view, could you go to the next paragraph down that page beginning "Although each indicator was scored"; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Accepting for the moment that when the word "scored" is used, it should be understood in the way you've just explained, you say:

The summary conclusion or finding was not determined by counting the number of "Yes" or "No" indicators et cetera --
eg, seven out of 10 indicators?
A. Sure.
Q. You say:

Rather, the process was described as intuitive and relied on qualitative data in the form of contextual information derived from analysing each case.

Do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. So "intuitive". And then lower down that paragraph,
you say that having taken notice of the requisite indicators of bias, they would also take into account the "Summary of Findings" section which was an amalgam of the "General Comments" section corresponding to all 10 indicators?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. And they're all - what you're referring to there are narrative - that is, textual - fillings in of the blank form?
A. Yes, to the best of my ability, that's what we --
Q. And you say:

The summary was often rich in detail and when viewed in concert with the ... indicators - allowed a view of whether bias was involved to emerge.
A. The one word $I$ want to draw attention to there was "often", it was often rich in details, but not always.
Q. Okay, thank you for that. What I'm asking you - what I want to ask you about is you describe the process of arriving at the view as intuitive, don't you?
A. Yes.
Q. That is, the process that the detectives were using in the strike force?
A. Yeah - yes.
Q. And by engaging in this intuitive process, and reading the totality of what had been written including the "General Comments" sections, they would arrive at a view as to whether this was a bias case or a not bias or a suspected bias and so on.
A. Yeah, I suspect so. You've got to remember that I'm relying - clearly $I$ wrote this at the time, so some six or so years ago. This would have been based on conversations that $I$ had with them in good faith, and that must have been the impression I formed.
Q. Yes. I'm not criticising it.
A. Sure.
Q. I'm just trying to explore this, really: would you agree that what's being described there in that
paragraph in that way, which I'm not challenging --
A. Sure, sure, sure.
Q. -- amounts to, in the end, the emergence of a subjective view on the part of the officer or officers who are handling each particular case?
A. Yeah, you'd have to say it's subjective, yes.
Q. It is subjective?
A. Yes, I will agree with that.
Q. It's a matter of opinion?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$.
Q. No doubt taking into account these various things, but it's subjective and it's a matter of opinion?
A. Yeah, that seems fair.
Q. Now, I asked you before lunch, and you answered, whether you were aware at any point that this Bias Crime Indicator Form had ever changed, and you said no, you weren't aware; if that happened, you didn't know that. Can I just ask - you'd better have that put aside for the moment and be shown volume 2 of the tender bundle, exhibit 6. If you go to tab 59 [SCOI.77317_0001] in that bundle --
A. Remember it's like the Seinfeld joke where George gets the wedding invitations, right at the back, which are the cheapest and it has the poisonous - has anyone seen that episode of Seinfeld? Right at the back?
Q. You're ahead of me there, Doctor, but all credit to you. This is a document you perhaps have never seen before, but I'll ask you, it is called the "Induction Package" for the Strike Force Parrabel1. Can you recall whether you ever saw that?
A. Induction Package? I don't - I don't recall seeing the Induction Package.
Q. No, and I'm not putting to you that you have.
A. No, I know.
Q. I'm just inquiring.
A. Sure, sure, that's fair.
Q. So you don't recall seeing it. Okay. Well, can you see that under the heading "Execution" on page 3, there are
various paragraphs there which have some similarity to the Coordinating Instructions that I showed you earlier, but are plainly not the same, identically, and in particular, do you see down the bottom of that page, they, in this document, nominate four findings as being available - the four bullet points?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you can probably recall that they're not quite the same as the four in the form itself that was ultimately used, as you understand it?
A. They're certainly not.
Q. They're not. And if you look at the form that forms part of this document, starting on page 4, "Bias Crime Indicators Form", it is different from the one that we were looking at earlier. For example, on page 4, under the heading "Indicators", can you see that there are only three findings offered, rather than four, first of all?
A. Yes.
Q. And among other things, there is no reference to "beyond reasonable doubt", or any of those qualifiers that we went through in the other one?
A. No, there's not.
Q. Now, if you assume - and I ask you to assume for the sake of this question - that for a period of time up to about June 2016 - that is, the first 10 or so months that the officers were engaged in their work - they were using a form, a Bias Crime Indicators Form of this kind, and then after June 2016 they were using a form of the kind that I showed you before lunch, does that have any impact on your views as to how they did or didn't go about their task or is it something that you can't comment on?
A. Well, as you said, presuming, as I said, the instrument had changed, it would potentially have a serious effect, because you've changed the instrument.
Q. Quite.
A. And the earlier instrument had higher standards, in terms of beyond reasonable doubt.
Q. Well - yes, when you say "the earlier instrument",
it's actually the later instrument.
A. The later instrument, apologies.
Q. Yes.
A. Oh, so, to be clear, this was the earlier instrument?
Q. Earlier one, that's right.
A. Okay, right.
Q. So the earlier one doesn't have the requirement of beyond reasonable doubt, et cetera, that we went through this morning. The later one that I'm inviting you to accept came into operation from about July 2016 did, and it's the one that is attached as an appendix to your report and it's also in the Coordinating Instructions.
A. Yes. Certainly if the criteria have changed, and then looking at each criteria and they're different, there is less, there are three instead of four, et cetera, you've got an imprecise instrument that's --
Q. It means, doesn't it - it may mean more than this but one thing it means, would you agree, is that it's pretty hard to know and pretty hard for you to have known what criteria they actually used throughout the course of their year and a half's work, since the criteria changed halfway through, according to the document?
A. Certain1y. It's complicated, because you could theoretically you could imagine someone using an instrument and picking it up and having to fill it in, and perhaps they've been - had the instrument explained to them, so there's an additional layer of - so you certainly - it's confusing.
Q. It's confusing. And as you say, another dimension to it would be what explanations may or may not have been given surrounding either or both documents, quite right. But one possibility, perhaps among many, might be that up to June 2016, they were approaching it in one way, and after June 2016, they approached it in another way, given the two different forms - that's one possibility?
A. It would - that would seem a fair proposition.
Q. And another possibility is that although the form changed, they continued to approach it in the real world, Monday to Friday, in exactly the same way they had been doing all along?
A. That's also a reasonable proposition, isn't it?
Q. And of course you don't know - and again I'm not criticising this - you don't know which of those
possibilities or some other possibility is the right one?
A. No, I don't.
Q. But the fact which I'm asking you to assume, that this change did occur, renders the reliability or the level of comfort that one could have or that you could have in their process lower than you had thought before today; is that right?

MR TEDESCHI: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Why?
MR TEDESCHI: Commissioner, might I be heard in the absence of the witness?

THE COMMISSIONER: Sure. Doctor, would you mind just stepping out into the corridor, close the door behind you, and we will let you know when you can come back in. Thank you.
(The witness left the hearing room)
MR TEDESCHI: I haven't been able to look at the transcript of Assistant Commissioner Crandell's evidence, but my memory of his evidence is that this document behind tab 58 was used - or 59 , sorry, was used as an induction document, and the BCI form, the other one that this witness has been shown, was throughout the process used to, in effect, score and do the process that resulted in findings that were made. My friend has asked him to assume --

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't know who is right and who is wrong about this. If what Mr Gray is putting - I don't have as - I must confess I do not have a - I certainly have a clear recollection that Mr Gray put the various forms and versions of the form to Mr Crandell. I certainly have no distinct recollection of what he said happened. So why don't we find it?

MR TEDESCHI: I'm just wondering if --
THE COMMISSIONER: One of two things can happen, either Mr Gray continues, you find it and you can raise it with Dr Dalton, or if you raise it with Mr Gray, if he has misstated the position, so be it, but at the moment I'm assuming that - as I said, I have a recollection, I don't
think my current recollection would really permit me to say either way, but I certainly have a recollection of Mr Crandell being asked about the change in the instructions and the change in the form, but I do not now recall whether you asked him, as it were, or Mr Gray got it out of him.

