

N.B. Copyright in this transcript is the property of the Crown. If this transcript is copied without the authority of the Attorney-General of the Northern Territory, proceedings for infringement will be taken.

NORTHERN TERRITORY OF AUSTRALIA

CORONERS COURT

A 51 of 2019

AN INQUEST INTO THE DEATH

OF KUMANJAYI WALKER

ON 9 NOVEMBER 2019

AT YUENDUMU POLICE STATION

JUDGE ARMITAGE, Coroner

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT ALICE SPRINGS ON 28 OCTOBER 2022

(Continued from 27/10/2022)

Transcribed by:
EPIQ

C1/all/rm
Walker

2738

THE CORONER: Dr Dwyer.

MR EDWARDSON KC: Your Honour, sorry - - -

THE CORONER: Sorry, Mr Edwardson.

MR EDWARDSON: - - - I do apologise. Your Honour, there's a matter that I overlooked yesterday. I'd like to formally tender, if I may, two exhibits?

THE CORONER: Sure.

MR EDWARDSON: It's item number 7155C and 7155D – sorry, I'll start again, 7115D. D is the original notebook of Constable Rolfe, and C are the transcribed copy of the document, which was done by Sapol(?) which formed part of the prosecution (inaudible) –

A PERSON UNKNOWN: What sorry? NT copy, as part of the prosecution brief.

THE CORONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Edwardson. They'll be given exhibit numbers, very shortly, I'm sure.

DR DWYER: Your Honour, the first and only witness today, is Ms Claudia Campagnaro. Ms Campagnaro has a non-publication order over her image. And so because of the technical challenges in this court, we're not able to both live-stream, and see her, in a way that protects her image. But what will be doing is recording these proceedings today. So that the recording is available on our website, and can be listened to by anybody who is interested in her evidence.

And of course, as your Honour knows, we are having – doing a summary at the end of each week, to have translated in Warlpiri, and that will be done, so that the community will have an understanding of what Ms Campagnaro has said, and anybody who wants to listen to it more closely can do so at a later date.

THE CORONER: And the transcript will also be on the website.

DR DWYER: Exactly.

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, can I ask on that basis, if I may, that the non-publication order that's been made – I haven't, as far as I'm aware, have not been asked about it. Ms Campagnaro's image is freely available on the internet, in the presence of my client, Zachary Rolfe, and in a whole variety of different ways.

THE CORONER: Dr Dwyer.

DR DWYER: Yes, your Honour. Well a request was made by Ms Campagnaro for a non-publication order over her image, because she has come forward and given some evidence that in effect, has at, on previous occasions, made her the subject of targeted insult. There is a social media campaign, as your Honour is aware, that has

been – that is – campaign perhaps is one way to describe it. I'll just describe it in a more neutral term, and withdraw that. It's a – it's the web site "I backed Zach", which is a support campaign for Constable Rolfe, has from time to time, contained material which is abusive towards other people.

Including for example, Sergeant Frost. And on occasion, there has been social media that is abusive, directed towards Ms Campagnaro. And she, in my respectful submission, has understandable concerns, as to the way in which she might be treated, on social media, including on that web site – on that site - - -

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, I – no, I understand. I – if that's the position the court takes, and (inaudible) appropriate that there be an order in those terms - - -

THE CORONER: Yes.

MR EDWARDSON: - - - (Inaudible) the evidence that she's about to give so.

THE CORONER: And can I say, that it is – obviously the court is open, and anyone present is able to view the proceedings in their entirety, and had we had the technology available, we would have continued to broadcast audio only today. But we can't do that. So we did try to maintain the open court as much as possible. And in fact, we are continuing to proceed in open court today.

DR DWYER: Thank you, your Honour.

THE CORONER: It's just a non-publication of the image of Ms Campagnaro.

DR DWYER: Thank you, your Honour. And just to be clear, there's – that – there is a proper basis for this, in circumstances where there are attacks on witnesses in social media. On that web site, there are criticisms of various people, including myself as counsel assisting, in extremely derogatory terms. I am personally able to withstand that, because I'm an offer of the court. And I don't take it personally. But in circumstances where witnesses, like Sergeant Frost, and like Ms Campagnaro, want to come to this court, and have to give evidence that in some circumstances, might be challenging, and difficult for them, then it is entirely proper, that they be afforded the protection, so that they're not intimidated to give evidence.

THE CORONER: Yes.

DR DWYER: Thank you, your Honour. I call Ms Campagnaro.

THE CORONER: Yes, so at this stage, we're going to break the live-stream.

Have we already done that? Not yet.

And we're going to return to the live-stream at 9.30 on Monday morning.

Mr Mullins.

MR MULLINS: Yes, just while that's happening your Honour, can I just indicate that the families have limited questions for Ms Campagnaro, and myself and Mr Hearn will be leaving later in the morning.

THE CORONER: Thank you.

CLAUDIA CAMPAGNARO, affirmed:

XN BY DR DWYER:

DR DWYER: Ms Campagnaro, can you see and hear me okay?---Yes.

Could you please state your full name for the court?---Claudia (inaudible) Campagnaro.

And Ms Campagnaro, if you drop out at any time, I'll remind you, but you're a tiny bit soft. So I'm sorry to have to ask you – that's terrific thank you for that?---(Inaudible).

Sit so your feel comfortable, but we can now see and hear you.

Is that okay, your Honour?

THE CORONER: Sure, I think that's fine.

It is – you are – you just need to keep your voice up, I'm sorry that you've been ill. If you become a little quiet, we'll just remind you, okay. And if you need a – if you need a break or anything, just let us know. We will have a morning break, a lunch break, as well?---Okay.

DR DWYER: Ms Campagnaro, you're coming – I'm not going to ask you what your address is, but you're physically located outside of the Northern Territory, is that right?---Yes, I am.

You work now as a nurse?---Yes, I do.

You were interviewed by police on 18 August 2020 and the transcript is some 92 pages and appears in her Honour's brief of evidence. Do you have a copy of the transcript with you today?---(Inaudible).

We are losing you a bit so I will keep asking you some questions to make sure we can hear you. You were asked by police in the Northern Territory to participate in that interview because of a previous relationship that you had had with Constable Zachary Rolfe, is that right?---That's correct.

I will come to some more details about this but just to put it in context, you were in a romantic relationship with Constable Rolfe from around January/February 2018 through to the end of 2018, is that right?---That's correct.

And for a period of time in that year you were engaged to him?---Yes, I was.

When was the last time that you saw him?---(Inaudible) September or October 2018. I can't be a hundred percent certain.

Okay, so you haven't maintained contact after that time?---Nothing.

On 9 November 2019 you were not living in the Northern Territory, is that right?
---No, I wasn't.

Do you remember now how you first heard that there had been a shooting death in Yuendumu?---I think maybe I had been told by a fellow officer that I used to speak to or I'd seen it on the news, I can't be (inaudible).

It was some time then before you were interviewed and by the time you were being interviewed in August 2020 Zach Rolfe had been charged with murder and manslaughter. Were you keen to give an interview to Northern Territory Police about him?---No, I wasn't. I didn't know that I was being interviewed until (inaudible).

Until - did you say 48 hours before?---I think it was about 48 to 24 hours before.

And how did that interview come about?---I had a phone call from the Northern Territory Police detective telling me that I was going to giving an interview at - in Adelaide.

In Adelaide, is that right?---Yes, and they were flying down.

Now, at the time, had you ever been interviewed by police in relation to any incident?---No, I had not.

When you sat down with the interviewers to talk to them, how were you feeling?
---Incredibly intimidated.

Did you feel like it was something that you wanted to actively do, give evidence about someone you'd previously been in a relationship with?---Absolutely not it was very, very (inaudible).

We're losing you a bit Claudia when you go back and forwards so I'll just repeat that because I can hear you okay, but you said, "Absolutely not, it was very very stressful"?---Yes.

Did you, when you were participating in that interview, understand that you were under an obligation to give a truthful account of what you knew?---Yes, at the beginning of the interview I had to state that I was going to tell the truth.

And did you tell the truth in your interview?---Yes, I did.

You are now, as I understand it, in a new relationship, is that right?---Yes, a very happy (inaudible).

And you're keen to move on with your life as I understand?---Very, very keen to move on with my life.

Has it been challenging for you to have had your name in the media, for example? ---Incredibly invasive. My name, my phone number got into the media. It's been very, very stressful.

Are you nevertheless, Ms Campagnaro, prepared to come to court and tell the truth today about what you know about these circumstances?---Yes, I am.

Ms Campagnaro, I am going to ask you a little bit first about our background. You were born in 1994. You are now 28 years of age, have I got that right?---That's correct.

And when did you first come to the Northern Territory?---I came a little bit before I started my training with the police, so early (inaudible).

We are just losing you with - you're cutting out a little bit, Ms Campagnaro, I am wondering, is our volume right up as far as it can be?---Yes, it's full, it's full.

That's great, okay, we can hear when you just said that. So I think you said you came to the Northern Territory just a little bit before you started your training as a police officer?---Yes.

And what year was it?---2017.

And what brought you to the Northern Territory?---It was just something different to do.

Did you come up specifically for the job, to be a police officer up here?---Yes, yes, I did.

How old were you when you first arrived in the Territory?---Twenty-four.

Had you had any sort of career prior to coming to the Territory?---Not really, no.

Prior to coming to the Territory had you worked - I withdraw that - had you had much contact with Aboriginal people?---Not really, no. Not, not (inaudible).

When you first joined the police force in the Northern Territory were you enthusiastic about the job?---Yes, very.

Were you excited to join the police force?---Yes, I was actually. I had always wanted to be an officer.

When you did your squad, I think, I withdraw that. You did your training as a 24 year old police officer in Darwin, is that right?---That's correct

And did you enjoy your training?---Yes. It was challenging but it was rewarding at the same time.

Do you remember - we are asking all the witnesses who come to court to give evidence about this, do you remember now having any training on cross-cultural issues or cultural competency?---A little bit I think. I mean, I can't remember specifically but there was a little bit about it.

Do you remember going into a community or anything like that?---Not in Darwin.

Was it anything - the cross-cultural training, or cultural competency, was there anything significant that you remember about it that was meaningful to you?
---No, not really, just that the majority of the clientele, there would be a large majority of Indigenous people, they were trying to give us a bit more of the background.

We're just having to - I will just check with her Honour. Your Honour, are you able to hear Claudia?---We are losing words here and there. We will keep trying. If it is causing a problem for anyone, the alternative is to cut the audio on the computer and have a visual from the computer and a phone connection as well. We'll keep trying though and we will see how we go?---Okay, sorry.

No, don't apologise, it's technology ad we're going to do our best and if we need to come up with a work around we will?---Okay.

DR DWYER: Ms Campagnaro, where was your first posting as a police officer?
---It was in Alice Springs.

That was some time in 2017, is that right?---December.

So am I right that from December 2017 until the following October or November 2018, you were a young police officer in Alice Springs?---Yes, I was.

Were you a probationary Constable for the whole time?---Yes, I was.

When you left Alice Springs - I withdraw that. You were in general duties for the whole time you were there, is that right?---Yes, Alice Springs general duty.

And when you left Alice Springs in October or November 2018 did you work anywhere else as a police officer?---No, I did not.

Did you effectively leave the police force after that year?---Yes. I (inaudible).

Why did you leave the police force?---Police - it just didn't give me job satisfaction. I realised it wasn't what I wanted to do and my passion was actually to be (inaudible).

That your passion was actually to be - sorry, we lost you at the end?---A nurse.

And that you've been able to pursue that passion since that time?---Yes, I studied and now I'm a registered nurse.

Okay, terrific. So, I'm going to come now to come now to ask you some questions about meeting Zach Rolfe. You met him, of course, when you were a police officer in Alice Springs and he was working as an officer. You explain in your interview that he was a couple of squads before you, so maybe 12 months or so, he'd already been in Alice Springs working as an officer. Correct?---Yes, I think so, yep.

And you were a probationary constable when he was a constable. Is that right?---That's correct.

Okay. Before you met Zach, when you arrived at the station, do you recall finding out about his reputation?---No, not that I can recall.

Did you meet him soon after you arrived in Alice Springs?---Yes, I believe I met him in December.

You explain in your statement at page 6, or your interview, you said:

“Zach, shortly after, one time – like we were on a changeover shift and he came and introduced himself to me and shoot my hand. And that was my first knowing of him. Then, not long after that, I found out later that he had organised on purpose to go a job with me looking for someone and that's how he started talking to me.”

Is that right?---That is correct, yes.

Okay. He then got your number and he texted you to say thanks for the job?---Yes.

And then he heard through a friend that you were having some issues with your dog crying at night, so he offered to look after your dog for a while when you were on shifts?---Yes, that's right.

Which appeared to you to be a kind and nice thing to do?---Well, it was, yes.

Okay. And it was obvious to you at that time that he might be keen to go on a date?--Yes.

All right. Did that all happen prior to your interviewing Malcolm Ryder?---I actually can't recall.

Okay?---I would think – I met him in December and Malcolm Ryder was January, so there's not much time.

True. So, I'll come to Mr Ryder then. On 11 January 2018, Malcolm Ryder was

arrested by a number of police officers, Constable Lorraine(?), Constable Geranios(?), Constable Rolfe and Constable Zendelli(?). Did you know, bearing in mind you hadn't recently long been in Alice Springs, did you know any of those people before that time?---Yes, I did.

Okay. Who did you know from those four?---I knew all of them.

Okay. So, you'd been introduced to all of them beforehand?---Yes, yep, because when you start your shift, you get to meet other officers.

MR FRECKELTON AO KC: Sorry, I didn't understand that?

THE CORONER: At the start of the shift, you get to meet other officers.

MR FRECKELTON: Thank you.

DR DWYER: And out of those four that I just mentioned, did you have any particular friendship with any of them?---Not at that point, no.

Okay. You'd only really just met them. Is that right?---Yes.

Okay. Mr Ryder was interviewed by yourself and another officer who you refer to a "Fish"?---Fisher, yes.

Fisher, okay. We've -- I think that his full name is Jason Gurvitz(?) Fisher. Does that ring a bell to you? Is that him?---Yes.

Do you recall what rank he was at the time of that interview?---Maybe a first class constable. I can't really remember.

He was certainly above you in rank because you were a probationary constable. Is that right?---Yeah, he was a lot more senior.

Okay. So, this is what you say at page 8 of your interview, Ms Campagnaro. You say, "There was this one job where I had to interview someone that had been placed under arrest, Malcolm Ryder, and I had to interview him. And I remember not liking Zach, because Malcolm Ryder had this massive gash above his head. My partner that -- him and I both interviewed, he wasn't happy about it either. So, that was another interaction. So, I didn't actually like him in the beginning. I thought he just loved himself and I hated that Malcolm Ryder thing and I still remember, that's how I remember his name."?---That is correct.

That's a truthful account of what happened with the interview?---Yes, it is.

Malcolm Ryder, we know, had an injury above his right eye after -- following an arrest from that group of four I just read you -- read the names of. He required 10 stitches above his right eye and three stitches above his left eye. There was an attempt by yourself and Officer Fisher to interview him. Is that right?---That is correct.

And you started the interview and then stopped it after a time. Is that right?---That is correct.

During the time that you started the interview, had Mr Ryder already been to the hospital to receive some treatment for his head wounds?---Yes, because before you can be interviewed, you have to have your wounds tendered to. That's - - -

Okay?---Yep.

And when Mr Ryder was speaking with you and Officer Fisher, did he complain about the arrest?---Yes, he did, over and over again.

What sort of things did he say?---First of all, he said that the officer "had the devil in his eyes?"

MR FRECKELTON: Sorry?

DR DWYER: He said the officer "had the devil in his eyes".

MR FRECKELTON: Thank you.

THE CORONER: Lean forward please, Ms Campagnaro?---He just kept saying over and over again that he hadn't done anything.

DR DWYER: That he – he kept saying over and over again that he hadn't done anything wrong, Mr Ryder?---Yes.

He told you that the officer that the devil in his eyes. Did he tell you which officer?---No, he just said "That officer".

Okay. Did he say anything else about he had suffered those injuries?---To be honest, his English was incredibly poor. So, that's why we ceased the interview because he did not understand the preamble, he didn't understand the interview at all.

MR FRECKELTON: I'm sorry, your Honour.

THE CORONER: He didn't understand the preamble.

DR DWYER: And he understands the interview at all.

Your Honour, do you think that it would be – should we at least give it a go on the phone - - -

THE CORONER: Sure.

DR DWYER: - - - and then Ms Campagnaro might feel more comfortable too

because she can sit back from the screen, and then we'll hear your voice on the phone?---I mean, I could do it on my phone with my headphones. It just means I have to hold it. So, I'm happy to do that.

MR COLERIDGE: Your Honour, what happens is when Ms Campagnaro speaks very close to the microphone seems to come through very clearly. I think it's when she moves back.

THE CORONER: I don't know. Is it possible for you to stay that close or is that difficult?---I mean, I can, but it's obviously very comfortable.

THE CORONER: Right. Let's – we might just try – I might just take a short adjournment. We'll try getting you on the phone and turning off the audio on your computer or putting that on mute, and we'll see if we've got a better – if we can hear you a bit better through the phone.

I'll just adjourn briefly while we sort that out.

WITNESS WITHDREW

ADJOURNED

RESUMED

CLAUDIA CAMPAGNARO:

DR DWYER: Ms Campagnaro, I'm hoping that we'll be able to hear you clearly now, as we did during the break?---Okay.

Can you hear us?---I can.

That's terrific, okay. So I was asking you previously about the interview you did with Mr Ryder, and you had Officer Jason Gurvitz Fisher there with you. And you – when I asked you what Mr Ryder said about how he got the injury, you said that he just kept – he kept saying over and over again, that he hadn't done anything wrong?---Yeah.

And he said "That officer had the devil in his eyes"?---Yeah, that's correct.

