

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO THE MANAGEMENT
OF POLICE INFORMANTS

Held in Melbourne, Victoria

On Monday, 1 April 2019

Led by Commissioner: The Honourable Margaret McMurdo AC

Also Present

Counsel Assisting: Mr C. Winneke QC
 Mr A. Woods
 Ms M. Tittensor
 Ms P. Neskovic QC
 Mr S. Mukerjea

Counsel for Victoria Police Mr S. Holt QC
 Ms R. Enbom
 Ms K. Argiropoulos
 Mr B. Murphy QC
 Mr M. McLay

Counsel for State of Victoria Dr C. Button SC
 Mr L. Brown

Counsel for Nicola Gobbo Mr P. Collinson QC
 Mr R. Nathwani

Counsel for DPP/SPP Mr C. Caleo QC
 Mr P. Doyle
 Ms K. O'Gorman

Counsel for Handlers Mr G. Chettle
 Ms L. Thies

10:05:03 1 COMMISSIONER: I understand there has been some delay in
10:05:05 2 publishing exhibits on the Royal Commission website and
10:05:09 3 that this has caused some concern, particularly to sections
10:05:13 4 of the media. This Royal Commission is committed to
10:05:21 5 holding, as much as possible, of the hearings in public and
10:05:24 6 to ensuring everything that can be made publicly available
10:05:27 7 will be made available. The delay is because in this case
10:05:36 8 great care must be taken in this Royal Commission because
10:05:39 9 unlike in most Royal Commissions there is a difficulty in
10:05:46 10 publishing documents because of public interest immunity
10:05:48 11 and informer immunity concerns which could impact on the
10:05:53 12 personal safety of individuals.

10:05:57 13
10:05:57 14 In future, the Commission expects all exhibits which are
10:06:06 15 tendered, if there is no objection at the time of
10:06:09 16 tendering, to be forwarded to the Royal Commission's
10:06:12 17 Director Media Communications by Deloittes, who are
10:06:16 18 managing the documents in this Royal Commission, for
10:06:18 19 publication on the website by the end of each day. Those
10:06:23 20 exhibits which have been tendered to date will be published
10:06:30 21 on the Commission's website within 24 hours.

10:06:35 22
10:06:35 23 Yes, Mr Winneke.

10:06:36 24
10:06:37 25 MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, the first witness this morning
10:06:39 26 is Mr Segrave and Ms Tittensor is going to be leading
10:06:45 27 evidence, or at least taking him through his evidence.

10:06:47 28
10:06:48 29 COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.

10:06:54 30
10:06:55 31 MR WINNEKE: In relation to - just excuse me.

10:07:05 32
10:07:06 33 (Discussion at Bar table.)

10:07:29 34
10:07:31 35 One of the names that will arise during the course of this
10:07:40 36 evidence may well need to be the subject of a
10:07:43 37 non-publication order and instead of the name, his actual
10:07:51 38 name being referred to. It's understood he will be
10:07:54 39 referred to by a pseudonym by the name of Kruger, is that
10:07:58 40 right? Can I mention his name?

10:08:02 41
10:08:02 42 MR HOLT: No. Commissioner, this is an issue we
10:08:04 43 communicated over the weekend and we're very grateful for
10:08:07 44 it. I apologise, I was under a misapprehension that the
10:08:11 45 order had in fact already been made and I don't have a
10:08:13 46 paper copy of the order immediately available.

10:08:19 47

10:08:20 1 COMMISSIONER: I was handed a copy of an order today. Can
10:08:23 2 I hand that down to counsel to see if - it's a bit cryptic,
10:08:29 3 but if that is suitable.
10:08:31 4
10:08:32 5 MR HOLT: Thank you.
10:08:37 6
10:08:37 7 COMMISSIONER: It may need to be amended. It's all a bit
10:08:40 8 hard to understand.
10:09:02 9
10:09:02 10 MR HOLT: That is the order, Commissioner, that's sought to
10:09:05 11 be made.
10:09:05 12
10:09:06 13 COMMISSIONER: Do you think that order's sufficient?
10:09:08 14
10:09:08 15 MR HOLT: We do.
10:09:09 16
10:09:09 17 COMMISSIONER: It's comprehensible?
10:09:11 18
10:09:11 19 MR HOLT: Yes. The critical issue is the non-naming of
10:09:14 20 that particular person as being a person present at the
10:09:16 21 Commission today, as opposed to being a person whose
10:09:21 22 historical future role is otherwise a concern. I'm sorry,
10:09:24 23 I'm being coy for obvious reasons. That's the primary
10:09:27 24 issue. The critical thing is that all those at the Bar
10:09:30 25 table are aware of who we're talking about.
10:09:33 26
10:09:34 27 COMMISSIONER: Sorry, did you want to see this order,
10:09:38 28 Mr Winneke?
10:09:39 29
10:09:39 30 MR WINNEKE: Yes, I wouldn't mind seeing it.
10:09:41 31
10:09:41 32 COMMISSIONER: Please. I didn't mean you not to be shown
10:09:45 33 it. If you're both happy I'll make that order.
10:09:48 34
10:09:48 35 MR WINNEKE: It's not clear to me whether everyone at the
10:09:52 36 Bar table knows.
10:09:52 37
10:09:53 38 COMMISSIONER: Perhaps it should be shown to everyone at
10:09:55 39 the Bar table so that they understand what's happening.
10:10:01 40
10:10:01 41 MR WINNEKE: The problem is the order doesn't say his
10:10:03 42 actual name so it's not clear to me whether the people at
10:10:07 43 the Bar table know who it is.
10:10:08 44
10:10:09 45 COMMISSIONER: Everyone at the Bar table knows the real
10:10:11 46 name of this person I understand.
10:10:15 47

10:10:15 1 MR HOLT: We've just been communicating that, Commissioner.
10:10:33 2 I'm just going to ensure the witness is told. I think he
10:10:38 3 knows but we'll just confirm that.

10:10:41 4
10:10:41 5 COMMISSIONER: Yes. The Commission orders that pursuant to
10:11:05 6 s.26 *Inquiries Act*: (a) the public streaming of the
10:11:09 7 evidence of the former police member who has sought this
10:11:11 8 order not include his real name, address, his current place
10:11:14 9 of employment, the location at which he was last stationed
10:11:17 10 or his image, and after being sworn in he be referred to
10:11:21 11 during his evidence by the pseudonym Kruger; (b)
10:11:25 12 publication is prohibited of any material that would
10:11:28 13 identify the former police member as being a witness in the
10:11:30 14 proceedings of the Royal Commission or any information that
10:11:32 15 would enable his identity as a witness to be ascertained.

10:11:36 16
10:11:36 17 2. The written submission provided to the Royal
10:11:40 18 Commission in seeking these orders be placed in a sealed
10:11:43 19 envelope marked "Confidential" and not be opened by anyone
10:11:48 20 other than the Commission staff without an order of the
10:11:49 21 Commission.

10:11:50 22
10:11:50 23 3. The name of the former police officer can be
10:11:52 24 accessed on request by accredited media from the solicitors
10:11:56 25 assisting the Royal Commission and otherwise on application
10:11:58 26 to the Commission.

10:11:59 27
10:12:00 28 4. A copy of this order be posted on the door of the
10:12:04 29 hearing room and the rooms into which the hearing is being
10:12:08 30 transmitted.

10:12:09 31
10:12:09 32 MR WINNEKE: Thank you, Commissioner.

10:12:11 33
10:12:11 34 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Ms Tittensor.

10:12:15 35
10:12:15 36 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, Your Honour. The first witness today
10:12:17 37 is Mr Gavan Segrave.

10:12:23 38
10:12:24 39 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Oath or affirmation,
10:12:51 40 Mr Segrave?---Oath please, Your Honour.

10:12:53 41
10:12:53 42 Yes, swear the witness, thank you.

10:12:55 43
10:12:57 44 <GAVAN SEGRAVE, sworn and examined:

10:13:11 45
10:13:12 46 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Argiropoulos.

10:13:15 47

10:13:15 1 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Thank you Commissioner. Mr Segrave, your
10:13:18 2 full name is Gavan Segrave?---Yes, it is.
10:13:21 3
10:13:21 4 You're currently employed by Victoria Police?---I am.
10:13:25 5
10:13:25 6 What is your rank and station?---Detective Inspector
10:13:29 7 attached to Northwest Metropolitan Region.
10:13:32 8
10:13:33 9 Thank you. Detective Inspector, you've made a statement to
10:13:39 10 this Royal Commission?---I have.
10:13:40 11
10:13:41 12 There's a document just in the witness box in front of you,
10:13:45 13 if you could just have a look at that. Do you recognise
10:13:48 14 that to be the statement that you made? It bears your
10:13:53 15 signature and is dated 22 March 2019?---Yes, that's
10:13:57 16 correct.
10:13:57 17
10:13:59 18 Are the contents of that statement true and correct?---Yes,
10:14:02 19 it is.
10:14:02 20
10:14:02 21 Commissioner, I tender the statement of Detective Inspector
10:14:05 22 Gavan Segrave.
10:14:07 23
10:14:07 24 COMMISSIONER: I think that's RC32.
10:14:09 25
10:14:10 26 #EXHIBIT RC32 - Statement of Gavan Segrave.
10:14:16 27
10:14:16 28 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Tittensor.
29
30 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MS TITTENSOR:
31
10:14:18 32 Mr Segrave, you came to make your statement on 22 March, it
10:14:23 33 was signed that day; is that right?---That's correct.
10:14:26 34
10:14:26 35 The first time you were spoken to by police in relation to
10:14:30 36 this matter was when investigators contacted you on 31
10:14:34 37 January this year?---I can't remember the exact date but it
10:14:37 38 would be around that time, yes.
10:14:38 39
10:14:39 40 Following being contacted by the police on that date how
10:14:43 41 was it that your statement came into existence?---I had a
10:14:52 42 number of meetings with lawyers from Corrs and the
10:15:02 43 statement was developed and signed.
10:15:03 44
10:15:03 45 Was it a statement that you drafted yourself or was it
10:15:06 46 something that was drafted for you?---It was drafted for me
10:15:09 47 as a result of conversations that I had with those people.

10:15:11 1 You note in your statement - have you got a copy of your
10:15:18 2 statement there?---Yes, I do.
10:15:20 3
10:15:20 4 I just want to ask you some questions about some of the
10:15:22 5 earlier matters you note. In paragraph 3(d) you indicate
10:15:26 6 that between December 1996 and March 1999 you were a
10:15:32 7 Sergeant at Richmond police station; is that right?---Yes.
10:15:35 8
10:15:36 9 Did you supervise DSG members that were stationed at
10:15:40 10 Richmond?---There weren't DSG members at Richmond.
10:15:47 11
10:15:47 12 There weren't. Did you have any association with someone
10:15:50 13 by the name of Tim Argall when you were at Richmond at
10:15:56 14 all?---Not that I recall.
10:15:59 15
10:15:59 16 Mr Ashton?---Are you able to provide me with his full name?
10:16:05 17
10:16:06 18 Trevor Ashton?---Not that I recall.
10:16:09 19
10:16:09 20 Jack Blayney?---No.
10:16:11 21
10:16:13 22 You know Jeffrey Pope?---Yes.
10:16:21 23
10:16:21 24 Did you know him before you went over to the Asset Recovery
10:16:24 25 Squad?---I may have known of him, I didn't work with him.
10:16:27 26
10:16:27 27 If I take you down a bit in your statement to paragraph
10:16:33 28 5(b). You indicate that you did some post-graduate studies
10:16:39 29 in fraud investigation at Latrobe University in
10:16:42 30 2000?---Yes.
10:16:42 31
10:16:43 32 Was that a night course or something of that nature?---I
10:16:46 33 think it was in part.
10:16:47 34
10:16:48 35 Can you tell us how long that course went for?---No, I
10:16:53 36 can't. It was a relatively significant period of time. I
10:16:58 37 think it may have actually been broken into components, but
10:17:02 38 again I'm not sure.
10:17:03 39
10:17:04 40 Can you tell us where that course was conducted, what
10:17:07 41 suburb or location?---It was - well, it was associated with
10:17:11 42 Latrobe University. Again, I can't be sure where it was
10:17:18 43 actually conducted. It may have been Bundoora.
10:17:21 44
10:17:22 45 Sorry?---It may have been Bundoora.
10:17:24 46
10:17:24 47 May have been?---Yes.

10:17:25 1 Might it have been closer to the city or you can't say
10:17:29 2 either way?---I really can't say. I can't say with any
10:17:34 3 certainty, no.
10:17:34 4
10:17:35 5 Was that a course that a number of police did?---Yes.
10:17:38 6
10:17:40 7 Do you know if Mr Pope did that course?---I'm unaware.
10:17:43 8
10:17:45 9 Can you recall who taught that course at all?---It was
10:17:50 10 facilitated to some extent - I think it was essentially a
10:17:56 11 joint venture, if you like, between Victoria Police and
10:17:59 12 Latrobe. I'm not sure of exactly what those arrangements
10:18:03 13 were and it was in part facilitated by then Detective
10:18:07 14 Senior Sergeant Brett Curran who obviously is a Victoria
10:18:14 15 Police member.
10:18:15 16
10:18:15 17 And Mr Curran had something to do with the Asset Recovery
10:18:19 18 Squad; is that right?---He was the Detective Senior
10:18:22 19 Sergeant.
10:18:22 20
10:18:23 21 At?---At Asset Recovery at the time I was there.
10:18:26 22
10:18:27 23 You reported to him; is that right?---That's correct, yes.
10:18:29 24
10:18:36 25 In March of 1999 you became a Detective Sergeant at the
10:18:41 26 Asset Recovery Squad?---I'll just refer to my statement if
10:18:46 27 I can.
10:18:47 28
10:18:47 29 Yes. Paragraph 3(e)?---Yes.
10:18:52 30
10:18:53 31 That squad was a sub-section of the Major Fraud Group in
10:18:57 32 the Crime Department?---That's correct.
10:18:59 33
10:18:59 34 And the work of that squad involved liaising with other
10:19:05 35 units where there might be Confiscation Act
10:19:10 36 proceedings?---Yes.
10:19:10 37
10:19:10 38 And often that would involve the Drug Squad?---Correct.
10:19:13 39
10:19:14 40 You've indicated that Detective Senior Sergeant Curran was
10:19:19 41 someone you reported to and is it the case that Detective
10:19:28 42 Senior Constable Jeffrey Pope was one of your
10:19:30 43 reports?---Yes, he was.
10:19:31 44
10:19:31 45 In terms of liaising with the Drug Squad, was that
10:19:34 46 something - would you hunt out the work or would they come
10:19:38 47 to you with the work?---It was probably a mixture of both.

10:19:43 1 It was a matter of, from whichever direction, trying to
10:19:49 2 identify investigations where we could add value in terms
10:19:52 3 of our remit.
10:19:53 4
10:19:56 5 Is it the case that there were informal chats happening all
10:20:00 6 the time or were there appointments always made for these
10:20:03 7 kinds of things?---No, it was - my recollection is that it
10:20:09 8 was to a significant extent built on relationships, and, as
10:20:14 9 you say, informal chats.
10:20:16 10
10:20:16 11 One of the people that regularly liaised with your squad
10:20:19 12 was someone by the name of Detective Senior Sergeant Wayne
10:20:24 13 Strawhorn?---I can't specifically recall that being the
10:20:35 14 case but I'm sure it would have been, yes.
10:20:39 15
10:20:40 16 When the police first spoke to you - we have some notes of
10:20:43 17 conversation - did you tell them then that you were in fact
10:20:46 18 introduced to Ms Gobbo by Detective Senior Sergeant Wayne
10:20:51 19 Strawhorn from the Drug Squad?---Can I refer to my copy of
10:20:54 20 those notes?
10:20:54 21
10:20:55 22 Sure?---Yes, that's correct.
10:21:10 23
10:21:13 24 You say in your statement it's your belief that Strawhorn
10:21:17 25 either approached you or someone else at the squad in
10:21:22 26 relation to Ms Gobbo providing information?---Yes, that's
10:21:24 27 correct.
10:21:24 28
10:21:26 29 There came to be an operation by the name of Operation
10:21:30 30 Ramsden; is that right?---Yes.
10:21:31 31
10:21:31 32 In relation to information that Ms Gobbo was
10:21:35 33 supplying?---That's correct.
10:21:35 34
10:21:42 35 Your statement really indicates the first time you have any
10:21:49 36 involvement as being 12 May 1999, is that right, paragraph
10:21:57 37 11?---Yes, that's correct.
10:22:12 38
10:22:12 39 We've been provided with some other information by Victoria
10:22:17 40 Police in the form of some diary notes of Mr Pope which
10:22:20 41 indicate that on 27 April he initiated contact with the
10:22:25 42 Drug Squad re a new job on money laundering. Do you recall
10:22:32 43 that it was Mr Pope that initiated contact with the Drug
10:22:37 44 Squad back in late April of 1999 which led to this
10:22:41 45 investigation?---I don't have any recollection of that but
10:22:49 46 I'm not sure what you mean when you say that Pope initiated
10:22:53 47 that contact which led to Ramsden.

10:22:57 1 We're simply going by his own diary notes?---Yeah, I
10:23:01 2 haven't seen his diary notes, so I'm not sure.

10:23:04 3
10:23:05 4 If that had have been the case would you have been aware of
10:23:09 5 it at the time?---So are you saying that on 27 April there
10:23:14 6 were conversations between Jeff Pope and the Drug Squad in
10:23:18 7 relation to Gobbo?

10:23:20 8
10:23:20 9 Yes, it says, "A new job re money laundering" which appears
10:23:25 10 to be in relation to this case, and in brackets "Operation
10:23:32 11 Ramsden"?---I don't have any recollection of that.

10:23:34 12
10:23:35 13 Sorry, his diary notes don't indicate that but the timeline
10:23:39 14 we've received from Victoria Police indicate that it's
10:23:41 15 Operation Ramsden. In any case, the following day, 28
10:23:48 16 April 1999, there's an investigation log which we've been
10:23:53 17 provided which we understand was compiled as the
10:23:56 18 investigation went along by Detective Pope. Have you seen
10:24:00 19 that document?---Sorry, 28 April?

10:24:03 20
10:24:05 21 Yes. Well, it doesn't just contain 28 April but it
10:24:10 22 contains a number of dates, it's called the investigation
10:24:13 23 log which was compiled by Detective Pope, we
10:24:17 24 understand?---I don't believe I have seen that document.

10:24:18 25
10:24:21 26 That investigation log, and I'm not sure that this has been
10:24:25 27 screened for PII so I won't put it up on the screen at the
10:24:29 28 moment, but I'll just read you the section from it.
10:24:34 29 "Meeting with Detective Senior Sergeant Strawhorn and
10:24:38 30 Detective Senior Constable Kruger at Drug Squad. Obtain
10:24:44 31 basic details of job and information coming from informer.
10:24:47 32 To be advised as to when we can be introduced to informer
10:24:51 33 and take over the investigation." The diary entries that
10:24:58 34 we have of Mr Kruger, Mr Strawhorn and Mr Pope all indicate
10:25:03 35 that you were also present for that briefing on that
10:25:07 36 date?---M'mm.

10:25:07 37
10:25:08 38 Do you have your diaries in court?---No.

10:25:11 39
10:25:11 40 Sorry, in the hearing room?---No.

10:25:12 41
10:25:14 42 The diaries that we've received from you don't provide any
10:25:18 43 information prior to 11 May 1999. Have you been asked to
10:25:24 44 check that earlier date in your diary?---No.

10:25:27 45
10:25:35 46 Would you expect at a briefing such as that, obtain basic
10:25:42 47 details of the job and information coming from the

10:25:44 1 informer, that you would have been told that Ms Gobbo was a
10:25:47 2 lawyer representing a number of parties in an operation
10:25:50 3 that had been conducted by the Drug Squad?---Not
10:25:55 4 necessarily, no.
10:25:56 5
10:25:58 6 You don't expect that you would have been told that
10:26:00 7 Ms Gobbo was a lawyer and she was representing people that
10:26:03 8 the Drug Squad had arrested?---Are you saying that those
10:26:10 9 people relate to Ramsden or to a different operation?
10:26:15 10
10:26:15 11 At least one of them gets their name mentioned in the
10:26:18 12 course of the information provided by Ms Gobbo?---Sorry,
10:26:22 13 I'm not following what you're saying.
10:26:23 14
10:26:24 15 Ms Gobbo represented a number of people in an operation
10:26:27 16 named Operation Carron which the Drug Squad had recently
10:26:32 17 carried out?---Yes.
10:26:33 18
10:26:33 19 There'd been a number of arrests and Ms Gobbo's firm, or
10:26:36 20 the firm that she was then solicitor for, represented at
10:26:41 21 least three, if not four, people arrested during the course
10:26:44 22 of that operation?---Yes.
10:26:46 23
10:26:46 24 One of those people was named Mr Reid?---Yes.
10:26:49 25
10:26:49 26 Mr Reid was said to have something to do or some
10:26:53 27 involvement in the money laundering that Ms Gobbo was
10:26:56 28 alleging against her employer or former employer?---Yes.
10:26:59 29
10:27:00 30 You understand that?---Yes.
10:27:01 31
10:27:01 32 Do you expect that you would have been told at this initial
10:27:05 33 briefing that Ms Gobbo was a lawyer representing a number
10:27:08 34 of parties that the Drug Squad had just arrested in their
10:27:11 35 operation?---No, I don't, and in fact I would expect that
10:27:16 36 we would not be provided with that if it was a separate
10:27:21 37 operation and a separate operation to the one that we were
10:27:24 38 being asked to contribute to.
10:27:27 39
10:27:28 40 So you expect that you wouldn't have been told the
10:27:30 41 background information to how this informer comes to
10:27:33 42 provide information to the police?---No, not necessarily
10:27:41 43 and, you know, I think there is quite possibly, as a
10:27:46 44 general proposition, good reason to quarantine particular
10:27:49 45 operations or investigations from others. Security around
10:27:55 46 those types of investigations is paramount so it doesn't
10:28:02 47 surprise me that we wouldn't necessarily have been told.

10:28:04 1 It wasn't something that you might think is relevant, that
10:28:08 2 the information being supplied by Ms Gobbo related to one
10:28:11 3 of the clients she was currently representing?---I can see
10:28:16 4 how it could be relevant but what I'm saying is that I can
10:28:23 5 understand as a general proposition that information
10:28:29 6 arising out of one investigation would, as a matter of
10:28:32 7 practice, be quarantined to the people that need to know.
10:28:36 8
10:28:40 9 In relation to that earlier investigation, the arrests had
10:28:45 10 already been carried out, the prosecutions were under way,
10:28:48 11 you understand that?---I don't understand - this is the
10:28:51 12 first time that I'm hearing all of this detail. I don't
10:28:55 13 have any recollection in relation to that.
10:28:57 14
10:28:57 15 Assuming that was the case back at this stage, you're
10:29:01 16 getting this briefing, the Drug Squad operation has come to
10:29:06 17 a conclusion, the arrests have been made, the prosecution's
10:29:10 18 under way, briefs were being served, was there any reason
10:29:15 19 to quarantine that information from you?---I don't think I
10:29:18 20 can comment on that without having a full understanding of
10:29:21 21 the investigation and the job.
10:29:27 22
10:29:27 23 Following 28 April, the first briefing, Mr Pope's diaries
10:29:34 24 indicate that he had a number of contacts with the Drug
10:29:41 25 Squad about the matter in the days thereafter, including
10:29:45 26 with Mr Kruger. Would you have been aware of that at the
10:29:52 27 time?---So is that - are you saying those communications
10:29:58 28 were in relation to the first operation, what was it
10:30:02 29 called?
10:30:02 30
10:30:02 31 No, the contacts appear to be with the Drug Squad in
10:30:07 32 relation to the information that Ms Gobbo was proposing to
10:30:12 33 provide?---And would I expect to have been made aware of
10:30:19 34 that, is that the question?
10:30:21 35
10:30:22 36 Yes?---Going back to the point that I made earlier in
10:30:24 37 relation to a lot of the interactions from the Asset
10:30:29 38 Recovery Squad were being built around relationships and
10:30:31 39 that sort of degree of informality. Potentially, not
10:30:37 40 necessarily.
10:30:38 41
10:30:46 42 Were you aware whether Mr Pope had any prior association
10:30:48 43 with Ms Gobbo at the time this information was about to be
10:30:56 44 provided to you?---Sorry, what point in time are we talking
10:31:01 45 about?
10:31:01 46
10:31:02 47 When this proposal first came along to you and you are

10:31:06 1 advised by members of the Drug Squad that Ms Gobbo is able
10:31:12 2 to provide some information, or wants to provide some
10:31:15 3 information, were you aware of any prior association
10:31:17 4 between Mr Pope and Ms Gobbo?---Just so I'm clear, sorry,
10:31:26 5 the point in time that you're talking about is as per
10:31:30 6 paragraph 10 of the statement where the way I characterise
10:31:33 7 is we were approached by Detective Senior Sergeant
10:31:38 8 Strawhorn, is that the point in time that you're taking me
10:31:41 9 to?

10:31:41 10
10:31:42 11 Yes, around that time period, or even once the operation
10:31:44 12 had commenced. Were you made aware of any prior
10:31:48 13 association between Mr Pope and Ms Gobbo?---I have very
10:31:52 14 little recollection of, you know, these matters given the
10:31:56 15 passage of time and I've got no recollection that I was
10:31:59 16 made aware or that I was aware.

10:32:01 17
10:32:04 18 Given that it appears as though Mr Pope was given
10:32:07 19 responsibility for the carriage of Operation Ramsden, would
10:32:11 20 you expect to have been made aware by him that if there was
10:32:17 21 a prior association between he and the informer that you
10:32:20 22 would be made aware of it?---Yes.

10:32:22 23
10:32:25 24 If you had have been made aware of such an association what
10:32:29 25 would your attitude have been in relation to his being
10:32:33 26 assigned as her handler?---What do you mean by association?
10:32:40 27 The answer to that would have turned on the type of
10:32:43 28 association primarily. If there was nothing to raise any
10:32:52 29 concern in my mind around that it wouldn't have been an
10:32:56 30 issue for me.

10:32:57 31
10:33:02 32 We come to the point where we've got some material in your
10:33:05 33 statement at paragraph 11, and that's on 12 May 1999, and
10:33:13 34 there's a short meeting, if you like, at the Drug Squad
10:33:24 35 with yourself and Mr Pope and Strawhorn and Kruger in
10:33:27 36 relation to an upcoming meeting with the informer; is that
10:33:32 37 right?---That's correct.

10:33:33 38
10:33:34 39 That went for approximately ten minutes?---Yes, that's
10:33:40 40 correct.

10:33:40 41
10:33:43 42 An hour or so later - sorry, can I just ask, where was the
10:33:47 43 Drug Squad located at the time?---412 St Kilda Road.

10:33:51 44
10:33:52 45 Whereabouts was the Asset Recovery Squad located?---I can't
10:33:56 46 remember the number but it was a building further south on
10:33:59 47 St Kilda Road.

10:34:00 1 Later that afternoon your diary indicates that you arrived
10:34:10 2 at the Emerald Hotel; is that right?---Yes.
10:34:14 3
10:34:14 4 Where you rendezvoused with Strawhorn and Kruger and
10:34:18 5 thereafter met the unregistered informer, as Ms Gobbo was
10:34:23 6 referred to at that stage in your diary, until ten past
10:34:27 7 seven that night?---Yes.
10:34:29 8
10:34:32 9 It's apparent from the diaries of Mr Kruger and
10:34:36 10 Mr Strawhorn that they arrived for the introduction at 5
10:34:42 11 o'clock, so perhaps you and Mr Pope were waiting around for
10:34:45 12 half an hour before Ms Gobbo and the Drug Squad members
10:34:48 13 arrived?---I've not no memory of that.
10:34:53 14
10:34:53 15 But in any event it seems that you and Mr Pope, as well as
10:34:55 16 Mr Strawhorn and Mr Kruger, were present with Ms Gobbo for
10:35:00 17 over two hours at the Emerald Hotel; is that right?---That
10:35:06 18 would appear to be the case.
10:35:07 19
10:35:07 20 Are you able to say whether Mr Strawhorn and Mr Kruger
10:35:10 21 remained present throughout that entire period?---No.
10:35:13 22
10:35:13 23 Would it be usual for them to stay or for them to make an
10:35:18 24 introduction and then leave you to it?---I don't think
10:35:20 25 there would be a usual practice in relation to these types
10:35:23 26 of things.
10:35:23 27
10:35:24 28 Do you recall there being any indication at that meeting
10:35:29 29 about whether Mr Pope and Ms Gobbo knew each other?---No.
10:35:31 30
10:35:34 31 Can you recall - - -?---Sorry, just for point of
10:35:36 32 clarification, I've got no recollection of that when I say
10:35:40 33 no, I have no recollection.
10:35:41 34
10:35:41 35 So you can't say either way whether - - - ?---No.
10:35:43 36
10:35:44 37 Do you recall what the relationship appeared to be like
10:35:50 38 between Ms Gobbo and the Drug Squad members?---I have no
10:35:54 39 recollection.
10:35:55 40
10:35:56 41 How do you say you and Ms Gobbo got along from that point
10:35:59 42 in time?---So there's a reference in the contact report to
10:36:11 43 words to the effect I think that - sorry, can I refer to
10:36:15 44 that?
10:36:16 45
10:36:18 46 Just for now, what's your recollection of your relationship
10:36:22 47 with Ms Gobbo?---Well my interactions with her were fine

10:36:27 1 but I think I've characterised it as - my recollection is I
10:36:34 2 had a sense she didn't really warm to me.
10:36:38 3
10:36:41 4 If you want to go to your note. I think it's pretty much
10:36:44 5 as you say. You recalled that "3838 never warmed Segrave",
10:36:49 6 or that's the content of the note?---Yes.
10:36:52 7
10:36:52 8 Was that in contrast to your observations of her
10:36:56 9 relationships with other people that you saw her
10:37:04 10 with?---No, I really can't recall a level of detail to be
10:37:10 11 able to say that, no.
10:37:12 12
10:37:13 13 There was an information report that was subsequently
10:37:16 14 generated in relation to that first meeting by Mr Pope; is
10:37:20 15 that right?---Yes.
10:37:20 16
10:37:21 17 If I can ask that the VPL.0005.0007.0193 - - -
10:37:33 18
10:37:33 19 COMMISSIONER: Be brought up on the screen, yes.
10:37:36 20
10:37:36 21 MS TITTENSOR: Be brought up on the screen. Your diary
10:37:42 22 doesn't contain any detail about what was discussed; is
10:37:47 23 that right?---That's correct.
10:37:48 24
10:37:50 25 Was anyone taking notes at this event?---Is this the
10:37:56 26 initial meeting?
10:37:57 27
10:37:57 28 This is the initial meeting?---I can't recall.
10:37:59 29
10:38:02 30 Do you know if there was any recording going on in any way
10:38:05 31 of the event?---I can't recall.
10:38:08 32
10:38:11 33 Would it be common that audio recordings might be made of
10:38:17 34 meetings with potential informers?---It certainly became a
10:38:24 35 more common practice over time. I'm not sure what the
10:38:27 36 practice was at that point in time.
10:38:28 37
10:38:35 38 You see a redaction on that page which indicates
10:38:42 39 s.26(1)?---Yes.
10:38:42 40
10:38:44 41 Is it your understanding that that refers to the name of
10:38:46 42 the person that Ms Gobbo was providing information
10:38:49 43 about?---Yes.
10:38:50 44
10:38:51 45 And that was someone that was formerly her employer?---Was
10:38:57 46 her employer at the time I think.
10:38:58 47

10:39:00 1 I think the evidence will indicate that she was, by this
10:39:03 2 time, a barrister and in the previous year had been a
10:39:06 3 solicitor at that person's law firm?---That doesn't accord
10:39:12 4 with my recollection but, as I say, I'm very hazy with a
10:39:17 5 lot of this detail given the passage of time.
10:39:19 6
10:39:21 7 You see that that information report was written on 28 May
10:39:27 8 1999?---Yes.
10:39:28 9
10:39:29 10 It uses Ms Gobbo's informer designation MFG13?---Yes.
10:39:37 11
10:39:38 12 It doesn't contain any real details of what was a two hour
10:39:43 13 meeting?---What it does say is no real information was
10:39:46 14 discussed.
10:39:46 15
10:39:49 16 Although it was a meeting that on any account went for two
10:39:54 17 hours plus?---Yes.
10:39:56 18
10:39:59 19 Do you have any recollection of that meeting?---No, I
10:40:02 20 don't.
10:40:02 21
10:40:05 22 Was it common that information reports were compiled up to
10:40:11 23 16 days or more or less following a meeting with an
10:40:15 24 informer?---I can't comment on whether it was common or
10:40:22 25 not. I've looked at that chronology and one of the things
10:40:26 26 that strikes me is I think there were a number of
10:40:28 27 information reports compiled immediately after the
10:40:30 28 registration process was completed.
10:40:33 29
10:40:34 30 That information report doesn't indicate that there were
10:40:39 31 two other people present, being the Drug Squad members
10:40:42 32 Strawhorn and Kruger; is that right?---That's correct.
10:40:49 33
10:40:49 34 It doesn't indicate that the meeting took place at the
10:40:52 35 Emerald Hotel?---That's correct.
10:40:53 36
10:40:53 37 Was there any drinking at the meeting?---Not that I recall.
10:40:57 38
10:41:02 39 When an information report such as this is written where do
10:41:06 40 they go?---I really cannot recall exactly how the process
10:41:13 41 operated at that point in time.
10:41:15 42
10:41:17 43 Would it be the case that you read them all, it went to you
10:41:19 44 and - - - ?---I can't recall whether they were filed hard
10:41:24 45 copy or electronically within the investigation file. I
10:41:31 46 really don't know.
10:41:32 47

10:41:35 1 I tender that report, Commissioner.
10:41:41 2
10:41:41 3 #EXHIBIT RC33 - Information report dated 28/5/99.
10:41:51 4
10:41:51 5 If we could bring up VPL.0005.0013.0952. This is a
10:42:29 6 document you've been asked to look at?---Yes.
10:42:32 7
10:42:32 8 This is an informer registration application. Is that -
10:42:40 9 the applicant details being Jeffrey Pope; is that
10:42:43 10 right?---That's correct.
10:42:43 11
10:42:45 12 And if we scroll down slightly further down the page, we
10:42:53 13 see the date of that application is 13 May 1999?---Yes.
10:42:57 14
10:42:58 15 That's an application to register Ms Gobbo as an informer
10:43:04 16 the day after a meeting where no real information has been
10:43:08 17 provided?---Yes.
10:43:09 18
10:43:14 19 Is any of that writing on that first page yours or is that
10:43:17 20 all Mr Pope's writing?---I can't say whether it's all
10:43:23 21 Mr Pope's writing but I'm confident none of it's mine.
10:43:27 22
10:43:31 23 You see down the bottom of that page that she's indicated -
10:43:38 24 sorry, the box is ticked that indicates there's a criminal
10:43:42 25 history and some other identification documentation
10:43:45 26 attached?---Yes.
10:43:45 27
10:43:46 28 Were you aware of - well presumably you became aware of
10:43:51 29 Ms Gobbo's criminal history?---Yes. Well, I can't recall
10:43:55 30 that but I'm aware that it formed part of that file and
10:43:59 31 it's clear that my signature appears on that file so I
10:44:03 32 infer that I would have been aware of it, yes.
10:44:06 33
10:44:08 34 I'll tender that document, Commissioner, but I'll come back
10:44:13 35 to some other portions of it in chronological order.
10:44:18 36
10:44:19 37 #EXHIBIT RC34 - Informer registration application.
10:44:32 38
10:44:32 39 If I can ask that the following information report be
10:44:35 40 brought up, VPL.0005.0007.0194.
10:44:46 41
10:44:46 42 MR HOLT: Commissioner, might I just approach my learned
10:44:49 43 friend briefly?
10:44:50 44
10:44:50 45 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10:44:51 46
10:44:51 47 (Discussion at Bar table.)

