
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER: HON. RAY FINKELSTEIN AO QC

**IN THE MATTER OF A ROYAL COMMISSION
INTO THE CASINO OPERATOR AND LICENCE**

MELBOURNE, VICTORIA

11.02 AM, FRIDAY, 25 JUNE 2021

Counsel Assisting the Commission (instructed by Corrs Chambers Westgarth as Solicitors Assisting the Commission)	MR ADRIAN FINANZIO SC
Counsel for Crown Resorts Limited	MS CATHERINE BUTTON QC
Counsel for Victorian Commission for Gambling and Liquor Regulation	MR PETER ROZEN QC
Counsel for Consolidated Press Holdings	MR OREN BIGOS QC MR NOEL HUTLEY SC MS KATHERINE BRAZENOR MR TOM O'BRIEN MS FIONA CAMERON
Counsel for the State of Victoria	MR PETER GRAY QC

11:03 1 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. It's a wonder you all stayed!
11:03 2
11:03 3 MR FINANZIO: Commissioner, during the course of our
11:03 4 examination of the witness for this morning, it's our intention to
11:03 5 go into the transcript of one of the witnesses whose evidence was
11:03 6 taken in a private hearing. Having discussed it with my learned
11:03 7 friend Mr Gray, there may be an application in relation to
11:03 8 passages. It concerns the evidence of police that was taken by
11:03 9 this Commission on 18 June 2021 and it concerns certain pages
11:03 10 of that transcript. My pages are pages 28 through 35. I think,
11:04 11 Commissioner, on your set ---
11:04 12
11:04 13 COMMISSIONER: On the running transcript pages they are?
11:04 14
11:04 15 MR FINANZIO: P-2079 to page 2086. It may be appropriate for
11:04 16 you to hear Mr Gray about those matters. There are some ways
11:04 17 in which I can ask questions which might alleviate some of your
11:04 18 concerns, but I'll let him address you on that.
11:04 19
11:04 20 COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you. Mr Gray.
11:04 21
11:04 22 MR GRAY: Thank you, Commissioner. Until a certain point
11:04 23 last week we understood that today's session was going to be
11:04 24 closed, but we now understand, Commissioner, you intend for
11:04 25 this session to be open to the public at least as much as possible.
11:04 26 I do wish to make an application on behalf of the State and in
11:04 27 particular on behalf of Victoria Police that when Mr Finanzio
11:04 28 wishes to take the witness to the transcript of 18 June, that you
11:05 29 temporarily do close the session, including closing the session to
11:05 30 accredited media.
11:05 31
11:05 32 The reason is as follows, Commissioner: Victoria police are
11:05 33 reviewing the transcript of 18 June to make a submission to you
11:05 34 about the form in which it would be available to be made known
11:05 35 to the public at large. But that process is not yet complete, there's
11:05 36 an Assistant Commissioner --- according to the approvals
11:05 37 requirements within Victoria Police --- for release of police
11:05 38 information to the public, who needs to make a decision about
11:05 39 that transcript, and she is very, very busy, including very busy
11:05 40 this morning and hasn't been able to give that final approval. It
11:05 41 places me in a difficult position.
11:05 42
11:05 43 COMMISSIONER: Almost impossible.
11:05 44
11:05 45 MR GRAY: I'm not able to do other than apply for the closing of
11:05 46 the session in the way I've suggested. If, alternatively, you wish
11:06 47 to hear me seriatim about the particular passages, I can do my

11:06 1 best. There are some arguments akin to public interest immunity
11:06 2 in support of some of them. Mr Finanzio's given me eight
11:06 3 references by page and line number --

11:06 4
11:06 5 COMMISSIONER: I see.

11:06 6
11:06 7 MR GRAY: --- to aspects of the transcript of 18 June, but there's
11:06 8 a limited utility in me doing that because those submissions won't
11:06 9 be supported by the approval process that I've ---

11:06 10
11:06 11 COMMISSIONER: I get that, or at least I understand that fully
11:06 12 and I understand your dilemma. I, when I looked at the evidence
11:06 13 not just this morning, but previously, I'll be perfectly frank about
11:06 14 this, I formed the view that there might be the odd part --- and
11:07 15 this was borderline --- where public interest immunity could
11:07 16 genuinely attach. I was concerned in a couple of places where
11:07 17 there were named individuals who had come to the attention of
11:07 18 the police for one reason or another. Even that, I was concerned
11:07 19 about whether the immunity could apply, because some of it is so
11:07 20 old that it couldn't interfere with any current investigation, or
11:07 21 seemed to me --- just reading the transcript --- it couldn't interfere
11:07 22 or disclose or make any reference to an investigation about
11:07 23 somebody else, which relates back to that person. But still, I
11:07 24 would have been cautious about allowing particular individuals'
11:07 25 names to be public if your client said that there was good reason
11:07 26 not to and explained it. But the general background information
11:08 27 ie without disclosing it, what actually happens at the casino and
11:08 28 what sounds like almost newspaper information, lots of it is
11:08 29 information that might be a surprise to many people in the public,
11:08 30 but I don't think it would be a surprise to many people who work
11:08 31 at a casino, that kind of thing. It seemed to me that that sort of
11:08 32 factual material, which I suspect is --- I don't know what page
11:08 33 references you've been given, what line numbers, but I know
11:08 34 generally the kind of evidence that's going to be looked at, and it
11:08 35 looks like it's almost public domain stuff. You get a good
11:08 36 investigative journalist and they would have written about this
11:08 37 stuff probably countless times, so that I understand from your
11:08 38 perspective your client has not had the appropriate opportunity to
11:09 39 look at the material and vet it and partly that's the Commission's
11:09 40 fault, because we did indicate that today's session was likely to be
11:09 41 in private session and I've just changed my mind about that and
11:09 42 you didn't have adequate notice, which means your client didn't
11:09 43 have adequate notice. But my reading of the transcripts indicates
11:09 44 to me that VicPol's activities are not in any way prejudiced, so I
11:09 45 think the way that we should proceed is we'll just allow the
11:09 46 evidence to proceed in the normal way; if there's a specific issue
11:09 47 about a specific sentence or specific subject matter that is risky or

11:09 1 a good chance it might be protected by immunity, we can deal
11:09 2 with it as we go on a question by question basis. And if it means
11:10 3 that there's a batch of questions that we have to deal with at the
11:10 4 end in private session --- because I don't want to interrupt --- I'd
11:10 5 rather go through it all and then if there's a bundle of questions
11:10 6 that attract the immunity or may potentially attract the immunity,
11:10 7 we'll just put them at the end, rather than --- like, we've had
11:10 8 enough interruptions already this morning --
11:10 9
11:10 10 MR GRAY: Yes, I understand.
11:10 11
11:10 12 COMMISSIONER: --- and your patience and my patience has run
11:10 13 out.
11:10 14
11:10 15 MR GRAY: I understand, Commissioner, and obviously we'll
11:10 16 just do our best and we understand the course that you've decided
11:10 17 upon. One mechanical issue is that I'm working off the
11:10 18 references Mr Finanzio gave me to the provisional transcript that
11:10 19 was provided to the parties with leave to appear, but it sounds
11:10 20 like you might have the transcript in that form.
11:10 21
11:10 22 COMMISSIONER: I don't have it, no.
11:10 23
11:10 24 MR GRAY: So we might have to ---
11:10 25
11:10 26 COMMISSIONER: If the only thing that's different is the page
11:10 27 numbering, I can work out what the first line of each page is and
11:11 28 translate it. Or, is it quite different?
11:11 29
11:11 30 MR FINANZIO: To put Mr Gray at ease, I'm working off the
11:11 31 same copy of the transcript that he's got and I've looked at your
11:11 32 running transcript --
11:11 33
11:11 34 COMMISSIONER: Yes.
11:11 35
11:11 36 MR FINANZIO: --- and I can give you the page numbers.
11:11 37
11:11 38 MR GRAY: Thanks very much.
11:11 39
11:11 40 COMMISSIONER: Thanks, Mr Gray.
11:11 41
11:11 42 Call your witness.
11:11 43
11:11 44 MR FINANZIO: Yes, we'll call Mr Craig Walsh, please.
11:11 45
11:12 46
11:12 47 **MR ROBIN CRAIG WALSH, SWORN**

11:12 1
11:12 2
11:12 3 **EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MR FINANZIO**
11:12 4
11:12 5
11:12 6 MR FINANZIO: Mr Walsh, can you tell the Commission your
11:12 7 full name, please.
11:12 8
11:12 9 A. My full name is Robin Craig Walsh.
11:12 10
11:12 11 Q. Can you tell the Commission your occupation?
11:12 12
11:12 13 A. I'm the Executive Director, Security and Surveillance.
11:12 14
11:12 15 Q. You prepared a statement in response to the Commission?
11:12 16
11:12 17 A. Yes, I did.
11:12 18
11:12 19 Q. That's dated 5 May?
11:13 20
11:13 21 A. I believe so, yes.
11:13 22
11:13 23 Q. It contains your statement in relation to facial recognition
11:13 24 technology at the casino?
11:13 25
11:13 26 A. That's correct.
11:13 27
11:13 28 Q. Are there any corrections you want to make to the
11:13 29 statement?
11:13 30
11:13 31 A. No.
11:13 32
11:13 33 Q. Do you adopt that as your evidence?
34
35 A. Yes.
36
37 MR FINANZIO: I tender that.
38
39 COMMISSIONER: Statement of Mr Craig Walsh, 5 May 2021,
40 will be Exhibit 258, thank you.
11:13 41
11:13 42
11:13 43 **EXHIBIT #RC0258 - STATEMENT OF MR ROBIN CRAIG**
11:13 44 **WALSH DATED 5 MAY 2021**
11:13 45
11:13 46
11:13 47 MR FINANZIO: You've been employed at the casino since

11:13 1 2009?
11:13 2
11:13 3 A. That's correct.
11:13 4
11:13 5 Q. In that time, you've had a number of roles starting in 2009
11:13 6 as the senior security operations manager?
11:13 7
11:13 8 A. Correct.
11:13 9
11:13 10 Q. Then general manager of security?
11:13 11
11:13 12 A. Correct.
11:13 13
11:13 14 Q. Then general manager, security and surveillance in 2013.
11:13 15
11:13 16 A. Correct.
11:13 17
11:13 18 Q. Can you just explain how the role expanded from security
11:13 19 to security and surveillance?
11:13 20
11:13 21 A. At that time, surveillance had a general manager running
11:14 22 the department, and that general manager left the business and it
11:14 23 was decided to put surveillance under mine.
11:14 24
11:14 25 Q. So you took over that role?
11:14 26
11:14 27 A. I did.
11:14 28
11:14 29 Q. You then became in 2018 Executive Director, Security and
11:14 30 Surveillance and you've held that position to the present?
11:14 31
11:14 32 A. That's correct.
11:14 33
11:14 34 Q. Can you just explain to us what the nature of the role is that
11:14 35 you have as the Executive Director, Security and Surveillance?
11:14 36 First of all, is it across all entities, or is it all premises or is it just
11:14 37 in Melbourne?
11:14 38
11:14 39 A. Just Melbourne.
11:14 40
11:14 41 Q. What is the structure of the team that you supervise?
11:14 42
11:14 43 A. So, there's two departments. Security and surveillance are
11:14 44 separate departments. Each has a director in charge.
11:14 45
11:14 46 Q. And do they each report to you?
11:14 47

- 11:14 1 A. They do. And I also have the investigations manager that
11:15 2 reports directly to me.
11:15 3
- 11:15 4 Q. So that's a third limb?
11:15 5
- 11:15 6 A. It's part of the security department, but it's the security
11:15 7 investigation unit. And each of the directors have direct reports
11:15 8 that report up through them and down, on down to security
11:15 9 officers and surveillance operators.
11:15 10
- 11:15 11 Q. And do you directly report to?
11:15 12
- 11:15 13 A. The CEO, Xavier Walsh.
11:15 14
- 11:15 15 Q. You report to him as the CEO --- you report to Xavier
11:15 16 Walsh now in his capacity as the CEO?
11:15 17
- 11:15 18 A. That's correct.
11:15 19
- 11:15 20 Q. In the past, you reported directly to the COO, didn't you ---
11:15 21 that was the way the structure worked?
11:15 22
- 11:15 23 A. That's correct, when there was a group COO.
11:15 24
- 11:15 25 Q. The group COO, the COO for most of the last decade has
11:15 26 been Xavier Walsh?
11:15 27
- 11:15 28 A. That's correct.
11:15 29
- 11:15 30 Q. So you've been directly reporting to Xavier Walsh for pretty
11:15 31 much the last ten years or so? I think you started in 2013, that
11:15 32 might be a bit long?
11:16 33
- 11:16 34 A. Yeah, I was going to say, about six or seven years or so.
11:16 35
- 11:16 36 Q. Before you went to Crown, you were a commissioned
11:16 37 officer of Victoria Police?
11:16 38
- 11:16 39 A. That's correct.
11:16 40
- 11:16 41 Q. You served for 24 years in a variety of roles?
11:16 42
- 11:16 43 A. I did.
11:16 44
- 11:16 45 Q. You started out as a general uniform police officer?
11:16 46
- 11:16 47 A. That's correct.

11:16 1
11:16 2 Q. You spent some time at the St Kilda CIB?
11:16 3
11:16 4 A. Correct.
11:16 5
11:16 6 Q. For a time you were with the Armed Robbery Squad --
11:16 7
11:16 8 A. That's correct.
11:16 9
11:16 10 Q. --- before it was disbanded?
11:16 11
11:16 12 A. Yes.
11:16 13
11:16 14 Q. You were then at the Homicide Squad?
11:16 15
11:16 16 A. I was.
11:16 17
11:16 18 Q. Then, the Armed Defenders Squad?
11:16 19
11:16 20 A. Yes, which was an iteration, I suppose the new iteration of
11:16 21 the Armed Robbery Squad.
11:16 22
11:16 23 Q. And then the Special Operations Group?
11:16 24
11:16 25 A. That's correct.
11:16 26
11:16 27 Q. Finally, before leaving the police force you were in the
11:16 28 Media Unit and in the Operational Safety Division?
11:17 29
11:17 30 A. That's correct.
11:17 31
11:17 32 Q. What was your rank when you left police?
11:17 33
11:17 34 A. I was an inspector.
11:17 35
11:17 36 Q. That is, your policing career involved a very wide range of
11:17 37 policing experience, didn't it?
11:17 38
11:17 39 A. It did.
11:17 40
11:17 41 Q. So at the SOG level or Special Operations Group level, is it
11:17 42 fair to say that unit or that group engaged in almost, in highly
11:17 43 dangerous environments?
11:17 44
11:17 45 A. That's correct.
11:17 46
11:17 47 Q. Sometimes combat-like operations?

- 11:17 1
11:17 2 A. That's correct.
11:17 3
11:17 4 Q. Which is a very physically and mentally demanding role?
11:17 5
11:17 6 A. Yes.
11:17 7
11:17 8 Q. What was your role in the Special Operations Group?
11:17 9
11:17 10 A. I was a tactical team leader, and then was promoted to one
11:17 11 of the Senior Sergeants, Senior Sergeants Training Operations,
11:18 12 and I performed Acting Inspector roles in there, as well. So
11:18 13 essentially I led teams on high-risk arrest scenarios and
11:18 14 counter-terrorism operations.
11:18 15
11:18 16 Q. At the other end, the Homicide Squad experience that
11:18 17 you've had is a more --- is a role that involves careful, painstaking
11:18 18 investigation.
11:18 19
11:18 20 A. That's correct.
11:18 21
11:18 22 Q. Assessment and analysis of available facts?
11:18 23
11:18 24 A. Correct.
11:18 25
11:18 26 Q. Intelligence?
11:18 27
11:18 28 A. Correct.
11:18 29
11:18 30 Q. The development of theories about what's going on?
11:18 31
11:18 32 A. Yes.
11:18 33
11:18 34 Q. Interviewing witnesses and suspects?
11:18 35
11:18 36 A. That's correct.
11:18 37
11:18 38 Q. It's also a highly complex and human-charged environment
11:18 39 investigating in the homicide context, isn't it?
11:18 40
11:18 41 A. Yes, it is.
11:18 42
11:18 43 Q. That's not to diminish the work that you've had, the work
11:19 44 that you or the experience that you gained in the armed robbery
11:19 45 squad or St Kilda CIB, but if I take those two areas of your
11:19 46 policing career as bookends, you've effectively done everything
11:19 47 that could be done as a police officer in this State?

