



TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW BETWEEN [REDACTED] AND [REDACTED] ON 12 JUNE 2008

[REDACTED] Today it's the 12th of June and it's coming up about 12.10 in the afternoon and my name is [REDACTED] and I work for [REDACTED] and I am talking with [REDACTED]

And [REDACTED] you have got no problem I'm taping our conversation here.

[REDACTED] None at all, just ask for a copy of the tape if I could have it.

[REDACTED] No problems and [REDACTED] I believe you live at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] That's right.

[REDACTED] And that's [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] And your date of birth is [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Correct.

[REDACTED] The contact phone here is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Correct.

[REDACTED] And you are an [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] For the moment yes.

[REDACTED] You understand that I am here acting on behalf of MAF with regard to an enquiry that they have got going at present and you do have the terms of the reference

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] And you are happy that I am here to talk to you about those things.

[REDACTED] Yes indeed.

RELEASED UNDER THE INFORMATION ACT

Certainly I must mention that we have been talking for a couple of hours before getting some proper background information behind what has occurred in the last little while and that for obvious reasons wasn't recorded because that is [REDACTED]

That's right.

OK. Getting to the enquiry where I am on terms of reference for which relates to an email that was sent to, was sent by you to I think it was [REDACTED], from the [REDACTED] relating to [REDACTED] and some allegations of some information that you might have regarding some things that [REDACTED] has done which you believe would stop [REDACTED] or would, should suggest that [REDACTED] warrant as [REDACTED] be voided.

That's correct.

Tell me a little bit about that.

I, as I acknowledge in my letter, accept that my information is what would absolutely be termed hearsay. I made that clear in my email.

Yes

The information that I have received I did not act upon until the person telling me had told me at least twice and had told a person independent of me at least twice and that independent person had confirmed it with me. Suffice to say that the independent person's [REDACTED] name is [REDACTED] and she has given me an undertaking that she will ring you herself and confirm what she has heard and so I will leave that to her.

OK. [REDACTED] do you know what her last name is.

I do but I, that's to be held back for the time because she is very worried that if she is giving evidence in my behalf or on my behalf against [REDACTED] and she saw what [REDACTED] did here she is not confident enough at the moment until she has tested the water for herself to have her surname go out.

Certainly. OK, that's fine. So she will contact me.

She will contact you if it's OK for me to give you her number.

I have got no problems with that whatsoever.

Oh thanks. Well because [REDACTED] is my [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Yeah

[REDACTED] And her telephone number, I only have her telephone number as [REDACTED]. This is the lady who approached [REDACTED] to get [REDACTED] to ask me to approach her. That is the link. OK?

[REDACTED] Sure

[REDACTED] I was reluctant too when I found out that she was a [REDACTED] various roles with the [REDACTED] of the SPCA but under [REDACTED] encouragement I did so. I will be quite candid the woman has said she will give evidence for me [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] I will put that on the table.

She told me amongst several phone calls that I have had with her at least twice, stories of [REDACTED] attempting to euthanize a horse and in doing so blowing the muzzle or the end of its muzzle off and the horse careering around the paddock in agony for 20 minutes or so before I believe if my memory serves me right – but she can fill in the details its her story – a vet was called into euthanize the animal.

She has also given me

[REDACTED] Did, did she say how long ago that was?

[REDACTED] If she did I didn't record it so I will leave that to her.

[REDACTED] No problem, yeah.

[REDACTED] I accept that I am the conduit of the message so I am going to stick to what I can, what I would be prepared to swear to in an affidavit that she told me, OK.

[REDACTED] Certainly.

[REDACTED] Um, she also told of her concerns that [REDACTED] was not when [REDACTED] uplifted animals putting them through the shelter if they were dogs [REDACTED] was giving them direct to Dog Control so that they could euthanize them under [REDACTED] instruction. That's contrary to the Seizure Terms of the Animal Welfare Act as I understand it.

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] She has, she says that she has got chapter and verse on that.

Now again, um, the broad base of the allegations was all that I listened to, I did not take chapter and verse because she said she was actually prepared to give these details to my barrister who is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Mm

[REDACTED] has been appraised of all this information by me.

