

VIKAPUB00001DOC
02/06/2015

VIKA
pp 00001-00043

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THERESA HAMILTON ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION VIKA

Reference: Operation E14/0418

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON TUESDAY 2 JUNE 2015

AT 10.07AM

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.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Please be seated. This is a public inquiry by the Independent Commission Against Corruption. The Commission is investigating several allegations, whether payments made by the New South Wales Rural Fire Service to companies controlled by Scott Homsey were induced by representations made by Arthur Hacking, Paul Springett, Scott Homsey and Darren Hacking which they knew to be false or misleading or by those persons concealing facts from RFS which they had a duty to disclose; whether Arthur Hacking and Paul Springett engaged in corrupt conduct by receiving a financial benefit or other benefits or gifts from Scott Homsey as a reward for their role in facilitating the RFS payments to Homsey's companies; whether Scott Homsey and Gay Homsey engaged in corrupt conduct by providing Arthur Hacking and Paul Springett with a financial benefit or other benefits or gifts as a reward for their role in facilitating the RFS payments to Scott Homsey's companies; and finally, whether Arthur Hacking engaged in corrupt conduct by taking without authority property belonging to the RFS including mobile telephones and other electronic devices.

This inquiry will proceed in accordance with the general practice directions made by the Commission which are available on its website. The scope and purpose of the inquiry will be further outlined in an opening by Counsel Assisting. Mr Katekar has been appointed as Counsel Assisting and I will now ask him to provide his opening. Thank you.

MR KATEKAR: The New South Wales Rural Fire Service saves lives and property. It regularly does this through acts of courage and heroism but heroes need supplies, often urgently. To meet those urgent needs in times of chaos and crisis the regular processes through which responsible governments acquires goods and services need to be relaxed. This creates opportunity for corruption.

This inquiry will examine how relaxed procurement procedures adopted by the New South Wales Fire Rural Service between 2011 and 2015 led to the diversion of substantial public funds into a small number of private pockets including an estimated \$400,000 into the pockets of one public official, Mr Arthur John Hacking.

Those funds had been made available to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service by the State and Commonwealth Governments to ensure that disaster relief is supplied immediately and effectively to those who are seriously in need to ensure that in such times of crisis and acute need the wheels of Government move with sufficient speed. The New South Wales Rural Fire Service applies an abbreviated procurement process. This inquiry will examine how certain persons of interest may have taken advantage of that abbreviated process to feather their own nests.

It is worth emphasising at the outset that the way the rural firefighting fund is structured it was highly unlikely that any of the money that members of

the public or insurance companies and other businesses kindly donate to that fund was taken. The funds depleted were those contributed by the Commonwealth and State Governments.

10 The Rural Fire Service is provided with \$7 million from State and Local Government as well as insurance companies to protect the New South Wales people and their properties against the ravaging damages caused by bushfires. As the bushfires spiral out of control so too does the expenditure required to battle those fires. It is not unusual for State and Commonwealth Governments to make many more millions of dollars available to get those fires under control and it is from these extra funds, tax payers' money, that money has been improperly obtained. The budget allocated to the Rural Fire Service for routine operational procurement is not in question. Procurement from these funds is protected by the Government's accreditation scheme.

20 The New South Wales Rural Fire Service is a public authority serving the public good in the most important of ways which it does effectively and skilfully with justifiable fame. It is staffed by over 900 employees who manage its day-to-day operations and is assisted by around 72,000 volunteers across more than 2,100 brigades. Those who work for the New South Wales Rural Fire Service, particularly in times of crisis and true public need, do so generously and selflessly. They are fulfilling a higher purpose in the interests of the welfare of the community. So much can be said of all volunteers of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service. So much can also be said of the employees of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service and those who provide services to it at least up until February this year, however, there were a couple of regrettable exceptions.

30 This inquiry will investigate allegations of corrupt conduct by two individuals within the New South Wales Rural Fire Service, Arthur John Hacking, known as John Hacking and Paul Springett. And three individuals outside the New South Wales Rural Fire Service who supply goods and services to it, Scott Homsey, Gay Homsey and Darren Hacking, who is John Hacking's brother. John Hacking was a contract's officer for the New South Wales Rural Fire Service. He reported to Paul Springett who was manager, Procurement Executive Services. Mr Hacking had a delegated financial authority of zero dollars. Mr Springett's delegated authority was limited to \$20,000.

40 Scott Homsey operated two main businesses. D'Vine Tastes and Emergency Management Catering Services, abbreviated to EMCS. D'Vine Tastes was the business name used by Mr Homsey to engage with the RFS between 2009 and 2013. In 2013 Mr Homsey decided to incorporate and created two new companies, EMCS and the D'Vine Group. All of Mr Homsey's business with the RFS was then conducted through EMCS. Mr Homsey's businesses supplied catering services and other products to the RFS such as

snack packs for offices and volunteers in the field, first aid kits and toiletry packs.

The core subject of this inquiry is the flow of transactions generated by John Hacking on behalf of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service by which EMCS supplied snack packs. Between 2011 and 2015 EMCS invoiced the New South Wales Rural Fire Service for more than \$8 million for snack packs. What I propose to do now and put up on the screen is a photograph of a snack pack and its contents. I'm just going to hold it up for you,
10 Commissioner, now, I propose to tender it later but it's, see what it is, it contains snacks for those in the field. Prior to 2011, the New South Wales Rural Fire Service obtained its snack packs from the Corrective Services Industries. The snack packs were provided by Correctional facilities using the efforts of inmates at those institutions which were made available for collection for \$11 per snack pack.

Mr Hacking arranged for Corrective Services to be replaced as supplier by Mr Homsey's business, D'Vine Tastes. This occurred in the latter half of 2011. From that time orders for snack packs were placed exclusively with
20 D'Vine Tastes and EMCS. Mr Homsey's price was, for most of the period since then \$14.50 per snack pack. Mr Hacking has told the Commission in an interview that the change from Corrective Services to D'Vine Tastes was brought about because Mr Homsey was able to supply the requisite number of snack packs at short notice as was required during periods of emergency.

Further Mr Hacking has explained that with Mr Homsey there was no difficulties with getting the snack packs since Mr Homsey delivered them, whereas with Corrective Services the New South Wales Rural Fire Service, had to collect them and it took some hours to get trucks in and out of the
30 gaol. In due course the Commission will be asked to consider whether it should accept this explanation. Once D'Vine Tastes began in 2011 as the New South Wales Rural Fire Services exclusive supplier of snack packs, the amount of snack pack orders increased.

I propose now to show a graph on the screen. In blue is the figures for the sales of snack packs, sorry, purchases of snack packs from Corrective Services Industries and in red is the level of purchases of snack packs from Mr Homsey's business and then later EMCS.

40 In 2009/2010 there were a number of fires in New South Wales. In that year the RFS Commissioner made 50 declarations under section 44 of the Rural Fires Act 1997 New South Wales, each indicating a major bushfire. The New South Wales Rural Fire Service paid about \$850,000 to Corrective Services Industries for snack packs at about \$11 a pack in that year. There were no declarations under section 44 in 2010/2011. There were only three declarations in 2011/2012. In 2012/2013 EMCS invoiced the New South Wales Rural Fire Service about \$2.8 million for snack packs. In that year there were 32 declarations under section 44. EMCS invoices for snack

packs increased to \$3 million in 2013/2014. Even allowing for the price increase from \$11 per pack to \$14.50 per pack this is an increase in the volume of snack packs of about two and a half times per annum. In 2013/2014 there were only 19 declarations under section 44. In the most recent fire season there was five.

10 But there was more to this than the increase in the amount of snack packs being ordered. Mr Hacking has told the Commission that from about October 2012 to about June 2014 Mr Homsey under-supplied the New South Wales Rural Fire Service by 10 per cent, that is, for each invoice of say, 10,000 snack packs Mr Homsey would deliver only 9,000. The invoices for 10,000 snack packs were nevertheless paid. How that was permitted to happen is one of the avenues of investigation in this inquiry. This left an excess of \$14,500, being 1,000 times \$14.50. Mr Hacking has told the Commission that Mr Homsey would keep half of this profit and give the other half to Mr Hacking. I will refer to this arrangement as skimming.

20 Mr Hacking has told the Commission that he spoke to Mr Homsey in about mid-2014 and told him the skimming arrangement had to stop because the New South Wales Rural Fire Service was implementing a new system known as equipment asset management. Once implemented there would be more checks on whether EMCS was in fact supplying what was contained in its invoices. Mr Hacking has explained that at this point Mr Homsey offered to double the skim, that is, Mr Homsey would undersupply the New South Wales Rural Fire Service by 20 per cent, thus using the example for every invoice from EMCS for 10,000 snack packs EMCS would only supply 8,000. This would lead to a margin of 2,000 snack packs totalling \$29,000 to be divided equally between Mr Hacking and Mr Homsey. Mr Hacking has told the Commission that he agreed to this. The arrangement was that Mr Homsey would give Mr Hacking his share in cash.

