

TUNICPUB00833
28/05/2015

TUNIC
pp 00833-00863

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 THURSDAY 28 MAY, 2015

AT 2.05PM

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 [2.05pm]

MR NAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr Bullock, I want to move to the next property please which is 1 Oxley Grove, Tahmoor and the – on 16 and 17 April the claim investigation was prepared by you and apparently –
10 when I say 17 April I mean the approval and I'll come to that in a moment but on 16 April a claim investigation report was prepared by you estimating the cost of repairs in relation to that property to be \$18,000 and it would appear on the following day the subsidence risk engineer approved that claim. Accept from me that that's what the records show?---Yes.

Now, that's an amount of money which as at April, 2014 required three quotes to be obtained. There are no quotes on the file. That would be a breach of that requirement wouldn't it?---Yes.

20 And there's nothing in the tender book. That would be a breach of the requirement wouldn't it?---Yes.

An invoice was rendered by A&DJ ultimately for just over \$17,500. Just to put you in the picture, quotes had been submitted previously by – well, a quote had been submitted previously by A&DJ. There are no other quotes on the file. Mr Salmon has given evidence that you instructed him to increase the amount to be added to the invoice by \$3,000 and if you can be shown please volume 6, page 2675?---Sorry, what was the page number again?

30 2675. It's this document which is a bit hard to read but you've seen it before when we were looking at the 20 Milne Street property. I want to direct your attention to the text, or the handwriting rather that appears on the left-hand side of the page?---Ah hmm.

And Mr Salmon's evidence is that the handwriting, the faint handwriting on the left-hand side of the page is his workings of what the value of the job is and his valuation of the work so far as he was concerned, including a profit margin and some extras, was fourteen hundred and – sorry, \$14,526 which
40 he would have taken up to 50 so \$14,550 and you'll see under that another figure 17,550. It has the word "inv" next to it, invoice, and then adjacent to that in what would appear to be your handwriting is a figure 18,000 and Mr Salmon's evidence is that the – that figure written he said by you 18,000 was an indication to him that you had instructed that he should elevate his invoice from 14,550 to 17,550 so as to include a secret commission in the amount of \$3,000 which was to be shared between you. That's right isn't it, that's - - -?---No.

All right. And the – he did indeed render as I say an invoice in the amount of 17,550. That occurred on 18 July, 2014. That’s apparent from the records. Just accept that from me?---Yes.

And the same day you authorised payment of that invoice and in so doing, sir, you authorised – you were purporting at least to validly authorise payment of an invoice but in actual fact what you were doing, you were embarked upon a process to defraud the Mine Subsidence Fund of \$3,000 which you and Mr Salmon were going to share. That’s right isn’t it?---No.

10

All right. And the various failures in the process that I’ve referred you to, such as the failure to get two other quotes, not putting it in the tender book, you deliberately failed to comply with your requirements because that was all in aid of your intention to obtain this secret commission. That’s right isn’t it?---No.

See, you didn’t want any other tenderers involved because that, that may have prevented you from having obtained this secret commission. That’s right isn’t it?---No. My understanding is too, towards the last year or so that I worked at the Board that we only had to get one quote up to 30,000.

20

All right. Let’s move on, sir, to the next property, 10B Abelia Street. On 4 August, sir, you prepared a claim investigation report. You estimated the cost of repairs to be \$6,000. No issue, sir, that you had an appropriate financial delegation without a reviewing officer to approve that claim. Then on 4 August which was the same date you request a quotation and ask A&DJ to attend to specified repairs. Now, you were required under the rules at that time to get one quote. It doesn’t appear as though there are any quotes on the file. Now, that being the case, there was non-compliance was there not with the rules that applied at that time?---That’s correct based on that.

30

And then a short time later, the following month actually, 30 September, 2014 there’s an exchange of text messages with Mr Salmon and he sends a text message to you to say “10B 3,240 plus” and you, you reply a short time later “elect 1,000 plumber 1,000” and Mr Salmon’s evidence is that that intended – that was, that was you conveying to him that he should add a secret commission to his invoice in relation to this matter in a total sum of \$2,000 to be shared between the two of you. That’s right isn’t it?---No.

40

That’s what you were intending to mean when you sent that text message? ---No.

All right. And Mr Salmon did in fact render an invoice for an amount of money that was \$2,000 in addition to the figure that he had sent you of 3,240. His invoice was for five, and a little bit more I must say, 5,270 plus GST. Accept from me that that was the amount of the invoice?---Yes.

Right. And the following day you authorised payment of that invoice. Accept from me?---Yes.

And in so doing you were knowingly involved were you not in defrauding the MSB and obtaining a secret commission that you and Mr Salmon would share?---No.

10 And, you know, once again, sir, where as you should have obtained a quote and you didn't that was all part and parcel of your intention to defraud the MSB. You were circumventing the rules so as to obtain a secret commission. That's right isn't it?---No.

20 All right. Let's move to the next property, 3B Connor Place Tahmoor. On 21 July, 2014 you prepared a claim investigation report and you estimated the cost of repairs at \$8,000 and just pausing, sir. I apologise. Can I just go back. There was a question I neglected to ask in relation to 10B Abelia. You see, Mr Salmon had sent a text message to you saying "10B 3,240" and what he intended to mean by that was that was the real cost of the works including a margin for himself. But you estimated the cost of repairs in the claim investigation report at 6,000 which, you know, is a fair bit more than 3,240 relatively speaking. We're talking about small figures but relatively speaking it's a fair bit more isn't it?---It is but it's an estimate.

All right. And I need to put to you, sir, that you deliberately inflated the cost of repairs in the claim investigation report so as to make provision or allowance for the \$2,000 secret commission that you subsequently arranged for with Mr Salmon?---No.

30 All right. Let's return to 3B Connor Place. I apologise for the interruption. 21 July, 2014 you prepared the claim investigation report estimating the cost of repairs at \$8,000. One quote it seems was required at that time but no quote appears on the file. That would be a breach of the rules?---Yes.

40 You prepared a scope of works and then a few months later – that was on 21 July, 2014, there was an exchange of text messages that you had with Mr Salmon and on 30 September, 2014 he sent a text message to you saying, "Other 3670 plus," and your reply a short time later, "Two plus two." And Mr Salmon says that what he took away from that text message was an instruction from you that he was to add a total of \$4,000 to his invoice in relation to this job, \$2,000 of the additional amount would be for you and \$2,000 would be for him. They would be secret commissions. That's correct isn't it, that evidence?---No.

