TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION

MELBOURNE

MONDAY 23 MAY 2016 AT 10.12 AM

(1st day of examinations)

MR STEPHEN O'BRYAN, Commissioner MR JACK RUSH QC, Counsel Assisting MR GARY HEVEY, Counsel Assisting

OPERATION ROSS INVESTIGATION

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

AUSCRIPT

1 MR O'BRYAN: Good morning, Mr Rush.

2 MR RUSH: So, Commissioner, this investigation was initiated
3 as a result of information provided to the Independent
4 Broad-based Anti-Corruption Commission, IBAC concerning
5 the circumstances of the arrest by Ballarat Uniform
6 Police and the detention at Ballarat Police Station of a
7 51 year old woman who will be referred to as Person A on
8 14 January 2015.

Upon investigation IBAC identified the Ballarat
Uniform Police Service Area has been the subject of a
high number of complaints of police assault, a failure to
perform duty of behaviour over a significant period of
years. The investigation has prompted questions (a) as
to whether there a systemic issues of conduct concerning
member of the Uniform Ballarat Police Service Area, the
manner in which the police executive at this region has
responded to the high number of complaints, the nature of
the oversight of police professional services the body
within Victoria Police with the responsibility for
ensuring the ethical standards of Victoria Police once
potential police conduct issues have been identified.

The Ballarat Police Service Area is responsible for the City of Ballarat and includes police response zones of Ballarat and Buninyong. The police service area consists of approximately 158 members, it is known as Division 3 of the Western Region.

This investigation starts with the CompStat report of November 2012. The CompStat process revolves around the



compilation of statistical data from the region under review. It is in fact stated in the CompStat document quote:

The golden principle driving the inclusion of data in a CompStat document is that it is performance data which would be available to the person being held accountable for their performance. The data contained in the document applies those business and counting rules that Victoria Police is obliged to use in its performance reporting to both government and the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

In November 2012 the Western Region Division 3

CompStat Management Team reported a high incidence of complaints of assaults by police in this region. It was said this incidence of complaints was being driven by inexperienced member at the Ballarat Watch-house. Then Chief Commissioner of Police Mr Ken Lay made observations that in fact a closer examination of complaints data demonstrated the majority of complaints were in fact being made against more experienced members of the Ballarat Uniform Branch.

Commissioner, this is perhaps identified by figure 1 at 930 and there we see a breakdown of complaints and allegations stemming from July 2010 to October 2012. And one sees particular at the rank of senior constable a total of 30 complaints, leading senior constable 49 complaints and importantly sergeant, the rank of sergeant 36 complaints. And so this was seen by the then chief

commissioner as being of some importance in relation to the breakdown of the statistical data. And at 931 one can see a breakdown of the complaints against years of service.

So under five years is the top section with a total of 48 complaints, but then at six to ten years we have 22, 11 to 15 years 23, 16 to 20 years 18 and 21 to 25 years a significant number of 23. What was drawn to the attention at this stage was that the complaints involved members of higher rank and members of more experience.

At June 2010 to October 2012 the statistics demonstrate that out of a total of 157 allegations made against Ballarat members 40 or 30.6 per cent related to members of less than five years and 69.4 per cent were recorded against members with six or more years' service. And the most frequent complaint allegation type related to duty failure which was 50 followed by assaults 36 and police behaviour 29.

At the request of the responsible region inspector a comparison was made of complaints as the complaints concerned Ballarat members compared with complaints against Frankston members over the same period, that being thought by the inspector to provide a reasonable basis of comparison. And a graph has been prepared demonstrating the complaints between the two service areas which is now on the screen.

Now, one has to take account in this graph to the second column of numbers of members stationed, but by way

of looking at ratio if one looks at leading senior constable, the fourth line, at Ballarat there are 49 allegations, 32 members stationed and the ratio is 1.53 complaint to each member. At Frankston there are only six allegations, but only ten members, but the ratio is 0.060.

At sergeant level and this perhaps provides a closer analysis at Ballarat 36 allegations, there are 24 sergeants at the relevant time stationed at Ballarat, a ratio 1.50 allegations to each sergeant. At Frankston 16 allegations, 22 sergeants and 0.072, almost twice the number of allegations by comparison between those two ranks.

Commissioner, the inspector responsible for the Ballarat Police Service Area put forward a 2012/2013 action place for Western Region Division 3 which referred to, "People issues," "Ethical Health," of the Ballarat members and set out priorities. Those priorities identified were (1) to prevent the opportunity for ethical health risks to arise through early identification of personnel potentially at risk, (2) enhance and promote exemplary ethical behaviour throughout the division.