10:45:10 1 MS TITTENSOR: You see that this is an information report
10:45:13 2 in relation to a meeting on Monday 17 May 1999?---Yes.
10:45:18 3
10:45:23 4 That reflects, I think, paragraph 12 of your statement that
10:45:30 5 you and Mr Pope met Ms Gobbo in Armadale between 12.20 pm
10:45:37 6 and 4.15 pm?---Yes.
10:45:39 7
10:45:42 8 An almost four hour meeting; is that right?---Yes.
10:45:46 9
10:45:47 10 There's no detail of that meeting contained in your diary.
10:45:52 11 Was that a common practice for you?---Yes.
10:45:55 12
10:45:59 13 What was the reason for that?---Well the diaries are much
10:46:08 14 more widely available for people to read the contents of,
10:46:13 15 so purely from a security point of view I would try and
10:46:18 16 avoid including that type of detail in my diary.
10:46:20 17
10:46:25 18 There's a significant amount of information provided during
10:46:30 19 that meeting; is that right?---It would appear so, yes.
10:46:34 20
10:46:40 21 Apparently the following page hasn't had some redactions
10:46:43 22 made which might be necessary, Your Honour, so I'll ask
10:46:46 23 that that not be scrolled to. I'll tender the document but
10:46:51 24 there'll need to be further redactions before it's made
10:46:55 25 publicly available.
10:46:56 26
10:46:56 27 COMMISSIONER: Yes. The process that I indicated earlier
10:46:59 28 today will need that from time to time. They should be
10:47:08 29 attended to as soon as possible though.
10:47:10 30
10:47:10 31 #EXHIBIT RC35 - Information report dated 17/5/99.
10:47:14 32
10:47:15 33 MS TITTENSOR: That was, as I indicated, an almost four
10:47:18 34 hour meeting?---Yes.
10:47:19 35
10:47:19 36 There seems to be some significant information provided on
10:47:22 37 that day?---Yes.
10:47:24 38
10:47:29 39 In a similar way to your diary, Mr Pope's diary doesn't
10:47:32 40 record any detail of what occurred at that meeting, and as
10:47:37 41 you can see from the top of that report the information
10:47:41 42 report is not compiled until 28 May. Does that give you
10:47:46 43 any indication about how that information - that that
10:47:52 44 information might have been recorded in some way?---Well
10:47:55 45 no, it doesn't, but standard practice at the time was you
10:48:01 46 wouldn't take your diary into the field, if I can use that
10:48:03 47 term, in any case. You'd rely on what was called a day

10:48:08 1 book and you'd subsequently transfer information from the
10:48:16 2 day book into the diary, or in this case potentially, I'm
10:48:19 3 not saying - I can't say exactly what occurred on this date
10:48:23 4 but potentially into a document such as an information
10:48:26 5 report.
10:48:26 6
10:48:27 7 Again, with this document, and probably in relation to a
10:48:30 8 number of documents that I'm going to take you to
10:48:33 9 thereafter, where it indicates s.26 (1) on the black
10:48:37 10 redactions, that refers to the name of Ms Gobbo's former
10:48:45 11 employer, the person she was providing information about,
10:48:52 12 or the law firm of that person; is that right?---Yes,
10:48:56 13 that's correct.
10:48:56 14
10:49:03 15 If I can take you to the information report on 19 May 1999,
10:49:09 16 VPL.0005.0007.0196. This is a date on which you again,
10:49:35 17 with Mr Pope, met Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
10:49:39 18
10:49:41 19 It's apparent from that that Mr Pope had been handed a
10:49:47 20 document by Detective Strawhorn relating to a property
10:49:52 21 owned by a particular person, whose name has been redacted,
10:49:56 22 and his wife which was signed over to another person, whose
10:50:00 23 name has also been redacted, through the solicitor that
10:50:05 24 Ms Gobbo was providing information about, do you see
10:50:12 25 that?---Yes.
10:50:12 26
10:50:13 27 Was Mr Strawhorn present or Detective Strawhorn present at
10:50:16 28 that meeting?---I've got no recollection of the meeting.
10:50:20 29
10:50:21 30 Do you have a recollection of attending meetings with
10:50:23 31 Ms Gobbo where Detective Strawhorn was present?---Yes.
10:50:28 32
10:50:29 33 How many of the meetings that you attended with Detective
10:50:34 34 Pope and Ms Gobbo did Detective Strawhorn also
10:50:38 35 attend?---I'm unable to say. I'd be speculating.
10:50:43 36
10:50:46 37 Are you able to say if it was more than two?---I'd be
10:50:50 38 surprised if it was more than two but I really can't
10:50:53 39 recall.
10:50:53 40
10:50:55 41 I tender that document, Commissioner.
10:50:59 42
10:51:00 43 #EXHIBIT RC36 - Information report dated 19/5/99.
10:51:09 44
10:51:09 45 If I can take you back to RC34, which was the registration
10:51:14 46 application. If we can then scroll down to the second
10:51:30 47 page. There's now been, it's apparent, three meetings that

10:51:36 1 you've attended with Ms Gobbo?---Yes, I believe so.
10:51:40 2
10:51:42 3 You indicate at paragraph 14 of your statement that, "I
10:51:47 4 believe, although I don't specifically recall, that
10:51:50 5 Ms Gobbo's position as a lawyer, together with the subject
10:51:53 6 matter of the information she was expected to provide,
10:51:56 7 would have been relevant considerations in determining that
10:51:59 8 she should be registered at an early stage of our
10:52:04 9 interactions with her". Do you recall seeing that in your
10:52:09 10 statement?---Yes.
10:52:09 11
10:52:09 12 It's apparent that Mr Pope had taken steps to register her
10:52:13 13 after the first day when she hadn't, at that stage,
10:52:16 14 provided any real information?---It would appear so, yes.
10:52:19 15
10:52:19 16 Had you ever encountered a situation where a criminal
10:52:24 17 defence lawyer wanted to provide information to the police
10:52:27 18 before?---No.
10:52:28 19
10:52:29 20 That would have been a very surprising state of affairs,
10:52:33 21 I'd suggest?---It was certainly unusual.
10:52:37 22
10:52:39 23 It would have given you pause to consider the possibility
10:52:44 24 that in having someone like that as an informer there might
10:52:48 25 be boundaries crossed?---Yes, no doubt.
10:52:55 26
10:52:55 27 It was within reasonable contemplation that the information
10:52:58 28 that she might provide could conflict with her professional
10:53:01 29 duties; is that right?---Well it would have been something
10:53:05 30 that was considered I believe, yes.
10:53:07 31
10:53:10 32 Her professional duties, of course, were to act in the best
10:53:13 33 interests of her client?---Yes, correct.
10:53:17 34
10:53:18 35 And she had duties of confidentiality or legal professional
10:53:24 36 privilege to clients that she had worked for; is that
10:53:32 37 right?---She may well have, yes.
10:53:33 38
10:53:34 39 And duties to the court?---Indeed.
10:53:36 40
10:53:41 41 You indicate in your statement that you expect you would
10:53:44 42 have discussed the registration of Ms Gobbo with your
10:53:47 43 Senior Sergeant and others before the decision was made to
10:53:51 44 register her; is that right?---Sorry, as a general
10:53:55 45 proposition there would have been discussions in relation
10:53:58 46 to registering her in general terms, is that what I'm being
10:54:02 47 asked?

10:54:02 1 I'm asking you effectively what's in your statement at
10:54:06 2 paragraph 14. You say halfway through that paragraph, "I
10:54:11 3 expect that I would have discussed the matter with my
10:54:13 4 Senior Sergeant and others before a decision was made to
10:54:16 5 register Ms Gobbo in accordance with the policy"?---Yes.
10:54:26 6
10:54:26 7 Do you recall when you discussed Ms Gobbo's information, or
10:54:33 8 potential information or cooperation with the police, that
10:54:36 9 there was some surprise around the office?---I don't have
10:54:49 10 any recollection of the conversation but I would imagine
10:54:54 11 that the conversation, I would expect that the conversation
10:54:57 12 would have been closely contained rather than something
10:55:00 13 that was privy to everybody within the office.
10:55:04 14
10:55:08 15 Who was your Senior Sergeant that you would have, you
10:55:11 16 expect you would have discussed it with?---Brett Curran.
10:55:15 17
10:55:18 18 Have you had any - do you still keep in touch with
10:55:22 19 Mr Curran?---I see him occasionally around the BPC and say
10:55:29 20 hello to him, but I don't have any contact with him as
10:55:33 21 such, no.
10:55:33 22
10:55:34 23 Have you discussed this matter or your recollections of
10:55:38 24 what occurred back at that time with him?---No.
10:55:42 25
10:55:42 26 When you say you expect you would have discussed it with
10:55:44 27 others in your statement, who would those others be?---I
10:55:50 28 can't - again, I apologise, this is going to be a theme in
10:55:53 29 my evidence. I really don't have very much recollection at
10:55:56 30 all of how this played out at the time. Having said that,
10:56:01 31 the person who ultimately signed off on Gobbo being
10:56:06 32 registered was effectively the Superintendent, so I would
10:56:12 33 assume that there may have been some level of communication
10:56:16 34 with the Senior Sergeant, the Inspector and potentially the
10:56:19 35 Superintendent.
10:56:19 36
10:56:25 37 Is Mr Curran still employed within the Police Force?---Yes,
10:56:29 38 he is.
10:56:30 39
10:56:30 40 Do you know in what capacity is he employed in the Police
10:56:34 41 Force currently?---He's a Commander attached to the Office
10:56:37 42 of the Chief Commissioner.
10:56:39 43
10:56:48 44 Under the heading "Supervisor's comments and
10:56:52 45 recommendations - eg: special considerations in handling",
10:57:00 46 you state there that, "I recommend the registration of the
10:57:03 47 informer", you see that?---Yes.

10:57:05 1 This is all in your handwriting, this section that we're
10:57:09 2 seeing on the screen?---Yes, it is.
10:57:10 3
10:57:10 4 Everything under part B there, that's your
10:57:14 5 handwriting?---Everything that's currently on the screen,
10:57:16 6 yes.
10:57:16 7
10:57:19 8 You say, "It is believed INF (I take it to be informer who
10:57:28 9 is Ms Gobbo) will be an ongoing source of information re
10:57:35 10 money laundering fraud activities"?---Yes.
11
10:57:38 12 "Is both credible, reputable"?---Yes.
10:57:41 13
10:57:41 14 "Informer has no known previous history of supplying
10:57:44 15 information to law enforcement agencies"?---Yes.
10:57:46 16
10:57:46 17 I just want to ask you a question about the statement there
10:57:50 18 that Ms Gobbo's expected to be an ongoing source of
10:57:55 19 information. By this stage it's not just a one-off that
10:57:58 20 you're expecting some information from her, is that the
10:58:00 21 case?---What do you mean by one-off?
10:58:06 22
10:58:06 23 She hasn't just provided information to you on one single
10:58:09 24 occasion, but it appears from this that you're registering
10:58:13 25 her because you expect there's going to be an ongoing
10:58:17 26 source of information coming from this informer?---In
10:58:20 27 relation to that particular matter under investigation is
10:58:23 28 the way that I would read it.
10:58:24 29
10:58:25 30 Yes. There's nothing in the special considerations section
10:58:29 31 here about her being a lawyer?---No.
10:58:31 32
10:58:32 33 There's nothing about there needing to be any care taken in
10:58:36 34 relation to the type of activity - type of information
10:58:39 35 that's received from her?---No.
10:58:40 36
10:58:43 37 Were you aware by that stage that she was providing
10:58:46 38 information that was impacting upon at least one client
10:58:51 39 that was being represented by the firm of the person she
10:58:55 40 was providing information about?---To the best of my
10:59:00 41 knowledge the first time I've become aware of that is when
10:59:04 42 you've told me this morning.
10:59:05 43
10:59:06 44 You don't recall being aware of her giving some information
10:59:10 45 connected with her former employer about someone by the
10:59:13 46 name of Mr Reid, Peter Reid?---Yes, yes.
10:59:19 47

10:59:25 1 One of the other points you make in relation to that in
10:59:29 2 that passage is that she's got no known history of
10:59:32 3 supplying information?---Yes.
10:59:33 4
10:59:35 5 It's apparent from the application by Pope, which I pointed
10:59:39 6 out to you on the previous page, had a checked box that she
10:59:42 7 had a criminal history?---Yes.
10:59:44 8
10:59:44 9 And if we scroll forward I understand that that might - a
10:59:51 10 number of pages. If we keep going. Keep going. Keep
11:00:01 11 going. Keep going. That document there is the document
11:00:12 12 that was attached to the application, is that right, in
11:00:17 13 relation to her criminal history?---It would appear so,
11:00:19 14 yes.
11:00:19 15
11:00:19 16 It indicates that she has a history in relation to drug
11:00:25 17 charges?---Yes.
11:00:26 18
11:00:28 19 Do you recall making any inquiry in relation to those
11:00:32 20 matters?---No, I don't recall whether I did or I didn't.
11:00:38 21
11:00:38 22 Would it be likely that some inquiry might have been made
11:00:48 23 of the informant in relation to those matters if you were
11:00:50 24 considering making this person a registered
11:00:58 25 informer?---It's a possibility but I can't say whether that
11:01:01 26 occurred or not.
11:01:02 27
11:01:02 28 Would it have been prudent to do so?---Possibly in terms of
11:01:12 29 trying to, you know, piece together the circumstances under
11:01:18 30 consideration, yes.
11:01:19 31
11:01:20 32 Do you know - I know you've indicated in your section in
11:01:26 33 part B that she has no known history of supplying
11:01:29 34 information, and that was clearly your understanding at the
11:01:33 35 time you wrote those words, do you know whether that was on
11:01:37 36 the basis of something she was asked about or was that
11:01:41 37 something you just assumed?---Again, I can't recall how I
11:01:47 38 came to form that view.
11:01:49 39
11:01:50 40 Is it something that you would have asked?---Asked her?
11:01:53 41
11:01:54 42 Yes?---No.
11:01:54 43
11:01:56 44 It was clear, at least by that stage, that she was already
11:02:00 45 supplying information to members of the Drug Squad. They
11:02:04 46 were the ones indeed that were bringing it to you?---Yeah,
11:02:09 47 I'm not sure that - I don't believe it was clear to me at

11:02:12 1 the time, no.
11:02:12 2
11:02:16 3 You understood by this stage, though, that the Drug Squad
11:02:19 4 had brought this informer to you because she had indicated
11:02:22 5 she wants to provide information?---Yes, that's right.
11:02:24 6
11:02:24 7 So it's readily apparent that she's already providing
11:02:27 8 information to others prior to the Asset Recovery
11:02:33 9 Squad?---No, I don't agree with that proposition. You
11:02:38 10 know, I guess in hindsight I can see that that is highly
11:02:43 11 likely, but as I've already said in evidence, certainly to
11:02:46 12 the best of my recollection I didn't have knowledge of some
11:02:54 13 of the conversations or communications that had occurred up
11:02:59 14 to my initial meeting with her. I don't believe I did have
11:03:02 15 that knowledge at the time.
11:03:03 16
11:03:03 17 Did you become aware that Mr Pope came to understand that
11:03:08 18 she was also providing information to the National Crime
11:03:12 19 Authority about the same matters?---On my reading of the
11:03:18 20 information reports there's a strong inference in those
11:03:24 21 information reports that we became aware at a point in time
11:03:27 22 that that was the case.
11:03:28 23
11:03:29 24 Do you have a recollection now of that happening?---No.
11:03:32 25
11:03:35 26 Would Ms Gobbo have been made aware of her being registered
11:03:39 27 at the time?---As I've said in my statement, I can't recall
11:03:43 28 whether she was or she wasn't but my belief is that the
11:03:47 29 practice at the time was to not necessarily provide that
11:03:51 30 information to informers as a general proposition.
11:03:53 31
11:03:54 32 What would the reason be for not telling a registered
11:03:57 33 informer that they were registered?---The view that was
11:04:01 34 held at that time was that persons who were otherwise
11:04:10 35 inclined to give information may be less inclined if there
11:04:13 36 was an explicit conversation around that.
11:04:16 37
11:04:27 38 If I can ask that the - sorry, I just want to make sure
11:04:33 39 that this document is okay. VPL.0005.0007.0197, it's an
11:04:50 40 information report of 20 May. If that can be taken down,
11:04:57 41 please. It appears that that hadn't had all the redactions
11:05:04 42 made, Commissioner. Perhaps if I can tender that document.
11:05:15 43 We seek that that be redacted as soon as possible and I'll
11:05:19 44 ask, do you have the information reports with you?---Yes, I
11:05:28 45 do.
11:05:28 46
11:05:29 47 If you can turn to an information report.

11:05:33 1
11:05:33 2 #EXHIBIT RC37 - Information report dated 20/5/99.
11:05:52 3
11:05:53 4 COMMISSIONER: Of course that will be in its redacted form
11:05:56 5 which is yet to be supplied.
11:05:58 6
11:05:59 7 MS TITTENSOR: The information reports that are being
11:06:03 8 compiled by Detective Pope were provided to you, is that
11:06:11 9 right, at the time that he compiled them?---I can't recall.
11:06:14 10
11:06:15 11 Was one of the conditions on which this informer was
11:06:21 12 registered that it's prudent to have all intended meetings
11:06:27 13 with the informer communicated to the controller prior to
11:06:30 14 such a meeting?---Yes.
11:06:31 15
11:06:31 16 Were you a controller?---Yes.
11:06:33 17
11:06:34 18 So you would have known when Detective Pope was meeting
11:06:37 19 with Ms Gobbo, or you ought to have known?---That's
11:06:40 20 correct.
11:06:40 21
11:06:43 22 And would it be common for him to report to you on the
11:06:46 23 content of those meetings once the meeting had taken
11:06:49 24 place?---Yes, I would expect so.
11:06:52 25
11:06:54 26 Were you aware that Detective Pope met with Detective
11:07:00 27 Strawhorn at the Drug Squad on 20 May and that he informed
11:07:08 28 you that a number of people were registered informers of
11:07:14 29 his and that they might be in a position to assist
11:07:17 30 regarding the person Ms Gobbo was providing information
11:07:21 31 about?---Sorry, I'm just trying to understand. The
11:07:32 32 conversation occurred between Senior Sergeant Strawhorn and
11:07:36 33 Jeff Pope, is that what you're saying?
11:07:39 34
11:07:39 35 Yes?---I believe there's an information report to that
11:07:41 36 effect.
11:07:42 37
11:07:42 38 Yes. Detective Pope meets Detective Strawhorn, or they
11:07:45 39 speak. Detective Strawhorn indicates that Detective Pope
11:07:48 40 that he's got a couple of registered informers that might
11:07:51 41 be in a position to assist with the Operation Ramsden
11:07:54 42 inquiry?---That's what the information report reads as I
11:07:58 43 understand it.
11:07:58 44
11:07:58 45 Yes. This is something that you accept you were likely to
11:08:02 46 have been made aware of at the time?---I would expect so,
11:08:07 47 yes.

11:08:07 1 Detective Pope was asking Detective Strawhorn about any
11:08:15 2 documents which the National Crime Authority might have
11:08:19 3 regarding the person the subject of the information or
11:08:24 4 Peter Reid?---That's as per the information report, yes.
11:08:29 5
11:08:54 6 Are you aware following that there was a - I'll read out
11:08:59 7 and tender this document, Your Honour, but I'm not
11:09:02 8 confident it's got redactions required so again I'll ask it
11:09:07 9 not be shown. VPL.0005.0007.0198. It's an information
11:09:16 10 report in relation to Wednesday 26 May 1999 which I'll
11:09:25 11 tender now, Commissioner.
11:09:28 12
11:09:29 13 #EXHIBIT RC38 - Information report dated 26/5/99.
11:09:37 14
11:09:38 15 This is an information report recording communication
11:09:40 16 between Detective Pope and Detective Hynam from the
11:09:46 17 National Crime Authority and a conversation they had
11:09:48 18 regarding Peter Reid?---Yes. I don't have that in front of
11:09:52 19 me from what I can see but I have read that information
11:09:55 20 report.
11:09:56 21
11:09:56 22 Yes. You would have understood at the time no doubt that
11:09:59 23 Detective Pope was chasing up the National Crime Authority
11:10:02 24 about a similar inquiry that they were conducting?---I
11:10:09 25 can't say what I was aware of at the time but I'm familiar
11:10:12 26 with the information report.
11:10:12 27
11:10:16 28 At the bottom of the first page of that information report
11:10:19 29 does it indicate that Detective Hynam also stated that they
11:10:24 30 had been introduced to an informer by Kruger and Lim at the
11:10:32 31 Drug Squad and the informer had told them the exact same
11:10:37 32 information which is outlined in previous information
11:10:39 33 reports for this job, do you recall that?---Do I recall
11:10:46 34 that conversation at the time?
11:10:47 35
11:10:47 36 Well, or becoming aware of something of that nature?---I
11:10:52 37 don't have the information report in front of me. I have
11:10:56 38 looked at it previously. It brings back to my mind a very
11:11:00 39 vague recollection that we were making inquiries with the
11:11:04 40 NCA but I have no recollection of the detail.
11:11:07 41
11:11:09 42 It's that kind of information which seemed to confirm to
11:11:12 43 Detective Pope that Ms Gobbo was also providing information
11:11:17 44 to the NCA?---I can't say what was in Mr Pope's mind.
11:11:23 45 Certainly from the material I've read recently there's a
11:11:27 46 very strong inference that that's the case, yes.
11:11:31 47

11:11:32 1 And that the NCA had been conducting a similar
11:11:35 2 investigation as the Asset Recovery Squad?---Well it would
11:11:40 3 appear there was certainly crossovers, yes. Again, I can't
11:11:45 4 say exactly what the focus of the NCA was but there were
11:11:49 5 apparent crossovers.
11:11:50 6
11:11:51 7 Do you recall reading in relation to that information that
11:11:54 8 report that Detective Hynam indicated that for some reason
11:11:58 9 the investigation on the subject had ceased and she
11:12:03 10 believed it had officially been written off by that
11:12:06 11 stage?---I can recall reading that in the information
11:12:09 12 report, yes.
11:12:09 13
11:12:18 14 If we can go back to the registration document, please.
11:12:29 15 And the second half of the second page. I take it that
11:12:41 16 much of that writing in the top part of that, is that yours
11:12:43 17 or is that someone else's, where it says, "Kevin Thomas
11:12:49 18 Sheridan"?---The only handwriting there that I recognise as
11:12:53 19 mine is the signature and the detail under the signature.
11:12:55 20
11:12:56 21 Yes. This form has been passed on to Acting Superintendent
11:13:04 22 Sheridan?---Yes.
11:13:05 23
11:13:05 24 Who, on the basis of the information provided to him, has
11:13:08 25 approved the registration?---Yes.
11:13:10 26
11:13:13 27 Following that occurring you sign down the bottom?---Yes.
11:13:19 28
11:13:22 29 Then I think if we go over the page there's a part C of
11:13:30 30 that document. Is that, we expect, filled out by Acting
11:13:41 31 Superintendent Sheridan?---It would appear so, yes.
11:13:42 32
11:13:43 33 It repeats some of the information and then it appears that
11:13:45 34 she's been formally registered on 27 May, as we see down
11:13:49 35 the bottom?---Yes, that's certainly the date there, yes.
11:13:55 36
11:14:03 37 If we can bring up on the screen, please,
11:14:14 38 VPL.0005.0007.0202. It's an information report of 27 May.
11:14:27 39 This is an information report, as I indicated, 27
11:14:32 40 May?---Yes.
11:14:33 41
11:14:33 42 Which records that Detective Pope received an email
11:14:37 43 attaching some law notes about constitutionalism around
11:14:44 44 that time and that she wanted to get together for a meeting
11:14:46 45 soon, do you see that?---Yes.
11:14:48 46
11:14:48 47 Is it the case that Detective Pope was involved in some

11:14:53 1 studies to do with the law at the time?---I believe he was,
11:14:56 2 yes.
11:14:56 3
11:14:57 4 Do you know what he was studying?---My memory is that he
11:15:01 5 was undertaking a law degree.
11:15:03 6
11:15:05 7 Do you recall at the time that he was having some
11:15:08 8 conversation with Ms Gobbo about his law studies or is this
11:15:16 9 something that you understand she was just offering out of
11:15:19 10 the blue?---I've got no memory of this.
11:15:22 11
11:15:24 12 I tender that document, Commissioner.
11:15:28 13
11:15:28 14 #EXHIBIT RC39 - Information report dated 27/5/99.
11:15:40 15
11:15:41 16 Do you recall knowing at the time she was providing
11:15:43 17 Detective Pope with law notes?---No, I have no memory of
11:15:47 18 that.
11:15:48 19
11:15:49 20 When you say that do you mean that you didn't know about it
11:15:53 21 at the time or you might have known but just
11:15:57 22 forgotten?---As I've already said, I have very little
11:16:00 23 recollection of the occurrences, you know, the subject of
11:16:06 24 today. Having said that, that information report would
11:16:14 25 have been available to me and I'm sure I would have had
11:16:17 26 some awareness that there'd been that interaction.
11:16:20 27
11:16:20 28 Where were the information reports stored?---I think I've
11:16:23 29 already given evidence to the effect that I can't recall.
11:16:25 30
11:16:28 31 Somewhere in your office, on a hard drive in your
11:16:33 32 office?---I can't recall. I think I said earlier I can't
11:16:36 33 recall whether they were hard copy or soft copy, whether
11:16:38 34 they were somehow housed with the other documentation
11:16:42 35 pertaining to the investigation. I really don't recall.
11:16:44 36
11:16:49 37 If you became aware that the relationship was developing
11:16:55 38 into something more casual or less formal would you have
11:17:00 39 taken him to task or counselled him in some way?---I would
11:17:04 40 have spoken to him about it, yes.
11:17:06 41
11:17:06 42 Do you know if you did that?---I think one of the things -
11:17:11 43 without having a specific memory of this particular set of
11:17:15 44 circumstances, one of the aspects or elements in source
11:17:25 45 managing as a general proposition is to try and develop a
11:17:28 46 rapport and it's not unusual at all for conversations to
11:17:34 47 occur between handlers and sources that are not directly

11:17:40 1 relevant to the, you know, the investigation per se or
11:17:44 2 issues related to the investigation. So I don't find it
11:17:51 3 particularly surprising that there would be some degree of
11:17:54 4 discussion around things of this type in the course of
11:17:58 5 their interactions around the investigation proper.
11:18:00 6
11:18:01 7 You as a superior also would have had some concern if an
11:18:07 8 informer though appeared to be trying to make the
11:18:09 9 relationship a bit more personal and perhaps, in the end,
11:18:14 10 to try and get some advantage themselves out of
11:18:17 11 it?---Absolutely.
11:18:18 12
11:18:27 13 The next information report, again I'm not confident,
11:18:33 14 Commissioner, that it's been redacted appropriately so I'll
11:18:37 15 refer to it and tender it but ask that it not be shown at
11:18:41 16 this stage. It's VPL.0005.0007.0203. It's an information
11:18:50 17 dated 28 May 1999.
11:18:56 18
11:18:56 19 COMMISSIONER: It relates to 28 May, does it?
11:18:58 20
11:18:59 21 MS TITTENSOR: Yes.
11:18:59 22
11:19:00 23 #EXHIBIT RC40 - Information report dated 28/5/99.
11:19:09 24
11:19:09 25 This is a conversation it seems between Detective Pope and
11:19:14 26 Detective Hynam, again from the NCA, effectively where she
11:19:19 27 provides him with some further information about the nature
11:19:22 28 of the NCA inquiry. Do you recall seeing that information
11:19:27 29 report?---I have seen that information report, yes, but
11:19:30 30 again I don't have it in front of me.
11:19:32 31
11:19:34 32 Detective Hynam indicated to Detective Pope that the NCA
11:19:39 33 inquiry was only in its infancy and was currently sitting
11:19:43 34 on ice as they had more pressing jobs, do you recall
11:19:47 35 reading something of that nature?---Words to that effect,
11:19:50 36 yes.
11:19:50 37
11:19:55 38 There was some suggestion at that point that maybe a joint
11:20:01 39 task force might be set up, do you recall that?---I recall
11:20:06 40 reading that in the information report, yes.
11:20:07 41
11:20:13 42 The next information report is related to 31 May 1999. It
11:20:20 43 can be shown on the screen, it's VPL.0005.0007.0205. This
11:20:38 44 is another information report indicating that Detective
11:20:43 45 Pope received an email which had more law notes attached to
11:20:46 46 it for his personal use?---Yes.
11:20:48 47

11:20:49 1 You recall at least seeing that in more recent
11:20:52 2 times?---Yes.
11:20:52 3
11:20:53 4 I tender that, Commissioner.
11:20:56 5
11:20:57 6 #EXHIBIT RC41 - Information report dated 31/5/99.
11:21:11 7
11:21:14 8 Again, I'm not confident about the next document having
11:21:17 9 been redacted. It's an information report related to 3
11:21:23 10 June 1999. I'll ask that it not be shown but the code is
11:21:33 11 VPL.0005.0007.0206.
11:21:40 12
11:21:40 13 COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, what's the date of this one, 3
11:21:42 14 June 1999?
11:21:45 15
11:21:46 16 MS TITTENSOR: 3 June 1999.
11:21:47 17
11:21:47 18 COMMISSIONER: It relates to it, yes.
11:21:49 19
11:21:50 20 MS TITTENSOR: This indicates that Detective Pope spoke to
11:21:52 21 Ms Gobbo. She told him that she would have to peruse the
11:21:56 22 30 discs to locate the one with the information regarding
11:21:59 23 her former employer on it. She said that this would take
11:22:03 24 some time and would probably be ready in the next two
11:22:07 25 weeks. Do you recall that information?---I recall reading
11:22:15 26 that information report recently, yes.
11:22:17 27
11:22:17 28 Do you recall being aware at the time that she was going to
11:22:20 29 provide a disc of information in relation to her former
11:22:25 30 employer?---I have a vague recollection that we were
11:22:33 31 anticipating receiving some sort of material but I can't
11:22:38 32 recall the form that that was going to occur in.
11:22:40 33
11:22:42 34 At the bottom of that that indicates that Detective Pope
11:22:49 35 arranged to meet her the following day on 4 June. I'll
11:22:55 36 tender that information report.
11:22:57 37
11:22:59 38 #EXHIBIT RC42 - Information report of 3/6/99.
11:23:05 39
11:23:05 40 There's an information report again the following day.
11:23:07 41 Again this one might be redacted although I'm not sure it
11:23:12 42 is. I'll ask that this one be shown on the screen, it's
11:23:19 43 VPL.0005.0007.0208. This indicates that you were present
11:23:31 44 at a meeting with Detective Pope and Ms Gobbo in South
11:23:35 45 Melbourne?---Yes.
11:23:37 46
11:23:37 47 And on that occasion she provided the computer disc which

11:23:41 1 contained information regarding her former employer?---Yes.
11:23:46 2
11:23:49 3 Sorry, it was a discussion about providing the computer
11:23:52 4 disc, not that she provided it. And she stated she'd be in
11:23:56 5 a position to locate the disc over the weekend and give you
11:24:01 6 a call the following week so that she could hand it
11:24:05 7 over?---Yes.
11:24:05 8
11:24:05 9 Do you recall where that meeting took place?---No.
11:24:07 10
11:24:11 11 Somewhere in South Melbourne?---I can only rely on what's
11:24:15 12 in the information report.
11:24:15 13
11:24:16 14 Do you have a recollection of how she came into possession
11:24:19 15 of the disc that she was to provide?---No.
11:24:22 16
11:24:23 17 Whether it was information that she had taken more recently
11:24:29 18 from the computer the subject of Operation Ramsden or if it
11:24:37 19 was something that she possessed historically?---I don't
11:24:40 20 have any recollection.
11:24:45 21
11:24:45 22 COMMISSIONER: That's RC43.
11:24:48 23
24 #EXHIBIT RC43 - Information report dated 4/6/99.
25
11:24:48 26 MS TITTENSOR: Thank you, Commissioner. Your statement
11:24:52 27 indicates that was the last contact you had with
11:24:55 28 Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
11:24:56 29
11:24:58 30 You're aware that Detective Pope continued to have some
11:25:02 31 further contact with her?---Yes.
11:25:04 32
11:25:13 33 If I can ask that the information report relating to 9 June
11:25:17 34 1999 be put on the screen. It's VPL.0005.0007.0214.
11:25:39 35 That's simply Detective Pope making arrangements to meet,
11:25:48 36 is that right, depending on her commitments?---Yes, I'm
11:25:50 37 just reading it. Yes.
11:25:52 38
11:25:52 39 I tender that document, Commissioner.
11:25:57 40
11:25:57 41 #EXHIBIT RC44 - Information report 9/6/99.
11:26:08 42
11:26:08 43 The next document is an information from Friday 11 June
11:26:16 44 1999, VPL.0005.0007.0215. If you can have a quick read of
11:26:36 45 that you'll see that it's postponing some arrangements to
11:26:39 46 meet?---Yes.
11:26:41 47

