

TUNICPUB00596
10/04/2015

TUNIC
pp 00596-00611

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THE HONOURABLE MEGAN LATHAM

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION TUNIC

Reference: Operation E13/1800

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON FRIDAY 10 APRIL, 2015

AT 10.10AM

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: Yes, Mr Naylor.

<DARREN WILLIAM BULLOCK, on former affirmation [10.10am]

10 MR NAYLOR: Mr Bullock, just before I resume asking you questions
about all of these financial transactions, and we have a number to go, I had
said at the beginning of this segment of your evidence that I was embarked
upon a process and that I had certain obligations and I just want you to be
perfectly clear, I want you to understand what is going on, that is to say,
what I am putting to you, sir, and indeed what I have been putting to you
from the outset in relation to your evidence are certain propositions that may
form the basis for me making submissions to the Commissioner at the end
of this hearing about facts that should be found. I may also make
submissions that – so if it is, if it is found, for example, by the
Commissioner at the end of this hearing – if it is found that, for example,
20 payments were made by Mr Inskip to you in return for you providing
preferential treatment in the performance of your role as Pictor district
manager for the Mine Subsidence Board, I may also make submissions, sir,
that you engaged in corrupt conduct. It's a matter for the Commissioner at
the end, end of the day as to what findings are made but I may make
submissions to that effect and I may also make submissions to the effect that
a recommendation be made that the Director of Public Prosecutions give
consideration to you being prosecuted for certain criminal offences. Do you
understand that?---I understand that.

30 All right. And the purpose in me putting all these propositions to you is to
provide you with an opportunity to respond to the various propositions
before all of those submissions and before any findings are made. Do you
understand that?---I understand.

Okay. And not, not only may I make submissions in relation to matters
being referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions in respect of the
commission of criminal offences under the Crimes Act but I may also make
submissions depending upon the evidence and the Commissioner may or
may not find that certain offences may also have been committed under the
ICAC Act. Do you understand that?---I understand that.

40 All right.

THE COMMISSIONER: Just before we go any further could I add
something to that, Mr Bullock, and that is that the documents and the
records that Counsel Assisting has been taking you to throughout this
process are able to be relied upon if there should be some future proceedings
to demonstrate objectively that cash has gone from one place and ended up
in your account. So I just want you to be very clear about this. You can
deny each of the propositions that are put to you by Counsel Assisting but at

the end of the day the inferences that someone might draw from those objective records nonetheless have evidentiary proof. Do you understand what I'm saying?---I understand that.

Right. Go on, Mr Naylor.

10 MR NAYLOR: Sir, you may recall that just before lunch yesterday when I embarked upon the process of putting to you these various transactions, the first series of transactions that I asked you about were in relation to payments that had been recorded as payments to the Mine Subsidence Board. Do you remember that was the first - - -I do remember that.

- - - series of transactions?---Yes.

And if you don't already have the evidence in front of you could you be provided please with Exhibit T16, volumes 2 and 3?---I have them here.

20 You have them there, sir. And, and if you go to the spreadsheet, the large spreadsheet that we were going through yesterday, so that's at tab 1, file 2? ---Yes.

And without going back to all the primary documents just look at the transactions which are summarised at tab 2 and tab 3. So the first of these transactions summarised at tab 2. This is, this was the very first one that I took you to yesterday before lunch, this was a payment, a withdrawal of cash of \$2,000 from Plantac's account, you can see there the denominations and that occurred on 13 February, 2008 and on the same date an amount of money, \$2,000, the same denominations was deposited into your bank account, do you see that?---I do.

30 And the next transaction, 30 April, 2008, \$4,000 in cash was withdrawn from Mr Inskip's bank account and two days later on 2 May \$2,000 in cash was deposited into your St George cheque account. Do you see that?---I see that.

40 And there was a, the deposit was all in \$100 notes and the withdrawal from Mr Inskip's account was all in \$100 notes and you have denied the proposition that (a) you had received either of those sets of moneys from Mr Inskip and you'd also denied that that money was the money that you had put into your bank account on each occasion or if the money had been received from Mr Inskip wasn't the same money put into the bank account then it was money that was taken out of your cash reserve at home after the money had been, which had been received from Mr Inskip had been put into the cash reserve and you denied all of those propositions didn't you?---I did.

