

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:39:16 1 COMMISSIONER: Yes, could the witness return to the witness
09:39:19 2 box. We're continuing in closed hearing, Ms Tittensor, the
09:39:24 3 appearances - - -
09:39:26 4
09:39:26 5 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, Commissioner.
6
09:39:28 7 COMMISSIONER: - - - are largely as they were yesterday.
09:39:30 8 Yes.
9
09:39:37 10 <BORIS BUICK, recalled:
09:39:39 11
09:39:39 12 MS TITTENSOR: Mr Buick, I think yesterday I had been
09:39:42 13 taking you through a Purana update from February 2004, do
09:39:46 14 you recall that?---Yes.
15
09:39:49 16 Following that Purana update, on 18 February 2004 there was
09:39:55 17 a committal mention in relation to the matter of the
09:40:02 18 Williams' threats against Mr Bateson. Do you recall that
09:40:07 19 occurring, that Ms Gobbo appeared at that committal and
09:40:11 20 made application to cross-examine Mr Bateson about the
09:40:14 21 threats?---No.
22
09:40:17 23 Do you recall that there was talk about that in the Purana
09:40:19 24 offices?---No.
25
09:40:22 26 That there was publicity about that matter?---About the
09:40:25 27 threats matter?
28
09:40:26 29 Yes?---Yes.
30
09:40:29 31 And if there was publicity at the time of the committal
09:40:33 32 mention about that as to the application to cross-examine
09:40:38 33 Mr Bateson, that would have been something that would have
09:40:40 34 been known to members of Purana?---Probably.
35
09:40:46 36 The month following that there was a committal mention in
09:40:49 37 relation to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], you certainly knew
09:40:53 38 about that one?---Yes.
39
09:40:56 40 You were present at court on that day?---Yes.
41
09:41:00 42 You've indicated in your statement that a solicitor by the
09:41:05 43 name of [REDACTED] appeared for [REDACTED] that
09:41:10 44 day?---Yes.
45
09:41:13 46 You were the informant for [REDACTED]?---Yes.
47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:41:15 1 And that barrister, another barrister, [REDACTED], appeared
09:41:21 2 for [REDACTED]?---Yes.

09:41:22 3
09:41:22 4 And you note that Ms Gobbo was present in court but your
09:41:26 5 statement seems to suggest that she was present in court in
09:41:29 6 relation to [REDACTED], not [REDACTED]?---Yes. That's what
09:41:33 7 my notes reflected when I reviewed them.

09:41:37 8
09:41:37 9 You had understood though to that point that she had been
09:41:42 10 representing in court [REDACTED]?---She had appeared in an
09:41:49 11 earlier hearing, yes.

09:41:51 12
09:41:51 13 And you understood that [REDACTED] was Ms Gobbo's
09:41:56 14 instructing solicitor for [REDACTED]?---I'm not certain of
09:42:01 15 that but I don't dispute that.

09:42:03 16
09:42:03 17 Have you got your day books there?---I do.

09:42:07 18
09:42:07 19 If can you go to the day book with the entry for [REDACTED]
09:42:12 20 2004?---2004? No, sorry, mine that I have here start in
09:42:19 21 2006. They'll be here though

09:42:26 22
09:42:26 23 MS ARGIROPOULOS: Commissioner, my instructor can locate
09:42:28 24 that day book.

09:42:29 25
09:42:29 26 COMMISSIONER: Thanks Ms Argiropoulos.

09:42:35 27
09:42:36 28 MS TITTENSOR: I'll put this to you anyway and perhaps we
09:42:38 29 can move on?---Sure.

09:42:39 30
09:42:39 31 Your day book for that date includes an entry saying,
09:42:43 32 [REDACTED], and you understand
09:42:49 33 [REDACTED] was a criminal law firm at that
09:42:52 34 stage?---Yes.

09:42:53 35
09:42:53 36 "Rang for a copy of brief, is now acting. Gobbo is still
09:42:55 37 briefed." That would indicate as of [REDACTED] 2004 you
09:43:01 38 understood that Ms Gobbo was briefed in relation to
09:43:03 39 [REDACTED]?---Yes.

09:43:07 40
09:43:07 41 No doubt then as at [REDACTED] 11 days later, you would have
09:43:12 42 understood that Ms Gobbo was present in court for
09:43:16 43 [REDACTED] not [REDACTED]?---Yeah, I'm not certain.

09:43:19 44
09:43:19 45 That seems logical?---Well, Nicola Gobbo - this is an
09:43:28 46 unfair description but I describe her as a ticket
09:43:32 47 barrister. She would routinely appear for bail

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:43:37 1 applications, administrative applications, mentions and it
09:43:42 2 was very hard to really identify precisely on any given day
09:43:48 3 who she was representing.
4
09:43:51 5 You had been - well, perhaps if the witness can be shown
09:43:55 6 that entry and confirm that entry, Commissioner?---It's
09:43:58 7 before me here, I can see it. I don't dispute that.
8
09:44:03 9 You'd been told on [REDACTED] 2004, and you see that that
09:44:09 10 entry relates to [REDACTED]?---Yes.
11
09:44:12 12 That Ms Gobbo was briefed in that matter?---Yes.
13
09:44:14 14 On [REDACTED] 11 days later, there was another barrister
09:44:18 15 representing the other person, [REDACTED]?---Yes.
16
09:44:21 17 And Ms Gobbo was present in court with [REDACTED] the
09:44:26 18 solicitor for [REDACTED]?---Yes.
19
09:44:28 20 It would seem logical that she was there on that day for
09:44:31 21 [REDACTED], would it not?---I don't dispute that.
22
09:44:36 23 Both you and Mr Bateson were present in court on [REDACTED]
09:44:41 24 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
25
09:44:47 26 You're aware that following the committal mention Ms Gobbo
09:44:50 27 spoke to Detective Bateson about [REDACTED] cooperating with
09:44:55 28 the police?---Okay, I don't dispute that.
29
09:45:04 30 Presumably Bateson having had a conversation about those
09:45:07 31 matters with Ms Gobbo would have relayed the conversation
09:45:12 32 to you given you were the informant for [REDACTED]?---May
09:45:15 33 well have.
34
09:45:18 35 It would follow, wouldn't it? He wouldn't have a
09:45:21 36 conversation about the accused in your case potentially
09:45:25 37 cooperating with the police and not tell you?---Oh no, I
09:45:31 38 suspect he would have.
39
09:45:32 40 So if he recorded in his statement that he spoke to
09:45:35 41 Ms Gobbo, who was the barrister for - sorry, in his notes,
09:45:40 42 who was the barrister for [REDACTED], he spoke to the same
09:45:44 43 re [REDACTED] cooperation, he recorded, "She was at pains to
09:45:48 44 point out she would not declare confidential communication
09:45:52 45 to CW or anyone else. Stressed to her the next step would
09:45:57 46 be [REDACTED] compiling a can-say statement which would
09:46:02 47 enable us to corroborate if possible and put something firm

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:46:07 1 to the OPP. She stated she would put this to him and
09:46:10 2 advise me of response and appeared to agree this was the
09:46:13 3 appropriate response". If Bateson has recorded those
09:46:17 4 matters in his diary or day book he would have discussed
09:46:21 5 those matters with you?---Probably.
6
09:46:24 7 One of the matters he recorded in his notes was that she
09:46:29 8 was at pains to point out she wouldn't declare confidential
09:46:34 9 communication to CW or anyone else. That would have been a
09:46:38 10 serious concern of police because of the fact that she was
09:46:41 11 representing many of the people whom [REDACTED] might speak
09:46:44 12 about within any statement that he made?---Sorry, what
09:46:50 13 would be a concern?
14
09:46:51 15 That [REDACTED] would nominate or would speak, if he came to
09:46:59 16 make a statement that he would be talking about people in
09:47:02 17 his statement, like Carl Williams and others, who Ms Gobbo
09:47:07 18 represented?---I don't understand why that's a concern.
09:47:15 19 That's precisely what we want him to do.
20
09:47:17 21 Sorry. Mr Bateson recorded in his notes that she was at
09:47:23 22 pains to point out she would not declare confidential
09:47:25 23 communications to CW or anyone else, right? You would want
09:47:31 24 [REDACTED] to speak about people such as CW, Carl Williams,
09:47:37 25 and others in his statement; is that right?---And he did.
26
09:47:42 27 Yes, and others such as [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and Mokbel,
09:47:51 28 for instance?---Yes.
29
09:47:53 30 And they were all people who Ms Gobbo had
09:47:57 31 represented?---Yes.
32
09:47:59 33 And it was a concern that Ms Gobbo might talk about those
09:48:05 34 matters with other people?---Oh well, it's not something I
09:48:13 35 felt concerned about or feel concerned about. It's not my
09:48:18 36 reflection.
37
09:48:19 38 It seems to have been the reflection of Bateson that she
09:48:22 39 was at pains to point out that she wouldn't do those
09:48:26 40 things?---It's a matter you need to raise with Mr Bateson.
41
09:48:30 42 Was this not a matter that you discussed with Mr Bateson?
09:48:34 43 Surely if he's had this conversation with Ms Gobbo, he
09:48:36 44 seems concerned about the fact that Ms Gobbo's representing
09:48:39 45 all these people and yet has this other client who might be
09:48:45 46 nominating all these people, is this something that you
09:48:47 47 never discussed with Mr Bateson?---I don't dispute that we

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:48:52 1 would have spoken about this. I don't recall any such
09:48:54 2 conversation.
3
09:48:56 4 It seems like a logical conversation that you might have,
09:48:59 5 wouldn't it be, that we've got this barrister who's
09:49:05 6 representing someone who's going to make a statement
09:49:08 7 potentially about all these other people that she's
09:49:11 8 representing?---I don't see that as a concern.
9
09:49:13 10 Why do you not see that as a concern?---The essence for me
09:49:24 11 at the time and today is that [REDACTED] makes a wholesome
09:49:30 12 and truthful statement about whoever was involved in the
09:49:34 13 criminal offending. Who people are representing is of no
09:49:39 14 relevance to me in the compilation of his statement for us
09:49:42 15 to use in prosecutions.
16
09:49:52 17 You understand that Ms Gobbo has obligations to each of
09:49:57 18 those clients to act in their best interests?---That's a
09:50:00 19 matter for her.
20
09:50:01 21 Is it not a matter for police at all that accused person's
09:50:07 22 best interests might not be being served by their
09:50:10 23 barrister?---So if [REDACTED] was to make a statement
09:50:16 24 implicating clients of Nicola Gobbo in a murder, that's of
09:50:22 25 no concern to me as an investigator.
26
09:50:27 27 If Ms Gobbo is representing all those people, is that of no
09:50:30 28 concern to you?---No, not at all. The time comes in these
09:50:36 29 matters where people make statements against each other,
09:50:40 30 and a number of them did. Their legal representation is
09:50:48 31 not an issue.
32
09:50:51 33 It doesn't matter who represents who at any stage?---In the
09:50:55 34 context that you're describing it's irrelevant.
35
09:51:00 36 That's a position you would take today as well?---Yes.
37
09:51:17 38 Was there any concern at all that there might be a conflict
09:51:21 39 with Ms Gobbo if she continued to represent any of those
09:51:24 40 people?---That's a different matter.
41
09:51:29 42 Well I'm asking you that question?---That does potentially
09:51:35 43 present a conflict for Nicola Gobbo if she continues to
09:51:41 44 represent people against whom [REDACTED] has made a
09:51:45 45 statement, certainly if she doesn't act in their best
09:51:52 46 interests and acts counter to their best interests. That
09:51:55 47 is a different scenario and that is a concern and it's a

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:51:58 1 concern for the barrister to deal with, the lawyer to deal
09:52:02 2 with.
3
09:52:07 4 Is it a concern for police at all if the people for whom
09:52:15 5 she goes on to represent don't know about the conflict of
09:52:18 6 interest?---We don't - police don't know, investigators
09:52:28 7 don't know, unless they're told, and clearly we're not, the
09:52:33 8 mind-set, the thinking, the intention of a lawyer
09:52:36 9 representing their various clients, you know. As I say,
09:52:41 10 they're matters for the lawyer to navigate and deal with
09:52:43 11 and, you know, I've seen many, many times good lawyers
09:52:49 12 compartmentalise their representation. I'll give you an
09:52:53 13 example. Robert Richter represented Paul Kallipolitis when
09:52:58 14 he was charged for a murder that became a manslaughter. It
09:53:03 15 was always our belief, of course, that Andrew Veniamin,
09:53:06 16 with Faruk Orman, murdered Paul Kallipolitis. Robert
09:53:12 17 Richter went on thereafter to represent Faruk Orman. He's
09:53:17 18 able to compartmentalise his representation.
19
09:53:21 20 Did Mr Orman know about that?---I don't know. Certainly
09:53:25 21 Robert Richter did.
22
09:53:27 23 The reality is it is a problem if you are aware that the
09:53:30 24 subsequent person does not know about the conflict. The
09:53:32 25 police have an obligation to act if they're aware of that,
09:53:39 26 would you agree?---If you're putting to me that the
09:53:41 27 scenario I've just described is a conflict that Robert
09:53:44 28 Richter was in, and I'm not certain that he was, if it was
09:53:50 29 a conflict then he has an obligation to declare that to his
09:53:54 30 clients.
31
09:53:55 32 If you are aware, let's step back to where we were, if
09:53:58 33 you're aware that Ms Gobbo has represented [REDACTED], she
09:54:03 34 then goes on to represent other people following that, and
09:54:07 35 they're not aware of her representation of [REDACTED], do
09:54:12 36 the police have any obligation in terms of exploring that
09:54:16 37 conflict?---Oh, I don't believe so.
38
09:54:19 39 And is that a position you would take today?---Yes.
40
09:54:25 41 Is that a position you expect that many of your colleagues
09:54:28 42 would take today?---I don't know.
43
09:54:32 44 Have you ever taken any steps to address conflicts of
09:54:36 45 interest where it doesn't suit, where the conflict doesn't
09:54:39 46 suit the police?---I don't believe so.
47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:54:55 1 A number of days later on [REDACTED] you had a meeting with -
09:55:02 2 perhaps we might tender these as a bundle, the day book
09:55:08 3 entries, if my instructors can keep a tally of which ones
09:55:14 4 we go to, Commissioner. We might tender them as a bundle.
09:55:17 5
09:55:18 6 #EXHIBIT RC644A - Day books of Boris Buck.
7
09:55:22 8 COMMISSIONER: What period of time are they from?
09:55:24 9
09:55:24 10 MS TITTENSOR: The first one was [REDACTED] I might tender
09:55:28 11 also [REDACTED]
12
09:55:35 13 COMMISSIONER: You'll be tendering the whole lot as a
09:55:38 14 bundle, won't you?
09:55:39 15
09:55:40 16 MS TITTENSOR: I will later. I'll refer to them by date
09:55:42 17 and can tender them as a bundle.
18
09:55:45 19 COMMISSIONER: Okay. [REDACTED] was it?
09:55:47 20
09:55:47 21 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, that's the day of the court hearing.
22
09:55:49 23 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
09:55:50 24
09:55:51 25 MS TITTENSOR: If we can have a look at [REDACTED] please.
09:55:56 26 At 3 pm you have a meeting with Detective Sergeant Bateson
09:56:03 27 and is that Henry Roberts?---Yes.
28
09:56:09 29 Who was Henry Roberts?---I don't recall, sorry.
30
09:56:12 31 And that's re [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]?---No.
32
09:56:19 33 Sorry, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]?---That's right.
34
09:56:25 35 You expect that you might have discussed the possible
09:56:29 36 cooperation of [REDACTED] at that meeting?---I don't know.
37
09:56:39 38 Over the page on [REDACTED] Do you see there at 10 o'clock
09:56:56 39 there's a meeting with the OPP with Inspector Allen, Senior
09:57:05 40 Sergeant Ryan, Detective Bateson and others?---Yes.
41
09:57:17 42 Is that a meeting at which was discussed - sorry, I might
09:57:21 43 just suggest to you that Inspector Allen's notes indicate,
09:57:29 44 "Re [REDACTED] and Ms Gobbo was to be advised of the urgency
09:57:33 45 of the situation re the can-say statement and to progress
09:57:36 46 same, with the OPP to be briefed". So you would accept at
09:57:40 47 that stage there was a discussion with the OPP about that

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

09:57:42 1 matter?---Yes.
2
09:57:47 3 On ██████████ 2004 yourself and Detective Bateson visited
09:57:54 4 ██████████ and it's apparent that Mr Bateson spoke with
09:57:58 5 Ms Gobbo following that visit. You would accept that if
09:58:04 6 that's what Mr Bateson's notes reflect and what yours
09:58:08 7 reflect?---Yes.
8
09:58:12 9 If you see down the bottom of that page you leave
09:58:17 10 essentially with Bateson, go to the prison and at ██████████
09:58:22 11 you're speaking with ██████████ at his request?---Yes.
12
09:58:26 13 It's apparent that the following day Ms Gobbo visited
09:58:30 14 ██████████ in custody. Are you aware of Inspector Allen and
09:58:40 15 Senior Sergeant Ryan's involvement in the process?---Not
09:58:46 16 really. I know that - and I think I described this
09:58:53 17 yesterday - I wasn't part of Stuart's crew. I was the
09:58:56 18 nominal informant for ██████████. So I charged ██████████.
09:59:13 19 The brief of evidence was prepared by Stuart's crew and I
09:59:17 20 sort of dropped off in terms of the ongoing engagement with
09:59:24 21 witnesses and the investigation proper and refocused on my
09:59:30 22 own investigation. So there was a time where I sort of
09:59:33 23 dropped away from contact and you suggested Gavan Ryan, I
09:59:38 24 actually thought it was Phil Swindells stepped in.
25
09:59:43 26 I think you're probably right in Swindells. He does come
09:59:47 27 to have some involvement. But it seems as though on ██████████
09:59:52 28 ██████████ 2004 Allen and Ryan meet with Ms Gobbo and
09:59:57 29 ██████████ Mr Allen's notes indicate discussion of
10:00:03 30 issues re ██████████ and Ryan, it seems, has also discussed
10:00:10 31 the ██████████ objectives and result of ██████████ Do you
10:00:19 32 know why they would be discussing those matters with
10:00:22 33 Ms Gobbo at the same time as discussing ██████████?---No,
10:00:25 34 sorry, no idea.
10:00:25 35
10:00:26 36 Your note yesterday in that Purana update that I took you
10:00:29 37 to, Operation ██████████ seemed to relate to a drug matter
10:00:32 38 involving Carl Williams, George Williams and someone by the
10:00:37 39 name of ██████████ ---Yes.
40
10:00:39 41 Is there any reason why they might be discussing both
10:00:42 42 ██████████ and a drug matter involving potentially Carl
10:00:46 43 Williams with Ms Gobbo?---I have no idea.
44
10:00:57 45 The following day there was a briefing of Command in
10:01:01 46 relation to what was going on. That would be consistent
10:01:05 47 with your understanding of how things were working?---Yes.

