

GALLEYPUB02042
03/08/2022

GALLEY
pp 02042-02126

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

STEPHEN RUSHTON SC
COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION GALLEY

Reference: Operation E19/0569

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON WEDNESDAY 3 AUGUST, 2022

AT 10.00AM

Any person who publishes any part of this transcript in any way and to any person contrary to a Commission direction against publication commits an offence against section 112(2) of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988.

This transcript has been prepared in accordance with conventions used in the Supreme Court

THE COMMISSIONER: I'll have the witness re-sworn.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Heger, I think you've got a little bit more?

MS HEGER: I do have a couple more questions, Commissioner. Before I get there, could I just note there was a private hearing conducted on the afternoon of 15 July. Commissioner, you've previously indicated your preliminary view that the transcript of that hearing should be made public.
10 Could I ask that those who were present at that private hearing consider their position throughout the course of the morning and be prepared to make submissions on that question, if they oppose the transcript being made public and we can deal with that - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Public, yep, sure.

MS HEGER: I'm sorry?

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, yep.

MS HEGER: And we can deal with that later this morning. All right. Mr Hindi, can I show you volume 3.23, page 1? These notes were prepared by you, correct?---Absolutely.

And did you prepare them for the purposes of your complaint to The Sydney Morning Herald?---No.

30 For what purpose did you prepare them?---I just prepared them so my memory can, doesn't fade.

THE COMMISSIONER: Why was it important that your memory didn't fade?---Well, you always, you put that in there – when was that prepared, if you don't mind me asking, sorry? When was that prepared?

MS HEGER: It doesn't have a date on it, Mr Hindi. Do you know when it was prepared?---It would have been after The Sydney Morning Herald.

40 After that article from 2 April, 2019 that I showed you?---Yes. And it would have been, it would have been after the council has moved a resolution, 23 April, I presume, to refer us to ICAC. So you prepare these things just in case thing happen, which they do. That's what it was for.

All right. In the second-last paragraph on that page it's referring to the dinner in Chinatown on 18 March, 2016. Just bear with me for a moment. ---Yep.

All right. It says in the second-last paragraph "I left \$200 for my wife and I and Mayor Badalati left \$100 on the table." You're aware that Mr Badalati gave evidence on 19 July that he didn't pay any money for that dinner at all. You're aware of that evidence?---Yes, I am.

10

So those notes that you've drafted, insofar as they refer to Mayor Badalati leaving \$100 on the table, that simply didn't happen, did it?---He told me it did happen. That's what these reflected, is the conversation I had with him. So if he told me he did, I put that down. I didn't say I witnessed it, did I?

Well, that's rather what you've implied by saying "I left \$200 and Mayor Badalati left \$100".---Sorry. That was, that's, that's my, that is my drafting and with all due, due respect, it's not your drafting, so that's what I meant by it.

20

All right. Well, you attended the dinner at Chinatown, correct?---Yes.

You didn't see Mr Badalati leave any money on the table, did you?---No.

I suggest to you when you wrote this note, you knew that that part, referring to Mayor Badalati leaving money on the table, was false. What do you say about that?---That is not correct, that is not correct. You're making too many assumptions. That is not correct. Sorry. With all due respect, it's not, not correct.

30

All right. And when it says "I left \$200 for my wife and I", did you in fact leave \$200?---It's a typo.

Oh, so that's not right either, is it?---It's a typo.

THE COMMISSIONER: A typo?---Yeah. It means that, instead of putting "my wife", I put "I". I was just typing up quickly. It wasn't something that I was going to use. It wasn't something, it was just quick refresh memory. Now, had that, when that becomes a real legal document that I have to use then I have to refresh it and retype it and reword it suit. So I just did it quickly.

40

MS HEGER: And what's the typo?---It's, when it says "I left", it, I didn't leave, my wife did.

All right. And did you see her leave that money?---I just, yeah, it was just, yeah, dropped it to the, to the waiter just like "Here, here's the money,"

THE COMMISSIONER: But it's not just the word "I". You say "I left \$200 for my wife".---Yeah, my wife left \$200 for me and I basically should
10 have said - - -

But that's not a typo.---Okay, so what do you call it, Commissioner? The wrong word?

Don't ask me questions. It's not a typo, is it?---It is a typo for me. I should have said "my wife" and I didn't, so it's a typo. That's what I call typo. It means you made a mistake in drafting something. So it's a incorrect, it's a mistake in drafting it.

20 MS HEGER: Well, I suggest to you on this topic of who paid for this dinner, your story has changed over time, do you accept that?---No, because I've said my wife paid, it's over. What I wrote there, sometimes you write notes in your diary. Sometimes you come up with some draft too quickly, you do it in a hurry so you don't forget things. And when you need to reuse it and be provided for a legal basis or for any basis, then you have to go over it and reword it properly.

All right. Mrs Hindi never left any money on the table at that dinner, did she?---She did. We do that at every dinner we go out with our friends and
30 we do that too, 'cause that's a tradition, a Lebanese tradition. When I let people pay our dinner, \$200.

All right. You said when you go out with your friends. Did you have friends at this dinner?---I said when I go with my friends, all, any other dinner. I've been with so many Lebanese developers. I paid for my dinner. I get the money, put it on the table.

In the next paragraph it says, "Early April, my wife and I decided to take a private trip as a holiday to Hong Kong, Shenzhen and Beijing."---Ah hmm.
40

Had you already decided to take this trip to China prior to being invited by China Liu?---No, well, you can't say "have you decided". I, I don't know what I was thinking, whether I did or I didn't. All I know is we were thinking of a holiday, and when that opportunity came you killed two birds in one stone if the Aussie slang says. I've killed two birds in one stone.

10 All right. So there were two purposes of this trip. One was to take a, a private holiday and the other was to go and see the waste-to-energy plant, is that right?---Absolutely. My wife loves shopping, so she thought it's a great idea to shop. And while you're there, you do a bit of business deals. That's how it works.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that paragraph doesn't mention the waste-to-energy plant at all, does it?---Commissioner, if you read up the top, it'll probably tell you about waste-to-energy. Mr Liu invited - - -

20 That paragraph doesn't refer to waste-to-energy at all, does it? It refers to a private trip.---Thank you for the question, Commissioner. You don't have to read paragraphs in isolation. I'm reading it as a whole.

What I'm putting to you, and it's pretty obvious - - -?---No, it doesn't, absolutely. You're right, Commissioner. Sorry, if that's what you're asking, a hundred per cent you're right. This paragraph does not mention it. But I'm talking when I wrote my thing it's as a, I'm an engineer, I'm not a lawyer so I don't dissect every word I do. I know numbers and square roots and integrals and all that, but I don't know this. This is just a typo. So I'm not great, I'm not a, I'm not a lawyer. I'm just a – or I'm an engineer. So we don't, we're not good with words. We're good with numbers.

30 MS HEGER: And you say, "Councillor Badalati met us in Shenzhen," and you say, "We stayed in Shenzhen (a) to do some shopping." So Mr Badalati did some shopping in Shenzhen as well, is that right?---I, that's what he told me, so I put that down.

40 Well, weren't you with him in Shenzhen?---Yeah. I, I don't recall it. That's why I – sorry. That is why in 2019 I wrote this, because when you come and ask me now in 2022, three years later, I can't recall these things. So when you show me that in front of me for the first time, had that been put in front of me before, maybe I would have recollected my thoughts. That hasn't been put in front of me before. It's now I've just seen it, and I'm

trying to get, recollect my thought. And you expect me to be an expert exactly about every word I said. I'm sorry. I can't tell you. I don't - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Please don't be rude. Please don't be rude.---I'm not being rude, Commissioner, I'm just trying to say I don't recall.

Well, I think you are. So just hold back, please.---I'm sorry. Well, if it is, I'll hold it back. Thank you, Commissioner. I don't recall, Ms Heger. Sorry about this.

10

MS HEGER: You don't recall - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Just remind me what the purpose of this memo was.---It's to basically put down on a piece of paper what I recollected from the trip.

And why did you want to do that?---And as I said earlier, it is subsequent to The Sydney Morning Herald on 23 April, sorry, 2 April, and subsequent to a council resolution that Hindi and Badalati be referred to ICAC for investigation, and I thought I better start writing these things down. Because if I'm coming here and get asked questions, I need to remember. Now, I haven't seen this for a while because you've had it and you haven't given it to me. So if I had seen it and studied it at home, I wouldn't, I would have a better understanding of why I did certain things, 'cause I hadn't seen it. So you've taken it – with all due respect, and you've got the right – you took it and you haven't given it back, so I can't do much about it.

20

MS HEGER: All right. So you can't remember whether you spent some time with Mr Badalati in Shenzhen, is that your evidence?---Oh, I think possibly we have but I don't recall.

30

All right. Well, that suggests you were on rather friendly terms around this time, doesn't it?---2019?

I'm sorry?---2019. Oh, 2016, you mean?

No, I mean as at April 2016 when you were in Shenzhen together.---No, not necessarily. It doesn't mean you go, you meet someone for a holiday that means you're, you're friends.

40

Doesn't it?---No. That's not my definition. If yours is that, that's not my definition. Again, we said a political or a colleague on council. So we'd been to a lot of trips as colleagues on council, colleagues on council. You go with, they're not friends.

Well, you could have easily not seen Mayor Badalati at all in Shenzhen if you wanted to, couldn't you?---If, well, if I was there and he was there it would be rude not to see each other. I don't know how you behave but I don't behave that way.

10

All right. If we go over to the next page - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Just before we do, you say in the third paragraph "I had been researching and working with others in Australia to obtain a DA for the construction of the incinerator." Who were the others in Australia you were working with?---Would you like me to put the names in public, because I don't think they're part of this inquiry but I'm happy to do it, but it's not fair because they aren't - - -

20 You can write them on a piece - - -?---Sorry, Commissioner.

You can write them on a piece of paper.---Sorry, Commissioner, they are councillors. So that's why I didn't want to - - -

You were working with councillors?---Yes. Because this whole thing, Commissioner - - -

No, you were working with, the others are councillors, are they?---Yes.

30 And you were working to obtain a DA?---Well, well, looking to look at a DA. Looking to see if we can get a DA in Dubbo.

All right. You'd better put those names on a piece of paper.---Yeah. Thank you. Where does it say that, Commissioner? I'm trying to read, which paragraph was it?

Paragraph 3.---3. Okay, all right. Paragraph 3. Paragraph 3 (not transcribable). Yep.

And those three councillors - - -?---No, they're two councillors and the other one is a, an accountant which you, which, through the private hearing you have spoke to him.

All right. The two councillors, they didn't know anything about waste-to-energy power generation, did they?---Of course they do.

10 What did they know, do you they have any qualifications in that sort of thing?---I think one of them is a chemical engineer and the other one is, knows, done a lot of research, knows a lot about it.

20 What sort of research?---Commissioner, you're, we're making it sound like you need to be an expert in burning waste. Burning waste is the simple part. Zero emission, it's the energy that you create which is my expertise. I'm an expert, I'm an electrical engineer, I've done designs, I've worked in power stations and I've worked in zone substations, I build zones, I design them. So I know once you've burnt it, that's the easy part but you've got to get zero emission. The hard part is to be able to convert it into energy to drive a, to drive a turbine. Once you've driven the gas turbine, that generates
20 Electricity, then you have to connect it to the grid and to connect to the grid you need to have political nous and you need to have expertise to talk to the electricity companies to allow you to connect to the grid. So that's the most difficult - - -

And these two councillors had that sort of expertise, did they?---No, I had the expertise in that.

30 What power station did you visit?---I, I, I used, I worked way back in Munmorah Power Station and I built probably - - -

In what capacity?---As an engineer.

Right.---And I, I - - -

As a civil engineer or construction engineer?---Electrical engineer and as a designer, electrical engineer, I've designed many zone substations here and substations in, in, in the CBD in Sydney. That's what I do, I design them.

40 But they have nothing to do with a power station that converts waste to energy, do they?---Absolutely it does. Because the first thing you do, Commissioner, with all due respect, is, is you get the waste and that gets

sorted, and once it's sorted it's actually incinerated, and the whole aim is you need a zero emission for incinerator, and that's where the hardest part is to find. That's why we went to China to see do they have zero waste incinerator or they're just saying it. And that's got to be tested. And once you got to that and you generated the gas and you heated up the gas, the gas drives the turbine. Once you drive the turbine, that generates electricity. That's, the whole thing's about electricity. It's not really about waste. Waste is a source. It's like coal, it's like gas, no difference.

- 10 No difference?---No, just simple. But you need to find, you need to find the technology that when you incinerate it gives you zero emission, 'cause New South Wales would not allow you to have anything with emission. It's got to be zero emission. That is the difficulty of it. So there's expert that will provide that as chemical engineers and all that, and then you've got the electrical engineers that provide the rest. And also I provide the project management experience and the, and the integration of the whole system together. That's what I would be providing as well. And on top of that, the political connection that I have that would enable me to do it, because these people want political connection to be able to, to allow you to build such a,
- 20 such an incinerator in, in New South Wales.

Well, in any event, you say these two councillors were experts in this area? ---Well, to me, Commissioner, maybe to use the word "expert" means you've got to have qualifications and degrees and all that. To me, "expert" means they understand their work and they've done their research and they've looked at other, they've looked at other waste that's been done in Dubai and in Belgium and other places, and they're thinking, yes, we understand it, we can build it here.

- 30 And to your knowledge those two councillors did that, did they?---That's, that's my understanding, yeah. I'm in discussion with them. They know it. Doesn't mean they build. It's very difficult to find, Commissioner, somebody that can, has built you a \$1 billion waste-to-energy converter. They're not here every day.

- Well, they're not experts in it, then, are they?---No, no, sorry, Commissioner, when you build a substation, a power station, you don't need one person to be the expert to, to build it. There's not one person that builds it. There's a multitude of people and skills that go into it. And that goes for a zone substation, that goes for a power station, that goes for waste-to-
- 40 energy, that goes for a transmission line.

Well, I suppose it gets back to something I raised yesterday, that these are the sort of people that are highly unlikely to have been engaged by a Chinese billionaire for the purpose of constructing a power station in New South Wales.---No, Commissioner. It's very simple. The reason the Chinese billionaire has asked me to be with him is because I have the political connection and the understanding of what the waste-to-energy is and the connection with the electricity companies. I work for Ausgrid so I have that understanding. What he would provide is the expertise to build it.
10 He's built one before, so he brings the expertise here to build it.

So what do you – you provide to the project political connections?
---Number one political connection to be able to get it built, you need to get it approved.

Of course.---Yeah, so that's what I provide.

Yeah.---Number two, I provide the connection with the electricity companies that would allow him and negotiate the terms that would allow
20 him – it's no point burning the waste but you can't, you generate the electricity, where do you put it? Plug it in the ground? You've got to plug it in the system. Someone's got to allow it. So he doesn't know any of that stuff. I've got to do it. I've got the expertise to do it.

Yeah, but are you telling me that you have made approaches to, for example, Ausgrid?---Commissioner, I didn't - - -

That's a simple question. Did you make approaches to, for example, Ausgrid in relation to a waste-to-energy project?---You don't need to make
30 approaches to anybody - - -

That's not answering my question. It's yes or no.---I did not make approaches but I, I know exactly how it works, that's why. I don't have to make approaches.

Thank you. We'll have that marked as a confidential MFI.---Thank you.

