
TRANSCRIPT OF MORNING PROCEEDINGS

WARNING - CONTAINS LAWFULLY INTERCEPTED INFORMATION AND INTERCEPTION WARRANT INFORMATION.

These documents contain information as defined within ss 6E and s 6EA of the Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Act 1979 (Cth) (TIA Act). It is an offence to communicate to another person, make use of, or make a record of this information except as permitted by the TIA Act. Recipients should be aware of the provisions of the TIA Act.

WARNING - CONTAINS PROTECTED INFORMATION.

These documents contain 'protected information' within the meaning of s 30D of the Surveillance Devices Act 1999 (Vic) (SD Act). It is an offence to use, communicate or publish this information except as permitted by the SD Act. Recipients should be aware of the provisions of the SD Act.

INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION

MELBOURNE

THURSDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2020

(32nd day of examinations)

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE ROBERT REDLICH AM, QC

Counsel Assisting: Mr Michael Tovey QC
Ms Amber Harris
Mr Tam McLaughlin

OPERATION SANDON INVESTIGATION

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS PURSUANT TO PART 6 OF THE INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION ACT 2011

Every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of transcripts. Any inaccuracies will be corrected as soon as possible.

1 <SAMEH AZIZ, recalled: 09:55:41AM
2 <EXAMINED BY MR TOVEY, continued: 09:56:57AM
3 COMMISSIONER: Good morning, Mr Aziz, Mr Peck. Are you ready 10:24:52AM
4 to proceed? 10:24:56AM
5 MR PECK: Yes, Commissioner. 10:24:58AM
6 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Yes, Mr Tovey. 10:25:00AM
7 MR TOVEY: Mr Commissioner, first of all, court book page 4095, 10:25:03AM
8 which is the WhatsApp conversations between Mr Aziz and 10:25:11AM
9 Ms Wreford between 10 and 12 August we thought was already 10:25:16AM
10 exhibited but it was not. That would be exhibit 278. 10:25:22AM
11 COMMISSIONER: Yes, I'll make that 278. Thank you. 10:25:27AM
12 #EXHIBIT 278 - WhatsApp conversations between Mr Aziz and 10:25:31AM
13 Ms Wreford between 10/08 and 12/08 at court book page 10:25:17AM
14 4095. 10:25:17AM
15 MR TOVEY: Could you please look at 4106. So that's a series 10:25:34AM
16 of WhatsApp exchanges between yourself and Ms Wreford. If 10:26:11AM
17 we could just stay where we are at the moment and go to 10:26:23AM
18 the - if you see there, she says halfway down the page, 10:26:39AM
19 can you see that, Mr Aziz, 'In your view,' on 8 September 10:26:44AM
20 at 10.25, 'how soon can you get me the contract of sale 10:26:50AM
21 for the Berwick property as I can't lodge the loan until 10:27:00AM
22 I have it. Thanks.' Now, at that stage was it the case 10:27:04AM
23 that you had asked Lorraine Wreford to seek to try and 10:27:12AM
24 find you finance?---Yes. 10:27:21AM
25 And were you preparing a contract of sale of the Berwick 10:27:25AM
26 property - this is back in September of 2018 - to 10:27:32AM
27 Mr Woodman or to one of his companies?---I can't recall if 10:27:43AM
28 it was for Mr Woodman. 10:27:49AM
29 Could we just scroll down. You indicate, 'Hi Lorraine. I can 10:27:54AM

1 get my conveyancer to prepare one by Monday. I just need 10:28:00AM
2 the name of the purchaser, the details of their 10:28:02AM
3 conveyancer and I will fill in the rest. Also the deposit 10:28:06AM
4 for September is still not in the account. Regards Sam.' 10:28:14AM
5 So, first of all, when you say there, 'I can get my 10:28:25AM
6 conveyancer to prepare one by Monday,' you're referring, 10:28:33AM
7 apparently, to a contract of sale?---Yes. 10:28:36AM
8 'I just need the name of the purchaser', and that's you 10:28:40AM
9 indicating that you want to find out which company 10:28:44AM
10 Mr Woodman is using or which entity he wants to use to 10:28:49AM
11 purchase the property?---Yes, if he was going to go ahead 10:28:52AM
12 with that, yes. 10:28:57AM
13 And, 'Also the deposit for September is still not in the 10:28:58AM
14 account.' What was the deposit for September?---I can't 10:29:07AM
15 recall exactly, Mr Tovey, but it may have been in 10:29:14AM
16 reference to the arrangements I had with Spicer 10:29:23AM
17 Thoroughbreds. But I can't recall exactly. 10:29:30AM
18 And you still maintain, do you, that, although you're speaking 10:29:32AM
19 about this with Ms Wreford when she's dealing as 10:29:39AM
20 Mr Woodman's representative, the Spicers arrangement had 10:29:43AM
21 nothing to do with Woodman so far as you knew?---As far as 10:29:50AM
22 I knew. It was just easier to deal with Wreford because 10:29:53AM
23 Lee was always very elusive and very hard to get in touch 10:29:58AM
24 with. 10:30:01AM
25 All right. So could we just scroll down, please, to the next 10:30:01AM
26 page. So you're there given the details about who 10:30:09AM
27 Mr Woodman's solicitor is; is that right?---Yes. 10:30:32AM
28 And I think also you're told that the company was going to be 10:30:34AM
29 Cordwood Pty Ltd?---Yes. 10:30:41AM