.30/10/19

8537

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
10:01:10 2 And in particular this was a pretty significant moment,
10:01:14 3 that the first of the gangland witnesses might roll on some
10:01:19 4 other very significant players?---Yes.
5
10:01:23 6 So you would expect that Command would want to be briefed
10:01:29 7 when significant events like that occurred?---Yes.
8
10:01:31 9 And do you know in what detail they might be briefed?---No.
10
10:01:35 11 Would they be told who was representing who, do you
10:01:38 12 know?---I don't know.
13
10:01:43 14 The following day after that, [REDACTED] 2004, Inspector
10:01:47 15 Allen's diary indicates that he had a phone call with
10:01:50 16 Ms Gobbo and then arranged to meet her re issues re
10:01:53 17 [REDACTED]. He went to a café in South Melbourne and his
10:01:59 18 diary notes indicate that they canvassed issues including
10:02:03 19 [REDACTED] and her acting for him. It seems there was a
10:02:07 20 discussion with her specifically about the fact that she
10:02:10 21 was acting for [REDACTED]. Now, do you recall that being an
10:02:14 22 issue around the Purana office?---No.
23
10:02:16 24 As to how she might be able to address that conflict?---No.
25
10:02:23 26 Mr Allen told Ms Gobbo that the Assistant Commissioner had
10:02:27 27 been briefed about the matter and his notes indicate that
10:02:30 28 Ms Gobbo might be able to provide information about where
10:02:33 29 media leaks relating to Purana were coming from. Were you
10:02:38 30 made aware of that, that Ms Gobbo was offering to provide
10:02:41 31 Inspector Allen with information at that stage?---No.
32
10:02:46 33 Do you recall incidents involving potential media leaks
10:02:50 34 from Purana?---Yes, it occurred from time to time across
10:02:56 35 the course of my time at Purana and other Task Forces and
10:03:02 36 investigations.
37
10:03:07 38 A number of days after that on [REDACTED] 2004 there was a
10:03:10 39 meeting between Marty Robertson and a member of the MDID
10:03:17 40 Mr Bartlett with [REDACTED] and another man by the name of
10:03:21 41 Emeido Navaroli. Do you recall being told about that
10:03:26 42 meeting?---No.
43
10:03:28 44 That [REDACTED] essentially offered up a number of people to
10:03:33 45 serve some gaol, short gaol sentences in return for
10:03:37 46 potentially stopping the gangland killings?---No.
47

.30/10/19

8538

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:03:42 1 That's something that would have been spoken about, I'd
10:03:45 2 suggest, at the time around the Purana offices, that he
10:03:49 3 might have the gall to suggest that?---No, I wouldn't think
10:03:52 4 so.

10:03:52 6 It wouldn't have been spoken about?---No.

10:03:55 8 Why not?---Well if, as described, you have someone like
10:03:57 9 [REDACTED] offering to provide assistance, so that would
10:04:00 10 place him at great risk in terms of his safety and that's
10:04:04 11 something that is a needs to know basis, so you wouldn't be
10:04:10 12 sprouting off about that around the office. That's the
10:04:13 13 first I've heard of that.

10:04:15 15 I think he was essentially offering to facilitate a deal of
10:04:19 16 other people going to gaol?---Well that's assistance that
10:04:23 17 he's providing to police which would put him at great
10:04:27 18 peril.

10:04:37 20 If we can go to your day book on [REDACTED] 2004. We can see
10:05:01 21 where the cursor is. There's an indication there that you
10:05:06 22 spoke to Mr Allen and Swindells?---Yes.

10:05:10 24 In relation to [REDACTED] communications and
10:05:17 25 negotiations?---Yes.

10:05:19 27 Presumably you had some discussion with them about what was
10:05:23 28 going on with Ms Gobbo in relation to
10:05:29 29 negotiations?---Possibly but I would think it's more really
10:05:32 30 about [REDACTED] and the progressive passage of him becoming
10:05:41 31 a witness. I wasn't in conversations with any lawyers
10:05:54 32 about that.

10:05:55 34 On [REDACTED] Mr Allen in his diary indicates that he went to
10:05:59 35 the OPP with Mr Swindells and met with Mr Horgan and
10:06:02 36 Ms Anscombe re Purana issues. His notes refer to a number
10:06:06 37 of matters, including contact with the ACC and Nicola
10:06:11 38 Gobbo, noting, "Horgan wants to contact both and advise of
10:06:15 39 the next stage". Your day book on that date indicates that
10:06:19 40 you spoke to Allen re discussion with the OPP, Horgan and
10:06:25 41 the ACC matter. Now again, you were being kept updated as
10:06:31 42 to what was going on in terms of [REDACTED] negotiations; is
10:06:35 43 that right?---It seems so.

10:06:43 45 The following day, [REDACTED] 2004, Ms Gobbo in her court
10:06:49 46 book recorded a conference with Mr Horgan. The first thing
10:06:53 47 written in her court book on that day was, "Who do I act

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:06:56 1 for and do I have a conflict?" Would you agree that the
10:07:00 2 answer at that stage was patently yes?---There's two
10:07:05 3 questions there. Who do I act for and do I have a
10:07:10 4 conflict? So I guess, depending on the answer to the first
10:07:13 5 question, you'd come to the consideration of the second
10:07:16 6 question.
7

10:07:17 8 Do you agree in relation to the second answer, the answer
10:07:20 9 was patently yes?---No. No, I don't. Assuming the answer
10:07:29 10 to the first answer is she's representing Lawyer X.
11

10:07:34 12 And assuming the answer to first question was, "And I'm
10:07:36 13 also representing Carl Williams, [REDACTED], Tony Mokbel and
10:07:41 14 I've also in the past taken instructions from [REDACTED]
10:07:47 15 [REDACTED]"?---There is certainly a minefield there and potential
10:07:51 16 for conflict.
17

10:08:13 18 On [REDACTED] 2004 - sorry, perhaps I'll go to [REDACTED] 2004 and
10:08:28 19 RC250. [REDACTED] 2004. Sorry. See there on [REDACTED] it's
10:09:06 20 apparent on the entry below that she's appeared for someone
10:09:10 21 by the name of [REDACTED]?--[REDACTED]? Sorry, whose notes
10:09:16 22 are these?
23

10:09:16 24 These are Ms Gobbo's court book notes?---Right.
25

10:09:19 26 She's appeared, it seems, before Ms Hannan in an
10:09:24 27 application to vary bail, which is granted. If we go to
10:09:29 28 the other side of the page. Sorry, the page below. The
10:09:43 29 other side of the page. Do you see there same day, later
10:09:49 30 that day, she's having a conversation with
10:09:53 31 Swindells?---Yes.
32

10:09:54 33 There's a question posed by someone at least, one of them,
10:09:59 34 "A reality difference between Purana and Horgan?" Do you
10:10:04 35 know what that might be referring to?---No idea, sorry.
36

10:10:08 37 Were there differences of opinion between Purana and Horgan
10:10:13 38 as to how things might be handled?---I don't recall any of
10:10:17 39 that.
40

10:10:18 41 Do you see there that she's noted under the conversation
10:10:22 42 with Swindells a suggestion that [REDACTED] might be [REDACTED]
10:10:27 43 [REDACTED] for the murder of [REDACTED]?---Yes.
44

10:10:32 45 Do you recall that information being discussed within the
10:10:35 46 Purana offices?---No.
47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:10:41 1 Do you know a police member by the name of Susan Hughes at
10:10:44 2 Moorabbin?---Yes.
3
10:10:46 4 Do you know what that reference might refer to, "Phil has
10:10:53 5 helped", Phil being the first name potentially of
10:10:57 6 Mr Swindells?---No idea.
7
10:11:01 8 If we can go to the next date, 4 May 2004, please. It
10:11:13 9 might be the next page. Keep going. Keep going. You'll
10:11:39 10 see there there's another reference to, it seems, a
10:11:43 11 communication with Mr Swindells?---Yes.
12
10:11:46 13 A reference to being a relevant witness at an ACC hearing,
10:11:51 14 another quiver in the bow?---Yes.
15
10:11:54 16 Do you know what that might relate to?---No.
17
10:11:58 18 Again, there's some reference to whatever views the OPP
10:12:02 19 have - we have, "The OPP have overall control of the
10:12:09 20 brief". Do you know what that might relate to?---No. It's
10:12:13 21 - I mean it's common sense, the OPP.
22
10:12:17 23 That Purana might have different views as to the way things
10:12:20 24 might be handled than the way the OPP have?---Oh no, the
10:12:24 25 OPP are in charge of the prosecution.
26
10:12:29 27 There's a discussion about political pressure, it
10:12:37 28 seems?---Yes.
29
10:12:39 30 Do you know what that discussion might have been
10:12:42 31 about?---No.
32
10:12:45 33 Copping a summons to appear. Do you know who was
10:12:48 34 potentially copping a summons to appear?---No.
35
10:12:51 36 And then again there seems to be some discussion by
10:12:54 37 Mr Swindells with Ms Gobbo about conflict regarding
10:12:58 38 specifically Mokbel, Williams and [REDACTED]?---Yes.
39
10:13:07 40 Then lower down there's a conference that she's indicating
10:13:11 41 that she's had with her instructing solicitor in relation
10:13:13 42 to the next step and Ms Gobbo refers to discussion with
10:13:17 43 Horgan re her difficult position, do you see that?---I see
10:13:21 44 that.
45
10:13:25 46 The following day your day book reflects that you spoke to
10:13:30 47 Mr Swindells?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
10:13:33 2 Swindells had spoken to [REDACTED] the day before who wanted
10:13:38 3 a full indemnity?---Yes.
4
10:13:43 5 Gobbo had had discussions with Horgan. [REDACTED] had been
10:13:49 6 advised that if he pleaded to the [REDACTED] murder the
10:13:51 7 prosecution would push for a minimum sentence?---Yes.
8
10:13:59 9 You attended at another meeting at the OPP on 17 May
10:14:05 10 2004?---Yes.
11
10:14:08 12 Nothing had progressed at that stage and the deal was going
10:14:12 13 to be for [REDACTED] to plead guilty to murder and give
10:14:17 14 evidence in relation to [REDACTED] and there was some
10:14:20 15 consideration being given to charging him with the [REDACTED]
10:14:23 16 murder, do you recall that?---Sorry, what's the source of -
10:14:26 17 whose notes are these?
18
10:14:28 19 Sorry, perhaps if we can go to the day book for 17 May.
10:14:51 20 See down on the left-hand side there?---Yes.
21
10:14:53 22 Do you agree that those conversations were had?---Yes.
23
10:14:58 24 Your notes indicate that aside from Mr Horgan and
10:15:04 25 Ms Anscombe, Inspector Allen, Swindells, Wilson and
10:15:08 26 yourself were present?---Yes.
27
10:15:10 28 Which Wilson would that be?---Craig Wilson I think.
29
10:15:20 30 The following day, on the 18th, you were told that Ms Gobbo
10:15:26 31 was meeting with Mr Horgan?---Yes.
32
10:15:34 33 Do you accept that?---Yes.
34
10:15:35 35 And then we understand that on [REDACTED] Ms Gobbo visited
10:15:40 36 [REDACTED] and made a note in her court book about calling
10:15:46 37 Mr Swindells and then Bateson and Swindells visited him on
10:15:51 38 [REDACTED] Following that it seems as though on 15 June 2004
10:15:59 39 there's been some disagreement between Mr Bateson and
10:16:03 40 Mr Swindells that's noted in Buick's diary in relation to a
10:16:07 41 lack of communication in relation to a proposal for the
10:16:10 42 plea with [REDACTED]?---In whose diary, sorry?
43
10:16:17 44 Bateson recorded a disagreement with Mr Swindells in his
10:16:21 45 diary in relation to lack of a communication in relation to
10:16:24 46 a proposal for a plea with [REDACTED] and a lack of notice.
10:16:27 47 Now, can you shed any light on that?---No.

.30/10/19

8542

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
10:16:31 2 Were you present on [REDACTED] 2004 when [REDACTED] pleaded
10:16:35 3 guilty in the County Court to some outstanding charges of
10:16:40 4 [REDACTED] and the like?---I'm not certain, sorry.
5
10:16:47 6 It's apparent that on that day Ms Gobbo had a conversation
10:16:50 7 with Bateson where she expressed concern for herself should
10:16:54 8 [REDACTED]'s plea deal become known and Bateson told her
10:16:58 9 that, "Our door was open any time". Were you aware that
10:17:02 10 that occurred?---No.
11
10:17:04 12 Would you have been - do you expect that you would have had
10:17:08 13 some discussions in relation to those matters?---Not
10:17:12 14 necessarily.
15
10:17:16 16 You would have had notes in your diary in relation to
10:17:18 17 Ms Gobbo's involvement in the process?---If I was there
10:17:22 18 that day.
19
10:17:23 20 Well, previously in relation to any discussions that she
10:17:28 21 was having?---Would I have notes in my day book?
22
10:17:33 23 Or diary?---About discussions she was having with other
10:17:37 24 people?
25
10:17:38 26 About Ms Gobbo's involvement in the process of [REDACTED]
10:17:40 27 potentially cooperating?---I certainly didn't have any
10:17:46 28 conversations with her about any of these matters.
29
10:17:53 30 Were you aware that there were concerns Ms Gobbo's role in
10:17:58 31 the process becoming known?---No.
32
10:18:00 33 At any time?---No.
34
10:18:04 35 Ordinarily a lawyer's role in advising a client is not
10:18:08 36 something that is hidden?---No.
37
10:18:15 38 And that the danger here was, well, if there was considered
10:18:20 39 a danger, it was because Ms Gobbo was seemingly aligned to
10:18:25 40 the people against whom her client, [REDACTED], was going to
10:18:30 41 provide evidence against?---And I guess that's precisely
10:18:34 42 why Andrew Veniamin threatened her, as he did in due
10:18:37 43 course.
44
10:18:41 45 That in itself indicates a conflict, would you
10:18:45 46 agree?---Certainly there's a perception by a number of
10:18:48 47 people there's a conflict and, you know, I can see there

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:18:52 1 may well have been a conflict. And certainly - well, with
10:18:58 2 the passage of time, with a far better view of
10:19:03 3 circumstances back then, clearly there is a conflict for
10:19:07 4 her to deal with. But these aren't things that myself as a
10:19:11 5 head to the ground investigator were privy to or aware of,
10:19:16 6 or indeed felt a need to turn my mind to at that time
10:19:21 7 because of that lack of awareness.

8

10:19:30 9 Do you say if you had been aware at any stage you would
10:19:34 10 have done something about it?---Not necessarily. But the
10:19:37 11 conflict is for the lawyer to manage and, you know, you
10:19:42 12 don't manage the lawyer managing their conflicts.

13

10:19:49 14 Do you ever contemplate a circumstance in which the police
10:19:53 15 might need to get involved when a conflict occurs?---Only
10:19:57 16 if you see that there may be some criminal offending in
10:20:05 17 behind the conflict, as was the case with Zarah
10:20:10 18 Garde-Wilson. Police became involved in reporting that I
10:20:13 19 believe.

20

10:20:14 21 What if as a result of the - what if the conflict itself
10:20:17 22 gives rise to criminal offending, like perverting the
10:20:20 23 course of justice?---Well as I said a moment ago, as a
10:20:25 24 Detective Senior Constable, Acting Sergeant pursuing the
10:20:30 25 investigations on the ground, you know, you don't encounter
10:20:35 26 these issues. I didn't speak a word with Nicola Gobbo over
10:20:41 27 the whole passage of this time from my recollection. I
10:20:44 28 certainly saw her at court, knew she was involved in
10:20:48 29 representing people, but I had no conversations with her
10:20:51 30 such as to get a grasp of her conflict or not.

31

10:20:56 32 But if you're aware of it, regardless of whether or not you
10:21:00 33 have any direct contact with her, if you're aware of it and
10:21:03 34 the circumstances which might give rise to criminal
10:21:05 35 offending by virtue of her acting, do you have an
10:21:11 36 obligation to do anything about that?---Yes.

37

10:21:14 38 And what's that?---Well if there's criminal offending
10:21:17 39 involved you investigate the criminal offending and if that
10:21:20 40 involves the conduct of a lawyer, they're a suspect and
10:21:26 41 they're investigated. That certainly wasn't my view at the
10:21:30 42 time but, as you're putting to me now, 2019, that's my
10:21:34 43 view.

44

10:21:39 45 Following that plea hearing for the County Court matters
10:21:42 46 you're aware that [REDACTED] embarked upon the statement
10:21:48 47 process?---Yes .