11:26:41 1 And she's providing some information in relation to Peter
11:26:51 2 Reid?---Yes.
11:26:52 3
11:26:53 4 The fact that she was providing some information in
11:26:56 5 relation to Peter Reid would indicate that he was of some
11:27:00 6 relevance to the Operation Ramsden investigation?---I'm
11:27:08 7 aware that he was of some relevance based on my reading of
11:27:12 8 the information reports, yes.
11:27:13 9
11:27:14 10 I tender that document.
11:27:17 11
11:27:18 12 #EXHIBIT RC45 - Information report dated 11/6/99.
11:27:27 13
11:27:39 14 The next information report which I'll ask not to be shown
11:27:43 15 on the screen relates to 14 June 1999. It's
11:27:53 16 VPL.0005.0007.0216. Detective Pope indicates that on that
11:28:02 17 day, 14 June 1999, he met with Ms Gobbo in South Melbourne
11:28:07 18 and he had with him Detectives Olney and Sneddon for
11:28:15 19 security. Do you recall reading something of that nature
11:28:18 20 recently?---Yes.
11:28:18 21
11:28:19 22 At that meeting she provided Detective Pope with a disc
11:28:23 23 which she told him had documents saved on it directly from
11:28:27 24 her former employer's computer. She told him that she in
11:28:35 25 fact didn't have lunch with Reid on Saturday but has been
11:28:38 26 invited to have dinner with him later that week before he
11:28:42 27 was due to be sentenced in the County Court. She told him
11:28:47 28 that the judge who is due to sentence Mr Reid has expressed
11:28:52 29 concerned about the negotiated sentence which her former
11:28:56 30 employer and the OPP had set and may be sentencing Reid to
11:29:00 31 a term of imprisonment. And Detective Pope indicated that
11:29:05 32 after he'd studied the documents on the disc he would
11:29:08 33 contact her the following week. Do you recall reading
11:29:11 34 that?---I do recall reading an information report around
11:29:16 35 that. I accept what you're saying.
11:29:21 36
11:29:22 37 It's apparent from the contents of that that it must have
11:29:26 38 been known to members of the - or the investigators in
11:29:30 39 relation to Operation Ramsden that her former employer at
11:29:36 40 least was, and someone whom she would have had duties in
11:29:43 41 relation to, she was providing information which might not
11:29:49 42 be in his best interests, do you agree with that?---Can you
11:29:53 43 read back the part of the information report around that
11:29:56 44 aspect, please?
11:30:00 45
11:30:00 46 The information report indicates that Mr Reid is due to be
11:30:05 47 sentenced. It further indicates that the solicitor for

11:30:12 1 whom she'd been working was representing Mr Reid. It was
11:30:22 2 plainly understood by this time that the information that
11:30:26 3 Ms Gobbo was providing about her former employer also
11:30:31 4 related to an involvement, a criminal involvement with
11:30:35 5 Mr Reid, is that the case?---But I'm not hearing anything
11:30:40 6 there that may well have not been on the public record.
7
11:31:09 8 It would have been plain to investigators that the
11:31:14 9 information that Ms Gobbo was providing, although primarily
11:31:19 10 in relation to her former employer, also impacted upon a
11:31:24 11 client of that former employer being Mr Reid, do you
11:31:31 12 agree?---On the basis of what you've read from the
11:31:33 13 information report there I don't agree, no.
11:31:36 14
11:31:42 15 COMMISSIONER: I think the question also related to the
11:31:45 16 earlier information report, RC45?---Unfortunately, Your
11:31:52 17 Honour, I don't have those information reports in front of
11:31:54 18 me.
11:31:59 19
11:31:59 20 I'll let Ms Tittensor take you back to that if she wants
11:32:03 21 to.
11:32:04 22
11:32:04 23 MS TITTENSOR: Do you understand that the information that
11:32:06 24 Ms Gobbo had been providing to that point in time related
11:32:10 25 primarily to a solicitor, money laundering by a
11:32:17 26 solicitor?---Yes.
11:32:17 27
11:32:19 28 Do you understand that that information, that money
11:32:22 29 laundering was being said to have been effected through a
11:32:29 30 real estate company?---At least in part, yes, I believe
11:32:33 31 that's the case.
11:32:34 32
11:32:34 33 And that that real estate company was run by Mr Reid?---I
11:32:40 34 would really want to have that material in front of me
11:32:43 35 before I can - sorry.
11:32:45 36
11:32:52 37 I think I've tendered that - have I tendered 14 June - - -
11:32:57 38
11:32:58 39 COMMISSIONER: No, I don't think so.
11:33:00 40
11:33:00 41 #EXHIBIT RC46 - Information report 14/06/99.
11:33:19 42
11:33:20 43 MS TITTENSOR: Sorry, Commissioner, that was - - -
11:33:21 44
11:33:21 45 COMMISSIONER: 14 June 1999 was RC46.
11:33:25 46
11:33:25 47 MS TITTENSOR: 46, thank you, Commissioner. The next

11:33:37 1 information report I think can be shown on the screen. It
11:33:40 2 relates to 15 June 1999. It's VPL.0005.0007.0217. This
11:34:00 3 indicates that Detective Pope received a call from
11:34:04 4 Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
11:34:05 5
11:34:06 6 She told him about the upcoming sentence for
11:34:09 7 Mr Reid?---Yes.
11:34:10 8
11:34:10 9 And that he was going to have an all night party and then
11:34:14 10 go straight to court and that she'd been invited and was
11:34:17 11 going to attend?---Yes.
11:34:18 12
11:34:20 13 During that conversation she raised the issue of a consent
11:34:27 14 to a variation of a restraining order on a property owned
11:34:32 15 by a client of hers?---Yes.
11:34:35 16
11:34:35 17 And wanted Detective Pope to speak to the informant about
11:34:40 18 that occurring to see what he could do?---Yes.
11:34:44 19
11:34:45 20 Were you made aware of that at the time?---Um, again I have
11:34:50 21 no recollection. I may well have been.
11:34:53 22
11:34:54 23 I tender that document, Commissioner.
11:34:58 24
11:34:59 25
11:35:01 26 #EXHIBIT RC47 - Information report 15/06/99.
11:35:04 27
11:35:05 28 The next document which can also be shown relates to 16
11:35:08 29 June 99, VPL.0005.0007.0218. That indicates that Detective
11:35:31 30 Pope called Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
11:35:34 31
11:35:35 32 He'd spoken to the informant in relation to the block of
11:35:38 33 land but essentially had had no joy in relation to any
11:35:44 34 consent variation?---Well I wouldn't put it in those terms
11:35:49 35 but that was not an avenue that the informant was prepared
11:35:54 36 to consider.
11:35:57 37
11:35:58 38 And she said she'd then go through channels at the
11:36:04 39 OPP?---Yes.
11:36:04 40
11:36:07 41 She then gave some information as to Mr Reid's
11:36:11 42 sentence?---Yes.
11:36:12 43
11:36:14 44 I tender that information report, Commissioner.
11:36:19 45
11:36:20 46
11:36:21 47 #EXHIBIT RC48 - Information report 6/06/99.

11:36:30 1
11:36:30 2 There's a note in Mr Pope's diary of 23 September.
11:36:38 3 According to his diary he spoke to Ms Gobbo on that day in
11:36:41 4 relation to Operation Ramsden, although we don't appear to
11:36:45 5 have any associated information report. Have you got any
11:36:50 6 information about that date?---Um, just bear with me. I'm
11:37:03 7 not sure whether that's a date that appears in the final
11:37:07 8 report that I provide in relation to the de-registration of
11:37:11 9 Gobbo.
11:37:15 10
11:37:15 11 Because I think you're right about that and perhaps I'll
11:37:18 12 come to it. We do have another last information report,
11:37:25 13 although I'm not sure again whether this has been redacted.
11:37:30 14 No. So I'll tender it but ask that it not be shown again,
11:37:36 15 Commissioner. It's 1 October 1999. It's
11:37:44 16 VPL.0005.0007.0219. This information report indicates that
11:37:50 17 after a number of preliminary phone calls Detective Pope
11:37:54 18 met with Ms Gobbo on Friday, 1 October. He said she didn't
11:38:00 19 have any new information, was mainly interested in how the
11:38:02 20 investigation was progressing. She told him that her
11:38:08 21 former employer had moved into a new office, that he owned
11:38:12 22 the entire building, and so forth. Do you recall that
11:38:16 23 information report?---I recall reading that information
11:38:19 24 report recently, yes.
11:38:20 25
11:38:20 26 She told Detective Pope that she was still in regular
11:38:23 27 contact with her former employer and is being briefed by
11:38:27 28 him on a regular basis?---Yes.
11:38:29 29
11:38:30 30 And that Detective Pope informed her that, "The
11:38:33 31 investigation is progressing slowly and we are awaiting the
11:38:37 32 end of the Lambert trial in the County Court"?---I recall
11:38:41 33 reading that, yes.
11:38:41 34
11:38:42 35 Was there some involvement in some other trial in the
11:38:44 36 County Court that was progressing at that time?---I've got
11:38:48 37 no memory of what those circumstances were.
11:38:50 38
11:38:51 39 Now, the fact is that there was nothing that ever arose out
11:38:57 40 of the investigations into Ms Gobbo's former employer, is
11:39:01 41 that right?---That would appear to be the case, yes.
11:39:04 42
11:39:04 43 He was not even interviewed, let alone charged?---Correct.
11:39:08 44
11:39:08 45 And in your statement at paragraph 22 you say, "Operation
11:39:13 46 Ramsden did not progress as an investigation and did not
11:39:16 47 result in any person being charged with a criminal offence.

11:39:20 1 My recollection is that Ms Gobbo was ultimately unwilling
11:39:23 2 or unable to provide the information she had initially
11:39:26 3 promised concerning the trust account and alleged fraud".
11:39:30 4 That's right?---Yes.
11:39:31 5
11:39:34 6 In the following paragraph of your statement you refer to
11:39:38 7 some action you took to have Ms Gobbo's informer status
11:39:42 8 changed from active to inactive?---Yes.
11:39:45 9
11:39:46 10 Did you make that known to Detective Pope at the
11:39:52 11 time?---Well I can't recall that I did but I would assume
11:39:56 12 that that occurred.
11:39:57 13
11:39:58 14 Would it have been usual for him to have a final meeting
11:40:02 15 with her to explain that the informer relationship is
11:40:08 16 over?---Um, I can't recall what the practice was at the
11:40:13 17 time but it's certainly the practice in more recent times,
11:40:19 18 yes.
11:40:19 19
11:40:20 20 I'll just take you to that document that you wrote. It's
11:40:24 21 VPL.0002.0002.0053. That's the document you're referring
11:40:37 22 to?---Yes, it is.
11:40:39 23
11:40:40 24 You've indicated in the second paragraph that there'd been
11:40:48 25 no contact with Ms Gobbo since 23 September 1999?---Yes.
11:40:54 26
11:40:54 27 I take it at the time you wrote this you weren't aware of
11:40:58 28 that last, or if you were aware you'd forgotten about it,
11:41:03 29 that last contact on 1 October reported by Detective
11:41:07 30 Pope?---I can't say what was in my mind at the time. I'm
11:41:11 31 sure if I was aware of the meeting I would have included it
11:41:15 32 in the report.
11:41:15 33
11:41:16 34 In any case, you've recommended then that she be
11:41:20 35 reclassified as inactive?---Yes.
11:41:23 36
11:41:33 37 Were you aware of there being a handover by Detective Pope
11:41:40 38 of Ms Gobbo back to members of the Drug Squad?---I can't
11:41:44 39 recall.
11:41:45 40
11:41:47 41 Were you aware that Ms Gobbo wanted to give information
11:41:53 42 about high level drug trafficking with potential corruption
11:41:57 43 links?---No, I have no recollection of that.
11:42:01 44
11:42:02 45 Do you say the only information you're aware that she was
11:42:05 46 able to or wanted to provide to police at this time related
11:42:10 47 to money laundering?---Um, as I said I have very little

11:42:18 1 recollection of the events at the time given the passage of
11:42:21 2 time. I don't have any recollection around that.
11:42:24 3
11:42:24 4 Would that be something that you would have a recollection
11:42:27 5 about, if Ms Gobbo has finished providing some information
11:42:34 6 or she can't go any further with the squad you're with, but
11:42:37 7 all of a sudden she has high level drug trafficking
11:42:42 8 corruption link information and is being handed over to the
11:42:45 9 Drug Squad, wouldn't that be something that you would
11:42:48 10 remember?---Not necessarily after 20 years, no.
11:42:51 11
11:42:51 12 Were you ever told that Detective Pope handed Ms Gobbo back
11:42:57 13 to Detective Strawhorn and Detective Steve Paton from the
11:43:02 14 Drug Squad at the Emerald Hotel?---I may well have been but
11:43:06 15 I have got no recollection of it.
11:43:08 16
11:43:09 17 If that had occurred by the time of your decision to change
11:43:15 18 her status to inactive, would that be something that you
11:43:17 19 would have noted in that letter?---Not necessarily, no.
11:43:21 20
11:43:22 21 Why not?---Well I think this goes back to this idea of
11:43:30 22 quarantining investigations. So she'd been registered as
11:43:35 23 an informer in relation to a specific investigation and a
11:43:39 24 specific inquiry and when that investigation had basically
11:43:44 25 run its course for whatever reason she was de-registered.
11:43:49 26 I don't see that there would have necessarily been a need
11:43:54 27 to roll out additional information into that communication.
11:44:02 28
11:44:05 29 Mr Pope's diary is delivered to Detective Senior Sergeant
11:44:10 30 Curran for an audit on 6 January 2000 in relation to
11:44:15 31 Ms Gobbo?---Sorry, delivered to Detective Senior Sergeant
11:44:22 32 Curran for audit did you say?
11:44:23 33
11:44:24 34 Yes, in relation to Ms Gobbo. Is that a standard matter
11:44:26 35 when an informer relationship finishes or is that something
11:44:30 36 unusual?---Sorry, what was the date?
11:44:32 37
11:44:32 38 6 January. I think your letter is dated 3 January and his
11:44:38 39 diary is delivered to Detective Senior Sergeant Curran for
11:44:41 40 audit re MFG13 on 6 January?---Is that an entry that's in
11:44:47 41 the diary is it, or - - -
11:44:49 42
11:44:50 43 Yes?---I've got no recollection of that.
11:44:53 44
11:44:53 45 COMMISSIONER: I'm not sure whether we tendered the
11:44:57 46 statement of the informant.
11:45:00 47

11:45:01 1 MS TITTENSOR: I'll tender that.
11:45:02 2
11:45:03 3
11:45:03 4 #EXHIBIT RC49 - Statement of the informant.
11:45:06 5
11:45:06 6 COMMISSIONER: Are you going to be a little while longer, I
11:45:10 7 thought we might have a break?
11:45:12 8
11:45:12 9 MS TITTENSOR: I'm getting very close to the end. You say
11:45:15 10 you don't recall that but is that something normal at the
11:45:18 11 end of an informer relationship or is that something
11:45:22 12 unusual?---I don't recall the detail of the practice of the
11:45:26 13 day but there's certainly a, part of the challenges around
11:45:36 14 the governance arrangements in relation to informers,
11:45:40 15 that's not inconsistent with that notion of governance.
11:45:44 16
11:45:45 17 Detective Pope's diary has got a number of entries in
11:45:48 18 relation to Operation Ramsden following that time. I'll
11:45:53 19 just summarise them for you. On 7 April, so a number of
11:45:58 20 months later, he says, "At Major Fraud Group, meeting with
11:46:04 21 Detective Acting Inspector Curran re Operation Ramsden. On
11:46:08 22 5 May 2000 he has, "Curro and inquiries re Operation
11:46:13 23 Ramsden". On 11 May he's got, "Inquiries with Janet Cohen,
11:46:17 24 legal Ombudsman's office re Operation Ramsden" and then on
11:46:22 25 18 May he has, "In office with Curro re Operation Ramsden.
11:46:28 26 Prepared report to legal Ombudsman's office and NCA re
11:46:31 27 Operation Ramsden". Can you shed any light on those
11:46:34 28 matters in Detective Pope's diaries following the end of
11:46:38 29 the relationship with Ms Gobbo?---So those dates in 2000?
11:46:43 30
11:46:43 31 Yes, in the months following, so in April and May of 2000
11:46:47 32 after you had changed her status effectively in January of
11:46:52 33 2000?---No, I can't, I can't take those matters any
11:46:57 34 further.
11:46:57 35
11:46:58 36 Now, it's apparent that when members of the Drug Squad,
11:47:07 37 Kruger and Lim, initially assessed Ms Gobbo as an informer,
11:47:12 38 at least one of those members, Mr Lim, had some concerns
11:47:17 39 about Ms Gobbo. He assessed her as being too overt in her
11:47:25 40 desire to provide information to police. Do you have any
11:47:30 41 comment to make about that?---No.
11:47:35 42
11:47:37 43 Would you agree with that?---Sorry, this is an observation
11:47:42 44 by then Senior Detective Lim?
11:47:45 45
11:47:45 46 Yes?---I'm unable really to comment what was in his mind
11:47:51 47 though.

11:47:51 1
11:47:51 2 Does it accord with your own observations of her? You met
11:47:55 3 with her sometimes for significant periods of time on at
11:48:03 4 least four occasions?---H'mm.
11:48:05 5
11:48:06 6 Does that assessment accord with your own observations of
11:48:09 7 her?---Sorry, I don't mean to be difficult, can you just
11:48:13 8 read me back his form of words again.
11:48:15 9
11:48:15 10 She was too overt in her desire to provide information to
11:48:18 11 the police?---My very hazy recollection is she was
11:48:23 12 certainly somewhat keen to engage with police. I wouldn't
11:48:29 13 necessarily - in terms of our meetings I wouldn't
11:48:34 14 characterise it as too overt.
11:48:36 15
11:48:36 16 One of the other concerns he also raised was her
11:48:40 17 relationships with some officers was inappropriate. Do you
11:48:42 18 recall there being such concern at the time?---What date
11:48:48 19 was that comment from Mr Lim, sorry?
20
11:48:53 21 She was assessed by Mr Lim and Detective Kruger back in
11:49:01 22 mid-1998. She was brought to your squad in around April or
11:49:09 23 May of the following year?---I don't think, to the best of
11:49:15 24 my knowledge I don't think I had any knowledge of Gobbo
11:49:18 25 prior to those first meetings I had with her.
11:49:23 26
11:49:23 27 Throughout the period that you had knowledge of her do you
11:49:26 28 recall there being any suggestion of her having any
11:49:30 29 relationship with police outside a professional
11:49:35 30 relationship?---Well I have no recollection of that but I'd
11:49:41 31 be confident that it would be something that would actually
11:49:45 32 stick with me, so I don't think I was aware that there was
11:49:49 33 that suggestion at the time.
11:49:50 34
11:49:52 35 Now in your statement you refer to having some involvement
11:49:58 36 in 2010 in relation to some matters relating to Ms Gobbo,
11:50:02 37 is that right?---Can you take me to a paragraph?
11:50:08 38
11:50:10 39 Paragraph 24?---Well not directly, but that's really in
11:50:18 40 there for the purpose of transparency, but yes.
11:50:21 41
11:50:21 42 You were at that stage performing duties as an Acting
11:50:25 43 Superintendent in the Covert Services Division?---Yes.
11:50:28 44
11:50:28 45 You were receiving reports and providing briefings to the
11:50:32 46 Assistant Commissioner?---Yes.
11:50:35 47

11:50:35 1 Who was the Assistant Commissioner that you were briefing
11:50:38 2 at that stage?---I've got a recollection that it was Tracey
11:50:44 3 Linford.
11:50:45 4
11:50:45 5 Sorry?---I've got a - I can't be sure but I think it was
11:50:50 6 Tracey Linford.
11:50:52 7
11:50:52 8 Linford?---L-i-n-f-o-r-d.
11:50:54 9
11:50:55 10 Amongst those reports and briefings were matters relating
11:50:57 11 to some civil proceedings that were going on between
11:51:01 12 Ms Gobbo and the police?---Well, it was solely, not amongst
11:51:06 13 - when you say amongst I think that infers there was a
11:51:10 14 range of matters, it was solely around that.
11:51:12 15
11:51:12 16 Sorry, when I say amongst the briefings, there were
11:51:16 17 obviously plenty of briefings but I'm specifically talking
11:51:19 18 about the ones now relating to Ms Gobbo and that related to
11:51:23 19 civil proceedings that were going on?---Yes.
11:51:24 20
11:51:25 21 And we know that those were occurring between April and
11:51:28 22 August of 2010?---I don't have a date in front of me but I
11:51:33 23 accept what you're saying. I should clarify though, I was
11:51:38 24 not in that upgraded role for all of that period.
11:51:41 25
11:51:41 26 Yes?---Yep.
11:51:42 27
11:51:43 28 Now at paragraph 27 of your statement you indicate that you
11:51:49 29 became, you say, "I've been asked whether I had any
11:51:54 30 knowledge or belief that Ms Gobbo was providing information
11:51:57 31 to police subsequent to 1999"?---Hmm hmm.
11:51:59 32
11:52:00 33 "I only became aware of that during the period of time that
11:52:03 34 I was Acting Superintendent as described in paragraph 24
11:52:07 35 above. The knowledge I received during that time
11:52:10 36 concerning Ms Gobbo's role was minimal and was conveyed to
11:52:14 37 me in the context of the civil proceedings that were then
11:52:18 38 on foot"?---Yes.
11:52:18 39
11:52:19 40 In terms of what you did learn, did you become aware in the
11:52:23 41 context of your briefings in those proceedings that she was
11:52:26 42 providing information about her clients to police?---No.
11:52:32 43
11:52:32 44 What did you become aware of?---Simply that there were
11:52:37 45 injunctions being sought at that point in time on the basis
11:52:42 46 of concerns that her identity would become public and a
11:52:47 47 concern around the risk and safety implications of that and

11:52:52 1 that was essentially it.
11:52:54 2
11:52:55 3 I just want to understand. There are two separate issues,
11:53:00 4 one Ms Gobbo was to be a witness in a trial or some
11:53:07 5 proceedings in early 2010 in relation to I think Mr Dale
11:53:13 6 and Rodney Collins being charged with the murder of the
11:53:19 7 Hodsons, do you recall that?---No, I had no knowledge of
11:53:21 8 that at the time.
11:53:22 9
11:53:22 10 The information about Ms Gobbo providing information to
11:53:26 11 police after 1999, what was the nature of the information
11:53:30 12 you understood she was providing to police after 1999?---I
11:53:34 13 had no understanding of what that information was.
11:53:36 14
11:53:40 15 So when you say in your statement at paragraph 27 you'd
11:53:47 16 been asked about that state of affairs and you say, "I only
11:53:52 17 became aware of this during the period I was Acting
11:53:55 18 Superintendent"?---H'mm.
11:53:56 19
11:53:56 20 That is in 2010. It infers that you became aware that she
11:54:02 21 was providing information to police after 1999?---I came to
11:54:08 22 understand in very, very general and broad terms that she
11:54:11 23 was providing information to police through that period. I
11:54:13 24 had absolutely no knowledge of what that information was.
11:54:16 25
11:54:20 26 Who was giving you the briefings during that period?---Then
11:54:25 27 Detective Inspector John O'Connor, I believe.
11:54:28 28
11:54:31 29 Was there any involvement of legal in the briefings that
11:54:33 30 you were receiving?---No.
11:54:35 31
11:54:41 32 Thank you Commissioner.
11:54:42 33
11:54:44 34 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Segrave, you're obviously
11:54:47 35 aware of the background to this Royal Commission?---In
11:54:50 36 general terms, yes Your Honour.
11:54:51 37
11:54:51 38 And the Terms of Reference?---Yes, Your Honour.
11:54:54 39
11:54:54 40 In particular number 1 and 2, the number of and extent to
11:54:57 41 which cases may have been affected by the conduct of Nicola
11:55:01 42 Gobbo as a human source. And the conduct of current and
11:55:05 43 former members of Victoria Police in their disclosures
11:55:05 44 about and recruitment, handling and management of her as a
11:55:10 45 human source. Is there anything you can add to your
11:55:15 46 statement or the evidence you've given today that would
11:55:18 47 help the Commission?---No.

11:55:21 1
11:55:21 2 Mr Collinson, do you have any questions?
11:55:24 3
11:55:24 4 MR COLLINSON: Just five minutes if the Commission please.
11:55:27 5
6 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR COLLINSON:
7
11:55:27 8 I wanted to have shown to the witness a document that
11:55:31 9 appears to be redacted but it's Mr Kruger's notes, however
11:55:37 10 the front page does refer to Mr Kruger's real name so I
11:55:43 11 simply wanted the operator to go to the body of the notes,
11:55:48 12 a particular page in that. I assume that can be done
11:55:50 13 without the front page being disclosed.
11:55:52 14
11:55:53 15 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
11:55:53 16
11:55:53 17 MR HOLT: I assume it can, yes.
11:55:55 18
11:55:56 19 MR COLLINSON: I'll read out that page and we'll find out.
11:55:59 20
11:55:59 21 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11:56:00 22
11:56:00 23 MR COLLINSON: So it's VPL.0005.0007 - - -
11:56:06 24
11:56:06 25 COMMISSIONER: Mr Collinson, why don't we have a short
11:56:09 26 break and then that can happen.
11:56:30 27
11:56:31 28 MR COLLINSON: Yes, of course.
11:56:33 29
30 (Short adjournment.)
12:12:04 31
12:12:04 32 MS TITTENSOR: Commissioner, it's been indicated to me that
12:12:07 33 I failed to tender one of the documents, it was the second
12:12:11 34 to last document - - -
12:12:11 35
12:12:11 36 COMMISSIONER: We were doing so well. My failure too.
12:12:12 37
12:12:13 38 MS TITTENSOR: Information report dated 1 October with the
12:12:17 39 code VPL.0005.0007.0219. If it was to be in order that
12:12:26 40 would have been RC49, which would make the letter of 3
12:12:34 41 January RC50.
12:12:36 42
12:12:37 43
12:12:38 44 #EXHIBIT RC49 - Information report dated 01/10/99.
12:12:45 45
12:12:46 46
12:12:47 47 #EXHIBIT RC50 - Statement about Nicola Gobbo becoming

inactive.

MS TITTENSOR: Thank you Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Collinson.

MR COLLINSON: So if the operator could go please to this particular page, it's VPL0005.0007.0149.

COMMISSIONER: And the page is part of - - -

MR COLLINSON: It's the diary notes of Mr Kruger. Now, do you know who Mr Kruger is for the purpose of this hearing?---Yes, I do.

I'd ask you to look at the entry around the middle of the page, do you see opposite 9.30 it says "briefing with Pope and Segrave"?---Yes.

If you could just read those three lines to yourself, please?---To myself?

Yes?---Yes, I've got that, thank you.

Now, I think, I realise that you're working from your file notes and you don't have a lot of independent recollection, but I think you gave some evidence that you doubted that you were given any information about Operation Carron in your evidence this morning, do you recall that evidence?---My recollection is that I said I couldn't recall.

Do you agree that this note by Mr Kruger suggests that in fact you were given a briefing about Operation Carron?---Yes.

And if the operator could go, please, to the next page, .0150. You'll see, Mr Segrave, the one line entry there opposite 9.40 am. Just have a read of that?---I'm just trying to understand what - are you able to give me some more context around that?

Sorry, all I wanted to direct your attention to was the expression, "Barrister Gobbo"?---Yes.

12:15:04 1 COMMISSIONER: So what time and date are we talking about
12:15:07 2 here?
12:15:09 3
12:15:09 4 MR COLLINSON: Yes. By reference to this, the dates, it
12:15:11 5 looks like 6 May 1999. Do you see that?---Yes, I do see
12:15:21 6 that. I'm just trying to understand, is that something I
12:15:26 7 acknowledge - - -
12:15:27 8
12:15:27 9 No, I should make it clear I'm not suggesting that you were
12:15:30 10 the recipient of the information at 9.40. These are the
12:15:34 11 notes of Mr Kruger?---Yes.
12:15:36 12
12:15:36 13 But the point I wanted to put to you was that you'll see
12:15:40 14 that Ms Gobbo is described as a barrister in that
12:15:44 15 line?---Yes.
12:15:44 16
12:15:45 17 Whereas I think when you were first interviewed by Task
12:15:52 18 Force Landow your recollection was that Ms Gobbo was
12:15:56 19 working as a solicitor?---Yes.
12:15:58 20
12:15:58 21 When you had the dealings with her?---Yes.
12:16:01 22
12:16:01 23 And it was suggested to you in questioning this morning
12:16:04 24 that in fact Ms Gobbo was a barrister. I take it, is it
12:16:10 25 the case you don't have any independent recollection as to
12:16:14 26 whether Ms Gobbo was a barrister or a solicitor in
12:16:18 27 1999?---That's correct.
12:16:18 28
12:16:20 29 My last question related, Mr Segrave, to your statement, in
12:16:28 30 particular paragraph 28. You say in paragraph 28, and by
12:16:42 31 all means refresh your mind by having another look at it,
12:16:47 32 that certain police officers whom you identify were aware
12:16:51 33 that Ms Gobbo was providing assistance to police in
12:16:59 34 1999/2000. My question of you was, and it might be my not
12:17:02 35 understanding the paragraph properly, and it might be my
12:17:05 36 not understanding the paragraph properly, are you aware of
12:17:07 37 any other police officer within Victoria Police in the
12:17:12 38 period after 1999 that became aware of Ms Gobbo providing
12:17:20 39 assistance as an informer in 1999?---So just so I
12:17:27 40 understand your question correctly, you're asking
12:17:30 41 specifically around that 99 period, but whether
12:17:35 42 subsequently I'm aware of anybody else becoming aware of
12:17:39 43 that?
12:17:40 44
12:17:40 45 Yes. Your involvement was 1999?---Yes.
12:17:45 46
12:17:46 47 Then you continued in Victoria Police?---Yes.

12:17:48 1
12:17:48 2 And I'm seeking to ascertain - perhaps I should be more
12:17:52 3 specific - whether you told anybody in the period after
12:17:55 4 1999 within Victoria Police that you can recollect that
12:17:58 5 Ms Gobbo assisted Victoria Police as an informer in
12:18:04 6 1999?---Not that I can recall, no.
12:18:06 7
12:18:06 8 You don't recollect anybody else doing so in that period
12:18:09 9 after 1999?---No one I'm aware of.
12:18:14 10
12:18:14 11 No further questions.
12:18:15 12
12:18:16 13 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Chettle.
12:18:17 14
15 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR CHETTLE:
16
12:18:18 17 Thank you, Commissioner. Inspector Segrave, in paragraph
12:18:22 18 24 of your statement refers to your acting as an Inspector,
12:18:29 19 Acting Superintendent at the Covert Services
12:18:32 20 Division?---Yes.
12:18:32 21
12:18:32 22 You started that in September of 2007 I gather from
12:18:36 23 reference to your statement?---Sorry?
12:18:38 24
12:18:39 25 You started there in 2007, I think that's what you say in
12:18:45 26 paragraph 3?---So just to be clear, I started in my role as
12:18:50 27 a Detective Inspector in charge of the Special Projects
12:18:55 28 Unit. That was one of the units within the Covert Services
12:19:00 29 Division that was headed up by a Detective Superintendent.
12:19:04 30 On occasions in my time as the Detective Inspector Special
12:19:06 31 Projects Unit I was upgraded into that Detective
12:19:09 32 Superintendent's role from time to time.
12:19:10 33
12:19:10 34 And during that upgraded period you had dealings with the
12:19:15 35 Source Development Unit?---I had line control of them, yes.
12:19:20 36
12:19:21 37 When did you become aware that Nicola Gobbo was a
12:19:25 38 registered source for the Source Development Unit?---Only
12:19:30 39 through the period that I've already given evidence in
12:19:32 40 relation to where there were the civil proceedings afoot
12:19:37 41 and I was providing advice to the Assistant Commissioner in
12:19:44 42 relation to how those proceedings, what was occurring
12:19:51 43 around those proceedings.
12:19:53 44
12:19:53 45 That was where you were getting information from O'Connor,
12:19:56 46 is that what you said before?---I'm sorry?
12:19:59 47

12:19:59 1 You were getting information from Inspector
12:20:03 2 O'Connor?---Yes, at the time but I need to be clear on
12:20:06 3 that. This was just for a very short period of time and
12:20:10 4 they were very general updates in terms of how the
12:20:15 5 applications were proceeding.
12:20:17 6
12:20:18 7 Applications. The civil applications?---That's right.
12:20:22 8
12:20:23 9 Have you produced to the Commission any of your diaries for
12:20:26 10 that subsequent period from 2007 onwards?---No.
12:20:30 11
12:20:31 12 Do you still have them?---There would need to be searches
12:20:37 13 undertaken I would assume.
12:20:38 14
12:20:39 15 Because you were part, I think you say in your statement
12:20:41 16 that you participated in the 2010 CMRD?---Correct.
12:20:47 17
12:20:48 18 And you in fact annexed, there's a reference to that number
12:20:52 19 in your statement, the number of the document, the
12:20:55 20 report?---Yes.
12:20:55 21
12:20:57 22 Is that unredacted yet? Commissioner, I understand there's
12:21:09 23 a PII issue in relation to that. I haven't got it and
12:21:12 24 obviously I need it.
12:21:14 25
12:21:14 26 MR HOLT: I can assist, Commissioner. It's one of the
12:21:16 27 documents that sits in the footnotes of Neil Paterson's
12:21:20 28 report. It is close to being completed.
12:21:22 29
12:21:23 30 COMMISSIONER: Close to being completed. Does this witness
12:21:26 31 have a copy with him?
12:21:27 32
12:21:28 33 MR HOLT: No.
12:21:28 34
12:21:28 35 COMMISSIONER: He won't have a copy of it with him.
12:21:28 36
12:21:28 37 MR HOLT: No, because we focused, as we were asked to,
12:21:30 38 quite properly on those statements for the 93 to 2000
12:21:34 39 period, obviously other than the holiday he is about to
12:21:40 40 embark on. Inspector Segrave was otherwise local so
12:21:43 41 managed to be contacted.
12:21:43 42
12:21:43 43 COMMISSIONER: Does anyone on your side, Mr Holt, have a
12:21:44 44 copy in court? No?
12:21:46 45
12:21:46 46 MR HOLT: Not appropriately redacted, Commissioner, no.
12:21:48 47

