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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS C MELIS: Commissioner, I appear to assist you in this hearing.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR M SHORT: Commissioner, Short, for the Commissioner of Police.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Short.
MS MELIS: Commissioner, this is public hearing number 14 of the Special Commission of Inquiry. These submissions address the death of Robert Hart Malcolm. Mr Malcolm's death was one of the cases reviewed by Strike Force Parrabell.

There are two volumes of material in this matter, Commissioner. I hand up now a copy of those materials, together with some short minutes in relation to orders that the parties seek to be made pursuant to section 8 of the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act.

Travelling also with that bundle is a copy of Counsel Assisting's written submissions dated 6 July 2023.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. They are agreed, are they, Mr Short?

MR SHORT: Yes, they are, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS MELIS: I understand, Commissioner, that the two volumes of material will be exhibit number 56 .

## EXHIBIT \#56 TWO VOLUMES OF MATERIAL FOR PUBLIC HEARING number 14 Re the death of robert hart malcolm

MS MELIS: I formally adopt and rely on the submissions handed up.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I have made those orders, thank you.

MS MELIS: May it please the Inquiry.

If a photo of Mr Malcolm could please be put up on the screen? Commissioner, this is a photo of Robert Malcolm with his mum, Edith. Mr Malcolm was a respected, well-liked and intelligent man. He was the son of Edith Malcolm and Robert Senior Malcolm, both of whom are deceased. He had a younger brother, Graham Malcolm, and a younger sister, Lynette Elias.

I start today by acknowledging Lyn and Graham, who are here in person today, Commissioner, in the gallery of the court. I also acknowledge all of Mr Malcolm's family and friends who may be watching on the live stream.

Commissioner, the Malcolm family have prepared a family statement honouring the life of Robert, and I now invite Ms Elias to come into the witness box and read that statement.

THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
MS ELIAS: Robert was a kind, caring and intelligent person. He had many talents and interests. From an early age, Robert was an avid reader and a gifted musician. He was a star of several musicals at his local high school. Robert was a talented singer and a virtuoso on the recorder. He was very good at public speaking and debating. In fact, when he met up with his aunt Bernice in Scotland while travelling, her husband Stanley gave Robert the nickname of "The Orator".

After secondary school, Robert attended the University of Sydney from 1969, where he embarked on an Arts degree, studying economics, modern history and geography.

Robert was a member of the Sydney University Musical Society and participated in musical performances as a tenor in the chorus. He was also the SUMS treasurer during that time. Robert worked at the GPO for the Australian Postal Service and appeared to enjoy his time there very much.

He loved train travel, and in 1978 Robert travelled on the Trans-Siberian Railway with a friend, exploring much of Asia and Europe.

Robert was always polite, gentle and generous with his time and possessions. He was well loved by many who knew
him.
The loss of Robert has impacted sadly on all of our family. We miss our Robert terribly. Our parents, Bob and Edith, were deeply saddened by the death of their first-born son. Their lives would have been so much happier and healthier if Robert had not been violently attacked.

While Robert never fathered children of his own, he would have delighted in being an uncle to his four wonderful nieces. Robert died in 1992 before he could ever know of or spend time with any of his nieces. Robert would have enjoyed talking with them and sharing in their company. His nieces could have benefited from Robert's interest and advice on all matters, particularly music, literature and history.

When our parents' health deteriorated as they aged, Robert may have made a valuable contribution to their care and wellbeing. Perhaps they could have avoided living their final years in a nursing home.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS MELIS: Thank you, too, Ms Elias for that statement.
Commissioner, I formally tender that statement, and I understand that will be exhibit number 57.

EXHIBIT \#57 FAMILY STATEMENT RE THE DEATH OF ROBERT HART MALCOLM

MS MELIS: On behalf of the Inquiry, I extend my sincere condolences to all of Mr Malcolm's family and friends and thank them again for sharing those words about Robert.

If that photograph could now please be taken down.
Mr Malcolm was 41 years old at the time of his death and lived in Jannali with his parents. He worked in a clerical position in the staff pay section of the General Post Office at Martin Place, Sydney. On the afternoon and evening of 10 January 1992, he was drinking at the Menzies Hotel with colleagues and was last seen by friends at around 8.15 pm .

In the early hours of Saturday, 11 January 1992, Mr Malcolm was found unconscious in an abandoned and derelict house on Holden Street in Redfern.

He had suffered serious head injuries, which were likely the result of being assaulted with objects including a piece of timber and a broken brick. He was found with his underpants down around his knees and his trousers around his ankles. He died of those head injuries at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital on 29 January 1992.

Three persons of interest were identified and charged in relation to Mr Malcolm's death. They were Anthony Stanley Hookey, Kirk Anthony Phillips and Richard John Green.

Mr Phillips and Mr Green are deceased.
Each person of interest was discharged at the committal hearing, which was held on 3 and 4 August 1992. I will come to the evidence in relation to each person shortly.

As previously submitted by Senior Counsel Assisting the Inquiry, the Inquiry's investigation of Mr Malcolm's death and Counsel Assisting's submission in relation to his case to you today, Commissioner, were affected by the late production of material by police. As late as 5 June 2023, the Inquiry received over 1,500 pages of material, including a large volume of running sheets not previously provided to the Inquiry, which related to the initial police investigation into Mr Malcolm's assault and death. These documents ought to have been produced to the Inquiry back in May last year when they were first summonsed.

The documents threw up a number of witnesses whose names the Inquiry was not previously aware of, and the Inquiry has endeavoured to follow up with these witnesses and any potential leads in the intervening period.

On 21 June 2023, the Inquiry received a further 1,827 documents, which the police indicated were produced pursuant to the summons issued in May last year. The Inquiry set to work reviewing all documents and reconciling the information with information it already had.

Commissioner, Inquiry staff continued to receive
further production in this matter by police as recently as 5.53 pm on Wednesday of this week, 5 July. Fortunately, a review of this material did not warrant any further delay to today's proceedings.

We do hope, however, that the Inquiry has now received the entire holdings of NSW Police in relation to Mr Malcolm's case, and it is on this understanding that we present this case to you today.

I now turn to events preceding Mr Malcolm's death.
Mr Malcolm's friends and colleagues described him as quiet, likeable and a happy-go-lucky guy but that he appeared to have a problem with drinking. One colleague, Richard Teaken, said that his nickname at work was "Alcy Malcy".

Two people who knew him said that as a result of being robbed of his watch and wallet two to three years prior to his death, Mr Malcolm did not carry a wallet, usually just some cash and an ATM card. Mr Malcolm's father confirmed that missing from his son's property at home after he was assaulted was his licence and Mastercard keycard.

Richard Teaken also stated to police that Mr Malcolm was sympathetic and naive with Aboriginal people and added that he was likely to go anywhere if offered a drink.

On 10 January 1992, between 1 pm and 3pm, Mr Malcolm attended the King George Tavern with colleagues to celebrate a fellow colleague's retirement. From 4.30pm to around 8pm, he was drinking with friends at the Menzies Hote1. First he went to the Terrace Bar at the Menzies Hotel. Sharon Stephens, a bar attendant there, said to police that he left really drunk at around 8 pm .

Mr Malcolm then drank in the Punt and Pint Bar of the Menzies Hotel with friends John Baxter and George O'Donnall. At the time Mr O'Donnall left, which was about 8.15 pm , Mr Malcolm was "pretty intoxicated". He was unsteady, his speech was slurred and his eyes were glazy and bloodshot. At one point, Mr Malcolm asked Mr O'Donnall, "Have you got $\$ 50$ on you I can borrow?", and Mr 0'Donnall responded, "I could give you a hundred, Bob." However, Mr O'Donnall did not end up giving Mr Malcolm any money.

Between 8.30pm and 9pm, four witnesses say they saw one of the persons of interest, Anthony Hookey, walking down Eveleigh Street in Redfern with a white man. Mr Hookey was well known to all four witnesses, each of whom lived in or around the Redfern area. Mr Hookey was also known by the name "Beaver". The sightings of the four witnesses are detailed in our written submissions at paragraphs 123 to 129. The identification evidence given by at least three of the witnesses appears consistent with them identifying Mr Malcolm as being with Mr Hookey between 8.30 and 9 pm , or otherwise a white man who looked very much like him. All three witnesses observed the white man to be drunk, unsteady and staggering.

The fourth witness, a Ms Sharon Murphy, said that she saw Mr Hookey and a man walking down Eveleigh Street between 8.30 and 9.30 pm . She said they were both drunk and staggering and carrying a carton of beer. Ms Murphy then called out to Mr Hookey for a dollar, and he told the man to give her a dollar. Ms Murphy stated that the man then opened a black wallet and gave her a gold coin, and she saw that he had a lot of money in 100 and 20 dollar notes and thought to herself, "He's going to get bashed and they'11 take the money off him." Mr Hookey and the man then turned left into Lawson Street.

Ms Murphy was later interviewed by police and stated that she saw Mr Malcolm lying in the abandoned house and spoke to her cousin about it. She stated that she had seen the man on the previous night.

It is noted that Ms Murphy's identification may not be reliable, for the following reasons: firstly, Mr Malcolm, by all accounts, did not carry a wallet; secondly, Ms Murphy stated that the man had blood on his shirt, on the left shoulder, when walking down the street on the Friday night, which does not match with the accounts of the other three witnesses; thirdly, Ms Murphy identified Mr Malcolm as the man she later saw lying in Holden Street, however, none of the other witnesses who found Mr Malcolm referred to her presence that morning; fourth1y, if Ms Murphy did see Mr Malcolm on the morning of 11 January, his face would have been injured and covered in blood; and, finally, the timing given by Ms Murphy would mean that Mr Malcolm was asking Mr O'Donnall to borrow money at around 8 pm to 8.30 pm but then flush with cash at around
8.30 to 9 pm .

Ms Murphy's evidence becomes important in the later part of this narrative, Commissioner, and I will return to her evidence.

There are limited sightings of Mr Malcolm from this point on, with the exception of one witness, whom I will refer to as "NP243", who spoke to police on 11 January 1992, saying that he was part of the group who found Mr Malcolm. This witness said that he had seen Mr Malcolm in the Redfern area at approximately 11.30 pm on 10 January. He did not provide a statement and, when followed up by police, did not live at the address given.

The existence of this witness was only revealed in the tranche of documents received by the Inquiry on 6 June 2023. After various attempts to contact this witness, he has declined to assist the Inquiry.

At about 2am on 11 January 1992, Mr Malcolm was found in the derelict house on Holden Street, Redfern. I will now show some photographs of that derelict house. These photographs are at tab 20 of the tender bundle, [SCOI.83955_0001].

Photo 1 here, Commissioner, you can see, is a front view of the house.

If we can turn over to photo 3, please, this is a rear view of the house.

If we also could now turn to photograph 4, this is the inside on the ground floor of the derelict house. It can be seen that it looks like it's been partly torn down.

Photograph 7, please. Here we can see a beer bottle that was found inside the house and was later taken as an exhibit.

Photograph 9, please. This is a shoe and some other rubbish found inside the house. The shoes that were found were also taken as exhibits.

And perhaps just one more photo, please, the next photo. That is all the photos, thank you.

These photos indicate, Commissioner, that this house was possibly used as a place to meet and drink. Mr Malcolm was found by young adults and children working or staying at what was known as "The Factory", next to the derelict house on Holden Street. It was also known as the Aboriginal Christian Youth Organisation. It was a place where young people slept, ate and hung out and where the Phillips family appeared to work - that is, the family of one of the persons of interest, Kirk Phillips.

A group of 14- to 15 -year-old children stated that they heard sounds from inside the abandoned house at around 2am and then went to investigate. They saw Mr Malcolm through a hole in the wall. He was lying on his back and bleeding heavily from his face. The younger children then fetched an older group, which included Kirk Phillips. Kirk Phillips then went to Redfern railway station to call an ambulance, and another person went back to The Factory to use the phone there to call an ambulance.

It appears that at some point between when the younger boys discovered Mr Malcolm and the arrival of the ambulance, Jason Phillips, the younger brother of Kirk Phillips, went into the house. Jason stated that Mr Malcolm was choking on the blood coming out of his mouth and down his face, and so he turned him on his side and propped him up with a stick to help him breathe.

Another witness, Richard Gilmore, then saw that Mr Malcolm was unconscious and propped up with a stick, so he removed the stick and put Mr Malcolm on his side.

In his second statement to police, Richard Green said that he was at The Factory when a young man came in and told them, "Some bloke's just been brought from Kings Cross, bashed and rolled." It is unclear how the young man obtained that information or, if invented by Mr Green, how he obtained that information without some involvement in the assault.

The witness whom I have mentioned as NP243, in his discussions with police, said he had gone into the building to meet some friends and that everyone knew he was in there but didn't know he'd been extremely beaten.

These statements indicate that the abandoned house was possibly being used as a meeting place, which accords with
the rubbish found, including the beer bottles. The statements also show that there was some awareness that Mr Malcolm had been "rolled" - that is, robbed - although those who found him appeared shocked at the extent of his injuries.

At approximately $2.17 a m$ on 11 January, paramedics arrived at the Holden Street address. One of the paramedics observed that Mr Malcolm's underpants were around his knees, and his grey pants were folded in half and placed across his buttocks. It is unclear who folded Mr Malcolm's pants, as the young people who discovered him only mentioned that his pants were down, not that they were folded.

At this time, Mr Malcolm did not have any identification or valuables on him. He was conveyed by ambulance to Royal Prince Alfred Hospital. A number of injuries were clinically evident on examination, including complex fractures of the base of the skull and right facial bones, damage to the right eye, a deep laceration of the right cheek, broken and/or missing front upper teeth, and bleeding from the nose and right ear.

At 7.30pm on 29 January 1992, Mr Malcolm was pronounced deceased.

I now turn to the persons of interest. Firstly, Mr Hookey. On 11 January 1992, information was received by police through Dave Bell, the Aboriginal liaison officer to the Redfern Police Station. The information was that Beaver Hookey was seen chasing a male Caucasian north in Eveleigh Street about $2 a m$ on 11 January.

At around 12.30pm on 11 January, Mr Hookey was located in Redfern and attended the police station. He later provided a further statement on 13 January and participated in an electronically recorded interview on 30 April, prior to being charged with murder that day.

On 22 January 1992, it appears that an unidentified person provided further information to the Aboriginal liaison officer that Kirk Phillips and Richard Green could be involved in the incident.

Mr Phillips and Mr Green were part of the group that had found Mr Malcolm and provided statements on 11 January.

Mr Phillips participated in an electronically recorded interview on 6 May 1992, prior to being charged with murder that day, and Mr Green provided a further statement on 4 March 1992, being later charged on 12 June with accessory after the fact to murder.

In his statement to police on 13 January, Mr Hookey provided an overview of his movements on 10 and 11 January. Counsel Assisting's written submissions detail Mr Hookey's alleged movements in great detail at paragraphs 150 to 169.

It is sufficient to observe the following: Mr Hookey puts himself at the Black Theatre in Redfern at around 6.55 on 10 January. At around 7.45 , he is at the Clifton Hote1 in Redfern. At closing time, which is unspecified, he says he left that hotel with his ex-girlfriend, Dianne McGuinness, and her cousin, Tracy McGuinness, and they walked up Regent Street towards the Westpac bank. There he saw a number of girls and they took a taxi together to Kings Cross.

After arriving at The Cross, he separated from the women and went to the Mansions Hotel. In the early hours of 11 January, he ran into Dianne McGuinness again, and they walked around the streets until it started to become light. At dawn, he said that he and Ms McGuinness took the train from Kings Cross to Central Station and then went to the Subway Hotel.

