

Document tendered by
<i>M. David Skene</i>
Received by
<i>C. Nguyen</i>
Date: 29 / 1 / 2015
Resolved to publish Yes / No

### Strike Force Emblems

On 16 December 1998 Informant Sea ("Sea"), who was then a serving police officer, disclosed to me that he had been corruptly involved with police in North Region over many years. His misconduct included the fabrication of evidence, the "loading" of witnesses, the theft of money from suspects, and assault of suspects. He indicated that this occurred on a large number of occasions. Sea was subsequently debriefed in relation to his allegations which also extended to a large number of then serving and former police officers.

On 9 February 1999 the Management Committee referred to the Commission for investigation the allegations of Sea. The Reference was codenamed *Mascot*. Part of the *Gynea* investigation team was used to investigate the allegations. The Commissioner of the Police Integrity Commission had been informed about the allegations in general terms.

On 3 August 1999 a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") was entered into between the Commission and the Police Integrity Commission so that the allegations of Sea could be divulged to the Police Integrity Commission whilst maintaining an ongoing covert investigation. That MOU foreshadowed a further MOU regarding the use of Sea and information provided by Sea or uncovered through the investigation.

On 9 June 2000 a further MOU regarding the joint pursuit of allegations of police corruption was signed by the then Commissioners of the Commission, the Police Integrity Commission and Police.

Following the signing of the MOU a briefing in relation to the *Mascot* investigation was held. Both the then Commissioner of Police and the then Commissioner of the Police Integrity Commission attended that briefing. The agenda for that briefing included the then current strategies and future strategies/opportunities. The briefing disclosed the extensive electronic surveillance that had been employed in the investigation to that point and the continued use of electronic surveillance was endorsed.

On 14 September 2000 a warrant under Section 16 of the Listening Devices Act 1984 was issued by Justice Virginia Bell. The warrant authorised the use of a listening device to record or listen to the private conversations of 114 named serving police, former police and civilians. The applicant for the warrant was Glenn William Trayhurn, a NSW police officer.

Ultimately a number of persons were charged as a result of the *Mascot* investigation and in one of the prosecutions the warrant was served with the brief of evidence. The names of all persons named on the warrant were included in the copy served in the brief. It appears that police had legal advice that they could not omit any names from the warrant. Following that service it appears that the warrant became widely circulated and by mid April 2002 the warrant became the subject of media scrutiny. The warrant was in fact a renewal of earlier warrants, the first of which was issued in June 2000 prior to a function to farewell an alleged corrupt police officer.

On 14 April 2002 Peter Remfrey, Secretary of the Police Association of NSW, issued in the following terms, a press release in relation to the warrant:

*Members of the Police Association of NSW have raised concerns about a warrant, apparently issued under the Listening Devices Act in September 2000, which authorised the secret recording of private conversations of over 100 current and former serving police officers.*

*We have taken legal advice and instructed our lawyers to act on behalf of our members named in the warrant. Amongst other things, our lawyers will seek to obtain the affidavit, and other material that was place(d) before the judge of the Supreme Court who issued the warrant.*

*We have advised those officers named in the warrant, that if their private conversations were secretly recorded, and if it transpires that their rights have been infringed, then they should file a complaint with the Police Integrity Commission and ask the Commission to investigate the basis upon which the application for the warrant was made."*

On 15 April 2002 Michael Costa the then Minister for Police met with myself and the then Police Commissioner and was briefed in relation to the warrant.

On 15 April 2002 the Minister for Police wrote to the Hon Mervyn Finlay QC, the then Inspector of the Police Integrity Commission, asking that he provide a report in relation to the matter.

I received a copy of the Inspector General's report dated 29 April 2002 under cover of letter from the Inspector General also dated 29 April 2002. In the letter the Inspector General confirms that the warrant was justifiably sought. In giving that answer the Inspector General observed that "this was an exceptional investigation encompassing a wide range of serious misconduct and corrupt behaviour by a large number of serving and former police".

The Inspector General further observed that "any challenge to the validity of a warrant granted by a Judge of the Supreme Court under the *Listening Devices Act 1984* can only be dealt with by the Supreme Court itself, and not by a statutory body such as the Inspector of the Police Integrity Commission. However, in making that observation, I also note that I have **seen nothing in the material inspected by me which would cast any doubt upon the validity of the warrant granted by Justice Virginia Bell of the Supreme Court on 14 September 2000**".

