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THE TRI BUNAL RESUMED, AS FOLLOVG, ON VEDNESDAY, 25TH OCTOBER 2017:

CHA RMAK My understanding is that people were delayed by traffic, which happens. I have also seen the baby and the baby is looking very well.
MR. MARRI NAN Sir, the first witness this morning is in relation to term of reference (d), which we are returning to.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MARR NAN Ms. Lisa O'Logh1en please. Her
interview with the Tribunal investigators and statement to the Tribunal is to be found at volume 5, at page 1418.

## MS. LI SA O LOGLEN, HAM NG BEEN SVORN, WAS

 DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR MARRI NAN, AS FOLLOVG:1 Q. MR. MARRI NAN would you just state your professional qualifications, please?
A. I am professionally qualified social worker, Masters in social work.

2 Q. How long had you been working in HSE and Tusla?
A. Since 2007, June 2007.

3 Q. What roles did you have during that period of time?
A. I started off in child protection in Dublin North for five years, and then $I$ moved to the regional office as social work team leader, then $I$ was in Child Protection as a team leader before moving to regional office again
to start with the Sexual Abuse Regional Team in April 2016.

4 Q. Would you just mind moving a little bit closer and speak into the microphone, please.
A. Yes.

5 Q. Because some of the parties might have difficulty picking up your evidence. If we could then go to the role that you had in May or June of 2016, what role did you have at that time?
A. So, the Sexual Abuse Regional team was being developed. I began the post at the end of April 2016. It was just me. So, for the first couple of months it was about developing policies and procedures and guidance around what the team was going to look like, and then also recruiting staff. So, the end of June, Clare Tobin started on the team, and it was myself and Clare for July and August and then I had two other team members join in September. So, in the July and August myself and Clare were going out auditing files and doing reviews and taking on some cases and putting them into low, medium and highest, what needed to be prioritised so that we could allocate them come September to the new staff that were coming on board.
6 Q. All right. We will come to that in due course, but I think that at the time you were reporting to your line manager, who was Lisa Anderson, is that right?
A. That's correct.

7 Q. She has the title of being a Principal Social worker, and she reports to Linda Creamer, who is the Service

Director, is that right?
A. That's correct.

8 Q. I think that she had the role of examining unallocated cases that had arisen in your region, is that right?
A. Lisa Anderson?
A. That's correct.

This team was set up with a view to dealing with those unallocated cases, is that right?
A. With the unallocated cases, yeah, prioritising what cases needed -- some were able to be closed. It was to support the local areas in managing and taking on some of the cases, the ones that we were able to prioritise. Ms. O'Loghlen, if you could help me with this, we heard from Clare Tobin, who was working with you, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

15 Q. I think that she had been on maternity leave and returned towards the end of June -
A. 2016 .

16 Q. - of 2016, and she was working alongside you in the examination of the Maurice McCabe file?
A. We11, I am her manager.

17 Q. Pardon?
A. I am her manager.

18 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

19 Q. She has given very helpful evidence to the Tribunal. But in terms of actually what was being reviewed, were the cases being reviewed or were the files being reviewed? Do you understand that there might be a distinction between the two?
A. No, could you explain, cases and files.

20 Q. One could be reviewing the actual referral, all right. So, you're looking in to the referral and you're dealing with it because it has remained unallocated for a period of time.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

21 Q. okay?
A. Yes.

22 Q. Or else one could be actually reviewing the file and the manner in which the file was dealt with by the Social Work Department, do you understand?
A. Yes, I do. Our role was the Section 3 policy, to see had it been put in place on each case, and, if it
hadn't, why it hadn't, and was it suitable for the case. So, it wasn't to review the whole file and look at everything that had gone wrong and everything that had gone right, it was to look at the section 3 policy and if there was an allegation there, had it been investigated, had it been done properly, and, if it had, whether it could go on to close or whether we needed to do fresh investigations, and some had never been started.
23 Q. You say had it been investigated properly?
A. Correct.

24 Q. So that was part of the issue that you were looking into?
A. Yes, because a Section 3 was in place in September 2014, but I think it's been given evidence that training hadn't been given out, so staff weren't all confident in using it. So it was inconsistent around the region as to whether it had been applied or not.
Q. All right. I am a still a little bit unclear in relation to this and if we could sort of nail it down. It was anticipated that on looking at the file, if you deemed that it was suitable, that the matter would be investigated by your team?
A. Correct.
Q. In other words, the allegation that had been made by the complainant would be investigated and that the issue would be brought to some finalisation and the file dealt with, is that right?
A. Correct.

