

## Part 11 - The conspiracy theory and count 9

153

Davidson ADCJ examined count 9, "the pistol", with particular regard to the method of investigation. His Honour ultimately considers the reliability of the Crown evidence. This discussion is in the following terms:

"Constable Cottee

Const Cottee said at the trial that, having gone to 1 Cornwall Street with the other police on 24 August 1989, she had been directed by Det Sgt Thomas to take the three Catt children then living there to the Taree Police Station where Mr Newell took them into his care. There was an issue as to how long it took her to do this and return to 1 Cornwall Street. In my view nothing turns on that dispute. It was clearly long enough for Det Sgt Thomas to have placed a gun in the en suite vanity drawer, if he did so. Const Cottee said that upon her return, at Det Sgt Thomas' direction, she searched the en suite bathroom off the main bedroom occupied by Ms Catt. In a drawer in the vanity cabinet she found a fully loaded .32 calibre Hopkins and Allen revolver, the subject of Count 9 in the indictment.

Ms Roseanne Catt

When shown this weapon, Ms Catt's response on 24 August 1989 was to ask whether it was a toy and to state that she had never seen it before (H.Ex 2.3; T/T p1652). Through counsel at the trial her case was that the weapon must have been "planted" there by Det Sgt Thomas.

The Pistol

On testing, the weapon was found to be in working order. It was said to have been manufactured in about the 1880s. It was not recorded on any official register as having

been licensed to any person including Ms Catt as at 24 August 1989 or at all, nor had it been reported as having been stolen (H.Ex 2.5; T/T p2342-6; T.Ex ZZ). It was, however, duly entered in the record of property seized on 24 August 1989 (H.Ex HH).

Other evidence relied on by the Crown as to count 9

As well as the direct evidence of the finding of the weapon, the Crown relied upon evidence from a number of witnesses to the effect that prior to 24 August 1989 Ms Catt was either in possession of a handgun or expressed an intention or desire to obtain one.

Mr Barry Catt

Mr Catt said he saw a Derringer (clearly not the revolver said to have been found) which, before their marriage, Ms Roseanne Annetts (as she then was) showed him at 2 Cowan Road, Taree.

A Derringer is a distinctive short-barrelled weapon of large calibre with two barrels mounted one on top of the other (see illustration Macquarie Dictionary 1989 Edn). Mr Catt clearly knows what a Derringer is (H.Ex 2.1; T/T p2545; H/T p764).

Ms Suzanne Miller

Ms Miller, Mr Catt's sister, said that about a week after the wedding of Ms Catt and Mr Catt in August 1987, Ms Catt said that she had scared Mr Catt with her gun (H.Ex 2.4; T/T p1537).

Ms Marie Whalen

Ms Whalen at the trial gave evidence that Ms Catt had told her that she was going to Sydney to buy a gun to protect herself (H.Ex 2.1; T/T p2309). This evidence was enlarged upon at the

section 12 hearing to the extent that she said that Ms Catt had told her that she had "got herself a gun, a handgun and she showed me. It was in her bag and she said it was to protect herself....she felt she needed it for protection and she'd use it". Ms Whalen described the gun as small with a little brown handle (H.Ex 41, Annexure J, Q&A 57). The statements of Ms Whalen, H.Ex LLLLL, include one in which she refers to a visit to her home by Ms Catt on 19 August 1989 as being the occasion on which Ms Catt had told Ms Whalen that she was going to Sydney to get a gun.

It seems to be clear that by 23 August 1989, Ms Catt had still not carried out her stated intention of getting a gun because according to Ms Whalen's statement of 23 August 1989, "Again, today, I was Roseanne's, during conversation she said, 'I'm definitely going to Sydney to get a handgun'" (sic). Ms Whalen makes no mention of Ms Catt showing her a handgun produced from a bag.

In cross-examination as to what occurred at Milligan Street on 23 August 1989 in which Ms Whalen referred to a weapon being on the table, she was shown the weapon allegedly found by the police, T.Ex HH, and gave no indication of having recognised it as any weapon produced to her by Ms Catt from a handbag (H.Ex 2.1; T/T p2396, 2440-5).

As already indicated, I do not regard Ms Whalen as a reliable witness (para. 224).

Mr Barry O'Brien

Mr O'Brien said that during a conversation with both Ms and Mr Catt which appears to have been towards the end of 1988, Ms Catt had said that she possessed an automatic rifle and a Derringer.