1 All right. I tender those two pages, Mr Commissioner. 10:30:43AM

2 COMMISSIONER: The WhatsApp messages between Mr Aziz and 10:30:55AM

3 Ms Wreford from 21 August to 8 September will be exhibit 10:30:59AM

4 279. 10:31:04AM

5 #EXHIBIT 279 - WhatsApp messages between Mr Aziz and Ms Wreford 10:31:10AM

6 from 21/08/18 to 08/09/18. 10:31:00AM

7 MR TOVEY: This of course is occurring shortly after the H3 10:31:12AM

8 matter has come up in council on 3 September and continued 10:31:18AM

9 to come up - sorry, on 4 September and come up for several 10:31:22AM

10 months after that; do you agree with that?---If you say 10:31:27AM

11 so. I can't recall when the H3 matter was coming up. 10:31:39AM

12 I won't pursue this at the moment, Mr Commissioner. I'll be 10:31:46AM

13 going back to H3 as a separate topic. 10:31:54AM

14 COMMISSIONER: All right. 10:31:57AM

15 MR TOVEY: I simply wanted to put this in context. 10:31:57AM

16 COMMISSIONER: I just wanted to enquire of Mr Aziz, familiar as 10:32:02AM

17 he now is with the H3 issue that has been explored at 10:32:08AM

18 length by the Commission, whether, Mr Aziz, you sought to 10:32:14AM

19 establish for yourself whether or not you had declared any 10:32:22AM

20 conflict of interest in relation to H3 during this 10:32:26AM

21 period?---No, I didn't, Commissioner, and in my mind there 10:32:34AM

22 would not - there was not any relationship with Woodman at 10:32:37AM

23 the time. There's a lot more that I would like to say 10:32:41AM

24 about H3 when I get the opportunity. 10:32:47AM

25 Yes. I just want you to focus on this issue: you looked at 10:32:49AM

26 this question, though, since the Commission focused on H3 10:32:54AM

27 and you remain, do you, of the view that there was no 10:32:58AM

28 conflict of interest that you needed to declare?---That's 10:33:02AM

29 right, yes. 10:33:08AM

1 Yes, Mr Tovey. 10:33:09AM

2 MR TOVEY: And that is despite the fact that during this period 10:33:16AM

3 you were getting payments from Mr Woodman and you were 10:33:20AM

4 negotiating to sell him your house?---You say I was 10:33:25AM

5 getting it from Mr Woodman. I didn't know I was getting 10:33:30AM

6 it from Mr Woodman, and the issue of the sale of the house 10:33:32AM

7 was just an idea, a concept that never materialised. 10:33:35AM

8 What are you saying was only a concept? Are you indicating by 10:33:41AM

9 that that in preparing contracts of sale you really had no 10:33:49AM

10 ambition that it would actually occur; it was just 10:33:55AM

11 something that was a mental thing?---No, I wanted the 10:33:58AM

12 refinancing and the transfer of the property from the ex's 10:34:02AM

13 name to me eventually to occur. I wanted possession of 10:34:06AM

14 the house, like I said yesterday, to facilitate my 10:34:10AM

15 interaction with my children. However, I was looking at a 10:34:15AM

16 number of private lenders, not just Mr Woodman, so - - - 10:34:18AM

17 What we've already been to from August onwards, you were 10:34:22AM

18 preparing a contract of sale to actually sell your house 10:34:31AM

19 to Mr Woodman in the expectation that that would occur; do 10:34:34AM

20 you agree with that? Otherwise you wouldn't have been 10:34:39AM

21 preparing a contract of sale?---In the expectation that it 10:34:42AM

22 might occur, as I was pursuing all other options for 10:34:46AM

23 refinancing. 10:34:51AM

24 And that didn't create a conflict, you say?---No, because there 10:34:52AM

25 was no executed agreement, there's no signed contract 10:34:57AM

26 between me and him for the sale. 10:35:00AM

27 All right. And did that remain your view that, what, unless 10:35:02AM

28 you were getting paid a bribe - I mean, what was your 10:35:07AM

29 view? Was it that unless you were getting paid an actual 10:35:10AM

1 bribe you weren't conflicted? 10:35:13AM

2 MR RUBENSTEIN: I object to that question. 10:35:16AM

3 MR TOVEY: Was that your view?---Well, first of all - - - 10:35:18AM

4 No, was your view, Mr Aziz - just yes or no - that unless you 10:35:22AM

5 were getting paid an actual bribe you weren't 10:35:27AM

6 conflicted?---I'm not going to answer the question if you 10:35:33AM

7 keep referring to it as a bribe because I have never 10:35:35AM

8 received a bribe. 10:35:38AM

9 Was your view that, if you had a financial relationship of any 10:35:38AM

10 sort with a person, you had a conflict in respect of the 10:35:42AM

11 business of that person?---It was a contractual 10:35:51AM

12 arrangement and - - - 10:35:54AM

13 I'm not asking you about what you did. I'm asking you about 10:35:55AM

14 what your view was about your need to declare a contract. 10:35:58AM

15 Was your view that, if you had a financial relationship 10:36:04AM

16 with a person, that did not give rise to a need to declare 10:36:09AM

17 a contract - to declare a conflict?---I'm trying to 10:36:14AM

18 describe my view, if you give me a chance to do so. 10:36:19AM

19 COMMISSIONER: Mr Aziz, if I followed you correctly, you say 10:36:23AM

20 that if you didn't enter into a contract with Mr Woodman 10:36:28AM

21 then no conflict arose?---That's right. 10:36:31AM

22 Surely that can't be correct, Mr Aziz, that a councillor can 10:36:36AM

23 engage in the most detailed discussions with a third party 10:36:40AM

24 developer who also has ongoing interests in decisions 10:36:48AM

25 which the council has to make and that that doesn't create 10:36:51AM

26 a conflict of interest unless the councillor enters into a 10:36:57AM

27 contract with the developer? You are not seriously 10:37:00AM

28 suggesting that, are you?---I am absolutely seriously 10:37:02AM

29 suggesting that because I have entertained many ideas with 10:37:06AM

1 many people that have never gone ahead. Now, if I was to 10:37:09AM
2 declare a conflict - - - 10:37:14AM
3 Mr Aziz, I'm not interested in what your practice was. I'm 10:37:18AM
4 interested in the principle. And you maintain - you 10:37:20AM
5 seriously maintain that whenever you were in discussions 10:37:25AM
6 with a developer who had issues that were before the 10:37:30AM
7 council, that it didn't matter the length or the depth of 10:37:34AM
8 those discussions; you were not required to declare a 10:37:38AM
9 conflict in relation to any issue that then arose relating 10:37:43AM
10 to that developer at the council?---Yes, my thinking was 10:37:47AM
11 I only declared a conflict if there was an actual executed 10:37:51AM
12 contractual arrangement. 10:37:56AM
13 May I suggest to you that that reveals and perhaps explains why 10:37:57AM
14 in so many instances you didn't declare a conflict when 10:38:03AM
15 I suggest to you you should have. What do you say about 10:38:07AM
16 that? Do you not, on reflection, realise that in all 10:38:14AM
17 those cases, with Mr Nehme, with Mr Woodman, you should 10:38:19AM
18 have declared a conflict once you were engaged in 10:38:25AM
19 discussions about possible financial support that that 10:38:28AM
20 person might give you?---If that is your view, 10:38:31AM
21 Commissioner, what can I say to refute that? 10:38:36AM
22 No, I'm asking you whether you've reflected on the practice 10:38:38AM
23 that you followed and whether or not you recognise now 10:38:44AM
24 that it was something you ought to have done that you 10:38:49AM
25 didn't do?---Well, perhaps it was. But in my mind I was 10:38:51AM
26 always acting in the best interests of the people who 10:38:55AM
27 elected me and the residents of Casey who elected me. 10:38:58AM
28 Yes, upon reflection, given what I now know about the 10:39:02AM
29 number of these issues, yes, perhaps I should have 10:39:06AM

1 declared a conflict of interest. 10:39:09AM

2 And if you now recognise that, Mr Aziz, then presumably you 10:39:12AM

3 also recognise that by not declaring a conflict of 10:39:20AM

4 interest the perception remained that you were in a 10:39:26AM

5 conflict of interest?---Yes. 10:39:36AM

6 Right. Yes, Mr Tovey. 10:39:42AM

7 MR TOVEY: Mr Aziz, the first payment you received pursuant to 10:39:44AM

8 what you say was the Little River agreement was \$23,000 in 10:39:49AM

9 early December of 2012. I think it was 3 December. You 10:40:00AM

10 recall receiving a payment at that time into your bank 10:40:09AM

11 account?---Yes, I do. 10:40:13AM

12 Before 3 December - - - 10:40:14AM

13 MR RUBENSTEIN: Mr Tovey, I point to correct. I think you said 10:40:19AM

14 2012. 10:40:21AM

15 MR TOVEY: I'm sorry, 2018. 10:40:23AM

16 COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Rubenstein. 10:40:24AM

17 MR TOVEY: I apologise. So before 3 December of 2018 I think 10:40:26AM

18 you had told us that some time in November you and 10:40:33AM

19 Lorraine Wreford started discussing the Little River 10:40:39AM

20 consultancy; is that right? She came to you with an offer 10:40:43AM

21 from Mr Woodman?---Late October, early November, yes. 10:40:48AM

22 I'm sorry?---Late October, early November. 10:40:55AM

23 All right. Could you then be played tab 112, which is I think 10:40:58AM

24 exhibit 9. 10:41:13AM

25 COMMISSIONER: Is there a date of this conversation? 10:41:30AM

26 MR TOVEY: This is a conversation between Mr Aziz and 10:41:32AM

27 Ms Wreford on 12 October 2018. 10:41:36AM

28 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 10:41:43AM

29 MR TOVEY: Sorry, it's exhibit 79, Mr Commissioner. 10:41:45AM

1 COMMISSIONER: Yes. 10:41:53AM

2 (Audio recording played to the Commission.) 10:42:00AM

3 MR TOVEY: Is that a conversation that you had with 10:42:57AM

4 Ms Wreford?---Apparently, yes. 10:43:00AM

5 So there you indicate you want her to go to the Blood Donor in 10:43:01AM

6 terms of the monthly consultancy fee. This is 12 October. 10:43:07AM

7 So had you already negotiated the Little River consultancy 10:43:13AM

8 in early October? By then, 12 October, you seem to be 10:43:19AM

9 talking about a consultancy fee?---I may have. I can't 10:43:22AM

10 remember. 10:43:27AM

11 You then say, 'Ask him if it's possible to cash that because 10:43:36AM

12 it's causing me all sorts of trouble with maintenance, 10:43:43AM

13 with child maintenance.' What did you mean by 10:43:47AM

14 that?---That may have been the reason why they chose to 10:43:51AM

15 give me \$2,000 in cash and the rest into my account when 10:43:54AM

16 the consultancy started. 10:44:00AM

17 But you're talking about an existing payment, because you're 10:44:01AM

18 saying, 'The way things' - if you look at line 9, what 10:44:05AM

19 you're saying there is that you want to cash the monthly 10:44:08AM

20 consultancy fee that you were then receiving because 'it 10:44:13AM

21 is causing' - not 'it will cause', but 'it is causing' - 10:44:18AM

22 'me all sorts of trouble with maintenance'. So what 10:44:23AM

23 you've done is you've said, 'Look, if I disclose the 10:44:26AM

24 income I'm getting' - sorry, 'Because I'm disclosing 10:44:29AM

25 income I'm getting, it's causing me all sorts of trouble 10:44:38AM

26 with maintenance,' and you wanted the payment to become a 10:44:41AM

27 cash payment so you could avoid maintenance; isn't that 10:44:44AM

28 what you were doing?---No, because, first of all, that 10:44:47AM

29 didn't happen. If I was referring to any other consulting 10:44:50AM

1 fee, everything was paid into my account. And, secondly, 10:44:56AM
2 maybe I was imprecise with the language in terms of 10:45:00AM
3 anticipating future action, and that's why I sought advice 10:45:04AM
4 from my accountant as to whether the billing that I do for 10:45:08AM
5 any of the consulting I did should occur under the company 10:45:13AM
6 name or under my own ABN name. 10:45:17AM
7 In October of 2018 were you still receiving any money through 10:45:19AM
8 Spicer Thoroughbreds?---Possibly. I think that - I'm not 10:45:25AM
9 sure. I think it continues through October, yes. 10:45:30AM
10 COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, Mr Aziz, you said a little bit 10:45:37AM
11 earlier when Mr Tovey commenced to question you about the 10:45:39AM
12 Little River consultancy that you corrected him to say 10:45:49AM
13 that you commenced the discussions with Mr Wreford in late 10:45:52AM
14 October, or did you say late September, early October? 10:45:58AM
15 You corrected him. What did you say?---I think I said 10:46:03AM
16 late October, Commissioner. But I don't precisely 10:46:06AM
17 remember when the negotiations actually began. They would 10:46:09AM
18 have begun - - - 10:46:13AM
19 No, but - yes, well, so this consultancy can't then relate to 10:46:15AM
20 Little River, can it, if you only commenced discussion 10:46:22AM
21 with Ms Wreford in late October?---I think it can because 10:46:26AM
22 of line 12 - that's what jolted my memory - because I talk 10:46:37AM
23 about that little bit on top, meaning the \$2,000 that they 10:46:42AM
24 had agreed to give me in cash for various disbursements 10:46:46AM
25 and other expenses. So I can't recall exactly, but it 10:46:52AM
26 would seem to correspond with line 12. 10:46:58AM
27 But, I'm sorry, to take up Mr Tovey's point with you, that by 10:47:01AM
28 the time of this conversation on 12 October you're saying 10:47:11AM
29 to Ms Wreford please let Mr Woodman know that the monthly 10:47:15AM

1 consulting fee is causing you problems with your 10:47:21AM
2 maintenance, and you were meaning to convey, weren't you, 10:47:27AM
3 that if you were in receipt of a monthly consultancy fee 10:47:31AM
4 that would affect how much maintenance you had to 10:47:36AM
5 pay?---Not necessarily, and if you allow me to explain. 10:47:42AM
6 No, no, I just want you to explain what you meant there. I'm 10:47:47AM
7 not interested in 'not necessarily'. If you are able to 10:47:53AM
8 provide an explanation for what you were actually saying 10:47:58AM
9 there, please do?---Yes. Every month the Child Support 10:48:00AM
10 Agency asks for projections of income, especially if 10:48:07AM
11 you're earning income by way of self-employment, and I was 10:48:11AM
12 thinking into the future, given that any backdated child 10:48:18AM
13 maintenance I would have to come up with, that the bit on 10:48:21AM
14 top that I was referring to was the cash component of that 10:48:27AM
15 future consultancy relating to Little River. I wasn't 10:48:30AM
16 aware at the time that Mr Woodman was funding 10:48:34AM
17 Thoroughbreds for the consulting that I was doing for 10:48:41AM
18 them. 10:48:42AM
19 I understand you say that. But, unless it be the fact that you 10:48:43AM
20 were already receiving consultancy fees for Little River 10:48:50AM
21 that was causing you difficulties in relation to your 10:48:56AM
22 maintenance, it seems to me the only reasonable inference 10:49:00AM
23 to draw from this conversation is that you were referring 10:49:05AM
24 to the Spicer consultancy fee?---I think the problem with 10:49:08AM
25 this conversation is that I used the wrong tense. Instead 10:49:15AM
26 of saying 'could cause me problems', I said 'is causing me 10:49:18AM
27 problems', which I tend to do. 10:49:24AM
28 Yes, Mr Tovey. 10:49:28AM
29 MR TOVEY: I tender that conversation and transcript - it's 10:49:31AM