She also tells stories of, stories is the wrong word, please strike that, she also tells of occasions when people have complained to [REDACTED] about the [REDACTED] of it being filthy, of bitches giving birth to puppies during the weekend and puppies being left out on the concrete, of animals not being fed over the weekend period, that [REDACTED] knows this but [REDACTED] relationship with the [REDACTED] and using them to euthanize stock is such that [REDACTED] is turning a blind eye to it.

She says she has the details of that.

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] Aw, there were other stories what I am doing is, or other events, I am sticking very, very tightly to the ones that she repeated to me and I know in discussions with [REDACTED] she's repeated to [REDACTED] — those are the ones that cause me concern because in their mass telling they seem to have credibility that was gaining in momentum.

She also has expressed concerns that [REDACTED] had commandeered the SPCA paid for telephone and fax lines, emergency lines and was using them for [REDACTED] business called "[REDACTED]" or words like that.

I must confess that I have a fax that is at my lawyer's that I received from [REDACTED] on SPCA notice, note paper which has the SPCA fax number on it and yet the printed out fax code at the top that fax machines print if you load them says that that identical fax number belongs to indeed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] or whatever it's called that is [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] business.

So it was when I actually re-sighted that email that I suddenly thought there is substance to what this

women is telling me.

[REDACTED] Sure

[REDACTED] OK.

[REDACTED] Now that's something that the SPCA, the SPCA has had investigated or spoken to [REDACTED] about or not, do you know anything about that.

[REDACTED] Again I believe so, I believe from what [REDACTED] has said that he has been confronted about a lot of issues by [REDACTED] and others. Now again this is somebody reporting to me not me that saw it.

She has repeated this several times, she says that now that [REDACTED] is actually resigned as the [REDACTED], that [REDACTED] was being specifically groomed for the job and that everybody knew [REDACTED] was being groomed for the job at the time [REDACTED] signed the affidavit that – aw, the search warrant against me, that [REDACTED] came in in good faith and that he and [REDACTED] are now mortal enemies over [REDACTED] conduct or misconduct as [REDACTED] reports it to me.

She also alleges that [REDACTED] has told her that [REDACTED] has received a series of up to 11 abusive emails from [REDACTED] which [REDACTED] was considering handing to [REDACTED] lawyer or the Police for action.

Um, now [REDACTED] I think is the person who is used as the [REDACTED] by [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Yes in signing the search warrants in the [REDACTED] area.

[REDACTED] That's right.

[REDACTED] OK.

[REDACTED] OK. Again I repeat and accept as my email to [REDACTED] to show that I am merely the conduit of this information.

[REDACTED] Sure

[REDACTED] OK. [REDACTED] felt and when she and I discussed it, that we were being literally asked to pass it on because of things that [REDACTED] had said like she had complained to MAF, MAF had allegedly sent [REDACTED] up to investigate the allegations against [REDACTED] but that [REDACTED] had turned the investigation back on her.

Again I merely repeat what I am told.

And, and is this where in your email you are saying that [REDACTED] is being covered by Her, [REDACTED] view to me was unequivocal, [REDACTED] and her [REDACTED] are mates and [REDACTED] was the last one who should have been sent because [REDACTED] was covering [REDACTED] tracks.

Another example that [REDACTED] gave was that somebody reported that a horse had been tethered or hung somewhere and it was owned by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] rang up the [REDACTED] to tell [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was coming out to inspect the horse and by the time [REDACTED] got there the horse had been spirited away.

[REDACTED] view was that the [REDACTED] was actually a friend of [REDACTED] and it was a matter of not wanting to do away with a source or something but that the branch was appalled to hear that [REDACTED] had warned them of the visit as nobody else gets visit warnings about inspection visits so that was also raised as contrary to the Act.

[REDACTED] also made the claim and gave me the name of two officers who believed [REDACTED] forged their signatures. I will go through my emails shortly and get the names of the two people she gave me.

I have also provided my lawyer with the names of those people. She is very, very concerned that [REDACTED] knows no limits about the Law but is very plausible until people really challenge [REDACTED] and then [REDACTED] loses [REDACTED] rag and shows exactly what [REDACTED] is made of.

She says that she is scared of [REDACTED]. She says that other people are scared of [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] takes warrants off people or sees to it that they don't get their warrants renewed if they stand up to [REDACTED].

