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THE COMMISSIONER: Detective, can you come back into the witness box, thank you very much. You are on your former oath from yesterday.
<STEWART JOHN LEGGAT, on former oath: [11.32am]
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Mykkeltveldt, what is likely to happen is, at some point, we will review the materials that have come before us and some of it we may wish to make public.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: We will do so after consultation with you and those instructing you. In other words, it won't be unilateral on our part and if there is any need to hear from you, we will.

For example, and just as an example, the cover sheet to the document which I have presently marked a confidential exhibit - I'm speculating because I haven't thought about it carefully - there are a number of assertions in there which I would have thought would be not the subject of confidentiality, but I'm not going to make any decision about that, and you can work on the basis that we will give your side ample opportunity to have a view about it and, if needs be, address me on it.

Likewise, some of the evidence given yesterday might we might think is relevant for public consumption. What I mean by that is not reproducing the transcript at length but perhaps snippets of it where helpful material has been presented by the witness. But again, we would take on board any views you might have to the contrary before we came to any view about that. But it did seem to me yesterday some of the materials I have presently marked confidential will remain so for the time being. We have made a list of them and you will have as well. But I think it would be helpful, in whichever break we have, even to have an exchange so there is absolutely no doubt about what I have said in the transcript and what we all understand should remain confidential.

Forecasting ahead a little, subject to any further documentation which we expect perhaps to get from your side, it may well be that, subject to his convenience, either Detective Chief Inspector Leggat, or whoever it
might then be relevant, would come back. And again, for the time being at least, until we can say otherwise, we deal with all of this in confidence because $I$ am extremely concerned, as I have to be, not to interfere with any ongoing operational matters and in this sort of circumstance one obviously doesn't know from day to day sometimes what may happen.

So, having said that, we will proceed today and then we will no doubt see each other in the near future, perhaps in the next few weeks. But again, it will be a time that's suitable for everybody.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes, your Honour.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Yes, Mr Gray?
<EXAMINATION BY MR GRAY CONTINUING:
MR GRAY: Q. Detective, again, if I may, just to recap a couple of things that we touched on yesterday. The first one is the case of Keam.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. We looked at this yesterday afternoon and you told us something about how the matter came to be reinvigorated because the officer at the station approached you and asked you to have another look at it. Do you remember that? A. That's correct, sir, yes.
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MR GRAY: $Q$. Thank you. At a general level, can I ask you this across the board: we have these case summaries that we are halfway going through in respect of the 23 and the seven, from Parrabel1?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is it possible for your team to provide the Commission with comparable documents in the form of or something like a case summary 1 ist for the 477 ?
A. We have discussed that and it's going to be a time-consuming task. Whether the 477 are relevant to the Commission or not --
Q. Quite so. They won't all be, no doubt.
A. Probably very few of them would be.

MR GRAY: I will stop you there for a moment, detective. I think Mr Mykkeltveldt can assist.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: If it assists, your Honour, I can provide an update in relation to the 477 , as it were. In fact, it will be more like the entire contents of the tracking file, so it might be more than 477. But $I$ can indicate that
three officers of the Unsolved Homicide Team have been allocated to that task and a great deal of work is being undertaken. It is difficult to say exactly how long it will take but certainly we are aiming for that to occur perhaps by next week some time.

We are in your Honour's hands as to whether that process could occur in tranches or whether it is best for it to occur in one lot. I must say from our perspective it would be, I think, prudent for it to occur in one lot so that we can organise all of the material appropriately.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm happy to work on the basis that even if you have a couple of weeks, two or three weeks, I would much prefer to give you a bit of extra time now so that you are comfortable, and the three officers can do other things if the time permits them to do it.