MS HEGER: MFI 73.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#MFI-073 – NAMES OF COUNCILLORS WORKING WITH MR HINDI

MS HEGER: On page 2 of these notes, in the fourth paragraph, last sentence, you say, “I found that to be unacceptable and argued with his staff to accept the payment.”---Sorry, what was that, which one? Which paragraph?

10

Fourth paragraph.---Fourth paragraph. Sorry.

Last sentence.---Yeah.

“I found that to be unacceptable and argued with his staff to accept the payment of 4,000 RMB for Mireille and I’s accommodation.”---Ah hmm. Ah hmm.

20 That’s false, isn’t it?---That is again I was putting it in my terms. I was using, I was using the “I” tense, basically.

Well, your evidence now in this public inquiry is that you didn’t participate in the discussion with China Liu’s staff at all, isn’t it?---Absolutely I didn’t.

So why did you say in this document that you argued with the staff?---This is just a document I created. It makes no difference. If it has to be used other than ICAC grabbing it from my house, it wouldn’t be used for nothing.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: But it’s untrue.---Sorry?

It’s untrue.---It is untrue what I wrote there but this is a typo, again. I used it - - -

Another typo?---It is. It’s an oversight, it’s s typo. This is, I wrote that for the sake of just for me, just to put it, did it in a hurry. That could have probably taken me about five minutes I’ve done that. It wasn’t that I sat there for about 10 days and thought about it and tried to put it – did it in about 10 minutes

40

What difference does that make?---It makes a big difference because your

recollection is quickly, you're putting things together, "I, I, I, I", and that's it. You just, I'm trying to throw words in there. This is what I do, I throw words, whether it's I or he or she, I throw words to remind me of what happened. That's all it is, it's reminder. It's like a quick note, just a reminder of what happened. Whether it's I or she or he, I just write it down and then I go back and recollect all my thoughts if I have to on that one. Because there's so many errors in it and it's pretty, there's so many things that's not right. So I just, I said there were about 20 people, oh, I don't know, there was some errors, I don't know. So I don't know, I just wrote it
10 down. I don't recall what was going through my mind at the time when I wrote this. That's all I can say.

MS HEGER: All right. In the next paragraph you say "Eventually Mireille left 4,000 RMB and Mayor Badalati 2,000 RMB with a staff member." You didn't see that happen, did you?---Oh, oh my God. How stupid can I be? I found that would be an acceptable, me making the money and then suddenly I said Mireille paid. How does that work? I must be an idiot. I'm sorry, but I'm just trying to say, that's what I said, I threw them in there without, without a thought. That's all it was in there. So, but I'll answer your
20 question. I'm sorry about this, but I'll answer your question. Did I see Mireille put the, no, I didn't.

And you didn't see Mr Badalati leave any money either, did you?---No, I didn't. I, I personally didn't. I don't recall seeing - - -

All right. So was that paragraph based on the conversation you had with Mrs Hindi in the car that you mentioned?---Yes.

All right. Well, I think the point you were just making was that the last
30 sentence and this sentence are inconsistent but they're not insofar as you were saying in the previous paragraph that you argued with China Liu's staff and then you go on to say that Mireille is the one who left the money. ---Mmm.

So on its face those two propositions are consistent, aren't they?---No, they're not because I don't talk to the guy.

No, but on the face of this document, those two sentences are consistent with each other.---Sorry?
40

In the sense that you did the arguing but then Mireille supposedly left the money.---No. Well, that's what's there. I don't know. I, I haven't read it. So if you give me time to read it carefully I'll probably be able to give you better answers instead of throwing paragraphs at me.

Well, if you'd like to read those two paragraphs now carefully, please do so.---Okay, okay. Okay. Let's go back to the fourth paragraph, if you don't mind. "I found that to be unacceptable and argued with his staff to accept the payment for \$4,000 from Mireille and I." I didn't say I paid the money, did I? Or, or I didn't say I argued, did I? It wasn't me that argued.

Well, you did. You said, "I found that to be unacceptable and argued with his staff to accept the payment."---I, yeah, well that, I probably - - -

That suggests, doesn't it, that you were the one who was arguing with China Liu's staff?---No. It probably said, "I found to be unacceptable and Mireille argued about it," because that - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Where does it say that? I mean, for heaven's sake.---Sorry, Commissioner. If you read the second paragraph that would reflect that.

Well, it doesn't.---Well, it does because Mireille paid the money.

Well, was it true or not that you argued with the staff?---I did not argue with the staff, as I said earlier, and I will repeat that again. I do not get involved in paying money at any hotel I go to and she knows that and we all know that and I've said that in private hearing and I said it now, before. I do not get involved in the money.

But this says differently.---This is what I just wrote. Now, you want to - - -

Is this another typo, is it?---No. To me, I wrote it, Commissioner, I said, probably what I meant by it, I found that to be unacceptable and Mireille argued with the staff for the payment. That's what I'm probably missing and I didn't put that in. Maybe I was in a hurry. So I found it to be unacceptable because they told us to, I found it to be unacceptable so Mireille argued and paid. Nothing wrong with it.

So that sentence should read "I found that to be unacceptable and Mireille argued with his staff"?---Yes, yes. Maybe it's not there. I might have

missed the word “Mireille”. It’s not a typo but I’m, I missed it. It’s the grammar.

MS HEGER: All right, in the next paragraph you also say, “He was pleading with us as his boss would be very upset.”---Yeah.

Now, that implies that you participated in this conversation with China Liu’s staff again, doesn’t it?---No, because I was about two metres away.

10 Well, you say that now, don’t you, Mr Hindi, but your evidence now is inconsistent with what you wrote in this document.---That’s not true.

And I suggest there are all these inconsistencies between this document and what you’re saying now. The reason for those inconsistencies is because none of this ever happened, did it?---That’s not true.

You’re making this up, aren’t you?---That’s not true. You know that. Because I’ve got, I don’t want to say this, I better not say the word, because I could have stuck with the same story of that one. It’s that easy. Why
20 would I change it? I just wrote it of my quick things and typos and grey matter like that. That’s what I wrote.

THE COMMISSIONER: So we should read “He was pleading with us as his boss would be very upset,” it should read, “He was pleading with Mrs Hindi”?---No, have a look what it says. “Eventually Mireille left 4,000 and Mayor Badalati 2,000 with the staff, who would not accept the money, but he finally reluctantly took it. He was pleading with us.” Maybe it meant Badalati and Mireille.

30 But it doesn’t say that.---It says “us”. It means - - -

Well, it includes you, doesn’t it?---Again it’s a grammar.

It’s grammar?---Yes. I call it grammar. I’m an engineer, I’m not a lawyer, so I just see it as grammar.

MS HEGER: You know the difference between the word “us” and the word “them”, don’t you?---Yeah. Sometimes I might have typed the wrong word. As I said, that was - - -
40

THE COMMISSIONER: This is another typo, is it?

MR KUTASI: Commissioner, “us” has a very broad semantic range. It hasn’t been explored at all, and this is not an English lesson. I think Mr - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Sit down.

THE WITNESS: Don’t worry. I won’t – no, keep going. I don’t know, Commissioner. That’s all I can say. I don’t know why I did it. But you’ve got to look at in context when you throw these things in front of me.

10 You’ve got to look at in context. How long did it take Mr Hindi to draft this document? If it took me five minutes, then you are liable to make mistakes. If it took you a week and you went over it so many times, you’re liable to have it correct. So that was done in a quick hurry.

MS HEGER: All right. In the next paragraph you say one of the people who picked, who had been picked up in Beijing saw what happened and he gave Mayor Badalati his business card and said he would gladly confirm what had happened. You didn’t witness that occur, did you?---No, because I was told by Mr Badalati that’s what happened.

20

All right. So this is another instance where you’ve just wrote down what someone else told you, is it?---Yes, absolutely. Because this, this whole thing is not about me and my wife. It was Badalati. So he said – because if you really looked at this, and I said it in my, in my evidence when you showed me the thing in the iPad, “Why did you have that on the iPad?” and I said, “Probably maybe I wanted to rejig that to have the ‘I’ sentence, to be the my tense.” That’s probably what I did, but I did it in a hurry. Changed a few things and did it in a hurry.

30 All right. In the last paragraph you say, “My wife and I have receipts for airfares and hotel accommodation in Shenzhen and Beijing and got a statutory declaration regarding the payment in Tangshan.” You’re referring to the statutory declaration that Mr Badalati provided you, is that right? ---Yes. Yeah, I think so.

And you’re referring to the first version or the second version that I showed you?---I don’t know. As I said to you, I just wrote it, I don’t, I do not recall what was going through my mind around that time.

40 Well, and this suggests that you intended to rely on that statutory declaration for your own purposes, doesn’t it?---No, it suggests that I just wanted to

have some, some notes in there for me for the future, not to rely on anything. This is, if I gave that to my lawyer, he'd laugh at it, the way it's written.

No, but I'm suggesting to you it indicates you intended to rely on that statutory declaration that Mr Badalati arranged, didn't you?---No, I just put comments in there to ensure that I don't forget there was a stat dec somewhere.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, I don't understand that.---Okay, let me explain it to you. It's like, it's like putting a file, a note in your diary, where you put something in there to say, oh, stat dec, I'm going to rely on a stat dec. Doesn't mean it's there. But if I have to down the track, if I need to, I just trying to remind myself there was a stat dec somewhere. And the stat dec, if, if, if I had to use it, I might have to go and ring up the guy and get it changed if that's not what it was, what happened.

20 But what it says is "My wife and I have receipts for airfares and hotel accommodation in Shenzhen and Beijing, and got a statutory declaration regarding the payment in Shenzhen." What you're saying is that you and your wife got a statutory declaration, doesn't it?---That's, that's what's written. Doesn't mean we have one.

So - - -?---Sorry, it depends who that's going to. Who's that note going to? It might be going in my bottom drawer. It's up to me to write what I want to write. This is, if it's going to somebody, then I need to justify what I'm putting.

30 So when you wrote, "My wife and I got a statutory declaration," that was a mistake was it?---We were given a copy, Commissioner. You know that. We, by, that was my evidence. I was given a copy. So I wasn't saying something's right. Whether I was going to use it, whether I thought it was good, I, I, not a matter for me to decide at that time.

I stand to be corrected but I thought your evidence yesterday was that you didn't receive a statutory declaration?---Commissioner, I said I was given a copy by Mr Badalati.

40 Right. Thank you.---Thank you. Sorry.

MS HEGER: If you go to the next page of this volume, take a moment to read the first, say, three dot points.---Yes. I don't have to read it. I've seen it.

All right. These are Mr Badalati's notes of his trip to China. Correct?
---Absolutely. You've shown us that before.

And these notes were found at your house?---Yes.

10 Mr Badalati gave you those notes?---Yes.

And the reason why you kept a copy of those notes is so that you could make sure your story was consistent with Mayor Badalati's account of the trip to China. Correct?---Oh, God. All right. You've shown me, with all due respect, you've shown me the, the, the similar thing on my iPad. So whether it's a hard copy, whether it's an iPad, the same thing. I was given a copy so just in case I need to use it in the future, so, or I can, I can reword it in my own "I" tense, I don't know how you say it in English, but the, the "I" tense rather than the Badalati tense.

20

So were you given a hard copy of these notes by Mr Badalati and then you copied them onto your iPad. Is that what happened?---No. I don't recall that.

So why do you have two versions of it, one in hard copy and one your iPad?---Well, I don't know. I don't recall.

All right. I'll tender volume 3.23.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MS HEGER: 301. Exhibit 301.---Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#EXH-301 – VOLUME 3.23

40 MS HEGER: I'm going to show you volume 3.25. Have you seen this document before?---I don't recall that.

All right. It's entitled Confidential and Not Investment Advice Not To Be Used Except By Xinfeng Australia International Investment Pty Ltd?
---Yeah.

And you understand that's China Liu's company?---Yes.

It refers to "potential issues with the development site, comprising" and then it lists an address and that's the address for Landmark Square. Correct?
10 ---Yeah.

All right. And the date of the document at the bottom says 2 August, 2016. Do you see that in the footer?---Yeah.

Now, I can tell you this document was found at your house. Why did you have a copy of this?---I don't - - -

Well, first of all, who gave it to you?---I don't recall.

20 And why were you given it?---I don't know. I don't recall it being there. I don't recall seeing it.

Well, did Philip Uy give it to you?---I don't recall.

Did China Liu give it to you?---I don't recall. No, China Liu? No. Sorry. I don't recall.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, somebody must have given it to you?---No. Someone, I don't know. I don't recall it being at home at all.
30

Well, I want you to assume for the moment that it was found at your home. ---Whereabouts?

Please don't ask questions.---I'm sorry, Commissioner, because my house is big and it could be in different offices, different places. I don't know. Someone could have given me something and I've never read it. It was part of, part of some, some documentation, I don't know.

It was found at your house.---Yes.
40
Why was it there?---I don't know.

MS HEGER: Did Wensheng Liu give it to you?---No. I don't, I don't recall the document to say yes or no. I don't recall.

You can't remember who gave it to you?---No. At all. I don't even remember seeing it.

All right. Well, it rather suggests that around this time, August 2016, you were working together with Philip Uy, at least, on progressing the
10 Landmark Square planning proposal, doesn't it?---No, no, no. 2016 August, I wasn't a councillor.

I understand that.---Yeah, so what was I doing with Philip Uy?

Well, you were still helping Philip Uy to progress the Landmark Square planning proposal around this time, weren't you?---Well, you've got plenty of phone records. If you can show me that I've spoken to him, I happy to - -
-

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I've - - -?---I don't know. I don't, I don't - - -

I've really had enough of this.---Sorry, Commissioner.

You're being asked questions. I don't want any more speeches.---Okay. Thank you.

Listen to the questions and answer them.---Thank you, Commissioner.

Do you understand?---I will do that. Thank you.

30

Thank you.---Thank you. Sorry, Ms Heger.

MS HEGER: Despite not being a councillor around this time, you were still advising Philip Uy on the Landmark Square planning proposal from time to time, weren't you?---I was not advising but maybe when he asked for help I, I, I talked to him about it if it was, as a normal constituent, or as a real estate agent.

All right. And you still can't recall why you had this document?---No. I've
40 never seen it before.

Well, you must have seen it before. It was found at your house.---Maybe Mrs Hindi had it, I don't know. I haven't seen it before. Why didn't you put it in front of - - -

Why would Mrs Hindi have it?---Why didn't you put in front of her?

Why would Mrs Hindi have it?---I don't know. I said I don't, I said – sorry. I don't know.

10 All right. I'll tender volume 3.25 as Exhibit 302.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#EXH-302 – VOLUME 3.25

MS HEGER: Mr Hindi, I asked you yesterday about the agreement you signed with China Liu regarding the waste-to-energy plant. Do you recall that?---Yes.
20

I should just show you the agreement to confirm that we're talking about the same thing, volume 1.8, which is Exhibit 131. Is this is the agreement you signed with China Liu first in Australia and then in Tangshan?---I don't recall.

Well, have a read of the first page.---No, no. Have a look at the end, if it's signed or not.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Please.---Sorry, I've read it. Yeah, I know it. I've read it. I've, I've read it.

MS HEGER: Do you need to read the balance of it to answer my question? ---No. I can answer your questions.

All right.---But you've got to just flick the pages if you don't mind so I can see.

