WITNESS: I'm sorry, Your Honour, they are actually not part of the hand-up brief and you won't have them. They were just page numbered for easier reference. They were documents served as not part of the hand-up brief.

MR LOVITT: I see. So they're not part of the hand up brief. Well, what page does the hand up brief end if you don't mind me asking?---I couldn't tell you without looking at it.

Well, perhaps the Crown can, because I've assumed, wrongly as it now turns out, that if they had a pagination number they were part of the hand up brief?---The - these numbers on - on these documents flow from documents that were supplied in relation to the investigation rather than the actual hand up brief.

All right, well, we'll attend to that right now while I think of it. You were the person who collated the hand up brief?---Well, we did it as _ - -

The buck stops with somebody. Was it you?---Well, ultimately I guess it does.

All right, and you, as it were, supervised the provision of the various police notes - there's vast numbers of different police, but the main body of notes comes from you, but there are heaps of others, Hatt, Swindells and then lots of police who had, shall we say, lesser roles right through the investigation, is that right?---Yes.

Lot of police on 22 June 2003 for obvious reasons?---Yes.
And those notes have been provided as a result, perhaps, of subpoenas and requests under the - well, we didn't have an 8 A , did we? But, what I'll do now, Your Honour, is indicate that I call for all of those notes that have been provided, including the amended passages to those
three dates that Your Honour indicated on Day 1 of this committal and I'll tender them as a block. I don't believe we'll get them in the right chronological order this time, but, in relation to this witness' notes because it was very confusing.

COUNSEL: Well, my learned friend has that material so it's been produced.

HIS HONOUR: Exactly. You simply want - - -
MR LOVITT: I just want to make sure it's part of the depositions.

## HIS HONOUR: You want to ultimately tender it?

MR LOVITT: Yes.
HIS HONOUR: When you do I'll give it an exhibit number, Mr Lovitt and it'll be formally then properly tendered. MR LOVITT: When Your Honour says when I do, I'm trying to do it now.

HIS HONOUR: It's really a matter of - it'll get an exhibit number when it comes up obviously. I'll take it as a tender and I'll make sure that it's in the tendered materials when we conclude.

MR LOVITT: Thank you, Your Honour.
HIS HONOUR: But I'll take it as - how would you describe that?
You'd describe that as all of the notes that were served

- for the purposes of describing it accurately, it's all of Mr Bateson's notes, is it, that have been served on defence outside of what's contained in the hand up brief? MR LOVITT: It's not just Bateson. It's all police notes. HIS HONOUR: All police notes outside of the hand up brief which have been served on defence?

MR LOVITT: Yes.
HIS HONOUR: That will be Exhibit No. 32 when that's collated

Tell me, are there any drafts in existence anywhere, including on the computer, of any statement that he made that later on was altered in some way prior to the signing of it on 13 July?---The only draft is, or the only difference that we have recorded is the addresses that we deleted out of the statements.

See, what I suggest to you, and I'm not just saying this by way of comment, but can you not see that the vice in that procedure is that until we get the police notes and what we can glean from the police notes, we're finally able to say, for example, that a paragraph was negotiated out apparently after consulting the prosecution. Now, I'm not suggesting there's anything remotely sinister about that, but things that he told you that turned out to be forensically contradicted by other evidence might, it might be said by the person who's a bit suspicious and wants to see justice be done, might be removed from the statement?

MR HORGAN: Can I just say something about "negotiated out"? I just query that expression. The circumstances which the witness has given evidence of concern me, so I want to say something about it. Advice was sought as to whether the caution paragraph ought to be in one of those statements. The advice given was that it shouldn't, but it wasn't a question of anything being negotiated out. It was just advice that the police sought about what form, what wording there should be in the statement.

HIS HONOUR: Thank you.
MR LOVITT: And that's exactly what I meant by negotiated out. I'm not remotely suggesting there's anything wrong with what happened on that occasion, and I made that clear,

9th?---Marshall's statement.
Was that altered between the 9 th and the 13 th?---No, basically - as you can see, there's that reference there, what happened from there, it was taken to his legal representative at his wishes.

He wanted the last two lines of paragraph added?---Yes.
What last two lines, I if you want something added it doesn't exist at that stage, I assume?---Well can I refer to that statement?

