

STATEMENT

Name: Paula JARSKI
Address: Epping Sexual Offences and Child Abuse Unit
785 High Street Epping 3076
Occupation: Senior Constable of Police
Ph Work: REDACTED

STATES:

My full name is Paula Maree JARSKI. I am a Senior Constable of Police currently stationed at the Epping Sexual Offences and Child Abuse Unit. At the time of this investigation, I was a prescribed person under the provisions of Section 37B of the Evidence Act 1958, having successfully completed a training course approved by the Chief Commissioner of Police pursuant to the Evidence (Recorded Evidence) Regulations 2004, clause 6. I am currently prescribed pursuant to Regulation 5 of the Criminal Procedure Regulations 2009.

On Wednesday the 2nd April, 2008, I received a notification regarding the alleged historical sexual assault of the complainant, CDL, by a Residential Support Worker employed by the Department of Human Services. The suspect was identified as CDJ, who is the accused in this matter. I was advised that the matter had been originally reported to police in 1999 when the complainant first made disclosures of the alleged abuse, but that due to concerns for his mental and physical health at the time, a formal statement was never obtained.

Prior to the complainant being re-interviewed by police, several enquiries were made with regards to the status of his cognitive health, and all notes from the original police investigation in 1999 were retrieved from archives for perusal. Parental consent was also obtained for the complainant to be re-interviewed, and for a Video Audio Taped Interview to be conducted.

The investigation was initially suspended whilst enquiries were made with the complainant's physicians, and due to a brief period where the complainant was recovering from surgery.

On Wednesday, the 18th March, 1999, I attended at the complainant's current DHS Residential Unit in company with Senior Constable Lea BOWEN, and conducted a disclosure interview with him in the presence of three support workers, known to me as REDACTED (House Supervisor), REDACTED, and REDACTED. As a result of information disclosed by the complainant a subsequent appointment was made for a Video Audio Taped Interview (VATE) to be conducted.

On Saturday the 25th April, 2009, I returned to the complainant's DHS Residential Unit in company with Senior Constable Donna SAGE for the purpose of conducting a VATE Interview. The complainant's mother, CDK, was also present and monitored the recording from an adjacent room. The same two Residential Support Workers, REDACTED and REDACTED, remained present during the recording.

At 1042 hrs I commenced an audio visual statement with the complainant who at the time of the recording was defined as a witness as under Section 37B of the Evidence Act 1958, by reason of his cognitive impairment. The statement was conducted on a JVC HDD Portable Digital Video Camera which was operated by me. I also utilised a digital voice recorder, placed in closer proximity to the complainant to ensure that audio was captured accurately.

The interview concluded at 1120 hrs. At the completion of the interview I checked the Video and Audio recording via the playback function on the camera, and also checked that the digital audio recorder had recorded our conversation accurately. I confirmed that the interview had been recorded accurately on both devices.

The Digital Video Camera and Digital Audio Recording Device remained in my possession until 1920 hrs that day. I subsequently downloaded the Video recording directly from the internal hard drive of the camera to two non re-writable DVD-Roms. I

viewed both of the DVD Recordings and completed the Affidavit of Accuracy as required by the relevant legislation, which at the time of the recording was Schedule 5 of the Magistrates' Court Act. I also downloaded the digital audio recording onto the computer hard drive and copied it to a non re-writable CD-Rom.

As a result of the information I received from the complainant, I then conducted an investigation. On Tuesday the 7th October, 2009, I obtained a Search Warrant under Section 465 of the Crimes Act 1958, to access any documents archived by the Department of Human Services which may afford corroboration to the allegations which had been made by the complainant. This warrant was executed by Senior Constable Robyn HARROP on Monday the 13th October, 1999.

Further protracted enquiries and investigation into this matter was required before making contact with the accused. On Wednesday, the 24th of March, 2010, I contacted the accused by phone and arranged to meet with him at the Sunbury Police Station to be formally interviewed in relation to the complainant's allegations.

On Saturday the 27th March, 2010, at approximately 3.45 pm, the accused arrived at the Sunbury Police Station at which time I had the following conversation with him:

I said, "[CDJ] thank you for meeting me here. I'm Senior Constable Paula JARSKI from the Ripping Sex Offences and Child Abuse Unit. Like I mentioned on the phone, I need to interview you in relation to historical sexual assault allegations dated back to 1998-1999 while you were a CRU Worker in Toolangi Grove Preston. Now, I must inform you that you are under arrest..."

The accused then interjected and stated "Well, there goes my fucking job."

I said, "...[CDJ], let me explain. Because of the nature of the allegations I have the power to arrest you and ask you questions in relation to the allegations. You are not being charged at this stage, this is simply a formal interview, do you understand that?"

He said, "Yes."

Revised 12/03

VP Form 287

I said, "So, yes, at this stage you are under arrest for the alleged historical sexual assault of ^{CDL} [REDACTED]. I must inform you that you do not have to say or do anything, but anything you say or do may be given in evidence, do you understand that?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "I must also inform you of the following rights. You have the right to communicate with or attempt to communicate with a friend or relative to inform that person of your whereabouts. You have the right to communicate with or attempt to communicate with a legal practitioner. Do you understand these rights?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "Do you wish to exercise any of these rights?"

He said, "No."

The accused was then placed in an interview room. Prior to the commencement of the interview, I unsealed three (3) non rewritable DVD Roms in the presence of the defendant, and inserted them into the DEC recording unit. At 4.03pm this day, I activated the DEC recording unit and a video recorded interview between myself and the defendant commenced. Also present during this interview was my corroborator Sergeant WILSON. The interview concluded at approximately 4.22 pm at which time I deactivated the DVD recording unit and removed the DVD-Roms. I then checked all three copies of the recorded interview for accuracy of recording. The defendant was then handed the third original copy of the interview. The DVD audio and visual recording produced on this occasion is an accurate copy of the interview. I now produce the Master DVD-Rom of that record of interview.

I now produce the Informant Master of that interview.

REDACTED

Paula JARSKI
Senior Constable 31651

Revised 12/03

VP Form 287

I hereby acknowledge that this statement is true and correct and I make it in the belief that a person making a false statement in the circumstances is liable to the penalties of perjury.

REDACTED

Paula JARSKI
Senior Constable 31651

Acknowledgment made and signature witnessed by me
at 1338 hrs on 28/3/2010 at Epping Police Station.

REDACTED

S. DE VRIES
S/C 32930