12:21:48 1 COMMISSIONER: Even if it's not redacted the witness could
12:21:51 2 be shown it and perhaps taken to unredacted bits of it.
12:21:51 3
12:21:52 4 MR HOLT: In fact not at all, ad that review, I don't even
12:21:54 5 know if the redaction review for that document has ever
12:21:57 6 been completed.
7
8 COMMISSIONER: I see.
9
10 MR HOLT: Because it's outside the period we were dealing
12:22:00 11 with today.
12
13 MR CHETTLE: I'm stuck with that but the point,
12:22:01 14 Commissioner, is I might - - -
12:22:01 15
16 COMMISSIONER: If it becomes relevant you might need to
12:22:05 17 have him recalled.
18
19 MR CHETTLE: Yes, I need to see it. Yes, thank you. To
12:22:07 20 your knowledge was Mr Pope an Assistant Commissioner from
12:22:10 21 roundabout 2010, 2012/13 period?---He certainly was an
12:22:14 22 Assistant Commissioner. I would have to check or have
12:22:21 23 something in front of me in relation to the actual date.
12:22:25 24
25 Did you report to him in any way in relation to the
12:22:28 26 financial issues between the police and Ms Gobbo?---I don't
12:22:31 27 think I reported to anybody in relation to the financial
12:22:38 28 issues.
12:22:41 29
30 Civil issues. Was there a committee in place that was
12:22:42 31 determining or looking at the issue of how much would be
12:22:45 32 paid to Ms Gobbo as part of the civil settlement?---Nothing
12:22:49 33 that I was a party to or had any knowledge of.
12:22:52 34
35 You didn't have anything to do with that?---No.
12:22:56 36
37 Your involvement such as it is would be set out in your
12:22:58 38 diaries, I take it?---Quite possibly. My involvement was
12:23:03 39 as simple as John O'Connor being involved in the process
12:23:08 40 that I've talked about.
12:23:14 41
42 Can you explain that, what that was?---Well, my
12:23:16 43 understanding was that it was injunctions being sought
12:23:20 44 with, in relation to media outlets in relation to
12:23:26 45 publication of details that would tend to identify Gobbo.
12:23:30 46
47 The dates of that are obviously 2010, after she's ceased

12:23:46 1 being an informer?---I'm not aware what her status was.
12:23:49 2
12:23:51 3 But that's the only way you became aware that she had been
12:23:54 4 a police source?---That's right, and again I think it's
12:23:59 5 important that I make it clear that I was given nor sought
12:24:04 6 any detail in relation to those communications. It was
12:24:07 7 really communication around the process that was on foot
12:24:13 8 rather than any detail around Gobbo.
12:24:15 9
12:24:16 10 So far as your participation in the 2010 CMRD, would that
12:24:20 11 be covered in your diary or in notes that you kept or
12:24:23 12 anything of that sort?---That was a piece of work that
12:24:27 13 probably took the best part of six months, so I'm not sure
12:24:31 14 what level of detail you'd be - - -
12:24:34 15
12:24:35 16 I haven't been able to see it so I'll wait until another
12:24:39 17 day. Finally, did you ever communicate with any member of
12:24:43 18 the Source Development Unit the fact that you had had some
12:24:47 19 involvement with Ms Gobbo as an informer in the early
12:24:52 20 years?---No.
12:24:52 21
12:24:52 22 Thank you.
12:24:53 23
12:24:53 24 COMMISSIONER: Thank you, anybody else applying to
12:24:58 25 cross-examine? No. Ms Argiropoulos?
12:25:03 26
12:25:03 27 MS ARGIROPOULOS: I have no re-examination.
12:25:04 28
12:25:05 29 COMMISSIONER: Ms Tittensor.
12:25:05 30
31 <RE-EXAMINED BY MS TITTENSOR:
32
12:25:07 33 Detective Segrave, we've been provided with your original
12:25:11 34 diary. The diary has some blue sticky notes in it or blue
12:25:18 35 tabs. You're aware of that?---Yes.
12:25:21 36
12:25:23 37 Those blue tabs correspond with the sections of your diary
12:25:28 38 that we've previously been provided with. Do you agree
12:25:33 39 with that?---I can't be sure what you've been provided with
12:25:39 40 but I accept what you're saying.
12:25:41 41
12:25:41 42 Who, to your knowledge, put the blue tabs on the diary?---I
12:25:45 43 don't know.
12:25:46 44
12:25:47 45 Were you responsible for going through the diary to
12:25:51 46 identify relevant material provided to the
12:25:57 47 Commission?---The diary was provided to me with those pages

12:26:02 1 marked. I haven't really gone through the diary in
12:26:07 2 forensic detail, if I can use that term, around that, no.
12:26:11 3
12:26:12 4 Were you provided with a copy of the relevant entries in
12:26:15 5 the diary that have been provided to the Commission?---Yes.
12:26:19 6
12:26:20 7 I took you earlier today to information which indicated
12:26:24 8 that the Asset Recovery Squad contact with the Drug Squad
12:26:28 9 in relation to this matter commenced earlier than 12 May,
12:26:33 10 which is the day that you commenced dealing with the facts
12:26:36 11 in relation to this matter, do you recall that?---The fact
12:26:39 12 that you took me to it, yes.
12:26:41 13
12:26:41 14 Yes. And that I took you to the dates of 27 and 28 April,
12:26:48 15 do you recall that?---I can't recall explicitly but I
12:26:52 16 accept that, yes.
12:26:52 17
12:26:53 18 There certainly is nothing in your statement in relation to
12:26:56 19 any time earlier or any dealings you've had earlier than 12
12:27:01 20 May 1999?---Yes.
12:27:09 21
12:27:10 22 And you've never been asked by anyone from Victoria Police
12:27:14 23 or from the lawyers representing Victoria Police to go back
12:27:17 24 to your diary and review an entry on 28 April 1999?---No,
12:27:28 25 not that I can recall. That's not referenced in my
12:27:31 26 statement?
12:27:32 27
12:27:32 28 There's no reference in your statement to that time. I'm
12:27:36 29 asking even since you've made your statement have you been
12:27:39 30 asked to go back and look at an entry in your diary for 28
12:27:42 31 April to provide some comment about it?---No.
12:27:45 32
12:27:45 33 That's not happened?---I don't believe so, no.
12:27:48 34
12:27:48 35 I just want to read to you an entry in your diary which is
12:27:55 36 marked with a yellow sticker and not a blue sticker. Have
12:28:00 37 you seen that?---I don't believe so, no.
12:28:03 38
12:28:03 39 When was the last time you were shown your original diary?
12:28:07 40
12:28:07 41 MR HOLT: Can I just approach my learned friend, Your
12:28:10 42 Honour.
12:28:13 43
12:28:22 44 MS TITTENSOR: Your diary indicates that at 9 o'clock in
12:28:24 45 the morning you cleared the office with Senior Detective
12:28:27 46 Pope to 9.30 attendance at Drug Squad. Meeting with
12:28:34 47 Detective Senior Sergeant Strawhorn and Senior Detective

12:28:38 1 [REDACTED]. Sorry, I ask for that name to be redacted.
12:28:45 2
12:28:45 3 COMMISSIONER: Yes, that can be struck from the record.
12:28:49 4
12:28:50 5 MS TITTENSOR: And Senior Detective Kruger re, and there's
12:28:54 6 an initial there, investigation, to 10.25 and then you
12:29:00 7 return to the office. You then say there, "Analysis of
12:29:07 8 above information/liaison with Detective Acting Inspector
12:29:13 9 Curran and solicitor Roger Jeans re related implications".
12:29:18 10 Now, who was Roger Jeans?---A solicitor attached to the
12:29:26 11 Major Fraud Group and specifically the Asset Recovery
12:29:29 12 Squad.
12:29:29 13
12:29:30 14 What were the related implications that you were discussing
12:29:36 15 with Roger Jeans?---I've got no recollection of that and I
12:29:43 16 think as I've already suggested, I haven't been aware of
12:29:46 17 that entry before you brought it to my attention now.
12:29:49 18
12:29:50 19 And no one else has brought to your attention to look at
12:29:53 20 that entry in your diary?---No.
12:29:55 21
12:29:58 22 Do you recall that that solicitor was on hand for you at
12:30:04 23 any time you wanted to discuss any issues with him?---More
12:30:11 24 or less, yes, he'd provided legal expertise around the
12:30:17 25 *Confiscation Act* and related issues.
12:30:19 26
12:30:20 27 Do you expect that you consulted him because of the
12:30:25 28 implications relating to Ms Gobbo wanting to provide
12:30:31 29 information about her former employer?---No, I doubt that
12:30:34 30 would have been the case.
12:30:35 31
12:30:36 32 What would you expect that you were consulting with
12:30:39 33 solicitor Roger Jeans about?---Well, I'm veering into
12:30:46 34 speculation here but, as I say, his expertise lay with
12:30:54 35 interpretation and application of the *Confiscation Act*.
12:30:57 36
12:30:57 37 Do you say you are unlikely to have raised with him that
12:31:03 38 the information you were receiving was from a lawyer about
12:31:08 39 a lawyer?---Yes.
12:31:11 40
12:31:11 41 That's just something that you wouldn't have discussed with
12:31:15 42 the solicitor in your squad?---Well I - at the risk of
12:31:21 43 repeating myself I've got no recollection of what I did or
12:31:24 44 didn't discuss but thinking about it now I can't see that
12:31:27 45 that would be something that we would necessarily have
12:31:30 46 sought his advice on.
12:31:31 47

12:31:32 1 Why wouldn't you seek his advice on that? You've indicated
12:31:38 2 that you would expect that that fact that she was a lawyer
12:31:42 3 would have been of some concern to you, why would you not
12:31:45 4 have sought advice about it?---Um, well I'm just thinking
12:31:55 5 about the types of involvements that I recall Mr Jeans
12:32:01 6 having and it would have been outside the normal types of
12:32:05 7 advice that we would seek from him and I think - I'm not
12:32:11 8 sure why we would seek advice around what really I think,
12:32:21 9 in my mind anyway, in terms of the facts that we understood
12:32:27 10 them at that time was an employer/employee relationship.

12:32:30 11
12:32:31 12 Albeit you express in your statement that the fact that she
12:32:34 13 was a lawyer would have been of some concern?---I'm not
12:32:38 14 sure that I put it in terms of concern, did I? What
12:32:43 15 paragraph is that in? Sorry, if you're able to take me to
12:33:15 16 a paragraph.

12:33:15 17
12:33:16 18 I'm just hunting for the paragraph. In paragraph 14 you
12:33:40 19 say, "I believe, although I don't specifically recall, that
12:33:43 20 Ms Gobbo's position as a lawyer, together with the subject
12:33:47 21 matter of the information she was expected to provide,
12:33:49 22 would have been relevant considerations in determining that
12:33:52 23 she should be registered at an early stage of our
12:33:59 24 interactions with her"?---So maybe a fine point but I think
12:34:03 25 my former words around consideration is different to
12:34:08 26 concern.

12:34:09 27
12:34:10 28 At the conclusion of your statement in paragraph 36 you
12:34:15 29 talk about, or you respond to some questions about some
12:34:18 30 fundamental rights that all police are taught in relation
12:34:26 31 to things such as the right to silence, the right to a
12:34:30 32 lawyer and so forth?---Yes.

12:34:31 33
12:34:31 34 Do you expect that those types of matters would have
12:34:35 35 factored into a consideration as to whether it would be
12:34:40 36 appropriate to register Ms Gobbo?---So do you mean all of
12:34:45 37 those points?

12:34:48 38
12:34:48 39 Do you expect that you might have sought some advice or it
12:34:53 40 might have been prudent to seek some advice about those
12:34:57 41 sorts of considerations, that she was a lawyer, that the
12:35:03 42 type of information that she might provide might impact
12:35:06 43 upon her professional duties such as legal professional
12:35:13 44 privilege, providing information that's not in the best
12:35:16 45 interests of her clients?---Um, again, I have no specific
12:35:25 46 recollection of what was in my mind at the time but I think
12:35:28 47 it likely that certainly issues around legal professional

12:35:33 1 privilege would have been something that we were mindful of
12:35:37 2 and I was mindful of, but my understanding of the
12:35:41 3 circumstances that we were considering at the time was
12:35:45 4 essentially an employer/employee relationship.

12:35:49 5
12:35:49 6 So you say that any discussion that you had in relation to
12:35:58 7 related implications with solicitor Roger Jeans related
12:36:04 8 nothing to the fact that Ms Gobbo or the person she was
12:36:07 9 providing information about was a lawyer, you say
12:36:11 10 that?---No, I say that I've got no recollection of that
12:36:15 11 conversation and, um, I'm actually struggling with the
12:36:20 12 context and the time line given that, you know, I have only
12:36:24 13 just been provided with this information in the last ten
12:36:27 14 minutes, so I'm struggling to contextualise it in terms of
12:36:32 15 the other information that my statement conveys. What I'm
12:36:36 16 relying on is my recollection of the type of work and the
12:36:41 17 type of advice that Mr Jeans provided and my understanding
12:36:46 18 of the general circumstances that we were dealing with in
12:36:51 19 terms of Gobbo and my assessment that it's unlikely, given
12:36:55 20 those two, that we would have sought advice from Jeans
12:36:59 21 specifically around this issue.

12:37:04 22
12:37:04 23 And whilst you say now that you would have taken the
12:37:08 24 matters, those factors into account that she was a lawyer,
12:37:13 25 that there might have been the possibility of such conflict
12:37:17 26 in relation to her professional duties, you agree that you
12:37:21 27 didn't raise any of those matters in the informer
12:37:25 28 application form, where those things might be expected to
12:37:31 29 be listed?---Well I'm not sure that I'm - what I'm saying
12:37:38 30 is we would have been mindful around the potential,
12:37:42 31 depending on how the relationship evolved, the potential
12:37:48 32 for issues around legal professional privilege, but at the
12:37:52 33 point in time, and as that relationship played out, I'm not
12:37:56 34 sure that that ever became a live issue. In terms of the
12:38:00 35 actual form, my view is that the process, the policy, the
12:38:08 36 framework, the systems, the documentation that was
12:38:12 37 available to us in 1999, with the hindsight of 20 years of
12:38:17 38 improved practice were probably somewhat lacking and one of
12:38:22 39 the areas that perhaps they were lacking was around a more
12:38:27 40 structured risk assessment process where something like
12:38:30 41 that may well have sat. But I think the fact that it's not
12:38:35 42 there is potentially an outcome of the process more than
12:38:39 43 anything else.

12:38:40 44
12:38:40 45 You'd never registered a lawyer or had anything to do with
12:38:45 46 a lawyer being an informer?---No.

12:38:47 47

12:38:47 1 This was something new?---Well it's the first and only time
12:38:51 2 I think that I've been in that situation, yes.
12:38:53 3
12:38:55 4 You've indicated that you, it was a factor in your
12:39:01 5 decision-making process, is that right?---Well, what I've
12:39:07 6 said in my statement I think is that it is likely that it
12:39:10 7 would have been. I have no recollection that it was per se
12:39:14 8 but I think given, you know, the fact that she was in my
12:39:22 9 words a solicitor, that would be something that we took
12:39:25 10 into account, yes.
12:39:26 11
12:39:26 12 But in relation to the person that comes to look at the
12:39:31 13 application by Pope and the supervisor details recommending
12:39:36 14 her registration, they are not given any information about
12:39:40 15 the fact that she's a lawyer and that there need to be
12:39:44 16 precautions in this ongoing relationship with this
12:39:47 17 lawyer?---Well they're certainly not given the information
12:39:49 18 that she is a lawyer. I'm not sure what you mean by
12:39:52 19 precautions.
12:39:53 20
12:39:53 21 Well if you're going to have an ongoing relationship with a
12:39:56 22 lawyer, I think you've already agreed that there are the
12:40:01 23 possibility of her breaching confidences, of her not acting
12:40:05 24 in the best interests of her clients and that those things
12:40:08 25 need to be taken into account, there need to be some
12:40:11 26 boundaries set?---Yes, and that goes to the commentary I've
12:40:14 27 given around the risk assessment process at the time.
12:40:17 28
12:40:17 29 Certainly none of those matters are dealt with in a section
12:40:21 30 of the report that deals with special considerations in
12:40:24 31 handling?---Yes, that's correct.
12:40:27 32
12:40:34 33 When you were upgraded in 2010, did you recall then that
12:40:43 34 you had dealt with Ms Gobbo back in the 1999 period of
12:40:50 35 time?---Yes.
12:40:51 36
12:40:51 37 Did you tell anyone?---No.
12:40:53 38
12:40:53 39 Why not?---Again I think it goes to this notion of
12:40:57 40 quarantining investigations and information and
12:41:01 41 intelligence around investigations. It's not my practice
12:41:04 42 to talk about any investigations that I've been involved in
12:41:11 43 with people other than those that need to know essentially.
12:41:16 44
12:41:16 45 Why would Victoria Police, who were dealing with this
12:41:20 46 litigation in 2010, the upper echelons of Victoria Police,
12:41:25 47 not want to know about this registration back in

12:41:28 1 1999?---Well my very scant understanding of what was
12:41:33 2 occurring was that there were applications being made
12:41:36 3 around her involvement in that more current period.
12:41:46 4
12:41:47 5 Are you saying you made a conscious decision in 2010 not to
12:41:51 6 tell anyone in Victoria Police that you'd had prior
12:41:54 7 dealings with this person as an informer?---Yes.
12:41:56 8
12:41:59 9 Is that something, is that an attitude that was widespread
12:42:05 10 amongst Victoria Police?---When you say attitude, if you
12:42:10 11 mean, um, being conscious of the need to ensure security
12:42:17 12 around a range of things pertaining to investigations, yes.
12:42:22 13
12:42:23 14 Were you aware of Mr Pope then in 2010 having anything to
12:42:29 15 do with this involvement with Ms Gobbo around that period
12:42:34 16 of time?---No.
12:42:35 17
12:42:37 18 Did you have any - you were aware that he was back at
12:42:40 19 Victoria Police around that period of time?---I'm not - I'd
12:42:44 20 have to check the chronology there as well. But my
12:42:49 21 recollection is that the person that I was reporting up to
12:42:52 22 was Tracey Linford and if that's right then Mr Pope would
12:42:56 23 have I think left the organisation at that point.
12:42:59 24
12:43:02 25 There's nothing further, Commissioner.
12:43:04 26
12:43:04 27 COMMISSIONER: Mr Segrave, a number of times in your
12:43:06 28 statement, for example paragraphs 11, 12 and 13, you talk
12:43:10 29 about the information reports and you say you have no
12:43:14 30 independent recollection of the information in the
12:43:18 31 information reports but you accept that the information
12:43:20 32 report accurately reports what occurred. Is the position
12:43:25 33 if you have no independent recollection of the information
12:43:26 34 in the information reports you can't say one way or the
12:43:29 35 other whether the information report accurately reports
12:43:32 36 what occurred?---I accept that position, Your Honour.
12:43:36 37
12:43:37 38 Thank you. Ms Argiropoulos, there was some new material
12:43:42 39 raised, was there anything arising out of that?
12:43:44 40
12:43:45 41 MS ARGIROPOULOS: No, Commissioner.
12:43:46 42
12:43:46 43 MS TITTENSOR: I might seek that copies be made of the
12:43:49 44 diary entries for 27 and 28 April, Your Honour, and provide
12:43:54 45 it and I'll tender those entries.
12:43:57 46
12:43:58 47 MR HOLT: We'll make those arrangements.

12:43:59 1
12:43:59 2 COMMISSIONER: That's the diary entries for - - -
12:44:03 3
12:44:03 4 MS TITTENSOR: I might say the 27 April entry indicates
12:44:06 5 that Detective Segrave was on sick leave, which is when we
12:44:12 6 understand there was the first contact between Detective
12:44:15 7 Pope in relation to the matter and then the 28th of April
12:44:19 8 is as I've just taken Mr Segrave through.
12:44:23 9
12:44:24 10
12:44:26 11 #EXHIBIT RC 51 - Diary entries for 27-28/4/99 for
12:44:35 12 Mr Segrave.
12:44:35 13
14
12:44:36 15 COMMISSIONER: Mr Segrave can be excused?
12:44:38 16
12:44:38 17 MS TITTENSOR: Yes.
12:44:39 18
12:44:39 19 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Segrave, you're excused?---Thank
12:44:42 20 you, Your Honour.
12:44:43 21
22 (Witness excused.)
23
12:44:44 24 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
12:44:44 25
12:44:44 26 COMMISSIONER: Yes. The next witness is to be?
12:44:54 27
12:44:55 28 MR WOODS: The next witness, Commissioner, is Mr Rodney
12:45:00 29 Andrew Arthur. He will be a fairly brief witness. I note
12:45:03 30 the time. We might be able to finish him before lunch, I
12:45:06 31 think.
12:45:58 32
12:45:58 33 COMMISSIONER: Would you like to take the oath or the
12:46:00 34 affirmation?---Oath please, Your Honour.
12:46:10 35
12:46:14 36 <RODNEY ANDREW ARTHUR, sworn and examined:
12:46:18 37
12:46:23 38 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Mr Arthur, would you state your full name
12:46:25 39 again please?---Rodney Andrew Arthur.
12:46:29 40
12:46:29 41 You are currently employed by Victoria Police?---That's
12:46:32 42 correct.
12:46:32 43
12:46:32 44 What is your current rank and position?---I'm normally a
12:46:36 45 Detective Senior Sergeant of police attached to the Task
12:46:40 46 Force Salus, I'm upgraded again today so Detective Acting
12:46:45 47 Inspector.

12:46:45 1
12:46:46 2 Is Task Force Salus part of the Professional Standards
12:46:50 3 Command?---It is.
12:46:51 4
5
12:46:53 6 COMMISSIONER: Would you prefer to stand? You can sit if
12:46:55 7 you want. Is it more comfortable to stand?---I'm fine like
12:47:00 8 this, Your Honour.
12:47:01 9
12:47:01 10 You prefer to stand?---Yes, Your Honour.
12:47:04 11
12:47:04 12 MS ARGIROPOULOS: You've made a statement to this Royal
12:47:06 13 Commission?---I have.
12:47:07 14
12:47:08 15
12:47:08 16 COMMISSIONER: Could you point the microphone a bit more
12:47:11 17 upwards if you're going to stand?---I have.
12:47:16 18
12:47:16 19 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Can I ask you to have a look at that
12:47:18 20 document in front of you and ask if you recognise that to
12:47:20 21 be the statement you made dated 26 March 2019?---Yes, it is
12:47:24 22 and that's my signature.
12:47:25 23
12:47:25 24 And the contents of that statement, are they true and
12:47:28 25 correct?---They are.
12:47:29 26
12:47:29 27 Commissioner, I tender the statement of Rodney Andrew
12:47:33 28 Arthur.
12:47:33 29
12:47:34 30 #EXHIBIT RC512 - Statement of Rodney Andrew Arthur.
12:47:38 31
12:47:39 32 Finally, as part of that statement have you prepared an
12:47:43 33 appendix which details your employment and education
12:47:48 34 history?---I have.
12:47:48 35
12:47:49 36 Commissioner, I wonder if that could be tendered as part of
12:47:52 37 the statement.
12:47:53 38
12:47:58 39 #EXHIBIT RC52 - (part of) Appendix to statement of Rodney
40 Andrew Arthur.
12:48:04 41
42 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR WOODS:
43
12:48:09 44 You went through the Academy in 1988, is that
12:48:14 45 correct?---That's correct.
12:48:14 46
12:48:14 47 After a few positions at Springvale and then Russell Street

12:48:18 1 in the period of May 94 to May 96 you were with the A
12:48:25 2 District Support Group, is that correct?---That's correct.
12:48:28 3
12:48:29 4 And that's as set out in Appendix A which has just been
12:48:33 5 shown to the Commission, is that correct?---That's correct.
12:48:35 6
12:48:36 7 Now, the Commission's received various diary notes and day
12:48:40 8 books from some police members. It's the situation that
12:48:44 9 you don't have - well I'll ask you this. Is it the
12:48:49 10 situation that you don't have diary notes at all from the
12:48:54 11 period or is it that your diary notes simply don't mention
12:48:57 12 anything about your contact with Nicola Gobbo?---My diary
12:49:01 13 notes don't mention any contact with Nicola Gobbo.
12:49:04 14
12:49:04 15 Do you have day books as well?---Yes, that's correct.
12:49:06 16
12:49:06 17 And have you been through those?---I have been through
12:49:10 18 those.
12:49:10 19
12:49:10 20 And again no mention?---No. And I've supplied those to
12:49:14 21 Landow.
12:49:14 22
12:49:15 23 But it is the case though that you have an independent
12:49:18 24 recollection of three meetings with Nicola Gobbo, is that
12:49:21 25 correct?---That's correct.
12:49:22 26
12:49:22 27 You can place those meetings in time as being in the first
12:49:26 28 half of 1995, is that correct?---Yes, prior to - within a
12:49:30 29 six month period sort of prior to about July of 95.
12:49:34 30
12:49:34 31 And you can do that because you remember the move from
12:49:38 32 Russell Street and you remember the three meetings were
12:49:41 33 before that move?---That's correct.
12:49:42 34
12:49:42 35 And each of those meetings were in fact outside the old
12:49:47 36 Melbourne Magistrates' Court which was on one of the
12:49:49 37 corners of Latrobe and Russell, is that right?---That's
12:49:54 38 correct.
12:49:54 39
12:49:54 40 And on an opposite corner was the Russell Street police
12:49:58 41 station where you were stationed?---Yes.
12:49:59 42
12:50:00 43 Now, I want to ask you about the first of those meetings
12:50:04 44 and you refer to this at paragraph 7 of your statement.
12:50:08 45 Now firstly Mr Ashton, who the Commission heard from a
12:50:11 46 couple of days ago was your crew Sergeant in the 94/95
12:50:15 47 period, is that correct?---Yes, sort of at various times.

12:50:19 1 So I originally was under Sergeant Mick Holding's crew and
12:50:23 2 at one stage, once he moved on I ended up with Sergeant
12:50:28 3 Ashton.
12:50:29 4
12:50:29 5 All right. Now, this first meeting you had outside the
12:50:33 6 Melbourne Magistrates' Court you describe it as being at
12:50:36 7 short notice. Why do you have a memory of it being at
12:50:39 8 short notice, can you remember how you found out about
12:50:43 9 it?---I just don't remember anything being planned and it
12:50:45 10 was sort of spur of the moment and very brief in duration.
12:50:48 11
12:50:48 12 And it was Trevor Ashton who took you out at short notice
12:50:53 13 to meet Nicola Gobbo on that first occasion?---That's my
12:50:56 14 recollection, that's correct.
12:50:57 15
12:50:58 16 The meeting happened just outside the Melbourne
12:51:00 17 Magistrates' Court?---It was literally on the corner near
12:51:04 18 the intersection, the stairs there, and just off to the
12:51:08 19 side of that.
12:51:09 20
12:51:09 21 All right. How long did that meeting last for, doing the
12:51:13 22 best you can?---From my recollection each of the meetings,
12:51:16 23 so the first one, five minutes, I don't remember any of
12:51:19 24 them being for an extended duration beyond sort of five
12:51:24 25 minutes.
12:51:24 26
12:51:24 27 Was it explained to you by Sergeant Ashton that he wanted
12:51:28 28 you to come and meet someone who was providing information
12:51:31 29 to the police?---Um, I don't know she had provided
12:51:34 30 information at that stage. It was to meet - what we would
12:51:39 31 term a community contact type person or community source.
12:51:43 32
12:51:44 33 It wasn't a social meeting then?---No.
12:51:46 34
12:51:46 35 It was information of a type, you're just not sure whether
12:51:51 36 it was a community contact or an informer?---My
12:51:54 37 understanding it was not as a registered informer.
12:51:56 38
12:51:57 39 But it was information to assist the police?---Potentially.
12:51:59 40
12:51:59 41 Do you remember what that information was that she provided
12:52:02 42 on that first occasion?---No, I don't particularly remember
12:52:07 43 her providing any specific information. My only
12:52:11 44 recollection is that it more I was introduced to her, who
12:52:14 45 Sergeant Ashton had already obviously had contact, I was
12:52:19 46 introduced to her and no information was obtained from her.
12:52:21 47

12:52:22 1 Your presence there, did you understand that of a
12:52:25 2 corroborator or something similar?---Yes.
12:52:27 3
12:52:27 4 That's good policing, I assume, to have two people present
12:52:30 5 for a meeting like that?---That's correct.
12:52:31 6
12:52:31 7 Did you know at that time that Ms Gobbo had been registered
12:52:36 8 by Mr Ashton and Mr Argall in July 1995?---No, I was
12:52:41 9 unaware of that.
12:52:42 10
12:52:42 11 Did you know that at all during the period of your three
12:52:44 12 meetings with her, that she was a registered
12:52:47 13 informer?---No, and I would say that's probably unlikely
12:52:50 14 because it was never indicated to me she was a registered
12:52:52 15 informer at that time and that's why I don't have notes and
12:52:55 16 I certainly wouldn't have met her outside that location.
12:52:59 17
12:52:59 18 As you stand here today you know that she was registered by
12:53:03 19 them in 1995 or is that the first you've heard of
12:53:05 20 it?---Subsequent to my involvement.
12:53:07 21
12:53:07 22 Yes, I understand?---That's correct.
12:53:08 23
12:53:12 24 Now, you say in your statement that you recall being told
12:53:15 25 that Ms Gobbo was a law student and that her father was a
12:53:18 26 judge. In fact that was an incorrect memory or an
12:53:22 27 incorrect thing that was told to you, in fact it was an
12:53:25 28 uncle, do you accept that now, who was a judge?---Yes, my
12:53:29 29 understanding was that it was her dad and I was of the
12:53:33 30 belief that he was the Chief Justice I think at that time.
12:53:36 31
12:53:37 32 That would have inevitably something that Mr Ashton told
12:53:40 33 you prior to the meeting, is that correct?---I believe so.
12:53:43 34
12:53:44 35 So it was a significant enough factor to be identified by
12:53:51 36 the person who wanted you to be a corroborator in this
12:53:53 37 meeting, do you accept that?---That's correct.
12:53:55 38
12:53:58 39 Now, the second meeting you recall, and this is paragraph 9
12:54:05 40 of your statement, you recall happened some months later,
12:54:09 41 some months after that first meeting and that again it was
12:54:11 42 at short notice, is that correct?---Yeah, I don't
12:54:14 43 specifically remember any of the meetings sort of being
12:54:17 44 planned and that's why I've sort of put as it short notice
12:54:21 45 and generally the fact that they all happened in the same
12:54:23 46 sort of location.
12:54:24 47

12:54:24 1 Might it have been the fact you were doing desk work and
12:54:28 2 you were simply tapped on the shoulder by Mr Ashton, "Come
12:54:34 3 outside I want you to meet someone"?---That's my
12:54:38 4 understanding and recollection, that's correct.
12:54:38 5
12:54:38 6 This was outside the old Melbourne Magistrates' Court, same
12:54:41 7 as the last meeting?---Yes, I don't recall meeting her
12:54:44 8 anywhere else.
12:54:45 9
12:54:46 10 Just pausing there. In relation to each of the three
12:54:48 11 meetings, did any of the meetings move to another location
12:54:51 12 or were they all just at those steps?---They were all at
12:54:56 13 that location and as I said wouldn't have gone beyond two
12:55:01 14 to five minutes maximum.
12:55:03 15
12:55:04 16 Sergeant Ashton's evidence was that he has very little
12:55:07 17 memory of any of the meetings. You have an independent
12:55:10 18 recollection of all three. What are the features of it, of
12:55:14 19 these three meetings that make them stand out in your
12:55:17 20 mind?---Um, so the first one obviously the fact that I was
12:55:20 21 introduced to her.
12:55:21 22
12:55:21 23 Yes?---The second one I don't specifically remember when it
12:55:24 24 was other than the fact that, I remember one being an
12:55:28 25 introduction, another one when we sort of handed her to or
12:55:32 26 introduced her to, um, Senior Constable Pope.
12:55:36 27
12:55:37 28 Yes?---And I have a recollection vaguely of having, meeting
12:55:40 29 her one other time in between.
12:55:42 30
12:55:42 31 I'll get to that meeting. Now this is the third of them
12:55:46 32 and you remember that this was in the late
12:55:49 33 afternoon?---Yes.
12:55:49 34
12:55:49 35 How do you remember the time of day?---I just remember I
12:55:53 36 was - we were always busy, I just remember I was really
12:55:57 37 rushed and had some other stuff on, and I think it was late
12:56:00 38 afternoon later on in the week and potentially even on a
12:56:04 39 Friday.
12:56:04 40
12:56:04 41 Again, it was Trevor Ashton who was coordinating the
12:56:08 42 meeting and asked you to come along?---That's my
12:56:10 43 recollection, that's correct.
12:56:10 44
12:56:11 45 You used the phrase a moment ago "handing Nicola Gobbo over
12:56:16 46 to Jeff Pope". That was in fact what the purpose of this
12:56:20 47 last meeting you attended was, wasn't it?---That's right.

12:56:23 1 To introduce her to Jeff Pope and for him to follow up with
12:56:28 2 her as a community contact.
12:56:30 3
12:56:30 4 That's because Jeff Pope was moving to Carlton and he was a
12:56:34 5 more appropriate contact for her just from a geographical
12:56:37 6 sense, is that correct?---Yes. I don't specifically recall
12:56:41 7 where Ms Gobbo was residing but I remember that Senior
12:56:45 8 Constable Pope had moved back to Carlton, his original
12:56:47 9 station, and I specifically remember the meeting because he
12:56:51 10 was in uniform. That's probably the first time I'd seen
12:56:54 11 him in uniform.
12:56:55 12
12:56:55 13 The purpose of that meeting was essentially the information
12:56:58 14 she had been providing to Mr Ashton would forthwith be
12:57:02 15 provided by Nicola Gobbo to Jeff Pope, that was what the
12:57:07 16 meeting was about?---Yes, that's correct. Because we were
12:57:10 17 moving offices as such.
12:57:11 18
12:57:16 19 Do you recall at the end of that last meeting, did Pope and
12:57:19 20 Ms Gobbo remain talking after the other two of you left or
12:57:24 21 do you remember that it dissipated and everyone went in
12:57:29 22 their separate directions or what do you know?---I vaguely
12:57:32 23 remember vaguely that we introduced Mr Pope to Nicola and
12:57:35 24 then from my recollection straight after that we sort of
12:57:38 25 moved on, myself and Sergeant Ashton.
12:57:40 26
12:57:40 27 Yourself and Sergeant Ashton left and you left the other
12:57:44 28 two of them there?---That's correct.
12:57:46 29
12:57:46 30 You were contacted by Operation Landow who are liaising
12:57:52 31 with the Royal Commission, the operation is part of the
12:57:56 32 Victoria Police, is that correct?---That's correct.
12:57:58 33
12:57:58 34 And they had a couple of phone calls and perhaps an email
12:58:01 35 with you in the lead up to you providing a
12:58:04 36 statement?---That's correct.
12:58:04 37
12:58:05 38 And have you seen a copy of the notes that were
12:58:08 39 produced?---I was shown a copy the other day, that's
12:58:11 40 correct.
12:58:11 41
12:58:11 42 Do you have a copy of them in front of you?---No, I don't.
12:58:13 43
12:58:14 44 I'll just identify it. I don't want to ask you any
12:58:17 45 questions about it, I simply want to tender the document.
12:58:21 46 For the Commission's purpose, it's VPL.0005.0028.0374.
12:58:28 47 I'll hand a copy which I don't think has any markings on

12:58:36 1 it.
12:58:36 2
12:58:36 3 COMMISSIONER: Can that come up on the screen?
12:58:39 4
12:58:39 5 MR WOODS: I believe it can, yes. You've had a chance to
12:58:46 6 look at that the other day. Do you accept that the person
12:58:49 7 who was recording the conversation, and these aren't your
12:58:54 8 own notes, this is second-hand, recorded accurately the
12:58:57 9 conversations they had with you?---That's correct.
12:59:00 10
12:59:00 11 Could you just scroll down to the next page, the dot point
12:59:07 12 that begins, "He was aware of her", which is just a couple,
12:59:13 13 that's the one. Can you just bring that up, please. "He
12:59:16 14 was aware of her when he worked at South CI. He believed
12:59:20 15 it was something to do with her dealing with member Jack
12:59:27 16 Carmody and Dino Dibra but he was not directly involved".
12:59:31 17 What's your recollection about Carmody and Dibra?---My
12:59:35 18 recollection is we had an investigation that we were
12:59:37 19 managing from South Melbourne CI.
12:59:39 20
12:59:39 21 Yes. When was this?---That probably would have been about
12:59:45 22 sort of around 97, 98, probably 98.
12:59:49 23
12:59:49 24 All right. So this is later in time obviously. Now, going
12:59:53 25 back to where you were, your recollection about member Jack
12:59:58 26 Carmody and Dino Dibra and Nicola Gobbo's involvement?---I
13:00:02 27 remember there was an investigation that Detective Senior
13:00:05 28 Constable Carmody was looking after that related to a
13:00:09 29 potential kidnapping, where Dino Dibra from memory was one
13:00:14 30 of the suspects and I think later on Ms Gobbo ended up
13:00:19 31 potentially representing him, but I had no involvement in
13:00:22 32 that investigation.
13:00:23 33
13:00:23 34 You just remember the name and the involvement of those.
13:00:27 35 Right on 1 o'clock I'll point out, they're all the
13:00:30 36 questions I have. Thank you Commissioner.
13:00:32 37
13:00:32 38 COMMISSIONER: Mr Collinson, do you have any questions?
13:00:34 39
13:00:34 40 MR NATHWANI: No, we don't.
13:00:36 41
13:00:36 42 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Nathwani. Mr Chettle?
13:00:37 43
13:00:37 44 MR CHETTLE: None, Commissioner.
13:00:38 45
13:00:38 46 COMMISSIONER: No one else has any questions? Nothing in
13:00:43 47 reply, Ms Agiropoulos, and nothing to finish off with.