In the letter the Inspector General advised that the **warrant complied with relevant legislation subject to one minor irregularity**. The Inspector General observed that:

*"the warrant contained the names of 114 serving police, former police and civilians, whose private conversations may be recorded or listened to by the subject listening device. This huge number of persons is explicable by the magnitude of this exceptional investigation and by the correction of a **common misunderstanding**.*

*The misunderstanding to which I refer is that some may think that for any person to be named in a warrant there must be reasonable grounds to suspect that such person was involved in a prescribed offence or at least had some information about it. That thought is erroneous. **The Crown Solicitor has given me his advice confirming my view that Section 16(4)(b) of the Act requires the warrant to specify "where practicable, the name of any person whose private conversation may be recorded or listened to by the use of a Listening Device pursuant to the warrant" whether or not such person is reasonably suspected of having information relating to "the prescribed offence".***

In the letter the Inspector General advised that he had no reason not to accept the advice of the Crime Commission that:

*"The material was downloaded from the device worn by SEA and most of it transcribed in draft. Relevant portions were reviewed and certified as correct. It was securely held and used only for the purpose of preparing for PIC hearings, criminal prosecution briefs, and in furtherance of this investigation. We are not aware of any information obtained pursuant to this warrant being used or disseminated for any other purposes."*

In the letter the Inspector General certified that it was necessary in the public interest for the information in his report to be divulged to specified persons including Ken Moroney, the then Acting Commissioner of Police.

On 8 May 2002 certain branches (including Crime Agencies) of the NSW Police Association unanimously carried a motion that they "do not accept the findings of the Inspector General of the Police Integrity Commission".

On 21 May 2002 Ken Madden, solicitor, acting for certain named police officers wrote to the Commission asking for, inter alia, a copy of the affidavit in support of the application for the warrant. In the letter Madden advised that:

*"With all due respect to the Inspector General, our clients do not accept at face value that all things to do with the warrant were in order, and we have been asked to advise them in relation to several aspects about the warrant. We in turn have briefed Senior Counsel to prepare an advice for us." (I have not been informed of the advice which Senior Counsel gave).*

On 24 May 2002 the Solicitor to the Commission responded and indicated that one of Madden's clients had previously requested a copy of the affidavit, that the request had been declined and the Commission's position had not changed.

On 13 June 2002 John Marsden, solicitor, acting for two civilians named on the warrant wrote to me enclosing a copy of a letter dated 13 June 2002 forwarded by him to the Police Integrity Commission. Marsden continued to forward copies of responses from the Police Integrity Commission together with his replies thereto.

Under cover of letter dated 12 September 2002 I received a copy of the Inspector General's report dated 11 September 2002 in relation to the complaint by Marsden on behalf of the two civilians against the Police Integrity Commission.

That report concludes as follows:

*"Careful consideration has now been given to the legality and propriety of the warrant issued by Justice Virginia Bell on 14 September 2000 by Mr Finlay, the Crown Solicitor, and myself.*

***The warrant was justifiably sought and complied with the relevant legislation. The material obtained as a result of the issue of the warrant was used appropriately.***

*The inclusion of the names of, inter alia, Mr Marsden's clients was in accordance with the law as prescribed by statute and case law in force in the State of New South Wales at the relevant time."*

In the report the Inspector General certified that it was necessary in the public interest for the information in his report to be divulged to specified persons including the Commissioner of Police.

The Commission understands that Marsden now accepts the Inspector General's report insofar as it affects his two civilian clients.

In October 2002 R Redfern, Acting Superintendent, Office of the Senior Assistant Commissioner, wrote to Steve Barrett, a journalist whose name appeared on the warrant, in the following terms:

*"I refer to our discussions in relation to this matter on the 9 October 2002. Senior Assistant Commissioner Walsh has asked that I write to you on his behalf in relation to the concerns that you have raised with regard to the inclusion of your name on Listening Device Warrant 266 of 2000.*

*I confirm that both Mr Walsh and myself met with Mr Bradley of the Crime Commission to discuss this matter and Mr Bradley has agreed to this letter of clarification being forward to you.*

*As I indicated during our conversation on the 9 October, in making application for a listening device warrant, and hence in any warrant that is issued, it is necessary to include the names of any people whose conversations it is reasonably expected may be recorded. The rationale for this would seem to be that the judicial officers, who authorise the issuing of such warrants, are aware of the extent to which individual's privacy may be effected. I am informed that this was the basis upon which your name was included on the relevant warrant.*