40 Certainly. Let's move through the document.---Okay. Can you stop at that, if you don't mind? Yep. Now you can ask me.

All right. Is this the agreement that you signed with China Liu in Australia in May 2016?---I don't recall if it's this one or another one but I've signed something, but I don't recall whether it's this one or not. But there is - - -

You signed something very similar to this, didn't you?---I don't recall because, unless you show me the document, I don't recall and I can't mislead you and say, yes, I did.

10 Well, if you need more time to read through the document, please take it, Mr Hindi.---No. Can I just, if you want me to, the last page says "This letter of intent is to prevail in Chinese." Now, I would not be signing – sorry, Commissioner. I would not be signing this if it prevails in Chinese because I can't read Chinese. So no idiot would sign this, if I did sign that one. I wouldn't be signing it, if I did I would be stupid because he could be writing anything in Chinese and it prevails over English.

20 So you deny signing this version of the agreement, is that right?---Well, I'm not denying it because I don't recall the version that I signed but I was in China and I signed a big ceremony. So of course it was signed by some agreement.

And I'm just asking to you look at this document and tell me whether it's the one you signed or not.---I don't recall.

Okay.---But as I said - - -

30 But the document you signed was substantially similar in terms of the obligations it imposed on China Liu and on you, or Variable Solutions?---I do not recall. I do not recall signing because it says "This letter, it prevails Chinese." When it says that I get worried because they can write anything in Chinese and - - -

Well, just put that to one side for a moment.---No, because it's important to me.

40 And look at the obligations that are set out in this agreement. If we go back to the first page - - -?---You can put it – oh, all right. You can put any obligation, I did maybe not sign it because I thought it prevails in Chinese, I'm not signing it. Maybe they gave me something else that was in English. I - - -

Mr Hindi, I would like you to look at the substance of the document, that is the obligations imposed on - - -?---Hang on.

- - - Xinfeng and the obligations imposed on Variable Solutions and I would like you to tell me whether those obligations are substantially the same as the obligations that you signed up to in Tangshan.---Okay, let's have a read. Can we go to the next page, please? Can you, yeah, next page, please. Can we go to the next page, please. Next page, please. Thank you. Yep.

10

All right. So in terms of the obligations imposed on Xinfeng and Variable Solutions, they're substantially the same as the obligations set out in the agreement that you signed in Tangshan, aren't they?---I don't know, but 'cause you're not accepting "I don't know", so I'll say yeah, maybe.

Well, you can't tell me there are any significant differences between the obligations set out in this document and the obligations you signed up to in Tangshan, can you?---How can I tell you if I haven't seen the other one after five years?

20

The answer to my question is no?---No.

All right.---Sorry? The answer to this question is no? I don't know whether they're the same or not, I don't know. Not sure.

No, you can't tell me that there are any significant differences between - - - ?---No, then I - - -

- - - the obligations in this document and what you signed up to in Tangshan? You can't tell me that, can you?---I cannot tell you if there are significant differences if I don't see the other copy.

30

All right.---It's not that difficult.

Can I show you volume 2.13, page 37.---Yeah.

40

2.13, page 37. All right. That's a picture of you and China Liu at the signing ceremony in Tangshan, where you signed the agreement between Variable Solutions and Xinfeng, correct?---Yes, that was witnessed by the senior minister of the government.

Yes. Thank you for that, Mr Hindi. I'll tender that. That'll be Exhibit 303.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#EXH-303 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 2.13 PAGE 37

MS HEGER: Mr Hindi, you mentioned a dinner at your house in August
10 2016 yesterday. Correct?---I, I don't recall that dinner even though I
mentioned it, 'cause I saw a photo of it.

All right.---That's the only thing that reminded me there was a dinner. If I
didn't have that photo, I wouldn't have been reminded of it at all.

Okay. Can I show you volume 2.13, page 49. You see this is dated 1
August, 2016.---I'm smoking, sorry, smoking's bad for you, but anyway,
yeah.

20 Is that a dinner at your house?---Absolutely.

That's China Liu there.---Absolutely.

Who else was at that dinner?---I don't recall. As I said, if it wasn't because
of that photo, I wouldn't have known.

And what was the purpose of that dinner?---We just signed an agreement in
China. We're going to work together on the waste-to-energy, being an
electrical engineer, connect it to the power grid and put New South Wales
30 on the map if we can.

All right. You were pretty friendly with China Liu by this point?
---Well, you can't be friendly with him if he can't speak English.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry?---Doesn't speak English.

MS HEGER: He had an interpreter, didn't he?---Yeah, but, you know, we
hug and we say hello, how you going, yeah.

40 You were pretty friendly with China Liu by this point?---I don't know what
you say friendly – yeah, okay. Friendly. I've been nice to him, yeah. I'm

nice to him. He's not my friend but, yeah, acquaintance. Business, sorry, he's a business acquaintance, yeah.

A business acquaintance.---Yeah. If, if it did eventuate and get off the ground but, yeah, that's at the time we've signed an agreement so you've got a business venture and that's when I wasn't a councillor.

All right. I tender that photograph. That will be Exhibit 304.

10

#EXH-304 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 3.12 PAGE 49

MS HEGER: Can I show you in the same volume 2.13, page 50. All right. Now, you don't need to tell me the name of any officials who attended this function but this was a Liberal Party function. Correct?---I don't recall.

That's Gensheng Yu in that photograph. Correct?---Who?

20 Gensheng Yu?---I don't even know who he is.

He's a person who worked with China Liu.---Oh, well, if you're telling me that, fine.

THE COMMISSIONER: Please.---Seriously I don't know. I don't - - -

Well, then the answer is "I don't know."---Oh, sorry. My apologies. I don't know.

30 I don't know. There are all these blue and white balloons there.---Yeah.

I think I can see some wording which I'm sure if it was blown up would say Liberal.---I don't - - -

And you're telling me you don't know that that's a Liberal Party function? ---I don't recall the function. It's six years ago.

MS HEGER: China Liu was at this function as well. Correct?---I don't, I don't recall the function.

40

You invited China Liu to attend this function, didn't you?---I don't recall the function.

All right. I'll tender that photograph. Exhibit 304 [sic].

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#EXH-305 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 2.13 PAGE 50

10

MS HEGER: Mr Hindi, you travelled to China again in August 2018 with Mrs Hindi. Correct?---Oh, gee, you've got my passport here. Sorry, what was that?

August 2018.---Yes, we did.

I'm going to show you volume 2.13, page 57.---Yes.

20 You can see the date of the photograph is 15 August, 2018.---Ah hmm.

That's you and Mrs Hindi in China. Correct?---Correct.

Yes?---Yes.

And Mr Badalati and his wife were on this trip as well, weren't they?---Yep, and his daughter.

And you met up with Philip Uy in China on this occasion.---Yes.

30

What was the purpose of this trip?---It was just a holiday and shopping.

All right. And did you just call Philip Uy when you arrived in China to meet him or did you arrange that before you left?---I don't think I called him. Maybe Mr Badalati did.

All right. You were certainly friends with Philip Uy by this point, weren't you?---I wouldn't say friends. Acquaintance.

40 Well, you chose to meet up with him on your private holiday to China. That rather suggests you were friends, doesn't it?---I met with someone in

Lebanon when I went. It doesn't mean he's my friend. The same thing. He lives in Hong Kong so I met him there. It doesn't mean he's your friend. It just happened he's there.

THE COMMISSIONER: What does it mean then?---It means he's an acquaintance. He's someone – friends, close friends and friends are people that you can count them on your hands. It's not just friends. An acquaintance. To me it's an acquaintance.

10 MS HEGER: All right. Volume 2.13, page 50 should have been Exhibit 305 and this photograph I'll now tender as Exhibit 306.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#EXH-306 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 2.13 PAGE 57

20 MS HEGER: Mr Hindi, you continued to make decisions on the Landmark Square planning proposal throughout 2018 and 2019. Correct?---Yes.

And I suggest to you that throughout that period you still knew that Philip Uy had some sort of financial interest in the Landmark Square planning proposal.---No.

I suggest to you that throughout that period, 2018/2019, you were friends with Philip Uy.---No.

30 Your relationship with him throughout that period constituted a non-pecuniary conflict of interest.---Absolutely not.

And indeed a significant non-pecuniary conflict of interest.---Absolutely not.

And I also suggest to you that as a result of receiving the cash payment from Philip Uy in July 2018 after that you felt a sense of obligation to keep voting in favour of Landmark Square.---Sorry. Now, have you pinned the date to July 2018, is it?

40 Yes, that's what I'm suggesting.---That is absolutely not true.

Philip Uy paid you cash at that time for Landmark Square and as a result, you felt on the hook, didn't you?---Absolutely not. I vote for things on their merit and I've proven here that everything I voted was on its merit.

All right. Can I show you volume 1.6, page 234?---Yeah. I thought we're not going to have any more questions? Okay.

You sent this text message to Ryan Cole in January 2020. Correct?
---Absolutely.

10

You were keen to follow up on the progress of the VPA for the Landmark Square planning proposal?---I was not keen. I was following up what people have asked me to, to chase up.

Who asked you to chase it up?---Philip Uy.

And why did he ask you to chase it up?---Because he was concerned it's taking too long, so I said I'll chase it up, see what happens. Can I just make it clear again, and I made that statement earlier and that needs to, did you say, what, when was that date of that? Sorry?

20

January 2020.---Yeah. Can I make it clear. As I said to you around, well, sorry, as I said to the Commission, around October 2019, my circumstances have changed and I've been meeting with a lot of more people, I met with Faye a lot more, discussed education, discussed other things. So I had to reassess and re-evaluate if anything came up to council, whether I'd declare interest or not and how I do it. So that would have been a normal chasing up.

30 And you understood the reason why Philip Uy was asking you to chase it up was because he still had some sort of financial interest in the Landmark Square planning proposal. Correct?---Absolutely not because he may have opportunities in the future. I don't know what they are. Maybe opportunities in the future. He may want to sell the units for him, I don't know. It's opportunity.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he must have had some interest to raise this issue with you - - -?---People have interest but the interest, Commissioner, might not be a current interest. It could be an opportunity in the future.

40 That's how real estate works, that's how everyone, developers work. They don't look at today. They look what the future brings. What can this person

as a Prime Hurstville, Aoyuan, big company, well-known in, in Sydney, what can they bring to me? Maybe that's what he was looking at. And he says, "I ring up the council and see what they say," so he did, and I said, "Quick, I'll send a text." No big deal.

MS HEGER: All right.---And I, sorry, Commissioner. Can I say something? Around this time, I knew the Commission was looking at all these things. So it wasn't I was sending them because I would have hidden it. I knew the Commission was looking at this because it was told, we were
10 told, so there's no issue. We knew around that time that the Commission was looking at all this, so didn't, it was leaked out, so it wasn't like we were trying to hide it. I had no - - -

Why did you ask this query of Mr Cole via text message as opposed to an email to and from council email addresses?---Because we normally have a habit. We, we text, we text managers and, and directors. It's easier because they have their phone in their hand. They can easily respond in something that simple rather than sending an email and then by the time they read it, comes back. That's why. You just text them. Most of the time, you text
20 them.

Most of the time, you text council staff rather than emailing them. Is that your position?---Yeah. Yeah, most of the time. Directors. Directors, you have. Managers, slightly different but directors and, and Mr Cole was acting as the, as the director of planning. So he, he was acting for Meryl Bishop. That's why I sent it to him.

All right. Well, if we go to page 233, the previous page in that volume.
---Yeah.

30 Ms McMahon responded to your query about the VPA. You read that email at the time. Correct?---Let's have a look. So when was the other text if you don't mind me asking?

Well, it was I think just prior to this email because you'll see - - -?---What, what date?

- - - beneath the email is an email from Ryan Cole, 15 January 2020, which says, "Hi, Cathy, can you please see the request" - - -?---Yes.

40 - - - "from Councillor Hindi below and provide a response?"---Good. Yeah.

So you received this response from Ms McMahon and you read it around this time. Correct?---Yes. Yes.

And then if we go to volume 1.7, page 1.---I might have to come back to that one, too.

Well, Mr Corsaro can ask you more about that email if he thinks that's appropriate.---Well, he's, yeah, he doesn't have time to ask me because we don't have the transcript.
10

All right. Meryl Bishop then also responded to your query regarding the VPA in this email?---Yes, when she got back from holidays.

And you read this email at the time?---I would have read it, yeah.

All right. Then if we move to page 2 of the same volume.---Ah hmm.

You responded and said, "Thank you. I agree. They must comply with our VPA procedures. We must ensure that council is fully protected."---Ah
20
hmm.

So you were satisfied with Ms Bishop's response at that time?---That's what she told me. I said, "Fine."

All right. If we move to page 3. You'll see in the email below, Adrian Liaw raises the issue of the caveat for the VPA again.---Yep.

And you then send an email to Ms Bishop again raising the question why a caveat cannot be registered on title, correct?---Correct.
30

And were you raising that as an issue to promote the interests of Philip Uy? ---No. I was raising it because I felt there was an injustice there. Clear. Of course. No, I wasn't doing it for him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Injustice. What sort of injustice?---Well, I'm looking at it because we've done caveats before and I'm thinking these people have been doing for five years. It's not like any special treatment, they've done it in seven months like Fridcorp and got 300 units. So I
40
thought it's only fair and if you can't get the, if you can't get the tenants on your land to actually agree to, to, to sign, because they've got to give

permission, they might say, “We’ll hold you to the ransom.” We’re not going to do it. So these people are sitting there on millions of dollars, and that’s Aoyuan we’re talking about here, and they can’t register because there’s some, something on the title to deal with their leases. So we said “Put a caveat, same thing.” “Oh, no, no.” I said “Parramatta Council does it. Liverpool does it.”

MS HEGER: All right. Did Philip Uy suggest to you that this should be done by a caveat?---He hasn’t got a clue what a caveat is. Well, maybe he
10 does, I shouldn’t be saying that but I don’t know but he didn’t suggest it to me, no, no. As a real estate agent he may.

All right. You were pursuing this issue so vigorously because you were still on the hook as a result of the payment you’d received in 2018 regarding Landmark Square, weren’t you?---That is not true. Do we back to the Cathy McMahon thing where it says “I will” – can we just go back, if you don’t mind to this? This is very important.

No, no, no. I’m not going to go back to that, Mr Hindi.---Oh, okay.
20 Anything positive for me we won’t put. Okay, I can see how - - -

I’m not going back to - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: I beg – that is totally unacceptable.---Well, I’m just – can we go back, if you don’t mind? Because that’s important. I’m going to make a comment that puts the whole thing in context, if you don’t mind me asking. Because that looks like badgering and persistence of me, I’m just going to show you why it’s not because it’s what Cathy McMahon said.
30

MS HEGER: All right. I think Mr Corsaro already covered this issue in cross-examination that you want to raise.---No, I don’t think he has. Anyway.

And you’re well entitled to raise it in your own submissions as well.
---Okay. It’s basically because she, because she said “I will” - - -

And Mr Corsaro can ask you questions about it in re-examination if he wishes to.---She said “I will ask the lawyers to see if we can put a caveat.”
40 She said, “I will chase it, I’ll tell to arrange for the caveat.” She said it.

I understand that and that has in fact been covered - - -?---“I’ll arrange for a caveat.” So that’s what we were asking.

- - - already by Mr Corsaro in cross-examination.---Okay. Sorry about that. Thank you.

All right. You’ll recall I showed you an iPad yesterday?---Yes.