11:19 1
11:19 2 A. At the operational end.
11:19 3
11:19 4 Q. At the operational level?
11:19 5
11:19 6 A. Yes, yes.
11:19 7
11:19 8 Q. Short of becoming inspector sitting behind a desk, you've
11:19 9 done everything operational?
11:19 10
11:19 11 A. I did a little bit of that.
11:19 12
11:19 13 Q. I was just about to say, actually my question wasn't quite
11:19 14 right, you were in the Media Unit for a bit?
11:19 15
11:19 16 A. I was, yes, that's right.
11:19 17
11:19 18 Q. Did that role involve you in assisting police and developing
11:19 19 communications?
11:19 20
11:19 21 A. It did.
11:19 22
11:19 23 Q. In the Operational Safety Division, I'm not sure what that
11:19 24 role involved?
11:19 25
11:19 26 A. That looked at developing training and running training for
11:19 27 the State's 13,000, 12,000 operational police members. So
11:19 28 firearms training and hands-on training.
11:19 29
11:19 30 Q. Right. From all of your experience, I suspect you'd agree
11:20 31 with me if I said policing at any level is about discipline first?
11:20 32
11:20 33 A. That's correct.
11:20 34
11:20 35 Q. It's about good structures?
11:20 36
11:20 37 A. Yes.
11:20 38
11:20 39 Q. And it's about those two things assist you in the
11:20 40 organisation of a large force?
11:20 41
11:20 42 A. That's correct.
11:20 43
11:20 44 Q. To act in unison, engagements, operations or the like.
11:20 45
11:20 46 A. Yes.
11:20 47

11:20 1 Q. That kind of background holds you in good stead to manage
11:20 2 a very large team like that at the casino, doesn't it?
11:20 3
11:20 4 A. I'd say yes.
11:20 5
11:20 6 Q. It's also the type of police work that you've done over time
11:20 7 makes you, it would be right to describe you as an "experienced
11:20 8 investigator".
11:20 9
11:20 10 A. Yes.
11:21 11
11:21 12 Q. Your vintage --- and I don't mean --- your vintage is similar
11:21 13 to that of current high-serving police, isn't it?
11:21 14
11:21 15 A. That's correct.
11:21 16
11:21 17 Q. You came through the academy with me of them?
11:21 18
11:21 19 A. I did.
11:21 20
11:21 21 Q. Some are still good friends?
11:21 22
11:21 23 A. Yes.
11:21 24
11:21 25 Q. With whom you still associate professionally?
11:21 26
11:21 27 A. Correct.
11:21 28
11:21 29 Q. And socially?
11:21 30
11:21 31 A. Correct.
11:21 32
11:21 33 Q. It's a valuable thing, isn't it, for someone in your position to
11:21 34 have that kind of understanding of police?
11:21 35
11:21 36 A. Yes.
11:21 37
11:21 38 Q. And even current police thinking?
11:21 39
11:21 40 A. Yes.
11:21 41
11:21 42 Q. You also have a Churchill Fellowship?
11:21 43
11:21 44 A. I do.
11:21 45
11:21 46 Q. What was that for?
11:21 47

11:21 1 A. It was for research into tactical unit selection and less lethal
11:21 2 munitions.
11:21 3
11:21 4 Q. I didn't quite hear you.
11:21 5
11:21 6 A. Sorry. Tactical unit selection, so how you select people to
11:22 7 go into a sort of a high-level elite unit and, also, less lethal
11:22 8 munitions.
11:22 9
11:22 10 Q. So, as I understand it, that work was about you travelling
11:22 11 overseas to visit other units and other entities overseas to develop
11:22 12 knowledge and understanding about how you select the best
11:22 13 people for the role?
11:22 14
11:22 15 A. That's correct.
11:22 16
11:22 17 Q. You have a number of formal qualifications: Master of
11:22 18 Education; Master of Public Policy and Administration; Graduate
11:22 19 Diploma of Administration (With Distinction); Diploma of
11:22 20 Security Risk Management; and a Bachelor of Science?
11:22 21
11:22 22 A. That's right.
11:22 23
11:22 24 Q. How big is your team at Crown?
11:22 25
11:22 26 A. I think there's around 600 with both departments again,
11:23 27 600-plus people.
11:23 28
11:23 29 Q. The Commission has had an opportunity to undertake an
11:23 30 inspection. You said before the team is divided into security and
11:23 31 surveillance. How many in each team?
11:23 32
11:23 33 MS BUTTON: Commissioner, I might just rise at this point.
11:23 34 There may come a point where Mr Walsh giving specific
11:23 35 numbers would need to be subject to a non-publication order and
11:23 36 cutting the livestream because of some security aspects that might
11:23 37 be misused by the wrong elements, if they knew exactly how
11:23 38 many people sit in which seats on which side of the surveillance
11:23 39 and security division. If I might leave it to Mr Walsh to alert the
11:23 40 Commission, if a point is reached where that becomes an issue, I
11:23 41 wanted to foreshadow it to the Commission.
11:23 42
11:23 43 COMMISSIONER: Okay.
11:23 44
11:23 45 MR FINANZIO: Okay, we'll trust you to tell us if we're
11:23 46 disclosing, by your evidence, information that might compromise
11:23 47 you, but can we start with the security side? The security side of

11:24 1 the business, how many --- what are the different roles that sit
11:24 2 underneath the security director?

11:24 3

11:24 4 A. There's senior operations manager, operations managers,
11:24 5 frontline managers, security service managers, and then we get
11:24 6 into the security officers.

11:24 7

11:24 8 Q. So the security officers are the, if I can use common
11:24 9 parlance, you probably wouldn't describe them in this way,
11:24 10 they're the people on the floor, I might call them a "bouncer"?

11:24 11

11:24 12 A. It's not a term I like, but yes that's correct.

11:24 13

11:24 14 Q. And they report up to a level and then there's another level
11:24 15 above them --

11:24 16

11:24 17 A. That's correct.

11:24 18

11:24 19 Q. --- and then they report to the director and then to you?

11:24 20

11:24 21 A. That's correct.

11:24 22

11:24 23 Q. And on that side of the business I'm assuming, there are a
11:24 24 number of those people?

11:24 25

11:24 26 A. That's correct.

11:24 27

11:24 28 Q. That's the biggest side of the exercise?

11:24 29

11:24 30 A. Yes.

11:24 31

11:24 32 Q. And they are connected into the surveillance operations by
11:25 33 audio, wireless pieces that they can listen to security people
11:25 34 sitting in the surveillance section; is that right?

11:25 35

11:25 36 A. That's correct.

11:25 37

11:25 38 Q. On the other side of the business, or on the other side of the
11:25 39 structure that you oversee, there is a surveillance section?

11:25 40

11:25 41 A. There is, yes.

11:25 42

11:25 43 Q. Can you describe how that works? I'll ask you to do that in
11:25 44 other words and that way you won't share with us anything, and I
11:25 45 won't ask you anything that you don't want to share, and then if
11:25 46 there are any gaps I'll ask you and you can tell me then.

11:25 47

11:25 1 A. Sorry, there's two rooms. One of the rooms is the
11:25 2 surveillance communication centre, which essentially manages all
11:25 3 of our responsive tasks. That is, emergency response, removals,
11:25 4 intoxications, fights, those types of issues. And there's a monitor
11:26 5 room in the surveillance area, which I'm not sure whether you
11:26 6 saw that downstairs, Mr Commissioner, but that looks after
11:26 7 gaming integrity and cash movement. So, they look after the
11:26 8 integrity of the game, disputes in the games that are being played,
11:26 9 those types of issues. And both rooms are supported by the
11:26 10 surveillance analyst section and the surveillance analysts
11:26 11 essentially are a proactive group of highly-skilled people that
11:26 12 look at --- they conduct proactive investigations into cheating and
11:26 13 advantage play and all of those types of things.

11:26 14

11:26 15 Q. If I can come back to that analyst role, how long has the
11:26 16 analyst role been in place?

11:26 17

11:26 18 A. I think around 2011 perhaps, 2010.

11:26 19

11:26 20 Q. That proactive investigation involves reviewing old
11:27 21 footage, for example?

11:27 22

11:27 23 A. It does.

11:27 24

11:27 25 Q. And analysing the way that games are played?

11:27 26

11:27 27 A. That's correct.

11:27 28

11:27 29 Q. And presumably looking at not only the way games are
11:27 30 played, but the nature of the people involved in the games?

11:27 31

11:27 32 A. That's correct.

11:27 33

11:27 34 Q. So that you might see a person playing poker, or some
11:27 35 game in the casino on a number of different occasions and a
11:27 36 pattern might form about their behaviour and the analysts look at
11:27 37 that?

11:27 38

11:27 39 A. Yes.

11:27 40

11:27 41 Q. And they might prepare for that purpose a brief to you that
11:27 42 would ultimately come up to you --- am I getting this right?

11:27 43

11:27 44 A. Yes.

11:27 45

11:27 46 Q. --- that would ultimately come up to you to make a
11:27 47 recommendation about how that might be dealt with?

- 11:27 1
11:27 2 A. Yes.
11:27 3
11:27 4 Q. What are some of the things that might happen as a result of
11:27 5 that?
11:27 6
11:27 7 A. We may ban a person, a patron. We may exclude a patron.
11:28 8
11:28 9 Q. Would that be a WOL?
11:28 10
11:28 11 A. It's a WOL, yes, withdrawal of licence. We may exclude
11:28 12 someone if it's got to do with gaming integrity. We may take
11:28 13 action against our staff if our staff are involved. So, that would
11:28 14 include HR and, depending on the nature of the incident, Victoria
11:28 15 Police.
11:28 16
11:28 17 Q. How did you come to work at Crown?
11:28 18
11:28 19 A. I got to a stage in my career where I thought it's now or
11:28 20 never. Either I stay in and basically spend my career as a police
11:28 21 officer, or I challenge myself and get out and see if I can survive
11:28 22 in the real world, so to speak.
11:28 23
11:28 24 Q. Were you approached?
11:28 25
11:28 26 A. No, I wasn't. I applied for it. I applied for a couple of
11:28 27 different roles, but that was one that I applied for.
11:28 28
11:29 29 Q. I see. Can I just ask you, in terms of your role over time
11:29 30 and the scope of it, it's always been focused on Melbourne?
11:29 31
11:29 32 A. Correct. I might just add to that. During the development
11:29 33 of Sydney, we had some interaction in terms of design of camera
11:29 34 locations and entrances and those sorts of things, but primarily
11:29 35 focussed on Melbourne.
11:29 36
11:29 37 Q. Does the security and surveillance team provide security
11:29 38 and surveillance services to the board?
11:29 39
11:29 40 A. Not often.
11:29 41
11:29 42 Q. When it does, what does it do?
11:29 43
11:29 44 A. Can provide advice, can provide escorts at annual general
11:29 45 meetings ---
11:30 46
11:30 47 Q. To directors, in particular?

11:30 1
11:30 2 A. Directors, yes.
11:30 3
11:30 4 Q. Say, for example, when the directors are travelling, or?
11:30 5
11:30 6 A. Not usually when they're travelling, no.
11:30 7
11:30 8 Q. Just bear with me for one second. Now, I want the
11:30 9 Commission to get an understanding of the committee structure,
11:30 10 the different committees that you participate in. What
11:30 11 committees have you participated in while you've been at Crown?
11:30 12
11:30 13 A. I was a member --- I can't recall the name of it now. It was
11:30 14 the Risk Committee which was restructured some time ago, a
11:31 15 couple of years ago, when Anne Siegers joined the ---
11:31 16
11:31 17 Q. So before Anne Siegers joined, you were ---
11:31 18
11:31 19 A. I was a member of the --- it may have been called the
11:31 20 Operational Risk Committee, the Emergency Planning
11:31 21 Committee. The Persons of Interest Committee.
11:31 22
11:31 23 Q. Yes. Is it right that you reported into those committees
11:31 24 from your experience and from your work as executive director
11:31 25 or general manager ---
11:31 26
11:31 27 A. Yes.
11:31 28
11:31 29 Q. And to each of the members --- and is it also right that you
11:31 30 reported directly to your immediate superiors, the COO, the other
11:31 31 Mr Walsh?
11:31 32
11:31 33 A. Yes.
11:32 34
11:32 35 Q. On a more frequent basis?
11:32 36
11:32 37 A. Yes, I did, yes. I see what you mean, yes.
11:32 38
11:32 39 Q. If something important occurred outside the committee
11:32 40 meetings you would directly report to him?
11:32 41
11:32 42 A. I had fortnightly meetings with Mr Walsh generally.
11:32 43
11:32 44 Q. Fortnightly meetings with him ---
11:32 45
11:32 46 A. Yes.
11:32 47

- 11:32 1 Q. --- but also free communication between you, because --- if
11:32 2 things emerged that you thought he needed to know about?
11:32 3
- 11:32 4 A. Yes.
11:32 5
- 11:32 6 Q. And if you thought he needed to know about something,
11:32 7 you would tell him?
11:32 8
- 11:32 9 A. Yes.
11:32 10
- 11:32 11 Q. So if someone was caught cheating at poker, or a staff
11:32 12 member was caught --- well, let's start with that as an example. If
11:32 13 you had discovered someone cheating through the intelligence
11:32 14 function, you would report that up?
11:32 15
- 11:32 16 A. I would eventually. It depends on the nature of the
11:32 17 offending, but yes.
11:32 18
- 11:32 19 Q. If you'd discovered a staff member who was cheating, of
11:32 20 course, you would report that up?
11:33 21
- 11:33 22 A. Yes.
11:33 23
- 11:33 24 Q. He would be the person that you would report to directly
11:33 25 about those matters?
11:33 26
- 11:33 27 A. Correct.
11:33 28
- 11:33 29 Q. I want to touch on, again in a bit more detail now, the
11:33 30 nature of the security and surveillance function that you have
11:33 31 there at Crown. It really is, isn't it, the first line of defence for
11:33 32 Crown to be able to see everything that is going on in the casino?
11:33 33
- 11:33 34 A. Yes.
11:33 35
- 11:33 36 Q. You'd agree with me that it's an important way to keep
11:33 37 customers safe?
11:33 38
- 11:33 39 A. Yes.
11:33 40
- 11:33 41 Q. And that's important for the business and its reputation?
11:33 42
- 11:33 43 A. Yes.
11:33 44
- 11:33 45 Q. Because no one really wants to come into a rugged place?
11:33 46
- 11:33 47 A. I'd agree with that.

- 11:33 1
- 11:34 2 Q. It involves the security and surveillance function enables
11:34 3 you to understand and respond to the types of risk that might
11:34 4 emerge on the casino floor?
11:34 5
- 11:34 6 A. Yes.
11:34 7
- 11:34 8 Q. And, there are different types of risks that emerge on the
11:34 9 casino floor that the security arm need to respond to
11:34 10 immediately?
11:34 11
- 11:34 12 A. Yes.
11:34 13
- 11:34 14 Q. So if you've got a drunk person in a bar cutting up rough,
11:34 15 you need to get security to them relatively quickly?
11:34 16
- 11:34 17 A. Yes.
11:34 18
- 11:34 19 Q. And if you like, the eyes in the sky help you see that and
11:34 20 understand what kind of response is required?
11:34 21
- 11:34 22 A. Yes.
11:34 23
- 11:34 24 Q. It also helps, it also protects the gaming licence too, doesn't
11:34 25 it, in this way; it helps you identify if there is any criminal
11:34 26 activity occurring on the site?
11:35 27
- 11:35 28 A. Yes.
11:35 29
- 11:35 30 Q. So, if you see people trading drugs, that's something you'd
11:35 31 want to be on straight away?
11:35 32
- 11:35 33 A. Yes.
11:35 34
- 11:35 35 Q. You wouldn't want to put the business in a position where
11:35 36 the place got a reputation for permitting that type of activity to
11:35 37 occur, because that would put the casino in many difficulty with
11:35 38 the police and put the licence at risk?
11:35 39
- 11:35 40 A. Yes.
11:35 41
- 11:35 42 Q. Also put your own reputation at risk?
11:35 43
- 11:35 44 A. Yes.
11:35 45
- 11:35 46 Q. But you need to be on the lookout for that activity so that
11:35 47 you can respond in a timely way?