Right. And the same day an invoice gets rendered and it is in the amount of \$7,670 plus GST, accept from me that's what the invoice says. You accept from me, sir, that's what the invoice says?---Yes, yeah, sorry.

And so that amount includes the \$4,000 secret commission that you directed Mr Salmon to add to the invoice, does it not?---No.

Right. And when you, you authorised payment of the invoice, pardon me, on the following day, 1 October, 2014, and in so doing you were involved in defrauding the MS, the Mine Subsidence Fund of \$4,000 and obtaining a secret commission that you would share with Mr Salmon?---No.

That's right isn't it?---No.

10

And again, again the amount that Mr Salmon said in his text message, \$3,670, that was, he was telling you what the real cost of the job was and that falls a long way short, relatively speaking, than the cost of repairs that you'd estimated in the claim investigation report. That's right isn't it? ---You're saying it falls a long way short, is that the question?

That's the question?---Yeah.

Yeah?---Seems to, yes.

20

And that's because you had deliberately inflated the cost of repairs in the claim investigation report to make provision or allowance for the secret commission that you had intended to obtain in relation to the works in this matter?---No.

Let's come to the next property, 47 Abelia Street, Tahmoor. This is a property, sir, that was considerably damaged by mine subsidence. September 2009 a claim investigation report was prepared by Mr Culbert that had recommended that the property be purchased and then repaired.

30

You had made a similar recommendation the following month, October 2009. Just pardon me for just a moment. It seems that a short time – in September, 2009, a short time after Mr Culbert's claim investigation report that same month, 23 September, 2009, the Board itself accepted the claim and according to the minutes recognised a commitment for repairs in an amount of \$120,000. Now there was this recommendation by Mr Culbert that the property be in fact be purchased and then repaired and you had made the same recommendation. But in any event there was this commitment to expend money on repairs up to a value of \$120,000. You had prepared a scope of works, 13 October, 2014 and then invited tenders.

40

And you invited tenders from A&DJ, Plantac and a company called M Bruton. Accept from me that that's what the file seems to show?---I accept that.

And tenders were in fact received. One from A&DJ in amount of \$56,100 plus GST, one from Plantac in the sum of \$56,600 and then one – and I asked you some questions about this on the previous occasion?---Yeah.

One from a company that at least had filled – the form had filled in, had been filled in to say M Burton Company and the tender price on the form was \$72,500. And I think, sir, the proposition I'd put to you on the previous occasion was that that tender was entirely falsified and indeed may have been filled out by yourself. That's right, isn't it? That's the proposition I put to you on the previous occasion?---I remember that you put that proposition, yes.

10 And indeed, what I'd, the proposition I put to you on the previous occasion was that you had met on site with David Salmon and Kevin Inskip that there was no other prospective tenderer on site and you had invited one of them to fill in the tender form by the third prospective tenderer and that invitation had been taken up by Mr Inskip that's - - -?---I don't remember you putting that proposition to me before.

Well, I'm putting that proposition to you now. That's what happened, isn't it?---No.

20 Right. That the invitation to tender that appears from the file to have gone to M Bruton and Company, that, that was just – no real invitation was in fact submitted to M Bruton and Company and they did not submit a tender in relation to this job. That's right, isn't it?---I question this tender myself. Because when it came in that it looked strange to me and I got one of the girls in the office to find out about it.

All right. And - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: I think we've asked this.

30 MR NAYLOR: We have?---Yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Or we've been through this before?---Yeah.

MR NAYLOR: We have.

THE COMMISSIONER: But I don't quite remember. What was the result of the enquiry by the member of staff that you directed to undertake?--- When I, I had the tenders received on my desk and - - -

40 No, no. I'm just asking you what was the result of the enquiry that the member of staff made?---She told me she'd spoken to someone at the company because I, I, said to her that I had a rubber stamp on the tender that I received previously off them and it doesn't resemble anything like it. And I asked her to check that the - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I know that but she spoke to someone at the company - - -?---She told me it was all, she told me it was all okay, I believe.

Well, have you seen the statement that has been admitted recently from the director of that company who says he made no such quote in relation to that matter?---I have, yeah. So I don't understand - - -

Well how do you explain that?---I, I can't.

10 MR NAYLOR: Well there is an explanation, sir. The explanation is that, to use a – that quote was, was just a fiction that you had created to make it appear as though you'd gone through a valid tender process which required three quotes. That's right, isn't it?---No, it's not. Because I - - -

Okay?--- - - - great concerns of something had happened to it. So and I don't know what happened to it and I can't explain what happened to it and I left actually before I think, that tender was nearly, it might have started just before I left and I really don't know what's happened so, yeah.

20 All right. Because you had instructed – Mr Salmon's evidence is that you've instructed him to add 15,000 plus 15,000 to his tender. That's his evidence and that's what you did, isn't it?---No, I didn't.

You'd instructed him to add a total of \$30,000 to his tender as a secret commission that you and he were going to share in?---No.

Right. Let's go to volume, do you still have volume 6 there, sir?---I think so. Yeah.

30 Go to page 2892 and just so you're not – I don't want to take it out of context. This bundle of documents which were produced by Mr Salmon to the Commission actually starts at 2870 and runs through to 2892?
---Ah hmm.

And this is the bundle that is prepared by your office, the scope of works, the tender forms and you – it's the kind of bundle which you give to prospective tenderers isn't it?---Correct.

All right. And the very last page records in handwriting 15,000 plus 15,000. See that?---Yes.

40 And Mr Salmon's evidence is that well, that's his handwriting and that's a record of the instruction that he received from you about the amount of the secret commission to be added to his tender. That's his evidence and that evidence is correct isn't it?---No, not that I'm aware of.

All right. You attended the site meeting?---Yes.

And Mr Inskip was there and Mr Salmon was there but there was no one there from M Bruton & Company was there?---No.

All right. Because you didn't invite anyone from M Bruton & Company to actually attend?---They were all posted out.

To the extent, sir, that there appears, and there does appear to be a letter on the file to M Bruton & Company inviting them to attend. That was placed on the file by you to make it appear as though they had been invited to submit a tender but that's not in fact what occurred?---I wouldn't have placed it on the file. One of the girls would have.