1 already exhibit 79. 10:49:37AM

2 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you. 10:49:40AM

3 MR TOVEY: Could the witness now be played tab 25, which is a 10:49:41AM

4 conversation between himself and Lorraine Wreford on 10:49:55AM

5 17 October 2018. 10:49:59AM

6 COMMISSIONER: Is this an exhibit, Mr Tovey? 10:50:08AM

7 MR TOVEY: No, it's not, I don't think, sir. 10:50:12AM

8 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 10:50:14AM

9 MR TOVEY: I'm sorry, I'm told that tab 24 is a more extensive 10:50:21AM

10 version of the same conversation. I've made the wrong 10:50:29AM

11 note. Could we please have played tab 24. That's not an 10:50:32AM

12 exhibit either, Mr Commissioner, I'm told. 10:50:42AM

13 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 10:50:45AM

14 (Audio recording played to the Commission.) 10:51:44AM

15 MR TOVEY: All right. So when that conversation starts off, at 11:03:32AM

16 line 12 Lorraine Wreford has said, 'He doesn't care which 11:03:39AM

17 one it is from.' You answer 'right', and then she says, 11:03:46AM

18 'His perspective.' Now, what she was saying there to you 11:03:53AM

19 was that John Woodman didn't care whether either Ablett or 11:04:01AM

20 Stapledon was voted in as mayor; that's right, isn't 11:04:06AM

21 it?---Yes. 11:04:11AM

22 And you had been concerned that he had taken the view that 11:04:13AM

23 Ablett should be mayor?---On the basis of what Ablett told 11:04:19AM

24 me. 11:04:25AM

25 Yes. So had you rung Lorraine Wreford to see if your deal with 11:04:25AM

26 Woodman was off the table if that occurred?---No. 11:04:33AM

27 Was anything going to be off the table, or, sorry, were you 11:04:42AM

28 concerned that something might be off the table?---No, 11:04:46AM

29 because Ablett was not aware of any negotiations that 11:04:51AM

1 I was involved in with Woodman and I only told him about 11:04:55AM
2 the \$600,000 investment around that time. So he wasn't 11:04:59AM
3 aware that there was anything between Woodman and I or 11:05:05AM
4 anything that was about to ensue between Woodman and I in 11:05:09AM
5 terms of Little River or anything else. 11:05:13AM
6 You were concerned that Woodman didn't tell Ablett about any 11:05:17AM
7 financial deal that you had or were 11:05:21AM
8 negotiating?---I wasn't sure if it was Mr Woodman's place 11:05:26AM
9 to tell Ablett personal things about me, as I didn't know 11:05:29AM
10 what Ablett was doing with Woodman. 11:05:34AM
11 Lorraine Wreford then goes on over the page at line 19. She 11:05:39AM
12 reassures you that there's never been a conversation. 11:05:47AM
13 'He's never said, "If you don't vote this way, this is off 11:05:52AM
14 the table." That's never been said.' All right? Now, 11:05:56AM
15 clearly that seems to be a reference to 'if you don't vote 11:06:02AM
16 this way in respect of the mayoral election' something is 11:06:07AM
17 off the table. What is it that was going to go off the 11:06:13AM
18 table?---This is something that Ablett told me, and I had 11:06:16AM
19 no idea what he was referring to. So I wanted to let 11:06:19AM
20 Wreford, as someone that I have confided in about 11:06:24AM
21 political matters in the past, that I was actually 11:06:28AM
22 switching my vote from Ablett to Stapledon because 11:06:30AM
23 I thought that was a fairer outcome and a better outcome 11:06:34AM
24 for the city. And then Ablett started talking to me and 11:06:37AM
25 making all these ambiguous claims, and I had no idea what 11:06:41AM
26 he was talking about. So I said to Wreford, 'Do you know 11:06:45AM
27 what this guy's talking about?' 11:06:48AM
28 When Lorraine Wreford says to you, 'Never been a conversation. 11:06:52AM
29 He's never said, "If you don't vote this way, this is off 11:07:00AM

1 the table." That's never been said,' she's reporting to 11:07:04AM
2 you, isn't she, Mr Woodman's assertion to you?---I think 11:07:12AM
3 she was reporting his response to what Ablett had claimed 11:07:19AM
4 at the time, which I didn't understand. 11:07:22AM
5 If you go down the page, you talk about what discussions you 11:07:25AM
6 have had with Ablett at lines 33 and following, and what 11:07:30AM
7 you've told him about your financial arrangements with 11:07:35AM
8 Woodman?---Yes. 11:07:38AM
9 Yes. So is that the fact, that you had told him that you had 11:07:43AM
10 money invested with Woodman and Woodman was paying you 11:07:47AM
11 interest?---I told him that well after the investment had 11:07:53AM
12 matured and it had all been paid back to me. Not at the 11:07:58AM
13 time of the investment. 11:08:03AM
14 Well, the conversation we're talking about is on 17 October of 11:08:04AM
15 2018. So it's some time during 2018 you've told him about 11:08:12AM
16 the fact - did you tell him that you had lent Woodman 11:08:19AM
17 \$600,000?---Yes, I did. 11:08:23AM
18 Did Ablett suggest to you - I mean, Ablett was 11:08:29AM
19 declaring - sorry, if I just start again. Ablett was 11:08:34AM
20 declaring a conflict, wasn't he, in respect of Woodman on 11:08:37AM
21 the basis that Woodman had at some stage - may have made a 11:08:40AM
22 donation to the Liberal Party supporting him or on the 11:08:48AM
23 basis that at one stage they owned - they part-owned a 11:08:52AM
24 horse together; you're aware of that?---Yes. 11:08:56AM
25 Did Ablett ever say to you anything about your need to declare 11:08:58AM
26 a conflict of interest if you had in recent times been 11:09:05AM
27 borrowing money from Woodman - sorry, lending money to 11:09:13AM
28 Woodman and getting paid interest by him?---No, he didn't. 11:09:17AM
29 Why were you having this conversation with Ablett about your 11:09:22AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

personal financial relationships with Woodman? Were you
and he both committed to assist Woodman if you
could?---I was having this conversation with Ablett
because he is a friend and I explained to him - he asked
me a question about matters to do with my previous divorce
and I explained to him what happened with the money that
I had lent Woodman. I explained to him a lot of things,
actually. That was one of them. And that's when Woodman
came up in the conversation, and I explained to him that
the only option I had at the time was to put the money
with Woodman to get a high rate of interest.

COMMISSIONER: Excuse me, Mr Aziz, so if I've followed the
sequence here, before this conversation with Ms Wreford
that's just been played you had either communicated to
Ms Wreford or Mr Woodman that Ablett had said to you, 'If
you don't vote this way', meaning for him, some deal that
you had with Woodman would be off the table?---He
didn't - I didn't understand what he was talking
about - - -

No, I understand that. But you had relayed what Ablett had
said to you to Wreford or to Woodman?---I think I relayed
that to Wreford because I wanted to understand what it is
that Ablett was talking about.

And so she was coming back to you saying, 'I've spoken to
Woodman, and he's never said anything like that to Ablett,
that anything's off the table if you don't vote in a
particular way; is that the sequence?---Yes, and there
could have been many things on the table, not just
anything related to me, and that's why I wanted to clarify

11:09:26AM
11:09:30AM
11:09:36AM
11:09:39AM
11:09:47AM
11:09:55AM
11:09:58AM
11:10:02AM
11:10:05AM
11:10:09AM
11:10:12AM
11:10:16AM
11:10:21AM
11:10:25AM
11:10:30AM
11:10:37AM
11:10:43AM
11:10:49AM
11:10:51AM
11:10:51AM
11:10:55AM
11:11:02AM
11:11:05AM
11:11:07AM
11:11:11AM
11:11:16AM
11:11:20AM
11:11:25AM
11:11:28AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

what is he talking about.

Yes. Yes, Mr Tovey.

MR TOVEY: So what you were clarifying was you wanted to make sure that your financial arrangements or your hoped-for financial arrangements with Mr Woodman would not be off the table if you voted in a way which he didn't want for mayor?---If I wanted that I would have been more explicit with Wreford.

So you deny that, do you?---I do. I don't recall that.

I - - -

I'm not asking whether you - look, there's one thing to say you don't recall. Do you say you deny having that concern and raising it with Wreford?---I don't remember having that concern.

Do you concede, then, that it was possible - if you can't remember, do you concede that it is possible that that conversation reflects the fact that you were worried that Mr Woodman would withdraw from your actual or planned financial arrangements if you didn't vote for mayor the way he wanted?---Could I just say explicitly that, first of all, I wouldn't vote for mayor based on what Woodman wanted anyway. But, secondly, I think what may have been my concern, if that was a concern, is anything to do with maybe the private financing of the property that Wreford had been working on from the time onwards for me, and so I just didn't want to blur or muddy the waters because they are two separate matters. Who I vote for for mayor and who I support as mayor is my decision. It's got nothing to do with Wreford, Woodman or anybody.

11:11:32AM
11:11:34AM
11:11:43AM
11:11:46AM
11:11:51AM
11:11:57AM
11:12:05AM
11:12:09AM
11:12:10AM
11:12:16AM
11:12:16AM
11:12:20AM
11:12:27AM
11:12:31AM
11:12:39AM
11:12:42AM
11:12:47AM
11:12:53AM
11:12:59AM
11:13:05AM
11:13:14AM
11:13:16AM
11:13:19AM
11:13:26AM
11:13:29AM
11:13:32AM
11:13:37AM
11:13:39AM
11:13:42AM

1 So you just wanted to clarify that the way you voted wasn't 11:13:45AM
2 going to affect the way in which Wreford sought a loan for 11:13:48AM
3 you?---It wasn't going to create - - - 11:13:54AM
4 Do you agree with that proposition?---Just - - - 11:13:56AM
5 I thought that's what you just told me, that what you were 11:14:01AM
6 wanting to do was to clarify that by voting one way or the 11:14:04AM
7 other for Ablett or Stapledon that you weren't going to 11:14:10AM
8 put in jeopardy your financial arrangements with 11:14:15AM
9 Wreford?---It could have been that, but it's also other 11:14:20AM
10 stuff way beyond that. 11:14:25AM
11 And don't you understand that if you are voting for mayor or 11:14:27AM
12 influenced in who you vote for for mayor that you are - by 11:14:34AM
13 financial arrangements you're making with a third party, 11:14:43AM
14 that's something which is an abandonment of your oath of 11:14:47AM
15 office, is it not?---No, because I was never influenced in 11:14:50AM
16 who I voted for for mayor and the biggest proof of that is 11:14:54AM
17 that I switched my vote from Ablett to Amanda. 11:14:58AM
18 I thought you just told me, though, that you were influenced by 11:15:01AM
19 it, that you wanted to check that the way you voted wasn't 11:15:05AM
20 going to affect your arrangements with Wreford. So it 11:15:09AM
21 follows logically from that that what your anticipation of 11:15:12AM
22 financial assistance from her or through her was capable 11:15:19AM
23 of affecting the way you voted; do you now deny 11:15:23AM
24 that?---That is absolutely not what I told you. So 11:15:28AM
25 I don't need to deny anything. I did say to you that 11:15:31AM
26 neither Woodman nor anyone else has ever influenced who 11:15:34AM
27 I vote for and who I support for the mayoralty, but I did 11:15:38AM
28 say to you that I did not understand what Ablett was 11:15:42AM
29 talking about. So all I did was talk to Wreford so that 11:15:45AM

