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CHIEF COMMISSIONER: This is a public examination pursuant to section 63 of the Law Enforcement Conduct Commission Act 2016.

Pursuant to section 64 of the Act, I have appointed Ms Lucy Saunders of counsel to assist the Commission in relation to the examination, instructed by Mr Ben Dunstan, solicitor for the Commission. I shall announce the scope and purpose of the examination shortly. In doing so, I propose to make one or two introductory remarks. After that, I will call upon Ms Saunders to make some brief opening remarks and then I will hear applications for leave to represent any person.

The general scope and purpose of the examination is to investigate whether the arrest and charging of [CU1] begin by NSW Police Force officers in Condobolin in May 2014 and the withdrawal of charges in February and March 2015 and the enforcement by NSW Police Force officers of bail granted to [CU1] in May and July 2014 was or concerned serious misconduct and/or unlawful, unreasonable, unjust or oppressive conduct, or arose wholly or in part from a mistake of fact or law.

Secondly, whether the rules, orders or practice of the NSW Police Force either generally or at particular stations or commands concerning the imposition and enforcement of bail conditions are or could be indicative of a pattern of unlawful, unreasonable, unjust or oppressive conduct or arose wholly or partly from a mistake of fact or law or systemic issues that could adversely reflect on the integrity and good repute of the NSW Police Force.

I will just take applications for leave to appear.
MR J VINEY: Commissioner, Viney, I seek your leave to appear for [OFFICER 1].

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you Mr Viney that leave is granted.

MR E OATES: My name is Oates, if you please Commissioner, I seek leave to appear for [OFFICER 2].

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, that leave is granted.
MR M HUTCHINGS: Commissioner, my name is Hutchings,

I seek leave to appear on behalf of the Commissioner of Police New South Wales.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, that leave is granted.
MS C GOODHAND: Commissioner, my name is Goodhand, I seek leave to appear on a behalf of [CU2] and [CU1].
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, that leave is granted. Are there any applications? Yes?

MS GOODHAND: There is an application to anonymise the names of my two clients for the course of the public hearing. That application is primarily on the basis of a precautionary measure. It is understood that there is already the Court of Appeal proceedings which identify my clients but it is not known what evidence may fall during the course of the investigation, so the application is made on that basis.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. I am not sure that quite articulates a basis upon which I should make such an order.

MS GOODHAND: The evidence that is ..
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Where are they living at present?
MS GOODHAND: Newcastle. I anticipate the evidence won't be more than what is already in the public arena, but if there is evidence that discloses further confidential information in relation to either of them, that may then be an issue so that the application is made as a precaution, but it may be that at the conclusion of the public hearing that the order can be lifted.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. For the time being I will order that there be no publication of the names of [CU1] or [CU2] and we'11 refer to them, I think, as perhaps "the person bailed", what's another term for [CU2], that person's partner?

MS SAUNDERS: Perhaps it might be easier to just assign pseudonyms CU1 for [NAME SUPPRESSED] CU2 for [NAME SUPPRESSED].

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly.

MS GOODHAND: Thank you.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Are there any other applications?
MR HUTCHINGS: Yes, Commissioner. The first is that these proceedings be conducted by way of a private hearing rather than a public hearing, noting that CU1 and CU2 are both represented by the same solicitors firms, I understand it, instructing my learned friend Ms Goodhand, as are instructed in relation to the civil proceedings. On one view it would be appropriate, given that parties are present who are currently plaintiff and defendant in proceedings. Some of the issues that will be determined here and I understand from the scope that you've articulated, Commissioner, that there is a broader scope than necessarily the finite issues in the civil proceedings, but it does give rise to circumstances that at the very least, without an order under 176 or 177 of the LECC Act the use by which the material may be put in any subsequent proceeding, whether there is a transcript and I seek a --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: If there were a --
MR HUTCHINGS: If there is a transcript and I'm about to make a application for that, so there's a basket of things that arise to address, whether that could be the subject of cross-examination and subsequent civil proceedings, whether that will affect the conduct of the civil proceedings.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I'm not quite sure what you mean by the conduct of the civil proceedings. Do you mean the conduct by the parties of the civil proceedings or the conduct by the court, the District Court, of the civil proceedings?

MR HUTCHINGS: At this stage, I mean the conduct of the parties.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Why should that matter? The parties, no doubt, proceed upon the basis of the factual material available to them. This is one part of factual material. For example, coronial proceedings are frequently conducted prior to litigation, or, indeed, whilst litigation is continuing and would not be the basis for applying to have coronial proceedings conducted in private or part of the evidence in coronial proceedings embargoed simply because
there were civil proceedings. Criminal proceedings are a different matter of course.

MR HUTCHINGS: Indeed.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: The fundamental test must be prejudice to the administration of justice, must it not.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: You have a judge without a jury, plainly that's not problematic in relation to happening to come across material that might be published in public. I might say that the media hasn't turned up so I'm not quite sure how much will get into the public arena, so I don't think that could be a relevant consideration. Then there's the fact that it is true the parties might obtain some advantage, for example, you might obtain the advantage of knowing what the police are going to be saying or what they might say under cross-examination, the plaintiffs might have the same advantage and it might uncover further material as to which they can lead evidence, but that's simply the result of fact finding.

I don't see how their positions are prejudiced by the acquisition of that additional information. Do you see --

MR HUTCHINGS: I see. Within the scope of the broader powers that this Commission enjoys, there is the potential that propositions could be put to those witnesses involving their interpretation of legal principle and --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I can assure you I'm not going to permit - I probably will permit questions of police officers as to their understanding of the law, but that's, as it were, a matter of fact.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: It is not because I want to know what the law is, but their understanding of the legal principles is obviously relevant to the performance of their duties and of course training and those kind of aspects are a relevant part of our inquiry.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: In that sense I would be asking them what did they understand the law to be, or they would be asked that question.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: That might be relevant in a civil proceeding if, for example, shall we say they had a view of the law or expressed a view of the law which they knew was wrong or had not been adequately trained in, that might have consequences, aggravated damages occurs to one, but again, what is the prejudice? I'm obviously not going to accept a view of the law that is the subject of a witness's evidence, so I don't quite see the problem, and neither is the judge, obviously.

MR HUTCHINGS: Indeed. One of the difficulties, I think, is pursuant to section 27(2) there is the potential of prejudice, which of course is the basis for your question Commissioner of me. In the course of the evidence, and because I don't know what sequence you intend to follow in relation to the calling of the witnesses, who might ask them questions, what the permitted ambit of those questions might be.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: We're yet to come to those matters.
MR HUTCHINGS: Indeed. I raise those questions as a preliminary step. It may be that .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: What is the prejudice? I think you do need to at least identify potential risks and I'm finding that difficult to see.

MR HUTCHINGS: At the present time, the pleading in the District Court includes pleadings of trespass to land with no articulation of the detail of individual entries and what occurred. There are some global propositions put that there was an attempt to draw the attention of the home dwellers, if I may call them that, to the fact that police had arrived on the premises.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: If you're saying that it is likely that those matters of fact will be explored in greater detail, accept that's almost certainly true, but I want to know what happened.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But how does that evidence prejudice either party? It might clarify the issues for the trial.

MR HUTCHINGS: It may. It may expand them, it may narrow them, it may clarify them. At the present time, in addition to the trespass claim, there's a misfeasance in public office claim that's never been properly articulated, and that may go to the clarity to which you just referred, but it also permits what might be seen to be, if the Commission permits it, some ambit questioning in the nature of discovery to see if something can be made rather than a claim that the --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I can tell you now I won't permit questions that don't relate to the subject matter of this hearing. This is not - in some respects this might form a kind of rehearsal for the trial, that's because they have a common subject matter, but I won't permit questions that go outside that ambit and you are certainly at liberty to object to them as going outside the scope and purpose of the examination should you wish to. I will rule - I think it is rather difficult to rule in a global way.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I have told you my view. I'm not going to permit questioning that goes outside the scope of the examination. At the same time, I can tell you that the scope and purpose of the examination, which you will not be surprised to hear, I myself drafted, were designed to try to capture the whole of the material evidence that explicates what happened, but not only what happened here, of course, here, as an example of other bail enforcement actions taken by the police. So, in that sense, although one could make the point, which you validly made, it is actually difficult to see what it might actually bite on, if you follow what I mean. But we can take that question by question.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you. Then in relation to at least the two witnesses, there are five witnesses as I understand it from the NSW Police, who are currently serving officer --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. I might say that almost
certainly there will need to be more in due course and the evidence of this particular hearing will inform us as to those other witnesses.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand. Insofar as those officers are to give evidence about their understanding, both historically and perhaps presently of the operation .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: We'11 certainly be asking about the present situation.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes. It would be appropriate in my submission that an order be made anonymising those officers' identities so that if there is, as you've identified Commissioner the press don't appear to have arrived, but if they do arrive and there is reporting of it, it seems a fair interpretation that the object of this Commission is not to embarrass or humiliate any individual officer but rather to look at a systemic issue of understanding of the operation of .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I think that's a fair point. These are officers working in the ordinary course of their employment and although police officers are not bank clerks or other public servants, so, in a sense, their activities are any way conducted in public, I think that they are entitled to privacy unless there are good reasons for exposing their privacy.

I assume most of them come from Newcastle or thereabouts. Newcastle is a rather large city, it is not like a small community where everybody knows everybody else and their kids go to a local school and they would be known as the kids of the local police, as it was in the Byron Bay hearing.

I think in principle I can't see a public reason for exposing them. I might say that, in saying that, there will be cases and have been cases where it is appropriate that police are identified, especially where there is a strong case of culpable conduct, but here I think you're right. I think my preliminary view at least is they were doing what they understood to be their duty, however misconceived that might be on a larger scale, and I don't think this is a case which calls for them to be named. I think we'11 call them Officer 1 and so on, so that answers that issue.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you. Then, does the Commission -
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I've made arrangements that they can come into the building without going through the public areas.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: So should there be media, they won't have an opportunity to be identified in that way.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Commissioner. I then seek an indication as to whether the Commission proposes to produce a transcript in relation to these hearings.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Eventually there will be a transcript. I understand there are connection issues at present with giving you a running transcript on your screen, but that's a luxury anyway. Hopefully it will be fixed in due course. Obviously we can proceed without that, but there will be a transcript and in due course I will make orders giving you access to the transcript.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you. Again, it may be premature, but in relation to the use of the transcript, perhaps it might be appropriate under section 176 and 177 to limit its use.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Since it is a public hearing it is a bit difficult to do that. I think we can decide that ex post facto, really, at the end of the day's evidence and if there are some particular matters. I am conscious of the risk, though I think this is a small risk, of police procedures becoming public so that wrong-minded persons might take advantage of what they see as a gap in the scheme, but I find it difficult to think that that kind of problem will arise in this case, given that bail proceedings in courts and so on are all public and freely able to be tested. It is difficult to imagine such an issue arising, but if it does, please make the point and I will do something about it.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Commissioner. Those were the issues I wished to raise at this stage.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right. Are there any other applications to be made?

MR OATES: No, Chief Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Very well. Just commencing, I think we wished to call on a notice to produce.

MS SAUNDERS: Yes. It is the notice to produce directed at the Commissioner of police. I have a copy I can provide.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR HUTCHINGS: I take it we're talking about a section 55 notice?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUTCHINGS: There appear to be one of them. Is it one in particular?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, it is the one which seeks copies of the amended pleadings and paragraph 2, statements, conferences.