Mr Gray, are you able to assist me?
MR GRAY: Yes, I can assist. First of all, Mr Crandell did agree that the form changed, and that it did so at about that time. I went through this with him. I don't have the precise tab numbers in my mind, but I went through this with him --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I recall that.
MR GRAY: -- towards the end of his evidence. And then, since then, there has also been produced and is now in the tender bundle at volume 14, tab 294 [NPL.0115.0002.3383] the email from Mr Bignell.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, 294?
MR GRAY: That's right, in which Mr Bignell sends to some Parrabell officers the "new Indicator Form". The "new Indicator Form" is the one that finds its way ultimately into the Coordinating Instructions and is appendix B to the Parrabell report. And there is other material, the tab numbers of which I just don't have in my head, which established that prior to that it was this earlier form. Mr Crandell's evidence - Mr Crandell readily accepted that.

THE COMMISSIONER: He what?
MR GRAY: Mr Crandell accepted that. There was no controversy about it.

THE COMMISSIONER: But Mr Tedeschi I presume, by inference at least, has some recollection, which I frankly don't have one way or the other, as to whether Mr Crandell either indicated the earlier form was not being used by detectives at some point and/or that it was purely used as part of an induction process.

MR GRAY: I would not be certain precisely what he said about those two things, but what he did agree was that the
form in the - as it appears in the Coordinating
Instructions and as an appendix to the report did not come into existence until June/July 2016.

THE COMMISSIONER: And there's no doubt, is there, that Parrabell started before that?

MR GRAY: It started in August 2015, 10 months earlier.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. And there's no doubt - sorry, there's no doubt. There is evidence that the process undertaken by the detectives had begun on or shortly after August 2015.

MR GRAY: That's so.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Tedeschi --
MR TEDESCHI: I --
THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, look, it seems like years ago, but it clearly wasn't. Mr Gray's on notice, you're going to check it. Let's deal with it, but for the moment, I'11 allow this line of questioning, subject to any revelation that you wish to draw to my attention having had the benefit of having heard what Mr Gray said and having another look at Mr Crandell.

MR TEDESCHI: If the Commission pleases.
(The witness returned to the hearing room)
THE WITNESS: Commissioner, I'd just like to apologise for my Seinfeld joke. I was so nervous when I had to turn to this big heavy folder that I thought of it.

THE COMMISSIONER: The only criticism I would make, Dr Dalton, is that you didn't disclose the full provenance of the joke, you didn't say it was Seinfeld [sic], so taking some sort of credit for it may be the only sin you've committed. That's perfectly fine, thank you.

MR GRAY: Q. Now, generally, as to the use of the Bias Crime Indicators Review Form, putting aside for the moment the complication that I've just been asking you about, but generally as to its use, you agree, I take it, that the academic team came to the view that the form was not one
that they could endorse?
A. Yeah, absolutely.
Q. Absolutely, did you say?
A. Yeah - well, as a - the form - yes, the form - yes.

The form itself.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. So when you used the term "absolutely" there, just so that I'm clear, you meant by that affirmatively "yes", as opposed to "not entirely"? A. Ask me the question again perhaps might be a good idea.

MR GRAY: Q. Did the academic team come to the view that the form itself was not a form that they could endorse?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. And perhaps a slightly different question but very similar. You came to the view - the academic team came to the view - that the methodology of the police in using the form and the indicators embedded in it was not a methodology that you could endorse?
A. Endorse as, what, reliable or --
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I seem to recall saying something at the start of the process like, "It was a shame you used this instrument". I think they were struggling to find something to use in the absence of many other alternatives, but certainly - I think even from recollection, they, in speaking about it, had serious reservations about the form themselves, but there aren't many instruments out there.
Q. Well, let me just unpack that a little bit. When you say that you seem to recall them saying that they had reservations about the form themselves, do you mean from the beginning or during the process or by the end? What do you mean?
A. I can't remember - I guess, we're coming in - I think we came in roughly halfway through.
Q. Well --
A. And so --
Q. -- you came in, if I can help orient you with dates, as far as we can all tell, you came in in about October. A. It's not so much the calendar month that's important, it's how many --
Q. I appreciate that. I'm just trying to orient you there. The police strike force began its work, so the evidence is, in or very soon after August 2015.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. They had, the police, got substantially to the end of their work by the end of 2016, although not entirely I don't suggest they had actually finished, but they'd got through most of it by the end of 2016 . There were some exceptions to that, in particular, the three Taradale cases were added late in the day, and that happened, it seems, in 2017. And there might have been one or two other exceptions. But between August 2015 and the end of 2016, the police strike force had largely completed its work. That's the evidence before the Special Commission? A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You, the academic team, start work, and the first significant thing that happens seems to have been your visit to Sydney, which was in October 2016. So that's a year and two months after the police had started?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And only a few months before the police finished, subject to the exceptions that I mentioned. So does that help you in terms of a continuum?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Right. Good. Well, then, when you say that the police said to you something to the effect that they themselves had reservations about the form, when did they say that to you - as soon as you came in and started or at some later point?
A. I don't honestly recall. I only recall the discussion about how clunky the instrument was in terms of some of the stuff about graffiti, as though - as if they're going to spray hate graffiti at the scene of the crime, that sort of thing. We would have discussions like that.
Q. Yes.
A. But no, I really - if I could precisely recall on my oath I would tell you, but I don't recall.
Q. We11, can I invite you to accept, without taking the time to get all these things out, that in early 2017 -
I think January but it might have been February you emailed Sergeant Steer and asked him - and I'm paraphrasing - "Have you got any academic literature or other support for the use of this form?" Do you remember asking a question along those lines?
A. I didn't until you put it to me but now that you put it to me I do recall something of the nature of that tenor.
Q. And his reply, again, I'm paraphrasing, was to the effect, "Well, no, I don't have academic literature" - and I will come to these emails, actually - "This form is for the use of policemen in the field" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- "as they are in the course of actually investigating an incident"?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. "It's not a form" - I'11 go back a step, I will withdraw that question. These indicators are for the use of policemen in the field when they are investigating an incident. He was telling you that?
A. Yes, I seem to recall that's what he was saying.
Q. And he was saying that, "That being so, it's not a set of indicators that I have sought to obtain academic support for; it's a practical set of indicators for police on the spot to have regard to."
A. Yeah, I seem to recall the phrase that was bandied around was that it was an aide-memoire.
Q. Yes. And indeed, and I will come to this, but do you recall him saying to you, either orally or in emails, that, in his view, the way the indicators were being used in this form for the Parrabell exercise was misconceived or wrong or not the way to go about it?
A. Yeah, I actually - he was very clear - he was adamant about that.
Q. Okay. That volume could go back, and could

Dr Dalton - well, unless it is the right volume, I need
Dr Dalton to have the report itself, exhibit 1, tab 2 [SCOI.02632_0001]. Yes, tab 2, the report itself.
A. Oh, wrong one. Okay.
Q. If you could turn to page 68 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- or it probably starts at 67. At 67, you're referring to the fact that the form was used and it had the 10 bias indicators in it?
A. Yes.
Q. And then there's the first full paragraph on page 68 where you say that numbers 1 to 9 are from the United States document, and you say that those indicators are widely used in training law enforcement and victim support officers across the USA. Do you see that? Just towards the bottom of that first main paragraph on page 68.
A. Yes.
Q. And there is a footnote, 20. Do you see that?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$-hmm.
Q. And the footnote, 20, says:

Whilst [the police] place great faith in
this instrument, the academic team were surprised to discover that scarcely any academic 7 iterature exists that has evaluated or critiqued this instrument.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then $I$ won't read it all out but you see that you couldn't find even one article, and neither could they, and then you say:

In the face of an apparent dearth of such literature, the academic team are reluctant to endorse these indicators.

That was your view, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was the view of your team, not just yourself?
A. Yes.
Q. While we're there, do you see that footnote 21, which is a footnote to the sentence at the end of that top
paragraph where you say accurately that indicator 10 had been developed by the New South Wales Bias Crimes Unit that is so on the evidence before the Commission - footnote 21 says:

The descriptive meaning and nuances of these ten Indicators will be critiqued in a subsequent section of the report, ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. But in fact, as best $I$ can see, there is no critique to be found later in the report. Is that your recollection?
A. It's not my recollection at all, but perhaps factually, if there is no such critique in the subsequent section, it would - it either got removed in the editing stage or we neglected to do it. I can't quite give a good accounting for that.
Q. Sure. Okay. Okay. Can we just go, then, to page 70.

Turn over one page.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Here you talk about the academic review of the cases.