30 Gay Homsey is Scott Homsey's mother. Ms Homsey has been named as a person of interest for the purposes of investigating her role in facilitating some of those payments. This inquiry will investigate how much money Mr Homsey paid Mr Hacking under this skimming arrangement. Mr Hacking has admitted to receiving in excess of \$300,000.

40 Under section 44 of the Rural Fires Act 1997 when a bushfire has reached such a scale that the local firefighting authority will not be able to control it, the Commissioner may make what is called a section 44 declaration. This is, in effect, a state of emergency in which the Commissioner is given amplified powers. This is, of course, an entirely necessary mechanism to allow the immediate mobilisation of all available efforts to meet the crisis. For each incident an Incident Controller is appointed. The Incident Controller is authorised to approve expenditure that relates directly to firefighting activities or firefighting support such as catering or accommodation.

The New South Wales State Government, in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government, provides funding for such events. This is to ensure that all arms of Government are able to mobilise effectively, immediately and co-operatively to respond to any natural disaster, including major bushfires so there is no delay occasioned by any squabbling as to who pays for what. It just gets done and is paid for.

10 When a section 44 event is declared and there is a major bushfire, the New South Wales Rural Fire Service co-ordinates an emergency response between different fire authorities, ambulance, police and various other arms of Government and non-Government organisations. This is, of course, a major logistical exercise. At the New South Wales Rural Fire Service headquarters upon the occurrence of such an event an incident room is set up called the State Operations Centre. Many of us will have seen footage of it. We're going to show now a picture of the State Operations Centre.

20 Also when that happens materials, transport, accommodation and catering services often need to be procured at short notice. In such times, the red tape of Government procurement practices can be an impediment to getting things done. For this purpose under a section 44 declaration procurement procedures are relaxed to enable goods and services to be supplied quickly to where they are needed. At these times money is less of an object.

30 Numerous stakeholders have logistical needs that must be met. For this purpose within the State Operations Centre there is a logistics desk. Generally speaking, between 2011 and 2015 the Procurement section within the executive services of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service populated that desk. That section comprised Paul Springett as Manager Procurement, John Hacking Contracts Officer, and Wendy Bucket and Matthew Lane who joined in September, 2012. Ms Bucket and Mr Lane were Purchasing Officers and reported to Mr Springett. In mentioning their names, I must emphasise that neither Ms Bucket nor Mr Lane is a person of interest in this inquiry.

In the photograph of the war room on the screen the Logistics Officers are shown with blue bibs at the logistics desk which is on the left-hand side of the picture.

40 The State Operations Controller sits in the middle of the room, the Incident Controller is there in the picture, although is not always in the room during the incident as he or she may be in the field. The Logistics Officers sit at a desk on the left-hand side of the picture as I've said. Their job is to coordinate the delivery of everyone's needs. The process is that a request is made, often verbally. A written request ought to then be raised, although this doesn't always occur. A senior officer may be asked to sign a logistics request. At such times senior officers place understandable trust in the Logistics Officers.

Once a logistics request is signed a Logistics Officer can raise a purchase order. However, the Commission will investigate to what extent the Logistics Officers were able to raise a purchase order themselves without the request being authorised by a person with appropriate delegation.

10 Once a purchase order is raised the Logistics Officer issues it to the supplier. On receipt, the supplier issues an invoice. The Logistics Officer then indicates that the invoice was okay to pay. The invoice is sent to a person with delegated authority to approve payment and the RFS then pays the invoice.

Within the approval process there was no control over how suppliers were selected. That was left to the Logistics Officer. This was an abbreviated approval system designed to ensure that the wheels of government moved quickly enough in order to save lives in the time of need. But it was an abbreviated approval process which created an opportunity.

20 I'm next going to put up on the screen a logistics request of the kind that I mentioned. This one is dated 4 August, 2014. It's in the bottom left-hand corner, that date. Mr Hacking has told the Commission in an interview that he obtained Mr York's signature which appears at the foot of the document. Although when he obtained that signature, the number of snack packs in the left-hand column was blank. Mr Hacking later inserted the figure of 100,000. Mr Hacking then used this logistics request to authorise the issue of purchase orders to EMCS for 100,000 snack packs. That purchase order is now up on the screen. It's also dated 4 August, 2014.

30 Mr Hacking raised the purchase order on 4 August, 2014, the first Monday back at work after a section 44 declaration was made for bushfires in the Clarence Valley. Two matters of significance may be observed at this point. First, the purchase order is for \$1.45 million of snack packs to be delivered to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service over the next four months. Second, the purchase order number starts with S-4-4-L and that number is in the box immediately below the heading Purchase Order on the invoice, on the, on the document. This indicates that the purchase is for a section 44 event or other emergency operation. This in turn indicates that the purchase has been conducted as an emergency procurement.

40 When a supplier issues an invoice against this purchase order it must quote this number. Once the invoice arrives at the New South Wales Rural Fire Service the purchase order and invoice are matched up against this number by a logistics officer. The next document I'm going to show on the screen is the first invoice issued by EMCS against this purchase order and is dated, 29 September, 2014.

As I just mentioned this is the first invoice issues against the purchase order for 100,000 snack packs. You'll see that it's for 20,000 snack packs.

Invoices for the remaining 80,000 snack packs were submitted between October and December, 2014. Mr Hacking has told the Commission that these goods were ordered for the upcoming 2014/2015 fire season. Mr Hacking arranged for this purchase under the guise of an emergency bypassing the proper procurement channels. They were not good procured in an emergency but goods procured for an emergency.

10 This inquiry will examine whether this is a hole in the fabric of the procurement processes at the New South Wales Rural Fire Service. Mr Hacking was apparently thus able to use the section 44 procurement processes outside a section 44 event by saying that the goods would be used for a section 44 event.

There was a further problem. Mr Homsey's companies primarily supplied snack packs to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service's warehouse at Glendenning. The Commission understands that at that warehouse there is no reliable system for checking what has been delivered to the warehouse against what had been ordered or what was being sent out from the warehouse.

20 The Commission understands that deliveries were not checked against an invoice and no receipt was issued. This inquiry will examine what procedures were in place at the Glendenning warehouse between 2011 and 2015 and whether any deficiency in those procedures contributed to the failure to detect the undersupply of snack packs by EMCS.

I will now outline the major subject matters of this inquiry's investigation into possible corrupt conduct. To introduce that topic I will show a further graph. There's lots of colours in this graph but it indicates this, that
30 between 2009/2010 and 2014/2015 Mr Homsey's businesses supplied a number of different products and services to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service for which he billed over \$9.7 million. This inquiry will investigate what procurement processes were used when first choosing Mr Homsey's businesses to supply such products or services and for ongoing procurement purposes.

In this connection this inquiry will investigate whether there was any corrupt conduct such as through partiality by officers of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service in making those decisions.

40 The graph on the screen shows first that Mr Homsey's businesses supplied catering services to New South Wales Rural Fire Service in – on the graph – 2009/2010 but not in 2010/2011. Second, Mr Homsey's businesses began supplying snack packs in 2010/2011 but in relatively small quantities. Levels of both catering and snack packs increased in 2011/2012. In 2012/2013 Mr Homsey's businesses also began supplying other packs such as first aid kits and toiletry kits.

I'm now going to show some pictures. That is a first aid pack, and then the next one is a toiletry kit. Mr Hacking has told the Commission that the skimming arrangement did not extend to these packs. This inquiry will investigate that issue.

Next, beginning in 2012/2013 Mr Homsey's businesses supplied courier services to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service, and up on the screen now is a graph of those charges.

- 10 This inquiry will investigate the genuineness of these charges and whether there was any corrupt conduct associated with them.

- Next, beginning in 2013/2014 EMCS supplied repacking services to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service and up on the screen now is a graph of those charges. Repacking occurred because certain items in the snack packs, primarily the chips, had a limited shelf life but other items did not. When the earliest items went out of date the packs could not be used but they still contained items mostly still usable so there was repacking of snack packs to prolong their life. It appears that the repacking was needed because too many snack packs had been ordered in the first place. This inquiry will investigate whether there was any corrupt conduct associated with the amount of orders placed for snack packs and in the obtaining of these repacking services from EMCS.
- 20

- Next, in 2014/2015 goods were supplied by Mr Homsey's businesses to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service which were sourced from third parties. Such goods included some bain-maries given as prizes at the New South Wales Rural Fire Service Catering State Championships in 2014. This inquiry will investigate whether such goods could have been purchased from the original source and in turn whether there was any corrupt conduct associated with the procurement process.
- 30

- As mentioned earlier, this inquiry will investigate what, if any, measures were in place at the New South Wales Rural Fire Service to check that the goods referred to in an invoice issued by D'Vine Tastes and EMCS were actually supplied. This inquiry will also investigate what, if any, involvement Mr Hacking had in facilitating the authorisation of invoices submitted by D'Vine Tastes and EMCS and to what extent such approval may have occurred without any verification of delivery. This inquiry will investigate whether there was any corrupt conduct by Mr Hacking in this connection.
- 40

A similar investigation will take place in relation to invoices issued by Mr Homsey's businesses for catering services. The inquiry will investigate the process by which such invoices were approved for payment and to what extent such approval may have occurred without any verification of what catering services were actually supplied and whether the invoice was

reasonable. This inquiry will investigate whether there was any corrupt conduct in this connection.