She gave the name of a lady, [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] think the township was, that had had her warrant renewal application refused because [REDACTED] refused to endorse it because she had stood up to [REDACTED] over some lies [REDACTED] was telling in another case and said she would not back [REDACTED] up.

I am going to be quite candid that yes this information was music to my ears because it matched blow for blow my experiences of [REDACTED] that I had already raised with MAF long before [REDACTED] even filed the information's about me and I had been ignored.

So the notion that [REDACTED] was a protected species was something I already believed and I put that quite

candidly and openly on the record.

That is why I have followed it through because it seems to me there have been a large number of people shouting the warnings and nobody has bothered to investigate them properly.

That's why I decided with [REDACTED] consent and I spoke to her first before I got in touch with [REDACTED] that she would repeat the information. That is why I put the carefully worded email through to [REDACTED] which stated I was merely the conduit in this business not somebody with first hand evidence but that it seemed as the women told me and at least two others it was worthy of following up.

[REDACTED] Where is [REDACTED] in the SPCA up in [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I believe

[REDACTED] What is her position?

[REDACTED] I believe she is runs the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Right

[REDACTED] And that dogs haven't, that have been picked up have not come to her.

[REDACTED] Yeah

[REDACTED] As they should have but have gone to the pound to be destroyed.

That she has the catalogue of dogs that have been treated improperly under the Act.

[REDACTED] Right and did she say how long she's known [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Her, I must admit that to me her narrative jumps around the years

[REDACTED] Right

[REDACTED] And I will also admit that when I spoke to her I did not want to make her feel I was using her though I have made it quite plain that I would be considering getting my lawyer to summons her if her evidence was relevant and she was quite comfortable about that.

So she also knew that I would be passing her information onto my lawyer. Um, I didn't push things because I think I was at one stage quite honestly in a state of disbelief that somebody from within

their system was telling me exactly what I knew was [REDACTED] behaviour and I was just prepared to listen rather than pin down.

[REDACTED] Right

[REDACTED] How often have you contacted [REDACTED]?

[REDACTED] I think I would have spoken to her three maybe four times in the last 8 to 9 months.

I don't do it often but I do double check her information to me and then ring her again a third time before I said that I was going to be making a complaint to see if she would stand by being somebody that I could use as a reference point because I actually pointed out that hearsay was no, well under the new evidence that it can be but to me it's no evidence at all.

[REDACTED] I think that you are probably, that's being a realist...

[REDACTED] Yeah I mean I..

[REDACTED] When you say that you checked out the information before you contacted her again, what did you do?

[REDACTED] I basically asked her open ended questions of the sort that you probably saw me demonstrate when I asked you about your background, um, asked her open ended questions to make sure that I was not putting words or concepts in her mouth.

And then I would say at the end of it, You're comfortable for me to repeat that "Yes I am

[REDACTED] All right

[REDACTED] Ok. I mean I am an experienced [REDACTED]. I know how to ask open ended questions, I know how to gain evidence and that I mustn't taint it or whatever no matter how excited I am to receive it and I will say openly I was delighted to receive it but she pursued contact with me, she couldn't get me directly because mine is an unlisted number.

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] But she knew [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] and that I will probably give you a clue as to who [REDACTED] is. She went through [REDACTED] and she rang [REDACTED] because she knew that [REDACTED] had helped me place some of my dogs and asked [REDACTED] to get me to ring because [REDACTED] wouldn't give her my number but [REDACTED] agreed to pass the message on that I should ring her. And then [REDACTED] actually hassled me for a couple

of weeks about when are you going to ring her because she has told me this, this, this, this, this and [REDACTED] had already been told at first and the women confirmed to me what [REDACTED] had told me, the woman had also told [REDACTED] so I was actually the second recipient of it in my sort of ripples of connection.

[REDACTED] Sure

[REDACTED] But what I heard when I heard it from [REDACTED] was exactly what [REDACTED] told me she had heard blow by blow.

[REDACTED] And in an open ended way the reason that you reported it to MAF is what

[REDACTED] I'm absolutely adamant, I believe [REDACTED] is a liability to animal welfare. I believe [REDACTED] conduct is absolutely sub-standard. I believe [REDACTED] is a law breaker. I believe [REDACTED] is protected if not by [REDACTED] own institution but also by MAF. Um, I am an ex-public servant that had an administrative role in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] If I had done one-tenth of what [REDACTED] had done to me and that I reported prior to [REDACTED] charging me I would have lost my job and I would have expected to.