*The inclusion of your name should not be taken to in any way infer that you were suspected of being involved in any criminal activity".*

On 20 December 2002 the State Crime Command Branch of the NSW Police Association passed a motion:

*"That the President of the NSWPA take the issues of concern in relation to the LD warrant to the COP as a matter of urgency and advise the results of the conversations with the COP to this branch within 21 days."*

By letter dated 4 July 2003 I was advised by Garry Dobson, Assistant Commissioner, that he had been tasked by the Commissioner of Police to investigate and, where possible, resolve a series of complaints that revolve around, but are not limited to, the warrant. By that letter Dobson sought access to certain documents. I had learned of Dobson's investigation through a telephone call from the Commissioner of Police's Chief of Staff the previous week. I met with Dobson on 24 July 2003 and advised him that section 29(2) of the New South Wales Crime Commission Act 1985 made it an offence to provide him with, or give him access to, the material sought in his letter. I indicated that I would raise this issue with the Management Committee. This was done at the meeting of the Management Committee on 30 July 2003 when a suggested resolution was passed in the following terms:

*"The Management Committee approves access being given to Assistant Commissioner Garry Dobson to information and evidence relevant to Listening Device Warrant No 266 of 2000 held by the NSW Crime Commission as a result of its investigation under Reference codenamed Mascot, which can be lawfully disseminated, other than applications that ground any listening device warrants. Where Mr Dobson identifies such information and evidence which he requires to be disseminated to himself for the purpose of his investigation, the Management Committee approves of such dissemination by the Commission".*

Dobson was advised of the resolution by letter dated 5 August 2003 from the Solicitor to the Commission who also advised Dobson as follows:

*"Access and dissemination is given to you on the understanding that the information and evidence is confidential. Accordingly you will be subject to the secrecy provisions of section 29 of the Act.*

*A large volume of material to which you will need access is at present with Task Force Volta and I have arranged to have that material brought back to the Commission so that it can be made available to you.*

*You will note from the resolution that you are only able to have access to material "which can be lawfully disseminated". Some of the material contains reference to telephone intercepts and a strict regime operates in respect of dissemination of that product (even the fact a telephone interception occurred). The dissemination of that material may be dependent on the purpose. A determination about this must be made by the Commission in each case.*

*So that the Commission can determine what is able to be lawfully disseminated would you kindly let me have as soon as possible a copy of your Terms of Reference and a copy of each of the individual complaints which led to them.*

*Some of the material will also disclose or tend to disclose the new identity and location of protected persons, the location of witnesses and the identity of informers. There are still ongoing investigations under the Reference. In this regard would you please advise the names of persons other than yourself and Mark Galletta who are assisting you in your investigation.*

*When this information is to hand we should be able to deal with all of your requirements.*

*As raised by Mark Galletta there may also be an issue by virtue of section 29 if you need to speak to police officers who were, or are, a part of SCIA. The Commission proposes to also deal with this issue once the Terms of Reference and the nature of the complaint, is known.*

*I await your reply."*

The Solicitor to the Commission by letter dated 12 August 2003 responded to a reply dated 5 August 2003 in the following terms:

*"I refer to my letter dated 5 August 2003 and to the reply thereto dated 5 August 2003 from Detective Inspector Mark Galletta.*

*A copy of the Terms of Reference in relation to Mascot and Mascot II are available. Additionally some of the folders containing material that relate to the "Schedule of Debrief" are also available. So that access to the material can be given to you would you kindly contact Marsha Canning, PA to the Commissioner.*

*A room is being made available in the Commission where you can have access to the material. Once you identify the material, if any, which you wish to have disseminated a formal dissemination will be made to you.*

As I indicated earlier a large volume of the material is at present with Task Force Volta and I confirm that I have arranged to have that material brought back to the Commission so that access can be given to you. You will appreciate that that material is currently the subject of work by that Task Force and is needed by them on a day to day basis.

I note that you have already been provided with transcripts of interviews with informer Sea. To avoid duplication would you kindly advise which interviews you have.

So far as the Joint Management Team minutes are concerned the parties represented at those meetings were the NSW Police, the Police Integrity Commission and this Commission. The NSW Police should have their copy of the minutes. It may be necessary to contact the Police Integrity Commission to advise them that you are seeking access to the minutes.