10

Okay. Did you, sir, invite Mr Inskip to add to the amount of his quotation too, an amount of a secret commission?---No.

Whether it be 15,000, 30,000 or any other amount?---No.

All right. See, in this particular case Mr Salmon's tender came in at the lowest 56,100. You recommended that it be accepted. Mr Cole-Clark accepted your recommendation and at least what's on the file is an invoice for half of the claim, a progress payment 10 November, 2014 and then the same day you authorised payment?---Ah hmm.

20

And notionally, sir, it would seem that by doing so you authorised – well, you were involved in defrauding the MSF, the Mine Subsidence Fund of notionally at least half of the \$30,000 that you'd arranged with Mr Salmon to be a secret commission in relation to this job. That's what happened? ---No.

All right. Excuse me. Commissioner, at this time it's appropriate to tender a statement by Kim Mary Reid of the Mine Subsidence Board Picton office, 26 May, 2015 which deals with the matters that were raised by – in part it deals with the matters raised by Mr Bullock on the last occasion he was here. Your Honour asked some questions of him about – or indeed – and he raised the fact that he had spoken to Kim Reid about contact having been made with M Bruton & Company. The Commission has obtained a statement which deals with that particular issue.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit T62.

40 **#EXHIBIT T62 - STATEMENT OF KIM MARY REID 26 MAY 2015**

MR NAYLOR: And it also deals, Commissioner, with other issues concerning office procedures.

Yes. Just while we're on office procedures, I mean I've already asked you some questions, sir, about date stamping on documents received by the Mine Subsidence Board - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - and indeed put to you the proposition that you deliberately applied the MSB Picton office received stamp to a number of quotations that had been received by you being cover quotes from Mr Salmon and that you deliberately manipulated the date mechanism and backdated the received stamp to before the date that it was actually received. Can I ask you this. You were the manager of the office for a long period of time, where was the date stamp – well, how many date stamps were there to the best of your knowledge within the office?---I couldn't be precise there, I think both girls
10 had one on their desks.

Did you have one in your office?---Not that I remember.

All right. And the ones that you do recall being on the desks of – is that Ms Reid and Ms Evans?---That's correct.

Right. Those desks were out in an open area that were accessible by you?
---Of course.

20 Right. You could have obtained access to the date stamp on either of their desks had you wanted to?---True.

Right. And if you didn't have a date stamp in your office, and you say that you don't recall having had one, then I need to suggest to you, sir, that that's in fact what you did, you obtained access to one of the date stamps on either Ms Evans' desk or Ms Reid's desk for the purpose of manipulating the stamp and applying it to quotes that, cover quotes that you received from Mr Salmon?---No.

30 Right. Have you still got volume 6 there?---Yes.

Could you go please to page 2715, and you will recall, sir, that I've already asked you some questions about this particular property, this is the scope of works in relation Tactical Operations Unit 42A King Street, Tahmoor?---Ah
hmm.

Just go – these are documents that have been produced to the Commission by Mr Salmon. Go through please to page 2720. You see some handwriting on that page?---Ah
40

3,000 plus 3,000?---Yes.

That's your handwriting?---I don't think so.

You deny that's your handwriting?---It doesn't look like my handwriting.

What's the basis for you saying that? It looks like your handwriting from my perspective?---Those loopy O's and whatever and I don't form my threes like that.

Are you making that evidence up?---No, I'm basing it on my own handwriting.

I see?---It's my handwriting.

10 I see. All right. Now, keep going, go to 2722. That's another scope of works. This one was in relation to 42 King Street, Tahmoor?---Ah hmm.

And go over please, this again is a document produced by Mr Salmon, 2724 is the last page of the scope of works and then on the next page you'll see some handwriting, 1,500 plus 1,500?---That does look like my handwriting.

I'm sorry, I missed that answer?---I said it looks like my handwriting, that.

20 It looks like your handwriting?---Looks more like my handwriting, yeah.

You accept that's your handwriting, okay?---Well, it looks more like my handwriting, it could be my handwriting.

Do you remember Mr Salmon giving evidence, this was in the context of various recordings of intercepted conversations being played to him, you were in the hearing room at the time that those conversations were being played?---I think I was, yes.

30 And Mr Salmon was giving some evidence about the content of them and I had asked him some questions about meeting that he had - - -?---Mmm.

- - - said that he had with you, and the import of his evidence, sir, was that – and some of the telephone conversations that were the subject of questioning related to arrangements being made for meetings with you. Do you remember that?---Yes.

40 All right. And the proposition that I had put to him was that the purpose of these meetings was for you to receive cash from him and the import of his answer was that yes, that was possible, his memory wasn't perfect but that was a possible reason for the meetings?---I remember he said that.

All right. So, and that's what occurred, that from time to time you met with Mr Salmon, whether at cafés or car parks or on building sites and he handed you cash. That's right isn't it?---No.

And when he did that, that was part of the arrangement that you had had with him that in fact commenced in about 2007 whereby you – the arrangement was that you would receive secret commissions and share them

with him and you would do that by defrauding the Mine Subsidence Fund through invoices submitted by Mr Salmon's building entity to you. That's right isn't it?---No.

Right. And I think you said you were in the hearing room when those intercepted telephone conversations were played and Mr Salmon acknowledged that he was one of the participants in the voice recordings that he heard on those intercepted conversations and you also heard your voice on those intercepted conversations?---I did.

10

Yes. You heard mention made during the intercepted telephone conversation of a reference to tools. Did you hear that?---Yes.

And that was code, was it not, for a payment of cash or payments of cash that Mr Salmon was intending to make to you as part of this arrangement for the payment of secret commissions?---No, that was my jewellery tools being returned to me.

Okay.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: The what tools?---Jewellery.

Why did Mr Salmon have them?---Because [REDACTED] had broken something, Dave said to me, and I offered to fix it and he said he'd fix it and he borrowed some of my tools including a jeweller's saw. I don't know actually what was wrong, he said it had broken and he had to put a link in or something or, and he knows I make jewellery and he borrowed them.

30 MR NAYLOR: We might need a non-publication order here, Commissioner, but who's [REDACTED], sorry?---Oh, [REDACTED].

I see?---Yeah.

Perhaps there be a non-publication order?---Yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. There's a non-publication order in respect of the name of [REDACTED].

40 **A NON-PUBLICATION ORDER IN RESPECT OF THE NAME OF**
[REDACTED].

