

AEROPVT02332
10/02/2020

AERO
pp 02332-02347

COMPULSORY
EXAMINATION

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THE HONOURABLE PETER M. HALL QC
CHIEF COMMISSIONER

COMPULSORY EXAMINATION

OPERATION AERO

Reference: Operation E18/0093

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON MONDAY 10 FEBRUARY, 2020

AT 2.00PM

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.

MR ROBERTSON: Chief Commissioner, Mr Kenrick Cheah attends in response to the compulsory examination summons issued to him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. Mr Dixon, you appear again?

MR DIXON: Yes, I do.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I grant leave to continue to appear.

10 MR DIXON: Thanks, Chief Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Cheah, thank you, if you'd come forward. Mr Cheah, do you take an oath or an affirmation?

MR CHEAH: Affirmation, I think it is.

THE COMMISSIONER: If you wouldn't mind standing, thank you.

MR CHEAH: Sorry.

<KENRICK CHEAH, affirmed

[2.04pm]

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Dixon, is there an application?

MR DIXON: Oh, to the extent that there needs to be – I wasn't aware of the procedure there, Chief Commissioner, of whether the previous ruling that was made in the public - - -

10 THE COMMISSIONER: There was a previous declaration under section 38, was there?

MR DIXON: Yes, exactly, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. I note that Mr Cheah has given evidence in this public inquiry previously. I made an order under section 38 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act. That order will apply to the evidence to be given today by Mr Cheah. So the declaration made on the previous occasion is applicable to this hearing.

20

**COMMISSIONER'S DIRECTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF
THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION
ACT CONTINUES TO APPLY**

MR ROBERTSON: There's a question as to whether or not you make the usual section 112 direction, given that this is proceeding as a compulsory examination in private.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I will. I will also make an order as to the presence of persons. I direct that the following persons may be present at this compulsory examination – Commission officers, including transcription staff; the witness, Mr Cheah; his legal representatives, Mr Dixon and Mr Taylor. The evidence to be taken by Mr Cheah today in compulsory examination is to be given subject to an order under section 112, and I consider such an order is necessary and desirable in the public interest, and being satisfied that it is necessary and desirable in the public interest to do so, I direct pursuant to section 112 of the Independent Commission Against
40 Corruption Act that the evidence given by Mr Cheah, contents of any exhibits or contents of any documents that may be shown to him, any information that might enable him to be identified, and the fact that he 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, and in that latter respect I note that the direction may be varied or lifted by the Commission without notification if the Commission is satisfied that it is necessary or desirable to do so in the public interest.

10 **BEING SATISFIED THAT IT IS NECESSARY AND DESIRABLE IN
THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO DO SO, I DIRECT PURSUANT TO
SECTION 112 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST
CORRUPTION ACT THAT THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BY MR
CHEAH, CONTENTS OF ANY EXHIBITS OR CONTENTS OF ANY
DOCUMENTS THAT MAY BE SHOWN TO HIM, ANY
INFORMATION THAT MIGHT ENABLE HIM TO BE
IDENTIFIED, AND THE FACT THAT HE 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, AND IN THAT
LATTER RESPECT I NOTE THAT THE DIRECTION MAY BE
VARIED OR LIFTED BY THE COMMISSION WITHOUT
NOTIFICATION IF THE COMMISSION IS SATISFIED THAT IT IS
NECESSARY OR DESIRABLE TO DO SO IN THE PUBLIC
INTEREST.**

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Robertson.

MR ROBERTSON: Mr Cheah, after you gave evidence in the public inquiry before this Commission, have you undertaken any enquiries with a view to testing, confirming, or clarifying the evidence that you gave?---I don't really understand - - -

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, you'll have to keep your voice up, please.
---Sorry, I don't really understand - - -

MR ROBERTSON: After you gave evidence in the public inquiry, have you gone away and sought any documents or other information with a view to testing, confirming, or clarifying the evidence that you gave in this public inquiry?---I, I retrieved a Commonwealth Bank credit card statement to ascertain whether I went to the Coles Lane Cove that I had said in my earlier evidence, which date that was.

40 Can we have on the screen document number 2, please? Is this the first page of the document that you're referring to?---Yes.

And we can see there's some redactions on the page. Are those redactions that you made, or are they redactions that someone else made?---Ah - - -

When I say redactions, I mean the black boxes we can see on the screen.
---Yeah, I, I know, I know. Made in consultation with my legal counsel.

And if we just turn to the next page, please, do you see there we have a transaction sheet page 3 of 4 in the top right-hand corner, do you see that there?---Yes.

And we can see an entry that's highlighted about eight-tenths of the way down the page. Is that highlighting that you did or the highlight of someone else?---Highlighted by myself.

10 And you referred a moment ago to attending a Coles Supermarkets at Lane Cove. Is it consistent with your recollection that you attended that supermarket on 8 April, 2015?---I think initially in my earlier evidence to the best of my recollection, I said that it would have been the 7th, if, if we're saying that that was the day that I received the money, but - - -

Well, don't worry about the presumptions or assumptions. Can I just confirm firstly, is it consistent with your recollection that you attended the Coles Supermarket in Lane Cove on or about 8 April, 2015?---Yes.

20 And is what you're saying you're not quite sure based on your own recollection whether that occurred on the 7th, 8th, 9th, or some day around those days? Is that why you're qualifying an answer you gave to me a moment ago?---When I gave the earlier evidence I wasn't sure what day it was and that's why I sought out this document.

And having found this document is it consistent with your recollection that you attended the Coles Supermarket at Lane Cove on 8 April, 2015?---Yes, I believe so.

30 When was it that you first recalled that you attended the Coles Lane Cove Supermarket around about the time of receiving the money the subject of this public inquiry?---When did I first recollect that?

Yes, that aspect.---I've always known that I went to a Coles.

So was that something that you had recalled at the time that you first gave an interview to the Electoral Commission?---I would think so.

40 Did you say that to the Electoral Commission?---I can't remember unless you bring up the transcript of the initial interview.

But you say that it's something that was at least in your mind, something that you recalled at the time that you were first asked questions concerning the matter of donations?---Yes.

Is that right?---Yes.

And just to try and put this in the time line, are you quite clear in your mind that at the time that you attended the Coles Lane Cove Supermarket on it

seems 8 April, 2015, that you had the bag of money, the ALDI bag of money that you and I have discussed separately in your car at the same time?---I took it down with me because I didn't want to leave it in the car. That's why I remember. I left my car, took two steps, walked back to the car, took the bag because I thought if it goes missing then I'm going to be to blame, so I'd better carry it with me. That's why I have a better recollection of that.

10 So you're saying when you were at the Coles Supermarket you had an ALDI bag with you that had the cash in the bag. Is that right?---That's correct.

And is it your best recollection that that was occurring on the same day you received the ALDI bag or is it possible that it was on some other day?
---Possible that it was the day after and this document seems to corroborate that, but I know my initial evidence was that it was the first day.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: How does that work, because if the sequence is money was taken by you in a bag from the ALP head office on the 7th - - - ?---Yes, sir.

- - - but you didn't attend at the Coles Supermarket until the 8th - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - so does that mean that on the 7th you would have taken the money home in the bag, presumably what, not left it in the car but took it into your home, and then when you left your home you took the bag from wherever it was stored in your home, put it in the car - - -?---Ah hmm.

30 - - - drove to Coles Supermarket, then you got out, walked back to the car, took the bag. Is that - - -?---No, no.

No. How does it work?---So in between, so correct until the 7th, bring the money home, bring it to the house for safekeeping, next morning bring it back with me, go to work, attempt to finish what, you know, the reconciliation - - -

40 I see.--- - - - and then not finish it in time or not finish it in time perhaps before the accounting staff had left, and then once again, nowhere to put it overnight so take it home, but on the way home went to Coles, decided to carry it with me for safekeeping.

I see.

MR ROBERTSON: But it's right to say, isn't it, that your best recollection is that you had the money at home with you on one night and not two nights? Is that right?---That was my previous best recollection, yes.

Well, does that remain your best recollection or not?---It does, but I think this, I believe that this corrects that, that I may have had it for two nights.

Well, let's just be clear about what you're saying. You recall having the bag of cash at your home on at least one occasion. Is that right?---At least one occasion, yes.

You don't in your mind specifically recall seeing it on two separate nights. Is that right?---No.

10

Your best recollection is you had it home on one night and not two nights. Correct?---To qualify that, at least one night, as we said before.

Well, your best recollection is that you had it at one night and not two nights. Is that right?---I guess you, I guess so.

But is it also fair to say you're doubting that recollection now in part because of the document that is currently on the screen. Is that right? ---Right, the document which I sought out because I wasn't sure.

20

I tender the document that's on the screen, being a transaction record, page 3 of 4, I'll tender both page 1 of 4 and page 3 of 4 as provided by Mr Cheah through his solicitor.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Well, the first of those documents will be marked as Exhibit 375 and the second 376.

MR ROBERTSON: Those are two pages within the same document so it may be more - - -

30

THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, the one document. 375 then, both pages.

#EXH-375 – COMMONWEALTH BANK STATEMENT FOR PERIOD 20 MARCH 2015 TO 20 APRIL 2015 (2 PGS)

MR ROBERTSON: May it please the Commission. So just to try and understand how this fits in terms of the time line.---Yes.

40

It's your evidence, isn't it, that Mr Clements provided you with an ALDI bag that had cash in it on the same day that you saw Mr Huang Xiangmo attend NSW Labor's offices in Sussex Street. Is that right?---Yes.

You're quite clear in your mind that that happened on one and the same day, there wasn't a day that happened in between those two events, namely you seeing Mr Huang at the Sussex Street office and Mr Clements giving you the bag?---No.

Quite clear in your mind - - -?---Quite clear.

- - - that happened on one and the same day?---Same day.

On how many occasions have you seen Mr Huang Xiangmo in the Sussex Street office?---That would be the only time.

10 So on the one and only occasion that you saw Mr Huang, on that same day Mr Clements gives you the ALDI bag with cash in it. Is that right?---Yes.

And doing the best you can, what was the period of time between when you first saw Mr Huang and when Mr Clements gave you the ALDI bag?

---I think there was about 20 minutes maybe after Mr Huang had left or half an hour, within an hour at least.

20 But it's right to say, isn't it, that you didn't actually see Mr Huang carrying the ALDI bag. Is that right?---I'm not sure. I don't think I saw him carry the bag.

Well, you gave evidence to the Electoral Commission where you said it was Mr Huang who had given the money to Mr Clements and Mr Clements had given the money to you. Is that right?---I'm not clear. I can't remember what I told, what I said in the other interview.

Well, do you at least accept that when I first asked you questions about that you told me that Mr Huang gave the money to Mr Clements and Mr Clements gave the money to you?---Yes, yes, yes, yes.

30 And you were questioned further regarding those matters and I think you ultimately said you weren't actually quite sure whether Mr Huang had carried a bag, an ALDI bag or some other bag, and given it to Mr Clements. Is that right?---Because I wasn't looking at what he was carrying or not carrying.

40 No, but what I'm trying to understand is why you first told the Electoral Commission and this Commission, or at least this Commission, that it was Mr Huang who gave the money to Mr Clements. Now, it's right, isn't it, that you didn't actually see an exchange of cash as between Mr Huang and Mr Clements. Is that right?---I definitely didn't see any actual exchange of bag or cash or anything like that.

And you didn't see the cash - - -?---Because that's in the office behind me.

And you didn't see the cash itself being carried by Mr Huang or perhaps someone with Mr Huang?---That's a very difficult question to answer in terms of recollection of if I saw him carrying a bag.

But what I'm trying to test is why it was when you first were questioned by this Commission by me, why it was you said Mr Huang gave the money to Mr Clements and Mr Clements gave the money to you.---I guess at the time were quite sure that he was carrying the money to give to Jamie.

10 But on what basis did you come to that conclusion if you don't have a recollection of actually seeing a bag or seeing the cash going from Mr Huang to Mr Clements.---Not sure if I have a recollection, I guess you'd say, not that I don't, not that I can categorically say he wasn't carrying a bag or the bag, but at the time that I gave the evidence that you mentioned, obviously I must have thought he was carrying a bag or he had a bag to give to Mr Clements.

But that was evidence, the evidence I've referred to is evidence that you gave in the public inquiry. Do you agree?---Ah hmm. Yeah.

But do you agree that when - - -?---And, and the, and the previous Electoral Commission investigation too.

20 But do you agree that when you were asked some questions by Mr Clements' lawyer, Mr Clements' barrister, you made it clear that you didn't have a clear recollection in your mind of actually seeing Mr Huang or anyone with Mr Huang carrying a bag on that day? Do you recall that? ---I can't recall what I said under cross-examination.

30 Well, you at least recall, don't you, that your ultimate evidence to this Commission has been, I'm not quite sure, I'm not, I don't have a clear recollection of Mr Huang carrying a bag into the offices. Is that right? Do I have that right or do I not have that right?---I, I am quite sure that he was carrying something, the bag, but whether I can, whether I can bring it up in my head to, to see the picture of it is a different story.

And can we bring up, please, page 136 of the public inquiry transcript? Because I just want to be quite clear about what your evidence is on this particular point.---Sure.

40 And just while that's coming up and before it goes on the screen, I just want to be clear about your best recollection sitting there right now. Is it that you recall seeing or not seeing Mr Huang carry a bag when you saw him come to the Sussex Street office on the one occasion you saw him come into the Sussex Street office?---To, based on what I said earlier, he must have been carrying a bag of something for me to think that.

Well, when you say "he must have been" - - -?---Okay. I think.

- - - why do you say "he must have been"?---Sorry, sorry, sorry, oh, let me rephrase. Based on what I had given earlier in my earlier evidence, I

believe he would have been carrying something, oh, the ALDI bag that I described, to give to Jamie, who gave it to me, after the meeting.

Well, let's put your earlier evidence to one side just for a moment, and let's just focus on your best recollection sitting there now, right now. You recall in your mind, and I appreciate this is some number of years ago, but you recall in your mind seeing Mr Huang come into Sussex Street office, is that right?---Yes.

10 You're quite clear about that in your mind?---Yes.

Not a possibility of mistaken identity and it was someone else?---No.

You're - - -?---100 per cent.

You're very sure sitting there, 100 per cent sure Mr Huang came into the office, correct?---Yes.

20 On that one occasion and no other occasions?---I don't recall seeing him in the office on any other occasion.

Now, do you have any recollection of whether he was on his own, or whether he brought someone with him?---Not sure.

And do you have any recollection of whether either Mr Huang or someone with Mr Huang was carrying anything, as you saw them in the Sussex Street office? Sitting there right now.---Not sure.

30 Now, Mr Clements then gives you the ALDI bag a relatively short period of time, I think you just said within an hour, perhaps half an hour, perhaps within an hour - - -?---Something like that.

- - - of you seeing Mr Huang come into the Sussex Street office, correct?---Yes, that's correct.

And Mr Huang, I think on your evidence, disappeared behind that partition near the back of where your workstation was, correct?---When he arrived, yes.

40 When he arrived.---Yes.

But ultimately, Mr Clements comes out and comes to your workstation.---After, yeah, after Mr Huang had left.

THE COMMISSIONER: How soon after Mr Huang left?---Oh, like I said, I think, I think it was about 20 minutes, half an hour, but it would have been at least within in an hour.

MR ROBERTSON: And when that happened, was Mr Clements with anyone or was he on his own?---On his own.

And did he just give you the cash at that point in time, or did he give you something else at the same time?---My best recollection was that he gave me the bag which included the cash and the forms.

Is it possible that he didn't give you the forms immediately, and that you obtained the forms at some later stage?---No.

10

Well, how can you be so certain about that in circumstances where you've been uncertain about some other things I've been asking you about?
---Because it makes no sense to just give me a bag of money. My job is to reconcile the forms with the money.

Yes, but we've seen that the cash was not in fact banked until 9 April, 2015.
---Right.

You've seen that evidence.---Right.

20

So you at least had between 7 April and 9 April to ensure that there were forms that matched the cash, do you agree?---I received the forms the same time as the cash.

So you're quite clear in your mind - - -?---I am quite clear.

- - - that you received the forms at the same time as receiving the cash.
---Yes.

30 Is that right?---Yes.

In what form did you receive the forms? Were they in the bag, were they provided separately, were they in a separate bag? How did that happen?---I think, to the best of my recollection, they would have been in the same bag.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you say "would have", but it's important to be clear. If you don't actually recall, you should say so, rather than draw inferences. Are you following me?---Yes. I, I'm - - -

40 So you're giving evidence as to actually what you heard, what you said, what you saw.---Okay.

Now, if your recollection doesn't permit you to say, don't answer it in terms of "I would have". Do you understand?---(No Audible Reply)

So perhaps if you could put the question again.

MR ROBERTSON: I just want to be quite clear in relation to the cash and the forms. Being as precise as you can based on your recollection, in what way were you given those forms?---In the same bag.

In the same bag. Now, are you sure about that, or is that your best recollection, accepting that there may, that you may have received those forms in some other fashion?---I am sure.

10 Now, you're aware that there was evidence before the Commission that suggested that Mr Huang came into the Sussex Street office on 7 April, 2015, you're aware of that evidence?---Yes.

And you're aware that there's evidence suggesting that \$100,000 was banked on 9 April, 2015?---Yes.

20 What explanation would there be for you to receive cash and forms on 7 April, but for them to not be reconciled and banked until two days later? ---As I said in the early evidence, it takes a long time to reconcile the forms, especially when they're from ethnic functions, due to, you could have a person's business address instead of their enrolled address there. You could have their ethnic name there instead of their enrolled name or vice versa. You might have to find an ABN for a, an association.

But you didn't have to do any of those things for the particular forms that we're now talking about, did you?---I have to check them. I don't remember what was on each form, but - - -

30 Well, you'll remember, won't you, that there were 10 forms, times two parties, times \$5,000 each, equals \$100,000. Correct?---Right.

You recall that was the reconciliation exercise that you had to do between getting the cash and the forms and their being banked by the Finance Department?---Yes.

40 Well, I want to suggest to you that there's no reason why it would have taken two days for you to do what is a simple exercise of reconciling 10 times two forms, times \$5,000.---It's not a simple exercise. Like I said, it takes, it takes time to do these things properly, making sure they're right, or to the best of my ability that they're right, plus counting the money, plus the fact that I have narcolepsy, which means when I'm doing menial tasks like counting money repetitively, I often do get dozy, I doze, and I need to restart counting again.

THE COMMISSIONER: But Mr Cheah, can I just ask you, there's a lot of evidence about the fundraising activities and the processes around those, and my recollection of the evidence is that after a fundraising dinner, the practice was that the forms and any moneys, cheques and so on, were

delivered very quickly after, usually the next day.---Not always the next day.

No, but usually that was the practice, wasn't it?---It would, it would be as soon as possible from the organiser's point of view. So that, I, I, you couldn't say it's the next day, always, or, or usually - - -

So, but normally you - - -?--- - - - because often it would be within a week.

10 In this particular instance of the fundraising we're talking about - - -?---Yes.

- - - there'd be no reason why there'd be any delay in bringing the forms to head office after, the next day, would there?---Well, the rest of the money, I think, besides this money that we're talking about, came a week later.

Yes, apart from that, though. I mean, a critical part of the accounting process after a fundraiser is to get the relevant documents and cash in as soon as possible.---That's right.

20 And that more often than not was the next day after a dinner, I'm told. Is that right? Usually.---Like I said, within a week would be more realistic.

No, no, no, no. The evidence is not to that effect at all, by my recollection. It was usually the next day or, that is to say, as soon as possible - - -?---As soon as possible, yes.

- - - staff would expect to see those forms and the money.---As soon as possible, definitely.

30 And soon as possible, as a matter of practice, was usually the next day, so I'm told. Is that not right?---Not if the money is, so let's - - -

Well, why wouldn't it be the next day?---Can I give an example?

Why would it not be the next day?---May I explain? With, by way of example?

No, no, no, just listen, just stay with me, please. If you've got a fundraising dinner, you're collecting forms and money, correct?---Correct.

40

The money belongs, having been donated, to the ALP.---Correct.

So people don't just hang onto it in their own personal possession, especially because it's cash. The practice was, was it not, for the cash and the money to be delivered to the ALP head office the very next day after a dinner?---If the person who was in charge of the function who doesn't work at head office can't make it to head office the next day, then - or hasn't finished collecting the money, then it may take two days, three days.