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
10:21:50 2 And that Detectives Bateson and Hatt attended at the prison
10:21:56 3 to obtain statements from him?---Yes.
4
10:22:01 5 And statements were being taken in relation to both the
10:22:05 6 [REDACTED] matter and the [REDACTED] murders?---Yes.
7
10:22:10 8 And those in Purana were very aware that that's what was
10:22:17 9 occurring?---I was certainly aware of the [REDACTED] matter.
10:22:20 10 I've had no involvement in the [REDACTED] investigation.
11
10:22:29 12 You were present on 17 May where there was discussion about
10:22:34 13 the deal was for him to plead to the murder and give
10:22:37 14 evidence in relation to [REDACTED]---Yes.
15
10:22:40 16 So you would have been, you would have known that there was
10:22:44 17 statement to be taken in relation to that matter as
10:22:46 18 well?---Yes.
19
10:22:48 20 Of course this was a very significant breakthrough for
10:22:50 21 Purana?---Yes.
22
10:22:56 23 Were you kept updated as things progressed with [REDACTED]
10:23:00 24 during this period of time?---Probably.
25
10:23:02 26 On [REDACTED] 2004 Mr Bateson went to see [REDACTED] to get him
10:23:07 27 to sign statements but he indicated at that stage he
10:23:11 28 wouldn't do that before going to Ms Gobbo for approval.
10:23:17 29 It's apparent he requested some minor additions at that
10:23:19 30 point and then Mr Bateson spoke to Ms Gobbo about her
10:23:25 31 reading the statements prior to [REDACTED] signing them.
10:23:28 32 You're aware of that occurrence?---I don't dispute that.
33
10:23:36 34 You're aware the following day that Detective Hatt attended
10:23:43 35 Ms Gobbo's chambers and gave her copies of the statements
10:23:46 36 to read?---I'm not aware of that but I don't dispute that.
37
10:23:49 38 It seems she made notes in her court book about various
10:23:54 39 aspects of that statement, in terms of the knowledge that
10:23:57 40 it was going to be a [REDACTED] more than a stand-over job,
10:24:01 41 and knowledge as to there being a [REDACTED] payment. Are
10:24:06 42 you aware that Ms Gobbo then spoke to Detective Bateson
10:24:09 43 about her scepticism over various aspects or claims made by
10:24:16 44 [REDACTED] in relation to those matters?---No.
45
10:24:21 46 You're aware in his initial statement [REDACTED], or the
10:24:26 47 unsigned copy up until that point, [REDACTED] had claimed

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:24:31 1 that he wasn't going to get paid for the job, that he
10:24:33 2 thought he was going to collect [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] him.
10:24:36 3 You're aware that that was his initial statement?---I don't
10:24:40 4 recall that but I don't dispute it.
5
10:24:42 6 Is that something you likely would have been made aware of
10:24:45 7 at the time?---Probably. It's certainly no surprise.
8
10:24:57 9 Are you aware that Ms Gobbo and Mr Bateson spoke about
10:25:02 10 those things and then Mr Bateson assisted to arrange a
10:25:05 11 visit by Ms Gobbo to see [REDACTED] ---No, I'm not aware of
10:25:09 12 that.
13
10:25:10 14 That Ms Gobbo went to visit [REDACTED]. She then spoke to
10:25:15 15 Mr Bateson again and he recorded in his notes that she told
10:25:18 16 him that [REDACTED] would be truthful. He crossed out the
10:25:26 17 word "more" in front of truthful, but that's what he
10:25:30 18 recorded in his statement?---Yes.
19
10:25:34 20 You're aware that the next version of his statement amended
10:25:39 21 those aspects?---I don't dispute that.
22
10:25:42 23 You would have been made aware of that at the
10:25:45 24 time?---Probably.
25
10:25:49 26 It's apparent at a Task Force Purana meeting involving
10:25:57 27 Assistant Commissioner Overland and others on 12 July,
10:26:02 28 according to Mr Purton's diary notes, it says this,
10:26:07 29 "[REDACTED] final read of statements today. Shown to Gobbo.
10:26:10 30 One thing to change. Didn't know it's going to be a
10:26:12 31 [REDACTED]. NG, that's ridiculous". If those are the types of
10:26:19 32 matters being reported up to the Assistant Commissioner it
10:26:22 33 would have been reported to you, the informant?---Probably.
34
10:26:32 35 It seems the following day Mr Bateson spoke to Ms Gobbo and
10:26:37 36 then he and Hatt went to the prison and the statements were
10:26:40 37 signed. I just want to ask you about Purana's record
10:26:48 38 keeping in terms of draft statements. What was
10:26:55 39 it?---Sorry, what was?
40
10:26:57 41 What was Purana's system of keeping draft
10:27:05 42 statements?---There was no Purana-wide policy or process or
10:27:10 43 procedure.
44
10:27:11 45 Did Detective Bateson have a policy or procedure or
10:27:16 46 practice that he adopted?---I don't know what his policy,
10:27:20 47 procedure, practice was.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
10:27:24 2 Did you have one?---I did. I guess so.
3
10:27:31 4 What was it?---Well, it depends if you're taking a written
10:27:34 5 statement or a typed statement or - - -
6
10:27:42 7 Well, if it was a written statement what would it be?---The
10:27:46 8 witness gives their account, you record their account as
10:27:51 9 they give it. They review their statement and they sign
10:27:54 10 their statement.
11
10:27:55 12 Yes. If there's amendments to the statement what would
10:27:59 13 happen?---You would - well, I guess it depends, the context
10:28:10 14 in which that arose. I mean as you're taking a statement
10:28:12 15 from a witness, and as you've probably taken many
10:28:16 16 affidavits, a witness might say, "Oh look, on Wednesday
10:28:19 17 morning, hang on, it was Thursday morning". Now you
10:28:23 18 wouldn't take a statement that included the Wednesday
10:28:26 19 morning, get them to sign it, then take another statement
10:28:32 20 that said, "I've previously made a statement in relation to
10:28:36 21 this matter. I thought it was Wednesday morning, it's
10:28:41 22 actually Thursday morning", and get them to sign that
10:28:43 23 statement. So that's an extreme.
24
25 Taking that example, you've got a hand written statement,
10:28:45 26 it's not yet signed. Before they sign it they realise it's
10:28:47 27 Thursday, and not Wednesday, would you just get them to
10:28:50 28 amend that and initial it on the statement?---No.
29
10:28:52 30 What would you do?---Well, you would - if you were typing
10:28:55 31 it or, sorry, if you were writing it, yes, you would.
32
10:28:59 33 Yes?---But if you were typing it, no, you wouldn't. You
10:29:03 34 would replace the Wednesday with the Thursday.
35
10:29:07 36 I'm just asking about the handwritten one first of
10:29:09 37 all?---Yes, you would have them initial it.
38
10:29:11 39 And it would be very apparent to a reader, to the defence
10:29:15 40 when they get a copy of that statement, that there's been
10:29:18 41 that amendment?---Yes.
42
10:29:20 43 And that could be examined upon?---Yes. But, of course, if
10:29:22 44 they articulate that change before you've had a chance to
10:29:26 45 record it, it'd be exactly the same situation has occurred
10:29:26 46 but you haven't recorded it. There's nothing deceptive
10:29:27 47 about it, you just haven't captured it in writing before

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:29:30 1 you commit to paper.
2
10:29:33 3 Right. You've got this typed statement. What's the
10:29:40 4 process with a typed statement?---Well, you type it on a
10:29:46 5 computer, print it, they review it, and if they're happy
10:29:53 6 with it they sign it.
7
10:29:55 8 If they want to contemplate it, if they want a solicitor or
10:30:03 9 a barrister to review it, they do so. If there needs to be
10:30:07 10 some changes you've got the printed copy there. They make
10:30:09 11 some changes on the next copy, obviously that's printed and
10:30:12 12 signed at some stage. What's done with the initial
10:30:15 13 copy?---My practice would be to - sorry, has the first copy
10:30:18 14 been signed?
15
10:30:20 16 No?---It's been printed?
17
10:30:28 18 It seems to be, yes?---Well you would retain that and you
10:30:32 19 would - the witness would adopt the subsequent statement.
20
10:30:36 21 Where would you retain it?---Within your investigation
10:30:43 22 file.
23
10:30:43 24 Would you consider that to be a draft statement?---Yes.
25
10:30:53 26 You would consider that to be something that was
10:30:57 27 disclosable to defence?---Yes.
28
10:30:59 29 Right. If you've not printed it and there's a change, what
10:31:05 30 would your practice be?---Not printed it and you go back
10:31:15 31 into it and make some alterations? Well there's no draft
10:31:20 32 as such.
33
10:31:21 34 Would your practice be to alter the title of the file so
10:31:24 35 that you have a copy of the initial draft and, you know,
10:31:28 36 you've added in a paragraph or something of substance
10:31:31 37 that's been changed?---If it was something of substance my
10:31:34 38 practice would be to retain, yes. More often not though
10:31:39 39 it's that example I gave before where you wouldn't retain a
10:31:44 40 draft changing a Wednesday to a Thursday based on a
10:31:47 41 witness's innocuous recollection.
42
10:31:51 43 If such a change was significant in the terms of a case,
10:31:56 44 for example, if someone made an observation of something
10:31:58 45 that occurred on a Wednesday but very significantly for
10:32:02 46 that case it actually, the event actually happened on a
10:32:05 47 Thursday and so that might have been something of great

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:32:13 1 significance, would you make a record of that?---Yes. I
10:32:15 2 mean you're well aware that I've taken a number of
10:32:18 3 statements from witnesses where you refer to the prior
10:32:21 4 statements and clarification is made. You're well aware
10:32:26 5 that's my practice.
6
10:32:32 7 There may be other ways in which drafts might exist. For
10:32:37 8 example, after you've taken the first draft on a computer,
10:32:42 9 often those drafts are emailed to other members so they can
10:32:45 10 go away and try and corroborate aspects of them. Would you
10:32:49 11 agree with that?---I don't dispute that.
12
10:32:51 13 And that's what happened in relation to a number of these
10:32:54 14 Purana cases with [REDACTED] and other witnesses following
10:32:59 15 that?---I don't recall that but I don't dispute that.
16
10:33:10 17 Are you aware of any practice by anyone else in Purana or
10:33:13 18 occasions, rather than a practice, where draft statements
10:33:19 19 were destroyed?---No.
20
10:33:26 21 Are you aware of any deliberate practice to just save over
10:33:32 22 the original file statements so that any substantive
10:33:39 23 changes were not recorded?---No.
24
10:33:41 25 You would consider that to be wrong?---If it had improper
10:33:48 26 intent, yes.
27
10:33:49 28 Well it has the effect of not allowing defence to know that
10:33:57 29 there's been a change of substance which provide the basis
10:34:02 30 for a prior inconsistent statement or a credit
10:34:04 31 attack?---Yes.
32
10:34:13 33 Do you agree that even if the intent is not improper, that
10:34:16 34 it's still wrong? It's a bad practice?---What's that?
35
10:34:26 36 Saving over a file so that's a substantive change is not
10:34:29 37 apparent?---Well if it's a material change then, yes, I
10:34:35 38 agree.
39
10:34:50 40 On 24 July 2004 it's apparent Ms Gobbo was admitted to
10:34:53 41 hospital having suffered a stroke. That was something that
10:34:57 42 Purana would have become aware of at that stage, or around
10:35:00 43 that time?---What was the date, sorry?
44
10:35:02 45 24 July 2004?---I don't - - -
46
10:35:05 47 It's within two weeks of the signing of the statement by

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:35:10 1 [REDACTED] ---I don't recall that but I don't dispute I may
10:35:15 2 have known that at the time.
3
10:35:17 4 That she rang Detective Bateson when she was at the
10:35:20 5 hospital and told him that she was still representing
10:35:23 6 [REDACTED]?---You're asking did that occur?
7
10:35:28 8 Do you recall being aware of that?---No.
9
10:35:30 10 That's something that likely you would have been
10:35:33 11 told?---Possibly.
12
10:35:34 13 Given that you were [REDACTED] informant?---Possibly.
14
10:35:40 15 Now there was interest by Purana in [REDACTED]; is that
10:35:47 16 right?---Yes.
17
10:35:48 18 And that was an interest that was occurring at this
10:35:52 19 time?---Yes.
20
10:35:56 21 Purana were interested if he might also assist them?---Yes.
22
10:36:06 23 If we can have a look at the 28th, the day book for 28 July
10:36:10 24 2004. It's apparent that Detective Bateson and a colleague
10:36:23 25 went on this day to meet with [REDACTED] to speak to him
10:36:28 26 about those kinds of things. I think your day book records
10:36:31 27 you being briefed by Detective Bateson about threats made
10:36:34 28 by a person to [REDACTED] which had been captured on some
10:36:38 29 telephone intercepts and that [REDACTED] may have known that
10:36:41 30 Condello had a contract out on Williams and hadn't said,
10:36:46 31 that's what the assault or threats were about. Do you
10:36:51 32 recall that?---I recall [REDACTED] being assaulted but I
10:36:57 33 don't - and I don't dispute the rest of it.
34
10:37:21 35 I'll just move on. Just some general propositions. In a
10:37:23 36 case where a witness has rolled over, such as [REDACTED]
10:37:29 37 and the person against whom they've rolled on, colloquially
10:37:35 38 expressed, the defence, if they're contesting the matter,
10:37:39 39 would seek to call into question the witness's credibility
10:37:42 40 and reliability?---Oh absolutely.
41
10:37:46 42 And they would do that by examining at committal, and later
10:37:54 43 at trial, how those statements came to be made in the first
10:37:57 44 place?---That would be a pursuit that may well occur.
45
10:38:04 46 You would have sat through many hearings in which there was
10:38:07 47 a great exploration as to the circumstances in which a

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:38:10 1 statement came to be made?---Yes.
2
10:38:14 3 The motivation behind making the statement?---Yes.
4
10:38:17 5 For example, you know, what they got in return, whether
10:38:20 6 there were any inducements, those kinds of things?---Oh
10:38:24 7 yes.
8
10:38:24 9 Whether the statements were really a product of the
10:38:26 10 witness's own account of events or whether it was possible
10:38:30 11 that someone else had some influence in the making of any
10:38:34 12 of the statements made?---I don't specifically recall that
10:38:40 13 line of questioning but I don't dispute it's occurred.
14
10:38:43 15 Well if they've said something based on their own knowledge
10:38:46 16 or if they're, you know, pretending it's their own
10:38:51 17 knowledge, or it might be the product of something they've
10:38:55 18 heard?---That's happened, yes.
19
10:38:57 20 Of course the defence would be very interested to know
10:38:59 21 that?---Yes.
22
10:39:00 23 And whether there have been, and we've already discussed
10:39:06 24 this, whether there have been changes to statements,
10:39:10 25 something very significant that defence would cross-examine
10:39:13 26 about?---Yes.
27
10:39:14 28 Defence would examine those matters in a number of ways,
10:39:17 29 some of it would be direct questioning of the witness in
10:39:20 30 court?---Yes.
31
10:39:21 32 They would engage in direct questioning of police witnesses
10:39:25 33 in court?---Yes.
34
10:39:26 35 And potentially any other witnesses that might have
10:39:29 36 knowledge of those things as well?---Yes.
37
10:39:32 38 They would also examine those matters by way of disclosure
10:39:36 39 of police notes?---Yes.
40
10:39:39 41 And disclosure of draft statements?---Yes.
42
10:39:45 43 All of those matters would have been very common
10:39:48 44 occurrences during the course of your career?---Yes.
45
10:40:02 46 On [REDACTED] 2004, as a result of the cooperation and
10:40:09 47 statements made by [REDACTED], there were charges laid

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:40:15 1 against [REDACTED] and Carl Williams; is that
10:40:20 2 right?---I accept that.
3
10:40:23 4 They were charged with the murders of [REDACTED] and
10:40:26 5 [REDACTED]---I accept that.
6
10:40:28 7 You would have known that at the time?---Yes.
8
10:40:31 9 Carl Williams was also charged at that stage with the
10:40:34 10 murder of [REDACTED]---I accept that.
11
10:40:38 12 And that's something you would have known at the
10:40:40 13 time?---Yes.
14
10:40:40 15 [REDACTED] had already been charged, of course, with that
10:40:45 16 murder?---I'm not sure of the sequence but I accept that.
17
10:40:48 18 [REDACTED] had been arrested on the day?---Yes.
19
10:40:50 20 He was charged shortly thereafter?---He was charged on the
10:40:54 21 day. He hadn't made a statement for some time.
22
10:40:58 23 No, but what I was saying was that Carl Williams on 16
10:41:01 24 August 2004 was also, was charged with [REDACTED]
10:41:05 25 murders?---Yes.
26
10:41:06 27 [REDACTED] as well as [REDACTED]---Yes.
28
10:41:11 29 And [REDACTED] had already been charged with the [REDACTED]
10:41:14 30 murder?---Yes.
31
10:41:15 32 And he was also charged on that day with the [REDACTED] and
10:41:18 33 [REDACTED] murders?---I accept that.
34
10:41:23 35 The initial intention was that those matters would proceed
10:41:27 36 by way of direct presentment?---I don't dispute that.
37
10:41:32 38 And that would bypass the usual committal processes?---Yes.
39
10:41:36 40 Do you recall that occurring?---No.
41
10:41:38 42 It was an unusual event?---Direct presentment?
43
10:41:41 44 At that stage, yes?---Oh, I don't know if was or it wasn't
10:41:44 45 but I don't recall it. I don't dispute it.
46
10:41:48 47 Well as a result of that occurrence, or the attempt along

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:41:53 1 those lines, it was challenged ultimately and then it
10:41:55 2 ultimately went to committal, but at the outset there were
10:42:00 3 subpoenas issued in the Supreme Court for disclosure?---For
10:42:05 4 which defendant?
5
10:42:07 6 I anticipate for most of the defendants?---Yeah, I don't
10:42:12 7 know. I wasn't the informant in any of those matters.
8
10:42:15 9 When did you become aware that Ms Gobbo was representing
10:42:20 10 ██████████ in those proceedings?---I'm not certain when I
10:42:29 11 became aware.
12
10:42:30 13 It would have been pretty soon after?---What was the date,
10:42:36 14 sorry?
15
10:42:37 16 16 August 2004?---Yeah, I don't know. As I sort suggested
10:42:48 17 earlier, it's really not a focus for an investigator who's
10:42:54 18 representing who, you know, unless of course you've charged
10:42:59 19 them yourself and you're engaged with that lawyer.
20
10:43:02 21 If you've got a particular barrister who's helped Purana
10:43:06 22 make the most significant breakthrough since it came into
10:43:10 23 existence, it might be something that you'd focus on a
10:43:17 24 little bit, "They've got her again"?---Are you suggesting
10:43:26 25 that's my thinking? No.
26
10:43:29 27 You would have been aware at that stage that the case
10:43:32 28 against ██████████ rested upon the evidence of
10:43:37 29 ██████████---At that stage ██████████ being the only - - -
30
10:43:39 31 Yes?---Yes.
32
10:43:41 33 You're aware certainly that Ms Gobbo had been involved in
10:43:45 34 advising ██████████ when he was deciding to cooperate?---I
10:43:50 35 accept that.
36
10:43:53 37 That Ms Gobbo had read and advised him about his statements
10:43:55 38 before they were signed?---I wasn't aware of that until you
10:43:58 39 told me. I may well have been aware at the time but I
10:44:02 40 don't think so.
41
10:44:03 42 The statements were changed as a result of scepticism
10:44:07 43 expressed by her and after her speaking with him?---You've
10:44:11 44 put that to me. I don't recall that.
45
10:44:14 46 Would she have spoken to Bateson about those
10:44:16 47 matters?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
10:44:19 2 You accept that you likely would have spoken yourself to
10:44:22 3 Bateson about those matters?--No, I don't accept that.
4
10:44:25 5 Well I think you accepted before, given that those matters
10:44:27 6 were being reported up the tree to the Assistant
10:44:30 7 Commissioner, that they might have been discussed with
10:44:32 8 you?---They may well have been. I don't accept that they
10:44:35 9 were. They may well have been. And I did try and indicate
10:44:38 10 before, my role essentially as a nominal informant for
10:44:43 11 [REDACTED] and then the bulk of the work was done by
10:44:52 12 Stuart's crew.
13
10:45:02 14 Do you agree that disclosure of those matters that I've
10:45:06 15 just raised with you should have been made to [REDACTED] so
10:45:10 16 that he was in a position to make a fair assessment of the
10:45:15 17 strength of the prosecution case against him?---Sorry, what
10:45:18 18 matters should have been put to [REDACTED]
19
10:45:23 20 That Ms Gobbo had been involved in advising [REDACTED] when
10:45:30 21 he's deciding to cooperate that she'd read and advised him
10:45:34 22 about his statements before they were signed, that she'd
10:45:36 23 expressed scepticism about aspects of those statements,
10:45:40 24 that she'd spoken about those matters to Bateson and then
10:45:45 25 [REDACTED] who accordingly changed aspects of his
10:45:49 26 statements. Do you agree that disclosure of those matters
10:45:51 27 should have been made to [REDACTED] so he could make a fair
10:45:54 28 assessment of the strength of the prosecution case against
10:45:56 29 him?---No.
30
10:45:57 31 You don't accept that those matters should have been
10:45:59 32 disclosed to [REDACTED]?---No.
33
10:46:01 34 Why not?---I don't regard it as the responsibility of a
10:46:09 35 police investigator to seek to navigate on behalf of a
10:46:12 36 barrister where his or her conflict might arise and how
10:46:17 37 best it be dealt with.
38
10:46:19 39 Do you agree that those matters shouldn't have been
10:46:23 40 concealed from [REDACTED]?---I don't accept that there was
10:46:26 41 any deliberate concealment. You don't negotiate with a
10:46:31 42 suspect for murder about legal representation.
43
10:46:39 44 Do you agree that in order for [REDACTED] to make a fair
10:46:42 45 assessment of the strength of the prosecution case against
10:46:45 46 him he was entitled to know that the statement had been
10:46:51 47 changed after scepticism had been expressed by his