At that bottom paragraph beginning "As academics", it begins:

As academics, we commenced our assessment of the [Strike Force Parrabell] review with a query concerning the authorities cited by the police to support the use of the BCIRF instrument.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. If you accept my dates for the moment, that query, at least the query to Sergeant Steer about whether he could point to any literature and so on, wasn't right at the commencement of your work in October; it was in about January or February. And the reason I'm asking that is did you, in fact, have a query or a wondering about the form even before you asked Sergeant Steer about it?
A. I don't recall. I don't recall, other than I think it would have become immediately apparent using the - looking
at the instrument, that it was not the most rigorous instrument in town.
Q. No. Again, I won't read it all out but if you read to yourself that paragraph beginning "As academics", at the bottom of page 70, and just read it through down to the first 10 lines or so of page 71.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. You say five lines down on page 71:

While we most often agreed on the result, we were less enthused about the means.
A. Yes.
Q. And in summary, in that paragraph you are saying, aren't you, that, in your view, the form was not fit for purpose; it was just not suitable to the task at hand?
A. Well, it was certainly a very imperfect instrument.
Q. So much so that you took the view that you yourselves wouldn't rely on it at all as a methodology; you would in fact come up with a taxonomy of your own by which to assess these cases?
A. Yes, well, it's a complicated explanation, but sometimes it's not just wise to replicate the use of an instrument and just see if you get a different result using the same instrument. We came to the view ultimately that it was better to engineer a different instrument.
Q. Understood. But in addition to needing to do the work your own way rather than replicate theirs, you also formed the view, as I understand what has been said at 70 and 71 and in that footnote, that the methodology they used, deploying the form, was not adequate or sufficient to the task?
A. Finding it hard to answer "Yes" or "No", because it's like there's a lot of qualifiers to it - wasn't sufficient to the task? It was the best that they had and I think they were using it in good faith.
Q. Well, you said in the footnote that you were "reluctant to endorse these indicators", didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And indeed, you did not endorse them?
A. No, we didn't.
Q. Rather than endorse them, you pointed out their shortcomings or the shortcomings of the instrument, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it right to read it - isn't the fair reading of what you have written that, in your view, the form, including the use in the form of the indicators, was not an approach that you regarded as fit for purpose?
A. I - I'm only struggling to answer because the determination of bias is such a profoundly difficult thing to do, and certainly their instrument wasn't particularly good, but nor was it so wholly terrible that it was, like, embarrassing or anything of that nature. It just, because of the fact it came from America and the nature of the way it had been put together, wasn't a sort of wonderful way to go about it.
Q. Well, all right. It had the various defects that you summaries in that paragraph from the bottom of page 70 to halfway down 71. You agree? You just need to say something.
A. Sorry, what --
Q. You agree that it had the defects --
A. Oh, yes, it had defects.
Q. -- that you summarise in that paragraph - at 70 and 71?
A. Yes, I agree. I agree. Not shying away from the defects.
Q. No. And the defects included as well, do you agree, that although it had the appearance of a kind of rigorous or somehow objective process, actually, ultimately, as you said this morning, what emerged was a set of subjective opinions?
A. I wouldn't call them wholly subjective. I think that's not particularly fair.
Q. I thought you did agree to that?
A. I mean, if I could make a point that I think it is very helpful for everyone to keep in mind is, we are fixating on the instrument, right, as well you might, but the wider problem is the paucity of data that the
instrument is applied to. You would often read these cases, sometimes they would run to 20 pages, and there was almost nothing in it - they were enigmatic. There was none in it that often any instrument could discover and I would suggest that that is because back in the 1980s and '90s, et cetera, a lot of police officers were only thinking about gay and lesbian subjectivity, they were not thinking about GLBTIQ, and the sort of nuanced things that could have been observed objectively, registered, counted, written down and collected, that might have gleaned a much more valuable insight into these crimes, wasn't captured.

So it's as though, focusing so much attention on the instrument is to misunderstand that it's the paucity of data that's actually in a way the problem.
Q. Well, putting that another way without seeking to debate that point with you - in fact, I'11 come back to that point - because there was such a paucity of data in particular with the older cases, the elaborate apparatus of the form was apt to conceal - I don't mean intentionally apt to conceal the near impossibility of the task?
A. Yeah, if you divest it of any sense of blame or -

I could go along with that.
Q. Yes, I'm not putting it in the sense of blame.
A. That does --
Q. I'm putting it in the sense of as a matter of reality, the form might look as though it's got lots of factors and alternatives and criteria and so on, but if there's not much to work with in paper, and all you're working with is paper, such a form isn't going to get you very far?
A. We11 I guess you're working with more than paper. There's stuff that sits behind that that's been captured that goes on the paper, but that seems a reasonable assertion.
Q. Well, if I may just press you, the Parrabel1 officers were only working with paper. That's all they had. We've established that.
A. Yeah, but "paper" is an oblique term. They're working with opinions from forensic psychologists, with witness sentiment, with other forms of evidence that have been captured.
Q. Sure.
A. So to reduce it to a sort of one dimensional description that it is just paper $I$ think is not quite accurate.
Q. Sure. We11, by a11 means factor that in, I accept that. With that matter being pointed out, all they had was a paper review, including papers such as opinions of experts and so on, and if there wasn't much there, there was little for any form to engage with.
A. That seems a fair proposition.
Q. Now, just on that same page, 71 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- but I wil1 come back to this more generally, you say that you determined that you needed to get behind the police instrument and reinterpret what you call the summary evidence, by which you mean the contents of the completed forms; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say that you became aware that you needed to distinguish the direction of the animus because it appeared that there were many cases in which there was a potential to over-categorise anti-gay bias?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was there such a potential in the work done by the police using their form?
A. To over-categorise?
Q. Yes.
A. I can't recall without my handwritten notes that I destroyed. I would have had some summation about that. I can't honestly recall why $I$ would have typed that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. But one thing you didn't do, Doctor, when you, as it were, created your own methodology - one thing you didn't do yourself, nor Professor de Lint, was to go back and recreate from your own perception the narrative or narratives or summaries which had already been created?
A. Correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Could Dr Dalton please have volume 12. And
could you turn in that to tab 258 [SCOI.82365_0001].
A. 258?
Q. So that's the response document that you and Professor de Lint have provided to this Special Commission responding to some expert reports by Professors Lovegrove and Asquith and Ms Coakley; correct?
A. Yes .
Q. This one, it says at the top, was written by

Dr de Lint and endorsed by you?
A. Correct.
Q. Did he write the entire thing and you simply said
"I agree", or what happened?
A. That's correct, he wrote the entirety of it.
Q. But you agreed with it?
A. I agreed with - yeah, almost all of the sentiments, such that $I$ could endorse it as a - in its entirety.
Q. I want to take you to other aspects of this later, but for the moment, on page 2 there is a heading, "Evaluation and Evaluation Tools"; do you see that?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And Dr de Lint, with your endorsement, is talking there about your form, the "BCIF", as he calls it, do you see that? You just need to say "yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. And he says in the second paragraph:

The evaluation of bias crime by police for purposes of recording crime and otherwise is fraught. It is dependent on subjective evaluation or non-objective consensus or concordance-seeking devices.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So when he gives those two alternatives, "subjective evaluation", or "non-objective consensus", that's two sides of the same coin, I take it; it depends on subjective evaluation or, putting it another way, non-objective; is that right?
A. Yeah, he writes - it's his sentence but yes, I think that's right.
Q. But that's - I mean, I can't see any other likely meaning.
A. I can't either. I can't either.
Q. Thank you.
A. But it's hard when you don't write the sentence yourself.
Q. Well, so he seems to be saying that recording or evaluating bias crime is dependent on subjective evaluation.
A. Yes, he does.
Q. He does. And what I would like to suggest to you is that that is indeed what was ultimately the output of the police in using their form: ultimately, as you said, it was intuitive, and it led to the emergence of a view and it was ultimately subjective?
A. Yeah, but I think in saying something is subjective, we can understand what "subjective" means, but it doesn't mean it's incorrect. Often --
Q. Well, for the moment, I'm not putting it's incorrect, just that it's subjective, and $I$ thought had you agreed with that this morning?
A. Yes.
Q. Righto. And then the next sentence in this document says "It" - that is, the evaluation of bias crime by police:
it requires but cannot deliver on an
objective weighing of the role of all
necessary and sufficient factors or
"indicators".
So it requires objectivity but it cannot deliver it.
That's something that you agree with?
A. He seems to have put it particularly forcefully there, but - do I agree with it? "Deliver on an objective weighting of the role of all necessary and sufficient factors". It feels 1 ike we're sort of getting bogged down somewhat in semantics in some ways because, for some of the cases I recal1 10oking at, whether they were or weren't was
actually really quite clear when you looked at all the factors. So to sort of reduce the totality saying all of them are objective or subjective --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Sorry, I'm just interrupting. When you say "it became clear" does that mean you'd know it when you saw it, is that the kind of analogy?
A. No, no, no, no, no.
Q. Well, what are you talking about then?
A. In the totality of reading the material and taking everything into account. There were some cases that were profoundly clear that hate bias was involved, and others where there weren't.
Q. Okay. And do I take it that this statement is one that you now do not endorse or do endorse - the one that you're being asked about?
A. I don't endorse - I mean, you can endorse --
Q. No, look, not "you can" do it, you can do a lot of things, Doctor. We've taken a fair bit of time to, obviously, cooperate with you and Professor de Lint in providing information to this Inquiry.

