



New South Wales

**CORONER'S COURT
OF NEW SOUTH WALES**

Inquest: Inquest into the death of Hillal Barbour

Hearing date: 16 June 2025

Date of decision: 18 June 2025

Place of decision: Coroner's Court of New South Wales, Lidcombe

Decision of: Magistrate Derek Lee, Deputy State Coroner

Catchwords: CORONIAL LAW – interlocutory application, application by New South Wales Police Officer to not be examined in oath or affirmation, death as a result of police operations

File number: 2023/74085

Representation: Mr P Rooney, Counsel Assisting, instructed by Ms E Leung & Mr H Zhang (Crown Solicitor's Office)

Mr T Lowe for Constable S Grammatikos, instructed by Ms A Wooldridge (New South Wales Police Force Office of General Counsel)

Introduction

1. An inquest into the death of Hillal Barbour commenced on 16 June 2025. Hillal died from a gunshot wound to the chest after he was shot by Constable Steven Grammatikos, a New South Wales Police Force (**NSWPF**) officer, outside his home on 5 March 2023.
2. Constable Grammatikos has been served with a subpoena to give evidence. He has attended the inquest in compliance with that subpoena. However, he now seeks that he not give oral evidence and be examined on oath or affirmation in the coronial proceedings.
3. Hillal's¹ family oppose such a course being taken.

Summary of factual background

4. At 8:49am on 5 March 2023, one of Hillal's brothers called Triple Zero and requested the NSWPF and Ambulance NSW (**ANSW**) to attend Hillal's home in Yagoona. It was reported that Hillal was holding a shovel and following his mother and that there were concerns for her welfare. This report was broadcast over NSWPF radio. Constable Grammatikos² and Constable Jessica Lieberman were on duty at the time and responded to the broadcast. They travelled to Hillal's address, exited their NSWPF vehicle and approached the front door of the house.
5. Hillal exited the front door holding a knife in each hand. The two police officers repeatedly told Hillal to drop the knives and get down on the ground. Hillal did not do so and continued advancing towards the NSWPF officers. Constable Grammatikos twice deployed a taser at Hillal which had the effect of causing him to drop to his knees. However, Hillal used a knife to cut the taser wires, stood up and continued to advance. He swung the knives at Constable Lieberman who lost her footing and fell to the ground.
6. Constable Grammatikos attempted to move Hillal away but he motioned towards Constable Grammatikos causing a laceration to Constable Grammatikos' cheek. Constable Grammatikos drew his service firearm and discharged three rounds at Hillal. Two rounds struck Hillal in the chest and lower abdomen and one round missed Hillal entirely. Hillal fell to the ground.
7. ANSW paramedics were called to the scene and Hillal was taken by ambulance to Liverpool Hospital. However, he could not be revived and was pronounced life extinct at 9:58am.
8. A Critical Incident was subsequently declared by a NSWPF Assistant Commissioner. Pursuant to relevant NSWPF Critical Incident Guidelines, both Constable Grammatikos and Constable Lieberman were identified as directly involved officers. Constable Grammatikos subsequently took part in a directed interview on 6 March 2023.

¹ Hillal's family have given their permission for Hillal to be referred to by his first name in the coronial proceedings.

² At the relevant time, Constable Grammatikos held the rank of Probationary Constable.

Procedural background

9. Constable Grammatikos and Constable Lieberman were performing duties as NSWPF officers on 5 March 2023. Given their actions outside Hillal’s home on that day, it appears that Hillal died as a result of police operations in accordance with section 23(1)(c) of the *Coroners Act 2009* (**the Act**). An inquest into Hillal’s death is therefore required to be held in accordance with section 27(1)(b) of the Act.
10. On 3 November 2023, Constable Grammatikos was notified that he was considered to have a sufficient interest in the subject matter of the coronial proceedings in accordance with section 57(1) of the Act.
11. On 2 April 2025, the inquest into Hillal’s death was fixed for hearing from 16 to 20 June 2025.
12. On 4 April 2025, a Witness List and an Issues List were distributed to the sufficiently interested parties. The Witness List identified Constable Grammatikos as a witness to be called to give evidence in the inquest. The Issues List identified the following issues for the inquest to consider:
 - (a) Was the response by police to the 000 call on 5 March 2023 appropriate, and in accordance with NSWPF policies and procedures?
 - (b) Were the interactions between the NSWPF and Hillal conducted appropriately, lawfully, and in accordance with NSWPF policies and procedures, including the use of force?
 - (c) Even if NSWPF policies and procedures were followed, does a review of the circumstances of Hillal’s death indicate that other measures should have been taken?
13. On 16 May 2025, Constable Grammatikos was served with a subpoena in accordance with section 66(1)(a) of the Act to appear at the inquest to be examined as a witness.