10 You did in fact use that iPad from time to time in 2020, didn’t you?---I don’t recall.

I’m going to show you a photograph, volume 19.9. That’s you using the iPad I showed you, isn’t it?---Yep. Is that the same iPad?

Well, I suggest to you it is the same iPad.---I did say I, I did say I have five iPads.

20 Right. Well, you see the cover on the back with the distinctive window? ---Yeah, they’re the same. Yeah, I had the same thing, another one.

You had another iPad with the same cover, did you?---Yes, yes.

I find that very hard to believe, Mr Hindi. Is that really your evidence? ---That’s my evidence.

Okay. I’ll tender that photograph. That will be Exhibit 307.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

30

#EXH-307 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 19.9

THE WITNESS: Where was that at? That’s a good photo taken of me, I didn’t know (not transcribable). A photo.

MS HEGER: The iPad I showed you yesterday, you used that in 2014, didn’t you?---I don’t recall.

40 Well, that iPad was found in the office upstairs at your house. Do you accept that?---Well, if that’s what you’re telling me, fine.

Well, you were there, weren't you, when it was found?---We have three storeys. I wasn't sitting with every officer. There were four of them so - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: That's not an answer to the question.---Sorry. I didn't not see him take it from there, Commissioner, because I couldn't. So I did not see him take it from upstairs.

10 MS HEGER: Well, when the iPad was taken from that office you told investigators that it was an office that you and your son used, didn't you? I don't recall saying that, but if that's what they said, that's what they said.

THE COMMISSIONER: Was that the fact?---No, well, what, we're talking about the, we're talking about the date that they came in, which was around October 2020.

No, I'm asking you, the question really is - - -?---Sorry?

20 - - - was that office one that was customarily used by you and your son?
---Okay. If you want to call it an office, I don't call it an office because - - -

Was that room - - -?---That's a bedroom. That's my main bedroom.

Was that bedroom customarily used by you and your son as an office?
---Post, post March 2020, yes. Prior to that, no.

MS HEGER: That iPad was primarily your iPad, wasn't it?---I don't recall.

30 Can I show you volume 2.24, page 5. Email number 17. Right. Look at email number 17. That's an email from your Gmail account to your own Gmail account. You see that?---Ah hmm.

Subject is "Landmark VPA". And then in the body?---When's the, sorry, when's the date of that?

Date is 14 April, 2020.---Ah hmm, yep.

40 The body of the email has the names of a number of councillors as well as some council staff.---Yes.

And it says, "Dear councillors, I'm writing to you requesting your assistance to finalise the above matter. I want to thank the staff and councillors for working with us as the new owners and applicants of this planning proposal."---Yes.

You drafted this note at the request of Philip Uy, correct?---I don't recall but I did say yesterday that I did assist him in draft, in, in putting words to say to send to the councillors about the, what Robert Stokes said.

10 Well, as I understand your evidence yesterday, you didn't say anything about you personally drafting the note.---I said I assisted him in doing it. Doesn't mean I drafted it. I assisted. Assisted. You could be drafting as well. You're assisting.

Okay.---And I wasn't hiding it. I've made it clear. September to 20 October, 2019, my circumstances have changed. I was helping. Didn't worry me.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Helping or not, you drafted it, didn't you?
---That's not the whole letter. This is nothing. It's a couple of words in there. This is just giving him an idea about Robert Stokes. And then I said, "You get your lawyer to do it." You think Philip Uy's going to draft it? I said to his lawyer, I said, "Send it to the councillors" - - -

Please come back to my question.---Sorry.

You drafted this, didn't you?---What do you mean "drafted this" as that little two paragraphs?

30 Correct?---I don't recall if I drafted them or not. But if I did, if it's shown there as Ms Heger's saying, then I accept it.

You sent this from your email to your email.---It doesn't mean I drafted it.

Who else would have drafted it?---Commissioner, as I said, I don't recall.

Who else could have drafted it?---I don't recall.

Can we accept that it wouldn't have been Philip Uy?---Absolutely.

40 Well, what are the other possibilities?---I don't know.

You don't know?---No.

MS HEGER: Did Mrs Hindi draft it?---I, I, I don't, I don't think so but I don't recall. I don't know. As I said, as I said, I - - -

Who else had access to your Gmail account around this time?---Sorry?

10 Who else had access to your Gmail account around this time?---I don't know.

There was no one other than you, was it?---Well, if you draw that - - -

Or Mrs Hindi?---If you're drawing that inference, if it's me, I don't recall it, but it could be me, but I don't recall it.

20 All right.---I don't recall it. But I do recall assisting in drafting something to do with Robert Stokes and to send to the councillors. I said, "You will do that." And I do that with many other constituents. Many. I've assisted, I've actually drafted things for them 'cause I said, to help them out because they don't know how to draft it to send to councillors so they can take their cause and, and, and talk to them. So - - -

Are there other examples where you've drafted correspondence on behalf of an applicant for a DA or a planning proposal that was then currently before council, correspondence to council?---Sorry, this is not before council.

30 Landmark Square planning proposal was still before council at this time, wasn't it?---No, it's not before council, I'm sorry. It was not before council on - - -

Well, the VPA was before council, wasn't it?---I'm sorry, in, we have not voted on anything post April 2020 so it couldn't have been on council and if it was, and I said clear, I'm happy to reassess and re-evaluate a perceived or potential conflict of interest and act accordingly as, in accordance with the code. There was nothing that did.

40 Mr Hindi, it was highly inappropriate for you to be drafting correspondence on behalf of the applicants for a planning proposal when the VPA was still under consideration by council, wasn't it?---When was the VPA finalised

and when, sorry, when did the VPA come to council to be voted on, to be voted on?

THE COMMISSIONER: Why does that matter?---It makes a big difference because if there's a, if there's a DA on foot, that's on foot, then I should have declared interest because I was, I was drafting or assisting in drafting so I had to declare interest if I voted on it. I want to see if I voted on something that I shouldn't have voted around that date.

10 I think Counsel's question was wasn't this inappropriate for you to be doing at all, that is assisting in the way that you have an applicant for a development which would find its way to council and you would vote on. ---Commissioner, if as I repeated, if that was on foot, that DA, it had to be, it's going to come to council it would be inappropriate absolutely but it is appropriate to assist as much as you can with people who can't draft in English to assist if it's not coming to council and if you did assist and it came to council then you'd declare interest because you have been involved. So it's clear. But this case I don't think I assisted them by saying this is what you should tell your lawyer to write and he should be able to write it.

20

But it did come to council, didn't it?---I don't, I don't recall if it did. Just tell me if it did and - - -

Well, I stand to be corrected but it did and you didn't make - - -?---No, no, sorry. Sorry, Commissioner. This is 14 April, 2020.

Correct.---So I don't think it came to council because it was gazetted in August 2020 and it didn't need to come to council. It - - -

30 MS HEGER: Well, it was still before council in the sense that there was still this debate around this time as to whether the VPA should be registered or subject to a caveat.---Yes, that's true. That's administration work. That is not council work. We don't vote on that.

Well, councillors may not vote on it but it's something council staff had to deal with and in fact - - -?---Yeah, but it's got nothing - - -

- - - Ms Bishop and Ms Macmahon were dealing with around this time. ---Yeah. So?

40

Correct?---I have every right to ask the questions as long as I don't vote on it. I can ask all the questions I want as long as I don't vote on it.

You can ask questions of staff about it but it's an entirely different proposition for you to ghost write correspondence to council on behalf of the applicants for the planning proposal that the VPA concerns.---You're making it sound I wrote the whole letter on their behalf and I've actually put it. That is only a couple of paragraphs that he can use because he was unaware that The Honourable Robert Stokes said, "We need to get this
10 planning proposal moved and we need to get construction happening and we need to get section 94 deferred until OC." That's what I was trying to tell him.

THE COMMISSIONER: What difference does that make?---That makes, I'm giving, I'm giving an applicant or I'm giving a, a, a real estate agent or a concerned citizen or even the people that actually have the sites, right, the owners, I'm giving them something to say this is something that just came up from the minister. Use it. Send it to the councillors and tell them.

20 Yeah, use it so it may help you.---Oh, so you think when I help a constituent I give them things that's not going to help them? Of course I'm, we're going to give things because - - -

Don't speak to me like that.---Sorry, Commissioner. We're going to give things to constituents to help them and that's what I was trying to do.

And so you're telling me on your oath - - -?---Yes.

- - - that you were doing this for Philip Uy as a constituent?---I was doing it
30 as a person that was requesting that and I've said my relationship has changed with Philip Uy and others post October 2019. That was made clear now and in the private hearing.

Well, in what capacity were you doing this, providing the service?---As a, as a real estate agent that may want to get work from Aoyuan down the track or maybe Aoyuan themselves.

What did that have to do with you?---I'm a councillor. I'm meant to be helping people. That's your job. You'll never get re-elected if you don't
40 help people. We're not like a board that you just, someone throws you in there. You have to be re-elected. You've got to show you've helped people.

That's how you do it. So what, what difficult for me was to say three words to the guy look, put in this thing, send it to councillors. Robert, because half the council wouldn't have heard what Robert Stokes has said or whatever. Tell them, bring, bring it up to their attention to see what happens.

Well, when it comes down to it you didn't see and you still don't see that there's anything inappropriate in what you did.---Absolutely not.

Absolutely no.---Because that's what we do all the time.

10

Because you do it all the time.---Yep, and we've done it before.

And you've done it before.---Now, the question is, Commissioner, I want to get it straight here, you're saying I've drafted the whole thing. This is only a part of a letter that was sent and if you, if you actually want to put the letter up there you'll get to see how much was used.

I did not say that you drafted the whole thing nor did Counsel Assisting.---I drafted a bit.

20

Just a moment.---Yes. Sorry. Yeah.

I just put to you that you have drafted what you've been shown.---Yes, because if someone can't speak English well you try to help him.

Right.---So if I get a constituent that I saved a \$3,000 fine 'cause he can't speak English, and I wrote, and I told him what to write to council and he did and he got the fine revoked, I did a deed for the guy. That's what you do. That's what our job is. But anyway. That's what a councillor does.

30

MS HEGER: Can I just go back to page 2 of the same volume. Just look at emails 1 to 4 there. They are emails to Mrs Hindi's Hotmail address and the subject lines refer to The One Capital Group put-and-call option.---Yeah - -
-

The dates of those emails are July 2014.---Sorry, sorry, sorry, just having a look. So which one you want me to look at?

Just look at items 1 to 4.---Ah hmm.

40

The first one is to Mrs Hindi's Hotmail address, the second one to Sydney Realty Online, the third one to Mrs Hindi's Hotmail, and the fourth one to Mrs Hindi's Hotmail.---Yeah.

And they were also found on the iPad I showed you yesterday.---Yep.

Each of them, the subject line refers to a One Capital Group put-and-call option.---Yep.

10 And the address, or part of the address, for Landmark Square.---Part of the address, yeah.

Did you see these emails at any point prior to voting on 20 April, 2016?
---No.

You sure about that?---Oh, well, I, best of my recollection, no. Why would I see it? Unless they send to me, that's different, but (not transcribable) been sent to me, I didn't see it. If he sent it to me - - -

20 Well, what I'm suggesting is that around this time, 2014 to 2016, Mrs Hindi's Hotmail account was accessible on the iPad that I showed you.
---May have been.

And it was accessible to you, wasn't it?---I've never used it, didn't use it. I, I don't go into her accounts. There's no need for it. I don't - - -

30 But you could have gone into her accounts because they weren't password protected around that time, were they?---They may have been. That's where you're getting it all mixed up. They may have been password because you may, I, you, all you do, change your password and then have to reset it to change the password, so it may have been changed the day before. Because that's why you're not putting it on aeroplane mode. You're leaving it there because you'll use it. That's why you keep it on aeroplane mode, because you can get it without password. But that would have been changed after that date. Easy.

All right. Can I show you - - -?---But if you can show me emails, then I, I don't know, I don't recall.

40 Can I show you volume 1.7, page 12. This is an email from Cam Ly to the minister, shown there.---Ah hmm. Ah hmm.

Copied to yourself and a number of other councillors and some council staff, dated 21 May, 2020.---Ah hmm.

And if we go to the attachment, you were referring to a letter earlier to this minister. Is this the letter you were referring to?---I think so, yeah, that's the one, yeah.

If we go to the next page.---Yeah.

10

All right. Aside from - - -?---I don't know if it's this one, sorry. Maybe a different one.

You're not sure if it's this one?---No, I don't think, 'cause that seems to be on behalf of the AC motors, whatever, I don't know.

Yep. Did – well, first of all, Cam Ly is a solicitor that Philip Uy uses from time to time, isn't he?---I don't know. I've only met him once.

20 In what context did you meet him?---I met him at (not transcribable) when ICAC took a photo of us.

Was Philip Uy there as well?---Yes. And Mrs Hindi was there and they took a photo.

Yeah.---And we saw it. Anyway.

30 And you – and when was that?---I don't know. It was around 2020 sometime. 'Cause he was showing us the Moorebank development that his friend wants to sell, and see if Mireille can sell it for him.

Was it before or after this email was sent?---I don't recall, to be honest with you. It's around that time 'cause it's 2020. And my, as I said, my circumstances changed around 2020, so, yeah, my - - -

All right. You knew from that meeting that Cam Ly was a solicitor Philip Uy uses from time to time, didn't you?---I did not, I didn't know. I - - -

40 Did you advise Philip Uy on this letter?---I don't recall.

Can I show you a photograph, volume 19.11? This photograph was taken on 20 May, 2020, which is the day before that email I just showed you was sent.---Before the email was sent?

Yeah.---Yes.

If we zoom in on the document you're holding?---Where's that at? Well, yeah. Yeah.

10 You see it says "Cam Ly & Co" at the top?---Yes.

Is that the letter to the minister I just showed you?---I don't know.

Could it be some other letter?---I don't know.

You were advising Philip Uy on the contents of this letter, weren't you, at this meeting?---How do you know that's the letter that she actually just sent to the minister?

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Please don't ask questions.---I'm sorry. I don't know.

MS HEGER: Well, the letter that you're holding in your hands, you were advising Philip Uy on the contents of that letter at this meeting, weren't you?---No, because I don't know what the contents of this letter is. I can't see it to know. I, I don't have X-ray vision but I don't know what it is.

Well, why else would you be holding it at a meeting with Philip Uy if you weren't advising him about it?---I don't know. Maybe it's a letter about
30 Moorebank, maybe, that his friends want to, he was trying to sell? I don't know. I can't tell you what it is - - -

Are you seriously suggesting that this letter had nothing to do with Landmark Square?---I'm not suggesting anything 'cause I don't recall what's in it.

Well, I suggest to you, Mr Hindi, it is a letter about Landmark Square and you were advising Mr Uy on its contents. What do you say about that?---I don't know what's in the letter. I don't agree. But I was, I did help to draft
40 things, what to put in letters to send to councillors, I don't shy from that.

And I don't see any issue with that. Plus there was no DAs in front of councillors to worry about.

All right. And you were still advising Philip Uy on Landmark Square at this time because you were still on a hook as a result of the cash payment you'd received. Correct?---That is not correct.

All right. I tender 19.11. That's - - -?---I thought you didn't have any more questions.

10

THE COMMISSIONER: I beg your pardon?---Sorry.

No. Repeat what you just said?---I thought we were told we were not going to have more question, but you did, that's fine. I just wasn't prepared, that's all. Thank you. I just, no, I understand, Commissioner. You've got every right to ask but I was just, wasn't prepared, that's all. Thank you. That's all I'll say.