Now, the top of the heading in this document says you endorse these views. I'm simply asking, given some of the hesitation I've perceived in the last few minutes, that the particular sentence you are being asked about now is something you don't endorse. I'm simply asking you do you continue to endorse it or not?
A. I endorse it, actually. I endorse it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, good.
MR GRAY: Q. Then on page 5 in the same document, do you see there's a heading at the top of the page on page 5 , "How are indicators or factors weighed or scored"?

THE COMMISSIONER: In the copy in my folder, it's at the bottom of page 4. So we've got a --

MR GRAY: Q. At any rate, can you find the heading "3. How are indicators or factors weighed or scored"?

THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps in your copy as well, Dr Dalton, it might be at the bottom of page 4.

THE WITNESS: It's on page 4 , yes.
MR GRAY: $Q$. I don't want to take you to all of this but do you see that the document that you endorse says - having quoted an aspect of what Associated Professor Lovegrove says, the document says:

As described briefly in our report, we were unable to follow [the police] in applying the BCIF to score the cases.

Do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And then the document - the document that you and Dr de Lint produced - goes on to set out various unhelpful and occasionally incorrectly designated features of the form.
A. Yes.
Q. And Professor Lovegrove is then cited again as pointing to particular features of the form that he has noted. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the paragraph beneath that, beginning, "As he observes", can you see that what your document says is this:

As he --
that is, Professor Lovegrove:
As he very helpfully suggests, since they
describe circumstances in very gross
dimensions that may just as easily describe
non-bias homicides this leaves a great deal
open to subjective interpretation
concerning the attribution of hate crime in the particular case.

Do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. So it would appear that you and Dr de Lint are agreeing with what Professor Lovegrove has said - namely,
that a great deal is left open in using the form to subjective interpretation; agreed?
A. Put that to me again, sorry?
Q. See the last sentence in that paragraph beginning "As he very helpfully suggests"?
A. I'm trying to read it. Sorry, the very last paragraph, is it?
Q. The one beginning, "As he observes".
A. Yes, "As he very helpfully" - yes, I've read that, yes.
Q. So that sentence, beginning "As he very helpfully observes [sic]", is you and Dr de Lint agreeing with Professor Lovegrove that using the form in the way that it seems to be intended leaves a great deal open to subjective interpretation.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in terms of why it was that you and your team were not prepared to endorse the methodology of the police, reliant as it was on the form, I think the only reason, but certainly a reason that you give, is that they weren't able to produce any academic literature or similar in support of it. That was certainly one reason you gave?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Now, was the ultimate reliance on subjectivity another reason why you felt unable to endorse the police methodology?
A. I can't recall. I mean, you - I just can't recall.
Q. Was the concern raised by Sergeant Steer, namely, that the police in Parrabell were using the independent indicators in the wrong way - was that another reason why you were reluctant to endorse the police methodology?
A. Yes, if you put it that way, yes, I think that would be fair.
Q. Now, a couple of things about the report itself --

THE COMMISSIONER: Just before you go on.
Q. And it was also clear to you, was it not, Dr Dalton, that a number of the questions were simply not directed to gay hate bias at all; they were directed to other forms of
discrimination or marginalisation?
A. In the bias instrument?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

MR GRAY: Q. Sorry to keep changing between volumes.
A. No, that's okay. You don't have to apologise for that.
Q. That's the world we are in.
A. Yeah, that's all right.
Q. You need exhibit 1, tab 2 [SCOI.02362_0001] again, the report itself.
A. Thank you.
Q. Now, tab 2 in that volume. I want to just take you to the police part of the report briefly?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Which is the first 30 or 40 pages. And could you turn to page 21. Down the bottom, there's a heading, "Is there evidence of a bias crime"?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, what the police say there is this:

Consistent with police methodology, this was the foundational question that allowed greater classification certainty from a policing perspective.

Pausing there, I won't go over this again, but you may have noticed on the way through this afternoon that that question, "Is there evidence of a bias crime", was one of the questions in the earlier version of the form, but it's not a question in the later, more detailed version of the form. I don't know if you noticed that on the way through. A. Yeah, you put that to me before, yes.
Q. Yes. So when he says, or when the police say, "This was the foundational question", it's not the question in the form as it finally emerged. You've seen that?
A. "Foundational question that allowed" - no, I guess it's not. It's a strange sort of sentence.
Q. Yes. And then the police paragraph goes on:

This position created value in the process of academic review because the academic research team did not necessarily adopt the same classification interpretation, which is one reason for differences between findings of both teams.

Now, pausing there, the academic research team not only did not necessarily adopt the same classification interpretation, they deliberately, for the reasons they gave, chose quite different classification interpretations, didn't they?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. And on the top of the next page, this sentence appears:

While different findings and
classifications were made, each team
understood and endorsed the systemic
approach of the other.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that's, with great respect to the author of this document, just not right, is it?
A. No, it's not true.
Q. It's not correct.
A. It's not true, I agree.
Q. No, because your team did not endorse the systemic approach of the police?
A. Correct.
Q. If you'd just fiick over now to the couple of aspects of academic part of the report, go to page 50?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. I'11 come back to this in slightly more detail probably in the morning, but on page 50, you talk about in fact, it starts at 49 , really. This is in the executive summary of your part of the report?
A. Yes.
Q. You talk about your taxonomy, which breaks bias into type A, type B and type C; correct?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And on page 50 at about seven or eight 1 ines from the top, do you see you say:

Anti-gay bias homicide is not typically a case of serial homicide offending where offenders or associates are 1 inked to more than one case.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, what do you base that on?
A. I don't recall because I destroyed my piles of homicide 1 iterature before I left the university. If I had my notes about when $I$ was putting some of this stuff together, I would recal1, but it's - so I don't recall.
Q. I see. Wel1, it's a rather declaratory and definitive assertion, isn't it, perhaps about anti-gay bias homicide general1y?
A. Yes, but when you don't have your research material anymore, you know, if you're trying to make me look a bit threadbare because $I$ don't have it, I can't rely on it, I had to destroy it.
Q. I'm not trying to make you look anything. I'm trying to --
A. Well, you're saying it's declaratory, but unlike you've all had this material for $X$ amount of years and you've been combing through it, I haven't seen it for approximately six years. It was sitting in a filing cabinet before I left the university. So I can't rely on it, my memory of it, in the way that you can.
Q. At any rate, sitting there today, you're not sure what the basis was for you making that statement?
A. No, I'm not.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Was it meant to be a reference to
or an exclusion of gangs?
A. Honestly, if I could tell you, I would. I have no idea.
Q. Well, presumably, if you crafted or agreed with someone else's crafting of the words, "anti-gay bias homicide is not typically a case of serial homicide offending where offenders or associates are linked to more than one case" - the question I've asked you is does that mean that the allegation or assertion, perhaps, that gangs are involved is to be excluded from the anti-gay homicide cases? I just don't understand what the reference to "more than one case" could mean?
A. I don't either with the passage of time. But certainly if you asked me, we certainly were not excluding the potential involvement of gangs. That wouldn't have made any sense, because there was - I have a vague recollection of some of the cases actually centring around gangs.
Q. That's what I'm trying to get to the bottom of, I'm not quite sure - anyway, at the moment, you've got no recollection?
A. I don't.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. Of course, in fairness to you - presumably you have noticed this - in the next couple of sentences you talk about numbers and statistics from within the 88 that you had been looking at, as to how many were cases involving more than one offender, and so on. So of course that's there. But the reason I was asking you the question is whether you were only relying on that material from within the 88 in support of that sentence or whether you had some broader basis for it?
A. I'm - I'm struggling to answer because it's just I feel it's kind of a convoluted point and I'm not following it. I'm doing my best, but I'm struggling.
Q. Right. Two paragraphs down, do you see the paragraph beginning, "A significant number of cases involved large age differences"?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And you then say:

Anti-paedophile animosity underwrote a substantial amount of lethal violence in the homicide cases under review.
A. Yes.
Q. And as you point out in the sentence coming at the end of that paragraph, in your number system, you have counted, of the 85 cases, 17 of them as being anti-gay bias and another 12 as being anti-paedophile animus.
A. Yes, that must - that would - yes.
Q. In other words, the 12 that you regarded as anti-paedophile, you excluded from the set of anti-gay?
A. No, no, that's not - that's not my recollection at a11. I'd put it a different way. It didn't seem he1pful to categorise anti-paedophile animus merely as anti-gay hate animus. But it certainly counted as anti-gay but it was put into a subcategory, to the best of my recollection.
Q. We11, let's just have a little look at that. If we turn over in your part of the report to page 92 --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. There's a chart there of your findings, isn't there?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, if you go back one page, there's a chart of the strike force findings, the police findings?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And their four categories, consistent with the document we looked at this morning, are: 1, "Evidence of Bias Crime; 2, "Suspected Bias Crime"; 3, "Insufficient Information"; 4, "No Evidence of Bias Crime"?
A. Yes.
Q. Yours are, on page 92: 1, Anti-Gay Bias; 2, Anti-Paedophile Animus; 3, Insufficient Information; and 4, No Evidence of Bias Crime; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So you appear to distinguish and separate anti-gay
from anti-paedophile?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. But you say that somewhere in the report we will find
something that says anti-paedophile was to be treated as a subset of anti-gay?
A. Irrespective of what is in this table and what the sentences say, my recollection is that when we noticed that the animus appeared to be anti-paedophile we made a distinction to treat it separately.

Now, the problem is I'm in a minefield here as I open my mouth because, you know, I don't want to appear some apologist for paedophiles, although I was - if I'm honest, I was quite shocked that Professor Gail Mason had some sort of quote where she seemed to think that a paedophile was undeserving of victim status, I didn't totally understand that, to be honest, because I think they can be victims, but it didn't seem helpful - it gets really messy, because back in the '90s, et cetera, for some men who hated homosexuals, a paedophile and a rock spider and a poofter and a this and a that, they were all inter-dispersed and they made no distinction between the two.

Just to complicate things even more, in some other categories I think there perhaps were men who might have just been able to distinguish the two and not have them conflated but still hate either or both of them. So it's as though the second you have to start using these very precise terms, it's helpful to be precise, but I just - we could not see any - any sort of valid social science justification to count different a phenomenon as being amorphous, like it's the same thing. Does that make sense?.
Q. Did you regard a case where there was present in whichever proportions both some element of anti-gay bias -A. I can't --
Q. -- and some element of anti-paedophile bias?
A. I can't - without my notes that were very voluminous, I had pages and pages --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Doctor, please, would you just listen and do your best. You've made the point more than once that you haven't got your notes. But just listen, please, to the question and do your best, please.

THE WITNESS: That's what I'm attempting to do.
MR GRAY: Q. I'm not asking you about - sorry.
A. That's what I'm attempting to do.
Q. We11, you started answering before $I$ had finished the question. So just let me ask the question. Was your approach this: that if you found a case where there appeared to be an element of anti-gay bias and also an element of anti-paedophile bias, in whichever proportion, you would exclude that as being anti-gay bias?
A. No.
Q. You say in such a case, it would be included in the Anti-Gay Bias column, do you?
A. No, I seem - I seem to recall that one had to then make a distinction to not double-count it. That's - and that we were worried about double-counting. But I cannot recal1 the precise mechanism by which we disaggregated. But we were certainly - didn't want to double-count.
Q. I'11 just come back to that topic a 1 ittle bit more --

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Is that another way of saying if you didn't want to double-count, that you excluded anti-paedophile cases from them being characterised as gay hate related?
A. No. No. It's merely that --
Q. Wel1, then precisely what do you mean?
A. -- it didn't - you couldn't - double-counting in terms of the statistics would have been problematic.
Professor de Lint would be able to speak better to that than me. He is better with the statistics.

MR GRAY: Q. By "not double-counting", you mean you'd be sure not to put in the "Anti-Gay Bias" column a case which you regarded as "Anti-Paedophile Bias"; is that what you mean?
A. I don't - in a way, I don't recal1. I'm feeling very confused by the way you're putting it. I'm doing my best, but it was six years ago.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Do your best, if I may ask, without overly persisting, why did you draw the distinction at al1?
A. Between anti-paedophile animus and anti-gay bias?
Q. Yes. Why did you even bother drawing the distinction? What was the purpose of drawing the distinction?
A. Wow, I thought it was most helpful to distinguish between different phenomena, and the animus --
Q. Why?
A. Because it seems to me that if you're attacking someone and you're doing so because you hate paedophiles, as opposed to whether you just hate gay people, that the distinction is worth preserving.
Q. Does that mean that the anti-paedophile would not be regarded or counted as an anti-gay offence?
A. No, my sense was it was counted.
Q. Then I get back the point. What is the point of the distinction if you're going to count them as equal?
A. What do you mean by "equal"? I don't understand what you mean by "equal".
Q. You are drawing a distinction because you want to be clear about the animus involved, and do I understand you to say that if you detected that the animus was an anti-paedophile animus, it would not be characterised as an anti-gay bias offence?
A. I don't - this is the problem with this sort of process - I don't - I don't accurately recall.
Q. You can't even explain it now?
A. Oh, no, I can't.

MR GRAY: Q. You see, lower down on the page, 50, just below where you've put some of the numbers forward - the paragraph beginning, "Our view" - this is on page 50 - you say that there can be a problem of over-reporting and recording of bias. Do you see that?
A. "Our view is that over-reporting and recording can produce unfortunate consequences", yes.
Q. That's the paragraph I'm directing you to,
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You say that's fuelled by a confirmation bias. What do you mean by - what did you have in mind there? What were you saying? What was your point about confirmation bias? And who were you saying was, as it were, guilty of such a thing?
A. I recall that when we wrote that section we were talking very generally about the general concept of over or
under-reporting.
Q. Well, it's right in the middle of a section dealing with the topic of paedophilia, isn't it?
A. It may well be, but I can't quite - I don't recall why it's placed there.
Q. Because the next paragraph goes on:

In addition to over-recording, mis-recording may occur where different kinds of bias motivation are collected under one categorisation. If the motive is complex, over-recording may occur where the subtlety of that motivation cannot be registered. For instance, we believe that a person who acts out once in sudden violence or without planning on apparent animus or fear towards a much older male may well not be homophobic ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes, thank you for highlighting it. Hang on. Yes.
Q. What was the relevance of saying that?
A. I think, and I'm not sure, that it relates to the early discussion about the complexities of latent homosexuality in men who ostensibly think they're heterosexual but have homosexual desires and then, in a particular context, those desires get triggered and they find them profoundly confronting in terms of the psychology of their sexual identity.
Q. The example that you're giving, the person who acts out once in sudden violence or without planning on apparent animus or fear, you seem to be saying, well, that sort of incident may not be an example of gay hate bias or anti-gay bias, simply because it's someone acting out once in sudden violence, et cetera.
A. If you put it that way, it's regrettable that the sentence is expressed that way, then, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. But more to the point, you use the example of a much older male. You are adverting at least implicitly, are you not, to a paedophilic reaction on the part of the much younger person?
A. The tricky thing is with these reports that --
Q. No, look, sorry --
A. No, no, allow me --
Q. No, no.
A. Please allow me to speak.
Q. No, Dr Dalton, you can speak as much as you like, but I won't have speeches. What I'm asking you: is that --
A. I wasn't going to deliver a speech.
Q. Would you please listen. Is that not a reference in clear but perhaps implicit terms to an exercise or an event, first of al1, it's once, it's not serial, but secondly, the juxtaposition is between a much older male and, by inference, a much younger person, male, not being homophobic, because he is reacting out of an animus or fear towards a paedophile? Isn't that what you are saying implicitly at the very least?
A. To be clear, I think Professor de Lint wrote that section, and so when people write particular sections in a report, often the logic that is being conveyed is very much in their head rather than the other co-author's head. So I suspect that might be the case with this particular sentence.