When spoken to by police on 11 January, Mr Hookey provided a different timeline of events from Kings Cross to Central. He said he stayed at the Mansions Hotel until around 3.30 am and then went to the Subway Hotel, Surry Hills, and there is no mention of wandering around the Kings Cross area with Dianne McGuinness. It is not until his statement on 13 January that Ms McGuinness is mentioned.

Another witness, James Smith, said that Mr Hookey had come into some money as at 10 and 11 January. Shortly after 2am on 11 January, at the Mansions Hote1, Mr Smith says Mr Hookey kept flashing all this money he had, mostly $\$ 20$ notes. During this time, Mr Hookey paid for two or three rounds of drinks, including beer and spirits, for the five or six people in the group. Mr Hookey told Mr Smith words to the effect of, "I just rolled someone", or "I did a roll."

Mr Smith's recollection of the event is not consistent with the account of his partner, Ms Honeysett, who stated that she was with Mr Smith and her friend Donna Morgan at the Mansions Hotel that morning but did not recall seeing Mr Hookey.

Mr Hookey denied making the statements to Mr Smith and denied giving him any money. He also denied buying drinks for other people at the Mansions Hotel and said that his aunt and her friend bought him a beer.

Mr Smith went on to say that he was at the Subway Hote1 from around 5am and Mr Hookey was again shouting drinks for the group there.

Overall, Mr Hookey's account is largely corroborated by witness statements up until around midnight at the Clifton Hotel and then again from around 8am at the Subway Hote1. However, the hours between around midnight to 8am, when Mr Hookey says he was in Kings Cross, are largely uncorroborated.

The only person who puts him at the Mansions Hotel is James Smith, who says he was spending up big. There was some doubt over his evidence, however, at the committal hearing, which I will come to.

There are also a number of people mentioned by Mr Hookey who may have been able to corroborate his movements during this period but who were not interviewed by police, nor did they give statements to police. Therefore, those elements of his story cannot be verified.

On 6 May 1992, Mr Phillips said the following to police, implicating Mr Hookey in Mr Malcolm's death. If I could now please show the electronic record of interview with Mr Kirk Phillips of 6 May 1992, [SCOI.10290.00014_0001]. It is at tab 69 of the tender bundle, Commissioner. If I could please go to page 10. Question 93, the officer asks Mr Phillips:
Q. Do you have any information whatsoever
in relation to any person that made an
assault of this gentleman on that night?
A. No, to be honest you know, I'm being
truthful, the only thing that I know, what

I heard was - I heard something happened and Beaver had something to do with it. That's what I heard.
Q. Where did you get that information
from?
A. Just on the street.

I now turn to the movements of Mr Kirk Philiips. Mr Phillips provided the following account for his movements on the night of 10 and 11 January 1992. From about 4 or 5 pm to around midnight, he was at the Clifton Hotel playing snooker with a few people. He left the Clifton Hotel at around midnight and stayed out the front for about 15 minutes. He then went to a ittle park at the top of Eveleigh Street, where the housing company is located, and continued drinking there for approximately two hours. At around 2am, he went down to The Factory on Holden Street and went inside to sleep, after which Mr Malcolm was discovered.

Mr Phillips denied seeing Mr Hookey or Mr Green on 10 or 11 January. However, if Mr Phillips was playing snooker at the Clifton and Mr Hookey was there, as he says he was, it seems unlikely that they could avoid seeing each other there.

Mr Phillips also denied speaking to any white person on the night.

I now turn to the movements of Richard Green. Richard Green stated that he went to bed at 6.30 pm on 10 January at The Factory and was asleep for seven and a half hours until he was woken up by some noise at about 1.50am, following which Mr Malcolm's body was discovered. Mr Green said he had never seen Mr Malcolm before.

When speaking with Detective Constable Starr on 9 June 1992, Mr Green gave two conflicting accounts regarding seeing Mr Phillips at the scene of Mr Malcolm's murder.

I now show that piece of dialogue. It is in the first statement of Detective Constable Michael Starr, dated 9 June 1992. It is at tab 14 of the tender bundle, [SCOI.10939.00092_0001]. If we could please go to paragraph 6. There, the constable deposes:

En route to the police station I said to Green, "Where are you living?" He said, "With my missus ... I helped you blokes out over that assault." I, said "Which assault?" He said "Doesn't matter. I've had people put guns to my head, 'cause I saw Kirk do it, the bloke was a rock spider. Hang on, I couldn't see Kirk do it, 'cause I wasn't there." I said, "I believe you are talking about the death of Robert Malcolm. You are not obliged to say anything further about that matter un7ess you wish to do so, but whatever you say I will record and it may later used as evidence. Do you understand that?" He said, "Mate, yeah. I mean I organised the ambulance." I said, "What assault are you referring to?" He said, "The one in Eveleigh Street. The dead bloke they locked two blokes up for."

Sharon Murphy, whom I have mentioned before, stated that she caught a train to her aunt's house on Eveleigh Street on 11 January and saw police standing on the corner of Eveleigh and Holden Streets. She saw her cousin and asked him what happened and then walked down to the crime scene and saw a man lying half in and half out the door, who looked like he had been bashed, with blood on his head, hair and clothes.

Ms Murphy walked back to her aunt's house and saw Kirk Phillips and Richard Green standing there. She participated in the following conversation, which is important to note. It can be found in Ms Murphy's first statement, dated 25 February 1992, at tab 44 of the brief, [SCOI.83025_0001], and if we can please go to paragraph 4. She says halfway through the paragraph:

> I heard Kirk say to Richard, "He should have been dead. We didn't do the job properly." I said to Kirk, "What are you taking about?" Kirk said, "That man Robert." He inclined his head towards the house where the man was laying. Then Kirk said, "Let's go before the coppers grab us." Then Kirk and Richard walked up
> Eveleigh Street away from the house where
the man was laying.
Mr Phillips denied seeing Mr Green in the street and having the above conversation.

Later that night, on 11 January, Ms Murphy went to another person's house on Eveleigh Street. Richard Green was there. At around 8.30, Mr Green turned to Ms Murphy and the following conversation occurred. It is at paragraph 7 of this same statement. Halfway through the paragraph, she says:

> He kept saying to me, "You're next." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Like what happened to that man last night."
> I said to him, "I'll get someone to bash
> you if you touch me." He kept saying, "Be
> careful." Then I got up and walked out and
> he sang out, "Sharon, come back."

Following some further argument, Mr Green told Ms Murphy that, "There's a man down there, there's a man there who's going to kill you. Come for a walk."

On 12 January, Ms Murphy was standing in Eveleigh Street across the road from Holden Street and reported that Kirk Phillips and Richard Green were outside the abandoned house. Ms Murphy says she heard Mr Phillips say to Mr Green, "See, we didn't do the job properly. He should have been dead." Ms Murphy reported then telling another witness, who I will refer to as "I312", what she heard, but this conversation is not referenced in I312's statement.

Ms Murphy failed to appear at the committal hearing on 3 August 1992. At 6pm of that night, Ms Murphy saw Mr Green on Darlinghurst Road in Kings Cross. She stated that he spat at her and said, "You fuckin' dog. You should have been at court. You give up."

Ms Murphy was not the only witness to link Mr Phillips and Mr Green to Mr Malcolm's murder. At around 11am on 11 January, another witness, who I will refer to as "I376", was at the Black Theatre in Cope Street, drinking beer. This witness indicated that Mr Phillips and Mr Green said, "We did it. We killed him." The witness thought it was possible they were big-noting themselves. Mr Phillips denied saying what the witness described.

In addition to hearing Mr Hookey admit to roliing someone, Mr Smith further stated that he had spoken to Richard Green on a number of occasions since 11 January, and Mr Green had been "carrying on real strange" and saying things like, "They're going to get me", and, "Watch me back."

On 30 Apri 1 1992, Mr Hookey was interviewed and subsequently charged with murder. When arrested, Mr Hookey asked Detective Sergeant Gary Phillips, "Can't you make it manslaughter?", and further told Sergeant John Martlew the following - if $I$ could please go to the statement of Sergeant Martlew of 1 May 1992 at tab 10, paragraph 9 , [SCOI.10939.00021]. Halfway through or quarter of the way down into that paragraph, Commissioner, the following exchange occurs:

> I could get this down to Manslaughter, I saw it happen but I can't say. I said,
> "Look, I want you to realise that you are not obliged to say any more about this matter, but if you do tell me anything more I will record what you say and it may later be given in evidence. Do you understand that?" He said, "Yeah, I can't dob them in but my family wil7 give them a bashing." I said, "If you are prepared to give me a further statement about what you know I can submit a report about your charge but I am not in a position to make any promises you must clearly understand that." He said, "I was there, I walked away, when I came back they was bashing him with a bat or a brick or something, he was crying out and screaming I saw the blood then they ran away." I said, "Was the man alive when you were standing there?" He said, "Yeah. I tried to move him onto the street, then I ran away."
> As mentioned, on 6 May 1992, Mr Phillips was interviewed and charged with murder.
> On 12 June 1992, Mr Green was charged with accessory after the fact to murder. When he was charged, he responded, "Bloody murder. It was an assault", and later
remarked, "If Kirk has done this to me, he's a fucking dog."

The committal hearing was held between 3 and 4 August 1992. As mentioned, all three accused were discharged on the last day of the hearing. Despite the Inquiry's best efforts, it has been unable to uncover the transcript of the committal proceedings in this matter or the audio tapes in order to better understand the basis for which all three accused were discharged.

The Inquiry did, however, locate the DPP solicitor who ran the case for the prosecution, Mr Mark Kelly. He was able to shed some light on the proceedings. Mr Kelly told the Inquiry that Ms Murphy was the key witness at the committal. Her evidence, if true, linked all three accused to the murder of Mr Malcolm. At the hearing, however, she failed to give the magistrate the evidence to link the accused with Mr Malcolm's death.

One document that we do have from the committal proceedings is the master tape history sheets. I would like to show one aspect of those sheets. It is at tab 95 of the tender bundle [SCOI.11290.00077] and it is the master tape history sheet for 4 August 1992. We can see there, Commissioner, the name of Sharon Lee Murphy, the witness, and against her evidence, in the right-hand column, we can see where she has been examined, including the number of objections that are recorded against her name with the letters "OBJ". There are a number of objections that can be observed.

Mr Kelly made the same observation when reviewing these documents. This tends to suggest that much of Ms Murphy's evidence was objected to by those representing the accused.

It is also possible that Ms Murphy perceived the words of Richard Green on the evening of 3 August as a threat and then, when giving evidence on 4 August, did not swear to the overheard statements implicating Mr Green and Mr Phillips out of fear of reprisals.

Reviewing his contemporaneous notes from the committal hearing on 3 August, Mr Kelly also said that Mr Smith was no longer sure about the day on which Mr Hookey said to him that he had rolled someone. This further weakened the case
against Mr Hookey.
Mr Malcolm's sister, Lyn, has told the Inquiry in a statement dated 21 June 2023, at tab 122 [SCOI.84073_0001] that she attended the committal hearing with her parents. At this time, the family had not seen any of the evidence and no-one explained the process to them, which was upsetting and confusing for Mr Malcolm's parents.

The family were not given a copy of the brief of evidence until after the hearing and only after Lyn asked police for further information.

She gave that information to her father. She remembers that her father said, "It was very hard to get information about Robert's murder", and that police had told him that no-one in the community was talking to police.

The Eveleigh Street community was described at the time as a closely knit community. In a media release by police dated 10 February 1992, which can be found at tab 87 [NPL.0174.0001.0001.0158], police appealed to the Eveleigh Street community's strong sense of family unit.

On 28 January, the police noted that the community expressed concern over the incident and a desire to catch the person responsible. However, an undated report by the Homicide Unit states that investigating police have "met with a wall of silence and have received little or no assistance from the Aboriginal community" and that a number of persons interviewed had "given fictitious addresses, thereby posing issues for follow-up or taking statements". This indicates, it is submitted, a poor relationship between the officers at Redfern Police Station and the Redfern community at that time.

Police collected a number of exhibits from the crime scene, including beer bottles, some of which we saw in the photos, a pair of black male shoes, which we also saw in the photos, two bloodstained buttons, a swab of blood from the verandah, a broken brick with bloodstaining, multiple pieces of bloodstained timber from the courtyard, and a Daily Mirror newspaper dated 10 January 1992.

Further exhibits were also collected at the hospital,
including Mr Malcolm's grey trousers, belt, a pair of underwear, a torn, bloodstained singlet, and a sexual assault investigation kit, which I will refer to as the "SAIK".

The SAIK, the broken brick with bloodstaining, the broken pieces of timber with bloodstaining, the swab of blood from the verandah, a red jumper apparently belonging to Mr Hookey, the grey trousers and a portion of the white singlet were forensically tested in 1992. Human blood was detected on each exhibit except for the SAIK and the red jumper. The analysis showed that the blood detected came from the same blood group. The Inquiry had this analysis reviewed by FASS. Essentially, the blood from the items was consistent with Mr Malcolm's blood type.

DNA testing was not carried out during the initial police investigation on the human blood as detected on the exhibits. Fingerprints were recovered from three of the exhibits collected. These fingerprints were submitted for analysis and cross-referenced against the prints of Mr Hookey, Mr Phillips and Mr Green and a number of the witnesses who were present at the Holden Street location, but no matches were identified.

Mr Green also stated that after the police left Holden Street at around 1 pm or 2 pm, he saw a three-feet long piece of wood, as round as a baseball bat, at the Holden Street address, with blood and hair all over it. If this is true, it does not appear that this piece of wood, which may have been a weapon used in the assault on Mr Malcolm, was collected or tested.

The Inquiry issued a further summons to police seeking the 14 exhibits collected in the original investigation. Police advised that 11 of the 14 exhibits had been destroyed, and the three remaining exhibits had samples stored with FASS.

It is not clear why the exhibits were destroyed, especially as no DNA testing has ever been carried out on them.

FASS confirmed that the three remaining crime scene samples were in storage - namely, the swab of blood from the verandah, the sample from the pair of grey trousers, and a sample from the bloodstained singlet. The Inquiry
requested that FASS conduct DNA testing of these exhibit samples. The DNA profile recovered from all three matched the profile of Mr Malcolm.

FASS also provided a statement regarding the nature of the forensic analysis which could now have been conducted in relation to the destroyed exhibits, had they been retained. This statement is at tab 119 of the tender bundle [SCOI.83957].

FASS observed that there have been enormous advances in DNA testing since 1992 and that for some exhibits with insufficient DNA testing in 1992, including the bloodstained brick, DNA testing in 2023 would be possible. FASS also raised possibilities of testing the exhibits for skin cells - for example, on the bloodstained brick and timber; also for saliva - for example, on the beer bottles. While Mr Malcolm's underwear were not tested, FASS states that in 2023, these exhibits could be tested for blood, semen, saliva or hair.

If police had taken the steps for the careful retention of these critical exhibits, further lines of inquiry and investigation may have been open to this Inquiry, which now it simply cannot take.

The Inquiry also requested that the NSW Police Forensic Evidence \& Technical Services Command conduct further fingerprint examinations regarding the unidentified fingerprints found specifically on a Tooheys Draught beer bottle found at the scene. A match was made. The person named was Percy Alexander Strong. At the time the match was made, the Inquiry had no information before it mentioning Mr Strong in connection with the police investigation. The Inquiry has ascertained that Mr Strong died on 11 July 2021.

In the third tranche of over 1,800 documents produced to the Inquiry on 21 June of this year, we ascertained that in fact, as at 11 January 1992, Mr Strong lived in Eveleigh Street in Redfern and spoke to police during the initial canvass of the streets surrounding the crime scene. Police recorded in the canvass form that Mr Strong didn't see or hear anything. Mr Strong does not appear to be interviewed further, nor is he mentioned by other witnesses as a person connected to the investigation. Mr Strong's home was approximately 50 metres from the abandoned home on

Holden Street.
While fingerprint testing was conducted on the exhibits during the initial police investigation, no match was identified until the further testing requested by the Inquiry this year. If a match had been identified earlier and prior to Mr Strong's death, a line of inquiry may have been open to police to interview Mr Strong about his knowledge of the abandoned house on Holden Street and whether he had witnessed any assaults or robberies at that location.