Yes?---OK.
I must say, reading that, it looks as if that's added later on, I will explain it, if you don't understand me in a moment. Wanted the last two lines of paragraph 52 added, but until they're added, there aren't any last two lines? ---The - it goes - "Marshall was going to be murdered - I am sure at this point that Marshall is going to be murdered, but by this stage it was too late for me to pull out, the best thing I could do was maintain order and keep focused, I didn't want anyone else getting hurt", so that from "the best thing", to the end of that paragraph, is what was added.

Right and he wanted those added?---Yes.
The way it reads in your notes on 9 July he wanted the last two lines of paragraph 52 added?---Yes.

Shouldn't it read, "he wanted to add to paragraph 52 , the following", and then just put what he wanted to add there, rather than $-\quad-\quad$ ?---Well it's clear $-\quad$ -

-     - -it almost seems as if you wrote this after they'd been added?---It may be - it may be clear - it's clear to me, it may not be clear to you but that's certainly what happened.

Why didn't he sign it then and there?---Because he wanted his legal representative to look at it before signing.

It really was a negotiated statement wasn't it?---Well - I don't know, I don't know if that's a fair summation, to have a wish that you want your legal rep to see it, before signing it, I don't know that that is fair, maybe it is, I don't know that that necessarily makes it a negotiated statement.

He's a man charged with murder, who's admitting to his involvement and he makes a statement to the police, he doesn't sign it but he wants his solicitors to look at it before he will sign it?---Yes.
That's a very unusual procedure isn't it, you're not talking about just any old eyewitness who's a bit worried until his lawyer's vetted what he's told the police, you're talking about a man charged with murder, who's admitting to being involved in the murder, but wanting the fine print to be perused and approved by his solicitor? ---I - I think it's a fairly - a very fair thing to do, I would have thought, I mean perhaps I would want to do just that if $I$ was in his position.

No, but you see the police normally don't let you, I've never seen - I've only been around the Bar for 35 years and I've never seen it before - with anyone?---I - I certainly think it would be a very fair thing to do and I couldn't see any reason why not to comply with his wishes.
Look, if he had have asked for a cream bun you would have given it to him at that stage, wouldn't you?---If I had a cream bun in the room, probably, yes.
A good honest answer Mr Bateson. Let's turn to the topic -
would have caused Mr Horgan to toss and turn. That's what he was telling you?---Yes.

I suppose you passed that on to Mr Horgan, dutifully?---Well, certainly it was passed on to the Office of the Public Prosecutor. I'm not sure whether I spoke to Mr Horgan directly.

He wanted an estimate from Horgan, that is what you've written down there?---Well, he focussed on Mr Horgan because Mr Horgan was involved in some court matters, but you know - - -

Did he get an estimate from Mr Horgan?---No. Well, certainly not through me. I mean if - if - if there was any communications between the director or the directors office it was done through his lawyer.

Through his lawyer?---Through is lawyer.
What, his lawyer would from time to time be in contact with Mr Horgan or those instructing Mr Horgan, or perhaps the Director of Public Prosecutions himself?---That's my understanding, yes.

That's 26 May, the next date?---The 18 th June, which is at the Bendigo Police - sorry, the court.

The note I've got for you that day is "Spoke to ${ }^{\text {MrMoGra }}$ in cells with PS." Who is that?---Phil Swindells.

Sorry?---Mr Swindells.
I beg your pardon. "Still willing to proceed with statements, explained procedures." Now this was the day that he was going to go - this was at Bendigo?---Yes.

Then Bendigo Court, plea hearing, Mr Horgan prosecuting, something else is crossed out. Pardon my being - why cross out another member of the legal fraternity there? ---Well. Well, I was just not - it's just an issue that
---Yes.
That would be reasonable?---Yes.
Sort of the same thing the next day?---Yes.
You are with him at 9.20 , for how long?---I believe we left at 1530 at that day.

No note? --- No note but I have since looked at Mr Hatt's notes and $I$ believe that is the case.

Then Friday 25th?---At $9.30,1530$ clear. And then again on the 29 th, 9.30 to 1630 clear. Then 30 th of June, 10.30 , I believe again to 1530.