MR GRAY: Q. And the analogy that then follows is:
... just as a woman who acts out aggressively against an unwanted sexual
solicitation by a male is not necessarily anti-heterosexual.

Is that an analogy that you would actually endorse and adopt?
A. I seem to recal 1 that $I$ didn't write those sentences, and so you'd perhaps have to ask Professor de Lint about them.
Q. I'm asking you is that an analogy that you would adopt and endorse?
A. A woman who acts out aggressively against an unwanted sexual solicitation by male is not necessarily anti-heterosexual. Yes, I guess so.
Q. So that's a suitable analogy to the example of a male acting out once against an older male?
A. I guess so.
Q. In the next paragraph, you say that, in your analysis, you sought to ensure a concordance between offender motivation and target category, target category being a reference to what?
A. The people being subjected to the crime, I guess.
Q. Well, what's the concordance that is being sought? I mean, the people being subjected to crime here are men who have met their death, where there is a possibility, which is being looked at, as to whether it might have had a bias factor. So what does "target category" mean in that context?
A. I don't recall.
Q. And your approach, which I'11 come to, the type A, type B, type C, et cetera --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- required, didn't it, a conclusion or a view to be formed about offender motivation?
A. Insofar as it was possible to do so, yeah.
Q. Well, that's what this sentence is referring to, and you develop it at greater length later, but you wanted to ensure a concordance between offender motivation and target category. So offender motivation was central to the way you went about it?
A. I - put that to me again, sorry, I just --
Q. Offender motivation - identifying that - was central to the way you went about your task?
A. In those cases where that would become apparent, it certainly wasn't apparent in all of them.
Q. Well, in all cases, it says:
... in our analysis, we sought to ensure a concordance between offender motivation and target category.

A11 I'm asking you is whether that means what it says, namely, that your approach involved the importance of identifying offender motivation?
A. I don't recall.
Q. In the next sentence you say:

As reviewers, we found the need to distinguish anti-paedophile animosity from anti-gay bias in the more generic form.

So you did distinguish between anti-paedophile on the one hand and anti-gay on the other hand?
A. Absolutely we did.
Q. Just lastly while I'm here on this part of the report, which is the executive summary, on page 53 , you say:
... the policy question on combating
anti-gay bias is not as simple as some moral crusaders make it out to be.

Who were the moral crusaders you had in mind?
A. Anyone who was promulgating the idea that there was a major and serious problem with too many homicides, proportionate to other places or cities in the world - that there was an epidemic, if you like, or whatever the phrases were that were being touted at the time.
Q. Well, who was doing that, according to you? Who were these moral crusaders?
A. People that seemed to be in the media reports.
Q. Like who?
A. I don't know. I don't recall. I don't have my notes.
Q. Do you mean Sue Thompson?
A. Yes.
Q. Was she one of the moral crusaders you had in mind when you wrote that sentence?
A. Yes, but in - you will note, and this is why I think I'm being misconstrued, I showed great respect and deference to Sue Thompson in the Strike Force Parrabell report and said that she was doing a good job, a well-intentioned good job, because drawing attention to the problem of how many homicides there are was a worthwhile thing to do.
Q. She is one of the moral crusaders you're referring to, though?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. And Stephen Tomsen?
A. Yes.
Q. Who else?
A. I couldn't say, that's - anyone who would support that proposition, I guess.
Q. And just to be clear, the proposition that you say those two were supporting - correct me if I'm wrong - is that there had been a lot of murders in the '80s and '90s that may well have been gay hate?
A. A lot - that there were - that there were many, that there were 88, that this total, this number of 88 , that they were all gay hate crimes.
Q. So anyone who said that there were as many as up to 88 deaths which were or might have been gay hate was a moral crusader?
A. Yeah, it sounds like such a pejorative sort of term, doesn't it, but Professor de Lint used it in a non-pejorative way, that they were - yes, that they were they were trying to draw attention to a problem.
Q. Well, it does look a bit pejorative, to use your word, and why was it put so pejoratively?
A. Because it seemed as though, from the second I started doing this work, if you were to find that there was any number less than 88, you were somehow a police apologist, which is an offensive sort of assertion.
Q. So you were concerned that the police not be unfairly criticised?
A. No, not at all. Let's be honest, and I think we made reference in the report, they did a terrible job in the '80s and '90s of policing hate crimes and other general crimes relating to violence against gay men. I think that's universally agreed upon.
Q. Let me just turn to another topic, which is how it was that you came to tender for this job and --
A. Certainly.
Q. -- be selected. So that volume could be put away for the moment, and could $\operatorname{Dr}$ Dalton first of all have volume 10.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. So did you think that the moral crusaders were engaged in a gross exaggeration of the numbers?
A. Perhaps not a gross exaggeration but an exaggeration.

MR GRAY: Q. In volume 10, would you turn to tab 244 [SCOI.79884_0001]?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. This is an email from - the bottom one is an email from Jackie Braw of the police to you on 24 June 2016; do you see that?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. She says:

Nicole Asquith gave me your name and
suggested you may be interested in
submitting a proposal.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the topic, the subject line is, "Seeking proposals to conduct an independent review 'Strike Force Parrabel1'"?
A. Yes .
Q. Now, is that the beginning of the raising of this topic with you? Is this when it was first broached with you?
A. I can't recall whether it was this email or whether it was a telephone call. It was one or the other, and I guess it may well have been the email. It was either an email or a telephone call. I seem to recall that it was actually a telephone call first.
Q. First?
A. But I could be wrong.
Q. You could be wrong. But in any event, you received this email at about, I assume, the same time as any such phone call?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Perhaps shortly after?
A. Yes, it would appear so.
Q. And she gives an account of what they're doing with Parrabe11?
A. Mmm-hmm
Q. And says they'd like an independent qualified assessment or evaluation, and she says:

We expect the following to be included.

And then there's 10 or so bullet points?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, I'm sorry, but there is a sequence of volumes. We now need volume 13. And you need to turn to tab 267 [SCOI.81750_0001].
A. Yes.
Q. Now, starting from the bottom of this email chain, which is at the very bottom of the first page, do you see there is one that says, "From: Jacqueline Braw, 30 June", and if we turn over the page we see what that said. This is six days later than the one $I$ just looked at with it you?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. It says:

Hi Derek.
I had a meeting with my manager and
mentioned your possible interest in
submitting a proposal.

If you are stil7 keen, just let me know but don't work on a detailed proposal yet.
... we wil7 be sending you and the other interested parties ... a "Request for quote" ...

Et cetera?
A. Yes.
Q. You respond to that the next day:

Dear Jackie.
I was going to emai 7 you the entire tender (including budget) Monday morning but will
hold off in 7 ight of what you have just advised.

So does that tel 1 us that in the six days between 24 June, when she sent you that initial email, and 30 June, or 1 July, you had already prepared at least a draft or the beginnings of a tender?
A. I guess so. I don't have a strong memory, but I guess that's - yeah.
Q. We11, the next email above that is from a Mr Tulsi--
A. Yes.
Q. -- who was someone from Flinders --
A. Yes, I know the man well.
Q. -- to Jackie Braw asking her did she know when the deadline might be for the request for quotation.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. That same man, Mr Tulsi, then emails you later the same day, 1 July, at the top of the page, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And he says to you:

I have also attached the documents --
this is in the third paragraph --
and spreadsheet we have worked on [so] far.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. If we turn to 267A [SCOI.81752_0001] in the bundle that is the attachment?
A. 267 - -
Q. The next one, the very next one?
A. Okay, here it is, okay. Sure, yeah.
Q. Now, when we come to your actual tender, which is a later version of this one, we'11 see a couple of differences, but do you see on the third page there is a heading "Independence [a key to objectivity ]"?
A. Mmm-hmm .

$$
2421 \text { D DALTON (Mr Gray) }
$$

Q. And you there refer to the fact that you were away from New South Wales, namely, in other states? You need to say something. Can you --
A. Sorry, can you put that to me again?
Q. You there refer to the fact that you and your team were away from New South Wales, in other states?
A. Yes.
Q. You refer to the fractious and divisive era in

New South Wales and the existence of much folklore and cultural memory?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say that baggage might be associated with some of the key players, among them being some academics?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that again a reference to Stephen Tomsen, among others?
A. Yeah, it's a reference to what did appear to be very fractious, very hostile relations between some people in the gay community, activists, people who - yes.
Q. One of the academics that you were saying had baggage was Stephen Tomsen; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. There is then a heading "Dedication to ensuring clear lines of communication are maintained"; do you see that?
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. You say "Clear lines of communication are vital", and then the next sentence says:

> A team that both assists with the production of an initial review report document and subsequently evaluates the quality of a finalised report is in a slightly invidious position.