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:46:56 1 barrister and the matter had been discussed with
10:46:59 2 police?---That's something I accept would arise once you're
10:47:05 3 in the process of discovery, brief service. But not in
10:47:08 4 negotiating with [REDACTED] about him rolling.
5

10:47:12 6 No, I'm not at that process. At this stage [REDACTED] is
10:47:15 7 contesting the charges. He's there looking at the strength
10:47:21 8 of the case against him. Do you agree that those matters
10:47:25 9 were relevant in terms of him making an assessment of the
10:47:29 10 strength of the case against him?---I'm sorry, I don't
10:47:33 11 really follow, but no.
12

10:47:37 13 You don't think it's relevant for him to know that the
10:47:42 14 witness, the only evidence against him had been changed in
10:47:48 15 the way that I've described to you and it had been changed
10:47:53 16 following his lawyer expressing scepticism and discussing
10:48:00 17 those matters with the police?---As I say, matters like
10:48:04 18 that will arise in discovery and, indeed, you may make a
10:48:08 19 PII claim on that knowledge.
20

10:48:12 21 Sorry?---You may, I don't know, you may make a PII claim on
10:48:18 22 that sort of knowledge or that negotiation that was
10:48:21 23 occurring back at the time with [REDACTED] lawyer, who
10:48:28 24 becomes [REDACTED] lawyer, I don't think you would
10:48:30 25 disclose - or you may indeed seek a PII claim in relation
10:48:37 26 to those discussions that you had with that lawyer.
27

10:48:39 28 There are a number of things I'm going to take you through
10:48:42 29 now. First of all, you don't consider it relevant for
10:48:45 30 someone to be told that a statement has changed in a
10:48:52 31 significant respect after a lawyer has advised that that's
10:48:55 32 ridiculous?---I accept that. I'm talking about the time
10:48:58 33 for that.
34

10:48:58 35 Right. You accept that those matters should be
10:49:04 36 disclosed?---Subject to a potential PII claim.
37

10:49:09 38 Right. You accept that it's relevant that it's
10:49:12 39 disclosable?---Yes.
40

10:49:13 41 What's the public interest in withholding that?---Look I'm
10:49:20 42 not certain that there necessarily is. But it would be
10:49:26 43 something that you would consider about discussing with
10:49:29 44 [REDACTED] conversations that you'd had with [REDACTED]
10:49:32 45 lawyer, [REDACTED] lawyer or [REDACTED] lawyer when you
10:49:36 46 have those discussions. It just doesn't seem a realistic
10:49:43 47 scenario that you're putting to me in terms of my

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:49:46 1 involvement, so it's just a bit difficult to - - -
2
10:49:49 3 No, well you're an experienced police member. I'm asking
10:49:52 4 your views. What's the public interest in withholding from
10:49:56 5 [REDACTED] those facts that his lawyer, regardless of who
10:50:03 6 the lawyer is, has had discussions about seemingly
10:50:08 7 unbelievable aspects of his statement which have then been
10:50:14 8 changed by the police?---I'm not meaning to state with any
10:50:19 9 strength that there is a claim. I'm just trying to put
10:50:22 10 myself in the scenario that you're putting to me, that I
10:50:24 11 wasn't involved in, and assist you with the position I
10:50:31 12 might have had at the time in that scenario.
13
10:50:37 14 Can you say what the public interest might be?---Not
10:50:40 15 particularly. Not without further real consideration of a
10:50:46 16 real scenario that I wasn't involved in.
17
10:50:50 18 Commonly notes are disclosed as to involvement of lawyers
10:50:57 19 of processes which lead to statements?---As they are in
10:50:59 20 mine, yes.
10:51:00 21
10:51:04 22 Do you agree if [REDACTED] had no idea of Ms Gobbo's
10:51:12 23 involvement in that process that would be wrong?---At what
10:51:19 24 point in time?
10:51:19 25
10:51:20 26 If [REDACTED] was contesting those matters, he's charged on
10:51:23 27 [REDACTED] 2004, he thereafter is contesting the charges
10:51:31 28 against him, he's in court seeking disclosure, do you agree
10:51:37 29 that it was wrong if he didn't know that Ms Gobbo had
10:51:43 30 represented [REDACTED] in the process of him deciding to
10:51:46 31 make his statement?---Is that what occurred?
32
10:51:50 33 Do you agree if that occurred that was wrong?---If it was
10:51:54 34 an intentional failure to disclose then, yes, I would.
35
10:52:22 36 Do you agree that if the police knew that that situation
10:52:22 37 existed that the police had an obligation to ensure that
10:52:22 38 [REDACTED] was getting fair and independent
10:52:22 39 representation?---I think that's a different question.
40
10:52:22 41 Well it is a different question?---And I think that's a
10:52:26 42 little bit removed from the previous scenario. Withholding
10:52:31 43 information from an accused is one thing, making judgment
10:52:35 44 calls about representation for the accused, I think it's a
10:52:41 45 different consideration and it's not one that I feel
10:52:45 46 responsible to make. It's a matter for the lawyer to deal
10:52:49 47 with their conflict and you're aware, you put it to me that

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:52:55 1 Gobbo represented, or Mokbel and others, quite a minefield,
10:53:04 2 I agree with that, but they're matters for the lawyer to
10:53:07 3 deal with.

10:53:08 4
10:53:08 5 Do you agree that if the lawyer was not complying with
10:53:12 6 their obligations, clearly, and it was being withheld from
10:53:16 7 ██████████ that his lawyer was not complying with those
10:53:20 8 obligations, that he was not getting fair and independent
10:53:23 9 representation, that Victoria Police had some obligation to
10:53:26 10 do something about it?---If you knew about that?

10:53:31 11
10:53:32 12 Yes?---Perhaps. So essentially what you'd be doing is
10:53:48 13 you'd be reporting a lawyer for misconduct in their duty,
10:53:52 14 is that - - -

10:53:53 15
10:53:53 16 Or you might be advising ██████████ he's not getting fair
10:53:57 17 and impartial representation?---No, I don't believe I would
10:54:05 18 do that.

10:54:05 19
10:54:06 20 You might do something to ensure that this person - -
10:54:11 21 -?---You're putting a hypothetical to me I think and I just
10:54:20 22 - - -

10:54:20 23
10:54:20 24 Would you do something about it? Would you get some legal
10:54:24 25 advice? Would you go to a superior, would you say, "What
10:54:27 26 do I do about this situation? ██████████ is charged with
10:54:31 27 murder, the evidence hangs on ██████████ and ██████████ is
10:54:35 28 not getting fair and independent representation"?---If I
10:54:39 29 knew that?

10:54:40 30
10:54:40 31 Yes?---Yes, I would have those conversations.

10:54:43 32
10:54:51 33 Do you agree that Ms Gobbo could not comply with her duties
10:54:54 34 to the court or her client if she was not to seek
10:54:59 35 disclosure for her client, that material which we've been
10:55:03 36 discussing, in order to protect herself?---Sorry, can you
10:55:07 37 put that question again?

10:55:08 38
10:55:09 39 If Ms Gobbo was to not seek disclosure for ██████████ of
10:55:16 40 those matters which we've discussed, in order to protect
10:55:20 41 herself, she could not possibly comply with her duties to
10:55:24 42 the court or to her client?---I accept that.

10:55:27 43
10:55:42 44 On ██████████, this is I think referred to at paragraph 15
10:55:47 45 of your statement, you were present in court when an
10:55:54 46 application was made by Purana members to interview ██████████
10:56:01 47 ██████████ for the murder of ██████████ is that right?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:56:05 1
10:56:05 2 Ms Gobbo was appearing for [REDACTED] on that date, is that
10:56:08 3 right?---Yes.
10:56:09 4
10:56:10 5 Mr Bateson was present also and spoke to [REDACTED] about
10:56:14 6 the possibility of his giving evidence. Do you know about
10:56:18 7 that?---At court?
10:56:21 8
10:56:22 9 Yes, I think so?---I don't recall that. I don't dispute
10:56:26 10 it.
10:56:26 11
10:56:27 12 Is it possible that that occurred in your presence, or you
10:56:30 13 don't know?---No, it won't have occurred in my presence.
10:56:33 14
10:56:34 15 It wouldn't have been something that Mr Bateson would have
10:56:37 16 withheld from you?---No.
10:56:39 17
10:56:40 18 Did you make any inquiry at that stage about how Ms Gobbo
10:56:44 19 could be representing [REDACTED] given her previous
10:56:46 20 involvement with [REDACTED]?---No. No consideration
10:56:52 21 whatsoever at the time.
10:56:56 22
10:56:56 23 Did you become aware that there was a concern within Purana
10:57:00 24 to cover up the extent of Ms Gobbo's representation of
10:57:03 25 [REDACTED]?---No.
10:57:06 26
10:57:07 27 At any time?---No. Cover up?
10:57:12 28
10:57:12 29 Yes?---Had she appeared in court?
10:57:18 30
10:57:18 31 The extent of her representation of [REDACTED]?---No.
10:57:20 32
10:57:21 33 You would understand that a lawyer can represent people
10:57:25 34 both in and out of court?---Yes.
10:57:27 35
10:57:27 36 And provide advice?---Yes.
10:57:29 37
10:57:42 38 Following that there were a number of coercive hearings
10:57:48 39 involving [REDACTED], is that right?---I believe so.
10:57:51 40
10:57:52 41 That you were involved in?---I was involved in?
10:57:56 42
10:57:56 43 Were you involved in those coercive hearings at all?---I
10:57:59 44 don't believe so.
10:57:59 45
10:58:01 46 Are you aware that Ms Gobbo appeared for [REDACTED] at a
10:58:04 47 coercive hearing on [REDACTED]?---I don't dispute that.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

10:58:08 1
10:58:09 2 And that she also appeared for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] a few days
10:58:15 3 later?---I wasn't aware of that. I don't dispute that.
10:58:19 4
10:58:29 5 Mr Horgan was the senior Crown Prosecutor from the OPP who
10:58:34 6 examined [REDACTED] during those proceedings?---I accept
10:58:37 7 that.
10:58:37 8
10:58:38 9 These are things that you came to understand at some stage,
10:58:40 10 is that right?---Probably.
10:58:43 11
10:58:44 12 In subsequent trials at least?---I certainly became aware
10:58:49 13 that [REDACTED] had been examined at the ACC and he was
10:58:53 14 cross-examined on that very strongly by Robert Richter at
10:59:04 15 at least one, possibly a number of [REDACTED] trials.
10:59:22 16
10:59:38 17 You became aware of those matters at some stage
10:59:42 18 subsequently?---I became aware that [REDACTED] had been
10:59:47 19 examined at the ACC. I'm not certain if this was this
10:59:52 20 hearing or another hearing, but yes, I accept that.
10:59:56 21
10:59:56 22 As you said, these things were examined upon by Mr Richter
11:00:00 23 during subsequent court proceedings?---Yes, that's right.
11:00:02 24
11:00:04 25 Are you aware how the arrangement came about that you had a
11:00:07 26 Crown Prosecutor from the OPP engaged in coercive
11:00:12 27 hearings?---No.
11:00:15 28
11:00:15 29 You are aware that that was occurring?---Yes.
11:00:20 30
11:00:20 31 What was the thought around having a Crown Prosecutor from
11:00:27 32 the OPP involved in those hearings?---What was the thought?
11:00:34 33
11:00:35 34 Yes?---I don't know what the thought was.
11:00:36 35
11:00:43 36 Was it for the Crown Prosecutor to have the maximum amount
11:00:48 37 of knowledge as to what went on in particular cases?---May
11:00:53 38 well have been.
11:00:54 39
11:00:55 40 And much of that knowledge wouldn't have been later
11:00:58 41 disclosable to defence?---I'm not sure that that follows.
11:01:06 42 I'm not sure how that follows. These hearings were
11:01:09 43 disclosed.
11:01:10 44
11:01:10 45 Were aspects of the hearings not disclosed?---I'm not sure.
11:01:17 46 I seem to recall subpoenas were issued against the ACC and
11:01:24 47 partial transcripts were provided by the ACC, not by

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

11:01:28 1 investigators, and that subsequently more fulsome
11:01:33 2 transcripts were provided, but they were matters for the
11:01:36 3 ACC based on the subpoena served on them.
11:01:38 4
11:01:38 5 There were particular people within the OPP that were
11:01:41 6 assigned to deal with Purana matters, is that right?---Yes.
11:01:47 7
11:01:48 8 And was there a reason for that rather than it just being
11:01:51 9 generally spread amongst the Crown prosecutors and
11:01:57 10 solicitors within the OPP, do you know?---No, I have no
11:02:00 11 idea what transpired in relation to that.
11:02:08 12
11:02:08 13 You're aware that in [REDACTED] of 2004 the Supreme Court
11:02:15 14 ruled that a committal should take place in relation to
11:02:17 15 proceedings faced by Mr Williams, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
11:02:22 16 [REDACTED]?---I accept that.
11:02:23 17
11:02:24 18 Did you have anything to do with those matters?---No.
11:02:26 19
11:02:29 20 You're aware that, or did you become aware at any stage
11:02:32 21 that whilst Ms Gobbo did not appear at the committal
11:02:36 22 proceedings, she was involved in the background providing
11:02:40 23 preparation and advice in relation to a number of those
11:02:43 24 accused?---No, not aware of that.
11:02:45 25
11:02:46 26 Would you agree that that would be wrong, if those accused
11:02:52 27 did not know of her role with [REDACTED]?---Sorry, what
11:02:59 28 background is she doing? She's representing [REDACTED] and
11:03:04 29 doing backgrounding for [REDACTED].
11:03:06 30
11:03:06 31 It seems as though by the time of the committal she's
11:03:10 32 involved in providing background preparation and advice for
11:03:14 33 [REDACTED] and Carl Williams. Would you agree that that was
11:03:17 34 wrong if they were not aware of her role in respect of
11:03:22 35 [REDACTED]?---Not necessarily.
11:03:24 36
11:03:24 37 Why wouldn't it be wrong?---Well, if she was acting
11:03:32 38 inappropriately then there's clearly something wrong but
11:03:36 39 the fact that a lawyer represents a person involved in a
11:03:41 40 criminal offending and another person involved in the same
11:03:45 41 course of criminal offending doesn't necessarily of itself
11:03:48 42 present a conflict.
11:03:49 43
11:03:50 44 If those people don't know about the conflict, if Carl
11:03:55 45 Williams didn't know, if [REDACTED] didn't know about
11:04:00 46 Ms Gobbo's role with [REDACTED], if this is a process - you
11:04:03 47 agree the committal process is about disclosure?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

11:04:06 1
11:04:08 2 And if she's involved in the preparation of matters
11:04:14 3 involved in the committal where potentially she might be
11:04:19 4 hiding her own involvement relating to [REDACTED], that
11:04:22 5 would be wrong?---I'm not sure what her motivation might be
11:04:32 6 for, for hiding. If it's an improper motivation then I
11:04:38 7 agree, it's wrong. If it's not an improper motivation, I
11:04:42 8 don't necessarily accept that.
11:04:44 9
11:04:44 10 It would be wrong if Carl Williams and [REDACTED] didn't
11:04:47 11 know about it. It would be wrong regardless of
11:04:52 12 motivation?---I'm not sure I accept the fact that Nicola
11:04:58 13 Gobbo had represented [REDACTED] and then came to represent
11:05:04 14 [REDACTED] and Carl Williams, the fact that she didn't
11:05:08 15 disclose to [REDACTED] and Carl Williams that she had also
11:05:12 16 represented [REDACTED], I don't accept that on its face it's
11:05:18 17 wrong.
11:05:20 18
11:05:20 19 Do you agree at committal it's likely that there might want
11:05:23 20 to be some challenge to the evidence of [REDACTED], given
11:05:26 21 that the cases against Carl Williams and [REDACTED] hang on
11:05:29 22 his evidence?---I guess that would be tested and that would
11:05:34 23 become apparent during that course of committal engagement.
11:05:37 24
11:05:38 25 Ms Gobbo has knowledge of certain things upon which it
11:05:44 26 might, a credit attack might be made upon [REDACTED]?---She
11:05:49 27 may well have.
11:05:50 28
11:05:50 29 So whose best interests is she going to represent, [REDACTED]
11:05:54 30 [REDACTED] Carl Williams?---Yeah, I don't know.
11:05:57 31
11:05:57 32 She can't do it, can she? She cannot represent each of
11:06:02 33 those people's best interests?---As you say, if she's
11:06:08 34 hiding matters as between those people then no, she can't.
11:06:13 35
11:06:13 36 It would be wrong?---Yes, it would be wrong if it was in
11:06:19 37 the scenario as I've just described.
11:06:22 38
11:06:22 39 And it would be especially wrong if [REDACTED] and Carl
11:06:26 40 Williams didn't know about it?---It would be wrong if
11:06:30 41 [REDACTED] and Carl Williams didn't know that a lawyer was
11:06:35 42 withholding material relevant to their defence, yes.
11:06:37 43
11:06:44 44 Her providing advice in those circumstances enabled her to
11:06:48 45 be in a position to know what material the defence might
11:06:54 46 have received that might compromise her position if she
11:06:58 47 wanted to hide it, you would agree with that?---Possibly,

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

11:07:02 1 yes.
11:07:02 2
11:07:03 3 It enabled her to potentially prevent senior counsel from
11:07:08 4 becoming aware of material that was relevant to the
11:07:12 5 case?---That's possible.
11:07:12 6
11:07:16 7 Did you have any discussion in relation to notes, providing
11:07:23 8 notes as to that proceeding?---Which proceeding?
11:07:26 9
11:07:27 10 This is the committal that took place in [REDACTED] of 05?---I
11:07:40 11 don't think I'm involved in that committal.
11:07:42 12
11:07:43 13 Do you know if you provided any notes at all for that
11:07:46 14 committal?---I don't recall.
11:07:47 15
11:07:47 16 Is there a way to find out whether you provided any
11:07:53 17 notes?---If there's a hard copy of the investigation file,
11:07:58 18 one of the folders you would maintain would be of various
11:08:02 19 member's notes that you collate, which is routine.
11:08:06 20
11:08:07 21 Where is that investigation file kept?---From 2005?
11:08:10 22
11:08:10 23 Yes?---Well at the time it would have been kept at Purana.
11:08:17 24
11:08:18 25 And that investigation file would say which notes and when
11:08:22 26 they were sent to the OPP, for instance, or what was
11:08:26 27 provided to the court?---Yes, you would include a schedule
11:08:31 28 of what was provided.
11:08:35 29
11:08:35 30 It would include a photocopy of any notes provided?---Yes.
11:08:39 31
11:08:39 32 Both to the court and to the defence if a PII claim was
11:08:45 33 being made?---Yes.
11:08:45 34
11:08:46 35 Do you know how they were stored subsequently, those
11:08:50 36 investigation files?---Well, at the conclusion of the
11:08:56 37 investigation ordinarily documents are decanted from the
11:09:01 38 folders, put in storage boxes and sent down to Laverton
11:09:07 39 archives.
11:09:10 40
11:09:20 41 Were you aware that during that proceeding Detective
11:09:25 42 Bateson redacted his own notes relating to Ms Gobbo's
11:09:29 43 involvement with [REDACTED]?---Am I aware of that?
11:09:34 44
11:09:34 45 Yes?---No.
11:09:35 46
11:09:35 47 Have you had any discussion at any time about that

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

11:09:38 1 matter?---No.
11:09:38 2
11:09:40 3 Are you aware that following the committal proceeding
11:09:44 4 Ms Gobbo thanked Mr Bateson for keeping her name out of
11:09:48 5 it?---No.
11:09:48 6
11:09:50 7 That would indicate that that was something that wouldn't
11:09:53 8 ordinarily occur?---Keeping her out of what?
11:09:57 9
11:09:57 10 Keeping her name out of the proceeding, presumably from
11:10:02 11 representing [REDACTED]?---Yeah, I'm not sure what the
11:10:07 12 context of the conversation was.
11:10:08 13
11:10:09 14 You've had no discussion with Mr Bateson about those
11:10:12 15 matters since?---No.
11:10:13 16
11:10:23 17 Following that time - if we look at your statement, your
11:10:30 18 statement jumps about two years from August 2004 in
11:10:33 19 paragraph 15 to July 2006 in paragraph 16, is that
11:10:41 20 right?---Yes.
11:10:43 21
11:10:44 22 You would agree you would have had, been aware of other
11:10:48 23 matters relevant to the Commission's work during that
11:10:51 24 period of time?---Sorry, can you be more specific?
11:10:58 25
11:11:04 26 Perhaps we'll come back to that. Is it a convenient time
11:11:06 27 for the morning break, Commissioner?
11:11:09 28
11:11:09 29 COMMISSIONER: It's a little early but we can do that. All
11:11:12 30 right, we'll have a mid-morning break now.
11:11:14 31
11:11:15 32 (Short adjournment.)
11:33:31 33
11:33:35 34 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Tittensor.
11:33:36 35
11:33:37 36 MS TITTENSOR: Thanks Commissioner, we can probably resume
11:33:40 37 in open session, at least for a short time.
11:33:45 38
11:33:45 39 COMMISSIONER: All right then.
40
11:33:50 41 ---
11:33:50 42
43
44
45
46
47

.30/10/19

8563

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:33:15 1 PROCEEDINGS IN CAMERA:

12:33:15 2
12:33:16 3 COMMISSIONER: Did you want to tender that email chain?