There are indeed a number of investigative steps that could have been taken in this case that were not. As I have mentioned, no steps have ever been taken by police to arrange DNA testing to see if any matches were made to Mr Hookey, Mr Phillips or Mr Green.

DNA testing may also have revealed other suspects. The running sheets show that one person was arrested by police at around 6.10am on 11 January 1992 with blood on his shirt, which he said was ketchup. Further inquiries in relation to this person, such as testing the blood on his shirt, were not taken. The inclusion of this information in relation to this person in the running sheets indicates that police thought there may have been a connection to Mr Malcolm's death. Again, what further inquiries police made or how this person was excluded is unknown.

Police did not take the steps of contacting or obtaining statements from a number of witnesses whose evidence may have been important, but in particular Dianne McGuinness, who was supposedly with Mr Hookey during the early hours of 11 January. A full list of the persons this Inquiry has identified as not having been spoken to appears at paragraph 107 of our submissions. At least 15 people have been identified.

Efforts should have been made by police to contact all relevant witnesses, especially those mentioned in Mr Hookey's statements as people who could vouch for his whereabouts. Accepting that some witnesses may have given fictitious addresses, one would expect that the investigative file would contain certain records of attempts to contact them. These attempts are not evidenced in the material before the Inquiry.

The Inquiry took steps, including through interagency corporation, to attempt to find Dianne McGuinness. However, no-one matching Ms McGuinness's details was able to be located.

The Inquiry also conferenced with Richard Yannakis, one of the original officers in charge. Mr Yannakis had no recollection as to whether NSW Police made contact with Dianne McGuinness.

This week, Commissioner, you have been hearing evidence from certain police witnesses in respect to the investigative practices of police. In evidence given by Detective Inspector Nigel Warren on Wednesday, he accepted that there are no records of any attempts by police to prove or disprove Mr Hookey's alibi. He agreed this would be an important step in the police investigation. He conceded that if this Inquiry were to find that there was no attempt made to explore that alibi, that would be a significant oversight in the investigation. On all the evidence available, Commissioner, we submit that those findings would be appropriate in this case.

Lastly, the theory of investigating police was that Mr Malcolm was robbed by Mr Hookey as a result of displaying cash, being intoxicated and easily led. A key element of that theory was that Mr Malcolm had money with him. The evidence of Mr Malcolm's family and friends was that he did not carry a wallet, as a precaution against robbery, and carried only his licence and keycard. There is also the evidence that he asked to borrow $\$ 50$ on the night of 10 January.

If this is true, Mr Malcolm would have needed to make an ATM withdrawal at some time in the evening of 10 January in order to be the cash-laden victim that Ms Murphy described. It does not appear that police took any steps to verify if there was a cash withdrawal from Mr Malcolm's account, despite having the details and ordering a freeze on the account on 13 January 1992, after speaking with Mr Malcolm's father and identifying his missing valuables.

I now turn to our submissions as to bias.
Commissioner, on the available evidence, it is not possible to say whether Mr Malcolm was gay or otherwise a member of the queer community. Lynette Elias,

Mr Malcolm's sister, says in her statement that whilst Mr Malcolm had a lot of interest from girls, they never knew him to have a girlfriend. However, there were no indications that Mr Malcolm was gay.

Mr Malcolm's colleagues provided statements to police around their knowledge of his relationships. The statements indicate that police must have been alive to the possibility that LGBTIQ bias may have been a factor in his death.

Richard Teaken stated that, "During the whole time that I knew Bob, I never suspected him of being a homosexual. I never knew of any regular girlfriends, although he had female acquaintances."

Another friend, Peter Pickett, said, "I did not know Mr Malcolm as a person who was inclined to pursue women and that he instead gained pleasure from having a drink with friends."

Mr Malcolm was found with his underpants down around his knees and his trousers around his ankles. However, the post-mortem examination did not identify any factors or injuries indicative of sexual activity or assault.

Before being charged, Richard Green referred to Mr Malcolm as a "rock spider", a slang term for a paedophile. When questioned about why he said this, Mr Green said, "'Cause that's what people were saying, everyone, the whole community." It is possible, although speculative, that Mr Malcolm was attacked because of a perceived sexual preference for young men or boys.

Strike Force Parrabell concluded that there was no evidence of a bias crime.

Forensic psychiatrist Dr Danny Sullivan provided a report to this Inquiry. It is at tab 114 [SC01. 83435]. He notes the statement that Mr Malcolm was a "rock spider" and that this may have been an inference from Mr Malcolm's behaviour or single status in his 40s. Alternatively, it may have been a post hoc rationalisation to justify his assault.

In Dr Sullivan's view, if Mr Malcolm was thought to be a paedophile and this was conflated with homosexuality,
this may have been one element of why he was selected for an attack. However, Dr Sullivan stated that other factors rendered Mr Malcolm vulnerable to attack, including his intoxication, possible display of money, and being in area of town in which he may have been at risk of being robbed.

If Mr Hookey, Mr Phillips and Mr Green perpetrated the attack on Mr Malcolm, Dr Sullivan is of the view that robbery was the driver of the assault rather than a bias motivation and that later describing Mr Malcolm as a "rock spider" may have been to depersonalise Mr Malcolm.

Dr Sullivan also states that Mr Malcolm being found with his pants and underwear down may be due to a number of possibilities - that he was urinating when attacked, that his clothes were removed after the attack, or he was engaged in sexual activity at the time. It is possible that the removal of his clothes was intended to humiliate, but Dr Sullivan did not think this was obvious or clear. He opines that the result of the sexual assault samples may have been relevant. However, as noted, those samples have now been destroyed.

It is submitted that if the Inquiry was to accept that Mr Hookey, Mr Phillips and Mr Green were the persons responsible for Mr Malcolm's death, then the likelihood is that the crime was motivated by financial gain.

It is relevant that Mr Green referred to Mr Malcolm as a "rock spider", but it would not provide a sufficient basis on its own for a positive conclusion that the crime was motivated by bias.

As mentioned, there are also a number of possible explanations for Mr Malcolm's pants being down. These isolated pieces of evidence raise grounds for suspicion that the crime may have been in part motivated by bias, but they do not provide a sufficient basis on their own to make a finding to that effect on the balance of probabilities.

Commissioner, I now turn to the conclusions that can be drawn on the evidence and my submissions on manner and cause of death.

It is clear that Mr Malcolm's death was a homicide and his injuries were the result of a violent assault on a person made vulnerable by intoxication. Mr Malcolm was
seen in the Menzies bar up until around 8.30 pm and then possibly recognised on Eveleigh Street between around 8.30 and 9. He was then discovered at the abandoned house at 2am on 11 January. It is submitted, therefore, that he was likely to have been assaulted between 9pm on 10 January and 2am on 11 January.

The following evidence links the persons of interest to Mr Malcolm's death. First, Mr Malcolm may have been in the company of Anthony Hookey at around 8.30 to 9 o'clock on the 10th. Mr Malcolm may have been chased by Mr Hookey down Eveleigh Street. According to James Smith, Mr Hookey came into money on the night of 10 and 11 January and told Mr Smith that he had rolled someone.

According to Sharon Murphy and another witness, I376, Kirk Phillips and Richard Green made various admissions and statements indicating guilt. And, finally, when charged on 30 April, Mr Hookey indicated that he had been present during the attack on Mr Malcolm.

However, the evidence in its totality was insufficient to convince Magistrate Hand of a prima facie case at the committal hearing. It appears that Mr Smith wavered in his memory of the event during cross-examination on 3 August and that Ms Murphy's oral evidence occurred immediately prior to Magistrate Hand finding that there was no case to answer.

No stronger evidence linking the persons of interest to the crime has been uncovered by police since the committal hearing, nor in the course of the Inquiry.

While the Inquiry is making findings to a different standard of proof, even on the balance of probabilities it is submitted that the Inquiry would not make any positive findings as to the involvement of any of the persons of interest on the available evidence.

On 29 January 1992, Mr Malcolm's death was reported to the Coroner. On 1 June 1992, as a result of persons being charged with indictable offences, the inquest was terminated under the Coroners Act.

According to the file as produced by the Coroners Court to this Inquiry, it appears that no formal findings in relation to the identity and time and place of death
were recorded in respect of Mr Malcolm.
It is submitted now that an appropriate finding as to manner and cause of death would be that Mr Malcolm died on 29 January 1992 at Royal Prince Alfred Hospital as a result of sequelae of head injuries inflicted during the night of 10 January or early hours of 11 January 1992 at Holden Street, Redfern by person or persons unknown.

Commissioner, those are my submissions, and I conclude by once again thanking the family for the engagement they have had with the Inquiry, and I again express my condolences for their loss.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR SHORT: Commissioner, the Commissioner of Police seeks to reserve her position with a view to relying on written submissions and also seeks to extend her condolences to Mr Malcolm's family, including those present today.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right, thank you. A11 right. I wil1 reserve my views on this matter for my report. I will now adjourn, thank you.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Emmett.
MR EMMETT: If it is convenient to the Commission, we are ready to resume the evidence of Detective Chief Inspector Laidlaw.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right.
<DAVID LAIDLAW, on former oath:
[12.02pm]
<EXAMINATION BY MR EMMETT CONTINUING:
MR EMMETT: Commissioner, I tender the Daily Telegraph
article.
THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you.

## EXHIBIT \#55 DAILY TELEGRAPH ARTICLE

MR EMMETT: Q. Mr Laidlaw, I asked you some questions

5187 D LAIDLAW (Mr Emmett)
about the memorandum prepared by Detective Chief Inspector Lehmann in August 2016. Do you remember those questions?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. That memorandum related to a number of problems with exhibits and documentary records in relation to unsolved homicides?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. The Commissioner received evidence yesterday from Superintendent Doherty that Mr Doherty said that he, Mr Doherty, wouldn't say those problems existed for a large number of unsolved homicides, although he said the number of cases affected by the problems was not known. Now, from your knowledge, are you able to say whether it's a large number of cases that are affected or likely to be affected by these problems?
A. It is unknown because we've got to go through all the matters that we do have to identify if there are exhibits associated. We're talking forensic exhibits in this case, so --
Q. Well, if you --
A. That's probably a valid answer as opposed to I can't say - quantify it.
Q. I'm not asking you to rule on the validity of

Mr Doherty's answer. I'm asking you from your knowledge.
A. That's what I'm saying, from my knowledge.
Q. From your knowledge, 572 matters have been triaged, so the majority, certainly not all. There are a number that haven't been triaged?
A. Yes.
Q. But 572 have been triaged?
A. Yes.
Q. From your knowledge in relation to the triage of those matters, are you able to assist the Commissioner, is it
a large number of cases or not?
A. I can't say, no.
Q. Might be?
A. I can't say.
Q. Well --
A. I can't - I don't want to mislead the Commission by giving a number that $I$ don't know.
Q. Can you exclude the possibility that it's a large number of cases?
A. I can't exclude it, no.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And it follows, does it, that you have absolutely no idea as to the dimension of the likely problem or possible problems?
A. That's correct, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR EMMETT: Q. The Commissioner also received evidence from Superintendent Doherty that it wasn't a common issue that they were having to talk about all the time. Now, in your team, is it a common issue that you're having to talk about all the time?
A. It's a discussion that's had in relation to when you go through the triages, where these exhibits are - have been maintained or retained. It is a discussion, yeah. With every triage that we do, we have to seek out where these exhibits are.
Q. So the problems identified in the memorandum, you would say, in relation to the work you do, it is a common issue that you are having to talk about all the time?
A. Yes, it's part of the triage process. So it comes up in every triage document that we undertake to complete.
Q. And are you finding these problems in every triage document?
A. There's some. I couldn't give you a number. There certainly are some.
Q. There are some problems in every triage document?
A. No, not every triage, no.
Q. You gave evidence yesterday in relation to the 19 cases where the triage document has been sitting on your desk for 12 months. Do you remember that evidence?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. You told the Commissioner that a reason why you had not reviewed or assessed those triage documents is because your time has been taken up dealing - finding documents
sought by the Commissioner. Do you remember that evidence? A. No, not my time. I've been engaged in other matters outside of the Commission, which has taken up the majority of my time, yes.
Q. What is it that has prevented you over the last 12 months from looking at those documents that have been waiting for your review? Well, I won't use the word "review". What is it that has prevented you from looking at those 19 triage documents that have been waiting for you to assess them to decide whether the matter can proceed to review or not?
A. There's - the work that I've undertaken during this time, plus the fact that, as I mentioned, the backlog of reviews that we have and the backlog of triages that we have. I didn't deem it that I needed to focus on that, because I was focusing on other things.
Q. Do you mean by "backlog of triages" that 12 months ago, there were more than the 19, and it's the 19 that you haven't got to?
A. No, we've gone through quite a few since this 2018 process.
Q. So 12 months ago, there were 19 triage documents on your desk ready for review; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that your evidence?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. More than 19 or 19 ?
A. No, no, there's 19.
Q. You haven't looked at those 19 in the last 12 months?
A. No, I haven't, no.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. And nobody else has?
A. No, because what the process is, your Honour, is that the people attached to the review team complete the triage document. I then go through it and vet it to ensure that the information is correct when I check on my systems. It then goes before our review panel so that it then gets disseminated out for a review. And currently we don't have the people to do those reviews because, as I mentioned before, the quality of people - we need the right investigators to look at these reviews.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR EMMETT: Q. The 19 triage documents that you needed to vet --
A. Yes.
Q. -- what was it, if anything, that prevented you from vetting them in the last 12 months?
A. My priority in relation to another investigation that I'm undertaking.
Q. So there was nothing that was preventing you from vetting --
A. No, I just said it, that it's my - I had to prioritise. So I had to - I'm doing another investigation apart from looking after the review team, so --
Q. And - I'm sorry, finish what you were saying?
A. No, no, I've finished.
Q. And that investigation has rendered you unable to look at those 19 documents; is that correct?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. That investigation is a matter entirely aside from this Inquiry?
A. That's so, your Honour, yes.

