

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

TONY HARGREAVES & PARTNERS LAWYERS

8 November 2019

Our Ref:TH:ER:190007

Mr Howard Rapke

BY EMAIL: [howard.rapke@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:howard.rapke@[REDACTED])

Ms Alexandra Tighe

BY EMAIL: [alexandra.tighe@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:alexandra.tighe@[REDACTED])

Ms Kylie Hall

BY EMAIL: [kylie.hall@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:kylie.hall@[REDACTED])

Dear Mr Rapke, Ms Tighe & Ms Hall,

**Re: Royal Commission into the Management of Police Informants
Officer Green**

Pursuant to the Notice to Produce Documents served on my office in relation to Officer Green on 11 November 2019, I now **enclose** his fourth statement.

Yours faithfully,

TONY HARGREAVES & PARTNERS

Tony Hargreaves & Partners

per: A.HARGREAVES

email: tony@tonyhargreaves.com.au

190007_344.docx

DIRECTORS
Tony Hargreaves
Peter Brown

Telephone 9605 3250
Facsimile 9670 4411
www.tonyhargreaves.com.au

P.O. Box 13204
Law Courts
Melbourne 8010

Level 11 Dominion Building
533 Little Lonsdale Street
Melbourne 3000

UNCLASSIFIED

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

Fourth statement of [REDACTED] GREEN

This statement is in response to a request from the Royal Commission into the Management of Police Informants dated 6 November 2019 to provide an additional statement relating to the use, or potential use, of [REDACTED] as a human source. This statement is produced to the Royal Commission in response to a Notice to Produce.

My original statement touched on this issue at Question 27. I have provided a copy of my original response to the question at the end of this statement.

In preparing this statement, I have had access to my police diaries and [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. I am not able to produce these documents myself. However, I can assist the Commission by suggesting that reference be made to [REDACTED] application form on the SDU drive as well as diary notes taken by me and, in particular, [REDACTED] ^{Hotham-O} [REDACTED]. A copy of ^{Hotham-O} [REDACTED] diary makes up part of the [REDACTED] application.

I also believe that the two conversations with [REDACTED] (or at least, the second) would have [REDACTED]

In response to the questions asked of me:-

Use of [REDACTED] as a Human Source

1. The contact I had with [REDACTED] during my time at the SDU is as follows:
 - (a) The first meeting with [REDACTED] was on the [REDACTED], 2008, at 1140hrs. The purpose of this meeting was for the introduction by [REDACTED] to us. Details of [REDACTED] were discussed and arrangements to meet up again later were made.

The second meeting occurred on the [REDACTED] 2008 at 1800hrs. This was an assessment to gauge what type of information or assistance could be provided by [REDACTED] and to assess his position and attitudes to our program and arrangements.
 - (b) I do not recall having contact with [REDACTED] prior to the SDU.
 - (c) I did not know he was a source at any stage before, during or after my time at the SDU.
2. Details of the management of [REDACTED] are as follows:
 - (a) The management of the assessment of [REDACTED] was in line with the SDU protocols.
 - a) Six Information Reports were drafted by [REDACTED] ^{Hotham-O} [REDACTED] after our meeting with [REDACTED]. From the records I have searched (that is, the 'IR Matrix'), none of the Information Reports were disseminated.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

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

- b) No ongoing risks arose from our meeting with [PII] as this was only an assessment phase by the SDU and [PII] was found not to be suitable as a human source.
3. The assessment would have been reviewed by our Controller, probably, Sandy White at that time. Our recommendation after meeting with [PII] was that he was not suitable for use by the SDU. This opinion, I believe, was shared by our Controller Sandy WHITE, and [PII] was not registered or ever used as a source.
4. I am unable to assist the Commission with details of person(s) involved in the authorisation or continued authorisation of the use of [PII] as a human source, as there was no authorisation to the registration of this person.
5. Details of [PII] motivation for becoming a human source are noted in the **SDU Issue** section and recorded in the [PII] request document. I am unable to assist the Commission further on this point.
6. I have been asked to provide details of any conversation relevant to a number of topics. My response to each is as follows:-
- There were no conversations regarding LPP;
 - There was no AOR as he never became a source;
 - There was no risk assessment as there was no ongoing relationship;
 - [PII] and I were both suspicious of his motivations to talk with us. I believe that they were probably self-serving at best or sinister at worse. These are recorded in the SDU issues section of the report.
 - There were no indications of criminal conduct; and
 - There were no issues detected of concern such as his mental or physical health.
7. My knowledge of [PII] providing information or intelligence is that he had been talking with [PII] I was not aware of the extent of [PII] involvement with [PII] at that point in time other than that he had been cooperative. I do not recall any specifics as to whether he had actually been before the [PII]
8. There are no further matters relevant to the Commission regarding [PII] that I can provide.

Regards

Officer GREEN

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

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

My original statement's response to these matters is as follows:-

27. Provide details of any other human source who, to your knowledge, has provided information or assistance to Victoria Police who were subject to legal obligations of confidentiality or privilege, including:

- a. the name of the human source;**
- b. if registered, the number of the human source;**
- c. the nature of the legal obligations of confidentiality or privilege;**
- d. the nature of the information or assistance provided by the human source.**

- a) No need to name (An [REDACTED])
- b) [REDACTED]
- c) No requirement at this point in time. There was nothing spoken about that was remotely like LPP etc, it was all historical information about [REDACTED] Organised Crime figures as part of an assessment process.
- d) An assessment was conducted by ^{Hotham-O} [REDACTED] and myself after an initial recommendation and introduction by [REDACTED]. A little general info was provided but was not suitable for SDU and of no assistance to current investigations. This individual was not registered as a source. I believe he was supported by the [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] to hopefully [REDACTED] one day. I did not trust this persons motivations and did not believe he would adhere to our conditions or instructions. No IR's were disseminated to my knowledge

UNCLASSIFIED