1 I can get some clarification because Ablett wasn't always 11:15:51AM
2 clear when he spoke to me about these matters. So I had 11:15:53AM
3 no idea what he was talking about. 11:15:57AM
4 Then you say to her at line 94 in respect of Ablett, 'Fuck him, 11:16:00AM
5 fuck him, fuck him, no, that's it. I've made up my mind, 11:16:10AM
6 Amanda is going to be the new mayor. End of story.' Is 11:16:13AM
7 that what you said?---If it's stated in the transcript, 11:16:17AM
8 I'm not sure what is the purpose of the question. 11:16:28AM
9 Obviously it is what I said, and I'm not sure - - - 11:16:32AM
10 Don't worry about the purpose of the question. I'm simply 11:16:34AM
11 asking you did you say, 'I've made up my mind, Amanda is 11:16:36AM
12 going to be the new mayor. End of story'?---Yes, 11:16:43AM
13 I believe I've said that, yes. 11:16:50AM
14 And that's immediately after she's told you that he, that is 11:16:51AM
15 the Blood Donor, doesn't care which one?---No, because 11:16:55AM
16 preceding that I had a meeting with Amanda where I told 11:17:02AM
17 her I was going to vote for her as mayor in any case. 11:17:05AM
18 Did you have control of council to the degree to which you 11:17:09AM
19 could decide who was going to be the next mayor?---No, but 11:17:14AM
20 I was very persuasive. But I never told anyone how to 11:17:18AM
21 vote or hold a gun to anyone's head as to how they should 11:17:24AM
22 vote. But I was extremely persuasive. 11:17:28AM
23 You stated to her categorically that you would ensure that 11:17:32AM
24 Amanda was the next mayor; is that right?---You do this by 11:17:38AM
25 marshalling numbers, as you would in any political 11:17:44AM
26 environment. 11:17:47AM
27 So you did state that categorically to her?---Yes, I did, but 11:17:47AM
28 I wasn't guaranteeing that Amanda would be mayor. I was 11:17:52AM
29 saying I would work as hard as I can to make sure Amanda 11:17:56AM

1 was mayor because that was the fairest thing, and if 11:18:00AM
2 I didn't want to upset Woodman I would vote for Ablett 11:18:05AM
3 over Amanda. But I chose to vote for Amanda. 11:18:10AM
4 Then at line 267 at the end of the conversation you say, 11:18:17AM
5 'Thanks a lot about the other stuff too, I really 11:18:21AM
6 appreciate it,' and she says, 'We've just got to work 11:18:24AM
7 out - I'll let today go over and then we've got to work 11:18:33AM
8 out details about how it's going to be done but you have 11:18:37AM
9 to end up picking it up.' 'I'm very happy to do that, 11:18:41AM
10 there's no problem at all.' That's what you say. And she 11:18:51AM
11 says, 'It won't be through Bernard so it will be - it will 11:18:55AM
12 have to be done elsewhere.' So at that stage you are 11:19:01AM
13 talking to her about an arrangement which is then being 11:19:08AM
14 made for you to receive payments in cash which you were 11:19:12AM
15 going to pick up; true?---No. 11:19:15AM
16 When you say, 'I'll let today go over' - sorry, when she says - 11:19:21AM
17 'and we've got to work out the details how it's going to 11:19:29AM
18 be done but you'll have to end up picking' - 'picking it 11:19:32AM
19 up,' what is it that you were going to be picking 11:19:34AM
20 up?---I'm not sure if she was referring to what you 11:19:38AM
21 intimate as financial or money or whether she's referring 11:19:42AM
22 to a document. 11:19:48AM
23 You talked to her about 'the other stuff'. What was 'the other 11:19:52AM
24 stuff'?---Got to do with the refinancing of my house. 11:19:57AM
25 So then she says, 'We've just got to work it out. I'll let 11:20:02AM
26 today go over and then we've got to work out the details 11:20:10AM
27 about how it's going to be done but you'll have to end up 11:20:13AM
28 picking it up.' Then she says, 'I'm very happy' - you 11:20:16AM
29 say, 'I'm very happy to do that, no problems at all.' And 11:20:22AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

then she says, 'It won't be through Bernard.' Now, I hear what you say, but in the context it becomes quite obvious, I'd suggest to you, Mr Aziz, that what's being said there is that she's in the course of at that stage cobbling together an arrangement where you're going to end up having to pick up cash and unlike the Spicer arrangement, which was done through Bernard, it won't be done through Bernard. Do you deny that?---Yes, I do, and I think the financial analysis proves it wrong. It never happened. How did Bernard happen to get mentioned in the course of this conversation, 'It won't be through Bernard'? The only association that you had with Bernard that we know about at this stage was an association where he was - he had arranged for you to get payments each month. Why would she at this point in time be talking to you having to pick up stuff because it's no longer going to be coming through Bernard?---There was a couple of occasions in my interactions with Ms Wreford in 2018 where Mr Lee actually delivered some documents to me on her behalf - - - It wasn't the fact that you saw this new arrangement, which was in the embryonic stage at this point, as replacing the Spicer Thoroughbreds arrangement?---There's no comparison, Mr Tovey - - - No, I just want to make this clear. That's your position, there was no issue - there could not possibly have been any issue in your mind of the arrangement you're there talking about replacing the Spicer Thoroughbreds arrangement because they were totally unrelated?---They were totally unrelated in my mind.

11:20:28AM
11:20:36AM
11:20:42AM
11:20:46AM
11:20:51AM
11:20:54AM
11:20:59AM
11:21:02AM
11:21:10AM
11:21:14AM
11:21:18AM
11:21:21AM
11:21:24AM
11:21:29AM
11:21:35AM
11:21:41AM
11:21:44AM
11:21:49AM
11:21:56AM
11:22:02AM
11:22:05AM
11:22:10AM
11:22:14AM
11:22:16AM
11:22:20AM
11:22:24AM
11:22:28AM
11:22:34AM
11:22:36AM

1 Okay. I just want to go back now. 11:22:38AM

2 COMMISSIONER: Mr Tovey, if you're about to leave this 11:22:48AM

3 conversation, there are some things I would like to raise 11:22:51AM

4 with Mr Aziz. 11:22:53AM

5 MR TOVEY: Yes, thank you. 11:22:56AM

6 COMMISSIONER: Mr Aziz, whether or not you thought you could 11:22:57AM

7 control the vote for mayor or were simply narrating to 11:23:02AM

8 Ms Wreford your assessment of how fellow councillors would 11:23:11AM

9 vote when it came to voting for mayor, was this an 11:23:17AM

10 appropriate discussion for a councillor to have with a 11:23:22AM

11 civilian, someone who was not involved in the 11:23:27AM

12 council?---In relation to Ms Wreford at the time, yes, 11:23:34AM

13 because she was a member of the Liberal Party, she knew 11:23:37AM

14 both the candidates, or all candidates, for that matter, 11:23:41AM

15 including Gary Rowe. There were political dynamics all 11:23:44AM

16 over the place in terms of broader relationships of the 11:23:50AM

17 Liberal Party. She had been a former mayor of Casey and 11:23:54AM

18 she understood how mayoral elections work. So in her 11:23:58AM

19 case, yes. It's not a conversation I would say I would 11:24:02AM

20 have with too many people that are outside the realms of 11:24:05AM

21 politics. 11:24:09AM

22 So it's because she was a member of the Liberal Party and had 11:24:09AM

23 had a previous history on the council; is that why you 11:24:14AM

24 were discussing this with her?---Yes, and she understood 11:24:17AM

25 how mayoral elections work. 11:24:20AM

26 So I'm confused then because I take it you were not here 11:24:23AM

27 speaking to her as a mortgage broker?---Not as a mortgage 11:24:30AM

28 broker but I tended to speak to her in many of her 11:24:37AM

29 capacities and many of my capacities. I guess that's 11:24:40AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

why - - -

Your weren't - - -?---That's why - - -

I'm sorry?---Yes, unfortunately, Commissioner, the lines of or
the demarcations in terms of the functionalities that she
used to play were not as clearcut as they should have been
on many occasions, and that's what created I think a lot
of the problems that I find myself in today.

I see.

MR TOVEY: I tender that, please, Mr Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER: Sorry, Mr Tovey, just bear with me, Mr Tovey.

Do you not accept, Mr Aziz, that the impression a listener
would get from this conversation is that you were dealing
with Ms Wreford as Mr Woodman's - to use your expression
again, as Mr Woodman's gopher?---I respectfully disagree.

Do you not accept that the entirety of your discussion with
Ms Wreford about how the council voting might pan out was
in the context of demonstrating to Ms Wreford for the
purpose of passing onto Mr Woodman that Amanda Stapledon
would become the mayor?---Once again, there were no
guarantees - - -

No, I'm not asking about that. I'm asking about the character
of the role which Ms Wreford was playing here. You were
passing onto her your assessment of how the vote would go
so as to conclude with Ms Stapledon being the mayor?---For
her knowledge, not for Woodman, and the reason being is
that she has told me previously in that conversation that
Woodman doesn't care who's mayor. But I care who's mayor
because I was serving on the council. And, even if
Woodman cared one way or the other, that would not have

11:24:43AM
11:24:43AM
11:24:44AM
11:24:52AM
11:24:56AM
11:25:02AM
11:25:05AM
11:25:11AM
11:25:13AM
11:25:15AM
11:25:23AM
11:25:29AM
11:25:34AM
11:25:39AM
11:25:51AM
11:25:58AM
11:26:05AM
11:26:09AM
11:26:19AM
11:26:24AM
11:26:25AM
11:26:31AM
11:26:37AM
11:26:42AM
11:26:48AM
11:26:52AM
11:26:55AM
11:27:00AM
11:27:02AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

formed a part of my assessment or my judgment. So
I wasn't going back to her for approval of anything.
I was simply having a chat to her as a political operative
who was aware of how these things work.

Do you accept that, if it had been the case that you were
telling her this with the expectation and with the
intention that in turn that information would be passed on
to Mr Woodman, that would not be an appropriate thing for
a councillor to do?---It would not be appropriate because
it's got nothing to do with Woodman who is the mayor of
Casey.