MR EMMETT: $Q$. Is it the case that - did you mention to any of your superiors earlier than yesterday that there were 19 triage documents that you were not reviewing because you were prioritising other things?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. So the first time any of your superiors would have learned that there were 19 triage documents that you had not looked at for 12 months was yesterday?
A. Yes, that would be correct.
Q. Have you at any point sought further - and I think your evidence yesterday was that you haven't raised with any of your superiors the need for more resources in relation to this, in relation to the review of unsolved homicides?
A. No, I haven't, no. Not myself, no.
Q. We11, when you say not yourself, are you aware of --
A. No, I haven't. No, I haven't.
Q. Are you aware of other people having raised lack of resources?
A. There were - I believe that there were files forwarded in relation to the expansion of the Homicide Squad in whole, which could facilitate more personnel to the Unsolved Homicide Team.
Q. And when was that?
A. I can't recall now. It would be within the last perhaps two to three years.
Q. Where did those documents - wel1, was that raised in writing?
A. I believe - yes, yes, yes.
Q. By whom?
A. It would have been by the Commander of the squad. I think it was prior to Detective Superintendent Doherty.
Q. If it was prior to Superintendent Doherty, Doherty joined - became the Commander in December 2019. So should we assume it was before December $2019 ?$
A. Yes, it would be, yes.
Q. Are you aware of any steps being taken in response to the matter being raised?
A. No.
Q. To your knowledge, were no steps taken?
A. I don't know.
Q. Some steps may have been taken?
A. I don't know.
Q. As the investigation coordinator in relation to the review team, if steps were taken, they would come to your attention, wouldn't they?
A. They could do. We could be asked about it. But I didn't pursue it because it's not in my realm of the command to do that.
Q. I'm sorry, what's not in your realm of the command?
A. Well, to seek out - it was a matter of $I$ knew that the files were forwarded, but $I$ don't know the result, the
outcome of it, so $I$ can't --
Q. When you say you knew that - I'm sorry.
A. I don't want to mislead the Commission by saying something I don't know.
Q. When you say you knew that the files were forwarded, what were the files that were forwarded and to whom were they forwarded?
A. Oh, they would have been forwarded up to the executive, the Commissioner's executive team.
Q. When you say "the files", what do you mean by "the files"?
A. It's where the request - a file to request more personne1.
Q. I see. So when you say "the files", you mean a document saying, "We need more personnel"?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. Did you see that document?
A. No, no.
Q. Somebody told you, did they, that they had asked for more personne1?
A. Sorry?
Q. Somebody told you, did they, that they'd prepared a file --
A. No, no. Did I see that document then or now?
Q. Yes, then.
A. No, I didn't see it then, no.
Q. We11, when did you 1 earn about this request?
A. I knew about it, but it was nothing that, I suppose I knew about it happening because of the situation of where staff were required and it was to - I suppose, in essence, it would have been maybe two or three years ago I may have heard about it, but because nothing eventuated, I didn't follow it up.
Q. Did you say anything to communicate to your superiors that the need for more resources was consistent with your own experience as investigation coordinator of the review team?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. You didn't mention that?
A. No.
Q. Do you have the aide-memoire that we were talking about yesterday? It's been labe11ed "Exhibit 54", although your copy might not have it. That's the three-page document, [SCOI.84314_0001].
A. Yes, I stil1 have that, yes. Yes.
Q. The document, on the second page, records that

96 cases have been reviewed more than once?
A. I don't see that 96 .
Q. I'm sorry --
A. Oh, sorry, I do, "more than once", yes.
Q. It's there in parentheses.
A. Yes. Sorry.
Q. Ninety-six have been reviewed more than once, and a small number, according to the words in italics underneath, have been reviewed three or four times? A. Yes, 403, I think it says there.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner with who decided which cases should get a second review?
A. What had occurred was the number of secondary reviews, it would have been upon review of the initial review, and with the elapse of time, to identify whether there were new investigative opportunities to further conduct a review and possibly look for an investigative strategy.
Q. So there are 96 in which that has occurred?
A. Yes.
Q. How were those 96 identified, are you able to assist the Commissioner?
A. It would have been - I think it was in - 2018, we worked back from 2014 backwards, and then when we ran out of - I would say when we got to a certain scope, we then decided to do the further reviews on matters that had been reviewed.
Q. What do you mean by you "got to a certain scope"?
A. We got down to about 2010, I think, from memory.

I can't - I can't advise the Commissioner the exact date. But then we then had a look at matters that needed - that had been reviewed to see whether there was any forensic purpose to review those matters.
Q. When you say you got down to about 2010, do you mean you reviewed the cases from 2014 to 2010?
A. I think so. I can't recall now.
Q. So during that period, you didn't review any cases between 1970 and 2010?
A. Not - say that again, sorry?
Q. During that period, were you and your team focused solely on the cases between 2014 and 2010 as you worked backwards through that - over that period?
A. Backwards, yes, yes.
Q. So during that period - and we'11 come to how long it was in a moment - during that period, you say you and your team did not look at any cases between 1970 and 2009 at 1east?
A. Quite possibly, yes.
Q. Well, was your --
A. That's what I said, I can't give a date. I don't recall the date we went back to.
Q. Okay. But during that time, your whole team was looking at those cases during that period from 2014 back to some date in the --
A. No, during that time, we were ensuring that the triages were being completed so that those reviews could then go out to police area commands and other commands, police districts, so that those reviews could be undertaken.
Q. Well, the triage documents weren't - there are still 213 documents, cases, that have not been triaged, 125 of which there's no good reason for them not to have been triaged; that's right, isn't it?
A. We just haven't had the time to do them, yes.
Q. So having worked through the cases from 2014 back to some date, maybe 2010, 2009, you can't recall --
A. I can't recall, no.
Q. -- having done that, your team, have I understood correctly, then turned to ask themselves what cases which had already been reviewed once might be ripe for a fresh review?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And how did they conduct that analysis?
A. Just by going through, seeing where the matter was, to identify first if it was undetected. If it was undetected, they took the priority of matters. So those matters were looked at in relation to whether there was anything from the initial review that we could establish, that there could be a possibility with - as I said, it could be changes in witnesses or the suspects, it could be forensic technology that could have been advanced. They're the ones that we looked at.
Q. But that only happened in 96 cases?
A. Sorry?
Q. That on1y happened in respect of 96 cases?
A. Yes, it would have been.
Q. Or fewer than 96 cases?
A. Well - yes, it would have been, yeah, yeah.
Q. And how were those fewer than 96 cases selected among the larger number that had been reviewed?
A. Like I said, it was a matter of going through those initial - some had been previously reviewed, which is the case screening document that occurred, from 2004 through to 2008. Those case screening documents - sorry, through to 2018, I apologise. They were case screening documents which - in effect, they were reviews. So we looked back at those documents to identify if there was any exhibits available, if the people were still alive, both witnesses and possible suspects, and that's how we would prioritise doing a further review.
Q. So you looked at all - according to this table, there were a little over 400, at least not including the undated ones - there were a little over 400 which were reviewed or screened between 2004 and 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. You looked at all 400 of those, did you?
A. Between when, sorry?
Q. If you look at the table --
A. No, we didn't look at all of them, no.
Q. We11, how did you select the 96 , or fewer than 96 , that were 1 ucky enough to have a second review?
A. Okay, first we looked at the undetected ones, and they were the ones we were focusing on moving backwards again, once again going back through, to see that matters that hadn't been - that had been reviewed, to identify whether there was any opportunity to conduct a further review.
Q. And so of the cases, a little over 400, which had been screened between 2004 and 2017, you looked at all of those that were recorded as "Undetected", did you?
A. Not looked at all of them, no.
Q. How did you select the ones you looked at?
A. Going backwards and identifying where they were, where
the position was in the initial review that was conducted.
Q. You had 400 initial screenings in front of you from the period 2004 to 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. A bit more than 400 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't look at all of them?
A. No, no.
Q. How did you identify - did you just pick them at random?
A. No, it was identified - well, you'd have a look at our tracking file to see what was listed on the tracking file. That would give you some sort of reference as to where matters were and whether there was exhibits available. Then we would go to the case screening that had been conducted, which is a review, and then identify that there was a possibility or there wasn't a possibility to put that forward as another review.
Q. And who picked --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. How did you determine there wasn't a possibility? How did you make that --
A. Well, if there was no exhibits, it would get a lower
priority.
Q. But when you say "no exhibits", you were relying, were you, on what to inform you one way or the other whether or not there were exhibits - what were you relying upon?
A. We were relying on that case monitoring document.
Q. And the accuracy of that?
A. That's correct, Commissioner, yes.

MR EMMETT: Q. In selecting them, each individual team member would select particular cases that they thought might be worth reviewing?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was no system to identifying which ones they were; it was a matter for each individual --
A. The initial picking of was, "Have a look at these" and have a - you would get 10 and have a look and see what information is contained within those, so you could then identify which would probably be the best opportunity to have another review conducted.
Q. And when one says you would get 10 , so, what, they would get 10 ?
A. It would be random.
Q. So each team member would receive 10 randomiy selected case screening documents?
A. Yes, screening backwards, yes, yes. That was the purpose of --
Q. When you say "screening backwards", each team member correct me if I have misunderstood - would receive 10 randomly selected case screening documents and ask to look at those documents and identify which of those might be ripe for a second review?
A. Yes.
Q. And during that process, you were only looking, were you, at the documents that had been the subject of a screening document?
A. Yes.
Q. So that process excluded all of the documents that had never been screened as at that date?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Could I ask, do members of your team deal with the Engagement and Hate Crimes Unit?
A. Not personally that I know of, no.
Q. They never have occasion to?
A. Not that I know - I can't say yes or no to the Commissioner.
Q. Pardon me for a moment.
A. You're right.
Q. When you say you can't say personally, you're the investigation coordinator?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Isn't it your - is it your responsibility to understand, among other things, where the members of the review team - the scope of their work and the extent to which it involves dealings with other units, such as the Engagement and Hate Crimes Unit?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. So if you know nothing about it, may we assume that there is no - any interaction is rare and not of a kind that would come to your attention as their supervisor? A. Well, I wouldn't say "rare". Because of - the Hate Crimes Unit is an intelligence-based unit, is my belief, is that our intel personnel that's attached to the Unsolved Homicide may engage with them to see whether there's information there that can assist our reviews.
Q. I thought you said a moment ago that in your role as the investigation coordinator, it was your responsibility to know the extent of - and forgive me if I misunderstood your evidence - the extent to which members of the review team had dealings with the Engagement and Hate Crimes Unit? A. Yes, I - it is - I couldn't - I couldn't say that they would come to me to say, "We've spoken to that unit."
Q. Have you ever spoken with them about that unit being a resource available to them?
A. No.
Q. And you have never been told about any occasion on which they have consulted with that unit?
A. No, no.
Q. Have you ever seen any document, such as a triage document, a screening document, any document recording a consultation between a member of the review team and the Engagement and --
A. That possibly wouldn't be recorded on any of the triage documents.
Q. Have you seen any document --
A. No.
Q. -- recording any communication between the Engagement and Hate Crimes Unit and a member of the review team?
A. No.
Q. We finished yesterday, the last matter I asked you about yesterday was the case of Richard Slater. Do you remember my asking you about the death of Mr Slater?
A. Yes.
Q. He died on 22 December 1980?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's no record of any screening or review or triage of Mr Slater at any time on the tracking file. Do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. It would be fair to infer that that case has never been screened, reviewed or triaged?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to assume that that was clearly a death following an assault. Do you understand?
A. Sorry?
Q. I want you to assume that Mr Slater died following an assault.
A. Yes.
Q. Clearly a homicide. Do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. A person was charged, but the prosecution was no-billed in 1983. Do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. So there was no double jeopardy issue in relation to --
A. No.
Q. -- further prosecutions?
A. Yes.
Q. And the matter, as much as any matter in which there had been no previous prosecution, was one in which reinvestigation might lead to further 1 ines of inquiry or breakthroughs?
A. Yes.
Q. The tracking file lists the case as "Unresolved"?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I understood your evidence to be that a matter is 1 isted as "Unresolved" if charges are brought or somebody is acquitted?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. A matter - is it correct that a matter should not be 1isted as "Unresolved" if charges are brought but then are no-bi11ed?
A. I suppose that's a terminology used within our tracking - within that scope of what is unresolved. It could be - and I don't know the reasoning why the matter was no-billed, nor when the matters are withdrawn, whether there's just not enough evidence to convict the person who we say has committed the crime.
Q. If that's a reason, that would be a good - that would be a case that would be ripe for review as part of your review team, wouldn't it, to consider whether there was more evidence?
A. To consider, but one would hope that all the evidence that was obtained would have been before the judicial process as it was.
Q. Well, you're dealing with unsolved homicides?
A. Yes.
Q. When you look at unsolved homicides alongside all of the homicides that come to the attention of the police, there is a greater chance, isn't there, that the homicides that go unsolved are the homicides in which something was overlooked or a particular investigative step wasn't taken?
A. No.
Q. Well, I'm not saying that that's the case in relation to all unsolved homicides, but it's --
A. There could be some, yes.
Q. It's a matter of commonsense, isn't it, that the unsolved homicides are more likely to have matters overlooked or investigative steps not taken than the solved homicides?
A. Yes, that's correct, if --
Q. On the whole and on average, not universally?
A. But you're putting it in a broad-brush sense and --
Q. Undoubted1y, in a broad-brush sense --
A. Yeah.
Q. Not true universally, but on the whole and on average, you would agree with that?
A. I wouldn't say so on average, I wouldn't say that. It would occur.
Q. Do I take it from that answer, that's not something that you or your team have in mind when you review cases? A. Of course we have that in mind.
Q. You do have that in mind?
A. Yes, as to whether anything has been overlooked. That's part of the process of triaging and reviewing, to see whether there were investigative strategies that weren't undertaken or were undertaken and not - not been able to resolve the actual matter that the person should be charged.
Q. So that is something that your team is mindful of when screening, triaging or reviewing cases?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And that's a reason why a case, even if it's been even if it was no-billed in 1983, there may nevertheless be material that your team might be expected to identify?
A. That's correct, there could be. It's not to say these matters won't get triaged and reviewed. They're just not given the priority because of that.
Q. Indeed, can $I$ understand - and when you say it won't
be given the priority, are cases that are listed as "Unresolved" - are they even lower down the list of priority than "Undetermined"?
A. No, no, no. It would be - before, everything used to be "Unsolved", and in 2018, using the Eng1ish mode1, we changed that to those "Undetected" and - and we changed that formula, that they weren't "Unsolved"; they were either "Unresolved" or "Undetected".
Q. Three categories you have referred to in your statement are "Undetected", "Undetermined" and "Unresolved"?
A. Yes.
Q. Are the cases that are 1 isted as "Unresolved" - are they lower down the priority than both "Undetected" and "Undetermined"?
A. No, they would be the same as - they would be - those two categories, the top category would be "Undetected". The other two categories would be a lower category to look at.
Q. And the "Undetected", that is, the top category, I think, that's the category with, as at the date of your statement, 440 -odd cases in it?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you agreed it could take 20 years to review?
A. It could do, yes.
Q. And the "Undetected" and "Unresolved" matters, another 200 or 300 cases?
A. Yes.
Q. So will it be, what, 40 to 50 years, on your current track, to review them all?
A. No, because some of those matters may - they would be looked at by way of a triage first to see whether there is anything, and then it would be determined then as to whether it should go to review or not.
Q. Wel1, when will someone get around to triaging them?
A. I don't know.
Q. Are you taking the same approach to prioritisation for triaging documents as you are for reviewing them - that is, deal with all the "Undetected" ones before turning to the
"Undetermined" ones?
A. Yes, the "Undetected" ones are our priority at this stage, and it could be during that phase of "Undetected" that we identify that we haven't got the evidence available, nor can we obtain the evidence available, so therefore then we would then have resolved back to the next level.
Q. Well, I'm just trying to work out, if a case is listed, as Mr Slater's is, as "Unresolved", I'm just trying to - on the basis that it was no-billed even though there was no acquittal, I'm just trying to understand when there is any prospect of its being looked at by your team?
A. There is a prospect, yes.
Q. When?
A. I don't know. I can't say.
Q. It could be 30 or 40 years away?
A. I can't say.
Q. It could be that long on your current --
A. I can't say.
Q. On your current trajectory, it could be that long; is that right?
A. On your trajectory, it is, but not mine.
Q. It's not my trajectory.
A. I don't know. I can't advise the Commission when it will be looked at.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Am I missing something or do I detect that the police as an institution don't rate unsolved homicide too highly in terms of priorities?
A. Sorry, sir?
Q. Unsolved homicide too highly in terms of priorities, that it is one of numerous priorities that have to be dealt with? Obviously day-to-day policing is a substantial -A. Yes.
Q. -- commitment on the part of the police, but do I get the - do I detect that unsolved homicides are really not given all that much priority within the Police Force? A. No, I would beg to differ there, in that the whole idea of setting up the Unsolved Homicide Team was to look
at those matters, therefore giving them the appropriate priority.
Q. But it would seem to me, if I may say so, that one of the primary considerations with old cases or unsolved cases is to take an immediate stocktake or audit of what you've got?
A. I agree, sir. I agree, sir.
Q. Because if you start off from the proposition that the exhibits have been lost or if important witnesses are dead --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and there are forensic opportunities which haven't been exploited historically but might now be exploited, isn't it something which a special - some sort of special audit and funding or resource allocation urgently needs to occur, so that you can draw a line in the sand and at least come to your own views as to where best to allocate your resources in relation to the unsolved cases?
A. I agree, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
MR EMMETT: Q. Can I ask this: in relation to unsolved cases, it has been your experience that in some cases there are exhibits that may be readily accessible to the police, cases where police do know where they are; it's just that they - on looking at the case, it emerges that they weren't tested for fingerprints or DNA as part of the original investigation?
A. That could have occurred, yes.
Q. And there are cases in which exhibits may be readily accessible but were not carefully examined as part of the original investigation?
A. That could be the case, yes, or --
Q. An example - I'm sorry.
A. -- carefully examined, could be further technology.
Q. We will come to further technology in a moment, but one example that this Inquiry received evidence about is Crispen Dye, where it appeared that pockets of clothing were examined for the first time in February 2023 and additional material was identified. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes, I'm aware, yes.
Q. Again, that's a forensic opportunity that was readily accessible?
A. Exactly, yes.
Q. There are other cases where exhibits were gathered and are still - cases where the Police Force does know where the exhibits are, and where they were gathered before technology such as DNA was available, and they might be amenable to analysis under technology that has arisen since the exhibit was gathered?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are other cases in which DNA or fingerprints were gathered but they didn't match anything on the database at the time because the database was smaller?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And the database, both for fingerprints and DNA, has grown over the years?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. People get arrested and their fingerprints are taken?
A. Yes. And DNA taken.
Q. The DNA database has been steadily growing?
A. Yes.
Q. And continues to. And so is it the case that there could be a number of exhibits currently held, and among the cases where you do know where the exhibits are, where there are clear and readily accessible forensic opportunities that may be conducted and that may lead to a breakthrough?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. But you will only know about those if you get around to screening, triaging or reviewing those cases?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And there may be many cases where there's been a paper screening, but nobody's got around to conducting those simple forensic tests or exploring those readily available forensic opportunities?
A. Yes, there could be, yes.
Q. There could be dozens of cases in that category,
couldn't there?
A. There could be, yes.
Q. Maybe even hundreds?
A. There could be, yes.
Q. Three more deaths that are not 1 isted as having been reviewed in 2004 to 2008, although there may be a reason for it that $I^{\prime \prime m}$ about to come to, are each of Gilles Mattaini, Ross Warren and John Russell?
A. Yes.
Q. Those three cases are not recorded as being reviewed in the period 2004 to $2008 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. At that time, they were the subject of - well, sorry, at that time, they had been the subject of Operation Taradale during the period 2000 to 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that there was a coronial inquiry in 2003 to 2005?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that those matters were then reviewed in August 2013, according to the tracking file?
A. Yes.
Q. And after that, Strike Force Neiwand took place?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Were you involved in Strike Force Neiwand?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any knowledge of it at the time?
A. No.
Q. Strike Force Neiwand concluded in January 2018. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware that the outcome of Strike Force Neiwand was that even though the Coroner had found likely homicide
in relation to two of the deaths, John Russel 1 and Ross Warren, they were reclassified as "Undetermined"? Are you aware that that was the outcome of Strike Force Neiwand?
A. No, no.
Q. You weren't aware?
A. Oh, sorry, I was aware of the strike force, yes.
Q. Were you aware that that was one of the outcomes of Strike Force Neiwand?
A. Yes.
Q. Am I right that your evidence is that the purpose of that classification is to determine priority?
A. Sorry?
Q. The purpose of that classification, "Undetected" or "Undetermined" or another --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is to determine priority?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And unless something new comes to 1 ight, all the "Undetected" matters will be reviewed before coming to an "Undetermined" matter; is that right?
A. That's correct, unless new information becomes available.
Q. Unless new information becomes available. And the "Undetected matters", the review of the "Undetected" matters, could easily take more than 20 years?
A. Could do, yes.
Q. So the consequence of the reclassification of those two cases was that they would be deprioritised and may not be looked at for more than 20 years?
A. Could be, yes.
Q. Am I correct, that's the consequence of that reclassification?
A. That could be a consequence, yes.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner with whether the Commissioner should assume that those involved in that strike force knew that that would be the consequence?
A. No. No.
Q. You don't know whether they would know?
A. No, I don't know, no.
Q. Do you know what involvement members of the Unsolved Homicide Team at the time had in that strike force?
A. In Neiwand? On1y the two - two officers that were conducting the review, was Sergeant Morgan, Detective Sergeant Morgan, Detective Senior Constable Chebl, from my knowledge of it.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner with what knowledge those officers had as to the consequence of these classifications?
A. No, I don't - I can't --
Q. You just don't know one way or the other?
A. I can't, no.
Q. Another matter which was, according to the tracking file, neither reviewed nor screened nor triaged, was the matter of Mr Walker, who died on 22 July 1992. Are you familiar with that case?
A. No, I'm not, no.
Q. That's a case that is listed as "Unresolved" - that's a case where there was a person of interest and there was a homosexual advance defence that was run. Does that jog your memory in relation to the case?
A. That doesn't, no.
Q. Consistent with that - is that sufficient information
for you to explain why that case was categorised as "Unresolved"?
A. That information you have given me, no.
Q. That's not enough?
A. No.
Q. You would need to know that the person was --
A. I would have to, yes.
Q. -- charged or acquitted?
A. Yes.
Q. And if no charges were brought, that wouldn't be enough to categorise the case as "Unresolved"?
A. No. No.
Q. If you assume it was obviously a homicide, it should have been on the list of unsolved homicides, or it should have been on the tracking file from 2004?
A. Yes.
Q. And it should have been the subject of the initial review between 2004 and 2008 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask this: there are five cases that the