27
Q. But part of that was a review of how the investigation had been conducted up until that time?
A. There was an audit to see, so we developed an audit form as the SART team and we looked through what had and hadn't been done. We weren't reviewing the full file, we weren't going off looking for details, we were focusing on the Section 3 policy and the allegation that was on the file.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. But not in any great detail?
A. No.
A. Exactly, and I would have audited hundreds of files and I would have escalated a number of files up to the service director and any concerns brought up in those risk escalators were for the local area and service director to manage.
Q. In any event, you started working on this on a preliminary basis in May and June and the first couple of months involved setting up policies and procedures that the team would adopt, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. It was determined that any cases that were deemed to be high risk would be escalated to your principal social worker and the service director, Linda Creamer?
A. Not all high risk ones were escalated, some were -they were all -- my principal social worker was informed about all of them, but some of them $I$ was able to work immediately and within a couple of phone calls they could be de escalated to medium or low. But the ones that were high and for serious reasons were risk escalated up to the service director.
A. It's professional judgment when you're reviewing a file and I'd experience in these cases, so if I saw that possibly a child could be at risk or long delays of cases and no fair procedures not being given, where a case may have started and then drifted for long periods of time. So, it just depended, each file was treated individually.
35 Q. Well, there are two issues that perhaps arise there. In the first instance there is an issue in relation to a high risk to children and the possibility of that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And then you're indicating that there's an additional high risk, namely high risk in circumstances where the matter hadn't been properly investigated?
A. Correct.

37 Q. That perhaps the accused, if I can put it that way, or I think the alleged accused hasn't been written to, but that that really is an administrative matter, is it not?
A. No. It was that if the case wasn't managed properly, because if it's on a duty system it should be regularly reviewed. Some cases weren't reviewed for long, long periods of time.
A. It could be an unknown risk, until you make your few phone calls to assess that.
40 Q. We11, is it that there's a potential high risk of an injustice being caused, is that included?
A. Possibly.

41 Q. Yes. So perhaps there could be a high risk to the organisation because a criticism could be levelled at it for not completing the various tasks that have been assigned to it, is that right?
A. Yes. Some of the risk escalations were organisational risks.
42 Q. So, there's high risk obviously to perhaps the welfare
A. That's the priority.

43 Q. There's high risk of unfairness that could be perpetrated against somebody who might be accused and not afforded fair procedures, and then there's a high risk to the organisation of adverse criticism being levelled against it.
A. Correct.

44 Q. Is that a fair assessment?
A. That is, yes.

45 Q. Yes, all right. So in any event, I think in July of -and we've heard evidence from Clare Tobin in relation to this, sorry, on 27th June of 2016, you went down to the Cavan Social work Department, is that right?
A. I think it was the 28th June.

46 Q. The 28th June?
A. She started on the 27th.

47 Q. You went down there, do you recall that?
A. I do recall that.

48 Q. That was with a view to looking at files that had been prepared for you?
A. Yes, that's correct.

49 Q. Now, before you went down, had you been in discussion with anybody from that region?
A. Michae1 Cunningham, the Duty Team Leader at the time, he was preparing the files that were coming down, he was organising booking the room.
50 Q. So you had been in contact with him to arrange to meet him?
A. To arrange to meet him in the Cavan office.

51 Q. With a view to going through the files. Had you been in contact with anybody else?
A. No.

52 Q. Had Linda Creamer advised you that perhaps you might be 10:40 going down to look at a particularly sensitive file?
A. No, absolutely not.

53 Q. So, as far as you were concerned, you were going down to Cavan to the Social Work Department there, to meet
with Mr. Cunningham, with a view to looking at files that he prepared, is that right?
A. Well, he was contacting other social work team leaders in the region to see which unallocated retrospective cases were in the region and he would have them ready for us to audit once we got there. The same was done for Louth, Meath, all of the areas.
54 Q. I suppose in a way what you were looking for were cases that perhaps had been measuring the pressure system, I think it's called, is that right?
A. Anything that was open and unallocated.

55 Q. The use of the word unallocated would be a file that had been sitting there and that there hadn't been any movement on for a period of time?
A. Correct.