No, but your fellow councillors would also expect, would they
not, that that's not the sort of thing you would talk to
third parties about; that is, persons who are not involved
on the council?---That wasn't our practice, unfortunately,
Commissioner, because people talk to third parties all the
time about mayoralities. In that year a councillor
actually made a Facebook posting - not Amanda Stapledon
but another councillor - predicting that she would be the
mayor of Casey by the time that election came around. So
that's telling the whole world, not just one third party,
but - - -

Yes, I'm sorry, I thought a moment ago you accepted that, if
you weren't merely talking to Ms Wreford as a former mayor
and a member of the Liberal Party but as Mr Woodman's
gopher, someone who would pass on this information to
Mr Woodman, that would be inappropriate?---Totally
inappropriate. I mean, if she was just Woodman's gopher
and none of those other things we've described her

11:27:05AM
11:27:08AM
11:27:11AM
11:27:14AM
11:27:17AM
11:27:23AM
11:27:27AM
11:27:32AM
11:27:36AM
11:27:41AM
11:27:44AM
11:27:45AM
11:27:51AM
11:27:55AM
11:28:00AM
11:28:03AM
11:28:06AM
11:28:13AM
11:28:18AM
11:28:20AM
11:28:23AM
11:28:26AM
11:28:28AM
11:28:38AM
11:28:42AM
11:28:48AM
11:28:52AM
11:28:56AM
11:28:58AM

1 together as, then it would be totally inappropriate. 11:29:01AM

2 Yes. Yes, Mr Tovey. I'm sorry, and there's one other thing. 11:29:04AM

3 When you said - rather, when Ms Wreford said to you that - 11:29:14AM

4 she reported to you that Mr Woodman had never said to 11:29:29AM

5 Mr Ablett that, if you, Mr Aziz, don't vote in a 11:29:32AM

6 particular way something's off the table, she's reporting 11:29:39AM

7 to you that Mr Woodman's told her he never said anything 11:29:42AM

8 like that to Ablett; correct?---Yes, because I did not 11:29:46AM

9 understand what Ablett meant when he - - - 11:29:51AM

10 No, no, I understand that. But I just want to get the meaning 11:29:54AM

11 here, that she's reporting to you that Mr Woodman rejects 11:29:59AM

12 Mr Ablett's suggestion that he said something like that to 11:30:02AM

13 him?---Yes. 11:30:06AM

14 And then it goes on. Ms Wreford says, 'Woodman was horrified, 11:30:08AM

15 absolutely,' and then Lorraine Wreford says, 'GA's got no 11:30:17AM

16 idea.' 'M-hmm.' 'Because that's not something he would 11:30:23AM

17 ever discuss with him'; that is, Woodman has said to her, 11:30:30AM

18 'I would never have discussed something like that with 11:30:36AM

19 Mr Ablett unless you' - Mr Aziz - 'have discussed it with 11:30:40AM

20 him. He'd have no idea.' What was Ms Wreford talking 11:30:47AM

21 about, Mr Aziz?---I think she was talking about the 11:30:51AM

22 refinancing proposition, and I'm becoming more convinced 11:30:54AM

23 that that was the case, and the reason being is that 11:31:00AM

24 Ablett had actually revealed to me at some stage that 11:31:04AM

25 Mr Woodman was actually buying a part of his property or 11:31:10AM

26 the whole of his property somewhere in the East Gippsland 11:31:16AM

27 region, and so I didn't make any comments because, you 11:31:20AM

28 know, people's business is people's business, but 11:31:24AM

29 I thought that someone may have mentioned to Ablett that 11:31:29AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Wreford had tried to seek private financing from Woodman for my property, and I just didn't want there to be any muddying or blurring of the waters, and I didn't want to be coerced into voting for someone I didn't want to vote for as a result of that person twisting my arm, not Mr Woodman but more Mr Ablett.

I follow. And applying your criteria as you've explained it back then, having discussions with Mr Ablett about - prospectively about something he might do contractually with you would not in any way create a - you didn't think that would create any conflict of interest for you absent a contractual arrangement?---Like I said to you, Commissioner, if the contract had been executed and implemented, then that would definitely be a conflict. But not otherwise?---But in - and while we're in the middle of just canvassing discussions and possibilities there was nothing there. So in my mind, no. I concede that that may have been a naive or a less than appropriate understanding on my part. But it wasn't an understanding made with any intent of malice.

All right. Yes, Mr Tovey.

MR TOVEY: Could I tender that conversation, please.

COMMISSIONER: Sorry, exhibit 280.

#EXHIBIT 280 - Audio recording and transcript of conversation between Mr Aziz and Lorraine Wreford on 17/10/18 at tab 24.

MR TOVEY: So that's tab 24. I now want to take you to the conversation which preceded that conversation; all right? So this is a conversation which you've had before this,

11:31:34AM
11:31:38AM
11:31:44AM
11:31:47AM
11:31:51AM
11:31:55AM
11:31:59AM
11:32:05AM
11:32:12AM
11:32:15AM
11:32:20AM
11:32:24AM
11:32:28AM
11:32:32AM
11:32:35AM
11:32:41AM
11:32:44AM
11:32:50AM
11:32:53AM
11:32:56AM
11:33:00AM
11:33:03AM
11:33:11AM
11:33:12AM
10:49:55AM
10:49:55AM
11:33:20AM
11:33:24AM
11:33:28AM

1 before the conversation you've just heard with Lorraine 11:33:32AM
2 Wreford. This is tab 115. So this is a conversation at 11:33:37AM
3 10.13 that morning, 17 October. 11:33:50AM
4 COMMISSIONER: Is this an exhibit, Mr Tovey? 11:33:57AM
5 MR TOVEY: It is an exhibit. It's exhibit 81, sir. 11:34:00AM
6 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 11:34:03AM
7 (Audio recording played to the Commission.) 11:36:45AM
8 MR TOVEY: Having read that, sir, do you want to revise 11:36:48AM
9 anything that you said to me having seen the subsequent 11:36:50AM
10 conversation?---I don't think so. 11:36:53AM
11 That conversation concludes with her resolving your concern 11:36:58AM
12 about whether or not it was okay to act - sorry, to vote 11:37:06AM
13 for Amanda by saying, 'He doesn't really care which 11:37:11AM
14 one' - and the 'he' there is obviously John Woodman, isn't 11:37:19AM
15 it; you agree with that?---I absolutely agree with that. 11:37:22AM
16 Yes. 'He said to me he doesn't really care which one it is as 11:37:25AM
17 long as one of them gets in and it's not Gary. If Gary 11:37:30AM
18 gets in everything is off the table I'm telling you now.' 11:37:35AM
19 So that's her talking on behalf of Woodman to you saying 11:37:43AM
20 that. 'If Gary gets in' - that is Gary Rowe gets in - 11:37:50AM
21 'everything is off the table. But things won't be 11:37:55AM
22 disturbed if either Stapledon or Ablett get in;' is that 11:37:59AM
23 the situation?---No. My vote was never going to be for 11:38:06AM
24 Gary. I just want to clear that up. And I've never voted 11:38:10AM
25 for him. And if we were still on council I would never 11:38:14AM
26 vote for him for many reasons. But I repeat I wasn't 11:38:18AM
27 waiting for instructions from Mr Woodman as to who would 11:38:22AM
28 be the next mayor of Casey. I simply wanted to clear up a 11:38:25AM
29 misunderstanding that I got from Ablett about what he 11:38:28AM

1 conveyed to me about an alleged discussion he had with 11:38:33AM
2 Woodman, and I didn't understand what 'off the table' 11:38:36AM
3 meant and what did he mean by the arrangements. So I had 11:38:40AM
4 an arrangement I discussed with Wreford about getting 11:38:43AM
5 financing for my property, and I had no idea what 11:38:45AM
6 conversations Ablett and Woodman might have had about 11:38:50AM
7 that, and that's what I wanted to clarify. 11:38:53AM
8 That's fair enough. So Ablett says to you, 'Look, I understand 11:38:57AM
9 from Woodman that unless you vote for me everything is off 11:39:06AM
10 the table,' and you're worried that your financial 11:39:09AM
11 arrangements with him are going to be off the table; 11:39:14AM
12 true?---Not necessarily my financial arrangements. 11:39:18AM
13 Well, your prospective financial arrangements, as you are now 11:39:21AM
14 putting it; is that right?---Yes, because at the time 11:39:25AM
15 I had no financial arrangements with Woodman in my mind. 11:39:29AM
16 Well, if you look at this conversation you're in the process of 11:39:34AM
17 negotiating payments of cash, are you not, because if you 11:39:42AM
18 look at - go back to line 13, you say, 'Now the issue, the 11:39:46AM
19 issue is the Blood Donor because he has been he has been 11:39:54AM
20 intimating', and that's talking about what Ablett's been 11:40:01AM
21 saying, and then Lorraine Wreford says to you, 'Yeah okay 11:40:06AM
22 I will get back to you about that and about the cash all 11:40:11AM
23 good but we will work we will work a deal out.' She is 11:40:15AM
24 there linking this issue with your deal to get some cash 11:40:26AM
25 from John Woodman?---No. She may have been trying to 11:40:31AM
26 refer, like I said before, to the consulting arrangement 11:40:35AM
27 of which was going to be paid to me - - - 11:40:41AM
28 I'm sorry, Mr Aziz, can I ask you to take your hand from your 11:40:43AM
29 mouth because it's difficult to work out what you're 11:40:46AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

saying?---Yes, I can. But can I also say to you that
I have a neuro disease because of my diabetes and
sometimes I get shakes, and so the only way to stop the
shakes is to actually hold my face.

If we're at that stage, it's quarter to 12, Mr Commissioner,
perhaps we should give the witness a few
minutes?---Whether you give me a break now or not, it's an
involuntary thing that happens to me because of my
diabetes. I could be doing this while I'm on my break.
I could do it when I come back.

All right. Perhaps we can continue through this document.

Would that be appropriate, sir?

COMMISSIONER: Yes, and then we'll take an adjournment,
Mr Tovey.

MR TOVEY: Thank you. So what's being referred to there,
'I will get back to you about that and about the cash all
good but we will work out a deal.' A deal is being worked
out - a deal is in the process of being worked out which
involves cash. That's as clear as day, isn't it? Are you
going to try and say that wasn't the case?---No, I'm not
going to try and deny that. But, like I said to you
previously and repeatedly, it may have related to the cash
components for the negotiations that we were trying to
have in relation to the Little River agreement.

But what you say is, look, having talked to you about the cash
deal, this stage it's not a Little River deal, you're
trying to work out some basis, I would suggest to you, on
which they can justify paying you cash; is that the
case?---No.