THE COMMISSIONER: Once again, Mr Bullock, can you explain to me any reason why that proposition wasn't put to Mr Salmon when he was here talking about the reference to tools?---By me?

By anyone?---I don't know, I didn't, didn't think about it.

You didn't think about it?---No.

While he was giving that evidence it didn't occur to you?---Well, Mr Salmon actually said they were Darren's tools. I'm sure he did. He said it was Darren's saw and - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: No. Mr Salmon said that tools was a code word?
---Oh, well - - -

10

That it didn't refer to actual tools?---I'm sorry, Commissioner, I - - -

It didn't occur to you?---No, it didn't occur to me. Sorry.

All right. Well, I need to put this to you because it arises out of a doctrine that's known in the law as recent invention. You're just making that up aren't you, Mr Bullock?---No I'm not.

Yes, go on, Mr Naylor.

20

MR NAYLOR: Sir, when you were here on the last occasion, I don't mean Monday just gone, I mean several weeks ago I had asked you some questions about a conversation that you had with Mr Inskip at his home in December last year. Do you remember that?---Yes.

You attended the home of Mr and Mrs Inskip in about December last year?
---Is that the night-time one you're talking about?

Yes, that's right?---Yes. Yes.

30

And your evidence was that Mr Inskip had had a bit to drink?---Yes.

Yeah. And you had a conversation about some money didn't you?---No. Not that I can recall.

There was a - let me - I'm just looking - just pardon me for a moment. See, on 9 April, 2015 I put this question to you, "You had had a conversation with him had you not about this matter that he paid to you in 2008, the 4,000 or \$5,000?" Answer, "I had a conversation with him to explain I resigned from the Board because there was just a lot of crap happening and I had to resign. I've had enough. And that I went there to pay him back for the sink and he told me that he hadn't had an invoice yet from Reece - - -?---Oh, that money.

40

- - - and it was on his account. Kevin was pretty drunk at the time. Barb had to go and wake him up. He was slurring his words, blah, blah, blah. I think, I think I'd been at - my mum only lives around the corner from him so I think, I think it was when I went there to Kevin's place that night."

That was your answer. Then question, “And, sir, what, what was, what I’m suggesting to you is that during that time that you were with Mr Inskip having a conversation with him you tried to suggest to him how he should answer a question that might be asked of him in relation to the circumstances of this payment of four or \$5,000 and what was suggested to him and that – and what you suggested to him was that it should. That the reason he would give was that it was in relation to difficulties being experienced with IVF treatment. That’s right isn’t it?” Answer, “No.”? ---No.

10

And then I asked a question, I said this, “You were trying to coach him in relation to evidence that he might give in relation to ICAC about this matter, this matter being the payment of four or \$5,000.” Answer, “There’s no way I would coach him, that, that he was drunk”?---Ah hmm.

All right. And the – just to give you the context, the payment of four or \$5,000 that was the subject of questions at that time was a payment, I think it was in 2008, sir. You remember that series of questions about that payment?---Yeah, vaguely. Yeah, yeah.

20

And then ultimately in fact the proposition that I put to you was that – you might remember this in relation to the financial aspect of the questions that were put, There was a spreadsheet of a whole lot of payments that I was suggesting were made from Mr and Mrs Inskip to yourself and it was the first couple of entries on that spreadsheet. Do you remember all those questions?---I do, yeah. Yeah, I don’t remember them all but I, I remember the - you know.

30

Okay. And, sir, you took with you that night a document didn’t you, you had with you that night that you went to see Mr Inskip a document?---Not that I remember.

That document was a bank statement wasn’t it?---I don’t remember taking any document with me.

You took a bank statement with you because what it showed was a transfer of funds from an account held by Mr and Mrs Inskip to yourself. That’s right isn’t it?---I don’t remember that, no.

40

And you went there with the purpose of trying to persuade them, Mr Inskip in particular, to when asked questions about that transfer which you knew ICAC would discover for them to say it was a loan in relation to IVF treatment. That’s, that was, that was the intention of you having a conversation with them while having in your hand a bank statement at the time. That’s right isn’t it?---No, that’s not right.

All right. So when Mrs Inskip gave evidence and said – was talking – gave evidence about your attendance at their home on this evening and said, “No,

he,” and he is a reference to you, “had the statement with him but I couldn’t remember the amounts.” Mrs Inskip was there saying “That she saw you with the bank statement.” Is that a proposition that you accept or deny?---I deny. I don’t remember having anything with me.

I'm going to show you two documents please, sir. See what I've you is two bank statements and there's a bank statement in relation to the account that you operated. This was the St George Freedom cheque account. And it's a statement for the period ending 20 October, 2007?---Ah hmm.

10

Statement number 84 and you'll see there's a highlighted entry there, 24 September, 2007 and this is a credit to your account so it's money coming into your account and the payee is Mrs Barbara [REDACTED] Barb. See that?---I see that, yeah.

All right. And over the page there's another entry highlighted, another payment into your account, 12 October, 2007, another \$5,000 payment, same payee, reimburse BI?---Ah hmm.

20

And accept this from me, sir, that Mrs Barbara Inskip's middle name is [REDACTED]. I seek a non-publication order Commissioner, in relation to that.

A NON-PUBLICATION ORDER IN RESPECT OF MRS INSKIP'S MIDDLE NAME

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That non-publication order is granted.

30

MR NAYLOR: And so what the shows, sir, is that money had come into your account from Mrs Inskip and this is the document or at least it's part of the document, that you took with you when that evening in December last year when you went to speak with Mr Inskip. That's right, isn't it?---No.

And the purpose of that conversation was to persuade them as to how they should answer questions in relation to these transfers of funds. That's right, isn't it?---No.

40

Because this is one of the few instances where the money that was paid to you by Mr Inskip by way of secret commissions was in fact paid by way of bank transfer as distinct from the usual method which was in cash?---I don't know what, what that's for. I can't remember.

All right. Look at the other documents, sir. This is the other side of the transaction. This is part of – these are bank statements in respect of the account operated by Mrs Inskip and you see the outgoing funds. On 24 September, \$5,000 withdrawal and similarly on 12 October, a \$5,000

withdrawal. So Mrs Inskip's transferring the money out of her account and into your account. See that?---I see that, yeah.

All right. I tender those documents, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. They will be Exhibit T63.