And you gave evidence, that when you were interviewed, you said, "And I remember not liking Zach, because Malcolm Ryder had this massive gash above his head, and my partner, that him and I both interviewed, he wasn't happy about it either." You were there with somebody much more senior to you. You'd only been in the job a month or so, what - - - ?---A month.

- - - what did your more senior officer say about it?---Fisher said to me that they'd done a bit of a dodgy.

MR EDWARDSON: Excuse me, I object to that, your Honour. I appreciate the rules of evidence don't apply in this jurisdiction, but nonetheless, unless that officer's being called, it's not appropriate to simply adduce an opinion that's being expressed by another officer, who's not available for cross-examination. By all means this officer – sorry, this witness, can tell us what she saw, what she heard, and any conversation that she had directly with Zachary Rolfe on the relevant topic.

DR DWYER: Your Honour, I'm happy to make the relevant officer available for cross-examination. So I am – I do press the question, in terms of – and I'll ask it directly in terms of what this witness heard the other officer say.

MR EDWARDSON: But it's (inaudible) hearsay.

THE CORONER: But the other officer is now going to be made available - - -

MR EDWARDSON: Yes, and that officer can give evidence about what he observed, and why he might have expressed that opinion. It's not to the point that he might have said something in the presence of this witness.

DR DWYER: It – it's – first of all, the rules of evidence don't apply in – as my learned friend says. But if - in circumstances where that officer was not available at all, I would take my learned friend's point about the difficulty of challenging it, or

testing it. But it goes right to the heart of any concerns, and whether they're credible or not. It's relevant to this witness' credibility, and in terms of that witness' credibility.

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, I haven't even had a statement from this other officer. I don't know what this other officer says about it, so how can I cross-examine her, on this topic, if you don't have a statement that informs me, relevantly, about what he says actually happened on this particular occasion that we're now talking about.

DR DWYER: I'll deal with it in this way. I'll ask this witness whether or not the other officer said anything to her about his concerns, and then I'm going to get a statement from the officer.

THE CORONER: Thank you.

DR DWYER: And if I then have to get another statement from Ms Campagnaro, I will do.

Ms Campagnaro, did the other officer, Officer Fisher, say anything to you about his concerns?---I can't tell you - - -

Okay so - - - ?---Exactly what was said.

Okay, but did - - - ?---But he - - -

- - - so - - - ?---He was unhappy.

MR EDWARDSON: (Inaudible) - - -

THE CORONER: Ms Campagnaro sorry, sorry to do this to you, and I'm sorry that we're interrupting. You're just being asked whether the police officer said anything to you, not what he said. So it's just a very specific question. Did he say anything to you about his concerns, so that's really a yes or no, or I can't remember?---Yes.

Okay?---Yes.

DR DWYER: All right, and then I'll follow that up, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Don't feel bad about the fact that you've just been interrupted then, it's just evidentiary issues, Ms Campagnaro?---It's fine.

DR DWYER: Ms Campagnaro, this – had you ever interviewed anybody, prior to this interview with Mr Ryder?---No, I had not.

So, at that time, is – was it important to you, as a learning exercise, to be sitting there with a more senior officer?---Yes, it was.

And you were watching the way that he ran those proceedings, or ran that interview?---Yeah, yes I was.

Did you at that stage, have an interpreter available to you?---No there was not.

Do you recall there being any consideration of calling the Aboriginal Interpreter Service and bringing someone in?---I actually can't remember.

Do you remember now, whether or not, when you're going through your training, you were trained in the use of Aboriginal interpreters?---Yes we were.

In those circumstances, in terms of getting an interpreter for Mr Ryder, I take it that that would have – you would have been looking for guidance from your senior officer as to when that was appropriate?---Yes I was.

Did you have any discussions with your senior officer, at that time, about – and I'll ask you this as a yes or no to begin with as well, did you have any discussions with Officer Fisher about whether or not you should escalate your concerns, that is, make a complaint, on behalf of the interviewee?---No.

At the time that you interviewed Mr Ryder, did you or – or beforehand, did you review any body-worn video footage from the incident?---I can't recall if it was before or after.

At some stage you did look at that body-worn video, is that right?---Yes, I did.

And I think - someone will correct me if I am wrong, it was only one of the officers, officer Brett Geranios who turned on his body-worn video. How did you come to look at it?---Someone would have shown me.

Did you look at it as part of your investigation into what had happened with Mr Ryder or just simply outside of that?---Outside of that.

Did Zach show it to you at all?---I cannot recall.

I just want to take you to some conversations you had with Zach Rolfe about that incident?---Yes.

When do you recall was the first time that you spoke to Zach about what had happened?---January 11th, the day that it actually happened.

How did that conversation come about?---So, we were on opposite shifts and when I started my shift he spoke to me at the front office about what had happened because he'd just come back from the job.

So did he speak to you about what happened before you even interviewed Mr Ryder or attempted to?---Yes, he did.

And what did Zach say to you about what had happened?---He just told me that everyone had been sprayed with OC spray and that Ryder had a gash on his head.

Did he tell you first of all, how everyone had been sprayed?---Yes, he did.

And how did that happen?---One of the officers had party-packed everyone with OC spray, and that was Brett.

Is that an expression - is that a sort of slang expression "party pack" or is that a formal police term?---Sorry, that's a slang expression for the larger OC spray bottle.

If you use that larger OC spray bottle in a confined space is it the case that a lot of people in there - or people in the area - will get sprayed?---Yes, that is correct.

When Zach was telling you about that was he joking about the spraying?---Well, he was covered in spray.

Okay so - - ?---And he was messy.

He was messy, okay. And did he tell you anything about how Mr Ryder had got that gash?---Not at that time, no.

So was there only one conversation with him prior to that interview?---Yes.

And then when was the next time that you spoke to Zach about Mr Ryder?---I'd say some point after we'd started dating.

So can I just be clear that on 11 January you spoke to Zach before you interviewed - or tried to interview Mr Ryder. Was there any other conversation with Zach on that day about it?---Not that I can recall, no.

So then what you explain in your statement is that - or your interview - is that - at page 8, Zach was helping you with your dogs and then obviously the friendship turned into more than a friendship and you started a relationship and you say, "And then seriously not long after that he proposed to me, like within four or five weeks of knowing him"?---That is correct.

And from that time on you were engaged to him I think from about March through to the end of the year, correct?---That's correct.

Do you remember roughly how long into your relationship he told you something else about the Ryder incident?---I cannot give you specifics. It was just after we had started dating.

So at page 10 of your statement you were asked a question by the interviewers, "Tell me in as much detail about the particular conversation you had with Zach" and you say, "I am just trying to recollect - it's two years ago. I was working - I can't remember his name - he's out somewhere now. We were on a changeover so they'd

been - we were doing evening and they were doing morning and we had obviously to interview this guy that they'd just arrested and they were covered in spray. So Zach - they'd all been sprayed and the members had been sprayed. His ex-girlfriend was on that patrol group. She was involved in that job. Can you remember who that ex-girlfriend was?---Her last name is Zendelli, she goes by "Jen".

Did you know at that time that Zach had been in a relationship with Ms Zendelli?
---I think it had been mentioned to me before.

You go on to say, "Someone called "Maxi(?)" he was involved in that job", that was - - -?---Lorraine.

Constable Max Lorraine?---Yes, that's him.

"A detective in the Northern Territory was involved in that job, who I really like". That was?---Brett.

That was Brett. And you go on to say that, "he's a straight shooter" by that do I take it that you mean he's someone who's - you know to be generally honest?---Yes, very by the book.

You say:

"So there was a domestic violence job - I'm just trying to remember. They'd gone in and apparently the defendant, Malcolm Ryder, shot his phone at them and that was kind of their justification for spraying him and when he was on the ground I think him and his ex were punching and kicking Malcolm Ryder and then Zach told me later" - so this was after - so that's the job I know of and then later, when I was at the station Zach told someone else - and I can't remember who else was with me, like secretly when the cameras weren't looking at work that he had someone scratch him. I can't remember where it was though. Someone upstairs had scratched him - for him - so he could say in his use of force that was why he'd get - given him - Mr Ryder - that gash on the forehead."

So on the day of 11 January, Mr Ryder told you that he hadn't done anything wrong when he got those injuries. Some time later you had a conversation with Zach. What did Zach tell you?---He told me that a detective upstairs had scratched him so that in his use of force documentation he could say that's why he had used force on Mr Ryder.

Did he tell you who the detective was upstairs who had done that?---No, he did not.

By "upstairs" you were in Alice Springs at that time, did you take him to be referring to a detective in Alice Springs?---Yes, so "upstairs" is because the detectives were based upstairs in the Alice Springs Police Station.

Can you recall now what prompted this discussion with Zach about what had happened?---Well, there was a PSC investigation so that's why we were talking about it.

PSC is Professional Standards Command, is that right?---That's correct.

In terms of that's why we were talking about it, did Zach say anything to you that gave you the impression that he was worried about that investigation?---He did seem worried because it was being taken to court.

By "It was being taken to court" do you mean the Malcolm Ryder matter was being taken to court?---Yes, it was.

Mr Ryder was being charged with offences that resulted from it?---Yes, but I think his lawyers were challenging what had happened, at a later date.

So you were asked about this - just to prompt your memory too in your interview from page 40 again and you explain that you were asked by Officer Pennuto in that conversation: "Can you tell us how that conversation came about Zach telling you" – I withdraw that - I've misled you. So there is something else that you say of relevance at page 40 on to 41 about this incident. It's in relation to a discussion about body-worn videos. You explain what Zach's attitude was to that from your perspective. You say:

"There was legislation that got brought in when I was there. He - Zach - never had his camera on - never. He never put it on. And he got told off by the lady upstairs. I can't think of her name, the senior sergeant, I can't think of her name. He got emailed by her maybe once or twice about the fact that he hadn't been putting on his body-worn. And he still continued not putting his body-worn on."

Ms Campagnaro, can you recall who that senior sergeant was now?---Now that I'm here, I'm having a mental blank."

If - - ?---She's retired now.

Is – does Vicary ring a bell?---That's her.

And what did Zach say to you about advice he'd been given about his body-worn?---He told me that he'd been asked to put it on by Sergeant Vicary and that he just didn't want to.

Did he say why he didn't want to?---He didn't want people to see what he was doing.

You were asked by Officer Pennuto, "Did he talk to you about that particular – about the body-worn not being put on?" And you say, "So, he didn't put it on because I think sometimes, he didn't want that footage of what he was doing to go through the station. That was his justification for that. He'd never put it on though, never."

When you – there are, I imagine, some jobs where Constable Rolfe’s video was on, you make a strong statement there saying, “He’d never put it on though, never.” What do you mean by that?---I mean, I can’t say that he never indefinitely had it on, but the majority of the time, he did not have his body-worn video on.

And you go on to say, for example:

“The Malcolm Ryder case, I don’t think he had his body-worn on.” This is page 41. “I recall him saying that they – thankfully it wasn’t on, so they couldn’t see what he had done.”

Is that something that Zach said to you about Mr Ryder’s case?---That is correct.

Did Zach tell you what he had actually done that he wanted not to be on camera?---He’d punched him in the head while he was on the ground.

And you explained this when you were interviewed in 2020 you say that:

“They would see if he had his body-worn on that he’d punched him unnecessarily when he was – I think this guy was already in handcuffs as well and he was being punched. So, a huge unnecessary use of force.”

And you go on – you’re asked, “Is that what Zach told you?”

And you say, “Yeah, him and Zendelli both did that. So, I don’t know whose camera. I think there was a big issue about – there was one person’s camera on. I think it was Brett, because Brett is a straight shooter and always – that’s how he became a detective so quickly, because he just wanted so badly to be a great cop. And I think none of them had their cameras on besides Brett, so a lot of the footage, you couldn’t actually – you couldn’t see what had actually happened in the incident.”

At the start of that answer, you say, “Yeah, him and Zendelli both did that.”

In relation to punching Mr Ryder. How did you – on what – how do you know that Zendelli also did that?---Zach told me.

Did you ever have a conversation with her about it?---No, I did not.

Did you ever have a conversation with Brett, Constable Geranios about it or Constable Lorraine?---Not that I can recall, no.

They were both more senior in rank to you, obviously?---Yes, they all were.

Did you ever hear from anybody else about who was the detective that had scratched Zach’s face?---No, I did not.

So, to this day, do you know who that detective was?---No. All I know is that it was a

female.

And how do you know that?---He told me.

When you say "He", you mean "Zach"?---Sorry. Yeah, sorry, Zach told me it was a female detective from upstairs.

Did you actually ever see a scratch on his face after that incident?---Not that I can recall, no.

Can you have a look, Ms Campagnaro, at your interview at pages 11 and 12. I appreciate I'm asking you to go back to an interview that you gave a couple of years ago. At the bottom of page 11, you were asked about this incident of someone scratching him?---Okay.

And you say:

"A member who had worked upstairs that was a detective had scratched him. I do not know who it was. He never said who it was, not to me."

And then over the page, you were asked, "Okay, can you recall whether or not there was any visible injury that you saw?"

And you said, "I think there was literally a scratch from someone scratching him."

And you were asked to describe it, and you say, "Oh I don't – I'm trying to think. I actually can't remember. I don't want to guess. I can't recall where it was, but it was a scratch."

Just thinking back on it, did you see a scratch, or did you just hear the story about him being scratched?---I can't remember seeing a scratch. This was four years ago.

Sure. And just to finish off on that topic, you explained part of this at page 13 when you say:

"What I know is, like I said, Malcolm Ryder ran out with his phone, so I know I've been told that. Then Brett sprayed him, but Brett was known for spraying people, just like off the bat, all the time. And then I know that Zach was punching him. He said that's what happened. Him and his ex-girlfriend were punching him, because then in the interview, Malcolm Ryder kept saying, 'He hit me. He kept -', he actually said to me, 'That man had black in his eyes.' He said, 'He hit me', and it was just like the worst – like my first interview I'd ever done. It was ridiculous."

Is that a truthful account of what you were told?---That is truthful, yes.

When you reflect on that now, Ms Campagnaro, did – what impact do you think that

might have had on a young officer, a probationary constable, in their first month of the job?---I think back now and – I mean hindsight is a wonderful thing and I should have reported it. But I was going under the guidance of my senior police officer. I just remember thinking at the time that it was ridiculous.

Did you feel any empathy for Mr Ryder?---A lot of empathy, yeah.

Did you feel like there was anybody – this is before you started going out with Zach, did you feel like there was anybody you could talk to, to raise your concerns?---No, I didn't feel like I could speak to anyone about it.

Within a short period of time, like a couple of weeks, Zach was asking you out on dates and you started dating him, and then you were engaged a short time later. Someone might question why it was that if you were concerned about what had happened in January, you're prepared to start a relationship with him. What do you think about that now?---Well, at the time, I fell for a charming fellow police officer and when you think you're in love with someone, you know, you're just going to listen to what they say and go with it. I think back to it now and I think – yeah, I should have done things a lot differently, but that's hindsight for you.

You, I think, moved in with Zach in Alice Springs. Is that right?---Yes, I did.

You met his parents. Correct?---Yes, I did.

He put your – some people in your family. Is that right?---Yes, he did.

He met your grandma you talk about in your interview?---He did.

He met your mum?---Yes, he did.

And did all that happened to June 2018?---Yes. Yes, it did.

So, I'm reminded by the Proctor report, your Honour, at page 34.

That on 5 June 2018, Mr Ryder put in a complaint of improper conduct by police. Which involved an allegation of excessive force. And his claim was that it was excessive because the use of OS spray, the take down to the ground, the strike to the head, the pulling of the hair, and nearly on his back. The matter was investigated by Police Standards Command. And it was determined that the use of force was reasonable. Another matter identified however, was that the body-worn video footage was not activated for Constable Rolfe, or three of the others. Do you remember any discussions with Constable Rolfe about that, around June 2018?---Yes, I do.

And what did Zach say to you?---He just told me that they were being investigated about what had happened in the Ryder case.

And you explain this in your interview at page 14. You say:

“When it – obviously when it came up again, so this is like six months later after this, after January, may be a bit longer after this happened, the defence were trying to build a case against him and his ex, and whoever else was involved in that job, trying to say they had used unjustified force against Malcolm. So that’s when it got brought up again.”

And you say:

“I know his mum was concerned, like trying to get involved, and he, Zach, was really manipulative. So even though he told me that all this was happened – had happened, he would try and justify it to you out loud, that had happened, because Malcolm had done something wrong. But he hadn’t. Like he just ran out with his phone. So he just mentioned again that him and Zendelli had punched him.”

So around this time, about six months after you first interviewed Mr Ryder, you became aware that Mr Ryder’s defence team were saying that there was unjustified force used against him? Is that right?---Yes, I do.

And - - - ?---That’s correct.

- - - and you know, Mr – Ms Campagnaro – well I withdraw that. It follows, does it, from what you’ve told us already, and what you’ve told police, that you had reason to believe unjustified force had been used against Malcolm?---Yes it was.

Did you think, at that time, six months later, that you should come forward and explain that?---No, I didn’t, no.

You were still in a relationship with Zach, at that time?---Yes, we were still in the relationship in June.

And do you think now, looking back on it, that even though you were a young officer, it was your obligation to come forward?---Yes, I do. I think about that all the time.

Is there anything that you want to say about that? Because some of Kumanjayi’s family are in the room, and it’s important to them to understand the processes of the police. And no doubt, Mr Ryder might be interested in it too. Do you want to reflect on it and make a comment?---I feel – I feel really sad that I was a part of you know, a cascade of events that led to that, and I do – even though I was brand new, I should have had more of a voice, and reported it. But I didn’t. And I am, I’m really sorry about that.

Ms Campagnaro, I’ll move on from that topic, and ask you something about attitudes generally in Alice Springs. You were young, so you’re 24, and you’re a probationary constable. Do you recall hearing other police in Alice Springs station, use derogatory terms about Aboriginal people?---Yes, I do.

You've heard in this inquest some of the terms that have come out. And I – well I'll just ask you as an open question. In the police station, what sort of derogatory terms would you hear used to describe Aboriginal people?---Coons, kunga, nigger, just terms like that.