Legislative framework

14. Counsel for Constable Grammatikos submitted that a coroner has a broad discretion to “*direct*” whether examination of a witness ought to be “*carried out*” and referred to the decision of Rafter AJ in *Christensen & Anor v Deputy State Coroner* [2021] QSC 38 (**Christensen**).
15. Christensen was concerned with whether section 37 of the *Coroners Act 2003* (QLD) (**Queensland Act**) provided a sufficiently broad discretion to allow a Deputy State Coroner to direct that a witness who was deemed to be medically incapable of giving oral evidence could instead provide written evidence in the form of answers to several discrete questions. Rafter AJ held that the discretion afforded by section 37 of the Queensland Act, which provides that the Coroners Court “*may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate*”, was sufficiently broad to allow such a direction to be given and the written evidence to be received. Counsel for Constable Grammatikos therefore submitted that an equally broad discretion exists within NSW for a coroner in coronial proceedings to inform themselves in any way considered appropriate.

16. Section 37 of the Queensland Act has no direct analogue in its NSW counterpart. Like section 37 of the Queensland Act, section 58 of the Act provides that a “*coroner in coronial proceedings is not bound to observe the rules of procedure and evidence that are applicable to proceedings before a court of law*”. However, unlike section 37, section 58 does not go on to provide that a coroner may inform themselves in any way they consider appropriate.
17. However, section 59(1) of the Act provides:
 - (1) The coroner in coronial proceedings may examine on oath or affirmation all persons who –
[...]
 - (b) are able, in the opinion of the coroner, to give evidence relevant to the proceedings.
18. It is clear from the above that there is no requirement that a coroner in coronial proceedings must examine on oath or affirmation all persons who are able, in the opinion of a coroner, to give evidence relevant to the proceedings. Rather, the use of the word “*may*” in section 59(1) affords a discretion to a coroner regarding whether such a person is to be examined. It necessarily follows that even where a person has been served with a subpoena issued pursuant to section 66(1)(a) of the Act, and appears at court in compliance with that subpoena, a coroner may decide not to examine that person even if they are able, in the opinion of the coroner, to give evidence relevant to the proceedings.

Relevance of Constable Grammatikos’ evidence to the proceedings

19. In his directed interview on 6 March 2023, Constable Grammatikos provided his version of the events of 5 March 2023. He was asked questions about a range of topics, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) the information available to him prior to his arrival at Hillal’s home;
 - (b) any discussions between himself and Constable Lieberman prior to their arrival at Hillal’s home;
 - (c) his actions prior to engaging with Hillal;
 - (d) his observations of Hillal;
 - (e) his observations of Constable Lieberman’s actions;
 - (f) his actions during his engagement with Hillal;
 - (g) his decision-making and reasoning prior to, and during, his engagement with Hillal; and
 - (h) what relevant training and education was provided to him by the NSWPF prior to 5 March 2023.
20. Having regard to the contents of the Issues List, it is plainly evident that Constable Grammatikos is able to give evidence relevant to the proceedings.

Grounds for application

21. In support of his application, Constable Grammatikos signed a statement dated 5 June 2025 which has been admitted into evidence as Exhibit 1 on the application. Constable Grammatikos was not called to give evidence on the application. The contents of Constable Grammatikos's statement were not contested.
22. The statement relevantly sets out that since 5 March 2023, Constable Grammatikos has:
 - (a) *"dealt with the matter by actively avoiding talking about the incident"*;
 - (b) *"purposely chosen"* to not have *"any medical treatment in relation to the matter"* because he feels *"it is what is best"* for him; and
 - (c) *"managed to work through this within [him]self and remained an operational police officer"*.
23. Constable Grammatikos goes on to state:
 - (a) his belief that giving evidence will cause him *"mental trauma by reliving the incident"*;
 - (b) his worry how he will *"process being asked questions in relation to the matter"*;
 - (c) his desire not to view or hear any electronic material in relation to the matter due to a feeling that *"doing this will harm"* him; and
 - (d) not giving evidence will *"mitigate any risk of harming [his] mental health and raising issues by reliving the incident"*.
24. In essence, the application by Constable Grammatikos is made on two bases:
 - (a) notwithstanding that Constable Grammatikos is able to give evidence relevant to the proceedings, the utility of this evidence is outweighed by the risk of harm to Constable Grammatikos; and
 - (b) the oral evidence that could be given by Constable Grammatikos is available from other sources that are already in evidence.