I am quite sure that the standards of a [REDACTED] are no lower or no higher than those of an [REDACTED] officer should be

I experienced the [REDACTED] illegal behaviour, I experienced [REDACTED] lies, so have my witnesses, MAF also have whether they like to put the word lie around it or not gave me their lengthy analysis of [REDACTED] affidavit in which [REDACTED] completely got it wrong in allegedly quoting them when [REDACTED] also quoted to the Court that [REDACTED] had meticulously checked [REDACTED] information and [REDACTED] has put in writing [REDACTED] checked nothing with them.

I am wondering how much [REDACTED] has to do before somebody actually takes a deep breath and says "Pardon me but all expletives in "Fuck a Duck it is time we did something".

PD: Again though you would agree that that is a process that will be before the Court and there will be a ruling on that by

DB: That doesn't stop MAF having their own responsibility to quality control.

[REDACTED] was out looking in other people's lives and animals with the same behaviours and no I don't accept it, [REDACTED] got pinged because [REDACTED] didn't do an investigation properly and these people should get off their backsides and do one. They are giving [REDACTED] a right to intrude in other people's

lives.

They are giving [REDACTED] a statement that [REDACTED] is trusted to be honest and I have showed them well before I was charged that [REDACTED] wasn't honest. I want to know why they have spent nine weeks doing nothing because I had all the information for them before I got charged. They should have implemented an enquiry immediately. It suited them not to.

So I am sorry I don't accept that, I accept that it is a concept but I don't accept it's one that has gone wings or legs. OK.

[REDACTED] That's fair and do you think in any way it is driven by what has happened as a result of the search warrants and stuff executed by [REDACTED] that you are reporting this.

[REDACTED] Well I would hope that MAF would manage to look at things reflects that. I would hope it did because they are the ones that exposed [REDACTED] without them opening their records and giving them to me I wouldn't have half the information I have in the form of proof.

I actually knew it from fact and would have had to have proven it another way but I would like to know why they would write a five or six page memorandum pointing out that, where [REDACTED] has quoted and under oath that there is no information in their files to match what [REDACTED] quotes them as saying but they didn't take action.

I mean whether or not [REDACTED] has taking a poke at me is quite immaterial when [REDACTED] misquotes them and is using them as part of the poke. I mean they cannot be passive about being misquoted. That is something that I believe they voluntarily should have reported to a court much, much earlier.

It is a fact they established it as a fact that [REDACTED] was misquoting them in an affidavit.

There is a duty as a public servant to draw that sort of information to the attention of the proper authorities whether or not it has an impact on may case or not. I mean the information that [REDACTED] misquoted them and used as an affidavit would exist even after the court result and they are still going to have to address it.

It's not, it's not taken care by the Court result. Whether I am pinged or not for breaching the Act is

actually quite independent of whether [REDACTED] is a liar or not and [REDACTED] lied about them.

[REDACTED] OK.

Well I think that explains exactly where, where you are at.

[REDACTED] Yeah and as I say I make no bones about it. I wouldn't deny it in a witness box if the Judge asked me and said you must have been pleased to hear it, I would say, "Rapt Sir" and grin on saying it because I believe [REDACTED] is a very plausible man who manages to con people because [REDACTED] never stays long enough to get caught out. Um [REDACTED] is the mouthpiece, the front piece, [REDACTED] is the results getter, and all these things are great until you start analysing the means by which [REDACTED] has got them.

And then it is not so great because we don't have a concept in Law in New Zealand that the end justifies the means. If [REDACTED] wanted me to obey the Law and wanted to allege I wasn't obeying the Law then [REDACTED] should have obeyed the same Statute [REDACTED] was imposing upon me after all [REDACTED] is the one given the power I am just given the obligation.

[REDACTED] OK and how many times have you actually had dealings personally with [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The first time [REDACTED] came with [REDACTED] as part of what MAF called a compliance visit but it wasn't, it was, they might have termed it that, it was a visit organised by mutual agreement to make sure that I wasn't sinking money into this property developing it in a way that wouldn't make it correct for my animals.