Ms Beverley Lyons

Ms Lyons said that in May 1987, Ms Catt had told her that she carried a gun for her protection against a couple of police at Taree who she "could not get on my side".

Ms Barbara Chapman

Ms Chapman, without objection, gave evidence at the section 12 hearing which she did not give at the trial. She said she had worked for Ms Catt as a housekeeper at 1 Cornwall Street prior to 24 August 1989, having cleaned the house on three occasions. On the second occasion she said she had gone into the en suite bathroom on a date that she could not specify. She said that when Ms Catt had opened a drawer she saw a gun in it. Ms Chapman described it as "a very small handgun". She said that she could not recall the colour but there was a piece of pearl or pearlised material in the butt of the gun which is consistent with the appearance of T.Ex HH.

Ms Chapman said that the en suite was reached through a walk-in wardrobe. She was shown three photographs, H.Ex JJ, Nos 20, 65 and 70, taken by the police on 24 August 1989 which depicts the en suite from the main bedroom at 1 Cornwall Street being approached directly from it and not through a walk-in wardrobe. Ms Chapman said that that was not the en suite of which she spoke.

Ms Chapman was also shown the photograph H.Ex BB No. 7 which is said to include the handgun found by the police in the en suite. She gave evidence that there was nothing in the photograph which she recognised, although the weapon depicted in it fits the description she gave.

Mr Stephen Foster

Mr Foster is the husband of Ms Chapman's stepmother. He said he had known Ms Catt from about 1985 until the early 1990s. He said he

had done work as a motor mechanic for Mr Catt. Prior to 24 August 1989, Ms Catt had come to his business premises numerous times to visit his wife, Julie. On one occasion, on a date he was unable to specify, she had taken from her handbag or shoulder bag a small calibre pistol. He said it was somewhere in the region of .25-32 calibre and of silvery colour. He said it was a semi-automatic, i.e. not a revolver as in T.Ex HH.

Mr Foster was familiar with firearms and said it was "definitely not a revolver but a pistol" which he had seen. He gave a statement to the police on or about 23 January 2003 (H/T p1157-64).

Mr Christopher Catt

Christopher Catt in his affidavit of 13 March 1993 (H.Ex 23, Q&A 41-2) said, "I never saw a pistol, but I had seen a gun". Although at the Roseanne Catt trial he said it belonged to Mr Catt, he swore in his affidavit that it belonged to Ms Catt.

On a 60 Minutes television programme which went to air on 28 October 2001, however, he is recorded as having said, "I saw a pistol or a part of one. It was covered up in the drawers of the en suite....I went in there one morning and she wasn't in there....looking for money, and I opened up the drawer and I just saw a handle of what looked fake but I don't know.....I saw the handle of a pistol" (H.Ex 11 p7). On a 60 Minutes television programme which went to air on 28 October 2001, however, he is recorded as having said, "I saw a pistol or a part of one. It was covered up in the drawers of the en suite....I went in there one morning and she wasn't in there....looking for money, and I opened up the drawer and I just saw a handle of what looked fake but I don't know.....I saw the handle of a pistol" (H.Ex 11 p7).

In the statement which he gave to the police assisting the Crown at the section 12 hearing (H.Ex 21) he said that when he had opened a drawer in the bathroom off Ms Catt's bedroom he had seen what he now thought was a handgun but which at the time he thought was "just a cap gun" (H.Ex 21, Q&A 217-226).

Christopher Catt said that he had been to Mr Newell's house at a time apparently after the trial of Ms Catt. Mr Newell had shown him a number of items which he claimed he had "got back from the courthouse". This included a photograph. He had told Mr Newell that it depicted what he had seen and asked Mr Newell whether it was, "a cap gun". Mr Newell had responded that it was not (H/T p1337-40).

Ms Sharon Catt

Sharon Catt said at the trial that she had complete freedom to come and go in Ms Catt's bedroom including the en suite. She said she had opened the drawers of the vanity cabinet to take things out and put things away. She said she had never seen a pistol, real or toy, at 1 Cornwall Street (H.Ex 2.8; T/T p3096-96A).

In her affidavit made on 24 March 1993, Sharon Catt verified the accuracy of a statement made by her on 22 March 1993. She had stated at the trial that she had seen a rifle and had claimed that it was Mr Catt's. However, she now claims that was untrue and that it was Ms Catt's rifle.