MR HUTCHINGS: Right, I have that. Forgive me, but if I might inquire, is the Commission satisfied about production pursuant to paragraph 1 of the schedule?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I do think we have the pleadings now. Yes, we are, thank you.

MR HUTCHINGS: That leaves paragraph 2 and in relation to that which part of paragraph 2 is the subject of a specific call so that I might provide some intelligible response?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All of them. There are witnesses well let's deal with the police witnesses to commence with. Any statements they made, any notices, notes of conferences with them.

MR HUTCHINGS: As I am instructed, there have been, since the commencement of these proceedings, no witness conferences conducted and no statements created in relation to any of the officers and I understand before the civil proceedings commenced - and I hope I prefaced the last by reference to the civil proceedings, not these proceedings the sum total of documentation, as I understand it, would
be found in COPS entry database records and if there are perhaps notebook entries, but there haven't been statements prepared for the purpose of the proceedings, as I'm instructed.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I must say that I'm a little baffled by that answer. I entirely accept it is truthful. But the the statement of claim made a number of allegations of fact to which the defendant responds in their defence.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: A number of matters were admitted, my assumption is on the basis of COPS documents and perhaps notebook entries.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I might say I'm a little baffled when I look through the particulars where requests for further and better particulars from the defendant's solicitors, Makinson d'Apice, included requesting particulars of COPS reports which plainly they had in their pocket. Government litigators, as I think you're well aware, and I don't wish to patronise you, government litigators are bound by different rules than an ordinary insurance company dealing with an industrial dispute.

MR HUTCHINGS: I accept that.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: They have to act in a way which does not pointlessly add to costs. For example, I think it is paragraph 16 of the statement of claim, which makes allegations about the way in which attendances occurred. You will see the response in the defence those matters were not admitted. Those are matters within the knowledge of the Commissioner. I ignore the nicety that Commissioner is not strictly speaking the party, I don't think it matter for this purpose, but, in effect, that is putting the plaintiffs to significant cost and inconvenience to establish those facts, which are plainly relevant facts because they go to the damages of claim and they probably go to the lawfulness also of the attendances.

It is one thing to march up to a door and bang on the door, it is quite another thing to go around the house, bang on the windows, prima facie.

MR HUTCHINGS: Indeed. I understand your point.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: So they're relevant facts. It is true in the knowledge of the plaintiffs, because they were aware of those things occurring, but they're also in the knowledge of the defendant. And there's a nice question about whether - it is not such a nice question - if those are facts within the knowledge or able to be within the knowledge of the defendant, upon which they would inevitably have to get instructions anyway, because you would need to know whether you are going to seek to contradict that evidence or not. So as an inevitable part of case preparation that you would not admit them strikes me as being inconsistent with the duties of a public litigator because it would needlessly add to costs and inconvenience and indeed the length of the trial.

Some of those events might be admitted as having occurred, some might be denied, but then the factual issues would at least be clarified and it is the duty of a public defendant to do its best to approach the litigation in that way.

I must say, when I looked at the pleadings I was, to attempt a neutral term, disappointed and, indeed, it was because of those pleadings that I directed the section 55 notice because I found it difficult to imagine that attempts would not be made to obtain that information.

Now, I understand that there was a preliminary agreement between the parties that they would attempt to litigate the purely legal issues which might, one way or another, avoid a trial, but in that event, I would have expected a communication from the defendant's solicitors saying, "in order to reduce costs, we have taken the pleading approach of not admitting these facts, depending on the outcome of the legal question, but we will revisit, should it have one outcome or another, the question in order to, in effect, tell the plaintiffs, don't waste time gathering that evidence at this point."

I know that litigation has become increasingly combative over the last 20 years, but one should not be seeing it in litigation involving the State of New South Wales and I would very much appreciate it if you would convey that view. And I can tell you in one case we are
looking at a particular file, but this raises important issues of administration which affect the Commissioner since the fons et origo, as it were, of the litigation from the defendant's point of view is, of course, the Commissioner and the Office of General Counsel.

You might tell them this is on the radar and from what I have seen I am not confident that the appropriate approach as a public litigator has been taken.

MR HUTCHINGS: Commissioner, I hear and I understand the nature of what you've said. Whether it is appropriate for me to respond to that 55 notice or just to take .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No, I accept what you say that there are no documents to produce in that class, I'm not gainsaying the response you make on behalf of your client.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But I wish to call on it because I wish to make what I think to be an important statement about the way in which this litigation or litigation like it should be conducted on behalf of the defendant. And it strikes me - there may be other things that I've thought of, although I have in my time, as you will appreciate, dealt with a lot of litigation - it doesn't strike me as being consistent with those rules, but with other rules that apply between private litigants. That's an important distinction.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right then. I think what I propose to do is to open the proceedings and will make some general remarks. I will ask counsel assisting to briefly open so that people here know and then we will call the first witness.

Could you tell people outside that the hearing room is now open. What were your proposed codes?

MS SAUNDERS: Continuing the pattern, Officer CU3 through --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No. I think we'll give them numbers.

MS SAUNDERS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But for [NAME SUPPRESSED]?
MS SAUNDERS: CU1.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: CU1. [NAME SUPPRESSED] is CU2?
MS SAUNDERS: Yes.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right.
MR HUTCHINGS: I take it, Commissioner, the officers will become in the order they're called, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and so forth?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. The scope and purpose of these public examinations is to investigate whether (a) the arrest and charging of CU1 by NSW Police Force officers in Condobolin in May 2014 and the withdrawal of charges in February and March 2015 and (b) the enforcement by NSW Police Force officers of bail granted to CU1 in May and July 2014 was or concerned serious misconduct and/or unlawful, unreasonable, unjust or oppressive conduct or arose wholly or in part from a mistake of fact or law.

Secondly, whether the rules, orders or practice of the NSW Police Force, either generally or at particular stations or commands, concerning the imposition and enforcement of bail conditions, are or could be indicative of a pattern of unlawful, unreasonable, unjust or oppressive conduct or arose wholly or partly from a mistake of fact or law or systemic issues that could adversely reflect on the integrity and good repute of the NSW Police Force.

I have appointed Ms Lucy Saunders, counsel assisting the Commission, instructed by a solicitor employed by the Commission. I will shortly ask Ms Saunders to make such opening remarks as are appropriate and I will make some introductory remarks in due course.

A principal function of the Law Enforcement Conduct Commission is to detect, investigate and expose conduct that is or could be serious misconduct or serious maladministration. In doing so it is not bound by the rules or practices of evidence and can inform itself on any matter in such manner as it considers appropriate at all times, of course, recognising the need for procedural fairness.

The Act further requires the Commission to exercise its functions with as little formality and technicality as is possible. And, in particular, its examinations are to be conducted with as little emphasis on the adversarial approach as is possible. Following the investigation, the Commission will prepare a report to parliament.

All exhibits admitted into evidence during the public examination will be sequentially numbered. If a public version of a confidential exhibit is to be produced it will be separately identified.

The public version of any confidential exhibit will be produced as soon as possible.

I wish to make this point: One of the reasons for conducting a public examination or public hearings in relation to particular events is, as in this case, to explore not only whether the impugned conduct disclosed in the particular circumstances is more widely practised. The Commission conducts a wide ranging community communication with various community bodies and one of the matters which has frequently been the subject of complaint to us is perceived oppressive conduct on behalf of police in relation to the enforcement of bail conditions.

Whether that conduct perceived as oppressive is in fact unlawful or inappropriate is, of course, another question. But the fact that the issue has been raised in a number of different fora attended by the Commission suggests that at least in terms of public perception there is seen to be a significant systemic problem.

Part of the reason for conducting public examinations of this kind is to enable police to explain their policies and practices to educate the public as to why they are undertaken in the form that they are so that the public can more readily accept the reasonableness of that conduct and
does not use or will not use negative perceptions that might damage the reputation of the force.

Another reason for conducting public examinations of this kind is that because, as is obvious in the case of bail, many thousands of people every month are subject to bail conditions, most of which pass without controversy, nevertheless, many people are unaware of what constitutes appropriate police conduct in this area and the holding of public hearings may instigate them to come forward with useful information to the Commission to enable us to obtain a wider degree of information as to the way in which this work is undertaken by the police and the way in which it is perceived by members of the public subjected to the various practices. So one of the reasons to have public hearings is to encourage people who have relevant information to come forward with that information to the Commission and assist us in the course of this investigation.

With those introductory words I now ask Ms Saunders to open these hearings.

MS SAUNDERS: Thank you, Commissioner. The inquiry arises specifically out of a complaint relating to police behaviour towards [CU1] and [CU2] in mid-to late 2014. That complaint is itself the subject of civil litigation currently in the District Court which has attracted public attention, but it is not as the Commission has observed an isolated complaint.

What the conduct is, is what's known as bail compliance checks, a phrase that is not found in the Bail Act but nevertheless appears to be significantly ingrained in police procedures and practices. In this matter it involves a number of officers, a large number of officers, some of whom have been required to give evidence in these proceedings, repeatedly late at night in the absence of an enforcement order in an unsuitable manner attending CU1's house in which he lived with CU2 to essentially check that he was there complying with the condition of his bail to abide by a curfew.

It is, as described, conduct that is capable of constituting serious misconduct, whether in respect of the identified officers or others. Whether it is or not will depend partially on how indeed the checks are carried out, the nature of the conduct itself, but perhaps more
significantly why it occurred, why the officers say they were engaging in in behaviour, what the system is directed at and indeed whether it is systemic the nature of training and explanation the officers have given and it is that which is the inquiry is directed at.

At this point the Commission has identified five witnesses, given the earlier rulings I won't name them, two of whom are to be examined today and three on Wednesday. I'm content to call the first witness now. It may be helpful, however, if Mr Viney is given a moment to explain to his client the non-publication orders that have been made and the pseudonyms that have been used simply so he knows who we are talking about.

MR VINEY: Can I do that quickly, Commissioner. Would you excuse me for that purpose?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
(Mr Viney conferred with his client).
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Are we ready to proceed?
MR VINEY: Yes, thank you, Commissioner. Officer 1 is present.

MR HUTCHINGS: Commissioner, before we do proceed may I ask a question? In opening counsel assisting the Commission identified that there had been attendance in a "unsuitable manner". I'm just not sure what behaviour that is sought to describe and if that might be further particularised for the Commissioner's benefit.

MS SAUNDERS: Certainly. It was the behaviour I went on to list, attending late at night, banging on windows, shining lights, otherwise behaving in an oppressive way.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But also in breach of the proprietary rights of CU1 and CU2. That is to say, without a licence implied by law.

MR HUTCHINGS: The reason I raise it is that if that characterisation of conduct arises from the content of the amended statement of claim --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand. Thank you.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: We're not litigating the statement of claim.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand that. I just sought some clarity; that's all.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. Very well.
<OFFICER 1, sworn:
[11.20am]
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. You may be seated officer. As you have been told by your solicitor, we will be referring to you as Officer 1.
A. Yes.
Q. However, I think we will need to identify you as a senior constable and what your station was at the time and is now, but I'11 leave that to a later point.
A. Yes.
Q. I just thought that is material. I should tell you, I think you've already been told this by your solicitor but there are some things that I do need to tell you myself. Firstly, you must answer all questions which you're asked and produce anything you're asked to produce unless I tell you you don't have to. You can object to answering a question or producing something, but you must nevertheless answer the question or produce the document, but the effect of the objection is that it can't be used against you in any proceedings except, if I use a general term, for disciplinary purposes.
A. Yes.
Q. This has been explained to you?
A. Yes, and I understand.
Q. In order to avoid the necessity for you to object to every question or every time you're asked to produce anything, I can make a declaration covering the whole of your evidence and I take it you would wish me to do that? A. Yes, please.
Q. I make a declaration pursuant to section 75 that all answers and other things given by this witness will be
regarded as having been given on objection by the witness. Yes.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS SAUNDERS:

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Thank you Commissioner. I just want to start with some background questions about yourself senior constable. When did you join the police force?
A. 2010 .
Q. You're a senior constable at the moment. When were you promoted?
A. I think around about 2015.
Q. What command are you based in at the moment?
A. Newcastle City Police District.
Q. Where were you in 2014?
A. The same district. It was known as Newcastle City Local Area Command at that time.
Q. You've always been in the same command?
A. Same area, yes.
Q. You're a general duties officer?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you explain what that involves, what you do day-to-day?
A. Our core duties, if you like, is responding to jobs, calls for assistance from the public, so whenever someone calls the police, accidents, break and enters, you know, suicides or threats of self-harm or kind of anything along those, any of those jobs.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. If one makes a 000 call, it is assigned to your station and then you have a duty officer who says go and attend to this or this?
A. We have - it gets broadcast on to our radio channel, which is Newcastle/Lake Macquarie, but we cover the Newcastle jobs, it gets broadcast and then the car crew acknowledges it. You put your hand up and say "yeah, we'll take that one" and go to the jobs after that.
Q. Are all your tasks happenstance in the sense that they depend on, they're instigated by some call by some member of the public or do you have some regular duties, places to
patrol or things of that kind which you do as a matter of course?
A. Yes, we have a bit of both, calls from the public and also we might have pre-assigned, like random breath testing on this street at nine o'clock or you know we used to do, like hour of power it was called, which is like kind of police flood an area. That might be at 1 o'clock somewhere, a shopping centre at Wallsend, say, everyone attend there.
Q. That's a sort of police visibility?
A. Yes, like a high visibility policing, yes, get everyone there at one time.
Q. Are they planned like a month or two months ahead so you're aware that that kind of thing .-
A. Generally, it's - when it is planned I'm not sure but we get told, notified that day, or that shift, yes.
Q. You come on shift and next to your name or somehow you'll be told at this time you need to be doing that?
A. Yes. Generally by the shift supervisor, give you a tap on the shoulder, this is what we've got on today, kind of thing.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. A little more specifically, how is that communicated? Is it written?
A. No, generally not written. You turn up to your shift, get allocated a car crew, that's written who you're working with, what car you're in, and then generally I think it is just verbally, you know, RBT at 9pm on Griffith Road.
Sometimes those appointments can't be met due to - if there's a heap of jobs happening, busy, then we can't always make it, but it's kind of like a general kind of guideline, yeah.
Q. What shifts do you work? What's your shift pattern?
A. 12 hour shifts, generally two days two nights consisting of 6 am until 6 pm and then 6 pm until 6 am . Sometimes we do a 3pm start, 3 till 3.
Q. Is that four on, four off?
A. Four on five off. Sometimes four, sometimes six, yeah, depending on the roster.
Q. Just to make sure I'm understanding, say you're working night shift you'd turn up at 6 pm ?
A. Yes, start at 6 .
Q. You would be tasked by the duty officer?
A. The sergeant or the acting sergeant, so the shift supervisor, yes.
Q. The duty officer is a step above them; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. They tell you essentially what you're going to do and when?
A. Yes.
Q. One of the tasks you perform is a bail compliance check; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. How frequently do you do those?
A. The last probably little while, a few months to a year, not as regularly, but people do get tasked, I believe, every night shift. Yeah, over the past few years it was more often we'd get tasked with them.
Q. When you say more often, how many per shift?
A. So how it kind of worked going back to 2014 .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes, let's deal with 2014 first and then we'll do --
A. Generally. Yes, 2014 how it worked was kind of in the timeframe of being told about other duties like random breath testing, a shift supervisor would print off what is called a curfew bail list and it had a list of people on curfew bail at that time, their address, their conditions, like what time they had to be at home from and until. So on some shifts - it wasn't always 100 per cent the same some shift supervisors would have that print out and come up and say can you do these bail checks and have them marked a certain number for, like that car crew to go and attend to and then other car crews get different ones.

Sometimes that wasn't the case, it might one or two individual officers, or like the offsider to say, okay do you want to do some bail checks, print off that list which we had access to and go around and do two or eight or you know however many you could kind of if you had time and all those kinds of things. So that's kind of how it worked.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. On that curfew bail list what information were you given?
A. There was a photo, name, address, the charge number, yes, the actual condition, so the curfew is from 9pm to 9 am or 11 pm to 7 am . And I think that's about all that's on there.
Q. Was this, just to your knowledge, a list of everyone who at the time was on curfew bail?
A. Yes.
Q. Or was it more selective?
A. No, I believe everyone who was on curfew bail at that particular time.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Could I just ask you this: at that time, more or less, obviously it would vary people on leave and so on --
A. Yes.
Q. -- by and large, how many general duties officers would be on a night shift?
A. On a shift? You'd generally have two car crews starting, so four officers starting at 6 pm over two cars and then another crew which would have started at 3 pm . That's on a general night shift. And also a supervisor in their own car. And then on busier times, say a Friday and a Saturday night would be possibly another 5 pm crew and yes maybe even another 3 pm crew, just depending upon the roster and how busy we were.
Q. So possibly up to 16 or so, but usually not much more than eight or nine, does that put it roughly?
A. Yes. Generally the three cars of two, so the six and supervisor seven out on the road and then a couple more in the station. Yes, generally that's kind of the basic framework they work in.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. I think you said a moment ago you've got the photo, you've got the charge and the conditions.
Did the curfew bail list have any information about previous checks that had been conducted?
A. No.
Q. Any information about other officers' encounters with the relevant person?
A. Every now and then there may be, like, a note to say
that - like I remember doing it myself - knock on, say, the side window, they've requested police go there or it is a share house, he's in very back room, just walk down the driveway and knock on the back door, things of that nature. If you speak to the parties while doing the bail check and they tell you go okay it's going to help them and it's going to help us the next time so you email the intel officer and they get it kind of updated on a list.
Q. If you were given - we'11 come back to the situation where you printed it out yourself?
A. Yes.
Q. Say the sergeant gives you the curfew bail list?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you check everyone on that list that shift?
A. Check, as in?
Q. I'll ask you again. Would you perform, say the sergeant gives you a list with five people on it? A. Yes.
Q. Would you perform a bail compliance check on everyone on that list?
A. You would hope so. It wouldn't always be the case. Like, yeah, if you got tied up with a job which took six hours you wouldn't get to your bail checks but you'd intend on getting to at least most or all.
Q. The idea is you're just checking everyone on curfew bail?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you need anything else? Is it just the fact that they're on curfew bail?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. In 2014 what training had you received on bail generally?
A. From my memory, of bail or bail checking?
Q. Bail first. We'll come back to checking?
A. Bail, exact training, I can't recall exactly what training I had done, but I knew that people arrested, charged, either released on bail, bail refused, yeah released on bail, obviously certain conditions, different
conditions for some people, depending on the circumstances of their arrest, I'm assuming. Yes, I hadn't done any supervising or bail authorisations for people so what goes into it I don't know, but that's about it, yeah.
Q. What about bail checks, what had you been told about those?
A. When I was a probationary Constable I remember my first bail check, just go to a house and we knock on the door, see if they're present, if they're on curfew bail obviously. They're at home, answer the door, they're complying with their bail. If they're not at home they are obviously in breach of their bail. When I first started doing them it used to be the case if they didn't answer the door it was considered to be a breach. And then when exactly it changed I'm not sure, but it changed if they didn't answer the door, it wasn't necessarily a breach but it was unable to determine whether they were in breach or not.
Q. If they didn't answer the door at the point in time where it was a breach what would you do?
A. You would create the police report and list them as kind of suspect for breaching their bail. And I believe it was either tasked to an oncoming shift to follow up or it could have been just like left there so when they were dealt with next so on the next bail check or when they went to the police station again.
Q. What do you understand the purpose of bail checks to be?
A. To ensure that they're complying with that curfew condition. Yeah, my thoughts are and were that if police are coming around and knocking on the door to check on on people they're less likely - well, the people on bail are less likely to go out in those curfew hours and potentially commit crimes, or other crimes.
Q. It is risk management; is that what you meant?
A. Yes, I guess risk management.
Q. With curfew bail these checks are always going to be conducted at night, aren't they?
A. I believe so. Yes, if they've got curfew between 11 and 7 or 8 and 6 generally they're all done at night.
Q. Were you told to carry out the checks at particular

## times at night?

## A. During the curfew period, so anywhere in there really.

Q. When you could?
A. Yeah, when you could. Like in my mind, like, I was never told otherwise or to do that, but like you'd want it to be kind of more random, to be more effective, you think it would be more effective that way.
Q. Explain that to me a little bit?
A. Well, I wouldn't want to go and check on someone at 10 o'clock every night because what would be the point of that. If people know that police are coming to check on them at 10 o'clock they' 11 be home at 10 o'clock and then they leave, you know, after that. Whereas if the police were to turn up at 10.30 and the next night it be at 2 am, then it is more effective they would comply with that bail and that bail checks were actually making a difference.
Q. Would you sometimes make a deliberate choice to turn up at odd hours like 2am?
A. I wouldn't say a deliberate choice to do that, but fitting in the jobs that we, general duties, do do, yeah, sometimes you may - I don't recall ever going I'm not going to do that bail check now, I'm going to do it later, you know.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. In other words, the pressure of your work automatically meant you're unlikely to be doing things at regular hours anyway?
A. Yeah.
Q. It would impose its variation?
A. Yes. Some nights you're busy from 6 pm to 2 am and you have no chance to do anything else but the jobs. Some nights you might get an hour window between 11 and 12 .
Q. Bail checks on adults is something different to bail checks on kids?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. With kids the odds are, it's not always the case, you're not only disturbing them you're disturbing their parents and families?
A. Yes.
Q. They're much less likely to be happy about being woken up at 3 or 4 am in the morning?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Was there a different practice adopted where the bailed person was a young person?
A. Not to my knowledge. I think the curfew bail list, I could be wrong, but the curfew bail list just had people on curfew bail.
Q. But you wouldn't know how old they, you might from the photograph?
A. I don't think the bail list had the date of birth on there.
Q. Anyway no different practice was adopted for young persons?
A. Not that I'm aware. It could be the case that children weren't on that list, I'm not 100 per cent sure, but to my knowledge it is no different, just a curfew bail check.
Q. You must have occasions where the bailed person didn't come to the door but some other occupant of the house came to the door?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And those exchanges would not always be courteous?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. What did you do when the person who came to the door told you to leave in, it doesn't really matter what form, but it's unlikely to be polite, and "we don't want you coming around here", shall we say? In other words, objecting not only to your presence on that occasion, but suggesting to you, "don't come around again"?
A. Yes.
Q. What then would you do? Would you report that?
A. At that time we would want to speak with the person and ask why they were wanting us to leave, like .-
Q. They might just say - they may give you a good reason, they may just not be disposed to engage in conversation, they're a whole lot of possible - I'm talking about
negative contact, obviously?
A. Yes, sometimes they'd tell us he's not here, he hasn't been here for two weeks or he's currently in gaol, so obviously the bail list was incorrect.
Q. A mistake?
A. Yes, a mistake. For that type of situation, if we were told to leave in leave in no uncertain terms, I don't know honestly what we would have done, try to tell them they're on bail I guess and they can't be out, try to check on them, it may be a breach, something along those lines.
Q. Did you ever have that kind of experience?
A. Possibly.
Q. But You don't particularly recall any as you sit there?
A. No.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. You would, though, have had situations where you were performing a bail compliance check and someone other than the bailed person answered the door?
A. Yes.
Q. What would you do?
A. I would ask is the bailed person here.
Q. Yes.
A. A lot of the times they would say, "yeah, I'll just get them", or, "no, they're not here, they're out in breach of their bail", or, "no, they're in gaol", or no - yeah, like I said, in breach of their bail. It may be the case that we get told to leave, but, yeah, I don't recall.
Q. You're conducting those at a range of different times, some of the houses you arrived at would have been dark with the lights out?
A. Yes.
Q. You would have had to wake people up?
A. Yes.
Q. What would you do?
A. Knock on the door.
Q. Yes.
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A. Yeah, possibly knock on windows, but mainly just started knocking on the door, that to my recollection was usually enough.
Q. Say 2am?
A. Yes.
Q. Likely everyone is asleep?
A. Yes.
Q. What kind of knock? How are you knocking at the door?
A. If they didn't answer to start with then obviously a louder knock.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I .-
Q. You mentioned windows before. Is that another option?
A. I'm assuming, yeah, when --
Q. Did you ever do it?
A. Yeah. Oh, I believe I possibly did knock on a window.

Specifically to the - each bail check, I can't remember over my time, but I possibly could have and would have knocked on a window if someone didn't answer the front door.
Q. Have you seen other people do that?
A. I'm assuming - I think so.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Is it fair to say, without any particular recollection of an actual event, that it would not be uncommon for you or police who you were with, because you wouldn't do a bail check by yourself, I shouldn't think; is that right?
A. Well, sometimes --
Q. You might be the one at the front door but there would be a police officer in the car?
A. Yes.
Q. So you or one of the others when there wasn't a response at the door it was accepted that you could go around the side and knock on a window and see if you could wake someone; is that right?
A. Yes. Me personally, not so much I don't think going
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around the side, but if there's a window...
around the side, but if there's a window --
Q. Next to the door?
A. You know, next to the door you may knock on it. Like if - like I said before, if you knew their bedroom was there it would give you a reason to knock on the window, yeah. It may be the case that people go around and knock on side doors, side windows, but, yeah, specific times that I've done that I can't recall, but it would have ..
Q. You would have done it from time to time?
A. Yeah, more than likely, yes.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. So it is not just a knock and go, you're trying to find out if they're there?
A. Yes, we're trying to make sure they're there complying, that's the reason for the bail check, knock on the door, see if they're there, yes.
Q. Sure. Would you ever shine a light in the window to see what was happening?
A. Possibly.
Q. You are saying possibly because you can't specifically recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. But it sounds like something that is common practice?
A. Yes, shine a light, similar to - like if there's a window next to the door, you could shine a light see if there's anyone in there, see if you could wake them up.
Q. Same example with the bedroom window from before, see if they're in there?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for the record, I suggest is probably not helpful, bedroom window - you might shine your torch in to see if they're there?
A. Yes.
Q. What about the car headlights?
A. Shining the car headlights?
Q. Yes.
A. Again, I'm being general. It may happen. I remember some checks that I've done with other people and we've
turned up and not so much shining the headlights through the window but just turning up, the headlines and the noise of the car was enough for them to just come walking out. So the officer knew and he just waited with his arm out the window waiting for them to come out.
Q. I want to ask you about specific bail checks you've done. Before we turn to that, in answer to a question from the Commissioner or possibly me, when someone came to the door you would explain that the person was on about bail and you could check on them?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you understand gave you the right to perform the bail checks?
A. We were checking to ensure that they were complying with their bail.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. That's not quite the question. That's what you were doing?
A. Yes.
Q. You're really asked what was your understanding about the legal basis that entitled you to do that?
A. The legal basis? I knew there was a Bail Act in police, specific parts in our legal, yeah, basis for going to do the bail checks I'm unsure of, yeah, I can't I can't tell you, but I assumed that we were.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. You were being directed to do them; is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. 2014 you performed two bail compliance checks on a person we've referred to as [CU1]. Has your solicitor explained to you who that is?
A. Not the [CU1] reference but --

MR VINEY: He is an anonymous name.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. This will become apparent. I will show you the document in a moment. Actually, could we show the witness document 8440969. Just before we go into it, this is a COPS record. Have you seen a print out of a COPS record like this before?
A. Yes .
Q. What is COPS, just in your own words?
A. COPS is the police system that obviously police use to report - create police reports, charges. It's the basis of all of your reports, police reports.
Q. How do you make entries into COPS?
A. You create, event, create, and just start of the report and --
Q. Slightly more basic question. Do you have to be back in the station to do it?
A. Sorry, yes. Back at the station, log into a computer and then start the report. There is - sorry, now there are ways that you can do it on the computer in your car. That's more of a recent thing to start the report.
Q. But in 2014 you were doing it back at the station?
A. Back at the station, create the report.
Q. Do you do them at the end of the night or throughout the shift?
A. Throughout the shift.
Q. Just take a moment to read through this to refresh your memory.
A. Yes.
Q. The person identified there as the person of interest we're calling him [CU1]?
A. Yes.
Q. Was [CU1] known to you at the time?
A. At the time - well, I can't recall specifically back at that time. Yeah, I'm assuming that I knew he was on curfew bail at that address but I don't know if I .-
Q. You didn't know what charges he was on?
A. No.
Q. You wouldn't have had any other interactions with him that you recall?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. You've entered there that the bail curfew conditions are between 11 am and 7 am . How would you have got that information?
A. From the bail list - curfew list.
Q. That would have affected the time that you decided to turn up, obviously?
A. Yes.
Q. You would want to be in the bail period, the curfew period?
A. Yes, you'd want to check that, yes.
Q. You've attended at 11.45 pm on 18 August. That's not a particularly late time to conduct a bail check, is it? A. It's late but it's, you know, in terms of bail checks it's not particularly late, I guess. On bail between 11 and 7 , and 11.45 I don't guess that's too late.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. You can't tell from this, aside from the fact that you know you were on shift at this time, when you happened to have started that shift, but the odds are it would have been a 6 pm start?
A. Yes, I believe it - I believe it was only because I did a search before today of my shift times for that shift and I think that one was a 6 pm until 6 am shift.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. If you'd known that the curfew started at 8 pm , would you have turned up earlier?
A. I could have, that doesn't rule it out, I guess. Again, it comes down to jobs and how busy you are and everything, but --
Q. Not necessarily?
A. Yes, not necessarily.
Q. When you performed this bail check do you recall what happened?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. Nothing out of the ordinary?
A. I can't recall that bail check.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. If there was something out of the ordinary, say he was abusive or something like that, would you have put that in COPS?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Would you have made a note if you'd had to make a particular effort to wake the occupants up?
A. As in --
Q. If you'd had to --
A. -- extra effort?
Q. -- bang the door a couple of times, go to the windows?
A. I don't think so. Like I said before, like, if there was something specific which you may get told, like, "He's in the granny flat down the back", or something along those lines, you may make a note of that and let other officers know, but yeah, without saying that, no.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Perhaps you might ask some questions in due course about the use to which these COPS entries were made. I will leave it to you.

MS SAUNDERS: Yes, indeed.
Q. When you conducted this bail check were you aware that there had been an earlier bail compliance check conducted that night?
A. No, I wasn't aware.
Q. Would you at the time have checked COPS before conducting a bail check?
A. No.
Q. When do you refer to these records generally?
A. To the COPS records?
Q. Yes.
A. When you'd go back to the station and create the report.
Q. I am sorry, when would you as a senior constable look up a COPS record that someone else had made?
A. That someone else had made?
Q. Yes.
A. If you create the report and you'd sometimes look at the previous report the police have been involved with, yeah, that's on the system, yeah. Sometimes you do look up things, like if there has been a previous incident of a similar nature, like if you're there for a domestic violence incident you may read through a couple of reports
and look for those type of things, but --
Q. Do you otherwise know what the COPS system is used for, what the records are used for?
A. What they're used for?
Q. Yes.
A. Creating charge papers, when people are charged, to go to court, AVOs which are going to court and AVOs that are in place.
Q. I asked you a moment ago about an earlier visit at 11.08 pm . You weren't aware of that at the time, I think was your answer?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Would you still have conducted the bail compliance check?
A. Would I have still -.
Q. Yes, if you had known.
A. Possibly.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because it's still on bail, if they're still on bail
in that time, yeah, you may, because they were there at
11.08 doesn't mean they're going to be still there at
11.45, check on it again.
Q. Is that part of the normal bail compliance procedure, occasionally coming back twice?
A. Not so much coming back twice, but if you turn up there and they tell you that "Someone has been here 40 minutes ago", "Okay, it's good that you're still here and you're complying", yeah.
Q. So that does happen from time to time?
A. Sometimes, yes, because I did mention it before, as well as the car crews that are on shift there's also plain clothes officers, like proactive type officers, and they also go and do bail checks and different things from time to time.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. So they would have the same list as you?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. In other words, the expectation is, if that's so, that the person - who makes those lists, by the way, the duty officer or the sergeant?
A. No. The actual compiling of the list .-
Q. Yes.
A. -- is, I believe, by the intelligence officers.
Q. Right. Do you remember you said you got a document that told you what you were supposed to do during the shift and one of those things would be bail compliance checks and you'd have a number of names and addresses?
A. Yes. The list that we would be given was just a curfew bail list.
Q. Right. Who would be responsible for preparing that list?
A. The intelligence officers.
Q. Right. So then, in effect, the intelligence officers would be deciding how often, in a sense, those checks would occur because if they gave that job to the plain clothes police, for example, they would be expecting that those officers would be attending. If they gave it to you they would be expecting that you would attend and I suppose if they gave it to another officer or officers, they would expect that they would attend.
A. Sorry, I'll just have to clarify it.
Q. Is that how it works or not?
A. No, I'm just - yes, I'll clarify a little bit. Just with that - so the intelligence officers they compile the list and they have it on their folder on the computer which any officer can access and print off.
Q. Right.
A. They don't task to people to complete the bail checks.
Q. You're sort of self-tasked, are you?
A. Yes. Sometimes the supervisor he accesses that list, prints it off and would write, "Okay, your car crew to do those four", or those three, or whatever. Sometimes us, as individual officers, would print them off and go and do them and I think in the plain clothes unit they'd print off their list and go and do however many.
Q. So that theoretically you could have in the course of
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a night four or even five checks done by different officers?
A. Yes, theoretically, yes, you could, if everyone printed off their own individual list and went and did bail checks of their own accord, then yeah.
Q. As I understand it, no-one controls that. Officers are expected if they've got, as it were, spare time, they should do it usefully and therefore one of those useful things is to go and do a curfew check; is that how it works?
A. Yes, that's fine, yes.
Q. Do you agree - perhaps you don't agree - if you were checking on someone four times during the night, it's a bit hard to get a night's sleep, that would not be - how would I put it? The bail person would be unlikely to be inviting that kind of supervision, do you agree?
A. Yeah, I would agree, yep.
Q. To your knowledge you might not know what other police are doing in the normal course, whether other police had done the same curfew check as you in the course of that night; is that what you're saying?
A. Yes, yes, you'd be right, yes, if police were .-
Q. Because you're not keeping track of what they're doing?
A. Yes, that's correct. You can track, obviously, their jobs that come in, but what they're doing in between those jobs you wouldn't track, yes, so you wouldn't know if they've - unless they were tasked otherwise by the supervisor at the start then you wouldn't know if people had been to this house or another house for checks or what times or anything like that.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. Yes, Ms Saunders.

MS SAUNDERS: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. You should still have that document in front of you. Do you see the section where you've written in what happened?
A. Yes.
Q. In the second paragraph there's a sentence:

The person of interest came to the door when requested.

What do you mean by "when requested"?
A. When - I don't know but I - either when me or my offsider knocked on the door or if we've spoken to someone else and requested they get the person to come to the door.
Q. Sure. Someone who isn't on bail has answered?
A. Possibly.
Q. That's what that means?
A. Yes, it could mean that, yes, when requested, yeah, by someone else.
Q. You've asked them to go and get the person of interest?
A. Possibly yes.
Q. Could I show the witness document 8440972. Have you got that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Just take a moment to read it to refresh your memory.
A. Yes.
Q. This is 19 August 2014?
A. That's correct.
Q. So it's the next day?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection of conducting this bail check?
A. No.
Q. You would have conducted it in the normal way, tried to wake them up to find out if [CU1] was there?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Had you had, to your recollection, any interaction with [CU1] between the two shifts?
A. Not to my recollection.
Q. You had been there at the same time, roughly the same
time the night before he was there; is that right? A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any reason to believe that he wouldn't be complying with his bail on Tuesday, the next day?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. But you, nevertheless, conducted the bail check?
A. Pardon?
Q. But you still conducted the bail check?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you need to have any of that sort of suspicion to conduct a bail check?
A. At the time I didn't believe so. We conducted, yeah, numerous bail checks on numerous people whenever we could.
Q. You say "at the time". Has your understanding changed recently?
A. Yes, in the last few days, yes, just after being notified of today I did a little bit of - I tried to do a little bit of research in relation to it.
Q. But no specific training from the police force?
A. When we have done - over the last six or 12 months we did an online training package in relation to bail checks, a bit more.
Q. What understanding did you take away from that training package?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Just before that, could we just have the details. When you say it was training, what was the particular way in which it was done?
A. The training?
Q. Yes.
A. Like an online learning package at your computer.
Q. What is the official name of it? Does it have a title or a description?
A. For that training?
Q. Yes, for the package.
A. I don't know exactly what the name of it is. Yes, there would be a name.
Q. How would you access it?
A. I think through a system called iLearn.
Q. Is what happens - you've got your own terminal, do you, or --
A. Yes.
Q. Right. When there was an iLearn package, it would indicate to you that there's a package here for you to look at, is that what would happen?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you would access that and it would record the fact that you'd accessed that particular package?
A. Yes, I believe so, yes.
Q. Al1 right. You say over the last six to 12 months there have been a number of those?
A. Yeah, on different topics.
Q. On different topics?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's just talk about bail. But on bail?
A. I believe there has been at least one, one that I remember, in relation to bail, or in relation to bail compliance checks.
Q. How long do they take to go through, usually, the packages? Are they five minutes, six minutes, 10 minutes?
A. Yes, around, yeah, the 5 to 10 minute mark, maybe five-minute mark.
Q. Are they just in terms of writing or is there a sort of lecture form or --
A. Yes, there's different ones. I think that one was a video package, maybe writing as well, but yeah, I remember there was a video - it played a video as part of that package.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. Was it compulsory?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. What understanding did you take away from that
training?
A. Just in relation to bail compliance checks, not to knock on side windows and shine torches through windows and stuff like that and if you're asked to leave by the occupier, I believe that you had to leave their premises.
Q. We touched on this earlier. You mentioned before that you were performing fewer bail compliance checks now than you were in 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. How frequently are you performing them at the moment?
A. Personally, I haven't done one for some time.
Q. Sure.
A. But it was the case back in 2014 that there would be kind of an encouragement or push for us to do a lot of bail checks, whereas now it's - you've still got that list of people but it's priority bail checks I think the terminology is. I don't know what they take into account with that but there's priority bail checks and the supervisor instead of, like in 2014, may hand out a heap of bail checks, they usually go, "Okay. Can you do this one?", or, "Can you do these two bail checks?", and I think maybe it's luck of the draw. I haven't been tasked to do that for a fair while.
Q. As you observe things, how frequently are people being tasked to do them now?
A. I think still every night, I believe.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. But a fewer number, a lower number?
A. A fewer number, yeah.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Have you seen a bail compliance list with the priority bail checks identified?
A. I think I have. Well, how our particular sergeant does it, I think he cuts them, the bail list, with the priorities, such as kind of one little kind of slip of paper with that person or those people. I haven't seen that.
Q. And you don't know how those priorities are assigned?
A. No. No.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Are there any key performance
indicators that are linked to bail checks?

## A. In relation to us as officers?

Q. Either you as an individual or the station as a whole? A. Yes. Yes. Oh, the station as a whole I don't know, but individual officers I don't know if there's much now as back in 2014, but it's something that's measured every six months. There's what's called a team review, a review of every officer's kind of work that they've been doing, yeah, one of those things that they measure with bail compliance checks, yes. It's a meeting with the --
Q. So obviously they could pick up from COPS how many bail compliance checks?
A. Yes.
Q. Would that be the primary information they would use to pick up the - they just search COPS .-
A. Yes.
Q. - look at the appropriate entry and that will say over a particular period, six, eight, 10, or whatever it happens to be?
A. Yes, and then they can do a download of individual officers and see what types, all types of reports, bail check column, yeah, audit number.
Q. Were you informed of any number that it was expected that you would perform?
A. No, no particular number.
Q. No.
A. Just never - they didn't like zeros, I've been informed that from supervisors, duck eggs, as they - yeah, didn't want zeros along any of the columns.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. Was that in that six-month period?
A. Yes, in the six-month period, yeah, they didn't want --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. But you weren't told, "We would have been expected $15,20,30,40^{\prime \prime} \ldots$
A. No, I've never heard that.
Q. "-- of that kind of thing"?
A. No.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. That measurement, is that part of the reason why you might take it on yourself to print out the bail list?
A. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: I have nothing further, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Could I just ask this then, have you been informed of the legal power that you have to enter on to the premise, what its nature is?
A. I think in that training package I would have; I can't remember everything.
Q. As you sit there, you can't?
A. Yes, I can't remember a specific power we have to enter or knock on the door and conduct bail checks.
Q. I don't think this is controversial. There is available to the public generally what is called an implied licence. People generally expect that you might want to visit to deliver a letter, deliver a pizza, make an inquiry of someone in the house.
A. Yes.
Q. And there's an implicit licence by the occupier to allow people to come and knock on the door, but that's just an implicit licence. In other words, if there's a notice on the front gate which says, for example, "Salesmen are not to come on to the premises", all the members of the public still have that licence, except if you're there as a salesman. Do you follow?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you can take it from me there's nothing in the Bail Act about that matter?
A. Yes.
Q. That makes it quite important, do you understand, if someone has said, shall we say, "I don't want you police coming to my house any more", and the police say, "Well, we have to bail check", and they say, "Look, that's your problem, but I don't want anyone to come to my house"? A. Yes.
Q. That would legally mean that you couldn't go to the house, providing it was the person who was the actual occupier of the house, do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you been told about that kind of rule?
A. Yes: Sorry, when you just mentioned the word "implied"?
Q. Yes.
A. By consent, yes, yeah, in that training there was if the implied consent is removed, I believe that we have to leave.
Q. Right. And it may mean that you can't go back too; it depends on the terms.
A. Yes.
Q. "I don't want police coming here again" implies "I don't want any police coming"; correct?
A. Ever, yes.
Q. I assume, but correct me if I am wrong, that where that happened, if you were informed that, you would note it on COPS so that other police would know?
A. Yes, I think so, yes.
Q. It might have other consequences. You might want to change the conditions of bail because if you can't any more conduct curfew checks, then that might change your view about whether the conditions were appropriate or indeed whether bail should be granted at all?
A. Yes.
Q. But that's a different question, do you agree?
A. Yes, I agree with all that.
Q. If you were informed of that, you would put it on COPS. Would you do anything else to bring it to attention?
A. Yes. I believe that you would email, firstly, those intelligence officers who compiled the list and more than likely the police prosecutors as well, or maybe the officer in charge of that particular charge that they're on bail for.
Q. Right.
A. Yes, like you said, if they're on curfew bail and the police can no longer go there, is it appropriate to have that condition still on their bail, yeah.
Q. If another police officer had been told that, I'd just put to you what seems to me to be the sensible thing to have happened and then I will ask you to comment on that. A. Yes.
Q. A police officer is told, "I don't want you police coming again", so you should at least tell the intelligence officer and put an entry on COPS, so he brings it to the attention of people. I would have expected the intelligence officer seeing that would not require a curfew check despite that indication. You might have to change the conditions of bail?
A. Change that, yes.
Q. But while you have that indication you would have expected that the officers, the general-purpose officers would not be tasked with a curfew check in the knowledge that the licence had been removed. Does that make sense to you?
A. Yes, yes, it does. Like in 2019 after that training then yes, definitely you're right, yes.
Q. Right. Obviously it is a bit difficult to expect officers, the ordinary officers who are going about their duty in their shift, to make a check every time whether a licence to enter the premises had been granted or not. You would expect those higher up the line who were supposed to be managing the process, that they would only give you curfew checks where, so far as they knew at least, the licence had not been revoked; is that fair enough?
A. Yes, that's .-
Q. That's what you would expect?
A. Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Are there any questions arising out of that?

MS SAUNDERS: There are, Commissioner.
Q. Would you have expected that in 2014?
A. In 2014? No, I wouldn't have expected that.

MS SAUNDERS: Can I show the witness a document, it is 8445650.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Would you repeat that number?
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MS SAUNDERS: 8445650, which is at tab 21.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I should say that all these are confidential exhibits but redacted copies will be placed on the website in due course, made available, and we'll discuss what should be redacted at that point.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. Have you got that on the screen in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Is it big enough? Can you read it?
A. Yes.
Q. It is a bit difficult.
A. The small part on the right, is that the same?

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. It is the same, so just read the part that --
A. Yes, I can read the left, yes.
Q. Have you seen that document before?
A. No.
Q. Were you ever advised that [CU1] had written to withdraw any implied consent?
A. From memory, no, but I did see an email over the last few days that an intelligence officer - I went and saw them about bail checks that I had conducted and there was a print-out of an email not containing that letter but I think the general gist that they've withdrawn the consent for us to go to that house.
Q. Sure. Who was that .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Would that concern this individual or another?
A. No, this individual.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Was that email from 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. Who sent that email?
A. I believe it was Inspector Officer 5
Q. Do you know who it was to?
A. To the Newcastle City Local Area Command group message, to everyone in the LAC.
Q. Is that every officer or the leadership team?
A. Yeah, every officer, I think.
Q. You would seen that at the time?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Do you see the date on that? It is before you went to perform your bail check?
A. Pardon?
Q. This .-
A. On, this yes.
Q. Was that email sent before you performed your bail check?
A. I don't recall the exact date, around that time.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. The email from $\operatorname{Mr}$ Officer 5 was dated when?
A. It was 2014. I think it was around the time, maybe before, or that August/September timeframe 2014, I don't remember exactly.
Q. You just got that recentiy?
A. I just looked at it recently.
Q. You looked at it recently?
A. Yes, it had been printed out. Yes, like I said, I did some research in relation to today.
Q. And this is part of your preparation?
A. Yes, someone from intel said there was an email from I'11 try to find it, printed it off and gave it to me.
Q. I would like to see whatever it was that you consulted, including that email for the purpose of giving your evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. So when we adjourn in due course, Mr Dunstan over there, who is the solicitor - perhaps Mr Viney, perhaps it is easier, if we communicate with you would you arrange for those documents or print-outs made available to the

## Commission in due course.

MR VINEY: I'11 get some instructions, yes, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. I'm not suggesting you've done anything wrong, by the way, it's a perfectly reasonable that you should refresh your memory. I want to know what you have refreshed your memory with?
A. Yes, that's fine.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. That email was send to every officer in your command?
A. I believe so.

MS SAUNDERS: I tender that document, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Very well.
MS SAUNDERS: I didn't tender the other two.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: We've got three, I think.
EXHIBIT \#1 CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT BARCODED 8490969
EXHIBIT \#2 CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT BARCODED 8440972
EXHIBIT \#3 CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT BARCODED 8445650
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: They are for the present confidential exhibits.

MS SAUNDERS: There is one further document, it's 8445652, which is tab 22.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Do you want to show that to the witness?

MS SAUNDERS: Yes, all right.
Q. Just the part on the left that's legible?
A. Yes.
Q. Take a moment to read it. When you're done, let me know if you've seen this document before?
A. I'm finished.
Q. Have you seen that document before?
A. No.
Q. The email we were discussing before it might also be about this document?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. Were you ever advised, at any point, that [CU1] had essentially said the police weren't allowed to come on to his property?

MR HUTCHINGS: I object. Just in relation to that, there's no evidence that C1, who has just been identified .-

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: There is to be no publication of that name.

MR HUTCHINGS: There's no identification that C1 can be described as enjoying any dominion over "his property".

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: No. We're asking what he said. He may have claimed it or not claimed it, but I think so far the question is admissible. Whether in fact he does or not is entirely a different question.

MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: That's a complicated feature here.
MS SAUNDERS: Yes.
Q. I am just asking what you have and haven't been told, officer. Were you ever advised that [CU1] had withdrawn permission for the police to enter his property? A. Not to my recollection.
Q. Have you ever been advised that any person on bail has withdrawn permission for police to enter their property? A. Again, not to my knowledge.
Q. To date?
A. Yes, I have seen the email recently that, yeah, but --
Q. I just want to be clear about the question. I'm not just asking about 2014 now, apart from the email you've seen recently, do you recall ever being advised that any person had withdrawn permission for the police to enter

## their property?

A. No, only recently and that person had withdrawn consent.

MS SAUNDERS: I tender the document, Commissioner.

## EXHIBIT \#4 CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT BARCODED 8445652

MS SAUNDERS: I have no further questions.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. Ms Goodhand, I will give you leave to ask questions but not to cover the same ground that has already been covered. If you have additional questions, you may ask them, subject of course to any objection that might be made.

MS GOODHAND: Thank you.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Do you have any questions?
MS GOODHAND: I have some short questions.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Do so. You don't have to apologise. I've given you leave for that very purpose.

MS GOODHAND: Thank you.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS GOODHAND:

Q. Just in relation to the COPS event, you gave some evidence that you would go back and enter that information into the COPS database and create the COPS event. When you attended at the actual property did you take notes in your police notebook?
A. Not in my notebook. The bail list which I referred to generally how it was and is done you have the list, write on a simple, like the time of attendance and a tick if the person presented at the door and if they didn't, a cross and then that would be enough to create the report later from that.
Q. When you were on duty it is the case that you wear a police radio --

MR HUTCHINGS: I object. It's difficult to see how that fits within the scope of this inquiry.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: It might though. I will allow it. MS GOODHAND: Q. You wear a police radio --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Just because I haven't thought of the question doesn't mean it is outside the scope of the inquiry. Yes, go on.
Q. Do you wear a police radio?
A. Yes, that's correct.

MS GOODHAND: Q. Does that police radio communicate back to VKG?
A. Yes.
Q. Can other police on duty in your command hear you communicate to VKG?
A. Yes.
Q. When you arrive at a particular address to do a compliance curfew check, would it be the case that you ordinarily communicate to VKG that you're about to get out of the police car and what you're doing?
A. No, on most times on a bail check you don't record I don't tell radio or don't record it. You just turn up, knock on the door, note what time you were there and then leave. It's very rare, if ever the people would ..

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. It is the practice to contact VKG?
A. No.
Q. Do I gather from that that by and large, it may be different in different commands of course, these checks were not regarded as particularly risky or dangerous; is that right?
A. Yes, generally speaking.
Q. If something were a risk or dangerous, you certainly would, would you not?
A. Yes.
Q. So that someone is keeping an eye on you, as it were?
A. Yes. Some officers these days, on the what's called the CAD, the dispatch systems, we've all the jobs, some officers create a list of bail checks that they're going to attend or are attending, like kind of as they're in that
street and hit on the computer system "on scene" that they're there, but you're not always looking at what other car crews are doing.
Q. Right.
A. Yes, in terms of telling the radio, it's --
Q. It is a security management tool?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that right?
A. Well, I think the reason people do it is so they've got a list of --
Q. Just as a useful record?
A. Yes, that's there, instead of looking at their bit of paper when they come back, they just look at that --
Q. Once you've put in your COPS entry would you throw away the list?
A. Yes.
Q. The piece of paper you'd just throw away?
A. Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS GOODHAND: I have no questions.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR HUTCHINGS: I have no questions, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Do you have any questions, Mr Viney?
MR VINEY: No, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Depending on what we see when we've got the documents we've asked for we might need to have you back, but for the present you're free to go. Although it has been a public hearing you ought not to discuss your evidence, do you understand that, with any of the other officers?
A. Yes, I understand.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Very well. Thank you. You're free to go. We'll take the luncheon adjournment and resume at

$$
1.45 .
$$

## LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Officer, you're still bound by your former oath. Do you understand that?
A. I understand.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR VINEY: I will just assist you by forming you that Officer 1 over lunch produced some documents which I have passed on to counsel assisting.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
MR VINEY: They were copies of exhibits 1 and 2 already before you Commissioner, a COPS entry of 30 October 2014 ending 146 and the emails that he referred to in his earlier evidence.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS SAUNDERS: It is those documents that I want to ask you some questions about officer. Could I show you first the document behind tab 73, which is barcode range 8449316 to 9317.
Q. Is that on the screen before you?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you identify this document for me, officer?
A. My knowledge of it?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. The other day I approached the intelligence officers at Waratah police station to try to get some kind of download of bail compliance checks I was involved with. They asked if I had to go down to Sydney this week and I said, "yeah". They said, "Okay there's also an email that was circulated. We'11 print that off." Just gave it to me as well, so that's what that document is.

| $.09 / 09 / 2019$ | $52 \quad$ OFFICER 1 (Ms Saunders) |
| :--- | :---: |

Q. The first email, the page currently before you, had you seen this email before?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Were you aware of any orders made in respect of [CU1] by the Newcastle Local Court?
A. No.
Q. Could we go to the second page of that document. Is this the email that you were referring to earlier in your evidence?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And this email where it says in the "to line" "MDL New City", does that mean it has been sent to everyone in the Newcastle Area Command?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So you would have seen this at the time?
A. Possibly.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Why only possibly?
A. Well, sorry probably. A lot of emails that we do receive, sometimes you don't view them for whatever reason, don't read them.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. You would have --
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. It is not likely but not necessarily?
A. More than likely.
Q. Just before that, who is Mr Officer 3
A. He was our crime manager at the time.
Q. Still the crime manager?
A. No, not at our command.
Q. Al1 right. And Mr Officer 4 ?
A. Mr Officer 4, he was our superintendent, our commander
at the time, Superintendent Officer 4
Q. But at present not?
A. Not at present, no.
Q. Inspector Officer 5 what rank was he?
A. Duty officer, inspector.
Q. And still?
A. I think he's still at our - yeah, at Newcastle.
Q. What about Inspector Officer 6?
A. I don't know who that is.
Q. It doesn't mean anything to you. What about Officer 7
A. She's a police prosecutor, maybe head of the police prosecutors in Newcastle.

## Q. And Officer 8

A. I'm not sure who that is.
Q. You don't know who that is?
A. No.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, go ahead.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. Could I show the witness a document behind tab 74, starting at barcode range 8449318.
I' 11 show you a page of that document. This is a third
COPS entry in addition to the ones we discussed earlier; is that right?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. It is another bail curfew check conducted by you on [CU1]?
A. That's correct.
Q. That was on 29 0ctober 2014?
A. In the narrative it says 30 th October. Yes, that's the document, yes.
Q. 0001?
A. Yes, sorry.
Q. But that's after you received the email we were discussing a moment ago, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you still conduct the bail check?
A. I just went about my duties as per normal. If it was on the bail list, like I discussed before, and we attended to the bail checks from the bail list, whether or not it was tasked from a supervisor on that date or not, I don't
know, by, yeah, pretty much it was on that curfew bail 1ist and nothing to say that don't conduct them at this address, then we would go and do the checks.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. I suppose there are two possibilities. The first one is that you were aware of the email, and consequently, that you were aware that your permission to enter on to those premises was revoked and therefore, that you conducted that bail check knowing you had no entitlement to be on the property. That's one possibility?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you say about that? Is that likely?
A. Oh, it's highly unlikely. If we knew --
Q. All right. The other possibility is that you were not aware of the email and that you just thought the bail check was just a conventional bail check with no particular qualifications. So which of the two possibilities?
A. Yes, the second option. If there was something that we were not supposed to go to that address we wouldn't have went to that address, having knowledge of that.
Q. Let's just go back a step. Does it follow then that the assignment of your duties which included the bail check on [CU1] was, first of all, done by another officer, yes? A. This one?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, he created the report, yes, on the system.
Q. No, no, sorry, we're at cross-purposes. You performed a bail check after this email had been sent. You tell me, as I understand it, you are almost certain that you had not read it before you did the bail check?
A. That's correct.
Q. Am I right?
A. Yes.
Q. The system is that you would have received, one way or another, a direction to do this bail check; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. From which it follows that the person who gave you
that bail check, on the assumption that person had the
email, took no notice of it; correct?
A. If they had seen it, like the email?
Q. Yes, if they had seen it they ignored it?
A. Yes, well I'm .-
Q. Would you not have expected that person to have let you know if they had read the email?
A. Yeah, I would hope that they would let --
Q. You wanted to act lawfully as far as you know about it?
A. Yes, if they were aware that we were lawfully to go then they would hopefully tell us.
Q. So the two crucial questions become, as $I$ see it, (a) whether you were aware or not, you tell me you don't believe you were?
A. That's correct.
Q. And (b), whether the officer who assigned the duty to you knew or not a matter about which you do not know; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But had that officer been aware, you would have expected that officer to tell you?
A. Correct.
Q. Or at least not put that bail check on your assigned duties?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You don't know, as you sit here, I suppose, who that officer was, or do you recall?
A. The supervisor on that night?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I don't know.
Q. But it would have been a sergeant, an inspector, what?
A. A sergeant or an acting sergeant.
Q. And they would have held the position of what, duty officer or --
A. Supervisor, shift supervisor.
Q. Shift supervisor?
A. Yes.
Q. Shift supervisor is usually a sergeant or acting sergeant?
A. Yes.
Q. Above that sergeant is an inspector?
A. Yes.
Q. But the inspector, as I understand you to tell me, does not do that job of actually assigning duties on a shift; correct?
A. Correct.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right. Go on.
MS SAUNDERS: I have nothing further, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Does anyone have any questions arising out of that? Thank you. You're free to go thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MR HUTCHINGS: Could I seek hard copy access to those two documents?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. Don't have any problem.
Perhaps Mr Viney you would be good enough to - would you mind arranging for that?