- 11:35 1
11:35 2 A. Yes.
11:35 3
11:35 4 Q. Before things get out of hand?
11:35 5
11:35 6 A. If that's possible, yes.
11:35 7
11:36 8 Q. Now, touching on the video surveillance function, that
11:36 9 gathers information in a real-time, it gathers information that's
11:36 10 being reviewed by operators in real-time, doesn't it?
11:36 11
11:36 12 A. Correct.
11:36 13
11:36 14 Q. They're on the lookout for excluded people, whether
11:36 15 self-excluded or excluded, by force of the Commissioner's
11:36 16 exclusion?
11:36 17
11:36 18 A. Yes, if they're well-known, yes.
11:36 19
11:36 20 Q. Well, now I understand that there is facial recognition
11:36 21 technology at the casino.
11:36 22
11:36 23 A. Yes.
11:36 24
11:36 25 Q. That makes it easier?
11:36 26
11:36 27 A. Yes.
11:36 28
11:36 29 Q. But before, in addition to people on the ground, the
11:36 30 surveillance people would be on the lookout for those people?
11:36 31
11:36 32 A. Yes.
11:36 33
11:36 34 Q. The difficulty that they might have in the absence of facial
11:37 35 recognition technology is they would have to know what the
11:37 36 excluded people look like?
11:37 37
11:37 38 A. Yes.
11:37 39
11:37 40 Q. And be able to make that judgment on a TV screen
11:37 41 remotely and then pass on the information to someone on the
11:37 42 ground?
11:37 43
11:37 44 A. Yes, or they might let security know to go and speak to that
11:37 45 person.
11:37 46
11:37 47 Q. You now have facial recognition capability ---

11:37 1
11:37 2 A. Yes.
11:37 3
11:37 4 Q. --- and that's happened iteratively over the last few years?
11:37 5
11:37 6 A. Yes.
11:37 7
11:37 8 Q. How extensive is that coverage?
11:37 9
11:37 10 A. There's 80 cameras, 80 facial recognition cameras
11:37 11 positioned around the property.
11:37 12
11:37 13 Q. Perhaps if I ask it in a different way. Is the casino covered
11:37 14 completely by cameras with facial recognition technology?
11:37 15
11:37 16 A. No.
11:38 17
11:38 18 Q. Is the casino covered totally by cameras, whether they're
11:38 19 facial recognition technology or not?
11:38 20
11:38 21 A. There are still blind spots there, but generally, yes.
11:38 22
11:38 23 Q. But they're relatively few, aren't they?
11:38 24
11:38 25 A. Yes, there's --- yes.
11:38 26
11:38 27 Q. Would you agree with me that the blind spots exist where
11:38 28 there's very low risk of anything occurring?
11:38 29
11:38 30 A. Yes.
11:38 31
11:38 32 Q. I'm not going to ask you where the blind spots are, because
11:38 33 I think Ms Button might stand up and object or you'll say that you
11:38 34 don't want to say. And, is it right that the facial recognition
11:38 35 technology with the 84 cameras that are now in place, cover
11:38 36 pretty much everywhere where someone would need to go to
11:38 37 either enter the casino or walk through the main gaming areas?
11:38 38
11:38 39 A. Yes.
11:38 40
11:38 41 Q. Even without facial recognition technology, that is, before
11:39 42 the period that facial recognition technology came into effect, the
11:39 43 surveillance capability was state-of-the-art, wasn't it? It's been
11:39 44 described by senior police who've given evidence here as "elite".
11:39 45
11:39 46 A. It was, it was great coverage, but it was an analogue
11:39 47 system. We've only recently transitioned to a full IP digital

11:39 1 system which is if it was --- well, I describe it this way, if it was
11:39 2 good before, it's very good now. So it's better than anything else
11:39 3 you would see around this State or country perhaps.
11:39 4
11:39 5 Q. Tell me the point in time when it stopped being --- it's
11:39 6 digital now?
11:39 7
11:39 8 A. Yes.
11:39 9
11:39 10 Q. It was analog?
11:39 11
11:39 12 A. Yes.
11:39 13
11:39 14 Q. When did it become digital?
11:39 15
11:39 16 A. That project has been ongoing for a number of years now.
11:40 17 We're only right now finishing off that project.
11:40 18
11:40 19 Q. So when did the project start?
11:40 20
11:40 21 A. I'm going to say probably about 2010/11, something like
11:40 22 that, in terms of scoping out what needed to be done and how it
11:40 23 was to be done and the main part of the project has occurred over
11:40 24 the last couple of years, and now we need to replace all of the
11:40 25 cameras which is, there's 4,500 cameras there, so.
11:40 26
11:40 27 Q. Can I ask you this: it's not like the digital technology was
11:40 28 only invented a few years ago; when was the first time that you
11:40 29 began to look at digital technology as a replacement for the
11:40 30 analog system?
11:40 31
11:40 32 A. I think that was underway already, or the plans were
11:40 33 underway when I took over surveillance.
11:40 34
11:41 35 Q. So it could have been the transition, it's fair to say to digital
11:41 36 technology could have happened a lot faster than ten years?
11:41 37
11:41 38 A. Yes.
11:41 39
11:41 40 Q. But when do you say digital technology could have been
11:41 41 deployed in the casino at its earliest time?
11:41 42
11:41 43 A. Well, I understand that we had some digital cameras when I
11:41 44 did take over back in 2013, so I think they were moving that way
11:41 45 then. It perhaps could have happened earlier than that.
11:41 46
11:41 47 Q. No, but what I'm getting at is, when do you say digital

11:41 1 technology as a technology in the casino could have first been
11:41 2 deployed?
11:41 3
11:41 4 A. Oh, my field of expertise isn't in that area. It's got to be
11:41 5 earlier ---
11:41 6
11:41 7 Q. It is or it isn't. You said to me a moment ago that it could
11:41 8 have been deployed earlier in the casino --
11:41 9
11:41 10 A. Yes.
11:41 11
11:41 12 Q. --- and I'm asking you as the head of security, involved in
11:42 13 security for the casino and I'm sure, involved in scoping out the
11:42 14 works over the journey, when do you think it could have been
11:42 15 done?
11:42 16
11:42 17 A. Probably 2010, 2009.
11:42 18
11:42 19 Q. Why wasn't it done, then?
11:42 20
11:42 21 A. I can't tell you.
11:42 22
11:42 23 Q. You no doubt, though, made recommendations when you
11:42 24 came along to the casino in those early years about how the
11:42 25 surveillance system could be improved?
11:42 26
11:42 27 A. Yes, I took advice from my technical section around that --
11:42 28
11:42 29 Q. Yes.
11:42 30
11:42 31 A. --- and we, like all the other departments, we apply for
11:42 32 capex, capital expenditure --
11:42 33
11:42 34 Q. Capital expenditure.
11:42 35
11:42 36 A. --- and we put a technological plan together, you know, in
11:42 37 terms of --- I think it was a 5-year plan.
11:43 38
11:43 39 Q. And that's very early on in your tenure?
11:43 40
11:43 41 A. Yes, I believe so. Yes.
11:43 42
11:43 43 Q. Would this be a fair summary: you arrived at the casino and
11:43 44 it's still operating analog and you know the digital technology's
11:43 45 out there. Correct?
11:43 46
11:43 47 A. Yes.

- 11:43 1
11:43 2 Q. And your first observation was, "Why aren't we using the
11:43 3 best technology available?"
11:43 4
11:43 5 A. I think I was aware when I first came into the role that we
11:43 6 were in the process of moving that way, but it was a --- I want to
11:43 7 say "piecemeal", it wasn't piecemeal, it was a planned approach
11:43 8 spaced out over a number of years.
11:43 9
11:43 10 Q. A planned approach that's happened slowly?
11:43 11
11:43 12 A. Yes.
11:43 13
11:43 14 Q. Could have happened a lot quicker if the business had
11:43 15 decided to spend the money on that technology?
11:43 16
11:43 17 A. Yes.
11:43 18
11:43 19 Q. It's right, isn't it, that the staff who --- without asking you
11:44 20 the numbers, you have sufficient numbers of staff in the
11:44 21 surveillance section in front of the screens watching what's going
11:44 22 on to keep areas of the casino properly surveilled?
11:44 23
11:44 24 A. Yes.
11:44 25
11:44 26 Q. Do you think there could be more, or are you comfortable
11:44 27 with the level of staffing?
11:44 28
11:44 29 A. It could always be more.
11:44 30
11:44 31 Q. What demand isn't being presently met?
11:44 32
11:44 33 A. I think you can put it in the general premise that the more
11:44 34 you look, the more you will find.
11:44 35
11:44 36 Q. Could you put it this way: if you're not interested in finding
11:44 37 then you don't have to look so hard?
11:45 38
11:45 39 A. If that was the case, yeah, I'd agree with that proposition,
11:45 40 but that's certainly not the case.
11:45 41
11:45 42 Q. Sure. But the levels of staffing in your department are not
11:45 43 decided by you ultimately, are they?
11:45 44
11:45 45 A. No, they're not.
11:45 46
11:45 47 Q. They're decided by who?

11:45 1
11:45 2 A. The executive, which would be CFO, the CEOs.
11:45 3
11:45 4 Q. COO, CFO, COO?
11:45 5
11:45 6 A. Yes.
11:45 7
11:45 8 Q. They're all above your station?
11:45 9
11:45 10 A. They are, correct.
11:45 11
11:45 12 Q. Have you made applications to them or made submissions
11:45 13 to them in the past about increasing the level of staffing in the
11:45 14 surveillance area?
11:45 15
11:45 16 A. Yes.
11:45 17
11:45 18 Q. And have they always agreed to increase the level of
11:45 19 staffing?
11:45 20
11:45 21 A. No.
11:45 22
11:45 23 Q. How understaffed, as compared with what you've applied
11:45 24 for, are you presently?
11:45 25
11:45 26 A. Just trying to think back. I think we'd applied for another
11:45 27 four or five over the journey, maybe more.
11:46 28
11:46 29 Q. Another four or five?
11:46 30
11:46 31 A. Yes, full-time staff in the sort of general surveillance area,
11:46 32 yes.
11:46 33
11:46 34 Q. Does that present the position now and over time from the
11:46 35 time you've been involved?
11:46 36
11:46 37 A. No. We've managed to get some increases along the way.
11:46 38
11:46 39 Q. So, if I ask you this: when you first started, was the
11:46 40 deficiency in staff that you identified more than four or five?
11:46 41
11:46 42 A. No, I think as we grew and as we developed, as our
11:46 43 requirements there was a --- I saw a need to ask for more staff,
11:46 44 you know, for where we end up operationally, I thought it would
11:46 45 be better to have additional staff there.
11:46 46
11:46 47 Q. You see, one of the important things about the surveillance

- 11:47 1 function for the casino is that it's kind of a --- it's kind of an
11:47 2 insurance policy in a sense, in that if there's an incident at the
11:47 3 casino, it's able to record visually what happened?
11:47 4
11:47 5 A. Yes.
11:47 6
11:47 7 Q. And that can be if a staff gets into a scuffle with someone,
11:47 8 there'll be accurate footage that can eliminate some doubt about
11:47 9 what might have happened?
11:47 10
11:47 11 A. That's correct.
11:47 12
11:47 13 Q. It's also important in maintaining --- it's also incredibly
11:47 14 important in helping police when called upon?
11:47 15
11:47 16 A. That's correct.
11:47 17
11:47 18 Q. And also to undertake your own investigations of staff?
11:47 19
11:47 20 A. That's correct.
11:47 21
11:47 22 Q. You have in the past caught croupiers and dealers cheating
11:47 23 in combination with third parties?
11:47 24
11:47 25 A. Yes.
11:47 26
11:47 27 Q. You've picked them up signalling, I think?
11:47 28
11:47 29 A. Yes.
11:48 30
11:48 31 Q. And you've, in substance, detained them?
11:48 32
11:48 33 A. Yes.
11:48 34
11:48 35 Q. And interviewed them?
11:48 36
11:48 37 A. Yes.
11:48 38
11:48 39 Q. Indeed, I think the interview was the subject of a decision
11:48 40 in the Court of Appeal?
11:48 41
11:48 42 A. Yes, we're now investigating officials.
11:48 43
11:48 44 Q. You interviewed them in a dedicated interview room;
11:48 45 correct?
11:48 46
11:48 47 A. Yes, we did --- sorry, one. They've only got one interview

11:48 1 room, the others were in separate offices.
11:48 2
11:48 3 Q. So, that was an example where the cameras were able to
11:48 4 identify a card cheat --
11:48 5
11:48 6 A. Yes.
11:48 7
11:48 8 Q. --- and a staff member complicit in that cheating?
11:48 9
11:48 10 A. There were four patrons and --- correction, three patrons
11:48 11 and a dealer.
11:48 12
11:48 13 Q. And a dealer?
11:48 14
11:48 15 A. Yes.
11:48 16
11:48 17 Q. You were able to use that surveillance technology to
11:49 18 identify who they were?
11:49 19
11:49 20 A. Yes.
11:49 21
11:49 22 Q. To bring them in for questioning?
11:49 23
11:49 24 A. Yes.
11:49 25
11:49 26 Q. You interrogated them and obtained from them
11:49 27 confessions, or admissions?
11:49 28
11:49 29 A. I think two of them confessed.
11:49 30
11:49 31 Q. Ultimately those admissions were ruled inadmissible,
11:49 32 weren't they?
11:49 33
11:49 34 A. Yes, they were.
11:49 35
11:49 36 Q. But nonetheless, leaving aside the intricacies of that case, it
11:49 37 was a very efficient system that enabled you to be able to be right
11:49 38 on top of that situation?
11:49 39
11:49 40 A. Yes.
11:49 41
11:49 42 Q. And you may have put in place systems to avoid the
11:49 43 outcome that arose in the Court of Appeal since --
11:49 44
11:49 45 A. Yes, we have.
11:49 46
11:49 47 Q. --- but nothing about the surveillance system that was in

11:49 1 place needed to be altered, because it worked perfectly well?
11:50 2
11:50 3 A. It did.
11:50 4
11:50 5 Q. It's also helpful, the surveillance system, in dealing with
11:50 6 Responsible Service of Alcohol matters, isn't it?
11:50 7
11:50 8 A. Correct.
11:50 9
11:50 10 Q. One of the things that's observed by the Sixth Review of the
11:50 11 casino is how good the management is of RSA at the casino by
11:50 12 the VCGLR. Are you aware of that?
11:50 13
11:50 14 A. Yes, yes ---
11:50 15
11:50 16 Q. You are --- sorry, were you going to say something?
11:50 17
11:50 18 A. I was going to say the RSA team do report through to the
11:50 19 security management.
11:50 20
11:50 21 Q. I was just about to say --- you are in charge of that, aren't
11:50 22 you?
11:50 23
11:50 24 A. That's correct, yes.
11:50 25
11:50 26 Q. You run the committees, you chair the committee meetings
11:50 27 or the subcommittee meetings of RSA?
11:50 28
11:50 29 A. Yes, yes.
11:50 30
11:50 31 Q. And, it's fair to say, you run a very tight ship?
11:51 32
11:51 33 A. Well, we try to, yes.
11:51 34
11:51 35 Q. It's right, isn't it, that from the perspective of any licenced
11:51 36 venue in the State, keeping patrons behaving well is incredibly
11:51 37 important to the reputation of the business?
11:51 38
11:51 39 A. Yes.
11:51 40
11:51 41 Q. And the relationship with law enforcement?
11:51 42
11:51 43 A. Yes.
11:51 44
11:51 45 Q. It's also right that you show very low tolerance for poor
11:51 46 behaviour at the casino?
11:51 47