In her pre-section 12 hearing recorded interview with the police (H.Ex 27), Sharon Catt referred to Ms Catt having a rifle and "a little pistol". She said Ms Catt produced a pistol at Mr Les O'Brien's property. She said that Ms Catt had said, "She was going to get a pistol. That she had a pistol. That she had a pistol that she put in her handbag and she'd use it if she needed to" (sic) (Q&A 238-249).

Sharon Catt gave evidence of a conversation

which she said took place between Ms Catt and Mr Vernon Taylor at 1 Cornwall Street. This refers to the circumstances relied upon by the Crown in relation to Count 7 and may be taken as having occurred in about June 1989. She said that Ms Catt had asked Mr Vernon Taylor inter alia whether he could get her a pistol. Her attention was drawn to the fact that she had previously said that Ms Catt already had a pistol. Sharon Catt responded incongruously, "It was the same pistol" (H/T p1458-60).

#### Ms Julie Catt

Julie Catt said, "We were told" by Ms Catt "not to say anything about her little gun". She told the police at the pre-section 12 hearing interview that she had seen a gun in what she described as a "dresser drawer". She states it was small "like a little pistoly gun". She drew a sketch of what she said she had seen. The sketch is Annexure B to her recorded interview with the police, H.Ex 18. Any resemblance to either the revolver said to have been found or to a Derringer is conjectural.

At the section 12 hearing Julie Catt said that the drawer in which she claims to have seen the gun was of a dressing table near the bed in Ms Catt's bedroom, not in the en suite bathroom. She too said that the bedroom was not always kept locked (H/T p1263-5). She also referred to having seen Ms Catt shooting with such a gun on a farm (H/T p1271).

#### Mr Tony Catt

Tony Catt was not called at the Roseanne Catt trial. Although he is recorded as having taken part in the 60 Minutes television programme (H.Ex 11) he makes no mention of a gun. He said he had not seen a gun in the house but spoke of going to a farm where Ms Catt would use a .22 weapon and shotguns, "and a little hand pistol" to shoot at cans (H.Ex 19, Q&A 119-159).

COUNT 9: EVIDENCE AT THE SECTION 12 HEARING IN  
THE CASE FOR MS ROSEANNE CATT

Mr Douglas Annetts

Mr Annetts was not called at the trial. Mr Catt had said that the "Derringer" (so described although he nevertheless identified the pistol, T.Ex HH), was shown to him by Ms Roseanne Annetts (H.Ex 2.1; T/T p167), in the presence of Mr Annetts.

At the section 12 hearing Mr Annetts said that he had never seen Ms Catt with a pistol or revolver of any kind. Although contacted by the police after the arrest of Ms Catt he said he was never asked to make a statement nor was he asked to give evidence.

Both counsel for Ms Catt submitted that the failure of the police to obtain a statement from Mr Annetts was "a deliberate choice to deprive the defence of vital evidence".

A statement ought clearly to have been sought by the police and made available to the defence. It was open to legal representatives for Ms Catt to have obtained a statement from Mr Annetts, however. His evidence is not in my view fresh, there being no explanation for the failure to call him at the trial.

Mr Peter Bridge

Mr Bridge said that he had never seen Ms Catt in possession of a gun; nor was he aware of any cap guns in the house (H/T p1652, 1674).

Ms Julieanne Bridge

Ms Bridge also said that she had never seen her mother in possession of a gun. She said her mother had never mentioned a pistol to her (H/T p1622, 1631-2).

Ms Faye Klarenbeek



Ms Klarenbeek, one of Ms Catt's sisters, said she had never seen Ms Catt with a gun and spoke of their brother, Keith, having been accidentally shot, as supporting the unlikelihood that Ms Catt would have a firearm in her possession. She spoke of Ms Catt having a dislike for guns (H/T p1715-6, 1725).

Ms Joy McGregor

Ms McGregor, also Ms Catt's sister, said she had never seen Ms Catt in possession of a firearm. She said she had never seen any guns at 2 Cowan Road whilst Ms Catt lived there with Mr Annetts (H/T p1735, 1740-1). Mr Annetts, however, said he did have sporting rifles and shotguns locked in a cabinet whilst he lived at Cowan Road with Ms Catt (H/T p1771).

I do not regard the evidence of Mr Peter and Ms Julieanne Bridge, Ms Klarenbeek and Ms McGregor as being fresh. These witnesses could have been called at the trial subject to some reservations as to Mr Bridge in light of his status as an alleged accomplice awaiting trial.

