

TUNICPVT00051
12/12/2014

TUNIC
pp 00051-0081

COMPULSORY
EXAMINATION

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THERESA HAMILTON ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

COMPULSORY EXAMINATION

OPERATION TUNIC

Reference: Operation E13/1800

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON FRIDAY 12 DECEMBER, 2014

AT 10.20AM

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

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

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, please be seated. This is a compulsory examination being conducted by the Independent Commission Against Corruption. I direct that the following people may be present, Commission officers including transcription staff, the witness and the witness's legal representative.

10 Being satisfied that it is necessary and desirable to do so in the public interest, I direct pursuant to section 112 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act that the evidence given by this witness, the contents of any exhibits tendered, the contents of any documents shown to the witness, any information that might enable the witness to be identified and the fact that the witness has given evidence today shall not be published or otherwise communicated to anyone except by Commission officers for statutory purposes or pursuant to further order of the Commission. It is a criminal offence for any person to contravene this direction. This direction may be varied or lifted by the Commission without previous notification if the Commission is satisfied that it is necessary or desirable to do so in the public interest.

20

BEING SATISFIED THAT IT IS NECESSARY AND DESIRABLE TO DO SO IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST, I DIRECT PURSUANT TO SECTION 112 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT THAT THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BY THIS WITNESS, THE CONTENTS OF ANY EXHIBITS TENDERED, THE CONTENTS OF ANY DOCUMENTS SHOWN TO THE WITNESS, ANY INFORMATION THAT MIGHT ENABLE THE WITNESS TO BE IDENTIFIED AND THE FACT THAT THE WITNESS HAS GIVEN EVIDENCE TODAY SHALL NOT BE PUBLISHED OR OTHERWISE COMMUNICATED TO ANYONE EXCEPT BY COMMISSION OFFICERS FOR STATUTORY PURPOSES OR PURSUANT TO FURTHER ORDER OF THE COMMISSION. IT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE FOR ANY PERSON TO CONTRAVENE THIS DIRECTION. THIS DIRECTION MAY BE VARIED OR LIFTED BY THE COMMISSION WITHOUT PREVIOUS NOTIFICATION IF THE COMMISSION IS SATISFIED THAT IT IS NECESSARY OR DESIRABLE TO DO SO IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

40

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Chee.

MR CHEE: Yes, that's correct.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You're appearing for the witness.

MR CHEE: Yes, your Honour. I seek your authorisation to do so.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. And does your client wish to seek a section 38 direction again?

MR CHEE: Yes, I have explained that and indeed he does seek that declaration.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And he will be affirmed I believe.

MR CHEE: That's correct.

10

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Is that my memory? Yes.

MR CHEE: Quite correct.

20

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Pursuant to section 38 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, I declare that all answers given by this witness and all documents and things produced by him during the course of his evidence at this compulsory examination 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 THIS WITNESS AND ALL DOCUMENTS AND THINGS PRODUCED BY HIM DURING THE COURSE OF HIS EVIDENCE AT THIS COMPULSORY EXAMINATION 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.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could the witness be affirmed, please?

<DARREN BULLOCK, affirmed

[10.21am]

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Bullock. The subject matter of this investigation has been outlined to you previously?---Yes.

And in a summons served on you, and Mr Marney will now ask you some questions?---Thank you.

10 MR MARNEY: Mr Bullock, you were here at a compulsory examination this time last week, so Friday, I believe that was 5. You gave some evidence in relation to your work at the Mines Subsidence Board?---I did.

Do you agree with that?---I do.

And you also gave some evidence in relation to payments that you did or didn't receive from various Mines Subsidence Board contractors. Would you agree with that?---I agree with that.

20 Shortly after that compulsory examination through Mr Chee you recontacted the Commission. Is that right?---That's correct.

And you asked to return to correct some aspects of your evidence. Is that right?---That is correct.

30 Can you please just give me an outline in broad terms, before we start going into details, what elements of your evidence you wish to correct?---I wish to correct the evidence in regards to Plantac. During last week's hearing I guess I was focusing on the extension to my home and with – why I – that it had Board's approval and I was concerned about all that, and it had been signed off by the CEO, and I had my train of thoughts with that. During the questioning when you threw lots of figures at me about how I paid for a boat, a car and various other things. I really, really got confused and I apologise for that. I actually said that I was – you were confusing me.

Ah hmm?---And when I walked out with Mr Chee I asked – I said look, I need to correct some evidence straight away.

40 If you take us through step by step, bearing in mind I don't know what evidence you're going to correct – that's the first time I've heard about what you're going to correct. Just take your time and tell us step by step the evidence that you want to correct?---The first thing I'd like to correct is you asked me about some payments I've received from Plantac and that you specified some denominations of notes which you said that had gone out of Plantac's account and into my account, all that. And the second part I'd like to correct is the – where you said about how did I pay for, I think, I think a car was the first one. There was 37 odd thousand dollars and the other one

was how I paid for a jet ski and how I paid for holidays, I'd like to correct that.

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?---Yes, I have.

10 Can you tell us the details please of that?---Referring to that first payment I think that you said of the – I think it was \$2000 amount.

Okay. If you can try and give us some dates roughly, we've got a list if you need it of your cash deposits into your account?---Mmm.

Try and do it from memory first, if not we can refer to that document?---From memory I think there was a payment of \$2000 in early 2008.

How was that paid in?---In cash.

20 Was that paid by someone from Plantac directly into your account or was it given to you and you paid it in?---It was given to me and I paid it in.

Who at Plantac gave you that money?---Kevin Inskip.

And what were the circumstances surrounding that payment of \$2000 in 2008?---It's hard to remember. I know it was – same, I was having a lot of troubles getting pay increases at work and whatever and I think, you know, he'd known me a long time and I – he said he could basically help me out in a way.

30 At this stage in 2008 was Plantac a Mines Subsidence Board contractor?---Yes, he was.

From what you're saying, my understanding is this was not a loan, it was a gift. Is that right?---It was a gift.

Were there any conditions attached to that gift?---No.

40 Did you or have you since that date in any respect acted favourably in relation to Plantac and its dealings with Mines Subsidence Board?---I don't believe I have, no.