Now, pausing there, what's described there is an initial review report and a finalised report, ie, singular. Was it your understanding or expectation, at least at that point, that the result of your work would be a single joint document with the police?
A. I - from memory, I think that's a fair - fair point.
Q. Right. And a few lines down, you say:

Clearly documenting and communicating unambiguous feedback with --

I think it should be "wi11" --
wil7 ensure the detectives authoring both the draft and subsequent version of the review report are given ample opportunities to craft a product [report] that wil7 be likely to meet with a more favourable review.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. That's what you have said?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, you seem to have had in mind at least then a single report?
A. Yes, I - yes, I would - yes, I agree.
Q. And you were of the mind that you would want, and that the police would want, a favourable review of that report?
A. But what I meant by "favourable" was that it would be wel1 received by the public.
Q. A11 right. Now, then, could I ask you to look at -
A. Could I also just comment on something that --
Q. Yes, do.
A. This was my first tender at the university and $I$ was very much constantly having to go to people of more experience saying, "What do you write in these things? What do you do?"
Q. Okay. Just turn over to tab 269 [SCOI.80109_0001], if you would?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. This is another email chain, and we just need to start from the bottom of it. It starts, do you see, with one on Friday, 22 July, saying "Please accept our invitation to tender"? It's the bottom one of the chain.
Q. Sorry, which page are we on, sorry?
A. It's the bottom email in the chain.

THE COMMISSIONER: The third page in, in fact.
MR GRAY: Q. 22 July, "Please" --
A. Yes, I've found it finally.
Q. "Please accept our invitation to tender"; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q.

Attached are two documents: the Request
For Tender and the Supply Agreement.
Agreed?
A. Yes.
Q. And you respond saying "Many thanks for supplying the tender information", and you ask some questions about references and so on. And on the front page, in an email from you to Dr Tyson, where she says that she's getting a reference in train, she says - or you say, rather:

EXCELLENT. The cops seem keen for our tender!

What was your basis for saying that?
A. I don't recal1. That they were keen to receive our tender, because I'd chatted to Jacqueline for quite a while, she seemed very friendly and she just seemed to think - I seemed to think that we could work well.
Q. That request for tender was sent to you on 22 July, as we've just seen?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And your tender, if we now need to go to volume 2, please, and turn to tab 25 [SCOI.75775_0001]. Your tender goes in six days later, on 28 July. Tab 25. Do you have a covering letter at the front of tab 25 ?
A. Yes, I do, yes.
Q. See it's dated 28 July?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's only six days after you get the request for tender, but can we assume, I suppose, that what you did in those six days was to revise the draft that you had already prepared a couple - a few weeks earlier when you first were contacted by her?
A. Sure. I seem to recall, I don't know why, amongst the things I do and don't recall, that there was some mad rush to do it, either there was a deadline or - because I
remember constantly having to hassle Narmon and ring him up and - I was reliant upon Narmon because he was the university person assigned to help us with tenders. We were under a lot of pressure at the university at the time to bring in any money, any tender sort of money to bolster the coffers of the university, and he - I also recall, you know, writing lectures, supervising PhD students and things being busy and manic and that it was put together in a fair amount of haste.
Q. I'11 just take you to tab 23 [SCOI.7696100007_0001] which is the request for quotation that you received.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You no doubt recall receiving that?
A. Well, vaguely, obviously form - yes, it was a request for quotation, yes.
Q. Turn to page 6.
A. Of the request, yes.
Q. Clause 3.4.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Do you see there is a heading "Challenges"?
A. Sure.
Q. And there's a couple of sentences in that including this one:

Many researchers in this area are connected to the "gay community" and may not be as independent as desirable.
Some researchers have had their own
personal history of negative relationships with police.

Do you see that, yes.
A. Do I see it? Yes, I do see it.
Q. Yes, please. Now, did you have any discussions with Jackie Braw or anyone else from the police as to what that was referring to?
A. Oh, I'm trying to remember. We did have some discussions, but did it - certainly not about the gay community bit. "Personal history of negative [relations] with police"?

Because I'm under oath, and I take it seriously, my only recollection of something negative ever being said about Stephen Tomsen was that, early on in the process, one or two officers had said that they had had some sort of interaction with him earlier in relation to just interactions.

I've got to be careful here because, like, what was the tenor of what they said? That he was a bit aggressive to deal with or difficult or words to that effect. And certainly - not "certainly" - did - if you're asking me did Jackie and I discuss him, or anyone else, I have no recollection, but she - there may have been some generic reference to people having negative relations. There may have been. I really just don't accurately recall or I would tell you.
Q. When you said in the first part of that answer that "some officers" had something to say about Stephen Tomsen, first of all, when, approximately, in the timeline; and, secondly, who?
A. I don't remember who, but I - the "when" would have been in one of the big meetings we had to discuss the cases.
Q. Do you mean after you had been awarded the tender?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. So at the moment I'm asking you about before you were awarded the tender, when you were indeed tendering.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Did anyone, in any conversation with you, indicate to you what those sentences under the heading "Challenges" were referring to?
A. She may well have read out or referred to that second
one, "researchers in the area", because I do recall fairly quickly marshalling an idea in my head that, okay, we're in South Australia, we don't share in the long horrible cultural animosity between the gay community and the NSW Police, and so that would be a selling point for our tender.

But I - but as to - as to any sort of - I remember I do remember having a long - fairly long discussions with Jackie. But she was very friendly and - and apart from anything, because this was a new tender for me, I had no idea, in a way, what was involved so I was trying to get my head around what the task was.
Q. Well, did she tell you or did you know who the other tenderers were or were going to be?
A. No. No, I don't recall that she did.
Q. Did she say anything to you to the effect, "We have some other tenderers, but they are researchers connected to the gay community"?
A. No, I don't - I honestly don't recall whether she whether she said that. I think she did say - she might have said that they were going to approach other people. I do recall being a bit surprised she'd rung me, just a little bit surprised, and she said a phrase like "Your reputation preceded you", whatever that means.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And what did you think was your selling point again?
A. Well, my - I thought our - my selling point --
Q. Well, you mentioned - your terminology, wasn't it, "selling point"?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. Well, what did you think was your selling point?
A. This is sort of vulgar language. This is the language
that the university told me to use to try to get a tender.
Selling point number 1, that we were in South Australia so we were not totally embroiled in the animosity that had long existed between the NSW Police and the gay community, which I don't think is any great secret; and secondly, I saw my expertise pertaining to gay culture, the way homosexuality has been policed in Australia, et cetera, particularly - it was clear to me that cases involving beats were going to be involved, et cetera. I'd written
a lot about that area, that that was going to be valuable and helpful.

And I saw, I have to stress - I wasn't going to - this was just more work to do amongst a very busy schedule as an academic, but $I$ saw it as work that was potentially necessary to gain - to try to keep one's job in a very competitive environment, but I can honestly say, hand on my heart, I came to the process of doing this with a genuine desire to help cast a bit of a light on what had happened and bring a modicum of sort of justice and insight into that period.

And had there have been - you know, I was prepared, once I opened the folders, to find 88 cases, if indeed there were 88. And you must take that as a statement of honesty. That's what I intended to do. I never - but you've asked me this - sorry, perhaps I haven't answered your question, so you might want to ask it again.
Q. Did you think at the relevant time you were putting the tender in that there had already been moral crusaders urging for large numbers of cases or did you discover moral crusaders in the course of your doing the report?
A. That's a very fair question to ask. I don't recall. I think it became - it certainly became apparent as we were doing it.