56 Q. Is that right?
A. Correct, or a case maybe that the area was struggling in and it was drifting, that SART were there to offer our support.
57 Q. In circumstances where you could see that a case had in 10:42 fact been allocated, would you have taken it on?
A. Yes. As I said, if the workers were really struggling with it and because they weren't as confident, some people in the Section 3 policy, we would either offer to co-work it, if they had the capacity to do that, or we would take it from them.
58 Q. So, in any event, you meet with Mr. Cunningham and we have heard evidence from Mr. Cunningham and he has advised the Tribunal that he had prepared or had a list
of and the files available for your inspection, 15 files?
A. Approximately.

59 Q. And that he added to that list at the request of Kay McLough1in, who is the Principal Social Worker who had, 10:42 in fact, been dealing with the file. When you spoke to him at the time, did he brief you in relation to each of the files?
A. Some of the ones that he had been working, he gave a brief background, but we were there to read through the 10:43 files and to do our own audits. But he was just answering a couple of questions that we might have had then at the end of our audit to clear things up if it wasn't clear from the file. Only his cases that he had knowledge of.
60 Q. He has given evidence to the Tribunal that he was aware that this file referred to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. Yes.

61 Q. Who is the Garda whistleblower?
A. Yes, correct.

62 Q. When you were presented with this file, were you aware at that time that it referred to --
A. I was.

63 Q. -- Sergeant McCabe?
A. I was.

64 Q. You were.
A. Mr. Cunningham said, this file is from Kay McLoughlin and it's Maurice McCabe file.

65 Q. In what sort of context was he saying that to you?
A. He said he knew nothing about it, it wasn't his case, he had just been asked to pass it from Kay to us and we said we would audit it and go from there and we would contact Kay if we needed to.
66 Q He was sort of flagging the fact that this -- was he flagging that this might be controversial?
A. No, he was just saying, these are my files and this one is from Kay, I haven't had any management of it, so I can't answer any queries, if you have any. We11, you see, who Sergeant McCabe may or may not have been was really quite irrelevant, wasn't it?
A. For us, yes.

68 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

So was it just out of interest, that you might be
interested that this was being conveyed to you, have you any reason why it would be conveyed to you that it was Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. He was just saying -- well, it was a high profile -like I knew who it was, Mr. Cunningham knew who it was, 10:44 so he was just letting us know. Normally if it's either a guard or a social worker or a high professional, he would point it out, that it's someone within a --
70 Q. He told you that Kay McLough1in had been dealing with it?
A. Correct.

71 Q. You and Clare Tobin then, you were sitting down and you reviewed --
A. Audited, with our audit form.
A. That day.

73 Q. And it would have been apparent to you on reviewing the file that a letter had been sent by Kay McLoughlin on 29th December of 2015 to Sergeant McCabe?
A. It was Clare that audited the file that day. I think you've spoken to her about that, it's her handwriting on the audit, but she would have discussed it with me and we would have taken it back to nexus, where I would 10:45 have looked at it further from there.

74 Q. We11, I mean, Mr. Cunningham is advising you that this is Kay McLough1in's file, right?
A. Correct, yes.

75 Q. And that she had been dealing with it?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

76 Q. A very quick review of the file to determine what stage has this got to, you would have seen that the file had been, in fact, brought to the stage where Kay McLoughlin had written out to Sergeant McCabe, advising 10:46 him of the allegation, in fact the wrong allegation, that had been made against him?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

77 Q. Al1 right?
A. Correct.

78 Q. There had been a response from Séan Costello \& Company Solicitors to that?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

79 Q. That would have been apparent to you, wouldn't it?
A. Yes, yeah.

80 Q. And I'm just wondering why perhaps you didn't raise a query at that time to say well, look, you know, this case has obviously been allocated, it's obviously been brought to the stage where Kay McLough1in has actually written out to the accused, why are we getting involved in this?
A. On many cases, if a case hasn't been worked properly through the Section 3 policy, often, from my experience, another team will be asked to take it on and a new assessment done, because the workers' views could have been tarnished from how they worked it. So, that my opinion at the time. I rang my principal social worker to talk about the high cases from that Kay in general and we agreed to take it from there.
81 Q. You referred the Section 3 policy?
A. The Section 3 policy it hadn't been followed properly.