2008 is a \$2000 payment. What's the next one that you can remember?---There's been another one after that which I don't know, it was a month or two after that, sometime around that.

So a month or two later?---Yeah.

What was the dollar amount for that figure?---I think it was \$3000.

And who gave you that money?---Kevin Inskip.

Was that provided in cash directly to you or into your bank account?---In cash.

What were the circumstances surrounding that payment?---I think they were similar to the first, that look, I can help you out a bit, and that was it.

10 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I don't really understand this. Last time you were here you said you always had big loads of cash at your house available, reserves. Why is this man having to help you out?---I still have that reserve there.

Yeah?---I guess he – I guess it was through me just whinging about work and whatever and we had been friends for a long time and that was – there's no more in it to that

20 MR MARNEY: The Commissioner's point goes to the heart of this, I think. What we're saying – and tell me if I'm wrong – is that at this stage that you are receiving money from Kevin Inskip, you have a cash reserve yourself?---True.

You're speaking to Mr Inskip. Was this during the course of other conversations or did you go and speak to him directly about financial issues that you were having?---I, I don't remember what, what the circumstance was. I – it's seven years ago or whatever it is, yeah.

30 You say it was in relation to general conversations about work. Can you give us any specifics about what was actually said?---I think it's – it's been just dealing with everyone at Tahmoor, the hard times I've been having down there. It's been, it's been hard on me, I've, you know, I've had threats against my life, I've had all sorts of things down there. I've had people take swings at me, I've had things thrown at me. I guess I was feeling down.

Well we'll speak about motivation a little bit in a second.

40 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry, could I just ask you something else?---Yes, your Honour.

You've told us of at least one occasion where you suggested Mr Inskip's company be given some work, Plantac, last time. You said they were having trouble and you suggested him?---I, I don't – you have to refresh my memory.

MR MARNEY: Commissioner, from memory, I think that was in relationship to - - -

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: At Appin?

MR MARNEY: - - -the tendering. You actually put Plantac on the tender board. Is that right? You put them up as a company that could - - -?--- That's, that's not 'cause they were having trouble. No, no, that's when I – that was probably a year or so after I'd been at the Board and because the Board was having trouble with their existing contractors, Greg Cole-Clarke who's the Board's CEO asked did I know any other contractors that we could use to do work for the Board.

10

What year was that?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. I guess my point is just you were in a position to assist Plantac, weren't you, through your job?---I – yeah, I guess you could - - -

That's an example?---That's probably – yeah, I guess you could.

20

You could suggest they're pretty good, let's put them on the - - -?---We put other people on at the same time as well.

Yes, that's not the point. I'm just asking you do you agree you were in a position to assist Plantac with their business through your position on the Board at the Mines Subsidence Board?---For the initial employment of Plantac?

Well I presume in various ways you could have assisted them. They were at various times a contractor, weren't they, to the - - -?---Yeah, yeah, yeah.

30

Yeah. And you were the representative of the Mines Subsidence Board?---Correct.

Well you see the obvious problem, don't you?---I need you to – I don't know what you – I don't know what - - -

Of you taking cash secret payments from somebody who's doing work for the Board. You don't see a problem with that?---Look, I – yeah, I do, yeah, I do. I honestly - - -

40

And you didn't declare the payments, did you?---No, I didn't declare them.

You knew you'd be in trouble if you declared the payments?---Yes. You're correct.

Yes, all right. Go on.

MR MARNEY: Thank you, Commissioner?---Sorry, sorry – I – sorry.

Let's move on, we'll revisit this in relation to your motivation. We're still now – in 2008 you've received a \$3000 payment, you've received a \$2000 payment. What was the next one after that?---None that I, none that I can recall.

Are you saying these are the only two payments you've received from Plantac?---To the best of my knowledge I don't think there's any more.

10 To the best of your knowledge?---I, I've gone through all my bank statements trying to work out what's what and I can't see anything else.

Without going over old ground, we went through your bank account on the last occasion you were here. Do you remember that?---I do.

And we highlighted some headline figures in relation to deposits of cash that had been made by you or into your wife's account?---Correct.

20 That appeared to be in excess of any explicable income that you had, you're aware of those questions, you remember those questions?---Yeah, I remember that and that's when I said you were starting to confuse me with the figures and - - -

Now you would have been through, I take it, your bank statements since you were here last Friday?---I, I was.

And you would've looked at all of these cash deposits and you would accept, would you not, that there are a lot of cash deposits into your account or your wife's accounts?---Yes, I do.

30 And that these are over and above any amount that can be reasonably explained by your wages or the assets that you had retained from your lottery win and your divorce?---No, I don't agree with that.

Okay?---And I believe that I can prove that – how that's done.

40 Returning to these payments, I want to give you another opportunity – because it is important – are there any other payments that you received from Plantac?---The only thing – I borrowed a truck off him once if you can call that a payment. (not transcribable)

Have you received any other benefits from Plantac?---(No audible reply).

Mr Bullock?---Mmm.

Let's be realistic about this. Since last week you were fully aware – if you weren't before – about the allegations that you face?---Ah hmm.

Since last week I doubt very much that you have thought about anything else, have you?---No, I haven't.

You would have racked your brains for any possible benefit that you would have received from Plantac or any other contractor. You would have thought about that, wouldn't you?---Yes.

And if there was, you would be in a position to say yes I received extra payments or no I didn't, wouldn't you?---Correct.

10

So why not are you not able to say I didn't receive anything else, this is it? Why are you thinking about it now?---Because I'm thinking of odd bod things, like the truck's just come to my mind, like, you know? I - - -

Is it because you think we'll be able to find these two cash payments but you still think there's a chance that in relation to other benefits we might not come across them? Is that why you're still being a little bit hesitant about your answers?---No.

20

Now on the last occasion we did, I accept, put lots of questions to you about deposits into your bank accounts. But do you remember I put a general proposition to you about receiving benefits? Do you remember that?---I do.

Yeah. I asked you, and I quote, "Are you receiving money from anyone who you do business with or you have contact with at the Mines Subsidence Board?" And your answer to that was, "No." You've already said in answer to the Commissioner's question you were aware when you took those payments that you shouldn't have taken them. That's correct, isn't it?---Yes.