Commissioner is looking at that are not on the tracking
file at all. They are the cases of Andrew Currie,
Paul Rath, Russell Payne, Samantha Raye and Blair Wark. Do you understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, all five were the subject of a coronial dispensation or a finding of a non-suspicious death?
A. Right.
Q. Okay?
A. Mmm.
Q. But some of those findings were from the 1970 s and the 1980s, and are you aware that this Inquiry has received evidence, including in several cases evidence that may have been available at the time of the original investigation, indicating reasons to regard those deaths as potentially suspicious?
A. No.
Q. You are not aware of that?
A. No.
Q. I want you to take it from me that the Inquiry has received evidence of that kind.
A. Yes.
Q. In cases like that, what scope is there for cases like that to come to the attention of the Unsolved Homicide Team and be added to the tracking file?
A. I don't understand that question.
Q. Well, I'm just trying to understand, if it hadn't been for the reports and research that led to this coronial
inquiry - I am sorry, this Commission of Inquiry --
A. This hearing.
Q. -- those cases would never have come to the attention of Unsolved Homicides?
A. No, they wouldn't have.
Q. And is there any scope for coronial findings to be reconsidered or for people - any process by which coronial findings made in the 1970s or 1980s might be reviewed by reference to concerns as to inadequate investigations?
A. Well, I've made - because within my role within the coronial liaison, I've made reference to the Registrar at the State Coroners Court a while - quite some time ago, in relation to all matters that have been referred where recommendations weren't made because they weren't specific. That's what I - in my statement, where I say that there were times when the Coroners would only assume - I would say would assume that the matter would come to the Homicide Squad, and where they didn't, be referred to the UHT; where a specific recommendation was made only when either the death or the missing person, had that suspicion that it was or possibly was a homicide. So try to go back-capture some of those matters that you are talking about now.
Q. That was an inquiry you made?
A. Yes, that's quite - it would have been perhaps two years ago.
Q. And what was the outcome of that inquiry?
A. I haven't received any data because they are going back into their archives to locate those files.
Q. Have you followed up on that request?
A. No, I'm expecting the registrar, who I have a good working relationship with, to notify me when that is available.
Q. Thank you, Detective Chief Inspector.

MR EMMETT: Would that be a convenient time, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I will adjourn unti1 2, thank you.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes.

MR EMMETT: Q. Chief Inspector, do you have in front of you, among other things, volume 11 of 11 that we started looking at yesterday afternoon?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you want to put to one side the other material you have, and can I ask you to open that at tab 21 [SCOI.02914_0001]?
A. Yes .
Q. My first question is, what's this document, this "State Crime Command Investigation Plan"? Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. When a strike force is created, a strike force being the name of an investigation, there is a fluid document which is called the investigation plan. It identifies the information there is, obviously what the mission is and what strategies are proposed to undertake. Norma1 procedure is that once certain aspects of an investigation, as per that plan, have been completed, then they will refurbish that plan to - upon identification of further strategies, et cetera.
Q. And if you turn three pages further on - if you go from the numbers in the top right-hand corner, it's _0004 there is a document titled "Review of an Unsolved Homicide Case Screening Form"?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this an example of one of the screening forms during the period 2004 to 2017?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. If you turn to pages 18 to 19, there's no signature at the bottom of that page or over the page on the top - nor date on the top of page _0019, nor a signature for the coordinator's certification. Do you see that?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. What's the status, to your knowledge, of a case screening form if it has not been signed by a reviewer or a coordinator?
A. I don't - I take into account that the review has been
completed and it could be an oversight on behalf of. They may have conducted a review by way of Word document and then it hasn't been signed. So I would say a mere oversight. It's not - it doesn't negate what's in that screening review.
Q. The Commissioner has received a number of these forms that are unsigned and undated.
A. Yes.
Q. Does the Commission have any way of knowing whether, where it is unsigned or undated, it was in fact completed?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know?
A. No.
Q. It may be that these forms are incomplete forms?
A. I would say not, if they're on our system, they wouldn't be, which I assume is where you retrieved them from.
Q. This screening form, which is in relation to Mr Walter Bedser, if you turn to page - if you go from the numbers in the top right, it's 0017. It's page 14 of the internal document.
A. 0007 or 17 ?
Q. 0017 .
A. Sorry. Yes.
Q. There is a recommendation there, it says:

The syndicate has determined that this case should not initially be reopened as such.

And then it identifies certain matters, phases that are followed, following which finalisation may be reached?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that language that you are familiar with?
A. It is, yes.
Q. What does it mean?
A. Well, one would say that the phases he's listed below that, if they're completed, then that matter can be finalised as a complete review.
Q. And what does it mean - so what does it mean to say the matter is finalised?
A. Finalised as in a decision could be made as to whether to reinvestigate or not.
Q. And the document doesn't give any guidance as to what that decision might be?
A. No, it doesn't, no.
Q. I want you to assume - we are told that the date of this document is 10 May 2005.
A. Yes.
Q. From your knowledge of procedures at that time, what would happen next in relation to this document? At what point would a decision be made as to review or reinvestigation?
A. Well, one would think that this - the phase 1 that they've identified was a complete forensic review of all material available, that once that was undertaken and the results thereof, then the decision would be made as to
whether to conduct a full investigation or not.
Q. So should the Commissioner understand that this document recommends that a full forensic review take place? A. Yes.
Q. And would you expect to find among the police records a record as to that review, if it took place?
A. Yes.
Q. We will come to a couple of documents shortiy. Could I ask you to turn back to page 0008.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see there there is a table "Exhibits Located"?
A. Yes.
Q. There is an entry there that says "Knife", and it says "To DAL on 10/12/1980". Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The Commissioner has received evidence that the knife has been lost since it went to DAL - I'm sorry, the evidence is since it came back from DAL, it was lost. Do you understand?
A. I accept that, yes.
Q. Are you familiar with this case at al1?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. If you assume that matter, is that a matter that ought to have been identified in this document - that is, that you can't find the knife?
A. Yes, it should be, if it can't be located. However, if it was located, then those other - the forensic strategy could be undertaken. So whether the author of this document has identified that these are the exhibits, that author may not have known these exhibits - you're saying it went missing. He may not have known. I don't know.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Well, when the document says, back at 0017, "Locate all exhibits" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it's rather intending to be a future exercise, by the sound of it?
A. It does, sir, yes.
Q. So, in other words, someone is saying, "Well, we'd better find out where all the exhibits are, and if we find all the exhibits, certain things may follow"?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. So in other words, this document was certainly prepared, as Counsel Assisting has just put, if the knife had disappeared and was not available, whoever prepared this document proceeded upon whatever they did in the absence of knowing that it had already been misplaced or disappeared?
A. That's quite possible, yes.

MR EMMETT: Q. There is evidence that this document was part of the detectives course. Do you understand what it means to say that a document is part of the detectives course?
A. I can only assume that with the Detectives Education Program as it was then, I believe, it would have been a review to be undertaken by those course participants as a part of their criteria for the curriculum relating to homicide matters.
Q. If you turn to page 20 of the document, 0020 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you will see there is a reference to "assessment criteria" by reference to cases, including this one?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it possible that this document that we've been looking at is no more than - well, is a document prepared by someone as part of training rather than a document prepared by somebody conducting a serious review?
A. No, to me - it is part of training and development, there's no doubt about that. However, the reviews were undertaken under management, strict supervision of these detective sergeants at the detectives training course, who were quite experienced, I have no doubt. I know the signature - I know that person there on that block there, and one would think that the idea is to have them - the review is a desktop review, as we call it. They don't go out to seek information or to investigate. It's just merely a desktop review.
Q. Can I ask you to turn - it is later in time but earlier in the folder - back to tab 20 [SCOI.02913_0001]. A. Yes.
Q. That's a similar form from - if you turn - well, you have written there, it appears to say 2008.
A. Sorry, where was that?
Q. I'm sorry. Again, if you turn to page _0019, you wil1 see it has not been signed or dated?
A. Yes.
Q. Again --
A. Sorry, 00?
Q. -- can the Commissioner draw any inference about
whether this form was in fact completed?
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
Q. I'm sorry, yes, he can draw an inference?
A. One - yes, it was completed, but --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes, but can I ask you this question: were they play-acting exercises or were they intended to have practical significance?
A. They were intended to have practical significance.
Q. So they weren't just sort of theoretical play-acting?
A. No, no.

MR EMMETT: Q. And the same goes for both the 2005 document and this document?
A. If it was before - under the same course.
Q. I want you to take it from me that this document is said to have been dated in 2008.
A. Was it undertaken by the Detectives Education Program?
Q. We11, could you tel1 us? Looking at the document, is there anything on the face of the document that enables you to know that one way or the other?
A. No, there isn't, no.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. What about the top of the page at 0001, "You have been selected to undertake a review of an unsolved homicide"?
A. That's the same on all of those.
Q. Is it?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Yes. So, in other words, it's really just, what, some random selection of people?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. For the purposes - and I'm not being disrespectful --
A. No.
Q. -- not a play-acting exercise?
A. No.
Q. It's meant to be a real-time and a real attempt to come to terms with what may or may not need to be done?
A. That's correct.
Q. Al1 right, thank you.
A. The theory behind that, sir, is the fresh-eye approach Unsolved use.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I understand. Thank you.
MR EMMETT: Q. If there's nothing in this document or in any other material that has been produced to indicate that
this 2008 review was part of the detectives course, should the Commissioner proceed on the basis that it was a review by somebody within the Unsolved Homicide Team or that he just doesn't know?
A. He just doesn't know.
Q. Can I ask you, in this document, if you turn to page 0018, in the recommendation, first --
A. Yes.
Q. -- there are recommendations that actions should take place?
A. Yes.
Q. According to the ordinary course of events, to your knowledge, when - if this document is dated 2008, when would you expect those actions to be taken?
A. At a reasonable time shortly thereafter.
Q. And what does that mean?
A. Well, upon receiving the review, then it should be taken.
Q. By whom?
A. By whoever has been assigned the matter.
Q. By somebody within the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. No, because at that stage, if this is a 2008 document, there was no investigative function within the Unsolved Homicide Team, so this would have been undertaken by somebody outside that agency.
Q. Someone would have received this document, if it were completed, some time shortly after it was completed; is that your evidence?
A. Yes, I - that should be the case.
Q. And that person, what, would be attached to the area command where the original investigation was?
A. We try not to do that, but $I$ don't know what the ambit was back in 2008/2009.
Q. When you say the person who received it, wherever they were, ought to have taken the actions identified within a reasonable time, what's a reasonable time?
A. As soon as possible. I can't give you --
Q. Are you talking weeks, months, years?
A. No, I can't give you that time frame.
Q. You can't assist the Commissioner --
A. No.
Q. -- at all with what a reasonable time is?
A. No. You've got competing factors involved in relation to the status of other investigations they're undertaking and where they're at. So it's all to be into consideration when undertaking these duties.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Can I ask you this: it's really the horse and the cart analogy. Why would all this time be spent providing all of this insight into a theoretical series of possibilities if you don't even know, when you start, that you have all the holdings, including the exhibits and fingerprints? It just seems to me to be cart and horse material. Wouldn't a sensible course be, given your now knowledge corporate-wise of how difficult it has been to produce and to find where things are --
A. Yes.
Q. -- wouldn't it smack of entire commonsense that if you say, "Wel1, 1et's look at the case of Bedser" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- "Okay, $X$ or $Y, X$ and $Y$, would you please go and find out all of our holdings, where are they, where might be they be, what they comprise of?", because if you discovered, say, if it be true, that in that exercise the knife, the murder weapon, has gone missing --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that would presumably have an impact --
A. Significant, yes.
Q. -- on what you could do?
A. Yes.
Q. And, indeed, what you might do?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, wouldn't that be a better use of time and resources than getting someone to sit down and review all of this and write out very nice theoretical scenarios, all of the witnesses, all of the people, before you actually
work out where the exhibits are, because a number of these documents are predicated upon an absence of knowledge of the current existence of holdings, but more importantly the exhibits, and more importantly things like fingerprints, murder weapons, whatever?
A. Yes, I agree.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, al1 right.
MR EMMETT: Q. Could I ask you to turn to page 0017 in the document.
A. Yes.
Q. You will see there the first full paragraph, it says:

The senior Detective course also reviewed this matter ...
A. Yes.
Q. And then there's a paragraph. At the end of that paragraph, the last two sentences say:

It is unclear whether all running sheets are truly available as they finish abruptly in January 1981.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Bedser died in December 1980. Do you understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it a reasonable inference that the running sheets had been lost?
A. That could be an inference, when they're saying they're truly available.
Q. The reviewer - I appreciate the reviewer wasn't you, but from your knowledge of the procedures, it should have been obvious to the reviewer that they didn't have complete information?
A. Yes.
Q. When we turn to the next page, _0018, in the last paragraph --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it says:

There are no exhibits available for retesting ...

By this stage, they had identified that the knife was missing?
A. Yes.
Q. Then it says:

It appears that some paperwork may be missing and the inquest material cannot be located
A. Yes.
Q. It nevertheless says:
... however it is the reviewers opinion that a thorough investigation pursuing all lines of inquiry was conducted at the time.
A. Yes.
Q. How could a reviewer form the view that a thorough investigation had been conducted if there were running sheets that stopped abruptly a month after the investigation commenced and they didn't have the inquest material?
A. They can't.
Q. So that statement is wrong?
A. Well, I won't say they don't have the inquest material. What I'm thinking there is the coronial file. Because on occasions that we do attempt to gather material that we may not have on file at our organisation, we go to the Coroners Court and request, and the Coroner's file may not be available. So that part alone may not contribute to the fact that they don't have all the documents.
Q. But the abrupt end of the running sheets --
A. Sorry?
Q. The fact that the running sheets ended abruptly in

January 1981 --
A. Yes, yes, yes.
Q. That would tend to indicate it?
A. Yes.
Q. A reviewer, to your knowledge, couldn't properly conclude that it was a thorough investigation pursuing all lines of inquiry if those documents were missing?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. If a case screening form uses language like, "This appears to have been a thorough investigation pursuing all lines of inquiry", does that affect the likelihood of the case being picked up and reviewed again in the future?
A. It could, yes.
Q. A statement like that may make this case less likely to be reviewed in the future?
A. It could, yes.
Q. It was incumbent on the people preparing this document
to take great care before making statements like that?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And if there wasn't a basis for it, it shouldn't have been recorded in this screening form?
A. I agree, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry to interrupt you again.
Q. Can I take you to 0005?
A. Sorry, sir?
Q. 0005, with the underscore. It's under the heading "Exhibits".
A. 0005 , is that -
Q. It is paragraph 7 heading "Exhibits". The upper right-hand corner, 0005.
A. Is that item $20-19$, sir?
Q. Forgive me, you're absolutely right. It's in tab 20 [SCOI.02913_0001].
A. Tab 20?
Q. Tab 20 .
A. Sorry, I was looking from the beginning of the document, sir. Yes, "Exhibits".
Q. Have you got it?
A. Yes.
Q. It says:

The original Exhibit Book is obviously the best place to begin ... many homicide exhibits however were never entered into the Station exhibit books as they were recovered from crime scenes ...

It goes on and on. I mean, that's part of the problem that was well known within Unsolved Homicide, I presume?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: A11 right. Thank you.
MR EMMETT: Q. May we infer from this, it was well known in 2008?
A. Yes, I'd say so, yes.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 26 [SCOI.10286.00008_0001]. That's a case screening form in relation to William Dutfield. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. He died on 19 November 1991.
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to page 0016 , there's a recommendation that a reinvestigation is warranted?
A. Yes.
Q. And the date there is 2 May 2005?
A. Yes.
Q. The reinvestigation identifies a number of 1 ines of inquiry?
A. Yes.
Q. If a recommendation like that is made, would you expect a reinvestigation to be commenced in relation to Mr Bedser --
A. Mr Dutfield.
Q. I'm sorry, Mr Dutfield.
A. Yes, I would.
Q. Within a reasonable time after 2 May 2005?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And at this stage, that should have been conducted by an investigative team that is not part of the Unsolved Homicides review team?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And should the Commissioner assume you're unable to assist with what length of time a reasonable time is?
A. No, no.
Q. Now, I want you to assume that by February 2007, the first step - and we'11 come to the document in relation to this in a moment, but the first step had been taken, that is, there were examinations of the cigarette butts and the tissue paper. Do you understand that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. But that there's no evidence of the other matters of re-examination being taken?
A. Right - as in the sticky-tape dispenser?
Q. As in items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
A. Okay, yes.
Q. Do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. There was a review offered at a later stage. Do you understand?
A. Sorry?
Q. There was a review offered - I'm just looking at item 9 - at a later stage?
A. Item 9 is about a media appeal.
Q. Media appeal and offer of reward?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what I mean. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 27 [SCOI.1006.00036_0001].
A. Yes.
Q. That's a document titled "Additional Information Case Screening Form".
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. What's an Additional Information Case Screening Form?
A. That would have been a - I don't know when that would have been created, if I can - so created some two years 1ater.
Q. Yes.
A. So it would be any additional information that may have come in to the Unsolved Homicide - the review team at that stage.
Q. Are you familiar with these forms titled "Additional Information Case Screening Form"?
A. Yes.
Q. And when are they used?
A. Sorry?
Q. Did I understand your evidence correctly, these forms are used when new information comes to the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. Yes, that was at that time.
Q. If you turn to page 0002?
A. Yes.
Q. It refers to a report being received from DAL, as I foreshadowed - in relation to the testing I mentioned?
A. Yes.
Q. And it refers there to obtaining a profile from a named person. Do you see that? It's the third paragraph. I'm not going to read the name.
A. Yes.
Q. But do you see it refers to --
A. Yes.
Q. -- a named person?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this was dated 1 March 2007. Do you see that over the page?
A. The 8th of - sorry? Sorry, the 8th of --
Q. Well, the first date is 8 February, and the second date is the 1st --
A. Oh, sorry, that's when it was certified, sorry.
Q. So this is an example of one that has in fact been signed?
A. Yes. Well, at that stage, Detective Senior Constable Henderson was a part of the review team that I know of that I know, and Nicole Passé-de Silva was also a member of that team.
Q. In the period between May 2005 and March 2007, the person named there died?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware - are you familiar with that case?
A. I will accept that. I don't know, but I will accept that, yes.
Q. Had a DNA sample been obtained from that person as suggested at item 5 in May 2005 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- had that been acted upon promptly, it may have been possible to obtain that DNA sample?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist with an explanation for that delay leading to the inability to obtain that sample?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Is that the sort of delay you would expect --
A. No, it isn't a delay I would expect.
Q. Taking two years, on any view, is outside a reasonable time; is that right?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. On any view, these investigations ought to have taken place much closer to May 2005?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 29
[SCOI.03268_0001]?
A. If I could just go back to - if I could, back to that
additional form. The receipt of that information was on 8 February 2007. So I don't know that that person, the named person there, was identified in the original.
I don't know.
Q. Turn back to tab 26 [SCOI.10286.0008_0001]?
A. Yes. Just when $I$ noticed the date, that was al1, sir.
Q. Turn back to tab 26 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Page 0016?
A. Yes.
Q. We looked at the various items, steps that were not taken.
A. Yes.
Q. And you see item 5?
A. Yes. Thank you. Then I - I appreciate what you're saying.
Q. Looking at these documents, there is no doubt in your mind, is there, that there was a recommendation in May 2005 - -
A. I didn't read that previous 1 y , but I accept what you put, yes.
Q. There's no doubt in your mind that there was a recommendation to do that in May 2005?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. That required action within a reasonable time?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. A reasonable time - wel1, it was a matter of weeks or months?
A. Yes.
Q. And had that been actioned within a reasonable time, the person named there would have been alive at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. On the assumption that $I$ have given you as to the date of his death?
A. Yes, yes. Just something in the date $I$ picked up, sir.
Q. Indeed, the document - the additional information form doesn't even appear to appreciate that the person has died?
A. No, no.
Q. Can I ask you to turn to tab 29 [SCOI.03268_0001].

This is a case screening form in relation to Crispen Dye. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. He was assaulted on 23 December 1993 and died two days later.
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to page 0017?
A. Yes.
Q. This document has a reviewer's certification. There's no signature, but there's a name. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's no signature, name or date for the coordinator's certification?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is the Commissioner - what can the Commissioner infer as to whether this document was in fact completed and whether it was reviewed by the coordinator?
A. I can't say, because the mere fact it wasn't signed doesn't mean it wasn't done.
Q. A number of recommendations are made. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, proper police procedures at the time required those actions to be taken within a reasonable time?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to assume that none of those steps were taken, save that, the third bullet point, a reward was reissued in 2014. Do you understand that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. About nine years later?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that consistent with the proper police practice that you have told the Commissioner about?
A. No.
Q. Those actions should have been taken much earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there any procedure by which anyone within the Unsolved Homicide Team or anyone anywhere followed up with whoever was responsible for implementing these recommendations to find out whether they were implemented?
A. That's unknown to me.
Q. You just don't know one way or the other?
A. No. I wasn't there at the time, so I don't know their practices.
Q. Could I ask you to turn next to tab 30 [SCOI.03267_0001].
A. Yes.
Q. This relates to the same person, Crispen Dye, and it's an "Annexure A Triage Form"?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the form that's been in place since I think you said - was it around $2018 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. Was it 2018 or a little bit earlier or you don't know?
A. It was 2018 when the new format of addressing the large number of unsolved matters that we had - to resource those reviews out to experienced police officers.
Q. Could I ask you to turn to page 0011. There is a recommendation that the matter proceed to review?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to assume there is no record of any review being undertaken.
A. I would say not, no.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. I would say not, no.
Q. When you say you would say not, do you mean it doesn't surprise you that no review was done?
A. No, you're saying to me - your question was, sorry?
Q. I said I want you to assume that no review was undertaken following this triage form, or at least the Commissioner has received no evidence --
A. I'm unaware.
Q. You're unaware?
A. Of this particular matter.
Q. If the matter had proceeded to a review, you would expect to see that in the tracking file?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would expect that there would be a record of the review?
A. You would expect to have a review document.
Q. Now, the recommendation that it proceed to review was on 16 November 2019. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Should the Commissioner infer that, despite that recommendation, no step was taken in relation to this matter after 16 November 2019?
A. Yes, that could be the case. It may not have been put - I don't know if a review was conducted on this particular matter, but if it's not on the tracking file, then I can assume it wasn't. However, there may be items on the tracking file that aren't - the detail isn't input accordingly.
Q. And it doesn't - does it surprise or trouble you that it's now several years after 16 November 2019 and no action is recorded?
A. Yes.
Q. That's not consistent with proper police practices?
A. No.
Q. Can you offer any explanation for why there's no record of any step being taken?
A. No, I cannot.
Q. Can I ask you to turn to tab 31 [NPL.0100.0015.0001].

This is again a case screening form. This relates to Scott Miller--
A. Yes.
Q. -- who died on 2 March 1997?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you turn to page 0011. It is signed and dated
by the reviewer?
A. Yes.
Q. 21 Apri1 2004?
A. Yes.
Q. There's no coordinator's certification?
A. No.
Q. Proper procedure required that coordinator's certification?
A. Should have been.
Q. You're not aware of any reason why the signature wasn't affixed?
A. No. No.
Q. But you tell the Commissioner it may nevertheless have been completed and - I'm sorry, the coordinator may nevertheless have certified this document?
A. Yes, it may have been certified.
Q. But should the Commissioner proceed on the basis that that's likely or that he just doesn't know one way or the other?
A. Likely, very likely.
Q. And why should the Commissioner proceed on that basis?
A. Firstly, I know who the reviewer is, and I would ascertain that he would have put it up for the coordinator and it just - an oversight is what $I$ would assume.
Q. What's the basis for that assumption?
A. Because I know who the investigator is that did the review, and it may not - just may not have been signed.
Q. Why is the fact that you know who the investigator is - how does that assist you --
A. His experience in relation to having conducted a thorough review.
Q. Well, how does that assist you in understanding whether the coordinator certified the document?
A. I can only assume, I said before.
Q. On what basis?
A. I don't have an answer.
Q. I want you to assume that the tracking file indicates that a triage has been performed in relation to this document, although the tracking file doesn't indicate the date. Do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. No such document has been produced to the Commission?
A. The triage document?
Q. No triage document has been produced in relation to this - in relation to Mr Miller. Do you understand?
A. Okay, yes.
Q. If a triage had occurred, if the entry in the tracking file is correct, there ought to be a record of it?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had occasion to look for the - look for any records in relation to Scott Miller?
A. No, I haven't, no.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner one way or the other as to whether such a triage form exists?
A. I'm not able at this present stage.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 32
[SCOI.03416_0001]?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a screening form in relation to a person recorded in this form by the name David Rose?
A. Yes .
Q. I want you to assume that the deceased person is Samantha Rose, who was a transgender woman. Do you understand that assumption?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Have you had occasion to look at this case before?
A. No.
Q. You don't know anything about the facts of it?
A. No.
Q. She died on 20 December 1997?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you to turn to page 0018 ?
A. Yes.
Q. There are a number of recommendations made?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you turn to page 0020?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, there's a reviewer's certification, a name but no signature, and a date, 6 May $2004 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. Again, there's no certification name or date for the coordinator?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is the Commissioner able to draw any inference as to whether or not the coordinator actually reviewed this document?
A. No.
Q. Going back to the recommendations, if these recommendations - well, if this document was provided by the Unsolved Homicide Team to somebody else, those recommendations should have been implemented?
A. Yes.
Q. And they should have been implemented within
a reasonable time?
A. Yes.
Q. There is a reference again to a person of interest whose name appears on the --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the third, fourth and fifth bullet points?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to assume that that person died in 2006.
A. Yes.
Q. Again, had those recommendations been taken earlier, or implemented within a reasonable time, those steps, it is to be expected, would have been taken while that person was still alive?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Was that a failure of police procedures?
A. Yes.
Q. The recording of Ms Rose under the name that $I$ showed you and mislabeling Ms Rose's gender - in 2004, are you able to assist the Commissioner, did officers receive training or education in respectful ways to refer to members of the trans community?
A. No, I'm unable to --
Q. You just don't know?
A. No, I don't know. I don't recal 1.
Q. Have you ever received such training?
A. No.
Q. Have you received any guidance in relation to that matter, professionally?
A. Not specifically, no.
Q. Have you undertaken a computer module that is, we understand, available in the Police Force in relation to LGBTIQ awareness?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you undertake that?
A. I can't recall now, sorry.
Q. Recently, a long time ago?
A. No, I - I don't know.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 34
[SCOI.03415_0001]?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a triage form in relation to Ms Rose?
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to page 0008, you will see it's dated May