11:40:48AM
11:40:53AM
11:40:55AM
11:41:01AM
11:41:03AM
11:41:07AM
11:41:10AM
11:41:12AM
11:41:15AM
11:41:18AM
11:41:20AM
11:41:23AM
11:41:25AM
11:41:28AM
11:41:29AM
11:41:40AM
11:41:43AM
11:41:49AM
11:41:49AM
11:41:53AM
11:41:54AM
11:41:56AM
11:42:01AM
11:42:04AM
11:42:08AM
11:42:13AM
11:42:17AM
11:42:20AM
11:42:25AM

1 It wasn't a Little River deal at this stage. It was a deal to 11:42:26AM
2 find a process by which they could shunt cash to you?---So 11:42:30AM
3 every time they paid me cash I've banked it into my 11:42:35AM
4 account and you've known about it. So if that's the 11:42:38AM
5 situation here where did the cash go? 11:42:41AM
6 I take it you don't want to answer that question. I'll just 11:42:44AM
7 move on to the next one then?---Sorry - - - 11:42:47AM
8 Then you go on to say, 'Oh that is awesome thank you but he can 11:42:52AM
9 I tell you that he has been intimating that unless I vote 11:43:05AM
10 for him everything is off the table.' So what you're 11:43:08AM
11 saying there is you're talking about your deal to get 11:43:11AM
12 cash, and you say, 'That's awesome because I was really 11:43:14AM
13 worried because he was saying everything's off the table.' 11:43:17AM
14 That's the only logical conclusion that somebody reading 11:43:21AM
15 this impartially could draw, I'd suggest to 11:43:24AM
16 you?---I totally disagree. I mean, if that was the case 11:43:29AM
17 I'm not sure if I was in my right mind to tell Ablett that 11:43:32AM
18 I was getting whatever cash you're inferring. In my mind 11:43:36AM
19 there were two issues at the time. One was the 11:43:40AM
20 refinancing of Barak Avenue and secondly was the initial 11:43:42AM
21 discussions we had about a consulting agreement in 11:43:46AM
22 relation to Little River. So in both of these situations 11:43:49AM
23 I was concerned that Ablett might have been having 11:43:52AM
24 discussions with Woodman and might have been privy to 11:43:58AM
25 information in relation to my personal life that I didn't 11:44:01AM
26 necessarily want him to be privy to at this stage. 11:44:03AM
27 That's exhibit 81, Mr Commissioner. 11:44:06AM
28 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Have you concluded with that conversation? 11:44:09AM
29 MR TOVEY: I have, yes. 11:44:15AM

1 COMMISSIONER: Mr Aziz, you have a break now and we'll resume 11:44:16AM
2 at midday. 11:44:19AM
3 (Short adjournment.) 11:44:25AM
4 COMMISSIONER: Are you ready to proceed, Mr Rubenstein? 12:05:37PM
5 MR RUBENSTEIN: Yes, Commissioner. 12:05:43PM
6 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr Tovey. 12:05:45PM
7 MR TOVEY: Mr Aziz, that conversation on 17 October immediately 12:05:49PM
8 followed upon a vote on the Hall Road H3 issue; I think it 12:05:53PM
9 was on 16 October. Do you recall such a vote having taken 12:06:04PM
10 place?---Yes, I recall Hall Road, yes. 12:06:08PM
11 And Hall Road was an issue which was tied up with the H3 12:06:14PM
12 intersection, was it not?---Yes. 12:06:18PM
13 Did the discussion about cash in that conversation have any 12:06:23PM
14 link with your vote on Hall Road?---No. 12:06:35PM
15 Was there ever any nexus in your mind between favours that 12:06:41PM
16 Woodman was doing you or that Wreford was doing you and 12:06:52PM
17 your vote in council on Hall Road?---No. 12:06:56PM
18 All right. I now want to go to tab 34 on 23 October of 2018, 12:07:01PM
19 and this is another conversation between yourself and 12:07:19PM
20 Lorraine Wreford. 12:07:24PM
21 COMMISSIONER: Is this an exhibit already, Mr Tovey? 12:07:45PM
22 MR TOVEY: Tab 34, I don't think it is, Mr Commissioner. 12:07:47PM
23 COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 12:07:53PM
24 (Audio recording played to the Commission.) 12:08:04PM
25 COMMISSIONER: [REDACTED] 12:15:13PM
26 [REDACTED] 12:15:21PM
27 [REDACTED] 12:15:24PM
28 [REDACTED] 12:15:26PM
29 [REDACTED] 12:15:29PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

[REDACTED]

12:15:33PM
12:15:35PM
12:15:41PM
12:15:47PM
12:15:51PM
12:15:55PM
12:16:00PM
12:16:04PM
12:16:08PM
12:16:18PM
12:16:22PM
12:16:28PM
12:16:36PM
12:16:41PM
12:16:59PM
12:17:04PM
12:17:08PM
12:17:09PM
12:17:12PM
12:17:15PM
12:17:20PM
12:17:22PM
12:17:26PM
12:17:27PM
12:17:32PM
12:17:34PM
12:17:40PM
12:17:47PM
12:17:50PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

[REDACTED]

12:17:53PM
12:17:55PM
12:17:59PM
12:18:02PM
12:18:04PM
12:18:07PM
12:18:10PM
12:18:12PM
12:18:15PM
12:18:17PM
12:18:21PM
12:18:24PM
12:18:26PM
12:18:33PM
12:18:35PM
12:18:41PM
12:18:45PM
12:18:51PM
12:18:54PM
12:19:00PM
12:19:02PM
12:19:04PM
12:19:06PM
12:19:09PM
12:19:14PM
12:19:18PM
12:19:19PM
12:19:25PM
12:19:27PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

[REDACTED]

12:19:29PM
12:19:31PM
12:19:34PM
12:19:37PM
12:19:42PM
12:19:45PM
12:19:49PM
12:19:52PM
12:19:56PM
12:19:58PM
12:20:01PM
12:20:04PM
12:20:11PM
12:20:14PM
12:20:14PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

[REDACTED]

12:41:19PM
12:41:19PM
12:41:29PM
12:41:32PM
12:41:41PM
12:41:41PM
12:41:45PM
12:41:49PM
12:41:52PM
12:41:57PM
12:42:02PM
12:42:08PM
12:42:08PM
12:42:13PM
12:42:14PM
12:42:16PM
12:42:19PM
12:43:17PM
12:51:06PM
12:51:13PM
12:51:31PM
12:51:38PM
12:51:42PM
12:51:47PM
12:51:53PM
12:52:00PM
12:52:03PM
12:52:09PM
12:52:13PM

(Audio recording played to the Commission.)

MR TOVEY: I just want to ask you one thing to start off with.

If you go to line 321 - can you see that?---Yes.

You there say - you're talking about the transfer of Barak

Avenue, aren't you, to John Woodman there?---Yes.

You say, 'I reckon the transfer needs to occur around the end

of 2020.' And she says, 'When's council elections?' And

you say, 'October 2020.' Then you go on to say, 'The

period between when we all cease to be councillors and the

declaration of the result.' And she says, 'He just wanted

a bit of space,' and then people start stumbling over

their words, I'd suggest. Now, when I suggested to you

1 yesterday that the timing of the taking over - sorry, of 12:52:18PM
2 you buying back or getting back Barak Avenue was to 12:52:26PM
3 coincide with the end of your term as a councillor you 12:52:31PM
4 became very indignant and you seemed to express outrage to 12:52:35PM
5 me. Why was that, when we see here that's precisely what 12:52:41PM
6 was being arranged?---What was being arranged was for 12:52:47PM
7 (indistinct) to allow me the opportunity to actually 12:52:53PM
8 secure employment beyond my council term because this was 12:52:56PM
9 going to be my last council term, my last term of service 12:53:00PM
10 on the City of Casey, and so I was happy for the 12:53:05PM
11 arrangement to continue while I had employment and while 12:53:10PM
12 I could draw an income from my councillor role and from 12:53:13PM
13 other activities I was doing. But I wanted the 12:53:18PM
14 opportunity to be able to get another position to support 12:53:21PM
15 the transfer of the property through another lender had 12:53:27PM
16 that arrangement actually taken place. Now, as it turned 12:53:30PM
17 out, Mr Tovey, as you're aware, that arrangement did not 12:53:35PM
18 take place. 12:53:38PM

19 COMMISSIONER: Mr Aziz, really, that's not an answer to the 12:53:38PM
20 question counsel was putting to you, which was, if he's 12:53:41PM
21 right that you were indignant the other day at the 12:53:47PM
22 suggestion that the time for the transfer back to you had 12:53:50PM
23 anything to do with council elections, what he's asking 12:53:54PM
24 you is why here are you suggesting that the best time for 12:53:59PM
25 this to occur is 'the period between when we all cease to 12:54:03PM
26 be councillors and the declaration of the 12:54:08PM
27 result'?---I tried to answer that question, but I don't 12:54:12PM
28 know why, I can't recall this conversation, and I've only 12:54:14PM
29 become aware of it since you've presented it just now, 12:54:19PM

1 Commissioner. I'm trying to work out why that arrangement 12:54:23PM
2 was suggested. But in my mind I simply required a period 12:54:26PM
3 of two years to be able to get the property back in my 12:54:28PM
4 name. 12:54:32PM
5 So you can't explain now what you're thinking was as to why the 12:54:38PM
6 best thing for it to occur is actually during the period 12:54:43PM
7 after the election and before declaration of 12:54:47PM
8 results?---That's the period where not a lot of activity 12:54:55PM
9 happens and, on the basis of my thinking, if I had just 12:54:59PM
10 finished my council term and if I was actually assisting 12:55:03PM
11 other colleagues with getting re-elected to the City of 12:55:06PM
12 Casey then that would be the time for me to be able to 12:55:10PM
13 organise the process, the legal process, for the transfer 12:55:14PM
14 to come back to me. So maybe they were all considerations 12:55:19PM
15 in my mind as I was having a chat to Ms Wreford on that 12:55:25PM
16 day. But I can't pinpoint exactly why those statements 12:55:28PM
17 were made and in any case, Commissioner, none of that ever 12:55:33PM
18 materialised. 12:55:38PM
19 Mr Aziz, you've said that numerous times now in relation to 12:55:40PM
20 various commercial transactions you were in the course of 12:55:45PM
21 discussing with either Mr Woodman or Mr Nehme. The issue 12:55:54PM
22 here is not whether those transactions were ultimately 12:55:58PM
23 consummated but whether or not you had placed yourself in 12:56:01PM
24 a conflict position by engaging in those discussions. 12:56:06PM
25 I think you understand now that that's quite a discrete 12:56:10PM
26 consideration from whether the transaction ever 12:56:15PM
27 eventuated?---Yes, I do. 12:56:19PM
28 Yes, Mr Tovey. 12:56:20PM
29 MR TOVEY: I want to be straightforward with you, Mr Aziz. 12:56:26PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

When one looks back at your denial of any - of the fact that there was any specific attempt to time you taking the house back with a period when you were no longer a councillor and put it back together with this discussion, you look at your relationship with Mr Woodman, the overwhelming inference would seem to be that what you were wanting to do was put the transaction back to a point where when you were no longer a councillor it would receive less scrutiny; do you have any comment on that?---I don't believe that that would have been the case at all. I think it's not when the transaction ends; it's when the transaction commences which is the problem, if it had commenced, not when it ends because what has been done is done. But how can that possibly enter into my thinking?

