

**In the matter of the *Inquiries Act 1991*
Inquiries (Board of Inquiry – Criminal Justice System) Appointment 2023
Board of Inquiry into the Criminal Justice System in the Australian Capital Territory**

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL CHEW

I, Michael Chew, of Winchester Police Centre, corner Benjamin Way and College Street, Belconnen, in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), swears as follows:

The following statement is provided in response to the subpoena I received from the Board of Inquiry into the Criminal Justice System in the Australian Capital Territory requiring me to give information in a written statement regarding my knowledge of matters set out in the Schedule attached to that subpoena. Attached and marked '**Exhibit 1**' is a copy of the relevant subpoena.

Current Employment

1. I am a Commander in the Australian Federal Police ("AFP").
2. I am currently the Commander, Protection Operations, Specialist Protective Command, AFP.
3. I am responsible for the protective security arrangements for Australian Government High Office Holders including their close personal protection details, the diplomatic community and the official establishments within the Australian Capital Territory ("ACT").
4. In my role, I participate in numerous internal committees and boards as well as some external boards. These relate to my duties as a Commander in the AFP and span aspects of my role outside of the matter before the Board of Inquiry.

Personal information
[Redacted]

.....
Michael Chew

Personal information
[Redacted]

.....
Witness

5. My current CV is attached. Attached and marked “**Exhibit 2**” is a copy of my current Curriculum Vitae.

Tertiary Qualifications:

6. Personal information

Course and/or Diplomas:

7. During my 39 years in the AFP, I have undertaken a significant number of internal and external courses. These courses related to my duties as an operational police officer and include a variety of leadership and investigative programs.

Employment Chronology

8. I commenced recruit training on 16 January 1984.
9. I applied for a position with the AFP and attended an interview with senior officers sometime in 1983. I commenced the 20-week recruit training program in January 1984. Members of the AFP through the AFP College delivered this training internally.
10. After graduating from the AFP college, I was deployed to ACT Policing where I remained until my promotion to Superintendent in 2002. During my career, I worked extensively in general duties, criminal investigations and all aspects of community policing.
11. In 1992, I obtained my Detective Designation and worked across all areas of criminal investigations including general crime, sexual assault and child abuse (“SACAT”) and drug operations. In 1998, whilst attached to SACAT I was promoted to Detective Sergeant in charge of that team. I performed a variety of Detective Sergeant roles within ACT Policing including general crime investigations until my promotion to

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

Detective Superintendent in 2002. At this time, I was in charge of the major and serious organised crime teams investigating homicides, serious assaults, organised crime and outlaw motorcycle gangs.

12. In 2003, I transferred to AFP National Operations, Head Office Investigations and assumed responsibility for the investigation of sensitive referrals made to the AFP. The team accepted and investigated referrals concerning Australian Government High Office holders, the disclosure of sensitive information and offshore referrals made to the AFP.
13. In 2005, I returned to ACT Policing and worked in several Superintendent roles performing higher duties as the Deputy Chief Police Officer on a regular basis.
14. In 2012, I was promoted to Commander and returned to AFP National Operations where I had responsibility for aviation and later the AFP's covert and capability areas. During this time, I performed two periods of extended higher duties (24 months in total) at the rank of Assistant Commissioner.
15. In August 2018, I returned to ACT Policing as the Deputy Chief Police Officer – Response assuming responsibility for Criminal Investigations, General Duties and Traffic Operations.
16. Whilst attached to the sexual assault and child abuse team (“SACAT”) I undertook a significant number of sexual assault investigations and as the Detective Sergeant in Charge oversaw an equal if not greater amount.

Training and Education

17. As Deputy Chief Police Officer, it was not my responsibility to observe or supervise the members of SACAT or their training.

