

Why has COMM0059723 Cheryl Tschupruk's April 22, 2022, interview been revised July 4, 2022 from her original interview? There are 2 pages missing from the original COMM005741.

Why has COMM0003760 Report of Post-mortem Examination – Perpetrator been removed from website?

COMM0021192 Email message of phone messages [see page 45 of Information Seeking from Families and Next of Kin Foundational Document for more information] clearly states “Brian Donovan@ 780 REDACTED Aaron Tuck lives in Portapique area and has not been heard from. Aaron is a member of callers military facebook group .. caller and family cannot get a hold of Aaron but **saw Aaron online at 1554hrs but did not respond**. says Aaron and soc are acquaintances. also has not heard from Aaron's wife Jolene Oliver or daughter Emily Tuck”

- Why has this been removed from MCC website?

This is clearly of deep concern to me as Aaron Tuck was my brother murdered in Portapique. We are told that he died on the evening of April 18. This email is dated April 19, 2020. Did anyone follow up with Mr Brian Donovan as to why he saw my brother online almost a full 14 hours after (accounting for time zone change) after he was supposedly murdered?

- Did the MCC look into the state of Lee Bergerman and her fitness to perform her role adequately? A/Commr Daley states in his Sept 15, 2022, interview (COMM0065065)

“I know one of the issues that then, you know, that surfaced as Chris and I talked was about her attendance at work and whether she was either working remotely or just not being found, period. So that I think is that reference that is "that's the way she is coping." "Alert Ready meeting today with the Province but she is not attending." I don't know ... "but the Province wants her to", you know, and the Commanding officer of a province is expected to do certain things, and one of them, you know, is to meet with the client. And the client in Nova Scotia is the Province of Nova Scotia. And I would extend that to mayors and wardens and the municipalities because they pay our bills directly in the model in Nova Scotia. But and with if he makes a reference that the Province wants or to, I'm making the assumption that the Deputy Minister would be present, you know, or the Assistant Deputy Minister and they want her to and she wasn't attending. So for me, that's a huge red flag in my ex- ... like in my experience dealing in those positions.”

The basis of the Quintet Wellness report was issues surrounding command. A/Comm Daley further states that C/Supt Leather:

Expressed concerns with the leadership in, within H Division. Certainly, what I recall were that there were two camps within the Division and he was on one camp and there was another camp, and just general lack of direction, lack of engagement, lack of not being present, for instance, on behalf of the CO. That then impacted the relationship with the Province of Nova Scotia, Department of Justice provincially, and **would have impacted on police partners**. And so that was his general information”

As/Comm Dennis Daley's notes COMM0064627 page 11, C/Supt Gray expresses:

- “leadership issues with her CO (Bergerman)”
- “absenteeism of CO, not at work”
- that “her, Chris Leather and Darren Campbell are holding Division together”

- How long was this lack of leadership going on? Did the Commission look at how this effected inter-police relations? How might have this impacted the response or lack there of April 18/19, 2020?
 - The MCC public enquiry was said to be over on September 23, 2022.
 - Then, on October 27th we were told that there would be 2010 new documents disclosed. It turned out there were 2036 disclosed and some of them were extremely important and should have been made public a long time prior.
 - Participants were given 18 days to read them and write submissions on what we had issues with or questions that arose. Reading non-stop, 24 hours a day that works out to be 2.36 documents an hour. This is my brother's life and I want answers, but I shouldn't be subjected to inhumane conditions which further traumatize me. Equally, this is preposterous especially for someone like me, who is not a lawyer.
 - Lucky for me, I am not doing this without a major amount of support, and it is only due to that support that the documents in this submission were even found.
 - Throughout this process the commissioners talked about being on a schedule and therefore couldn't extend the amount of time given for participants to make submissions, however, the commissioners extended the time they have to compile a final report to March of 2023.
 - Everyone should be given until at least a month after the final dump of documents to make their written submission.

Regarding your "trauma informed" approach, I'd say it failed. Every single family member I have spoken to says your mishandling of witnesses and redactions of documents has caused almost as much trauma for us as the murders themselves. One clear case of this glaringly obvious failing is Leon Joudrey, who told me he wanted to tell his story at the MCC; I requested he be made a witness and was denied. Leon, and all of us have been let down by this disastrous approach. Our mental health has been irrevocably damaged by this Commission under the guise of mental health. It is clear this was a ruse to prevent the truth from coming out.

Being that such a time restraint exists, I will only be making submissions of a few very important documents.