Yes?---The 9th of July.
The 9?---Yes. It is 1055 - -
The notes you've got there, is that at the start of the day, that is the one that I have already referred you to, a portion to reference to the Marshall statement?---Yes. At 11.25: MrMcGrath entered Government functions. Marshall" and then you had the notes that I have read concerning Marshall. Then there is some deletion? $--M^{\prime} m m$.

And then Moran Barbaro's statement and then there is some further deletion?---Yes.

I am a little bit hamstrung here, Your Honour, but I would like to ask the witness what it was about that note that has been blacked out that he felt shouldn't be disclosed.

HIS HONOUR: I don't think you can. Whilst I can understand your curiosity, curiosity obviously, your frustration, perhaps. Having dealt with in the way that $I$ have, for the reasons that I did indeed gave, I don't believe - - MR LOVITT: I am not (indistinct) at Your Honour's ruling. I understand that.

HIS HONOUR: I appreciate that.

MR LOVITT: I understand that, all right?---At 1300 - sorry. You are now writing out the Moran Barbaro statement, rather than just, you know, you see ${ }^{\text {MrMoGrath }}$ for six hours. It now has that heading, "Moran Barbaro's statement". Did you have a document with you by that stage?---Yes.

When did that come into existence?---Well, if I can take you back to the 22 nd and $23 r d$.

Yes?---On the 22 nd and the $23 r d$ we did the Marshall statement, effectively, saving it on disc. On the 25 th and 29 th we did the Jason Moran, finishing it off on the 30 th. So that's when those two documents came into being.

How do you know you did it on those days, your notes don't reveal that?---I remember. And it does to a certain extent there, Mr Lovitt. On 29 June you will see: "At 9.30 at with MrMcc. Jason Moran's statement." On the 25 th - it would start with the 25 th: "The 25 th of June 0930 at re $\quad$ Mrmce, Moran's statement." On the 29th: "0930 at $\square$ with MrMcGr Jason Moran's statement."

I take it that on 25 June you didn't get all the statement. You had part of it?---Well, 25 th of June was - yes, continued into the 29 th and finished on the 30 th.

Yes. So you get a bit on the 25 th, more on the 29 th and the balance on the 30 th?---Correct.

Now, next, after 30 June? We got to 9 July?---We've done 9 July?

Yes?---12 July.
What happened then?---On 12 July we went with - just let me look over this page here. Went to the - to the prison. Sorry, I thought it was in the right order, so I was confused? ---OK.

12 July, yes?---Yes, we gave him a look at the statements. We
then went to to print them off and then got him to read them and once again he wanted to talk to his lawyer before he signed them and that's why we came back on the 13 th for a videorecorded read back.

He wanted to have another chat to his lawyer?---Yes.
The statements were in what form? Were they in hard copy or just on a computer, say around 9 or 12 July?---I believe they were in hard copy by that stage.

But not signed?---Not signed, no.
What happened to the unsigned statements that existed prior to the signing on 13 July?---They were signed.

The same documents?---Yes.
How do you know?---How do you know or how do I know?
All right, how do you know?---Because $I$ have a memory of it. And of course, you know, we've got to accept that what you're saying is true, right?---I hope you do, Mr Lovitt.

OK. Now?---Then we go onto the 26 th.
Just hang on a sec. Yes, if you wouldn't mind?---26 July we attend at 0930 and leave at 1220. On 27 July, I receive a call from ${ }^{\text {MrMcGrath }}$ On 29 July, 0915 to 1035. 3 August, 1115 to 1255. 18 August, 1400 to 1500. Sorry. Continue?---26 August, 1135 to 1200. 31 August, I receive a call from ${ }^{\text {MrMcGrath }}$

What did he want?---Pardon me?
What did he want?---Received call from ${ }^{\text {MrMcG }}$ advise re conditions at Inspected by Hatt this morning. There was
some talk at that stage that he'd be transferred to the Prison which never came about so he was talking about the conditions and being informed about the conditions there.