12:33:18 4
12:33:19 5 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, I will Commissioner.

12:33:20 6
12:33:21 7 #EXHIBIT RC648A - (Confidential) Email chain between
12:33:30 8 Smith, White and Buick 3/5/06.

12:33:25 9
12:33:26 10 #EXHIBIT RC648B - (Redacted version.)

12:33:36 11
12:33:36 12 MS TITTENSOR: Mr Buick, in February of 2006 did you become
12:33:39 13 aware that [REDACTED] had indicated that he would also plead
12:33:44 14 guilty and make statements against others?---I became aware
12:33:49 15 of that at some stage, I'm not certain when.

12:33:51 16
12:33:52 17 Given that around that time you went back to Purana to
12:33:56 18 investigate the Condello murder, it's something you would
12:34:00 19 have become aware of?---Yes.

12:34:01 20
12:34:03 21 And the people that [REDACTED] was going to give, make
12:34:08 22 statements about included Carl Williams and [REDACTED]
12:34:14 23 [REDACTED]---Yes.

12:34:15 24
12:34:20 25 To that point Solicitor 2 had represented both [REDACTED]
12:34:26 26 and [REDACTED], is that something you would have been
12:34:28 27 aware of?---No, I wouldn't think so. I may have been but I
12:34:33 28 wouldn't think so. I didn't deal with [REDACTED] for a very long
12:34:40 29 time.

12:34:40 30
12:34:40 31 Did you become aware that Justice King was handling a
12:34:46 32 number of those matters in the Supreme Court?---I recall
12:34:48 33 that.

12:34:48 34
12:34:48 35 And that at that stage she made it clear that Solicitor 2
12:34:52 36 could not represent either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] given
12:34:58 37 the conflict?---I don't recall that.

12:35:00 38
12:35:02 39 You understand why that would be the case though?---Why is
12:35:10 40 it the case?

12:35:11 41
12:35:12 42 Do you understand that she might have been able to
12:35:16 43 represent [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] while their interests
12:35:19 44 aligned?---Yes.

12:35:20 45
12:35:21 46 Once their interests didn't align she could represent
12:35:26 47 neither?---Yes.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:35:26 1
12:35:27 2 Because she held instructions for both. Do you understand
12:35:30 3 why?---No, I would have thought - I didn't realise that was
12:35:33 4 the specific reason, I thought it was one or the other,
12:35:36 5 once their interests weren't aligned. I didn't realise it
12:35:40 6 couldn't be either or.
12:35:41 7
12:35:43 8 You would understand that you were in possession of
12:35:48 9 information about both entities, having taken instructions
12:35:51 10 from both, you would know the weaknesses or strengths of
12:35:55 11 each?---Yes.
12:35:55 12
12:35:56 13 And you can't just pick one against the other?---Well I
12:36:01 14 wasn't aware specifically of that principle, and I'm a bit
12:36:05 15 confused because I note, for example, that Tony Hargreaves
12:36:09 16 is representing the handlers in this matter and represented
12:36:15 17 Paul Dale, who the handlers were handling a witness who was
12:36:20 18 giving information against Paul Dale, so to that extent
12:36:24 19 Tony Hargreaves is equally possessed and it hasn't
12:36:28 20 presented a conflict.
12:36:29 21
12:36:30 22 Might it make a difference if each of those parties are
12:36:33 23 aware?---That may well be.
12:36:35 24
12:36:35 25 And each of those parties consent?---That may well be.
12:36:38 26
12:36:55 27 That having occurred around that time, that Justice King
12:36:59 28 had made that clear that Solicitor 2 was not to represent
12:37:05 29 either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] that would have been
12:37:07 30 something readily apparent within the Purana Task
12:37:14 31 Force?---Certainly to the crews investigating those
12:37:19 32 particular murders and the management, but it wouldn't have
12:37:24 33 necessarily been known across the Task Force.
12:37:26 34
12:37:26 35 It might have been something of some excitement given that
12:37:30 36 Solicitor 2 had been charged the previous year and was the
12:37:35 37 subject of investigation by Purana?---I don't know that it
12:37:43 38 was something of excitement. It's relevant. It's
12:37:45 39 something that may well have been broadly known.
12:37:48 40
12:37:48 41 People would have not been displeased with that turn of
12:37:52 42 events?---I wouldn't think so.
12:37:53 43
12:38:04 44 Are you aware that Justice King at that stage also made it
12:38:07 45 clear that Ms Gobbo could not represent [REDACTED] because
12:38:12 46 she had a conflict of interest?---I wasn't aware of that.
12:38:18 47 Sorry, I may have been, I don't recall that.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:38:20 1
12:38:21 2 You accept that she had a conflict of interest in relation
12:38:24 3 to her representation of [REDACTED] --Yes.
12:38:26 4
12:38:36 5 The reality was, aside from the conflict that we've
12:38:39 6 previously discussed about her, about the conflict existing
12:38:43 7 because of her previous representation of [REDACTED] her
12:38:47 8 conflict was even greater than that because by that stage
12:38:50 9 she was effectively a police agent?---Yes.
12:38:55 10
12:38:56 11 And she couldn't represent [REDACTED] interests at a time
12:39:01 12 when she's serving the interests of police?---If she's
12:39:08 13 serving the interests of police as against [REDACTED]
12:39:10 14 that's correct.
12:39:11 15
12:39:19 16 [REDACTED] was entitled to have fair and impartial
12:39:22 17 representation, you would agree with that?---Yes.
12:39:24 18
12:39:24 19 And if Ms Gobbo was acting as a human source for the police
12:39:33 20 assisting them, that would be inconsistent with her being
12:39:40 21 able to provide [REDACTED] with fair and independent
12:39:45 22 representation?---Yes, if, as I say, she was assisting
12:39:50 23 police as against [REDACTED] I agree with that.
12:39:52 24
12:39:59 25 [REDACTED] came to make numerous statements by the middle of
12:40:04 26 that year, is that right?---Yes.
12:40:05 27
12:40:07 28 And he'd - were you aware that he'd spoken on a number of
12:40:13 29 occasions since March of 2006 with members of Purana about
12:40:18 30 what evidence he might give?---The lead up to it, no, I
12:40:22 31 wasn't privy to.
12:40:24 32
12:40:24 33 You became aware of that at some stage?---Yes.
12:40:26 34
12:40:27 35 When did you become aware of that?---Well I took one of the
12:40:32 36 statements, so - and I knew that a number of statements
12:40:36 37 were taken in a period of time, so I was aware of it then.
12:40:41 38
12:40:43 39 But that specifically [REDACTED] had had a number of
12:40:49 40 conversations with the likes of Jim O'Brien, the head of
12:40:52 41 the Purana Task Force, Stuart Bateson and Michelle
12:40:56 42 Kerley?---I'm aware of that now. Not in the lead up.
12:40:59 43
12:41:00 44 But were you aware of that by the time the statement was
12:41:04 45 taken, that you took?---No, I wasn't aware of the number of
12:41:12 46 visits, who made the visits. I know that [REDACTED] rolled
12:41:16 47 and statements followed, but the mechanics of how that

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:41:20 1 occurred I wasn't aware of at the time.
12:41:22 2
12:41:23 3 When did you become aware of the mechanics?---I became very
12:41:30 4 clearly aware of the mechanics when material, transcripts
12:41:35 5 of those visits were disclosed as part of the Dale
12:41:39 6 prosecution.
12:41:39 7
12:41:43 8 Were transcripts of those matters disclosed in any
12:41:46 9 proceeding before then?---I'm not sure.
12:41:50 10
12:41:52 11 In the [REDACTED] murder?---Probably.
12:41:56 12
12:41:57 13 Were there redactions made?---Probably.
12:42:01 14
12:42:03 15 Who would have done the redactions in those
12:42:14 16 matters?---Possibly me, possibly Stuart Bateson, I can't
12:42:19 17 recall.
12:42:19 18
12:42:19 19 Were you consulted about them?---Yes.
12:42:22 20
12:42:22 21 At the very least the two of you would have spoken about
12:42:25 22 what was appropriate or not to come out of those
12:42:27 23 transcripts?---Probably.
12:42:28 24
12:42:33 25 Do you recall taking out reference to Ms Gobbo from those
12:42:37 26 transcripts?---No.
12:42:39 27
12:42:40 28 Would that have been appropriate or
12:42:43 29 inappropriate?---Depends on the context.
12:42:44 30
12:42:45 31 Well if the context was about her potentially providing
12:42:49 32 advice and representation for [REDACTED] would it have been
12:42:52 33 appropriate to take them out?---No.
12:42:59 34
12:43:06 35 You had an interest in potential cooperation by [REDACTED]
12:43:09 36 because of the information in relation to a number of
12:43:12 37 matters that you'd been involved in, is that right?---Well
12:43:16 38 specifically the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] matters. _
12:43:22 39
12:43:24 40 Were you an investigator in relation to the [REDACTED]
12:43:27 41 matter as well?---I was the initial investigator, yes.
12:43:33 42
12:43:33 43 Really three matters you had a potential interest
12:43:37 44 in?---What's the third?
12:43:38 45
12:43:38 46 [REDACTED] ---I came to have an interest
12:43:42 47 in [REDACTED] once a statement was provided to me. I had no

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:43:46 1 interest or involvement prior to that statement being given
12:43:48 2 to me.
12:43:49 3
12:43:50 4 When did you become aware of Ms Gobbo's involvement in
12:43:55 5 discussions with [REDACTED] and Purana?---In the making of
12:44:02 6 the statements?
12:44:03 7
12:44:04 8 Yes?---At the time.
12:44:05 9
12:44:06 10 When you say at the time, what do you mean? As the process
12:44:09 11 of the statements were being taken or - - - ?---Yes.
12:44:12 12
12:44:14 13 Who were you told by?---I can't specifically recall but I -
12:44:20 14 and I don't specifically remember but I believe it would
12:44:23 15 have been Stuart Bateson. He was managing, coordinating
12:44:27 16 the taking of statements from [REDACTED] by various
12:44:31 17 statement takers.
12:44:35 18
12:44:38 19 Are you aware that Purana investigators provided, through
12:44:44 20 the SDU, transcripts of conversations held between them and
12:44:49 21 [REDACTED] unbeknownst to [REDACTED] and his solicitor, for
12:44:54 22 the purposes of her having further discussions with [REDACTED]
12:44:57 23 [REDACTED] --No.
12:44:57 24
12:44:59 25 What are your thoughts on that?---Just describe that
12:45:02 26 scenario again.
12:45:02 27
12:45:03 28 [REDACTED] and Purana investigators have had certain
12:45:07 29 conversations about what he might say in his statements if
12:45:11 30 he were to make them, okay?---Yes.
12:45:13 31
12:45:13 32 And you've seen some of those transcripts?---Yes.
12:45:15 33
12:45:18 34 Purana investigators provide transcripts, or at least
12:45:23 35 partial transcripts, of those matters to Ms Gobbo through
12:45:30 36 the SDU so that she can have a read of those and have
12:45:35 37 further discussions with [REDACTED] about his cooperation.
12:45:39 38 That's unknown to [REDACTED] and unknown to [REDACTED]
12:45:44 39 solicitor?---Right.
12:45:45 40
12:45:45 41 What are your thoughts?---It seems odd that if Gobbo is
12:45:49 42 representing [REDACTED] that they wouldn't be provided
12:45:53 43 direct from investigators to Gobbo.
12:45:58 44
12:45:58 45 By this stage it's apparent that Justice King has said
12:46:01 46 Ms Gobbo is conflicted and can't represent [REDACTED]
12:46:05 47 That's known to members of the Purana Task Force?---I

.30/10/19

8591

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:46:09 1 accept that. I don't recall that but I accept that.
12:46:11 2
12:46:12 3 [REDACTED] has at least a solicitor on the record.
12:46:16 4 Ordinarily investigators would have contact directly with
12:46:22 5 the solicitor, would you accept that? They might have
12:46:25 6 contact directly with a barrister but ordinarily if they're
12:46:29 7 providing documentation it would be through a
12:46:31 8 solicitor?---In the ordinary course of events with many
12:46:33 9 Homicide investigations I've been involved in yes, you deal
12:46:37 10 with the solicitor. It was quite a unique scenario at
12:46:40 11 Purana that Gobbo was so involved, indeed not just Purana,
12:46:44 12 but so involved, hands-on herself. I never quite
12:46:49 13 understood how that worked.
12:46:50 14
12:46:51 15 Might it have worked because it was known that she was
12:46:55 16 assisting police and not assisting her, necessarily her
12:46:59 17 clients?---That's a possibility.
12:47:00 18
12:47:08 19 That scenario that I've just taken you through, Ms Gobbo
12:47:12 20 through the mechanism the SDU, being provided with those
12:47:19 21 transcripts in secret so that she then might go and have
12:47:22 22 some further conversations with [REDACTED] who Purana were
12:47:25 23 wanting to roll?---Wanting to roll? He had rolled.
12:47:30 24
12:47:31 25 Not by this stage. These transcripts, these conversations
12:47:35 26 were occurring prior to him agreeing to roll?---Yes.
12:47:40 27
12:47:40 28 They started in March, ended in June. At some stage within
12:47:44 29 that period some of those transcripts at least were
12:47:47 30 provided to Ms Gobbo so that she could have some further
12:47:50 31 discussions with [REDACTED] about whether he was going to
12:47:57 32 assist police or not?---Right.
12:47:58 33
12:47:59 34 That was done secretly by Purana giving them to the SDU to
12:48:04 35 give to Ms Gobbo?---Okay. I wasn't aware of that.
12:48:07 36
12:48:07 37 No. These are transcripts that she wasn't to keep either,
12:48:14 38 these are transcripts for her to read, to give back, and
12:48:19 39 this is all a process that's engaged in without the
12:48:22 40 knowledge of, as I say, [REDACTED] himself, her client,
12:48:27 41 supposedly, and the instructing solicitor. Now, what do
12:48:33 42 you say as to that procedure?---It's a conflict of interest
12:48:39 43 clearly.
12:48:44 44
12:48:44 45 Is it an extraordinary practice that the police themselves
12:48:48 46 have engaged in?---I've never heard of that occurring
12:48:52 47 before.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:48:52 1
12:48:53 2 A deception upon [REDACTED] ---I don't know what the
12:48:58 3 motivation was.
12:48:59 4
12:49:01 5 It's apparent during this process that Purana are pretty
12:49:05 6 keen to get [REDACTED] to roll?---Yes.
12:49:07 7
12:49:08 8 That was something they would have been excited at the
12:49:12 9 prospect for. He was another person that might have a lot
12:49:15 10 of information about a lot of different things?---Yes, as
12:49:19 11 it turned out.
12:49:20 12
12:49:23 13 Now, at that stage the evidence initially against him was
12:49:30 14 simply that of [REDACTED] but by March of 2006 [REDACTED] had
12:49:37 15 also provided evidence against him?---Yes.
12:49:41 16
12:49:42 17 But in essence the evidence against him was of two
12:49:46 18 witnesses who might have some credit
12:49:50 19 issues?---Predominantly yes, there would have been some
12:49:53 20 other evidence but predominantly yes, I accept that.
12:49:56 21
12:49:56 22 He was entitled to get some independent and impartial
12:50:01 23 representation before he pleaded guilty to [REDACTED] ---Yes.
12:50:04 24
12:50:06 25 Ms Gobbo was not in a position to provide that advice to
12:50:10 26 him?---I accept that.
12:50:11 27
12:50:20 28 If he was asking police about whether or not he should seek
12:50:29 29 advice from Ms Gobbo or anyone else, what would you have
12:50:34 30 said?---I don't know, that's a hypothetical that didn't
12:50:38 31 happen.
12:50:40 32
12:50:40 33 Would you have let him know in no uncertain terms that you
12:50:44 34 cannot get independent impartial advice from Ms Gobbo?---I
12:50:48 35 would be very concerned at that stage that that course of
12:50:51 36 action would undermine the admissibility of evidence and I
12:50:55 37 would be suggesting that he gets advice elsewhere.
12:50:58 38
12:51:02 39 Knowing those things, any senior investigator within Purana
12:51:08 40 would, you would think, have the same reaction?---As I've
12:51:13 41 just described?
12:51:13 42
12:51:13 43 Yes?---In possession of that knowledge I would expect so.
12:51:16 44
12:51:16 45 You would know it's wrong, is that right?---Well yes.
12:51:23 46
12:51:24 47 If you know Ms Gobbo is a human source and she is advising