Right. Sir, when you were before the Commission on 12 December, 2014, and I've already asked you questions about this, you admitted did you not to being paid one amount of \$2,000 and another amount of \$3,000 and the first

payment that you, you admitted receiving from Mr Inskip was in early 2008. I'm looking, sir, at, for the benefit of others in the hearing room, this is Exhibit T22, page 55 and I'll take you to the text of what was said, sir. Line 4, question, "Start off with payments from Plantac. Have you ever received any payments of any type either cash, gifts by way of goods or any other gift from Plantac?" Answer, "Yes, I have." "Can you tell us the details please of that?" "Referring," answer, "Referring to that first payment I think that you said of, I think it was a \$2,000 amount." "Okay. If you can try and give us the dates roughly, we've got a list if you need it of your cash deposits into your account." Answer, "Mmm." Question, "Try and do it from memory first and if not we can refer to the document." Answer, "From memory I think there was a payment for \$2,000 in early 2008." Question, "How was that paid in?" Answer, "In cash." "Was that", question, "Was that paid in by someone from Plantac directly into your account or was it given to you and you paid it in?" Answer, "Well, it was given to me and I paid it in." Question, "Who at Plantac gave you that money?" Answer, "Kevin Inskip." A little further down the page, line 42. "2008 is," question, "2008 there's a \$2,000 payment. What's the next one that you can remember?" Answer, "There's been another one after that which I don't know, it was a month or two after that, sometime around that." Question, "So a month or two later?" Answer, "Yeah." "What was the dollar amount for that figure?" "I think it was \$3,000." Question, over the page, page 56 line 1, "And who, who gave you money?" Answer, "Kevin Inskip." Question, "Was that provided in cash directly to you into your bank account?" Answer, "In cash." Sir, they're the same – the admissions which you made on that occasion are the same payments that I put to you at the, just before lunch yesterday and which I've just taken you to which are listed at items 2 and 3, tabs 2 and 3 in the spreadsheet are they not?---I couldn't be sure.

Well, if you couldn't be sure, sir, why did you deny on two occasions now that the moneys that are indicated there that were put into your bank account are the same moneys that seem to have been received from Mr Inskip? Why did you deny having received that money if now you say you can't be sure? ---Because it's not.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Bullock, you see, there's only really one explanation for this, isn't there? They're the self-same payments to which you admitted last year when you were here in December and you have simply denied that you received the cash payments when it was put to you yesterday either through inadvertence or because you're simply just denying everything that's put to you. That's one explanation. Another explanation is that the payments that you admitted to in December last year are in fact a separate lot of cash payments to the ones that were shown to you by way of the bank records by council assisting. They're the only two possible explanations?---That's correct. And when I look at, Commissioner, this first payment there's, it's not my handwriting and there's a funny signature on it, so how can it be me?

MR NAYLOR: Well, sir, I'm just looking at the documents and what they indicate and you admitted that you received \$2,000 from Mr Inskip in early 2008?---I did.

10 And the documents indicate that on the 13 February, 2008 you deposited \$2,000 into your account and that was on the same date and in the same denominations that money was paid out of Mr Inskip's account and Mr Inskip says he gave cash to you in envelopes. So I'm just putting one and one together, sir, and what it seems to be is that you now deny the, the admission that you made in respect of that, it would appear, self-same payment. Is that right?---I don't deny it but I'm unsure whether these are the same ones.

All right.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: So you adhere to the evidence you gave in December last year that you did receive those two payments from Mr Inskip?---I do.

MR NAYLOR: Let's return to the transactions, sir.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Do I take it, Mr Bullock, while council assisting is looking at that material, do I take it that essentially, no matter what objective records council assisting takes you to by way of bank statements and deposits and things of that nature, cash withdrawals, deposits, the amount of money, the size of the denomination, whether it corresponds to what was withdrawn from Plantac accounts and then deposited into your accounts in cash, do I take it that no matter how many transactions of that nature, Mr Naylor takes you to, you're going to deny the receipt of any of those cash payments?---That's correct.

MR NAYLOR: Commissioner, I've heard the witnesses answer and I tend to feel obliged to - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't, well I - - -

MR NAYLOR: Maybe, maybe not much purpose is served now.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think any purpose is served - - -

MR NAYLOR: No.