COMM0064752 Situation Report (SITREP) July 10, 2020

A Situation report is an internal report to surmise investigative details and files for those higher up the chain of command, a briefing note of sorts). Going forward, anytime SITREP is referred to, I will be referring to the July 10th, 2020, SITREP. When the SITREP was sent, a SiRT referral was made to determine the validity of an independent investigation.

This SITREP report was filed with both, the Nova Scotia Serious Incident Response Team (SiRT) and to the Commissioner of the RCMP, Brenda Lucki in Ottawa. SiRT: "is an independent, civilian-led unit responsible for investigating serious incidents, criminal matters, involving police officers" according to their website. The ultimate authority of SiRT was Felix Cacchione at the time this referral was made. Retiring in May 2022, the director decides whether to pursue an investigation and/or whether to recommend laying charges to the Crown.

This report was brought to the public's attention, released within 1000's of documents from the MCC. During Supt Costa Dimopoulos's MCC interview on August 30th, 2022, he disclosed the existence of this SITREP report. More details on this SITREP were then requested by the MCC from the DOJ, the Federal Department of Justice. A subpoena was issued August 31st, 2022. The MCC received a copy of the SITREP September 6, 2022, COMM0065726.

Some examples of "serious incidents" within this SITREP report are as follows:

- information was brought forward by "two persons" alleging "serious criminal behaviour committed by" REDACTION.
- Information relating to REDACTION "having a sexual relationship with" REDACTION as well as "diversion of source monies" (the word source was redacted in the 2nd release of this document, labeled irrelevant) by the REDACTION and behaviour described as "predatory in nature".
- Two witnesses provided "details about serving police officers being complicit in taking overt action to cover up criminal activity"
- There is "significant detail provided by both witnesses of non-criminal behaviour in relation to Police Act Violations by several members of REDACTED" along with the "cover up" of those actions of several members of the "senior command".
- There are several very serious accusations in this report including the "arrest of" REDACTED.
- Page 2 "one witness provided several examples of both routine, and high-risk calls, where the safety of RCMP officers could be compromised, and civilians could have been placed at risk".

It should be very concerning to the public and should be more concerning to the families of the victims of April 18/19, 2020, mass murders, that there are members involved in this investigation who are allegedly committing criminal acts and a concerted effort to cover up this alleged criminality by multiple people in senior command in one or more police departments.

The MCC understood the severity of the criminal nature of the allegations contained within the report, according to Supt Dimopoulos's interview COMM0063690:

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [00:35:07] "... information that was provided to me with respect to the criminality of some of the information or the criminal allegations that were ... that were provided to me"

Even though the MCC was ending, they decided to immediately investigate more into these allegations, issuing a subpoena the very next day.

- Given the immersion of these new details, how can the MCC conclude without fully investigating this?

With the immergence of this late release of extremely pertinent information, the MCC should return to the Government to change the Orders in Council to extend the time frame. Allowing the MCC to subpoena documents, past the October 4th, 2022, deadline. Additionally, since this information was released post interview(s) with witnesses, an extension must be demanded, allowing the MCC the ability to conduct new hearings. This would allow the MCC to recall witnesses and call new witnesses, to investigate the full impact this had on the incidents of April 18/19, 2020.

I am deeply disturbed by the allegations of "predatory behaviour" "diversion of source payment monies" and "concerted effort to cover up these allegations" as well as "suppression of evidence by not referring the matter to SIRT when several witnesses came forward" when it was first brought to light.

It wasn't until C/Supt Leather, Acting Commanding Officer of NS, and Costa Dimopoulos, brought this forward in July 2020. Though RCMP command had known about this since Sgt Bernard and others disclosed information to Supt Dimopoulos on June 17. Bernard also had an interview June 22, 2020, as per Supt Dimopoulos' notebook pages 38-43.

Chief Superintendent Chris Leather's notebook July 7th, 2020

I will be referring to the original document released on approx. July 29th, 2022, COMM0053317 as the **newly released document on October 27th, 2022, COMM0065182, is heavily redacted. This seems very intentional, as I was originally instructed to only comment on the newly released documents. If this was the case, I would not be aware of the original pertinent details.** I contacted the MCC and was told that I could reference the original documents.

Each italicized line is directly from C/Supt Leather's notebook.
All newly redacted portions will use **red** font.

Meet with Costa and Janis Re: **Pictou statement**

- C/Supt Leather's meeting is with Supt Costa Dimopoulos and Supt Janis Gray
- Is he referring to Shari Pictou, a seconded officer from Truro Police Services (TPS) to Bible Hill MCU?