It appears that people at risk were those who had gathered complaints over and above what could be said to be the norm. The action plan appears to have had the effect of drawing a line under the conduct issues from a police professional standards perspective there was none

or very little follow up, no monitoring of the manner in which the division went about its processes of identifying people at risk and the mitigation strategies to be employed. It was left to local command to put into place the promised early identification of personnel potentially at risk and to establish mitigation strategies.

Regrettably time has not seen an improvement in ethical behaviour referred to by the action plan.

Complaint levels have remained constant and high, it is unclear just what of any mitigation strategies were adopted in Division 3 at Ballarat and some examples of the continuing high levels of complaints suffice. For the financial year to end 2015 (1)(c) depicts here,

Commissioner, the number of members complained against within the Ballarat PSA.

And one goes back to the years that were the subject of the action plan or produce the action plan 2011 and 2012 at Ballarat Uniform we see 27, I think it is 27 and 31 - I seem to have lost it, 933. Briefly, Commissioner, as indicated 2000 - here are we, 2011/2012 27 and 31 and so continuing until the end of financial 2015 we see 30, 29 and 27 they represent numbers that show very little difference in the number of complaints received.

It's also exemplified at 935 which is a pie chart which depicts the number of uniform members Ballarat with assault complaints compared with other representative police stations. So here, Commissioner, we see Ballarat

and what is identified there is that with comparable stations from Bendigo to Warrnambool that Ballarat has by far and away the most number of assault complaints made, it's three times the average of comparable stations.

And complaint statistics provided by Victoria Police to IBAC in June 2015 enable further comparison of the complaint history of members of Ballarat against 14,643 sworn workforce of Victoria Police. And so here we have that complaint distribution and what is shown,

Commissioner, for instance at the first line, number of complaints zero, so 2867 sworn members have no complaints and that's 19.6 of the sworn workplace.

Once complaint there are 3013 members with one complaint which is 7.2 per cent, two complaints is the next line, and that being 11.9 per cent. Three complaints, 1858 at 13.4 per cent. And so by the time we get to, for example, two complaints, what's indicated at that number is that close to 20 per cent of the sworn workforce at the N column, Commissioner. 19.1 per cent of the sworn workforce have two or less complaints, and 57.1 have — I beg your pardon.

Approximately 50 per cent have nil and two complaints, and if one goes to the bottom of those complaint statistics, one can see that 12.7 per cent have three complaints, and so it's approximately 70 per cent of the sworn workforce have between nil and three complaints. Putting it the other way, 30 per cent are responsible for 66 per cent of the complaints.

At Ballarat, members - there are 52 members who have four or more complaints, and this is a graph showing the complaints as at 30 June 2015 as they concern Ballarat Police. And one sees in the middle of that graph, Commissioner, the state-wide average of complaints for the sworn police force is 2.5 per cent. One sees that one member has 18 complaints, one has 11 complaints, and the 25 - the 18 complaints come in 25 years of service, 11 complaints in 14 years of service, eight complaints in 14 years of service, eight complaints in seven years.

This graph, Commissioner, is indicative of Ballarat members who have more — who have three or more complaint files in the last five years. And, again, it is significant numbers. Commissioner, as of June 2015, the three members of the Ballarat Uniform Branch with the highest number of complaint files held the rank of Sergeant. The senior and experienced members have the highest number of complaints raises concerns as to systemic and cultural issues.

The stated - what is demonstrated by the statistics is that the number of assault complaints made against Ballarat Uniform members is more than three times the average of comparable stations. Ballarat Uniform members are responsible for 4.56 per cent of all complaints force-wide, yet with 158 members, Ballarat Uniform is just 1.9 per cent of the total Victoria Police members. Further, Ballarat Uniform members have submitted three

times the average number of WorkCover claims in the past two years for injuries that have occurred during arrest and restraint.

These figures suggest members of Ballarat Uniform are more likely to be involved in physical confrontation and may lack sufficient training in dealing with physical incidents. And that graph is showing number and causation of claims in the last two years and one sees the first column, arrest and restraint, in the Ballarat Station there are 15 incidents - WorkCover incidents against the state-wide average of 5.1.

So the inquiry, Commissioner, will look at just what has occurred at Ballarat Police since 2011 and 12, what has been done to identify persons at risk, what has been done to promote ethical standards, how is it that a member with 16 complaints just eight months after the 16th complaint could be promoted to sergeant, what is the impact of more senior members having a high rate of complaints on the culture and performance of Ballarat Uniform Police.

Potentially relevant to the inquiry are other issues such as time and tenure of more senior members and management and promotion from within. The matters I have referred to are highlighted by four incidents put forward as case studies in this investigation. These are case studies of conduct occurring at Ballarat Police Station over a number of years. Each incident is to be considered separately.

The similarity of matters under investigation, the timeframe over which they occurred, again accentuates the questions as to whether to a systemic culture has been permitted to develop a culture which would be inimical to the high standards demanded and met by the vast majority of the members of Victoria Police. In examining these incidents, it is to be said that the Victorian community recognises that police in performing their duties are often faced with difficult and demanding circumstances and person that severely test resolve and resilience.

There is further the understanding that these demands are placed on our police force on a daily basis. The community and those responsible for oversight of police are not demanding perfection. However, there is a legitimate expectation that police will perform duties with a professionalism and respect for all those with whom they come into contact, and particularly in circumstances where people are deprived of their liberty.

Those high standards are not always easy to maintain in the face of dealing with persons who suffer from psychological difficulties, who are drunk or drug affected, who are disabled, or who wantonly ignore authority or breach the lawyer as a matter of choice. The community recognition of the work of police and the difficulties that are faced every day in policing is just that - a recognition and admiration of that sometimes very difficult and draining work that the vocation of being a police officer entails.

But with that difficult work, there is an expectation that in accord with police policies, standard operating procedures, and acts of Parliament, police will treat people with whom they come into contact with humanity, dignity and respect. Each of the persons involved in the incidents put forward as case studies will be described by letters A to D to protect their identity. All four are women.

It is not their conduct that is here being investigated. It is the manner in which they were treated by Victoria Police that will be called upon to be explained. Now, deal, Commissioner, with the incident involving person A. At approximately 11.00 pm on 14 January 2015, person A was arrested in Ballarat for being drunk in a public place. Person was 51 years of age and prior to being arrested by police had been taken into the home of a concerned person who arranged for police to attend.

Evidence indicates at the time person A was spoken to by police, an ambulance was called and attempts were made to admit her to the Ballarat Hospital for medical examination. Person A refused. Ambulance officers reported her mood as agitated. Her speech content, rate, and volume were normal, and made the assessment she was affected by alcohol. Police reported her behaviour as aggressive, abusive, and continually resisting arrest.

Person A was eventually handcuffed and conveyed to Ballarat Police Station, where she was registered and

placed in a cell. Commissioner, there is CCTV footage of person A's arrival into Ballarat Police Station in what is called the sally port. She is here brought in by - there were, in fact, I think four police who attended, and police brought her into the police station in the divisional van.

The female custody sergeant, advised Person A - or says in her statement that she advised Person A that if she removed herself from the divisional van, that the handcuffs she was wearing would be eventually removed, that she'd been arrested for being drunk in a public place, and that she would be released in about four hours. The station records at the time record that Person A was seen as being moderately affected by alcohol, and she eventually, after what is the next piece of CCTV footage, showing Person A at the custody area of the Ballarat Police Station - she was placed in Cell 1, but she was not released for 18 hours. This is the custody area where she walks into from the sally port area. The handcuffs have been removed. We can leave it there, Commissioner.

The - from the custody area Person A was conveyed to Cell 1, where she underwent a full search, which is removal of clothing. Then sometime - I think I said she was in custody for 18 - I think it's 16 hours, Commissioner. The CCTV footage, which we will come to, demonstrates that Person A was able to exit her cell on two occasions. This was the first occasion, after

demanding attention from the senior officer on duty. She exited the cell and was forced back into the cell by two female police officers. And during the course of being forced back into her cell, she removed the lanyard and pass around the neck from the senior officer on duty, the sergeant. On the second occasion, after the sergeant came back into the cell to retrieve her pass, Person A exited the cell and there was a further scuffle, and Person A was sprayed during the course of a scuffle over some time, by both female police officers with oleoresin spray, or OC spray.