MS HEGER: 19.11 will be Exhibit 308.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. Thanks.

#EXH-308 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 19.11

MS HEGER: Can I show you 19.12? That's a picture on the same day of the same meeting. Why was Mrs Hindi there?---Yeah, we saw the bloke take the photo.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: But that wasn't - - -?---The question, wasn't the question, sorry - - -

Just stop your gratuitous comments and answer the questions, please?
---Now, what was that, sorry?

40

MS HEGER: Why was Mrs Hindi at this meeting, as well?---That was around COVID time. We were walking around the park, meeting with Philip Uy, when I was trying to come up with new businesses, education, anything that comes up, I'm happy to deal with because I need, at the time, I didn't have a job.

So that's what you were talking about at this meeting - - -?---I don't know what I was - - -

- - - potential job opportunities for you?---I don't know what I was talking to them about because I don't recall it, recall the, what, what the, I recall the meeting but I don't recall the conversation. That's at Carss Park, so I don't recall the conversation.

10 Okay. I'll tender that. That's Exhibit 309.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

#EXH-309 – PHOTO AT VOLUME 19.12

MS HEGER: Just two more documents I want to show you. Volume 1.7,
page 15. This is an email from yourself to Ms McMahon, 3 June, 2020,
20 where you're following up on the question of the VPA for Landmark Square
again. Correct?---Absolutely.

And when you say you received a call from one of the owners, was that, in fact, the case?---Yes, I did.

It wasn't Philip Uy who prompted you to make this query?---No. It was after. He called me and he called, he called the chair of the committee and Mr – I won't mention his name, Counsel, I shouldn't mention his name. And he called another councillor as well, a Greek guy, same as him, and,
30 and he's ringing them up. He was ringing up all the councillors.

All right. And then if we go to the next page, page 16, an email from you to Ms McMahon, 17 June, 2020. You were asking when the planning proposal will be gazetted, correct?---Ah hmm.

And when does council expect to receive the VPA money, correct?
---Absolutely.

40 Did Philip Uy ask you to follow this up?---Absolutely not. It was actually a discussion between myself and another councillor, I won't mention his name because he is the mayor at the moment, and we were talking about

losing the, trying to get the money as quick as we can because there's projects that we want to do, we were talking about COVID, we need to get projects on the road and if we get that done quickly we get our money and we start using it. That's what it was for. Not because try to get, what's it got to do with Philip Uy? I mean, you've, you've got Adrian Liaw that could be chasing all that. Why is he chasing? Because they're not concerned. We wanted the money, council wanted the money so they can spend it on projects.

- 10 Well, I suggest you also knew by this point that Philip Uy was expecting some sort of payment upon the Gazettal of the Landmark Square planning proposal.---That is not correct because, as the evidence by Andrew [sic] Liaw, their agreement was not subject to any dates or anything. They didn't care. They weren't going to get it paid anyway. That's according to what we saw, what Adrian Liaw said. So that's not true. I was helping because I wanted the money to come to Georges River Council to use it when we are in a pandemic in 2020, and if you notice that councillor, that, that councillor, I'm not going to mention him because that's not right, he actually pushed hard to say "When do we get the money? We need it."
- 20 And there's emails to that effect, that we only got the emails that pertain to me, not to others. And can I just make a comment on this? We're talking June 2020. As of January 2020 when Ms Condie wrote that, when Ms McMahan said to me that Ms Condie said no-one deals with that application anymore except the general manager. I knew what was going on and I kept sending the emails as per normal because I'm doing my duties as a councillor.

All right.---I could have stopped sending them and I didn't.

- 30 All right, Mr Hindi. Thank you. I just have one more question for you. Yesterday you wrote down details on a post-it of the family members who's loaned you some money.---Yes.

The third person that you listed on that post-it, can you remember who that was or do you need me to show you the post-it again?---No, if you don't mind, show me.

- Do we have a copy of that post-it available?---Oh, let me just remember. How much was the third? I don't know that, yeah, yeah, the, the Z
- 40 something?

Yeah, it was a loan for \$30,000.---Yeah. I know, yeah, yeah.

No, no, we won't put in on the screen.---Oh yeah, that's fine. Can I just ask you, on a piece of paper, to write down the contact details for that person?
---I don't have it with me.

You don't know that person's email, phone number or address?---I don't, I, I, my apology. I would have it on my phone but I don't have my phone.

10 Okay.---It's not with me here, it's at home.

Well, can I ask for a direction then, Commissioner, for Mr Hindi to provide those details, the email, phone number and address for - - -?---I can't get you an email.

- - - that person.---I can get you the phone and the, phone number.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have an address?---His building at the moment so I'm not – yeah. I, I'll have to find out where he lives, yeah but
20 he's moved a couple of times because they're, they're renting, so when you rent you move. Yeah, for sure. I'll do that.

Pursuant to section 35(2) of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act I direct this witness to produce by 5.00pm tomorrow the phone number and address of the third person named in MFI - - -

MS HEGER: 72.

THE COMMISSIONER: 72. Yes, thank you.
30

DIRECTION TO PRODUCE: PURSUANT TO SECTION 35(2) OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT I DIRECT THIS WITNESS TO PRODUCE BY 5.00PM TOMORROW THE PHONE NUMBER AND ADDRESS OF THE THIRD PERSON NAMED IN MFI 72.

MS HEGER: I have no further questions for Mr Hindi.
40

THE COMMISSIONER: Just before we adjourn, what was the period during which you weren't a councillor? That is - - -?---I wasn't a councillor on 12 May at midday, 2016 to the probably 7 September, 2017.

7th, was it?---Around, either the 4th or 7th. Usually the first Saturday of, of, of September. So it's either the 4th or the 7th of 2017. Someone can check what the, what the first Saturday – normally the election is on the 4th or the 7th or something like this (not transcribable)

10 During that period when you were no longer a member of council, did you ever attend in an unofficial capacity council meetings where Landmark Square was discussed?---I don't recall that because I was not on the committee.

No, I'm not suggesting you were but - - -?---No, I was not – sorry, Commissioner. There was, there was a group of people from the 24 councillors, they elected 12.

Yeah.---To be there as, as representatives well, to continue.

20

No, but members of the public can turn up to - - -?---Yeah, yeah, yeah. Absolutely.

Yeah. And this time you weren't a councillor.---Yeah, no.

What I'm asking you is whether you every turned up or attended - - -?---No, I don't think so. I don't, I don't believe so.

30 Right.---There was no need to because you can read the business papers and you can read the, the outcome. There's no need to attend.

Well, to your knowledge, did your wife ever turn up?---No. She doesn't go to council meetings. Unless someone specifically asks you "Please, can you come with us because we're not sure", that's different. I'm not talking, that's normal, general, that's what happens but you don't - - -

No, I'm just interested to see whether you were there - - -?---No. No, I was not.

- - - in an unofficial capacity - - -?---No.

- - - when Landmark Square was being discussed?---No, no. I was not.

All right. We'll take 10 minutes or so and then move over to Mr Moses I think, from memory. Mr Moses, you very kindly provided us with details of the matters that you wish to question on. There's one that I'm a little concerned about, whether it's all that relevant. I'm not going to raise it publicly because there may be some forensic reason why you wouldn't want me to do so but I just flag now that I may query you at some stage as to where you're going.

MR MOSES: Of course. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yep. Thanks.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[11.41am]

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Moses.

MR MOSES: Yes, thank you, Commissioner. Mr Hindi, I just have a few questions for you on behalf of Georges River Council. You were a councillor of both Hurstville Council and Georges River Council, correct?
---Correct.

30

And you served as Mayor of the Hurstville Council?---Yes.

And as councillor you understood that you had a duty to make considered and well-informed decisions on behalf of constituents?---Yes, absolutely.

Your role was to look after the public interest, not your interest?---Yes.

Your role was to look after the public interest, not to prefer the interests of developers?---Yes.

And you took your obligations as councillor seriously?---Yes.

As part of this, you knew that you needed to be aware of codes and policies that applied to you as a councillor?---Yes.

You knew that you had an obligation to disclose all pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests?---Yes.

10 And you knew, did you not, in the case of non-pecuniary interests you had to, as soon as reasonably practicable, disclose all those interests that conflicted with your public duty, correct?---Well, you need to disclose it at the council meeting or the committee meeting, yes.

Okay. Well, I'll come to that. But you knew that the onus was on you to disclose those conflicts?---Yes, yes, absolutely. Absolutely.

20 And you told I think Counsel Assisting, this is at transcript page 1774, lines 10 to 20, you accepted that it was your "personal responsibility to comply with the code and to regularly review personal circumstances with this in mind", correct?---Correct.

Now, as someone who used to participate in the decision-making of council, you knew that it was important that decisions were not tainted by any actual bias or apprehension of bias, correct?---Yes.

And the reason that was important was that the community needed to have confidence in the decisions of council because those decisions impact upon their lives, correct?---Absolutely.

30 Now, you understood that to participate in decisions in which you or your wife had an interest which you had not disclosed and taken steps to deal with the potential conflict could undermine community confidence, correct? You knew that?---Yes, if you are aware of that interest.

I'll come to that. Your wife runs Sydney Realty, you've said that, correct? ---Yes.

40 And you knew that through Sydney Realty your wife acted as an agent in relation to buying and selling property within both the Hurstville and Georges River Council area, correct?---Yeah, she was a part-timer, basically. Wasn't a full-timer.

No, no. Listen to the question. You knew that through Sydney Realty your wife acted as an agent - - -?---Yes.

- - - in relation to buying and selling property in Hurstville and the Georges River areas, correct?---Yes.

And you told the Commissioner that from your recollection she may have sent you some emails in respect of her business dealings within the council area, correct?---Correct.

10

And you told the Commissioner that she may have spoken to you about certain things that she believed in her mind that don't jeopardise your position on council. Do you recall giving that evidence to the Commissioner?---Yeah, jeopardise or compromise my position, yes.

And, Commissioner, that's transcript page 1784, line 1. It's the fact, isn't it, that you would send your wife information on the current status of development applications in the Hurstville Council area whilst you were a councillor, correct?---I don't recall.

20

Well, Counsel Assisting showed you an email dated 11 July, 2014, which is Exhibit 253.---Yep.

Which you sent to your wife - - -?---Yep.

- - - on 11 July, 2014. Do you recall - - -?---Can you show me that, please?

Do you recall that?---No, I don't.

30 Okay.---Which one are we talking about?

With the Commissioner's leave - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

MR MOSES: Your leave, Commissioner, could Exhibit 253 be shown on the screen?---I wasn't sure which one, sorry. Yeah.

Do you recall Counsel Assisting showed you this document - - -?---Yes.

40

- - - which you forwarded to your wife? Do you see that?---Yes.

And the reason you sent it to your wife was because this was something that you thought she would be interested in, in relation to her business, correct?
---I don't recall why I sent it.

Well, I want to put it to you that the reason why you're saying you can't recall that you sent it is that you don't want to admit to the Commission that you were sending information belonging to the council to your wife to assist her in her business, is that right?---That is not true. I didn't know what was
10 going through my mind at the time, so I'm not sure why I sent it and I don't recall.

Okay. You gave evidence on Monday that if your wife had a financial interest in a matter coming before council, that would be a conflict of interest that you should declare. Do you recall giving that evidence?---It depends what interest she has.

Well - - ?---And if I'm aware of it.

20 Well, the transcript reference, Commissioner, is transcript page 1783, line 22.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry? What was that reference?

MR MOSES: Page 1783, line 22, Commissioner. I'm going to put the question again to you, Mr Hindi. Do you accept that if your wife had a financial interest in a matter coming before council, that would be a conflict of interest that you needed to declare?---I needed to assess it at the time and if it is, then I would declare it.

30 Okay.---But you need to assess it at the time.

It's the case, isn't it, that you never made a disclosure to council at any stage, that is of Hurstville or Georges River Council, of a conflict of interest in relation to your wife's business dealings. Do you accept that?---I don't recall.

Well, I'm going to put it to you you never did. Do you accept that?---Well, you, no, do you have the evidence? So, I don't know.

40

I'm putting to you directly. Do you accept that you never made such a disclosure?---I don't know.

Right. Are you playing games, Mr Hindi?---No, I don't know.

Okay. Well, listen to the question carefully.---I am listening.

You say you can't recall - - -?---Yes.

10 - - - do you, ever making a disclosure concerning your wife's interests?
---No.

Well, I'm putting to you directly you never made such a disclosure. Do you accept that?---I, I, I can't, I don't know.

Okay. Now, is this the position. I just want to understand your evidence. You never sought to question your wife as to whether matters which you were adjudicating upon at council were matters that she had an involvement in. Is that right?---If you read the code of conduct, it says clearly if you're
20 aware of your wife's interest, and I wasn't aware. And it's not my job to go and found out from everybody because - - -

Are you finished?---Yes, I am.

Listen to my question. I'm going to keep asking you the question till you answer it.---Sorry.

You never sought to question your wife as to whether matters which you were adjudicating upon at council were matters which she had an
30 involvement in. Correct?---I don't recall whether I have or have not.

You took that position of not questioning your wife 'cause you wanted to be blind to the conflict. Is that right?---I don't recall whether I did or did not.

Okay. Well, can I understand this. Was it your solution to avoid the conflict was not to ask your wife about her business dealings?---I don't know. I don't recall.

40 You also told the Commissioner, and this is at transcript, page 1784, line 1, that you relied on your wife not to tell you about anything that she believed

didn't jeopardise your position. Do you recall giving that evidence?---I recall that.

You don't recall telling the Commissioner that?---I recall that, I said. I do.

You do. Now, by "jeopardise" - - -?---Sorry. Should have used the word compromise, but, anyway, I've used jeopardise.

10 Okay. Well, let's use compromise. By compromise, do you mean create a conflict of interest that you would need to disclose?---Yes.

And therefore be taken off dealing with the matter. Correct?---Not necessarily 'cause you can have a non-pecuniary, have it disclosed, you can still stay there, depending on the interest.

20 Yeah, but the critical issue is that your colleagues and council officers know about the potential conflict so that they know how to manage any representations from you. Correct? Do you accept that?---Can you, can you repeat that, please?

Well, you would need to know, for instance, whether any of your colleagues on the council had a potential conflict so that you could manage what they were telling you. Correct?---No, it's not correct.

No. Okay. Well - - -?---Why would I need to know about them? It's, it's up to them.

30 Okay. Well, can I suggest, how would your wife know whether something could compromise your position?---She was an ex-councillor. She, she knows.

So she would know what properties you're dealing with at council meetings?---She doesn't know.

No.---But she doesn't tell me. If it's got anything to do - sorry. Yeah. Keep going. Sorry (not transcribable)

40 Isn't the evidence that you're giving just now in respect of this, though, is try to explain why - - -?---Sorry? I can't hear you, Mr Moses. Can you speak up, please?

Isn't the evidence that you're giving now trying to explain why you did not disclose a conflict of interest? That's what you're trying to do now, isn't it?---No.

No. Okay. Well, can I ask you this. You would agree, though, it would have been a simple matter for you to ask your wife whether she had an interest in a particular property that was before council, that you were making a decision on?---Would you allow me to speak or just say "yes" or "no"?