It appears she transferred to the RCMP after a 20 year plus TPS career, after the April 18/19, 2020, shootings.

- Was her transfer in any way related to this SITREP and has the MCC investigate this?
- Has the MCC even interviewed Cpl Pictou?

At CROPS pre-meeting with CO (Commanding Officer Bergerman) RE **Truro PS.**
Two hour recorded statement - left **December 2019.**

- Was this ever investigated?
- If so by whom?

In Supt Dimopoulos' interview, COMM0063690 pg. 97, Sgt Bernard (ret), then Detachment Commander of Millbrook, made a 2-hour statement:

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [00:35:07]

"... Sergeant Bernard was pretty ... pretty vocal. So I spent ... I saw ... over ... over two hours with him..."

- If issues and tensions existed between TPS and RCMP since at least December 2019, how did this affect the choices to call Truro for support on April 18/19, 2020?

In Supt Dimopoulos' notes COMM0062686, pg. 38-43 of the pdf is an interview with Sgt. Bernard. Of the 12 pages, over 9 pages are redacted.

- Why?
- Why are 9 pages completely redacted?
- Are these the criminal allegations?
- What is being covered up?
- What is the government hiding?

Sgt. Bernard's statement was supplemented by both on the record and off the record statements from other members and finalized in a report that was then forwarded to C/Supt Leather.

- Is this the "cover up of those overt actions (alleged serious criminal behaviour) by several members of senior command" that is referred to in the SITREP, COMM0064752?

Future JFO - MCU- D/Cst Lake.

- Is this referring to Detective Constable Bruce Lake who was also seconded from TPS to Bible Hill MCU?

In COMM0021306 Det. Con. Bruce Lake was investigating the 2011 CISNS bulletin regarding firearms possession of Gabriel Wortman.

- How thoroughly was the apparent struggle for the contract of Colchester investigated?
- Did this play any relevance in the response April 18/19, 2020?
- Is the future of the Major Crimes unit at risk?
- Given that Major Crimes, was heading the investigation of April 18/19 2020, and the alleged bad blood between Truro and RCMP, could this have affected the investigation in any way?

In Supt Dimopoulos' notebook: COMM0062686 on page 38, Sgt Bernard:

"...expressed concerns to me (Supt Dimopoulos) about Truro Police department and the relationship between the RCMP within the context of operations. Sgt Bernard was very upset about what Truro Police were saying and felt that they were taking advantage of the homicides to lay public criticism of the RCMP for what he describes to be a concerted campaign to have the RCMP replaced in the surrounding area so that Truro Police could take over"

How come to light - through Sargent Bernard

- Did this play any role in Sargent Bernard's retirement?
- How widely known was this issue?
 - as Sgt Bernard is from Millbrook Detachment, and it appears that this happened in the Bible Hill.

Given the toxic nature of the environment, it seems unlikely that Sargent Bernard would report unfounded allegations for fear of retribution.

Townhall - operational input post Portapique

referring to COMM0053317 June page 21 at the Bible Hill meeting, Sgt Bernard was present.

Sex (REDACTED – Privledged Information) issues, predatory allegations (REDACTED – Personal Information) focus of much information of impropriety.

Chief Cecchetto has knowledge of information

Pictou confided in Julia

- Is this "Julia" Chief Julia Cecchetto who retired from Kentville Police Services Sept. 15, 2021, first woman serving Chief in Nova Scotia?
- The same Julia Cecchetto who is President of the Nova Scotia Chiefs of Police Association (NSPCA)?
- The NSPCA later demoted the RCMP to non-voting status. Is this part of the ongoing issues between Truro and RCMP and struggle for Colchester contract? Was this ever

explored by the MCC? C/Supt Leather states in his notes June 12, 2020, COMM0053317 page 9:

“relationship with NS Chiefs – *sabotage*
-Officer safety bulletin”

The bulletin referenced is the 2011 CISNS bulletin regarding threats that Gabriel Wortman made against police officers. This was disclosed to media by Truro

- Why did C/Supt Leather write: NS Chiefs and Sabotage on the same line? The past president of the NSPCA, is Truro police chief Dave McNeil.
- If there was bad blood between and Truro and RCMP, is it possible that Chief McNeil influenced the NSPCA to demote the RCMP?

Julia Cecchetto serves as co-chair of NSPCA subcommittee on domestic violence. I would think that she of all people would defend women who are subjected to sexual violence if such a crime were reported to her, especially if it came from another female officer, Shari Pictou.