THE COMMISSIONER: - - - frankly Mr Naylor because - - -

MR NAYLOR: No.

THE COMMISSIONER: - - - I was sitting here yesterday thinking that, you know, this would be - - -

MR NAYLOR: All right.

THE COMMISSIONER: - - - a pointless exercise. But can I just say that, of course, all of that material is available - - -

MR NAYLOR: Yes.

10

THE COMMISSIONER: - - - to Mr Chee and of course it would be the basis of submissions and at some point the documents will speak for themselves, as I said before. But I just want to make sure that Mr Bullock appreciates the effect of what he's saying. Mr Bullock, you, what you have to grapple with is this, your salary and your wife's salary were deposited into your various accounts by electronic funds transfer. Was that right? ---Correct.

20

And so you met your expenses from time to time by withdrawing money from those accounts and, or, as you say, from what you said were your cash reserves. Is that right?---Correct and, and other assets as well. Um, money deposited in from my wife's compensation claims and selling of things and other various means, yes.

Well we know, we know about the compensation claim, we know about the lottery win, we know about - - -?---Mmm.

30

- - - where those cash deposits came from. We know about the loan from your parents that went towards the purchase of the Mitsubishi?---Yeah.

We know all of that. But at - leaving those cash amounts to one side, your regular sources of income were your salary and your wife's salary?---Correct.

So what you have to grapple with is this, Mr Bullock. Those transactions that Mr Naylor has been taking you to demonstrate something in the order of, I think it's \$270,000 is it not, Mr Naylor?

40

MR NAYLOR: No, it's more like about - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Close to - - -

MR NAYLOR: - - - \$300,000.

THE COMMISSIONER: Close to \$300,000 of cash, Mr Bullock. Cash that has gone into your account over that period of time. Where did that money come from?---I've explained it all to you and I've got, I've got - - -

No, no. No. Answer my question. Where did all of that money come from? I'm not talking about the lottery, I'm not talking about loans, I'm not talking about compensation. Where did that money come from?---Well, if you can't talk about the lottery you can't talk about where it came from a lot of it and you can't talk about the other things where that money came from and it was cycling around. A lot of it's the same money cycling back in and out.

10 So your explanation - - -?---And I've said that all the way along, Commissioner.

No. No, I'm sorry, you haven't because this is the first time we've actually put that proposition to you. I have to understand this. Your explanation for the deposit of \$300,000 in cash into your various accounts over that period of time is that this is all effectively your cash reserves being recycled through your various accounts. Is that your explanation?---Yes.

Are you sure about that?---It is.

20 Thank you?---Plus, plus the other money coming in from the other resources.

Well, the only other resources as I said was your wife's salary and your salary?---And money off our parents and, and money from sales of vehicles and, and money from Julie's, Julie's claim.

Yes, all right. Well, we – I understand - - -?---There's lots of other resources, Commissioner.

30 I understand all of that. Well, hang on a minute. I understand all of that but I want to make sure that you appreciate what you're saying. You're saying that effectively over that period of time all of those funds were just recycled through your accounts at various times?---And I, and I've produced the documents in my compulsory hearing where I've – money gone into the account has only been 50, money taken out has been 100-odd. It's been cycled around and I believe I've produced some of that evidence before in my compulsory hearing.

40 Well, of course the difficulty with cash reserves, Mr Bullock, is that we can only rely upon your assertion that moneys were taken out and that moneys went back in?---The bank – my bank statements.

No, I'm talking about your cash reserves?---Yes.

Thank you.