Mr Peter Caesar and Ms Leanne Cheers

The evidence of Mr Caesar and Ms Cheers is clearly fresh. It is evidence not only of a continuing harbouring of ill-will by Mr Thomas against Ms Catt but more specifically of his having admitted to Mr Caesar, soon after he gave evidence at Roseanne Catt's trial, that he had "planted a gun" on her. (the evidence is more fully dealt with at paras. 403-414).

If the jury had entertained as a reasonable possibility that Mr Thomas may have said words to that effect to Mr Caesar, it may have resulted in her acquittal of Count 9. It may also have had repercussions favourable to Ms Catt as to the other counts.

Ms Roseanne Catt

Ms Catt denied that she had ever possessed a handgun as deposed to by various witnesses and also denied conversations indicative of an intention that she should obtain one.

Notwithstanding directions given as to the necessity to consider each count separately, an adverse finding as to Count 9 is likely to have reflected on her credit generally and hence on her substantive response to the Crown's case. I accept the submissions of Mr Molomby in this respect.

#### THE PERIPATETIC ALCOHOL

Both of counsel for Ms Catt relied on Const Cottee's evidence that when she returned to 1 Cornwall Street, having delivered the Catt children to Taree Police Station, she was directed by Det Sgt Thomas to search the ensuite, the implication being that it had not yet been entered by other police.

Const Cottee said that she had found bottles of alcohol underneath the sink.

H.Ex JJ, No.s 20, 65 and 70, are photographs showing a chest of drawers in the main bedroom. In photograph No. 20, all of these drawers are closed and on top of the chest of drawers, there are depicted a number of items including bottles and glass containers. Det Parkes agreed that Photograph No. 20 was an "establishing shot" i.e. indicating the position of items before the search of the chest of drawers commenced. Photograph No. 65 shows a male police officer searching the bottom drawer of the set of three (H/T p611-2). H.Ex JJ, No.s 20, 65 and 70, are photographs showing a chest of drawers in the main bedroom. In photograph No. 20, all of these drawers are closed and on top of the chest of drawers, there are depicted a number of items including bottles and glass containers. Det Parkes agreed that Photograph No. 20 was an "establishing shot" i.e. indicating the position of items before the search of the chest of drawers commenced. Photograph No. 65 shows a male police officer

searching the bottom drawer of the set of three (H/T p611-2).

A comparison of No. 20 and No. 65 shows that a number of items had been moved between the taking of these photographs. Most importantly, three bottles of alcohol, two marked "Toro" and one marked "Black Douglas" depicted in No. 20, are not depicted in No. 65.

The inference counsel for Ms Catt seek to have drawn is that the three bottles of liquor were removed from the top of the chest of drawers between the taking of the establishing shot No. 20 and the commencement of the search of the en suite by Const Cottee and put under the sink, indicating that one or more police officers had gone into the en suite before Const Cottee.

These submissions depend on the assumption that the liquor bottles found under the sink in the en suite were the three which are depicted in photograph No. 20.

At the section 12 hearing, Const Cottee said that in searching the en suite under the sink she saw three bottles of alcohol. She could not remember precisely what sort of alcohol the bottles indicated. She was shown a photograph, apparently Photograph No. 20, and said that the bottles depicted on the top of the chest of drawers were those that she had seen under the sink. She said that she could not recall if she herself took them out but she did recall that they were put on top of the chest of drawers and the scientific officer took a photograph of them (H/T p515).

If Photograph 20 is, as Det Parkes deposed, an establishing shot indicating the position of items on the chest of drawers before the search commenced, and Const Cottee is accurate in her evidence that the bottles depicted in Photograph 20 were what was taken from under the sink, then there is obvious merit in the submission of counsel for the appellant. The

bottles could only have got there by the act of a police officer engaged in the search. There is, however, no other photograph in evidence before me indicating the later return of the bottles to the top of the chest of drawers. The only photograph depicting the bottles on top of the drawers in evidence is Photograph 20. If that is the photograph which Const Cottee says was taken, this is contrary to the evidence of Det Parkes and if accepted the submission of counsel is not soundly based. The evidence is too ambiguous to draw any firm conclusion. In any event it indicates no possible explanation why a police officer engaged in a search such as this would remove bottles from the top of the chest of drawers and place them under the sink in the en suite."

Davidson ADCJ's conclusions with respect to count 9  
154

The conclusions of Davidson ADCJ in relation to count 9 were expressed in the following terms:

#### "CONCLUSIONS AS TO COUNT 9

It was incumbent upon the Crown if it was to succeed on Count 9 to prove that it was the revolver described and charged in the indictment which was in possession of Ms Catt on 24 August 1989, and not some other handgun, such as a Derringer, on that or some earlier date.