So we can talk about that before close of play today, but I wouldn't expect it under two weeks, and I'm happy to make it three. If we can get it in between two and three weeks, that would be helpful.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: I'm sure that can occur, your Honour.
THE COMMISSIONER: Then let's do it. I think it would be better to get it in one go, for any number of reasons, first of all to make the drafting uniform. I'm happy to talk about that, but if your side works on the basis of two or three weeks, it would be very helpful, and I thank you, each and every one of you in advance. It will help us enormously and help us enormously in culling those cases that we need not trouble about, and then when we do have Detective Chief Inspector Leggat, or whoever it may be, back, we can be very narrow in the scope of the questions we ask so it will help us all in the end, thank you.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Thank you. The other thing I might update your Honour on in relation to was your Honour's query in respect of the particular cases that are under investigation at the moment.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, the 10 and the 10 , roughly.
MR MYKKELTVEDT: It turns out that the 10 and the 10 are more like 35 , but we will provide a list of those cases today.

THE COMMISSIONER: And if we get a list of those, that's the first thing. Secondly, we can look at the tracking document to get at least some information or a lot of information, presumably, about the 35.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: They will be included in the document we're discussing going forward. What we'11 get perhaps going forward might be even slightly less information than is currently in the tracking document, but it will be helpful for us to get an early warning on the 35 that are currently under investigation so that again we can narrow the scope of any further questions we might have for Detective Leggat or anybody else.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes, your Honour. We will pass those on today.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's very good. Thank you so much.

```
Yes, Mr Gray?
```

MR GRAY: Thank you, Detective Leggat and to my learned friend.
Q. Now, just as I asked you about the Keam matter, may I take a moment to ask you about the Johnson matter, Scott Johnson. We know that ultimately, after 2013, that matter was reinvestigated?
A. That's correct.
Q. And ultimately progress and/or breakthroughs were made there, ultimately leading to the arrest of a person. Are you able to tell us at the level of the investigative method how it was that the reinvestigation, 25 years after the event, was able to make the progress that it did? A. My understanding - and I'm not familiar with the case itself - is that the partner of Scott White or Scott Newman came forward with information some 30 years after the event.
Q. But prompted by anything done by the police or --
A. I'm not sure. Whether it was a reward announcement or why it has occurred, I'm not sure.
Q. I see. Just remind me of this, was it the Unsolved Homicide Team that did that work?
A. The Unsolved Homicide Team - and I wasn't part of this, it was under my predecessor - had Strike Force Macnamir that had investigated issues related to the Scott Johnson matter for the coroner, for the State Coroner. So that was a fairly detailed investigation. I believe that Scott White, or as he was, Scott Newman, his brother came up in that investigation, Shane Newman. But other than that, I'm not overly familiar with the case itself. I know it was undertaken by Detective Chief Inspector Yeomans from the sex crimes unit.
Q. Rather than the Homicide Squad?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. And not the Unsolved Homicide Unit?
A. Not the - as I said, we undertook the coronial
investigation, but it was undertaken by sex crimes.
Q. And was there a reason why that was done rather than your unit;
A. Look, I can't provide you with an answer in regard to that. I wasn't privy to the decision-making for that. I think it was prior to my starting that Macnamir started.
Q. That's certainly true. Macnamir started before 2017. But Macnamir led up to the third inquest?
A. Led up to the inquest.
Q. And the inquest returned the different finding, namely, that the death was caused by actual or threatened violence.
A. That's correct, sir.
Q. And after that there was then the investigation under Detective Yeomans?
A. That's correct.
Q. Which was not, I don't think, part of Macnamir?
A. No, definitely not.
Q. Thirdly, we were provided yesterday, as you know, with the tracking file electronically, and that will undoubtedly be very helpful and we are grateful to have that.
Overnight - and this is far from comprehensive - people on our team simply plugged in the word "gay" and the word
"homosexual" to see what was produced from the tracking file, and three - on one view, four, but certainly three names came up where there is a reference to possible homosexual hate crime and comparable expressions. That would indicate, I presume, that plugging in such terms and/or other terms is likely to throw up simply from the electronic entry level inquiry some of the information that we are hoping to find?
A. It could. If you filter it for particular words, it may bring up those words if they're incorporated in the file itself.
Q. I'11 just mention these three to see whether you happen to know anything about them. One is a victim called Barry Richard Jones who died in September 1976.
A. I'm not familiar with that matter, sir.
Q. In the tracking file it is recorded as "possible homosexual related hate crime". That would indicate, I presume, that somebody in your unit in the course of a triage or review has made that note?
A. It'd be in the narrative for the matter itself, so yes, that would be right, sir.
Q. And then a second one is Peter Kar1 Baumann, who died 27 October 1983, and the tracking file contains this notation:

May be gay hate related. The word "AIDS" was written on a mirror at the crime scene.