It was by co-operation between MAF and I not by their right to do so. I didn't want [REDACTED] here, I expressed my concerns if [REDACTED] was a redneck for them before [REDACTED] came.

[REDACTED] And how long ago was that.

[REDACTED] That would have been mid to late August 2006.

[REDACTED] And that was at this property was it.

[REDACTED] Yes

[REDACTED] Yeah

[REDACTED] I will be candid, I had seen [REDACTED] While I applaud anything, any legal means that stops [REDACTED] and I really do I did not approve of [REDACTED]

arriving with 20/20 with [REDACTED] shoulder pack and forensic photographers and then going through the house with the guy.

Um, I'm sorry that is an outright conflict of interest, a news agency will not have the dignity to take proper forensic photography. They are neither trained nor experienced to do so. Um, [REDACTED] techniques alarmed me, um, [REDACTED] reasoning for doing it did not. It was sound. The purpose of [REDACTED] visit was sound that dog fighting establishment, the methodology [REDACTED] used was absolutely inappropriate and I said to MAF that I was not happy with such a red neck coming especially on what was a co-operative visit.

[REDACTED] came, [REDACTED] tormented one of the animals when [REDACTED] was here and was repeatedly asked not to do so. Um, when the animal lounged at [REDACTED] I can remember [REDACTED] and so can my witnesses saying and it was [REDACTED] words not mine "Serves you fucking right you were told not to do it". We can all remember that.

I can remember having to tell [REDACTED] not to [REDACTED] in my cattery building and I passed it off as not being able to afford the [REDACTED] patches for the cats for a new addiction so please don't do it.

Um, yeah [REDACTED] also wrote up a report and has made statements subsequently from that visit that are a tissue load of lies that MAF have also exposed as a tissue load of lies. Why they have any trust in [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] lied and one of their staff members know [REDACTED] lied about that visit is beyond me.

How many lies does a liar have to tell before [REDACTED] is called a liar. It is as simple as that.

[REDACTED] OK.

All right so, so let's just in finishing the statement just to be, clear that I understand where you are at, the information that you have got regarding [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] with the horse running around, having possibly forged search warrants or signatures

[REDACTED] Signatures on the documents, yes.

[REDACTED] Is hearsay through [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Yeah

Um

Which she has repeated to other people and I have confirmed with them that she has repeated it to them. I got the feeling that she was desperately hoping without being as direct as I was, like I asked her if she would be a witness. I got the feeling and so did [REDACTED] get the feeling that they were hoping we would be able to back them up because they had walked the same track we were earlier and being treated quite inappropriately. So that is why I sent an email to [REDACTED] making it quite clear that it had been reported to me and apart from putting in an affidavit which I'll state how that [REDACTED] said it to me there is nothing that I can actually testify to directly other than she has told me and that I have another friend who has told me she has been told the same thing by [REDACTED] that's it.

Oh and secondly the allegation regarding [REDACTED]

Having covered up for [REDACTED] is basically because of what you were told also by [REDACTED] made that allegation too.

Right

So you are not saying that [REDACTED] is saying that.

Um, it's because her allegations a large amount of them match my own experiences of the people that when she repeated them to me three times I decided to take action.

Her stories, stories I don't want that word, her statements remained quintessentially identical over a space of eight months therefore I was inclined to say that they must have some substance and I put the substance before [REDACTED]

OK.

All right is there anything else that you want to say about this at this stage.

No I mean I have clarified with [REDACTED] as you would know in the email that you sent on GO that I was making it quite clear I was the conduit not the

Sure, sure.

And that the only accusation, if this accusation to be made that I am making is that [REDACTED] told me. OK that is what it amounts to in three words is [REDACTED] told me, I'm repeating what she told me - that's a few more than three there but that's it. OK.

[REDACTED] Excellent. Again you have no worries that we have been taping the conversation here.
And you have no worries with the way that I have

[REDACTED] None at all.

[REDACTED] Handled the investigation.

[REDACTED] No I don't do anything I don't want to do and I accept responsibility for every word I say or have recorded. OK.

[REDACTED] Sure.

[REDACTED] I would just like a copy of it in writing and a taped copy if I could that's all.

[REDACTED] With pleasure.

Coming up to about 12.35 and I'll be stopping the tape.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT