ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES
TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

AT SYDNEY

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA
Royal Commissions Act 1902

NEW SOUTH WALES
Royal Commissions Act 1923

PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO
Sporting Institutions

CASE STUDY 39 – TENNIS VIGNETTE

Submissions in Reply Of Amanda Chaplin

1. Ms Chaplin generally agrees with and supports the submissions of Counsel Assisting the Commission and the suggested findings therein concerning the tennis vignette, specifically:

   F19 Other than Mr Watson speaking with Mr Callaghan on one occasion about Ms Chaplin’s claims of victimisation, no further steps were taken by Tennis NSW in relation to Ms Chaplin’s claims. Tennis NSW failed to take appropriate steps to protect Ms Chaplin.

   F20 Tennis NSW should have apologised to Ms Chaplin for failing to take appropriate steps to protect her from the behaviour she complained of as a result of her role in making BXJ’s allegations against Mr Callaghan known to Tennis NSW.

   F25 Tennis NSW should liaise with Tennis Australia regarding whether the definition of victimisation in the Tennis Australia Membership Protection Policy should be broadened to prohibit victimisation of those who assist complainants in bringing complaints.

2. Ms Chaplin gave evidence about the disclosure made to her by BXJ and Ms Chaplin’s immediate referral of that complaint to her superiors within the organisation. Ms Chaplin also gave evidence of her subsequent victimisation at the hands of Noel Callaghan and the lack of support from Tennis NSW.

3. In submissions, Counsel Assisting summarised Ms Chaplin’s evidence about her son’s victimisation, at [369]. Ms Chaplin’s evidence was that her son was denied the opportunity to play overseas whilst a Tennis Australia/AIS scholar on a program specifically designed for junior
players to play overseas. He was the only player out of 12 not given the opportunity and when Ms Chaplin met with Craig Morris and Craig Tiley from Tennis Australia about the matter, she was not given a valid explanation about why her son was left behind.\(^1\) She said that the head coach of the program was Brent Larkham, who was a "close associate" of Mr Callaghan. She believed that the treatment of her son was as a result of the actions she took in reporting BXJ’s disclosure and was designed to deter her and others from making disclosures.

4. Ms Chaplin was not cross-examined on this evidence and her assertion that her son became a secondary victim of the pervasive victimisation begun by Noel Callaghan ought to be accepted.

5. Ms Ann West of Tennis Australia gave evidence to the Commission that she had no knowledge of the meeting between Ms Chaplin and Tennis Australia.\(^2\)

6. Notwithstanding Ms West’s assertion that she had no knowledge of the victimisation of Ms Chaplin’s son, she did agree that:

   "If there was any suggestion of victimisation, we would investigate it" even though it happened in 2009.\(^3\)

7. There is a suggestion of victimisation. It should be investigated.

8. It is submitted that, in addition to the suggested findings of Counsel Assisting, the following finding also be made:

   Finding:
   Tennis Australia and the Australian Institute of Sport should have taken appropriate steps to investigate the allegation of unfair treatment of Ms Chaplin’s son as a result of her role in making known BXJ’s allegations against Mr Callaghan. Those institutions should do so at the earliest opportunity.

Tim Hammond
Counsel for Amanda Chaplin
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\(^2\) Transcript of A West, Case Study 39, 12 April 2016, 18989: 45 – 47.

\(^3\) Transcript of A West, Case Study 39, 12 April 2016, 18989: 21 – 38.