13:00:47 1
13:00:48 2
13:00:55 3
13:00:56 4
12:58:23 5
13:00:58 6
13:00:58 7
13:00:59 8
13:01:02 9
10
11
13:01:36 12
13:01:36 13
13:01:37 14
13:01:39 15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

MR WOODS: I may not have tendered that final document and if not I would seek to do so.

#EXHIBIT RC53 - Document VPL.0005.0028.0374.

COMMISSIONER: Thanks very much, Mr Arthur. You're free to go, just make sure you leave those notes there, thank you.

(Witness excused.)

<(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)

COMMISSIONER: We'll resume at 2 o'clock.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

14:04:01 1 UPON RESUMING AT 2.00 PM:
14:04:01 2
14:04:01 3 COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Winneke.
14:04:03 4
14:04:04 5 MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, the next witness we propose to
14:04:06 6 call is Timothy Argall.
14:04:10 7
14:04:10 8 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Yes, Mr Argall into the witness box.
14:04:17 9 Oath or affirmation?---Oath is fine.
14:04:20 10
14:04:21 11 Yes.
14:04:23 12
14:04:23 13 <TIMOTHY ARGALL, sworn and examined:
14:04:35 14
14:04:35 15 MR STEWARD: Commissioner, my name is Steward and might I
14:04:38 16 seek leave to appear on behalf of Mr Argall?
14:04:41 17
14:04:41 18 COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Steward. Your firm is?
14:04:44 19
14:04:44 20 MR STEWARD: I'm at the Bar. I'm instructed by Kenna
14:04:48 21 Teasdale, Mr Kelly.
14:04:48 22
14:04:49 23 COMMISSIONER: Instructed by? The name of the firm, sorry,
14:04:53 24 I missed it?
14:04:54 25
14:04:55 26 MR STEWARD: Kenna Teasdale, and specifically by Mr Brendan
14:04:58 27 Kelly.
14:04:58 28
14:04:58 29 COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you Mr Steward. No one wants to
14:05:00 30 be heard on this application? No. You have leave to
14:05:03 31 appear on behalf of Mr Argall, thank you Mr Steward.
32
14:05:15 33 You're taking the witness first, Mr Winneke?
14:05:18 34
14:05:19 35 MR WINNEKE: It doesn't really matter. I'm happy to tender
14:05:21 36 the statement or Mr Steward can do it, but I'm on my feet
14:05:24 37 so I might as well do it.
14:05:26 38
14:05:26 39 COMMISSIONER: All right then.
14:05:27 40
14:05:27 41 MR WINNEKE: Mr Argall, you have made a statement, as I
14:05:30 42 understand it, which you have provided to the Royal
14:05:34 43 Commission and it's dated 27 March 2019; is that
14:05:38 44 correct?---Yes.
14:05:38 45
14:05:38 46 Do you have a copy of that with you?---Yes.
14:05:40 47

14:05:53 1 Are the contents of that statement, are they true and
14:05:56 2 correct?---They are.
14:05:57 3
14:05:58 4 I tender that, Commissioner.
14:06:04 5
14:06:04 6 #EXHIBIT RC54 - Statement of Timothy Argall.
14:06:09 7
14:06:09 8 Mr Argall, were you approached by members of Task Force
14:06:17 9 Landow for your comments and/or recollections of your
14:06:21 10 association with Ms Gobbo some time around January of
14:06:27 11 2019?---Yes.
14:06:27 12
14:06:30 13 Do you recall the name of the police officer you spoke
14:06:31 14 to?---I spoke to a Wayne Walsh initially.
14:06:34 15
14:06:34 16 Wayne Walsh?---And then Brett Paddy.
14:06:37 17
14:06:37 18 You were asked to bring to mind your recollection of your
14:06:43 19 interaction with Ms Gobbo over the years; is that
14:06:46 20 right?---Yes.
14:06:47 21
14:06:49 22 Indeed, initially you met at 313 Spencer Street; is that
14:06:56 23 correct?---Yes.
14:06:56 24
14:06:56 25 Had you been forewarned that you were going to be asked
14:07:00 26 questions about these matters?---In very general terms,
14:07:04 27 yes.
14:07:05 28
14:07:06 29 And how long prior?---Not long, a day or two maybe, yeah.
14:07:12 30
14:07:13 31 And you were asked to attend at police headquarters and you
14:07:17 32 did so and you went along and spoke to Mr Walsh; is that
14:07:21 33 right?---That's right.
14:07:21 34
14:07:25 35 There were notes made of the discussion that you had with
14:07:32 36 the police officer on that occasion on 14 January 2019 and
14:07:37 37 then again you came back, did you, and had another
14:07:40 38 discussion - I'm sorry, via mobile you had a discussion on
14:07:45 39 4 February of this year, is that right, or not?---Yeah,
14:07:53 40 I've spoken to him on the phone as well. I think we met
14:07:56 41 once in person and then a phone call, so that would be
14:07:59 42 right.
14:07:59 43
14:08:00 44 Do you have a copy of those notes that were taken at your
14:08:03 45 discussions or not?---If that's the contact report or - - -
14:08:05 46
14:08:05 47 It's a blue headed document?---Yeah, I've got a black and

14:08:09 1 white copy but we're probably talking about the same one.
14:08:11 2 Is that it?
14:08:13 3
14:08:13 4 We probably are. There's a note of a discussion on 4
14:08:28 5 February, it says 2018, but I assume it's 2019, at about 20
14:08:35 6 past eight in the morning via mobile phone, is that right?
14:08:37 7 Look at the second page of that?---Yeah, I've got it.
14:08:41 8 Yeah, that'd be right.
14:08:42 9
14:08:43 10 All right. Have you had a look at those notes at any
14:08:51 11 stage?---I had a look last night, yeah.
14:08:53 12
14:08:54 13 Are you satisfied that the contents of the notes are
14:08:57 14 correct or not?---Yeah, I don't have any major issue with
14:09:00 15 them.
14:09:00 16
14:09:00 17 I tender that document too, Commissioner.
14:09:04 18
14:09:04 19 COMMISSIONER: Is this the document I've got a copy of,
14:09:07 20 Police Veteran/Member Contact ?
14:09:09 21
14:09:09 22 MR WINNEKE: Yes, that's the one, VPL.0005.0028.0356.
14:09:18 23
14:09:19 24 #EXHIBIT RC55 - Police Veteran/Member Contact document.
14:09:22 25
14:09:23 26 MR WINNEKE: That can come down. I don't need to ask the
14:09:25 27 witness about that just at the moment. Can I take you
14:09:32 28 through your history briefly in the Police Force. As I
14:09:36 29 understand it you graduated in August 1990?---Yes.
14:09:39 30
14:09:40 31 And initially you were assigned to duties at St Kilda Road
14:09:44 32 police station?---Yes.
14:09:45 33
14:09:45 34 They were general duties, were they?---Yes.
14:09:47 35
14:09:48 36 In 93 you transferred to the Richmond Police
14:09:52 37 Station?---Yes.
14:09:52 38
14:09:53 39 And what were your duties there?---General duties.
14:09:56 40
14:09:57 41 General duties, uniform?---Yes.
14:09:59 42
14:09:59 43 Were you seconded at some stage during that period to the A
14:10:06 44 District Support Group, Russell Street?---Yes.
14:10:10 45
14:10:11 46 You did transfer over to Russell Street?---Yes.
14:10:13 47

14:10:14 1 You were in plain clothes thereafter; is that
14:10:16 2 right?---That's right.
14:10:16 3
14:10:16 4 The duties there commenced on about 3 April 95?---Yes.
14:10:20 5
14:10:25 6 Do you recall whose crew you worked on when you were
14:10:28 7 there?---I worked with a couple of different Sergeants but
14:10:33 8 one was Trevor Ashton.
14:10:35 9
14:10:36 10 Yes?---I think I then moved to Craig Brien's crew.
14:10:39 11
14:10:40 12 So the earlier one was Trevor Ashton?---That's right.
14:10:42 13
14:10:42 14 And do you remember who you worked with then?---Again, the
14:10:46 15 crew's changed a little bit but Rod Arthur was one of them.
14:10:57 16 No. If you gave me some names I might be able to recognise
14:11:02 17 them.
14:11:03 18
14:11:03 19 Do you recall dealing with a Jack Blayney at that
14:11:08 20 stage?---No. I know who Jack Blayney is and what his role
14:11:12 21 was but he wasn't with the DSG.
14:11:15 22
14:11:15 23 Jeff Pope?---No, Jeff had left before I got there, I
14:11:19 24 believe.
14:11:19 25
14:11:20 26 (Indistinct)?---I believe so.
14:11:21 27
14:11:21 28 Was he at the same - at the DSG for a period of time prior
14:11:28 29 to you but you understood he'd gone?---He would have been
14:11:30 30 in a similar situation to me. He would have been attached
14:11:32 31 to another uniform station within that area, seconded in.
14:11:35 32 His secondment would have finished and I may have even
14:11:39 33 taken his spot perhaps, but I don't think we crossed over.
14:11:41 34
14:11:45 35 Is it the case that you recall an occasion where you were
14:11:51 36 working with Trevor Ashton and you went to the MCG and you
14:11:56 37 met Ms Gobbo there?---Yes.
14:11:58 38
14:12:00 39 Do you recall the circumstances of that meeting?---Yes. We
14:12:07 40 were working at the MCG. We were tasked plain clothes, it
14:12:12 41 involved liquor licensing, public order, that sort of
14:12:16 42 thing.
14:12:16 43
14:12:17 44 Yes?---And it wasn't - I don't remember whether it was
14:12:22 45 before we arrived or not long after we got there but it was
14:12:25 46 at the, towards the start of the shift I remember Sergeant
14:12:28 47 Ashton saying we had to go and meet somebody.

14:12:31 1
14:12:31 2 Yeah?---That's how it came about.
14:12:33 3
14:12:33 4 Was it just the two of you working at that stage or was
14:12:36 5 there another officer?---Oh look, it probably would have
14:12:40 6 been more common that there would have been more than two
14:12:43 7 of us but I don't have a specific recollection.
14:12:45 8
14:12:45 9 Okay. You recall going up to one of the upper floors of
14:12:51 10 the MCG?---Yes.
14:12:52 11
14:12:53 12 And you recall - and that's the first time you met
14:12:56 13 Ms Gobbo, I take it; is that right?---Yes, that's right.
14:12:58 14
14:12:59 15 You understood that the discussion was taking place in the
14:13:01 16 nature of business, that is the Sergeant was speaking to
14:13:05 17 someone who he knew would be there?---Yes.
14:13:09 18
14:13:10 19 And it wasn't a social discussion?---That wasn't the
14:13:12 20 impression I had, no.
14:13:15 21
14:13:16 22 What impression did you have?---I didn't really know. I
14:13:19 23 assumed it was something connected to work.
14:13:21 24
14:13:21 25 Yes?---Yeah, I didn't get a whole lot of information about
14:13:25 26 the context of the meeting.
14:13:26 27
14:13:27 28 All right then. That meeting went for about five or ten
14:13:34 29 minutes; is that correct?---Yes.
14:13:35 30
14:13:37 31 Have you had access to any diaries of yours?---No.
14:13:40 32
14:13:41 33 Have you tried to find them?---Yes, I have, yes.
14:13:43 34
14:13:44 35 Enquiries have been made by other police officers to see if
14:13:48 36 they can lay hands on them?---Yes, they have. I'm not sure
14:13:51 37 what the filing system was for diaries from the DSG or
14:13:56 38 notes at the time that were taken back then but I haven't
14:13:58 39 been able to locate them and I believe all the inquiries
14:14:00 40 other people have made haven't turned them up otherwise.
14:14:04 41
14:14:04 42 Likewise day books, running sheets, any other
14:14:07 43 contemporaneous records?---Same, yeah.
44
14:14:08 45 You've been able to come up with none basically?---I'm
14:14:12 46 empty, I've got none.
14:14:13 47

14:14:14 1 What you do have is recollections?---Yes.
14:14:18 2
14:14:19 3 You do a recollection that at some stage thereafter you
14:14:22 4 went with Ms Gobbo and Sergeant Ashton to the Special
14:14:30 5 Response Squad at St Kilda Road?---Yes.
14:14:31 6
14:14:32 7 Do you recall the circumstances of that?---I recall it
14:14:40 8 wasn't that long after the meeting at the MCG when I first
14:14:44 9 met her.
14:14:44 10
14:14:44 11 Yes?---I can't recall how the meeting came about but it's
14:14:51 12 my recollection that Ms Gobbo had some information that we
14:14:58 13 obviously wanted to share or have her convey to the Special
14:15:03 14 Response Squad.
14:15:03 15
14:15:04 16 Was it your understanding at that time that Mr Ashton had
14:15:10 17 dealt with Ms Gobbo for a period of time prior to your
14:15:14 18 initial meeting?---I didn't know how long but it was
14:15:18 19 obvious that he had some prior dealings with her, at the
14:15:25 20 MCG it wasn't my impression that was the first time they'd
14:15:28 21 met, but as to the background and history I'm not sure.
14:15:30 22
14:15:30 23 You're not sure?---No.
14:15:32 24
14:15:32 25 Have you not ever discussed it with her, Ms Gobbo?---I'm
14:15:36 26 not sure that I have.
14:15:37 27
14:15:38 28 Right?---No.
14:15:39 29
14:15:40 30 You don't recall ever having discussed it with her?---No, I
14:15:43 31 don't think so.
14:15:43 32
14:15:43 33 Okay. Can I just ask this: when was the last time you
14:15:51 34 spoke to Ms Gobbo?---It'd be ten years ago.
14:15:53 35
14:15:54 36 Ten years ago, all right?---Maybe longer.
14:15:57 37
14:15:58 38 All right. At the SRS at St Kilda Road there was a
14:16:12 39 discussion and you and Mr Ashton introduced Ms Gobbo to
14:16:17 40 some detectives for the purposes of what?---As I say, my
14:16:26 41 recollection is that Ms Gobbo had some information that
14:16:31 42 somebody was buying or selling firearms or bringing
14:16:37 43 firearms in from interstate or something like that.
14:16:39 44
14:16:40 45 Yes?---And, yeah, I'm not exactly sure how we came to be
14:16:47 46 involved with the SRS but I'm making the assumption that
14:16:54 47 Trevor Ashton had made the arrangements for us to go to the

14:16:58 1 SRS or had contacted someone there and they thought the
14:17:01 2 information was useful.
14:17:02 3
14:17:02 4 All right. What is the SRS or what was it?---Sorry,
14:17:06 5 Special Response Squad.
14:17:07 6
14:17:08 7 What was their business?---I think they were mainly
14:17:12 8 concerned with armed hold-ups and aggravated burglaries and
14:17:16 9 those sort of things, which presumably involved firearms.
14:17:18 10
14:17:18 11 Firearms. So that was why, I presume, it was thought
14:17:22 12 appropriate to put her in touch with them?---That makes
14:17:24 13 sense to me, yep.
14:17:26 14
14:17:33 15 You say in your statement that you weren't really part of
14:17:37 16 the - I'm sorry, I withdraw that. You were present in the
14:17:41 17 conference with Ashton and Nicola when she spoke to them
14:17:45 18 about a male who she knew was trying to purchase firearms.
14:17:51 19 The conversation went for about 30 minutes. You recall one
14:17:54 20 of the SRS detectives who was present was Detective
14:17:59 21 Sergeant John Gibson. There were several others but you
14:18:02 22 don't recall who they were?---No.
14:18:04 23
14:18:04 24 All right. That meeting went for, you say, at least 30
14:18:11 25 minutes?---Yes.
14:18:12 26
14:18:12 27 And did you participate in discussions there at all to your
14:18:17 28 recollection?---Not really. I think I was just a fairly
14:18:20 29 junior Constable who was just sitting in the room.
14:18:23 30
14:18:29 31 At that stage you had met her on one occasion only or more
14:18:33 32 than one occasion?---I think it was probably only the one
14:18:37 33 occasion.
14:18:37 34
14:18:37 35 And that was at the MCG?---Yes.
14:18:40 36
14:18:40 37 After that meeting do you recall whether you spoke to her
14:18:48 38 over the telephone on a number of occasions?---Yes.
14:18:53 39
14:18:53 40 How did that come about?---I don't remember whether we made
14:18:59 41 contact with Ms Gobbo or whether she was contacting us but
14:19:04 42 it's my recollection that it was perhaps information or
14:19:09 43 extra stuff we wanted clarified. I can't remember whether
14:19:12 44 those questions were coming via the Special Response Squad.
14:19:15 45
14:19:15 46 Yes?---Or how that came about but I - yeah, I remember
14:19:19 47 there was some phone contact back and forwards in perhaps

14:19:24 1 the week or two after that meeting.
14:19:26 2
14:19:26 3 All right. Do you believe that at that stage she had been
14:19:31 4 registered as an informer or not?---It would have been
14:19:35 5 around that time. If it wasn't prior to the meeting with
14:19:41 6 Special Response Squad I think it probably would have been
14:19:44 7 soon after but I don't remember exactly when.
14:19:45 8
14:19:46 9 Is it likely that you would have her registered before you
14:19:49 10 took her to the SRS or not?---Yeah, reasonably likely if we
14:19:54 11 believed she had some important information, that could
14:19:57 12 quite well have been the case.
14:19:58 13
14:20:00 14 Would that be usual practice if someone had some important
14:20:04 15 information, to have them registered?---Yes.
14:20:08 16
14:20:08 17 And obviously you considered it to be significant
14:20:10 18 information otherwise you wouldn't have taken her off down
14:20:13 19 to the Special Response Squad?---Yeah, that follows
14:20:16 20 logically.
14:20:16 21
14:20:17 22 Okay. I wonder if you can have a look at this document,
14:20:23 23 VPL.0005.0007.0088. If you could just have a look at that
14:20:46 24 page of that document. Do you recognise that?---Yes.
14:20:51 25
14:20:53 26 Do you recognise it because you remember it from back then
14:20:56 27 or because you've seen it recently?---Because I've seen it
14:21:00 28 recently and I - yeah.
14:21:02 29
14:21:02 30 And you recognise the handwriting on it?---I do.
14:21:04 31
14:21:04 32 And it's yours?---Most of it is. There are a couple of
14:21:07 33 pieces that aren't but the majority is my handwriting.
14:21:10 34
14:21:11 35 Which of it is your handwriting and which of it isn't?---So
14:21:15 36 if we start at the top where it says "registered number".
14:21:19 37
14:21:19 38 Yes?---That's not my handwriting.
14:21:20 39
14:21:21 40 Yes?---We move down, everything else is until we get to
14:21:24 41 where it says "reliability".
14:21:26 42
14:21:27 43 Yes?---That's not.
14:21:30 44
14:21:30 45 Who do you assume that hand is?---My assumption is that
14:21:34 46 it's Sergeant Ashton's.
14:21:37 47

14:21:37 1 Yes?---I believe the next one down where it says "no" is
14:21:41 2 mine.
14:21:41 3
14:21:42 4 Yes?---"Contact members", all of that box is not mine.
14:21:47 5 Again, I'm believing it's Sergeant Ashton.
14:21:50 6
14:21:50 7 Yes?---Then the rest of that page is me.
14:21:52 8
14:21:52 9 You've written that the informant is a law student at
14:21:56 10 Melbourne Uni currently living with a known criminal. "She
14:21:59 11 was charged with possess amphetamine last year as a result
14:22:03 12 of the criminal that was living with her. Is quite
14:22:07 13 reliable, seeking a career as a solicitor"?---Yes.
14:22:10 14
14:22:12 15 If we can just move up to the next page. That handwriting
14:22:17 16 there?---That's mine.
14:22:18 17
14:22:20 18 And that's the address and there's a reference there to
14:22:27 19 prior convictions?---Yes, that's right.
14:22:28 20
14:22:29 21 I take it that you would have done a check, would you, as
14:22:33 22 part of that application process to find those
14:22:39 23 priors?---Yes, and there's - where it says MNI.
14:22:43 24
14:22:44 25 MNI?---Yeah, I would have had to do a check to get that.
14:22:48 26
14:22:48 27 That would be a LEAP check?---Yes.
14:22:50 28
14:22:50 29 You would have got those records and that would have been
14:22:52 30 part of the application that you put together for
14:22:54 31 signing?---Yes.
14:22:55 32
14:22:55 33 Then was that taken elsewhere for approval?---I believe the
14:22:58 34 process back then was that it went to the Superintendent.
14:23:01 35
14:23:01 36 Yes. Now, insofar as the prior matters are concerned, is
14:23:15 37 it the case that you would have firstly asked her questions
14:23:23 38 about that prior matter and the circumstances of it, would
14:23:28 39 you do that with an informer?---Yeah, in some circumstances
14:23:33 40 you would but I don't remember speaking to her about these
14:23:36 41 matters before she was registered so I can only assume that
14:23:43 42 these - someone else must have relayed this information to
14:23:48 43 me.
14:23:48 44
14:23:48 45 You've discussed them, I take it, subsequent to
14:23:51 46 registration; is that right?---Her priors?
14:23:53 47

14:23:53 1 Yes?---With?
14:23:54 2
14:23:55 3 With her?---I'm sure at some stage they probably came up,
14:23:59 4 yeah.
14:24:00 5
14:24:00 6 In the context of dealing with her as a registered informer
14:24:04 7 or otherwise?---Probably during her dealing as an informer,
14:24:13 8 yep.
14:24:13 9
14:24:14 10 Right. I might be taxing your recollection but do you
14:24:17 11 recall what she told you about the priors?---No.
14:24:19 12
14:24:19 13 The circumstances of her priors?---No. I probably would
14:24:23 14 have had some background from the other members at the DSG
14:24:28 15 but I don't specifically remember what her responses were.
14:24:31 16
14:24:32 17 All right then. What about Ashton, did you discuss it with
14:24:35 18 Ashton?---I don't specifically recall but it would be a
14:24:40 19 reasonable assumption that we did.
14:24:42 20
14:24:42 21 You would have found out, I assume, that Ashton was
14:24:45 22 involved in those matters earlier on?---When I was making
14:24:51 23 my statement it was my belief that it was actually another
14:24:56 24 DSG, not the Russell Street one.
14:25:00 25
14:25:00 26 Right?---I don't know why, but that was my recollection at
14:25:04 27 the time. But since I've, you know, become more aware of
14:25:07 28 the circumstances and what have you I'm now aware that it
14:25:10 29 was Ashton and the Russell Street DSG, yeah.
14:25:15 30
14:25:16 31 So your initial recollection was that there was another
14:25:21 32 DSG, that being the Moonee Ponds DSG?---Yes.
14:25:23 33
14:25:24 34 Which was involved in a raid on her house?---Yeah, and I'm
14:25:26 35 not sure where that came from but that was my recollection.
14:25:29 36
14:25:29 37 Your recollection was that that raid had occurred prior to
14:25:32 38 you meeting her at the MCG?---Yes.
14:25:36 39
14:25:36 40 Is that your understanding?---No, my understanding now is
14:25:39 41 that it was the Russell Street DSG, the same unit where I
14:25:43 42 was attached, but perhaps a different crew.
14:25:45 43
14:25:46 44 Do you say that there was an occasion that the Moonee Ponds
14:25:50 45 DSG carried out a raid on her house?---Not that I'm aware
14:25:55 46 of.
14:25:55 47

14:25:56 1 Right. Did you ever speak to her about the fact that there
14:26:11 2 was a raid on her house in 95?---I expect I would have. I
14:26:17 3 don't have a specific recollection of it.
14:26:19 4
14:26:19 5 And that would have been in the circumstances of dealing
14:26:22 6 with her as an informer or socially?---Yes. No, dealing
14:26:26 7 with her as an informer.
14:26:28 8
14:26:32 9 Your initial recollection was that there was a raid on the
14:26:36 10 house on 4 April - sorry, prior to your dealing with her at
14:26:41 11 the MCG?---Yes.
14:26:44 12
14:26:44 13 If in fact that was the case, that on about 4 April 95
14:26:47 14 there was raid on her house by the DSG Moonee Ponds, your
14:26:52 15 initial recollection would be correct, wouldn't it?---If
14:26:54 16 that was the case, yes.
14:26:56 17
14:26:56 18 Did you ever have any dealings with the Moonee Ponds DSG
14:27:00 19 which gave you an understanding about that raid or
14:27:04 20 not?---No, but obviously something - I must have had some
14:27:08 21 communication or some information about it if that's
14:27:12 22 actually how it panned out and that's what I recall. But I
14:27:15 23 don't know where I came by that information, but yeah.
14:27:18 24
14:27:19 25 All right. But you do think you probably would have spoken
14:27:22 26 to her about that at some stage in any event?---Yes.
14:27:26 27
14:27:28 28 The communications which occurred after the meeting at the
14:27:32 29 SRS were between you and her over the telephone; is that
14:27:36 30 right?---Yes.
14:27:37 31
14:27:37 32 Would you have called her or did she call you?---I don't
14:27:43 33 recall how the conversations happened.
14:27:46 34
14:27:47 35 Yes?---It could have been either.
14:27:49 36
14:27:50 37 Did you get the impression in the early days of dealing
14:27:52 38 with her that she was actually quite keen to provide
14:27:55 39 information?---Yes.
14:27:57 40
14:27:59 41 One of the things that you said to Detective Walsh was that
14:28:03 42 your general recollection was that she was always getting
14:28:08 43 far too ahead of herself?---Yes.
14:28:10 44
14:28:11 45 What do you mean by that?---Well, perhaps more so with the
14:28:18 46 subsequent job that we were involved in with her.
14:28:20 47

14:28:20 1 Yes?---She mentioned things, she was just - yeah, she was
14:28:25 2 eager to participate and she was, yeah, when it come to
14:28:30 3 using the covert operative, yeah, she was excited about
14:28:35 4 that.
14:28:36 5
14:28:36 6 Excited about getting involved in that, was she?---Yes.
14:28:43 7
14:28:43 8 COMMISSIONER: Did you want to tender that earlier document
14:28:45 9 you had on the screen?
14:28:49 10
14:28:49 11 MR WINNEKE: The registration form.
14:28:52 12
14:28:52 13 COMMISSIONER: That was part of the registration form
14:28:54 14 already tendered then.
14:28:56 15
14:28:56 16 MR WINNEKE: I think it's been tendered, Commissioner.
14:28:58 17
14:28:58 18 COMMISSIONER: Yes, it has. Thank you.
14:29:01 19
14:29:01 20 MR WINNEKE: I think we tendered that through Mr Ashton.
14:29:04 21
14:29:04 22 COMMISSIONER: 30, yes.
14:29:07 23
14:29:08 24 MR WINNEKE: All right. Was there a period of time where
14:29:16 25 after that SRS meeting, where she contacted you over the
14:29:22 26 telephone, you received information and then the
14:29:27 27 information dried up?---Yeah, that's a fair assessment.
14:29:32 28
14:29:33 29 In terms of the information that she did provide you, you
14:29:38 30 say that it was by way of clarification of a few matters,
14:29:42 31 you're not too certain whether that was on behalf of the
14:29:45 32 SRS or not; is that right?---Yes.
14:29:47 33
14:29:47 34 Do you know what happened to the SRS investigation?---No.
14:29:50 35
14:29:55 36 Do you know how many occasions it was that you spoke to
14:29:57 37 her?---I don't have a specific recollection. I believe
14:30:01 38 maybe a couple, two or three perhaps.
14:30:03 39
14:30:03 40 Right. Ultimately your relationship with her did become
14:30:09 41 more of a social relationship; is that correct?---Yes.
14:30:13 42
14:30:14 43 When did that social interaction commence?---It was more so
14:30:19 44 after I left the DSG.
14:30:21 45
14:30:21 46 You went on to the Malvern CI; is that right?---Yeah,
14:30:26 47 that's right. There was another station in between and

14:30:28 1 then I ended up at Malvern CI.
14:30:30 2
14:30:30 3 Where did you go before Malvern?---St Kilda police station.
14:30:34 4
14:30:36 5 If I come back to a period in or about August or September
14:30:40 6 of 95, did she contact you after you'd moved from the A
14:30:49 7 District Support Group to Flinders Street?---I was still at
14:30:53 8 the A District Support Group, we'd just moved buildings.
14:30:58 9
14:30:58 10 So you moved from Russell Street to Flinders Street; is
14:31:01 11 that correct?---Yes.
14:31:02 12
14:31:04 13 Do you recall how that came about, the contact there?---My
14:31:10 14 recollection is she just called, rang the phone and I spoke
14:31:15 15 to her.
14:31:15 16
14:31:16 17 Right. That was a matter of months after the SRS meeting,
14:31:41 18 she contacted you again, spoke to you but she wanted to
14:31:47 19 provide information; is that correct?---Yes.
14:31:48 20
14:31:50 21 This time it was information on the male that she'd
14:31:56 22 previously shared a flat with; is that correct?---Yes.
14:31:58 23
14:31:58 24 The information concerned the male being involved in drug
14:32:02 25 trafficking or manufacturing; is that right?---Yes.
14:32:04 26
14:32:05 27 Did you understand it was the same male that she'd
14:32:08 28 previously been providing information about or not?---I
14:32:11 29 can't remember whether it was the same person or not.
14:32:13 30
14:32:14 31 Do you know whether she was telling you that this person
14:32:17 32 wanted to buy or sell amphetamine?---No, I don't remember
14:32:22 33 whether it was buy or sell but it involved, yeah, buying or
14:32:28 34 selling amphetamine or perhaps pseudoephedrine, the
14:32:31 35 precursor chemical.
14:32:32 36
14:32:37 37 As a consequence of that - just excuse me. At that stage
14:32:44 38 you were of the view that you had, you were no longer in
14:32:46 39 Ashton's team, is that right, you were with
14:32:50 40 O'Brien?---Brien, yes.
14:32:51 41
14:32:52 42 Craig Brien?---Yes.
14:32:52 43
14:32:56 44 You mentioned that she wanted to - you spoke about the
14:33:05 45 introduction of an undercover person?---Yes.
14:33:08 46
14:33:09 47 Without going into details, what does that mean?---An

14:33:15 1 undercover police operative.
14:33:17 2
14:33:18 3 Yes. To introduce an undercover to the target, is that the
14:33:24 4 - - - ?---Yes, sorry, I'm sure how far you want me to go
5 with it, sir.
6
7 Perhaps if you go a little bit further than you've
8 gone?---You'll stop me when - - -
9
14:33:33 10 Someone will anyway?---All right. So, yeah, it effectively
14:33:36 11 involved Nicola introducing an undercover police officer to
14:33:43 12 the male that she told us was looking to buy or sell drugs
14:33:48 13 and the plan was to see whether that undercover police
14:33:54 14 operative could buy or sell drugs from the target.
14:33:56 15
14:33:57 16 By the time she contacted you when you were down at
14:34:00 17 Flinders Street, how many times had you met her?---I reckon
14:34:11 18 it might have been only been the twice, perhaps at the MCG
14:34:16 19 and at the Special Response Squad.
14:34:19 20
14:34:19 21 There'd been telephone communication on a number of
14:34:23 22 occasions; is that right?---Yes.
14:34:23 23
14:34:27 24 Insofar as setting up this operation, that's something that
14:34:33 25 you had a discussion with Mr Brien about; is that
14:34:36 26 correct?---Yes.
14:34:36 27
14:34:40 28 I wonder if you could have a look at this document,
14:34:48 29 VPL.0005.0007.0116.
14:35:05 30
14:35:05 31 COMMISSIONER: Is this a new document?
14:35:07 32
14:35:07 33 MR WINNEKE: This is a new document. Have you seen that
14:35:09 34 document before or something like it?---Not that I recall.
14:35:13 35
14:35:16 36 It appears to be an application for authorised CIU
14:35:20 37 assistance; is that right?---Yes.
14:35:21 38
14:35:22 39 And there's target details?---Yes.
14:35:25 40
14:35:27 41 And there's a reference to Brian Wilson?---That's right.
14:35:31 42
14:35:32 43 Was it your understanding that that was a person who had
14:35:35 44 previously resided with Ms Gobbo?---Yes.
14:35:45 45
14:35:46 46 There's a reference to a "93 AD SG completed a job targeting
14:35:53 47 Wilson which involved surveillance performed by DSG members

14:35:54 1 for approx. two weeks. To our knowledge Wilson has not
14:35:58 2 been exposed to any undercover operatives"---Yes.
14:36:01 3
14:36:01 4 And there's an operation name in the detail section there
14:36:04 5 and it says that the operation name must be registered with
14:36:08 6 the BCI, right?---Yes.
14:36:11 7
14:36:11 8 And the operation name is called Scorn?---Yes.
14:36:13 9
14:36:14 10 And the type of offence is amphetamine trafficking?---Yes.
14:36:18 11
14:36:19 12 Correct?---Yes.
14:36:19 13
14:36:20 14 If we move to the next page. I wonder if we could move
14:36:31 15 down quickly to the next page. Now go back to that. It
14:36:37 16 says here that the member - the operations involving the
14:36:43 17 informer - "Is the informer available? Yes. Registered
14:36:46 18 number: G395". That was her number; is that
14:36:51 19 correct?---Yes, that was what was written on the top of the
14:36:55 20 registration form, so that's her number.
14:36:57 21
14:36:58 22 And G, as we understand it, reflects the seventh letter in
14:37:01 23 the alphabet which reflects the seventh month, and that's
14:37:04 24 July?---Yes.
14:37:05 25
14:37:05 26 The 3 indicates that she was the third informer registered
14:37:08 27 in July; is that right?---Yes.
14:37:10 28
14:37:10 29 Of 95?---Yes.
14:37:11 30
14:37:11 31 What that makes clear is that whatever date it was, she was
14:37:16 32 the third informer registered in 95, July 95?---Yes, that's
14:37:21 33 right.
14:37:21 34
14:37:24 35 Do you recall when - this application was made in 96; is
14:37:32 36 that right?---I'm not sure of the date.
14:37:34 37
14:37:34 38 Go back to - yeah?---February, yep.
14:37:38 39
14:37:38 40 19 February 96?---Yes.
14:37:40 41
14:37:40 42 Could you explain what the dealings were leading up to this
14:37:44 43 application between you and Ms Gobbo?---I believe we'd met
14:37:53 44 her after the initial phone contact and would have
14:37:59 45 discussed, you know, what the information was, what she
14:38:04 46 believed was happening and what she was, I suppose - how
14:38:08 47 she was prepared to assist.