- 11:51 1 A. Yes.
- 11:51 2
- 11:51 3 Q. The casino, if it got the reputation of being, I think I said
- 11:51 4 before, a rugged place or a rough place, from a liquor licensing
- 11:52 5 perspective, that would put the liquor licence at risk, wouldn't it?
- 11:52 6
- 11:52 7 A. Yes.
- 11:52 8
- 11:52 9 Q. And you'd also agree with me that a way to avoid that is to
- 11:52 10 make sure not only that you can respond to situations as they
- 11:52 11 arise --- that's one thing ---
- 11:52 12
- 11:52 13 A. Yes.
- 11:52 14
- 11:52 15 Q. --- it gives you the surveillance capacity to do that, but
- 11:52 16 another way to avoid those things occurring at the casino is to
- 11:52 17 make sure that patrons know what to expect when they go. By
- 11:52 18 reputation.
- 11:52 19
- 11:52 20 A. Yes, yes.
- 11:52 21
- 11:52 22 Q. So that if you run a tight ship from a security point of view,
- 11:52 23 patrons generally attend knowing that if they do misbehave, the
- 11:52 24 security team will capture them? The surveillance cameras will
- 11:52 25 capture them and the security officers will be on the situation
- 11:52 26 straight away?
- 11:52 27
- 11:52 28 A. Yes, trying to prevent any misbehaviour before it happens.
- 11:52 29
- 11:52 30 Q. That's right, and you do that in a polite way. Correct?
- 11:52 31
- 11:52 32 A. Yes.
- 11:53 33
- 11:53 34 Q. But you're consistent in your approach?
- 11:53 35
- 11:53 36 A. Yes.
- 11:53 37
- 11:53 38 Q. And where the rules are clear ---
- 11:53 39
- 11:53 40 A. Yes.
- 11:53 41
- 11:53 42 Q. --- and they're enforced?
- 11:53 43
- 11:53 44 A. Yes.
- 11:53 45
- 11:53 46 Q. This is a huge venue that you look after, isn't it?
- 11:53 47

- 11:53 1 A. Yes, it is.
11:53 2
11:53 3 Q. And staff resourcing to monitor that behaviour is
11:53 4 important?
11:53 5
11:53 6 A. It is.
11:53 7
11:53 8 Q. How many security staff do you have on the floor at any
11:53 9 one time?
11:53 10
11:53 11 A. On a Saturday night, peak night, it can be anything up to
11:53 12 170.
11:53 13
11:53 14 Q. 170?
11:53 15
11:53 16 A. Yes. Depending on what functions are going on and the
11:53 17 nightclubs and various other events taking place, but it could be
11:53 18 up to there. New Year's Eve is more than that.
11:54 19
11:54 20 Q. I now just want to ask you some questions about the
11:54 21 process. If surveillance personnel see an incident in real-time,
11:54 22 they record that incident, don't they?
11:54 23
11:54 24 A. If they are monitoring it, it will be recording, yes.
11:54 25
11:54 26 Q. Yes, so am I right that the surveillance works in both
11:54 27 directions? So, take the first example. Someone on the floor will
11:54 28 say, will send a message through --- correct me if I get the
11:54 29 technology wrong here, I could be totally wrong ---
11:54 30
11:54 31 A. Sure.
11:54 32
11:54 33 Q. --- but send a message to the surveillance team, "This is
11:54 34 going on over here," then the cameras, if they're not looking, get
11:54 35 down and look at exactly what's going on, who's there and what's
11:54 36 going on?
11:54 37
11:54 38 A. Correct.
11:54 39
11:54 40 Q. Is that connectivity confined to just the security people?
11:55 41
11:55 42 A. No.
11:55 43
11:55 44 Q. So, other staff members can call you up and say, "Hey,
11:55 45 there's a thing going on" ---
11:55 46
11:55 47 A. Yes.

11:55 1
11:55 2 Q. And then the cameras go over?
11:55 3
11:55 4 A. Yes.
11:55 5
11:55 6 Q. So the staff people include RSG, Responsible Service of
11:55 7 Gaming people?
11:55 8
11:55 9 A. Yes.
11:55 10
11:55 11 Q. But they also include people on the gaming floor, like
11:55 12 people in the gaming division on the gaming floor?
11:55 13
11:55 14 A. Yes.
11:55 15
11:55 16 Q. They also include people at reception at the different
11:55 17 gaming rooms?
11:55 18
11:55 19 A. Yes.
11:55 20
11:55 21 Q. So the Teak Room or the Mahogany Room, and they also
11:55 22 include other staff members including hosts?
11:55 23
11:55 24 A. Yes.
11:55 25
11:55 26 Q. VIP hosts?
11:55 27
11:55 28 A. Yes.
11:55 29
11:55 30 Q. International VIP hosts?
11:55 31
11:55 32 A. Yes.
11:55 33
11:55 34 Q. So there's a network of people on the ground who are
11:55 35 feeding information back to surveillance?
11:55 36
11:55 37 A. Yes.
11:55 38
11:55 39 Q. There is also surveillance generally looking that might feed
11:55 40 information back out to security to respond to a situation that
11:56 41 surveillance itself has picked up?
11:56 42
11:56 43 A. Yes.
11:56 44
11:56 45 Q. If the incident comes to their attention, they can go back
11:56 46 over the footage and review it, can't they?
11:56 47

- 11:56 1 A. Yes.
- 11:56 2
- 11:56 3 Q. But the footage doesn't last forever?
- 11:56 4
- 11:56 5 A. It does not, you're right.
- 11:56 6
- 11:56 7 Q. Am I right that it writes over itself on a loop?
- 11:56 8
- 11:56 9 A. Yes, that's my understanding, yes.
- 11:56 10
- 11:56 11 Q. Over how many days?
- 11:56 12
- 11:56 13 A. Currently 14 days. Except for the nightclubs, which is 30, I
- 11:56 14 believe.
- 11:56 15
- 11:56 16 Q. Except for the?
- 11:56 17
- 11:56 18 A. Nightclubs, which is 30 days.
- 11:56 19
- 11:56 20 Q. If an incident is captured, that footage would be saved?
- 11:56 21
- 11:56 22 A. Yes.
- 11:56 23
- 11:56 24 Q. Other than there being an incident, there's no reason to
- 11:56 25 capture the footage and save it?
- 11:56 26
- 11:56 27 A. Correct.
- 11:57 28
- 11:57 29 Q. You would keep footage of exclusions that were captured?
- 11:57 30
- 11:57 31 A. Yes.
- 11:57 32
- 11:57 33 Q. And incidents resulting in WOLs?
- 11:57 34
- 11:57 35 A. Yes.
- 11:57 36
- 11:57 37 Q. And people being identified who were either excluded or
- 11:57 38 had a Withdrawal of Licence being identified on the premises?
- 11:57 39
- 11:57 40 A. Yes.
- 11:57 41
- 11:57 42 Q. They would be retained?
- 11:57 43
- 11:57 44 A. Yes.
- 11:57 45
- 11:57 46 Q. I just want to ask you some questions about the staff that
- 11:57 47 you have. They're very diligent staff, aren't they? Most of them

11:57 1 are ex-police; is that right? When I say "most of them", at the
11:58 2 senior levels, the direct reports to you and in the surveillance
11:58 3 team?
11:58 4
11:58 5 A. Neither of the directors are ex-police, but some of the
11:58 6 operations managers, the senior operations manager on the
11:58 7 security side, one of the operations managers, the investigations
11:58 8 officer, they're all ex-Victoria Police.
11:58 9
11:58 10 Q. Going back to your Churchill Fellowship before, you pick
11:58 11 your own staff?
11:58 12
11:58 13 A. It's a competitive process, but yes, we do.
11:58 14
11:58 15 Q. But you choose?
11:58 16
11:58 17 A. Yes.
11:58 18
11:58 19 Q. And you choose on the basis that they are extremely good
11:58 20 at their job in identifying activities that are going on in the
11:58 21 casino; that they have the skillset?
11:58 22
11:58 23 A. It's hard to know if they don't work for you already, but you
11:59 24 ---
11:59 25
11:59 26 Q. I get the impression from you Mr Walsh that if they did
11:59 27 start working for you and they weren't very good they wouldn't
11:59 28 last very long?
11:59 29
11:59 30 A. That might be the case.
11:59 31
11:59 32 Q. Might be?
11:59 33
11:59 34 A. Well, we try and coach people to get to a standard that we
11:59 35 find appropriate. But we hold people accountable and make no
11:59 36 apologies for that.
11:59 37
11:59 38 Q. When they are reviewing in real-time, or looking back, they
11:59 39 rely among other things, what they're looking for when they're
11:59 40 reviewing among other things is suspicious activity.
11:59 41
11:59 42 A. If I can explain it this way, in surveillance there is a risk,
11:59 43 there is a monitoring log and it's based on risk. So, there's a
11:59 44 whole --- as you would appreciate --- there's many different
11:59 45 functions across the casino from hotels to valet parking to
11:59 46 high-end action in salons. There's a range of different things,
12:00 47 different areas that would have their own respective risk rating

12:00 1 attached to them. So there's a monitoring schedule, if you like,
12:00 2 and if it's a high-risk activity it would get monitored more often
12:00 3 and longer than a low-risk activity, if that makes sense.

12:00 4

12:00 5 Q. Yes. So that's the length of time being monitored.

12:00 6

12:00 7 A. Yes.

12:00 8

12:00 9 Q. Is it also right to say that the more senior or better staff
12:00 10 would be assigned the task of looking at the more high-risk
12:00 11 things? Or is that just wrong?

12:00 12

12:00 13 A. Well, it generally comes down to the operations manager in
12:00 14 the surveillance rooms to apportion the tasks of the shift out to
12:00 15 who they see, to people's strengths.

12:00 16

12:00 17 Q. But I'm not wrong, am I, the highest risk to the business
12:00 18 achieves the highest level of observation, or highest amount of
12:01 19 time of observation?

12:01 20

12:01 21 A. Yes.

12:01 22

12:01 23 Q. And the best staff?

12:01 24

12:01 25 A. Well, you would have in the ---

12:01 26

12:01 27 Q. Highly capable?

12:01 28

12:01 29 A. Yes, you would have oversight by the operations manager
12:01 30 on the shift in those areas.

12:01 31

12:01 32 Q. It's always been part of the security operations, the SOPs,
12:01 33 the security operations protocols, that security staff be on the
12:01 34 lookout for suspicious activity?

12:01 35

12:01 36 A. Absolutely, yes.

12:01 37

12:01 38 Q. And you want people who are alert to possible criminal
12:01 39 activity, you don't want people who don't know what they're
12:01 40 looking for or looking at?

12:01 41

12:01 42 A. That's correct.

12:01 43

12:01 44 Q. You engage them often because they have a police
12:01 45 background, or some skills that enable them to be able to do that
12:01 46 in that surveillance role?

12:01 47

12:01 1 A. There aren't --- there have been people in our surveillance
12:02 2 department who've gone on to be police. I don't believe we have
12:02 3 anyone who is ex-police in the surveillance department right
12:02 4 now, or generally they haven't had a policing background. They
12:02 5 generally come from gaming, or since I've been there we've taken
12:02 6 them from outside as well, outside the --- Crown. If they've got
12:02 7 the capability, we believe we can teach them.
12:02 8
12:02 9 Q. Let's go back a step. I understand that in the past you have
12:02 10 had police there, ex-police?
12:02 11
12:02 12 A. On the security side?
12:02 13
12:02 14 Q. Yes.
12:02 15
12:02 16 A. Not on surveillance, sorry.
12:02 17
12:02 18 Q. I see. And, is it right that on the security side, which
12:02 19 includes as a part of it the investigations side, that you have
12:02 20 ex-police in that role?
12:02 21
12:02 22 A. Yes.
12:02 23
12:02 24 Q. And you, in the training that you do for your team, try to
12:03 25 make them alert to the types of things they'd need to be looking at
12:03 26 to be able to be suspicious of criminal activity?
12:03 27
12:03 28 A. Yes. That would be correct.
12:03 29
12:03 30 Q. I want to ask you now some questions about the evolution
12:03 31 of the facial recognition technology, if that's okay.
12:03 32
12:03 33 At this point, Commissioner, Mr Walsh's statement is only very
12:03 34 short, I'm sure you've read it. I'm not going to take him to it in
12:03 35 too much detail, but I will ask you some questions about the
12:03 36 content of it.
12:03 37
12:03 38 That's an incredibly important tool, isn't it, the facial
12:04 39 recognition technology ---
12:04 40
12:04 41 A. Yes.
12:04 42
12:04 43 Q. --- to be able to identify excluded people in particular?
12:04 44
12:04 45 A. Yes.
12:04 46
12:04 47 Q. You said in your statement that Crown didn't have facial

12:04 1 recognition technology until early 2018.
12:04 2
12:04 3 A. No, no, that's not correct, I'm sorry.
12:04 4
12:04 5 Q. Let me go back a step. It commenced trialling technology
12:04 6 in 2017?
12:04 7
12:04 8 A. We commenced trialling facial recognition, I think, in
12:04 9 about 2010/11.
12:04 10
12:04 11 Q. So, in your statement --- I may have got this wrong --- in
12:04 12 your statement at paragraph 8:
12:04 13
12:04 14 *..... Crown consulted widely and subsequently*
12:04 15 *conducted small-scale trials of single camera systems on*
12:04 16 *the property during 2012.*
12:05 17
12:05 18 A. That would be right, yes.
12:05 19
12:05 20 Q. And then in 2014, two FR products were assessed.
12:05 21 Following on from that trial, a proof of concept utilising three
12:05 22 facial recognition cameras was conducted at the entry to the Teak
12:05 23 Room in January 2017. In December 2017, 12 cameras were
12:05 24 installed at the entrances of the gaming floor with a significant
12:05 25 amount of success.
12:05 26
12:05 27 So the trials commenced in 2012, but the facial
12:05 28 recognition technology didn't come onstream in the
12:05 29 context of a trial until, a proper trial until the
12:05 30 beginning of 2017.
12:06 31
12:06 32 A. Yes.
12:06 33
12:06 34 Q. That trial involved only three cameras?
12:06 35
12:06 36 A. It was in the Teak Room and we were using it to --- if I can
12:06 37 put it this way, there wasn't a lot of belief in facial recognition
12:06 38 technology even as late as 2017, so ---
12:06 39
12:06 40 Q. So when you say "belief", you mean belief in the business,
12:06 41 belief by the business in facial recognition technology?
12:06 42
12:06 43 A. I think broadly, because everyone assumed that we had
12:06 44 facial recognition and had it for a long time. Everyone assumed
12:06 45 that in the industry, when you went to Vegas, that they all had
12:06 46 facial recognition. They didn't, and hadn't had it there. Macau
12:06 47 was the first --- it was the Melco Casino in Macau that trialled it

12:06 1 first in, I think, 2015 or 2016, they went with a Cognitech system,
12:07 2 which is one of the system we trialled, and that was the first
12:07 3 successful trial that I was aware of. They use it a little bit
12:07 4 differently than what we use it. So there still wasn't a wide belief
12:07 5 in the efficacy of facial recognition in a casino environment.

12:07 6

12:07 7 Q. When were facial recognition cameras first introduced? Or,
12:07 8 let's just go through, as I understand the numbers. 12 cameras
12:07 9 were introduced in 2017, in December 2017.

12:07 10

12:07 11 A. Yes.