- When did Julia Cecchetto become aware of this?
 - Was it in December 2019 or before?
- Is she, or the NSPCA, one of the names redacted as having knowledge in the Situation Report?

In the original notes, it says "**members of Truro** will not back up our members on call". When I look at the Situation Report, it says "one witness provided several examples of both routine, and high-risk calls, where the safety of RCMP officers could be compromised, and civilians **could have** been placed at risk"

- Is this the reason the RCMP didn't call on the TPS initially on April 18/19, 2020?
- How many lives could have been saved if the RCMP had a working relationship with Truro Police Services?

The individual's name listed before the words: **Big RCMP hater** changes from the original version "**A TRURO POLICE OFFICER**" to the newly released version "**Irrelevant person information**"

- Who is this person?
- Has the MCC investigated?
- Did it affect the response on April 18th and 19th 2020?
- Could my family still be alive?
- How much trauma was Nova Scotia and Canada subjected to as a result of this problem?

Interesting to note here that after this entry in C/Supt's Leather's notes, C/Supt Leather meets with C/Supt Gray, head of IMT at the time, Supt Dimopoulos, and A/Comm. Bergerman, Commanding Officer of Nova Scotia. The first item on the agenda isn't Portapique or the mass casualty but the Bible Hill townhall meeting.

MCC Transcript of recorded interview with Felix Cacchione's Sept. 9, 2022.
COMM0064899

At the 6:20 mark we are told what is considered "serious incident". This includes:
"to investigate police-involved serious incidents involving injury or death or other potentially criminal conduct by police?"

On pg. 39 at 54:30 Director Cacchione says he read the allegations and decided not to proceed with an investigation, but this allegation clearly falls within the SIRT mandate.

- How does he justify not investigating such criminal allegations other than to say he doesn't want to get involved in a turf war?

The fact that there might be a "turf war" is the exact reason his job exists; to make sure there is an impartial body investigating these types of allegations.

The second reason he gave was that the SITREP was based on second hand information. These allegations are serious enough that they should have been investigated thoroughly, if only to dispel them.

SiRT Director Cacchione's MCC interview, he seems to indicate that he never accepted the SiRT referral.

Page 39, Director Cacchione states:

Mark UNDERHILL [00:57:30] And so there is a couple things you just said I want to follow up on. First of all, you said there was no basis in that report for moving forward with a SiRT investigation, is that what I understood you to say?

Felix CACCHIONE [00:57:45] Yes.

This is again validated on page 40:

Felix CACCHIONE [01 :01 :50] Well, they made the referral, but we didn't accept it.

This seems at odds with C/Supt Leather and A/Comm Daley.

In C/Supt Chris Leather's MCC interview COMM0065199 on page 7:

Mark UNDERHILL [00:18:48] And as we understand your notes, the Director agreed at that meeting that the allegations should be investigated by SiRT?

C/Supt. Chris Leather [00:19:01] That was my understanding.

Again, on page 10:

Mark UNDERHILL [00:27:05] And in that meeting or a telephone conference, we understand **you advised** Assistant Commissioner Daley and Chief Superintendent Rupa that **SiRT had accepted the referral** and would be investigating, right?

C/Supt. Chris Leather [00:27:19] **Yes.**

In A/Comm Daley's notes COMM0064626 page 5, which were taken directly after the two-hour interview that C/Supt Leather, Supt Dimopoulos and Director Cacchione's meeting July 17, 2020. The information was relayed to A/Comm Daley from C/Supt Leather and Supt Dimopoulos. This was repeated in A/Comm Daley's MCC interview COMM0065065 page 97: **Emma RONSLEY** [00:07:43] I have one question from the notes. After it says, "**He will invoke his mandate,**" can you read what follows there?

It follows that C/Supt Leather and Supt Dimopoulos would repeat what they were told and discussing over the last couple of hours with accuracy. Supt Dimopoulos also participated in both, the phone call with Director Cacchione and C/Supt Leather, and subsequent phone call with A/Comm Daley. It appears he did not correct C/Supt Leather, when he made the statement about Director Cacchione invoking his mandate. Thereby he either, stayed quiet and didn't correct C/Supt Leather, or he agreed with C/Supt Leather's statement.

Further in A/Comm Daley's statement, COMM0065065, on page 97 he says:

Emma RONSLEY [00:07:43] I have one question from the notes. After it says, "He will invoke his mandate," can you read what follows there?

A/Commr Dennis DALEY [00:07:52] "Will invoke the non-disclosure piece into the Act that prevents Director."