10 **#EXHIBIT T63 - BANK STATEMENTS OF DARREN BULLOCK
FROM 2007**

MR NAYLOR: Sir, just one other matter. While you were district manager at the Picton district office up to December, 2014, you kept, did you not, hard copy diaries?---Um, not all the time. Towards the end there I didn't keep a diary too much. I, um, it was on my phone, I think. I used my phone more as a diary.

20 When you used your phone as a diary, you've got to explain that to me, I'm sorry?---You use the, like, the Outlook part of my phone as my diary to put my appointments in.

But when you say not so much, that doesn't mean to say, that's not a denial though that you did have - - -?---No, I used, I used, I used - - -

- - - a hard copy diary?--- - - - a bit of both but I think early on we had older-type phones so I used a diary all the time.

30 Okay?---And then as we got the new windows phones I think I used a combination of both.

Right. So you did have a hard copy diary even right up to the end but you may not have used it very much?---That's correct.

Right. Do you still have in your possession, sir, hard copy diaries for the period 2011 to 2014?---I'm not sure.

You might have?---It's possible, I'm not sure.

40 Okay. And you might have them at your home?---Maybe, I'm not sure.

All right. Thank you. Pardon me, Commissioner. Yes, they're all my questions, thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Does anyone have any further questions of Mr Bullock? Yes?

MS HOGAN-DORAN: Commissioner, I don't have any questions for Mr Bullock having regard to the practice direction.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I'm grateful, Ms Hogan-Doran.

MS HOGAN-DORAN: The basis for disbelieving this witness has been demonstrated.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

10

MS HOGAN-DORAN: And for the avoidance of doubt I will be submitting that his evidence is unreliable.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. Yes?

MR GRIFFIN: Commissioner, I have a similar approach. The lack of specificity in relation to any comments made about my client is such that in my view cross-examination wouldn't assist you.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Griffin. Anyone else? No. Mr Chee? Oh, sorry, I'm sorry.

MR BECKETT: That's all right, no questions either.

THE COMMISSIONER: No questions. Thank you. Yes, Mr Chee?

MR CHEE: Mr Bullock, I'd like to ask you some questions about your handwriting. Could the witness have Exhibit T1, page 2094 made available to him?---Thank you. Two zero?

30

MR CHEE: 94. Do you recognise the document, Mr Bullock?---I'm still getting to it, Mr Chee. Yes, it's a claim processing sheet.

Do you see the handwriting on that sheet?---Yeah, that would be my handwriting on all the sheet.

Thank you. Could the witness be provided with Exhibit T54 page 2942? ---2942?

40

Correct?---I've got it, yeah.

Do you see the handwritten annotation two plus two?---Yes, I do.

Is that your handwriting?---No.

And why, why do you say it's not your handwriting?---Because I don't, I don't write A's like that, I don't write twos like that, I don't write D, I don't just write, it's just not my writing.

Thank you?---It's formed wrong.

Could you go to page 2742 of the same exhibit?---2?

742?---Of the previous exhibit?

No, the same exhibit, T54?---Yes.

10 Do you see the handwritten annotation, two plus two, on that document?
---I do.

And is that your handwriting, Mr Bullock?---No, definitely not.

And why do you say that's not your handwriting?---It's not, I write twos more like zeds nearly sort of, yeah.

MR NAYLOR: Commissioner, without wanting to interrupt, I didn't put to this witness that either of these - - -

20

THE COMMISSIONER: No, no.

MR NAYLOR: - - - were his handwriting.

THE COMMISSIONER: No. And that was in fact what I was just thinking, Mr Chee. It wasn't specifically put that it was. I understood Mr Salmon's evidence to be that on occasions Mr Bullock wrote figures and on occasions he wrote figures at the direction of Mr Bullock, so we're not, we're not - - -

30

MR CHEE: I understood Mr Salmon's evidence was that this particular notation was Mr - he recognised it as Mr Bullock's handwriting.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well - - -

MR NAYLOR: That's not my understanding but in any event Mr Chee can be assured that I have put to this witness every incident in relation to which I will be making a submission that it's his handwriting.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

MR CHEE: In which case I'm content with that. I'll move on.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.

MR CHEE: Could the witness be shown Exhibit T6?---Thank you.

Do you recognise the document from the first page?---It's the Tahmoor spreadsheet that we use to keep track of the jobs.

And I understand that you've reviewed this document?---I have.

And that you have identified matters which – in which you have allocated work to Plantac. Is that correct?---That's correct.

10 Is it the case that in 2008 you say that you allocated work to the value of \$66,290 to Plantac?---That's correct.

In the following year a sum of 181,407.23 to Plantac?---That's correct.

The following year 19,290.72 to Plantac?---That's correct.

In 2011 55,846 to Plantac?---That's correct.

2012 454,085.61 to Plantac?--- Correct.

20 The year after 134,882.82 to Plantac?---Correct.

Okay. Thank you. Could the witness be shown Exhibit T20 and could you have regard to page 4 of that exhibit?---Thank you.

Is that a – are those photographs of the tender box at the Picton office of the MSB?---They are.

30 During your time at the MSB did you find out or come to know that the tender box had become damaged?---It was around the time of - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: We've had this evidence, Mr Chee. We had this evidence on a previous occasion.

MR CHEE: I'm getting to it, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, go on.

40 MR CHEE: How was it damaged as you perceived it?---To me someone had levered the, the metal top off the box and in doing so they'd damaged the laminate top to the counter because it had ripped it up with it because that metal top is actually glue-fixed to the counter and it ripped the top off the counter as well - - -

And this is something – sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you?---Yeah. I mean – and when that metal top is not on the counter the hole under that metal, the slot is probably nearly three times as big as what you actually see there so - - -

And you discovered – how did you discover this?---One morning when I turned up at work I walked in and our entrance gate is adjacent to this tender box. It's literally right next to it. It's on the end of the counter and I said to the girls, "What happened to the tender box?" And they, they said, "What do you mean?" I go, "Well, look, it's been – someone's tampered with it. It's ripped. It's destroyed the counter."

Thank you. Could the witness be shown Exhibit T40. Do you recognise the document?---I do, yes.

10

Do you notice in the top right-hand corner the initials DB:LE?---I do.

What does that signify to you?---That it was a document for Darren Bullock and Lyn Evans was the, the – either the author or the typist of the document.

Do you recall whether, which one it was?---It's a possibility she could have been either the author or the, just typing it.