2019?
A. Yes.
Q. By 2019, would it be fair to assume that officers, including the officer named as having completed this triage form --
A. Yes.
Q. -- had undergone training in relation to cultural awareness in respect of the LGBTIQ community?
A. Yes.
Q. Definitely or possibly or you just - you don't know?
A. Possibly.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner with whether that training included information about respectful ways to refer to members who were or might be members of the trans community?
A. It would have, yes.
Q. Would you --
A. If I can make an assumption, and it is only an assumption, that the recorded name given with the initial review was utilised across the board so that there would be no - admittedly, there should have been an alias or another name, but it wasn't recorded that way.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 33
[SCOI.02713_0001]? I should ask this - no, turn to tab 33.
A. Yes.
Q. This is a review in relation to Ms Rose's case?
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to page 0064, it's dated 30 September 2021?
A. Yes.
Q. That's quite a lengthy evidence summary?
A. Yes.
Q. It looks not altogether dissimilar to the degree of information one might see, for example, in a coronial inquest OIC's statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the intention to mirror that?
A. No, no.
Q. On page 1, the author of this document - I want to draw your attention to the last two sentences, or in particular the second-last sentence of the introduction on "Background". Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You would agree that that language is not considered an acceptable or respectful way to describe a member of the trans community?
A. Which - are you saying on page 1, sir?
Q. Page 1, "Background".
A. Yes.
Q. Where it says:

He was a cross-dresser, wore make-up and commenced treatment for a sex change.
A. Oh, sorry, I thought you meant down the bottom, sorry.
Q. I'm terribly sorry.
A. I apologise.
Q. Is the training that you received - did you learn from that that that would not be a respectful way to refer to a member of the trans community?
A. That's correct.
Q. You did receive that training?
A. Yes.
Q. And would it be fair to infer that the officer who completed this report received that training, too?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. This entry can't be explained by reference to a - that language cannot be explained by reference to a desire to ensure consistency of names, can it?
A. No.
Q. Can you offer any good reason for --
A. No, I cannot, nor valid reason.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 37
[SCOI.02706_0001]?
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Before you do that, could I ask you to go to 0064 in this same tab?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, this was a homicide?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any particular reason why the person who prepared this document is said to be a detective sergeant in the Financial Crime Squad?
A. Yes - is there a reason?
Q. Yes.
A. Because what happened when the - the new process was undertaken in 2018, there were - it was identified --
Q. You got people outside Unsolved Homicide?
A. Outside.
Q. And that could be anybody in any squad?
A. That's correct. It actually went to the other squads as a matter of having experienced officers there.

THE COMMISSIONER: Understood. Understood, thank you.
THE WITNESS: 37 , sir?
MR EMMETT: Q. 37 , yes.
A. Yes.
Q. The first page is a summary page, and if you turn to the second page, you'11 see again a case screening form?
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to page 0012, you will see this form includes no signature but a name and date for both the reviewer and the coordinator?
A. Yes.
Q. But you tell the Commissioner - so this form, at
least, it appears - well, can the Commissioner infer that this form was reviewed by both the reviewer and the coordinator?
A. Yes.
Q. Prepared by the reviewer?
A. Yes.
Q. And reviewed or assessed by the coordinator?
A. Yes, assessed, yes. Mr Jarratt was the person that set up the Unsolved Homicide Team in 2004.
Q. Can I ask you to turn to page 0005 ?
A. Yes.
Q. It says - do you see in the top entry, it says:

Further examination: Projectiles removed from victim's body at Post Mortem are stil7 on hand ...

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I want you to assume that the evidence before the Commissioner is that there were no projectiles recovered post-mortem because there were entry and exit wounds. Do you understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the evidence before the Commissioner is that the fired bullets, if they were ever taken into custody, could not be located. Do you understand that?
A. That's correct.
Q. On that assumption, that appears to be just plain wrong, doesn't it?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. I appreciate it's not your document, but if that is an error, are you able to assist the Commissioner with how often errors like that --
A. Oh, no.
Q. Do you observe them - or how often do you have occasion to review these screening forms?
A. Not often at all, not these, these screening forms, no.
Q. You can't assist the Commissioner with how prevalent errors like that are?
A. No.
Q. But this is an important detail?
A. Of course, yes.
Q. You wouldn't expect a competent reviewer to make a mistake of that significance?
A. Sorry?
Q. It's an important detai1, it's a significant matter; do you agree?
A. Mmm.
Q. You would not expect a competent reviewer preparing this screening form to make that mistake; is that right?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Again, going to page 0010, it was recommended that the investigation be reopened?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, you tell the Commissioner the expectation was on the - assuming that made it back to someone outside the Unsolved Homicide Team, that person who received it should have commenced the reinvestigation within a reasonable time?
A. Yes.
Q. And if there is no evidence of such a reinvestigation being commenced, that would be a failure of proper police procedure at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you to turn to tab 37A [NPL.0131.0017.0258]?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this document, I want you to assume, is not dated, but the information we have received, or the Commission has received, from the Police Force is that it is from 2018. Do you understand?
A. I would hazard a guess that it wouldn't be from 2018, because it's an old-style document, wouldn't be, unless it was --
Q. I'm sorry, did I say 2018 ?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm terribly sorry. I meant to say 2008. I apologise, Chief Inspector. I want you to assume 2008.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. That review on page 0009 recommends that the investigation is reopened?
A. Yes.
Q. So if we assume this document was dated 2008 , by 2008 or 2009, or by 2008, there had been two recommendations to reopen this investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. If it wasn't, if the investigation wasn't reopened, can you offer an explanation?
A. No, I cannot.
Q. Again, would that be a failure of proper police practice at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you to turn next to tab 38
[SCOI.38971_0001]?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a triage form in relation to a missing person named Peter Baumann. Do you see that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Again, if you turn to page 0007 , this document appears
to be unsigned and undated?
A. Unnamed as well.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Unnamed as we11.
Q. Unnamed, unsigned, undated?
A. Yes.
Q. And, indeed, quite a few of the boxes are empty?
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to page 0003?
A. Yes.
Q. There is a reference to a post-mortem result?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to assume that the evidence indicates that Mr Baumann has disappeared and his body has never been recovered?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with the Baumann case?
A. I am in relation to reading this error.
Q. You say "this error". That's an obvious error in the document, isn't it?
A. Obviously an error.
Q. Have you seen that error before?
A. No, no.
Q. Is that the sort of error that ought to be picked up by the vetting process?
A. It should be. It should be picked up under the reviewer when the reviewer reads it, and myself in vetting it.
Q. Can the Commissioner draw any inference about whether this triage form was in fact completed?
A. No. I would say it wasn't completed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Is that partly because, if you go to 0006, as an example --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the yes/no option is stil1 left open?
A. That's correct, and a lot of the - a lot of those options are still open, so --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR EMMETT: Q. Can $I$ ask you to turn to tab 39 [SCOI.62861_0001]?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a case screening form in relation to Mr Barry Jones --
A. Yes.
Q. -- who died on 26 September 1976 ?
A. Yes.
Q. The document is unsigned, unnamed and undated. You wil1 see that at page 0011?
A. And 0012, yes.
Q. And there is a lot of information in the document, but there is nothing in the recommendation?
A. No.
Q. Can the Commissioner draw any inference about whether this document was in fact completed and reviewed?
A. No, to me, it wasn't completed, because a quick scan of the document there, you have fingerprints and then there's question marks behind it, which is indicative of, one would think, we've got to identify whether they're - if I can just find that page for you, page 0008, partway down. So, to me, that is indicative of something that the reviewer would seek to clarify.
Q. The Commissioner should infer, should he, then, that a screening of Mr Jones's case was never completed - or, I'm sorry, was not completed in this document?
A. That's correct.
Q. And if this document is the only record of a screening in respect of Mr Jones, the Commissioner should infer that there has never been a completed screening review or triage in relation to Mr Jones?
A. I would suggest that.
Q. It also suggests, doesn't it, that that's the case, even though this case was clearly on, if $I$ can put it this way, the radar of the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. Yes.
Q. And so, according to proper police practices, should have been reviewed, assuming it was on the tracking file at the time, between 2004 and $2008 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. We've identified a number of cases in which there are reviews or screenings or triages that identify lines of inquiry where those lines of inquiry then either are not implemented or are not implemented for a decade or more?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is that a common occurrence?
A. I can only say $I$ hope not.
Q. Do you know one way or the other?
A. No, I don't.
Q. If material emerges from this Inquiry in relation to some of the matters that the Commissioner is looking at -A. Yes.
Q. -- that supports further lines of investigation in relation to some of the deaths that this Commission is looking at --
A. Yes .
Q. -- how should the Commissioner expect those matters to be dealt with under the current Standard Operating Procedures of the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. With the - the Unsolved Homicide Team is to assess any information, and if new information is being gleaned as a result of this Commission, then we are to assess it and then act upon that.
Q. And how would the Commission know how long it will
take to get to looking at any given case?
A. I could only undertake that it will be done as soon as possible.
Q. My question is --
A. If there's new and fresh information that is unknown to the Unsolved Homicide Team.
Q. Would you pardon me for a moment. Can I just ask, in relation to a number of the forms that we have looked at, where particular cells or where particular parts of the form are incomplete or unpopulated --
A. Yes.
Q. -- should we assume that in relation to those forms, the form is incomplete and may never have been - the relevant form may never have been completed?
A. Yes.
Q. Or is it possible - or is it equally - let me ask that: is the inference that the Commissioner should draw that if cells in these forms are empty, that's a sign that the relevant form was never actually completed?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Now, coming back to - what can the Commissioner conclude about what will happen in relation to any cases in which he identifies lines of inquiry for further investigation?
A. That those lines of inquiry will be looked at and assessed by the Unsolved Homicide Team.
Q. Within what time frame?
A. As soon as possible.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner any further in relation to that?
A. No.
Q. How will that question - well, how will that interact with whether the matter has been failed at a triage before or decided - whether there is an extant decision that it not be - proceed from triage to review?
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. If the Commissioner has looked at a case where there has been a triage --
A. Yes.
Q. -- no review --
A. Yes.
Q. -- can the Commissioner draw any inference about when the Unsolved Homicide Team may take action in relation to matters he looks at?
A. To do those reviews, complete them, you mean, or to complete the triage?
Q. To take some step.
A. Sorry?
Q. To take some step.
A. Upon the result of what the Commissioner has
identified, then we would look at it, certainly, to assess it.
Q. And what if the matters are matters that are currently categorised as "Undetermined" or "Unresolved"?
A. It would still get looked at. As mentioned in our procedures, if any new information comes aboard in relation to any unsolved matters, we will review it.

MR EMMETT: Thank you, Chief Inspector. Commissioner, those are our questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Yes, Mr Mykkeltvedt?
MR MYKKELTVEDT: Might I have five minutes with him just to address a couple of things?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course. I will adjourn for five minutes. Thank you.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Thank you for that time, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
<EXAMINATION BY MR MYKKELTVEDT:
MR MYKKELTVEDT: Q. Detective Chief Inspector, are you able to say how many officers there are in the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. There's 38.
Q. And are you able to say how many officers there are in the Homicide Team or Squad as a whole?
A. 109 .
Q. So approximately one-third, perhaps even a little bit more, of the officers in the Homicide Squad generally fall within the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You were asked a number of questions yesterday in relation to the fact that the latest matter recorded in the Unsolved Homicide Team's tracking file dates to 17 August 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you whether that date is a date referable to the date of the relevant incident or to the date that that matter was added to the Unsolved Homicide Team's tracking file?
A. The date of the incident.
Q. So it wouldn't be correct, for example, to think that there hasn't been any matters added to the tracking file in the last seven years?
A. No, they're being added constantly.
Q. You have given some evidence in relation to your contact with the Coroners Court?
A. Yes.
Q. In particular with the Registrar of the Coroners Court?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that you're in regular contact with the Registrar of the Coroners Court?
A. Yes, and also with the State Coroner and Deputy State Coroners.
Q. And what form does that contact take?
A. As part of my role as Coronial Liaison Officer,

