

From: Gary Bourke [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 8 June 2020 3:46 PM
To: Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee <pccc@parliament.qld.gov.au>
Subject: REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CCC

Firstly, a little about my background. I have lived on the Gold Coast for 23 years. I am currently retired but owned a business on the Gold Coast for 19 of those 23 years. Prior to that time I was The National Security Manager for TNT Express Worldwide, having taken up that position after spending 13 years in the NSW Police Force, a job I voluntarily left after attaining the rank of Sergeant. I spent most of my Police life in plain clothes, working as a Detective investigating criminal matters.

One of the people I formed a friendship with on the Gold Coast was the Regional Director for the Education Department, [REDACTED]. He was charged by the CCC with an offence that was the equivalent to 'nepotism'. He was initially suspended with his pay reduced to that of a School Principal. After being suspended for approximately three years, he was formally charged and remained suspended, but without pay.

Over the ensuing years I had many discussions with [REDACTED] about the case against him. From the facts that he provided, I could not believe that he was charged. However, I have enough experience with criminals to know that many ultimately begin to believe their own lies and I suspected that there was something [REDACTED] had not told me.

[REDACTED] trial eventually commenced at the Brisbane District Court, from memory in May of 2018. I was a spectator at that trial for the first two days. It was the worst prosecution case I have ever witnessed and I have been to many trials, let alone Magistrate's Courts. The first Crown witness admitted the offence for which [REDACTED] had been charged, saying he thought that was what [REDACTED] wanted. However, he admitted he had never had a conversation with [REDACTED] about the appointment, which was the subject of the charge.

The second witness, the Human Resource Manager of the Education Department stated that even if [REDACTED] had been responsible for the subject appointment, he had the legal right to do so. Further, she stated that he made similar appointments on a weekly basis.

I was not able to attend Court on the third day of the trial. It is my understanding that the Crown Prosecutor withdrew the charge against [REDACTED] at the beginning of the day's proceedings.

Prior to the trial, I learnt that investigators for the CCC recorded statements from potential witnesses. Then years later they asked those same witnesses to sign a printed copy of the statements. However, they left pertinent information out of the printed version that may have been to [REDACTED] benefit and only recorded aspects of the statements that adversely portrayed [REDACTED]. In other words the people signing the statements knew they were signing for things that they had said but not for all the things that they may have said.

In my opinion, CCC investigators did not investigate an allegation against [REDACTED] with an open mind. They assumed he was guilty and set about trying to prove the allegation rather than impartially investigating the allegation. I may have only had 13 years of Policing experience but, in my opinion, the investigators in this matter

were inept. Further, I cannot fathom how the Crown Prosecutors Office considered that a Prima Facie case had been established and continued with the prosecution.

In this case, the actions of the CCC destroyed the standing and reputation of one of the Gold Coast's finest citizens. Further, it almost destroyed his family, both mentally and financially.

I hope this is the sort of information you sought when advertising for Submissions in a weekend paper. I am happy to discuss this matter personally and can be contacted on the number listed below.

Yours sincerely,

Gary Bourke

Gary Bourke

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]