

## submissions to royal commission

**From:** Confidential  
**To:** Contact (RCCOL) <contact@rccol.vic.gov.au>  
**Date:** Mon, 03 May 2021 19:27:44 +1000  
**Attachments:** Submission- cover-sheet\_4.pdf (711.59 kB)

Dear Sir/Madam

About 2 months ago I contacted Daniel Andrews' office to enquire about submissions to the royal commission. I did not receive any further communication from them at all.

I have just checked and saw submissions closed last week and I'm hoping you can accept my late submission.

I would like to make a public submission on my treatment by Crown 'security' and their breaches of protocol – AND their internal investigation which also was not completed to any competent standard.

Details are as follows:

### The incident

1. 1. On or around [redacted] December I entered Crown which was in a restricted capacity due to covid-19.
2. 2. I was told the entry requirement for people who have entered by need to temporarily leave to visit the ATM is to just advise security, this eliminates the need to join the lengthy line again.
3. 3. I left that day without incident.
4. 4. The next day, I visited Crown again. Entered without incident. Left the gaming floor shortly after entry to go to the ATM and told security I was visiting the ATM.
5. 5. When I returned from the ATM I was told by a very blunt security officer to line up again (there were over 50 people in the line)
6. 6. I told the new security officer that I believed that was not the process but but eventually requested management.
7. 7. When [redacted] came to the entrance to visit me, I tried to explain but he was *instantly aggressive*.
8. 8. At one stage he said words to the effect of "are you coming onto me" as if to insinuate I was being aggressive so he could be forceful
9. 9. I asked for his surname, he said words to the effect of "I'm not giving you nothing"
10. 10. He was very intimidating and I never once raised my voice, swore or gave him any reason to behave in that manner
11. 11. I have **never once** been in a fight, never once thrown a punch in my life.
12. 12. I then finally agreed to line up. I waited at the entrance for the line to go down. [redacted] did not leave and stood next to me.
13. 13. I admit I did not accept their instructions as the clarification did not make sense, nor did it align with the practice from multiple prior visits.
14. 14. I asked him "is there a problem still?"
15. 15. He said words to the effect of "for you there is. I'm refusing you entry"
16. 16. I was stunned. He went on to tell me I'm trespassing and going to be forcibly removed.
17. 17. His ally then used his radio and said words to the effect of "male refusing the leave"
18. 18. At which point I said fine, I don't want to end up dead like some other patrons who have come across crown security.
19. 19. I went to the car, sat for a moment, I was visible shaken.
20. 20. His behaviour was heavy handed, intimidating and aggressive.

### The 'investigation' into the incident

1. 1. Shortly after this incident I contacted crown to file a complaint.
2. 2. I described my treatment by [redacted]
3. 3. The complaint was handled by [redacted]
4. 4. She advised [redacted] was actually a manager. I said that is even more shocking.
5. 5. [redacted] advised me that every security office wears a recording device so she will be able to corroborate my version.
6. 6. I said that is excellent and I look forward to being advised of the outcome
7. 7. Approximately 2 months later I contacted crown again to see why the delay
8. 8. [redacted] called me and advised that [redacted] did not have his recording device on, there had been no investigation and I believe she said something about training but otherwise the matter was closed.

I believe this incident is relevant to the question of Crown being able to keep their licence. Crown is infamous for their security officers showing aggression and in one case, killing a patron who was smaller, vastly outnumbered and unarmed.

Crowns licence should also relate to public confidence and expectations. In this case I believe the community would be appalled by both the security team and the completely incompetent investigation that was done.

Thank you for reading my submission.

**Confidential**