As I have previously indicated some of the material to which you seek access contains information in connection with and as a result of telephone intercepts. That information cannot be disseminated to you unless it relates, or appears to relate to the commission of relevant offences or acts or omissions by officers of the NSW Police that may give rise to disciplinary proceedings against that officer.

Based on the information provided by you at the meeting of 24 July 2003 and on the face of your letter dated 5 August 2003 there appears to be no basis upon which my Commissioner could make a determination to disseminate telephone interception information to you.

It would not be lawful for "this issue will be addressed on a merit basis after analysis of disseminated material from your organisation" as suggested by Detective Inspector Mark Galletta.

So that my Commissioner can make a determination as to dissemination of the intercepted material would you kindly provide all the documents that ground the complaints together with all documents that relate to any determinations made by NSW Police in relation to the complaints.

I await your reply."

By letter dated 20 August 2003 Dobson indicated, inter alia:

"At this point in time I am unable to provide you with any details of the complaints in regards to the Strike Force Emblems investigation as this matter is under legal counsel."

By letter dated 8 September 2003 Paul Akon, then Senior Solicitor, Manager Special Projects, NSW Police Service wrote to the Solicitor to the Commission indicating, inter alia, that a meeting had been arranged for 9 September 2003 directed at resolving the concerns of each agency.

The meeting was attended by Mr Akon, Ian Temby QC, Deputy Commissioner Madden, Assistant Commissioner Dobson, three police officers, as well as myself and John Giorgiutti, Solicitor to the Commission.

At the meeting Madden set out some of the history of the matter and the complaint put forward by the association on behalf of a number of people. He referred to the fact that the Commission was concerned to know the identity of complainants, and about the wrongfulness of inclusions of the names of persons in warrants. I responded by referring to the fact that this investigation had been ordered without consultation with me, notwithstanding the impact that it has on my organisation. I was informed about it by the Commissioner's Staff Officer after the event. I explained that Mr Aust rang me as to inquire as to whether I would cooperate with an inquiry, and I said I would. The following day I heard from sources within the State Crime Command that I was not cooperating with the inquiry. This prompted me to write to Aust telling him that I was cooperating with the inquiry. I later read, in an article in the Sydney Morning Herald, written by Neil Mercer that I had said I was cooperating with the inquiry.

I said I was very disturbed by this sequence of events. I said I was not necessarily interested in the identity of the complainants, as I know the identity of the main complainants, and have spoken to several of them. I said my concern was to know the terms of the complaint as I was being called upon to respond to requests for information to assist in relation to the investigation of the complaints. I said also that I was concerned about the assumption that the inclusion of persons names in warrants indicated that they were targets of the investigation. I said similar complaints have been made by Marsden who, after having the terms of the Listening Device Act explained to him, retreated.

I said that I had two principle concerns. The first was to ensure that I acted lawfully, and the second was to ensure that this relatively minor matter, which was consuming a large number of resources was resolved as quickly as possible.

I said that I was interested to find a way to assist the inquiry within the limits of the law. I said that I did not agree with the legal propositions put forward in the letter that I had received the previous day. I said that it was likely that a way could be found using the power of delegation of the Commission.

There was some wide-ranging discussion about the disclosure of affidavits to ground listening device warrants. It was put by Temby that it was largely a matter for me, a proposition with which Giorgiutti disagreed.

There was also some statements by Dobson and Galetta in which they disclosed that they had received new complaints from people who had said that that they had never met the undercover operative, or never had anything to do with him, therefore there



was no basis for them being named in the warrant. We discussed the proposition that complaints came from a number of sources, but if there is no basis for assuming that the person should be the subject of an investigation or is likely to be recorded by the LD, it would be difficult to know how the name could be included in the warrant.

Giorgiutti said that an answer to this issue could be achieved by looking at the material, other than the affidavit. I also said that there was no obvious motive for including the name in the warrant if the person was not a major target or not likely to be recorded.

There was discussion about Temby providing joint advice on the question of delegation of authority to disseminate through the interview process. He ultimately agreed to do this. Giorgiutti and I then left.

The advice dated 11 September 2003 of Temby QC confirmed and highlighted the issues surrounding Section 29 of the Crime Commission Act. The Strike Force did not seek further legal advice in relation to those issues until January 2004 and at the time of finalising its most recent report, it had not received further legal advice. The Strike Force, not having received further legal advice, made no meaningful attempt to pursue the investigation in the terms of the advice of Temby QC.