A PERSON UNKNOWN: What was the second?

DR DWYER: Kunga.

And when you first heard them, were they terms that you were – that your friends or family would have used at any time, before you got to the police force?---Absolutely not. I don't even like saying it now.

Were you shocked when the first time you heard it?---Yes, I was.

Did you hear that on more than one occasion?---Yes, I did.

Did you hear Zach use language like that?---Yes, I did.

Did you hear him use language like that in the police station?---Yes, I did.

Did you hear sergeants use that sort of language?---Yes, I did.

Did it shock you that people of senior rank, like sergeants, were using that language?---It did when I first started, but then when you're there, everyone around you was using those terms.

Did you – do you think you became desensitised to it, by the time you left the station, at the end of the year?---To a degree, yes.

At that time, did you have a thought process going on, that the use of that language was dehumanising, of Aboriginal people?---Incredibly dehumanising, yes.

And is it something that you ever raised with your seniors?---No, I didn't.

Is it fair to say, that would have been very difficult to do, as a probationary constable, when some senior officers were using that language?---Incredibly difficult. When the seniors are doing it, you have no one to turned to.

Did you ever hear a senior officer, senior constable, or sergeant, or anyone above that rank, pull someone up, for the use of racist language?---No, I didn't.

I've asked you about that incident with Mr Ryder. Were there any other times in Alice Springs Police, when you were there for your year, where you heard of police officers covering up for each other, for the use of excessive force?---Yes. Yes, I did.

Did any of those involve Zach?---Yes. Yes, they did.

Can you remember any other specific incident, that involved Zach?---I remember one involving a river. So the Todd River, where he had punched someone in the river with another officer called Barclay(?), and yeah, that – that's the only really specific one that I can think of.

And do you remember roughly what time of year it was, in that year of 2018?---I believe it was after we were engaged. So some time after the end of March.

And how did you find out about that?---He told me.

What - - - ?---Zach told me.

- - - what did Zach tell you about it?---Well he told me that he'd – that's how he'd injured his wrist, was in this, you know, this incident in the – in the river. And he was – he'd punched someone with this fellow officer. That's all I can remember.

Did he tell you why he punched him?---No he didn't. I think it was during an arrest.

Do you know whether or not the person who was arrested was an Aboriginal person?---Not that I can recall.

Do you recall whether he told you, if they were or weren't Aboriginal?---No, I can't remember that.

Did he – did you know this other person, Barclay?---Yes, I did, but he was on a different patrol group to me.

Was any – was the person that was punched arrested, do you recall?---I can't recall, sorry.

Do you remember whether or not that matter ever went to court?---Not that I think, but I don't think so.

Did you ever discuss that matter with any of your superiors?---No, I didn't.

Did Zach ever say anything to you, about female cops, in general, in the force, and what he thought of them?---Not that I can remember, no.

What about bush cops? Do you recall any discussion with him about bush cops?---No, he just said they were lazy.

In what context did he say that?---Mm mm, I think we were just talking about bush cops in general. I can't really remember a specific conversation.

You explain in your interview, that Zach's plan, that you knew about, was to get into the TRG?---Yes it was.

What did he say to you about that?---He had previously tried before we were together. And then he was trying again when we were together. So that was the ultimate goal, was to be in TRG in Darwin.

And he also wanted to get – you explain in your interview, he was interested to get into the SAS?---Yes, he was.

Did he tell you why he wanted to get into the SAS?---He wanted to be paid to go out and shoot people.

Do you remember when he said that to you? Roughly what time of year?---It would have been after we'd started dating, so February onwards.

And was anyone else with you when he said that?---No, not that I can recall, no.

Do you recall whether or not he said that to you, I'm not suggesting it's funny, but do you recall whether – what you thought, when he said to you?---I mean, it wasn't until later on, in the relationship, that I started thinking those comments were vile.

So at the time he said that, what were you thinking?---I can't recall.

Bec – I just –

Excuse me for a minute, Ms Campagnaro, there's a little sign on there saying your mic's been muted –

But do you think that's okay Bec? All right. Thank you.

In page 24, when you tell the interviewers about this, with the SAS, you say:

“He didn't like being in the NT Police. He thought it was a joke, and yeah, he just wanted to get into the SAS, because basically, yeah, they go away for long periods of time, get paid a lot of money, and go out and kill people. They go out on missions.”

And you were asked, “So tell me about this, you've mentioned it two or three times now, about that they go out and kill people. Has there ever been, or can you describe any conversation you had with Zach, that might touch on that sort of thing?”

And you say: “Yeah, there's a few conversations. It's not necessarily related to that, about going and killing people. Zach said on several occasions to me, and probably other people too, that he would like to shoot someone. Then he can go on a paid holiday, because obviously when you shoot someone, you go under investigation, like what is happening now. And you go on a paid holiday. And I actually remember saying that to one of my best friends. This was way after the fact, when we'd broken up. And they actually said, ‘What did you ever see in that guy’ et cetera.”

So in relation to what Zach said to you, when he said: "I'd like to shoot someone so I can go on a paid holiday."

What tone did he say that in?---So this was toward the end of our relationship, because I actually remember saying to him, "No that's the kind of holiday that I want to go on." And I remember feeling, at that time, uncomfortable him saying that.

And do you – did you, towards the end of your relationship, start to feel more uncomfortable with some of the things he was saying?---Yes, I did. Because I'd started telling my best friend about it.

And in the interview, you're specifically asked, by Officer Pennuto:

"I want to clarify, I'm going to have to ask a direct question to clarify this. So are you telling us, that Zach Rolfe told you that he wanted to be in a position, he wanted to shoot someone?"

And you say, "Yes."

And Officer Pennuto said "Are you also telling us that you've had a conversation of that nature, on more than one occasion with Zach?"

And you say, "Yes"?---That is correct.

Another thing you say in your interview, at page 30, towards the bottom of that page is:

"So he loved arresting people. He was active, like he was good in that sense I suppose. But he didn't care about, or like any of the Indigenous people there. I know this, because he told me, that a lot of his unjustified forces, were just swept away by the senior sergeants that were in charge of him."

So I just want to break down that a little bit. You have said there, that Zach didn't care about or like any of the Indigenous people there. You mean there, in Alice Springs, is that right?---That's correct.

And what did he say to give you that understanding?---I mean, he definitely told me that working in Alice Springs was a joke. And he just – yeah, would use derogatory terms when referring to Indigenous people.

Okay. And when – when you say there that a lot:

"He told me, that a lot of his unjustified forces, were just swept away by the senior sergeants that were in charge of him."

You mean that Zach actually, specifically told you, Ms Campagnaro, that the unjustified use of force was swept under the carpet?---Yes he did. He told me that

Lee Bauwens, and Alistair Gall, had on several occasions, dealt with his, you know, reports, and unjustified forces, for him.

And when he was telling you that, did he say that they had dealt with his use of force, or his unjustified use of force? That is, did he give you the impression that the force he used was not justified, and they just got rid of it?---Yes, so – yes. That's correct.

What did you think about that at the time, when he was telling you?---I mean, at the time, I just thought they were helping him out.

Do – what do you think about it now that you look back on it?---I mean, I look back at this period now, and I feel embarrassed, that I went along with any of this, you know, it just – I don't know, I feel deeply embarrassed that I was a part of this cycle of behaviour.

I just want to read to you something that you say at page 27. Actually, I'll go back to page 26. You – it's the issue in relation to Zach telling you that he – on several occasions, about wanting to shoot someone to go on a paid holiday. And you say:

“I don't think there was anything in particular. He just said on several occasions, I don't think” – sorry, “He just said on several occasions, and I know I said, ‘I don't think that it would be a fun holiday at all’, I said, ‘Because I remember obviously when you're a cop, people talk about like what happens, if that does happen to you.’”

Do you mean there, what happens if you actually do shoot someone?---Yes, so I remember personally, I was frightened at the idea of ever having to use my gun. So for me, that was a scary idea of going on a – you know, a paid holiday. You know, it's not a holiday, you're stood down from work until an investigation is completed.

And Zach had a different view, from what you tell us?---Yes, he saw it as a holiday.

And you said to him:

“It's not a holiday, they freeze all your assets, they work out how much money you actually use, and they only let you utilise the money that – it's a massive process. It's not a good thing. On several occasions, I said that. And he just thought it would be a holiday. That was actually his words. ‘It would be a holiday. I want to go on a paid extended holiday’. I don't know the circumstances though, because it had been said numerous times.”

Now I'm not suggesting that it's a funny thing to say, but did you at the beginning think he was joking, or did you take him seriously?---I mean I thought he was joking. Because it's not funny, and it's not a holiday, to the average person. So – but I remember he kept saying it, and I started thinking, you know, it's not – it's not a normal comment to say. You know, I was scared of that kind of thing.

And you go on to say:

"I thought it was horrible and I still do. I never thought that it was a good idea - never - and that's when I started to realise that the person I thought I'd fallen in love with, it was not actually him at all. He put on this massive pretence in the beginning to kind of - because I would see myself as being a nice person that gives a shit about people, and that's why I became a nurse - because I really want to care for people in that way. Towards the end of the relationship I realised that he was just totally different to how I thought he was. He was really different".

And you give some examples in the interview to things that he said and things that he did that made you concerned about him - and I am not going to read them all out onto the record but do you think that the scales fell off your eyes a little bit while you were going out with him?---Sorry, I didn't hear that last bit.

Do you think that the scales - your attitude - well, I will put it neutrally. Did your view of him change from the time you started going out with him to the end of it? ---Definitely. When we first met I thought he was - he was, he was very charming but I thought he was so kind and generous and by the end of it he was just the total opposite of what I thought he was. The charm had well and truly fallen.

In terms of - I am going back to the issues in relation to people turning a blind eye to the use of force. When you were out of the relationship at the end of 2018, did you think about raising any of those issues with him?---No, I didn't.

And did you think about raising them with your superiors?---No, I didn't.

What would you say if someone at the Bar table says to you, "Well, what you're saying now is just because you had a break-up with Zach, you didn't like him by the end, like sometimes happens in romantic relationships and so you're saying this just to get back at him". What would you say to any suggestion like that?---Absolutely not. This entire process has caused me nothing but grief and stress. I would never go out of my way to say something negative about someone. I've purely been doing this to assist the NT Police and now the Coronial process.

I have only got a couple more topics for you, Ms Campagnaro. In terms of Zach's attitude to management, you've told us already that he had some problems with the body-worn video footage and you told us that he was reluctant to turn is body-worn on? You note in your interview, at page 35, a particular attitude he had to Officer Vicary?---Yes.

You said, you were asked by Officer Pennuto:

"Claudia, you said to us just a minute ago that he didn't have much time for the way NT Police were doing it. Can you describe any conversation you had where he described how he thought things should run?"

And you say: "No particular conversations. I just thought he thought management could have been better. He didn't like the clientele we were dealing with, he didn't like the managers. He didn't like the people we worked with. He felt that all the females that he had come through weren't deserving of their spots."

In relation to the females not deserving of their spot, was that in relation to TRG or what spot?---I think just getting into the police in general, because they were having a massive recruitment drive to get females in, so actually a lot of the male officers believed that, you know, the women who were getting through weren't worthy of their position.

And was that something that you heard discussed within the station in Alice Springs?---Not directly, but I just felt like every day I was having to prove myself to some senior male officer that thought I didn't deserve to be there.

How did that impact on you in terms of your job?---It was incredibly stressful. I just felt like every small mistake I made, or everything I was doing was being heavily scrutinised.

You talked about in instances - or some issues in terms of Zach's use of force and what our thoughts at the beginning, for the sergeants who were turning a blind eye to them, you thought at that time that they were just trying to help him out. Did you feel like anybody would help you out in those circumstances?---No, I don't, but I, you know, wasn't using unjustified force when I was arresting people, so I didn't need that.

Sure. Did you feel, at the time, like those senior sergeants were trying to have Zach's back? They were trying to help him?---Yes, they were.

Did you feel that the - I'm asking about the culture of Alice Springs Police Force, did you feel like the make senior officers had your back?---No, I don't.

Did that have any impact on your ability to stay in the Northern Territory Police?
---Well, I mean, I just felt - I mean, the job wasn't for me.

Okay?---But I realised that but no, it didn't impact me staying there. I'd made up my mind I wanted to leave and I left.

Zach was on Patrol Group 5 in that last year - in 2019, was he - I'm not entirely sure if 2018 off the top of my head - can you recall?---He was on my patrol group with me by the middle of the year I believe, in 2018, so yes, patrol group 5.

And then did you stay on his patrol group after you started dating?---Yes, I did.

Just going back to the issue of managers, you say at paragraph 35:

"He hated what's her name, she had all those things on her shoulder - I've already forgotten the terminology, it was one of the female people in charge, like upstairs. She wore glasses. He hated her. He didn't like her at all because he claims that she changed what happened on the job when he saved those people from the river, but I can't remember her name, she's got dark hair, wears glasses and had a lot of shiny brass on her shoulders."

Was that Officer Vicary?---Yes, it was.

And can you tell her Honour what Zach said to you about the river rescue and what management had done there?---He believed - he believed that Vicary had changed the details of the job because she had originally advised him not to go to the river because he was a probationary constable, so he believed that her changing, you know, the narrative of it led to him not getting the highest medal, you know, that he wanted.

And did he tell you that fairly soon after you started dating?---Yes, because he was being awarded a bravery medal in Canberra.

And did you go with him to that ceremony?---Yes, I did. I went to the one in Canberra.

And did his attitude to Officer Vicary change at all while you were there?---No, I don't think he ever liked her.

At page 18 of your interview you are talking about Constable Rolfe being pretty sporty and keeping fit. Can I first ask you, do you recall him getting into the IRT? Or being in the IRT?---Yes, I remember him being in the IRT.

What did he say to you about the IRT, if anything?---I mean, he thought it was fun but I can't remember specifics about what he said.

In relation to him being active, at page 18 you say that there were times when you were in a - well you were asked whether or not you saw him taking medications, you say, "He injected peptides to recover - get his injury recovered". Do you know where he got the peptides from?---Did you say where or when?

Where?---Online, I believe.

And that was my question. Were they - do you recall him going to a GP and getting a prescription for those or was it something he got online?---Yes, it was online, not prescribed.

Do you know what they were?---Just that they were peptides.

Do you recall what stage of your relationship he was using them?---Maybe midway through.

Do you recall how long he used that for?---No, I don't recall how long.

And they were injectable peptides, is that right?---Yes, they were.

And do you recall was there any other - did you see him inject those peptides or were you told about it?---I was just told about it.

And do you recall him telling you anything about taking any other drugs?---No. No, I don't recall that.

Did you know him to be someone who smoked marijuana for example, from time to time or had hash cookies or anything like that?---No, not when he was with me, no.

And similar, MDMA or Ecstasy. Is that something that you ever knew him to do?---No, not at all.

The peptides that you talk about were for injury recovery, is what you explain in your interview. Zach went to the gym a lot. Did you know him to ever use any performance-enhancing drugs, like testosterone?---No, not when he was with me, no.

In terms of the time that you were with Zach from – over the course of 2018, did you have any concerns about his mental health?---I thought he had a bit of PTSD.

Why did you think that?---He used to have nightmares a lot. But other than that, no.

You explain in your statement about a bad dream where you woke up one night and he had his hands around your neck, and that he told you that he'd been having a nightmare?---Yes, that's correct.

And you accepted that that was his – a genuine explanation from him at that time?---Yes, I did.

And did you ever talk to him about why he might have done that, or why he might be having those nightmares?---I told him I thought he had PTSD, but he said that PTSD wasn't real.

Okay. Did you ever ask him anything about what had happened while he was on deployment in Afghanistan?---I can't recall.

Did – I withdraw that. Do you understand, given your background in nursing and your time in the police, that one symptom of PTSD or even depression might be poor sleeping?

MR EDWARDSON: Well, object to that. How can this witness - - -

DR DWYER: I'll withdraw that. I was actually trying to help your client, but that's fine.

Did you know whether or not Constable Rolfe ever raised any concerns with management about anything?---No, not that I remember.

We heard some evidence yesterday from Officer Mitch Hansen. Did you hear any of that evidence on the livestream?---I heard a bit of it.

And Officer Hansen explained about the impact of going to so many very stressful jobs, seeing a number of jobs that involved violence and how to cope with that, and doing some reading himself on how to cope with it. Do you recall any discussions during your training with the police about how you deal with very confrontational situations, the impact on you?---We were advised not to drink, not to eat poorly and to discuss it with our peers.

Do you recall being advised about the services that you could go to if you weren't coping. For example, if you were having nightmares?---Not that I can recall, but I'm very sure that we would have been told that - - -

Okay?--- - - - in the academy.

You say something about this in your interview at page 64. It's on the back of a question that Officer Pennuto asked you:

“So, you mentioned Indigenous, have you ever or can you describe any conversations that you might have had with people that led you to believe that there might have been an issue related to Indigenous people?”

And you say – and he goes on to say, “Or the relationships between police and Indigenous people.”

You say, “Not specific conversations, but it was well-known that the majority of our jobs were domestic violence between Indigenous people, PCAs. So, picking them up off the street, Indigenous people. Like rarely do you go to a white person job, and that's just like a fact. The relationship wasn't good. They didn't trust police, or I was say, police officers.”

You're referring there to Indigenous people?---Yes, I was.

And you say:

“I guess everyone gets complacent and gets over what they do day in/day out and they just, I guess, stop seeing them as like humans. And it became more of just like, pick them up off the street, take them to the watchhouse. There wasn't a good relationship. They hated the police, like hated. So, that's my view.”

That's an interesting reflection that her Honour will want to know about, Ms Campagnaro. From your own perspective, do you feel like you picked up a lot of

Aboriginal people and put them into protective custody, or is that what you're watching other people do?---No, that's what I had specifically done myself.

Did you think that's what the job was going to involve when you went into the Northern Territory Police?---No. I didn't think that the majority of the jobs were going to be picking up Indigenous off – literally off the ground.