Next?---2 September, I received a call from

$$
\text { Tvesidar } 22|6| 04
$$

```
-ci 6s5
```



```
    -2.* P」RaNA
```




-L2 PUMANA
U


Apriovien 3 a $\quad$ |svor
いー一がった。

$$
\text { WED.0E50+7 }\left.\left.22\right|_{6}\right|_{t}
$$

```
C700-ご 685
    - filve ve olsht batesion
O7LE- L2 PJRANA
    CORROlouga RE MrMgGral STATEMENT RE MACAW
```

```
09:0 - (1)
```

09:0 - (1)
C430}-\mp@code{C5 PRMON OU OSTAIN STATEMENT

```
C430}-\mp@code{C5 PRMON OU OSTAIN STATEMENT
```

$10-i$
160 - L2 PiRANA.

$175-61685$
- Decer olsut grason hume
:750 is HAT-'; ADORES VEAVLE AARVED sin
Arrgoven By Dlso? WiAtMuに

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\Omega \rightarrow 0 \sim 2=|6|=4 \\
& \text { c720- } 20 \text { 685 } \\
& \text { - pickor blsuT satasel }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\because G E C$-2 PURANA

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ©90: i1 } 655 \\
& \text { 093: }-5 \text { ronsen }
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ls: }-1 \\
& \text { itue in FuEANA }
\end{aligned}
$$

173: c二F Dut1

EbS Ol~ SEZED AT HATTS ADDVESS

1

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { とフにー心 685 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { O7LO-C2 PJ=ANA. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { こ9.~ ć PR b: } \\
& \text { FROM FERSOー } G \text { F NTEREしT -G PJミANA. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1630-4 \\
& 17.6 \cdot 2 \quad \text { ? } 22+i x
\end{aligned}
$$

$1745-4685$

$$
w=D N=s i n n \quad \text { So |t leic }
$$

ENQ RE DURNR STNTEMENT EN

$$
\left.-6^{-}\right) \cdot-1
$$

$$
1700 \quad-2
$$

1730 －$i \quad$ by

$$
\text { VEムILLE PARVED }=\mid N \text { APR }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0710-465 \\
& \text { - Pile ve Dlsut BATES=~ } \\
& \text { CフルO- } 22 \quad \text { PURA~A }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { Mojnriq }\left.\left.\quad 2\right|_{7}\right|_{0}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 07.c. c. 665 } \\
& \text { - Pick ve d|snt sateson } \\
& 0750 \text { iz PVRA」A. } \\
& \text { LORR RE DCZZR FHONES|こTTーIUK citecks } \\
& 0900 \text { - } 685 \text { DSN BATESE」 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dozer/MALAN STAイEMENTS. }
\end{aligned}
$$



ジぢるごい
$1 \leq$ こ．．．と
weroleva
Mo ：



$$
\text { Thuresban } 29|7| 04
$$

$072=-6165$

$$
080=-2 \quad f_{V}=A N A .
$$

$0840-i 1 \quad 685 \quad D \sin t$ skiascu
DROR DISlC $K=R L E M+$ SlC MINNE AT TRANSPERT HCNB


(2)
(0)
(1)



RON J=NES + MVN\&AT FRLE TO Fル SAAME.

$145-C 1 \quad 635$


$$
\text { Wivkinin To } S \text { tiss sAM=o- }
$$


 1820 - U HATH'S $A D D R=S 5$.





```
    かっここ
F゙ァI-S\MrAndrews
```

$.446-2$
¿~ )




NO APPGLATVOM FE= BALL.
4is-i.
+3~-i2 हン2NNA.
vi $A R=$ EN 2 .
100 OFF D.JTY.

WEDNESDAY 6/10)OM.

$$
0800 \text { - O. DOEU }
$$

CORRO RE bIFRM

1000-~ 685 D) sit BNTESO. $1030-c 5 \square P_{R}$ SO. $\square$.


## NOTES



Mark HATT.
Detective Senior Constable 30272

Homicide Squad


Senlon inopory nanaja
Propcrly Manajer.

Nor prexart.

Homicide Squad


Homicide Squad
Date: $12^{\mathrm{m}}$ of mach 2004


Homicide Squad


Homicide Squad


(il i shier (inside bach 15 a unknown make (sea)

10 c N. he socks while, blood spots belonging to nosshall.
Nor examined for wearers
will be done,
Blood patterns also to be examainea for opinion on how they were deposivele

Date:


Homicide Squad


Homicide Squad


Homicide Squad



MORAN/BARDARO shalemen $V$


Homicide Squad


Homicide Squad