MR GRAY: Q. You will see on the next page, there's a heading "Terms of Reference", then "4.1, Services Required"?
A. Yes.
Q. So you understood that page to be the Terms of Reference for the academic review that was being proposed?
A. Yes.
Q. And bullet point number 1 was:

A collaborative approach to working with [the police] ...
A. Yes.
Q. Was that something that Ms Braw drew to your attention, the importance of a collaborative approach? A. I honestly don't remember, but certainly it's in the
document, so there can be no arguing with it.
Q. Well, when we go to the actual contract, which is at tab 24 [SCOI.76961.00008_0001] the next tab, this is - it doesn't have the signatures on it, but this is the contract that you ultimately entered into -- -
A. Mmm-hmm, yes.
Q. -- or the university did. Do you see that it also contains the same schedule at pages 18 and 19 , with the heading "Challenges" and the heading "Terms of Reference", in the same terms?
A. I'm just waiting for it to appear. Yes.
Q. When we come to your tender itself, which is at tab 25 [SCOI.75775_0001]. It's in tab 25.
A. Oh, sorry, yes.
Q. You'11 need to flip through the first 10 or 12 or maybe more pages until you get to the actual text of your application, with the Flinders University logo at the top.
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Now, do you see it's seven pages long, the application, or the tender - the tender proposal?
A. Yes.
Q. And I just want to go through a couple of aspects of
it. Under the first heading, "Excellent Research
Expertise", you have set out the expertise of yourself, Professor de Lint and Dr Tyson --
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- relevant to this tender?
A. Sure.
Q. And for yourself, you say:
... extensive experience conducting and publishing research in relation to the policing, homosexuality and public space.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. What does "the public space" mean?
A. I wrote an article that got published in a fairly prestigious journal years ago that looked at - it was in
relation to the analysis of that Australian version of the Wolfenden Committee about the way public space was understood or as a place where homosexual bodies could flow in and out of this space and get regulated. I'd have - I'd literally have to find my own article to refresh my memory about some of my arguments.
Q. Do you mean geographical places like toilet blocks and the like?
A. Yes, yes, yes.
Q. And then you go on:

His research --
that is, your research --
... has primarily focused on problematic
"Beat" spaces ...
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You say:
... [that] research culminated in the publication of "Policing Sex" ...
A. Yes.
Q. You say that your grasp of legal, social and cultural complexities of "Beat" spaces will be indispensable to this project, given the manner in which they figure prominently in the review brief?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you say that you do not profess to be expert, per se, in hate crime?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. And that was correct, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any background in hate crime itself?
A. I taught hate crime units at third-year level of university on various occasions over 16 or 17 years. I'd the trick is, a criminologist often - you have a series of interests that are very defined but then you have wider
interests, and whilst I hadn't published on hate crime per se, I had kept abreast of literature, read a lot about it, enough that the South Australia Police saw fit once to invite me to their headquarters to give them kind of a lecture on the current status of hate crime investigation and knowledge from a world sort of perspective.
Q. Right. So is this the position, that you had not published in the area of hate crime?
A. No.
Q. Are you agreeing with me?
A. Yes, I'm agreeing with you, yes.
Q. But you say that you had an excellent grasp of the literature relating to hate crime?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had given some lectures, some to third year students and some to police, that did bear upon hate crime?
A. Yes .
Q. And is that --
A. Could I be allowed to --
Q. Certainly?
A. I'11 go out on a limb here and say there's probably only two people in Australia that could rightfully probably, in inverted commas, say they were hate crime experts, one is Gail Mason, and the other, and I'm being a little bit generous, is Stephen Tomsen.
Q. Why is that being generous?
A. Because if you look at a lot of his literature it's about homicide in general, not necessarily gay hate.
I mean, when you go to the literature about gay hate, there's a lot of people overseas who come to mind, Eric, et cetera, that do all the literature reviews, that's not to disparage Stephen Tomsen, he certainly has - I mean, you'll see in the Parrabell report, I cited him and said very generous and kind things about him. I read all of his - as much of his literature as I could. It was very important. It would have been remiss not to look at it.
Q. In the next paragraph you refer to one lecture that you gave for an hour in December 2004 --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- entitled "Hate Crime and homophobic violence: an overview" to 22 police officers?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you refer to a keynote address in 2006 entitled "International perspectives on community building between police and the GLBTI community"?
A. Yes.
Q. And thirdly you refer to attending monthly meetings from 2004 to 2007 of the "GLBTIQ Police Focus Group" in South Australia?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in bold at the end of that paragraph you say
this:
These experiences testify to the fact that
[you] have extensive experience communicating with police officers and fostering mutual respect, trust and cooperation with a view to securing positive outcomes.
A. Yes.
Q. So it is fair to say - it is in bold - you are stressing your credentials as someone who works with police in a cooperative way?
A. That's fair. I would say that's very fair.
Q. And I will just briefly for this afternoon - you then talk about Professor de Lint's credentials for this project. You say:

His areas of interest include security and policing, particularly public order policing ....
A. Yes.
Q. After referring to his work on editorial boards you
say he has an international reputation in relation to policing research?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And then you refer to his expertise in policing culture?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it from that that he also had no background, academically, in the field of gay hate?
A. That's a fair assertion.
Q. And thirdly, Dr Tyson, in her case, you refer to her experience in:
... intimate partner violence, domestic homicide, filicide in the context of separation and divorce, and family violence and family law reform.

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, worthy topics but unrelated to gay hate?
A. Not totally unrelated but - you see, I'd - in terms of these processes, I'd respectfully like to say, in terms of the reality for how the world works in Australian universities, et cetera, the question sort of is, in Australia, who were these requisite people who could have done the job better - as well as us or better than us? And I would suggest that Gail Mason could have done it - I'm not sure why - who knows whether she put in a tender, I have no idea. I imagine Stephen would have put in a tender. I can't speak to why he didn't get it. But once you leave those two people out of the equation, you're then left with a whole lot of other people, myself included, and our team, who have skills and knowledge that cluster around the area but don't sort of neatly get printed on a sort of vellum card that you can hold up and go, "I am a hate crime expert."

So I'm trying to think, in terms of Australia - you know, even someone who does similar - has done, in a way, similar work to me but in a later period, Angela Dwyer, at the University of Tasmania, looking at gay and lesbian youth interactions with the police, et cetera - you know, I don't think she professes to be a hate crime expert at all.

So I guess what I'm respectfully trying to say, amongst all the factors that were at work here, including
a university that was banging its fist on the table screaming at people, "Bring in the money or your job's on the line", I saw my expertise in terms of all this stuff as relevant and helpful. Could you even accuse me, in this document, of kind of embellishing a little to try to get the tender because this is what you have to do with this process? I think even you could do that and that would be justified. We were told to embellish, to sell yourself like there's no tomorrow to get the money.

They were literally salivating when I went into that office saying, "We might be able to get this tender." They were sort of just seeing the dollar signs, they took 20 something per cent or 25 per cent off the top of it.

I'd like to stress as well, I didn't get any money in my back pocket here to go shopping at David Jones or JB Hi-Fi; the money was paid into a research consultancy. I had intended prior to COVID occurring to travel to Poland to visit the memorial sites of Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor, to do Holocaust research, which is my true passion, but COVID got in the road there.

But I can honestly tell you, it just was - it's been a poisoned chalice from the second I started it, all this hatred and animosity. I would send emails to people who one person who had stayed in my house and been very kind, I sent her an email and she didn't even reply. I was immediately constructed as a police apologist.

It's a disgusting thing. I'm not a police apologist. I've spent years of my life documenting hate against gay people and to be constructed as such is a despicable thing - and that's what I feel is happening today with all this minutiae about all this sort of stuff. You would have been better to sequester your energies to look at the 25 or 30 odd cases that weren't determined and spent a whole lot of resources looking at that, not attacking people like me.

MR GRAY: Is that a convenient time?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Dr Dalton. I will adjourn until tomorrow morning.

AT 4.06PM THE SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY WAS ADJOURNED
TO WEDNESDAY, 1 MARCH 2023 AT 10AM
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