## BOARD OF INQUIRY - CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

MR JONES: Your letter of 1 November, you haven't provided that to the media, save for under the FOI.

MR DRUMGOLD: No.

5

20

25

30

MR JONES: I've read the response from the office. Were you involved directly in that decision, or do you have an FOI or --

MR DRUMGOLD: I have a communication officer, an information officer, that manages FOI.

15 MS LONGBOTTOM: We talked about this. We talked about the context in which --

MR DRUMGOLD: She wrote to me saying, 'Surely this must be subject to legal professional privilege.' They had waived legal professional privilege on the document through the subpoena material. So I wrote back to Katie saying, 'Oh, no that's all clear', meaning LPP is all clear; thinking she would then go and consult and do whatever else she needed to do. She read that as being 'the letter is all clear' and released it.

The Guardian then approached the AFP for comment. And I had a chat with Neil. And then I then got Katie - I was flat out at this stage. I got Katie. Hooked her up with the information officer from Justice and Community Safety. Ran some immediate training and did a review of the decision. They contacted *The Guardian* the next day. Said, 'Sorry; it should be released. We want it back though because it should be redacted.' I didn't see an issue with the redaction, I've got to be frank, because it named officers in there that had been named in detail in a report in *The Australian* that led to the - so Chew and Boorman and Moller had all been named in *The Australian* article as saying they felt from the outset that it shouldn't have proceeded, yadda, yadda, yadda, I was subject of political influence so therefore I told them - I made them lay charges. So their names were there. So I didn't see it as really an issue. But I don't deal with that side of the aspect of it.

You'll see in there - it was subject to an FOI ombudsman. I ended up writing an apology because ultimately I'm accountable for everything.

178