And did it affect you, do you think, in a way, negatively during your year there?---I struggled seeing the suicide jobs. I remember I had a bit of a hard time post that. But yeah, it did form part of the reason why I left. It just wasn't what I wanted to do with my life.

Do you feel like you became desensitised to people – seeing Aboriginal suffering?---I'm sure that I did by the end of it, yeah.

And was there anything in your training that helped you to understand that at the time?---Not really, no.

Final question, I think.

And so, I'll ask that we take a break after this, your Honour and just reflect.

THE CORONER: Yes.

DR DWYER: At page 73 of your interview, you talk about hearing that Zach had been the one who was involved in Kumanjayi's death and you say halfway down the page:

"I wasn't surprised, if that's what you're going to ask. Like I wasn't really surprised that it was him. If it was going to be anyone that was involved in that kind of thing, it was going to be him."

Why was that? Why did you think that?---Because of previous comments he'd made, you know, about the paid holiday, and just his attitude towards the job.

Thank you, your Honour. Is that a convenient time to have a break?

THE CORONER: Yes.

Ms Campagnaro, we'll just have a 15-minute break.

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, would you mind making it 20, I just have to finish at 10:30.

THE CORONER: Sure.

MR EDWARDSON: Thank you.

THE CORONER: We'll have a 20-minute break. It's sometimes a little bit longer than that, but we'll aim for 20 minutes and we'll get you back on the link shortly?---Okay.

Thank you.

WITNESS WITHDREW

ADJOURNED

RESUMED

THE CORONER: Mr Edwardson.

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, I've asked – and I appreciate your Honour, if you just, if you wouldn't mind, hearing from me, before we resume this witness.

THE CORONER: Yes.

MR EDWARDSON: Can I hand up to your Honour an email that's been sent to my client, Zachary Rolfe. And I want to read it into the transcript, because it is significant in the context of the (inaudible) by counsel assisting. And we've been in approval, to treat this (inaudible) to your Honour.

THE CORONER: Yes.

MR EDWARDSON: Shortly before the break, Detective Superintendent Lauren (inaudible) Professional Standards Command, emailed my client, Zachary Rolfe, in these terms.

“Hello Constable Rolfe, please read the email below for context, and this email is to provide formal advice to you. Please note, the subject officers have received individual emails specific to their circumstances, which include the email below, and caveats similarly apply. Following the public comments by Judge Borchers, in the Alice Springs Local Court, a particular number was created. Due to the gravity of an allegation – sorry, of an alleged serious criminal offence, the investigation was conducted by Crime Division, and was recently reviewed by Crime Command. It is determined, there is no evidence to support the allegation of perjury, associated to the comments made by Judge Borchers following the hearing of Malcolm Ryder. I have also reviewed internal investigation, and there is no evidence to support a breach of discipline, and the allegation is not substantiated. Legal counsel for Commissioner of Police, have also provided the same advice to the Coroner in the early days of the inquest into the death of Kumanjaya Walker.”

The email goes on, and reads as follows:

“Hello this email is to provide you with advice on a complaint against police that was re-opened, and further examined, due to the police shooting at Yuendumu in 2019. I have been told you may be aware of this matter being re-examined.”

My apologies, this is addressed to – the officers who are addressed to are Brianna Bonney, Cameron Chatterton, Brett Geranios.

“In June 2018, a complaint against police by Malcolm Ryder was received by the Office of the Ombudsman. This incident involved Officers Rolfe, Bonney, Chatterton, Geranios, Lee Rain(?), Zindelli's attendance.”

And there's an address in Alice Springs identified.

"Sergeant Roche of the then Complaints Management Division, sought and received a response from each of you that was consistent with your initial statements. The section item two report refers to the *Ombudsman Act*, Zach, was signed in October 2018, and the relevant parties are notified of the outcome.

The CAP(?) was closed, and the findings determined, that police action was lawful and reasonable in relation to the use of force, and remedial advice was provided by Acting Senior Sergeant Roche by email, and Acting Superintendent Furness, by email, about use of body-worn video. The hearing for Mr Ryder, the defendant, was held in the Alice Springs Local Court on 3 September 2018, 2 to 3 April 2019, and on 9 May 2019. The charges against Mr Ryder were dismissed. Judge Borchers, when handing down his decision, criticised the conduct of some (inaudible) members, and considered the evidence given by both Constable Rolfe and Constable Zindelli to be untruthful. These comments were reported to the media. The publically stated comments by Judge Borchers were referred to the Professional Standards Command. I wish to confirm, that the complaint against police is closed."

In other words, your Honour, from a police perspective at least, that is a complete end of the matter, and your Honour would, of course, understand that this current witness forms part of that comprehensive investigation.

I tender that email, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Yes.

Are you happy to have that marked as an exhibit?

DR DWYER: Yes, your Honour. And I just note for my learned friends benefit, the documents are tendered through counsel assisting in inquest. So I'll tender that, your Honour, next.

THE CORONER: Thank you, well we'll receive that, and that can be marked as an exhibit.

DR DWYER: Thank you, your Honour. And if the witness could come on the (inaudible).

CLAUDIA CAMPAGNARO:

THE CORONER: Hi, we're just getting the video up, but I can hear you at the moment, Ms Campagnaro?---Okay.

Okay, so I think you need to join Teams?---Re-join.

Yes. Thank you. We've got –

Sorry did you have anything further, Dr Dwyer?

DR DWYER: No I didn't, your Honour, so I was just jumping up to let Ms Campagnaro know, I don't have any further questions. I apologise to my learned friend.

THE CORONER: So Mr Mullins will ask some questions. You can see, I think, Ms Campagnaro, that there are a number of different lawyers around the table. So there's a few different people who probably will like to ask you some questions?---Okay.

And they'll – they'll let you know who they are, and who they represent?---Okay.

Thanks.

Yes.

MR MULLINS: Thank you, your Honour.

XXN BY MR MULLINS:

MR MULLINS: Good morning, Ms Campagnaro, can you hear me okay?---I can.

My name is Mullins. I appear on behalf of the Brown family. I just want to ask - - - ?-
--Okay.

- - - some questions about your relationship with Constable Rolfe. As I understand it, you arrived in Alice Springs, just prior to 2018, is that right?---That's correct.

And did you meet in November 2018?---November or December.

2018 or 2017?---Sorry 2017, sorry.

And you were not in a relationship at the time?---No we weren't.

You were – but you personally weren't in any relationship with another person?---No I was not.

And – but you were sort of the new kid in town, is that right?---Very new.

And you were open to a new relationship?---Yes. Yes I was.

You were a little overwhelmed, as I understand your statement, by the wave of attention you initially received from Constable Rolfe?---Yes, that's correct.

He was very kind to you, in that - - - ?---Yes.

In that - initially, and he was very kind to our dog, Bear?---Yes.

I understand that he took him walking when he was crying or something?---Yes, he was, while I was working.

And so he was very attentive to you?---He was, yes.

An was very nice to you in other people's presence?---Yes.

And from your observations at the station he was nice and friendly to other people as well?---At times, yes.

And even his mother, for example, at one point in time made comments about how nice and how happy he seemed to be?---Yes.

You say in your statement at one point, "His mum made comments to me saying, 'We've never seen him like this before, like when he was being really nice to me and like in love and stuff'. They said, 'We've never seen him like this before, like never ever ever before.'" His mother said that to you?---Yes, she did.

And you must've felt good, first of all that she said that?---Yes.

And you must've felt very good that he felt that way about you?---Yes, I did.

Now, just - on the day before your birthday in 2018 Constable Rolfe proposed? ---Yes, he did.

And you accepted his offer?---I did.

Had you been engaged before?---No, I hadn't.

There was a lot of fanfare around the engagement, I understand you went to a winery, is that right?---No, it was restaurant.

And you had a photo shoot?---An engagement shoot, yes, after the engagement.

And where was that, at what winery?---That as in Adelaide but it was at various locations.

And you had some plans for the wedding?---Yes, to be married.

And you had arrangements. I understand that you picked out a wedding dress? ---I'd started to, yes.

Organised some bridesmaids?---Yes.

Your bridesmaids at one point in time you bought some boxes for them?---Yes, I did.

And one was Regan was it?---Yes.

And your bridesmaids were very excited?---Yes, they were.

And your family was very excited?---Yes, they were.

And on reflection you committed to the relationship very heavily, very early?
---Yes.

But over that period of time you began to see some aspects of Constable Rolfe's behaviour that concerned you?---Yes.

One of those was the Ryder situation that you've described to counsel assisting?
---Yes.

Another was the way he spoke about Indigenous people, you didn't like that?
---That's correct.

The way he spoke about the body-worn videos and the fact that he wasn't wearing his body-worn video from time to time?---Yes.

Did you not like the way he behaved around some of his friends?---No, I didn't.

You mentioned the PTSD or the event that you attributed to PTSD which is the event where you work up with him with his hands around your throat. Can you just describe your recollection of that?---Well, I woke up and his hands were around my throat - that he was having a nightmare.

And did he say it was from PTSD or is that something you deduced?---It's something I deduced.

Was he taking any medication for anything that you know of?---No, I don't know

Can I suggest that you were a very forgiving and understanding person?---I am, yes.

You're one of those people who realise that not everybody is perfect?---Yes.

And you were prepared to forgive some of these things that you saw as being potentially problematic in his behaviour?---Well, I was in love and in a relationship.

And you felt that the positives in the relationship outweighed the negatives?---At the time, yes.

As time moved on though, you realised as you were getting potentially toward a wedding, that you were going to be in a long term relationship with this person?
---Yes.

And can I say you're a traditional type person who respects long-term relationships?
---Yes.

And thinks they are important?---Yes.

And who thinks trust is important in a long-term relationship?---Yes.

As his behaviour started to change some of the kindness started to evaporate, is that right?---That's correct.

You started to doubt his honesty both personally and professionally?---Yes.

You started having doubts about whether he was likely to be a suitable long term partner because you couldn't trust him?---We started to have issues, yes.

Did you think that you were having difficulty trusting him?---Yes, towards the end.

And ultimately the relationship ended and irrespective of whether he broke it off or you broke it off, it's likely that it would've ended anyway if - because you wouldn't have entered a long term relationship with a person you couldn't trust?---I mean I can't make assumptions on what would've happened.

You told the counsel assisting that you've moved on the best you can?---Yes, I have.

You are giving this evidence because you have to give it?---Yes, I am.

You don't have any particular hard feelings toward Constable Rolfe, is that right?
---Absolutely not.

If anything, you feel a bit sorry for him, that he's had to go through these court proceedings and what-not?---Well, yes.

Things worked out for you a lot better in the end?---I mean, I can't comment on his life. I don't know what he's up to, but my own life is going well, yes.

And you are simply telling the truth to the court about what he told you and what you observed?---Yes, I am.

Nothing further. Thank you, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Any other questions?

MS WILD: Yes, thank you.

XXN BY MS WILD:

MS WILD: Ms Campagnaro, my name is Beth Wild and I am the lawyer for NAAJA?

---Hi.

I want to - I am going to jump around a little bit so we don't have to go back over evidence you've already given. You had said in evidence, Ms Campagnaro, that you didn't like what Mr Rolfe said about Aboriginal people, is that right?---Yes, correct.

And I just want to go to your - read out a specific example which is at page 33 of your statement. This is a conversation that happened in front of your friend Chelsea. You were there and you said that Zach said - he told her, "I was there, that the Indigenous people's heads are like rocks, like you can't break through them". Do you remember him saying that to your friend Chelsea?---Yes, I do.

You were asked by the officer what you thought about that and you said, "I think he just devalued their lives and just think - and just didn't think that they were worth much, to be honest, he just thought that it was another arrest and just didn't care really". Is that what you - - -?---That's correct.

That's what you thought at the time?---That's correct.

Is that what you still think?---Well, I can't really make comment on what he's like now. I don't know him.

And that was the response you gave when you were asked about Zach's attitude towards Indigenous people, is that right?---Yes.

Okay. I now want to talk about the support that Zach Rolfe got after the shooting. You were contacted by a lot of people, is that right?---Yes, I was.

Even though they knew you'd broken up with him?---Yes.

And why were they contacting you?---Some were reaching out to see if I was okay and others were just reaching out to tell me that that had happened.

And you said that there was a very pro-Zach sentiment, is that right?---When did I say that?---In your statement when you were talking to police, you said they were very pro-Zach?---Yes, at the time, yes, it was all over the news.

Yes, and so people reaching out to you were very much supportive of Zach Rolfe is that right?---Yes, they were.

And that's people in the police force?---Yes, it was.

I'll briefly talk about the management structure at the police station. You said that management was more like a "gossip sess". What did you mean by that?---So, there was no privacy in that station. Everything was known to everyone and it was just like an open field for people to talk about everyone.

Okay. And that extended to the culture of the police station in Alice Springs, would

you say?---Very much so.

When you first started, Zach Rolfe had recently broken up with Jen Zendelli. Is that right?---That's correct.

And he made out to you like she was crazy?---Yes, he did.

All right. I'll just go to page 80 of the statement and I'll give you the direct quote that you say to the officers in your interview. You were asked:

"What do you know of their relationship before and afterwards?"

And you said, "So, I know – so from him, he painted her out to be – like they weren't together for very long, but she had sort of moved in too, and he kind of said that, you know, she was crazy. Like, when he was at work, she came home to the house and touched his things and went through his stuff and he just, yeah, painted her out to be like – to be like - this like bit of a stalker and that."

So, is that your recollection of what he was saying about Jen Zendelli when you first met him?---That's correct.

And did he say that out – well, did he say that to you as well as other members at the police station?---Yes, that narrative was known by almost everyone in the police station.

Right. And is that what he did to you after you broke up?---I mean, not that I know of directly.

Yes, but you said that he would tell everybody that you wouldn't even walk your own dog. Is that right?---He did say that to people.

Right?---He said, I wouldn't clean. I didn't walk my own dog after shifts.

And were getting a bit crazy about the wedding planning?---Yeah.

Right, so he was saying that to other people in the station after you broke up?---Yes, he was.

Such that continuing to work there became effectively untenable. Is that right?---What do you mean?

You couldn't continue to work there because of all the things that were being said about you at the station?---That wasn't the only reason why I left.

Okay. Was it part of the reason?---It was a small part of it.

Okay. You went to your manager to complain or to a mentor. Is that right?---I went

to someone in the station that was meant to be like a support contact.

I see. And they dismissed your concerns. Is that right?---They told me I would never change the culture of the station.

And you quit the next day?---Yep, I did.

Now, that behaviour of talking about you after you broke up and what he did to Jen Zendelli, do you regard that as gas lighting?---I mean, that's a bit of a pop culture term.

Yes?---You would have to tell me the meaning of "gas lighting".

All right. Well, his – he is undermining you and making you out to be crazy?---Well, yes, then.

And you've said at length in your evidence that you're only here telling this because you've been made to do it?---Yes, very much so.

And you want to help out the Coronial process?---Yes, I do.

It's not because you've got any vendetta against Mr Rolfe?---Absolutely not.

And in fact, you're very fair in your statement. You acknowledge that, for example, saving the tourist was a heroic action?---Well, of course it was. He saved someone from drowning.

Yes. And you do acknowledge that after you broke up, you found that everything he did was stupid when you were referring to him wearing his own vest that he'd bought that wasn't police issue. Is that right?---Yes.

All right. But just finding that stuff he does irritating, it's not the same as telling an untruth. Would you agree with that?---I agree with that.

And you're very careful in your statement to make sure that what you say are things you've heard with your own ears. Would you agree with that too?---Yes. Yes, I do agree.

And in fact, you go to some lengths, there's a story about Alex Fraidman(?) who - Mr Rolfe uses that as his Instagram name. Is that right?---He did back then, yeah.

All right. And you were very careful to say that you never heard the explanation for that, but that was explained to your (inaudible)?---That's true.

So, you're very careful to say, you never heard him say that to you directly?---No.

But where he has said things to you directly, you've been clear about that also, haven't you?---Yes, I have.

You were living together with Mr Rolfe?---Yes.

You spent a lot of time with just him and you. Is that correct?---A lot of time, that's correct.

In fact, you do say at some points that he didn't have any friends outside the police force?---That's true.

Right. So, there was a lot of time with just you and him with no one else around?---That's true.

And in those – it was in that context that he was telling you about the paid holiday if he shot someone. Is that correct?---That's correct.

And he would say it many times to you?---Sorry, what was that?

He said it many times to you?---Yes, he did.

My – the last thing I want to ask you about.

And perhaps if we could cue it up. It's the exhibit 03-077. And at page 45 of the transcript. Perhaps we'll just watch it, we've got up already.

Can you see that, Ms Campagnaro?---I can.

Okay, great. We'll just play this footage.

DVD PLAYED

DR DWYER: Okay, that's it.

Ms Campagnaro, you said at page 45 when you were asked if you actually saw him effect an arrest, and you say this:

“So, I'm trying to think if I saw him. Oh – actually no, I saw once, everyone was looking for this – I think it was a kid, like it's always Indigenous children.”

And I'll go back to that, “But I think it was a young Indigenous man and he was – we had to get like – um - the satellite involved and he'd been found in one of the abandoned schools. And Zach pulled him out of the bin, like he was in a bin and he literally pulled him out. That's all I ever saw him do.”

Were you referring to this incident?---I think it was that incident, yeah.

Right. Now, were you there?---I don't think I was there, no. I saw it on the video.

Why did you – how did it come to be that you saw it on the video?---Well, body-worn

videos, you can see them on the application once they've been uploaded or if someone shows you, you see them.

Okay. So, did Zach show you this video?---I can't recall that. I couldn't tell you.

Was it common for people's videos to be shown to each other?---I'd say yes.

All right, but you can't remember the context of why you saw this, is that right?---No, no I can't.

But you specifically remember this incident, why is that?---I can't tell you why now. This was four years ago.

Okay. You're aware that it was subject – the subject of a complaint?---No I'm not.

All right, then I'll go back to what you said in this, you said "I think it was a kid, like it's always Indigenous children." What did you mean by that?---A lot of the jobs involved Indigenous children.

Right, and what about Zach's arrests of Indigenous children?---Mm mm, I would just say, a lot of them were children, because that's just how it was.

Thank you, Ms Campagnaro, no more questions from me?---Okay.

THE CORONER: Yes, Mr McMahon.

MR MCMAHON AC SC: Thank you, your Honour.

XXN BY MR MCMAHON:

MR MCMAHON: Ms Campagnaro, my name's McMahon, and I am for the Parumpurru Committee of Yuendumu, which is a justice committee?---Hi.

And so that's, if you like, various representatives of the community at Yuendumu?---Okay.

And the – the questions I'm going to ask you aren't so much about many of the details that you've been asked so far, but if you like, more fanatic issues. So we're looking at issues, you might summarise them as saying some big issues around the inquest, rather than a lot of the details. You understand?---I understand.

Okay, so the first issue I want to talk to you about is the culture of your work place. Now I don't want to go back over the details of the whole Malcolm Ryder matter. You've given evidence about that already. But as I understand it, to summarise, at the point in time when you were conducting an interview with him, in an interview room. Is it right you say that he'd been to hospital? That he had stitches - - - ?---Yes.

- - - in his head, and that you very quickly realised in the interview room, if not before, that his English was very poor. Is that all correct?---That's correct, yes it is.

And just so I don't make mistakes, were the stitches in various places in his head?---I just remember one where his eyebrow had been.

And you've already given evidence that you felt uncomfortable about that interview. It didn't seem right to you that it would proceed, is that correct, is that fair to say?---That is fair to say.

So the issue I want to focus your mind on now is, you can take it from me that there are – there are many places in Australia, where a person who had stitches like that, and whose English was very poor, such a person would not be placed in an interview room with two police officers, and interviewed about a recent crime. Particularly if it wasn't a crime of enormous seriousness. So just take that from me as – as pretty standard around the country. At that moment in time, when you were doing the interview, in the first minute or so, when presumably you felt very uncomfortable. Wasn't there a situation or a scenario or a way that you could walk out of there, or put the interview on pause, and say let's go and talk to our bosses, this just can't be right. This kind of interview can't proceed?---I believe so, yeah.

Did that happen at that time?---I don't – I don't think so, no.

So in terms of work place culture, which is where we started with this, you didn't feel at that time, that you and the colleague you were with could go and speak to someone senior and say this just can't happen?---No I didn't.

Was there any supervisor around about when you were doing that interview, commencing that interview, saying, look just get on with it, sure there are some difficulties, but just get on with it. Was there anything like that happening?---Don't remember a supervisor being around, but there are supervisors in close proximity. I just went with what my partner was doing.

All right. Now in your long statement, which you had been taken to several times today already. At various points, and I'm just piecing together a few different answers that you've given. You do speak about the work place culture. And effectively you say that the culture was terrible. That you say there was bullying. And another point in your interview you say it was awful. And another point you say it was terrible, and so on. Okay? So they're answers spread through parts of your interview. You follow?---Yes.

You also said that one reason it was terrible, as I understand, is that no one manages anyone?---Yes.

Can you just expand on that a bit, because in this hearing, we've heard some evidence about the hierarchical nature of the police force, where somebody answers to somebody. Everybody's got to answer to somebody up the chain of command - - - ?---Yes.

- - - and it's been compared by at least one witness, may be more, to a bit of a military structure, that the police operate in a similar way to the military with that ladder of authority, going from the bottom to the top, or the top to the bottom?---That's correct.

So we've heard a bit about that, and yet, your evidence is saying, your perception, you were there for about a year as I understand your evidence, roughly from about - - - ?---Yes.

- - - October 17 to October/November 18, roughly?---Yes.

So can you just expand on that idea that no one was managing anyone. How did that manifest itself? How do you understand that? How do you remember it?---So obviously there is a structure you're supposed to follow. So when you have an issue, you go to the next person ahead of you, and so forth. But what I meant by no one was managing anyone, was someone would do a file, for instance, and just say the file wasn't doesn't correctly, instead of the sergeant telling the proby or the constable how to do it, they would talk about them behind their back with other officers.

So an absence of appropriate mentorship and absence of appropriate guidance, is that the kind of thing you're talking about?---Yes I was.

Okay. And is that something you spoke about with any of your junior colleagues? Is that a thought that you kept to yourself, or was that something that was discussed amongst people of roughly your level at the police station?---I more than likely discussed that with others, but I could not tell you actual conversations.

You talk also in your statement about how the culture worked in terms of the police, and what you perceived, what you saw the others doings. And I'll just read you a couple of sentences.

"I felt like they're all just there for the money. It's just a job. Same shit every day, dealing with the Indigenous."

So that's one thing you said. And then a bit later in your statement, you were asked about how the police, at the station, whether there was an issue relating to Indigenous people. And you gave an answer which the counsel assisting, Dr Peggy, read out to you, or she read part of it to you I think. That jobs were involving domestic violence. You often had to pick up people off the streets, especially Indigenous people, and so on. And then you make a very interesting comment. You say:

"Everyone gets complacent, and just gets over what they do, day in and day out. And they just I guess stop seeing them as like humans."

So I just want to ask you about that observation that you made. Because it does seem like important insight. Do you want to develop that a bit? The idea that people got complacent, because the work was of a certain kind, and gradually they lost their sense of respect for the people that they were serving. Is that what you - is that the idea you were saying there?---Yes it was.

And this idea of not seeing people as being like humans. Is that something that you relate both to the language that you heard, and also the culture that you were part of?---It was definitely a part of the culture, but – yeah, I can't recall actual conversations regarding that. It was just the feel of the station.

So it's very complicated thing to describe culture, that's not a problem that you alone - - - ?---Mm mm.

- - - would have, Ms Campagnaro, it's a very complicated concept to come to grips with. So let's just zero in on language, because language is part of culture. And language is a way of understanding culture and gives insight to culture, so can I just ask you some more questions about language. You've said that at the station you were asked a question by Ms Dwyer around the concept of things being dehumanising and then you were asked a question about derogatory terms, do you follow?---Yes.

I am just checking - I can see there's someone there with you, is that bothering you or is that just someone in the house passing around?---It was my partner saying goodbye.

Okay. So this idea of words being dehumanising, can I just ask you some questions about that?---Yes.

You were asked whether other people in the police station used derogatory terms and your answer was very clear, you basically said you were shocked when you started, to hear these terms and that everyone around the place was using these terms, so can we just talk about that in terms of culture. There are many workplaces that - and I am sure you know - and I am sure where you work now in a hospital or you were trained in a hospital because you're - are you working in a hospital?---I am.

I am sure you don't hear consistent racist language when you're working in a hospital with a multi-cultural workforce and multi-cultural community, do you?---Absolutely not.

So let's just contrast that. I mean, everyone in the room knows what hospitals are like and it's a very easy concept to understand what it's like to work there. Let's contrast that with being at the police station. Just as we would all expect nurses and doctors and everyone in the hospital to speak respectfully to the patients and about the patients and with the patients, just contrast that to the kind of language that you're hearing around the station so we get a good sense of it?---You wouldn't hear that language in the hospital - you wouldn't - and we deal with Indigenous people day in, day out, post surgery and I have never heard that language spoken before.

And how is that different? What was happening at the police station which was so different?---It was just so freely spoken about, you know, that language about Indigenous people.

And this is the kind of language that you said to Dr Dwyer, words like "coon" and "nigger" and those kinds of words?---That's correct.

And you know from the rest of your life outside that one year working in the police station there, you know from the rest of your life the community doesn't generally talk like that at the workplace. You understand that, don't you?---Yes, I do.

So would you say that it's an extremely strong contrast from the rest of the community such as your hospital and so on, compared to what was happening at the police station?---Yes, it is.

And you were also asked to reflect on the idea of reporting up the line, like for instance in a well-run military unit, we've heard some evidence about that kind of unit, if something is going wrong a concerned member can report up the line to their superior officer and say, 'There's a problem - I need it fixed' but it sounded from the evidence you gave earlier that that wasn't going to work for you at the police station. Can you just explain why?---Well, every - nothing was confidential, so if you were making a complaint about someone, that person was going to find out, all the rest of the station was, so I just didn't feel comfortable telling anyone anything.

And was it also the case that our superior officers like sergeants, were also using this language freely in the way that you've described a moment ago?---Yes, that's true.

And as I understand it, unlike what you would expect in a well functioning workplace, it seemed that you were saying that, "Well, if someone used this language no-one pulled them up for it, no-one got them into trouble?---No.

Is that your observation?---Yes.

And overall, upon reflection, your assessment of that reality is that it was incredibly dehumanising of Aboriginal people?---Definitely.

And in a way that's very obvious I am sure you understand that and everyone understands that once you hear what you have to say but would you agree also that when that language is freely used by people of all ranks within a workplace, that it also has a very dehumanising effect on the people using the words?---I think it makes - I think it makes it seem normal to people when the superiors are using those words, those terms.

And you'd agree that when people are using those words as it it's normal, that that has an impact on the whole culture of the workplace, that seems obvious, doesn't it? ---Definitely, yes.

And then that has an impact on the culture of how the police in that workplace interact with members of the community?---Yes, that's true.

Including especially, members of the Aboriginal community?---Yes.

So just to summarise all that, in terms of culture, once you start using these words freely your observation from being there and being shocked and observing, is that these words and this kind of language infiltrates or is part of the culture of the workplace firstly, do you agree with that?---Yes.

And secondly, that influences and is part of the culture of how the police involved deal with Aboriginal people when they are out on the street?---Yes.

Now, just dealing firstly, I want to ask you about a couple of sergeants who were at the workplace when you were there?---Yes.

And it's important that your answers are clear in your mind because we are talking about a significant matter here but if I give you the name, for instance, Sergeant Lee Bauwens is a witness in this case?---Yes.

Is he a sergeant who, in your mind and in your memory was freely using these kinds of racist terms?---Yes. Yes, he was.

What about Sergeant Paul Kirkby?---Yes, yes, he was.

You say that - you're certain about that?---I'm definitely certain about that.

And is that because you're remembering a particular incident as you say that? ---He actually was a senior partner of mine for a period of time, so I know him.

Were you in his patrol group?---Maybe for a small period of time.

I'm just not familiar with the - what you mean when you say "senior partner"?---So when I first started he was one of the senior members I was with for, you know, maybe a week or two of my shift.

There was a Sergeant Kelly. Do you know him?---Sorry, who was that?

Sergeant Kelly?---No, I don't know that person.

He might not - I am confused, he arrived after you left?---Okay.

And just moving away from people who were sergeants. What about people who were closer to you in age and rank. People like Mitch Hansen. Is he someone you remember speaking in this way?---Yes, he did.

In fact, in your statement - correct me if I'm wrong - but I think you said that effectively our memory was that he hated Aboriginal people?---He did at that time, yes.

In all of these people that we're talking about, we're only talking about that time when you were there in the year up to 2018?---Yes.

And just so you understand what the people in this room - in this courtroom - understand, we had a witness yesterday who was saying, "I am deeply ashamed about the things that I used to say" and so on. Okay so - - -?---Yes, I did hear that.

So a lot of ground has been covered about these issues?---Yes.

There was a constable Sykes. Is he somebody you remember speaking in this way? Did you know him?---I met him away from the police force. I didn't know him in the police force, so no, not when I met him, no.

There was a Constable, Adam Eberl. Do you remember him?---He's actually - he's actually a lovely person.

Okay. Well, that's good to hear. There was a Constable Tony Hawkins, or Senior Constable Hawkins?---Another lovely person.

And so, when you say someone's a "lovely person", you're also saying, and correct me if I'm wrong, you're also saying, it's not someone whom you remember as using this racist language freely?---No, they were very respectful towards me as well.

Okay. So, to go back to any earlier answer you gave, at one point in your evidence today, you said everyone was using this language freely. And of course, "everyone" means "everyone", but what you're really saying now, and just correct me I'm wrong, is that the language was used freely in the presence of everybody. Is that a fair thing to say?---That's probably a better thing to say, yes.

And you have clear memories that some people used this kind of language freely and you've named a couple and you have clear memories that some people did not use this kind of language and you've described them as lovely people?---Yes.

All right. And to finish on that point, would it be fair to say that either though we've only talked about a few names, if I went through all of the names of the people that you worked with, there would be quite a good collection of names who use this bad language, racist language freely. Would that be fair to say?---That is. Yes, it is.

And that would be - would it be fair to say that there's at least as many people using that kind of language as those who did not use that kind of language?---Yep.

So, in other words, are we talking about roughly half the people who you worked with might use that language freely and the other half might not?---Yes, yep.

Or is it fair to say that most people use that language freely and a few did not? I'm just giving you - - -?---A lot of people use that language. I can't say everyone used that language, but the majority.

All right. And as I said to you at the beginning, Ms Campagnaro, we're looking at culture here, from the point of view of my client, and police working out at Yuendumu and so on. And so the culture of the police force and in particular, Alice Springs is very important to the people whom I represent. You understand? And one of the other issues, this is my last set of questions for you, you said that a lot of men – this is your impression, that a lot of men at the station seemed to think that a lot of the women at the station didn't deserve to be there. Have I got that right?---That's correct.

And you felt that every day you had to prove yourself to some senior male officer as to justify your presence there?---That's true.

So, just to contrast that in a way that we did earlier when we spoke about the difference between say a hospital where you work now and a police station. Once again, in a hospital, a very significant part of the workforce is no doubt female, and are you able to clarify this insight of yours by contrasting the way the women are treated at hospital, compared to the way they were treated at the police station where you work?---At the hospital, I'm not always trying to prove my existence. My existence was proven by getting a degree and working towards where I am now. So, I just do my job and do it well, so versus in the police force, I felt like every day I was trying to prove why I was there.

Did you feel like there was a hostility to women in the workforce when you were at that police station?---Yeah, there was actually.

Thank you, nothing further.

THE CORONER: Just before I come to you, are you next, Mr Edwardson?

MR EDWARDSON: I think I am.

THE CORONER: Just before one of the other lawyers asks some questions, I just wanted to ask you about the free use of racist language, you've talked about it being freely used amongst people or other members of your rank and of a sergeant's rank, as I understood your evidence?---Yes.

And were there sometimes senior sergeants involved when there was a free use of racist language?---Well, yes, they sat in their offices, but the doors were open so they could hear everything.

And I understand there might have been some different floors at the police station, but from time to time, did you ever see any people of higher rank down on your floor?---Yes, at times, they would come downstairs and just see what was happening in general duties.

And was any of the kinds of conversation that you're talking about, which involved racist terms in banter or conversation or describing an incident, used when there were more senior members of the police force visiting your area?---Not in front of people like superintendents. Not those kinds of people. I never heard that language in front of them.

Thank you.

Mr Edwardson?

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, I'm in your Honour's hands. I think I might be about an hour.

THE CORONER: Right.

MR EDWARDSON: Would your Honour like me to just press on or would you like to have a shorter lunch. I would rather do it in one hit, so to speak.

THE CORONER: Sure. Well, let's take the lunch break and we'll come back at 10 to 2:00.

MR EDWARDSON: As your Honour pleases.

THE CORONER: Is that okay with you, Ms Campagnaro, if we take the lunch break now?---What time was that, sorry?

I'm talking our time. So, your time is – it's 10 to 1:00 now and we are talking about having an hour's lunchbreak?---Okay.

Okay.

MR EDWARDSON: We could even have a short lunch, your Honour, if that's possible.

THE CORONER: Would it be okay if we had a shorter lunch, so we could come back - - -?---That's fine. That's fine by me.

- - - at 1:30, because I think there are a few people who need to make arrangements about travel.

So, if it suits everybody, we'll come back at 1:30 pm – 40.

MR EDWARDSON: Thank you, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Sorry?---Thank you.

2:30 our time?

That's 2:30 maybe at your time. I'm not sure.

WITNESS WITHDREW

ADJOURNED

RESUMED

CLAUDIA CAMPAGNARO:

THE CORONER: Mr McMahon.

MR MCMAHON: Thank you, your Honour, I thought I'd finished. I just have one minute to go if I may.

THE CORONER: Sure.

XXN BY MR MCMAHON:

MR MCMAHON: Ms Campagnaro, can you hear me again?---Yes, I can.

Thank you. I don't want to repeat anything that we have dealt with, but just to focus your mind. Just before lunch, we spoke about people freely using racist language around the station, and how some people are quite the opposite, and don't do that. And then I asked you about a number of people who you might have remembered. And you gave some answers about your memory of how – what sort of language they used?---Yes.

What I failed to do, Ms Campagnaro, is just to mention a few other names to you, which as a matter of fairness to them, I ought to mention. So you've just got to make sure you're clear in your mind about what your memory is. Either you remember they used racist language freely, or quite the opposite. Or you simply don't know, and can't say. Understand?---Yes.

One of the names is James Kirstenfeldt, or Jimmy Kirstenfeldt?---Yes.

What would you say about his language?---I heard him speak racist very often.

All right. Shane McCormack, or Paddy McCormack, with an Irish accent?---No, not that I can recall.

Senior Sergeant Alistair Gall?---No, not that I can recall.

And when you say not that you can recall, in both the case of McCormack and Gall, you remember them as people, but you don't recall them using racist language freely. Is that what you're saying?---Yes, that's correct.

And finally, Constable [REDACTED]? Did you know - - - ?---Yes. Yes.

Sorry, I just got to get this straight. What was your answer for Constable [REDACTED] [REDACTED]?---Yes, I heard [REDACTED] using that language.

And Constable [REDACTED]?---Yes, I do remember.

Using racist language freely?---Yes, that's correct.

All right, thank you very much.

THE CORONER: Yes, Mr Edwardson.

XXN BY MR EDWARDSON:

MR EDWARDSON: Ms Campagnaro, my name's Edwardson, and I appear on behalf of Zachary Rolfe?---Hello.

Hello. Ms Campagnaro, can I start by asking you this. You've given some evidence today about what might be described as systemic racism. Officers, lots of them, using racist terms against members of the community in Alice Springs?---Yes.