Just by way of background, Commissioner, OC spray is known as pepper spray as it is a lachrymatory agent made from extract of chili peppers, and contains the neurotoxin capsaicin. The spray, when used, deploys a foam which is rather like shaving cream. When it comes into contact with the skin, eyes, mouth, throat and lung it causes immediate sensation of intense pain, tearing in the eyes, and inflames the respiratory tract, resulting in uncontrollable fits of coughing and breathing difficulties. Not all persons respond in the same way to the applications of OC spray. Some are severely affected.

And during the course of what we will now look at, which I want to go to the second occasion, Commissioner, when Person A came out of the cells. This is an occasion when the sergeant and constable on duty entered the cells, the sergeant with a can of OC spray, demanding her

1	lanyard back. And part of the investigation to take
2	place will just include police techniques in relation to
3	the entry of cell in such circumstances.
4	I think what's in fact - we will - this is the first
5	occasion when there is the demand for the officer-in-
6	charge to attend the cells. We will be looking at that
7	during the course of the inquiry, Commissioner. I just
8	felt for the purposes of opening, it may be better if we
9	just go directly to the second one.
10	MR O'BRYAN: So is this after the lanyard's been taken?
11	MR RUSH: This is after the lanyard had been taken. So there
12	are two officers
13	MR O'BRYAN: (indistinct)
14	MR RUSH: want it back. That's the sergeant who's on
15	the left of the screen now, talking to Person A. Person
16	A pointing to the camera.
17	MR O'BRYAN: Yes.
18	MR RUSH: Commissioner, I'm told we may need a two or three
19	minute adjournment, just to load this into proper order.
20	MR O'BRYAN: (indistinct) Adjourned.
21	MS MCCARTHY: All stand, please.
22	ADJOURNED [10.49 am]
23	RESUMED [10.58 am]
24	MR O'BRYAN: Sort out the order?
25	MR RUSH: I think so, Commissioner. What we are about to play
26	is the second entry by the sergeant on duty and a more
27	junior officer into cell 1, the sergeant carrying the can
28	of OC spray for the purposes retrieving the lanyard. I
	13 DISCUSSION



should say just before we get underway there is a cup there and again when this is being fully examined the cup was provided for water to enable a drink; the drinking fountain in that cell was not in working order.

And there's CCTV footage which I won't show in opening of Person A looking up at the camera indicating that the cup couldn't be filled and eventually having to go the toilet to get water. So this is now - as I've indicated there was a first entry when Person A demanded to see the officer in charge of the police station during the scuffle to put her back in her cell, she took the lanyard from the senior sergeant and this follows very shortly after that incident when the police officers come into the cell to retrieve the lanyard.

15 **RECORDING PLAYED**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 16 MR RUSH: That's the can of OC spray being kicked away.
- 17 MR RUSH: So, Commissioner, at this stage Person A has been -
- the expression is foamed, and the secondary effects are
- 19 perhaps noticeable from the police officer there.
- 20 MR O'BRYAN: So the police member that's left has been
- 21 affected?
- 22 MR RUSH: Yes.
- 23 MR O'BRYAN: And the lanyard is still not retrieved, is it?
- 24 MR RUSH: The lanyard is not retrieved and eventually you will
- 25 see Person A turn around and go into a storage room. And
- if we just stop it there. So just to encapsulate what we
- have seen, as you have indicated, Commissioner, is the
- spraying of with OC foam. The lanyard has not been

retrieved and so into the storage room an emergency call was made from the police station by the two officers that have been depicted.

Other police then attended to assist And it's after their attendance at the police station that Person A was located in that room, restrained, dragged back to her cell and handcuffed with her hands behind her back, as we will see, lying prostate on her stomach and searched by having her pants pulled down from her so that she was left only wearing a T-shirt, bra and panties. Those panties were at one stage positioned between her bottom and her knees and all this occurring in the presence of male officers, whilst lying prostrate on the ground covered with OC spray around her facial area. She was kicked, stomped and stood upon.

RECORDING PLAYED

And I think this is underway at the moment, so at
this stage Person A is handcuffed and being - this is in
the doorway to cell 1 and being made to lie prostrate on
the ground.

21 MR O'BRYAN: So her pants are down. Is that right?

MR RUSH: I think here they are removed with her socks. What the evidence in the full investigation will disclose is that the sergeant, during the course of the scuffle, felt that she, on the pat down search, felt the lanyard and pass in her pants. Now, this is the removal of the pants by a female officer, socks, her panties here. So at this stage obviously she has nothing on her legs and has an

officer in boots standing on her legs.

2 MR O'BRYAN: So do you know if the lanyard is retrieved at

3 this stage?