Emma RONSLEY [00:07:59) Do you know what that's referring to?

A/Commr Dennis DALEY [00:08:00) I don't. I don't at all.

A/Comm Daley's notes, COMM0064626 Pg 5, say he had a phone call with Chris Leather on July 17, 2020, he wrote:

"He will invoke his mandate"

This seems contrary to what Director Cacchione indicates in his interview.

- Did the MCC have access to A/Comm Daley and C/Supt Leather's newly unredacted notes, prior to his questioning?

"Will invoke the non-disclosure piece into the Act that prevents Director"

- What does this mean?
- Why does it appear as though Director Cacchione changed his mind about accepting the SiRT referral?
- Why do C/Supt Leather's notes, in COMM0065182, A/Comm Daley's notes, COMM0064626 and Supt Dimopoulos interview, COMM0063690, all speak to large scale investigation, costs of such an investigation and recruiting large out of province, independent oversight bodies such as IIO, ASIRT?
- Which Act is he referring to?
- What is the non-disclosure piece?
- How can he not know what his notes mean?
- Did the MCC investigate?
- What is the purpose of preventing the Director? Preventing the Director from what?

In COMM0065156 email re the SiRT referral. C/Supt leather set up a teleconference for November 5, 2020, with A/Comm Daley, C/Supt Rupa and C/Supt Gray to discuss the SiRT Referral. Looking at C/Supt Leather's newly disclosed notes COMM0065477, on November 5 there is a phone call involving all of the above listed parties to discuss the SiRT referral. The SITREP is discussed as is the decision of the Director of SiRT Cacchione, who had informally turned down C/Supt Leather's SiRT referral on October 26, 2020, 10 days earlier COMM0065154. C/Supt leather had been waiting for formal refusal of the SiRT referral, which had been made July 10, 2020. The final written refusal was not made until December 17, 2020, COMM0065367. The previous day, December 16, 2020, there was an hour-long meeting between Director Cacchione and C/Supt Leather, to discuss the SiRT referral. It is noted that they "decided that matter should be briefed to Minister for the New Year.

- How many times do C/Supt Leather and Supt Costa Dimopoulos have to appeal to SiRT to get these extremely serious criminal allegations, involving a concerted effort to cover up, by multiple senior officers, from what appears to be the RCMP, and Truro PD. investigated?

Even in Director Cacchione's final, formal written refusal of the SiRT referral, he states: "possible extortion of a large sum of money".

- How can Director Cacchione state second hand information and a turf-war he wasn't prepared to get in the middle of?
- How can he use these excuses, when he writes this should be considered by the Policing Services section of the Nova Scotia Department of Justice?

This is completely contrary to SiRT's mandate, as it states, SiRT: "is an independent, civilian-led unit responsible for investigating serious incidents, criminal matters, involving police officers"

- Why is it Director Cacchione is more than reluctant to investigate?
- Why did it take him months to answer a referral formally, when Supt Leather says he has never seen this behaviour before?

In Director Cacchione's MCC interview, when confronted with the question:

Mark UNDERHILL [01 :05:31] Was SiRT's capacity or resources a factor in the decision not to proceed forward with this referral?

Director Cacchione's reply was:

Felix CACCHIONE [01 :05:43] May have been a minor factor....

During Supt Dimopoulos's MCC interview COMM0063690, when asked why he didn't continue with his 10-point review of Amhurst and Bible Hill Detachments, he answers:

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [00:53:38] Certainly the issues that were presented to me, again, the information that was presented to me was such that a review would have to take a back seat to SiRT ... the SiRT referral. The nature of the information was ... was serious enough to ... to warrant a SiRT referral.

Again, later in the interview, when asked:

Emma RONSLEY [01 :08:44] I also just have a follow up. So just so that I'm understanding, because it does sound like this review that you undertook didn't go as originally envisioned. In your initial email to the affected detachments, you know, you said there would be a report and recommendations and that the feedback received

would make a difference. And so, is it ... am I correct that sort of the reason this review didn't end up coming to fruition is because you ended up receiving unrelated information that was of a serious nature and that meant you were unable to continue as originally you intended to, which was gathering operational concerns from members of those two detachments. Is that right?

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [01 :09:38] Yes, you're right.

- Why in the middle of Canada's largest mass murder investigation, would Supt Dimopoulos immediately cease speaking to the Bible Hill and Amhurst Detachments, discontinue his original review upon learning from officers (plural-recall that the SITREP mentions dozens of witnesses, civilian, police and RCMP) about very serious criminal information involving police?
- Why is the MCC not looking into this?