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:51:29 1 this person potentially to plead guilty [REDACTED] in those
12:51:34 2 circumstances I've just described, you'd know it's
12:51:38 3 wrong?---Well, if I knew that she was a human source and
12:51:40 4 providing information as against [REDACTED] then yes,
12:51:44 5 that's wrong. But if I know that she's a human source as
12:51:48 6 well as representing [REDACTED] and not necessarily
12:51:54 7 providing information as against [REDACTED] but so happens
12:51:59 8 to be a human source, of itself I don't see as an issue.
12:52:04 9
12:52:05 10 If she's being used by the police to assist them to get
12:52:10 11 [REDACTED] - - - ?---Yes, I agree.
12:52:12 12
12:52:12 13 - - - over the line?---Yes, I agree.
12:52:13 14
12:52:14 15 If there's any possibility of that you know it's
12:52:17 16 wrong?---Yes.
12:52:17 17
12:52:17 18 And any senior investigator within Purana, within the
12:52:20 19 police would know that that's wrong?---Yes.
12:52:23 20
12:52:34 21 Now as you say in July 2006 Mr Bateson was coordinating
12:52:41 22 various statements being taken from [REDACTED] ---Yes.
12:52:43 23
12:52:45 24 How was it decided who would witness and acknowledge their
12:52:50 25 statements, do you know?---Sorry, how was it decided?
12:52:54 26
12:52:54 27 Who would witness and acknowledge various statements that
12:52:56 28 were being taken, he made many, many statements?---I think
12:52:59 29 the investigators involved in the investigations were
12:53:03 30 brought in for the most part to take those statements,
12:53:07 31 hence why I came in to take the [REDACTED] ' statement. I
12:53:11 32 had no involvement in the [REDACTED] investigation but one sort
12:53:16 33 of seemed to follow the other so I took the
12:53:21 34 [REDACTED] statement.
12:53:21 35
12:53:23 36 You say in your statement at paragraph 16, "On 10 July 2006
12:53:28 37 I commenced taking a statement from [REDACTED] in relation
12:53:30 38 to the [REDACTED] murder of [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] murder of
12:53:36 39 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
12:53:36 40
12:53:36 41 "This statement was continued over the 14th and 19th of
12:53:40 42 July"?---Yes.
12:53:40 43
12:53:41 44 "On 19 July I had a note that the statements were being
12:53:45 45 checked by Ms Gobbo. I did not engage directly with
12:53:48 46 Ms Gobbo over this time"?---Yes.
12:53:49 47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:53:51 1 Is that one statement that referred to both murders or two
12:53:54 2 statements?---One statement, two murders.
12:53:56 3
12:53:57 4 And who was implicated in those statements?---In relation
12:54:01 5 to ██████████ it was ██████████ and I believe
12:54:10 6 ██████████. And then in relation to ██████████ I
12:54:20 7 believe ██████████ and others.
12:54:27 8
12:54:28 9 Had ██████████ been a suspect himself in either of those
12:54:32 10 murders?---Certainly a person of interest.
12:54:47 11
12:54:47 12 What's the difference, is there a huge difference within
12:54:51 13 Victoria Police as to a person of interest and a
12:54:54 14 suspect?---No, it's not, not really that clearly defined
12:54:58 15 but a suspect is someone you would have sufficient
12:55:02 16 information to arrest, to seek a warrant, an evidence
12:55:09 17 warrant. But a person of interest might be far more
12:55:13 18 peripheral, but where the line crosses from one to the
12:55:17 19 other it's a bit nebulous.
12:55:21 20
12:55:22 21 Was there any concern that ██████████ might be telling
12:55:25 22 mistruths or not the whole truth in relation to the
12:55:28 23 statement you were taking?---Absolutely.
12:55:30 24
12:55:33 25 Where did those concerns arise?---He was a career criminal.
12:55:37 26
12:55:41 27 Did you have discussions with others about those
12:55:45 28 concerns?---Yes.
12:55:46 29
12:55:47 30 Mr Bateson?---Probably.
12:55:48 31
12:55:50 32 If we can bring up ICR p.353, please. And just scroll
12:56:12 33 down. Keep going. You'll see there in the middle that
12:56:25 34 Ms Gobbo rang Detective Bateson, ██████████ not being
12:56:31 35 totally truthful re murder matters. Ms Gobbo to speak to
12:56:36 36 same Thursday morning, ██████████ 2006". Do you see
12:56:42 37 that?---Yes.
12:56:42 38
12:56:45 39 The ICR then goes on to refer to Ms Gobbo's location on the
12:56:51 40 day of the ██████████ murder and her contact with ██████████
12:56:58 41 ██████████ on the day of the murder and her supplying telephone
12:57:02 42 bills to Detective Bateson in order to assist his
12:57:05 43 investigations. Do you see that?---Yes.
12:57:08 44
12:57:14 45 She would potentially be a witness in that matter
12:57:17 46 again?---She would be?
12:57:18 47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:57:18 1 Yes?---Yes.
12:57:23 2
12:57:23 3 I think I put to you yesterday in relation to certain of
12:57:26 4 her interactions potentially making her a witness in
12:57:29 5 respect of those events and you agreed, but again providing
12:57:35 6 - you see there we're talking about [REDACTED]
12:57:37 7 nominating [REDACTED] as an [REDACTED] and Ms Gobbo providing
12:57:42 8 telephone bills potentially in relation to that matter as
12:57:47 9 evidence in that matter?---Potentially a witness, yes.
12:57:50 10
12:57:55 11 A couple of days later on [REDACTED] there were arrangements
12:57:59 12 made with Purana for Ms Gobbo to meet with [REDACTED] at the
12:58:07 13 Victoria Police Centre. It might not be recorded in that
12:58:11 14 but it's recorded in Mr Bateson's diary as occurring
12:58:15 15 between 11 o'clock and 12.30. It's consistent with
12:58:21 16 Ms Gobbo's indication that she was going to speak with him
12:58:24 17 on that day. Were you aware that that was occurring?---No.
12:58:27 18
12:58:27 19 Is it likely you would have been aware through
12:58:31 20 discussions?---Did you say [REDACTED] at the Victoria Police
12:58:35 21 Centre?
12:58:35 22
12:58:36 23 Yes?---No.
12:58:36 24
12:58:40 25 You commenced taking the statement on 10 July. On 11 July
12:58:45 26 Ms Gobbo is speaking with Detective Bateson about [REDACTED]
12:58:49 27 not being totally truthful re murder matters. I think
12:58:53 28 you've agreed earlier that it's likely that you would have
12:58:56 29 had some discussions with Bateson about him not being
12:59:00 30 truthful?---Probably.
12:59:01 31
12:59:01 32 Do you accept it's likely you would have been given this
12:59:04 33 information that Ms Gobbo is going to speak to him?---No.
12:59:07 34
12:59:08 35 Why wouldn't you have been given that information?---I
12:59:10 36 don't know.
12:59:10 37
12:59:11 38 Why would it not be likely that you would have had those
12:59:15 39 discussions with Detective Bateson?---I don't know. I
12:59:17 40 don't know why we didn't have those conversations.
12:59:21 41
12:59:21 42 Is it likely that you would have given you - you accept - -
12:59:27 43 - ?---Possible.
12:59:27 44
12:59:28 45 - - - you had discussions with him as to concerns about
12:59:31 46 [REDACTED] not being truthful and it seems he's also having
12:59:35 47 these discussions with Ms Gobbo and she's going to speak to

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

12:59:37 1 the witness?--I'm not aware of that chronology of
12:59:41 2 discussions. My concerns about [REDACTED] not being a
12:59:47 3 truthful witness are not isolated to the occasion I took a
12:59:53 4 statement from him. I said to you before he's a career
12:59:58 5 criminal. I didn't trust him, I didn't trust any of them,
13:00:01 6 hence why their statements, their assertions need to be
13:00:05 7 corroborated.
13:00:06 8
13:00:06 9 We have the day after you commencing to commence a
13:00:09 10 statement about a number of murders, Ms Gobbo having a
13:00:12 11 conversation with Detective Bateson about him not being
13:00:16 12 totally truthful re murder matters?--Yes, I follow that.
13:00:18 13
13:00:19 14 She goes it seems to meet with him a couple of days later,
13:00:22 15 the [REDACTED] as I've indicated and then later that day tells
13:00:28 16 her source handler that [REDACTED] is up to 80 per cent
13:00:32 17 truth now. Were you aware of those kinds of communications
13:00:40 18 at all?--With source handlers?
13:00:41 19
13:00:41 20 Yes?--No.
13:00:43 21
13:00:43 22 Any of that information filter through?--No.
13:00:49 23
13:00:50 24 You continue, as you say, to take the statement from
13:00:55 25 [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] and then on [REDACTED] you complete, the
13:01:01 26 statement is completed and it was signed?--Yes.
13:01:03 27
13:01:07 28 Were there any draft versions of that statement, do you
13:01:10 29 know?--No.
13:01:10 30
13:01:11 31 There were none?--I don't think so. I don't recall any.
13:01:14 32
13:01:14 33 No. And there were none provided to defence?--No.
13:01:17 34
13:01:28 35 Commissioner - sorry, I was looking at the wrong time.
13:01:32 36
13:01:32 37 COMMISSIONER: Wishful thinking.
13:01:35 38
13:01:35 39 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, I think that's right. I think we're
13:01:37 40 all wishful. Now, you, as I took you through yesterday,
13:01:43 41 provided your redacted notes to the Commission earlier this
13:01:47 42 year?--Yes.
13:01:48 43
13:01:49 44 And you'd redacted those yourself?--Yes.
13:01:51 45
13:01:52 46 If we can put up the note on [REDACTED] provided to the
13:02:00 47 Commission earlier this year. Do you see that note? This

.30/10/19

8597

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:02:05 1 is the day that [REDACTED] statement is signed?---Yes.
13:02:08 2
13:02:11 3 It's had a number of things redacted out of it. And this
13:02:20 4 is the day I think in your statement you say you have a
13:02:23 5 note that the statements are being checked by Ms Gobbo and
13:02:26 6 you didn't engage directly with her, is that right?---Yes.
13:02:29 7
13:02:32 8 Now, if we can put on the screen beside that a further
13:02:43 9 version of that page, please. Do you see there down the
13:02:57 10 bottom a difference between the two pages that have been
13:03:04 11 provided to the Commission?---Yes.
13:03:05 12
13:03:08 13 Can you read the note down the bottom? It says, "Boris,
13:03:16 14 here is the statement. It has red pen on it. These
13:03:24 15 alterations were made by Nicola last night. If you don't
13:03:28 16 have this format let me know and I will email to you.
13:03:32 17 Regards, Stu"?---Yes.
13:03:34 18
13:03:35 19 Can you explain why that note was not provided to the
13:03:38 20 Commission on the page first provided?---No.
13:03:43 21
13:03:45 22 Do you agree that that's a note relating to the provision
13:03:48 23 of the statement by - do you agree that that indicates that
13:04:00 24 you were provided with a statement of [REDACTED] with
13:04:04 25 alterations on it made by Nicola in red pen?---Yes.
13:04:08 26
13:04:11 27 If we look at the other page it's apparent that before that
13:04:15 28 photocopy was made that Post-it Note had been
13:04:18 29 removed?---Yes.
13:04:18 30
13:04:19 31 Can you explain that?---No.
13:04:21 32
13:04:27 33 It's apparent that the Post-it Note was put back on to the
13:04:31 34 page?---Yes.
13:04:33 35
13:04:35 36 And you were the one responsible for making the redactions
13:04:40 37 and providing those to the Commission?---Yes. I haven't
13:04:46 38 made all those redactions, but yes.
13:04:49 39
13:04:53 40 You've just indicated that there were no draft statements
13:04:56 41 in relation to [REDACTED]---That was my recollection.
13:04:59 42
13:04:59 43 That indicates that there must have been a draft statement
13:05:01 44 in existence?---Yes.
13:05:03 45
13:05:03 46 Where did that go?---I don't know.
13:05:06 47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:05:12 1 What were the alterations made to that statement by Nicola
13:05:16 2 Gobbo?---I don't recall.
13:05:17 3
13:05:17 4 Do you think it would be important to have kept that
13:05:19 5 statement?---If they were material alterations, yes.
13:05:23 6
13:05:23 7 Regardless, do you think it would have been important to
13:05:26 8 keep that statement?---Yes.
13:05:27 9
13:05:31 10 You've got this note, if that note was ever disclosed
13:05:34 11 that's the first question anyone in any trial or committal
13:05:37 12 would ask you about, "What were the alterations, let me see
13:05:40 13 that statement"?---Yes.
13:05:41 14
13:05:44 15 Do you agree that should have been disclosed?---Yes.
13:05:46 16
13:05:48 17 To the Commission earlier this year and also to any accused
13:05:53 18 in relation to that statement?---Yes.
13:05:55 19
13:05:57 20 It never was?---I'm not certain.
13:06:01 21
13:06:03 22 You're pretty certain there was never any draft statement
13:06:06 23 provided to any accused?---I believe so.
13:06:13 24
13:06:21 25 COMMISSIONER: Sorry, could you just clarify that? You're
13:06:25 26 certain that there was or there wasn't a draft
13:06:27 27 statement?---I'm not certain if a copy was retained and
13:06:31 28 provided or not.
13:06:34 29
13:06:34 30 All right. You don't know whether one was given to the
13:06:37 31 accused?---That's right.
13:06:39 32
13:06:39 33 All right.
13:06:40 34
13:06:40 35 MS TITTENSOR: If there's no cross-examination about any
13:06:42 36 statement with red pen or alterations made on it in any of
13:06:46 37 the proceedings following, would that indicate that it's
13:06:49 38 likely it wasn't provided?---It may well.
13:06:53 39
13:06:59 40 That indicates that Mr Bateson had had some contact with,
13:07:06 41 directly or indirectly, with Ms Gobbo?---Yes, which I
13:07:10 42 clearly was aware of because I make reference to that in my
13:07:14 43 statement.
13:07:14 44
13:07:15 45 Yes. That she'd checked the statement?---Yes.
13:07:17 46
13:07:17 47 You say that in your statement but you don't say anything

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:07:20 1 about her having made alterations to the statement?---No.
13:07:23 2
13:07:24 3 Were those alterations ultimately made, do you know?---No,
13:07:29 4 I don't recall.
13:07:30 5
13:07:31 6 Were there email versions of that statement?---I don't
13:07:36 7 recall. There may have been. I can't recall if the
13:07:39 8 statement was taken on a stand alone or on a networked
13:07:43 9 computer.
13:07:44 10
13:07:44 11 It seems to be the case that Mr Bateson's got a copy that
13:07:49 12 could be emailed to you?---Yes.
13:07:50 13
13:07:52 14 Presumably by this stage you would have also had a copy
13:07:56 15 because you were taking the statement?---Perhaps an
13:08:01 16 electronic copy, but yes.
13:08:02 17
13:08:04 18 Would there have been copies emailed to, through this
13:08:08 19 process to various investigators to go off and try and
13:08:12 20 corroborate?---Possibly.
13:08:14 21
13:08:16 22 Do you know if there were any alterations made to the
13:08:19 23 statement in terms of what could or could not be
13:08:22 24 corroborated during that period of time?---I don't recall.
13:08:24 25
13:08:30 26 You see on that page there's a second Post-it Note?---Yes.
13:08:35 27
13:08:35 28 Do you know what that is?---The one on the above right?
13:08:41 29
13:08:42 30 Yes?---I don't know whose handwriting it is.
13:08:50 31
13:08:51 32 Are you aware it's Ms Gobbo's handwriting?---No.
13:08:54 33
13:08:54 34 In red pen?---No.
13:08:56 35
13:08:56 36 Seemingly something that would likely have been attached to
13:08:59 37 that statement that you, the draft statement that you
13:09:01 38 received back with red pen on it?---Possibly.
13:09:04 39
13:09:07 40 Was that ever provided to the defence in any of those
13:09:11 41 proceedings?---I'm not sure but possibly.
13:09:20 42
13:09:21 43 You would have understood when you received that statement
13:09:24 44 back, assuming it contained that Post-it Note there, that
13:09:30 45 that was from Ms Gobbo?---Possibly.
13:09:34 46
13:09:35 47 And that she was herself providing information that could

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:09:40 1 be followed up on to assist the police?--Well, that wasn't
13:09:46 2 my understanding at the time. My understanding was, of
13:09:49 3 course, that she was his barrister representing him.
13:09:52 4
13:09:52 5 Yes?--And it seems that she's correcting a mistake by
13:09:58 6 [REDACTED] as to who his solicitor was.
13:10:01 7
13:10:01 8 Yes. So the note for the transcript reads, "[REDACTED] solicitor
13:10:07 9 was actually Jim Valos from Valos Black. He had a letter
13:10:11 10 from [REDACTED] however [REDACTED] may not know this and may
13:10:15 11 genuinely believe it's [REDACTED]?--Yes.
13:10:20 12
13:10:21 13 Whether or not that's made its way into [REDACTED]
13:10:24 14 statement, it may not have, because all she's saying is, he
13:10:28 15 "Might genuinely have that belief but the reality is
13:10:33 16 this"?--Do you have a copy of the statement here?
13:10:35 17
13:10:35 18 It?--It may well be that his statement asserts that his
13:10:39 19 lawyer was [REDACTED].
13:10:40 20
13:10:41 21 I'm not suggesting otherwise. All I'm saying to you is
13:10:42 22 that she's providing you with information as to where a
13:10:44 23 particular letter might actually be found?--Yes.
13:10:46 24
13:11:21 25 If we can go to the day book notes.
13:11:25 26
13:11:25 27 COMMISSIONER: Did you want to tender those documents at
13:11:27 28 this stage or not?
13:11:29 29
13:11:30 30 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, I'll tender those, Commissioner.
13:11:32 31
13:11:33 32 COMMISSIONER: These are extracts from the witness's day
13:11:36 33 book or diary?
13:11:43 34
13:11:44 35 MS TITTENSOR: Day book, Commissioner.
13:11:45 36
13:11:46 37 COMMISSIONER: Extract from the day book, from the
13:11:49 38 witness's day book dated what date?
13:11:52 39
13:11:52 40 MS TITTENSOR: [REDACTED] 2006, Commissioner.
13:11:59 41
13:12:01 42 #EXHIBIT RC649A - (Confidential) Extract from left-hand.
13:12:02 43 side of Boris Buick's day book [REDACTED] 06.
13:12:02 44
13:12:03 45 #EXHIBIT RC649B - (Redacted version.)
13:12:06 46
13:12:06 47 COMMISSIONER: How would I describe this as opposed to the