20 Okay. Thank you. Could the witness be provided with T41. Do you recognise this as a record of telephone contacts between yourself and Kevin Inskip?---I just need to read it a little bit. Seems to be, yes.

And it's for the period from 18 February, 2014 to 21 February, 2014?
---Yes.

Having regard to this time period does the frequency of contact seem to be unusual in terms of the contact that you normally had with Mr Inskip?
---No, I don't think it does, no.

30 Thank you. At any time, I'm sorry, I'm jumping about and I'm trying to move as quickly as I can. At any time have you held, or sorry, acted as CEO of MS, on the MSB?---Yeah, I acted as CEO I think twice is my memory in a shared capacity where, between myself and Peter Evans when Greg was on leave for extended periods of time.

And can your recall those dates?---Not the actual dates. I think one time was over a Christmas/January-type period, another time, I don't know, I think it was more towards the middle of the year. I can't recall the precise dates.

40

Do you recall – thank you for that. Do you recall being played or hearing a telephone intercept of a conversation between yourself and Will Kendall in relation to 9 Abelia Street?

MR NAYLOR: I object, Commissioner. This is a question like several of my colleague's previous questions that arise out of the evidence on the previous occasion.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it does rather.

MR NAYLOR: There have been no questions asked about Mr Kendall.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think we're going over old ground, Mr Chee, aren't we? I mean look, let's be clear about this. Your client denies that he shared in any corrupt arrangement with Mr Salmon although he acknowledges that he did provide money to Mr Salmon at Mr Salmon's behest. He denies, and I don't know to what issue it goes, frankly, he denies that some of the examples of handwriting on the documents relating to figure are not his handwriting, but as I said, I don't know where that goes because he's already acknowledged that he did all of this at Mr Salmon's behest, and his case is as I understand it that we can't draw an inference that he in fact withdrew documents from the tender box in an unauthorised fashion because the tender box was damaged and therefore anybody could have had access to it. Now, beyond that where do we go? I'm trying to focus on his positive case. Where do we go?

MR CHEE: Well, I, I, I take your point, Commissioner. I have instructions but I am mindful also of the practice directions and I will - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, unless there's something that he hasn't already given in evidence or that hasn't been the subject of questions from you on a prior occasion, then I don't think we're under any mistaken apprehension about what his case is.

MR CHEE: Right. Well in such circumstance I - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: By all means, Mr Chee, by all means - - -

MR CHEE: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: - - - if you wish to review that, and there is something that you need to put perhaps on another occasion, but for present purposes I'm not shutting you out but it would be good if we could just get to Mr Inskip.

MR CHEE: I'm very mindful of that and I think that's probably the appropriate course.

THE COMMISSIONER: Because your client might have to come back after Mr Inskip in any event.

MR CHEE: I appreciate that, absolutely.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

MR CHEE: Thank you. Nothing else?

MR NAYLOR: Two questions arising, Commissioner.

T20, you were asked some questions by Mr Chee about the photographs of the tender box?---Yes.

Your answer was that someone must have damaged the box?---Yes.

10 Did you damage the box?---No.

Exhibit T40, Mr Chee took you to a minute that went to the Board concerning the increase of the tender limit, the financial delegation tender limit for Tahmoor-related jobs from \$20,000 to \$50,000?---Ah hmm.

And he took you to a notation on the top right-hand corner - - -?---Yes.

- - - DB.:LE?---Yes.

20 And I understood the import of your evidence to be that Ms Evans might have drafted that document. Is that what you're saying?---Ms Evans did draft some documents for me, yes.

What, for you? I just want to understand what you're saying. Are you trying to suggest that Ms Evans, without instructions from you, drafted that document and sent it up to the Board? Is that what you're trying to suggest? ---No, no, what I'm saying is she, sometimes she wrote minutes for me.

30 Right?---I might have said, look, I need a minute for da da da da - - -

Right?--- - - - can you write it for me, show it to me and I'd look at it and if I needed to make changes or, or I didn't need to make changes and then I'd just sign it.

But you're not suggesting that that document would have gone up to the Board without your imprimatur in some way?---Without me looking at it you mean?

40 Without your consent, without you having checked it and essentially put your stamp on it?---No, I would have checked it.

Right. Okay. Nothing further, thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Bullock, you can stand down for the time being.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW

[3.06pm]

THE COMMISSIONER: Is Mr Inskip here?

MR OATES: He's outside, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR NAYLOR: I call Kevin Inskip, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, sorry, Mr Oates.

10

MR OATES: I seek a declaration on behalf of Mr Inskip, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly, and Mr Inskip, you can just take a seat for the time being.

Can I just confirm with you, since it's been a while since your last appearance, that the order that I make under the Act protects you from the use of your answers against you in civil and criminal proceedings but doesn't protect you if you've given false or misleading evidence to the Commission. You understand that?

20

MR INSKIP: I do.

THE COMMISSIONER: 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 this witness during the course of the witness's evidence at this public inquiry are to be regarded as having been given or produced on objection and there is no need for the witness to make objection in respect of any particular answer given or document or thing produced.

30

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 THIS WITNESS DURING THE COURSE OF THE WITNESS'S EVIDENCE AT THIS PUBLIC INQUIRY ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HAVING BEEN GIVEN OR PRODUCED ON OBJECTION AND THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE WITNESS TO MAKE OBJECTION IN RESPECT OF ANY PARTICULAR ANSWER GIVEN OR DOCUMENT OR THING PRODUCED

40

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you like to be sworn or affirmed, Mr Inskip?

MR INSKIP: Sworn in, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR NAYLOR: Mr Inskip, you've already given evidence on one previous occasion and that evidence concerned Mr Bullock making requests of you to add to the amount of variation invoices which your wife or you then submitted to the MSB for payment. You've already been asked questions and answered questions about that arrangement?---Yes.

10 All right. And during the current hearings, the Commission has heard from David Salmon who you will be aware of. You know Mr Salmon?---Well, only, not socially but yes, I know him, I - - -

Okay. Well, you know he's the principal of a building contractor called A&DJ - - -?---Yes.

- - - Building Services?---Yes, I do.

20 And I'm not sure, sir, if you've been following the evidence at all but the Commission's heard evidence that Mr Bullock imposed upon or requested Mr Salmon to do two things really, first of all to add on to the price of both quotations, that is tenders, as well as invoices, amounts of money that were intended as secret commissions which both he and Mr Salmon would share in after the invoices had been paid by the Mine Subsidence Board. That's, that's the, that's part of the substance of the evidence that the Commission has heard. Do you have any awareness of that?---Only - I haven't been reading the transcripts.

