

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 19 October 2016 1:41 PM
To: Crime and Corruption Commission
Subject: MAKING ALLEGATIONS OF CORRUPT CONDUCT PUBLIC: IS IT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMISSION,
POLICY AND RESEARCH,
MAKING ALLEGATIONS OF CORRUPT CONDUCT PUBLIC: IS IT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

Dear Research Team,

Over the last two years, I have been in contact with the CCC and I am concerned about their processes.

I lodged a Grievance on [REDACTED] October 2012 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] mostly related to Workplace Health and Safety issues, emailed to my manager who replied that they were unsubstantiated. Since then, I provided evidence to my manager via email on two separate occasions requested a reply to which he did not respond.

On [REDACTED] January 2013, I lodged a Public Interest Disclosure for the Ongoing Unhygienic Condition of [REDACTED] Park Toilets.

I lodged a Grievance [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] August 2014 [REDACTED] to which I did not receive a reply.

In late 2014 and early 2015 I was subject to Harassment, Bully and Victimization by management and although I raised my complaints appropriately, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I was terminated in May 2015 from [REDACTED] Council after forty years of service. My Grievances were not investigated or responded to.

I made a complaint to the CCC in 2015 for Unfair Dismissal as to the way I was treated and not protected under both the Whistle-blowers Act and Council's own Whistleblowers (Public Interest Disclosure) Policy.

To my surprise, the CCC responded that they were aware of the complaints of [REDACTED] October 2012 and [REDACTED] January 2013 although I had not been advised by anyone that they had been lodged with the CMC. Even more surprising, was that the CMC referred these back to the [REDACTED] who replied that they were unsubstantiated. Let's make it perfectly clear, I was not contacted by the CMC or called to any meetings to discuss the complaint of 17 October 2012; the only acknowledgement for the complaint of [REDACTED] January 2013 was from the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who advised they would basically look into it. When the CMC received the advice from [REDACTED], that the complaints were unsubstantiated, they closed the files. As I did not have any details as to the investigation of either complaint, I had to apply to the CCC RTI to obtain the information. When I received the information from the CCC RTI, it was essentially my own emails, there was not any details to any investigation as to whom made the investigation or any findings, they were just classed as unsubstantiated.

After providing further information to the CCC, I was recently advised on [REDACTED] October 2016, that the CCC will not take any further action and will just place any further correspondence on file. I'm still concerned that the CCC and [REDACTED] did not investigate the Complaints or Grievances. I'm not aware of who completed the investigation or that any witnesses

were interviewed and that various [REDACTED] Policies were breached especially the [REDACTED] Whistleblowers (Public Interest Disclosure) Policy.

To the issue of MAKING ALLEGATIONS OF CORRUPT CONDUCT PUBLIC: IS IT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

I would initially not have agreed to having someone's name made public for allegations of corrupt conduct however, after my dealings with the CCC, I would strongly recommend the following:

1. If authorised by the complainant, the complainant's name be published or their position within the organisation, e.g. City Cleaning Worker, City Cleaning Section.
2. If authorised by the complainant, the subject of the complaint be made public, e.g. Ongoing Unhygienic Condition of [REDACTED] Park Toilets.
3. The company name, e.g. [REDACTED].
4. The position of the person to which the complaint is made against, e.g.. ganger, supervisor, coordinator.
5. The author of the complaint be fully involved in the process. In my situation, in both complaint's, I was not involved or advised the complaints were unsubstantiated until I applied to the CCC RTI. In my most recent complaint of Unfair Dismissal, I was not involved in any investigation or meetings.
6. The author of the complaint be involved in the investigation. In my most recent complaint of Unfair Dismissal, I was not involved in any investigation or meetings.
7. The author of the complaint be advised as to who lodged the complaint. In my situation, I am not aware of who lodged the initial two complaints on my behalf.
8. The author of the complaint be advised as to who investigated the complaint. In my most recent complaint of Unfair Dismissal, I was not made aware of who made the investigation.
9. If the complaint is not considered as corruption then the author of the complaint be advised of such and who to lodge the complaint with.
10. The complainant be protected by both the Whistle-blowers Act and Council's own Whistleblowers (Public Interest Disclosure) Policy.
11. That a complaint that the complainant had not been protected by either the Whistle-blowers Act and Council's own Whistleblowers (Public Interest Disclosure) Policy be investigated by the CCC and not referred back to the organisation the complaint was made about.

In summary, by including the above items in a public forum, the complainant's position, company and allegation and investigation findings would not have an adverse effect on the person the complaint is about. Moreover, it would be a wake up call to the organisation to ensure it's processes are in order so that complaints are minimised. I have not included the names of any staff in this correspondence.

Thank you for consideration of my submission.