MR NAYLOR: Sir, now that the process has perhaps been short circuited, let me make it abundantly clear I had yesterday been taking you to a series

of transactions and I had been doing it in a way which was consistent with the evidence given by Mrs Inskip in that I first put to you a series of transactions where the designated payee was the Mine Subsidence Board. I have then taken you to a transaction where the payee was the Sydney, was Sydney Labour Contracting, then a payment designed against Variplan, then a payment where the payee was New Colour Painting & Decorating, then a payment where the payee was Fowler Carpets Pty Limited, then a number of payments where the payee was A.C. Brush Brothers. I had moved on then to a number of transactions where the payee was Handyman Timber Sales Pty Limited, one transaction where the payee was One Stop Roofing Pty Limited, one transaction where the payee was DB Kitchen Installations and I'd got partway through dealing with transactions where the payee was Don Bruce Kitchens. And what I want to indicate to you, sir, and I can do it on this basis, that you've already answered the Commissioner's question this morning and you won't be released from your summons and indeed you will need to come back, so let me just indicate this, that I will give you the numbers of the tabs in respect of these two financial files that I would otherwise have taken you to, not being necessary now, and I would put the same propositions to you in respect of all of the transactions behind each of these tabs, i.e. that you received the cash from Mr Inskip and you either deposited it into your accounts as designated in the documents or you put the money into your cash reserve at home and you withdrew from the cash reserve and deposited into your accounts, and can I indicate what the relevant transactions are. One other transaction in relation to Don Bruce Kitchens, tab 7, the following transactions where the designated payee is D&D Kitchens, numbers 11 and 48, the following transactions where the designated payee is Lamond Contracting numbers 42, 52, 53, 54, 56, the following transactions where the designated payee is APC New South Wales Pty Limited transactions numbers 10, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, the following transactions where the designated payee is Demo Force Pty Limited 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 55, 57, the following various transactions, designated payee of DB transaction number 4, transaction number 8, designated payee B&D Kitchens or alternatively specified as D&B Manufacturing, transaction number 12 designated payee withdrawal DB and wage \$350, designated payee Austral Bricks (MSB job) transaction number 18, finally transaction number 49 no supply name designated, only MSB painting.

MR CHEE: Commissioner, could I ask for my benefit if a schedule could be provided setting out – it's been – it might, might assist me.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I appreciate that, Mr Chee, at some stage we will, we will have to produce a schedule, yes.

MR NAYLOR: That can be done, Commissioner.

Sir, I just want to go back to your compulsory examination on 12 December and at page 60, this is Exhibit T22, after you'd been asked this series of

questions about the \$2,000 payment and the \$3,000 payment you were asked this question, "Taking cash from a contractor that you provide work to on behalf of the Government is a massive, massive thing isn't it?" Perhaps not a question I would have asked but, "It, it is, it is now," answer, "It is now in, now that I've looked back on it yeah, it is the wrong thing to do, yes." You were admitting there, were you not, sir, that it was – and by saying the wrong thing you meant unlawful for you to receive those two payments, the \$2,000 and the \$3,000, from Mr Inskip because they were corrupt commissions or rewards that you had received in return for providing preferential treatment to Plantac. That's what you were admitting to wasn't it?---No.

Right. And the same applies to all of the other transactions that I took you to yesterday and that I just indicated now, that is, all of the transactions were of the same type were they not?---No.

All right.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: What were you admitting to, Mr Bullock, when you said that you'd done the wrong thing?---Um, when – Commissioner, when I went back and looked at it, the two payments that Mr Inskip made to me were more for our friendship and when I looked back on it, when it was put to me and I had had time to think between my first um, appearance at the Commission and that appearance on that day, on the 12th, I could, I looked back and I could see how that could be construed, construed as being the wrong thing to do but at the time when Mr Inskip did it and the, the circumstance around it, it was more like um, friends, that's, that's - - -

30 What, are you talking about payments that were made ostensibly while you were going, undergoing IVF treatment?---Correct.

Well, well, what was wrong about that? You had a friendship with Mr Inskip and he provided - - -?---That's - - -

- - - he provided some money to you to help you through a tough time, what was wrong with that?---Well, there was nothing wrong with that but when it was put to me at the Commission because the Commission put forward that um, because he was a contractor there was a conflict of interest there that I hadn't thought of in the first place because I just, I just didn't think of it.

40 But you didn't have any difficulty determining that you needed to inform Mr Cole-Clark of your intention to use Mr Kendall as a builder on your premises?---And I think I, I told Greg, we were at the district meeting that we had up in Wollongong I was getting quotes and that and I was going to use the Board's contractors. We'd had, we'd had a verbal discussion.

I understand that but - - -?---Yeah.