If the allegations are true, and this is not pursued, this means that there are criminals in our police forces at a senior level and this jeopardizes the safety of civilians and police.

Further in the interview when asked:

Emma RONSLEY [01 :11 :03] So those were general operational concerns from the members, but not ... not specifically related to the mass casualty?

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [01 :11 :13] There was specific information provided to me about past behavior, nothing to do with the mass casualty directly.

Emma RONSLEY [01 :11 :26] Okay. Did they ... did it relate to the ... or did any of it relate to the areas outlined in your email, so soliciting feedback. So things like communication, personnel training?

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [01:11:41] Yes.

Emma RONS LEY [01 :11 :41] So, they did fall ... they were general operational concerns but just not linked to the mass casualty?

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [01 :11 :48) That's right.

In addition:

Patricia MacPHEE [01 :12:18] I think there's been a confusion here and so I'll let the witness perhaps clarify.

Supt. Costa DIMOPOULOS [01 :12:21) Yeah, so no, there was no second report. The only report I produced was that SiRT referral and operational issues that were brought to my attention that had nothing to do directly or indirectly with the mass casualty event were reported to me. These are ... these are historical issues that are not directly related to the event. However, to provide a historical understanding regarding the relationship between the RCMP and the Truro Police Service.

- How is it plausible to believe that the possibility of bad blood between, the Truro PD and the RCMP did not have a direct influence on the response (operational concerns) to the April 18/19 mass casualty?

C/Supt Chris Leather stated in his interview, COMM0065199 on page 27 when speaking of disclosure of information related to the SITREP July 10, 2020:

“But for me to put that into writing, what it means to me that someone raised concerns to me early on at the level, meaning Santosuosso, Dimopoulos, maybe Chris Romanchych, who is Sergeant in Charge about what we should or shouldn’t or could be putting into the dataset.”

- The IMT dataset the database of all items intended for disclosure to MCC, ESDC and HOIT investigations. If information was withheld from the IMT dataset, then none of the three investigations can be done with any accuracy. This is deeply alarming to me.
- Who raised concerns early on about what should or shouldn’t or could put into the July 10, 2020, IMT dataset?
- Why would there be concerns about what should or shouldn’t or could be included in the IMT dataset?

Mark UNDERHILL [00:19:29] Sorry. So your understanding was the Director was telling you SiRT would be willing to investigate, but had some concerns about its capacity or resources to do so?

C/Supt. Chris Leather [00:19:48] Yes, the cost, overall, of such an investigation and then the human resource requirements in terms of their footprint being four investigators for all matters of SiRT, and that that would have to be either bolstered or some sort of referral made to another agency to undertake the investigation and even a discussion as to whether or not the RCMP, you know, from another division, for instance, might be positioned to undertake the investigation

COMM0063062 On November 24, 2021, in A/Comm Bergerman's notes she meets with Director Cacchione in her office

- Did this meeting have anything to do with the July 10, 2020, SITREP?

COMM0065199 MCC transcript of recorded interview COMM0064899 Leather Sept. 23, 2022
Why is the MCC waiting until the very last day of the Commission to interview C/Supt Leather?

The July 10, 2020, SITREP COMM0064899, refers to an arrest.

- Who was arrested?
- Cover up?
- Whose names are covered up? Were they involved in any capacity with April 18 & 19th 2020?
- How is it "irrelevant" to know who has been arrested?
- Who makes the decision about all these redactions, which are seemingly unjustifiable?

COMM0063062 page 19, A/Comm Bergerman’s notes on Dec 17, 2020:

- “Too much risk, more dangerous worse than Wortman. A lot of losses”
- Who/what is she referring to that could possibly be more dangerous?
- Is she being literal or figurative?

In COMM0065477 page 4, the day prior, Dec. 16, 2020, C/Supt Leather and A/Comm Bergerman met with Director Cacchione to discuss the SiRT referral and it was decided to brief “the Minister” in the New Year. The next day, Dec 17, 2020, Director Cacchione officially and formally refuses the SiRT referral in writing.

A/Comm Bergerman’s notation: “Too much risk, more dangerous worse than Wortman. A lot of losses”, was this related to:

- Director Cacchione’s SiRT eventual refusal after he choose to stall after many meetings with NS RCMP executive?
- Briefing “the Minister”
- Director Cacchione’s suggestion of passing the SITREP over to the Policing Services section of Nova Scotia Department of Justice even though it quite clearly falls under SiRT’s mandate?