You make no mention of that in the statements that have been filed and presented to this court.

DR DWYER: Well I object. There is one interview with Ms Campagnaro. So she hasn't filed a number of statements where she tasked with that.

MR EDWARDSON: All right.

There's one interview and two further statements. You don't deal with the issue of systemic racism, do you, in those documents?---If it's not there, then no I didn't.

So when was the first time that somebody asked you about your recollection, back in 2018, of who might be expressing things in racially offensive terms?---Sorry, what was that? I didn't. hear.

When was the first time anyone asked you about your recollection of anyone expressing themselves in racist terms?---I can't recall.

Well, you've given evidence about it today?---Yes.

I assume before you gave evidence in this court, you spoke to other people, other lawyers, about the evidence you might give?---Yes.

Were you asked questions about whether you could recall anybody using racist terms, before giving evidence in court?

MR FRECKELTON: I object to any questions which would intrude upon legal professional privilege, your Honour.

MR EDWARDSON: Well I'm not quite sure how that would intrude on legal professional privilege, your Honour.

MR FRECKELTON: She's been - - -

MR EDWARDSON: Sorry, I'll do it another way.

I want you to – you've obviously spoken to your lawyer, who is Dr Freckelton?---Yes.

And obviously those communications are private. Have you spoken to anybody else, whose not your lawyer, about the evidence you might give, on the topic, of racism at the work place?---Do you mean friends? Family, is that who you're trying to get at?

No, no, I'm talking about lawyers, getting ready to come and give evidence in court. For example, have you spoken to counsel assisting?---Yes.

And were you asked questions before giving evidence in court, about whether you could recall anybody talking in racist terms?---I've only spoken to that with my lawyer.

All right, okay. I don't want to know anything about what you've spoken to with your lawyer. Next thing I want to ask you is this. You've identified those officers that you say, would from time to time, if not frequently, use racist expressions - - - ?---Yes.

- - - what about you?---Not that I can recall.

Never?---I'm not going to say never, because I just cannot think back to four years ago of every single thing that I have ever said.

Of course not. But you seem to remember, lots of what other people have said, back then?---Yes.

Well, I'm simply asking you this. As – I got the impression, that anybody who used racist – racist language, you found offensive?---Yes.

And no doubt, you would have said so, at the time, to those who were friends of yours, or were colleagues?---Not that I can recall, no.

What about Zach Rolfe? Did you ever say to him, for example, I don't like you talking in those terms?---Yes, I did say that to him throughout our relationship.

And when did you do that?---I cannot recall.

All right. All right, let's deal with this particular incident involving Mr Malcom Ryder. We know that the incident occurred on 11 January 2018. You may not remember the date. Can you accept that from me?---Yes, I can.

And the first time that you were asked to give an account of your involvement in that particular incident, or at least in so far as speaking to Zachary Rolfe and others, was in your first interview, which was conducted on 19 August 2020?---That's correct.

And you've got a copy of that in front of you haven't you?---Yes, I do.

And you've been taken to parts of it by various counsel?---Yes.

And you can see that the person asking the questions is Detective Sergeant Wayne Vual(?), who was present. But I should say the person predominantly asking is Detective Senior Sergeant Kirk Punnuto?---Correct.

I want you to have the statement in front of you, because I'm going to ask you some questions about it if I may. Can you - - - ?---Go ahead.

- - - can you turn to page 10. And I'm going to take you from page 10 through to page 12?---Yep.

All right. There's a couple of key dates I just need to put on the record to put this in sequence. The Ryder incident is 11 January 2018. When were you engaged to Zachary Rolfe?---March 29th.

March the 29th, 2018?---Correct.

There was an occasion – there was an occasion was there not, when you attended at Government House in Canberra, where Zachary Rolfe received a medal for bravery?---That's correct.

When was that?---I can't recall. I don't know.

Was it before you were engaged, or after you were engaged?---I believe it was afterwards.

After you were engaged?---That's correct.

So at that time, you were not engaged, but you had commenced your relationship with him?

THE CORONER: At which time?

MR EDWARDSON: When you attended at Government House?---No, I believe we were engaged.

Sorry, you were – my apologies.

THE CORONER: (Inaudible).

MR EDWARDSON: Yes, thank you, your Honour, you are quite right.

Now, we know that the Malcolm Ryder went to trial in September 2018?---Yes.

All right - - -

THE CORONER: I don't know if she knows that, but you're telling her - - -

MR EDWARDSON: You – will you accept that from me? We've got transcript that show us the dates that the matter went to trial?---I only know that date, because various people have told me in these proceedings.

All right, just accept if you wouldn't mind, that the Coroner has, on file, the date of the trial, and the transcript of the trial?---Yes.

But I just need – I just need to understand some of the people that you knew who were involved on 11 January 2018?---Yes.

Obviously Zachary Rolfe?---Correct.

A person that you didn't particularly like at that point in time?---Where are you getting that assumption from?

Well isn't that what you said? You didn't particularly like him at that time?

THE CORONER: She didn't like him because of the incident.

MR EDWARDSON: Exactly.

THE CORONER: So she formed the opinion on the basis of this incident.

MR EDWARDSON: On the basis of this incident, is it the case that you didn't particularly like him?---I'd say yes.

So in other words, as at 11 January 2018, on the basis of this incident, you didn't like him?---I'm not going to say that I didn't like him. I can't go back four years and tell you exactly how I felt at that point in time.

Thank you. In any event, you happen to be in the station, when you had a conversation with him?---That's correct.

And we know, don't we, that the conversation – or the conversation occurred around changeover didn't it?---I think so, yeah.

And so that would have made it about 3 pm in the afternoon?---Yes, that's correct.

And you've told us that it was obvious that Mr Ryder had suffered a significant injury to his head, as a consequence of his apprehension?---That's correct.

We know that the police officers who were involved, including Zachary Rolfe, had OC spray all over them?---That's correct.

That you could see?---I could see that Zach was covered in OC spray.

And you knew some of the others who were involved in his apprehension?---Yes.

And you had this conversation, at the police station, with Zachary Rolfe?---That's correct.

Did that occur before you had interviewed, or after the interview with Malcolm Ryder?---Before.

Before. So before you went into the interview with Malcolm Ryder, you had this conversation with Zachary Rolfe, and you were at that point in time, can I suggest, in the presence of your partner, Mr Fisher, or Fish?---I don't know that he was there.

So you can't - - - ?---I don't know.

- - - remember one way or the other?---No, I cannot.

You don't remember?---Nope, no I don't.

You do – you do know that it was both you and Fish who conducted the interview with Mr Ryder?---That's correct.

And when you spoke to him, where were you when you spoke to Zachary Rolfe?---It was in the corner of the police station near the front, like the front office bit, the front desk. So, in the corner part.

And you've told us that it occurred around changeover and that's what you told Pennuto on page 10 of your interview. So, that puts it at around 3 pm. We've established that much?---Yes.

And when you saw him, you were able to see and identify an injury to his forehead, weren't you?---Whose forehead?

Zachary Rolfe's?---No.

Well, isn't that what you told Mr Pennuto in the interview?---That's the injury of Malcolm Ryder is what that is referring to.

Can I take you to the bottom of page 11 of your interview?---Yes.

Right at the bottom, "A member who worked upstairs that was a detective had scratched him. I do not know who it was. He never said who it was, not to me." Do you see that?---Yes.

That's where you're describing, aren't you, what you claim Zachary Rolfe had told you was the cause of the scratch or the mark on his forehead?---No, that's not what the forehead remark is referring to.

Well, what scratch are you referring to?---I'm referring to the gash on Ryder's head. The scratch was separate.

Well, let's just follow it through, if we can. If you look at the bottom of page 11, have you got it in front of you?---Yes, I do.

A member who worked upstairs that was a detective had scratched him. You're referring to the female detectives that you claim Zachary Rolfe had told you had scratched him?---Yes.

"I do not know who it was. He never said who it was, not to me." In other words, Zachary Rolfe never told you who that female detective was?---That's correct.

And then over the page, "Okay", Mr Pennuto goes on, "Can you recall whether or not there was any visible injury that you saw?" And you said, "I think there was literally a scratch from someone scratching him." That's a reference to Zachary Rolfe, is it not?---That's correct. But I also say, "I actually can't remember. I don't want to guess."

All right. But nonetheless, that's what you told him, isn't it, that you recalled at that stage that there was a visible injury that you saw - - -

THE CORONER: At which stage?

MR EDWARDSON: In that stage of the interview, your Honour.

THE CORONER: In that stage of the interview, yes.

DR DWYER: And your Honour, I'll just – sorry, Mr Edwardson, I'm entitled to make an objection and - - -

MR EDWARDSON: You are, indeed.

DR DWYER: Thank you very much. What Pennuto asks is:

"Can you recall whether or not there was any visible injury that you saw?"

And Ms Campagnaro replies, "I think there was literally a scratch from someone scratching him."

"Can you describe for me where?"

"I don't – I'm trying to think, I actually can't remember. I don't want to guess."

And he says, "No, don't guess."

And she says, "I can't recall where it was, but it was a scratch."

That's a full outline of what was said.

MR EDWARDSON: And Ms Campagnaro has it in front of her, your Honour.

THE CORONER: I know, but I'm also concerned about the sequence in which the position is being put.

MR EDWARDSON: I'll approach it in a different way, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Because it seems to me from reading this interview, that there are a number of conversations with Zachary Rolfe about this incident. There is the one before the record of interview is conducted or the attempted record of interview was conducted. But it appears to be with (inaudible) to the possibility of other conversations as well.

MR EDWARDSON: Yes, your Honour.

THE CORONER: So, the suggestion that this all happened in that conversation, I don't read that when I read it. I could be wrong.

MR EDWARDSON: I understand, your Honour. I'll try and clarify by reference to the transcript.

Can I go back to, if I may, your initial description which we have on page 10? And that's where, for the first time, you actually identify the first conversation that you had with Zachary Rolfe at the changeover at about 3 pm. Do you see that?---Yes.

All right. And you said this, "I was working with – I can't remember his name", we now know that that's Fish, but we can't remember his full name. Is that right?--- That's correct.

"He's out somewhere. We came in and we were on a changeover, so they'd been – I think we had been – we were doing evening and they were doing morning and we had to – obviously had to interview this guy that they'd just arrested and they were all covered in spray." So, that's you describing your first interaction with Zachary Rolfe with Fish when he gets back to the police station at about 3 pm?---That's correct.

So, Zach's was that they'd all been sprayed with – all the members had been sprayed. So, Zach had been sprayed and all the other members had been sprayed, you said then?---Involved in that job, yeah.

Yes. "His ex-girlfriend was on that patrol group. She was involved in that job. Someone called 'Maxie'. He was involved in that job – um – a detective in the Northern Territory was involved in that job who I really like." So, this is all information that he was telling you about what had occurred and you weren't present, of course?---I was present when him and I were speaking.

Yes, of course. He was telling you or describing to you the incident, the arrest of

Malcolm Ryder.

THE CORONER: That's a question. I know it sounds like a statement, but he's asking whether or not those were the things that Zach had told you, like listing the names of the other people who were on the job?---I don't know that he specifically listed me the names, but I would have been told who was involved in that job.

MR EDWARDSON: All right?---I can't tell you who by, I don't know.

All right. In any event, you refer after that to this person that you really liked. You said you can't remember his name. "I've got him on Facebook, Brett, he's a detective"?---Yeah.

Back then, you were very, very prolific, were you not, on both Facebook and Instagram?---That's correct.

That's correct? Anyway, you continue on, "Brett's a straight shooter, and so I remember there, so it was a domestic violence job. I'm just trying to remember and they've all gone in and apparently the defendant, Malcolm Ryder, like shone his phone at them and that was kind of their justification for spraying him." I'll just pause there for a moment. Who gave you that description of what happened when Malcolm Ryder was arrested?---I can't recall who specifically told me, the ins and outs of the job.

So, was it not just Zach alone that was contributing to this conversation, this description of what had happened?---I'd say no, because it was, you know, general knowledge of the people at the station. I can't tell you exactly who told me. It was a very long time ago.

Well, did Zachary Rolfe contribute at all in this description that we've got of - - -

THE CORONER: I just feel that this is unfair, Mr Edwardson. This interview appears to be recounting information that Ms Campagnaro could remember two years after the event when she was asked about a particular incident. She's being asked about a conversation, but it's not clear to me that all of the information that is included in this very long paragraph can be attributed to one conversation with Zachary Rolfe.

MR EDWARDSON: I couldn't agree more, your Honour.

THE CORONER: However, it is a confirmation of information which - - -

MR EDWARDSON: I couldn't agree more.

THE CORONER: - - - she received.

MR EDWARDSON: That's what I'm trying to clarify, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Okay then, you could ask her that, but the way you're doing it - - -

MR EDWARDSON: I just did.

THE CORONER: - - - is suggesting and trying to force her into a position.

MR EDWARDSON: I'm not trying to force anybody into anything, your Honour. I'm trying to cross-examine.

THE CORONER: Okay then, could you do it in a way which is fair.

MR EDWARDSON: Well, I'm sorry, your Honour, I don't understand how that's unfair at all. Not a single question that I have asked, with the greatest of respect, is unfair.

THE CORONER: Well, it's putting the proposition as though, this is all a conversation, or all this information has arisen from one conversation and one person.

MR EDWARDSON: Your Honour, I just qualified that very issue with the witness and tried to understand whether this was what Zachary Rolfe is telling the witness, or whether others contributed to it or whether it's just talk around the police station.

THE CORONER: All right. But when you suggested that others contributed to it, you wanted to put it in opposition that there were other people present at the one conversation with Zachary Rolfe. And you were rolling out those concepts in a way which I don't think is clear or fair. So, if you would like to ask the witness - - -

MR EDWARDSON: If your Honour pleases, I'll rephrase.

THE CORONER: Thank you.

MR EDWARDSON: Mx Campagnaro, I appreciate it's a long time ago. I don't expect you to remember every detail of what happened even at the time that you participated in this interview. I'm simply trying to understand if you can now recall. Do you understand?---I understand.

Now, the first time that you gave a description of how you learnt about the Malcolm Ryder incident, we see appears on page 10?---Yes.

What her Honour is concerned about is whether that description which appears on page 10 is all information that came from Zachary Rolfe or did it come from all sort of people, was it lots of conversations? Do you understand what I'm saying?---I understand and like I've said, it's come from a compilation of people.

Right, so it's a compilation of people. But right at the bottom you say - sorry I'll start again:

"And then Zach told me later - so this was after - so that's the job that I know of, and then later when I was at the station Zach told someone else and I can't remember who else was with me - like secretly where the cameras weren't looking at work, that he had someone scratch him"?---Yes.

Do you see that?---Yes.

Are you there saying that later that day at the station he told you about what I'll call the "scratching incident"?---No, that was at a later date I believe.

A later date, all right. So the first time that you had this conversation with Zachary Rolfe was back at the police station at changeover. You remember that you were at the police station, do you remember roughly where you were?---Yes, I do.

And you can't remember now whether Fish was present when that conversation occurred?---No, and I said that in a later statement.

Yes, and you can't remember how long the conversation went?---Definitely cannot.

You can't remember whether officers who had been party to the apprehension of Malcolm Ryder were present also?---No, they were not there.

So it was just you and Zachary Rolfe and possibly Will Carter - Fish?---Yes, that's correct.

Presumably the two of you were looking at each other when you were talking?---Yes.

We know that it's at 3 o'clock, so it's happened, I can tell you, if that's the right time, that roughly an hour after Mr Ryder had been apprehended?---Yes.

So you must have been able to see his forehead?---You mean Zach's forehead?

Yes, Zach's forehead?---I cannot remember his forehead.

Right, you might not remember now but there was nothing that stopped you being able to see physically whether he had any injuries apparent to his face?---No.

We know that he was photographed at the police station that day after this incident?---Okay, if that's what we know then that's what we know.

And we also know that there is an injury to his forehead which was photographed on that day - the same day as the incident?---Okay, if that's what you're telling me.

I want you to have a look at some photographs which I will ask to be displayed. It's 3-91. Just while that is being put up, Ms Campagnaro, can I just ask you about two other people. Do you know Lucas O'Donoghue?---Yes.

How do you know him?---I met him very briefly at the station but he went out bush for quite some period.

It's probably unlikely but I'll ask anyway, do you remember Lucas O'Donoghue who is the person responsible for taking the photographs I am about to show you, being at the station on 11 January 2018?---I can't remember, sorry.

If you have a look at the second photograph in this picture, which is now being displayed you can see, can't you, that there's a plainly visible mark above the left eyebrow of Zachary Rolfe?---I can see some discolouration, yes.

And you can see, can't you, that one might describe that if you like, it appears to be a scratch mark?---Yes, that's correct.

And you were looking directly at Zachary Rolfe when he was describing to you the incident, how it unfolded, before Malcolm Ryder?---Correct.

And that injury was present, wasn't it, when you were talking to him?---I'm not saying yes or no to that. I cannot recall.

So you say it might have been visible and plain to you?---Could have been.

And isn't it the case that contrary to the evidence that you've given in this court and indeed what you've said on multiple occasions in your statement, that Zachary Rolfe never ever suggested that that scratch or that mark on his forehead had been inflicted by a female detective? That never happened?---Can you - can you repeat that?

The truth of the matter, can I suggest to you, Ms Campagnaro, is that Zachary Rolfe has never ever suggested that an injury to his forehead was manufactured by a female detective scratching him?---No, it's not a fabrication and you're trying to put words in my mouth.

Well, what else could it be?---I don't know where the scratch was.

All right. Let me ask you this. You say you don't know where the scratch was. He told you, in any event, that a scratch had been created by a detective to somehow justify the use of force. That's the gist of what you've been alleging, isn't it?---Yes he did say that.

Right, so in other words, he was prepared to fabricate evidence?---Yes, he was. I'm sorry, but he was.

All right. So he told you that he was prepared - he had fabricated evidence?---Yes, he did.