- - - what I'm pointing out is that you understood you needed to get Mr Cole-Clark's approval in relation to using Willbuilt Homes because they were an MSB contractor but you didn't at the time appreciate that Mr Inskip's gift of \$5,000 was something that you needed to - - -?---No, I didn't, I didn't.

You didn't appreciate that?---I didn't, Commissioner, no.

10 MR NAYLOR: Sir, you can put those two volumes to one side and if you could please be provided with Exhibit T23 again and T27. Have you got -- oh, I'm sorry?---Thank you, ta, ta.

Just look at T23 first of all, sir?---Yes.

Pardon me. And these are the documents, are they not, that you provided during the course of your compulsory examination on 12 December last year?---That's correct.

20 And looking at the last of those documents, bank accounts, cash in and out, only 2008 to present?---That's correct.

The import of the evidence that you gave on 12 December was that the level of the cash reserves kept at home increased when you drew down on your bank account, so withdrew from the bank accounts and deposited into the cash hoard, and the level of the cash hoard decreased or diminished when you took out of the cash reserve at home and put it into your bank accounts and that, this schedule represents the amounts going in and out of your accounts and by inference it represents how the cash reserves at home went up and down, that's right isn't it?---Yeah, and the only thing this doesn't
30 cover is our personal wages.

And that's indicated, is it not, by the previous page doesn't it, sir, net, net incomes?---Oh, yeah, sorry, I didn't see that was on the back, yeah.

And, and the page which is cash in and out, you, you weren't paid in cash by -- your wages weren't paid in cash were they?---No, no, that's me depositing cash, cash out of, yeah, like withdrawals out of the bank and then putting it back in there.

40 Okay. So if you can then go to Exhibit T27, that's the smaller financial file and I've already taken you, sir, to tab, tab 5 and tab 6 and, I'm sorry, tab 5 and tab, a number of these, tab 8 and what I want to do is take you to tab 1, I'm sorry, tab, tab 2 and what you'll see here, sir, is a -- this is a spreadsheet which reconstructs or attempts to reconstruct your accounts from the beginning of 2008 based upon the evidence which you gave at the compulsory examination on 12 December. So the evidence -- and you'll see there there's a green, well, perhaps, I'm sorry, but there's a schedule headed

Darren Bullock's account on the left-hand side of the page?---Yes, I can see that.

And adjacent to that on the right-hand side of the page is another table headed reconstruction of cash transactions et cetera. See that? ---I do, yes.

And you'll see, just going back to the first table on the left-hand side of the page headed Darren Bullock's account, there's an opening balance of \$40,300. See that?---I see that, yes.

10

And the one in which, sir, that's been constructed is, if you look at the, the table immediately above that, opening balance calculation?---Ah hmm.

You see that?---Yeah.

And it's based upon, it's based upon your evidence from the compulsory examination which is that, in fact your evidence was, that \$95,100 was withdrawn in 2003 and, so we start with 2003 and that represents the beginning of the cash reserve kept at home. And below that there's an amount in red, negative amount of \$50,000, and again that based upon your evidence given at the compulsory examination on the 12 December and your evidence in fact was that about \$55,000 or \$50,000 was, was deducted or taken out of the cash reserve kept at home so that's been taken off the \$90,300. We're left then with the figure of about \$40,300. Now, you were asked to estimate at the compulsory examination how much you might have had at the beginning of 2008 and you'd given a figure of, like I said, the sum of half of the \$60,000, about \$30,000, the figures would seem to suggest it was slightly more so we've made a more conservative estimate based upon your actual evidence of \$40,300. Then, if you go to the table below that headed Darren Bullock's Account, we've applied, we've applied your evidence of what went to into and out of the cash reserve kept at home that sheet that I've just taken you to from T23. When you do the sums, and indeed, you make for provision for the fact that you purchased various assets and went on holidays - as at the end of 2014 if you applied your figures, what you're left with in the cash reserve at home is a figure of about \$145,000. Do you see that?---I see that, yes.

20

30

And looking at the table to the right of that - when we - when ICAC has done the reconstruction based upon the cash withdrawals and the cash deposits into your account, then the figure that you should have had at home at the end of last year was in fact in the negative. So if you go over to the next tab sir, putting that a slightly different way, the documents would seem to suggest that in fact your cash reserve ran out entirely in about April 2009. So you wouldn't have any cash in reserve at the end of 2014, it puts the lie to the figures that you were trying to give to the Commission on the 12 December last year about how much cash you had at home. The figures you were giving last year to us were incorrect and they were a lie, were they not?---No.