14:38:10 1
14:38:10 2 Yes?---I would have then gone to my Sergeant, I presume,
14:38:17 3 explained the situation to him. I can't recall whether he
14:38:22 4 would have met with her and made his own assessment but
14:38:26 5 clearly at some point we decided it was viable to pursue
14:38:33 6 this avenue as an investigative tool with the Undercover
14:38:37 7 Unit.
14:38:37 8
14:38:37 9 Right. Did you have a particular view about whether or not
14:38:45 10 she was a reliable source of information or not?---Yeah, I
14:38:51 11 thought she was.
14:38:52 12
14:38:56 13 I think you took the view, or at least Sergeant Ashton took
14:39:00 14 the view, that she was very reliable and did you agree with
14:39:04 15 that assessment?---I had nothing to dispute it so yeah,
14:39:08 16 yep.
14:39:08 17
14:39:09 18 Had you dealt with many informers at that stage in your
14:39:12 19 career?---No.
14:39:13 20
14:39:14 21 How many do you think had you - - - ?---One or two perhaps.
14:39:18 22
14:39:18 23 So she might have even been the first or second registered
14:39:24 24 informer as far as you were concerned?---No, there was at
14:39:27 25 least one but, yeah, perhaps second or third, yeah.
14:39:29 26
14:39:33 27 Was she typical for an informer in terms of the sort of
14:39:41 28 person who would be providing information to police?---I'm
14:39:44 29 not sure there's a typical informer but she was different
14:39:48 30 from the previous one I had dealt with.
14:39:49 31
14:39:51 32 Did you wonder why it was that she wanted to provide
14:39:57 33 information against this person who you understood she was
14:40:00 34 living with?---Yeah, I suppose you're always curious about
14:40:06 35 what their motives are.
14:40:08 36
14:40:08 37 Did you ask her?---I expect I would have at some stage but
14:40:11 38 I don't remember what the situation was.
14:40:13 39
14:40:17 40 You knew her for quite a while after these events on and
14:40:21 41 off, you had a lot of contact with her over the
14:40:23 42 years?---Yes.
14:40:23 43
14:40:24 44 Are you able to offer any insight, looking back now?---No,
14:40:32 45 I'd be guessing as to why she wanted - maybe she saw that
14:40:38 46 he was the reason why she was in trouble initially, I'm not
14:40:42 47 sure.

14:40:42 1
14:40:47 2 You say maybe that was the reason. Is that a guess or is
14:40:50 3 that an educated guess?---Oh, it's a guess.
14:40:53 4
14:40:53 5 Simply a guess?---Look, it's a, I suppose, a logical motive
14:40:59 6 that some people have is to, you know, if they see
14:41:03 7 someone's responsible for the predicament they're in and
14:41:06 8 they see an opportunity to, you know, provide some
14:41:11 9 information against them, it's not an uncommon situation.
14:41:13 10
14:41:14 11 Did you understand that this person was living with her in
14:41:17 12 1993 when she first got into trouble, is that your
14:41:22 13 understanding?---I understood they'd been living together
14:41:27 14 at some stage and, yeah, I think my understanding was
14:41:31 15 they'd been living together when the house was raided.
14:41:33 16
14:41:34 17 And you understood that at least in April of 95 when the
14:41:37 18 house was raided again by the Moonee Ponds DSG, this fellow
14:41:43 19 Wilson was still living there?---I think it's my
14:41:46 20 recollection that I only knew about the one search or raid,
14:41:50 21 if you like. I'm not sure I knew that there was multiple
14:41:54 22 ones but I was of the understanding that he had been there
14:41:56 23 living with her and was present at the one raid that I knew
14:42:00 24 of.
14:42:00 25
14:42:01 26 In any event, so your recollection back then was that it
14:42:04 27 was in - shortly prior to you meeting her?---Yes.
14:42:06 28
14:42:06 29 One assumes, because you thought that that was the April
14:42:11 30 raid when the Moonee Ponds DSG raided?---Yes.
14:42:17 31
14:42:17 32 You understood that she was still living with this fellow
14:42:22 33 in or around February 1996, the following year?---I'm not
14:42:28 34 sure whether she was still living with him at that stage or
14:42:30 35 just still had an association with him.
14:42:31 36
14:42:31 37 Do you know where she was living in 96?---No. I would
14:42:38 38 assume maybe still in the Rathdowne Street address but I
14:42:41 39 don't know.
14:42:41 40
14:42:41 41 You had a conversation with her, didn't you, in early 1996
14:42:45 42 at some stage when there was some media scrum outside her
14:42:50 43 house?---Yes. Yes, I did, sorry.
14:42:51 44
14:42:52 45 Where was that?---That was on the phone.
14:42:54 46
14:42:54 47 Where did you understand she was living then?---Sorry, at

14:42:59 1 that stage I think she was living in Kew, yeah.
14:43:00 2
14:43:01 3 Do you understand that she'd moved home?---Yeah, she may
14:43:04 4 have.
14:43:04 5
14:43:04 6 Did you know that she lived in Kew?---I think she had
14:43:10 7 relatives that lived in Kew, yeah.
14:43:12 8
14:43:14 9 Did you ever discuss with her where she lived?---I would
14:43:18 10 have at some point.
14:43:19 11
14:43:20 12 You would have been told where she lived but you've
14:43:24 13 forgotten now, is that what you're saying?---No, I
14:43:27 14 understood she lived in Carlton.
14:43:28 15
14:43:29 16 Yes?---You've refreshed me that that time involving the
14:43:34 17 journalist she was in Kew.
14:43:35 18
14:43:36 19 Right?---Yes.
14:43:38 20
14:43:42 21 In any event, if we can come back to this operation. As I
14:43:45 22 understand it you get a call from her. Is it out of the
14:43:49 23 blue?---Yes, I think it was.
14:43:50 24
14:43:51 25 And you hadn't been actively receiving information or
14:43:54 26 seeking information from her in the months prior to
14:43:56 27 this?---No.
14:43:57 28
14:43:59 29 If this application was made to the CIU in February of 96
14:44:04 30 how long prior do you think the contact was that was made
14:44:08 31 between you and her?---I don't think it was long, maybe a
14:44:11 32 couple of weeks.
14:44:12 33
14:44:14 34 Right. So that gave you time to, what - did you go and see
14:44:17 35 her after you rang her?---We would have.
14:44:19 36
14:44:19 37 And where would you have met her?---I don't remember. It
14:44:24 38 wouldn't have been at a police station. It could have
14:44:28 39 been - yeah, I don't know, it would have been somewhere
14:44:31 40 reasonably discrete I suppose but not at a police station.
14:44:33 41
14:44:33 42 And would you have told anyone that you were going to meet
14:44:36 43 her?---Yeah, I would have told the Sergeant and the
14:44:40 44 Sergeant might have come with me or we would have taken
14:44:43 45 somebody else.
14:44:44 46
14:44:44 47 Do you recall that meeting at all or not?---No.

14:44:46 1
14:44:51 2 Effectively what's being sought here are ancillary services
14:44:54 3 and sources and there'll be funding for initial buys from
14:45:00 4 the Drug Squad, et cetera, so there'd be the necessity to
14:45:07 5 obtain drugs, I suppose, for the purposes of the
14:45:11 6 operation?---Yes.
14:45:12 7
14:45:12 8 That was done or that was considered. And there'd be
14:45:19 9 utilisation of analysts, et cetera. "A CIU controller is
14:45:23 10 currently attached to A DSG", and that's Sergeant Barlow.
14:45:28 11
14:45:32 12 MR HOLT: I apologise, I'm sorry, it was a
14:45:35 13 misunderstanding. Sorry, I was being overly cautious.
14:45:38 14
14:45:39 15 COMMISSIONER: It's all right.
14:45:40 16
14:45:40 17 MR WINNEKE: That was a Sergeant Barlow?---Yes.
14:45:42 18
14:45:44 19 And he'll be available during the operation?---Yes.
14:45:47 20
14:45:47 21 Do you recall speaking to Sergeant Barlow?---Not
14:45:50 22 specifically.
14:45:50 23
14:45:50 24 Would you have spoken to him?---It would be logical that I
14:45:54 25 would have.
14:45:54 26
14:45:55 27 If we can go to the next page. There's information about
14:46:05 28 the person who's the target; is that right?---That's where
14:46:12 29 the description part is, yes.
14:46:13 30
14:46:13 31 And then there's the nature of the assistance required and
14:46:16 32 it says, "A covert operative is required to be introduced
14:46:19 33 to the target by the informer. The undercover will be
14:46:23 34 introduced as a prospective buyer as a large quantity of
14:46:26 35 amphetamine from a target"?---Yes.
14:46:28 36
14:46:28 37 If we go to the next page, then there's some redacted
14:46:31 38 material. There's some associate details. Now I take it,
14:46:35 39 did you obtain that information to put into the report
14:46:40 40 here?---I don't remember this report, sir. I'm not sure
14:46:44 41 whose compiled it.
14:46:45 42
14:46:46 43 I take it you were the police officer who had the contact
14:46:50 44 with the informer?---Yes.
14:46:51 45
14:46:53 46 So one assumes that whoever's actually prepared the report
14:46:56 47 and put it down, the information would have come to you via

14:46:59 1 Ms Gobbo?---Yes.

14:47:00 2

14:47:02 3 A person whose name isn't revealed is a friend of Wilson
14:47:07 4 who was dealing, and there's blanked out words, worked
14:47:18 5 somewhere and possibly met Wilson through this. There's
14:47:21 6 another person there whose details are removed. Perhaps if
14:47:31 7 we just go over to the first part at the top. "G93 states
14:47:35 8 that" a person whose name is removed "was a supplier of
14:47:40 9 amphetamine in the past. It is believed that Wilson has
14:47:45 10 recently re-established contact with that person", right.
14:47:56 11 The next one, "Friend of Wilson who was purchasing up to a
14:48:03 12 pound of speed off Wilson in 93 when he was dealing", et
14:48:05 13 cetera?---Yes.

14:48:06 14

14:48:06 15 Then if we move down the page we get to the final person
14:48:08 16 and we move over to the next page. There's some
14:48:11 17 information about him. He was a previous associate of
14:48:15 18 Wilson and was present at his address in 93 when police
14:48:23 19 executed a search warrant. That information all came from
14:48:25 20 Ms Gobbo and was provided to you and is part of this
14:48:28 21 application?---Yes, that's reasonable.

14:48:29 22

14:48:32 23 If we can just move to the next page. That's the end of
14:48:37 24 that document. I'll tender that document.

14:48:43 25

14:48:43 26 #EXHIBIT RC56 - Police report dated 19/02/96.

14:49:01 27

14:49:05 28 Is it your understanding that - perhaps I'll - there was an
14:49:33 29 introduction to the undercover at a café at
14:49:37 30 Southbank?---Yes.

14:49:38 31

14:49:38 32 There were two meetings. Apparently the target couldn't
14:49:43 33 access any amphetamine but in fact was looking to buy it
14:49:46 34 from the undercover and in effect the information that you
14:49:54 35 were receiving didn't live up to the expectations?---That's
14:49:56 36 how I recall it.

14:49:57 37

14:49:58 38 That's how you recall it, all right. It appears that
14:50:02 39 nothing further came of that operation; is that
14:50:06 40 right?---Yes.

14:50:06 41

14:50:07 42 Is it your understanding that that operation was in effect
14:50:11 43 cancelled?---Yeah, I don't remember it necessarily being
14:50:16 44 cancelled. My understanding was that the target just
14:50:20 45 couldn't provide what we were after.

14:50:22 46

14:50:23 47 Right?---Yeah, I don't specifically remember it being

14:50:27 1 cancelled or how it finished, but it finished.
14:50:29 2
14:50:30 3 Yes, all right. What was your next contact with Ms Gobbo
14:50:37 4 after that?---I can't remember whether it was before or
14:50:42 5 after that I had some contact with her in relation to she
14:50:48 6 had a media scrum at her house.
14:50:51 7
14:50:52 8 Right. Was it your understanding that she got caught up in
14:50:56 9 a scandal surrounding the 1996 Federal election?---I don't
14:51:08 10 remember whether it was State or Federal election but there
14:51:12 11 was an election around that time, yes.
14:51:14 12
14:51:14 13 You recall one Saturday perhaps when you were working in
14:51:18 14 the city getting a call from her; is that right?---Yes, I
14:51:20 15 do.
14:51:21 16
14:51:21 17 What was the effect of that call or the gist of that?---I
14:51:23 18 remember her saying that there were some media outside her
14:51:27 19 house in Kew, or perhaps a relative's house in Kew, and
14:51:33 20 they were hounding her and she effectively, she essentially
14:51:38 21 said she wanted some assistance to get rid of them.
14:51:41 22
14:51:41 23 Were you somewhat surprised about that
14:51:44 24 communication?---Yes.
14:51:45 25
14:51:46 26 Why was that?---It seemed a bit unusual.
14:51:50 27
14:51:51 28 I suppose. But what were you going to do about
14:51:58 29 it?---That's the thing, I don't know.
14:52:00 30
14:52:00 31 Right?---"What do you want me to do, Nicola?", really.
14:52:04 32
14:52:05 33 So is what you said?---I expect that's probably what my
14:52:08 34 initial reaction was.
14:52:09 35
14:52:09 36 Yes?---And then I think it was a case of, oh well, you
14:52:14 37 know, she's somebody who has provided some assistance to
14:52:16 38 the police. If there's something within our ability to,
14:52:23 39 you know, help her, you know, I'm happy to see what we can
14:52:28 40 do. So I spoke to my Sergeant and, yeah, or a Sergeant, I
14:52:33 41 don't know which one it was.
14:52:34 42
14:52:36 43 The suggestion was that you should advise her to drive into
14:52:39 44 the city, meet at some sort of crowded public place where
14:52:42 45 it would be difficult for the media to follow her; is that
14:52:45 46 right?---Yes.
14:52:45 47

14:52:46 1 And if needed, put her in the car and drive her a short
14:52:50 2 distance away so that the media couldn't follow her?---Yes.
14:52:55 3
14:52:55 4 So you rang her back and you gave her that advice; is that
14:53:00 5 correct?---That's right.
14:53:00 6
14:53:01 7 And yourself and another couple of members of the
14:53:06 8 DSG?---Yes.
14:53:06 9
14:53:07 10 So three members of the DSG went off to deal with this
14:53:14 11 errand?---Yes.
14:53:14 12
14:53:15 13 And you met her at the Melbourne Central Shopping centre
14:53:17 14 and you remember you arrived before she arrived and when
14:53:21 15 she arrived she parked in Latrobe Street; is that
14:53:21 16 correct?---Yes.
14:53:22 17
14:53:22 18 She got out of the car and said that the media were still
14:53:25 19 following her?---Yes.
14:53:26 20
14:53:27 21 Did you look around to see if you could find any media
14:53:30 22 scrum or media following her?---Yes.
14:53:33 23
14:53:33 24 Did you see any?---No.
14:53:34 25
14:53:34 26 What did you then do?---We then walked through Melbourne
14:53:39 27 Central shopping centre to the next major street across, I
14:53:42 28 think it was Lonsdale.
14:53:43 29
14:53:43 30 Yes?---Didn't seem to be anyone, any media or anything like
14:53:48 31 that, so we came out the other entrance.
14:53:50 32
14:53:52 33 What did you do after that?---I'd spoken to the other
14:53:58 34 police that I was with and we all agreed that there didn't
14:54:02 35 appear to be anyone following her or any media around so we
14:54:05 36 said, "You're right to go because there doesn't appear to
14:54:10 37 be anyone following you. If they were they're not now.
14:54:13 38 Problem solved".
14:54:14 39
14:54:15 40 That's in, apparently about the start of March of 1996,
14:54:24 41 right?---Yeah, I haven't got a real clear recollection of
14:54:28 42 the timeframe, I'm sorry.
14:54:29 43
14:54:30 44 Whatever the election day was in around early 96, whatever
14:54:35 45 scandal it was that she was involved in, you would accept
14:54:38 46 that that was the date?---Yeah, it might have even been the
14:54:44 47 day of the election.

14:54:45 1
14:54:45 2 All right. After that - did you know Jack Blayney, or I
14:54:50 3 think he was Detective Sergeant Blayney at that
14:54:53 4 stage?---No, I know who he is and what his role was but I
14:54:57 5 never knew him at that time.
14:54:58 6
14:54:59 7 Was he involved in this operation?---Only insofar as he, I
14:55:04 8 think, was the officer-in-charge of the Undercover Unit.
14:55:07 9
14:55:07 10 Yes. It was your understanding that he was involved, in
14:55:15 11 effect, in calling off this job?---I've only become aware
14:55:18 12 of that recently.
14:55:19 13
14:55:20 14 Did you ever have any discussions with him about Ms Gobbo
14:55:23 15 and calling off the job?---No.
14:55:25 16
14:55:28 17 He's apparently described her as a loose cannon and in part
14:55:34 18 that was one of the reasons, it seems, why the job was
14:55:37 19 cancelled and do you have a view about that?---I wouldn't
14:55:53 20 have described her at the time as necessarily a loose
14:55:56 21 cannon, no.
14:55:57 22
14:55:57 23 He said she was making arrangements and not liaising. What
14:56:03 24 do you say about that?---I do remember at one stage I think
14:56:08 25 she nominated to Wilson, the target, what the undercover
14:56:17 26 operative's name was, or what his assumed name would be,
14:56:20 27 but she had done that without any consultation with us and
14:56:23 28 I think that caused a degree of angst.
14:56:25 29
14:56:25 30 Yes?---Yeah, so if that's what he's talking about, making
14:56:29 31 her own arrangements or whatever, I'd agree with that.
14:56:32 32
14:56:33 33 Had you provided the name of the person?---No, I don't
14:56:38 34 think anyone knew what the assumed name was that the
14:56:41 35 undercover operative planned to use. I think she
14:56:44 36 just - - -
14:56:44 37
14:56:45 38 Made it up?---Plucked a name and we had to run with it.
14:56:48 39
14:56:53 40 That would be somewhat unusual I take it?---I hadn't had -
14:56:58 41 I think this was my first foray into dealing with an
14:57:03 42 undercover operative but I now understand the problems that
14:57:06 43 that causes.
14:57:07 44
14:57:08 45 I take it - was it the case that those who were trying to
14:57:14 46 do this job were of the view that she was really getting
14:57:19 47 into the spirit of the operation and in effect enjoying the

14:57:21 1 process?---I think that's a fair assessment.
14:57:26 2
14:57:26 3 I was asking you before about the expression you used, I
14:57:30 4 think in discussion with Mr Walsh, that she was getting
14:57:32 5 ahead of herself or getting too far ahead, or something
14:57:35 6 along those lines?---That probably describes what I'm
14:57:40 7 talking about.
14:57:40 8
14:57:41 9 After the 96 election business did you have an interaction
14:57:51 10 with her as an informer after that?---No.
14:57:53 11
14:57:54 12 Did you receive any telephone calls from her in which she
14:58:00 13 was offering to provide information?---Not that I recall.
14:58:03 14
14:58:06 15 It appears that you did resume interaction with her?---Yes.
14:58:10 16
14:58:10 17 How did that occur?---After I left the DSG I ended up a
14:58:17 18 year or so later at the Malvern CIB office.
14:58:22 19
14:58:23 20 That was your commencement of being a detective; is that
14:58:30 21 right?---Yes.
14:58:30 22
14:58:35 23 How did it come about that - I stopped you, how did it come
14:58:39 24 about that you resumed contact with her?---My recollection
14:58:42 25 is that I had court cases at Melbourne Magistrates' Court
14:58:45 26 and ran into Nicola there in her capacity as a solicitor.
14:58:50 27
14:58:51 28 Right. If we go to the timeline of your employment, do you
14:58:57 29 recall what year it was that you first became a
14:59:01 30 detective?---I believe it was November 1996.
14:59:06 31
14:59:07 32 Towards the end of 96, early 97?---Yep.
14:59:12 33
14:59:15 34 As a detective you charge people, you bring them to
14:59:18 35 court?---Yes.
14:59:19 36
14:59:19 37 And they're dealt with in court?---Yes.
14:59:22 38
14:59:22 39 And you interact with barristers and solicitors?---Yes.
14:59:25 40
14:59:27 41 That occurs either if you're an informant or if you're a
14:59:32 42 corroborator or a witness; is that right?---Yes.
14:59:33 43
14:59:35 44 When you were a detective at Malvern do you recall charging
14:59:40 45 any people who she defended?---No, not directly that she
14:59:46 46 defended, no.
14:59:47 47

14:59:47 1 Do you recall charging any people who she advised at any
14:59:50 2 stage?---No.
14:59:51 3
14:59:53 4 Do you say it didn't occur or it might have occurred?---I'm
14:59:56 5 not going to say it didn't occur but I don't remember it
14:59:59 6 happening.
14:59:59 7
14:59:59 8 You say that you met her at Melbourne Magistrates'
15:00:01 9 Court?---Yes.
15:00:02 10
15:00:02 11 Do you recall when that was?---There would have been a
15:00:06 12 number of occasions while I was there either to give
15:00:10 13 evidence or for whatever reasons connected with my court
15:00:15 14 cases she was there representing people connected with her
15:00:20 15 cases.
15:00:21 16
15:00:21 17 All right. You understand that she initially was a
15:00:25 18 solicitor?---Yes.
15:00:26 19
15:00:27 20 And subsequently she became a barrister?---Yes.
15:00:30 21
15:00:34 22 In 96 she worked for a commercial firm. Would you have had
15:00:40 23 any interaction with her then when she's doing her articles
15:00:44 24 in a commercial firm or not?---I wouldn't have thought.
15:00:46 25
15:00:46 26 She starts work as a criminal solicitor in about April of
15:00:54 27 1997?---Okay, yep.
15:00:56 28
15:00:58 29 At that stage you're a detective at the Malvern CI?---Yes.
15:01:03 30
15:01:03 31 And it's probably the case during 97 you had contact with
15:01:07 32 her in that capacity as a detective and she as a solicitor;
15:01:13 33 is that right?---Correct.
15:01:13 34
15:01:14 35 Did you know, I'm not asking you for the name of the firm,
15:01:18 36 but did you know that she worked for a solicitor in 97?---A
15:01:21 37 criminal solicitor?
15:01:22 38
15:01:22 39 Yes?---Yes.
15:01:22 40
15:01:22 41 And did you know who that solicitor was, again without
15:01:25 42 asking you the firm?---Yes.
15:01:27 43
15:01:27 44 Do you know whether that firm ever represented any of the
15:01:30 45 people that you charged?---I'm not going to say no but I
15:01:37 46 don't believe so.
15:01:37 47

15:01:38 1 Do you know whether that firm represented any people who
15:01:41 2 your colleagues charged or any other people that you knew
15:01:45 3 or charged?---I couldn't say but, no, I'm not sure.
15:01:49 4
15:01:52 5 You met at the Magistrates' Court. There was social
15:01:57 6 interaction I take it?---Yes.
15:01:58 7
15:01:59 8 And you went out and had meals with her or drinks with her;
15:02:08 9 is that right?---Yeah, we would have had lunch over - while
15:02:12 10 we were at court and, yeah, there were occasions where I
15:02:16 11 went out after work for a drink and a meal.
15:02:18 12
15:02:18 13 And you were with other police officers when you did
15:02:21 14 that?---On some occasions but no, some occasions I was just
15:02:28 15 with Nicola.
15:02:29 16
15:02:31 17 Did you know whether other police officers interacted
15:02:36 18 socially with Nicola as well?---No, I wasn't sure.
15:02:39 19
15:02:45 20 There was an occasion in about 1997 where you had an
15:02:49 21 episode of physical intimacy with her, if we can put it
15:02:54 22 that way?---Yes.
15:02:55 23
15:02:55 24 Was that the only occasion that occurred?---Yes.
15:02:57 25
15:02:59 26 Without going into details, did that occur after one of
15:03:03 27 these occasions where you'd been at court and you went out
15:03:06 28 to drinks afterwards or was it an occasion where you rang
15:03:09 29 her up and arranged to meet?---I don't specifically
15:03:14 30 remember. I don't think it was after court.
15:03:16 31
15:03:16 32 Yes?---There was probably some other contact or arrangement
15:03:20 33 to catch up and it eventuated from that.
15:03:23 34
15:03:26 35 Subsequent to that did you meet her on a regular basis and
15:03:31 36 interact with her?---Yes.
15:03:33 37
15:03:33 38 How frequently - are we talking the middle of 97 or towards
15:03:39 39 the end of 97?---When we began to catch up socially?
15:03:44 40
15:03:44 41 Yes?---My recollection is that she was working at the
15:03:48 42 criminal firm so from the timeline you've given me was that
15:03:53 43 April 97?
15:03:54 44
15:03:55 45 April 97, yes, thereabouts?---If we use that as the marker
15:03:59 46 I would say it was subsequent to that.
15:04:01 47

15:04:03 1 How far subsequent, are we talking - - - ?---I don't know.
15:04:06 2 My recollection is that she was a criminal solicitor and I
15:04:10 3 was a detective at Malvern CIB.
15:04:13 4
15:04:14 5 Right?---I wouldn't have thought it was - I had it in my
15:04:18 6 mind it was the first half of 97.
15:04:21 7
15:04:22 8 You would go out with her with other police officers; is
15:04:26 9 that correct?---On occasions, yes.
15:04:27 10
15:04:27 11 What other police officers would you go out with, do you
15:04:31 12 recall?---There could have been any number I suppose. I
15:04:36 13 went to different social functions when she was there.
15:04:39 14
15:04:40 15 Yes?---Sometimes I'd be out with a group and she'd be there
15:04:44 16 with another group and you'd cross paths, so yeah.
15:04:47 17
15:04:55 18 You've already said that in 97 you would go to court and
15:04:58 19 you'd take your clients, if you like, to court and she'd be
15:05:04 20 there representing her clients. You say that they weren't
15:05:08 21 ever the same?---No, I don't believe she represented anyone
15:05:12 22 I charged.
15:05:12 23
15:05:13 24 Did that ever occur?---I think she might have appeared as a
15:05:21 25 barrister in perhaps a bail application when I was at the
15:05:24 26 Homicide Squad that involved someone my crew had charged.
15:05:28 27
15:05:28 28 A person by the name of McDonald?---Yes.
15:05:31 29
15:05:32 30 Was that when you were in the Homicide Squad after being
15:05:35 31 attached to Lorimer?---Yes.
15:05:36 32
15:05:37 33 We're talking about 2004?---2004 or post that, yeah.
15:05:46 34
15:05:47 35 Let's go through the timeline. 98 you went to Lorimer,
15:05:51 36 that's the task force set up to investigate the Silk,
15:05:55 37 Miller murders?---That's right, yes.
15:05:57 38
15:05:57 39 You were there until 2002; is that correct?---That'd be
15:06:01 40 about right.
15:06:01 41
15:06:02 42 And after that you went to Brunswick; is that right?---I
15:06:07 43 went from Lorimer to like a sort of a normal response crew
15:06:13 44 at the Homicide Squad and then to Brunswick, Brunswick
15:06:15 45 police station as a Sergeant.
15:06:16 46
15:06:16 47 As a Sergeant?---Yes.

15:06:17 1
15:06:17 2 Was Paul Dale at Brunswick when you were there?---Yes, he
15:06:21 3 was.
15:06:21 4
15:06:21 5 You'd known him at Lorimer; is that right?---That's right.
15:06:25 6
15:06:26 7 Had you known him before Lorimer?---No.
15:06:27 8
15:06:30 9 You became friends with him at Lorimer?---I did.
15:06:33 10
15:06:33 11 And you resumed the friendship when he went to Brunswick as
15:06:37 12 well; is that right?---We continued friends, yeah. I don't
15:06:42 13 think we actually ever worked a day at Brunswick together.
15:06:45 14 He had been seconded off as a Sergeant to a DSG or an
15:06:51 15 equivalent when I got to Brunswick.
15:06:52 16
15:06:56 17 But notionally you were at the same station?---Yes.
15:06:59 18
15:07:00 19 But you actually didn't work together; is that
15:07:03 20 right?---Yes.
15:07:03 21
15:07:03 22 You attended social functions together though?---Yes.
15:07:06 23
15:07:06 24 Whilst you didn't work together during the day, at
15:07:10 25 night-time you'd socialise?---Correct.
15:07:12 26
15:07:12 27 Where would you drink then?---Sometimes in the city,
15:07:15 28 sometimes in Brunswick. Yeah, different places. At each
15:07:21 29 other's houses.
15:07:21 30
15:07:25 31 You drank with Gobbo on occasions when you were at
15:07:28 32 Brunswick?---I would have.
15:07:30 33
15:07:32 34 Would Paul Dale have been present when you were drinking at
15:07:34 35 Brunswick?---On occasions he was, yep.
15:07:38 36
15:07:39 37 Back at Lorimer Task Force, I think is it the case that
15:07:45 38 there were occasions when the Homicide Squad would have
15:07:51 39 balls or functions?---Yes.
15:07:52 40
15:07:53 41 Did you ever invite her?---I did.
15:07:55 42
15:07:55 43 On how many occasions?---I think I invited her one occasion
15:08:02 44 and then I think after that she probably invited herself.
15:08:04 45
15:08:05 46 Right. How many occasions did she invite herself?---She
15:08:08 47 was a regular at the functions.

15:08:11 1
15:08:11 2 She, I take it, would have been known to very many of the
15:08:18 3 police members, the detectives at the Homicide Squad; is
15:08:21 4 that right?---Yes.
15:08:21 5
15:08:25 6 Including yourself and obviously Paul Dale?---She was - by
15:08:34 7 that stage she was a well-known criminal barrister, I'm
15:08:37 8 sure virtually the whole squad would have known who she
15:08:40 9 was.
15:08:40 10
15:08:40 11 Would she have been appearing - as you say, she certainly
15:08:44 12 appeared for someone by the name of McDonald who you
15:08:48 13 charged. Now do you think that was after you'd been at
15:08:51 14 Brunswick or was it before when you were at Lorimer and
15:08:54 15 then the Homicide Squad general duties?---No, I think I was
15:08:58 16 back at Homicide as a Sergeant, so it would have been
15:09:02 17 post-Brunswick.
15:09:03 18
15:09:03 19 Right. Did you ever discuss with her any of the cases that
15:09:06 20 you were doing when you were socialising?---Not in any
15:09:11 21 significant detail I wouldn't have thought.
15:09:14 22
15:09:14 23 Maybe not in any significant detail but I take it the
15:09:17 24 answer as a general proposition is, "Yes, of course, we
15:09:21 25 would have discussed the things that we were doing"?---Yes.
15:09:24 26
15:09:24 27 Did she discuss with you the sorts of cases that she was
15:09:27 28 doing?---Yes.
15:09:28 29
15:09:28 30 You understood that she went to the Bar and became a
15:09:32 31 barrister and was in effect employing herself in about
15:09:35 32 November of 1998?---She progressed quickly to becoming a
15:09:40 33 barrister. I don't know exact timeframes, but yeah, she
15:09:44 34 wasn't a solicitor for long.
15:09:46 35
15:09:47 36 As far as you knew, as a barrister she was employing
15:09:51 37 herself and she had to get work, if you like, you
15:09:56 38 understood that?---I think that's the business model.
15:09:58 39
15:09:59 40 Did you ever assist her in getting work?---Not directly. I
15:10:07 41 may have - I do remember speaking to her about the Claire
15:10:12 42 McDonald case. I don't know that there's anything that I
15:10:15 43 actually did to assist in getting her that case or - - -
15:10:21 44
15:10:21 45 One assumes as a detective you arrest someone, you pull
15:10:24 46 them in, you interview them?---Yes.
15:10:26 47

15:10:45 1 Or at least prior to interviewing one hopes you say, "Look,
15:10:49 2 you're entitled to a lawyer"?---Yes.
15:10:51 3
15:10:51 4 "I've got the number of a lawyer if you want", did that
15:10:55 5 ever occur do you think?---No, I don't think I ever
15:11:00 6 referred anyone or anything like that.
15:11:01 7
15:11:01 8 Are you sure about that?---I'm not going to say it didn't
15:11:03 9 happen but I don't think - - -
15:11:04 10
15:11:05 11 It might have happened?---It might have but I don't think
15:11:08 12 so.
15:11:08 13
15:11:09 14 What about other detectives at the Homicide Squad, do you
15:11:12 15 think there were occasions when other detectives might have
15:11:16 16 pointed work in her direction?---Look, again, I'm not going
15:11:24 17 to say it didn't happen. There could have. It wasn't
15:11:29 18 normally the case that you'd refer someone to a barrister,
15:11:32 19 you'd normally refer them to a solicitor's firm and then
15:11:35 20 they might brief somebody. So, yeah, I'm not sure we would
15:11:40 21 have been referring directly to Nicola.
15:11:42 22
15:11:43 23 You knew that she was appearing and advising Debs, Bandali
15:11:52 24 Debs?---No, I don't think I did know that.
15:11:55 25
15:11:57 26 I mean it I take it - it may well have been after your
15:12:01 27 time. When was Mr Debs charged?---I think it was around
15:12:05 28 2000 perhaps.
15:12:07 29
15:12:08 30 So did you - the evidence is, at least the evidence will
15:12:12 31 be, that she was - - - ?---Okay.
15:12:14 32
15:12:15 33 - - - representing Bandali Debs?---I don't dispute that,
15:12:19 34 sir, but I don't think I knew that.
15:12:20 35
15:12:21 36 At least on one occasion?---Okay.
15:12:24 37
38 I'm not saying that she did ultimately?---Right.
39
15:12:24 40 You say you didn't know that?---No.
15:12:26 41
15:13:18 42 If I can go to the period that you were at
15:13:21 43 Brunswick?---Yes.
15:13:21 44
15:13:25 45 Do you recall any of the jobs that you did there that were
15:13:32 46 jobs that she had an involvement in in a peripheral
15:13:43 47 way?---Nothing comes to mind.