By letter dated 22 October 2003 I wrote to the Commissioner of Police in the following terms:

*"I refer to our discussion on this matter on 7 October.*

*You will recall that I became aware of this investigation for the first time when I was contacted by Bernie Aust to ascertain whether I was prepared to co-operate with the inquiry. I did not, at the time, understand why this would be an issue, but I indicated that I would co-operate. The following day I heard that there was a rumour circulating among complainants that I would not co-operate. This prompted me to confirm in writing that I would co-operate. I later read in the Sydney Morning Herald that I had agreed to co-operate.*

*The Commission has co-operated, but progress has been slow due to the work being done by Volta, legal restrictions, and also because we have not had access to the terms of the complaint.*

*Co-operation does not mean that the Commission will hand over all documents regardless of the provisions of the Crime Commission Act, the Telecommunications (Interception) Act, the interests of the PIC, public interest immunity and legal convention. As to the legal issues, the Police Service sought (as it turns out) hurried advice from Mr Temby QC which did not, in my view, advance the position, notwithstanding my communication with him and others, including Messrs Madden and Dobson.*

*In our meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup>, these issues were again canvassed. I also expressed concern about the sensitive nature of the documents and perceptions about the motivation of those who initiated the complaints. As I understand it, you share these concerns, and more specifically the continued leaking of information. As*

to this, I note that I have received questions from journalists about the specifics of the investigation. The Minister has also received questions from a journalist and a parliamentarian. Yesterday, the attached article appeared in the Australian. Apparently Mr Barrett and others are being kept well informed of the status of the Emblems investigation. The recurring issue of my co-operation, or lack of it, is again specifically raised.

The information which is sought is very sensitive information about police who were 'mentioned' in Mascot/Florida. Some of those police are 'innocent' of wrongdoing and others, as you know, may not be so categorised – at least at this stage. I am not confident that the Commission can disseminate information without it falling into the hands of those who are talking to journalists.

The irony of this is that those seeking access to the information are apparently accusing the Commission of preventing access on the basis of the secrecy provisions. Yet I cannot get access to complaints in order to make up my mind whether the information can be properly handed over. It is also ironic that the complaints apparently assert or imply that officers within Mascot abused their position in order to settle old scores or at least prejudice the position of antagonists. There is now an inference available that the Emblems exercise is retaliatory. Certainly one of the complainants to whom I have spoken appears to regard it in that way.

If officers involved in Emblems, or others who are aware of the details of the investigation, have formed the view that there are clients in this matter other than yourself, and are communicating with persons in order to advance an interest other than the public interest, then it is a serious misconception of their role.

Since we last spoke, I have even less confidence that this matter can be handled appropriately or that confidentiality will be preserved. You indicated that you would investigate other options. I would be interested to know whether you have found any.

The so-called businessman referred to in the attached article has been very selective in the disclosure of communication between myself and Marsdens. A more recent and relevant piece of correspondence from Marsdens has been received. In it Mr Marsden withdraws all adverse allegations concerning the issue of the warrant."

At the CEO's Meeting on 16 September 2003 the Commissioner of Police advised that:

1. the Strike Force has advised him in writing that there is an overwhelming prima facie case for prosecution;
2. he was directing the Strike Force to refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions the brief of evidence in support of the above prima facie case; and
3. the Strike Force was to be disbanded."

At that meeting I raised concerns in relation to Strike Force *Emblems* and the Commissioner of Police indicated that he also shared concerns in relation to the Strike Force.

By letter dated 20 January 2004 I responded in the following terms to a letter dated 5 January 2004 from the Commissioner of Police:

*"Thank you for your letter, which I did not receive until 13 January 2004. It would have been useful to discuss it at the CEO's meeting on 12 January as the issues are of interest to the PIC and the Ministry.*

*When the matter was last discussed at the CEO's meeting, it was agreed that, given the Strike Force had advised you in writing that there is an overwhelming prima facie case for prosecution, the brief would be referred to the DPP. Consideration was to be given to a further independent examination. I do not know whether either of these decisions has advanced. At the time you also advised that Emblems was to be disbanded and the officers would return to their normal duties.*

*You will also recall that I raised concerns in relation to the Strike Force and you acknowledged those concerns.*

*If a course is to be adopted which is different from that agreed, I think we should put that before the next CEO's meeting. A copy of your letter could perhaps be circulated to the others prior to the meeting.*

*There are a number of matters raised in your letter which need to be fully discussed in that forum. At this time, I should also mention that Commander Dobson's recollection of the meeting of 24 July differs from my own. It has always been the case that the inclusion of the names on the warrant need not flow from the SOD's but in some cases are a requirement of the statute.*

*For reasons which I have previously mentioned, I am less sanguine about the prospects of satisfying the complainants."*

The Strike Force finalised its report in March 2004 and in May 2004 I was advised by the Ministry of Police that given that the investigation had been finalised, no further action was required.

I now understand that:

1. by letter dated 29 April 2003 the Police Association of NSW wrote to the Commissioner of Police following discussions between the Commissioner of Police and representatives of the State Crime Command Branch and Commissioned Officers Sub Branch meeting held on 2 April 2003. That letter concluded as follows:

*"In conclusion Commissioner members named in the warrant are passionate in their desire to see what they believe to be legitimate complaints investigated and, if criminal acts or Departmental breaches are*

*apparent, to ensure that those responsible are dealt with. In addition the other matters raised need to be addressed as soon as possible to ensure the wider membership can have confidence that the high level internal affairs investigations are being conducted with the same level of integrity as are expected from front line officers. As part of this process the expeditious release of the recommendation from Task Force Tumen would be an appropriate starting point".*

2. by letter dated 8 May 2003 the Commissioner of Police wrote to the Deputy Commissioner Operations, relevantly, in the following terms:

*"On the 29 April 2003, the Secretary, Industrial Branch of the Association, Mr Peter Remfrey, wrote to me in the attached terms. Having viewed Mr Remfrey's letter of the 29 April 2003, I am of the view that the issues raised herein, both individually and variously, constitute a complaint within the meaning of the Police Act.*

*Accordingly, I have referred the original of Mr Remfrey's letter to the Commander, SCIA for assessment and initiation (see attached papers).*

*Given that some members of the Special Crime Unit are still attached to SCIA (and who may be the subject of any consequent investigation), it is not appropriate that that Command undertake any investigations associated with this complaint. After assessment and initiation, I have asked Commander Reith to refer all relevant papers to you for further attention.*

*On receipt of the original documents I ask that you convene an Executive Complaint Management Team (ECMT) meeting. Given that the current Deputy Commissioner, Support, was the Commander, SCIA during an important phase of 'Mascot/Florida' it is not appropriate that he participates in the ECMT. This latter aspect is more for transparency and openness.*

*Your ECMT should consider each of the seven issues raised herein and if an investigation is warranted in respect to any or all of those matters, I believe it appropriate that initially a small Task Force be constituted to resolve any such matters".*

3. a managerial assessment was prepared on 23 May 2003 for consideration by the Executive Complaint Management Team at its meeting on 2 June 2003.
4. at its meeting on 2 June 2003 the Executive Complaint Management Team declined to investigate any of the complaints of the Association and the Association was so advised by letter dated 3 June 2003.
5. at a meeting of the Executive Complaint Management Team on 10 June 2003 a discussion occurred as to a meeting that had taken place between the Commissioner of Police, the Secretary of the NSW Police Association and others where the Commissioner of Police may have given an undertaking to investigate the complaint. That meeting resolved that the Secretary should be invited to Police Headquarters to further discuss the complaint. That meeting

occurred on 11 June 2003. After a lengthy discussion it was resolved that: "an informal resolution process should be undertaken with a senior, qualified officer being selected to look at all the available material, including previous investigation that touch on this matter and attempt to conduct an alternate dispute resolution meeting with affected parties".

6. the Executive Complaint Management Team again met on 17 June 2003 when it resolved that the complaint from the NSW Police Association should now be considered as a notifiable Category 1 complaint and allocated to Dobson.

I note that the Police Integrity Commission and the Ombudsman have declined to investigate the complaints of the NSW Police Association.

The issue of the warrant has been the subject of two reports by the Inspector General.

I have concerns about Strike Force *Emblems*. I understand that those concerns are shared by the Commissioner of Police. Those concerns may be summarised as an apprehension that the operations of that Task Force are more in the nature of a campaign (partly conducted in the media) on behalf of complainants who are colleagues, rather than an objective investigation by disinterested professionals. Because of those concerns, I cannot provide highly confidential information to that Task Force.

In light of the report of the Inspector General, the legal position as enunciated by the Solicitor General, and the substantial expenditure of resources on this matter, I recommend that the Management Committee take no action in relation to the report tabled at its last meeting.