82 Q. What do you mean by the Section 3 policy?
A. The allegations of abuse and neglect, the investigations that we do, that's the primary role of my team. The September 2014 allegations against -- We11, I am just wondering, I need to thrash this out to know why this file was taken on by you at all.
A. Fair procedures hadn't been followed. Timelines and the details were given wrong and it was clear that the file was not in a proper order, and we felt it needed --

Was that al1 apparent to you from a quick view of the file when you were up in Cavan?
A. Yes.
A. Well, the wrong details were given to Mr. McCabe. It was clear that the worker hadn't read the file in total and hadn't dealt with it properly and that he hadn't been given --

89 Q. I will just return to that when we come to look at the actual risk escalation, as to what was available to you at the time. But you say that you were able to determine this from reading the Maurice McCabe file?
A. Clare Tobin read it she was informing me, yes.
A. No, not that day.

91 Q. Did you have access to the CSA file which refers to Ms. D?
A. No, I never saw that file.

92 Q. Are you sure about that? Because Ms. Tobin thought that she had sight of the Ms. D file?
A. She did have sight, but not on that day, at a later day
she did go down to Monaghan and see the file. I never personally saw the file, but she did go and view the file in Monaghan.
93 Q. Because again, Mr. Cunningham says that he was a hundred percent certain Ms. D's file wasn't made available at that initial meeting?
A. And I'm hundred percent certain as well.

94 Q. You're certain?
A. A hundred percent.

All right. So, the file is then taken away to be
A. Yes, back to regional office, with a number of other files.
Q. If you don't mind, if we could just look at some documents that you have supplied to the Tribunal, and have become available. At page 1442, this is a letter by you to -- I think it's a memo, is it, for yourself?
A. It's just a note of a meeting with Tara Downes. I brought a number, a number of cases from the region to the Brunell, our national office, to talk to Ms. Downes 10:50 about. And I just made a note that Mr. McCabe's file was one of those cases and that what I had been instructed to do.
97 Q. So this is after a review of the file, you had a meeting with Tara Downes and you were discussing the various files and then the Maurice McCabe file arose during the course of discussions, is that right?
A. Correct.

98 Q. And her advice to you was that you should write out to

Ms. D --
A. Correct.

99 Q. -- and offer her an appointment?
A. And restart the process.

100 Q. So, effectively you're going back to square 1, as it were, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. At that time you were -- or, were you aware of the fact that this matter had been looked into by the HSE in 2006 and 2007?
A. Yes, I knew, and I knew about the DPP and the no prosecution, but it wasn't clear from the file that Ms. D had been met with or attempted to be met with.
102 Q. Were you aware of the fact that Kay McLoughlin had written out to Ms. D seeking to arrange appointments with her --
A. Yes.

103 Q. -- in 2015?
A. Yes. And that Ms. D hadn't been able to meet, that she wanted to arrange an appointment at a later date. So, that indicated to me that she possibly would meet with us, hence why we said that we'd try.
104 Q. So, if we could just then perhaps just come to the following page, page 1443, this is the risk escalation document. We can see there that it is headed "serious i nci dent ot her than HI QA and risk escal ation", it has "Maurice McCabe", his date of birth "unknown", then address, "Child and Family Agency" and then the contact details and yours are there?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

105 Q. The regional director Linda Creamer. Then it says:
"Nat ure of inci dent gi ving rise to escal ation."

It says:
"Report made to the Social Welfare Department in 2006 regarding an allegation of child sexual abuse made by ME. D. "

And her date of birth.
"Agai nst detective Ser geant Mauri ce MLCabe."

We know that --
A. That's an error, yeah.
Q. -- that's an error but it's of little consequence.
". ... who was al legedl y sexually i nappropriate towards
Ms. D, aged 7 at the time of alleged abuse.
D/ Ser geant McCabe and DPP gave no prosecution. "

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { You discerned that from the examination of the Ms. D } \\
& \text { file, is that right? }
\end{aligned}
$$

A. I never saw the Ms. D file.

107 Q. You never saw it?
A. Clare Tobin did, but $I$ never saw it.
Q. And:
"The Social Wbrk Department finding was inconcl usive at that time on file but no report as to how the social wel fare came to that concl usion?
A. Correct.
Q. And then it says:
"In 2013 --"
A. It was meant to be 2015 .
Q.
" -- ME. D was attendi ng ther apy."

In fact, that's a mistake, is it>
A. A typo, 2013, it should read.