30

When that cash was handed over to you, you knew that was in breach of your duty as a member of the Mines Subsidence Board, didn't you?---Yes.

So when you came here and you were asked not about specific amounts going into your bank account but you were asked categorically have you received payments from Mines Subsidence Board contractors, you would have known at that stage that you had received them, wouldn't you?---I was focused on the extension and I thought it all related to that, and I just had that in my head. I had the blinkers on about the extension.

40

Do you remember the summons that you received for your original compulsory examination?---But, yeah, well not word for word, but yes.

And in there it mentions payments from Mines Subsidence Board contractors, doesn't it? We can bring it up and show it to you?---No, no, that's fine. Yes.

You accept that, that was in the original summons?---I accept that, yes.

So you were on notice even before the compulsory examination that payments were an issue, yet when you were asked, "Have you received money from anyone that you do business with at Mines Subsidence Board?", you categorically said, "No." When you said no to me last week you knew, didn't you, that you had received at least two payments from Plantac, didn't you?---No. When I was sitting here, this is the honest truth, I – it was a long time ago, I'd put it out of my mind and when I walked out of here with Mr Chee I said I've been focused on the extension with Will Built and I've made a mistake, we need to contact the Commissioner straight away and that was my instructions to Mr Chee.

Yes. Because we can go through the transcript and there was more than one occasion when you were asked about cash payments, wasn't there?---I, I don't remember.

The reason that you said no to me last week is because you just panicked, didn't you?---I probably did.

20 Yes. You knew that you had received payments and at that stage you realised this is what they're asking me about, and through panic you said no, didn't you?---That would probably be correct, I guess.

But you knew, you realised when I asked the question that we were talking about payments that you've received from Plantac and you knew at that stage yes, I have received payments, didn't you?---You know, at that point in time my head was spinning and I guess – I don't know.

30 Mr Bullock, let's be realistic. It's inconceivable that you would receive what anyone would review as potentially kickbacks from an MSB contractor. That's what these look like, don't they?---That's what they perceive to look like, yes.

You were asked a question about receiving money and the first thing that would've come into your mind is they know about the Plantac payments. That's what came into your mind last week, didn't it?---How would I remember that? I don't know.

40 It's a significant thing isn't it? Taking cash from a contractor that you provide work to on behalf of the Government is a massive, massive thing isn't it?---It is now in, now that I've looked back on it, yeah, it is the wrong thing to do, yes.

And you knew it was the wrong thing to do and that's why you said no last week isn't it?---Oh - - -

I want to go back now to revisit some of the things that we spoke about last week and there's two reasons for that. Firstly, these payments now put a

slightly different perspective on your relationship with MSB Contractors and the second is in fairness to you relates to a policy document that we've come into possession of.

Commissioner, if I can hand up, this is two documents, one is headed "Schedule C, Schedule of Delegations as at 1 July, 2012".

10 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Marney, before we got to this I wonder whether we shouldn't allow the witness – he said there was another area where he wanted to change his evidence in relation to - - -

MR MARNEY: Yes.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: - - - payment for a car and a jet ski?

MR MARNEY: Thank you, Commissioner.

20 The, the payment for the jet ski, let's start with that?---Ah hmm. Can I, can I just refer to that sheet, I don't know what you've, Commissioner, what we call this, the sheet that I've, this spreadsheet that I've handed in today.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Oh, is that something you've prepared yourself?---Yeah, yeah, it is.

Well - - -?---And Mr Chee's provided it.

All right. Well, we'll mark it as an exhibit so everyone knows what we're talking about?---Just so if I can refer to that.

30 And then you may refer to that?---Yeah, so - - -

Yes.

MR MARNEY: Commissioner, so you're aware, this was handed to me just before the hearing so I've, I've skimmed through it but have no great depth of knowledge about its contents.

40 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No. Well, the spreadsheet prepared by Mr Bullock will be Exhibit C2.

#EXHIBIT C2 – SPREADSHEET PREPARED BY DARREN BULLOCK

MR MARNEY: Mr Bullock, the jet ski?---The jet ski - - -

You want to, to refer to this document and we'll give it a heading, it's Darren Bullock financial status?---Ah hmm. So in, in relation to this document just – can I just speak freely about this document, Commissioner, or – to put in the background or - - -

10 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, if you like?---Yeah. Um, with this document basically what I did was went and worked out where the, the major things, money going in and out, I, I, I included our, my wife or my personal income in this so it's just (not transcribable) what happened so it's in chronological order um, um, so all as I want to do is basically – I don't know if – will you allow me to work my way through the whole document or you want to just pick bits out of it?

MR MARNEY: Well, let's deal with the major assets that you've got. We spoke about the jet ski, we mentioned that specifically last week. We also spoke specifically about your two cars?---Yeah.

20 Let's deal with those as assets, just talk us through. If you need to refer to this document do but talk us through how you paid for those assets?---Yeah. So with, with the cars before this the, the T-bucket I had prior to, I bought that in 2001 um, which was referred to in here and it's, it's included in the assets here where it actually says with the divorce settlement and other assets \$127,000, it's in that figure there.

30 Ah hmm?---There's, I have a spreadsheet which Mr Chee has which includes, lists all those assets and um, it is with my previous wife's assets as well and that was our split of what we had at the time of the divorce so that car is included in there. That car was then used later in the spreadsheet back where – on 12/06/2009 for the purpose of the Mazda RX-8 um, which was paid for by a Westpac, part of a Westpac credit card. There was a cash payment in there and there was a cheque which was the guy that bought the hot-rod made the cheque out direct to the Mazda dealer to save me cashing it and redrawing it and that's just what he did, that was the 38,000-odd and there was - - -

I'll just hold you there. We asked you about that cheque last week?---Yeah, and I couldn't remember last week what, how I did it, no.

40 Carry on?---Yeah. I have, I have a copy of that dealer receipt and the cheque number there which Mr Chee has to back that up. Um, as far as the other cars I guess the, the Mitsubishi car on there, the 2003 was bought out of the funds that I had left from the, my winnings of the Lotto win and you can also see after that there's a Caldwell and, and Cox um, 38,928 which was from vendor finance from when we sold the house at Grasmere, it sold for 1.15 million, we owned it outright back in two thousand and - we owned it - - -

Just give the dates on there, just slow down a little bit - - ?---Sorry.

- - - because we need to follow you through these?---Sorry.

So what date are we talking about now?---Um, which, what's that with?
With the - - -

10 You're talking about specific entries on here?---Oh, 17/09/2003, there's vendor finance on there for \$38,928, that's when I, when I sold the house at Grasmere as part of the divorce settlement, it sold for \$1.15 million but the, the purchaser didn't have enough finance so we had vendor finance which was paid in the, in that, the September and with the interest it was like \$103,000-odd, I've got a copy of that and a solicitor's letter for that there and that was my portion of it and my wife got the other 70,000-odd or whatever it was so, as well with that Mitsubishi car Julie's dad, my wife's dad, offered at the same time and there's a, you'll see he gave us a cheque for \$20,000 that was deposited into the account on 9/10/2003 um, from Rodney Andrews and that was to either pay for part of the car or the HECS or some of Julie's HECS debt.

20 Because the issues we concentrated on last week related to cash payments didn't they?---Mmm, ah hmm.

And I took you through a document that summarised the cash payments into your account - - -?---Correct.

- - - and the accounts of your wife. What this document doesn't do to any extent is explain those large numbers of cash deposits does it?---Well, that's where I want to go forward from this document.

30 Ah hmm?---If – back, when I went back through my bank records between March 2003 to September 2003 I took \$95,100 out in cash over about 13-odd payments, straight out in cash.

And what did you do with that money that you withdrew?---That, that's the money that I spoke about last week when I said to you I had, I think I quoted a figure of between 80 and 60,000, when I've gone back now and checked it's 95,100.

40 And where was that money drawn out of?---My St George account and I have the receipts there and the withdrawal dates, Mr Chee has those.

You drew the money out, what did you do with it?---Kept it at home.

Because the issue - - -?---Because - - -

- - - is not money coming out, is it, the issue is money going into your accounts?---But that, but that's where I want to explain something. When, when – what I did was then because as I said I'd had troubles with my

ex-wife taking money from me and the Lotto win was a large portion of that so what I basically did was deduct half of that Lotto win out and kept it at home so I wasn't paying more in child support and, and that, and that's what I did and then from, from, and then from - - -

10 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry, I'm sorry, could you just stop? So was the purpose of taking it out so it wouldn't show up in your bank account and your wife might claim it?---And, and also because it becomes um, part of income because of the large amount of interest it would draw I'd be paying greater child support.

All right. So - - -?---And, and - - -

But you'd already had the divorce settlement at this stage?---But that's - I'm talking about child support, ongoing child support payments, yeah.

Right, so - but I'm talking about the first part?---Yeah.

20 So it wasn't really concern that your ex-wife would be able to claim it because you'd already had your settlement?---Yeah, well, she did make a, try to make a claim on that and - - -

But that didn't go anywhere did it?---No, it didn't go anywhere, no.

So was the main reason you say you took out this 95,000 was so that it wouldn't be earning interest in an account and you wouldn't have to pay more child support?---Correct.

30 Yes, yes, carry on?---I mean that, that's what happened so - - -

Can I, can I - I want to clarify a few points on that. You drew out 91,000 - - -?---No, 95,100 I think it is.

- - - \$95,100 - - -?---One hundred. Yeah.

- - - from your St George account?---Correct.

And that was the account that the Lotto win was paid into was it?---Correct.

40 So the Lotto win goes into your St George account?---Yep.

And you draw out 91,000 - sorry, 95,100 - - -?---From between the March and basically the September that year, the same year, the 2003.

So March, 2003?---Three.

To September 2003?---Correct.

And what did you use that money for?---So that money then was – just sat there for a while and then between 2004 and 2007 I put about 50-odd thousand odd-dollars, I think it was \$55,000 back into my account in bits and pieces in like 2,000 here, 1,000 there, 3,000 there. So as I was spending money and I needed to keep my account topped up I kept depositing bits and pieces so my account balance was always somewhere between I guess zero and \$10,000 and no more.

10 So if we look at your accounts there will be cash deposits between 2004 and 2007. Is that what you're saying?---Correct.

After 2007 you ceased putting cash deposits into your account. Is that what you're saying?---No. No. No. No. No.

What happened after 2007?---Well, there was cash going in and out all the time. My, my wages were going in and roughly between 2007 and 2014 the average of nett wage going in each year was around \$100,000 or more.

20 Mr Bullock, I want you to focus please on cash payments?---Yeah.

Your wages go in. Shows up very clearly on accounts?---Ah hmm.

The issue we've got – and again I'll show you this document which is an updated schedule of cash payments into your account?---Yeah.

30 Commissioner, this is – hopefully you've got a copy of this. It's headed Aaron and Judy Bullock Accounts Held 1 January, 2008, November, 2014. That's the cover page. And then following on from that there is a summary of deposits into your accounts?---Yeah.

Just have a very quick look through that?---Yeah. Ah hmm.

You accept that, as you did last week, these are cash deposits into your account. Yes?---Yeah.

If you look from – you're saying the last cash deposits were put in in 2007. Is that right?---Not in total, no, no, because - - -

40 But you told us after that - - -?---Yeah, yeah.

- - - that your – it was just your - - -?---But I, I - - -

- - - wages going in?---No, I haven't finished talking yet.

Sorry. Go on?---Sorry. Um, also between 2008 and present in actual cash withdrawals out of the same St George account was \$106,540 and the reason that this is, is as I've always said to keep my overall cash balance in – or my bank account balance low. So when I took the 95 out I put \$55,000

back in between – that I had which is the spare money out of the 95,000 because I'd only put 50-odd thousand in before and also I took 106,000 out in cash in various payments. I mean, you actually haven't got on this sheet here the money that I drew out in cash. Do you have - - -

So your evidence is that there will be corresponding cash withdrawals from a St George account - - -?---Correct.

- - - that equate to payments into other accounts. Is that right?---Correct.

10

Doesn't that rather sort of negate the whole purpose of - - -?---No.

- - - keeping the money out of an account?---Because I kept a – I took two out, three in, four out, two out. Look at my account. That's what I do. That's – I'm paranoid about paying my wife – I'm – I don't object to paying child support, in no way. I've always paid it but I don't believe - - -

Your evidence is, as I understand it, you take it out of one account and put it into another. Is that right?---Correct.

20

So where is the advantage of the money not being in a bank account because it's either in one account when you draw it out and then put it into another? ---No. As, as it builds up a bit I take a bit out and then if I need – as it goes down a bit I put a bit in. It balances out. I've been through all my sheets. I've spent days upon days working it out.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: But can I just ask you, most bank accounts, the interest they give is either nothing or one per cent or something. It's not going to affect your child support?---But if you, if, if it's, it's building up. I've taken it out to spend it and then I've put more back. That's just what I've done.

30

Yes, but - - -?---I've done - - -

I'm exploring your explanation for that. Your explanation for that is you didn't want to have excess funds in your account because you'd get interest - - -?---Yeah.

- - - and then you'd have to pay more child support. Well, there are many answers to that. Some bank accounts don't pay any interest. You could've put them in a bank account that didn't pay you any interest, or the interest they pay is so small even on a fairly large amount you wouldn't be getting enough I would've thought to affect your child support payments except by a few dollars. So your explanation doesn't make much sense to me?---It may not make sense to you but that's what I did. That, that's what I've done. I mean, I was doing that – I've done that forever or ever since I've been divorced.

40

So you're saying since 2007 where you were gradually putting back in 55,000 of what you'd got out - - -?---Mmm.

- - - you'd continue to build up large sums of cash at home – by the way, where do you keep all this cash?---In a couple of places. Some is in a safe.

You have a safe at home?---Yes.

10 All right. And so you'd keep it at home and then just put it back in eventually?---Or spend it on other things.

Or spend - - -?---I guess the other thing is too – I mean, we've got our wages going in here as well that I haven't even included in - - -

Yes. But you see we don't – we're not interested in the wages because you don't get them in cash?---But that's where, that's where I - - -

I know you can take them out?--- - - - take it out.

20 But, yes, we're not - - -?---When, when I did these figures I actually have only based it on EFTPOS withdrawal. I didn't base it on payments or things I based it all on cash in, cash out to - - -

MR MARNEY: Because the, the point that I made last week – during your explanation today the point I made is still valid. There is more money being paid into your accounts in cash than can be explained by your lottery winnings and your divorce settlement. There is just more money going in - - -?---No, there's not.

30 - - - than you can account for?---No, there's not. If you – if I refer to – if you look at this spreadsheet that I've prepared, the financial status one, and you go through it you'll see that there's money going in here too to cover these plus there's a surplus of money there at the end of the spreadsheet of \$445,000.

40 So if I can summarise your, your evidence in relation to cash deposits like this you're saying there will be a balance roughly between your cash withdrawals from your St George account and your cash deposits into the family bank accounts – other family bank accounts. Is that what you're saying?---I wouldn't say there'd be a balance but there probably is a rough balance there. I mean, I mean, yeah.

In fact if you're drawing money out in cash from your St George account, spending some of it for cash purchases there should actually be less going into the accounts in cash than was drawn out, shouldn't there?---And that's true I think.

And the money that you drew out of the St George account was that purely lottery winnings or was that also your divorce settlement?---There was lottery winnings, there was – and divorce settlement. There was 54-odd thousand paid in the divorce settlement as well. That’s, that’s um, on the 18th of the 3rd, 2003. There’s 54 - - -

And you told us about that last week?---No, I told you about – no, I didn’t know that figure last week.

10 No, but you told us about the lottery winnings?---Yeah. Oh, you’re, you’re asking about another figure additional to the, the lottery winnings which is the 54,000.

Ah hmm?---With that divorce settlement figure - - -

Yeah?--- - - - which is left over from the purchase of the land and then the other – there’s the borrowings there for the um, SGE loan to build the house.

20 Ah hmm?---So that’s got a shortfall there of roughly \$100,000 which is the other \$100,000 which is – that was left from the Lotto win.

I want to move on now to issues I spoke about and the documents that we’ve come to since last week?---Ah hmm.

Can I hand up this document to you, it’s called, it’s called “Schedule C, Schedule of Delegations as at 1 July, 2012.”?---Ah hmm.

30 Just put that in front of you for the time being?---Thank you.

Now last week you accepted that you may well have breached some Mine Subsidence Board policies didn’t you?---Definitely.

But in fairness to you, you said I’m not actually 100 per cent sure what the policies were and you also said to us that you believed there was another document that you had worked off that we weren’t in possession of. Is that right?---Correct.

40 And that would seem to be borne out by the fact that nowhere was it recorded that you had a higher delegation in Tahmoor up to \$50,000. Is that right?---That’s correct.

But it was accepted that there was this delegation?---(No Audible Reply)

You mentioned a document that had been agreed at a Mine Subsidence Board district managers meeting. Is that right?---I did, yeah.

And is that that document?---No.

You said you had that document?---Yes.

Have you provided it?---Yes. Mr – I provided it to Mr Chee.

Are you in a position to provide it to the Commission?---Ah, have you got that? It's called "Infrastructure Consultants" it's headed up. It's a two-page document I think, if my memory is right.

10 Well, we'll – once that's located we can maybe have a look at that?---Yeah.

That document that you're talking about, what did that give you addition powers to do – delegations to do?---Um, as far as money, money wise as my sign-off delegation none as far as like, the \$50,000 limit. Um, it gave us delegation instead of using – getting um, three quotes to a certain figure that we only needed to get one um, or varying amounts. There's different schedules on there for different amounts.

20 And when was this document produced?---I think it was at the Wyong district meeting and it would've been in – my guess is about two to two and a half years ago roughly.

So we're talking around the 2012 time would you - - -?---Time roughly, yeah. That would be my best guess. And we were told to implement that document. I think Peter Evans, the risk engineer, spoke about it at the meeting and they said to start to use it and it'd be put in the Procedures Manual later.

30 So you were told in 2012 that it would be put in the Procedures Manual. Is that right?---Correct.

There was at this stage in 2012 an existing Procedures Manual wasn't there?---Yes.

40 Can you remember the date the new Procedures Manual was, was promulgated?---It's been – it actually hasn't been replaced in whole. It's had bits and pieces taken in and out of it all over the place and some of it I – look, I know like, even our job descriptions I don't think have been in there for about seven years. So there's, there's holes in the document I guess, if you want to call it that.

It's right that the old policy they changed things to it as the years went on? ---Yeah.

But at some stage they actually brought out a whole new document didn't they, albeit some policies from the old policy document were put in to the new policy document but there was a new document - - -?---It was all just mismatched together. I wouldn't say it was a new document. The only

thing was it used to be a paper document and it was put on electronically.
That was the main difference that I'm aware of.

The – we went through the policy document last week and you accepted that
in relation to quotes the police document says that up to \$1,500 someone
can be instructed directly from the contractor list without any formality?---
Ah hmm.

That's what the police said doesn't it?---Yes.

10

And that has been in place since January, 2005 if we look at the policy
document. Would you accept that from me?---I'd – if you say that I'd
accept that, yeah.

The policy says that up to \$5,000 one competitive tender is required. That's
right?---It you're saying that, yes.

I mean, we can go through it if you don't accept it?---No, no. Look, if – I'll
believe what you say.

20

The sum between five and \$10,000 three competitive tenders are sought?---
Ah hmm.

So that means you have to ask three companies. Do you accept that?---
Yeah.

And between 10 and \$20,000 on normal planes three competitive tenders
are required. So not do you have to ask for three competitive tenders you
actually have to receive three competitive tenders. Will you agree with
that?---Yes.

30

Okay. In Tahmoor you had an increased delegation where you could go up
to 50,000 but that wouldn't affect the policy as far as quotes is concerned
would it?---No.

No. And in fact it would make sense wouldn't it if you have to get three
quotes for the bracket 10 to \$20,000 over and above that you would have to
get three quotes as well?---Correct.

40

On the last occasion you were here you told us that there was a document
bore out the fact that you had been told up to 50,000 you could just get one
quote?---Correct.

And you say you can provide that to us today?---Yeah. Has Mr Chee found
that?

MR CHEE: Assistant Commissioner, it's - - -

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Perhaps the witness could approach Mr Chee and show him where it is. Do you have it?

MR CHEE: We are making copies at the moment.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Oh, you are making copies.

MR CHEE: Yes.

10 MR MARNEY: Thank you.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well done, Mr Chee.

THE WITNESS: Sorry, sorry, sorry.

MR CHEE: Thinking, thinking hats.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

20 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That's good. I might just mark these while we're talking about that. The Schedule C will be Exhibit C3.

#EXHIBIT C3 - SCHEDULE C SCHEDULE OF DELEGATIONS AS AT 1st JULY 2012

30 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And I think I'll make the list attached to it of cash payments which seems to be a separate issue, that will be Exhibit C4.

#EXHIBIT C4 - DOCUMENT "DARREN BULLOCK – CASH DEPOSITS TO ACCOUNTS JANUARY 2008 – NOVEMBER 2014"

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And then we'll be clear what we're asking the witness about when we come to it.

40 MR MARNEY: So that's in relation to quotes and I think we'll see this document. We can check it's either right or it's wrong?---Ah hmm.

There are very clear steps in relation to what you can do and what you can't do and that is contained in the delegation schedule isn't it?---Correct.

And there has been a delegation schedule – have you got the tender bundles in front of you there?---(not transcribable)

The two, the two bundles that we looked at last week?---No.

It the witness can just be shown those?---No.

Two please, yeah. Okay. If you can just go to page 348?---Which one am I looking in?

It will be probably be in the first one I would imagine?---Is that that one? That one. Ah hmm.

10

Now that should be headed Schedule C. Is that right?---Correct.

Okay. And it's dated 10 January, 2007?---Correct.

If you look at line 4?---Yeah.

That says "claims"?---Yes.

20

Now my understanding of your evidence last week is that is someone puts in a claim to the Mine Subsidence Board, it's initially assessed and is either accepted or rejected. Is that right?---Correct.

So if we go through working from right to left you'll see that there's a heading "DS"?---Yeah.

And that's district supervisor?---Correct.

30

So that would be the three gentlemen we spoke about last week who were working for you?---Yes.

They can't accept any claims at all can they?---No.

No. So every claim that comes into the Picton office has to be authorised as a minimum by you?---Correct.

Okay. So the next column to the left of that you'll see "DM" as the heading and that's district manager. That's you isn't it?---That's me, yeah.

40

Okay. And it says that you can accept claims up to \$20,000. Correct?---Correct.

Okay. And it says that you can accept claims up to \$20,000. Correct?---Correct.

Over that it has to be authorised by someone above you?---Yes.

And you'll see footnote 5?---Yeah.

We go down to the bottom and it says to accept only, not refuse?---Yeah.

So actually you can only accept claims, you can't refuse them. Is that correct?---Yeah. You can refuse it if it's not undermined.

Yeah. But that doesn't affect (not transcribable) Corp for our purposes. And you see the bit – the end of that sentence it says, “10,000 unless DS does report.” Do you see that?---Yes. Yes.

10 So what that means, isn't it, is if a district supervisor does the report, so goes out and does the initial assessment, you can authorise the claim up to \$10,000. That's correct, isn't it?---Correct.

And if you did the report - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - you can authorise it up to \$10,000?---Correct.

20 Over and above that you would have to get your supervisor to do it, so that was the position from January 2007?---Ah hmm.

If you go now to page 8 – you might not have it in there but 8.30, if I can tell you the position is exactly the same would you accept that that's right?---I can't see anything.

Is it not on that – just that screen.

30 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Both of our screens just flash on and off all the time, so you'll have to have it in hard copy if you want the witness to see it?---Is this, is this, is this the same as this, or - - -

No, it's - - -?---I can't, I can't read it.

MR MARNEY: Basically it's an updated policy, so it appears in the new policy manual?---How come, how come it's got the same date on it?

Because they've taken the policy from the old manual and just transferred it into the new one?---All right.

40 So that's why it's got the same date on it even though it comes in the new policy, so would you accept from me, looking at that, that the position hasn't changed?---From, from 2007?