Risk of harm

25. In *Commissioner of Police (NSW) v Deputy State Coroner (NSW)* [2021] NSWSC 398 at [3], Hamill J observed:

By their nature, coronial proceedings are straining and emotional occasions.

26. It might be said that, by the nature of their roles and responsibilities, a NSWPF officer is more experienced than a member of the public in giving evidence (commonly in criminal proceedings)

and therefore better equipped to deal with any strain or emotion of the kind described by Hamill J above. However, it might also be said that giving evidence about a matter which is the subject of criminal proceedings is likely to be different for a NSWPF officer than giving evidence regarding the death of a person in coronial proceedings.

27. This may be particularly so when:
 - (a) a NSWPF officer is considered to be a directly involved officer or a sufficiently interested party, or both; and
 - (b) the NSWPF officer, in the execution of their duties, has used lethal force which has caused the death of the person who is the subject of coronial proceedings.
28. It is recognised that section 6(3)(a) of the *Police Act 1990* provides that one of the functions of the NSWPF is to provide police services for NSW which include amongst other things the protection of persons from injury or death. It is also recognised that section 230 of the *Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Act 2002* (**LEPRA**) provides that it is lawful for a police officer exercising a function under the LEPRA, or any other Act or law, to use such force as is reasonably necessary to exercise the function.
29. Having regard to the above provisions, it can be accepted that:
 - (a) the use of lethal force by a NSWPF officer in exercising a function under the LEPRA is likely to have an effect on that NSWPF officer; and
 - (b) viewing a video recording of an incident where lethal force is used is used by that NSWPF officer, and being asked questions and giving evidence about the incident itself is also likely to have an effect on that NSWPF officer.
30. In the present application, Constable Grammatikos in his statement has described this likely effect as “*mental trauma*”, “*harm*” and “*harming [his] mental health*”. Similarly, counsel for Constable Grammatikos submitted that the giving of evidence by Constable Grammatikos is likely to cause him “*psychological harm*”, “*harm*”, and is a risk to his “*psychological health*”.
31. To properly determine the application, it is therefore necessary to embark on a predictive exercise. In other words, is the examination of Constable Grammatikos likely to have the effects which he has described in his statement and which his counsel has referred to in submissions? Such consideration in applications of this kind is typically informed by evidence in the form of an opinion expressed by a healthcare practitioner who has treated and/or assessed the person to be examined.
32. No evidence of this kind is available in the present application. This should not be seen as a criticism of Constable Grammatikos or any aspect of his application. Rather, as Constable Grammatikos has explained, he has deliberately chosen not to engage with a healthcare practitioner because he considers that this is the best way for him to deal with his experience of the events of 5 March 2023.

33. However, precisely what the terms referred to by Constable Grammatikos and his counsel mean for the purposes of the present application is difficult to determine in the absence of any evidence from a healthcare practitioner. It is therefore not possible to determine whether any examination of Constable Grammatikos will, for example, reveal or exacerbate an underlying, undiagnosed condition, or limit or prevent Constable Grammatikos' ability to remain as an operational NSWPF officer, or have some other adverse impact on Constable Grammatikos' well-being beyond the broad descriptors described above.
34. Equally, it is not possible to make any qualitative assessment of the degree to which the examination of Constable Grammatikos may have on the effects which he and his counsel have described. Such an assessment is necessary because if the likely effect of being examined is less significant this would tend to weigh in favour of examination. Conversely, if the likely effect is more significant this would tend to weigh against examination.
35. On one view, it could be argued that Constable Grammatikos is the person who is best placed to know how examination is most likely to affect his well-being. On another view, it could be argued that Constable Grammatikos' statement is entirely self-serving. Again, this is not intended to be a criticism. Rather, it emphasises the difficulty in assessing the reliability and weight of Constable Grammatikos' statement in the absence of medical evidence.
36. In these circumstances, the evidence in support of Constable Grammatikos' application, taken at its highest, establishes that he holds a genuine belief that being examined is likely to have an adverse impact on his well-being and his functions as an operational NSWPF officer. However, it is not possible to make any assessment as to:
 - (a) whether this belief is well-founded and reliable;
 - (b) the likelihood of this belief eventuating; and
 - (c) the precise nature and degree of any impact on Constable Grammatikos in the event that he is examined.
37. Therefore, the evidence on the application does not establish that the utility of any evidence given by Constable Grammatikos on examination is outweighed by the risk of harm to him.