10 This inquiry will investigate the full extent of the money paid by Mr Homsey to Mr Hacking under their skimming arrangement. It will also investigate what other payments have been made by Mr Homsey to Mr Hacking. Mr Hacking's brother, Darren Hacking, was employed by Mr Homsey. This inquiry will investigate whether this was a form of benefit supplied by Mr Homsey to John Hacking for the purposes of obtaining and maintaining further orders from the New South Wales Rural Fire Service. This inquiry will also investigate what knowledge Darren Hacking had of the arrangements between his brother and Mr Homsey. The inquiry will investigate whether, and if so to what extent, Mr Springett received any gifts or other financial benefits from Mr Homsey and the purpose of any such gifts or benefits.

20 When Mr Hacking was first approached by the Commission in February, 2015 and his home was searched under a search warrant a number of telephone handsets were found. Telstra supplied mobile phones and tablets to the New South Wales Rural Fire Service. As part of its contract Telstra provided a fund which increased in amount the more hardware was purchased by the New South Wales Rural Fire Service. In 2014 this fund was worth in the order of \$215,000 and Mr Hacking had unfettered access to it.

30 In December, 2014 Mr Hacking placed an order against this fund for about \$107,000 worth of equipment. Some of this equipment was found in Mr Hacking's home and other pieces have been returned by some of Mr Hacking's friends. This inquiry will investigate the extent of any corrupt conduct by Mr Hacking in this connection.

The second part of this inquiry will examine the extent to which the procedures which were in place at the New South Wales Rural Fire Service from 2011 to 2015 rendered the RFS vulnerable to abuse through corrupt conduct of the kind being investigated.

40 This investigation will also extend into the procedures relating to the allocation of mobile telephones, tablets, and other computer hardware in the New South Wales Rural Fire Service.

This inquiry will examine some of the senior officers in the organisation to investigate how it was possible for Mr Hacking to perpetrate the skimming arrangement and the other aspects of possible corrupt conduct by Mr Hacking and Mr Springett, the subject of this inquiry.

This inquiry will investigate what changes could be suggested in procedures at all levels of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service in order to prevent these events reoccurring. In that context the Commission is mindful of the

important public service the New South Wales Rural Fire Service fulfils, in particular in times of extreme crisis during section 44 events.

10 The abbreviated procurement procedures implemented under section 44 declarations of which Mr Hacking appears to have taken advantage for his own personal gain were put in place for perfectly understandable reasons enabling the crisis to be met and the functions of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service to be properly and effectively fulfilled in the interests of the community is plainly of paramount of importance. The Commission will investigate how this can be achieved without compromising the security of the public purse.

May it please.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We will take a short adjournment after which I will take applications for leave to appear.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[10.48am]

20

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Please be seated. Yes, I'll now take applications for leave to appear.

MR BREWER: Commissioner, my name is Brewer, B-r-e-w-e-r. I seek the Commission's leave to appear for Scott Homsey.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes Mr Brewer, you're given leave to appear.

30

MR WHITFIELD: Whitfield, solicitor. I seek leave to appear on behalf of Arthur John Hacking.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Whitfield.

MR MOSES: Yes, Commissioner, my name is Moses. I appear with my friend Ms Gleeson for the Commissioner of the Rural Fire Service and the Rural Fire Service.

40 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes thank you, Mr Moses. Are there any other applications? Yes?

MS HALL: Commissioner, my name is Hall, H-a-l-l. I seek the Commissioner's leave to appear on behalf of Mrs Homsey.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: For Mrs Homsey? Yes Ms Hall, you're given leave to appear.

MS HUGHES: Commissioner, my name is Hughes. I seek leave to appear on behalf of Bruce McDonald and Wendy Bucket.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mrs Hughes, you're given leave to appear.

MS HUGHES: Thank you, Commissioner.

10 MR HARRIS: Commissioner, Harris. I'm seeking authorisation to appear for Brett Wallace, Matthew Lane, and John Parnaby.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Harris, you're given that leave.

MR HARRIS: Thank you.

MR OATES: Commissioner, my name is Oates. I seek your leave to appear for Darren Hacking.

20 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Oates, you're given leave to appear for Mr Hacking.

MR OATES: Commissioner, I also say that – as I advised Counsel Assisting this morning – I'm a volunteer member of the Rural Fire Service as is my son, my son's partner, and my daughter. However, we belong to a brigade in the south of the state and have no contact with that area which is under investigation.

30 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for declaring that, Mr Oates. Yes?

MR DUNN: Commissioner, my name is Dunn. I seek permission to appear on behalf of Mr Springett.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Dunn.

MR CHEE: My name is Chee, C-h-e-e. I seek authorisation to appear on behalf of Patrick Grady.

40 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Chee, you're given that leave.

MR CHEE: Thank you.

MS McGLINCHEY: Commissioner, my name is McGlinchey. I seek leave to appear for Deputy Commissioner Robin Rogers.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms McGlinchey.

MR HEENAN: Commissioner, my name is Heenan, solicitor. I seek leave to appear for Assistant Commissioner Stephen Yorke.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Heenan?

MR HEENAN: Yes.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. Yes, you're given leave to appear.

10 MR HEENAN: Thank you.

MR CHALMERS: Good morning, Commissioner.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Hello.

MR CHALMERS: Chalmers, solicitor. I seek leave to appear for Stephen O'Malley.

20 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Chalmers.

MR CHALMERS: Thank you.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think that's all. Mr Katekar, do you wish to call your first witness?

MR KATEKAR: Well before I did that, Commissioner, I was proposing to tender some documents.

30 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR KATEKAR: If it would please. There is 21 volumes of documents which have been made publicly available, volumes 1-12. I was proposing, if Commissioner, you have a list – I can read them out of you wish but just to mark them Exhibits 1 to 21 in accordance with their title.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, I don't think they need to be read out if they've been provided to all relevant parties?

40 MR KATEKAR: Yes.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And if they're referred to during the evidence it will be as volume 2 of Exhibit 1, that type of thing or?

MR KATEKAR: Well, I was proposing, yes, we could do that. I was proposing each volume would be a separate exhibit.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: All right.

MR KATEKAR: If that would be convenient?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: All right. Well, the volumes 1 to 21 will be marked Exhibits 1 to 21.

#EXHIBITS 1 TO 21 - TENDER BUNDLES VOLUMES 1 – 21

10 MR KATEKAR: Thank you, Commissioner. I was proposing to tender this example of a snack pack.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR KATEKAR: Perhaps it could be marked Exhibit 22?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The snack pack will be Exhibit 22.

20 **#EXHIBIT 22 - SNACK PACK**

MR KATEKAR: And then lastly, within the volumes there was some missing copies of section 44 declarations and so there's a separate bundle of section 44 declarations that I seek to have marked Exhibit 23. They only relate to the year of 2014/2015.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The section 44 declarations will be Exhibit 23.

30

#EXHIBIT 23 - SECTION 44 DECLARATIONS FOR THE 2014-15 FIRE SEASON

MR KATEKAR: Thank you, Commissioner. And then lastly, these are not things for tender but I have two aide memoirs which I provide to you and can be made available on request. I can hand them up. One is just a two-pager of acronyms and abbreviations - - -

40

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right.

MR KATEKAR: - - - to find your way through and otherwise it's a, sort of picture with boxes showing who's involved and where they fit in.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.

MR KATEKAR: I'll make that generally available. Before I leave the tender, I needed to mention something which is this. Firstly in Exhibit 19 a suppression order has already been made over all exhibits to the statement of Karen Andersen of 8 May, 2015 and Exhibit 2 to the statement of Arthur Pangrath. So I just wanted to mention that. Apart from tendering them they are subject to the existing suppression order.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. And they are a part of which volume?

10

MR KATEKAR: Exhibit 19, the Telstra Statements.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. And the suppression order relates to the entirety of those?

MR KATEKAR: All of the exhibits to the statement of Karen Andersen - -
-

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

20

MR KATEKAR: - - - of 8 May, 2015 and Exhibit 2 to the statement of Arthur Pangrath.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: All right. Well, I confirm that a suppression order is made in respect of those exhibits outlined by Counsel Assisting.

30

THERE IS A SUPPRESSION ORDER OVER THE EXHIBITS OF THE STATEMENT OF KAREN ANDERSEN AND EXHIBIT 2 TO THE STATEMENT OF ARTHUR PANGRATH

MR KATEKAR: And then also in relation to the documents tendered I seek a suppression order in respect of those documents and also to any other documents or records tendered in this inquiry in respect of private telephone numbers, private addresses, private email addresses and private bank account numbers.

40

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. Well, an order is made suppressing all of those matters outlined by Counsel Assisting in respect of the exhibits generally.

THERE IS A SUPPRESSION ORDER OVER DOCUMENTS OR RECORDS TENDERED IN THIS INQUIRY IN RESPECT OF PRIVATE TELEPHONE NUMBERS, PRIVATE ADDRESSES,

PRIVATE EMAIL ADDRESSES AND PRIVATE BANK ACCOUNT NUMBERS.

MR KATEKAR: May it please. That's the evidence so far tendered. I propose to tender further things as the Commission proceeds.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

10 MR KATEKAR: But apart from that I am now ready to call Scott Homsey, and I do.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Just take a seat there Mr Homsey. Mr Brewer. Mr Brewer, sorry, is your client seeking a section 38 declaration?

MR BREWER: He is. Yes, he is.

20 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And he understands the effect of such a declaration?

MR BREWER: He does.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

Pursuant to section 38 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, I declare that all answers given by this witness and all documents and things produced by him during the course of his evidence at this public inquiry are to be regarded as having been given or produced on objection.
30 There is no need for the witness to make objection in respect of any particular answer given or document or thing produced.

**PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT, I DECLARE THAT ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY THIS WITNESS AND ALL DOCUMENTS AND THINGS PRODUCED BY HIM DURING THE COURSE OF HIS EVIDENCE AT THIS PUBLIC INQUIRY ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HAVING BEEN GIVEN OR PRODUCED ON
40 OBJECTION. THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE WITNESS TO MAKE OBJECTION IN RESPECT OF ANY PARTICULAR ANSWER GIVEN OR DOCUMENT OR THING PRODUCED.**

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Homsey, will you take an oath on the Bible or make an affirmation?

MR HOMSEY: Affirmation please, Commissioner.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr Katekar.

MR KATEKAR: Can I first check the pronunciation of your name. I think I might have got it wrong in the opening?---It's Homsey.

It's Homsey is it?---That's correct.

10

Okay. I thought I got it right then, perhaps I got it right. There's been an order suppressing addresses but I would like to ask your address please. Where do you live?---[REDACTED].

And who else lives there?---Just myself.

All right. Was there a time at which you lived with your mother?---No, I visited. Currently nearly every second day if not every day.

20 All right. So she lives elsewhere?---That's correct. Yeah.

You lodged a debtor's petition for bankruptcy in May, 2011?---That's correct.

Why?---I did a job for the Government, a Silver Jubilee catering job down at Nowra and due to the contractual agreement unfortunately I was unsuccessful in, in, in making a profit in that, that role so it left me with quite an outstanding amount and through my accountants, taxation accountants moved forward in – I couldn't repay my debts at the time.

30

All right. Since about 2011 – from 2011 to say late last year you were producing snack packs for the New South Wales Rural Fire Service?---Yes.

And the contents of those snack packs changed a bit over the time?---Yes, they did.

Can you give the Commission an idea, not including labour costs, what it cost for each snack pack?---Pending on product.

40 Yes?---Pending on availability and the price rise within that every year it changed. It would go from anything from \$6.80 to \$7.30, \$7.40 depending what the product was.

\$6.80 to \$7.40 in that range?---Yeah. Sometimes up to \$8 depending on the product.

And then you had labour on top of that?---That's right.

But you had people you paid about \$20 an hour?---Yes.

And they could get through several, several snack packs in an hour?---Yeah.

So that - - -?---I mean it took a season or so to, to get the, the rolling of that but, yes.

10 So the incremental cost of labour wasn't substantial was it?---Only when the amounts of, of the snack packs went up incrementally. We, we enlisted the services of, of an agency so then the cost of that went up to \$35 an hour.

I see. Can you give the Commission an idea of the range of the labour costs per pack, per snack pack?---If I was just working on the \$20 - - -

Yes?--- - - - it could be anywhere up from \$1.50 and, and then I had packaging, labelling.

20 \$1.50 per pack?---Well, in, in – depending on the, on the actual labour itself so if we only had short staff obviously it would take longer to get those, those snack packs out so really depending on the quantity of the product itself.

The next thing I'm going to do, Mr Homsey, is remind you that earlier this year you attended the Commission for some compulsory examinations?
---That's right.

30 And I'm going to ask for suppression order to be lifted in respect of certain pages of that transcript. Do you have that list of the page numbers for me? The page numbers are these, if it would please the Commission, page 80, 93, 104, 105, 129, 130, 133, 135, 138, 139, 142, 143, 433, 434, 439, 442 and 443, and also there's an exhibit, pages 1, 21, 83 and 84 of Exhibit C9. Might the suppression order be lifted on those pages please.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR BREWER: What are the pages numbers of that please, those last page numbers you read out?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Of the exhibit.

40

MR KATEKAR: Oh, 2, 21, 83 and 84.

MR BREWER: Thank you.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The suppression orders in respect of the nominated pages are lifted.

THE SUPPRESSION ORDERS IN RESPECT OF PAGES 80, 93, 104, 105, 129, 130, 133, 135, 138, 139, 142, 143, 433, 434, 439, 442 AND 443 OF MR HOMSEY'S COMPULSORY EXAMINATION AND PAGES 1, 21, 83 AND 84 OF EXHIBIT C9 ARE LIFTED

10 MR KATEKAR: Thank you, Commissioner. I just want to remind you of some of the things that you told the Commission on those occasions. At page 80 of the transcript you indicated that you knew Paul Springett prior to 2009?---Ah hmm.

You agree?---Agree.

And that his brother, Brendan Springett, was married to Lisa?---That's correct.

And Lisa is the sister of Joanne?---Yes.

20 And Joanne has been a friend of yours for about 25 years?---Yes.

And at page 93 you told the Commission you did not ever participate in a tender process for the Rural Fire Service for any work?---I was under the belief for, for the snack packs but I had, I had tendered for the café there at 15 Carter Street.

Right. So you did a tender for the café at 15 Carter Street?---Not for the external catering.

30 But not for the external catering or for the snack packs?---Or for the snack packs.

Page 104, you said that you didn't provide any documentation to the Rural Fire Service at any time about what products had been delivered?---That's correct.

And that is correct?---Yes.

40 And at page 105, you said, you didn't ask for any receipts for goods delivered to the RFS?---No.

And you never saw any receipt?---No, I didn't.

And you sent the invoices originally to Paul Springett or John Hacking?---That's right.

But in the last 18 months or so you sent them to the Rural Fire Service Finance Department?---Timeline, not sure. That was a rough, but then it went straight to the finance officer.

All right. So originally to those two?---Yes.

And then at some it changed?---That's right.

And then at 129, you said in relation to your arrangement with Mr Hacking you said that when it first started I was given an order and then the next order I was asked could I have a certain amount of that?---That's correct.

10 And that was Mr Hacking asking for a certain amount of that?---Yes.

And when he asked for it you said it was a percentage of the order?---I didn't ask. I didn't say percentage.

Okay?---I wasn't aware when he said the amount and I questioned him on what his meaning was for that.

All right. Well, this was when it originally began?---That's right.

20 And you had said, page 130, that John Hacking had asked "Can you put that aside for me"?---Yes.

And then at page 133, you indicated that when you allocated 1,000 bags to John Hacking, you invoiced the RFS for those 1,000 bags but did not in fact supply them. Is that correct?---That's correct.

And John Hacking told you that you didn't have to supply them because he said to you "I do the warehousing, the moving around of stock."?---Yes.

30 And that's - - -?---Correct.

And at page 135, you said to the Commission you always paid Hacking in cash?---Yes.

Occasionally you would ask your mother to get cash out for you but you didn't tell her what it was for?---That's correct.

40 Page 138, in reference to an order for 100,000 snack packs placed in August, 2014, you said to the Commission that Mr Hacking told you "Can we stick to the same arrangement"?---Yes.

And you told the Commission that you said that that involved Mr Hacking letting you know what part was for him?---That's correct.

And then at page 139, out of that 100,000 order for snack packs you told the Commission that 82,000 had been supplied?---Yes.

Although 100,000 had been invoiced?---That's correct.

You said you hadn't been paid for that missing 18,000?---Yes.

Also on that page you indicated that all cash payments to Mr Hacking were funded by under supply?---Yes, that's correct.

Page 142, you told the Commission on maybe three occasions, Paul Springett had to get somebody to go down the south coast and Paul had paid them cash?---South coast was just one.

10

Just one?---I used that as an example, yes.

All right. But that Paul would then send you a purchase order?---Yes.

You would send an invoice to the RFS?---That's correct.

Mr Springett would approve it?---Yes.

20

The Rural Fire Service would pay you against that invoice?---That's correct.

And you would give Paul Springett the money?---Yes, or the driver.

Or the driver?---Yeah. On one occasion.

On one occasion you paid it to the driver?---That's correct.

But on other occasions you paid it to Mr Springett?---Yes, that's right

30

On 143, you indicated that \$1,000 or \$1,500 was one?---Yes.

And \$1,100 was another?---Um, I was guesstimating that the amounts were that for, for a certain trip, yes.

All right. But you, on one occasion you said it might have been for \$2,000?---I, I wasn't clear but I, there was a couple of trips that were, one up north and back overnight and yes, I believe it was of \$1,000.

40

Right. Now, might page 1 of Exhibit C9 be brought up on the screen please? You should see a purchase order there and you'll see that it's got 11/2/2012, and you were asked about this but I think – and I'll provide separate evidence to the Commission later, Commissioner, that that's an error. It should be 2/11/12. It's the 2nd of November that purchase order. There's a separate purchase order in existence, but you were asked about this one in your examination and you'll see that it refers to Ray to pick up four raft packs from Grafton - - -?---Yes.

- - - Airport and return them to Glendenning, and you said in your examination you didn't know what a raft pack was?---I didn't know what a raft pack was, no.

Oh, you did not?---No.

No. And didn't know whether he could fit four on his truck?---Um, that wasn't whether I, I knew whether it could fit in his truck because I don't know what a raft pack was.

10

Yes. But that Mr Springett – you told the Commission that Mr Springett paid this to Ray and put the order through you?---That's correct.

Right. Or to be fair I think you said or it was paid to Ray directly?---Yes, I wasn't sure.

You're not sure?---That's right.

20

Then on page 21 of C9, could that be brought up? There we are. That's the invoice. You'll see that it's dated 2 November, 2012, and you won't remember but the purchase order number is the same appearing on page 1. But you'll just have to assume that from me, and that in relation to that you agreed that that money was paid into the account of Gay Homsey?---That's correct. If it's 2/12, yes.

30

Yes. And then you said the money was then paid out of, paid out to either Mr Springett or to Ray. Now just on that, just while I've got this invoice it's just clear, just make this clear for the Commissioner, you'll see that it's an invoice from D'Vine Tastes?---Yes.

And in November, 2012 that was a business name but was not incorporated?---That's correct.

And the payments were going to Gay Homsey's account?---That's right.

Your mother's?---Yes.

Because you were bankrupt?---That's correct.

40

Then at page 439 of the transcript you indicated that since early 2012 there was an arrangement in place with Ray regarding, through Mr Springett and the courier charges that happened three or four times?---It might have been including that, maybe three times, yes. It wasn't, it wasn't regular.

All right. It was not regular, are you saying that to the Commission?---Well it wasn't every week, it was three or four times so, over that period. I think there was somebody else used in that, in, in driving as well.

I'm going to suggest to you, Mr Homsey, that it was a regular occurrence?--
-Okay.

And happened about at least 12 occasions. Do you agree with that?---Um,
I'm not sure about 12 times. I would say there was in, if that's over the full
period but 2012 I'm not sure about 12 times.

2012 to 2015?---Okay.

10 But you're not sure?---Um, I thought the question was how many times
through 2012. My apologies.

I'm glad I asked about that. No that's fine, that's, I'm glad I went there?---
Okay.

So 2012 would have been three or four times?---That's right.

But in the period from 2012 to 2015 it may have been - - -?---A possibility,
yes.

20

Then moving to – if the operator could go to page 83? That's an email from
Mr Springett to you of Friday, 6 February this year at 2.03pm – and then if
the operator could please go to page 84 that that's a purchase order – and at
pages 442 to 443 you eventually agreed that you think that this was a
purchase order resulting in money being paid to Mr Springett?---A
possibility, yes.

A possibility?---Yes. I wasn't sure who drove at that time but that, yes, if
it's logistics either to the driver or to Mr Springett.

30

At page 443 you told the Commission that you recalled giving Mr Springett
money in February, 2015 for the purpose of reimbursing him for paying
Ray?---That's correct.

All right. And that invoice is January, 2015. Do you agree?---Yes.

So is it possible that that purchase order is connected to the payment that
you made to Mr Springett in February, 2015?---That's a clear possibility.

40

A clear possibility. A likelihood?---A likelihood. There wasn't much on so,
yes.

Excuse me. Oh, thank you. I'm being reminded if I could tender those
pages. Pages 1, 21, 83 and 84 of Exhibit C9 please.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. That will be Exhibit 24.

#EXHIBIT 24 - EXHIBIT C9 – PAGES 1, 21, 83, 84

MR KATEKAR: All right. I'm going to go through things, some evidence with you, Mr Homsey, but before I do this I just want to make a couple of things clear and ask you whether you accept them. The first is this, that the Commission understands this, that on and from at least October, 2012 you and Mr John Hacking had an arrangement which had these elements, and I'm going to ask you if you agree to each of them. The first element is that for each and every order for snack packs that was placed by the New South Wales Rural Fire Service through John Hacking to your company EMCS you – EMCS would undersupply by 20 per cent. Do you agree with that? ---No. Not every, not every, not every order at the start of 2012 – middle – end of 2012.

Yeah. All right. Now, just picking up on that answer you say that for – the arrangement was that for some of the orders there was a 20 per cent undersupply?---Yes, that's correct.

20 And you also said that not from the start - - -?---That's correct.

- - - in your answer to me. Do you say that it turned into an arrangement where it would be 20 per cent every time?---The arrangement started with a – not a set amount. I would get a phone call asking certain amounts to be put aside so for a while, and dates I'm not clear of, but I was asked to put certain amounts aside from a phone call.

All right. Did it start – I'm being reminded Mr Hacking has told the inquiry that it started at 10 per cent. Did it start at 10 per cent?---It was 30 intermittently depending on the phone call.

Right?---But generally after that it was – the phone calls were in, in those 10 per cent ranges, yes.

Did it move to 20 per cent at any particular point?---No, it didn't.

It never moved to 20 per cent?---Occasionally it went to – I would be asked to put – depending on the amount he would ask for 2,000 so some orders would be 20 per cent, yes, but it wasn't an agreement as such. 40

And the – do you say to the Commission that the arrangement was reached by phone call?---Yes, and occasionally on, on meeting.

All right. And that that arrangement occurred each time a purchase order was issued?---Not every time in 2012. It seemed as it got busier, the requirements of the payments stepped up from that.

And let's fast forward from 2012 to 2014?---Yes.

Do you say to the Commission that each time you issued an invoice that there was a new discussion about how much would go to Mr Hacking?---It was a clear understanding by 2014/'15 season that that was the case, yes.

Well, when you say it was a clear understanding, was there a separate conversation for each purchase order or invoice?---No, I believe it was just, it was a clear, actually, 2014, yes, there was a clear understanding.

10 That is, it wasn't necessary for you to have a discussion about it?---No, that's correct.

Because it was understood?---That's right.

Based on past practice?---That's - - -

20 And what was that understanding?---The understanding towards 2013 was that, um, for an order placed, um, he would give me a call if, if the arrangement had changed. But it was generally was worked on a phone call, um, but the purchase order then there was a clear understanding for me that I had to put certain amount aside.

How much?---Pending on the size of the order.

Well?---It wasn't, it wasn't a percentage. He would ring, ah, then I got a clear understanding that, yes, it was a 10 per cent towards the end of 2013.

30 Towards the end of 2013, do you say to the Commission that you had a clear understanding that it was a 10 per cent skim?---That's right.

Not a 20 per cent skim?---No.

40 The next thing I'm going to put to you is that during a fire season, and when I refer to fire season I appreciate they start and end at different times. But let's say from October to March for any given year. So if we're talking, say the 2013 – no withdraw that – 2014/2015 year, I appreciate that it ended on the 14 February, 2015 this year as far as you were concerned. That starting in about October, 2014 the arrangement that you had in place with Mr Hacking worked in these steps. The first step was a section 44 declaration would be made and then the next step was you would be sent a purchase order under that section 44 declaration for snack packs. Do you agree with that first step?---The section 44, um, generally was, was the reason why a snack pack would – I would receive an order but, um, we were moving towards '14/'15, of having enough snack packs and supplying the right product for that snack pack within the '14/'15 season. So, I was asked to provide a service outside the section 44 so they would have stock. That's correct.

All right. Well, I'm just going to break that up. Do you say that for the previous years – let's keep it confined for the moment to say 2013/2014 – that the first step in the process was a section 44 declaration followed by a purchase order for snack packs?---Yes, correct.

But that in 2014/2015 you had an advance purchase order for a 100,000 snack packs?---Correct.

Which was different to the previous years?---Ah, generally, yes.

10

And that the next step in the process was – after you got the purchase order, however that was – was that you would make a supply?---That's right.

And issue an invoice?---Yes.

Not necessarily in that order?---That's right, yes.

20

Sometimes the invoice would come first?---Sometimes the delay, sometimes I wouldn't get a purchase order for a little while so depending on the circumstance but an invoice occasionally did, was produced prior to the product being finished.

Why was that?---Um, bad management.

Bad management?---Well I put, we put, sometimes we knew the process of three month um, two to three month payment and we always had the product finished by then so it was pre I guess stepping, stepping that invoice prior to the product being finished.

30

I'm just not sure I understood that answer. The - - -?---In – I was told to put an invoice in because we had two to three months of sometimes delay in payment.

Right. So Mr Hacking told you?---It's been, in the past it's happened two or three times, yes.

So you say to the Commission today that on about two or three occasions Mr Hacking told you to put in an invoice before you'd given a supply?---That's correct.

40

Because there might be a two or three month delay in getting paid?---There can be a delay in some payments, yes.

But apart from those two or three occasions you say there were no other occasions?---Um, possibly it could be four times but there was occasions when supply was done, or invoice was done prior to finishing the order.

And just so that we're absolutely clear in saying three or four times are you talking about the period from 2011 to date or are you confining it to a date range?---Um, I'm not saying from 2011. It would be in the last two years.

Right, so in the - - -?---Two fire seasons.

- - - in the last two years, you say, there was three or four occasions were you issued an invoice before you'd made a supply?---That's correct. To the best of my knowledge.

10

Then after the invoice was issued – sorry, I withdraw that. It was the case wasn't it – and I think we've been through this – that delivery was generally to the Glendenning warehouse?---Yes.

The - - -?---Occasionally Rural Fire would, would pick up from my warehouse.

20

Occasionally they would pick up from your warehouse. And there were other occasions were Darren Hacking would supply to some other RFS warehouse near Coffs Harbour?---That's right.

But otherwise you primarily supplied to Glendenning?---Yes.

Or they would be picked up?---That's right.

And on either of those two pick up or delivery you did not provide an invoice to the Glendenning warehouse or to the pick up at the same time?---No, that's right.

30

Because you supplied it directly?---That's right.

And you did not get a receipt for the delivery?---No I didn't.

Then each, approximately each month during a fire season you met with Mr Hacking and provided him with cash?---Which fire season, sorry?

Well, I'll start with the 2014/2015 season. You met with him each month didn't you?---Um, I'm not sure about each month but I did meet with him a few times.

40

All right. When you say you're not sure you met with him each month you met with him a few times between about October, 2014 and February, 2015, do you agree?---That's correct.

For the 2013/2014 season how many times did you meet him to pay him cash?---Off the top of my head maybe six or seven times.

Six or seven times. And what about the 2012/2013 season?---Um, a few times.

A few times?---Probably two, two times. Two or three.

Only two or three times?---Yeah.

10 All right. Now, Commissioner, I think I've gone – we were going to count the morning tea adjournment for the adjournment that we had, is that what we were doing or did you wish to have an adjournment now? I'm happy to carry on but I'm in your hands. I'd overlooked the time.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Oh, right. Look, I think we will have short morning tea adjournment.

MR KATEKAR: All right.

20 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: There's something I have to take care of so it suits me.

MR KATEKAR: Oh, okay.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We'll just adjourn for 15 minutes.

MR KATEKAR: Okay.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[11.50am]

30

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Please be seated. Yes, Mr Katekar.

MR KATEKAR: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr Homsey, before the break I spoke to you about an arrangement that the Commission understands that you had with Mr Hacking and I neglected to put to you the second part which was that for each undersupply there would be a profit. You agree with that?---That's correct.

40 And that you would divide that profit equally between you and Mr Hacking. Do you agree with that?---Yes.

What I'm going to do now, Mr Homsey, is that I'm going to take you through the events as far as the Commission is aware on the evidence that it has collected since August last year relevant to the arrangement that you had in place with Mr Hacking and could I just ask you to assume for the moment that on 2 August, 2014 a section 44 declaration was made in relation to Clarence Valley and that is in Exhibit number, if I had my things together,

Exhibit 23 for the Commission's purposes. Then if the next document I'd like to be brought up is the email from Mr Hacking to you – that's it, you'll see it on the screen – of 5 August, 2014 at 20 minutes to 3.00 saying "Scott, good afternoon. Please find attached an order for 100,000 snack packs", and then the following page is that order and you got that at that time?

---Yes, that's correct.

10 It's correct isn't it that before that order was placed to you, you had already reached an agreement with Mr Hacking that three would be a pre-order for 100,000 snack packs?---There would be a pre-order, yes.

And this was that pre-order?---That's correct.

The next event for the purposes of this chronology is on 29 September, 2014 which is in the order of several weeks later at page 30 – you'll see it on the screen – this was your first invoice under that purchase order. Do you agree?---Yes, that's correct.

20 And just so the Commissioner and the people in the room follow that is, next to the date, to the left of the date of 29 September, 2014 is the number S44L14150052. See that?---Yes, I can see that.

MR OATES: Commissioner, I'm loath to interrupt Counsel but we don't have these documents on our screen.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Oh.

MS HALL: It seems to be our whole entire row is blank. I don't know.

30 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That, that row?

MS HALL: Yes.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We'll see what we can do. Can you see it on the screen up there or is that too far for you?

MS HALL: It's a little far.

40 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are these documents in the folders or not?

MR KATEKAR: Yes. That document on the screen is in volume 10, page 32.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you have access to those volumes, Mr Oates?

MR OATES: I - - -

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you have - - -

MR OATES: I have my PC here. I can access it through that, Commissioner, yes.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think you might have to in the short term because I don't know that we can fix this immediately.

10 MR OATES: Unlike others at the bar I can read that.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well, that's very good. That's very good.

MR KATEKAR: I can indicate this – I don't think it's going to delay things to say this – but the number appearing on that invoice corresponds to the purchase order, do you agree?---That's correct.

20 And that this invoice is for 20,000 snack packs, do you agree?---Yes, that's correct.

Yep. Then I'm just going to draw your attention – lower down on the page you'll see there's a square box that says "Approved 28 October, 2014." See that?---(No Audible Reply).

At the bottom - - -?---Yes.

- - - foot of the document?---That's just moving. Yes, I can see that.

30 Yes. The next document in this chronology is another one of the kind, and I'm not trying to put my friends at a disadvantage if they haven't got it yet but it's just an invoice for 10,000 snack packs on 9 October, 2014. It's at page 37 of volume 10 for – and the total being \$159,500 and approved on the same date of 28 October, 2014 – and again at the top it's got that S44L number, being the same as the purchase order number, taking it to 30,000 snack packs?---Yes.

Do you agree? Against that 100,000 order?---Yes.

40 And then – so as far as my friends are concerned if they haven't seen the documents yet against the purchase order of 5 October so far on 29 September and 9 October, 2014 two invoices have been raised, one for 20,000 and one for 10,000 snack packs and the two amounts are 319,000 and 159,500. And I'll just ask you to assume for the moment, Mr Homsey, that those two figures add up to \$478,500. Do you agree with that?---I'll take your word for it.

You can take my word for it. Because then the next document – no, now I'm going to go to something separate. I'm going to go to a telephone call that you had with Mr Hacking on 3 November, 2014 and I'm going to ask that it be now played and I will subsequently tender it and the transcript.

AUDIO RECORDING PLAYED

[12.18pm]

10 MR KATEKAR: Now I'm going to tender that transcript, if I may?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And the call or just the transcript?

MR KATEKAR: And the call.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, the tape of the call and the transcript of the call of 3 November, 2014 will be Exhibit 25.

20 **#EXHIBIT 25 - AUDIO RECORDING AND ACCOMPANYING
TRANSCRIPT OF INTERCEPTED TELECOMMUNICATION 3
NOVEMBER 2014**

MR KATEKAR: Mr Homsey, a few things arising out of that. Just going through it, at one point or another you said "There's no hurry. It's better for me to do it in little chunks and keep doing it"?---Yes.

30 Do you remember saying that?---That's correct.

And that's in reference to doing the snack packs against the purchase order for 100,000 in little chunks?---Yes.

Then Mr Hacking asked you "How many more have we got to go?" Do you agree with that?---That's correct.

40 And then he said, you said "We took a delivery today and we start Thursday." He said "Yep." And you said "For another 10,000 and that's halfway"?---Yes.

You remember saying that? He said "Halfway, yeah, yeah. That's just 40 just on 40 with Darren 42." Do you agree with that?---That's correct.

And halfway being 40 was halfway to 80. Do you agree?---Yes.

And you were supplying 80 against the 100,000. Do you agree?---That's correct.

So there was a 20 per cent skim on that purchase order?---That was I was asked, yes.

Well, you've said "Obviously with the deal and everything." Do you remember saying that?---Yes.

10 Because that's the deal that you had?---I said that later on it got more but originally it started with phone calls with I was receiving an amount. He would say can you put this aside and then later on it became 10 per cent and then on that last order it became 20 per cent.

Yes. So you say that the 20 per cent only applied to this order?---A majority of that, yes. There was 20 per cent, sometimes it was 20 per cent because of the order and he would give me a call and say "Could you put 2,000 away," on a 20, 20,000 order, so that made it 20 per cent.

So do you say that the 20 per cent skim was a specific deal against this purchase order?---On that purchase order, yes.

20 When was that deal reached?---Um, it would've been August. What we were trying to do was supply a certain product. Um, I asked Mr Hacking could we look at – I need to get a supply from my, from my confectionary people and he said, "Well, I'll give you – I'll have to look at getting you a pre-order if we want to put those bags in and it's not going to be busy summer. This is where we're going to have to look at." And I would look at 20 per cent. The same deal but would look at a little bit more. Um, but saying it, it was the 2,000 that went to Mr Hacking as well.

So Darren Hacking did another 2,000?---Yes, for the north region.

30 So it was essentially an 18 per cent skim?---That's right.

Including Darren Hacking's 2,000?---Darren Hacking's 2,000.

Do you say that the – that skim for that deal was arranged in a conversation that you had with Mr Hacking, is this right in about August, 2014?---Ah, it might've been a little bit earlier because I took a product down to Carter Street and we laid it out on the table what we're looking for and all agreed on the product going in for that summer into that bag.

40 All right. Now, what product was that?---Um, in the snack pack.

The snack pack. Right?---That's right.

So, so you met with Mr Hacking sometime before August, 2014 at Carter Street at Homebush. Is that right?---That's right.

At the head office - - ?---That's right.

- - - of the New South Wales Rural Fire Service and laid out the products that you proposed to be going into that run of snack packs. Do you agree?
---That's correct.

And in that meeting Mr Hacking said to you it's not going to be a busy season?---He did say that, yes. He said we need stock for if the fires take off this season we'll have stock ready to go but it's not looking – his words were "it's not looking as busy as previous years".

10

Was it not the case that also at about that time there was excess existing snack packs at the Glendenning Warehouse?---They ran out September after repacking, yes.

All right. Sorry, ran out September. Sorry, I'll just rephrase my question. There were some snack packs that were running out of date?---That's correct.

And you were repacking them?---Yes, I was, yes.

20

About 17 pallets worth?---Yes.

Now, in that meeting at Carter Street, Homebush who else – was there anybody else in the meeting?---I'm not sure on that particular meeting but through that year there was quite a few – there was a few meetings with Mr Springett, Mr, Mr Hacking and myself.

I'll ask you to cast your mind back, Mr Homsey, right now and tell the Commission as best you can recall was Mr Paul Springett in that meeting?

30

---Possibly not in that meeting itself.

Well, can you answer my question directly. I don't want a possibility. I want you to sit there and remember that meeting. You've said to the Commission you remember having a conversation with Mr Hacking - - -?
---Yes.

In relation to that order. You agree?---I agree.

There was an approval over contents of the snack packs. You agree?

40

---As every product was, was signed off, yes.

And in the past you had had a meeting with Mr Hacking and Mr Springett at which products were signed off?---In the past, yes.

In the past, yes?---With every product.

With every product. So it was customary that Mr Springett would attend a meeting of that kind?---Sometimes if – depending who was on that shift.

We would make an appointment and if I came down and somebody was off or somebody was sick that meeting still took place but generally every product was signed off and I – we took the meeting on, on the products going into a bag or any contents that was used for Rural Fire.

And at the time you had that meeting there was no section 44 declaration in place was there?---No, there wasn't.

And so Mr Hacking and Mr Springett were working Monday to Friday?

10 ---Possibly, yes. I believe that sometimes they work weekends.

All right. And at that meeting – I'm just going to go back to it, Mr Homsey.

MR WHITFIELD: Commissioner, I don't know if there's been a date actually given for when this meeting took place.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well, I thought it was sometime prior to August?---It was prior to August, yes.

20 MR KATEKAR: How long prior to August?---Well, it would have been possibly a month prior because I needed that lead time to order the product in off the confectionary company. An exact date – but I could, I could tell you definitely June/July that meeting would have taken place.

June or July?---Yes, that's right.

And when you say you needed a month lead time, do you say that it was a month before the purchase order was issued?---No. From the time that I receive the go ahead that's the product and that I receive a purchase order - -

30 -

Yes?--- - - - I, I allow my confectionary guy the chance to get that product in because each product comes from a different company.

Within the evidence that the Commission has is a memorandum – you may not have seen it – dated 30 June, 2014 in which there is an approval for the order of 100,000 snack packs in advance. At the meeting that you held were you told of any such approval?---Approval in regard to approval of the product itself - - -

40

No?--- - - - that was going in the bag?

The approval of the proposal to purchase 100,000 snack packs in advance for the season?---I wasn't told about the approval but the Rural Fire, Mr Hacking told me he was working towards so we can have that supply ready, then he would be working towards a purchase order for that 100,000.

All right. So he told you in that meeting that he was working towards having an approval?---That's right.

And that the purpose of the meeting was to confirm the contents of the snack packs for that proposed 100,000 order?---That's correct.

Now, before I leave it I want you to exhaust your memory. You say that the meeting was at Homebush?---Absolutely, yes. Every product meeting was held at Homebush.

10

Any particular room at Homebush?---Um, it was done in um, the staff canteen. Some proposals were done in Mr Springett's office, and I have had two times it was just done at the desk of Mr Hacking's.

Was this meeting done at the desk of Mr Hacking?---No it wasn't.

So it was either in the canteen or in Mr Springett's office?---I, that meeting would have been at the staff canteen in an open environment there.

20 And do you say to the Commission that at that meeting in the staff canteen in an open environment Mr Hacking said to you you need to put 20 per cent aside?---No, it was on the way out.

On the way out?---That's right.

When you say on the way out did Mr Hacking escort you from the building?---Not directly um, to the, I have to put my, well I, you get signed in and get signed out and I gave my badge – I tore off the plastic, the, the name tag and he walked me to the front um, door.

30

With the security guards there?---There's no security guards.

But you have a badge anyway?---Yeah, I had a, a sign in sticker.

Was there any other people around?---Ah, the front, there would have been the front office people.

And in front of the front office people Mr Hacking asked you to undersupply - - -?---He was - - -

40

- - - 20 per cent?

MR BREWER: Well that's a non-sequitur?---He was sitting - - -

Hang on, just a moment. That doesn't follow from the evidence (not transcribable).

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could you stand up if you want to make an objection.

MR BREWER: Yes, Commissioner. That doesn't follow from what he just put. That evidence wasn't given and he's trying to suggest that that was what was said.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well he did say there were front office people there.

10

MR BREWER: Oh, he did say that. But he said as he was exiting the door of the building and the next question was about whether there were guards present around the doorway.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: All right. Yes, Mr Katekar?

MR KATEKAR: Where were you when Mr Hacking said to you that for this 100,000 order there should be an undersupply of 20 per cent?---I was with Mr Hacking.

20

Where?---Um, we were leaving the lunchroom and I was heading outside.

Leaving the lunchroom?---That's correct.

Was there anyone else around you?---No. There was one, they had, there was one lady that sat behind the desk at that stage.

One lady that sat behind the desk at that stage?---Yes.

30 Was she there?---Yes. I had, I gave my badge, my - - -

All right?---I tore it off and threw it away.

The conversation that you had with Mr Hacking about the 20 per cent undersupply, was that in front of the lady?---No it wasn't.

40

In your conversation with Mr Hacking either on your way out of the building or beforehand in the canteen was there any discussion about Darren Hacking supplying any of this product?---I was asked that 2,000 um, he needed 2,000 um, snack packs for the north region – was his words, and could we give Darren Hacking, which he had worked as a subcontractor for the last couple of years – could he supply 2,000 to the north region and he'd get it picked up and moved to north region.

So is this right, that John Hacking was asking you - - -?---That's correct.

- - - to arrange for Darren Hacking to supply 2,000?---Yes.

But that the, you would render the invoice for that supply?---Yes. Darren wrote um, an invoice to me and I paid on, on that invoice. It was Coffs Harbour Catering.

And Darren Hacking charged you \$13.50 per snack pack?---That's right.

And you on-charged at \$14.50 per snack pack?---Yes. Because Darren didn't pay GST was my understanding.

10 Before I leave this telephone call I just want to remind you that you said, "That's right but again I didn't want to load you up having a 120. I didn't think it would be a good look just having 120 pallets there for you, that's all." Do you remember saying that?---Yes. Because in, in - - -

You can wait for my question?---Okay.

There's 640 snack packs in a pallet isn't there?---That's correct.

And 120 times 640 is 76,800?---Ah hmm.

20

Do you agree?---I agree.

And so 120 pallets was what you were proposing to delivery against the 100,000 order, apart from Darren Hacking's 2,000. Do you agree?---No, that's not right.

What is right?---82,000. Including Darren Hacking's.

30 Then the next document I'm going to take you to which is in volume 18, page 108 is that on 6 November, 2014 the Rural Fire Service deposited 478,500 into the account of EMCS. Hopefully that will come up on the screen. I'm just reminding you – I think we agreed, or you took my word for it a moment ago that your first two invoices, 319 and 159,500 totalled 478,500. Do you remember that on 6 November you received that amount?--Yes, if - - -

40 Then the next thing that happened was that on 18 November you issued a further invoice for 10,000 snack packs, and that's at volume 10, page 38. Now, that is in a sense simply to remind you that that was, this is the sequence of events because I now need to take you to some series of text messages between you and Mr Hacking on 18 November, 2014 – and the operator is going to bring them up one by one and I'm going to for the record remind you what they say, and for the transcript. They're short but it's a little bit clunky and you have to wait for each of them to come up. The first one was from you to Mr Hacking, "Hi mate, can I please ask a favour, would I be able to get all your contacts for Victoria please"?---Yes.

10 And the next one, which, that was sent at 8 minutes past 4.00. At 5.33 Mr Hacking responded – if it comes up, “Yes. Sorry. I will get this tomorrow for you,” followed by three minutes later you sent a text to Mr Hacking saying, “Thanks, and need to see you this week.” Then at 6.19pm Mr Hacking asks you, “When would you like to hook up, mate?” Then you responded at 6.38pm on 18 November, 2014 which I will remind you is a Tuesday, you wrote, “Thursday afternoon.” Thursday afternoon being 20 November – and then Mr Hacking responds a minute later, “Sounds good. I’ll come to you about 5.00pm.” And what was being organised in that exchange of text messages was a time to meet up through which you could pay Mr Hacking some cash?---Correct.

But before you could do that you needed to get cash from the bank. Do you agree?---Agree.

20 And the process that you adopted was that either by yourself or with the assistance of your mother, Gay, phone calls would be placed to one or two branches of the bank to ensure that they had the cash there?---That’s right, yes.

And then after placing those phone calls you would visit the bank to get the cash. Do you agree?---That’s correct.

The next thing I’m going to do – I’m reminded – I need to tender those text messages.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The text messages will be Exhibit 26.

30

**#EXHIBIT 26 - INTERCEPTED TELECOMMUNICATION SMS
CONTENT 18 NOVEMBER 2014**

MR KATEKAR: Exhibit 26. Then the next thing I’m going to do is play a conversation you had with your mother, Gay, on 19 November, 2014, at 12.33pm. Could that be played, please?

40

AUDIO RECORDING PLAYED

[12.42pm]

MR KATEKAR: The purpose of playing that to you, I appreciate you’ve agreed that that was the process that you adopted about calling in advance. But in that conversation you were talking to your mother about how money you had in the bank?---Ah hmm.

And the money was coming out. Do you agree with that?---That’s correct.

And she said “You’ve got to get it all back in.” Do you agree with that?---
Yes, that’s, that’s - - -

And then, and then she was speaking to you about how much you were
supplying the – when they’re referring to this delivery, this is definitely
number 50,000, you were referring there to the 50,000 snack packs?---
That’s right, yes.

10 And your mother said “We’ve done 40 this is 50.” Do you agree?---That’s
right.

Your mother was aware of how much money you had in the bank from time
to time?---At time to time, because she did get the money out, yes.

Well, she got the money out but she knew what was going in and going out,
didn’t she?---Yes, she did.

20 And when you were getting the two lots of 10,000 cash out, she knew what
it was for, didn’t she?---Um, she knew it was for, um, Rural Fire.

She knew that you were being – paying cash to John Hacking, didn’t she?---
Towards the end, yes.

Towards the end. When you say towards the end, when towards the end?---
She knew in that payment, in that summer ‘14/’15 of what was going on.

30 In that summer of ‘14/’15 what is going on. And when you say she knew
what was going on, do you say, as I understand it, that she knew that, for
that 100,000 purchase order there was going to be an under supply?---Ah,
she didn’t know it was actually how much or what it was but she knew the
money was going to John.

She knew that cash was going to John Hacking?---Yes.

The next thing – excuse me – I’m reminded I have to tender it. I’ve got a
transcript of the, of the TAA, could that be tendered, please?

40 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The transcript of the conversation
on 19 November, 2014 will be Exhibit 27.

**#EXHIBIT 27 - AUDIO RECORDING AND ACCOMPANYING
TRANSCRIPT OF INTERCEPTED TELECOMMUNICATION 19
NOVEMBER 2014**

MR KATEKAR: And as well as the - - -

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And the recording will be part of that exhibit also.

MR KATEKAR: Then, then what happened is – I'm going to ask you to accept this. And for my friends in the room at page 111 of volume 18, is a page of the bank statement for EMCS indicating that on 19 November, two withdrawals were taken from the EMCS bank account, each of \$10,000. One was from the Gosford branch and one was from the Wyoming branch.
10 Do you agree with that?---Yes.

And that your mother went to the Wyoming branch and withdrew \$10,000?
---Correct.

And you went to the Gosford branch and withdrew \$10,000?---Correct.

Then the next thing that I'm going to do is play a video from 20 November, 2014. And you will see that it's between 5.21 and 5.34. It's just extracts. And that's you in that video in the black T-shirt and Mr Hacking in the
20 Everlast T-shirt?---That's it. Yes, correct.

VIDEO RECORDING PLAYED

[12.48pm]

MR KATEKAR: And at that meeting you gave Mr Hacking \$20,000 in cash?---Yes, I did. I tender that video.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The surveillance video of 20
30 November, 2014 will be Exhibit 28.

**#EXHIBIT 28 - SURVEILLANCE VIDEO RECORDING FROM 20
NOVEMBER 2014**

MR KATEKAR: Then I'd ask the operator if you could, please, to pull up the document which an email, series of emails of 20 November, 2014 in volume 14, page 642. And at the foot of the page you will see that that's an
40 email from John Hacking on 20 November, 2014, actually sent at 12.29 that day and it's headed Agency Procurement Contacts. That's the contacts that Mr Hacking had for his contacts in Victoria. Do you agree?---That's correct.

And that was what he agreed to send to you?---Yes.

Excuse me. No, I don't need to tender that. Yes. The next thing that I'm going to do, Commissioner, is I'm going to play some extracts of a

telephone conversation between Mr Homsey and Mr Springett on 25 November, 2014 at 6.41pm. Sorry, did I say 6.41pm, 4.41pm.

AUDIO RECORDING PLAYED

[12.51pm]

10 MR KATEKAR: Two things arising from that, or three. First of all, just as far as the tone is concerned you seem to be good friends with Mr Springett?
---I get along well with Mr Springett, yes.

How long have you known Mr Springett?---2009 prior I've met him a couple of times and, and very good friends of the family.

Good friends of the family?---Of, yeah.

His family?---Oh, it started with his in-laws.

20 Yeah?---Yeah.

Second, on two occasions, one by Mr Springett where he says, "Oh mate, I haven't caught up with you yet"?---Yes.

And you saying, "All right, leave it with me. Definitely when we catch up I'll bring a list"?---A list of canapé foods.

I'm not talking about the list. I'm talking about "catch up"?---Yes.

30 Was "catch up" a code?---No, it definitely wasn't a code.

Was "catch up" a code that you used with Mr Hacking?---No. No, it wasn't a code with Mr Hacking. It would be a catch up. To meet him, yes, but there was no code involved in anything.

All right. Was what was being arranged in that phone call was for Mr Springett to visit you?---That's correct.

40 And he was going to – you – when he visited you to catch up with him he was – you were going to give him a list. You agree?---That – agree.

A list of things that he might have for Christmas?---Yes.

That you would supply - - -?---That's correct.

- - - for free?---We're looking at a product that I was going to give him. As we were doing D'Vine Christmas functions I was going to give him some of those products.

Right. So because – is this right, you say that because you were looking to supply it for the Rural Fire Service, yes?---I was – no, no. That’s from my D’Vine kitchen.

10 Well, you said to him that because he was in the Rural Fire Service he could sign off on the program. Do you remember saying that?---The program was for a long-life product that we were developing, looking at developing which was in a bag for the Rural Fire so what I was looking at was – that conversation was about the bag product, the long-life, two week, frozen shelf life product that was cooked in a bag so then on the fire ground they could put that in water and serve it. So that was, that was what that discussion was about.

And do you say that you were going to supply him that product for free to use for his family at Christmas?---I was going to actually talk – we were talking about him trying out that product but he was looking at the canapé list through my D’Vine product.

20 That you were going to supply him for free for Christmas?---That’s correct.
I think we’ve just got just enough time before 1 o’clock to play your video of your meeting with Mr – I’m reminded, I have to tender the, the transcript and the recording of the video.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The conversation between Mr Homsey and Springett on 25 November will be Exhibit 29.

30 **#EXHIBIT 29 - AUDIO RECORDING AND ACCOMPANYING
TRANSCRIPT OF INTERCEPTED TELECOMMUNICATION 25
NOVEMBER 2014**

MR KATEKAR: Thank you. Do we have enough time to play that video? We do I think don’t we. It’s a quick video.

VIDEO RECORDING PLAYED [12.59pm]

40 MR KATEKAR: That’s you with Mr Springett?---Yes, that’s right.
First question, Mr Springett came to visit you?---Yes.
How far is the drive?---From his work or home?
Either?---I think 15 minutes.

15 minutes. And you gave him four bottles of wine?---Yes, I did.

And a list?---Yes.

Did you give him anything else?---No, I didn't.

How long did you meet him for?---I think we sat for about 15, 20 minutes.

15 minutes?---Maybe, maybe half an hour.

10

Excuse me. I'll tender that video.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. The surveillance video of Mr Homsey and Mr Springett will be Exhibit 30.

#EXHIBIT 30 - SURVEILLANCE VIDEO RECORDING FROM 27 NOVEMBER 2014

20

MR KATEKAR: 30. And is that a convenient time, Commissioner?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. We will adjourn at this time until 2 o'clock.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[1.00pm]