4 MR RUSH: The lanyard was subsequently Found in the storage
5 room. It certainly wasn't in the garments that were
6 removed. The guidelines in relation to spray which you

will be taken to, Commissioner, are that it is a danger

8 of affixation lying prostrate under the effects of OC

9 spray and being handcuffed at the back. So at this stage

there is OC all over Person As face and she is handcuffed

11 from behind.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

So the full CCTV footage of the incident will indicate that a number of police officers were affected by the OC spray in a secondary way. The sergeant who deployed the spray was attended by ambulance officers at the Ballarat Police Station and later taken to the Ballarat Base Hospital for medical treatment. The ambulance officers who attended were not called upon to examine Person A whilst they were at the police station.

Eventually Person A was taken to a shower by way of aftercare. She was placed in the shower. She remained handcuffed with her hands behind her back which obviously meant she was unable to do anything with her hands to alleviate the presence of the OC spray. Warm water in combination with OC spray has the effect of magnifying its effects. She was in the shower for approximately 20 minutes, then was wrapped in a large blanket or towel and taken by police to Ballarat Base Hospital.

On arrival at the hospital she was recorded as being aggressive, violent and agitated. The examination carried out whilst Person A remained in the rear of the van, there being a concern, apparently, she could escape. On the examination she was reported as being handcuffed, intoxicated and her eyes being slightly red and she was cleared to return to the cells.

On that night in Ballarat it was approximately 11 degrees centigrade with a high humidity. It had been raining. From approximately 2.40 am when Person A was returned to the cells she was left without her pants or any form of replacement garment. The clothes which she was wearing have been the clothes she was wearing at the time she was placed in the shower. She was left without any blanket and it was not until 7.00 am that a blanket was provided and replacement pants were provided later in the day.

Police who were present and participated in the events described will be each asked to explain the events and why they happened in the way they did. Police officers not involved in the events of the night and morning of 14 and 15 January, but who subsequently had the opportunity to ascertain what had occurred, will also be asked to advise in this examination what they learned and what actions were taken in response.

Person A has been charged with offences arising out of the circumstances of 14 and 15 January, no charges have been laid against police.

Incident B occurred on 8 December 2010. Person B had attended at the front counter of the Ballarat Police Station. She was there to lodge a complaint concerning the arrest of her son and she wished her complaint to be recorded. In brief, the evidence and CCTV footage indicates that in response to the female's requests of the male police officer to record her complaint she was forcibly handled by the male police officer, who was assisted by a female officer, arrested and detained at the police station.

Allegations have been made as to the treatment of Person B whilst in police custody and the male officer will be asked to explain his actions in relation to her.

Incidents C and D involve the night and morning of 24 and 25 April 2009. Person C attended at the front counter of the Ballarat Police Station to inquire about her son who had been arrested earlier that night. A male officer, the same officer involved in Incident B, and one of the senior officers present at the time of Incident A, ordered Person C to leave the police station.

When Person C refused to do so the male police officer went to the front of the counter and placed Person C in what can be best described as a chokehold. That is from behind he had his right arm around Person Cs neck as he pushed her through the front doors of the police station. The male officer will be asked to explain his actions in relation to Person C.

On exiting the police station the male officer

apparently formed the view that one of the friends of 1 Person C was wanted in relation to other matters. 2 male police officer then placed that person, Person D, in 3 4 a similar hold and pushed her back into the police station and detained her for a period of time while 5 inquiries were made. Again, the male officer will be 6 7 asked to explain his actions in relation to Person D, in particular the use of the chokehold as an approved method 8 9 of containment by Victoria Police will be the subject of 10 questioning. So in short, Commissioner, they are the case studies 11 that will be particularly under examination together with 12 the matters that I have earlier raised concerning the 13 14 issues or the historical issues of complaints and the way 15 in which they have been addressed by the executive of the Ballarat PSA. 16 MR O'BRYAN: Thank you. Does that conclude the opening 17 18 address? 19 MR RUSH: That concludes the opening, Commissioner. MR O'BRYAN: As I understand it there are some housekeeping 20 21 matters? There are, Commissioner, firstly - - -22 MR RUSH: 23 MR O'BRYAN: Well, we might (indistinct) The media cameras 24 (indistinct). Yes, sir. 25 MR RUSH: I will adjourn now and ask that the camera be 26 MR O'BRYAN: 27 removed and then I will come back shortly. SHORT ADJOURNMENT 28 [11.18 am]