Other sources of evidence

38. Counsel for Constable Grammatikos submitted that apart from the evidence which Constable Grammatikos might give on examination, other cogent evidence has been already adduced in the proceedings. It was further submitted that this evidence is relevant to the issues which the inquest is examining and that the absence of Constable Grammatikos's potential evidence would not prejudice the operation of section 3 and section 81 of the Act. This requires consideration of two matters:
 - (a) Can sufficient evidence be adduced, apart from Constable Grammatikos's evidence, that is capable of adequately informing the issues which the inquest is examining?

- (b) Is there any other matter relevant to the issues which the inquest is examining which could potentially be adduced from Constable Grammatikos' oral evidence?

Sufficiency of evidence

39. The evidence which has already been adduced in the proceedings and which is likely to be relevant to the issues which the inquest is examining include:
- (a) Constable Grammatikos's directed interview of 6 March 2023;
 - (b) Constable Lieberman's directed interview of 6 March 2023;
 - (c) oral evidence given by Constable Lieberman on 17 June 2025;
 - (d) a statement of Detective Acting Superintendent Virginia Gorman, Senior Critical Incident Investigator, dated 6 November 2023;
 - (e) oral evidence given by Detective Acting Superintendent Gorman on 16 June 2025;
 - (f) expert statements of Sergeant David Lamb, NSWPF Senior Operational Safety Instructor, dated 3 August 2023 and 3 February 2025;
 - (g) NSWPF Certificate of competency for Constable Grammatikos for the period 2022 to 2023;
 - (h) Body Worn Video (**BWV**) footage of Constable Grammatikos from 5 March 2023;
 - (i) BWV footage of Constable Lieberman from 5 March 2023;
 - (j) Footage from taser deployed by Constable Grammatikos from 5 March 2023;
 - (k) an expert report from Associate Professor Danny Sullivan, forensic psychiatrist, dated 21 April 2024; and
 - (l) various policy documents, manuals and operating procedures produced by the NSWPF contained within Volume 5 of the brief of evidence.
40. Additionally, oral evidence is expected to be adduced from both Associate Professor Sullivan and Sergeant Lamb on 18 June 2025.
41. One of the underlying public policy reasons for the mandatory requirements provided for by sections 23(1)(c) and 27(1)(b) of the Act is so that an independent and transparent inquiry can be conducted to examine the manner of a person's death. This ensures that appropriate consideration is given to whether any power exercised by a NSWPF officer was reasonable and appropriate, and consistent with the provisions of the LEPR and any applicable NSWPF policies, manuals, guidelines and operating procedures.