Mr Catt's use of the expression "Derringer" and his accurate description of a pistol corresponding to that type cannot be reconciled with the revolver said to have been found by the police. Yet he purported to identify the revolver as the Derringer he had seen in Cowan Road. Therefore, his evidence is unacceptable.

Mr Barry O'Brien's evidence in which he also asserts that Ms Catt spoke of a Derringer is not supportive of the Crown's case that a

revolver, T.Ex HH, was found.

I accept the evidence of Mr Foster, to the effect that the handgun which he saw was not the one charged in Count 9. Similarly, the weapon sketched by Julie Catt cannot be regarded as descriptive of the weapon depicted in photographs in evidence as being the weapon found. As to Ms Chapman, her evidence is not conclusive that there was a revolver at 1 Cornwall Street on 24 August 1989.

As to the evidence of the Catt children, leaving aside the evidence of Tony Catt who saw no handgun in the house, there is no jury finding in relation to it which might inhibit any assessment of its reliability. Having regard to the fact that two juries have not seen fit to act upon their evidence in other respects especially the sexual assault allegations, I do not accept their evidence as to Count 9.

The absence of Const Cottee from the house with the children gave Det Sgt Thomas an opportunity to place the revolver in the drawer. The lack of any traceable antecedents of that weapon is a factor leaving in my mind a feeling of unease when considered in the context of the whole of the evidence now available as to Count 9.

There is evidence to support the inference that Mr Thomas had a motive for securing the conviction of Ms Catt by means which might include the manufacture or arranging for the giving of evidence known to be untrue or not believed to be true, and that he had a propensity for so acting.

The evidence of Mr Caesar as to Mr Thomas' alleged admission that he had "planted a gun" on Ms Catt is fresh and, is capable of acceptance although from a witness whose credit is under attack. It is of substantial materiality.

There is a reasonable possibility that if Mr Caesar's evidence had been before the jury, supported as it was to an extent by that of Ms Leanne Cheers, the verdict, at least as to Count 9, may have been different, with a real possibility of repercussions favourable to Ms Catt as to other counts.

Summary of Davidson ADCJ's findings in relation to counts 5 and 9 and the police investigation.  
155

When providing a summary of his report, Davidson ADCJ set out his conclusions with respect to the general police investigation and to counts 5 and 9 in particular. His Honour's findings raise significant questions in relation to both counts and it is useful to reproduce them for consideration in the resolution of this appeal. I am satisfied that this Court should accept his Honour's conclusions.

"COUNT 5: LITHIUM/RIVOTRIL (SEE PARAS263-460)

It is likely that Det Sgt Thomas knew on 29 July 1989 that Mr Newell was going to collect from office premises at 2-8 Cornwall Street specimens of Mr Catt's consumables in order that they might be subjected to analysis (see paras. 279-287).

Mr Newell's evidence to the effect that he did not tell Det Sgt Thomas what he intended to do on 30 July 1989 at the office premises at 2-8 Cornwall Street is rejected (see para. 285).

It is likely that on or before 31 July 1989, and probably on 29 July 1989, Mr Newell informed Det Sgt Thomas of the advice of Dr Sandfield to the effect that the erratic behaviour being exhibited by Mr Catt may have been the result of overdoses of Lithium and a drug such as Rivotril in combination (see paras. 273-288).

Mr Newell had both a motive and an opportunity to contaminate the substances he removed from Mr Catt's refrigerator on 30 July 1989 before they were submitted for analysis.

Mr Newell was motivated by antipathy towards Ms Catt and by sympathy towards Mr Catt to such an extent that he may have himself contaminated the liquids removed by him from Mr Catt's refrigerator on 30 July 1989 before they were submitted for analysis.

It is likely that the request for analysis for the presence of both Lithicarb and Clonazepam was made to the Government Analytical Laboratories when the milk and orange juice were delivered to the Laboratories on 10 August 1989 (see paras. 311-322).

It is likely that the request for analysis in respect of both substances referred to in para. 44 above was made by or with the knowledge of Det Sgt Thomas prior to 24 August 1989 (see paras. 311-322).

Contrary to his sworn evidence to that effect, there is a reasonable possibility that Det Paget may not have found containers of Lithium and Rivotril in a black handbag in a drawer in the main bedroom at 1 Cornwall Street on 24 August 1989 (see paras. 297-306; 311-344; 456).