From the – these are the – we've been provided with two policy documents, both of them the original schedule C and this is the one in the second policy document but the position hasn't changed, the delegations as far as claims are the same?---Till when, till when, though?

This is in the current policy document. We'll go onto the schedule - - -?---
That's not right.

We'll come onto that?---Yeah.

But this was the position we spoke about last week?---Yeah.

Now please look at the other document that I gave you which is C3, the one
that's just been given to you, which is schedule 3 as of 1 July 2012?---
10 That's that document?

That's right, yeah. It's not easy to read. You'll see on the left hand side
there's a heading, "Claims"?---Ah hmm.

And this appears to have been updated slightly and it says, "Claims
approved rectification."?---Yes.

And so that is if there is a house that needs repairs doing to it, this is the
delegation in relation to accepting that?---Yeah.
20

Again, working from right to left from 1 July 2012 there's been no change,
your district supervisors can't accept any claims, can they?---No, for, for –
no.

Looking at the next column to the left of that, again it's headed district
manager?---Yeah.

And you'll see that your delegation remains unchanged as far as that
column's concerned?---Yeah.
30

At \$20,000, but there are two footnotes now, five and eight. Do you see
that?---Yeah. Yes.

Unhelpfully footnote 5 is now a different footnote. No, it is the same?---
Same.

Yeah?---Yeah, the same.

So that remains unchanged. If you do the report you can only authorise it
up to \$10,000. That's right, isn't it?---Correct.
40

Okay. But then you'll see footnote 8 which includes your \$50,000
delegation in Tahmoor?---Yeah.

And that's the one you spoke about - - -?---Yeah.

--last week, so that bears out what you've said?---And my recollection of this is, too, I had that delegation before 2012. I've had that quite a long time.

Ah hmm?---So I, I don't know whether you have something different to this but I've had it more than two years, yeah.

10 The point is, though, that throughout all of the policies you are only allowed to authorise claims that you have assessed up to \$10,000. That's right, isn't it?---(No audible reply).

Well that's what it says there and you've agreed with that?---No, to accept whether report indicates - - -

Look at footnote 5?---Yeah.

To accept where report is prepared independently by DS?---Yeah, 10, yeah. Yeah, correct.

20 Otherwise the delegation is 10,000?---Yeah, correct, correct. Yeah, correct.

So throughout the entirety of that period that you've been working covered by these policies, you have to get someone else to authorise your claims over \$10,000. Has that always happened?---To the best of my knowledge, it should've.

30 So you're saying that claims over \$10,000 will always have a corresponding signature by either the CEO or the Board's engineer. Is that right?--- Hopefully, yeah.

What do you mean hopefully?---Well I'm presuming it's right, I, I can't see why it shouldn't.

If you go down that page - - -?---The only, the only, the only thing is emergency works or whatever where we've done work and, you know, it might be me flicking an email to Greg and we're going for - to do something else or there's reasons where there's not, like, a formal claim report where we had to do something along those lines, so - - -

40 Because my understanding of your evidence last week is that you said you had authorised claims over \$10,000. Is that right or not? You're saying now you've never authorised a claim over \$10,000 where you've done the report?---No, I've authorised claims over 10,000 where other people have done them or whatever, yeah.

If you go down to line 3.2 just below that?---We - are we - which one are we - - -

The same document. The same document?---Which one are we looking at?

Just stay on the same one, the one dated as of 1 July, 2012?---Yeah.

And that's headed "Open and Selective Tenders"?---Yeah.

See that?---Yeah.

10 Now this deals with who can accept tenders doesn't it?---Yes.

Other tasks including rectification works, see that line?---Yeah.

Starting from right to left, the district supervisor can accept tenders up to \$8,000 can't they?---Correct.

Go to the column to the left of that. You can accept as the district manager tenders up to \$20,000 can't you?---Fifty for Tahmoor.

20 Yeah, hold on. Let's just go with there?---Yeah. Yeah.

We'll talk about the footnotes in a second?---Yeah.

But in the normal course of events - - -?---Twenty, yeah.

Only up to 20. Then we look at footnote 5 which says the same thing, you can accept tenders up to \$10,000 if you've written the report. So the same restriction applies doesn't it to the exception of – to the accepting of tenders?---Ah hmm.

30 Okay. And then there's footnote 8 which again talks to the maximum sum in Tahmoor. So in Tahmoor it goes up to 50,000?---Yeah.

But nowhere does it say that the 50,000 limit affects the 10,000. So that \$10,000 ceiling remains whatever the level of the claim doesn't it, that's the maximum you can authorise if you've written the report?---No.

Where's the authority for that?---Can, can you just clarify the question again because - - -

40 Footnote 5 - - -?---Yeah.

- - - deals with your delegation to accept tenders if you have written the report?---Ah hmm.

Accept that?---Yeah.

And it says if you write the report the maximum tender you can accept is \$10,000. Yes?---Ah hmm.

The footnote 8 deals with the limit in Tahmoor?---Ah hmm.

So it says in Tahmoor you can accept tenders up to a value of \$50,000?---
Correct.

But it doesn't say anything about the effect if you've written the report does it?---No.

10 So it would remain the same. There is still that \$10,000 ceiling isn't there?
---No.

Where's the authority to get around that?---That's just what's been done.
That's um - - -

Do you know if there's any paperwork in relation to that?---That's just been
what's – the way it's been forever. I – it's – that's just the procedure I
guess. I don't know – I've done that over and over again. I mean – and
even when I've done even greater than that where I've sent it to the CEO
20 it's – I mean, that's just commonly – that's the way it's always been done.

The number of quotes that you get – clearly that document that you've
provided us will either clarify what you're saying or not – have there been
contracts that you've awarded to Plantac where you have only sought a
quote from them?---Um, there probably is. There's probably contractors
where I've done – where I've sought one quote from lots of people just
depending on what the amounts were, all different contractors. The amount
– the volume of jobs we do there – I mean, you've obviously seen the
amount of work that comes out of that place. It's um - - -

30 Since 2008 I think when you're – sorry, 2012 when you say that this new
tendering policy was introduced which says - - -?---Oh.

- - - you only have to get one quote?---Mmm.

How many invitations for tenders have you sent out where three quotes are
sought?---I wouldn't know off the top of my head.