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

Organisational Structure

18. In February 2021 the Chief Police Officer (“**AFP Deputy Commissioner**”) was responsible for ACT Policing and there were two Deputy Chief Police Officers (“**AFP Commander**”) and one unsworn Director (AFP SES Band 1) who reported to the Chief Police Officer. Under each Commander were various operational portfolios each with a Superintendent responsible for them. As Deputy Chief Police Officer – Response I had four Superintendents as my direct reports:

- (a) North District - Detective Superintendent [REDACTED]
- (b) South District – Detective Superintendent [REDACTED]
- (c) Criminal Investigations - Detective Superintendent Moller; and
- (d) Traffic Operations – Superintendent [REDACTED]

19. Criminal Investigations was led by Detective Superintendent Moller who had two Detective Inspectors (Boorman and [REDACTED] as his direct reports. The two Inspectors had responsibility for a number of crime teams split between response crime and specialised crime of which SACAT was one under Detective Inspector Boorman.

Duties and Responsibilities

20. As the Deputy Chief Police Officer – Response in ACT Policing I was responsible for the policing response to the ACT community and reported directly to the Chief Police Officer. The portfolios under my direct supervision were North and South District (General Duties), Traffic Operations and Criminal Investigations. Each of these portfolios had a Superintendent in charge with a number of Inspectors under them who dealt with day-to-day activities and any police response. In total, I was responsible for approximately 500 staff.

21. In my role, I provided broad strategic direction for the Superintendents to work towards. Each Superintendent was responsible for the activities of their portfolio and delivering on my stated direction. It was not my role to directly supervise the activities that occurred under these Superintendents. I would be informed of issues that may

Personal information
[REDACTED]

Michael Chew

Personal information
[REDACTED]

Witness

have an impact on ACT Policing and the AFP.

22. Early in my investigative career, I both worked in and supervised SACAT and the investigations they undertook. ACT Policing has always had a ‘victim first’ approach to the investigation of sexual assaults. Regardless of this ‘victim first’ approach the investigators will gather all available evidence at the time they receive the report to ensure a prosecution can be commenced then or in the future if the victim wishes to proceed. The investigators will work closely with the victim and other support services in an attempt to have the victim comfortable with moving to a prosecution.

Triage Process for Sexual Assault Complaints

23. In my role, I was not directly involved in the triage process for sexual assault complaints. Historically, the first response to a report of sexual assault would be the uniform members, who would call a criminal investigator to attend once the circumstances were established. Generally, with complaints of sexual assault this would be a member of SACAT.

Investigating Sexual Assault Complaints

24. In my role as Deputy Chief Police Officer, I would not have any direct involvement with the investigation and any subsequent liaison/consultation with the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (“ODPP”).
25. Generally, in high profile cases regardless of the offence being investigated it would be my responsibility to undertake general liaison with the ODPP including the Director and his senior counsel.
26. Generally, during a sexual assault investigation the matter would be handled and managed by the detective responsible for the investigation. The Detective Sergeant responsible for the team would supervise this. The Detective Inspector would maintain oversight of the investigation providing a further level of supervision and independence. The Detective Superintendent would have knowledge of the significant

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

investigations being conducted within his area of responsibility.

27. It is my expectation the Detective Superintendent would have an oversight role of the investigation if it were warranted. In this case, due to the high profile of the investigation and the external influences present, I was comfortable with the Detective Superintendent and Detective Inspector taking a more active role to provide a level of distance for the investigators to do the investigation without interference.
28. In my experience with conducting and supervising investigations it is normal practice for the brief of evidence to be compiled by the investigating officer and then checked by the Detective Sergeant to ensure there is sufficient evidence to commence a prosecution. This would then be forwarded to ACT Policing Judicial Operations for checking content and ensuring the brief meets the parameters set out in the DPP protocol. They do not conduct an adjudication of the brief. The brief is forwarded to the ODPD where a prosecutor is assigned, and the matter progresses through the court process.
29. For a person to be charged with an offence, regardless of the crime the investigator needs to satisfy themselves there is sufficient evidence for the prosecution to commence and there is reasonable possibility of obtaining a conviction. This assessment is undertaken once all the available evidence is collected, including, in regard to a sexual assault report, the willingness of the victim to proceed.
30. I do not believe there has been any change in the way a sexual assault complaint is treated since I was working in SACAT as a Detective. The very nature of sexual assault complaints brings with them a stigma that makes it challenging for all those involved. Due to these reasons and the nature of the crime, it is very personal for the victim and often requires a different approach to other investigations that involve victims of crime. The court process does not help the victim in continuing a complaint where they are often traumatised again by having to relive the experience.
31. Regardless of when the victim feels strong enough to commence or re-commence a