12:07 12

12:07 13 Q. The trial was in January and 12 cameras were introduced in
12:07 14 December.

12:07 15

12:07 16 A. Yes.

12:07 17

12:07 18 Q. In 2018, 57 cameras were added.

12:07 19

12:07 20 A. Yes.

12:07 21

12:07 22 Q. When were facial recognition cameras first introduced into
12:07 23 the Mahogany Room?

12:08 24

12:08 25 A. I believe they were part of that larger tranche of cameras in,
12:08 26 I think you said 2018?

12:08 27

12:08 28 Q. Yes.

12:08 29

12:08 30 A. So down ---

12:08 31

12:08 32 Q. Believe, or no?

12:08 33

12:08 34 A. I think that was the case.

12:08 35

12:08 36 Q. All right, and what about in the salons and the VVIP
12:08 37 rooms? They were the last to be fitted out, weren't they?

12:08 38

12:08 39 A. Yes, I believe so. So it was either 2018 or 2019.

12:08 40

12:08 41 Q. Yes. I'm right that the salons were the last to be fitted out?

12:08 42

12:08 43 A. That's my understanding, yes.

12:08 44

12:08 45 Q. The high-roller rooms?

12:08 46

12:08 47 A. Correct.

12:08 1
12:08 2 Q. You may have answered this a minute ago and I need to put
12:08 3 this to you: it's fair to say that facial recognition technology has
12:08 4 been around a lot earlier than 2017?
12:09 5
12:09 6 A. Yes.
12:09 7
12:09 8 Q. I mean, from the mid-2000s, facial recognition technology
12:09 9 has been in use in different spaces.
12:09 10
12:09 11 A. Arguably not successfully. I'm sorry, can I just explain
12:09 12 that?
12:09 13
12:09 14 Q. Sure.
12:09 15
12:09 16 A. So, there's the facial recognition where you turn up at the
12:09 17 airport coming back into the country. You walk up and you stand
12:09 18 there and it's a one-to-one match. So, your face matches the face
12:09 19 on the passport one-to-one. In a casino environment it's
12:09 20 one-to-many. So, I'm not sure whether you've ever been to
12:09 21 Crown on a Saturday night, but there's like a river of people
12:09 22 coming in. You're trying to match a database of, say, 20,000
12:09 23 people against, or images against all of those people coming in
12:09 24 continually. So it's a very different proposition, and that's why, I
12:10 25 think, it took a while to --- for people to believe that it could be
12:10 26 installed successfully.
12:10 27
12:10 28 Q. Other casinos around the world had deployed technology
12:10 29 before 2017, hadn't they? It's not like there wasn't technology
12:10 30 that was deployed that was already in existence?
12:10 31
12:10 32 A. It wasn't widely deployed. I think everyone thinks it would
12:10 33 have been. There were certainly trials going on, and as I said, in
12:10 34 Macau there was certainly a successful deployment of a system,
12:10 35 facial recognition system.
12:10 36
12:10 37 Q. And that was successful in 2016?
12:10 38
12:10 39 A. I think that's about --- I think that's right.
12:10 40
12:10 41 Q. Trialled in 2015, successful in 2016?
12:10 42
12:10 43 A. Possibly.
12:10 44
12:10 45 Q. What I'm suggesting to you is that Crown was a pretty slow
12:10 46 starter in getting itself into the space of facial recognition
12:11 47 technology.

12:11 1
12:11 2 A. It could have been quicker.
12:11 3
12:11 4 Q. A lot quicker. Put it this way, let's just go through it. It's
12:11 5 identified as something that should be explored in 2012.
12:11 6
12:11 7 A. Yes.
12:11 8
12:11 9 Q. It's further identified as something that should be scoped
12:11 10 out in 2014.
12:11 11
12:11 12 A. Yes.
12:11 13
12:11 14 Q. In 2015/16, Melco at Macau, which is known to Crown,
12:11 15 deploys the facial recognition software technology. Correct?
12:11 16
12:11 17 A. Yes.
12:11 18
12:11 19 Q. In 2017, at the beginning of 2017 you do a trial with three
12:11 20 cameras in the Teak Room only.
12:11 21
12:11 22 A. Yes.
12:11 23
12:11 24 Q. The three cameras is all you do, is all Crown does until
12:11 25 December that same year where only a further 12 cameras are
12:11 26 deployed. Correct?
12:11 27
12:11 28 A. Yes.
12:11 29
12:11 30 Q. And, 54 cameras, so not the full complement, are then
12:12 31 deployed iteratively over the period of 2018?
12:12 32
12:12 33 A. Yes.
12:12 34
12:12 35 Q. It's right, isn't it, that the trials in relation to facial
12:12 36 recognition software or facial recognition technology were very
12:12 37 successful at Crown ---
12:12 38
12:12 39 A. Yes.
12:12 40
12:12 41 Q. --- when they were finally deployed?
12:12 42
12:12 43 A. Yes.
12:12 44
12:12 45 Q. From very early on you were getting 75, 80 per cent
12:12 46 success rate?
12:12 47

12:12 1 A. I was comfortable with it, yes.
12:12 2
12:12 3 Q. So what you were really doing was sharpening a pencil on a
12:12 4 pencil that was already sharpened, delaying putting that facial
12:12 5 recognition --- when I say "you", I'm saying Crown.
12:12 6
12:12 7 A. Yes, I understand what you're saying.
12:12 8
12:12 9 Q. Can I suggest to you that you would have been very keen to
12:12 10 see facial recognition technology employed a lot earlier than it
12:13 11 was?
12:13 12
12:13 13 A. Yes.
12:13 14
12:13 15 Q. And am I right in saying that you also made those views
12:13 16 known to your supervisor, your immediate report?
12:13 17
12:13 18 A. Yes.
12:13 19
12:13 20 Q. And, you're aware that those views were made known to
12:13 21 the board?
12:13 22
12:13 23 A. Yes.
12:13 24
12:13 25 Q. And the reason your views were not acted upon was based
12:13 26 on capital expenditure?
12:13 27
12:13 28 A. That's my understanding, yes.
12:13 29
12:13 30 Q. Let me set the context for you. In 2019, there were some
12:13 31 newspaper articles about activities at Crown that ultimately ---
12:14 32 and then there was the announcement of the Bergin Inquiry, and
12:14 33 then the Bergin Inquiry commenced.
12:14 34
12:14 35 A. Yes.
12:14 36
12:14 37 Q. You're familiar with the background ---
12:14 38
12:14 39 A. Yes.
12:14 40
12:14 41 Q. --- obviously. And it's right that in that period after those
12:14 42 things occurred, there were some --- Deloitte's were engaged and
12:14 43 you met with Deloitte's to talk about junkets, in particular.
12:14 44
12:14 45 A. I don't recall it being specifically around junkets, I thought
12:14 46 it was around the POI process and I thought it was more of a
12:14 47 broader discussion than just junkets.

12:14 1
12:14 2 Q. But you recall being interviewed by ---
12:14 3
12:14 4 A. Yes, I do.
12:14 5
12:14 6 Q. And you participated in the interview freely?
12:14 7
12:14 8 A. Yes, I did.
12:15 9
12:15 10 Q. The interview, as I understand it, was conducted over Zoom
12:15 11 or Skype or some such technology? I think it was in the middle
12:15 12 of COVID. Or was it in person?
12:15 13
12:15 14 A. I'm not sure. My recollection ---
12:15 15
12:15 16 Q. It's all a blur to me, too, 2020.
12:15 17
12:15 18 A. I kind of think it was in person, but I might be wrong.
12:15 19
12:15 20 Q. Do you know whether it was recorded?
12:15 21
12:15 22 A. I don't believe so. Obviously I've seen the notes that were
12:15 23 made, yes.
12:15 24
12:15 25 Q. Did you see them recently?
12:15 26
12:15 27 A. Yes, I did.
12:15 28
12:15 29 Q. Had you seen them before?
12:15 30
12:15 31 A. No, I had not.
12:15 32
12:15 33 Q. When you read the notes, the --- I'm conscious that the
12:15 34 notes weren't prepared by you, but when you read the notes do
12:15 35 you agree that they broadly capture the views that you expressed?
12:16 36
12:16 37 A. Yes, I mean there's some inaccuracies there, but broadly I
12:16 38 think the sentiment captured the correct.
12:16 39
12:16 40 Q. The note captures some language which seems
12:16 41 idiosyncratic, it seems like what the recorder of the notes is trying
12:16 42 to do is capture the way you were speaking to her and capture
12:16 43 your sentiments.
12:16 44
12:16 45 A. Yes, I'd agree with that.
12:16 46
12:16 47 Q. Do you agree that the notes captures the sentiments of what

12:16 1 you were explaining to her, even if the exact words might be
12:16 2 different?

12:16 3

12:16 4 A. Yes, I think there's some context missing around it, but
12:16 5 other than that, I think the sentiment's accurate.

12:16 6

12:16 7 Q. I'd like to take you to that note, and that's behind --- let me
12:16 8 just see. That is behind Commissioner your tab 32. And it is
12:17 9 DTT.001.0002.0382. I'm going to jump around in the note a little
12:17 10 bit just because I don't want to take you through it and read it out
12:17 11 line by line. Could you go to the second page of that note,
12:17 12 operator, which is --- this interview was concerned with --- and
12:18 13 perhaps it's useful to show the witness the first page again.

12:18 14

12:18 15 Sorry, operator, could you just scroll up to the top of the first
12:18 16 page? See how it says "Junkets due diligence and persons of
12:18 17 interest process review", it kind of covered both areas, didn't it?

12:18 18

12:18 19 A. Yes.

12:18 20

12:18 21 Q. I want to ask you some questions about junkets, but also
12:18 22 about POI due diligence as well.

12:18 23

12:18 24 A. Yes.

12:18 25

12:18 26 Q. If you go to the bottom of the second page, in the second
12:18 27 last paragraph you say there:

12:18 28

12:18 29 *As far as junkets go, generally dealt with misbehaviour of*
12:18 30 *various members of junket groups. Could be physical.*

12:18 31

12:18 32 Do you see that?

12:18 33

12:18 34 A. Yes.

12:18 35

12:18 36 Q. Can you give us some examples of that?

12:19 37

12:19 38 A. Oh, brawls, fights on the gaming floor, in salons.
12:19 39 Disagreements, those types of issues.

12:19 40

12:19 41 Q. Treatment of staff?

12:19 42

12:19 43 A. Yes.

12:19 44

12:19 45 Q. When I say "treatment of staff", rough handling of staff?

12:19 46

12:19 47 A. I'm just trying to think. If we're talking about physicality

12:19 1 ---

12:19 2

12:19 3 Q. Yes.

12:19 4

12:19 5 A. --- I'm just thinking of one incident where there was a
12:19 6 sexual assault. I wasn't quite sure whether that was a junket ---

12:19 7

12:19 8 Q. Is this the one in the elevator?

12:19 9

12:19 10 A. Yes.

12:19 11

12:19 12 Q. I'm going to come to that one.

12:19 13

12:19 14 A. Okay.

12:19 15

12:19 16 Q. But I did want to ask you about someone being physically
12:20 17 aggressive with staff, a junket player being physically aggressive
12:20 18 with staff, or someone associated with a junket being ---

12:20 19

12:20 20 A. Yes, yes.

12:20 21

12:20 22 Q. Examples of that?

12:20 23

12:20 24 A. I couldn't give you a specific one, but I would certainly say
12:20 25 that had occurred.

12:20 26

12:20 27 Q. It would be right, wouldn't it, that that kind of behaviour ---
12:20 28 that is physical aggression, including assault, even minor assault
12:20 29 --- is pretty unacceptable behaviour?

12:20 30

12:20 31 A. It's totally unacceptable.

12:20 32

12:20 33 Q. That would ordinarily, on the gaming floor, downstairs,
12:20 34 anywhere, result in "You're out"?

12:20 35

12:20 36 A. Yes.

12:20 37

12:20 38 Q. WOL?

12:20 39

12:20 40 A. Yes. Indefinitely.

12:20 41

12:20 42 Q. Indefinitely?

12:21 43

12:21 44 A. Yes.

12:21 45

12:21 46 Q. Because the safety of the staff is incredibly important?

12:21 47

12:21 1 A. Correct.
12:21 2
12:21 3 Q. Okay. It's right, isn't it --- I'll come back to the example
12:21 4 you raised a minute ago --- there was an allegation made by a
12:21 5 staff member, a female staff member who was a host on level 39
12:21 6 of the casino?
12:21 7
12:21 8 A. Yes.
12:21 9
12:21 10 Q. Can you explain to the Commissioner what level 39 was?
12:21 11
12:21 12 A. Level 39 is the high-end salons, the highest salons.
12:21 13
12:21 14 Q. Do you need minimum front money to play up there?
12:21 15
12:21 16 A. Yes, you do.
12:21 17
12:21 18 Q. How much?
12:21 19
12:21 20 A. I don't know. I think that moved around a little bit.
12:21 21 Nothing that I was involved in. Millions.
12:21 22
12:21 23 Q. Millions of dollars?
12:21 24
12:21 25 A. Yes.
12:21 26
12:21 27 Q. Front money?
12:21 28
12:21 29 A. Yes.
12:21 30
12:21 31 Q. Millions of dollars to walk in the room?
12:21 32
12:21 33 A. That's my understanding, yes.
12:21 34
12:21 35 Q. So, security in that room, pretty important?
12:22 36
12:22 37 A. We never had security on level 39. Or in any of the
12:22 38 premium areas.
12:22 39
12:22 40 Q. I beg your pardon. Why not?
12:22 41
12:22 42 A. The business didn't want security in those areas. Unless
12:22 43 there was a request for it.
12:22 44
12:22 45 Q. Your security did not have presence in there?
12:22 46
12:22 47 A. No.

12:22 1
12:22 2 Q. Did it have video surveillance in there?
12:22 3
12:22 4 A. Oh yes, yeah, absolutely.
12:22 5
12:22 6 Q. But not facial recognition software or facial recognition
12:22 7 technology?
12:22 8
12:22 9 A. Not initially.
12:22 10
12:22 11 Q. But it certainly wasn't the first to get facial recognition
12:22 12 technology, was it?
12:22 13
12:22 14 A. No, it was not.
12:22 15
12:22 16 Q. It was the last?
12:22 17
12:22 18 A. It was the last tranche or second-last.
12:22 19
12:22 20 Q. Do you know who determined what the priority of the
12:22 21 rolling out of the cameras were?
12:22 22
12:22 23 A. Yes. That would have been my technical team and myself
12:23 24 and then, report that back up to ---
12:23 25
12:23 26 Q. Xavier Walsh?
12:23 27
12:23 28 A. Yes.
12:23 29
12:23 30 Q. So facial recognition technology in the salons came last, or
12:23 31 close to last?
12:23 32
12:23 33 A. Yes, it wasn't first.
12:23 34
12:23 35 Q. Was that your choice?
12:23 36
12:23 37 A. I guess it was a matter of prioritisation.
12:23 38
12:23 39 Q. Who set the priorities?
12:23 40
12:23 41 A. We would, and we would as I say, my technical team and I
12:23 42 and it was then agreed to by, by Xavier and others.
12:23 43
12:23 44 Q. You are now aware of all of the allegations about money
12:23 45 laundering and so on going through the casino.
12:23 46
12:23 47 A. Yes.

