

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police. These claims are not yet resolved.

From: Lardner, Peter
Sent: Wednesday, 8 September 2010 8:43 AM
To: Sheridan, Paul
Cc: O'Connor, John T; Pope, Jeff; McRae, Findlay; Jones, Ken
Subject: RE: Witness F - CONFIDENTIAL
Hello Paul,

My advice is:

Re [REDACTED] - proceed with it being [REDACTED] at 4:00pm on Friday, 10 September 2010.

Re witsec - At this stage SDU should act as the conduit and facilitate any direct discussions necessary between her and Witsec staff. She should not make any direct contact with any Witsec member outside of the meetings arranged by SDU and no Witsec member should be making contact with her other than being present at the SDU facilitated meetings. It is important that there is only one entry point to 'victoria Police for her (other than 000). Should she agree to enter into the program then different arrangements may be appropriate.

Re receiving information for a priority criminal investigation - If she rings and makes a statement that Joe Bloggs did this or is about to do that, then we write it down and say thanks, good bye - She should not be tasked to make any enquiry or follow-up any piece of information.

The accountability for her management still sits, as far as I am aware, with Jeff Pope so it is important that he is comfortable with any activity occurring in relation to her.

I am in the office for most of the day so give me a call whenever suits you if you wish to discuss.

Regards

Peter

From: Sheridan, Paul
Sent: Tuesday, 7 September 2010 8:51 PM
To: Lardner, Peter
Cc: Pope, Jeff; O'Connor, John T
Subject: RE: Witness F - CONFIDENTIAL

Peter, we (SDU) have no feeling one way or the other about the [REDACTED] We do not require it. It is her request and given it came from [REDACTED] and payment etc was linked to them, Geoff Always thought you should consider same and advise?

The main question from us (SDU) is about point number 1, being her current desire to explore entry into Witsec.

The other issue pertains to point 3 and the issues associated with receiving information for a priority criminal investigation. Hopefully we can discuss in due course. Paul Sheridan.

From: Lardner, Peter
Sent: Tuesday, 7 September 2010 5:16 PM
To: Sheridan, Paul
Cc: Pope, Jeff; O'Connor, John T; McRae, Findlay
Subject: RE: Witness F - CONFIDENTIAL

Paul,

There is nothing to prevent her retaining the [REDACTED] but I do have some concerns with it being done now. If you do agree to same then please ensure you do not pay for it as that could be taken to indicate some sort of ongoing arrangement with her.

Regards

This document has been redacted for Public Interest Immunity claims made by Victoria Police. These claims are not yet resolved.

Peter

From: Sheridan, Paul
Sent: Tuesday, 7 September 2010 7:29 AM
To: Lardner, Peter
Cc: Pope, Jeff; O'Connor, John T
Subject: Witness F - CONFIDENTIAL

Hi Peter,

John O'Connor has spoken with F yesterday.

1. She wishes to speak with the Witness Protection people to [REDACTED] and with consideration to entering the program.

2. She also wishes to retain the issue of a [REDACTED] that is [REDACTED] to her from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which she states is contracted until April 2011. She believes that the [REDACTED] will be cut of from 1600hrs this Friday. I have advised Geoff Alway of Witsec of this who also seeks your advice.

She also seeks to provide information concerning the Driver investigation. (Det. Supt Doug Fryer).

I have meetings throughout the day but will be at the VPC this afternoon,

Paul Sheridan.