Personal information

.....
Michael Chew

Personal information

.....
Witness

sexual assault investigation, I do not believe there is any change of approach or cultural bias by the investigators as they are responsible for gathering the evidence in support of the complaint and assisting the victim through the court process.

Challenges, Issues and/or Pressures

32. The very nature of sexual assault investigations brings extraordinary challenges with them, as it is a very violent and personal crime, often with limited corroborative evidence. This is made more difficult with a judicial system that victims see as adversarial due to the manner in which defence teams undertake their case. This view is supported, in the victim's eyes, by the low conviction rate for these offences in the ACT.

Report of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Steering Committee

33. I have not read the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Steering Committee's report titled "*Listen. Take Action to Prevent, Believe and Heal*" published in December 2021 ("**the Steering Committee's Report**") as I was transferred from ACT Policing in August 2021.
34. I had left ACT Policing by the time the Steering Committee's Report had been handed down.

Sensitive Investigations Oversight Board ("SIOB")

35. I have read the "*Review into the AFP's Response to and Management of Sensitive Investigations*" by Mr John Lawler AM APM dated 17 January 2020 ("**the Lawler Review**").
36. I understand an outcome from the review was a clearer definition of a 'sensitive investigation' was established and the need for greater oversight by the AFP of these type of investigations. A further recommendation from the review was the formation of a senior officer board to review investigations of a 'sensitive nature' and provide strategic direction and be in a position to understand the impact of a 'sensitive'

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

investigation for the organisation.

37. The SIOB's role is to oversight 'sensitive' investigations through consideration by senior officers on the impact a particular investigation may have on the AFP. They are an oversight board that are tasked with ensuring the direction and outcome of 'sensitive' investigations are appropriate. They do not direct or conduct the investigation but provide an oversight and consideration role. The SIOB do not differentiate between ACT or Commonwealth investigations.
38. The SIOB is chaired by an AFP Deputy Commissioner and has senior officers from other AFP Commands as its members. In my role as Deputy Chief Police Officer, I was not a permanent member of the SIOB and would be co-opted for specific referrals relating to ACT Policing. During my time in ACT Policing, I was only co-opted for the matter subject of the Board of Inquiry. My purpose in attending was to be available to answer questions from the SIOB on the investigation.
39. In general terms any investigation can be classified as a 'sensitive investigation' dependant on the circumstances. The normal process for a referral to the SIOB involves a briefing being prepared by the investigator and this being sent to the SIOB for consideration. The SIOB then determines the investigation status and the investigation is progressed. I did receive a SIOB briefing for this investigation which was forwarded to the SIOB for consideration.

Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP)/Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP)

40. In my interactions with the ODPP and Director before and during the Investigation were always professional and positive.
41. In my role as Deputy Chief Police Officer – Response I did not regularly attend meetings with the DPP or ODPP as responsibility for the relationship rested with the other Deputy Chief Police Officer. I did attend meetings in company with other ACT Policing members where activities and issues were raised by both areas that may have

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

needed executive attention. I am unsure if file notes were kept of these meetings, as they were informal in nature.

42. Generally, I would have no direct involvement with the DPP or ODPP concerning an investigation/matter of sexual assault.
43. I did not have any direct relationship with the DPP or prosecutors within the ODPP during the investigation.