And he told you that scratch was done - had been created deliberately to justify what had happened?---Yes, he did.

And you were the person - one of the two police officers that was involved in the interview of Malcolm Ryder?---Sorry, can you repeat that?

You were one of the two police officers involved in the interview of Malcolm Ryder? ---Yes, I was.

So you were part of the investigation team?---I was.

So potentially you were always going to be a witness in the trial of Malcolm Ryder? ---Not that I'm aware of. I never got called.

Well you may not have been called but plainly if you are an interviewing officer in an investigation you could always be called?---That's correct.

Did you provide a statement about your contribution to that interview?---Not that I can recall, but maybe I did, I don't know.

In any event you know that the matter was going to go to trial? You knew that the matter was going to trial - later?---Well, you assume so, yes.

Well you knew, didn't you, that the defence was suggesting the excessive use of force - bad conduct by police?---Correct.

And you knew, didn't you, from apparently this conversation on more than one occasion with Zachary Rolfe, that evidence had been fabricated?---That's correct.

So you therefore also knew that Zachary Rolfe was going to intend to perjure himself to justify what he had done?---Sorry?

THE CORONER: Well, I don't know that she would know that unless he told her that he was (inaudible) - - -

MR EDWARDSON: Well, you knew that he was giving evidence in trial?---Yes, I did know that.

And I thought your evidence before lunch was that in the lead up to the trial he was having conversations with you about the issues that were going to develop in the trial?---We had numerous conversations, yes.

In any event, you felt very sorry, so I understand, for Malcolm Ryder because of the injury he had sustained when he was apprehended?---I did actually because he had to come to the police station and sign every day because he was on bail.

Now, you knew also, didn't you, because of your training and because of the code of conduct that exists for all police officers, that you were absolutely required to disclose and report anything that would affect your policing, or policing generally, that came to your attention?---That's true.

And you knew, didn't you, that because evidence had apparently been fabricated, there was always the real possibility that Malcolm Ryder might be wrong convicted of an offence he didn't commit?---That's correct.

So is it your evidence that you were prepared to remain mute and allow that man to be condemned to a potentially false prosecution. Is that your evidence?---That's true but what are you trying to get at?

Well I'm asking you this, if you felt sympathy and you were sorry for Malcolm Ryder, you told us that?---That's true.

You've said that unlike your good self, many others within the office were using racist terms that you found offensive?---Unlike my good self?

Yes?---That's correct.

THE CORONER: She didn't exclude the possibility that she might have used a term like that while she was (inaudible) - - -

MR EDWARDSON: I'll put it another way.

Ms Campagnaro, what I am getting at is this, do you know what perverting the course of justice is?---I do.

Well, isn't it the case that you armed with all of that information that you told about us, apparently multiple admissions, the fabricating evidence, potentially perverting or perjury, potentially this man Malcolm Ryder being condemned for an offence he didn't commit, you were prepared to remain silent?

DR DWYER: Just before the witness answers that question, might I ask your Honour to grant a certificate for this witness, so that she can speak freely about that matter. I don't - - -

MR EDWARDSON: No, I think it's appropriate your Honour.

MR FRECKELTON: That can be an application your Honour.

THE CORONER: Well, let me just hear from Dr Freckelton, who, as I understand it acts for Ms Campagnaro.

Yes, Dr Freckelton?

MR FRECKELTON: We appear to be inching toward a suggestion that the witness has committed in some way a criminal offence. Before we get to that point, in my respectful submission, would be appropriate for an objection to be made on her behalf. I make that application and ask that a certificate be issued.

THE CORONER: Does anyone want to explain to Ms Campagnaro what's happening?

DR DWYER: Yes, perhaps we could have a brief pause, your Honour if your Honour would go off the Bench, no doubt, Dr Freckelton would like to do that, otherwise I can.

THE CORONER: All right.

Ms Campagnaro, again, I – sometimes issues come up in proceedings. An issue has just arisen. It's no reflection on the way you're giving evidence or anything like that. It's just something we need to deal with so I'm just going to have a short adjournment so that you can speak to your lawyer?---Okay.

ADJOURNED

RESUMED

CLAUDIA CAMPAGNARO:

MR FRECKELTON: Thank you, I've had the opportunity of speaking with Ms Campagnaro. It's a little difficult to understand what's taking place, but as best I can apprehend it, my learned friend seems to be inching towards suggesting that the witness has entered into some kind of a conspiracy to attempt to pervert the course of justice, we've decided, if there's any suggestion of anything to do with a commission of criminal activity, she has instructed me to object on her behalf to answering, but she is more than happy to do so, given a certificate by your Honour.

THE CORONER: All right yes.

In those circumstances, Ms Campagnaro, I'm now giving you a certificate, under s 38 *Coroners Act* of the Northern Territory. And that means that you are required to continue to answer questions, but if there's anything in answers that might criminate you, or any other proceedings, then they can't – then the evidence can't be used in any other proceedings, other than for a prosecution for perjury.

MR FRECKELTON: Thank you, your Honour.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

XXN BY MR EDWARDSON:

MR EDWARDSON: What I'm trying to understand, Ms Campagnaro is this. You've told us on the evidence that you'd given, and indeed in earlier statements provided to the Northern Territory Police, Zachary Rolfe had made admissions of what could only be described as criminal conduct?---It seems that way, doesn't it.

And yet, you didn't challenge him on it?---At the time, no.

You didn't consider that it was appropriate in those circumstances, even to say to him, you can't do this to this man?---No, been in the job a month, and just didn't act like that - - -

Well - - - ?---So no, I didn't say that to him.

- - - you may not have been – you may of only been in the job for a month. But you were fresh out of cadet school. You would know what the difference between right and wrong, yes?---Yes.

You know, and you had been taught and trained, about what criminal conduct is?---Yes.

You, yourself, had arrested people for criminal conduct?---Yes.

You couldn't possibly think that it was appropriate to fabricate evidence, to justify illegality?---No.

And yet you say – you said nothing to anybody?---That's correct.

And the first time you ever make any disclosure, or allegation, against Zachary Rolfe, or anybody else, is after you were approached by police, and after your engagement had been ended?---That's correct.

Now you said before that you were prolific – accepted that you were prolific in your posting on Facebook and Instagram?---Correct.

Throughout 2018, until Zachary Rolfe pulled the pin on your engagement, you were prolific, were you not, about him, who he was, what he stood for?

DR DWYER: (Inaudible) - - -

MR FRECKELTON: I'd that the question be broken into two. There are two very important and very separate components to it, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Sure.

MR FRECKELTON: First is as to who pulls the pin, and then there's a separate part.

THE CORONER: Yes, I don't - - -

MR EDWARDSON: Fair enough, no, no, I accept that.

It was Zachary Rolfe who terminated the relationship with you, was it not?---At the very end, yeah.

He's the one that ended the engagement?---It was a bit of a mutual thing I'm going to say, but it was him that made the final decision, after he'd moved out.

When the decision was made by him, the final decision - - - ?---Yes.

- - - to move out, and the relationship was over, by that - - - ?---Yes.

- - - by that stage, you had posted frequently, had you not, your wedding plans?---I had, yes.

And it's true, is it not, that when the relationship ended, you were bitter?---No, I'm not going to use the word bitter, sorry. I will not let you put that word in my mouth.

All right. Do you agree with this much? That you would regularly post on both Instagram and Facebook, disparaging remarks about Zachary Rolfe?---Sorry what was that?

You accused him, did you not, of all sorts of things, after the relationship broke down, didn't you?---That's incorrect, no.

You accused him, for example, of infidelity, or sleeping with other people?---In what context was this?

You certainly weren't complimentary about him, were you, in your postings?---In my postings?

Yes?---That's not true.

What about conversations with a whole lot of people, afterwards? You were furious about the fact that he'd ended the engagement, weren't you?---No, I think I was more upset that the relationship had ended, just like any normal person.

I want to ask you about a photograph I'm about to produce to you.

DR DWYER: Sorry, can I just explain to my learned friend – can I just see that photograph? Is it in the brief of evidence?

MR EDWARDSON: Not yet.

DR DWYER: Okay, so it doesn't work like, Mr Edwardson, in an inquest. You need to provide that material to counsel assisting. Counsel assisting then needs to provide it to the court officer, that's how it works.

MR EDWARDSON: (Inaudible).

DR DWYER: In a non-adversarial proceeding.

MR EDWARDSON: I provide you with a copy now.

DR DWYER: Thank you so much.

MR EDWARDSON: And, look, I'm not familiar with the procedure, but Dr Dwyer is. I've appeared in many inquests, and I can say that that's the very first time, ever, in my professional life that anybody's objected to me introducing an exhibit, in a Coronial inquest. But I'm sorry - - -

DR DWYER: It's not an objection to producing an exhibit. It's just that it works by providing it to counsel assisting, so that they can then have it available for the court officer, and then it's tendered through counsel assisting. So I hope that assist my learned friend.

MR EDWARDSON: It does.

All right, what I'll do – Dr Freckelton's kindly agreed to the photograph, being texted to Ms Campagnaro, so that way she can at least identify it.

THE CORONER: Okay?---Is that the image?

MR EDWARDSON: I hope you've got an image of a photograph with the Governor General, Zachary Rolfe and yourself?---Yes.

That is you in that photograph?---It is.

And is that the occasion that we talked about earlier, when I was asking you some questions about after the Ryder incident, you attended in Canberra with Zachary Rolfe so that he could receive this bravery medal?---Yes.

And this is after the Ryder incident?---Yes, it would have been.

And before of course, the Ryder trial, which is later that year?---Yes.

And at that stage, you'd said nothing to anybody about - - - ?---No.

- - - the fabrication of evidence?---No I hadn't.

No one?---No.

And indeed, the very first person that you ever made an allegation about Zachary Rolfe, is when you spoke to Detective Pennuto, isn't that the case? In that very first interview that we've just been through?---That's correct.

And before then, you've never said anything to a soul?---I mean, I may have spoken to my friends about it, but I can't be a 100 percent certain, exactly what I spoke to them about. Because it's actually quite embarrassing.

Well Ms Campagnaro, it's not about embarrassment. What I'm putting to you, is that the reason you never told anybody, is because it never happened?---That's not true.

What I'm suggesting to you, Ms Campagnaro, is that there is no way, you, as a person, would have ever allowed Malcolm Ryder, to be condemned on false evidence, with your knowledge, on your watch?---What are you trying to get at?

Well if it had happened, surely, any common sense of decency, not to mention the law, would have required you to make sure, that he could not be condemned on fabricated evidence?---I'm sorry sir, but it did happen. And no amount of you trying to say it didn't, is going to change what I'm saying. It did happen.

All right, I'll put it another way - - - ?---And that's that.

- - - if it did happen, why didn't you put a stop to the prosecution of Malcolm Ryder?---Because I didn't. I was in a relationship with him.

What, you were prepared to sweep it under the carpet, because you were in a relationship with him, is that what you're telling us?---That's what happened, yes.

So you were prepared to sacrifice Malcolm Ryder, on the strength of your relationship?---I don't like what you're getting at, I'm sorry.

Well that's the truth of the matter, isn't it? Isn't it?---You're trying – you're trying to paint me out to be this person that I'm not.

Well, if you're not that person, you would never have allowed that matter to go to court, on fabricated or false evidence, would you?---But it did.

And you let that happen?---Well yeah, I don't think I was the only person that let that happen, but yes.

When you say you don't think you were only person to let that happen, are you suggesting that the others were in on the fix, so to speak?---The people that were involved in the job, I'm sure they knew exactly what had happened.

And why do you say that?---Because they were there, and they were present.

Exactly. They were there. They were present. They know what happened. You weren't, were you?---No, I wasn't.

Do you know a police officer by the name of – sorry, before I forget, your Honour, I seek to tender that photograph.

DR DWYER: I'll tender that one, Mr Edwardson.

THE CORONER: Sure.

MR EDWARDSON: Do you know a police officer by the name of Cameron Chatterton?---Who, sorry?

Cameron Chatterton?---I believe so.

How do you know him?---He worked at Alice Springs with me.

He what sorry?---He worked at Alice Springs.

He worked at Alice Springs. And he was working at Alice Springs, wasn't he, on 11 January 2018?---I don't know if he was there on the day, but he was a member.

And I suggest to you that not only was he there on the day, but he provided a statement specifically identifying the mark on Zachary Rolfe's forehead?---Okay, I don't know that.

Had anybody ever shown you the photograph of Zachary Rolfe or that mark that I showed you before, photograph 2 in the photographs produced, has anybody ever shown you that before?---I'm not sure. I can't recall, sorry. When you say you're not sure, "I can't recall", as far as I can tell, it doesn't appear that that photograph was ever shown to you in the statements or the interviews that were conducted with Pennuto and others?---No, not when I gave my statements, no.

No, I don't want you to say anything about any conversation that you'd had with Dr Freckelton, who's your lawyer, as you understand. Right?---Yeah.

It's covered by when we get legal professional privilege. Do you understand?---Okay.

Leaving him aside, has anybody else, to your knowledge, ever shown you that photograph and asked you, have you seen – did you see that mark on Zachary Rolfe on the 11th?---I might have. I can't recall.

When did you stop being involved in the Ryder investigation?---After I gave that interview with him.

Right, so the way the prosecution works is this, different police officers have different roles to play. Correct?---Correct.

You might have the search and seizure, you might have the arrest, those who are involved in that process and then there's subsequent interview?---Yes.

To be able to interview, you need to know something about the case?---Yes.

So, you have to be briefed by those who were responsible, don't you?---Yes, that's how it's meant to go.

Otherwise, you can't possibly participate in an interview?---Yes.

So, you need to know as much as is possible, don't you, before the interview commences?---Correct.

So, it would make logical sense, would it not, in the case of Ryder, that you would have consulted the police officers involved in his apprehension?---I assume so, yes.

You would need to have a comprehensive understanding of what went down before he was presented at the police station?---Yep.

THE CORONER: Can I just clarify, there's two police officers here in this interview. There's the senior officer and as I understand it, is Campagnaro.

MR EDWARDSON: Yes, your Honour.

THE CORONER: So, I'm not sure. Maybe it's correct, but - - -

MR EDWARDSON: Well, your Honour, that's for the witness to say.

THE CORONER: All right. It just seems to me that more needs to be (inaudible).

MR EDWARDSON: Well, I don't know, your Honour. I wasn't there and I'm sure your Honour wasn't there.

THE CORONER: Well, you're putting propositions - - -

MR EDWARDSON: I'm putting propositions which I'm entitled to.

THE CORONER: - - - as though they're facts.

MR EDWARDSON: I'm putting propositions which I'm entitled to do in a leading fashion, and the witness can correct me and resist and the objection is taken. But there is nothing impermissible about what I'm putting at the moment.

Now, Ms Campagnaro, I'll start again. I'm asking you generally about the processes involved in a police investigation, an arrest and a subsequent interview?---Yes.

If I'm correct, you were the subordinate. You were the – Mr Fisher or Fish was your superior, or he was the one that was, as it were, more senior to you for the interview purpose. Is that right?---That's correct.

THE CORONER: And this was your very first interview that you've ever been involved in?---Very, very, very first interview.

Right.

MR EDWARDSON: So, it would not be easy to forget your very first interview, would it?---Apparently not.

No. All right, so as your first interview, you would remember – I imagine it was quite confronting as your first interview, was it?---Well, of course.

Right. So yes, what I'm simply putting to you, as it was your very first interview, you wanted to understand what the case was about before you went into that interview room?---I cannot tell you what I was thinking four years ago.

All right. Can you remember what information you had before the interview commenced?---No, I don't remember.

Do you remember whether you watched the body-worn video, for example, to familiarise yourself with the circumstances of the arrest?---I did see the body-worn, yes. But I don't know if it was before or after.

Where did you – well, it must have been before, mustn't it, because it wouldn't be any good after the interview.

DR DWYER: Well, I object. I mean, there's no proper basis for that question.

THE CORONER: No, there isn't.

MR EDWARDSON: I'll put it another way.

THE CORONER: There might be a proper basis, I don't know. There might be evidence that it was viewed by this officer before he interviewed, but I'm not aware of it.

MR EDWARDSON: Do you know whether you looked at the body-worn video before or after the interview?---I don't know, like I already said to you twice.

All right, let me put it this way to you. It would make sense, wouldn't it, that you would look at the body-worn video before going into an interview, because the body-worn video before going into an interview, because the body-worn video would show you in very graphic terms what had had happened in connection with the arrest?---That would make sense, yes.

Yes. And it's obvious, isn't it, that anybody who's going to conduct an interview would likely want to look at the body-worn video, so they could ask appropriate questions armed with that information?---That's correct.

And so, whilst you might not now remember the obvious, was it before or after the interview that you looked at the body-worn, I think you accept this much, it would make sense to look at the body-worn video first?---That's correct.

Now, when you looked at the body-worn video, whenever that was, where was it in the police station?---I don't know.

Was your superior officer, Mr Fisher or Fish, was he with you when that happened?---I don't know.

Who was the active questioner in the interview?---Not me.

Not you?---It would have been Fisher.

It would have been Fisher, when you say not you. Was it or wasn't, or can't you remember?---I was junior. It wouldn't have been leading the questions.

All right. But you were present when the questions were asked?---Yes, I was there.

Were any allegations put at all about the forehead injury that was seen in photograph 2 that I showed you? Do you remember now or you don't remember?---I can't recall. I don't have the transcript of that interview. Do you?

So, well I'm asking the questions, I'm afraid, Ms Campagnaro.

DR DWYER: Well, just to be of assistance to the witness, I can let the court know, because it's an issue that may concern your Honour, there – we are currently looking for a transcript of that interview, which of course should exist, and a record and we can't locate it currently, so further efforts will be made. So, there's nothing that we can show Ms Campagnaro, at least, for the moment.

MR EDWARDSON: Thank you, I'm grateful for that.

THE CORONER: And this interview would have been videoed?

DR DWYER: Yes, Superintendent Morgan instructs. So, we'll make further efforts to see where it is. It's not on the Ryder file that we have on the brief of evidence, your Honour.