I would meet with them regularly in relation to any matters that they can see are an issue for any of the police officers, such as pending inquests or the like, and also for recommendations on how to word certain recommendations that would - which is akin to the stuff that - sorry, the investigations that get sent to us upon inquest findings and also my involvement in the Coronial - New South Wales Coronial Services Committee, which is a broad committee of Justice, Health and the Police.
Q. And as part of that contact, have you entered into any arrangements, formally or informally, in relation to the process by which a matter transitions from the Homicide Squad to the Coroners Court and back to the Unsolved Homicide Squad?
A. Yes, I have, with several - with the Deputy State Coroner and also with the State Coroner and former State Coroners where it was identified that matters of missing persons, whether they be suspicious or otherwise, were being referred to the Unsolved Homicide Team when it was apparent that there wasn't any suspicion in relation to homicide being involved in that disappearance. It was reflective that a family at inquest would get a finding that it would be referred to the Homicide Squad, they would think that their loved one had died as a result of a homicide, when they in fact hadn't; it was more apparent
from the evidence given that they had died from misadventure and/or suicide or --
Q. In addition to that, is there a process whereby once the Homicide Squad decides that an investigation is not able to be further advanced, the matter is referred to the Coroner?
A. Yes. It has been identified that there are matters that have never been before the coronial jurisdiction and they're matters that should be taken to that jurisdiction. How many, I don't know, I couldn't give you, but that's the process that should be occurring.
Q. So the process that you have arranged with the Coroners Court is that once a matter is concluded or the investigations into a matter effectively hit a brick wall --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it is referred to the Coroners Court?
A. Yes, provided it's suspicious.
Q. And then subsequent to the Coroner's review, the matter is referred back to Unsolved Homicide?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And it's at that juncture that the matter falls within, effectively, the jurisdiction of the Unsolved Homicide Team?
A. Yes, yes, we as a - the review team, we own that investigation then.
Q. Now, I think you gave some evidence yesterday in relation to the fact that reviews are not, as a matter of course, immediately conducted in respect of matters that have been referred by the Coroners Court?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you explain to the Commissioner why that is?
A. The rationale behind that is that all relevant information that has been obtained during the investigation will be placed before the Coroner, whether it be a full coronial inquest or an "OIC only" inquest, where it would be deemed that all investigative strategies have been undertaken, and it's only upon when - we have a time frame of [REDACTED], is how we assess it. However, if there's information coming to us prior to that [REDACTED], we look
at it - we assess the information first, sorry, and then consider whether we should reinvestigate or reopen the investigation.
Q. During the course of the time the matter is before the Coroner, the matter is effectively subject to the direction of the Coroner in connection with, for example, investigative steps; is that right?
A. That's correct. Under the Act, we are the investigators on behalf of the Coroner.
Q. Why have you chosen [REDACTED] as a time period?
A. I didn't choose it, but it's just an assumption from previous that [REDACTED] would be a line in the sand, so to speak, for want of a better word, that nothing fresh has come forward. We still review it if we can, if we find that there's - like if there's new information come available or new technology.
Q. So if you find that new information is uncovered in some way, for example, in response to a reward announcement --
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ a review will be conducted?
A. Yes.
Q. And similarly if there is some technological development that is perceived to be relevant to a particular case?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. The period of [REDACTED] is something that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- there may not be any particular science to?
A. No, no.
Q. The Inquiry has heard some evidence in relation to, for example, the importance of relationship shifting - I've just been told that the time period that I've been asking you questions about is something that should be subject to a - wel1, is subject to a non-publication order and that some steps have been taken.
A. My apologies.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: I'm grateful to my friends.
Q. I might leave that time period alone.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have your statement in front of you
[NPL.9000.0019.0001]?
A. Yes, I have a copy, yes.
Q. Can I just ask you to turn up paragraph 77?
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked some questions yesterday arising out of the apparent disconnect between the number in that paragraph, that being 829 matters 1 isted in the UHT tracking file --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and the number that appears in what is exhibit 54, suggesting 790. You might not know the answer to this, but I'm just going to ask you whether it's possible that the number that you have put in paragraph 77 reflects not the period between 1970 and 2010 but rather the total number of the matters that appear in the tracking file?
A. That's correct. It's an error on my behalf, that I downloaded and acquired the numbers at that - at the time that I made the statement.
Q. So you didn't make that calculation by reference to the document that had been produced to the Inquiry? A. No.
Q. But rather by the document as it exists in the NSW Police Force system?
A. That's correct, yes.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Commissioner, I'm quite sensibly reminded that there are people, for example, in the courtroom who may not be privy to the precise terms of the orders that have been made, and because of that, I would seek that there be a non-publication order expressly made in connection with the time period that $I$ have previously --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I think that's appropriate. So for those in the courtroom who are not part of the Commission staff, I will make an order that any time frame that was mentioned, let's say in the last half hour, not be published or republished outside this room or even within
this room.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: I'm grateful, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Q. You gave some evidence yesterday that a process was in train in relation to the development of the Homicide Investigation Monitoring System?
A. Yes.
Q. That is intended to be a database that is designed to capture and monitor information in respect of all homicides?
A. Al1 homicides, yes.
Q. Both unsolved --
A. No, all homicides. As soon as a homicide has been identified, it is recorded on that database.
Q. The process of setting that up, as it were, is transpiring in two phases?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it right that the first --
A. There are probably more than two phases, but I would say two phases at this stage.
Q. So the first phase is a back-capturing phase?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And that's ongoing?
A. Yes.
Q. And then subsequently there wil1 be a back-capturing phase in relation to the unsolved homicides?
A. Yes, it'11 be where it's identified that - matters that are homicide related that are unsolved will be identified.
Q. So step 1 is the matters that fal 1 within the broader Homicide Squad?
A. Yes.
Q. Which of course mostly are unsolved at the moment?
A. Yes, yes, yes.
Q. But they have not yet been referred to the Unsolved Homicide Squad?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And that second stage will relate to the UHT
matters --
A. Yes.
Q. -- ie, those within the tracking file?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. I understand that the intention of that system is effectively to improve the monitoring and prioritisation of UHT matters generally?
A. Yes.
Q. And also to aid in relation to decision-making as concerns reinvestigations?
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
Q. Are you able to indicate how it's considered that that will occur?
A. I think it's - I don't - I haven't got a full concept of the technical side of the system because it's only in its infancy, but it's to identify that the appropriate data is placed into that database that would enable us to make the decision as to whether the status of an exhibit is and/or any information that comes in that can be input into the system that would - would produce a red flag, "This is something new. This is something we should consider." It doesn't mean it has to happen, but it's a consideration to act upon it.
Q. And acknowledging that you have indicated that the system is in its infancy --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and that also you're not necessarily au fait with all of the intricacies of the system?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Would you expect that a system of that type might have some impact in a positive sense on the likelihood that difficulties of the type that his Honour has been taken through by Senior Counsel Assisting today might arise in the future?
A. Yes, we hope so, yes.
Q. Why do you say that?

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Could I interrupt and ask, is it software which is currently available or has it been - has the functionality been written, the algorithm been written, or is it existing software which will be adjusted? Do you have any idea?
A. I think its functionality is being --
Q. But is it a new piece of software or is it simply adapting the current system to new demands?
A. No, it's new software.
Q. New software?
A. Yes.
Q. And has it been rolled out?
A. No, it hasn't. We're still collecting that data.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right, go on. Yes,
Mr Mykkeltvedt.
THE WITNESS: There are certain phases to it,
Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I understand about software and I understand about rolling it out. Anyway, thank you.

Yes, you go on.
MR MYKKELTVEDT: Q. And you yourself aren't responsible for overseeing that process?
A. No, no.
Q. You were asked a number of questions in relation to the triage forms that have not been completed --
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. -- and your responsibilities and workload.
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that since 2019 you have been the officer in charge of the investigation into the death of William Tyrrell?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Can I ask you to explain to the Inquiry what the kinds of demands on your time have been in connection with that matter?
A. Since January 2019 I assumed control as the Investigation Supervisor of Strike Force Rosann, whereby --

THE COMMISSIONER: Can you just stop for a moment.
Are you certain you want to air this, Mr Mykkeltvedt, frankly, given the current environment?

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes, Commissioner. I would ask him not to go into the specific details - for example, the investigative steps. Certainly the information that I anticipate that he is going to give is well and truly in the public domain.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, if I may say so, it's at the risk of your client in the current environment, which I am vaguely aware of, but you take the course you want to take.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes.
Q. I simply want to ask, has that been an investigation that has taken a lot of your time?
A. A significant amount of my time.
Q. And you have also been engaged in an investigation into the Luna Park Ghost Train since 2021; is that right?
A. The coronial review in relation to that matter.
Q. And was that investigation or review conducted in response to a specific request by the State Coroner?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Can you provide some information to the Commission in relation to the demands on your time that were associated with that investigation?
A. It was not as significant as the other matter.

However, there was - there have been occasions where it has taken up quite a deal of my time to ensure matters are before her Honour so she can make a decision as to matters that may arise for any other inquest to be held.
Q. You have given some evidence in relation to the fact that you have not completed a review of the 19 triage forms that have been, effectively, sitting on your desk?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Is there any reason you have not, for example, back-filled to have someone else conduct those reviews for you?
A. No, there's no reason - there's no reason I can give. The fact that it's my job, that I should be doing it and I haven't had the time to do it. The other members of the review team are engaged in the triages and the review process.
Q. In your observation, are the members of those teams all busy or not?
A. Yes, extremely busy.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Nothing further, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Anything arising?
MR EMMETT: Nothing arising, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Mr Laidlaw, thank you very much for your assistance over the last few days.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: I will adjourn to a time and place next week. I won't say what it is now; I'm not quite sure about arrangements. I will adjourn. Thank you.

AT 3.32PM THE SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY

| \# | 1,800 [1] - 5181:38 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,827 [1] - 5166:42 |
| \#55 [1] - 5187:45 | 1.50am [1] - 5174:34 |
| \#56 [1] - 5163:38 | 10 [24]-5165:44, |
| \#57 [1] - 5165:31 | 5167:30, 5169:12, |
|  | 5172:8, 5172:14, |
| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5172: 40,5173: 40 \\ & 5174: 11,5174: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| \$20 [1] - 5172:43 | 5174:32, 5177:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 50[2]-5167: 44, \\ & 5183: 31 \end{aligned}$ | $5179: 23,5179: 45$,$5183: 32,5183: 35$, |
|  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 5186: 5,5186: 13, \\ & 5187: 7,5198: 19 \\ & 5198: 24,5198: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 'cause }[3]-5175: 6, \\ 5175: 9,5184: 30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5198: 28,5198: 34, \\ & 5214: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  | 10.00am [1] - 5162:21 |
| 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10/12/1980" } \\ & 5214: 41 \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| 00 [1] - 5216:35 | 100 [1] - 5168:23 |
| 0001 [1] - 5217:19 | 107[1] - 5182:36 |
| 0002 [1] - 5225:28 | 109 [1] - 5245:27 |
| 0003 [1] - 5240:43 | 10th [1] - 5186:11 |
| 0004[1] - 5212:29 | 11 [31]-5166:1, |
| $\begin{gathered} 0005[5]-5222: 32 \\ 5222: 35,5222: 37 \\ 5222: 40,5238: 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5168: 43,5169: 9 \\ & 5169: 21,5171: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5171:29, 5171:33, } \\ & \text { 5171:35, 5171:47, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0006 [1] - 5241:28 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0007 \text { [2] - 5213:27, } \\ & 5240: 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5172: 8,5172: 24, \\ & 5172: 30,5172: 40 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0008[3]-5214: 34, \\ & 5234: 47,5242: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5172: 41,5174: 11, \\ & 5174: 23,5175: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| 0009 [1] - 5240:5 | 5176:6, 5176:42, |
| 0010 [1] - 5239:18 | 5177:4, 5180:36, |
| $\begin{gathered} 0011[3]-5229: 35 \\ 5231: 6,5242: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5181: 36,5181: 40, \\ & 5182: 21,5182: 34 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0012[2]-5237: 38, \\ & 5242: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5186: 4,5186: 6 \\ & 5186: 13,5187: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0016[2]-5223: 33, \\ & 5227: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 5212:3 |
|  | 11.30pm [1]-5169:12 |
| 0017 [5]-5213:25, | 114 [1]-5184:39 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5213: 29,5215: 17 \\ & 5220: 10,5228: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 119 [1] - 5181:8 |
|  | 11am [1] - 5176:41 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0018[3]-5218: 8, \\ & 5220: 46,5233: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12[10]-5172: 4, \\ & 5176: 25,5177: 45, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0019[2]-5212: 40, \\ & 5216: 30 \end{aligned}$ | 5189:42, 5190:7, <br> 5190:19, 5190:25, |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0020[2]-5215: 47, \\ & 5233: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 5190:19, 5190:25, 5190:35, 5191:9, |
|  | 5191:38 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0064 \text { [2] - 5235:36, } \\ & 5237: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 12.02pm [1] - 5187:36 |
|  | 12.30pm [1] - 5171:35 |
| 1 | 121 [1]-5162:18 |
|  | 122[1]-5179:4 |
|  | 123 [1] - 5168:9 |
| 1 [9]-5169:27, | 125 [1] - 5195:39 |
| 5177:14, 5186:41, | 129[1] - 5168:9 |
| 5214:19, 5225:46, | 13 [4]-5171:37, |
| 5236:4, 5236:13, | 5172:7, 5172:36, |
| 5236:15, 5250:41 | 5183:40 |
| 1,500 [1] - 5166:29 | 14[7]-5163:13, |

5163:39, 5170:11, 5174:44, 5180:35, 5180:36, 5213:25
15 [2]-5174:15, 5182:36
15-year-old [1] 5170:11
150 [1] - 5172:10
16 [3] - 5230:20, 5230:25, 5230:34
169 [1]-5172:10
17 [2]-5213:27, 5245:36
18 [1] - 5212:38
19 [17]-5189:41, 5190:10, 5190:20, 5190:25, 5190:32, 5190:33, 5190:35, 5191:4, 5191:23, 5191:32, 5191:37, 5212:38, 5222:41, 5223:30, 5253:46
1969 [1] - 5164:33
1970[3]-5195:11, 5195:21, 5249:22
1970s [2]-5210:26, 5211:10
1976[1]-5241:45
1978 [1] - 5164:42
1980 [2] - 5200:21, 5220:31
1980s [2]-5210:27, 5211:10
1981 [2] - 5220:26, 5222:1
1983 [2] - 5200:45, 5202:41
1991 [1]-5223:30
1992 [39] - 5165:12, 5165:44, 5166:1, 5166:10, 5166:20, 5167:30, 5169:10, 5169:21, 5171:25, 5171:29, 5171:41, 5172:2, 5172:4, 5173:35, 5173:38, 5174:11, 5174:39, 5174:44, 5175:35, 5176:35, 5177:9, 5177:14, 5177:42, 5177:45, 5178:5, 5178:25, 5179:23, 5179:45, 5180:10, 5181:12, 5181:13, 5181:40, 5182:21, 5183:40, 5186:40, 5186:41, 5187:5, 5187:7, 5209:22
1993 [1]-5228:11
1997 [2] - 5231:3,

5233:5
1pm [2] - 5167:30, 5180:27
1st [1] - 5226:4

| 2 |
| :---: |
| 2 |

2 [6]-5162:18,
5211:43, 5223:37,
5224:5, 5224:28,
5231:3
2.17am [1] - 5171:7

20 [12]-5168:23,
5169:24, 5203:28, 5208:32, 5208:37, 5215:47, 5216:23, 5222:41, 5222:43, 5222:45, 5222:47, 5233:5
200 [1] - 5203:32
2000 [1] - 5207:19
2003 [2]-5207:19, 5207:26
2004 [14]-5196:31,
5196:43, 5197:14, 5197:23, 5207:8, 5207:14, 5210:5, 5210:9, 5212:35, 5231:10, 5233:18, 5234:13, 5238:7, 5242:37
2005 [10]-5207:26, 5214:12, 5217:5, 5223:37, 5224:5, 5226:14, 5226:23, 5226:42, 5227:25, 5227:30
2006 [1] - 5233:47
2007 [4]-5224:17, 5225:46, 5226:14, 5227:2
2008 [16] - 5196:32, 5207:8, 5207:14, 5210:9, 5216:27, 5217:10, 5218:1, 5218:16, 5218:28, 5223:22, 5240:1, 5240:2, 5240:9, 5240:10, 5242:37 2008/2009 [1] 5218:41
2009 [3]-5195:21, 5195:45, 5240:10 2010 [7]-5194:47, 5195:6, 5195:7, 5195:11, 5195:15, 5195:45, 5249:22
2013 [1] - 5207:30
2014 [6]-5194:41,
5195:7, 5195:15,

5195:30, 5195:44, 5228:42
2016 [2]-5188:2, 5245:37
2017 [4]-5196:43, 5197:14, 5197:23, 5212:35
2018 [12]-5190:22, 5194:40, 5196:33, 5203:5, 5207:42, 5229:27, 5229:30, 5229:31, 5237:18, 5239:40, 5239:41, 5239:45
2019 [9]-5192:24, 5192:25, 5230:20, 5230:25, 5230:34, 5235:1, 5235:4, 5252:43, 5253:4
2021 [3]-5181:36, 5235:37, 5253:29
2022 [1]-5162:7
2023 [9]-5162:21, 5163:26, 5166:28, 5166:41, 5169:18, 5179:4, 5181:14, 5181:19, 5205:46 21 [5]-5166:41, 5179:4, 5181:39, 5212:8, 5231:10
213[1]-5195:39
22[3]-5171:41, 5200:21, 5209:22
23 [1] - $5228: 11$
25[1]-5175:35
26[4]-5223:25, 5227:6, 5227:9, 5241:45
27 [1] - 5224:46
28 [1] - 5179:27
29 [6]-5166:10, 5171:25, 5186:40, 5187:5, 5226:45, 5228:6
2am [7]-5169:21, 5170:13, 5171:33, 5172:41, 5174:18, 5186:4, 5186:6
2pm [1]-5180:27

## 3

3 [8]-5166:20, 5169:30, 5176:35, 5178:4, 5178:39, 5178:45, 5186:25, 5224:28
3.30am [1] - 5172:33
3.32PM [1] - 5254:31
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