30 Okay?---Yeah, that's, if that's what you mean.

That's - - -?---The only part, my wife's been reading them and sort of giving me - - -

Okay?--- - - - telling me bits and pieces of them, yeah.

So it differs, the substance of Mr Salmon's evidence differs slightly from yours?---Ah hmm.

40 In that he did say on a couple of occasions that Mr Bullock asked him to add to the, to variation invoices. That is invoices submitted for variations to jobs. So there was that commonality in a sense with the evidence that you gave?---Yes.

About what Mr Bullock asked you to do but it was different in relation to Mr Salmon in the sense that what Mr Bullock asked him to do was to add to, for the most part, the price, original contract prices. So when the tenders were invited and tenders were being submitted, he would ask Mr Salmon to

add to the cost or the price of the original tenders that Mr Salmon submitted?---Right.

That's the substance of Mr Salmon's evidence?---Ah hmm.

Not in total but to a large extent. And I want to ask you, did Mr Bullock ever ask you to do the same thing? So not in relation to variations but in relation to - - -?---No, no - - -

10 - - - original tenders?---Through tender - - -

Yeah?--- - - - iust supposedly. Not that I can ever, the only time that that, um, situation happened was Abelia Street, I can't remember the, ah, number of, of the, the job.

Right?---The street number. Um, and that was where Dave Salmon and I were there and Darren asked us both to do that. But previous to that I can never recollect Darren ever asking – I don't know how he could do it. Because you know like, the only times that we, um, there would not be a
20 tender meeting if there was like a commercial situation where there was a quote on a letterhead and we might, might go to site. There may have been, depending on the size of the job, there might've been, if it was a smallish job I would just take notes and then take that back and work out the price and then send it to Darren.

All right?---I lost myself there. If it was a bigger quote, sorry.

Yeah?---Darren would probably have, already drafted up a scope of works which we'd, we'd base it on. But in that situation I always had to send the
30 quote to him. But he never sent or asked me to, but I can never remember, other than Abelia Street to put money on a tender as such or a quote.

Right. So leaving aside Abelia Street and we'll come to that in just a minute. Leaving aside Abelia Street there was never an occasion that you can recall when you added to the price of a tender that you were submitting to the MSB or quote that you were submitting to the MSB an amount for Mr Bullock?---I honestly can't ever remember - - -

All right?--- - - - him asking me to do that, free tender.

40 Right. Because you know, the evidence that Mr Salmon gives and the evidence that the Commission has received is that, you know, we've got evidence from Mr Salmon about what the real cost to him of the job was?--- Right.

And how much he was asked to add and in many cases there's a parity or there's a similarity between the tender that you put in for the job and the tender that Mr Salmon puts in for the job. So it gives rise to this question, if

there's this similarity in the prices that have been submitted and particularly where Mr Salmon's been asked to add a lot to the tender. It gives rise a question which, which I have to ask as to whether or not you were also asked to add?---I can, I can understand - - -

Yeah?--- - - -the question.

10 Yeah?---Um, look, I don't know what Darren, um, did with Dave. I mean the situation is I, yeah, I don't know how to answer that. Because you know, as I said just previously, that, I don't ever recall him asking or, or directing us to put money on a tender or a quote prior to actually submitting it.

Right. Let me just – I'll come to Abelia Street in just a moment. But I'll just give you an example. So there was a job at 33 York Street? I'm not asking - - -?---Sorry. Yeah.

I'm not - - -?---I can remember where York Street is but - - -

20 Right?---Yeah.

I'll just, I'll just what the facts are and you just tell me - - -?---Okay.

- - - what you know or you remember. It doesn't - - -?---All right.

30 If you don't remember that's okay. There was a job at 33 York Street and the input of Mr Salmon's evidence is that it would've cost him including a profit margin of \$11,660. And he says also that he was asked by Mr Bullock to add 10,000 to that quote. So he put in a quote for \$21,660?--- Right.

And your quote, you put in a quote as well and your quote was \$22,460. So it's not that far away from what his quote was?---Yeah.

So I have to ask the question whether or not you were also prevailed upon by Mr Bullock to up the value of your quote so as to include an amount for him?---Was that on a, um, a letterhead or a tender form?

40 Let me get an answer to that for you. Pardon me for just a minute. Pardon me. So your quote in on a letterhead?---Okay. Well then it was probably a cover quote.

Your quote's probably a cover quote, is it?---Possibly, yeah.

Right?---Possibly.

This is page 2645 of Exhibit T54?---I'm not 100 per cent sure of that because I can't even remember the job, but that's what - - -

I see?--- - - -I'm thinking that it probably is.

And Mr Salmon's quote is on a letterhead as well?---Yeah.

So they're not done on tender forms?---That's what I'm thinking that's happened in that situation, yeah, that it was a cover, probably a cover quote.

10 I see. So - - -?---Not 100, yeah, I'm pretty sure that's what it would be.

Okay. Okay. If it was done on a tender form it would – you're saying with the exception of the Abelia Street job, we'll leave that to one side - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - if it was done on a tender form it wouldn't include an amount for Mr Bullock that you're aware of?---Well, I, I wouldn't have known what amounts were – if that's a cover quote - - -

20 Yes?--- - - -whatever arrangement Darren had with Dave I wouldn't have a clue.

Right?---I would have been just asked to you know, submit a cover quote for that particular job.

Did that happen very often, do you know?---Not a lot.

Yeah?---Not a lot.

30 Because I was going to come to cover quotes. Mr Salmon gave evidence that he submitted cover quotes, backdated cover quotes - - -?---Yeah.

- - - at Mr Bullock's request?---Ah hmm.

And see, I'm just conscious of the time but you see he said, he said that he cover quoted for, you know, quite a few properties, 23 Abelia Street – I'm sorry, I withdraw that. 336 Moreton Park Road, 31 Park Street, 286 Douglas Park Road, and there were a number of others?---Ah hmm.

40 And on each occasion he received a fax - - -?---Right.

- - - of your quote?---Yes.

And it was sent to him he says by Mr Bullock?---Right.

And the evidence seems to show that it comes from the MSB Picton office?
---Ah hmm.