12:23 1
12:23 2 Q. Particularly in the high-end rooms?
12:23 3
12:23 4 A. Yes.
12:23 5
12:24 6 Q. Do you now regret not prioritising or at least making facial
12:24 7 recognition technology occur sooner in the roll-out program than
12:24 8 it did?
12:24 9
12:24 10 A. My wishes would have been to roll out facial recognition in
12:24 11 2012/13.
12:24 12
12:24 13 Q. You wanted to do it in 2012 and 2013?
12:24 14
12:24 15 A. I did.
12:24 16
12:24 17 Q. The business wouldn't spend the money on it?
12:24 18
12:24 19 A. That's correct.
12:24 20
12:24 21 Q. When you put forward the proposal to do it you were
12:24 22 forced to prioritise?
12:24 23
12:24 24 A. Yes.
12:24 25
12:24 26 Q. The priorities were explored in plenty of discussions
12:24 27 between you and Xavier Walsh and plenty of others in the
12:24 28 management team? You just didn't come up with them on your
12:24 29 own?
12:24 30
12:24 31 A. We would present where we were going to go with them.
12:24 32 There was some discussion with the VCGLR as well about where
12:24 33 they wanted cameras.
12:24 34
12:24 35 Q. Put it this way: salons represent as a percentage of the floor
12:25 36 area of the casino a very small percentage. Correct?
12:25 37
12:25 38 A. Yes.
12:25 39
12:25 40 Q. Very few cameras?
12:25 41
12:25 42 A. They have the same ---
12:25 43
12:25 44 Q. Pardon me. Very few cameras relative to the roll-out
12:25 45 elsewhere in the casino?
12:25 46
12:25 47 A. Are you talking about facial recognition?

12:25 1
12:25 2 Q. Correct.
12:25 3
12:25 4 A. Yes.
12:25 5
12:25 6 Q. And so from a capex perspective, not a particularly big
12:25 7 spend if you're rolling out cameras everywhere else?
12:25 8
12:25 9 A. Correct, yes.
12:25 10
12:25 11 Q. Let's come back to the example that we were talking about
12:25 12 before. Level 39, minimum front money, a lot of money, host up
12:25 13 there working. I've summarised it; do you agree with any of the
12:25 14 summary that I've put forward?
12:25 15
12:25 16 A. No.
12:25 17
12:25 18 Q. Her allegation was that in an elevator with a high roller, he
12:26 19 assaulted her sexually?
12:26 20
12:26 21 A. Yes.
12:26 22
12:26 23 Q. Groped her?
12:26 24
12:26 25 A. Yes.
12:26 26
12:26 27 Q. The high roller was prosecuted?
12:26 28
12:26 29 A. Yes.
12:26 30
12:26 31 Q. The casino in that instance was unable to furnish the video
12:26 32 surveillance logs or records from the lift.
12:26 33
12:26 34 A. That's correct.
12:26 35
12:26 36 Q. If they had been able to do that, it would have proved one
12:26 37 way or the other what happened?
12:26 38
12:26 39 A. Yes.
12:26 40
12:26 41 Q. It was unable to do that. Why?
12:26 42
12:26 43 A. I understood the camera in the lift was malfunctioning.
12:26 44
12:26 45 Q. For how long?
12:26 46
12:26 47 A. I'm unaware, I'm sorry.

12:26 1

12:26 2 Q. It's your understanding, isn't it, that the absence of the video
12:27 3 evidence was a significant factor in the overall result?

12:27 4

12:27 5 A. Yes.

12:27 6

12:27 7 Q. How is it that cameras in a lift that take you to a room
12:27 8 where you need millions of dollars of front money don't operate?

12:27 9

12:27 10 A. So, at that time --- I can't be sure of the year, I remember
12:27 11 the incident. I think that was the previous GM had surveillance
12:27 12 then. I don't think I'd taken over the department then. Since
12:27 13 then, we've implemented a maintenance, camera maintenance
12:27 14 program at the COO's insistence that we go from one end of the
12:27 15 casino to the other and then back again to maintain cameras ---
12:27 16 all of them.

12:28 17

12:28 18 Q. So is it your evidence that at that time, the camera
12:28 19 maintenance program for building services was inadequate?

12:28 20

12:28 21 A. Yes.

12:28 22

12:28 23 Q. Notwithstanding how important the cameras are to the
12:28 24 surveillance function of the casino?

12:28 25

12:28 26 A. Yes, I don't think we had a robust system in place.

12:28 27

12:28 28 Q. Okay. Did you do your own investigation?

12:28 29

12:28 30 A. Into that particular --- you said, it's a bit difficult when you
12:28 31 don't have the camera. You become very used to using cameras
12:28 32 at the casino and digital voice recorders. We hadn't either in that
12:28 33 incident. I can't recall ---

12:28 34

12:28 35 Q. Was there digital voice recording capacity in the lift?

12:28 36

12:28 37 A. No, no there's not. Again, I can't say for certain, but I
12:29 38 believe the security investigation unit would have assisted the
12:29 39 police once that was reported. I know we spoke to the victim and
12:29 40 assisted her, and I'm not sure from my recollection, I don't think
12:29 41 she wanted to report it straight away, but post that she was
12:29 42 provided with support and subsequently wanted to report it, and I
12:29 43 think one of the security investigation unit members may have
12:29 44 gone with her to report it to the police.

12:29 45

12:29 46 Q. So, is the first person that she reported it to, the casino?

12:29 47

12:29 1 A. I think it was her manager.
12:29 2
12:29 3 Q. I see, and then she went to the police?
12:29 4
12:29 5 A. Yeah, post that.
12:29 6
12:29 7 Q. And it was only then that it was discovered that the camera
12:29 8 wasn't functioning in the lift?
12:29 9
12:29 10 A. I think that camera would have been checked. I'm only
12:29 11 surmising, that camera would have been checked. As soon as we
12:29 12 knew there was an incident, there was a review done straight
12:29 13 away and the camera would have been discovered malfunctioning
12:30 14 when that review was done.
12:30 15
12:30 16 Q. You're confident --- can I take you to the bottom part of
12:30 17 that statement, the next part. See this phrase there that says:
12:30 18
12:30 19 *Walked fine line of maintaining relationship, trying to*
12:30 20 *protect business.*
12:30 21
12:30 22 You mean there, don't you, the reputation of the
12:30 23 business; is that right?
12:30 24
12:30 25 A. Correct.
12:30 26
12:30 27 Q. You also say in the statement that you:
12:30 28
12:30 29 *You don't get direct to VIP host.*
12:30 30
12:30 31 It's not in that part, I haven't got the right reference.
12:31 32
12:31 33 A. I see it there.
12:31 34
12:31 35 Q. Pardon me. It follows on. You also say:
12:31 36
12:31 37 *You don't go direct to VIP hosts --- that might sound*
12:31 38 *harsh but I don't trust them.*
12:31 39
12:31 40 And then you say:
12:31 41
12:31 42 *In past, targeting murder, VIP host mentioned police had*
12:31 43 *been on site. Could get charged for being accessory.....*
12:31 44
12:31 45 I just want to explore that with you. VIP hosts are very
12:31 46 closely aligned with their client, aren't they?
12:31 47

12:31 1 A. Yes.
12:31 2
12:31 3 Q. You'd go as far as to say --- would you go as far as to say
12:31 4 --- I want to explore with you, why don't you trust them? Is it all
12:31 5 of them?
12:31 6
12:31 7 A. I'm generalising there, obviously.
12:31 8
12:31 9 Q. Sure.
12:31 10
12:32 11 A. We have had ongoing issues with VIP hosts, a number of
12:32 12 them over the years in terms of integrity issues.
12:32 13
12:32 14 Q. Were they the subject of investigations by you?
12:32 15
12:32 16 A. Yes. And we have moved many of them on. That
12:32 17 particular example I talk about, that was very early in the piece,
12:32 18 but it was a murder inquiry.
12:32 19
12:32 20 Q. Murder that happened at the casino?
12:32 21
12:32 22 A. No, it was a murder inquiry elsewhere and the suspect was
12:32 23 a person who was a VIP.
12:32 24
12:32 25 Q. Domestic or international?
12:32 26
12:32 27 A. Domestic. And, the police made inquiries with us about
12:32 28 whether --- I think it was arrest or some electronic surveillance or
12:32 29 something, or we were monitoring while they did --- while they
12:32 30 did an installation or something like that. And, we found out,
12:32 31 post that, that the VIP host had told the target of the police
12:32 32 interest in them, which was you know, in terms of relationships,
12:33 33 it's pretty hard to come back from that. You know, as a former
12:33 34 Homicide Squad investigator and, you know, you almost never
12:33 35 get a second chance to prove your integrity again. We did and we
12:33 36 have over time, but that was unforgiveable, in my view.
12:33 37
12:33 38 Q. Can we infer from what you've just said that you had a very
12:33 39 low tolerance for risking the relationship that the casino had with
12:33 40 the police?
12:33 41
12:33 42 A. Yes.
12:33 43
12:33 44 Q. And can we also infer from that, that from at least that
12:33 45 moment --- which I think you described as "very early on" ---
12:33 46 your suspicions, your intuition that leads you to be suspicious had
12:33 47 you cautious of the VIP hosts?

12:34 1
12:34 2 A. Yes.
12:34 3
12:34 4 Q. And, is it fair to say, also the VIP clients?
12:34 5
12:34 6 A. Yes.
12:34 7
12:34 8 Q. Would you say this: that if you had to draw a distinction
12:34 9 between VIP hosts domestic and VIP hosts international, who
12:34 10 would be least trustworthy? As a generalisation, based on your
12:34 11 intuition and suspicion?
12:34 12
12:34 13 A. Well, we've had issues in both, I can say that.
12:34 14
12:34 15 Q. Right. You wouldn't rate one more than the other?
12:34 16
12:34 17 A. No.
12:34 18
12:34 19 Q. Who do the VIP hosts report to?
12:34 20
12:34 21 A. It varies, depending if you're international, they did report
12:34 22 up through Jacinta McGuire to Jason O'Connor, domestically ---
12:35 23 and this might be incorrect. I thought they reported, at least some
12:35 24 of them, through their manager to Peter Lawrence in the
12:35 25 Mahogany area.
12:35 26
12:35 27 Q. That's the domestic?
12:35 28
12:35 29 A. Yes.
12:35 30
12:35 31 Q. Is it also right that you were --- if you were suspicious of
12:35 32 them, were you also suspicious of the people they reported to?
12:35 33
12:35 34 A. No, um, I was frustrated.
12:35 35
12:35 36 Q. Frustrated. Why?
12:35 37
12:35 38 A. Because we kept investigating people for doing the same
12:35 39 thing. Over and over again.
12:35 40
12:35 41 Q. What sorts of things?
12:35 42
12:35 43 A. Inappropriate use of comp privileges. Hiring hotel rooms,
12:35 44 buying things on people's accounts that weren't in the property.
12:36 45 Integrity issues, essentially.
12:36 46
12:36 47 Q. And those very integrity issues, they're the things that,

12:36 1 when they actually happen, give you a proper basis for the
12:36 2 suspicion you might otherwise have had?

12:36 3

12:36 4 A. That's right. I mean, as I said, there had been many of them
12:36 5 over my 12 years.

12:36 6

12:36 7 Q. When you say that you were frustrated by the things that
12:36 8 were occurring, is that because people who were caught doing it
12:36 9 were allowed to remain? Put it this way, a kind of zero tolerance
12:36 10 that you would apply was not applied in the business?

12:36 11

12:36 12 A. I'd agree with that.

12:37 13

12:37 14 Q. Okay, I want to take you now to another part of the
12:37 15 statement, of the interview notes.

12:37 16

12:37 17 I'm conscious we've been going for a bit. I don't know if the
12:37 18 Commissioner wants to take a comfort break.

12:37 19

12:37 20 COMMISSIONER: Keep going until a break?

12:37 21

12:37 22 A. I'm good to keep going.

12:37 23

12:37 24 MR FINANZIO: Page 3 of the statement in the fourth paragraph
12:37 25 down:

12:37 26

12:37 27 *Junkets, no doubt you've got the feeling so far that that's a*
12:38 28 *very different world.*

12:38 29

12:38 30 That sounds like them recording something that you said
12:38 31 that goes something like:

12:38 32

12:38 33 *Junkets, no doubt you've got the idea so far that that's a*
12:38 34 *very different world.*

12:38 35

12:38 36 A. Yes.

12:38 37

12:38 38 Q. And is that a fair capturing of the sentiment?

12:38 39

12:38 40 A. Yes.

12:38 41

12:38 42 Q. It was a very different world, wasn't it?

12:38 43

12:38 44 A. It was.

12:38 45

12:38 46 Q. Extraordinary amounts of money?

12:38 47

- 12:38 1 A. Correct.
- 12:38 2
- 12:38 3 Q. With those extraordinary amounts of money, you can buy
- 12:38 4 any service that's available, can't you?
- 12:38 5
- 12:38 6 A. Yes.
- 12:38 7
- 12:38 8 Q. Legal or illegal?
- 12:38 9
- 12:38 10 A. Yes.
- 12:38 11
- 12:38 12 Q. The fact that so much money is around just by itself
- 12:38 13 suggests the possibility, at least, that illegal activity like drugs
- 12:39 14 and prostitution might be occurring?
- 12:39 15
- 12:39 16 A. Yes, I mean, equally, you could say at different levels that
- 12:39 17 could occur anywhere across society.
- 12:39 18
- 12:39 19 Q. Of course it can, but with so much money available you'd
- 12:39 20 have to say the casino was a place and in particular the junket
- 12:39 21 environment, was a place where that was an obvious risk?
- 12:39 22
- 12:39 23 A. Certainly a lot of money around.
- 12:39 24
- 12:39 25 Q. It was an obvious risk.
- 12:39 26
- 12:39 27 A. Yes.
- 12:39 28
- 12:39 29 Q. And, in a way, I'm sure you understand this to be the case
- 12:39 30 now, the fact that people were coming internationally coming
- 12:39 31 from overseas with money that they were bringing outside the
- 12:39 32 country unlawfully from the country, brings with it an element of
- 12:40 33 unlawfulness anyway, doesn't it? A sentiment. I'm escaping, for
- 12:40 34 example, China, with money that I'm not supposed to be bringing
- 12:40 35 out of the country. Got all this money here, I'm using the casino
- 12:40 36 to launder it. There's an element, isn't there, of the mentality of
- 12:40 37 the person that tends towards unlawfulness; correct?
- 12:40 38
- 12:40 39 A. I have to say, I'm not aware of unlawful money being
- 12:40 40 brought into the casino. Our visibility around junkets, high
- 12:40 41 visibility around junkets in a financial sense was just, we had
- 12:40 42 none. So we weren't involved in junkets at all other than
- 12:40 43 checking people against our surveillance database on the way in.
- 12:40 44
- 12:40 45 Q. So are you saying that for the whole time that you were at
- 12:40 46 Crown, you did not think at any time that the junkets were being
- 12:40 47 used to launder money?