Victims of Crime Commissioner

44. In my role, I had a professional relationship with the Victims of Crime Commissioner, as there were a number of programs being introduced by the ACT Government that required collaboration from a variety of agencies. My dealings with the Victim of Crime Commissioner were always professional and positive. I did not have any direct conversations with her about the investigation as that would have been inappropriate.
45. My understanding of the Victim of Crime Commissioner's role was to ensure support for all victims is being provided by the ACT Government. They perform an oversight role to protect victims and ensure the right support services are 'wrapped' around the victims.
46. Prior to *R v Lehrmann* I am not aware of the Victims of Crime Commissioner (or her staff) had supported a complainant at court or acted as an intermediary between the police and the complainant and between the ODPP and the complainant.

Investigation

Involvement in the Investigation in 2019

47. In my role, I was aware of the general nature of the allegation being made as it was briefed to me by Detective Superintendent Moller. This briefing included the circumstances of the allegation, and that the victim was initially reluctant to proceed with a prosecution. I had no direct involvement in the investigation at that stage.

Personal information

Personal information

Michael Chew

Witness

48. With regard to this matter, I briefed the Chief Police Officer on the general nature of allegation and the external interest being generated by the media and other issue motivated groups. I did this so he would have an understanding of the possible ramifications of the allegation and that it may affect ACT Policing and the broader AFP.
49. To my recollection, I did not have any direct involvement with the investigation in 2019 but had received general information on the nature of the complaint.

Involvement in the Investigation from 5 February 2021 to 6 August 2021

50. In early 2021, Detective Superintendent Moller briefed me that the victim had requested the matter she earlier reported be reopened with a view to a prosecution being progressed. I verbally briefed the Chief Police Officer on the re-commencement of the investigation by the victim and that she wished a prosecution to progress.
51. During the period from 5 February 2021 to 6 August 2021, Superintendent Moller and Detective Inspector Boorman regularly briefed me on the progress of the investigation and avenues of enquiry being undertaken. Responsibility for the progression of the investigation was the responsibility of Detective Superintendent Moller. I was supporting Detective Superintendent Moller during the investigation with advice and managing the external influences that existed at the time. During this period, I authorised advice be formally sought from the ODPP on the prospects of a prosecution being successful given the entirety of the information and evidence collected during this period. I had no direct contact with any of the parties involved in the investigation.
52. I had total confidence in the investigators undertaking the investigation and the oversight being provided by Detective Superintendent Moller and Detective Inspector Boorman. I was briefed regularly on all the evidence that was collected and the issues that had been identified in relation to the credibility of the victim. In consideration of all this material and information/evidence collected, I formed the belief the matter should be adjudicated on by the court and should progress to prosecution. That

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

remains my view to this date.

53. Based on my briefings throughout this time from Detective Superintendent Moller I authorised for a formal adjudication be sought from the ODPP. I received a reply from the Director informing a reasonable prospect of a successful prosecution was possible and therefore the charges were laid.
54. I authorised the laying of charges against Mr Lehrmann and the progression of service of summons in the most appropriate manner as possible and therefore charges were laid.
55. I informed the Chief Police Officer of the charges being laid and by this time an AFP Assistant Commissioner (Peter Crozier) had been deployed into ACT Policing as a structural change predominately to support the Chief Police Officer. I briefed him on the investigations and the charges being laid. I also kept him informed on the plan for service of the summons.
56. I had directed that both Detective Superintendent Moller and Detective Inspector Boormann to prepare documents in support of the progression of the investigation that clearly identified the potential issues with the victim and the concerns being raised by the investigators to ensure the DPP had all the information so he could make an informed decision.
57. On or around the 17th June 2021 I had a briefing from Detective Superintendent Moller where we discussed the investigation. During this briefing Detective Superintendent Moller expressed his view there was insufficient evidence to proceed with charging Mr Lehrmann. I expressed my view that despite the issues already identified in the investigation the most appropriate place for the matter to be adjudicated on was in court at trial. This position was supported by the view of the DPP who had stated there was a reasonable prospect of a successful prosecution being achieved.
58. Regardless of my personal view which I may have expressed to Detective

Personal information

.....
Michael Chew

Personal information

.....
Witness

Superintendent Moller I still held the same position the court is the most appropriate place for this matter to be tested. In this conversation I expressed my view to Detective Superintendent Moller that the high profile of this investigation and significant media commentary would not stop and the possibility of Mr Lehrmann having a fair trial would be greatly reduced. Once the matter was before the court suppression orders could be applied that would cease the public commentary and perhaps provide the possibility to Mr Lehrmann of having a fair trial.