Well, Mr Woodman has indicated that he was never comfortable with this because of the obvious reason it would link his name to yours and cause the possibility of people making allegations of an inappropriate relationship; but he only involved himself in it because you were insisting on it and you were a councillor. Do you have any comment on that?---That is absolutely not true. Mr Woodman had all the power. He was suggested to me as a private financier by a mortgage broker who also used to work for him; that's Wreford. He had all the power. He's not shy of saying no to people, as I discovered later. So I wasn't holding anything over him. I was not blackmailing him about anything.

See, if you put this in context, Mr Woodman puts himself in

12:56:32PM
12:56:36PM
12:56:43PM
12:56:47PM
12:56:52PM
12:56:57PM
12:57:02PM
12:57:07PM
12:57:11PM
12:57:19PM
12:57:21PM
12:57:26PM
12:57:33PM
12:57:36PM
12:57:39PM
12:57:41PM
12:57:44PM
12:57:47PM
12:57:54PM
12:58:00PM
12:58:02PM
12:58:05PM
12:58:10PM
12:58:16PM
12:58:21PM
12:58:26PM
12:58:31PM
12:58:34PM
12:58:34PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

jeopardy by, from his perspective, assisting you to hide funds from your wife and the Family Court which could have him involved in a perversion of the course of justice. Can you explain why it was - what there was between you which would have led him to take such a risk in respect of accepting the \$600,000 from you?---There was nothing between us except somewhat of a friendship at that stage. Then here you are, you have a situation where you suggest he buys your house and you buy it back some two years later for next to nothing. But if we forget about the actual process of that you have a situation where there is going to be a record of a company associated with him in a commercial transaction with you which is negotiated during the time that you're heavily involved in H3 at least. Is that something that he ever discussed with you as him being worried about?---No, and when you say 'forget about the process', the process is fundamental to all this. It's the association which to him as a rational businessman would have been only - would only have led to negative perceptions, particularly after The Age article. Now, the question is again: why would he do something which is only going to put himself in a position where he might be subject to criticism and allegations and where there is no commercial advantage to him; why do you think he would do that for you?---He may have just wanted to help me out because of the state of distress that I was in. I see?---Can I just - I need to clarify one point here, Commissioner, and that is I have given evidence before that the process was never going to be that he would just

12:58:41PM
12:58:47PM
12:58:51PM
12:58:55PM
12:58:58PM
12:59:04PM
12:59:11PM
12:59:17PM
12:59:24PM
12:59:27PM
12:59:32PM
12:59:36PM
12:59:41PM
12:59:46PM
12:59:52PM
12:59:56PM
01:00:01PM
01:00:04PM
01:00:15PM
01:00:19PM
01:00:24PM
01:00:29PM
01:00:35PM
01:00:40PM
01:00:44PM
01:00:48PM
01:00:50PM
01:01:03PM
01:01:06PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

give me the house back. I would have to borrow money from
a generic lender to actually take the house back off him,
and I would have to pay him the stamp duty cost that he
incurred as well. And that was just having a normal
agreement - - -

We're cognisant of the fact that you assert that. However,
there are numerous conversations and there are numerous
references to documents to which you have been taken and
to which you will be taken. Never once is that mentioned.
Can you explain why that would be?---It was certainly
discussed with Wreford as the model for how we would
execute this, and this is why I keep saying to her,
'I need security,' because essentially I was transferring
my property into his name, and I was going to pay him
mortgage repayments on that property for those two years.
So I need some sort of security the property can come back
to me, because it's the only property that I had left.
You didn't address my question. Can you explain why it is that
you say there was the arrangement you've just described,
but that's never referred to any document and it's not
referred to any conversation, and indeed in this and other
conversations where you lay out every term of your
agreement with Mr Woodman that doesn't crack a mention,
Mr Aziz? I suggest to you that the reason it doesn't
crack a mention is because the arrangement was that you
got the money in your pocket for nothing and you were
going to get the house back for next to nothing?---That is
absolutely not true.

All right?---I had discussions with Wreford reflecting that

01:01:09PM
01:01:14PM
01:01:18PM
01:01:21PM
01:01:25PM
01:01:29PM
01:01:33PM
01:01:37PM
01:01:41PM
01:01:46PM
01:01:50PM
01:01:56PM
01:02:00PM
01:02:03PM
01:02:07PM
01:02:11PM
01:02:15PM
01:02:18PM
01:02:24PM
01:02:31PM
01:02:33PM
01:02:37PM
01:02:42PM
01:02:47PM
01:02:50PM
01:02:55PM
01:02:59PM
01:03:04PM
01:03:06PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

agreement that I've just described to you of that understanding. And there are many things, many elements missing from the conversations that you have captured where those discussions and those exact discussions were had.

You put that together with both the fact that Ms Wreford and Mr Woodman say that the arrangement was the one I've described. Why would Mr Woodman or - sorry, I can't ask you what he thought, but can you think of any reason arising from what was occurring at the time that Mr Woodman would want to hide from us the fact that you say the whole arrangement was quite different and legitimate?---I'm not sure that he was trying to hide it from you. I think he was trying to hide it from the people that were leaking information from the City of Casey and going to the media all the time.

COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, Mr Tovey, I think the question might have made the point of your question a little obscure. Were you intending to convey to Mr Aziz that Mr Woodman never advanced this explanation in the course of his lengthy evidence at the Commission?

MR TOVEY: That's quite the case, and indeed his explanation was what I have just put to Mr Aziz as being the truth of the matter, and Ms Wreford's?---I understand why that has occurred.

COMMISSIONER: All right. Mr Aziz, I want to ask you something else again about this conversation. You recall earlier you said that you were having these conversations with Ms Wreford because she was a member of the Liberal Party,

01:03:10PM
01:03:12PM
01:03:15PM
01:03:17PM
01:03:21PM
01:03:23PM
01:03:28PM
01:03:31PM
01:03:39PM
01:03:42PM
01:03:45PM
01:03:52PM
01:03:54PM
01:04:02PM
01:04:05PM
01:04:08PM
01:04:10PM
01:04:12PM
01:04:21PM
01:04:26PM
01:04:30PM
01:04:33PM
01:04:37PM
01:04:41PM
01:04:48PM
01:04:49PM
01:04:51PM
01:04:53PM
01:04:57PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

as were you, and she was an ex-mayor. Did the Liberal Party have any particular interest in who was going to be mayor at this next election?---I would say yes, but no-one - everybody follows mayoral elections and indeed general elections. But nobody explicitly puts their hand up and says, 'I'm interested in this election and I hope this is the outcome.'

No, no, I'm sorry, it's a much more specific question. Had there been any expression of interest by the Liberal Party or anyone at a more senior level in the Liberal Party expressing any interest in which member of the Liberal Party was going to become the next mayor?---Not in this particular election of (indistinct).

So the fact that you and Ms Wreford were members of the Liberal Party didn't have any relevance in terms of your discussions other than, what, a common interest in who the next Liberal member of the council would be that would become mayor; is that what you say?---Yes, and she did reflect on her own experience of mayoral elections.

And you made that point in the context of answering my question about whether or not it would have been appropriate for you to be engaging in these discussions about who would become the next mayor and who will vote for who and the numbers et cetera on the basis that it was okay for you to do that because Ms Wreford was discussing this with you as a member of the party and as an ex-mayor, not because she had any connection to Mr Woodman and not because you expected her to relay any of this information to Mr Woodman; do you recall saying that?---I recall saying

01:05:00PM
01:05:08PM
01:05:11PM
01:05:22PM
01:05:26PM
01:05:30PM
01:05:34PM
01:05:35PM
01:05:41PM
01:05:46PM
01:05:50PM
01:05:53PM
01:06:00PM
01:06:04PM
01:06:10PM
01:06:13PM
01:06:21PM
01:06:25PM
01:06:28PM
01:06:34PM
01:06:37PM
01:06:40PM
01:06:47PM
01:06:51PM
01:06:55PM
01:07:01PM
01:07:05PM
01:07:09PM
01:07:12PM

1 that. But I also recall telling her in either this 01:07:17PM
2 conversation or another conversation that representations 01:07:23PM
3 made to Mr Woodman by other people may not necessarily be 01:07:27PM
4 the truth. 01:07:34PM
5 And do you recall in this conversation you expressly say to her 01:07:35PM
6 that Mr Woodman needs to be told about the substance of 01:07:40PM
7 what you were discussing with her?---Yes, because I wanted 01:07:44PM
8 him to be aware from my personal perspective that issues 01:07:49PM
9 in relation to the transfer of property or that were 01:07:57PM
10 I think conveyed to me in an ambiguous - need to be kept 01:08:02PM
11 separate from all of this process. 01:08:06PM
12 So does that mean - and I don't want to put words in your mouth 01:08:08PM
13 here, Mr Aziz, but does that mean applying the standard 01:08:11PM
14 that you articulated before about when it would be 01:08:15PM
15 inappropriate to have such a conversation that you 01:08:19PM
16 acknowledge it was therefore inappropriate to be having 01:08:22PM
17 this conversation with Ms Wreford as a person that you 01:08:26PM
18 expected would convey the information to Mr Woodman?---In 01:08:30PM
19 this context, most definitely. 01:08:34PM
20 Yes. So why were you doing that?---I really can't answer that. 01:08:37PM
21 I have general discussions with Wreford about a whole heap 01:08:46PM
22 of political matters. Sometimes Woodman has come into the 01:08:49PM
23 conversation. But if the inference is that I was trying 01:08:53PM
24 to let Woodman know that I was doing him a favour, no, 01:08:57PM
25 I wasn't doing him a favour because ultimately the mayoral 01:09:02PM
26 election had nothing to do with him. 01:09:05PM
27 Again, I'm not sure now because of the length of your answer 01:09:07PM
28 and how it ultimately digressed from the question what 01:09:14PM
29 your answer is to my question. Having identified for me 01:09:18PM