10

Well, I'm asking you. Do you agree with that?---No, because if you looked at the code of conduct, it quite clearly says a spouse, a de facto, a husband, a son, a nephew, an aunty, a mother, a father all fall in the same category unlike the minister's code of conduct where a wife is separate, you have to go and find out what your wife does. If I'm going to find out what my wife's doing, then I need to find out about my nephew, my cousin, my uncle, my brother and my aunty. They sit in the same category. And if the, if the Local Government Act believed they should be separated, then they should have done it separately and separate those.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Does that mean you considered it appropriate not to make any inquiries?---There's no need to because if I make it on, inquiries of my wife, I've got to make it on my brother, on my cousin, on my - - -

No, put that to one side. I'm talking about your wife.---If, the code clearly says if you're aware of the conflict. You don't have to go and search, you don't have to go and become a, an investigator. It just says if you're aware.

30 But in the interests of the community - - -?---Yes.

- - - and in the interests of transparency - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - wouldn't it have been incumbent upon you to find out whether there were things that you shouldn't be involved in?---Well, it would be on that one, it would be on my cousin, it would be on my uncle, my aunty or my brother.

40 Don't worry about your cousins or your uncles.---That's the same thing. That's why I'm saying the code applies in the same area.

I'm asking about your wife.---No, because the code is, if the code believed that the wife is different than all the others, then they would have put them separately. They're not. It's not like the Ministers' Code of Conduct. The Ministers' Code of Conduct clearly stipulates a spouse, you have to know what the income of your spouse is and you have to declare it. It is clear. So you have to make a conscious decision to ask her. While this one doesn't say that.

10 But why wouldn't you?---Why would I? I've got cousins, aunties, my brothers. It's all the same.

Why wouldn't you, in the interests of your constituents - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - in the public interest, in the interests of your fellow councillors - - -?
---Ah hmm.

- - - make inquiries of your spouse who's involved in real estate - - -?
---Okay.

20 - - - as to whether there were matters that might compromise you if you became involved? Because if you didn't do that, chances were that you would become involved in matters that you shouldn't.---Commissioner, you're making it sound so simple when it comes on local government.

Don't tell me it's complicated.---No, it is complicated.

30 Well, it's not complicated to go and ask your wife - - -?---Sorry, Commissioner, there's somebody who goes and buys a block of land, calls it X, Y and Z. You don't know who he is. He puts an application, planning proposal for 1,000 units, uses the old owner's name. You don't even know who he is, it could be your brother, we don't disclose the directors of that company, and they get 1,000 units approved. And it could be your brother. If you - - -

But if you asked your wife and she said, well - - -?---Yep.

- - - there's nothing, fair enough.---Do I need to ask her every - - -

40 But as I understand your evidence, you didn't bother to. And counsel has put to you you didn't do that because you didn't want to know.---No, because she sits in the same category as a brother, a cousin, a - if my

brother was a builder, do I have to go and ask him every week, “What are you working on?” If my nephew was a builder, do I have to go and ask him? If my aunty was a, was a real estate, do I have to ask her? I can’t. They sit in the same category. It doesn’t have anything extra about a spouse you need to do. If you want it something different, change the code. Change the Act.

10 But she’s a person who is involved in real estate in the Hurstville Local Government Area.---So if I had a brother who was involved and I had to go and ask him every time?

20 Yes.---No, it’s not true. No, it’s not true. You can’t – Commissioner, we’re putting our heads in the sand here. If you really want to look at how people get things approved without declaring an interest, we should go and look at how big developers do it in five seconds. They don’t put their name on it, on the application. They are not the owners of the land. They get a thousand bucks. They know every director in that council, they’re their mates. And I’ve seen it happen. And they do it and they get it approved without declaring interest. Because it’s simple. You don’t have to show it because they have a new company, they don’t show themselves, the applicant is the architect, and the owners are the old people. Anyway. Sorry.

MR MOSES: Mr Hindi, Mr Hindi, can I just ask you to return to this question?---Yes.

30 It would have been a simple matter for you to ask Mrs Hindi whether she had an interest in a particular property that was before council. Do you accept that?---No, because it would have been the same as the mayor that didn’t declare interest on his mates for the plumber. Same thing.

You’re – but don’t, listen, don’t worry about throwing rubbish at other people. Just focus on the - - -?---No, because I can give you the facts.

No, no. Don’t worry. Just listen to my question.---I’m listening. No, it’s not.

40 Your evidence was that your wife’s business was “just part-time, nothing” I think you said. This is transcript page 1793, line 34. Do you remember giving that evidence to Counsel Assisting?---Maybe, yeah.

You said it was a very small operation, no office, no staff, nobody.
Correct?---Yes, yes.

You could have easily asked, if you wanted to, what properties or clients she was doing work for in order to ensure that you did not sit on matters that involved those clients, correct?---That's not correct.

10 You failed to take that basic step because you wanted to continue to sit on matters concerning Landmark, for instance, correct?---That is not true. The code of conduct should be changed if you want these to happen, so don't, let's not play around the code of conduct. Clear.

Okay, so your position is you didn't need to do that because the code of conduct didn't require you to do that, is that right?---It says "if you are aware of". If you're not aware, you don't worry about it.

Okay. You would agree that if your wife had a financial interest - - -?
---Yes.

20 - - - over half a million dollars in respect of a project that was coming before council, that was something you would need to disclose. Do you accept that?---If I'm aware of it, yes.

Yep, ah hmm. And the community, you would accept as a councillor, would reasonably think that you may be influenced by your wife's interests in making a decision, which is why you should not be sitting on such a matter, correct?---Absolutely.

30 You never made a disclosure to council in relation to Mrs Hindi acting as an agent in relation to the Landmark development, correct?---Of course not.

And your sworn evidence to this Commission is that the reason you didn't disclose it is you didn't know that she had a potential financial interest in the Landmark development. Correct?---Yes.

And your evidence is that you weren't aware of the agency agreement that she entered into in 2014. Is that right?---Yes.

40 Commissioner, with your leave could Exhibit 196 be shown on the screen to the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly, Mr Moses.

MR MOSES: This document that appears on the screen that Counsel Assisting has asked you some questions about, can I ask you this, when is the first time that you say you became aware of the existence of this agreement between your wife's business and One Capital Group?---I don't recall.

You don't recall.---No.

10

Well, was it in 2014?---I don't recall.

Was it in 2015?---I don't recall.

You're not willing to deny it, are you, because you were aware of this agreement, were you not, in 2014?---That's not true.

And the reason you're saying you can't recall is that because if you admit the awful truth that you were aware of this, you've committed misconduct in public office by sitting on council deliberations involving this very issue that your wife was to get a half a million dollars from. Correct?---Yes - - -

20

Just admit it, Mr Hindi.---Sorry?

That's the point isn't it?---No.

You were aware of this - - -?---No.

- - - in 2014.---No.

30

And you've been playing games with this Commission, haven't you?---Oh, no.

Haven't you?---No.

Okay. Well, let's go through this slowly then. When did you become aware that your wife was using your son's name to execute this type of an agreement?---I don't recall.

40 Did you raise it with her?---I've never seen that agreement.

I'm sorry, you've never seen it?---Yes.

Well, Counsel Assisting showed it to you.---We're talking - - -

When did you first see this?---We're talking at the time of '14 because that's what you mentioned.

10 I'm going to ask you the question, well, I asked you whether you were aware of this agreement in 2014 and you said you can't recall. So which is it, you can't recall, you deny or you admit you knew about this in 2014?---I did not - - -

Which one - - -?---I did not - - -

Which one do you want to pick?---I did not know about it.

So your evidence says you did not know about this in 2014.---Yes.

Is that right?---Yes.

20

Were you aware of that in 2015?---No.

In 2016?---No.

Okay. 2017?---No.

2018?---I don't think so, no.

You don't think so?---No.

30

Okay.---But it had expired after that so anyway.

Well - - -?---But I don't.

Well, you know when it expired, don't you?---No. You just showed it to me. It was shown in the public inquiry.

Well, when do you say, when do you say it expired?---I don't know.

40 Well, you're aware it expired in 2017, aren't you? 2016. Correct?---'17 or '16?

'16, 2016.---I don't know, I don't know.

You don't know.---I just saw it. Firstly, I'm aware of these things now, yes.

Are you? Okay.---As of now we're talking, yes.

Okay. Well, when did you first become aware that your wife knew Philip Uy?---I don't know.

10

You don't know.---No.

Okay. Well, I'm going to come back to that because at the dinner in 2016 that Counsel Assisting has been asking you some questions about your wife was present. Correct?---Yes.

Now, are you suggesting that your wife never told you about this agency agreement with The One Capital Group?---Yes.

20 Did your wife tell you that she knew Philip Uy?---Well, she would have because, yes.

Well, can you recall what she told you about him?---I don't recall.

You don't recall. Did you introduce her to Philip Uy?---I don't recall.

You don't recall.---No.

30 Are you saying that because you don't want to admit that you were the one who introduced them?---No.

The truth is, isn't it, that you knew that your wife had an interest in the Landmark Square development whilst you were voting on it at council. Correct?---No.

40 The truth is that you didn't disclose the conflict of interest because you wanted to remain involved in the decision making for the Landmark Square development in order to influence the outcome for The One Capital Group. Correct?---That's not true but I can give you an explanation (not transcribable)

No, I'm not, no.---No.

Is your answer no?---Sorry, what was that question again?

You didn't disclose the conflict of interest because you wanted to remain involved in the decision making for the Landmark Square development to influence the outcome. Correct?---That is not correct. If I was aware of it I would have but if I was not I won't.

10 Okay. Well, I'm going to ask you this question then, the dinner on 18 March, 2016, you said that you were invited to it by Mr Badalati, correct?
---Yes.

You said that you asked Mr Badalati what the purpose of the dinner was and he said "We're just talking about waste-to-energy." Do you recall giving that evidence to the Commission?---I don't recall it.

The reference, Commissioner, is transcript page 1837, line 20. So let's break this down then and unpack it. Who invited you to the dinner on 18
20 March at Chinatown?---Mr Badalati.

And did you ask Mr Badalati what the purpose of the dinner was?---Of course I did because he's told me he's met with him at his address about waste-to-energy.

I'm going to ask you the question again. Did you ask Mr Badalati what the purpose of the dinner was, yes?---I don't, maybe.

Maybe. Did Mr Badalati tell you what the purpose of the dinner was?
30 ---Yes.

What did he tell you was the purpose of the dinner?---He said, "We got someone from China, he came to my office, he saw me. We wants to invest in Australia waste-to-energy, he wants to build something in Hurstville and he's invited us to dinner. Do you want to come?" I said "Yeah." (not transcribable)

Okay. And who invited your wife to be there?---I did.

40 You did.---Yes.

Why?---Because if you were listening before you would know that 95 per cent of the time my wife goes to me, goes with on functions and dinners.

Mr Hindi, no need to be offensive. Just listen to the questions and answer them if you could.---I am, sorry. Okay. Sorry.

Now, I'm not interested in your apologies. Just focus on the question.
---Yes.

10 Who invited your wife to go to this dinner?---I did, I think.

Yeah. The reason you invited your wife to do to the dinner was because her client would be there, correct?---No. That's what I said before, because 95 per cent of the time she goes with me, on all the functions.

Well, when you arrived at the dinner, did it become apparent to you that your wife knew the people there?---I'm sorry, I thought we've asked all those questions by the Counsel Assisting.

20 No, listen to my - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Please don't make speeches and just listen - - -?
---No, seriously. Do I, do I have to because it's already been asked of me. Do I have to answer?

Just answer the question. I don't know how many times I have to tell you.
---Yeah, but I thought I was, I was asked before. Okay. All right. Sorry. Sorry, Mr Moses.

30 MR MOSES: When you arrived there with your wife, did it become apparent to you that she knew the people there?---Oh, she probably knew Philip Uy, yeah.

Yeah. Did she tell you that he was a client?---No. They were real estate agents, both of them.

She didn't.---Talking to each other, she said "He's a real estate agent."

40 Oh, okay.---Of course she knew he was there.

Did she tell you that she was doing work for the Landmark development?
---No. Oh, was she doing work, I don't know.

No, no. Listen to the question. Did she tell you she was doing work for the Landmark development?---What at the dinner?

Ah hmm.---No.

10 Now, what about the signing of the agreement that occurred there? What did you understand the signing of the agreement to be about?---I don't know. I saw some Chinese writing and that's about it.

But you asked Mr Badalati about it, didn't you?---At the end, I did. Yeah.

Yeah. And what did he tell you.---He said "Oh, they're signing some projects in China." I said "Fine."

20 So he told you that?---Yeah. That's what he said and that's what he said in his evidence too.

Yeah. So he told you that, did he?---Yeah, that's my recollection.

That's your recollection.---That's the best of my recollection.

Is it the truth?---That is the best of my recollection.

30 Could Exhibit 301 be shown to the witness, which Counsel Assisting tendered this morning, Commissioner, which is the note found, file note of this dinner? This document, you've told the Commission, it was something that you prepared, correct?---Yeah.

And this is the dinner that occurred on 18 March, 2016, correct?---Yes.

And you said, I think, that in respect of this dinner that you insisted on paying the share, correct, you and your wife?---Yeah, yes.

40 And if you go to the second-last paragraph, you said "Mr Liu was offended but I insisted that this is the protocol and we must follow the rules." Do you see that?---Yeah.

What rules were you referring to?---What rules.

Yeah, what rules?---I don't know. I don't know why, why I wrote that. That was a, that was a, a paper that was stuck on the fridge. I don't know. It wasn't going to be given to anybody.

No, no.---Maybe I just make up things as I'm writing then, I don't know.

10 What, you're a fantasist, you just make things up?---It doesn't mean you're a fantasist. You can write things that you remember and put them there and you don't know why.

Well, you write - - -?---And then you – sorry?

You write things that you think are going to get you out of trouble, right?---That's not true.

Okay, well, let's go back to it.---Go back.

20 When you were answering the Commissioner's questions and Counsel Assisting's questions about this, you basically said you wanted to pay for yourself and you referred to your heritage background.---Yep.

But in this document you're saying that "this is the protocol, we must follow the rules". Do you see that?---Yes.

30 The reason you wrote that there, is this right, is that you knew that these were developers involved with the Landmark project, and they had paid for you that evening, and you had to come up with an explanation in this document that you could not allow that to happen 'cause that would be a breach of the code of conduct, correct?---That's not correct, Mr Moses. You know better than I do that when you go to Lebanese dinners, one person pays and the rest put the money on the table.

Yep, yep. Don't worry about invoking Lebanese issues. Focus on - - -?
---Well, I'll say Greeks, Italian, anything else.

It doesn't matter. Focus on this issue.---I'm focusing on the same heritage.

You were coming up with a false explanation here in relation to allegedly paying money back based on protocol and rules, correct?---I was, I paid the money, that's all, my wife paid the money, that's all we know.

Okay.---I'm not telling you what it was. I don't recall at the time that I did it.

Now, you might recall Counsel Assisting asked you some questions about this dinner and what you thought was being the subject of signature at this
10 dinner.---Ah hmm.

And you didn't mention in the evidence that you gave to the Commissioner – this is at transcript page 1841 at about line 10 to 40 – you didn't mention that Mr Badalati had told you that this was an MOU for projects to be delivered in China. You didn't mention that when you gave evidence to the Commission, did you?---Maybe I forgot to mention it.

Well, it's because it's a lie, isn't it?---No, it's not a lie.