40

All right. I should just note, the figure in the right hand table for - you see there's a - the second last row in the right hand table, the reconstruction table for 27 July 2010 to 18 March 2011, do you see that?---Ah hmm.

There's a, that relates to your home extension sir. What it says there is that \$42,832 was used in cash to pay for the home extension, see that?---I see that, yes.

- 10 And I have shown you a smaller schedule during the course of your evidence in relation to the home extension - just getting the exhibit number, Commissioner. While that's being looked for, the, what that smaller schedule says is that the figure is in fact slightly higher, the figure is \$47,302 not \$42,802 that's the point I want to make and I'll show you the document in a moment which confirms that. So in fact when the reconstruction is done the disparity between the two sets of figures is slightly higher. When you look at what the disparity is, the disparity is about \$280,000. So on The Commission's reconstruction based upon the documents there's about a - compared with what your evidence was on 12
20 December 2012 - there's about a \$280,000 difference. I want to put to you, sir, that that disparity of about \$280,000 approaches the figure of about \$300,000 which as you will have seen from the schedule at tab 72 of Exhibit T16, that's the third of those files in relation to the financial investigation, there would appear, sir, to be something of a correlation between the amount that is the disparity between your construction of your accounts and what it would appear the financial analysis shows is the amount that you received in cash from Plantac and I want to suggest to you, sir, that that tends to confirm that the amount that you, that what's shown in the financial transactions is the amount that you received from Inskip as corrupt
30 payments, that is, payments that were made by Mr Inskip to you in return for preferential treatment being provided to Plantac in your role as district manager of the Picton District Office?---No.

All right.

- THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Bullock, just for more abundant caution in the course of the analysis that the Commission undertook which as I understand from Counsel Assisting was based upon your own evidence in December
40 last year, Counsel Assisting indicated that the analysis discloses that the cash reserves, the ones that you rely upon for the purpose of explaining how all of this cash came into your account over the years, those cash reserves were exhausted in April 2009, now that's on the basis of the evidence you gave in December last year. Do you agree or disagree with that proposition?---I think there's, there's mistakes in there, there's, there's mistakes in the Commission's calculations here where they've, which I know and um - - -

No, don't worry about whether you think there's mistakes. Do you agree or disagree that your cash reserves were depleted by April 2009, halfway through 2009?---I disagree.

So you say that in April 2009 you still had a large cash reserve in your home do you?---I wouldn't say it was a large cash reserve but there - - -

10 Well, let's put a figure on it. How much do you say you had in April 2009 in cash?---I wouldn't know. I've, I don't want to estimate it, I can't give you a figure. All as I'm saying is that a lot of this money I kept my bank balances and you, the Commission I'm sure has looked all through my bank balances but - - -

Let me come at it a different way, Mr Bullock, let me just ask you this, on your own evidence you have anything between 90, I don't know, 100,000 who knows, I mean your own wife said that at some stage you indicated to her that there was 90,000 in cash in your home. So we're looking at anything from \$90,000 upwards aren't we, at any given time?---Correct.

20 When you decided to take money from the cash reserves whether to pay for your holidays or for school uniforms or for some expense that you wanted to meet, where did you record how much money you had taken from the cash reserves so that you could keep account of what you had left?---It was only in my head.

In your head?---Mmm.

You never wrote it down anywhere?---No.

30 So you had no way of knowing when it was that those cash reserves were going to be depleted provided of course that your memory was absolutely failsafe in that respect?---I'd never needed to be that accurate because it wasn't important.

It wasn't important to you?---No.

And your wife had access to the safe in the study?---Yes.

40 She had access to the cash reserves?---Of course.

Did you ever say to her listen, how much did you take out today, it looks like I'm a few thousand short?---No.

You never asked her to account for the cash that she took from the safe at all?---We, we're married, we trusted each other. Why is that important?

Well, I would have thought if you had something like \$100,000 in cash reserves you'd want to know that it wasn't being frittered away?---She's not like that.

Yes, Mr Naylor.