111 Q. 2013.
"....was attending therapy and made di scl osure to
therapist, who referred the matter to SW Department in
Cavan. SW Department recei ved a copy of ME. D Garda statement taken on 5th Decenber 2006 and used this to write to D/Sergeant MECabe in Decentber 2015."
where did that come from?
A. Okay. So, what I meant by that was that Ms. McLoughlin's rationale for writing to Mr. McCabe was because the 2006 Garda investigation had never been investigated, in her view, by Tusla, that we had never
met with Mr. McCabe and put the concerns to him. So, that should read that -- not the contents of the Garda statement was used in the letter but that was her rationale for the assessment.
A. Well, it's missing a couple of words and I can totally understand why, to everyone else I can see how it -- I have written it wrong. But the Garda statement taken, her rationale was used -- she used this to write to Mr. McCabe, that was her rationale for writing to him in December 2015, because of the Garda statement that had never been put to Mr. McCabe by Tusla.
113 Q.
"However, unfort unatel $y$ i naccurate details of the di scl osure were given in the letter. Detective Ser geant McCabe has Séan Costello \& Company solicitors i nvol ved and they are hi ghl y di ssatisfied that this is being rei nvesti gated and wrong inf ormation being sent to their client."

Then you go on to deal with the assessment of relevant protective factors, and you point out:
"D/Sergeant McCabe has never been met with by our with his wife and notes on file that his wife should have been met in 2006 but no evi dence this occurred and there is no justification to informing Mrs. McCabe of
concern at this stage, gi ven ten years have passed and no foundation of allegations to date. "

Then under:
"Actions taken or plan to address immedi ate saf ety i ssues:

Stabilise client, mitigate injuries, prevent further harmand timeframes for same.

SART sought legal advice on this matter gi ven the case was investi gat ed ten years ago, approxi matel y, but the inf ormation is scant and now ME. D has come forward agai n gi ven Detective Sergeant McCabe recei ved a lot of media attention in recent years as a Garda whi stl ebl ower."
where did that information come from?
A. That came from Kay McLoughlin. That was written on the file, that that's the reason. So, I was taking
information from the file and putting it onto my risk escalation.
114 Q. Did you speak to Kay McLoughlin?
A. No, not in detail.

115 Q. Pardon?
A. No, not in detail, no. There's a couple of emails but I didn't speak to her. But that was on the file, about the media attention and that that was the reason why.
116 Q. I will return to that in a minute.
"Séan Costello \& Company Solicitors are quite aggressive in the defence of their client and the incorrect details of the letter sent. Detective Sergeant McCabe's legal team has referred this correspondence to the Chi ef Executive of Tusla in the expectation that decent standards of public administration will be adhered to. Tusla legal have advi sed SART to seek to meet ME. D to assess whether her di sclosure is credi ble to proceed the matter to i nvestigation. "

And then:
"Tusl a legal will respond to D/ Sergeant McCabe's I egal team "

Then we go over the page to 1445 , then:
"Subject of serious incident risk."

In fact, the wrong name appears there, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

117 Q. It has been redacted, but it's actually the wrong name 10:58 entirely.
"Descri be any internal/external i nvestigati on revi ews initiated to date. SART compl et ed audit July 2016 and
consi dered it a hi gh concern gi ven compl ex Iegal issues and D/Sergeant MECabe's profession and hi gh media profile."

You thought it appropriate, did you, to highlight the fact that he was a detective, he was a member of An Garda Síochána and that he had a high media profile?
A. Yes, it was an organisational risk, $I$ felt, to Tusla.
Q. It's not suggested there that it's been risk escalated as a result of any concern for Maurice McCabe's children, isn't that right?
A. No, but that wasn't my role.
Q. Sorry?
A. I didn't have any immediate concern for his children from what was on the file.
121 Q. So, really at this stage the complaint that had been made by Ms. D was secondary to your considerations, is that right?
A. It hadn't been investigated, there was no foundation to it.
122 Q. Yes, I know, but you had an opportunity to look back at the history of it?
A. Yeah.

123 Q. You were in a position to see that it had, in fact,
been investigated in 2006/2007?
A. By the Gardaí.

124 Q. That she had attended the HSE?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

125 Q. And that she had attended and been assessed at that time?
A. I didn't have those -- I didn't have that file or the details of Ms. D having been met with.
Q. That, in fact, effectively the Ms. D file had been closed in 2007, with a note on the file indicating that 11:01 Maurice McCabe hadn't been contacted. Were you aware of that?
A. No.

