



ATTORNEY GENERAL

Ms R Beckett  
7 Cambridge Road  
DAPTO NSW 2530

S156752  
06/1887

01 MAY 2006

Dear Ms Beckett

I refer to your letters requesting an ex gratia payment.

I have read your concerns and would like to assure you that your application will be given serious consideration, and that it will be considered entirely on its own merits.

An ex gratia payment is made in the exercise of the prerogative power of the Executive Government. It is in the very nature of the power that the circumstances in which it is exercised are discretionary. There are no formal or mandatory criteria. Every case is considered on its own facts and in its own context.

There is a large amount of material available to take into account including, but not limited to, the material collected in the course of considering your petition under Part 13A of the Crimes Act 1900, the findings of Acting Judge Davidson and the judgment of the Court of Criminal Appeal. As is usual in such matters I will ask the Director of Public Prosecutions to provide me with a report. The matter will then be referred to Crown Law Officers.

I would appreciate your advice whether you wish to submit any additional information at this time in support of your application. If you wish to do so please provide this information by 19 May 2006 or an indication when you will provide the additional information. If no material is received by this date or an indication that you will be providing additional information to support your application then I will determine your application on the material that is available.

Yours sincerely

**BOB DEBUS**

16 May 2006

The Hon. Bob Debus MP  
Attorney-General for NSW  
P.O. Box A290  
Sydney South NSW 1232

Dear Mr Debus,

I refer to your letter of 1 May 2006.

In making an application for an ex gratia payment, I certainly rely on the findings of Acting Judge Davidson and the judgment of the Court of Criminal Appeal.

The only extra material I wish to add relates to the effects on me of my imprisonment. No doubt you would take it for granted that imprisonment is harsh, especially for the nearly nine years for which I seek compensation. Nevertheless, I wish to draw attention to specific features of my imprisonment. You may be aware that last year my book 'Ten Years' was published. I enclose a copy of that, and an index of the major references to the experience and effects of imprisonment from December 1992 to August 2001. Of course, I was unable to earn income while I was in prison. I had worked the whole of my adult life. The length of my imprisonment, and injuries while I was there, have affected my chances of gaining employment.

I remain concerned, particularly in light of the matters to which I referred in my second letter to you, that irrelevant and inappropriate factors may be used against me in consideration of this matter without my being given an opportunity to respond. I would welcome any assurance you can give that I will be allowed an opportunity to respond to any matters which have not previously been raised.

Yours sincerely

*Roseanne Beckett*

ROSEANNE BECKETT  
7 Cambridge Road  
Dapto NSW 2530  
Ph: 02 42 617624

**CORE REFERENCES TO THE EXPERIENCE AND EFFECTS OF  
IMPRISONMENT ON ROSEANNE CATT AS DETAILED IN HER BOOK  
'TEN YEARS'**

1. **FRIGHTENED & ALONE:** 184, 241-244.
2. **HARASSED & INTIMIDATED:** 207 - 208, 228, 236, 243.
3. **VICTIM of COLLUSION:** 179, 187 - 188, 236.
4. **PSYCHOLOGICAL & EMOTIONAL TRAUMA:** 188, 200, 220, 223, 239, 248.
5. **EXPOSED TO DISEASE ongoing in jail:** 64 - 65, 91, 116, 117.
6. **EXPOSED TO DEGRADATION ongoing:** 70, 95 - 96, 126 - 127, 161.
7. **SEPARATION FROM LOVED ONES ongoing:** 189, 209, 214, 220.
8. **EXPOSED TO LIFE THREATENING SITUATIONS:** 194, 196, 212, 250.
9. **LACK OF DUTY OF CARE by minders:** 199, 218 - 219, 220, 225, 233.
10. **MONEY TO KILL/THREAT TO KILL:** 124, 139, 235.
11. **EXTREME DISTRESS/FEAR:** 221, 244.
12. **CULTURE SHOCK ongoing:** 182, 183, 199, 269.
13. **SUBJECT TO SMEAR CAMPAIGN:** 187, 200, 241.
14. **VICTIM OF A MEDIA SMEAR CAMPAIGN influenced jail:** 179, 254.
15. **PHYSICALLY ABUSED & HUMILIATED:** 66, 97, 116, 118, 123, 125, 154, 250.
16. **INADEQUATE MEDICAL ATTENTION:** 211, 222, 227.
17. **MEDICAL CONDITIONS DEVELOPED:** 242.

23 August 2006

Director-General  
Attorney-General's Department  
P.O. Box 6  
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir,

I refer to your letter dated 10 August 2006, and the enclosed information sheet, which I had not seen before. I rely on my previous letters of 31 March, 7 April and 16 May 2006. I address below the five principles listed in the sheet.

1. **Clear and verifiable loss**

This is the 8 years and 8 months spent in prison from 10 December 1992 to 6 August 2001, for offences on which my convictions have been quashed.

2. **Conduct by the applicant which may have contributed.**

It has never been suggested that there was any such conduct by me. The evidence before Judge Davidson, and referred to in his report, showed that Mr Peter Thomas behaved improperly in cases which had nothing to do with me.

3. **Fault or error.**

While the sheet refers to fault or error by an officer or agency under the administrative responsibility of the Attorney-General, I understand that traditionally people who have spent time in prison for convictions later quashed (for example, Messrs J.E.S. Pohl, A. Lindsay, A. Rendell) have been compensated through the Attorney-General's department even though there was no fault or error by an officer or agency under its administrative

responsibility, on the basis that the loss was caused through the court system.

4. **Other avenues of redress.**

As with the cases mentioned above, and others in which compensation has been paid ex gratia, there are none.

5. **The extraordinary circumstances.**

First, there is the very unusual length of time spent in prison (compared to the time spent by someone who, for example, is acquitted at an initial appeal). Second, there is the fact that the person in charge of the investigation, whose improper behaviour and tendency to improper behaviour was the main reason for my appeal succeeding, should never have been in charge of the investigation.

The latter factor means that my loss could in no way be considered to have occurred in the normal operations of the court system. It was the highly abnormal operation of the court system.

Yours sincerely

Roseanne Beckett (Catt)