MR NAYLOR: Sir, may I just make it abundantly clear the – I have shown you at tab 3 this chart which shows how your cash reserve at home according to the Commission's reconstruction diminished?---Ah hmm.

10

Do you see that and - - -?---I do.

- - - that shows that as at about April 2009 on the Commission's reckoning you shouldn't have had any cash left at home which raises obviously the question as to how there could have been all that cash at home on, on your evidence as at the end of last year and let me not, let me be perfectly plain about it, the proposition is, sir, that if you did have all that cash at home at the end of last year then that was as it were ill-gotten gains, that was the unexplained cash reserves at home was income that you had received from Mr Inskip by way of corrupt commissions or rewards in return for providing Plantac with preferential treatment, I just want you to be absolutely clear what is being suggested?---I'm absolutely clear.

20

And behind tab 3 is tab 4 and that is a listing of all the transactions which goes to make up that chart, yes?---Yes.

And it refers to a whole lot of bank statements, so all the data has been drawn from bank statements and I can put this on the record, Commissioner, the bank statements are all in the possession of the Commission, they are not in evidence formally because they are voluminous. This represents a summary of all the transactions. Should the need arise, Commissioner, I suppose the bank statements can be made available but the approach being taken is for this to serve as the summary of the information in the Commission's holdings.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR NAYLOR: Pardon me, Commissioner. Commissioner, may I at this point tender the compulsory examination transcripts for Kevin Inskip. There are two, Commissioner. The first one is dated 3 February, 2015 and I would seek for the purpose of the tenders relief from the non-publication orders that apply to both.

40

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, the non-publication orders made in respect of Mr Inskip's compulsory examinations are lifted.

THE NON-PUBLICATION ORDERS MADE IN RESPECT OF MR INSKIP'S COMPULSORY EXAMINATIONS ARE LIFTED

MR NAYLOR: And so the first of those was 3 February, 2015, the second is 27 March, 2015, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: So the compulsory examination transcript of 3 February, 2015 is Exhibit T45.

10

#EXHIBIT T45 – TRANSCRIPT OF COMPULSORY EXAMINATION OF KEVIN INSKIP ON 3 FEBRUARY 2015

THE COMMISSIONER: And what was the date of the other one, I'm sorry?

MR NAYLOR: 27 March.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: And the transcript of the compulsory examination of 27 March, 2015 Exhibit T46.

#EXHIBIT T46 – TRANSCRIPT OF COMPULSORY EXAMINATION OF KEVIN INSKIP ON 27 MARCH 2015

MR NAYLOR: : If the Commission pleases. Commissioner, I have no further questions for Mr Bullock at this time. What I would propose Commissioner, is that he be stood down. It will be necessary for Mr Bullock to be recalled. May I suggest Commissioner that in those circumstances, cross-examination of Mr Bullock might be deferred until after that time which will be during the next bracket of hearings.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, well I think that's probably not only preferable but necessary from the point of view of being able to allow Mr Bullock to respond to any further evidence that's called on the next occasion and then after he's been given that opportunity then everybody can cross-examine in the knowledge that all of the relevant evidence has been called. Is that suitable to you Mr Chee?

40

MR CHEE: I agree with that course of action.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. All right.

MR NAYLOR: I anticipate also, Commissioner, that there will be a further tender bundle. We are continuing to obtain documents from the MSB and

that will of course be made available on the restricted web site as soon as possible and in an orderly way prior to the recommencement of the hearing.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Now I understand after discussions with everybody it seems as though the best course is to adjourn the proceedings to the week commencing 25 May.

MR NAYLOR: Correct, Commissioner.

- 10 THE COMMISSIONER: And whilst that is somewhat more of a delay than I had anticipated, I understand that it is necessary to meet the convenience of everyone who needs to be in attendance. So at this stage all I can do is adjourn the hearing to 25 May 2015. Mr Bullock can stand down, he's not excused from attendance at this inquiry and he will have to, of course, return on 25 May and be recalled thereafter.

THE WITNESS STOOD DOWN [10.57AM]

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Does anyone want to raise anything else before I adjourn? No. All right. Thank you. I'll adjourn.

**THE MATTER WAS ADJROUNED UNTIL 25 MAY 2015 AT
10.57AM [10.57AM]**