40 But you're still doing it aren't you, you're still asking for three quotes on
certain jobs?---Yeah. We vary it around, yeah, depending on what it is,
yeah.

So how do you decide – if you have the authority on your account to just get
one quote up to 50,000 in Tahmoor, why do on some occasions you still
seek three quotes?---I guess it depends on the, the type of work we're going
to do. People request different people to be on the job. Um, people request
to – not to use some people on the job. It depends on if we're doing jobs in
the area is there a small job across the road and we can piggyback that on

another job that had been tendered across the road and the guys can just tie the two in (as said) jobs together. We, we do it all, all sorts of different ways. And I mean, a lot of that decision making isn't only mine. It's the district supervisors in that office's decision as well. A lot of the time I wouldn't know what they're doing as far as, you know, they – you know, as far as if they've done that.

Commissioner, now might be a good time to go through the document that Mr Bullock has handed up.

10

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR MARNEY: If I can provide – have you, have you got a copy of this document with you?---No. No. Thank you.

Commissioner, I'll tender this document as well.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: So what is, what is the nature of this document, is it something the Mine Subsidence Board has prepared?---Yes.

20

Yes. Well, the Business Management System document produced by this witness will be Exhibit C5.

**#EXHIBIT C5 - BUSINESS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM DOCUMENT
PREPARED BY THE MINE SUBSIDENCE BOARD DATED 10
APRIL 2013**

30 MR MARNEY: You spoke to us last week about your role and you spoke to us about the difference between infrastructure and residential repairs and there is a difference isn't there?---Yeah.

Because this document is headed "Consultant Infrastructure"?---Correct.

So how does this – as a document that deals with infrastructure how does it affect the way you deal with residential premises?---We were told to implement this document as far as residential as well.

40 And who gave you that instruction?---Um, Peter Evans who was the engineer, he gave a talk on it at that district meeting where all the other district supervisors and that were involved.

And was that - - -?---And - - -

- - - recorded in a minute anywhere that you know?---Hopefully it should be but I couldn't – you'd have to get the minute. I, I – it should've been.

Now you're obviously familiar with this document. Can you please take me to the part where it deals with claims up to 50,000 only being required to have one tender?---It's at the bottom. It's um - - -

Bottom of page?---Page 1.

Okay. Well, unfortunately I think we – this must be a double-sided document?---Oh, is it.

10 We've only got page 1 and 2 of 5?---Oh.

So where are you saying that the - - -?---In the table at the bottom.

Yeah?---It's got um, um, estimated cost between 30 and 50,000.

Ah hmm?---And then if, if you go along to if you can use someone off the selective tender list you just require one tender. The third line up from the bottom.

20 And what do they mean by "selective"?---Someone off our preferred tender list. Now generally our procedure at Picton offices we've been using more than that not just one.

Because if you look at paragraph 1.1 General it says "This procedure provides general guidance for the procurement of consultants associated with infrastructure"?---Correct. We were told that this document was going to be – to use this document with tender – with claims as well. That was our instruction and that it would be changed to implement that. And I can remember at the meeting everyone said that seems totally bizarre to go
30 along that format but that's what we were told to do.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: So, sorry. A consultant though means a person engaged under contract to provide specialist or professional service so the person you'd have to give the selective tender to would have to be under contract to the - - -?---Yeah, well, on that selective tender list, contract list.

They were on a pre-qualified list of suitable contractors?---Correct. Correct. And that, that list is retendered every two years roughly.

40 Right.

MR MARNEY: So you're saying Mr Evans was the one who gave you the instructions to follow?---He was the one, he's the one that gave the briefing on this at the meeting. He um, said look, this is what we're going to do and um, that meeting had all the relevant district supervisors and managers from all the offices and the Board CEO at that meeting as far as - - -

So you're saying this was across all Board offices not just in the Tahmoor region?---Correct.

Have you ever shown any favouritism to Plantac in your dealings with them as part of your role as the Mine Subsidence Board?---No, I don't believe I have.

10 If we go through Mine Subsidence Board files will we find any instances of you breaching procedure in favour of Plantac?---I really don't know. I'd have to – I don't believe so. I, I, I did a schedule which um, I haven't got with me today. I did have – had it – I know it's back in Mr Chee's office where I did a search through contractors and how many had done what jobs over a period of time from – I went back – I think I went back to – I can't remember now. I went back as far as nearly I'd worked at the Board, the last 11 years and when I did that schedule I found that I think Will Built Homes had done more jobs than anyone even though he'd been on the tender list less than anyone. Um, Plantac I think were second, and this is just off the top of my head um - - -

20 So you would accept would you not that by accepting money from Plantac that compromised your position as the person who was in charge of Mine Subsidence Board contracting in your area?---I accept that now, yes.

And that when you took that money you knew it was both wrong and in breach of Board policy?---You know, I guess at the time, you know, I'd known him a long time. It becomes something like, you know, a mate helping a mate which is wrong in the context of the government, yes.

30 When you say "mate helping a mate", what are you specifically talking about?---So it's more friendship I guess or something or whatever. I don't know.

But what I'm making is when you're saying mate helping mate, are you talking about the money he gave you, are you talking about assistance you've given to him?---No, no assistance, no. It's probably the wrong thing to say. I mean, him just helping me. I haven't given him any assistance I don't believe.

40 Have you ever provided him with advice about submitting tenders to the Board?---No.

Have you ever divulged information to him about tendering that would give him a financial or commercial advantage?---No.

Excuse me. Commissioner, thank you. At this stage I have nothing further for Mr Bullock.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR MARNEY: Thank you, Mr Bullock?---Thank you.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you want to ask anything, Mr Chee?

MR CHEE: Commissioner, I don't have any questions. Thank you.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, well, that concludes
10 your examination today, Mr Bullock. I'll just remind you again about the
non-publication order?---Yeah.

You're only allowed to discuss this matter with Mr Chee and nobody else
and it's an offence to breach that order. You understand that don't you?---I
understand that, Commissioner.

All right. Well, you're now excused and this examination is adjourned.

THE WITNESS EXCUSED

[11.30am]

20

AT 11.30AM THE MATTER WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY
[11.30AM]