12:41 1
12:41 2 A. I went to a symposium conducted by Victoria Police, where
12:41 3 a gentleman from the Hong Kong Jockey Club spoke about Suncity
12:41 4 junket.
12:41 5
12:41 6 Q. When?
12:41 7
12:41 8 A. Perhaps 2016, maybe '15.
12:41 9
12:41 10 Q. What was the name of the person?
12:41 11
12:41 12 A. I can't recall his name, I'm sorry.
12:41 13
12:41 14 Q. And what did ---
12:41 15
12:41 16 A. Essentially what he said was Suncity was backed by the
12:41 17 14K Triad and he was very strong on that. It was a sporting
12:41 18 symposium that was around gambling in sport and such things.
12:41 19
12:41 20 Q. And you were doing your "We have to do CPD to remain
12:41 21 accredited"?
12:41 22
12:41 23 A. No, I was actually invited by Victoria Police as an invited
12:41 24 member to go along to its symposium. It involved people from
12:42 25 the racing industry, greyhounds, I mean, it was a broad church, if
12:42 26 I can say that.
12:42 27
12:42 28 Q. In that presentation, you were advised that Suncity ---
12:42 29
12:42 30 A. Yes. I think they went back to Crawley,
12:42 31 I think, and so, I came back to the office and passed on that
12:42 32 information --
12:42 33
12:42 34 Q. Now, you passed it onto whom? Presumably, Xavier
12:42 35 Walsh.
12:42 36
12:42 37 A. Xavier, and Barry Felstead.
12:42 38
12:42 39 Q. And am I right, that's in 2015, '16, '17, that's before Suncity
12:42 40 was set up with its own room?
12:42 41
12:42 42 A. It might have been later than that, I think I recall Suncity
12:42 43 actually having their own salon there. I said that --- it wasn't long
12:42 44 afterwards when I was asked to come and speak to the AFP
12:43 45 commander in Melbourne who said to me that --- he said pretty
12:43 46 directly --- "We are coming after junkets. We think that they are
12:43 47 drug money. It's, you know, AFP and our partners overseas

12:43 1 believe, strongly believe it's drug money. We need your
12:43 2 assistance. We'd like your assistance to understand junkets and
12:43 3 how Crown works with them."
12:43 4
12:43 5 So, again, I escalated that as a proposition and post that, we met
12:43 6 with a number of areas of AFP around junkets. So, how they
12:43 7 operated, those sorts of things.
12:43 8
12:43 9 Q. Are you able to tell us the date that you went and had this
12:44 10 meeting with Victoria Police?
12:44 11
12:44 12 A. I'm not able to now, but I'm sure I could find it.
12:44 13
12:44 14 Q. Dig it up?
12:44 15
12:44 16 A. Yes.
12:44 17
12:44 18 Q. I'd like you to do that.
12:44 19
12:44 20 MS BUTTON: Can I clarify with my learned friend, I think
12:44 21 Mr Walsh referred to AFP rather than Victoria Police?
12:44 22
12:44 23 A. Yes, it was AFP.
12:44 24
12:44 25 MR FINANZIO: AFP. Thank you.
12:44 26
12:44 27 A. And so, getting back to your original question, I suppose I
12:44 28 had concerns from then on. Not "concerns", I mean, I thought
12:44 29 there's a risk.
12:44 30
12:44 31 Q. And it's your evidence, is it, that you had no concerns
12:44 32 before that?
12:44 33
12:44 34 A. I had no visibility about junkets or how, really, they were
12:44 35 operating or how the money was or wasn't coming in, who ran
12:44 36 them.
12:44 37
12:44 38 Q. So go back a step. When you say "no visibility", you had
12:44 39 no surveillance or security presence in the junket rooms?
12:45 40
12:45 41 A. No, we always had surveillance.
12:45 42
12:45 43 Q. Pardon me. Surveillance, you had --
12:45 44
12:45 45 A. Yes.
12:45 46
12:45 47 Q. --- but you had no surveillance security inside the junket?

12:45 1
12:45 2 A. Not unless they were called in, and we treated the rooms
12:45 3 from as surveillance perspective the same as any of the
12:45 4 high-action rooms. You know, we would treat them the same
12:45 5 way as a Crown salon.
12:45 6
12:45 7 MR FINANZIO: Commissioner, I would like to take a short
12:45 8 break here.
12:45 9
12:45 10 COMMISSIONER: That's okay, I thought we might break now.
12:45 11 12.45 until 1.30, if that suits everyone.
12:45 12
12:45 13 MR FINANZIO: And if I can ask the witness in the break to pass
12:45 14 onto us, after making inquiries, the date of the meeting with the
12:45 15 AFP.
12:45 16
12:45 17 A. I'll have to actually go back in through my emails to get that
12:45 18 date, I believe.
12:45 19
12:45 20 COMMISSIONER: If it's possible.
12:45 21
12:45 22 A. I can't do it from here.
12:46 23
12:46 24 COMMISSIONER: All right, I'll adjourn now until 1.30.
12:46 25
12:46 26 MR FINANZIO: Thank you.
12:46 27
12:46 28
12:46 29 **ADJOURNED** [12.46 PM]
13:25 30
13:27 31
13:27 32 **RESUMED** [1.34 PM]
13:35 33
13:35 34
13:35 35 COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
13:35 36
13:35 37 MR FINANZIO: Thank you, Commissioner.
13:35 38
13:35 39 Mr Walsh, before lunch we were trying to explore some
13:35 40 meetings that you might have gone to where you were given
13:35 41 some information by different law enforcement agencies;
13:35 42 do you recall that?
13:35 43
13:35 44 A. I do.
13:35 45
13:35 46 Q. I know that everyone's trying to find the email
13:35 47 correspondence, but I just wonder if we can't do this a different

13:35 1 way. Is it right that you attended a meeting where the AFP were
13:35 2 involved?

13:35 3

13:35 4 A. Correct, yes.

13:35 5

13:35 6 Q. Just on the best of your recollection, how did that meeting
13:35 7 come about? You were invited?

13:35 8

13:35 9 A. I was invited by, I think it was Bruce Giles who was the
13:36 10 commander in Melbourne at the time.

13:36 11

13:36 12 Q. Invited by Bruce Giles?

13:36 13

13:36 14 A. I believe so, yes.

13:36 15

13:36 16 Q. And is it also the case that you attended a separate
13:36 17 symposium conducted by Victoria Police?

13:36 18

13:36 19 A. That's correct.

13:36 20

13:36 21 Q. That's what I thought I heard. And, when was that one?
13:36 22 Who were you invited by there?

13:36 23

13:36 24 A. The Victoria Police supporting intelligence area.

13:36 25

13:36 26 Q. Supporting intelligence?

13:36 27

13:36 28 A. Which encompasses what used to be the Casino Squad. It's
13:36 29 kind of melded into that.

13:36 30

13:36 31 Q. A sort of an amalgam of all the different supporting
13:36 32 integrity bodies?

13:36 33

13:36 34 A. Yes.

13:36 35

13:36 36 Q. Can I ask you some questions about the symposium first. Is
13:36 37 it at the symposium that the person from the Hong Kong Jockey
13:36 38 Club spoke?

13:36 39

13:36 40 A. Yes.

13:36 41

13:36 42 Q. And they spoke generally about junkets; is that correct?

13:37 43

13:37 44 A. Yes.

13:37 45

13:37 46 Q. As one of a number of other things that they might have
13:37 47 spoken about --- pardon me --- as one of a number of things that

13:37 1 were discussed at the symposium?
13:37 2
13:37 3 A. Yes.
13:37 4
13:37 5 Q. So the symposium was about sporting integrity broadly?
13:37 6
13:37 7 A. Yes.
13:37 8
13:37 9 Q. And one of the topics was junkets?
13:37 10
13:37 11 A. One of the topics was online gambling ---
13:37 12
13:37 13 Q. Online gambling and other ---
13:37 14
13:37 15 A. This was wrapped up in that, from memory.
13:37 16
13:37 17 Q. Right, and one of the speakers was the person from the
13:37 18 Hong Kong Jockey Club?
13:37 19
13:37 20 A. Correct.
13:37 21
13:37 22 Q. You were invited to that symposium by police?
13:37 23
13:37 24 A. Yes.
13:37 25
13:37 26 Q. Do you know when that one was?
13:37 27
13:37 28 A. Again, I'd say there were a couple of those.
13:37 29
13:37 30 Q. Right.
13:37 31
13:37 32 A. That particular one, I can't recall whether it was the first or
13:37 33 the second one I went to.
13:37 34
13:37 35 Q. You mentioned 2015 /16?
13:37 36
13:37 37 A. It was around about that sort of date.
13:37 38
13:37 39 Q. And that was definitely the first one, those symposiums
13:38 40 came before the AFP invitation to ---
13:38 41
13:38 42 A. From my recollection, yes.
13:38 43
13:38 44 Q. It's right, isn't it, that the AFP invitation was not so much a
13:38 45 symposium but a briefing?
13:38 46
13:38 47 A. No, no, it was two officers, the Melbourne Commander and

13:38 1 his head of investigations.

13:38 2

13:38 3 Q. Who was that?

13:38 4

13:38 5 A. Can't think of his name right now, sorry. And, it was the
13:38 6 three of us and basically they, they essentially asked for our
13:38 7 assistance, gave us a background, asked for our assistance in
13:38 8 providing assistance in understanding junkets, because they were
13:38 9 about to start investigating was what I understood.

13:38 10

13:38 11 Q. So, that second meeting --- that one with the AFP --- they
13:38 12 met with you to tell you that they were about to begin
13:38 13 investigations in relation to junkets?

13:38 14

13:38 15 A. Yes.

13:38 16

13:38 17 Q. And they were seeking your assistance in relation to that?

13:39 18

13:39 19 A. Yes.

13:39 20

13:39 21 Q. By that stage, Suncity was up and running?

13:39 22

13:39 23 A. I believe so.

13:39 24

13:39 25 Q. But not necessarily in its own rooms?

13:39 26

13:39 27 A. May not have been.

13:39 28

13:39 29 Q. If that was in about 2017, probably not?

13:39 30

13:39 31 A. I'm trying --- I think it was earlier than that, but I'm sorry, I
13:39 32 can't be sure.

13:39 33

13:39 34 Q. Okay. But we'll get the chronology right. It will either be
13:39 35 2015, 2014, 2016, 2017, whatever it is ---

13:39 36

13:39 37 A. Yes.

13:39 38

13:39 39 Q. --- your documents will bear it out or we'll find some other
13:39 40 way of proving it. But it's right isn't it, that the moment that you
13:39 41 found out that Suncity was associated with triads you informed
13:39 42 your superiors about that?

13:39 43

13:39 44 A. That's correct.

13:39 45

13:39 46 Q. Those superiors included Xavier Walsh?

13:39 47

13:39 1 A. Yes.
13:39 2
13:40 3 Q. And they included Barry Felstead?
13:40 4
13:40 5 A. Yes.
13:40 6
13:40 7 Q. There's a fella that keeps popping up from time to time
13:40 8 called Ishan Ratnam.
13:40 9
13:40 10 A. Yes, I know Ishan.
13:40 11
13:40 12 Q. Would you describe him as a superior?
13:40 13
13:40 14 A. In the international business, certainly. He was the senior
13:40 15 vice-president.
13:40 16
13:40 17 Q. Was he the person in charge of the international business?
13:40 18 Did people answer to him?
13:40 19
13:40 20 A. Yes, they did.
13:40 21
13:40 22 Q. Whenever there was an issue with the international
13:40 23 business, it's the case he was involved, wasn't it?
13:40 24
13:40 25 A. Yes.
13:40 26
13:40 27 Q. Who did he report to?
13:40 28
13:40 29 A. Ah

13:40 30
13:40 31 Q. It's unclear, isn't it?
13:40 32
13:40 33 A. I don't really know. Look, Jason O'Connor was the head of
13:40 34 that area, Executive General Manager of that area, but I'm not
13:40 35 sure whether ---
13:40 36
13:40 37 Q. Would you say from your interactions with them that really,
13:40 38 even Jason O'Connor reported to him?
13:41 39
13:41 40 A. It was unclear who reported, where he reported.
13:41 41
13:41 42 Q. No doubt about it, though, that he exercised significant
13:41 43 sway in the operation of the international business?
13:41 44
13:41 45 A. Yes.
13:41 46
13:41 47 Q. And that sway was also evident --- he exercised significant

13:41 1 sway even over gaming issues or the interaction of international
13:41 2 players on the gaming floor in the casino? Let me put it a
13:41 3 different way, let me explain what I mean. If an international
13:41 4 player had an issue gaming at Melbourne, it would be fed through
13:41 5 Ishan, wouldn't it?

13:41 6
13:41 7 A. Most likely, yes.

13:41 8
13:41 9 Q. And it's right, isn't it, that Veng Anh reported to Ishan?

13:41 10
13:41 11 A. I believe so, yes.

13:41 12
13:41 13 Q. Veng Anh was also very deeply involved in issues arising
13:42 14 for international players at the casino?

13:42 15
13:42 16 A. Yes.

13:42 17
13:42 18 Q. Okay. I want to go back to this document again, and the
13:42 19 part I want to take you to I think, if we just go to the top of page
13:42 20 3, please. Now, perhaps just take that off the screen just for the
13:42 21 minute, because I want to be super cautious about this. My
13:42 22 understanding is that part of the passage that I want to go to is
13:42 23 redacted, and it's in the second paragraph of that.

13:43 24 DTT.0001.0002.0382_0002. There's a redaction there. I don't
13:43 25 know what the redaction is, but it deals with an investigation.
13:43 26 You haven't got anything there yet. The version that I looked at
13:43 27 last night had a redaction in it.

13:43 28
13:43 29 COMMISSIONER: I've got a version with redactions.

13:43 30
13:43 31 MR FINANZIO: I've got a version with redactions.

13:43 32
13:43 33 Have you got a version with redactions, Commissioner?

13:43 34
13:43 35 COMMISSIONER: Only with redactions.

13:43 36
13:43 37 MR FINANZIO: Is that an unredacted version? Could you pass
13:43 38 that? I don't know who's responsible for the redaction.

13:43 39
13:43 40 COMMISSIONER: Yes, I don't know.

13:43 41
13:43 42 MR FINANZIO: I read it in unredacted form, and then when I
13:43 43 was preparing my cross-examination on the new documents that
13:43 44 were provided to me I saw it in redacted form and I thought that
13:43 45 was something I should get. Just excuse me.

13:44 46
13:44 47 COMMISSIONER: Sure.

13:44 1
13:44 2 MR FINANZIO: Can I just inquire of the operator whether
13:44 3 what's going to be put on the screen is visible outside this room?
13:44 4
13:44 5 COMMISSIONER: The answer is "no".
13:44 6
13:44 7 MR FINANZIO: It's not visible outside the room?
13:45 8
13:45 9 COMMISSIONER: Just in the room.
13:45 10
13:45 11 MR FINANZIO: I'm aware there's a non-publication order, a
13:45 12 non-publication claim made in relation to some passages, which I
13:45 13 can navigate around. I'm prepared to navigate around. I can
13:45 14 simply ask the witness to read the unredacted version and I'll ask
13:45 15 him some questions about it.
13:45 16
13:45 17 So if that document can come back up unredacted on the
13:45 18 screen, do you see there, I'll read to you --- see there
13:45 19 it says:
13:45 20
13:45 21 *Suspicious reporting, excess of 10k, 9, 8 then the 5k ---*
13:45 22 *that sort of stuff. Deal with them when targeting people*
13:45 23 *in our casinos.....*
13:45 24
13:45 25 Do you see that?
13:45 26
13:45 27 A. Yes.
13:45 28
13:45 29 Q. Can you just read on to the end of the passage?
13:46 30
13:46 31 A. Yes.
13:46 32
13:46 33 Q. There's some text blocked out there, and I suspect by you
13:46 34 reading it you'll understand why, because it deals with some
13:46 35 security capability ---
13:46 36
13:46 37 A. Yes.
13:46 38
13:46 39 Q. --- or surveillance capabilities and it also deals with the
13:46 40 nature of an investigation.
13:46 41
13:46 42 A. Yes.
13:46 43
13:46 44 Q. I don't seek to press the details of that now, except to say
13:46 45 this: that didn't involve a junket?
13:46 46
13:46 47 A. No, it did not.