42. Such an inquiry is typically informed by the receipt of oral evidence from any NSWPF officer who exercised a lawful power available to them in the exercise of their functions. Where that NSWPF officer is considered to be a directly involved officer, it is typical for that officer to be directed pursuant to clause 8 of the *Police Regulation 2015* to take part in an interview. During such a directed interview, the directly involved officer is asked certain questions regarding the exercise of any lawful power and typically provides a version of events of the circumstances which resulted in a person's death.
43. All of these features are present in this case. In order to give effect to the public policy considerations underpinning sections 23(1)(c) and 27(1)(b) of the Act, it is typically the case that an inquest will adduce oral evidence from a directly involved officer and not rely only upon a version of events given compulsorily by a directly involved officer during a directed interview.
44. However, in certain instances, a directly involved officer may not be so examined. Counsel for Constable Grammatikos drew attention to two such instances: the *Inquest into the death of Brett Walker* [2024] NSWCorC 44 (**Walker**) and the *Inquest into the death of TE* [2023] NSWCorC 68 (**TE**).
45. Mr Walker was fatally injured when a NSWPF officer discharged a firearm at him in the course of a police operation. The incident was captured on BWV. No directly involved NSWPF officers were called to give evidence during the inquest. However, the inquest was primarily concerned with examining the circumstances of Mr Walker's release from custody into the community and the availability of support services, particularly mental health services, within the community.
46. TE concerned a matter where TE intentionally caused their own death after jumping from a height at The Gap Bluff following several hours of negotiation with NSWPF officers. Counsel for Constable Grammatikos referred to closing submissions made by Senior Counsel Assisting in TE. However, those submissions are not in evidence in the present matter nor are they referred to in the findings in TE. However, in TE, Deputy State Coroner Ryan (as her Honour then was) found that there was "*no controversy*" regarding one of the issues which the inquest was examining, namely the NSWPF response at The Gap Bluff. The other issues which the inquest examined, and which occupied the vast majority of the findings in TE, were concerned with TE's mental health presentation, and the nature and adequacy of care provided to TE at hospital and by a psychologist.
47. Walker and TE can be distinguished from the present matter because neither was primarily concerned with whether the conduct of a directly involved NSWPF officer was reasonable, appropriate, and in accordance with applicable NSWPF policy material. Instead, the primary focus in Walker and TE was the availability and adequacy of community and healthcare support services.
48. So far as their application in the present matter is concerned, Walker and TE do no more than confirm that in the examination of the manner of a person's death during an inquest, the scope of that examination will be defined by the relevant coroner, typically by the distribution of a list setting out the issues which that inquest will examine (whilst acknowledging that other issues may arise for consideration during the course of the inquest). However, the scope of this examination will turn on the particular features of the circumstances surrounding a person's death. The scope will inform a

coroner's decision as to which witnesses who are able to give evidence relevant to the coronial proceedings should be examined.

49. The circumstances of the death of a person as a result of police operations may be subject to an expansive inquest with a multitude of issues which necessitate the calling of oral evidence from every directly involved NSWPF officer. Equally, where a person dies of natural causes even, for example, whilst in lawful custody, the scope of an otherwise mandatory inquest may be necessarily narrow. This is because the person's death may represent the progression of a diagnosed natural disease process in circumstances where any healthcare and/or treatment provided to the person was entirely appropriate.
50. Indeed, in the *Inquest into the death of AAB* [2024] NSWCorC 65, which involved the death of a person from illicit drug toxicity, whilst being lawfully detained by NSWPF officers, I made the following findings:

After considering all of the evidence gathered from the coronial investigation, no organisation or individual was identified as having a sufficient interest in the subject matter of the coronial proceedings in accordance with section 57(1) of the Act. Accordingly, neither the Commissioner of the NSWPF or any individual NSWPF officer was considered to be a sufficiently interested party in the inquest.

Similarly, unlike most other inquests, the inquest did not consider any discrete issues other than the statutory requirements pursuant to section 81 of the Act. This is because the totality of the evidence gathered during the coronial investigation, and in particular the consensus of the expert evidence, did not suggest that any aspect of AAB's death, including the conduct of NSWPF officers [...] warranted specific examination or consideration.

51. Even though the potential evidence which Constable Grammatikos may give on examination may also be available from other sources, there is still utility in examining Constable Grammatikos in order to properly inform the issues which the inquest is considering. This is because:
- (a) the version of events and relevant answers provided by Constable Grammatikos in his directed interview ought to be tested in oral evidence;
 - (b) independent and transparent exploration of Constable Grammatikos' reasoning, decision-making and actions on 5 March 2023 in oral evidence is directly relevant to the discrete issues set out in the Issues List; and
 - (c) independent and transparent exploration of Constable Grammatikos' reasoning, decision-making and actions on 5 March 2023 in oral evidence will give effect to the public policy considerations provided for by sections 23(1)(c) and 27(1)(b) of the Act.
52. Further to (a) and (b) above, it is well-recognised that coronial proceedings may have a therapeutic jurisprudence aspect:

Therapeutic jurisprudence emphasises the harmfulness of exclusion and alienation of participants to the any legal process and conversely the advantages of being given a meaningful voice and treated as integral to the matters being investigated.³