MR VINEY: Yes, I've taken some photocopies of that.
MR HUTCHINGS: I'm obliged.
MR VINEY: Could I be excused in the meantime Commissioner, now my client has finished.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. I should tell you we'll naturally be calling people I named.

MR HUTCHINGS: I understand.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: But that's for another occasion, obviously.

MR HUTCHINGS: Yes, thank you.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Very well, thank you.
MS SAUNDERS: We're ready for officer 2. Perhaps Mr Oates could have the same discussion about the pseudonyms.

MR OATES: I've done that, Commissioner.

## <OFFICER 2, sworn:

[1.55pm]
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Thank you, you may be seated, officer. I am sure that Mr Oates - by the way I should say I give you leave Mr Oates to appear for this witness.

MR OATES: Yes, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I give leave as previously to the other legal practitioners mentioned. Thank you.

MR OATES: Could I indicate a declaration will be sought.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Obviously, Mr Oates has told you about your duties as a witness, but I do need to formally tell you that, first of all, you must answer all questions that are asked unless I tell you not to. You must provide any documents that you're asked to provide again unless I tell you not to. You can object either to answering a question or to giving a document, but you still have to answer the question or give the document, but the effect of the objection is that that particular evidence cannot be used against you except in disciplinary proceedings under the Police Act. I assume that Mr Oates has explained this to you?
A. Yes.
Q. I can make a declaration which avoids the need for you to object to every question you're asked and I take it you ask me to make that declaration?
A. Yes.
Q. The answer is yes, just say yes?
A. Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I make a declaration pursuant to section 75 that all answers and other things given by this witness will be regarded as having been given on objection.

Yes, thank you.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS SAUNDERS:

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Officer, are you a currently serving police officer?
A. I am.
Q. I just want to ask you some questions --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Where are you stationed?
A. Waratah.
Q. And what is your rank?
A. Senior constable.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. Where is Waratah?
A. It's in Newcastle.
Q. Is Tuggerah Lakes also in Newcastle?
A. No.
Q. You were at Tuggerah Lakes for a few years when you started in the force; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Whereabouts is that?
A. On the Central Coast.
Q. I see. Why did you move?
A. I wanted to be closer to home.
Q. When did you join the police force?
A. May 2001.
Q. You became a senior constable in 2006; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's your current rank, I think you just said?
A. Yes.
Q. You're a I general duties officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain in layperson's terms what that means?
A. It's a bit of everything, from domestics to car accidents, deceased, stealings, malicious damages, yeah.
Q. What sort of shift pattern do you work?
A. Two days, two nights, 12 hour shifts.
Q. Are those 6 am to 6 pm and vice versa?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you just describe an average shift? What do you do day-to-day? Start with what happens to you when you first arrive at the station, how you're first tasked? A. So I arrive, I get dressed, I go downstairs, put my appointments on and my .-
Q. By appointments you mean, what do you mean?
A. Firearm and cuffs and --
Q. I see.
A. Yes. And then I go into the sergeant's office and that will have on the board what my duties are for that day. I might be in the station or on the truck.
Q. If you're on the truck what sort of duties are listed on the board?
A. What sort of duties?
Q. Yes. Does it just say you're on the truck or does it say you're on specific things?
A. Yes, it will just say you're on this truck and who you're working with.
Q. How do you get assigned specific tasks throughout the day?
A. The team leader, the sergeant, will give me a task, whatever he wants me to do.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. How is that task given, verbally or do you get given a piece of paper?
A. Yes, verbally and sometimes you're given a piece of paper.
Q. So this will be where say someone rings in and wants some help or reports a crime or --
A. It could be, yes.
Q. A domestic violence case or something like that. The
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[^0]sergeant will see who is available in the station to attend to it?
A. Yes.
Q. You might be one of those officers?
A. That's correct, yes.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Is that the same system as in 2014?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. One of the tasks that you performed in 2014 was bail compliance checks; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you still perform those?
A. I have. I couldn't tell you when the last one I did.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Would it be weeks or months ago?
A. I've only just come back from maternity leave, but two and a half months ago, and I've done at least one, I think.
Q. Since you've come back?
A. Yes.
Q. How long were you away?
A. October last year to June, 19th June this year.
Q. So eight months?
A. Yes.
Q. Near enough?
A. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. How frequently were you doing bail compliance checks in 2014?
A. I couldn't tell you. I'm not sure I'm sorry.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Daily, weekly, monthly?
A. Probably at least every block.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. A four day block of shifts?
A. Yes, I would say.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. I think overwhelmingly, of course, curfews are during the night, not during the day; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so you would be making checks but only when you happen to be on the night shift?
A. Yes.
Q. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. That would follow. By and large, were you day shift or night shift or fifty-fifty?
A. Probably fifty-fifty.
Q. Right.
A. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. Were you working the two day, two night roster usually?
A. Yes.
Q. Roughly speaking, in 2014 on one of your two night shifts in a block you'd do some bail compliance checks? A. Yes.
Q. I see. How would you be instructed to do those?
A. One of the sergeants would give me, if I was on a car crew, or my partner, a sheet of - which is a list of people that are on curfew bail and he'd highlight a couple with whatever call sign our car is, or was, and ask us to go and do those checks.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Would that be a handwritten sheet of paper or a print out?
A. It's a print out, yeah, a print out.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Do you know how that sheet was prepared?
A. I believe the intel unit prepares that sheet.
Q. And what information was on that sheet?
A. It's usually a picture of the person that's on bail, their address, a charge number.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Their name obviously? A. Yes, sorry, a name. Charge number, whether it's Waratah or Newcastle sector, and the times, the curfew times.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. What training did you receive in how to perform a bail compliance check?
A. Training? Just working with - observing senior police over the years who have done those, yeah.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Just following what other police have done when you were following along?
A. Yes. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. What do you understand the purpose of a bail compliance check to be?
A. Make sure the person's complying with whatever the conditions of their bail.
Q. Why do you need to do that? It's all right if it sounds like an obvious question, it probably is, but just in your own words?
A. Crime prevention. Sorry, I'm having a mind blank.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Take your time. Just relax. We're not going to put you on the rack. Thumb screws are prohibited.
A. Sorry, what was the question?

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. You said that the purpose of a bail compliance check was to make sure a person is complying with the conditions of their bail?
A. Yes.
Q. Why do you need to do that?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. One of the reasons is you're told to do it?
A. Yes, sorry.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. If you don't know the answer that's fine, that's all you need to say that. Was it just the fact that they were on bail that meant that bail compliance checks were being done. Did you need anything else?
A. No, not - not - no, not that I -.
Q. You were just told to check up on certain people?
A. Yes.
Q. As the Commissioner said, this tends to be at night?
A. That's right.
Q. A range of different times at night?
A. Yes.
Q. It depends on when you're able to with all your other jobs?
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
Q. You didn't always want to turn up at the same time; is that right?
A. No. Yeah, no - yes, it's usually when I'm able to do them, yeah. Yeah.
Q. It could sometimes be quite late at night?
A. It could be.
Q. It's not unusual to do a bail compliance check at a house where all the lights are out?
A. Yeah, I guess. I guess.
Q. At a time where you might expect people to be asleep?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Your job, when you're doing the check, is to find out if they're there or not; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Is it just you knock and go or do you sort of try a bit harder than that?
A. I usually knock and then go if we're unable to raise anyone, yeah. Move on to the next job.
Q. You'd knock once, is that what you're saying?
A. Yeah, I do, yeah.
Q. Would you knock a number of times?
A. No, not really, no, I usually just .-
Q. Have you ever seen anyone else?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. What about knocking on the windows, have you ever seen that?
A. I might have knocked on a window over the years, like, if it's near the door.
Q. Sure. Just trying to wake people up?
A. Yes.
Q. What about shining a torch in to see if anyone's there?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever seen anyone do that?
A. No. No, I probably would have a torch so we can see where we're going.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Right, but what's your view? Do you think you would be entitled to shine a light through a window to see if anyone was in there?
A. Maybe if the window is right near the door, like, and it was just --
Q. Yes.
A. -- might but yeah, I can't think of a --
Q. You can't think of a situation where you would do it,
is that what you're saying, or .-
A. Like me personally?
Q. You've never done it yourself?
A. I have had a torch but I don't .-
Q. I understand that. What I'm asking you is what your view, do you think it is appropriate for an officer conducting a bail check to shine a light through a window if you're unable to raise someone by knocking on the door? It's not a trick question.
A. Yeah, I would --
Q. I'm just trying to find out what your attitude is?
A. It depends on, I guess, the circumstances, why you're there and how badly do you .-
Q. Well we know why you're there, you're there for a bail check?
A. For a bail check?
Q. Yes.
A. I'm not sure. I can't - I'm sorry, I -.
Q. Is it fair to say that you've never asked yourself the question?
A. Yeah, I - no. Yeah, sorry.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, go on.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. Just going back a few steps, it is not a social call, you're there to find out if someone is
complying with their bail; is that right?
A. Yes, yes, that's right.
Q. It's a pretty significant matter if they're not there?
A. Yeah. Well, if they're not there they're not
complying - they could potentially be not complying with their bail, so --
Q. Is it fair to say that you wouldn't just politely knock on the door once, particularly if it was quite late, and then give up?
A. Sorry, what was that?
Q. Imagine it is one of the later visits, say it is one or two in the morning?
A. Yes.
Q. People are almost certainly going to be asleep; would you agree with that?
A. Yes, yes, they would be, yes.
Q. They're on bail, you have a job to do. I would just knock once politely or would you make an effort to wake them up and find out if they were there? A. Me personally, I'd just knock and do what I have to do and then, like I say, I'd move on to the next thing. It's an not a - like for me the other things take priority my own things.
Q. Have you observed people conducting a bail check in a different way than you do personally?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of it?
A. Aware of?
Q. People having a different attitude or approach to these things?
A. No. No.
Q. I want to ask you about some specific bail checks you completed in 2014?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Could I show the witness document 8440948. It will come up on the screen in a second before you.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. Just take a moment to read that and refresh your memory. Could we scroll down to the second page just initially. Do you see the person identified there as the person of interest?
A. Yes.
Q. We are referring to them here as [CU1], when I say that that's who I'm talking about. Could we just go up to the first page, please. You have seen a document like this before, officer?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. It's a COPS event.
Q. How do you create those?
A. On our COPS system.
Q. Yes.
A. We create -.
Q. What do you personally do?
A. I type in "EVECRE" which is event create and then follow the bouncing ball from there.
Q. Where it says "CAD incident bail check" do you type that in yourself or is it a drop-down menu?
A. Sorry, where is that?
Q. On the first page. Do you see your name is there twice?
A. CAD?
Q.. Sorry, at the top of the page, just hold the screen where it is, do you see "event classification" at the top?
A. Yes.
Q. If we go down a little bit, do you see "CAD incident", about five or six lines.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. On the left-hand side?
A. Incident, yes, bail check, yes.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Do you type that in yourself or do you select it from a drop-down menu?
A. It is from a drop-down menu.
Q. This is a record of a bail check you conducted on [CU1] on 3 June 2014; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember what happened?
A. Do I remember this?
Q. Yes.
A. No, honestly, no.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Could I just ask you under the CAD incident, do you see it, there is a title "priority" and it says "4". What does that indicate?
A. It's not a priority, it's low on the list of priorities. Yes, it's not .-
Q. So the list of priorities is 1 to 5 or 1 to 6 or something?
A. Yes, there's priority 2 which is urgent, priority 2 which is semi and priority 4 . It comes up automatically when you select bail check.
Q. In effect, priority 4 is if you're not busy with anything else, is that what it amounts to? If you've got some spare time this is what you do?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Is that right? More or less, obviously I oversimplify it?
A. Yes, there's a whole - there's admin, serving files, they're all 4 s , they all come up as 4 on the thing automatically, yes, I'm pretty sure.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. Is the reason perhaps that you don't recall it because partially the time that's passed but partially because it was quite routine for you to be performing bail checks of this kind?
A. Yes.
Q. You've attended at 12.50 am on a Tuesday morning. Is
there anything unusual about that? If the answer is no, the answer is no, it's not --
A. No, I don't - no.
Q. It's just the middle of your shift really?
A. Yeah, pretty much.
Q. It's more likely than not that the house was dark at that time of the morning?
A. Could have been, probably.
Q. If it had been you would have knocked on the door; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. And on this occasion you knocked and there was no answer; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In your case, because of the way you personally conduct these bail checks, it's likely that you just knocked once; is that fair?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. You said earlier you did bail checks when you were given the curfew bail list by your sergeant; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you ever print that list out by yourself and do them of your own initiative?
A. I have printed it out, usually, probably, if I've lost the other - misplaced it, yes.
Q. Would you do a bail check in circumstances where you've --
A. Usually own when I've been told to do it.
Q. More likely than not you've been direct to do it here?
A. Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Can I just ask this: You've told us about knocking, would you call out, for example, police bail check or any verbal communication or just the knock? A. Just a knock, yes.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Were you aware at the time, if you can recall, that there had been a check performed at 2 am the
day before?
A. No, I'm sorry, I --
Q. Would you have any way of being aware of that at the time? I just need you to answer verbally for the transcript.
A. No. Sorry.
Q. If you had known would you still have conducted the bail check? If you'd known that someone had been out yesterday and you'd nevertheless been told to go out again, would you still have done it?
A. Probably not, if it's already been done.
Q. The day before?
A. Maybe, or maybe not, I couldn't -
Q. I can make it a little simpler for you.
A. Thanks.
Q. It's Tuesday, 3 June 2016 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You turn up to your shift and you're given the bail curfew list and told to do a check on [CU1]?
A. Yeah.
Q. Yes. Would you have been told any other information at that point, just in the usual course?
A. No, just do - just - there's your list.
Q. If you had known that on Monday, the day before, someone had been out, done a check and he was there, would you still have performed the bail check as asked?
A. I might have because it is a different day, I might have, or - yeah.
Q. Would it have concerned you particularly if someone had been out the day before?
A. No, I don't -.
Q. It wouldn't necessarily be unusual to do repeated bail checks on consequent days?
A. I just do what I'm told, or whatever is - whatever ones they pick for me that's the ones I do.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Having done one, though, that
would satisfy it, you wouldn't go back again that night and do another one?
A. No.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. All right. So he --
A. I would say no.
Q. He didn't answer, you generated the COPS report and you would have finished your shift at 6am that day?
A. More than likely, yeah.
Q. Yes?
A. Yeah.
Q. And then you would have come back on shift if you were on night shift again at 6 pm ?
A. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: I tender that document.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That will be exhibit 7.