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:12:09 1 one on the right-hand side? Without Post-it Note I
13:12:12 2 suppose. Without Post-it Note will be A and B and without
13:12:23 3 Post-it Note will be C and the redacted version D.
13:12:26 4
13:12:28 5 #EXHIBIT RC649C - (Confidential) Extract from Boris Buick's
13:12:30 6 day book with Post-it Note [REDACTED] 06.
13:12:30 7
13:12:30 8 #EXHIBIT RC649D - (Redacted version.)
13:12:32 9
13:12:32 10 COMMISSIONER: It's pretty close to the right time now.
13:12:35 11
13:12:35 12 MS TITTENSOR: Excellent.
13:12:36 13
13:12:36 14 COMMISSIONER: If that's convenient we'll adjourn.
13:12:43 15
13:12:43 16 MS MARTIN: Commissioner, before we do adjourn.
13:12:45 17
13:12:45 18 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Martin.
13:12:46 19
13:12:46 20 MS MARTIN: I wasn't cognisant of the fact that the
13:12:48 21 submissions I made earlier were actually during open court.
13:12:53 22 I laboured under the misapprehension that we were in closed
13:12:57 23 court and my instructions are now that if we could seek a
13:13:01 24 restriction on publication in respect of the exchange as
13:13:05 25 between myself and the Commission, as well as the
13:13:09 26 references to the ACC examinations, at least temporarily
13:13:15 27 whilst - - -
13:13:15 28
13:13:16 29 COMMISSIONER: Why is that? Really, this, I'm trying to
13:13:20 30 conduct this hearing in public as much as possible. Why
13:13:23 31 should that, why should I give that order?
13:13:28 32
13:13:29 33 MS MARTIN: I appreciate that, Commissioner, but the
13:13:30 34 sensitivities in respect of any ACC examinations that may
13:13:34 35 be subject to these ECDs, the examiner confidentiality
13:13:37 36 directions, are extremely strict and in order for the ACIC
13:13:41 37 to ensure that there is compliance with those directions
13:13:44 38 there will need to be some further inquiries made at the
13:13:48 39 ACIC's end to ensure that there hasn't been a breach of
13:13:53 40 those particular directions. In respect of that we do
13:13:56 41 request that there is at least an interim non-publication
13:13:59 42 order for perhaps just 24 hours whilst some of those
13:14:03 43 inquiries can be made.
13:14:04 44
13:14:04 45 COMMISSIONER: What do you say, Ms Tittensor?
13:14:06 46
13:14:07 47 MS TITTENSOR: I think it will have already been

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:14:11 1 live-streamed, Commissioner. I don't see any harm in a
13:14:16 2 temporary restriction perhaps in the transcript this
13:14:22 3 evening, but I would imagine at least two of those three
13:14:27 4 matters have been publicly aired and I wouldn't be
13:14:31 5 surprised about the third one as well.
13:14:34 6
13:14:44 7 COMMISSIONER: So the order that's requested is to be no
13:14:49 8 publication of - - -
13:14:53 9
13:14:53 10 MS TITTENSOR: I think the Mokbel matter is the one that
13:14:56 11 might potentially need some checking, although that's been
13:15:01 12 publicly examined upon previously.
13:15:05 13
13:15:05 14 COMMISSIONER: There's no publication of the reference to
13:15:07 15 the coercive hearing referenced at 11.50 am and the
13:15:12 16 subsequent exchange about those hearings. So the live
13:15:17 17 stream has already gone, so that's redundant, and an
13:15:21 18 interim order for 24 hours, is that - - -
13:15:24 19
13:15:24 20 MS MARTIN: Commissioner, thank you for that. The request
13:15:26 21 is actually in respect of the, the references to ACC
13:15:30 22 examinations that preceded the exchange as between myself
13:15:34 23 and counsel assisting.
13:15:35 24
13:15:35 25 COMMISSIONER: You want both out?
13:15:37 26
13:15:37 27 MS MARTIN: If that's possible please.
13:15:39 28
13:15:39 29 COMMISSIONER: For 24 hours. In terms of the streaming,
13:15:43 30 the horse has bolted.
13:15:44 31
13:15:45 32 MS MARTIN: Clearly.
13:15:45 33
13:15:46 34 COMMISSIONER: Pursuant to s.26 of the *Inquiries Act* there
13:15:49 35 is to be no publication of the reference to the coercive
13:15:54 36 hearing at 11.50 am or of the subsequent exchange about
13:16:03 37 those hearings between counsel assisting the Commission,
13:16:06 38 counsel for the ACIC and the Commissioner from 11.50 to
13:16:13 39 11.54 am. All such references are to be removed from the
13:16:18 40 published transcript. This order is to remain in place for
13:16:22 41 24 hours unless a further order is made and a copy of the
13:16:31 42 order is to be published on the door of the hearing room.
13:16:39 43 All right then.
13:16:41 44
13:16:42 45 MS MARTIN: Commissioner, can I just check please, does
13:16:44 46 that refer to the ACC examinations that preceded the
13:16:47 47 exchange?

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:16:48 1
13:16:49 2 COMMISSIONER: Yes, the reference to the coercive hearing.
13:16:53 3
13:16:53 4 MS MARTIN: Proceedings. There were other references to
13:16:56 5 the examinations by and for the ACC other than in respect
13:17:00 6 of coercive proceedings. I believe that's the case, I
13:17:04 7 don't have access to the transcript but that's my
13:17:07 8 understanding.
13:17:08 9
13:17:08 10 COMMISSIONER: What are you wanting? What do you want the
13:17:11 11 order to say?
13:17:12 12
13:17:12 13 MS MARTIN: Any references to examinations by or for the
13:17:15 14 ACC in respect of that period of the cross-examination
13:17:22 15 preceding or - - -
13:17:24 16
13:17:24 17 COMMISSIONER: Any reference to an ACC coercive hearing, is
13:17:27 18 that what you want?
13:17:29 19
13:17:29 20 MS MARTIN: Or examination, I believe that would capture
13:17:31 21 it.
13:17:32 22
13:17:32 23 COMMISSIONER: Is that all right with you, Ms Tittensor?
13:17:34 24
13:17:35 25 MS TITTENSOR: For that minor patch I think where my
13:17:39 26 learned friend got up and indicated the objection. There
13:17:41 27 had been some earlier cross-examination from this witness
13:17:44 28 about Mr Richter examining upon those matters and I don't
13:17:48 29 seek - - -
13:17:48 30
13:17:48 31 COMMISSIONER: I don't quite understand whether she's
13:17:51 32 wanting every single reference out or whether it's just
13:17:55 33 around about 11.50.
13:17:56 34
13:17:57 35 MS MARTIN: It would include the prior aspects that are in
13:17:59 36 the transcript.
13:18:00 37
13:18:00 38 COMMISSIONER: Everything out.
13:18:01 39
13:18:02 40 MS MARTIN: As I've indicated we will seek instructions and
13:18:05 41 try to determine whether or not that is in fact - - -
13:18:07 42
13:18:07 43 COMMISSIONER: You'll need to justify your application with
13:18:10 44 various legislation and whatever it's based on.
13:18:14 45
13:18:15 46 MS MARTIN: Understood, Commissioner.
13:18:16 47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:18:17 1 COMMISSIONER: So I'll amend the order so that it's to be
13:18:19 2 that there's no publication of reference to any ACC
13:18:24 3 coercive hearings or examinations. All right, we'll
13:18:35 4 adjourn until 2 o'clock.

5
13:18:38 6 <(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)

13:18:38 7
13:18:38 8 LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

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

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

13:18:39 1 UPON RESUMING AT 2.00 PM:
2
14:05:25 3 COMMISSIONER: Yes Ms Tittensor. Could we just close the
14:05:27 4 door. Yes, thank you. We are in closed hearing.
14:05:38 5
14:05:38 6 <BORIS BUICK, recalled:
14:05:41 7
14:05:42 8 MS TITTENSOR: Mr Buick, if I can ask you to look at the
14:05:44 9 statement that will come up on the screen. I think this is
14:05:46 10 the statement of ██████████ dated ██████████ 2006 and this is
14:05:51 11 the particular page that refers to that paragraph, the
14:05:58 12 subject of that Post-it Note, the top Post-it Note?---Yes.
13
14:06:03 14 As I understand it this is the version of the statement
14:06:05 15 that was signed?---Yes.
16
14:06:07 17 It continued to at that stage refer to ██████████ in
14:06:20 18 terms of him being the possessor of that letter?---Yes.
14:06:24 19 Notwithstanding Nicola Gobbo's note, yes.
20
14:06:26 21 If we can go to p.134 of that document. Are you aware that
14:06:32 22 ██████████ signed a further statement in ██████████ of 2008?---A
14:06:37 23 further three I believe.
24
14:06:39 25 Yes. That statement again addressed the issue of the
14:06:48 26 letter, do you recall that?---I don't recall it but I don't
14:06:52 27 dispute it.
28
14:06:55 29 I think that those people are being mentioned at the bottom
14:06:58 30 of that page. If you see that, ██████████ was supposed
14:07:09 31 to have this letter, the letter that's being referred
14:07:11 32 to?---Yes.
33
14:07:13 34 Do you accept that that's a statement, if we scroll
14:07:16 35 through, made by ██████████ - it might be of some length but
14:07:21 36 that was a statement made by him, you'll accept, on ██████████
14:07:24 37 2008?---Yes.
38
14:07:27 39 Do you recall it being determined at some stage that that
14:07:30 40 letter might be potential corroboration for ██████████ in
14:07:34 41 the case?---I don't specifically recall. I know it was -
14:07:44 42 the letter was an issue. It was a letter, quite a lengthy
14:07:50 43 letter, some musings of Paul Kallipolitis, but I don't
14:07:57 44 think they were really relevant to these matters.
45
14:07:59 46 The letter, do you recall that there was a warrant executed
14:08:05 47 on the office of Jim Valos?---Yes.

.30/10/19

8606

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
14:08:08 2 And the letter was recovered and that was executed on 3
14:08:11 3 July 2008?---I accept that.
4
14:08:16 5 That was the subject of Ms Gobbo's previous
14:08:21 6 information?---The correction?
7
14:08:22 8 The correction?---Yes, that's right.
9
14:08:23 10 Are you aware if that is the method by which the warrant
14:08:29 11 came to be executed on Mr Valos's office and the letter
14:08:34 12 recovered?---I'm not sure what the affidavit stated was the
14:08:39 13 basis of the evidence but it's possible that is part of it.
14
14:08:48 15 Were you aware that Mr Valos, following the recovery of
14:08:51 16 that letter from him, [REDACTED]
14:08:56 17 [REDACTED] ---I think I do recall that now that you
14:08:59 18 mention it.
19
14:09:03 20 [REDACTED]
14:09:06 21 [REDACTED]
14:09:10 22 [REDACTED]
14:09:13 23 [REDACTED]
14:09:18 24 [REDACTED]
25
14:09:21 26 Yes?---I accept that.
27
14:09:22 28 Is that something you would have been aware of at the
14:09:24 29 time?---No.
30
14:09:30 31 [REDACTED]
14:09:34 32 [REDACTED]
14:09:38 33 [REDACTED]
14:09:41 34 [REDACTED] Does that accord
14:09:46 35 with your understanding?---I accept that.
36
14:09:50 37 Was there ever any query of Ms Gobbo as to how she became
14:09:54 38 aware that Mr Valos had the letter?---No. Well not by me.
39
14:10:08 40 If we can go to the ICRs p.105, please.
41
14:10:21 42 COMMISSIONER: Did you want to tender this statement?
14:10:24 43
14:10:25 44 MS TITTENSOR: Yes, I will tender those, two or three pages
14:10:28 45 of those statements. The first was the paragraph on - I
14:10:37 46 can't say what page number of that statement unfortunately,
14:10:41 47 Commissioner.

.30/10/19

8607

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
14:10:41 2 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Do you just want to tender the page?
14:10:51 3
14:10:51 4 MS TITTENSOR: It's a paragraph in relation to a letter,
14:10:56 5 [REDACTED] statement dated [REDACTED] 2006 was the first one.
14:11:08 6
14:11:25 7 COMMISSIONER: It's the two paragraphs beginning "I have
14:11:27 8 explained" and down to "he wanted to get it".
9
10 MS TITTENSOR: Sorry, it's the "I could" - - -
11
12 COMMISSIONER: "I could understand", it's that paragraph?
13
14 MS TITTENSOR: It might be those two paragraphs.
15
16 COMMISSIONER: Those two?
17
18 MS TITTENSOR: Yes.
19
20 Commissioner: The two paragraphs beginning "I have
14:11:28 21 explained" and then finishing in the second be paragraph,
14:11:31 22 "It was soon after that I started to distance myself from
14:11:34 23 him".
14:11:35 24
14:11:36 25 MS TITTENSOR: I might add to those, Commissioner, I'm just
14:11:38 26 reading down the statement referring to the letter further.
14:11:42 27 In any case, the next two paragraphs, so four paragraphs.
28
14:11:45 29 COMMISSIONER: Okay. Ending with "I believe Andrew" - no,
14:11:53 30 the next paragraph. Ending with "I've spoken about [REDACTED]
14:11:59 31 [REDACTED] in my statement". Is that where we're wanting to
14:12:03 32 finish it?
14:12:03 33
14:12:03 34 MS TITTENSOR: Ending with the one line paragraph, "I
14:12:08 35 believe that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] wanted to kill [REDACTED] over this
14:12:11 36 letter".
37
14:12:12 38 COMMISSIONER: That's 650A and B.
14:12:20 39
14:12:20 40 #EXHIBIT RC650A - (Confidential) Portion of [REDACTED]
14:10:57 41 statement dated [REDACTED] 06.
14:12:21 42
14:12:22 43 #EXHIBIT RC650B - (Redacted version.)
14:12:28 44
14:12:28 45 COMMISSIONER: Does that have a date?
14:12:29 46
14:12:30 47 MS TITTENSOR: The first one was [REDACTED] 2006, the second

.30/10/19

8608

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:12:36 1 document, this one - sorry, if we can move up. Sorry, no,
14:12:51 2 no, the other way. Sorry, no, no. I think this is
14:13:03 3 actually the second document that I referred to,
14:13:05 4 Commissioner. This is this one with the four paragraphs.
5
14:13:12 6 COMMISSIONER: Right.
14:13:13 7
14:13:13 8 MS TITTENSOR: [REDACTED] 2008. The other one was at - just the
14:13:19 9 one paragraph.
10
14:13:21 11 COMMISSIONER: Beginning, "My relationship with Andrew",
14:13:24 12 and finishing with, "I moved to" - - -
14:13:32 13
14:13:32 14 MS TITTENSOR: "One day soon", the four line paragraph - -
15 -
16
14:13:35 17 COMMISSIONER: "One day soon", just that one, and finishing
14:13:37 18 with "[REDACTED] didn't have this letter", just that paragraph?
14:13:42 19
14:13:43 20 MS TITTENSOR: Yes. That one paragraph is the statement
14:13:46 21 dated [REDACTED] 2006. The four paragraphs are from the
14:13:49 22 statement dated [REDACTED] 2008.
23
14:13:52 24 COMMISSIONER: This is from the first statement?
14:13:55 25
14:13:55 26 MS TITTENSOR: Yes.
27
14:14:00 28 COMMISSIONER: The first statement of [REDACTED]
14:14:04 29
14:14:05 30 #EXHIBIT RC651A - (Confidential) Portion of [REDACTED]
14:14:06 31 statement dated [REDACTED] 08.
14:14:06 32
14:14:06 33 #EXHIBIT RC651B - (Redacted version.)
14:14:13 34
14:14:14 35 COMMISSIONER: Sorry, just a minute. I'm just getting the
14:14:16 36 exhibits. We just did 650. This is 651. The second one.
14:14:23 37 Yes.
14:14:32 38
14:14:33 39 MS TITTENSOR: You'll see down the bottom of that page,
14:14:36 40 this is an ICR which records contacts between Ms Gobbo and
14:14:41 41 her handlers?---Yes.
42
14:14:44 43 As well as other issues from time to time. You'll see on
14:14:49 44 30 December 2005 that Ms Gobbo is reporting that she's
14:14:54 45 looking after Jim Valos solicitor's office whilst he's away
14:15:00 46 on holidays, which is a regular arrangement, it seems,
14:15:03 47 between them. Were you aware of that?---No.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
14:15:07 2 It might be a means by which she could obtain information
14:15:12 3 from solicitor files, do you agree with that?---Yes.
4
14:15:15 5 That would be concerning?---Yes.
6
14:15:25 7 Was anything like that ever conveyed by the SDU members to
14:15:31 8 investigators?---Not to me.
9
14:15:38 10 If any source had access to solicitor files that would be
14:15:44 11 concerning? Solicitor files that didn't belong to
14:15:50 12 them?---Yes.
13
14:16:02 14 If we can go to an email dated 17 December, it's
14:16:15 15 VPL.6069.0002.2346. You'll see this is a much later email
14:16:21 16 in 2014. Do you see that?---Yes.
17
14:16:30 18 If we can scroll down. If we can go to the bottom of the
14:16:43 19 email chain. It's apparent from - that's a letter
14:16:55 20 from - - -?---An email.
21
14:16:57 22 Sorry, an email from Mr Campbell to you?---Yes.
23
14:17:04 24 He had delivered a letter to F, which was the name given to
14:17:09 25 Ms Gobbo when she was a witness at some stage?---That's
14:17:12 26 right.
27
14:17:15 28 She had been offered - sorry, she stated that Mr Gatto had
14:17:20 29 approached her partner with an offer of half a million
14:17:24 30 dollars for her to supply a statement that the evidence
14:17:27 31 against Faruk Orman was tainted by her?---Yes.
32
14:17:33 33 "Apparently it has something to do with his High Court
14:17:37 34 court that he's abandoned." She's also had a similar
14:17:41 35 approach by, she says by Mr Orman's solicitor, "was just
14:17:45 36 going to get your thoughts". Do you recall receiving that
14:17:48 37 email?---I do now.
38
14:17:50 39 If we can scroll to the response. That indicates that the
14:18:00 40 matter had in fact already been to the High Court; is that
14:18:04 41 right?---Yes, that's right. It wasn't abandoned, it went
14:18:08 42 to the High Court.
43
14:18:11 44 But Ms Gobbo had mentioned the notion of tainted evidence
14:18:16 45 before to you?---Yes.
46
14:18:19 47 Do you recall in what context she'd mentioned the notion of

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:18:22 1 tainted evidence to you before?---Well I don't know if it
14:18:27 2 had been mentioned to me before but when I was dealing with
14:18:29 3 her at Driver as a witness that's obviously become
14:18:37 4 information I've come into possession of. I don't know if
14:18:42 5 it was mentioned - well, it wasn't mentioned to me, or it
14:18:46 6 may have been but I don't recall that, but clearly there
14:18:49 7 has been a mention of it.

8
14:18:50 9 When you became aware that there might be tainted evidence
14:18:53 10 in relation to Orman's case did you do anything about
14:18:58 11 it?---No.

12
14:19:07 13 You go on to say, "Mr Orman was convicted on some TI
14:19:13 14 evidence and evidence of [REDACTED]"?---Yes.

15
14:19:17 16 That when [REDACTED] had rolled he provided [REDACTED] or so
14:19:21 17 statements about a number of murders and was being
14:19:25 18 "advised" by Ms Gobbo?---Yes.

19
14:19:28 20 Why would you put advised in inverted commas?---I'm not
14:19:35 21 certain but by this stage I'm far more privy to the
14:19:44 22 circumstances of her relationship and her history and
14:19:49 23 whilst at the time I understood her to be his barrister
14:19:54 24 acting in his best interests, it's clear that there's a lot
14:20:01 25 more to it.

26
14:20:02 27 You go on to say she reviewed and ticked off all the
14:20:07 28 statements he made?---Yes.

29
14:20:08 30 In that context, and you putting in inverted commas he was
14:20:15 31 being advised by Ms Gobbo, do you think you're referring to
14:20:19 32 the fact that in reality she was working for the
14:20:23 33 police?---No.

34
14:20:24 35 Can you explain why the inverted commas, which seem to
14:20:29 36 indicate he was being advised but not really advised by
14:20:34 37 her?---Well that's not my interpretation, that's your
14:20:37 38 assertion. As I say, I - well I've explained it.

39
14:20:52 40 [REDACTED] was vigorously cross-examined by Richter at the
14:20:57 41 trial, as you were?---Yes.

42
14:21:01 43 It was not known by those people that Ms Gobbo had any dual
14:21:05 44 role?---By who? By Richter or I?

45
14:21:08 46 Yes?---No.

47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:21:09 1 Well it was not known by Richter that Ms Gobbo had any dual
14:21:14 2 role, you certainly knew at that stage?---I don't know what
14:21:18 3 Richter knew.
4

14:21:19 5 You knew that Ms Gobbo had a dual role when you were
14:21:23 6 cross-examined at trial?---I came to know that she had a
14:21:26 7 dual role, yes.
8

14:21:27 9 You knew from 2006?---At some stage, I'm not certain
14:21:31 10 exactly when, but certainly by the time of the trial I was
14:21:36 11 aware that she was a human source. I accept that.
12

14:21:44 13 You say, "The appeal to the court and then to the High
14:21:47 14 Court was based in large part on the unreliability of
14:21:50 15 [REDACTED]"?---That's my understanding.
16

14:21:52 17 "Unless she's now saying that she knew at the time or was
14:21:58 18 implicit in [REDACTED] making false statements I'm not sure
14:22:01 19 what she means"?---Yes.
20

14:22:05 21 What about the possibility that she was influencing those
14:22:09 22 statements which was not known to defence?---Well that is a
14:22:14 23 possibility but that wasn't in my mind at the time and it's
14:22:16 24 clear what it's in my mind at the time because I wasn't
14:22:20 25 certain.
26

14:22:25 27 You had an awareness at this stage that Ms Gobbo was not
14:22:30 28 simply involved in marking up - sorry, you had an awareness
14:22:37 29 at that stage that Ms Gobbo had been involved in the
14:22:39 30 marking up process of [REDACTED] statement?---I accept
14:22:42 31 that.
32

14:22:45 33 And you would have had a knowledge that that wasn't
14:22:48 34 disclosed to the defence?---I think I acknowledge that.
14:23:00 35 Well, when I say I acknowledge that, at the time that Gobbo
14:23:08 36 was involved with [REDACTED] when he was making those
14:23:11 37 statements it's my belief that he was entirely acting as
14:23:14 38 his barrister.
39

14:23:28 40 Sorry Mr Buick?---I finished. I think I've made it pretty
14:23:33 41 clear, and I maintain, that when [REDACTED] was making these
14:23:38 42 statements it was my understanding - I acknowledge I was
14:23:41 43 wrong, I accept I was wrong - it was my understanding that
14:23:44 44 she was acting just as his barrister, making sure he got
14:23:48 45 the best deal for the plea he was making on a number of
14:23:50 46 [REDACTED] I accept now as I sit here it was different to
14:23:56 47 that, but at the time that was my state of mind.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
14:24:00 2 She in that position even just as his barrister would have
14:24:04 3 been in a position to know of credibility and reliability
14:24:13 4 issues in relation to him?---Yes.
5
14:24:17 6 And certainly was discussing those with Detective Bateson
14:24:21 7 at least; is that right?---You've shown me those records,
14:24:27 8 yes.
9
14:24:27 10 And certainly discussing those with her handlers, she was
14:24:31 11 talking - - - ?---Again, you've shown me those records and
14:24:34 12 I accept that.
13
14:25:05 14 You being a member of Purana would have known that there
14:25:09 15 were multiple other statements being made by [REDACTED]
14:25:11 16 [REDACTED]?---Yes.
17
14:25:15 18 And would have assumed that in the same way you received a
14:25:19 19 marked up statement with red pen from Nicola Gobbo, that
14:25:24 20 others were likely to have experienced the same
14:25:29 21 thing?---Possible.
22
14:25:30 23 Were you aware of the arrangement for Ms Gobbo to attend
14:25:35 24 the offices of Purana on 18 July 2006 for the purposes of
14:25:43 25 going over those statements?---No, I wasn't aware of that.
14:25:48 26 I've heard that evidence here and I wasn't aware of that.
27
14:25:58 28 You were aware of other investigations and prosecutions
14:26:01 29 occurring as a result of various of [REDACTED]
14:26:05 30 statements?---Eventually there were a number of
14:26:08 31 prosecutions.
32
14:26:10 33 You were aware that the defence for Carl Williams was
14:26:13 34 seeking disclosure in relation to a number of those
14:26:17 35 statements made by [REDACTED]?---No doubt.
36
14:26:20 37 Those statements potentially - a statement not necessarily
14:26:24 38 in respect of him specifically, but in relation to another
14:26:28 39 matter or another prosecution, may well have relevance to a
14:26:33 40 trial of Mr Williams?---Yes.
41
14:26:39 42 It's apparent in evidence before the Commission that
14:26:41 43 lawyers had been instructed by Victoria Police in relation
14:26:44 44 to PII and disclosure issues associated with [REDACTED] and
14:26:51 45 [REDACTED] statements from late [REDACTED] 2006. Were you aware
14:26:58 46 of those matters, or were you aware of that matter?---Not
14:27:04 47 specifically. That's vis-à-vis a Williams' prosecution, is

.30/10/19

8613

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:27:11 1 it?
2
14:27:12 3 Both the Williams' prosecution and the Milad Mokbel
14:27:15 4 prosecution?---No. No, I wasn't intimately aware of the
14:27:21 5 machinations of those prosecutions.
6
14:27:24 7 Would you have been aware that lawyers had been instructed
14:27:27 8 by Victoria Police in relation to PII and disclosure issues
14:27:32 9 associated with [REDACTED]?---In relation to my
14:27:36 10 investigations, yes.
11
14:27:44 12 Is it the case that on 20 December 2006 you gave evidence
14:27:48 13 before Justice King resisting disclosure in relation to a
14:27:52 14 number of those statements because of ongoing
14:27:54 15 investigations?---I don't recall that but clearly I did.
16
14:28:00 17 Those occasions where you're giving evidence in private
14:28:06 18 necessitated often confidential affidavits?---Yes.
19
14:28:13 20 Presumably yours, if you were the one giving
14:28:15 21 evidence?---Yes.
22
14:28:18 23 Prior to that Mr O'Brien's diary records conferring with
14:28:23 24 Brian Walters SC and Dianne Preston of the VGS0 in relation
14:28:28 25 to PII issues in relation to statements of both [REDACTED]
14:28:32 26 and [REDACTED]. Do you recall conferring with Brian Walters
14:28:37 27 SC?---No.
28
14:28:40 29 Do you recall giving evidence before Justice King resisting
14:28:43 30 disclosure of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] statements?---I don't
14:28:48 31 recall but clearly I did.
32
14:28:55 33 Do you know whether either with the lawyers or with the
14:29:00 34 court there was any disclosure of issues associated with
14:29:04 35 Ms Gobbo, Ms Gobbo's involvement?---I don't know, I don't
14:29:09 36 think so.
37
14:29:10 38 At any stage, in terms of Purana matters, was there any
14:29:17 39 disclosure to your knowledge of issues associated with
14:29:21 40 Ms Gobbo to lawyers employed by Victoria Police?---I don't
14:29:29 41 know.
42
14:29:33 43 Do you say you would remember if there had been such
14:29:35 44 disclosure to lawyers?---Not necessarily.
45
14:29:39 46 Were you involved in any discussions with lawyers in
14:29:42 47 relation to Ms Gobbo during your time at Purana?---No.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
14:29:52 2 Or your involvement in Purana matters?---No.
3
14:30:11 4 By that stage I've taken you - I earlier referred you to an
14:30:19 5 issue in relation to Justice King having indicated that
14:30:22 6 Ms Gobbo had a conflict for [REDACTED]?---Yes.
7
14:30:27 8 Do you know if anyone made the court aware of Ms Gobbo's
14:30:31 9 continued role in relation to [REDACTED] up until the time
14:30:36 10 he made those statements?---No, I don't know.
11
14:30:45 12 Do you know if there was any effort made to hide Ms Gobbo's
14:30:51 13 role in relation to various Purana matters?---Well,
14:31:00 14 accepting that Nicola Gobbo was a registered human source
14:31:06 15 for drug matters, yes, great effort would have been gone to
14:31:18 16 to protect the identity of that human source.
17
14:31:25 18 Ought that have extended to redacting diaries indicating
14:31:33 19 her representation of people, her legal representation of
14:31:37 20 people or purported legal representation of people?---I
14:31:40 21 don't understand why that has occurred or the context
14:31:46 22 but - - -
23
14:31:47 24 Well, should there have been any redaction of notes which
14:31:57 25 indicated that Ms Gobbo had been advising [REDACTED] through
14:32:02 26 this process?---No.
27
14:32:08 28 Do you recall there being any discussion about that within
14:32:12 29 Purana?---I don't recall.
30
14:32:22 31 Are you aware that that's what - - - ?---Sorry, a reason
14:32:25 32 that you may, and I don't know if this occurred, but a
14:32:27 33 reason why you may redact Nicola Gobbo's name from a
14:32:30 34 statement made by John Smith who is implicating Tony
14:32:39 35 Mokbel, you might redact that not because Nicola Gobbo is
14:32:47 36 or isn't a source, but because it would place her at
14:32:51 37 potentially great risk if Tony Mokbel knew that Nicola
14:32:55 38 Gobbo was doing her job in relation to John Smith.
39
14:32:58 40 She was a lawyer doing a job?---If that's the case. This
14:33:01 41 is a hypothetical I'm giving you as a possible reason. But
14:33:05 42 as I say, I didn't - not aware until you just raised it
14:33:09 43 then as to what the context is.
44
14:33:11 45 On what basis would you redact it? It remains relevant,
14:33:15 46 doesn't it?---Yes, well any redaction of course you would
14:33:17 47 have to argue PII on.

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

1
14:33:19 2 Yes, and you would have to disclose the reason for the
14:33:23 3 redaction to the court?---Yes.
4
14:33:25 5 And to do that you'd have to disclose the reason for the
14:33:28 6 redaction to your lawyers before that?---Yes.
7
14:33:31 8 And part of the reason why she might be at risk also would
14:33:35 9 be because she was a source providing information against
14:33:39 10 those people as well?---Yes.
11
14:33:41 12 And the court would have probably a problem with that, do
14:33:47 13 you agree?---Yes.
14
14:34:09 15 Do you recall there being any discussion about matters
14:34:11 16 related to Nicola Gobbo being hidden from the courts?---No.
14:34:19 17 Hidden from the courts?
18
14:34:20 19 Yes?---No.
20
14:34:24 21 What I mean by that is, "We won't redact it, we won't
14:34:30 22 provide the material, we won't make any PII claim, we'll
14:34:33 23 just take it upon ourselves"?---No.
24
14:34:36 25 That would be wrong?---Yes.
26
14:34:48 27 If we can go to Mr Bateson's chronology, p.39, 4 December
14:34:58 28 2006. You'll see there this is the chronology we referred
14:35:07 29 to earlier that everyone contributed to; is that
14:35:10 30 right?---Yes.
31
14:35:11 32 Mr Hatt recorded a phone call on that date from Nicola
14:35:16 33 Gobbo?---Yes.
34
14:35:17 35 He stated that a few days earlier than that she was
14:35:22 36 contacted by Faruk Orman and asked to meet him for a
14:35:26 37 coffee. Stated she subsequently met Orman and Steve Kaya
14:35:31 38 and had a general discussion with no mention of [REDACTED]
14:35:34 39 Gobbo thought this was very strange and that she believed
14:35:37 40 they were testing her. She told Mr Hatt that she would
14:35:40 41 advise police of any further contact?---Yes.
42
14:35:45 43 Do you recall being told about that at the time?---I don't
14:35:50 44 recall it. I don't dispute that I may have been but I
14:35:55 45 don't recall it.
46
14:35:55 47 It's likely, given that you were the lead investigator in

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:35:58 1 relation to Faruk Orman?---That's a reasonable assumption.
2
14:36:08 3 Do you know in what capacity Mr Hatt was acting at that
14:36:13 4 stage? Was he reporting to you?---No.
5
14:36:16 6 Do you know why Ms Gobbo was having contact with him?---He
14:36:19 7 was on Stuart Bateson's team.
8
14:36:24 9 Were you aware that she was having contact with
14:36:28 10 Mr Hatt?---No.
11
14:36:28 12 Generally?---No, I wasn't.
13
14:36:33 14 Do you know if she was reporting that as a barrister or as
14:36:36 15 a human source?---No idea.
16
14:36:38 17 Or as a victim of threats?---No, I don't know.
18
14:36:45 19 Are you aware whether that contact was reported to anyone
14:36:48 20 else?---I'm not sure.
21
14:36:56 22 If we look at the SMLs for two days before that, 2
14:37:06 23 December, noting that that entry itself had referred to the
14:37:09 24 meeting with Orman being on 2 December?---Yes.
25
14:37:15 26 You see there's a report - this is the source management
14:37:19 27 log. Are you familiar or do you know what that is for?---I
14:37:23 28 am now.
29
14:37:26 30 Ms Gobbo has reported an intention to have dinner with
14:37:29 31 Orman and possibly Mick Gatto and she states, "Because they
14:37:35 32 are drug traffickers it will be good for business"?---Yes.
33
14:37:39 34 Now that seems at odds with what she'd purported to Mr Hatt
14:37:44 35 about the meeting a few days later?---Yes.
36
14:37:48 37 If we can go to the ICRs at p.571 please. You see there
14:37:59 38 initially on the 2nd she's reported that she's been invited
14:38:03 39 to dinner, and again that's an indication of the source
14:38:07 40 taking that information which has been passed on to the
14:38:09 41 controller?---Yes.
42
14:38:10 43 Sorry, the handler taking the information passed on to the
14:38:14 44 controller. At the bottom of that it indicates 3838 happy
14:38:17 45 to attend a dinner for her own purposes, do you see
14:38:23 46 that?---Yes.
47

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:38:24 1 The following day she reports on the dinner. Orman had
14:38:31 2 organised it on behalf of Kaya, and Mick Gatto had been
14:38:35 3 invited and didn't attend. Of the rest that attended they
14:38:40 4 were all perfect gentlemen and she provided the SDU with
14:38:45 5 Mr Orman's phone number at the bottom of that?---Yes.
6
14:38:51 7 It seems as though Ms Gobbo was someone who wore different
14:38:56 8 hats depending on who she was dealing with, would you agree
14:39:00 9 with that?---I would.
10
14:39:01 11 She was quite happy to have dinner with these people who
14:39:03 12 might be good for business?---Yes.
13
14:39:06 14 Who might be a good source of information also to provide
14:39:09 15 to the police?---Yes.
16
14:39:15 17 And yet another hat for Mr Hatt, essentially, when she's
14:39:18 18 dealing with him. With him it's a problem that Mr Orman's
14:39:22 19 been in touch, it's highly suspicious?---Yes.
20
14:39:26 21 You've dealt with Ms Gobbo for some time?---I have now.
22
14:39:32 23 Did you get along with her?---I was professional.
24
14:39:42 25 What was your assessment of her?---As you've described,
14:39:49 26 with the multiple hats.
27
14:39:51 28 Well, was she intelligent, pleasant, controlling,
14:39:54 29 manipulative, what was she?---All those things. All those
14:39:59 30 things.
31
14:40:05 32 Anything else?---Pathological, narcissistic, desperate,
14:40:22 33 troubled, without compass.
34
14:40:32 35 You say without compass. From what point of your dealing
14:40:35 36 with her did you become aware of that?
37
14:40:41 38 COMMISSIONER: I presume you mean without moral compass, do
14:40:44 39 you?---Yes, Commissioner.
40
14:40:46 41 Thank you?---I don't mean to denigrate, and I don't wish to
14:40:51 42 denigrate, but - I think it's important that I say that in
14:40:59 43 the course of dealing with Nicola Gobbo over this Purana
14:41:03 44 phase I had nothing to do with her. I avoided contact with
14:41:08 45 her. It came to a time when I was at Driver where I was
14:41:14 46 compelled to manage her and it's in that context that I've
14:41:17 47 gotten to know her as described

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

14:41:20 1
14:41:21 2 MS TITTENSOR: That's later in 2011?---Yes.
3
14:41:26 4 But you had some contact with her at least within a court
14:41:33 5 situation?---Very peripheral contact I myself had.
6
14:41:38 7 You had knowledge of her involvement as a source in terms
14:41:44 8 of investigations that were being conducted by
14:41:47 9 Purana?---Yes.
10
14:41:48 11 And not just drug matters, but other matters?---I have come
14:41:55 12 to know that but when I was at Purana it was my
14:41:58 13 understanding, and it was a developmental understanding,
14:42:02 14 that she was an informer in relation to drug matters
14:42:05 15 basically for Jim O'Brien's investigations.
16
14:42:11 17 Jim O'Brien was the head of Purana. I mean he came from
14:42:16 18 MDID but he was the head of Purana and Purana looks after -
14:42:20 19 at that stage there were lots of murder trials, homicides
14:42:23 20 going on?---Yes, which had, of course, predated Jim O'Brien
14:42:28 21 and continued whilst Jim O'Brien came to Purana and, you
14:42:33 22 know, again, I'm not being critical here at all of Jim but
14:42:37 23 his focus and his reason for being at Purana was to run the
14:42:42 24 investigations against Tony Mokbel and his network.
25
14:42:50 26 That's the reason Ms Gobbo came to be involved with
14:42:54 27 Purana?---So I believe.
28
14:42:56 29 But her assistance extended beyond simply drug
14:43:02 30 matters?---So I've learnt.
31
14:43:04 32 Well she came to be involved in matters related to Orman
14:43:09 33 and Gatto which were not necessarily confined to drug
14:43:12 34 matters?---So I've learnt.
35
14:43:31 36 At paragraph 18 of your statement you refer to commencing
14:43:34 37 an investigation into the murder of [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]
14:43:38 38 [REDACTED] 2006?---Yes.
39
14:43:41 40 And you at that stage took possession of a statement
14:43:44 41 recently made by [REDACTED] implicating [REDACTED],
14:43:51 42 [REDACTED] and others in [REDACTED]'s murder?---Yes.
43
14:44:05 44 Just having a quick look at my notes, it may be that we can
14:44:10 45 - if I'm careful with my language we can go into open
14:44:16 46 session.
47

.30/10/19

8619

BUICK XXN - IN CAMERA

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police.
These claims are not yet resolved.

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

COMMISSIONER: All right then.
- - -