53. Excluding two breaks of approximately 15 minutes, Constable Grammatikos' directed interview took 2 hours and 7 minutes. The coronial brief of evidence consists of a total of 2,059 pages of which at least 432 pages are devoted to NSWPF policies, manuals and operating procedures.
54. Hillal's family are not legally represented in the proceedings. Even leaving aside the distress that may be caused in reviewing some of this evidence, it may also be impractical for Hillal's family to consider such a large volume of material. Hearing oral evidence from Constable Grammatikos is more likely to provide a clearer understanding of the events of 5 March 2023 and the manner of Hillal's death, and therefore give effect to the therapeutic jurisprudence aspect of the coronial jurisdiction.
55. Of course, as has already been acknowledged at [24] and [25] above, coronial proceedings often impact persons involved in the proceedings who are not relatives of a deceased person. Giving effect to therapeutic jurisprudence as it relates to relatives of deceased persons should not be taken to override the interests of witnesses giving evidence in coronial proceedings. Nor should the wishes of a deceased's persons relative that a particular witness be examined be given automatic primacy over any impact that that examination is likely to have on that witness. However, this is often a regrettable and unavoidable consequence of coronial proceedings in order to achieve the objects of the Act in determining the cause and manner of death of deceased persons.

Other relevant evidence

56. Examination of Constable Grammatikos may also adduce evidence of the following matters which are not available from other sources.
57. *First*, one matter relevant to the issue regarding the appropriateness of the NSWPF response to the Triple Zero call is whether Constable Grammatikos and Constable Lieberman had sufficient information available to them regarding Hillal's background prior to approaching the front door of Hillal's house. In her directed interview and in oral evidence, Constable Lieberman indicated that information available via a Mobile Data Terminal in the NSWPF vehicle that she and Constable Grammatikos were in was "*taking time to load*" and she was therefore unable to access the information. In his directed interview Constable Grammatikos initially said that the only thing that Constable Lieberman said to him during the drive to Hillal's house was that the address was "*coming up on the right*". Later in his directed interview Constable Grammatikos said that he could not "*recall what was said between*" them. There is utility in examining Constable Grammatikos about this issue.
58. *Second*, in her directed interview (at Q/A 156) Constable Lieberman said that as she and Constable Grammatikos walked up to the porch of Hillal's house, Hillal opened the front fly screen door. In contrast, Constable Grammatikos said in his directed interview (at Q/A 151) that he "*stepped forward, reached to the door and swung the door open and taken [sic] a step back*". Whilst the BWV

³ *When coroners care too much: Therapeutic jurisprudence and suicide findings* (2015) 24 JJA 172.

clearly shows Constable Grammatikos opening the fly screen door, one matter relevant to the issue of whether the interaction between the two directly involved officers and Hillal was conducted appropriately is the decision by Constable Grammatikos to open the fly screen door. Whilst Constable Grammatikos in his directed interview (at Q/A 152) provided an explanation for this decision (namely so that he could “*get a clear view of [...] who [he] was dealing with*”), it is evident from the BWV that after the fly screen door was opened Hillal immediately walked through the doorway towards Constable Grammatikos and Constable Lieberman. This is a matter of some importance to Hillal’s family and there is utility in examining Constable Grammatikos about this issue.

59. *Third*, Constable Grammatikos was asked in his directed interview (from Q/A 283 to Q/A 345) whether he had undertaken any training prior to 5 March 2023 that was relevant to the situation that he found himself in on that day. However, it is not entirely clear from the contents of the coronial brief of evidence precisely what further relevant training Constable Grammatikos has undertaken since that day. This is particularly relevant given that Constable Grammatikos remains an operational NSWPF officer and his oral evidence is likely to inform the question of whether the power available pursuant to section 82 of the Act ought to be exercised. There is utility in also examining Constable Grammatikos about this issue.
60. Equally, another matter which may inform the exercise of this power is whether, with the benefit of hindsight and having reflected on the events of 5 May 2023, might have done anything differently on that day. Constable Grammatikos was not asked about this matter in his directed interview and it is also relevant to one of the discrete issues which the inquest is examining. There is utility in also examining Constable Grammatikos about this issue.

Conclusions

61. The utility of the evidence which Constable Grammatikos is capable of giving on examination is not outweighed by the risk of harm to him. Although the evidence may be found in other sources, the evidence ought to be appropriately tested on examination. Finally, it is likely that Constable Grammatikos is capable of giving evidence on examination that cannot be found in other sources and that is relevant to the issues which the inquest is examining and the objects of the Act.
62. The application by Constable Grammatikos is therefore refused. Constable Grammatikos is required to be examined on oath or affirmation in the proceedings.



Magistrate Derek Lee
Deputy State Coroner
18 June 2025