## EXHIBIT \#7 COPS EVENT BARCODED 8440948

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Could I just ask you this, though, if you got no response that could be due to a whole lot of reasons, of course, they could just be too drunk to respond?
A. Yeah, could be, could be, or -.
Q. It could be a whole lot of possible reasons?
A. Could be, yeah.
Q. Would you then make it a point to go back later in
your shift or you would let it go, by and large?
A. If I - it depends if - if --
Q. On?
A. Time and what else you've got on, like, you know, to follow up or --
Q. If you had spare time on your shift?
A. In that same shift would I -.
Q. Yes.
A. No, no.
Q. You wouldn't?
A. No, no, generally, no.
Q. Okay. So he either responded to enable you to say you had complied or your report on COPS would say, "no response"?
A. Yes.
Q. That would be it?
A. Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
MS SAUNDERS: Q. Could we go to 8440954. This is another COPS record from, again, 3 June 2014 ?
A. Yes.
Q. This time it is at 10.24 at night?
A. Mmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. Again, it is a check - I'm sorry?
A. Sorry?
Q. I didn't mean to cut you off?
A. Yep.
Q. Again, it's a check on [CU1]?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Really what has happened here, although it is the same day, on one shift, your Tuesday shift - your Monday shift I should say, you've turned up just after midnight and he wasn't there, you've gone off shift and then you've come back to check; is that right?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Do you recall anything about this bail check?
A. No, I'm sorry.
Q. That's all right.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. Would you have done that - you've gone back again, would you have done that on your own initiative or would you have needed to have been tasked?
A. I probably - with these I'm usually tasked, the only time I do them is when I'm told.
Q. I said it was 10.24 but according to the note it was 9.30pm earlier in the evening?
A. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: I tender that document.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. Exhibit 8.
EXHIBIT \#8 COPS ENTRY BARCODED 8440954
MS SAUNDERS: Could we go back to exhibit 7 .
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Do you recall - this is in 2014 - the name of the intelligence officers who would have originated the task?
A. I can tell I who I - who was working in that department, in that unit, but whether or not they did it I don't know.
Q. We can find out. What's the name?
A. Officer 9 he's a senior constable. He works in that unit. And Sergeant Officer 10 and there was someone else.
Q. Just see if you can think of the name.
A. Officer 11, I think. I think - yeah, I can't think of anyone else.

MS SAUNDERS: Q. Could we just scroll down a little. It is the section entered by you explaining what happens, officer, and there's another note in that entry from 10.26 - 22.26, can you see that?
A. Yes .
Q. So is it right that after your second visit you made one COPS entry for that visit but you've also gone back to update the earlier entry?
A. Yes, that's what it looks like.
Q. Because he explained why he didn't answer the previous day?
A. That's right.
Q. "Didn't hear you knocking"?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. Have you done any training recently about bail checks, officer?
A. Not that I can recall. Like, I've only been back for a couple of months.
Q. Of course. Do you recall doing any formal training on bail or bail checks?
A. There's your online lectures, that - yeah.
Q. Have you done one of those about bail checks?
A. I'm sure I would have. There's a list - there's a
fairly long list of things.
Q. Sure.
A. Off the top of my head I don't know. I'd have to have a look at it. I'd say - -
Q. You don't recall?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall ever being notified that a person on bail had withdrawn permission for the police to attend their property to perform a bail check?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever seen an email like that?
A. No.
Q. Could I show the witness exhibit 5. You've been at Newcastle since 2010; is that right?
A. I was at Waratah, I arrived at Waratah in 2004. I was there for six years.
Q. Around --
A. Over six years and then $I$ went to Newcastle. And then I've been back and forth between the two.
Q. Could we just scroll down to the second page of this okay. Take a moment to read that to just refresh your memory.
A. Mmm.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Have you read that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you recall ever seeing that?
A. Honestly, no, I --
Q. Would you have a look at the addressee right up the top. That would have gone to your email account, would it not? That's your address up there, generally to staff of course; is that right?
A. Yeah. Yeah all of - yeah.
Q. Is there any reason why you wouldn't have read it?
A. I'm sorry, I don't recall reading it. I'm not sure. I couldn't tell you why, yeah.
Q. Well, it's from an inspector. Wouldn't you read these emails as a matter of course, it's the main method of communicating, isn't it?
A. Yeah, yeah, that's right.
Q. Can you think of a reason you would not have read it?
A. Maybe - I might have been sidetracked, I might have been doing another job, but I don't - yeah. But I - yeah I might have just missed it. I don't .-
Q. I understand you to be saying as you sit there you don't know whether you read it or not?
A. I don't recall reading .-
Q. You don't recall reading it?
A. No.
Q. Is that because you have a failure of recollection or because you did not in fact read it? In other words it -A. I probably didn't read it.
Q. -- are you saying I don't know whether I did or not?
A. I probably didn't read it.
Q. You probably didn't read it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think you might be likely to have recollected it had read it at the time?
A. Not necessarily, sorry, it's five years ago.
Q. No, that's all right, this is a long time ago.
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you understand the thrust of it, do you? What is it saying, in effect.
A. That permission to attend the premises has been withdrawn.
Q. And then the second paragraph says?
A. Police no longer have a lawful right to access.
Q. To routinely check compliance with the curfew conditions?
A. Yes.
Q. At this property alone?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you think that means, in substance?
A. That you can't do routine bail checks.
Q. Sorry?
A. You're not allowed to do routine bail checks.
Q. At that house?
A. At that house.
Q. Had you read it that message would you have understood?
A. Yes. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. It is fair to say that you really relied on the person tasking you to tell you what you were and weren't allowed to do?
A. Sorry, what was that?
Q. Would it be fair to say that you really relied on your sergeant to tell you who to bail check?
A. Yeah. I .-
Q. You'd expect that sergeant to not put someone on the
list that had withdrawn permission like that?
A. You'd have to ask them, I'm sorry, yeah, sorry.
Q. What would you expect?
A. Yeah, I guess so.
Q. You really just turn up and do what you're told?
A. Yeah. Yeah, I do whatever - mostly - yeah.
Q. You've done maybe one --
A. Sorry?

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. Sorry, you sound a bit uncertain. Did you turn up and do what you were told? It is not a complicated question.
A. Yes. Yes. Yes.

MS SAUNDERS: $Q$. You said you've done maybe one bail check since you've come back from leave?
A. Yes.
Q. Has the process changed at all?
A. I don't - I - no, I don't believe so, no.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Q. You've noticed no change?
A. No, I've noticed no change, sorry.

MS SAUNDERS: I have nothing further, Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Oates, do you have any questions?

MR OATES: I do not, Chief Commissioner.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Ms Goodhand, do you have any questions?

MS GOODHAND: No, thank you, Commissioner.
MR HUTCHINGS: No, Commissioner, thank you.
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Thank you. You're free to go. It's likely we don't need to call you again but if we get more information which we need to check with you in that event you might have to come back.
A. Okay.
Q. But very likely you won't have to come back. Although this is a public hearing you must not discuss your evidence with any person. Do you understand that?
A. Yes.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Very well. I will adjourn.
MR HUTCHINGS: Commissioner, sorry, before you rise --
CHIEF COMMISSIONER: You can go. There's no need for you to stay, Mr Oates.

MR OATES: If the Commission please.
MR HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Commissioner. In the course of evidence today Senior Constable 1 gave evidence about an iLearn product training.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR HUTCHINGS: That's a micro-learn course and I propose to produce to the Commission this afternoon --

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: I was going to ask you in due course but thank you very much that would be helpful.

MR HUTCHINGS: There's also a nemesis dissemination in relation to bail that is relevant to that question so I propose to produce that to the Commission as well.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: If you emaited them to Mr Dunstan that's probably adequate for our purposes.
MR HUTCHINGS: Hope it doesn't get caught in the firewall but if it does I'11 communicate with Mr Dunstan and I'11 make that available in some accessible form.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you very much.
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