13:46 1
13:46 2 Q. Nor --- and it wasn't junket money laundering?
13:46 3
13:46 4 A. No, it was not.
13:46 5
13:46 6 Q. It was another group?
13:46 7
13:46 8 A. Yes.
13:46 9
13:46 10 Q. Not Asian?
13:47 11
13:47 12 A. No.
13:47 13
13:47 14 Q. And not international VIP?
13:47 15
13:47 16 A. No.
13:47 17
13:47 18 Q. You did the surveillance?
13:47 19
13:47 20 A. The surveillance did the surveillance, but yes.
13:47 21
13:47 22 Q. The surveillance team in the casino did the surveillance?
13:47 23
13:47 24 A. Yes, they did.
13:47 25
13:47 26 Q. And you passed on that surveillance to the authorities?
13:47 27
13:47 28 A. Yes, that was a request from one of the task forces to
13:47 29 monitor a particular person and we obviously got a significant
13:47 30 amount of intelligence that they didn't expect, but were quite
13:47 31 grateful for.
13:47 32
13:47 33 Q. And you didn't do --- I suppose the point I'm making to you
13:47 34 is, you didn't do that kind of work with the Asian money
13:47 35 laundering activities in the junkets, did you?
13:47 36
13:47 37 A. No. However, I could say if we saw, if we were asked to
13:47 38 monitor by a law enforcement agency which was the reason we
13:47 39 were monitoring these individuals, if there was a suspicion about
13:48 40 someone in a junket or an international visitor of any description,
13:48 41 or anyone for that matter, we would, to the best of our ability,
13:48 42 monitor. That's taking down associations and doing those type of
13:48 43 proactive tasks.
13:48 44
13:48 45 Q. There's a couple of things about that. When you say "to the
13:48 46 best of your abilities" your abilities are pretty good?
13:48 47

13:48 1 A. I'd agree with that.
13:48 2
13:48 3 Q. So then the second of that is "You'd do it if you were
13:48 4 asked"?
13:48 5
13:48 6 A. Yes, or if we saw something that was suspicious, or we
13:48 7 knew that we had an issue with somebody we would do that, yes.
13:48 8
13:48 9 Q. What I want to ask you about is this instance that's recorded
13:48 10 here came as a request from a law enforcement agency to look at
13:48 11 someone in particular.
13:48 12
13:48 13 A. Yes.
13:48 14
13:48 15 Q. But it is the case, isn't it, that there was suspicious activity
13:48 16 occurring in the casino without you even having to be asked; that
13:48 17 you could have identified for yourself?
13:48 18
13:48 19 A. Yes, and we've done that many times.
13:48 20
13:48 21 Q. But not in relation to Asian junkets or the international
13:49 22 trade?
13:49 23
13:49 24 You're saying that there were just no signs of suspicion ---
13:49 25
13:49 26 A. I wouldn't have agreed with that. I mean, certainly we had
13:49 27 suspicion around Suncity, we were helping them put tracking
13:49 28 devices and listening devices in rooms and cars. And we knew
13:49 29 Suncity were targets of a law enforcement investigation.
13:49 30
13:49 31 Q. You knew Suncity were targets of a law enforcement
13:49 32 investigation from the time they told you ---
13:49 33
13:49 34 A. Yes.
13:49 35
13:49 36 Q. --- that they were the target of a law enforcement
13:49 37 investigation?
13:49 38
13:49 39 A. That's correct.
13:49 40
13:49 41 Q. Right?
13:49 42
13:49 43 A. Yes.
13:49 44
13:49 45 Q. Are you saying that you didn't know Suncity was suspicious
13:49 46 at any time before that?
13:49 47

- 13:49 1 A. No ---
- 13:49 2
- 13:49 3 Q. So you are saying that they were suspicious before that?
- 13:49 4
- 13:49 5 A. I'm saying apropos my earlier comment to you that post that
- 13:49 6 symposium, I was suspicious of Suncity and we fit in monitoring
- 13:50 7 schedules around --- I mean, we've got, there's a finite number of
- 13:50 8 people and there's a finite lot of action that we can look at, and so
- 13:50 9 no doubt the junket rooms were viewed, but at that time we didn't
- 13:50 10 see anything. If we did, we would certainly escalate.
- 13:50 11
- 13:50 12 Q. Okay, let's just test the fact, though. You didn't escalate
- 13:50 13 anything until after law enforcement told you that Suncity was a
- 13:50 14 target?
- 13:50 15
- 13:50 16 A. I'm not sure what monitoring we had done and what issues
- 13:50 17 we had located other than we were aware of the law enforcement
- 13:50 18 investigation.
- 13:50 19
- 13:50 20 Q. You did not contact the law enforcement before law
- 13:50 21 enforcement contacted you --
- 13:50 22
- 13:50 23 A. No, we did not.
- 13:51 24
- 13:51 25 Q. --- and told you that Suncity was a target of their
- 13:51 26 investigation?
- 13:51 27
- 13:51 28 A. No, we did not.
- 13:51 29
- 13:51 30 Q. Are you saying that you had no intelligence at all that
- 13:51 31 Suncity was suspicious?
- 13:51 32
- 13:51 33 A. At that time, no. Other than a general understanding.
- 13:51 34
- 13:51 35 Q. That they were related to the triads?
- 13:51 36
- 13:51 37 A. Yes. But you could say that about any of junkets in
- 13:51 38 general, as I understand.
- 13:51 39
- 13:51 40 Q. And did you know that to be the case before law
- 13:51 41 enforcement targeted Suncity?
- 13:51 42
- 13:51 43 A. I think so, because I think the symposium was before we
- 13:51 44 knew about Suncity.
- 13:51 45
- 13:51 46 Q. So the question is: at that time, if you knew it from then, if
- 13:51 47 the casino knew it from them, why wasn't for example, upgrades

13:51 1 of technology in those areas prioritised?
13:51 2
13:51 3 A. I think, I think we had, the cameras were fine.
13:52 4
13:52 5 Q. No facial recognition technology?
13:52 6
13:52 7 A. That did go in after they took on that salon, yes.
13:52 8
13:52 9 Q. Yes, so in terms of the concept --- you're familiar with the
13:52 10 concept "Know Your Customer"?
13:52 11
13:52 12 A. Yes.
13:52 13
13:52 14 Q. Know who's around the place?
13:52 15
13:52 16 A. Yes, I am now.
13:52 17
13:52 18 Q. The prioritisation decisions that were made about facial
13:52 19 recognition technology de-prioritised the Suncity salon,
13:52 20 notwithstanding that the casino knew that Suncity was associated
13:52 21 with, or, if not associated with, strongly suspected of being
13:52 22 associated with the triads. Correct?
13:52 23
13:52 24 A. I'm not sure I agree with you de-prioritising, but I take your
13:52 25 point.
13:52 26
13:52 27 Q. All right. Well, put it this way, in simple terms they didn't
13:52 28 put the facial recognition technology in there?
13:52 29
13:52 30 A. Correct.
13:52 31
13:52 32 Q. But they put it everywhere else in the casino first?
13:53 33
13:53 34 A. Yes.
13:53 35
13:53 36 Q. Can I take you to page 4. In the fifth paragraph down from
13:53 37 the top there's a statement there:
13:53 38
13:53 39 *For junkets more generally, the majority of the guys they*
13:53 40 *bring out here are pretty good.*
13:53 41
13:53 42 A. Yes.
13:53 43
13:53 44 Q. To be able to say that, you have to have a view about the
13:54 45 rest, don't you?
13:54 46
13:54 47 A. Let me put some context around that statement which is

13:54 1 clearly not there. I was talking about behaviour. So, generally
13:54 2 98 per cent of the people that came in on junkets behaved very
13:54 3 well.
13:54 4
13:54 5 Q. You mean in terms of, when you say "behaviour" you mean
13:54 6 they weren't having fights or ---
13:54 7
13:54 8 A. Yes.
13:54 9
13:54 10 Q. Fair enough?
13:54 11
13:54 12 A. Yes.
13:54 13
13:54 14 Q. Can I ask you to go to on that page another paragraph just
13:54 15 below it. It says:
13:54 16
13:54 17 *Could I put hand on my heart and say there's no money*
13:54 18 *lending going on.*
13:54 19
13:54 20 I think you probably meant money laundering going on
13:54 21 there? I don't --
13:54 22
13:54 23 A. Money lending.
13:54 24
13:54 25 Q. Money lending or money laundering?
13:54 26
13:54 27 A. Well, money lending I think I was referring to.
13:55 28
13:55 29 Q. Is that the purpose of junkets? Money lending is the
13:55 30 purpose of junkets?
13:55 31
13:55 32 A. I'm not sure the context of that, again, I ---
13:55 33
13:55 34 Q. Let me ask you this. At the time that you did this, which is
13:55 35 I think it's late last year or in the middle to late last year, could
13:55 36 you put your hand on your heart and say there's no money
13:55 37 laundering going on in the junkets?
13:55 38
13:55 39 A. No.
13:55 40
13:55 41 Q. Meaning that you knew that it was likely to be going on?
13:55 42
13:55 43 A. I certainly couldn't say it wasn't, yes.
13:55 44
13:55 45 Q. Would it be a fair statement of your opinion that it's
13:55 46 between them --- see the next passage ---
13:55 47

13:55 1 A. Yes.

13:55 2

13:55 3 Q. You say:

13:55 4

13:55 5 *It's between them, they have lines of credit and business*
13:55 6 *between them but that's their business model. Where does*
13:55 7 *the matrix exist in terms of policy?*

13:55 8

13:56 9 Is that your question?

13:56 10

13:56 11 A. No, that's not my question.

13:56 12

13:56 13 Q. Can I put this to you: for your part, so long as there was no
13:56 14 physical disturbance, you just weren't, it wasn't your job to look
13:56 15 at money laundering?

13:56 16

13:56 17 A. That's correct. Can I expand on that answer? It certainly
13:56 18 was our job to look at loan sharking, money lending, structuring,
13:56 19 smurfing, all of those things. Suspicious transactions, but that
13:56 20 was a far cry from what happens now, which is a complete
13:56 21 180-degree movement from what we used to do and what I
13:56 22 understood about our responsibilities in AML to the process we
13:56 23 have now, where we've exited many, many tens of, if not
13:56 24 hundreds of people out of the business under that "Know Your
13:57 25 Customer" regime that you spoke of earlier.

13:57 26

13:57 27 Q. Yes. So, thank you for that remark. I suppose my
13:57 28 questions were, though, based on what you were doing then.

13:57 29

13:57 30 A. Yes, okay.

13:57 31

13:57 32 Q. And, it was the responsibility based on the SOPs that were
13:57 33 applicable at that time to be alert to potential criminal activity,
13:57 34 correct?

13:57 35

13:57 36 A. Yes, certainly.

13:57 37

13:57 38 Q. And money laundering is an indicator of potential criminal
13:57 39 activity, isn't it?

13:57 40

13:57 41 A. Yes.

13:57 42

13:57 43 Q. The evidence suggests that it was rife in the casino, doesn't
13:57 44 it?

13:57 45

13:57 46 A. I'm not sure whether I could say it was rife.

13:57 47

- 13:57 1 Q. Okay.
- 13:57 2
- 13:57 3 A. It's clear that it was occurring.
- 13:58 4
- 13:58 5 Q. Are you saying that before this 180-degree turn, this was
- 13:58 6 not something that you were focused on?
- 13:58 7
- 13:58 8 A. I would say the business wasn't focused on it.
- 13:58 9
- 13:58 10 Q. Let me go --- would you agree that the business knew that it
- 13:58 11 was a risk?
- 13:58 12
- 13:58 13 A. Yes.
- 13:58 14
- 13:58 15 Q. Would you agree that in not --- in you not being focused on
- 13:59 16 it, it facilitated the business turning a blind eye to it?
- 13:59 17
- 13:59 18 A. No, I wouldn't agree with that. There are many instances of
- 13:59 19 security. Not so much security, but certainly surveillance
- 13:59 20 escalating susters, which were suspect transactions, as a result of
- 13:59 21 their observations and as a result of observations from across the
- 13:59 22 business on the gaming floor.
- 13:59 23
- 13:59 24 Q. Can I just ask you this. Go to page 2 of this document and
- 13:59 25 to the paragraph which is five from the bottom. See where it says
- 14:00 26 there:
- 14:00 27
- 14:00 28 *We got involved, thankfully, not a lot to do with the junket*
- 14:00 29 *business.*
- 14:00 30
- 14:00 31 A. I think I was being facetious there, but yes.
- 14:00 32
- 14:00 33 Q. Yes, but you were saying, in fact, you didn't have much to
- 14:00 34 do with the junket business?
- 14:00 35
- 14:00 36 A. That's correct.
- 14:00 37
- 14:00 38 Q. You were, by the way the organisation was structured and
- 14:00 39 by what your instructions were, not part of supervising that
- 14:00 40 activity?
- 14:00 41
- 14:00 42 A. No, I wouldn't agree with that. They were subject to our
- 14:00 43 monitoring schedule, as well.
- 14:00 44
- 14:00 45 Q. But other than that, no physical presence?
- 14:00 46
- 14:00 47 A. No.

14:00 1
14:00 2 Q. Other than that --- I'll leave it there. It does sound like an
14:00 3 expression of relief?
14:01 4
14:01 5 A. I think perhaps we were into the Bergin Inquiry at that
14:01 6 stage.
14:01 7
14:01 8 Q. So, you were thankful that you --- (overspeaking) --- at
14:01 9 cross-hairs?
14:01 10
14:01 11 A. We just didn't have visibility of what went on in
14:01 12 international gaming. We weren't privy to what went on, other
14:01 13 than if it was obvious there was criminal behaviour, there were
14:01 14 things that were observed that needed to be escalated. We
14:01 15 weren't involved in running that sort of business. Not so much ---
14:01 16 we're not involved in running the gaming side of the business
14:01 17 anyway, but there's visibility about how that runs.
14:01 18
14:01 19 Q. Yes.
14:01 20
14:01 21 A. There wasn't, in international VIP.
14:01 22
14:01 23 Q. I want to take you to the fourth page of that document again
14:02 24 and to a passage that is sort of middle of the page:
14:02 25
14:02 26 *I take the view; I'll be consistent across the board. I'll*
14:02 27 *escalate if I'm not sure about something.*
14:02 28
14:02 29 That's right for you --- the way you approach things is
14:02 30 if you see things that you think are problematic, you'll
14:02 31 escalate them up?
14:02 32
14:02 33 A. I'll take action if it's within my purview to take action
14:02 34 and/or I'll escalate them up.
14:02 35
14:02 36 Q. A moment ago, you told us that you escalated up the intel
14:02 37 or the information that you'd received from AFP and from ---
14:02 38
14:02 39 A. Yes.
14:02 40
14:02 41 Q. --- VicPol. You escalated that up, how?
14:03 42
14:03 43 A. Ah, verbally, I think.
14:03 44
14:03 45 Q. Verbally?
14:03 46
14:03 47 A. I think.

14:03 1
14:03 2 Q. Pretty important piece of information to only escalate
14:03 3 verbally?
14:03 4
14:03 5 A. I may have sent an email, you know. It was a while back.
14:03 6
14:03 7 Q. 170-odd thousand to look at.
14:03 8
14:03 9 A. I'll see --- I intended to see if there was an email attached to
14:03 10 that, with the document I was talking about before.
14:03 11
14:03 12 Q. What was the feedback about that very important piece of
14:03 13 information from, let's start with Xavier Walsh?
14:03 14
14:03 15 A. I think he escalated those, that information to the CEO,
14:03 16 with the group CEO at the time.
14:03 17
14:03 18 Q. Did you ever attend a meeting with other people where it
14:03 19 was discussed?
14:03 20
14:03 21 A. Yes, I believe I spoke to Barry Felstead in person about it
14:04 22 and explained what it was that was said and what was proposed.
14:04 23
14:04 24 Q. Sorry, you also spoke to Xavier Walsh about it in person?
14:04 25
14:04 26 A. Yes, yes.
14:04 27
14:04 28 Q. Anyone else?
14:04 29
14:04 30 A. No.
14:04 31
14:04 32 Q. Did you discuss it with Ishan Ratnam?
14:04 33
14:04 34 A. I don't believe so.
14:04 35
14:04 36 Q. You never discussed the possibility of triad influencing
14:04 37 Suncity with Ishan Ratnam?
14:04 38
14:04 39 A. No, I don't believe so.
14:04 40
14:04 41 Q. Why not?
14:04 42
14:04 43 A. I didn't spend a lot of time with Ishan.
14:04 44
14:04 45
14:04 46
14:04 47

1
2 **ADJOURNED** [2.04 PM]
3
4
5 **HEARING ADJOURNED AT 3.12 PM UNTIL MONDAY,**
6 **28 JUNE 2021 AT 9.30 AM**

Index of Witness Events

MR ROBIN CRAIG WALSH, SWORN	P-2563
EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MR FINANZIO	P-2564

Index of Exhibits and MFIs

EXHIBIT #RC0258 - STATEMENT OF MR ROBIN CRAIG WALSH DATED 5 MAY 2021	P-2564
---	--------