20 Ah hmm.---Absolutely it's not a lie. He didn't tell me that. And he even repeated that in Tangshan, he said.

Ah hmm. The reason you said that, the reason you said that in answer to Counsel Assisting was that you wanted to give the impression to this Commission that you were completely ignorant about the MOU for the property development, correct?---That is not true.

And you told the Commission that the following month or so the Landmark Square matter was coming up before the council in May-June 2016, correct?
30 Do you remember giving that evidence?---Sorry?

Do you remember agreeing with the proposition in relation to what was put to you by Counsel Assisting that a month or so after attending this dinner, the Landmark Square planning proposal was likely to be voted on the following month or the month after that? Do you recall that?---Yeah.

Yep. And you told Counsel Assisting that it didn't occur to you that when you saw Philip Uy there with Wensheng Liu that this had something to do with Landmark, correct?---Absolutely.
40

And the reason you had to tell Counsel Assisting that was because you knew that this was a dinner to celebrate the proposal that you were advocating through council, correct?---Sorry, to celebrate?

Yeah.---You don't celebrate something before it happens.

Celebrate the entering of a deal in respect to that proposal, correct?---I'm going to celebrate? I didn't sign anything to celebrate.

10 Mmm, okay. Okay. Now, I'm going to come down to a different topic now if I can. You accept – and, Commissioner, this may fall within the issue that you raised with me, so I'll just ask some of the questions and then you might then rule upon it – you accept that as a councillor you were a public official?---Yes.

And you accept that as a public official you're subject to the jurisdiction of ICAC?---Yes.

20 And you accept that ICAC has jurisdiction to consider and investigate your actions when exercising your powers and duties as a public official, correct?---Yes.

In particular in relation to matters concerning potential misconduct in public office or corrupt conduct, correct?---Yes.

And you're familiar with section 11 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act?---Yes.

30 That imposes a positive duty on certain persons to report matters to ICAC? ---Absolutely.

Ah hmm. And you accept, don't you, that it would not be appropriate for you to engage in retribution against any council officer who complied with their duty to make such a report to ICAC?---Absolutely. But they can't leak it to the paper.

Well, no, listen to my questions.---I'm listening.

40 It would not be appropriate for you to engage in retribution - - -? ---Absolutely.

- - - against any council officer who complied with their duty to make a report to ICAC, correct?---I do.

Ah hmm. And in fact you know that's a criminal offence, don't you?---I don't know if it's criminal but I know you can't do it.

Okay. Can the witness be shown Exhibit 205? That's the article that Counsel Assisting asked you some questions about that appeared on 2 April, 2019, in The Sydney Morning Herald. Do you see that?---Yes.

10

You were upset about that article. Correct?---Absolutely.

And one of the reasons you told the Commissioner you were upset was because it mentioned that you had been referred to ICAC. Correct?---Yes.

And you said that that was an allegation that damaged your reputation?---I, yeah, I didn't say "damage" but it did, yeah.

20 I'm sorry?---It, I don't know whether it damaged my reputation because I've had bad publicity all the time, anyway.

Well, you engaged lawyers - - -?---Yeah.

- - - to write to the Sydney Morning Herald to tell them that this article had damaged your reputation?---I don't know, that's how my lawyer worded it, excellent, yeah, I'm happy with that. He's, he's an expert. He knows what he's doing. He's done it.

30 Well, can the witness be shown Exhibit 298, please? That's the letter dated 22 October, 2019, from Mark O'Brien lawyers to The Sydney Morning Herald.---We should be putting the reply, as well.

THE COMMISSIONER: What was that?---I said we should have the reply, as well, 'cause the reply is important, too. Anyway, I'm not here.

MR MOSES: Well, Mr Hindi, you have counsel here. I'm sure that they'll take you to it if they consider it relevant.---Because the reply will identify who actually told them.

40 Now, that's the letter that you instructed your lawyers to write. Correct? ---Yeah.

And that was published, that was sent some six months after the first article appeared. Correct?---Yeah, something like that.

Yes?---Yes.

And you wanted to see first what Mr Badalati had happen in respect of his claim before this letter was written. Correct?---Maybe, yeah.

10 No, not maybe.---Well - - -

Do you have a problem with your memory?---I said it may be.

No. The reason you sent it at this time was you were waiting to see what was happening with Mr Badalati. Correct?---I said, I said maybe that would have been the reason.

20 When you say “maybe” is there a doubt in your mind?---That could be, maybe I decide, ‘cause I, you’ve got to understand something. I was working for Ausgrid. I don’t want to go into defamation with papers and they have more articles on me, so I can lose my job and lose my redundancy. So there’s a big decision for me, whether I go or not. But I gathered the information to ensure just in case I decided to, I will do it. That’s what it was for. That’s why maybe.

One of the matters that you complained about in respect of this letter was that there had been a referral to ICAC. Correct?---Yes. Absolutely.

30 But you also claimed in this letter that what The Sydney Morning Herald had published was untrue, that is allegations that you had taken trips to China with a developer. Correct?---Correct. Yeah. But the main one was paragraph 1.

Well, you’ll see that if we go to the next page, after point 7, there’s another page. The imputations that are conveyed there set out there the matters that you were worried about, that they had published, that you had accepted bribes, that you had had accommodation paid for. Do you see all that? ---Yes, I do. That’s what the general manager gave to The Herald.

40 Sorry? Listen.---Yeah. I’m listening.

We'll come to that in a moment - - -?---Yeah.

- - - but just focus.---Sorry. Yeah.

These are the things you were complaining about. Correct?---Well, that's what my lawyer thought were good enough to, to, for a defamation case if it had to go through. I, I'm not an expert on these.

10 But you told the Commission yesterday, but you correct me if I'm wrong, you never had any intention of commencing defamation proceedings. Is that right?---That was my recollection. I did not have any intention because I, as I said earlier, Mr Moses, that I was concerned about my employment with Ausgrid, if I lose my job or whatever, I can lose a big redundancy that I had to take.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, no. What you told me - - -?---Sorry?

20 What you told me was that you didn't because you had communications with The Sydney Morning Herald in the past and they didn't do anything, so - - -?---Yeah. Yeah. That's one of them. But the other thing, too, is taking defamation against a big, major newspaper where you work for as a public servant at Ausgrid has a huge implication on your career. So you've got to decide do you really want to do that or not. So all these things run through your mind, whether you do it or not.

I can understand why the publication of the material in The Herald may have caused you concern in relation to your employer.---Yeah.

30 But why would defamation proceedings make a negative difference? In fact they might be seen as a positive that you're out there saying this is untrue and defending yourself.---No. No, Mr Commissioner. I'm not sure if you're familiar with defamation because with any major newspaper, and I'm not having a go at The Sydney Morning Herald, once you go to defamation there'll be an article after another article after another article. That's the problem. Before it finishes you'd end up with so many articles about you. So, and it was based on that, there was more articles that were written about me about other things. So that's what you get worried about. It's just that continual thing that doesn't stop.

40 Very well.

MR MOSES: Just to be clear, in respect of The Sydney Morning Herald article you liaised, did you not, with Mr Badalati in respect of coming up with a joint explanation of what you were doing in China. Correct?---That is not true. We did have a discussion but we said what's your recollection, what's my recollection, put them together, move on.

Well, you were shown a document by Counsel Assisting which was Exhibit 284, volume 2.24, page 8 which was the email from Mr Badalati which you copied - - -?---Ah hmm.

10

- - - and saved so you could amend it to suit your needs. Do you remember giving that evidence?---Yep, yep.

Ah hmm.---I said if I could amend it to suit my need. Yes, that's what I thought at the time maybe, yeah.

And what you were trying to do is to make sure, were you not, that the both of you had a consistent set of notes about what you say occurred in China. Correct?---Not necessarily. Just to recollect what would have done because one person's recollection may be different than another person because that was over three and a half years.

20

Yeah. But what you wanted to do was to make sure that you were both consistent with your accounts. Correct?---Well, just, not consistent if you want to call it that way or just put the facts. He has his facts, I have mine, we'll put them together.

Yeah, yeah, and see what comes up. Is that right?---No. I don't know, sorry, I don't know what you mean by that.

30

Well, what do you mean putting his facts together and my facts together, what - - -?---The question is did you pay - - -

- - - what does that mean?---Did you pay the 2,000 RMB? Yes. Did Mrs Hindi pay it? Yes. Okay. So we'll put it Badalati paid, Hindi paid. That's how it works.

But the truth is, and let's be blunt about it, you were trying to get your story straight with Mr Badalati in relation to the allegations in the article.

40

Correct?---I deny that.

And you were happy for Mr Badalati to pursue a defamation action in relation to the article as it damaged both your reputations. Correct?---No. Because he would have got the apology himself not me so it wouldn't have made any difference to me.

Okay. Well, you told the Commission you settled your defamation dispute with The Sydney Morning Herald. Correct?---Well, if you call it defamation. Yeah, it was a letter that we sent.

10 You settled it. Correct?---Yeah, we settled.

You gave that evidence. The transcript page 1853, line 29.---Yes, yes, we did. Yes.

And the reason you pursued The Sydney Morning Herald is, is this right as I understood your evidence - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - you wanted to find out who informed The Sydney Morning Herald about the referral. Correct?---Oh, it was one of the reasons.

20

Your evidence is that you were told by The Sydney Morning Herald the identity of the person. Is that right?---I got a letter from them saying the person that made the section 11 is, the person that made the referrer in March 2019 is directly who told us.

Yeah.---So no one can make that referral because when we got the letter from the general manager that dictated she made a section 11 in March 2019. Nobody can do that except the general manager, section 11. Section - - -

30

But you were not told by The Sydney Morning Herald that the general manager had made a section 11 notification when you settled the defamation claim. Do you accept that?---Yes, absolutely.

Yeah.---No.

Yeah.---But I can draw the line. I knew that because I never made any accusation until the general manager gave the councillors a letter around 2020 and says, "The letter from ICAC will refer to your section 11 of March 40 '19 and July '19 and we're going to do a preliminary investigation." So it

was already laid out. When I saw that I thought well, that's exactly what The Sydney Morning Herald was saying.

Yeah. So when you told the Commissioner yesterday at transcript page 1856, line 9 that they said it's, and then you named the former general manager, you were lying on oath to the Commissioner when he asked you the question about this issue and you said, you said, "They said it's the general", and you mentioned the person's name. When you said that yesterday, you were lying on oath, weren't you?---That is not true.

10

The Sydney Morning Herald did not tell you the name - - -?---Yes.

Listen to me.---Ah hmm.

The Sydney Morning Herald did not tell you the name of their source, did they?---They said the person that made the referral in March 2019 directly told us. There's nobody else made it other than the general manager so I drew the lines together.

20 Yeah, don't worry about drawing the lines. Answer my question.---Well, no, that's why I drew the lines.

Yeah. Don't worry about that.---Why not?

Were there other people drawing the lines?---Yeah, okay, yeah. Draw the lines.

If you focus on the question - - -?---I am.

30 The Sydney Morning Herald did not tell you the source of the article, did they?---The Sydney Morning Herald clearly said the person that made the referral and there's nobody else other than the general manager. It's clear.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Hindi - - -

MR MOSES: Do you want to answer the question, Mr Hindi?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. Ask it again because that certainly wasn't an answer.

40

MR MOSES: Do you accept that The Sydney Morning Herald did not tell you the name or position of the person who provided them with information about - - -?---Hundred per cent - - -

Listen to the question.---I am.

About the referral, do you accept that?---I said they did not provide the name or the position, that's true.

10 Thank you. Yeah. Now, this is the position, isn't it, the reason you wanted to know who made the referral to ICAC is because you wanted to harass and intimidate them, didn't you?---That is not true because the code of conduct says you're not allowed to disclose confidential information, it's against the code. But you're not using that, are you, to tell her she, she leaked it to the paper?

Yeah.---That's a big breach but no-one's doing anything about it.

20 Listen, Mr Hindi, with all due respect to you, you are here giving evidence to the Commission but it doesn't give you the right to make assertions from the witness box concerning individuals, with all due respect.---Okay.

So I want to put this directly to you. You told the general manager of the council in 2019 that you wanted to lodge a code of conduct complaint against councillors as retaliation for having code of conduct complaints lodged against you and also for the council resolving to refer you to ICAC in April 2019, correct?---I don't - - -

30 Do you recall saying that to her?---I don't recall saying that.

Are you willing to deny it on your oath, sir?---I said I can't deny it, yes or no, because I don't recall.

Yeah. You said that to her in order to threaten her, didn't you?---That is not true. We had a good relationship. We had a good relationship.

40 You said that because you were trying to silence people against you, weren't you?---That is not true. It's already gone to ICAC, so what are you going to silence?

You didn't want people speaking to the Independent Commission Against Corruption, did you?---That is not true. I cannot tell that to anybody.

Okay.---That is outrageous.

Can I ask you this, are you familiar with a Facebook page called Georges River Council Are you Joking?---Yeah, yeah.

Yeah. Do you know who operates?---I have no idea.

10

Do you contribute to it?---I don't contribute to it. It's only occasionally I might throw a couple of words here and there. Yeah.

Have you yourself provided information to that Facebook which makes derogatory comments about directors of the council?---I may have.

Yeah. And you think that was appropriate to be posting?---No, no. I said I may have. I don't know until you show it to me.

20

Yeah. Well, sorry, are you saying "may have" because you know you've done it and you don't want to be caught out, is that right?---When someone says "I don't know. I don't recall", it doesn't mean I don't recall it, whether I did or didn't because I don't want to say no and then you drag something out I did one word in here and you're going to say "Oh, there you go." I don't recall.

Well, if you're telling the truth you don't have to remember a lie, do you?
---I'm sorry. Memory, I just lost my wallet two days ago and I can't remember where it is. If I had a good memory I would go and find it now,
30 wouldn't I?

Well, your answer a few minutes ago was that you may have contributed, not that you couldn't remember.---I said, I said, I, I did say I may have. I don't know. I don't recall.

Yeah. Well the fact is, isn't it, you are somebody who does contribute to that Facebook page, correct?---If you can give me the comments, I'll tell – it may have been once or twice, I don't know. But this Facebook page has a lot of, lot of comments. They write a lot on it.

40

THE COMMISSIONER: And you're being asked about your own, whether you did or did not.---Commissioner, I do not recall but if you can, if, if Mr Moses would be kindly to be able to say "Here is one over there" and I'll be going "Is that mine or not mine?" I don't know, I don't recall. There's so many Facebooks that, around and there's a council one.

10 So you don't recall ever supplying information in relation to posts on that Facebook page?---I do recall supplying – no, no. Sorry, sorry. There's a, there's a big difference. Are you asking me, Mr Moses, that I supplied the administrator with information or are you saying I have made a comment on that Facebook? There's a big difference.

MR MOSES: Well, let's break it up.---Yeah, let's break it up. All good, let's go.

Who is the administrator of that page?---I don't have a clue but Ms Connolly told me who the administrator is.

20 And secondly, I'll get you to write that down in a moment, and second - - - ?---I don't know who the person is.

I'm sorry?---She told me but I think it's, I can get you some, if I can remember his name, but anyway,

Okay. And secondly, did you post things on this Facebook page?---Did I post anything on the Facebook?

Yeah, yeah.---Yeah, I may have, yeah.

30 Okay. I think this morning, Commissioner, there was a letter sent to the Commission which attaches an entry on the Facebook. It's the second page attachment. I don't want the covering email but just the actual Facebook entry.---Why don't you just give it to me?