Again, presumably written by someone in your unit in the course of review. Is that one that rings a bell for you? A. No, sir, it's not.
Q. Is there, so far as you know on your watch - that is, since 2017 - a practice or a recommended way of proceeding that someone should note such a possibility if they come to the view that the possibility exists?
A. It would be incorporated in the narrative for the matter itself, so - and if the fact that the victim was gay was a factor, that will be incorporated either on the tracking file, on the triage document, or in a review document.
Q. So that's since 2017. And what about, so far as you know, prior to 2017 within your - within the Unsolved

Homicide Team?
A. The tracking file's been in existence for quite some time so I should imagine that, yes, sir.
Q. The fourth one is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, Mr Gray, I only remember two.
MR GRAY: Sorry, the third one. Yes, I've done my maths wrongly.
Q. The third one that I want to mention is Stephen Seymour whose death occurred on 16 April 1994. In this case, what was thrown up on the tracking file was this:

The suspect for the murder, David Jabour, is also a suspect for the murder of Crispen Dye.

Now, Crispen Dye is one of those -A. One of the matters here.
Q. -- on the list, probably homosexual, it seems, from what information is available. So is this matter, the matter of Seymour with the same suspect as applies to Dye, something that has come across your radar?
A. No, sir, it hasn't. No, it hasn't.
Q. Then there is a fourth one, not quite in the same context. This one was thrown up - this is just random examples from overnight that I'm putting to you for your comment - not so much by the tracking file search but by a search of the reward page.
A. Right.
Q. In the case of Stephen Neville Jelfs, the reward page notes, "Mr Jelfs was a member of the gay community." Now, is that the kind of thing that the reward page is likely to have in other cases?
A. It may have. Look, I'm not overly familiar on who words the rewards themselves, so --
Q. Not your unit?
A. It's not my unit, no. We provide information which will enable them to create the reward and put the announcement up on line or do the media release for the reward, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. In the event that someone's lucky enough to be able to claim the reward, where does it come from, New South Wales Treasury or --
A. Yes, sir, it comes from the government.

MR GRAY: Q. In the case of Mr Jelfs, the other tidbit is that the tracking file contains this note, "Believe that Mr Jelfs met with foul play due to his lifestyle". When one cross-references that to the reward page referring to the gay community, one can put two and two together. So it may be that "lifestyle" is another term that has a usage in the team's work? Is that something that --
A. It may have.
Q. You're not sure?
A. Look, I'm not creating the wording on the document. It'd be up to the individual. So I don't know the exact wording that they may use. But there's also Bernd Lehmann. Did you come across that one on the tracking file?
Q. Not that I've so far been told.
A. 2008 murder of Bernd Lehmann in Alt Street at Burwood or Croydon, murdered by Naji Fakhreddine. We charged him last year with murder. It's before the Local Court at the moment and will go before the Supreme Court. That is a gay related murder.
Q. How did that become apparent?


Q. Thank you. I was going to ask you, but I think from something that my learned friend said this morning, I may not need to. The number of cases under investigation, I think we just heard is 35 ; is that right?
A. Roughly 35. And there's a number that have been finalised as well that - where the accused has been convicted. So I don't know whether they're relevant for you --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. They're relevant in the sense that we simply would like to know and get a handle on the precise numbers. So any information at all, even if they are matters which were previously on the list and now you regard as finalised - because "finalised", I take it, in your mind could mean deceased suspect, trial, conviction, but I suppose it could also mean deceased suspect, trial, acquittal, or no-bill.
A. Yes, sir, no-bill.
Q. Because if there's no other person reasonably suspected as having committed the crime, but for whatever reason the accused gets off or the DPP takes the view that on that particular charge there's insufficient evidence, you would still regard that as a "solved", or whatever it is --
A. Our term is "unresolved", but yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see. Yes, thank you.
MR GRAY: Q. I will go back to the case summaries that we were going through yesterday.
A. Yes, sir.


Q. And then what is the likely timeline from today onwards?
A. Without knowing the extent of the original investigation, how many archive boxes, how much material they have to go through, I can't give you a time frame, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. This is not - or is it - one of the 10 roughly that are under current consideration?
A. Under current review, and then they will go before the quality assessment process.

MR GRAY: Q. But not one of the 35 that are actually under investigation?
A. No, they are not - no, it's not one 35 , sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q . \quad Y o u$ used the term "reviewed" - it is being looked at again but it is not in the same category as the others?
A. No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GRAY: $Q$. Then the next one that $I$ need to ask you about briefly is Mr William Dutfield?
A. I actually went to this job back in 1991. Mr Dutfield was murdered with a sticky tape dispenser, bludgeoned to death. The suspect in the matter, they had a suspect in mind who was involved in the attacks on gay males, but it turned out he was in custody at the time of the offence.

We reinvestigated - or in 2008 Strike Force Hamish was formed to reinvestigate the matter, and some forensic 1 inks put through to Mr Ashworth, Arthur Ashworth, who was 76 at the time. He lived in a retirement village down in Mosman,

I think it is called The Manors. He lived down there. Mr Dutfield was living in the unit that was owned by Mr Ashworth. And on the night that the murder occurred they had been out to dinner, there was evidence of two glasses at the scene. The sticky tape dispenser, a fingerprint from Mr Ashworth was identified down the track, and I believe they got a fingerprint from a passport that Mr Ashworth had that was provided by a relative.

It's more a domestic murder than a gay hate crime. And there is a post-operational assessment that I have included or provided to you, sir, that outlines what investigation was undertaken and how they came to the conclusion that it was most probably Mr Dutfield - sorry, Mr Ashworth.
Q. Mr Ashworth. I see. Mr Ashworth is long deceased?
A. Yes, sorry, he is deceased. He was 76 at the time.
Q. So that's one where, as best as you can tell, there is really nothing more to be done?
A. Yes, sir, and it appears to be a domestic related murder - a domestic related homicide, I apologise.
Q. The next one is Robert Malcolm - not one of the 23 but one of the seven?
A. Yes. It's not on Strike Force Palace, which is the e@gle.i reference for intelligence, but it is on our tracking file. There was a suspect in this matter, and I'm just --
Q. Two suspects, apparently?
A. Two suspects. Phillips, Hookey, and I think a third by the name of Green. We were unable to locate anything on COPS. But it appear that it may be an unresolved matter in that the - they didn't proceed with the offences.
Q. I see they were both found not guilty, charged but found not guilty?
A. It was a discharge, via a judicial direction.
Q. Do you know on what basis, insufficient evidence or -A. No, I don't, sir. I don't.
Q. Strike Force Parrabell apparently concluded that there was no evidence of a bias crime, even though his pants and underwear were found around his ankles. Does the Unsolved

Homicide Unit have a view about that?
A. Without - look, if I reviewed the brief I'd be able to provide you with hopefully a little bit more of an informed view with regard to what has occurred, but just off what Parrabell said, no.
Q. The next one is Brian Walker, which again is not one of the 23 but one of the seven?
A. There was a suspect for that one, a John Raymond Hokin. The DPP decided not to proceed with the matter. It says "Manslaughter". I have a charge reference. It was discharged on 1 October 1992.
Q. Again, it does seem slightly surprising, given the narrative, references to Mr Walker talking in a sexual manner and the suspect saying that he was frightened by gay men, and so on, that Parrabell concluded there was no evidence of a bias crime. But again, is that one that you are able to comment on?
A. No, sir, no, it's not.
Q. All right, then. Cyril 01sen is one of the 23. He is the man whose body was found floating face down in Rushcutters Bay. What can you tell us about that one, in terms of the present position?
A. Well, it says - it's on the tracking file. It was reviewed back in 2005. Under the process that we have adopted, we've sent that matter out to a region, which is an area of policing, for it to be re-reviewed. It hasn't returned yet. So we're just waiting for that to return.
Q. So the review has been, as it were, outsourced again?
A. That was one of the ones that was outsourced, yes, sir.
Q. What's the Central Metropolitan Region geographically?
A. Central Metropolitan is the city area, so the Sydney City LAC, The Rocks, Surry Hills, Eastern Beaches, Eastern Suburbs, Mascot. It's that central area and the eastern suburbs - southern suburbs.
Q. So does that effectively mean that it has been reviewed by detectives from the same station as would have investigated it in the first place?
A. What we are doing is we're pulling them back because they've taken - some of these have taken too long to be reviewed, so we've requested them to be returned and
they're going to be allocated to someone from the Unsolved Homicide Team.
Q. So this is one that is going to be brought back from the Central Metropolitan Region?
A. Yes, that's right. Yes, it is.
Q. That's what is referred to as a backlog issue?
A. It is the backlog issue, yes, sir.
Q. In your note on this one there is a reference to the original officer in charge, Constable Byrnes. Is he, Constable Byrnes, still part of the Central Metropolitan Region?
A. I don't think so. It dates back to 1992. Whether he's still in the police or not, I don't know. I would have to review the review document or the file itself.
Q. The next one is Crispen Dye, which I referred to earlier, referred to your team by the coroner and still classified as unsolved.
A. That's right.
Q. I see a second review is currently - that means as of right now - being undertaken?
A. Again, it's with the Central Metropolitan Region.

It's one of those matters that we are pulling back to have reviewed by someone from our team.
Q. So it was reviewed - I'm just reading from your document - in 2005.
A. That's right.
Q. And the second review was to have occurred in or after 2020, but it hasn't happened yet?
A. It hasn't happened yet, sir, no.
Q. And the second review, the idea of doing it, came from the process that you described yesterday under your watch, whereby, in effect, everything was going to be reviewed again?
A. That's the thought process, yes.
Q. Then James William Meek?
A. Yes, sir, this is an unresolved as opposed to unsolved matter. This one was by judicial direction. There was an accused in the matter charged with murder but by direction
it didn't proceed.
Q. Just bear with me one second. If you know the answer to this, is this one where there were fingerprints or other evidence of that kind?
A. I'm not sure on that, but it appears that the flatmate of the victim was the individual that was charged. He was said to be sleeping on the couch at the victim's home. But, look, I can't provide an answer in regard to fingerprints.
Q. It seems that he was struck with a ceramic bow1. One would think that there would be fingerprints on that item ordinarily, but you don't know?
A. I don't know, sir.
Q. And this one, should we understand, has never been reviewed?
A. It appears that that's the case, that it hasn't been reviewed. It says "Not yet reviewed", so --
Q. And is it going to be reviewed?
A. Ultimately when the undetected matters are finalised, we'11 move on to the unresolved, which are the matters where double jeopardy may come into play, and we will have a look at those. But we need fresh and compeling evidence for - actually, he hasn't been dealt with by - we would need fresh and compelling evidence for this one.
Q. It would have been --
A. We would need that for this one.
Q. Then Kenneth Brennan?
A. Yes, Strike Force Skaratt was commenced by the Unsolved Homicide Team to look at Mr Brennan's murder. It was quite a vicious murder. His partner was probably the last person to see him alive other than the killer. They had been involved in a liaison with another male who provides an alibi for Mr Brennan's partner.

We've just got a few more things we'd like to do with the forensics with this one because there were - my understanding - multiple profiles developed at the scene. So we just want to have a look at that again but there is a post-operational assessment that $I$ have included or provided to you, sir, that outlines what was done with the investigation to date.
Q. Again, as with one we talked about a few minutes ago, the review is well advanced but we're not at the point where there is a reinvestigation?
A. There was a reinvestigation so it was reinvestigated, yes. It was actually one of the jobs that was reinvestigated. Whether that was prior to my arrival, it was on the other side of the floor, teams 7 and 8 were looking at this matter.
Q. I see. So it was reviewed and that did lead to a reinvestigation, but now there is a further review? A. There's a forensic review, just with the development with the improvements in forensic technology, we like to just have a look at things and present them back to Dr Bruce out at FASS to see what can be done.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Does that mean in this case that the murder weapon is still available as an exhibit? It doesn't say so.
A. It's more forensic samples that have been located at the scene, underpants and the like.
Q. But the question I have asked you is, the man was stabbed to death. Does your note - it may not disclose it, but is this one of the cases where the exhibits are intact as far as you know, or --
A. I'm not sure whether the murder weapon for this one is available. But that might be incorporated in the post-operational assessment. As I said, this wasn't a matter that my side of the floor, my teams, were investigating.

MR GRAY: Q. Now, Scott Stuart Miller. Are?
A. My understanding is that this gentleman went to the Mardi Gras back in 1997. It was - a review's been conducted in 2004 and it's been investigated on three separate occasions by The Rocks, Strike Force Corone and Strike Force Lincoln. The matter has recently been triaged again by us and it's awaiting a comprehensive review.
Q. So when it says it has been investigated on three separate occasions is that within the Unsolved Homicide Team's work or by some other means?
A. Well, The Rocks would be The Rocks just down here in George Street, the police station, when that was a separate command. Strike Force Corone and Strike Force Lincoln -

I'm not familiar with the two strike forces, so it may be that they were undertaken by The Rocks or alternatively by homicide or the Unsolved Homicide Team.
Q. But if they had been done by Unsolved Homicide Team that would be clear from your records, wouldn't it?
A. Not necessarily, if the matter wasn't resolved, if we didn't - because the matters continually remain open, so if we don't get a result, as I said, they remain open.
Q. Sure. But you're not able to tell whether - I don't mean sitting here in the witness box but generally - Strike Force Corone or Strike Force Lincoln were Unsolved Homicide Team exercises?
A. Not off the top of my head but I'm sure that if we went on to our eegle.i, which is the major crime management system, I'd be able to tell you who the units were that were in charge of those two strike forces.
Q. If it wasn't the Unsolved Homicide Team, how does it come about that a strike force would be set up, in the era of your team being in existence, to reinvestigate an unsolved homicide that wasn't you doing it?
A. Well, it could be that the reinvestigation has just been initiated by the police station itself, because they've got a matter that they needed to have another look at.
Q. Would that mean that they still had the files, that the files hadn't come to you?
A. The files would be in archives unless we request the files for review.
Q. But it says the matter was referred to the Unsolved Homicide Team by the coroner?
A. That's correct.
Q. Wouldn't that mean the files would come to you?
A. No. What it means is that we would leave a letter from the State Coroner or the Deputy State Coroner indicating that the matter has been referred to us and then, in due course, the matter would be triaged and reviewed. But we don't do - we don't get all the boxes for all the various matters. They remain in archives until we are ready to do the review or undertake a reinvestigation in regard to the matter.
Q. So take me through that again, what you get in such a situation is what?
A. Some correspondence from the State Coroner or the Deputy State Coroner or the registrar from the Coroner's Court.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. The note says that apart from having attended the Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras, there was nothing in relation to Miller, but there doesn't seem to be any comment about Robinson or Henry or how they came to be suspects. Were they - seemingly because of things they said, but the note doesn't really disclose anything known about either of them. I take it what you have currently got in front of you wouldn't take it any further?
A. Look, no, your Honour, I couldn't take it any further.

MR GRAY: $Q$. The next one that I will mention is Carl Stockton?
A. This matter has been reviewed, sir. Mr Stockton didn't identify as homosexual. He was found in a - he was conscious, I think, from memory, but he was disorientated. It could have been the result of an accident, a serious assault or the like. We could never - well, the original investigators could never establish that. It was reviewed under the current process in 2018, so there is a comprehensive review that outlines the facts associated with this matter and the difficulty in identifying who may be responsible, if anyone is responsible at all.
Q. It is striking, just while we are on it, that he was living at Campbell House, apparently, and yet he had a Rolls-Royce. Does that ring a bell with you as to what was going on?
A. I think what they were able to say from that, sir, is that - I think his keys were missing but there was no indication that his unit or house or wherever he lived or his Rolls-Royce had been touched. But, yes, it is very unusual that someone living in a proclaimed place would have a Rolls-Royce.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. I take it when we look at the file we will see, will we, someone making some inquiries as to how he paid for the registration and other things on the Rolls-Royce? It may be an old model but old Rolls-Royces are no less expensive to keep on the road than --
A. Sir, what they would have looked at is the facts associated with what has happened to him. The Rolls-Royce,

I can't provide you with an answer as to whether they did research in regard to how he financed that. Whether the records would still be available from the financial institution in regard to how he financed it, I don't think so.

MR GRAY: Q. Then finally, I think, David Rose.
A. This matter has been recently reviewed. It has to go before our quality assurance panel. Mr Rose was a kind-hearted individual who took down and outs into his house and helped people in need, I guess, and the prime suspect to this matter was a female, who I think is by the name Durward. She's now deceased - I'll just double-check on that. But she is the prime suspect for the matter. And the reviewer has made a number of recommendations. There may be another fellow by the name of David John Thwaites, who was an associate of Durward, who may be able to provide us some information. Whether it is sufficient to proceed against anyone, particularly if the suspect is now deceased, is difficult to say.
Q. I see one of the recommendations is DNA testing should be considered?
A. Without knowing the nature of the exhibits, that is a possibility. That's something that will come up before the panel. So he's recommending the examination of a number of exhibits. And whether those exhibits exist or not --
Q. Well, it says:

Some exhibits were tested for the presence of blood, however no exhibits have been tested for DNA.
A. And that's the purpose of the review, to see what we can do forensically with a job, and this may be a job that we have a major crime review on - that's a review with crime scene, the forensic pathologist from FASS and other crime scene experts.
Q. Is it surprising or not surprising that no DNA testing was done back in 1999?
A. 1997 .
Q. Or 1997?
A. Look, I can't offer an explanation as to that, whether
the techniques used back in those days were as sensitive as they are now, whether the items were tested, I don't know. But again, that's going to be subject of the quality assurance process when we do it.

MR GRAY: Would your Honour just pardon me one second?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GRAY: They are the only questions that I have for the detective at this stage.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I don't have any further questions, detective. Can I just thank you very much, and those with you, for your assistance to date.

Mr Mykkeltveldt, could we have the document, say, within two weeks. If you strike any problems - you ventured a week, I'm giving you a bit more than that. If you do strike any problems, please let Mr Herrington or anybody else in the team know so that we can work out how best to do with it.

I suspect what we will do today or tomorrow is craft a letter which might cover some of the things you have proffered. It might go a bit further, and it might suggest some search terms for some of the items. We can obviously do some of the searching ourselves. I will take on board whether we can do it or whether we would like you to do it. There is no point both of us doing it if I can do it, but I will think about those things and we will be in communication by no later than end of play tomorrow.

MR MYKKELTVEDT: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Detective, can I just excuse you for the moment. I won't excuse you indefinitely, only because we may want you back, but if for some reason you are not available, just keep us informed.

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honour.
THE COMMISSIONER: We will no doubt find somebody else who can -THE WITNESS: I retire on 21 July.

THE COMMISSIONER: That means you are going to have all the time in the world to come back in. I dare say the last thing in the world you may want to do is sit there. All right, we will keep that in mind and if we do need you again, we will keep in mind 21 July.

After 21 July, apart from joy and happiness, perhaps, are you going to be, at the moment, planning to be in the Sydney area or --

THE WITNESS: Up the coast a little bit, sir. But, look, if required, I am happy to --

THE COMMISSIONER: We will try not to worry you in retirement but we will keep 21 July in mind.

THE WITNESS: Thank you your Honour.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you all very much. We will send a letter tomorrow
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