

From: Joshua Preston
Sent: Thu, 1 Aug 2019 16:48:07 +1000
To: Xavier Walsh ([REDACTED])
Cc: [REDACTED]@crownresorts.com.au
Subject: FW: Confidential and Legally Privileged
Attachments: Zhao (Simon) PAN2019 - POI.DOC
Importance: High

X,

Please see following and attached as discussed.

I would appreciate your views once you have had the opportunity to consider.

Cheers
JP

Joshua Preston
 Chief Legal Officer – Australian Resorts



T [REDACTED]
 T [REDACTED]
 M [REDACTED]
 F [REDACTED]
 E [REDACTED]
 W crownresorts.com.au

From: Barry Felstead
Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 2:15 PM
To: Joshua Preston <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Confidential and Legally Privileged

I am supportive of that position.

Barry Felstead
 Chief Executive Officer – Australian Resorts



T [REDACTED]
 T [REDACTED]
 M [REDACTED]
 E [REDACTED]
 W crownresorts.com.au

From: Joshua Preston [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 2:14 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Confidential and Legally Privileged
Importance: High

BF,

Please see attached which I propose to table with the POI Committee.

As a result of the recent media reports regarding Simon Pan, the team has:

- reviewed its records and I can confirm that there is nothing on our records that indicated that Mr Pan is related to 39 Tope Street. I do note however that there have been a number of law enforcement requests for records which refer to Sex Work and Crimes Act. We have no information as to the outcomes of those requests for records and accordingly no action was taken against Mr Pan (I also note that we receive approximately 1,500 to 2,000 law enforcement/regulatory requests for information per year).
- carried out further searches and due diligence on Mr Pan and we can confirm that as a result of a property search, Mr Pan is the owner of 39 Tope Street. We have also now obtained and reviewed the 2 County Court documents, both of which do not name Mr Pan as a party, however he is involved as a witness or referred to by the parties the subject of the proceedings. One of these matters found that several individuals were involved in money laundering (but not Mr Pan). I note that we WOL'd those persons some years ago as a result of their convictions.

Accordingly, having carried out further due diligence after considering the new information that we have become aware of, I am of the opinion that we should issue a barring to Mr Pan due to him being the owner of a premises where money laundering occurred and the comments of law enforcement in those matters (of which we were not aware until now).

I would appreciate any views you have before I progress this matter to the Committee.

Cheers
JP