And he was asked to send in a backdated quote and Mr Bullock told him what date to put on it and these cover quotes, he'd always make sure it was higher than the Plantac quote?---Yeah, well - - -

So it was not meant to be genuine?---Yeah.

It was intended to make it appears as though there was a process, and that you'd get the job?---Yeah, yeah, that's right.

10 Yeah. And so you were asked by Mr Bullock to do the same thing on occasion?---Yes, but there was never any, Darren never asked me to put money on the - what he's, what he'd do - - -

No?--- - - - we'd go and - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: We understand what your arrangement was - - -?
---Sorry.

20 - - - about the payment of money, but at the moment what we're asking is where there occasions when he asked you to put in a cover quote?---Yes.

Yes?---Against other contractors.

Right?---Yes.

MR NAYLOR: All right. How often did this happen do you know?---Oh, Mr Naylor, I couldn't tell you exactly. I mean, you know, there's a few times, half a dozen, ten maybe type of thing.

30 Yeah. Pardon me?---If you're talking over seven years, you know - - -

Sure?--- - - - I, I couldn't honestly tell you.

How did it happen, did you get sent a quote by the other contractor?---No, no.

Did Mr Bullock provide you with a document and say oh, please do a cover quote for this?---Yes.

40 That's how it happened?---Yes.

So you were sent some other contractor's quote?---Yes.

Right. And how did he do that, did he hand it to you or he faxed it to you or - - -?---I'd say that, I would say that he's actually handed most of them to me.

Yeah. And were they quotes from A&DJ Building Services?---Pretty much. I can't recall of any others - - -

Right?--- - - - that come, come to mind. I, and I'm pretty sure they were never faxed or emailed.

No. Can I just go to 47 Abelia. You met on site didn't you with – this is the Abelia Street job that you referred to before?---Yes.

10 I think the number is 47?---Okay. Yeah.

And we can go to the documents but you've met on site with Mr Bullock and with Mr Salmon didn't you?---Yes, I did.

You remember that meeting?---Yes, I do.

Right. And there wasn't anyone else there was there?---No.

20 No. And you've already given some evidence about this but Mr Bullock asked you to submit a quote on behalf of a third contractor didn't he?
---That's correct.

Right. And you took up that invitation, you did, you did submit a quote on behalf of - - -?---I sent it by mail, yeah.

Yeah. Did you write it out?---Not all the details, no.

You wrote out some of it?---Yeah.

30 Right?---Because I was supplied – because I, you know, I wouldn't have a clue who those people are.

Yeah. I just need to try and clarify this, sir. If you can be shown Exhibit T57 and go to page 136. It's on the screen if that helps?---Yeah. Yeah.

Do you think you might have written this out?---I can barely understand it.

40 Yeah?---Oh, some of it. Look, I – yeah, some of it. It looks like there might be some of my handwriting there but - - -

Right?--- - - - I mean, yeah, I can barely understand that.

All right. And - - -?---What actually – do you mind if I explain to you - - -

Not at all?--- - - - what happened?

Go ahead?---When, when this happened Darren asked Dave or myself, he said, “Look, will one of you two send this back in,” right and unfortunately I was silly enough to say I’ll do it.

THE COMMISSIONER: When you say “send this back in” do you mean - - -?---The, the - - -

- - - that form that’s appearing on the screen now?---Yes.

10 Right?---And, you know, I made an ill judgement and said that yeah, I’d do it, you know. But um, and that’s what happened and I posted it by express mail.

MR NAYLOR: Right. And were you going to get anything out of by - - -? ---No.

- - - by doing this at Mr Bullock’s request?---No.

20 Were you going to get something out of it?---No.

Do you know if he was going to get something out of it at all?---Yes.

What?---\$15,000.

How was that going to happen?---Well, whoever won the job which we didn’t he was, he asked us to put 15 and \$15,000 which is as I said before - - -

30 Yeah?--- - - - is the first time that I’ve ever, especially in front of someone else, heard, heard him – well, his exact words were “15 each”.

And what did you think he meant by that?---I know what he meant by it. \$15,000 each put on – to put \$30,000 on the job.

How do you know that?---Because it was – I could, I, I knew what he was talking about, you know.

40 Okay. And so what he meant was you – and he was talking to both of you? ---Absolutely.

And he said to both of you “\$15,000 each” and you, you say that you’re sure that what he meant by that as put 15,000 on for me and 15,000 on for you? ---Correct.

Right. So – and you were therefore to have added at his request \$30,000 to the tender that you were going to submit?---That’s right.

And is that what you did?---Yes, I did.

Right. So your tender – pardon me. Your tender was 56,600 plus GST?
---Yes.

And that included the \$30,000?---Yes.

Right. Right. Just one other issue. Can you be provided please – give that back, back that file. Be provided with volume 5 of Exhibit T54 and go to page - - -?---It'll come up on screen anyway won't it, yeah.

10

I'm sorry. I've got the page wrong. It's not T54 it's T1 and go to page 2055 of Exhibit T1, volume 5. Do you want this one?---Okay.

See that, sir?---Yes.

That's a quote or it would appear to be a quote by a building contractor named MAB Building Services Pty Limited. Have you seen that document before?---I have.

20 When and in what circumstances?---That's a cover quote for a job that well, I assume we did at, at that address.

Right. That's a cover quote that was sent to you or that you created?
---Well, I wouldn't have personally created it but I'd say that we probably – our office probably typed it up, yes.

Okay?---I would - - -

At Mr Bullock's request?---Yes.

30

Right. Might that be your signature or - - -?---No.

- - - your handwriting on the bottom of the document?---No.

Right. You don't know whose - - -?---No.

- - - handwriting that is?---No.

40 Okay. But this is a document that at Mr Bullock's request you, you've created?---Yes.

Okay. All right. Commissioner, I note the time. I think – I haven't finished
- - -

THE COMMISSIONER: You, you have some - - -

MR NAYLOR: I haven't finished with Mr Inskip.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

MR NAYLOR: But I won't be terribly long tomorrow with him.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. All right. Well, Mr Inskip, I apologise for having to bring you back tomorrow and I apologise for the delay but we will be a relatively short time tomorrow. If you could return tomorrow morning at – shortly before 10 o'clock and we'll resume?---Okay.

10 Thank you.

THE WITNESS STOOD DOWN

[3.30pm]

AT 3.30PM THE MATTER WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY

[3.30PM]