It is reasonably possible that the only container of Rivotril dispensed to Mr Catt in existence as at 24 August 1989 was that produced by Mr Newell to Crown prosecuting authorities on 14 May 1991 at the trial of Roseanne Catt (see paras. 297-306; 358-371; 457-458).

It is reasonably possible that Mr Newell and Mr Catt did not find the container of Rivotril last-mentioned at 1 Cornwall Street on 5 September 1989 as Mr Newell claims (see paras. 297-306; 358-371; 457-458).

The evidence of both Mr Newell and Mr Catt to the effect that Mr Catt had a mandarine and other consumables from the refrigerator at 2-8 Cornwall Street on 6 August 1989 is not credible and is not accepted by me (see paras. 372-382).

The evidence of each of the four Catt children as to Ms Catt putting medication into Mr Catt's food and liquids and as to them doing so at the direction of Ms Catt lacks credibility and is not accepted by me (para. 460). The evidence of each of the four Catt children as to Ms Catt putting medication into Mr Catt's food and liquids and as to them doing so at the direction of Ms Catt lacks credibility and is not accepted by me (para. 460).

COUNT 9: THE UNLICENSED PISTOL (SEE PARAS. 461-520)

Det Sgt Thomas had an opportunity to place the revolver charged in Count 9 in a drawer in the en suite vanity of the main bedroom at 1 Cornwall Street on 24 August 1989 (see para. 461).

It is reasonably possible that Det Sgt Thomas had an improper motive for securing the conviction of Ms Catt and of doing so by means which might include the giving, or procuring the giving of evidence known to be untrue or not believed to be true (Ch XI).

There is fresh evidence to support the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas had a propensity to act in the way referred to in para. 52 above (see paras. 623-688).

There is fresh evidence to support the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas may have put the revolver in the drawer where it was found by Const Cottee on 24 August 1989 in order to incriminate Ms Catt (see paras. 501-502; 512-520).

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE POLICE INVESTIGATION (SEE PARAS. 521-688)



The use of 27 Milligan Street, Taree, for the purposes of taking statements of potential witnesses in the investigation of Ms Roseanne Catt was inappropriate (see paras. 521-524).

The failure to charge any person on the basis of evidence then available with any offence arising out of the alleged breaking and entering of the house of Mr Bridge on 15 September 1989 has not been adequately explained (see paras. 525-542).

There is evidence to support the inference that Det Sgt Thomas may have improperly used his seniority and influence to prevent the proper investigation and the charging of any person with participation in the alleged offence referred to in para. 56 above (paras. 525-542).

On 24 August 1989, Det Sgt Thomas seized or supervised the seizure of property in purported compliance with a search warrant which did not authorise those seizures. He subsequently disposed of some of that property otherwise than in accordance with law. There is evidence to support the inference that he did so in disregard of his duties as a police officer and was acting in abuse of his powers (see paras. 543-572).

There is evidence to support the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas abused his powers by having Ms Catt charged with breaches of bail conditions on no or inadequate evidence and for improper purposes (see paras. 573-592).

There is evidence to support the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas, contrary to the instructions of a superior and having been judicially criticised for lack of objectivity as an investigator, improperly continued to take part in the investigation of charges against Ms Catt and in the preparation of the prosecution case as to those charges (see paras. 593-598).

Det Sgt Thomas may have abused his powers and responsibilities as such in the making of allegations to the Independent Commission Against Corruption on the basis of no or inadequate evidence (see paras. 599-608).

There is fresh evidence which, when considered with evidence given or available to be given at the trial of Roseanne Catt, supports the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas may have used improper methods which were calculated to induce information or evidence to be given by potential witnesses, regardless of its truth, and that in doing so Det Sgt Thomas was motivated by bias against Ms Catt (see paras. 609-688).

There is fresh evidence to support the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas may have offered an inducement to Ms Crista Van der Merwe to give evidence which was false or not believed to be true in order to secure the conviction of Mr Ramon Bracamonte of a criminal offence (see paras. 639-662).

There is fresh evidence to support the conclusion that Det Sgt Thomas may have given false evidence before a Magistrate in relation to the investigation of Mr Ramon Bracamonte and Ms Crista Van der Merwe (see paras. 663-671).

There is fresh evidence to support the conclusion that Mr Thomas, as an insurance investigator, may have offered a monetary bribe to a potential witness to give evidence which was false or not believed to be true in relation to the investigation of one Ms Margaret Nagy in connection with a fire (see paras. 672-688).