Which is 8.49am, which I just wanted shown to the witness to ask him whether he is the one. That's the document there. Just read that to yourself, Mr Hindi. And once you've read it, could you please let me know.---Is that the only page?

40 That's what I'm showing you.---I think there's more to go.

Sorry, have you read this before?---I don't recall it, but - - -

Okay. Well, I'm going to ask you two questions.---Ah hmm.

Did you provide that information to the administrator of the Facebook page?---There was no need to provide that, no, it wasn't, 'cause that was public knowledge.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, but did you provide it?

10

MR MOSES: Ah hmm. Did you post this?---No, no, no. I don't think I did. And that's public knowledge. That's what I'm saying.

When you say you don't think you did, is it possible you did?---I did not. I did not. I don't, I don't – so, yeah, sorry, I just want to get it right. Is that a comment with my name on it or was that put in by the administrator?

I'm asking you, are these your words?---I'm asking. I'm sorry. I don't know.

20

Okay, thank you.

MR KUTASI: Commissioner, this is very unfair to show part of the document to Mr Hindi and ask him to, what his memory about this or who wrote it is. In fairness, he should be shown the entirety of the document.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he's already said it wasn't him. He's already said it wasn't him.

30 THE WITNESS: No, I was just saying I don't know because, I don't know, is it my actual comment? Is it my actual – what do they call them? Is it my actual comments on the Facebook? Is it the administrator that put it in? I don't know. You can tell me. You can't just throw that at me.

MR MOSES: Okay, Mr Hindi - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Why can't you tell us?---I don't know. When was it done? What, what year?

40 MR MOSES: Well, Mr Hindi, can I ask you this question.---Yes.

Do you accept as a proposition that as a public official within a council it is inappropriate for you - - -

MR KUTASI: I'm going to object again, Commissioner. There is no date. There's, we don't know anything about this. We don't know, we don't have any information. We're being shown partial documents. It's extraordinarily unfair to my client to be put in a position where a whole bunch of assumptions have been made about something that he knows nothing about.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: What assumptions?

MR KUTASI: Assumption of the date that it was posted, whether it - - -

THE WITNESS: Yeah, who posted it?

MR KUTASI: Con, please.

THE WITNESS: (not transcribable)

20 MR KUTASI: The date that it was posted, who posted it, under what name. Is it an excerpt of a council document? Is it a post from the person directly? There's a whole lot of assumptions about any type of documents. We don't know what they are and we're being deliberately shown partial documents, for which no notice has been given, in an attempt to entrap answers for - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Entrap answers? Are you going to withdraw that? Entrap answers? Is that what you're saying?

THE WITNESS: Well, what else would it be?

30

MR KUTASI: Con, please.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

MR KUTASI: Commissioner - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: I think what Mr Moses is getting at – put to one side who did or did not do this or provide this information, does the witness accept that as a councillor it would have been inappropriate for him to
40 supply that information to the administrator or publish it himself? Am I right, Mr Moses?

MR MOSES: Yes, Commissioner.---Is that the question you're asking?

Yes.---I don't recall whether that's mine or not but it's not inappropriate to supply anything to anybody, provided you are a private citizen, not as a councillor. So it was clear, and the code of conduct says if you're a councillor you can't make comments, but if as a private citizen – and I've had a councillor attack me many times on Facebook, and the general manager knows her, her best friend, she knows she attacked me left, right
10 and centre on Facebook, and I've made a complaint and a comment and they said she's done it as a private citizen. It's not, and down the bottom it says it's a private citizen, not a councillor. So they all do it.

Do you accept this proposition - - -?---Yeah.

- - - I think you've accepted this proposition but I'll just, just want to recap it for you.---Yep.

You accept that in your role as a councillor this Commission had
20 jurisdiction to deal with your conduct, correct?---This Commission?

Yeah, the Independent Commission Against Corruption.---It depends in, in what way.

Your conduct as a councillor, correct?---Yeah, and the OLG has the right which was (not transcribable) and, and - - -

No, I'm talking about this Commission. Do you accept that?---Yes, yes, absolutely.
30

And as an official of the council, it is no part of your role to threaten or retaliate against people who lodge complaints with this Commission, correct?---Correct.

Thank you.---Of course you don't - - -

Now I'm going to move to a different topic, the trips to China, if I can. You told the Commission that you went to China in April 2016 with your wife, correct? Yes? Do you recall that?---Yes.
40

Yeah. And the flights that were originally booked for you and your wife to go, were they paid for originally by Mr Uy?---By who?

Who paid for those flights?---Go and ask my wife.

Okay.---Sorry, go and ask Mrs Hindi.

Okay.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: What, you don't know?---As I gave evidence yesterday, that she reimbursed Mr Uy.

MR MOSES: You said that your wife told you.---Yes.

When did she tell you?---She told me after she done it, probably before we left on the, before we left on the trip.

20 What did she say to you?---I said, "You paid for the flights?" She goes, "Yeah." She goes, "I didn't have a chance to book them because I'm (not transcribable)."

Did she tell you who'd paid for the flights?---I don't know. She said, "I'll pay for the flights." Like, she reimbursed, we're paid. I said, "Fine, as long as you've paid, move on." I know that she has.

30 Why was it important that the flights needed to be paid for?---Why do you think? I'm trying to do a business with somebody and I'm going to get them to pay for my flight? That's stupid. You do, you're going on a business deal with people and you want to say – we're talking about '16 or '18, sorry, sir?

2016.---'16. Sorry, sorry, sorry. Are we talking April '16 or June '16?

April 2016.---Sorry, my apologies. Can I take it back? Can I withdraw that? 'Cause I thought you were talking about the, the second trip, 'cause we're getting it mixed up. So we're talking about, Mr Moses, the first trip.

40 Yeah, you told the Commission yesterday - - -?---Sorry, sorry, yeah, I - - -
- - - just to refresh your memory - - -?---Sorry, we're talking about the - - -

- - - page 1852, April China trip.---Are we talking - - -

“Did you reimburse him for those flights?” “I did not personally, no.”---So
- - -

You were asked by – let me finish. “Did Mrs Hindi?” “I believe so. She told me she did.”

10 MS HEGER: Can I also just clarify – are we talking about the flights from Shenzhen to Beijing or the flights from Sydney to Hong Kong? Because I think the evidence you’re referring to, Mr Moses - - -

MR MOSES: It’s from Shenzhen to Beijing.

MS HEGER: Yes.

MR MOSES: That’s at line 20.---Okay, so - - -

20 Page 1852.---So if you can make it clearer for me, I’d appreciate it. It’s the first trip.

Yep.---And it’s not from Sydney to Hong Kong, it’s from where? Shenzhen to Beijing.

Correct.---Thank you. Thank you, Mr Moses.

Did you reimburse Mr Uy for those flights?---Mrs Hindi says she has.

30 No, did she tell you that?---Yes, she did.

Did she tell you who’d paid for those flights?---I don’t know, but she said she reimbursed Mr Uy. She told me - - -

What did she say to you?---She said, “I reimbursed him.”

Ah hmm. When did she tell you?---At the, at the, at the airport.

40 Ah hmm. Now I’m going to ask you about the June China trip, page 1971 of the transcript.---I just want to make – sorry, sir, that’s, that’s the second trip, is that correct?

The second trip.---With the senior minister.

It's the second trip.---What is it? What date?

This is the 1st of June.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'd ask you to stop asking questions.---Sorry, I'm trying, 'cause I need to understand 'cause otherwise I'm being picked on every word. So I just want to understand what I'm saying.

10

MR MOSES: Yeah. Do you have a problem with recalling what you told Counsel Assisting about this?---Yeah, well, read it to me and I'll tell you.

Okay. Well, let me ask you the question. Do you know who paid for the flights associated with that trip?---From where to where?

Well, let's go with every aspect of the trip. You're on the flight. Who did you know was paying for the flights on that trip?---My wife.

20 At all times?---Yes.

Okay.---That's what she told me.

Okay. Did you ask your wife as to whether she reimbursed Mr Uy for flights on that trip?---Which flight are we talking about?

All of them.---No, we can't talk about all of them. Sorry.

30 I'm asking you. All of them.---With all due respect to you, you gotta, tell me from where to where, so, because they're all complex, so I need to - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm going to tell you for the last time, just stop it. ---I don't recall. Is that what I'm going to say, Commissioner, because I just want to know the question properly 'cause I'm getting worried.

No, you're not. You're just firing questions back. And I've asked you so many times not to do it.---Yeah, but he has, could you just tell me, please, Mr Moses, if you don't mind, are we talking from Sydney to Beijing first? Is that what you're saying?

40

MR MOSES: Let's ask, I'm going to ask you the question.---Yes.

In respect of the June trip, I want to understand this, the business class trips to China - - -?---Yes.

- - - from Sydney, they were initially paid for by GR Capital Group. Correct?---I was not aware of that until the public Commission, public inquiry has demonstrated that, initially, yeah.

Okay. And, well, I just want to understand this, then, if I can.---Yes.

10

When did you become aware that the GR Capital Group had paid for those flights?---Public inquiry.

Okay. When was that?---Well, public inquiry, I don't know. What, what day was it that they revealed? I'm not sure what date.

Okay. And when did you ask your wife about whether she had reimbursed GR Capital for those flights?---I, I asked her when she paid them at that time, '16.

20

But if you weren't aware that GR Capital had paid for those flights until this public inquiry, why would you have asked your wife back then in 2016 as to whether she'd reimbursed for the flights?---Simple. Very simple.

Yes?---At the time, and I mentioned it yesterday and we, Commissioner, I thank you for putting the non-publication order about my, Mireille's brother,

So because we weren't going on the trip, it was booked for us, her, she was talking to Elaine and others and Faye was, Elaine, I think, it was, she booked it, they booked it for her rather than she didn't get a chance to actually book it herself. They did a business class. We normally don't fly much business class, but she did a business class. I said, "Fine." And they booked it, as well, for the senior minister.

30

Okay. Who's "they"?---I don't know, it's Elaine, whoever did it. So the senior minister was booked on the same flight too. So - - -

You knew in 2016 - - -?---Yeah. No, I didn't - - -

40

- - - that the flight was being paid for - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Just a wait for the question, surely.---Oh, sorry, sorry.

MR MOSES: You knew that the flight was being paid for by GR Capital, correct?---Absolutely not. If it had been paid by anybody, the reimbursement was Philip Uy and he was working for China Liu and he was going to give him the money back because that trip is being sponsored by China Liu, nothing to do with GR Capital.

10 Did you ask Mrs Hindi whether she had reimbursed Faye for the flights?
---Yes, I did, in 2016.

Yeah. What triggered you saying that to her?---I'm sorry?

What caused you to ask her?---Because I said, "It looks like you've got a text here that the flights have been booked for you."

Sorry, say that again?---I said, "It looks like you have a text here that the flights have been booked for you and for, for" – I shouldn't say that, sorry, I
20 take that back – "and for the senior minister." She goes "Yeah." I said, "I thought you were going to book it." She goes, "I didn't get a chance and I'm just" – blah, blah, blah. And she goes, "I'll reimburse it." So that was, because she told me, whether she recollected that exactly I don't know but that's what she told me.

Yeah. And you're just making that up to try and get out of trouble here, aren't you?---No, no, no. Not to get out of trouble. It, this trip is sponsored by China Liu.

30 Okay.---If the others paid and then he reimburses them in China as you've heard the evidence, that's basically what it should be.

When you say the trip was sponsored by China Liu, for what purpose?
---Well, we, as I said, we went out there, we tried to sign a big agreement, you've seen the photos this morning, how big the table was and how many people from all over the world, and the senior minister of the government represented the, the government that he wants the waste-to-energy plants to be built in NSW. He was there with, with me signing the agreement. And how good is that?

40 Are you finished?---Yeah.

Okay.

MR KUTASI: Oh, with respect, Commissioner. That's a fairly rude comment to Mr Hindi, "Are you finished?" He's just giving his answer.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, it's not. No, it's not.

MR KUTASI: He had clearly finished.

10

THE WITNESS: Oh, don't worry. I'm the sacrificial lamb here. Don't worry - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: He'd clearly finished? Oh, I was waiting for more.

THE WITNESS: Were you? Okay, I'm happy to go. Do you want me to go more?

20 MR MOSES: Sorry, Mr Hindi, do you find this amusing?---No. But, because if you want me to go more, I'll go. If you don't - - -

So, do you understand you're facing grave allegations here?---Absolutely.

Okay. Well, let's go through this then, if I can. You remember you were asked yesterday by Counsel Assisting, this is at transcript page 2016, "And Mr Badalati's evidence was that in his two bags there were \$100,000 in cash. Were you given two bags containing cash?" You said "No." "By Philip Uy?" "No." "That never happened?" You said "No. Never
30 happened." "Did Philip Uy ever pay you any money in respect of Landmark Square for the planning proposal?" "No." "Did you receive any kind of money or other benefit upon the gazettal of the Landmark Square planning proposal around 7 August?" "No." "Did Vince Badalati?" "No. Well, I'm sorry, I'm saying, no, he didn't tell me." Do you recall being asked those questions yesterday carefully by Counsel Assisting? Do you recall that?---Yes.

Yes?---Yes.

40 And the reason you went quiet as you're going quiet now is that you were lying on oath, weren't you?---Because I go quiet - - -

You were lying, weren't you?---No. Because I go quiet because the Commissioner has been hammering me my voice is too loud. I'm too aggressive so I've got to go quiet.

You knew - - -?---I'm not an SC. I'm a normal person. I've got a loud voice and that's how we talk, but I get hammered.

You knew that you betrayed the people you were meant to represent.

10 Correct?---I'm sorry?

You knew you betrayed the people you were meant to represent by taking the money. Correct?---I did not take the money and I never betrayed any of the people. That's why I get re-elected with a majority every time because people know what I do for them and how I go out of my way to help the constituents and they all know that but when management gets against you that's what happens.

20 Do you accept though what happened here in relation to your role as a councillor is that in effect you became somebody who was on the take from the developers concerning the Landmark Square project and you continued to do their bidding. Correct?---That is absolutely incorrect. But then you should ask your general manager what she did at Fridcorp and how she gave him 330 units for nothing. That's what you should be asking and that's what the Commission should be looking at.

Yeah. I'd ask, Commissioner, that last answer be struck from the record. That was a - - -?---No, why? Because it's true. I'm putting, I'm putting - - -

30 That was a gratuitous comment by the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: I agree. That's going to be struck from the record.

MR MOSES: I have no further questions of the witness. Thank you, Commissioner for your patience.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr Moses.

40 MR FAHD: Mr Commissioner, this is Mr Fahd, solicitor for Mrs Hindi.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR FAHD: I make the same application as I made yesterday in relation to her brother. Any evidence relating to his health or his situation.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Unfortunate it was repeated but I'll just make clear that the order that was made yesterday extends to the evidence given with the same subject matter today. There will be no publication.

10 MR FAHD: Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: We're just about to adjourn so who is going to go next?

MR PARARAJASINGHAM: Commissioner, I'm up next I understand.

THE COMMISSIONER: Good.

20 MR PARARAJASINGHAM: Are we going to take the luncheon break?

THE COMMISSIONER: I think you said you'd be, I'm not going to hold you to it. I think we'll take a luncheon adjournment and come back.

MR PARARAJASINGHAM: Thank you, Commissioner.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[1.01pm]

30