But if the person - - -?---That's what I mean by "as soon as possible".

But if the person does work in head office, you'd expect that person to bring it back to the office the next day, wouldn't?---Yeah, if, if the person who works at head office has the money, then yes.

And the forms?---And the forms of course.

10 MR ROBERTSON: Mr Clements didn't give you the forms at the same time as the money, did he?---Yes, he did.

The forms came later, didn't they?---Not to my knowledge.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, is it possible that you - - -?---My recollection, and I'm sure, is that the forms came with the money together.

MR ROBERTSON: Well, how sure are you on that matter?---Because what he said was, "Check the forms, count the money and then bank it."

20

Well, what I want to suggest to you is that that's not right, and the reason that there was an apparent delay between 7 April, 2015 when Mr Huang appears to have attended the Sussex Street office and 9 April, 2015 when the money was banked, was that you couldn't give the money to the Finance Department immediately because you were still waiting on forms to match the money. Do you agree with that?---No, I don't.

30 Other than acquiring the bank statement that you and I discussed a moment ago, have you engaged in any other inquiries searching for documents and the like that may be of assistance to this Commission?---I don't believe so.

Well, you don't believe so or you have not?---No.

And subject to the matters that you've told us today, do you stand by the other evidence that you've given to this Commission?---Yes.

40 Since you've given evidence in the public inquiry have you become aware of any other information, whether recollections of yourself or other information of which you've become aware which may be of assistance to this Commission in its inquiries?---No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Have you had any communications with Mr Wong since - - -?---No.

- - - since you last gave evidence?---No.

MR ROBERTSON: What about with Jonathan Yee?---No.

That's the examination, Chief Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cheah, are you still with the ALP?---My position was made redundant before Christmas, so that's a no.

Sorry to hear that. Yes, Mr Dixon.

10 MR DIXON: I just have one matter in re-examination, Chief Commissioner.

MR ROBERTSON: Just before Mr Dixon does, can I just indicate one matter?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

20 MR ROBERTSON: One matter that I'll need to reflect on after today is whether the transcript of this examination be made available to interested parties. I'm likely to make a submission to you, Chief Commissioner, that that occurs. There may be a question as to whether individuals should be entitled to cross-examine Mr Cheah in relation to what's happened today. I simply raise that before Mr Dixon starts and not in any way seeking to encourage him or discourage him from asking questions, but if he does traverse a matter that hasn't already been the subject of cross-examination or hasn't already been made live in the public inquiry, that may mean that Mr Cheah will need to give evidence again in the public inquiry. To be clear, I'm not suggesting for a moment these questions shouldn't be asked and I'm not seeking to encourage it or not encourage it, but I thought it's appropriate that I should indicate that before my learned friend opens his
30 mouth.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Robertson.

40 MR DIXON: I thank Counsel Assisting. My question won't traverse those matters, if I can put it that way. Mr Cheah, you were asked a question at the end there whether other than the bank statements that you produced that have now been tendered, whether you undertook any other investigations in order to assist the inquiry. After thinking about it your answer was no. Can I ask you, did you undertake a search of, for example, your emails in order to determine where you were in the critical period in April that you've been asked questions about?---I had, I had, I had had an initial look at emails regarding what had been happening around the office at that time because there was a thank you function I think on the Thursday, and after getting the bank statement I think I rechecked those emails just to kind of piece it all together for myself.

Yes. And other than checking your emails, did you undertake any other investigations of any of your records or devices to inform you as to where

you were at the critical times?---Ah, just checking diary entries and, and, and the like via, via any paperwork I had or - - -

And did you take any steps to make the information that you uncovered in those searches available to ICAC?---I did offer a few emails to ICAC through the legal representatives, just to help, help them piece, piece the time line together as well.

Yes, thank you. That's the re-examination, thank you.

10

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Dixon. Anything else, Mr Robertson?

MR ROBERTSON: Nothing further from my point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cheah, you may step down, you're excused. Thank you.---Thank you, sir.

20

THE WITNESS EXCUSED

[2.35pm]

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Nothing else, Mr Robertson?

MR ROBERTSON: Nothing else from my point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. Then I'll adjourn.

30

AT 2.35PM THE MATTER WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY

[2.35pm]