15:13:45 1
15:13:45 2 Yes?---At Brunswick I was a Sergeant and a supervisor, I
15:13:52 3 didn't necessarily conduct investigations myself or wasn't
15:13:59 4 directly involved in charging a whole lot of people in the
15:14:03 5 supervisory role, so I'm not going to say that constables
15:14:11 6 or junior members at Brunswick might not have been involved
15:14:14 7 in a case she was involved in, but I don't specifically
15:14:18 8 remember.
15:14:19 9
15:14:21 10 Did you ever go to her house at any stage?---I went to her
15:14:35 11 house in Port Melbourne on one occasion.
15:14:37 12
15:14:37 13 When was that?---That was while I was at Brunswick.
15:14:40 14
15:14:43 15 What was the purpose of that?---Um, I don't specifically
15:14:50 16 remember what the purpose was but it was after I finished
15:14:54 17 work one time, um - yeah, I can't remember how the
15:15:01 18 arrangement came about, yeah - I don't remember how it came
15:15:06 19 about.
15:15:07 20
15:15:14 21 Other than the case of McDonald do you say that there were
15:15:21 22 no other cases in which you had charged someone in which
15:15:25 23 she appeared or provided advice?---There's none that I
15:15:29 24 recall, Mr Winneke. I'm not going to say categorically no,
15:15:35 25 but I don't recall any.
15:15:36 26
15:15:50 27 If I can just ask you a couple of questions about - just
15:16:08 28 excuse me - a period when you go back to the Homicide
15:16:35 29 Squad, so you've been at Brunswick 2002, you're promoted to
15:16:42 30 Sergeant there, and you're there for two years, is that
15:16:46 31 correct?---Thereabouts.
15:16:47 32
15:16:48 33 And then you go back into plain clothes, into the Homicide
15:16:55 34 Squad as a Detective Sergeant, is that correct?---Yes.
15:16:58 35
15:17:04 36 Did you continue to maintain social contact with Ms Gobbo
15:17:07 37 in that period?---Yes.
15:17:09 38
15:17:12 39 Do you know other people, other detectives who maintained
15:17:16 40 social contact with her in that period post 2004?---Um, I'm
15:17:23 41 aware Paul Dale maintained contact with her. I don't know
15:17:27 42 specifically of anybody else.
15:17:32 43
15:17:36 44 And did you continue to communicate with her and meet her
15:17:43 45 in 2004?---Yes, I would have.
15:17:47 46
15:17:48 47 How frequently would you have socialised with her in

15:17:53 1 2004?---It wouldn't have been any more than monthly I
15:18:05 2 wouldn't have thought.
15:18:06 3
15:18:07 4 Did you have any professional dealings with her in
15:18:11 5 2004?---Um, if we exclude the Claire McDonald matter, which
15:18:15 6 I'm not sure when that was.
15:18:17 7
15:18:17 8 Yes?---I don't believe so.
15:18:19 9
15:18:22 10 What about in 2003, did you have social dealings - now 2003
15:18:29 11 you were at Brunswick, is that right?---Yes.
15:18:30 12
15:18:31 13 In 2003 did you have social dealings with her?---Um, I
15:18:36 14 would have but I'm not sure of the frequency. It wouldn't
15:18:39 15 have been, it wouldn't have been a lot I wouldn't have
15:18:44 16 thought.
15:18:44 17
15:18:46 18 How frequently? When you say wouldn't be a lot - - - ?---I
15:18:51 19 don't know maybe, maybe monthly.
15:18:54 20
15:18:58 21 Did you have any other dealings with her in 2003?---Um,
15:19:05 22 2003 I sought some legal advice from her.
15:19:09 23
15:19:09 24 You sought legal advice from her?---Yes, that's right.
15:19:11 25
15:19:13 26 On one occasion or more than one occasion?---More than
15:19:16 27 once.
15:19:17 28
15:19:17 29 How many occasions did you seek legal advice?---It was two,
15:19:21 30 possibly three.
15:19:23 31
15:19:23 32 Yes, all right. Without going into the details, what was
15:19:30 33 the purpose of seeking legal advice from her?---Um, I had
15:19:34 34 an association with Paul Dale at the time and I just wanted
15:19:38 35 some advice about my association with Paul.
15:19:41 36
15:19:41 37 Right. Do you know when that was?---It would have been
15:19:47 38 late 2003, towards the end of 2003 I think.
15:19:51 39
15:19:54 40 Where did you get that legal advice? Where did you go to
15:19:57 41 get that legal advice from her?---I think on one occasion I
15:20:01 42 went to her chambers and I think on another occasion we met
15:20:04 43 at a coffee shop or somewhere like that.
15:20:06 44
15:20:10 45 Were you with anyone else on those occasions when you
15:20:12 46 sought legal advice?---Paul came with me on one occasion.
15:20:16 47

15:20:25 1 Again, was he seeking legal advice at all or not?---I
15:20:30 2 believe he was.
15:20:31 3
15:20:39 4 At that stage I take it you were aware that - did you know
15:20:49 5 whether she had an involvement in the matters that you were
15:20:52 6 seeking legal advice from her about?---No.
15:20:54 7
15:20:57 8 Did you know - clearly this is in relation to, as I
15:21:00 9 understand it, the Dublin Street burglary?---Yes.
15:21:05 10
15:21:05 11 Did she ever tell you whether she had had an involvement in
15:21:10 12 advising any people in relation to that transaction?---Not
15:21:15 13 when I was seeking the advice, I think I found out
15:21:17 14 subsequent.
15:21:18 15
15:21:18 16 Right?---Yeah.
15:21:19 17
15:21:25 18 Did you get any written legal advice or not?---No.
15:21:29 19
15:21:30 20 You got verbal legal advice, is that right?---Yes.
15:21:33 21
15:21:39 22 All right. Commissioner, I'm not going to go any further
15:21:43 23 into this aspect of this matter at this stage so I might
15:21:47 24 leave it there, at that. I'm not saying that in due course
15:21:51 25 we mightn't need to deal with this further but I don't
15:21:54 26 propose to go into this at this stage. So those are the
15:21:58 27 matters - just excuse me. Those are the matters I need to
15:22:02 28 deal with at this stage, Commissioner.
15:22:05 29
15:22:05 30 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Winneke. Mr Nathwani.
15:22:08 31
32
33 <CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR NATHWANI:
34
15:22:09 35 Mr Argall can we just go to paragraph 7 because in August
15:22:14 36 2004 you say you completed the internal Victoria Police
15:22:19 37 Level 2 human source management course?---Yes.
15:22:22 38
15:22:23 39 You then set out that you don't have any notes but you
15:22:26 40 recall it concentrated on the initial recruitment and
15:22:31 41 registration of sources, practical day to day management of
15:22:33 42 sources, meeting with sources and recording the information
15:22:35 43 collected from the meetings?---Yes.
15:22:36 44
15:22:36 45 And then you go on, just to complete the paragraph, "I do
15:22:39 46 not recall any instruction or discussion about dealing with
15:22:42 47 a source that had potential confidentiality obligations

15:22:47 1 such as a legal practitioner". Can I just ask you about
15:22:51 2 the level of recording of information as in what documents
15:22:54 3 you were trained to record contact with human sources
15:22:58 4 on?---Are you talking about training at this course?
15:23:02 5
15:23:03 6 Yes. Obviously some of the documents you refer to later on
15:23:07 7 is in relation to IRs?---Yes.
15:23:09 8
15:23:09 9 And that's one of my particular focuses because you say at
15:23:15 10 paragraph 1, and this is to do with this in particular in
15:23:19 11 relation to Ms Gobbo, that your best recollection without
15:23:22 12 access to contemporaneous documents that would help refresh
15:23:27 13 your memory?---Yes.
15:23:28 14
15:23:28 15 Just to go through that, you're referring to your day books
15:23:31 16 that you've already told Mr Winneke about?---Yes.
15:23:33 17
15:23:34 18 And also the IRs that you refer to throughout the
15:23:37 19 document?---Yes.
15:23:37 20
15:23:38 21 Have you ever had an opportunity to consider the IRs that
15:23:42 22 were completed as far as Ms Gobbo is concerned?---I haven't
15:23:45 23 - I'm not aware that those, any IRs have been located in
15:23:50 24 relation to that initial contact from the 95/6 period.
15:23:54 25
15:23:54 26 Have you sought to find out?---My understanding from the
15:23:58 27 Landow Task Force is that those documents don't exist.
15:24:01 28
15:24:01 29 I can't remember the paragraph, there we are, 19, these
15:24:05 30 were word processed, in other words on a computer?---Yes.
15:24:08 31
15:24:09 32 So saved digitally and I think you set out there that in
15:24:13 33 fact you don't remember if hard copies were ever
15:24:17 34 generated?---Yes.
15:24:17 35
15:24:18 36 Can you help us just generally, firstly, back in the 90s
15:24:23 37 when you were dealing with Ms Gobbo, the level of
15:24:25 38 information you would put into the IRs. For example, would
15:24:31 39 you report who else was present with you? This is your
15:24:34 40 practice I'm interested in?---Yes, I expect I would have.
15:24:38 41
15:24:38 42 Where exactly you were meeting, for example, not
15:24:41 43 necessarily South Melbourne but somewhere like the Emerald
15:24:45 44 Hotel, say if it happened in a hotel?---You may or may not.
15:24:50 45 You might just say "met at South Melbourne", you might not
15:24:53 46 put the location.
15:24:54 47

15:24:55 1 Would you detail how long you were there?---If you're
15:25:01 2 talking about information reports you may not.
15:25:03 3
15:25:03 4 Understood. What about ICRs?---ICRs didn't exist back in
15:25:11 5 the 90s.
15:25:12 6
15:25:13 7 Was there anywhere else back in the 90s where you recorded
15:25:16 8 the more detailed information?---Your day book or your
15:25:20 9 diary and then from that the information report.
15:25:24 10
15:25:24 11 Just help us with the practice back in the 90s. Let's say
15:25:28 12 of two of you meet with Ms Gobbo as an example?---Yes.
15:25:31 13
15:25:32 14 Would you both complete an IR?---No.
15:25:34 15
15:25:35 16 Just the one of you?---Yes.
15:25:36 17
15:25:36 18 And would only one person be responsible and it would be
15:25:39 19 submitted or would you both look at it and both have an
15:25:42 20 input or would it just be left to individual officers to
15:25:46 21 deal?---You may just be the independent officer if you
15:25:50 22 wanted to clarify or you might seek some advice, you know.
15:25:56 23 You often, if you were meeting with an informer you often
15:26:00 24 wouldn't sit there writing.
15:26:01 25
15:26:01 26 No, I understand that?---You're relying on your memory but
15:26:04 27 you would generally complete the IR reasonably soon after.
15:26:09 28
15:26:09 29 The detail in the IRs is contingent on the author, which I
30 know sounds pretty obvious, but it's literally the one
15:26:15 31 person responsible for including or not including what they
15:26:16 32 want to?---Yes.
15:26:17 33
15:26:18 34 You've detailed that during your time of contact with
15:26:21 35 Ms Gobbo you never recorded her, in other words
15:26:26 36 digitally?---Didn't record the voice of the conversation,
15:26:28 37 yes.
15:26:28 38
15:26:28 39 Were you ever present when any of your colleagues recorded
15:26:32 40 her?---If they did I wasn't aware of it. It wasn't really
15:26:35 41 the practice back in the 90s. The technology wasn't as - -
15:26:43 42 -
15:26:43 43
15:26:43 44 Sorry, I'm being reminded. We're obviously talking about
15:26:47 45 the 90s?---Yes.
15:26:48 46
15:26:49 47 Back then it wasn't the practice as you've said as far as

15:26:52 1 Ms Gobbo was concerned. Right. Can I go on to deal with
15:26:55 2 the actual contact you had with her. The first contact was
15:26:58 3 at the MCG as you've told us. And before you arrived
15:27:05 4 Mr Ashton, Trevor Ashton told you that you had to go and
15:27:09 5 meet someone?---Either before or shortly after we got
15:27:12 6 there.

15:27:12 7
15:27:12 8 At that stage did he give you any more information about
15:27:15 9 who you were going to meet?---No.

15:27:17 10
15:27:18 11 On the Landow document that you've seen, and this is on p.2
15:27:24 12 of 3. I'll just read the second bullet point from 4
15:27:27 13 February. It's recorded you as telling Mr Walsh, "Was
15:27:32 14 definitely sure that he met with someone and someone
15:27:35 15 regarding 3838 as this was the first time he had dealt with
15:27:38 16 an informer. Ashton was the driver behind this". Was it
15:27:42 17 Ashton who was the driver behind recruiting Nicola Gobbo as
15:27:46 18 a human source?---I think that's a reasonable assumption
15:27:52 19 but that's what it is, it's an assumption, but yeah.

15:27:56 20
15:27:56 21 Obviously now going through your statement we can see, I
15:27:59 22 think paragraph 60 you say it was Ashton who told you you
15:28:04 23 needed to go and meet someone. And then you say in
15:28:06 24 paragraph 17 you made your way up to the top of the grand
15:28:12 25 southern stand, to the food outlet where he spoke to
15:28:16 26 Ms Gobbo. Towards the end of that paragraph you write,
15:28:19 27 "I'm not sure how Ashton had come to know Nicola, what
15:28:20 28 their previous interactions were that led to this meeting".
15:28:22 29 I'm trying to jog your memory. Do you recall the
15:28:26 30 impression that he had met her on a few occasions before
15:28:30 31 then?---I'm not sure a few but it was apparent that this
15:28:35 32 wasn't the first meeting but I don't know how many previous
15:28:39 33 meetings.

15:28:39 34
15:28:39 35 You then detail obviously that what happens is you speak to
15:28:44 36 other members at the SRS in days later. Paragraph 19,
15:28:48 37 there's further conversations on the phone, some to Ashton,
15:28:52 38 some to you, IRs recorded. And then at paragraph 20, and
15:28:58 39 if we could bring up, please, I think it was RC30 which was
15:29:03 40 the application, the registration form.

15:29:07 41
15:29:07 42 COMMISSIONER: The registration, yes, that's right.

15:29:10 43
15:29:12 44 MR NATHWANI: Now, looking at that document you've
15:29:14 45 identified your handwriting and in fact Trevor Ashton's
15:29:18 46 also identified his, so you're right when you say which
15:29:24 47 bits are which?---Thank you.

15:29:25 1
15:29:26 2 You detailed that she was a law student from Melbourne
15:29:29 3 University currently living with a known criminal. "She
15:29:32 4 was charged with possession of amphetamine last year as a
15:29:36 5 result of the criminal that was living with her. Is quite
15:29:41 6 reliable and seeking a career as a solicitor." What was
15:29:43 7 your purpose in including that information?---I don't
15:29:47 8 actually recall filling this document out. My belief is
15:29:52 9 that I would have been given that information from somebody
15:29:55 10 else in order to help fill out the form.
15:29:58 11
15:29:58 12 If you look at paragraph 20, and just trying to help us
15:30:02 13 with it, you say, "I understand Nicola is registered as an
15:30:06 14 informer in A District around about this time. I
15:30:10 15 remembered this being discussed with Ashton and myself and
15:30:14 16 perhaps other members of our team". You clearly there say
15:30:18 17 you remember discussing the registration of Nicola Gobbo at
15:30:22 18 that time. Do you remember where you got that information
15:30:27 19 from, that A she was a law student, B that she was living
15:30:30 20 with a known criminal and, and finally, that she was
15:30:35 21 intending to become admitted to practice?---I have no
15:30:37 22 specific recollection but the conclusion I draw is that it
15:30:39 23 was Sergeant Ashton.
15:30:39 24
15:30:39 25 That is based on him introducing her in the way he did, you
15:30:43 26 indicating your feeling from back then he was the driver
15:30:48 27 behind this and the document itself, is that fair?---Yes.
15:30:50 28
15:30:50 29 Understood. Was any consideration then given at that time,
15:30:56 30 or was Mr Ashton ever saying to you is she'd be a good
15:31:00 31 asset if she became qualified and admitted?---No, I don't
15:31:05 32 believe it went that far.
15:31:06 33
15:31:14 34 In your dealings, this is just generally, with Ms Gobbo for
15:31:18 35 the period you got to know her, were you aware of occasions
15:31:21 36 where her handlers, be it you or in your team or others,
15:31:26 37 would get information from her and then ring an
15:31:31 38 investigating officer anonymously so it would be logged as
15:31:34 39 a Crime Stoppers report so as to hide her identity?---No.
15:31:38 40
15:31:40 41 Were you aware, and there's examples in 2005 to 2009, that
15:31:48 42 to hide her identity the police would use search warrants,
15:31:54 43 make an application to a court and then execute a search
15:31:57 44 warrant on her chambers for material so as to hide that she
15:32:01 45 was providing that information, in other words, making
15:32:04 46 false warrant claims before the courts?---I was not aware
15:32:08 47 of that.

15:32:09 1
15:32:15 2 You detail, and this is going through your statement, the
15:32:19 3 further contact you had with Ms Gobbo and that ultimately,
15:32:24 4 as we know, Mr Blayney pulled off, or stopped the
15:32:31 5 operation. You said earlier you wouldn't describe Ms Gobbo
15:32:34 6 as a loose cannon and you obviously knew her quite well.
15:32:38 7 How would you describe her back then, so this was when the
15:32:45 8 operation was stopped?---She was enthusiastic.
15:32:50 9
15:32:51 10 But not a loose cannon?---I think loose cannon goes further
15:32:56 11 than being enthusiastic. She went, as I describe with the
15:33:02 12 name of the operative and things like that, she went
15:33:05 13 perhaps further than we would have liked but that might
15:33:09 14 just have been through her enthusiasm or whatever, but I
15:33:11 15 wouldn't have quite gone to the level of loose cannon.
15:33:16 16
15:33:16 17 I think you say you don't think there was a process to
15:33:20 18 de-register her but there must have been a period of
15:33:23 19 non-contact. You then discussed the time when she called
15:33:26 20 you during the election and that you were surprised?---Yes.
15:33:28 21
15:33:29 22 And your initial instinct was I think, "How do you want me
15:33:32 23 to help?" You detail a discussion with another Sergeant
15:33:37 24 who was working at the DSG at that day and the suggestion
25 then was for three of you to go in and effectively rescue
15:33:43 26 her or take her away from the scene and get her away from
15:33:45 27 the press. Who were those officers, do you remember?---No,
15:33:48 28 I don't.
15:33:48 29
15:33:49 30 Was Mr Pope working with you at that time?---No, definitely
15:33:53 31 wasn't. Mr Pope definitely wasn't one of them.
15:33:56 32
15:33:57 33 What then follows, as we know - help us with this: do you
15:34:03 34 agree it was indicative of her leaning on you and her trust
15:34:08 35 in you as the police in her calling you on that
15:34:11 36 day?---Yeah, that's reasonable.
15:34:13 37
15:34:13 38 Because there was a trust relationship that she had towards
15:34:17 39 you, do you agree with that?---Yes.
15:34:19 40
15:34:20 41 You then go on in your statement to deal with, and this is
15:34:23 42 paragraph 37, your contact with her after she was a source.
15:34:30 43 Can I ask you, how is it then that she attended the
15:34:33 44 Homicide Squad social functions?---Um, there was at least
15:34:38 45 one occasion where I had spoken to her and said the
15:34:41 46 function was on and asked if she wanted to come.
15:34:44 47

15:34:44 1 As a plus one or - - - ?---No, no.
15:34:46 2
15:34:46 3 I'm asking?---No, just - it was not uncommon for members of
15:34:50 4 the legal profession to come along to these functions. So
15:34:54 5 I just asked her, you know, "Would you like a ticket, would
15:34:59 6 you like to come?"
15:35:00 7
15:35:02 8 I'm new to the area so I don't really know, and I haven't
15:35:08 9 had an invite from the Homicide Squad for a social
15:35:12 10 function?---I can arrange one.
15:35:13 11
15:35:13 12 It was normal practice, was it, for lawyers and the like to
15:35:16 13 attend?---Yes.
15:35:17 14
15:35:17 15 And on those occasions she would have access to other
15:35:20 16 members of the Police Force. Do you remember who else was
15:35:24 17 present? You've been asked about Mr Dale, because you said
15:35:29 18 other sergeants. Was he present?---He came to some of the
15:35:33 19 functions.
15:35:33 20
15:35:33 21 You said Ms Gobbo would sometimes be with other groups, did
15:35:39 22 that group ever include Mr Pope, for example?---I don't
15:35:42 23 think I've ever seen those two together.
15:35:45 24
15:35:45 25 As far as other contact, you say there were occasions when
15:35:50 26 you went out to lunch with Ms Gobbo, sometimes with
15:35:54 27 colleagues, sometimes not. Can you remember which
15:35:58 28 colleagues they were?---No, not specifically. If I was at
15:36:02 29 court with a group of other colleagues or there was a few
15:36:06 30 of us there, we might have grabbed lunch and if she was,
15:36:09 31 you know, "Would you like to grab a sandwich", so yeah it
15:36:14 32 could have been - - -
15:36:15 33
15:36:15 34 You obviously got to know Ms Gobbo well. You detail an
15:36:20 35 intimate occasion with her?---Yes.
15:36:22 36
15:36:24 37 Were you aware at any time that she was undertaking a
15:36:27 38 masters course in 1999 at Latrobe University?---Not
15:36:32 39 specifically, but she was fairly driven with her career.
15:36:34 40
15:36:35 41 And that other police officers were present and doing those
15:36:36 42 courses, does that ring any bells?---No, it doesn't.
15:36:39 43
15:36:48 44 All right, thank you very much.
15:36:52 45
15:36:52 46 COMMISSIONER: Mr Holt?
15:36:53 47

15:36:54 1 MR HOLT: No, there's no cross-examination.
15:36:56 2
15:36:56 3 COMMISSIONER: Mr Chettle?
15:36:58 4
15:36:58 5 MR CHETTLE: No questions, Commissioner.
15:37:00 6
15:37:00 7 COMMISSIONER: Mr Steward.
15:37:02 8
15:37:03 9 MR STEWARD: No questions, thank you Commissioner.
15:37:05 10
15:37:05 11 COMMISSIONER: Anything by way of re-examination,
15:37:08 12 Mr Winneke?
15:37:09 13
15:37:09 14 MR WINNEKE: No, Commissioner.
15:37:10 15
15:37:10 16 COMMISSIONER: So you'd like the witness stood down for the
15:37:12 17 time being, he may be required later?
15:37:15 18
15:37:16 19 MR WINNEKE: He may be required later, Commissioner.
15:37:17 20
15:37:17 21 COMMISSIONER: But not in the immediate - - -
15:37:20 22
15:37:21 23 MR WINNEKE: Not the immediate short term.
15:37:22 24
15:37:22 25 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Argall, you're free to
15:37:25 26 go?---Thanks, Commissioner.
15:37:28 27
28 (Witness excused.)
29
15:37:29 30 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
15:37:29 31
15:37:29 32 MR STEWARD: Thank you, Commissioner.
15:37:31 33
15:37:31 34 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Steward. Yes Mr Winneke.
15:37:34 35
15:37:35 36 MR WINNEKE: Commissioner, I propose to call Jeffrey Pope.
15:37:39 37 He's represented.
15:37:43 38
15:37:43 39 MR THANGARAJ: Commissioner, Thangaraj for Mr Pope. I
15:37:45 40 understand that I've been granted leave, as has Bloch
15:37:50 41 Leibler.
15:37:50 42
15:37:51 43 COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. Can I just have your name
15:37:57 44 again, please?
45
15:37:57 46 MR THANGARAJ: T-h-a-n-g-a-r-a-j.
15:38:02 47

15:38:03 1 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Mr Thangaraj. Yes, Mr Pope, the oath
15:38:18 2 or affirmation?---Oath, please.
15:38:21 3
15:38:23 4 <JEFFREY POPE, sworn and examined:
15:38:41 5
15:38:42 6 COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Winneke.
15:38:44 7
15:38:44 8 MR WINNEKE: Your full name is Jeffrey Steven Pope?---Yes.
15:38:51 9
15:38:52 10 You are currently a Deputy Electoral Commissioner at the
15:38:57 11 Australian Electoral Commission, is that correct?---Yes.
15:38:59 12
15:39:01 13 You were asked on or about 8 March to provide a statement
15:39:06 14 to the Royal Commission and we've been provided today with
15:39:11 15 a statement. Mine is unsigned, do you have a signed copy
15:39:18 16 of it there?---Yes, I do.
15:39:20 17
15:39:21 18 The contents of that statement, are they true and
15:39:25 19 correct?---Yes, to the best of my recollection, yes.
15:39:27 20
15:39:30 21 That's dated today's date I take it, is it?---Yes.
15:39:34 22
15:39:34 23 I tender that.
15:39:35 24
15:39:36 25
15:39:36 26 #EXHIBIT RC57 - Statement of Jeffrey Pope.
15:39:44 27
15:39:44 28 MR HOLT: Commissioner, there will need to be redactions
15:39:49 29 made to that. There will be more redactions made that only
15:39:50 30 came through this morning.
15:39:50 31
15:39:51 32 MR WINNEKE: There are a number of redactions which need to
15:39:54 33 be made, Commissioner, so perhaps if that - that will need
15:39:57 34 to be attended to before it goes out. I don't need to put
15:40:00 35 it up and if I refer to it I won't put it up on the screen.
15:40:05 36 If we could do it that way.
15:40:07 37
15:40:07 38 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
15:40:12 39
15:40:12 40 MR WINNEKE: Now, the statement that you've made refers to
15:40:18 41 events in the period from 1993 to 2000?---Yes.
15:40:24 42
15:40:24 43 Correct? It doesn't refer to events subsequent to
15:40:30 44 2000?---That's right.
15:40:31 45
15:40:31 46 Albeit you have involvement in matters which concern
15:40:36 47 Ms Gobbo subsequent to 2000, perhaps in your capacity as an

15:40:48 1 employee of the Australian Crimes Commission but certainly
15:40:51 2 in your capacity as a member of Victoria Police when you
15:40:54 3 returned to Victoria Police in 2009, is that
15:40:57 4 correct?---Yes.
15:40:57 5
15:40:57 6 Both of those?---Well, I think almost exclusively at
15:41:04 7 Victoria Police.
15:41:04 8
15:41:05 9 Right, okay. Almost but not entirely?---I don't recall
15:41:11 10 having any direct - - -
15:41:13 11
15:41:14 12 Okay, all right. In any event - - - ?---Any direct
15:41:17 13 involvement at the ACC.
15:41:18 14
15:41:19 15 You understand unfortunately that there are other matters
15:41:22 16 that the Commission will need to look into and those
15:41:27 17 concern events which occurred subsequent to your return in
15:41:29 18 2009 which means you will need to come back at some stage
15:41:33 19 and you're prepared to do so obviously, is that right?---I
15:41:36 20 understand that and I understand I'll need to prepare a
15:41:39 21 second statement for that.
15:41:40 22
15:41:40 23 All right. And you'll do that as soon as you can?---Yes.
15:41:45 24
15:41:45 25 Can I ask you a couple of questions about your background.
15:41:52 26 Going back to your commencement in Victoria Police Force,
15:41:57 27 you graduated from the Police Academy in June of 1990 and
15:42:02 28 you commenced as a Constable with Victoria Police at that
15:42:07 29 stage and initially where did you work with Victoria
15:42:12 30 Police?---I think after doing about one month of city
15:42:16 31 patrol in the city in uniform I then went to Mount Waverley
15:42:22 32 police station and Glen Waverley police station were my
15:42:26 33 training stations in about 1991, 92.
15:42:29 34
15:42:29 35 And then you stayed there until about 93, is that correct
15:42:35 36 when you moved to City West police station?---I think I had
15:42:39 37 two months at D24 at the end of 1992 and maybe the first
15:42:43 38 month of 1993 and then I went to City West police station.
15:42:47 39
15:42:47 40 And then you were there at City West until 94, is that
15:42:53 41 correct?---Yes, my recollection it was very late 1993, or
15:42:58 42 very early 94.
15:43:00 43
15:43:00 44 At which time you transferred to plain clothes duties at
15:43:05 45 the Russell Street DSG?---Yes.
15:43:08 46
15:43:09 47 A District?---That's right.

15:43:10 1
15:43:13 2 You remained there until 94, is that late 94?---That's my
15:43:22 3 recollection.
15:43:22 4
15:43:22 5 That's your recollection?---Yes.
15:43:23 6
15:43:24 7 Do you have any notes at all in relation to your early days
15:43:29 8 at Victoria Police?---No, I don't.
15:43:31 9
15:43:31 10 So no - you haven't found any in your own holdings and
15:43:36 11 haven't been supplied with any that anyone else has found
15:43:40 12 amongst the records of Victoria Police?---No, that's
15:43:43 13 correct.
15:43:43 14
15:43:45 15 So your statement here is based on obviously your
15:43:49 16 recollection combined with various investigation logs and
15:43:53 17 information reports and so forth, is that right?---That's
15:43:56 18 right.
15:43:56 19
15:43:59 20 In late 94 when you went over to the Richmond police
15:44:04 21 station, was that at about the time - perhaps I'll withdraw
15:44:08 22 that. When do you understand in effect Russell Street
15:44:14 23 closed down and the goings on were transferred down to
15:44:20 24 Flinders Street?---I can't, I can't remember when they
15:44:22 25 transferred but I left, as far as I can recall I left
15:44:26 26 Russell Street DSG before it transferred.
15:44:29 27
15:44:29 28 Before it transferred?---Yes.
15:44:30 29
15:44:31 30 Do you remember who you were working with at Russell Street
15:44:34 31 DSG?---I briefly worked with Sergeant Ashton.
15:44:41 32
15:44:42 33 In his team?---In his team.
15:44:44 34
15:44:45 35 You reported to Ashton?---Yes, for a short period of time.
15:44:48 36
15:44:48 37 And then after that?---My recollection is I worked on a
15:44:52 38 team managed by Sergeant McNamara.
15:44:55 39
15:44:57 40 If we go back to the team that Ashton was involved in or
15:45:04 41 which lead - who were the other officers that you can
15:45:07 42 recall that you worked with?---Briefly Constable Randoe or
15:45:14 43 Senior Constable Randoe I should say.
15:45:16 44
15:45:17 45 Yes?---I think Senior Constable Neil Thompson.
15:45:23 46
15:45:23 47 Yes?---They were the ones that I can recall.

15:45:28 1
15:45:28 2 They are the ones you can recall. We might be able to jog
15:45:32 3 your memory by the provision of further names. Do you
15:45:35 4 remember a gentleman by the name of Arthur?---I remember
15:45:38 5 Rod Arthur being at the DSG for a short period of time
15:45:42 6 while I was there.
15:45:43 7
15:45:43 8 In your team?---Not that I recall.
15:45:45 9
15:45:45 10 Mr Trichias?---Same, he was - I think briefly we crossed
15:45:52 11 paths at the DSG but not in my team.
15:45:54 12
15:45:55 13 All right. What sort of duties were you involved in at the
15:46:04 14 District Support Group?---A variety of duties, liquor
15:46:10 15 licensing, drug warrants predominantly.
15:46:17 16
15:46:18 17 Investigations of drug warrants, so I assume investigations
15:46:23 18 of drug offending?---That's right. They were generally
15:46:26 19 short term investigations, nothing too extensive.
15:46:29 20
15:46:31 21 There's been evidence that you were given a handover, if
15:46:40 22 you like, by those who were handling Ms Gobbo in or about
15:46:47 23 94, 95. Do you have any recollection of meeting Ms Gobbo
15:46:51 24 back then?---None at all.
15:46:52 25
15:46:52 26 None at all?---None at all.
15:46:54 27
15:46:57 28 Do you say it didn't occur or you simply have no
15:47:02 29 recollection?---It's possible that I might have been
15:47:05 30 introduced to her but I don't recall it.
15:47:07 31
15:47:09 32 Did you have any informers with whom you were working when
15:47:14 33 you were at the Russell Street DSG?---Not that I recall.
15:47:18 34
15:47:22 35 Did you work at the MCG on occasions?---I recall working at
15:47:28 36 the MCG once or twice in uniform.
15:47:30 37
15:47:30 38 Yes?---But I don't recall working there as part of the
15:47:36 39 District Support Group.
15:47:37 40
15:47:37 41 That means you might have been at the Richmond police
15:47:40 42 station?---Or City West.
15:47:41 43
15:47:42 44 Or both?---Or both.
15:47:42 45
15:47:43 46 At the DSG you were always in plain clothes?---Yes.
15:47:50 47

15:47:51 1 Or that was that occasionally in uniform?---No, no, always
15:47:54 2 in plain clothes.
15:47:55 3
15:47:59 4 Were you aware that Mr Ashton - perhaps before I go there,
15:48:05 5 how frequently would you be working with your Sergeant,
15:48:09 6 with Ashton in those days?---Well generally probably almost
15:48:15 7 every working day.
15:48:17 8
15:48:17 9 Yes?---But my recollection was, and I stand to be corrected
15:48:24 10 otherwise, but my recollection was I think he was my
15:48:29 11 Sergeant only for a couple of months.
15:48:32 12
15:48:32 13 Is that at the start of 94 or end of 94?---At the start.
15:48:37 14
15:48:38 15 Were you transferred into a different group for any
15:48:41 16 particular reason?---No, I think there was just a change
15:48:44 17 and new sergeants came along and they rotated people
15:48:47 18 around.
15:48:47 19
15:48:53 20 In your statement you say that you hold a Bachelor of Laws
15:48:57 21 from Latrobe University. When did you carry out your
15:49:02 22 studies towards that degree?---I think I started in 1999
15:49:07 23 and I graduated in 2008.
15:49:12 24
15:49:13 25 Bachelor of Arts, Police Studies at Monash University, was
15:49:18 26 that done subsequent or prior to that?---Prior.
15:49:20 27
15:49:20 28 When were those studies?---I think I started in 1993 and
15:49:24 29 finished that the year before I started law in 1998, as I
15:49:30 30 recall.
15:49:31 31
15:49:33 32 The diploma in company directorship, when was that
15:49:38 33 done?---I think 2007.
15:49:42 34
15:49:48 35 From 94 to October 95 you went back in uniform to the
15:49:54 36 Richmond police station as you say as a uniformed officer,
15:50:01 37 did you work with informers or not?---No.
15:50:03 38
15:50:03 39 Not at all?---Not at all.
15:50:05 40
15:50:07 41 And then you remained there until October of 95 whereupon
15:50:12 42 you went to the Asset Recovery Squad, is that
15:50:15 43 correct?---Yes.
15:50:16 44
15:50:22 45 Then you were also a Detective Senior Constable at the SRS
15:50:35 46 from January 98 to early 99?---Yes.
15:50:40 47

15:50:40 1 And then early 99 you transferred to the Asset Recovery
15:50:45 2 Squad or back to the Asset Recovery Squad as a Detective
15:50:50 3 Senior Constable, is that correct?---Yes.
15:50:51 4
15:50:54 5 Now the Asset Recovery Squad is associated with the Major
15:50:59 6 Fraud Group, is that right, or was?---Yes.
15:51:01 7
15:51:03 8 Could you tell the Commissioner what sort of work that
15:51:07 9 organisation was engaged in?---Effectively the
15:51:11 10 identification and restraint and seizure of proceeds of
15:51:15 11 crime.
15:51:16 12
15:51:19 13 I take it that group worked relatively closely with other
15:51:25 14 investigative units but in particular at that time the Drug
15:51:31 15 Squad?---That was one of the main sources of work, yes.
15:51:33 16
15:51:34 17 What were the other sources of work?---Organised Crime
15:51:38 18 Squad was probably another one.
15:51:39 19
15:51:39 20 Yes?---Sometimes some of the district support groups when
15:51:43 21 they came across large drug seizures, we'd help them quite
15:51:49 22 a bit.
15:51:49 23
15:51:49 24 Yes. And you had recourse to legal advice or a solicitor
15:51:53 25 in the Asset Recovery Squad I take it?---Yes.
15:51:58 26
15:51:59 27 Do you recall who that was in 99?---Mr Roger Jeans.
15:52:05 28
15:52:07 29 Was he employed, a civilian employee of Victoria Police
15:52:14 30 Force, is that right?---Yes, he was a full-time solicitor,
15:52:18 31 public service position attached to the Asset Recovery
15:52:23 32 Squad. The Major Fraud Group had a number of solicitors
15:52:24 33 that were employed full-time, permanently attached to them.
15:52:27 34
15:52:28 35 How many, do you know?---My recollection would be about
15:52:31 36 six.
15:52:32 37
15:52:33 38 I take it if any of the officers needed advice, then they
15:52:38 39 were available to provide advice to police officers around
15:52:47 40 matters concerning asset recovery or asset confiscation,
15:52:53 41 those sorts of matters?---Mr Jeans was particularly more
15:52:57 42 specialised in asset recovery than anything else. Some of
15:53:00 43 the others were more specialised in corporate fraud and
15:53:04 44 white collar crime.
15:53:05 45
15:53:06 46 Do you know whether they were in effect on secondment from
15:53:10 47 the VGSO or were they - - - ?---No, my recollection is they

15:53:14 1 were full-time employees of Victoria Police.
15:53:17 2
15:53:17 3 Right, okay. And where were they located?---The Major
15:53:21 4 Fraud Group was divided into divisions. The Asset Recovery
15:53:26 5 Squad was one division within the Major Fraud Group and the
15:53:29 6 solicitor was attached to the division. So my recollection
15:53:32 7 is the other solicitors were attached to the other four or
15:53:36 8 five divisions in the Major Fraud Group.
15:53:38 9
15:53:38 10 So physically they were within the same working area as the
15:53:42 11 detectives?---We were in the same - yes, we were in the
15:53:45 12 same building, yes.
15:53:46 13
15:53:47 14 And accessible?---Yes.
15:53:49 15
15:54:03 16 Are you able to recall any of the police officers who you
15:54:07 17 had regular contact with because of business in the Drug
15:54:16 18 Squad?---Well the main one that comes to mind is Detective
15:54:20 19 Senior Sergeant Strawhorn.
15:54:20 20
15:54:20 21 Right. And why is that the main one that comes to mind, I
15:54:25 22 assume there were other detectives you dealt with as
15:54:28 23 well?---I think I dealt with him on a couple of occasions.
24
15:54:31 25 Yes?---And I remember his name because I worked with his
15:54:34 26 brother at the Special Response Squad.
15:54:36 27
15:54:36 28 Right?---Um - - -
15:54:39 29
15:54:39 30 And you knew him reasonably well, I assume, in a
15:54:42 31 professional way?---Only professionally, yes.
15:54:45 32
15:54:46 33 Not socially?---No. I remember Kruger.
15:54:53 34
15:54:54 35 Yes. And he was, he worked in the same team, if you like,
15:55:03 36 as Mr Strawhorn?---That's my recollection.
15:55:06 37
15:55:07 38 Did they work in teams?---Yes.
15:55:09 39
15:55:09 40 Do you know of any other police officers in his team?---Um,
15:55:15 41 I can't recall that one at the time. I remember working
15:55:22 42 with Senior Detective Steve Paton and Senior Detective
15:55:30 43 Firth I think were some of the other names that I'd come
15:55:35 44 across at some stage.
15:55:36 45
15:55:46 46 Did you know a person by the name of Peter Doody?---I've
15:55:53 47 got a vague recollection of that name.

15:55:56 1
15:55:56 2 Was he a person who worked at Richmond, at the Richmond
15:56:01 3 police station?---He may have, yes.
15:56:04 4
15:56:05 5 Is he a person through whom you met Mr Kruger?---I don't
15:56:11 6 recall that.
15:56:11 7
15:56:15 8 If that's Mr Kruger's recollection, that he knew you
15:56:22 9 through Peter Doody, that may or may not be the case. I
15:56:26 10 mean if he was at Richmond that might ring true?---That's
15:56:29 11 possible.
15:56:29 12
15:56:29 13 No reason that it mightn't be the case?---No.
15:56:33 14
15:56:40 15 In 99 and 2000 you were investigating a Melbourne lawyer,
15:56:47 16 let's call him lawyer 1, who you later understood to be the
15:56:56 17 employer or former employer of Nicola Gobbo, is that
15:56:59 18 right?---Yes.
15:57:00 19
15:57:03 20 Can I ask you, you say in your statement that you were
15:57:09 21 working in the asset recovery and you were investigating
15:57:12 22 that lawyer. Can you tell the Commission how that
15:57:17 23 investigation commenced?---I couldn't recall how that
15:57:25 24 investigation commenced until I've refreshed my memory by
15:57:28 25 looking at my notes.
15:57:29 26
15:57:29 27 All right. And you've refreshed your memory, so having
15:57:32 28 refreshed your memory are you able to say how it commenced
15:57:36 29 or do you need to see your notes?---No, my recollection
15:57:39 30 from seeing notes is that the Drug Squad had asked for the
15:57:44 31 Asset Recovery Squad assistance with this particular
15:57:47 32 investigation.
15:57:51 33
15:57:53 34 Perhaps if you can have a look at your notes. Have you got
15:57:58 35 them there or at least copies of them?---No, I've only got
15:58:02 36 my statement.
15:58:03 37
15:58:03 38 Do we have Mr Pope's notes in the court? We've got copies
15:58:08 39 of the redacted notes I believe. I think what I might do
15:58:20 40 is if I can ask that this note be put up now. We may have
15:58:35 41 redaction issues, Commissioner, and I don't want to put up
15:58:39 42 something which might - - -
15:58:41 43
15:58:41 44 COMMISSIONER: We're very close to 4 o'clock I suppose.
15:58:46 45 You're going to be a while - - -
15:58:48 46
15:58:49 47 MR WINNEKE: I will be a while. I'm just looking at my

15:58:54 1 learned friend who has a smile on his face, not because
15:58:56 2 he's happy I suspect but quite the opposite.
15:58:56 3
15:58:57 4 COMMISSIONER: Maybe it was the mention being close to 4
15:58:59 5 o'clock that made him happy.
15:59:01 6
15:59:01 7 MR WINNEKE: No, not at all. The reality is we had hoped
15:59:04 8 to get through Mr Pope today and - - -
15:59:07 9
15:59:07 10 COMMISSIONER: I see. I'm prepared to sit until 4.30 if
15:59:11 11 that helps.
15:59:12 12
15:59:12 13 MR WINNEKE: I don't think that's going to help frankly, I
15:59:15 14 really don't. Perhaps we'll keep going.
15:59:19 15
15:59:19 16 MR HOLT: It would avoid the redaction issue if these could
15:59:24 17 just be shown to Mr Pope.
15:59:26 18
15:59:26 19 MR WINNEKE: Yes. I'm sympathetic to my learned friend who
15:59:48 20 has come down from Sydney in the expectation that we were
15:59:52 21 going to conclude today. I'm happy to keep going but I
15:59:57 22 suspect we'd be sitting until 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock and
15:59:59 23 everyone would be sick and tired of hearing me by then.
15:59:59 24
15:59:59 25 COMMISSIONER: It might be a bit tough on the recorders.
16:00:03 26
16:00:03 27 MR WINNEKE: Yes, I agree. If we can we'll keep going for
16:00:09 28 a little while longer. Just excuse me. I've been provided
16:00:15 29 with the notes but they're the wrong ones. If I can just
16:00:31 30 show you this note, please, and I'll get you to hand it
16:00:34 31 back once you've had a look at it. There's some yellow
16:00:38 32 highlight there. 27 April, do you see that?---Yes.
16:00:45 33
16:00:46 34 What does that say?---"Initiated contact with Drug Squad re
16:00:52 35 new job on money laundering."
16:00:56 36
16:00:56 37 It may well be that that is misleading, but that suggests
16:00:59 38 that you initiated contact. I'm not suggesting that the
16:01:03 39 job was initiated by you, but can you explain that
16:01:06 40 note?---I think it's probably just clumsy grammar but my
16:01:10 41 understanding is that I just initiated the contact with
16:01:16 42 them.
16:01:16 43
16:01:16 44 Regarding a new job?---Regarding a new job in response to
16:01:20 45 them making the request to us.
16:01:21 46
16:01:22 47 Right. Do you know whether if we look harder in your notes

16:01:27 1 there'd be a reference to a communication from the Drug
16:01:31 2 Squad to you prior to that, because on looking at that one
16:01:34 3 assumes that you're the person who is initiating it?---I'm
16:01:39 4 not sure if there'll be anything else that would further
16:01:44 5 clarify it.
16:01:44 6
16:01:45 7 Were you the person at the recovery group who was the
16:01:49 8 conduit, if you like, the person who was the first person
16:01:54 9 involved in this job?---My understanding is I was allocated
16:01:58 10 the lead for this, for this role, for this job.
16:02:02 11
16:02:02 12 By Mr Segrave?---I can't recall.
16:02:06 13
16:02:06 14 Who did you report to at that stage?---Yes, Mr Segrave.
16:02:11 15
16:02:12 16 Is it likely he would have allocated a job or would it have
16:02:16 17 come straight to you perhaps from Mr Kruger?---I expect
16:02:19 18 that a request from the Drug Squad coming from a Detective
16:02:23 19 Senior Sergeant would have come into the Asset Recovery
16:02:26 20 Squad at a higher level than myself. It has either come in
16:02:31 21 I would expect to the Detective Sergeant or the Detective
16:02:35 22 Senior Sergeant and it has been allocated to me and then
16:02:37 23 I've initiated the contact.
16:02:39 24
16:02:39 25 I wonder if that can be handed back on that note.
16:02:43 26 Commissioner, I'll tender the notes in due course, perhaps
16:02:47 27 in a bundle rather than doing each and every page. I won't
16:02:51 28 do it bit by bit.
16:02:53 29
16:02:53 30 COMMISSIONER: All right then.
16:02:54 31
16:02:56 32 MR WINNEKE: So that was on Tuesday, 24 April. The
16:02:58 33 following day it appears that you had a meeting with
16:03:05 34 Detective Sergeant Segrave in the morning and you went to
16:03:10 35 the Drug Squad. Was that usual, that you'd go to the Drug
16:03:14 36 Squad?---I would go there for meetings for different jobs
16:03:18 37 from time to time.
16:03:19 38
16:03:20 39 And the meeting was regarding lawyer 1, "Meeting with
16:03:26 40 Detective Senior Sergeant Strawhorn and Detective Senior
16:03:28 41 Constable Kruger" and you were there for a while and
16:03:33 42 thereafter you went and spoke to Detective Acting Inspector
16:03:41 43 Curran regarding the solicitor job, right?---Yes.
16:03:46 44
16:03:48 45 Curran was in effect the boss, if you like?---Yes.
16:03:55 46
16:03:58 47 Did you need to get permission from him to continue with

16:04:02 1 the job?---I don't think we would have needed permission.
16:04:08 2
16:04:09 3 Right. What was the purpose of speaking to Detective
16:04:16 4 Acting Inspector Curran?---Well the understanding that I'm
16:04:20 5 forming would be to come back and brief him on the job.
16:04:23 6
16:04:23 7 On the job?---H'mm.
16:04:24 8
16:04:24 9 That's the usual thing to do, is it?---Um, certainly he
16:04:29 10 would want high level understanding of the sorts of jobs
16:04:33 11 that his squad would be taking on.
16:04:36 12
16:04:36 13 Right. So it's not every case that you'd need to go and
16:04:40 14 brief the Inspector?---Probably not on every case.
16:04:43 15
16:04:43 16 But this was a matter of some significance?---Yes.
16:04:46 17
16:04:47 18 One, because it involved a solicitor?---Yes.
16:04:51 19
16:04:51 20 And, two, perhaps because it also involved an
16:04:55 21 informer?---Yes.
16:04:55 22
16:04:55 23 And you understood at that stage when you went to see the
16:05:00 24 Drug Squad that the informer was in fact a practising
16:05:03 25 barrister?---I think I learned that at that time.
16:05:06 26
16:05:06 27 At the meeting, yes?---Yes.
16:05:08 28
16:05:10 29 Subsequent to seeing Detective Acting Inspector Curran, you
16:05:16 30 went and had a meeting with Roger Jeans re the same?---Yes.
16:05:19 31
16:05:22 32 I take it likewise you wouldn't be going and speaking to a
16:05:27 33 solicitor every time you got a job to do?---Not every time.
16:05:31 34
16:05:31 35 If there was anything unusual or significant about a job,
16:05:35 36 then in those cases you might need to go and see the
16:05:38 37 solicitor?---Most likely.
16:05:40 38
16:05:40 39 To get legal advice?---Yes.
16:05:41 40
16:05:42 41 And what do you recall the legal advice was here?---I don't
16:05:46 42 recall that meeting I'm afraid.
16:05:48 43
16:05:49 44 You don't recall the meeting but you recall - I suppose
16:05:53 45 what you do know is that you made a note about it and you
16:05:57 46 can say it's unusual, relatively unusual?---Yes, and for me
16:06:01 47 to make a note of it indicates that it was important.

16:06:08 1
16:06:18 2 One of the other things that you learnt out of the briefing
16:06:22 3 with the Drug Squad members was that this job as far as you
16:06:28 4 were concerned had arisen out of a job that they were doing
16:06:32 5 called Operation Carron, is that right?---I've ascertained
16:06:39 6 that from looking at notes recently.
16:06:41 7
16:06:42 8 Yes?---That that was the case, but I don't recall that.
16:06:46 9
16:06:46 10 I'm sorry?---But I don't recall.
16:06:48 11
16:06:48 12 I'm not suggesting you do, but what you can say is having
16:06:52 13 looked at the notes you can effectively reconstruct what
16:06:56 14 was going on at the time and you're prepared to accept that
16:06:59 15 you would have been told how the job came about from the
16:07:02 16 Drug Squad and they would have given you a reasonably
16:07:05 17 comprehensive briefing about what it was all about?---Um,
16:07:11 18 yeah, the Drug Squad jobs generally one job rolls into
16:07:15 19 another, as you charge offenders other things come up and
16:07:20 20 then you can sometimes start another operation as a
16:07:23 21 consequence. This looks to me like it might have been one
16:07:27 22 of those situations. I don't recall having a comprehensive
16:07:32 23 understanding of what the other operation was about.
16:07:34 24
16:07:34 25 But what you do say is that the rolling nature of it was
16:07:39 26 that the Drug Squad would put together a brief and then out
16:07:45 27 of that would come a job for the Asset Recovery
16:07:49 28 Squad?---Yes.
16:07:49 29
16:07:50 30 Almost as a matter of course, one follows the other?---Not
31 every time.
32
16:07:54 33 Not every time but as a general proposition and looking
16:07:54 34 back at your notes that appears to have been the course
16:07:57 35 here and in fact what had occurred is that a number of
16:08:01 36 people were arrested the previous year, in November of
16:08:05 37 1997, and out of that arrest a number of people have been
16:08:12 38 charged, right?---I don't recall having that detail.
16:08:16 39
16:08:16 40 You were aware subsequently in your interactions with
16:08:22 41 Ms Gobbo that there was a person by the name of Peter Reid
16:08:25 42 who had been charged?---I remember that name appearing in
16:08:31 43 our investigation but I don't remember having,
16:08:34 44 understanding that he had been charged as a consequence of
16:08:36 45 that operation.
16:08:37 46
16:08:37 47 Perhaps we'll come back to that. Maybe we're getting ahead

16:08:41 1 of ourselves. In any event you certainly do recall a
16:08:44 2 person by the name of Peter Reid and he was involved in
16:08:47 3 some way in the alleged money laundering which was going on
16:08:50 4 with the solicitor?---His name comes up in the information
16:08:53 5 reports.
16:08:53 6
16:08:59 7 If I can ask you this: you've got a number of documents
16:09:06 8 that you can use to in effect reconstruct what occurred.
16:09:10 9 You've got your diary, you've got day books as well?---I
16:09:16 10 don't have day books. I did have.
16:09:18 11
16:09:18 12 You did have but you don't have now?---Yes.
16:09:20 13
16:09:22 14 Just so we can understand the process, you've got an
16:09:26 15 official police diary?---Yes.
16:09:28 16
16:09:29 17 And you record in that diary shorthand what you're doing
16:09:35 18 throughout the day?---Yes, at a broad level.
16:09:37 19
16:09:37 20 At a broad level. The next level of detail in terms of
16:09:40 21 what you're doing is a day book?---That's where all your
16:09:43 22 detail generally goes.
16:09:45 23
16:09:47 24 In addition to the day book you've got various
16:09:51 25 investigation logs?---Yes.
16:09:53 26
16:09:53 27 For example, if you commence an investigation you'll
16:09:55 28 commence an investigation log?---Yes.
16:09:57 29
16:09:58 30 And in terms of the use of informers, if you've got an
16:10:02 31 informer you will have recorded information reports of
16:10:11 32 meetings with informers, is that right?---Yes.
16:10:12 33
16:10:15 34 Do you know where your day book went, what happened to
16:10:20 35 it?---No, I don't.
16:10:21 36
16:10:21 37 What's the usual process with the day books?---I normally
16:10:25 38 keep them for a period of time. Unfortunately I've moved
16:10:30 39 house and interstate a few times so I'm not sure at what
16:10:34 40 stage I disposed of them I think.
16:10:38 41
16:10:38 42 You don't hand them back to the Police Force, they can be
16:10:42 43 disposed of, can they?---That's my understanding, yes. The
16:10:45 44 diary must stay with the Police Force, yes.
16:10:48 45
16:10:48 46 But your day book, you can do what - - - ?---Is your own
16:10:53 47 personal property.

16:10:53 1
16:10:53 2 Are there rules about how long they should be hung on for
16:10:57 3 or not?---Not that I'm aware of.
16:11:01 4
16:11:01 5 In any event it's gone?---Yes.
16:11:04 6
16:11:04 7 Try as you might you can't find it?---No.
16:11:06 8
16:11:11 9 The meeting with Strawhorn and Kruger at the Drug Squad was
16:11:15 10 between you and Segrave and the effect of it was to enable
16:11:19 11 you to get the basic details of the job and information
16:11:23 12 coming from informer and you were to be advised as to when
16:11:27 13 we can be introduced to the informer and to take over the
16:11:32 14 investigation, right?---Yes.
16:11:32 15
16:11:33 16 So the understanding was that you would be the people who
16:11:36 17 would be carrying this investigation?---This component of
16:11:41 18 the investigation which was, um, alleged money laundering
16:11:46 19 by a lawyer.
16:11:47 20
16:11:55 21 You were advised on 7 May by Detective Senior Constable
16:12:02 22 Kruger that they would be meeting with the informer on that
16:12:05 23 day, 7 May, and you would be further advised as to when you
16:12:11 24 would be introduced to the informer. Do you want to see a
16:12:17 25 note to that effect or do you accept what I've got to say
16:12:19 26 about that?---No, I can accept that.
16:12:21 27
16:12:23 28 Then the first meeting that you had with the informer was
16:12:27 29 on 12 May?---Yes.
16:12:29 30
16:12:30 31 And do you recall where you met her?---At the Emerald
16:12:35 32 Hotel.
16:12:35 33
16:12:35 34 And who was there?---My notes have refreshed my memory on
16:12:43 35 that. So it was myself, Detective Sergeant Segrave,
16:12:48 36 Detective Senior Sergeant Strawhorn and Kruger.
16:12:50 37
16:12:51 38 And the meeting commenced at 4.30 pm and you and Segrave
16:13:01 39 met with the informer at South Melbourne at the
16:13:04 40 hotel?---Yep.
16:13:04 41
16:13:04 42 And you made the information report. It was the first
16:13:22 43 meeting and no real information was discussed. This is
16:13:25 44 what you've got in the information report. You don't have
16:13:28 45 the copies of the information report?---No, I don't.
16:13:31 46
16:13:32 47 "After the introduction we ascertained how far the informer

16:13:36 1 was prepared to go with the information regarding the
16:13:38 2 solicitor and the meeting concluded at 7.10 pm with the
16:13:42 3 intention of meeting again within the next few days." Now
16:13:46 4 that note is contained in an information report which was
16:13:50 5 made on 28 May 1999 concerning an event which occurred on
16:13:57 6 Wednesday, 12 May 99. How did it come to be that you made
16:14:02 7 that information report 16 days later?---It might have been
16:14:13 8 a couple of reasons. One is it's not uncommon for you to
16:14:18 9 just conduct your investigations and take your notes and
16:14:21 10 your day books and actually catch up on your diaries and
16:14:25 11 your information reports a week or so down the track.
16:14:27 12
16:14:27 13 Yes. It seems a fairly long meeting to get that amount of
16:14:34 14 information from about 4.30 through to 7.10 pm?---I don't
16:14:41 15 think we got any information.
16:14:44 16
16:14:44 17 Even longer then. How could it be that you go to the hotel
16:14:48 18 and you're there for that long and you get no
16:14:51 19 information?---I think that was really just about
16:14:54 20 establishing relationships and whether this was going to
16:15:01 21 continue on, I think I made a note, how far she might have
16:15:05 22 been willing to go with respect to being an informer.
16:15:11 23
16:15:12 24 And in your notes you make reference to drawing \$50 by way
16:15:20 25 of expenses. One assumes that that was for refreshments at
16:15:26 26 the Emerald Hotel?---Yes, I think there would have been a
16:15:29 27 couple of drinks and a snack or two.
16:15:33 28
16:15:37 29 Did you form a view as to the informer at that stage?---I
16:15:41 30 can't recall.
16:15:42 31
16:15:44 32 Did you believe that you had - did you recognise her, had
16:15:50 33 you seen her before?---I knew of her.
16:15:53 34
16:15:54 35 Right?---That's about all I can recall. I don't ever
16:16:00 36 recall having met her before that day.
16:16:05 37
16:16:05 38 At that stage were you engaged in studying?---Yes, I think
16:16:12 39 that would have been my first year of my part-time law
16:16:17 40 degree.
16:16:17 41
16:16:17 42 And in the first year what are you studying, constitutional
16:16:23 43 law and criminal law?---I think constitutional, I can't
16:16:28 44 remember what some of the other ones were.
16:16:30 45
16:16:32 46 Indeed I think on the very next day it seems that you had
16:16:36 47 study leave and you were off duty. You got study leave at

16:16:42 1 various times?---That was approved, approved study leave
16:16:47 2 where if you're studying a degree that's of relevance to
16:16:51 3 your occupation then the organisation will consider
16:16:55 4 providing you time to attend lectures.
16:16:59 5
16:17:03 6 Do you have a recollection of - and you were attending
16:17:08 7 lectures at Latrobe University at that stage, is that
16:17:11 8 right?---At Bundoora, yes.
16:17:14 9
16:17:15 10 Were you doing those basic courses or were you doing any
16:17:21 11 sort of additional courses related to the job that you were
16:17:26 12 engaged in?---No, I was purely doing my law degree.
16:17:29 13
16:17:30 14 Do you understand that there was a course that Detective
16:17:39 15 Curran was involved in presenting at Latrobe
16:17:44 16 University?---I understand he was, yes.
16:17:46 17
16:17:46 18 Did you ever have an involvement in that course?---No.
16:17:49 19
16:17:50 20 Are you sure about that?---Certain.
16:17:52 21
16:17:54 22 Did you ever come into contact with Ms Gobbo in association
16:18:00 23 with a course that you were attending at Latrobe
16:18:03 24 University?---No.
16:18:04 25
16:18:08 26 Did you ever have any discussions with Ms Gobbo about the
16:18:14 27 subjects that you were studying at Latrobe
16:18:18 28 University?---Upon reflecting on my notes it looks like I
16:18:21 29 did. I don't recall having those discussions but it looks
16:18:24 30 like I did.
16:18:25 31
16:18:25 32 Upon reflection what sort of interaction did you have about
16:18:28 33 that?---I think, you know, maybe as part of establishing
16:18:33 34 some form of rapport with her that I might have shared with
16:18:37 35 her that I was studying law, given that she was obviously a
16:18:42 36 lawyer.
16:18:42 37
16:18:44 38 As a result of that, what, there was some communications
16:18:47 39 about legal studies and so forth, is that right?---I can
16:18:52 40 only make that assumption, yes. I can't recall it.
16:18:55 41
16:19:03 42 You were off duty for a while and then you returned on 17
16:19:12 43 May and you had a meeting with Ms Gobbo regarding Operation
16:19:21 44 Ramsden. That's what the operation was called?---Yes.
16:19:24 45
16:19:24 46 And that was on 17 May, is that correct?---I think so, yes.
16:19:28 47

16:19:32 1 It seems that on 28 May 99 you again made notes concerning
16:19:38 2 your meeting on Monday, 17 May 99. Do you recall where you
16:19:42 3 met Ms Gobbo on 17 May?---No, I don't.
16:19:44 4
16:19:45 5 In Armadale?---No, I don't.
16:19:46 6
16:19:46 7 How did the meetings come about, were you contacted or did
16:19:53 8 you contact her?---I can't recall but it could have been
16:19:57 9 either way, or both.
16:19:59 10
16:20:01 11 In any event this was the second meeting. You'd said it
16:20:06 12 was your view that you'd meet again within the next few
16:20:09 13 days and this was the next meeting, 17 May, and that
16:20:12 14 occurred at Armadale and you went with Mr Segrave and you
16:20:16 15 met with her, the registered informer?---Yes.
16:20:18 16
16:20:25 17 On that occasion you had obtained a number of documents,
16:20:33 18 including some which were computer generated. Do you
16:20:37 19 recall what that was all about?---No, I don't.
16:20:40 20
16:20:41 21 Did you ask her to get documents when you initially spoke
16:20:44 22 to her?---I can't recall.
16:20:48 23
16:20:50 24 Is it likely that you would have asked her to provide
16:20:53 25 documents?---It's possible that I may have asked, it's
16:20:58 26 possible that she may have offered.
16:21:00 27
16:21:03 28 She gave you information about what she was alleging that
16:21:15 29 the lawyer was doing?---It seems that way, yes.
16:21:17 30
16:21:17 31 And the informer stated that the lawyer is continually
16:21:22 32 charging clients who are eligible for Legal Aid and have
16:21:25 33 received payments from Legal Aid. The lawyer charges the
16:21:28 34 client the same amount as what Legal Aid provide for the
16:21:33 35 plea or the committal, whatever the case may be. There's
16:21:36 36 evidence in the trust account of the two amounts, one from
16:21:36 37 Legal Aid, the other from the client. And secondly the
16:21:40 38 informer stated that the lawyer has been doing the exact
16:21:43 39 same thing with cost certificates, et cetera, et cetera,
16:21:46 40 right?---Yes.
16:21:47 41
16:21:49 42 What was done in relation to that information, do you
16:21:52 43 recall?---No, I don't.
16:21:53 44
16:22:00 45 Do you recall whether you followed that up, you got
16:22:03 46 warrants or anything like that?---I've got no recollection
16:22:06 47 of the details of these meetings, I'm afraid.

16:22:09 1
16:22:10 2 What do you think, looking back, you would have done about
16:22:14 3 that information, what's the expectation?---If you're given
16:22:18 4 documents you'd go back and assess those documents to see
16:22:21 5 if it corroborates in any way the information that you've
16:22:24 6 been given.
16:22:25 7
16:22:25 8 Would you have done that or not?---I'd expect that I would
16:22:29 9 have.
16:22:29 10
16:22:32 11 And she also mentioned something about trust accounts and a
16:22:37 12 number of large amounts invested. Many appear to be shelf
16:22:41 13 companies. Fourthly, there were incidents where the lawyer
16:22:45 14 has taken a lump sum of money from a client to pay for a
16:22:48 15 defence, et cetera, and those sorts of - quite a bit of
16:22:53 16 information was given to you?---Yes.
16:22:54 17
16:22:54 18 And one assumes that you would have started conducting an
16:23:01 19 investigation, correct?---Yes.
16:23:02 20
16:23:02 21 Ultimately no charges were ever laid out of this operation,
16:23:06 22 were there?---That's correct.
16:23:07 23
16:23:20 24 Then you met - at the end of that meeting did you arrange
16:23:27 25 to meet again?---I think so.
16:23:32 26
16:23:41 27 You met a couple of days later - I withdraw that. On 19
16:23:51 28 May at approximately 5.30 pm you and Segrave met with the
16:23:57 29 informer in South Melbourne. You'd just been handed a
16:24:00 30 document by Strawhorn which related to a property in
16:24:03 31 Ballarat which was owned by a person and which appears to
16:24:07 32 have been signed over to another person through the
16:24:10 33 solicitor, the lawyer you were investigating. This is
16:24:18 34 RC36, Commissioner.
16:24:21 35
16:24:21 36 COMMISSIONER: Do you want it up on the screen?
16:24:23 37
16:24:24 38 MR WINNEKE: I think that can go up. Well, just - I'm
16:24:27 39 going to keep my fingers crossed but I believe there is a
16:24:31 40 redaction on that. I wonder if the - yes, okay. Can I
16:24:52 41 just ask you about that. Firstly, that's an information
16:24:56 42 report which you prepared?---Yes.
16:24:59 43
16:25:01 44 And it contains information that you receive from the
16:25:07 45 informer but it also refers to a document that had been
16:25:10 46 handed to you by Mr Strawhorn?---Yes.
16:25:14 47

16:25:26 1 I don't know whether you can follow this or not but - what
16:25:48 2 you see there is that the informer was unable to say
16:25:52 3 whether the title of the property, where the title of the
16:25:55 4 property is however believes that the same property is
16:25:58 5 owned by blank, is under restraint to satisfy a PPO. Do
16:26:03 6 you know what that stands for?---Pecuniary penalty order.
16:26:08 7
16:26:08 8 Against another person, the Asset Recovery Squad have
16:26:11 9 restrained the property. Are you able to explain
16:26:17 10 that?---No, I can't, I can't recall the details of that.
16:26:21 11
16:26:31 12 As time went by were you able to form an assessment of the
16:26:36 13 informer, that is her reliability firstly?---Um, well my
16:26:47 14 very vague recollection was that she was very keen to
16:26:52 15 assist.
16:26:52 16
16:26:52 17 Right?---And seemed to be reliable.
16:26:58 18
16:26:58 19 On what basis do you say that she seemed to be
16:27:03 20 reliable?---Well in terms of, you know, attending meetings,
16:27:06 21 handing, providing documents to support, trying to support
16:27:10 22 information that was being provided.
16:27:11 23
16:27:12 24 Yes. Had you registered an informer prior to this?---I
16:27:22 25 think, I think I may have registered one or two, but not
16:27:26 26 too many.
16:27:26 27
16:27:27 28 Had you ever registered a legal practitioner before?---No.
16:27:30 29
16:27:34 30 You understood that she was a barrister?---Yes, I think, I
16:27:39 31 think that was clear at the time.
16:27:42 32
16:27:42 33 And you understood that the information that she was
16:27:45 34 providing, she obtained in the context of her practice as a
16:27:49 35 barrister?---I think I understood that the information she
16:27:54 36 provided was in the context of her ex-employment.
16:27:59 37
16:28:00 38 In the context of her employment as a solicitor?---At that
16:28:06 39 time probably, yes.
16:28:07 40
16:28:09 41 At this stage it's clear that she was a barrister but she'd
16:28:13 42 previously been employed as a solicitor?---Yes.
16:28:15 43
16:28:16 44 I take it you were studying law and in terms of obligations
16:28:20 45 owed by people who are solicitors or barristers, whether it
16:28:23 46 be confidentiality or legal professional privilege there's
16:28:28 47 no real distinction between the two, is there?---No, but

16:28:31 1 I'm not sure at that stage I'd quite got that far into my
16:28:36 2 law degree.
16:28:36 3
16:28:36 4 You'd been a police officer for quite a while in any
16:28:40 5 event?---About eight or nine years, yes.
16:28:42 6
16:28:42 7 And you understood, for example, a person's right to
16:28:47 8 silence?---Yes.
16:28:48 9
16:28:49 10 Because that's something that you would inform a
16:28:52 11 person?---Yes.
16:28:52 12
16:28:52 13 Prior to interviewing, that they were a suspect?---Yes.
16:28:55 14
16:28:55 15 And you understood that the person had a right to speak to
16:28:59 16 a lawyer?---Yes.
16:29:00 17
16:29:00 18 Okay. Commissioner, I'm probably going to move on to a
16:29:04 19 different topic.
16:29:04 20
16:29:05 21 COMMISSIONER: You're obviously going to be some time.
16:29:07 22
16:29:08 23 MR WINNEKE: Yes.
16:29:08 24
16:29:08 25 COMMISSIONER: We'll adjourn now. We've got the media
16:29:13 26 application for the revocation of orders about - - -
16:29:19 27
16:29:19 28 MR WINNEKE: 9.30.
16:29:20 29
16:29:21 30 COMMISSIONER: Yes, suppression at 9.30 tomorrow morning.
16:29:25 31 We'll adjourn until 9.30. Thank you.
32
33 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)
16:30:04 34
16:30:11 35 ADJOURNED UNTIL TUESDAY 2 APRIL 2019
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47