1 what would have been inappropriate, namely you talking to 01:09:23PM
2 Ms Wreford about these matters if you understood her to be 01:09:27PM
3 a conduit that would pass this information to Mr Woodman, 01:09:31PM
4 do you accept that you should not have been having this 01:09:37PM
5 particular conversation with 01:09:40PM
6 Ms Wreford?---Mr Commissioner, I believe I've answered yes 01:09:44PM
7 to that already. 01:09:47PM
8 All right. And so my question is you were a very experienced 01:09:47PM
9 councillor; why were you engaged in an inappropriate 01:09:52PM
10 conversation with Ms Wreford?---Perhaps a slip of the 01:09:57PM
11 tongue. Perhaps lack of consideration at the time. 01:10:01PM
12 Perhaps I was under various stressors that made my 01:10:05PM
13 decision making erratic. There could be a range of 01:10:10PM
14 reasons as to why I did that on that particular occasion. 01:10:13PM
15 And that explain that you didn't appreciate it was 01:10:16PM
16 inappropriate at the time?---Perhaps, yes. 01:10:22PM
17 All right. Yes, Mr Tovey. 01:10:24PM
18 MR TOVEY: If you go to line 27. Thank you. And you see 01:10:27PM
19 you're there saying, 'I'm not interested. So anyway he's 01:10:53PM
20 getting to the desperation stage, he's now trying to get a 01:10:58PM
21 formal alliance with Gary'. The 'he' you're talking about 01:11:02PM
22 is Mr Ablett; is that right?---Yes. 01:11:07PM
23 Then you went on to say after a break 'and the BD'; that's the 01:11:09PM
24 Blood Donor?---Yes. 01:11:18PM
25 And you and Ablett both called him the Blood Donor, did you 01:11:18PM
26 not?---I actually instigated the term. 01:11:25PM
27 I know you've given us an explanation, but did it have 01:11:28PM
28 anything - did it have any relationship to vampires 01:11:34PM
29 sucking blood or anything of that nature?---I believe I've 01:11:37PM

1 explained to you why we called him that. But it had 01:11:42PM
2 nothing of the certain nature that you suggest, Mr Tovey. 01:11:46PM
3 Anyway, 'The Blood Donor needs to know all of this and he needs 01:11:52PM
4 to know how unreliable the person that's talking to him 01:11:57PM
5 is.' So you're saying there that Mr Woodman needs to be 01:12:04PM
6 told that Geoff Ablett, with whom he's dealing, is 01:12:09PM
7 unreliable; is that right?---Yes. 01:12:17PM
8 Now, this is in respect of council business. Why is it that 01:12:19PM
9 the Blood Donor has to be told these things? I mean, he's 01:12:27PM
10 just a client of the council, isn't he? He's not even a 01:12:30PM
11 member of the local community. Why is it that he needs to 01:12:34PM
12 be given in-depth and indeed almost forensic information 01:12:38PM
13 about the operation of the council?---I'm not sure that 01:12:47PM
14 the reference that I was making there was in relation to 01:12:51PM
15 the council. I was referring to the information that 01:12:53PM
16 Ablett told me he had discussed with Woodman, which 01:12:56PM
17 I couldn't understand. I did not understand what it is 01:13:01PM
18 that he was discussing with Woodman. 01:13:04PM
19 What you wanted him to know, it's clear from that, is that he 01:13:06PM
20 had a too high an opinion of Geoff Ablett and of his 01:13:13PM
21 reliability, particularly in terms of consideration of his 01:13:19PM
22 eligibility to be the mayor. And what I'm asking you is 01:13:25PM
23 why are you concerned that John Woodman knows these 01:13:30PM
24 things? I mean, he's just a council client. He's not 01:13:34PM
25 even a constituent?---I'm not sure that I was necessarily 01:13:39PM
26 concerned that John Woodman in his capacity as a client or 01:13:41PM
27 a constituent should know these things. But I was more 01:13:48PM
28 concerned about whatever conversation transpired between 01:13:51PM
29 them, which I didn't understand, and I wanted to make sure 01:13:54PM

1 that whatever information that was being passed on from 01:13:56PM
2 Ablett to him about me was actually passing through some 01:14:00PM
3 sort of reliability test. 01:14:04PM
4 It seems implicit in what you say there that you were aware 01:14:07PM
5 that he had some sort of special relationship with 01:14:10PM
6 Mr Woodman; is that fair enough?---No, because even 01:14:13PM
7 Wreford admits that Woodman saw him as unreliable and 01:14:17PM
8 everyone realised that he was being very erratic 01:14:23PM
9 towards - - - 01:14:26PM
10 No, I'm not asking you that. I said it seems from all you say 01:14:26PM
11 there that you acknowledge that from your perspective 01:14:29PM
12 there was some special relationship between Mr Ablett and 01:14:33PM
13 Mr Woodman?---No. I would say no because I was aware 01:14:39PM
14 generally that Woodman supported Liberal Party members 01:14:46PM
15 when they sought - after they won preselection and they 01:14:50PM
16 sought election to State parliament. But I wasn't aware 01:14:55PM
17 of the specifics that existed between them. I know that 01:14:59PM
18 Ablett talked to him during his mayoralty, as any mayor 01:15:02PM
19 would talk to any developer I suppose. But what do you 01:15:07PM
20 mean by special relationship is not - - - 01:15:10PM
21 You knew more than that, didn't you? You've already told us 01:15:13PM
22 that you knew that Woodman was offering to buy his 01:15:15PM
23 property in the country at Curwen Road?---He mentioned 01:15:19PM
24 that to me at one stage, but - - - 01:15:24PM
25 All right. Now, let's face it. And what did you say to him? 01:15:27PM
26 Did you say to him, 'Hold on, Woodman's a developer client 01:15:30PM
27 of the council. How is it that you're doing 01:15:34PM
28 that'?---I generally don't pry into people's private lives 01:15:40PM
29 to that extent or impose my opinion on them. 01:15:43PM

1 See, let me tell you something. Mr Ablett says that the reason 01:15:45PM
2 that that transaction was being discussed is that it was 01:15:51PM
3 going to be a reward for Mr Ablett for supporting C219 and 01:15:58PM
4 this was a process of reimbursing him for that support. 01:16:05PM
5 That's what Mr Ablett himself has indicated to us. Now, 01:16:09PM
6 if that's the case, can you explain why it is that he 01:16:15PM
7 would be discussing this with you, other than the fact 01:16:20PM
8 that you both saw yourselves to be under Mr Woodman's 01:16:22PM
9 corrupt umbrella?---I disagree with that entirely. I'm 01:16:26PM
10 not aware of the evidence that Ablett has given the 01:16:34PM
11 Commission or the evidence that Woodman has given the 01:16:36PM
12 Commission. But I am certainly aware in fact in some 01:16:39PM
13 instances of the conversations that did go on. So it 01:16:43PM
14 wasn't a competition between Ablett and I to see who could 01:16:47PM
15 win the most favour with Woodman. That wasn't the case at 01:16:50PM
16 all. And, if it was the case, then why did I switch my 01:16:54PM
17 vote from Ablett to Stapledon when Ablett, according to 01:16:57PM
18 your thinking, would have been the more preferred mayor? 01:17:04PM
19 You knew, did you not, Mr Aziz, that Ablett was in a position 01:17:07PM
20 from which he couldn't extricate himself and that is where 01:17:12PM
21 he couldn't vote on Woodman issues; you knew 01:17:15PM
22 that?---Neither could Stapledon. 01:17:20PM
23 And, even though you knew he was conflicted, that didn't deter 01:17:23PM
24 you in the least from working in the background with him 01:17:26PM
25 to achieve Woodman's aims?---I worked with him not to 01:17:29PM
26 achieve Woodman's aims, and I think I've been misled on a 01:17:36PM
27 number of issues, one of them being the representations on 01:17:40PM
28 the H3 intersection. But it wasn't about achieving 01:17:44PM
29 Woodman's aims. It was actually achieving a resolution to 01:17:50PM

1 an intersection ahead of a State election where funding 01:17:53PM
2 was being promised and, as it was explained to me, we 01:17:56PM
3 would miss out on that funding if we didn't go ahead and 01:17:59PM
4 expedite the building of that intersection where two 01:18:02PM
5 fatalities had occurred. 01:18:05PM
6 Would that be an appropriate time, Mr Commissioner? 01:18:06PM
7 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Before we adjourn, just a couple of 01:18:09PM
8 questions arising out of that last portion of your 01:18:12PM
9 answers, Mr Aziz. Do you mean to say, Mr Aziz, that it 01:18:16PM
10 was relevant to your considerations of how to deal with 01:18:28PM
11 the H3 issue that Mr Woodman - you believed that 01:18:33PM
12 Mr Woodman was going to make financial contributions to 01:18:40PM
13 the Liberal Party at the forthcoming State election?---No, 01:18:43PM
14 there was actually funding on the - - - 01:18:48PM
15 I'm sorry, could you explain then your last answer, 01:18:50PM
16 please?---It was actually the Labor Party that put funding 01:18:55PM
17 on the table for roads and intersections, and Ablett 01:18:58PM
18 approached me when he was mayor some time before then and 01:19:04PM
19 said to me, 'I want you to take on the additional 01:19:07PM
20 responsibility of roads advocacy because of all the work 01:19:11PM
21 that you've done with the National Areas Growth Alliance.' 01:19:15PM
22 I said, 'Look, I'm happy to do that.' And so when it came 01:19:20PM
23 to the H3 intersection he said to me that he was going to 01:19:23PM
24 declare a conflict, and then he said it was really up to 01:19:26PM
25 me to argue the issue before we actually miss out on this 01:19:30PM
26 funding. And then himself and Schutz, as Woodman's 01:19:36PM
27 consultant, started sending me material relating to some 01:19:41PM
28 advocacy group in relation to the issue. 01:19:46PM
29 Look, I'm sorry, Mr Aziz, but - look, I don't know whether you 01:19:52PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

realise that you're not answering questions when you go on
with these long statements, but what I was wanting you to
explain was what did you mean by - the reference to the
fact that Mr Woodman - you understood Mr Woodman was going
to contribute to the next campaign at State Government
level?---I didn't say that, Commissioner. I said that
there was funding on the table, and the funding I meant
was actually coming from the Labor Party for dangerous
intersections in the City of Casey.

And you didn't make any reference to any expectation of
Mr Woodman contributing funds?---To this particular
situation, no.

I'm sorry, then I've completely misunderstood your answer.

Perhaps I'll have to revisit the transcript. All right.

Thank you. We'll adjourn now until two o'clock.

<(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

01:19:59PM
01:20:02PM
01:20:07PM
01:20:11PM
01:20:15PM
01:20:20PM
01:20:24PM
01:20:28PM
01:20:32PM
01:20:35PM
01:20:41PM
01:20:46PM
01:20:47PM
01:20:52PM
01:20:54PM
01:21:01PM
01:21:02PM