59. The issues raised concerning the victim's credibility, the evidence collected to corroborate her version of events and her mental health were all part of my considerations in making the decision to proceed with a charge. I had been kept informed of the status of the victim's mental health but understood she was still of the view she wanted the matter to proceed to court. I was confident the support services being provided to the victim were sufficient to assist her in continuing with the allegation.
60. At no time did I have any 'political pressure' placed on me to continue or not continue a prosecution. In my experience the external commentary certainly made this investigation unique and required my closer supervision. My actions in this case were twofold, firstly to shield the investigating team from this commentary so they could conduct the investigation and to ensure a fair and proper assessment of the evidence/information could be taken by those who had responsibility for making such decisions.
61. It is not usual for police officers to have differing views on the direction, progression and outcome achieved of any investigation. In this conversation Detective Superintendent Moller and I had different views on how the matter should progress. I expect my direct reports to challenge my thinking and present me with different perspective. In this conversation there was no ill will between us, and I made the decision to commence the prosecution.

Personal information

.....
Michael Chew

Personal information

.....
Witness

62. In my discussions with the Chief Police Officer, it was decided to seek an independent review of the investigation by a senior AFP officer, Commander Andrew Smith. Commander Smith reviewed the investigation and drafted a report for consideration. My general impressions of this report were there was sufficient evidence to support a prosecution with a few areas requiring further follow up by the investigators. Without seeing the document, I am unaware of the recommendations identified as I had transferred from ACT Policing by that stage.

Advice provided by the DPP

63. During my briefing on this investigation, I formed the view that a formal adjudication should be sought from the DPP on the prospects of a successful prosecution being obtained. My reason for this was a large amount of evidence/information had been collected by the investigators and most of it had limited corroborative value to support the victim's account of the alleged offence. There was also information collected that demonstrated the victim was reluctant to fully support the investigation by delaying investigator's requests and in some cases withholding information or reporting the progress of the investigation to the media. There was a question arising on the credibility of the victim due to the reasons identified above and the continuing assessment of her mental health. I instructed a preliminary brief of evidence be provided to the DPP for a formal adjudication which should include a comprehensive document that fully explained the issues that had been identified and how this may influence any subsequent prosecution. This was to ensure the DPP had a full understanding of the evidence collected as well as the issues surrounding the credibility and ongoing mental health of the victim. I believed this would allow the DPP to have all the information that was available at the time to make a full assessment on the possibility of a successful prosecution being obtained.
64. In my experience it was not unusual for advice to be sought from the ODPP on serious and complex matters. My understanding is this would be obtained from prosecutors within the ODPP, not necessarily the Director.

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

65. I had no direct involvement in the preparation of the preliminary brief of evidence served on the DPP on or about 21 June 2021.
66. During the preparation of the advice from Detective Superintendent Moller I had been consulted and supported the content of that advice. This was to ensure the DPP had all the information/evidence available to make an informed decision.
67. I had formed the view there was sufficient evidence to commence a prosecution but remained concerned on the issue identified relating to the credibility of the victim. How these issues could be mitigated during subsequent court proceeding would be the responsibility of the DPP.
68. In my conversations with the DPP I believe he was acting in a professional manner when making the decision to support a prosecution. It was my impression the Director had not been placed in such a high-profile case with significant media interest that had a national profile. I cannot comment on how this profile may or may not have affected his decision-making process. Certainly, I found it unusual, as previously stated for the Director to take this case on as the lead prosecutor when the ODPP had prosecutors who specialised in sexual assault matters.
69. During my consideration on this matter and through conversations with Detective Superintendent Moller and Detective Inspector Boormann they raised the prospect of seeking independent legal advice, but I was of the view that advice from the DPP, who would be responsible for advancing the prosecution in court should provide the supportive direction needed to move forward with a charge.
70. During these conversations, Detective Superintendent Moller expressed his view that the matter should not progress. We had differing views on this point, and I firmly believed once the DPP advice was received the matter should progress to a prosecution.

Personal information

.....
Michael Chew

Personal information

.....
Witness

71. In past serious and complex investigations, I have been involved in ACT Policing has sought external legal advice on those matters, but I did not believe it was warranted in this case for the reason stated above.

Decision to Charge

72. Throughout the briefings provided to me and my understanding of the evidence collected and issues arising with the victim I continually assessed, in my own mind the warrants of progressing the matter, which is why I sought formal advice from the DPP. Once I received the advice, I was comfortable a charge should be preferred and instructed Detective Superintendent Moller to have that done. I did not have any vision on the actual process and became aware Detective Superintendent Moller had taken it upon himself to be the swearing officer.
73. At no time did I receive any pressure from within or external to the AFP to commence or discontinue any prosecution. My reasons for progressing were to have the court decide on the alleged offence as that was the most appropriate place to have the investigation resolved and all the evidence/information tested. Additionally, by placing the matter before the court suppression orders could be sought to cease the external commentary being made in the media and have some hope of a fair trial for the Mr Lehrmann.
74. It is standard practice that a victim be informed that a charge will be preferred, and the investigators should discuss the next steps with the court process. This is mandated under the Victims of Crime legislation in the ACT. I was not aware of this being or not being done.
75. I had no direct contact with the investigators responsible for the investigation after the decision to charge Mr Lehrmann and therefore cannot comment on their views.

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

Summons, Brief of Evidence and Disclosure

76. In this investigation, the usual process for progressing brief of evidence was not followed as there were restrictions in place due to COVID and I directed the quickest way for serving the summons be completed. Based on my experience I expected a 'mention' brief would be prepared and as the matter had been subject to a formal adjudication by the DPP there was no need to have this 'mention' brief processed through the usual process. The 'mention' brief should contain relevant information, the evidence being presented and a statement of facts outlining the circumstances of the alleged offence.
77. Once the matter was accepted by the ODPP further liaison should occur between the assigned prosecutor and the investigating officers. It was my view as the matter had been subject to close supervision from a variety of senior officers there was no need to have the content reviewed again. I had no part in preparing any brief of evidence.
78. I was not involved in preparing the Summons and/or Brief of Evidence for the DPP/ODPP and/or the legal representatives for Mr Lehrmann.
79. I had no direct involvement in the service of the summons and/or brief of evidence or interactions with Mr Lehrmann or his legal representatives.
80. During 2021, the ACT was in lock down due to the COVID pandemic and usual avenues for serving summons were restricted as were the operations of the ACT Courts. In order to expedite the service of the summons and get the matter before court I authorised a direct service of the brief on Mr Lehrmann's legal representative in Sydney. This would allow the matter to come before court where suppression orders could be sought to stop the external commentary on the investigation ensuring the prospect a fair trial would be afforded Mr Lehrmann. As the matter was proceeding by summons and being processed in a COVID restrictive environment the DPP were not consulted on its service.

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

81. I was informed that a plan for service had been developed and it appeared to be suitable for the restrictions that were in place during COVID. I have no direct knowledge if this plan changed or who changed it. My decision was to have the summons served as quickly as possible with consideration of the restrictions that were in place. I informed Detective Superintendent Moller of this decision.
82. I was later informed material was included in the brief of evidence that should not have been and therefore the brief should be retrieved from the legal representative. I was briefed this had occurred and that the legal representative had not opened the file so therefore had not read the information contained in it.
83. I do not recall directing any member involved in the investigation to not contact the victim or the Victim of Crime Commissioner to inform them of the service of the summons. It is accepted practice that the victim is kept informed of every step in the investigation including when the prosecutions commence.
84. I was not involved in the preparation of the Disclosure Certificates in the matter of *R v Lehrmann*.
85. I was on leave for the following dates. 6-14 April 2021, 7-11 May 2021 and 7-15 July 2021.

Other Involvement in the Investigation and/or Trial in the Matter of R v Lehrmann

86. I had transferred from ACT Policing in August 2021 and had no further involvement in the matter *R v Lehrmann*.

1 November 2022 Correspondence

87. I became aware of the correspondence through media reporting. The Chief Police Officer contacted me to check on my welfare. I asked him about Detective Superintendent Moller, Detective Inspector Boorman and the investigating team's

Personal information

Michael Chew

Personal information

Witness

welfare and that they were being supported. I expressed a view that the Director was 'off the mark' about the issues, I had seen in the media.

88. I had no involvement in enquiries surrounding documents disclosed by the DPP through a Freedom of Information request received on or about 8 December 2022 in relation to the 1 November 2022 Correspondence.

Impressions of the DPP/ODPP during the Investigation and Trial in the Matter of R v Lehrmann

89. During my conversations with the DPP he indicated he would be personally prosecuting this matter which I thought was unusual. The ODPP has specialist sexual assault prosecutors with a level of expertise in sexual assault prosecutions who undertake these types of prosecutions on a regular basis and I felt they would be more appropriate. I had no further involvement after the matter was before the court.

90. I had moved from ACT Policing so can offer no commentary on the status of the relationship.

Impressions of the Victims of Crime Commissioner during the Investigation and Trial in the Matter of R v Lehrmann

91. I was briefed the Victims of Crime Commissioner had taken a very active role in this matter to the point where she was acting as an intermediary between the investigating officers and the victim. I had not seen this level of engagement before by an ACT Government Statutory Officer and the perception this brought to the investigation. It is my opinion the active engagement of the Victim of Crime Commissioner immediately brought a level of credibility to the victim's version of events and supported the media agenda. It also created a situation where the possibility of a fair trial would be all but lost. I did not speak to the investigators on this involvement however her very public involvement was unusual and not something I had seen in the past.

92. As I had no direct involvement with the Victims of Crime Commissioner on this

Personal information

Personal information

.....
Michael Chew

.....
Witness

matter, I cannot comment on status of any subsequent relationship breakdown.

Media

93. The media interest in this investigation was something I had not seen for any other sexual assault investigation. I believe the location of the alleged offence coupled with the social commentary being made at the time and the political nature of the commentary presented an opportunity for the media to increase their reporting and drive some agendas not related to this allegation of sexual assault. At times, this media commentary was driven by the victim despite it being made clear to her not to make any public commentary, as this would affect any subsequent court proceedings. I do not believe the media interest/commentary affected the investigations as I have confidence at all times they acted professionally and gathered the evidence/information without any external or internal influence.
94. The development of any media plan would usually occur between the investigators, their executive officers and executive officers from the ODPP ensuring a collaborative effort can be provided.
95. I had no conversations with the media.

Board of Inquiry

96. I have not spoken to any AFP/ACT Policing staff or other persons about my provision of evidence to the Board of Inquiry under s 26(1)(b) of the *Inquiries Act 1991*.
97. I have no comments on the Terms of Reference of the Board of Inquiry.

Personal information
.....
Michael Chew

Personal information
.....
Witness

SWORN before me at Canberra in the Australian Capital Territory on 21 April 2023.

Personal information
[Redacted]

Signature of Person Making Statement
MICHAEL CHEW

Personal information
[Redacted]

Signature of witness

Personal information
[Redacted]

NAME OF WITNESS

Personal information
[Redacted]

Michael Chew

Personal information
[Redacted]

Personal information

Witness