THE CORONER: So, potentially, a lost record of interview?

DR DWYER: Potentially, your Honour.

MR EDWARDSON: I assume it's almost impossible for you to say how long you looked at the video, what you actually saw on the video, the body-worn video?---No, I can't really recall specific details.

Okay, all right. I've nearly finished. I just need to make sure I understand all of this. In any event, having gone to government house in a relationship, you've told us that Zachary Rolfe ultimately terminates the engagement?---Yes.

We agree on that?---Yeah.

Do you deny that you were extremely bitter about the breakup?---Yes, I do deny that. this is not the right term.

What was the right term?---I'd say, sad, after a breakup would be a normal term, not bitter.

Now, when the shooting came to your attention, you started texting your friends, didn't you?---They started texting me.

All right. They started texting you, because they knew about your past relationship with Zachary Rolfe?---Sorry, what was that?

They knew about your past relationship with Zachary Rolfe?---Yes, they would have.

And so, that's why they were contacting you?---Yes.

And is one of your friends or acquaintances a person by the name of Ernie

Bellis(?)?---He's not a friend of mine, no, but he contacted me.

Right. In any event, Ernie Bellis contacted you in connection with the fact that Zachary Rolfe had been arrested?---Yes, he did.

And did you, in that – did you have an exchange with him, in fact, disclose text messages that you had with him about that issue?---Yes, I was asked to disclose them.

And you were asked to disclose them to police - - -?---Yes.

- - - for the purposes of their investigation - - -?---Yes, that's true.

- - - into, amongst other things, your allegations against Zachary Rolfe?---Sorry, can you repeat that?

I'll withdraw it. In any event, when you were engaging in text messages with Bernie Bellis, and this is in, I suggest, or on 14 November 2019?---Yep.

Did you ask Ernie Bellis, did you say this, "I need to get his number again." That's Zachary Rolfe's?---If that's what it says, then that's what it says.

Could you have a look at – have you got your statement which attaches all of those text messages?---Let me look.

DR DWYER: Your Honour, that's at 8-8. So, if there's anything that needs to come up on the screen in that one, we can put it up.

MR EDWARDSON: Thank you for that. If you could put it up. It's about – right at the very end. I think it's appendix A. Can I just approach, if I may.

THE CORONER: Mine says 8-7, but - - -

DR DWYER: So, there's the statement – it depends what my friend wants to show?---I can see them.

You got them?---Yes, I do.

The one I'm looking for is a text exchange which occurs on 14 November 2019 commencing at 21:50 and you will see from the top of the page that I'm reading from, it says, "Might have come up as if bloody autocorrect --", – whatever that means, but I assume that somebody's dictating and Siri's gone mad, whatever. Do you see that?---No, sorry, I'm just looking. There's a lot of them.

Just go right – I think it's about the second-last page.

THE CORONER: So, it's 14 November, did you say?

MR EDWARDSON: I did, your Honour.

DR DWYER: So, it is 8-7.

THE CORONER: 8-7. And is there a - - -?---Yes.

MR EDWARDSON: And at the top, the very first thing under Ernie Bellis is "Why" Do you see that?---No. What are you trying to get me to look at?

What I'm trying to get you to look at is an exchange - - -?---Just tell me.

- - - where you say this to him, I suggest, "I need to get his number again. I'm probably the last person he would think would have his back."?---Yes.

Is that the exchange that you had with him?---Well, if that's what it says, then that's what it says.

All right. Can you have a look at what's coming up on the screen?---Yes. Well, I'm going to tell you right now, I never got his number. I never contacted him. If that's what you're going to ask.

Don't be defensive. I've just got to ask you about this text message. Do you see there, it says, "I need to get his number again", right? That's what you were saying to Bernie Bellis?---Yes.

So, you were asking him for Zachary Rolfe's number?

THE CORONER: No, she's not asking him.

MR EDWARDSON: Well, you were telling - - -?---I'm actually not. I'm sorry, I actually didn't ask for it.

All right. You said, "I need to get his number again." You were expressing to him your desire to get his number, however that might happen?---In this text conversation, yes.

Thank you. And you said, "I'm probably the last person he would think would have his back"?---Okay. So, what are you trying to get out with this.

"But I do". Can you just concentrate on the question, please? You went on to say, "I'm probably the last person he would think would have his back, but I do." Do you see that?---Yes.

So, you were - - -?---I see that.

- - - telling Bernie Bellis that you had Zach Rolfe's back?---Yes.

What did you mean by that?---I can't recall. Maybe to do with what had happened.

Did you ever get his number?---Definitely not, no.

Did you try and get his number?---No, I didn't.

Well, do you think you had his back when you accused him of a whole array of things set out that we've traversed today in court and set out in your statements.

DR DWYER: I object. It's not having someone's back or not having someone's back to come to court and tell the truth about what somebody has told you. So, having someone's back in the context after learning about tragedy is one thing.

But then months later, being asked to give evidence is another. And so, I don't actually see how it follows. Unless my learned friend suggests that to have someone's back, you need to not tell the truth when you're asked questions.

MR EDWARDSON: Did you have Zach Rolfe's back when you found out from him that he had fabricated evidence and you were going to permit Malcolm Ryder go to trial. Is that what was happening then?---Having his back and not telling superiors about it?

Yes?---Well, I suppose so, yes.

So, you had his back and you were prepared to condemn Malcolm Ryder because of your relationship with him.

MR FRECKELTON: Well, I object to that, your Honour. That's just a gross mischaracterisation. If anyone was condemning Malcolm Ryder, it's my learned friend's client. He's the one falsifying according to the evidence you're hearing now.

MR EDWARDSON: Well, your Honour, there is one basic thing and that is, firstly, these allegations have been dismissed by two separate investigations. That's the first one. The second one is, it's a matter for your Honour to determine about the credibility and reliability of her evidence and it's not for counsel assisting or Dr Freckelton to accuse my client of in fact committing these acts which are contested.

DR DWYER: Well, your Honour, might I just say for the record, I absolutely agree with my learned friend. It is not for me and I'm not making a judgment of this witness or inviting your Honour to at this point in time. It is absolutely for your Honour.

The only thing I am trying to do now is to ensure that questions are asked of Ms Campagnaro in a fair way. And I can assure your Honour and my learned friend that when Constable Rolfe comes to give evidence, I will be doing the same thing to ensure that he is asked questions in a way that are fair, clear and reasonable, so that your Honour can make an assessment of his evidence.

MR EDWARDSON: And your Honour would have heard that I chose my words carefully and adept, according to this witness. I am making no accusations.

All right, Ms Campagnaro, I will finish up by putting this to you, as I must. I suggest to you that the allegations that you'd levelled against Zachary Rolfe about him fabricating evidence and so on, that we've traversed at some length are false and you know that they're false?---That's not true.

I am suggesting to you that if it had happened as you suggest it did there is no way a person like yourself would have condemned Malcolm Ryder and allowed him to go to trial and be put at risk of imprisonment.

MR FRECKELTON: I object to the question on the same ground as previously made, your Honour.

THE CORONER: All right.

MR FRECKELTON: It's an assertion of condemning someone. It's just emotive nonsense.

MR EDWARDSON: What else could it be beside this?

THE CORONER: The fact that she may have allowed someone to go to trial - - -

MR EDWARDSON: All right, I will use (inaudible).

THE CORONER: - - - without coming forward and providing additional evidence is very different from condemning them to an outcome.

MR EDWARDSON: You were prepared to allow Malcolm Ryder to go to trial knowing, as you say, Zachary Rolfe had fabricated evidence. That's what you're telling this court?---Well, I didn't tell anyone.

No. That was okay, was it?---No, it wasn't okay.

And not only that, he said it on more than one occasion and you didn't ever challenge him on it you say?---No, I didn't. Have you ever met anyone that always has an excuse for everything?

He had an excuse for everything, did he?---Yes, he does.

Right. In any event, when the matter came towards trial and you knew, as you told us, that the defence were going to challenge the lawfulness of his apprehension, you must have been on notice that the matter was coming to trial not only because you were in a relationship, because you were one of the interviewing officers?---I only knew because he told me.

And when he told you that the matter was going to trial did you challenge him, given the conversations that you'd had about what he had done, according to you?
---Not that I can recall, no.

Did you even question the morality of what he was suggesting to you?---No, not to him, no.

Why not?---Because I didn't.

Nor did you challenge or suggest to anybody else - you didn't tell anybody about what had happened?---No, I didn't.

Not a soul?---Not that I can recall, no.

And then finally some time - considerable time later - the first time you make these allegations is after the relationship has broken down?---The relationship had ended - not broken down - just ended like a natural course of life.

Right, the engagement was terminated?---Yes, it was over.

And it's only after all of that, that you make these allegations for the first time to Detective Pennuto?---So I had to give an interview, as a part of the criminal case. I was assisting the Northern Territory Police, not because I did it - I contacted them, they contacted me. I had to assist the Northern Territory Police.

After he was charged with murder?---Yes, I didn't have a choice.

Thank you, nothing further, your Honour.

THE CORONER: (Inaudible).

XXN BY MR FRECKELTON:

MR FRECKELTON: Ms Campagnaro, from your perspective, was the morality of Zachary Rolfe one of the reasons why the two of you went your separate ways?---Towards the end, yes.

Thank you, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Any questions, Dr Dwyer?

DR DWYER: Just briefly, your Honour.

REXN BY DR DWYER:

DR DWYER: Ms Campagnaro, at the beginning of the questions, I failed to take you to each of the separate documents. So just to be clear, you were interviewed on 19 August 2020, for the first time?---That's correct.

And that appears at 8-7.

You were interviewed again, or you gave a very short statement, that's just nine paragraphs, on 15 October 2020. And that's when you provide the Northern Territory Police, with a number of different emails, and text messages, that are really clarifying statements that you made in your first interview. Is that right?---That's correct.

And that appears at 8-8.

And then you were asked to provide a further statement, a statutory declaration, which again clarifies evidence that you've given previously, is that right?---That's correct.

And that's at 8-8A.

Just in relation to that very first statement when the police come on – to South Australia, on 19 August 2020. Officer Pennuto explains, at page two

“Claudia the reason we are here, is that we are involved in an investigation into a fatal police shooting that occurred in the Northern Territory of Yuendumu on 9 November 2019. And you've been identified as a potential witness in respect to various aspects of this investigation. We're obviously requesting that you will provide us with this statement to help us establish some background, or facts and circumstances around the actual incident themselves, and the persons involved.”

That suggests that the police contacted you to request that statement. Is that correct?---Yes, that's correct.

In your second statement that I referred to earlier, of 15 October 2020, you might recall that you attach a number of different text exchanges that you'd had with Annalise(?)?---Yes.

Do you remember her? Was she a police officer in the Northern Territory at that time?---Yes, she was.

And on 19 November, she says – I'll just read it to you, so you've got the flow of it. “Hey love, sorry this is a bit late. There's a lot going on here. And processing things has taken a while for most of us. I just wanted to see how you were with everything that's happened. Just wanted to make sure you're all good.” So she was in effect, checking up on you?---Yes she was.

You thought that was a nice thing for her to do?---Yeah it was.

And there was a back and forward text exchange. And one of the things that you say to her, after she says “We're all hurting and angry, and I've wanted to message

you, but I needed to be able to process things before I did. Just know I'm here any time, regardless of what's happened between you two. You have every right to be here with us, and a part of how we feel. We will always – you will always still be part of this family.” You interpreted that as her being kind, and reaching out to make sure that you're emotional state was okay, is that right?---Yes, yes that's correct.

And you write back to her, “I totally understand, and you're so sweet. I've been hurting from here about it all too. I've been hounded by people, so I deactivated my Facebook, and have been laying low. I feel it for you all, and appreciate your message. I'm here for you too, all of you. It's a dark time for him, and of course I still care. I'm so worried for him, and all of you.” The him that you're referring to there. Who was that?---Zach.

Did you feel for him, having been – been in this situation, given he had been charged with a criminal offence?---Of course. It was all over the news. People were sending me screen shots. Of course I was concerned about him.

Would you ever have gone out of your way to contact the Northern Territory Police at any time prior to the trial, if they hadn't contacted you?---Absolutely not.

I think that's clear. You were asked some questions about the body-worn video footage that Ms Wild, who appears on behalf of NAAJA, showed to you. You remember that? It's the one you referred to a child who was in a bin - - - ?---Yes.

- - - and you told the police about that, in your first interview?---Yes.

At page 45, you say “Actually no I saw once everyone was looking for this, I think it was a kid, like it's always Indigenous children. I think it was a young Indigenous man.” That young Indigenous man, I'm informed is 14 years old. And he as an intellectual disability. Was there any discussion about that, when you saw that video footage?---No, not that I can recall.

Do you remember seeing that body-worn video at the station, or outside of the station?---I'm not sure, sorry.

Did you ever see anybody-worn video footage on Zach's phone?---Not that I can recall. I've seen body-worn video's on phones, but I don't know if it was his phone.

When you were in Alice Springs – I withdraw that. At any stage while you were in the Northern Territory Police, do you recall getting any instruction about what to do with your body-worn video footage of an arrest, for example?---Just that you have to dock the camera after your shift, or just after the job. And then it would be uploaded to the Axon web site, and then you had to label it, that's all I remember.

Okay. And was that so that it would be available for that file, if the matter went to court?---Yes.

Did you ever receive any instruction about not showing – or when you could or couldn't show the body-worn video footage to other officers?---Not that I can recall, no.

Do you recall knowing yourself, back then, whether it was appropriate to show body-worn video footage to anybody who wasn't a police officer?---Yes, it's definitely not appropriate.

Okay. And do you recall getting any instruction about whether it would have been okay to get your own personal phone, and film body-worn video camera footage?---I think we just knew we couldn't do that.

All right, well you knew you couldn't do that, is that right?---Yes, yes.

The last question is this. In relation to the questions you were asked by my learned friend Mr Edwardson. About whether you let evidence go to court for Malcolm Ryder. Do you – you've given evidence that you never raised your concerns about what happened with Mr Ryder's case, before you were interviewed by police. Reflecting on the dynamic of your relationship, tell me if you need to – tell me if you need to stop before I ask you this, but reflecting on your relationship with – the dynamic of your relationship with Zach, was there anything in particular about the relationship - - - ?---Sorry, (inaudible) you're on the camera.

THE WITNESS: Remember the mirror that – sorry, it's my sister. Sorry, I'm at home.

DR DWYER: That's all right I'll start - - - ?---I could see her, I was like - - -

I'll start that question again. You've given evidence that you were actually still in the relationship with Zach, when the complaint raised by Mr Ryder was first heard. And you've said that was about six months after January – after the January interview?---Yes.

So her Honour, understands that you were still in the relationship. And- - - ?---Yeah.

- - - everyone can appreciate dynamics of a – of a relationship that's romantic. But was there anything in particular about your relationship with Zach, that you reflect on, that might have stopped you coming forward?---I was just – I thought I was in love, so you know, you've got these love goggles on, and the last thing you're thinking about is dobbing them into the police. I'm sure everyone else has done that. And at the time, hindsight's a wonderful thing, and you think back and think I really wish I'd told someone about it, but I just didn't.

And you've probably – you know, you've said a lot about this, and I'm about to sit down, Ms Campagnaro, but when you reflect back, as a more mature person now, 28 years of age, is there anything else you want to say about that, on

reflection?---I look back at that time, and I'm incredibly saddened that I was a part of those cascade of events. You know, I should have told someone that he was doing the wrong thing. But I didn't. And all I can say now is that I'm sorry.

Those are my questions, your Honour.

Thank you, Ms Campagnaro.

THE CORONER: Ms Campagnaro, I appreciate from what you've said in your evidence that it has been difficult to answer questions of police and have that forced upon you and also to come to court and give evidence today. However, we do appreciate that even though you have moved on, you've been able to reflect on what happened back in 2018 and share some of your evidence and experiences with us in the inquest. Thank you very much?---Okay.

WITNESS WITHDREW

THE CORONER: We'll adjourn until – I don't think there's anything else.

DR DWYER: Your Honour, just before you do, there's just one - witness to go, so I need a break to detain. Your Honour, I've just – I've notified the media who are here in court.

Might I ask for just an interim nonpublication order over a number of names that came out today that I was not anticipating, and they are – my learned friend, Mr McMahon, asked some questions about whether certain people had used racist terms. I counted six specific names and they include Officers Bauwens, Kirkby and Kirstenfeldt.

I'm less concerned about that because those officers are legally represented and I can provide for procedure fairness by informing their legal representatives and if they need certain questions answered, then they at least have an opportunity to put on further evidence to deal with that. But there are three names, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and I'll doublecheck the transcript tonight to make sure that I haven't missed anybody.

DR DWYER: [REDACTED].

I beg your pardon, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED], Ms [REDACTED] and then an Officer [REDACTED]. And I just ask for a nonpublication order or an interim nonpublication order over their names until I've had the opportunity to discuss it further, because they have not yet – they're not legally represented unless Dr Freckelton – I mean, Dr Freckelton appears for the agency, but also, they just haven't had an opportunity yet to answer what are the allegations that affect their reputation.

THE CORONER: Yes. And she's to be heard in relation to that, do they - - -

MR FRECKELTON: I support the application, your Honour.

THE CORONER: Thank you. So, I'll make an interim nonpublication order in relation to the three names identified by counsel assisting and that order is in force until further order of the court.

DR DWYER: Thank you, your Honour. And we will make sure that the - - -

MR FRECKELTON: And Mr Gall?

DR DWYER: Yes, I beg your pardon. I think – that's true, it's - - -

MR FRECKELTON: There was an Alistair Gall.

DR DWYER: Alistair Gall.

THE CORONER: He can come in to give evidence.

DR DWYER: I'm grateful. I don't need to trouble your Honour with that. He's giving evidence next week, and my learned friend's reminded me that the evidence from Ms Campagnaro was that he was not using those terms.

THE CORONER: . If there's nothing further, we'll adjourn until 9:30.

ADJOURNED