127 Q. Are you disappointed that you weren't informed of these things?
A. Yes. My risk escalation, they reflect what was on the file. If we had had all of the details, they could have been different.
Q. I mean, your colleague Clare Tobin gave evidence to the Tribunal that she was horrified how the case had been managed?
A. I think it was poorly managed.
Q. But I'm not getting that flavour from you. If we just continue on then.
"I dentify difficulties being experienced or antici pated regar di ng seri ous i nci dent."

And then:
"Fair procedures have not been followed and our investigation ten years ago proceeded without ever meeting Detective Sergeant McCabe and with no formal cl osure. Again we wrote to detective Sergeant McCabe in Decenber 2015, despite re-opening the file in August 2013 and wrong information was gi ven and ME. D was not met with. It is likely Detective Sergeant MECabe has a strong argument that procedures had been dealt with i nappropri at el y. "

And then it deals with:
"Antici pated completion date for overall management of serious incident.

SART has allocated case hi gh priority, so will
endeavour to contact alleged victimin August 2016."

That's sent to Lisa Anderson, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. With a view to be sent to Linda Creamer. I suppose you're aware from the work of the Tribunal and from general knowledge in the media that there were a litany of errors that were made in relation to the sergeant McCabe file, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

131 Q. I suppose they were internal errors within Tusla and the HSE and only surfaced twice really externally; once
was when a letter was written to Sergeant McCabe on the 29th December of 2015.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

132 Q. And the other time is when a referral was made to the Gardaí, a Garda notification was sent. We've heard evidence in relation to the fact that the wrong information was sent to the Gardaí, that Ms. D became aware of that, that she corrected it, she went to her counsellor, Laura Brophy, that Laura Brophy was in contact with Eileen Argue and that steps were taken to rectify the error, and that ultimately Seamus Deeney, in June 2014, sends a correct notification, an amended notification to the Gardaí which high1ights the error that had been made up until then. And that the file is then put back into the drawer, apparently, in a filing cabinet and left there until it is taken out of the drawer by Kay McLough1in. None of that is referred to in your risk escalation?
A. My role was the section 3 and had the investigation been investigated properly, or the allegation been investigated properly. It wasn't to do a full review, as I said earlier, of all the errors, and I didn't have access to all of that either, the Garda notifications.

133 Q. Do you mind if we just return to that, because I am not going to go through the whole file with you, but I am just going to point out certain documents. This is the file that you would have had. It's probably easier for you, I will put it up on the screen if you like, but it might be easier if you follow the folder. This is in
volume 9 and it's headed -- there are two volume 9s there, for some reason, it's pages 2189 to 2484 ?
A. 2189 .

134 Q. Yes. As I say, I'm not going to go through the whole document with this, Clare Tobin has already dealt with this, but there are certain documents that she has indicated that she doesn't believe were not on the file when she received it from Mr. Cunningham. I would just like your comment in relation to it. You can see there the file reference number at the front, at page 2307. It's file reference number 0208/2013. If we could just in the first instance go to page 2309. This is a document Clare Tobin believes wasn't on the file when she looked at it. You will see there that it's Cavan-Monaghan, a Social work Department case review. 11:07 We haven't been able to ascertain who actually dealt with this, but it's believed that it was in the writing of a Louise Byrne, in her handwriting and it's headed the children's name and refers to Maurice McCabe. Then you wil1 see:
"Activity services provided. Garda notification corrected in May 2014 due to --"

This should be 2319. Scroll there, thank you very much. There you see it refers to:

[^0]You see there?
A. Yes.
Q. Then:
"Soci al work recommendation. "

It says:
"Awaiting allocation. Case di scussi on to incl ude Rhona 11:09 and Keara."

And then:
"Cont act Garda re DPP decision 2007 cl arification. "
A. No, I don't recall that document.
Q. Pardon?
A. I don't recall this document.
Q. CHA RMAN Well, is it possible for you to say definitively it just wasn't on the file?
A. Yeah, it wasn't on the file. I don't remember anything about that Garda notification, so.
138 Q. MR. MARR NAN well, you see, we are going to deal with this by reference to your risk escalation?
A. Okay.

139 Q. I have just pointed out to you that the only reference
A. Is that they weren't put on the file, which can happen paperwork on files, it's not done until a later date. It wouldn't be my way of working but from doing audits around the region, there was lots of paperwork that wasn't on file that should have been.

145 Q. Had you considered this before you came to give evidence today? Have you considered this matter?
A. I have.

146 Q. Because it is of concern. We have established through

Clare Tobin that when you had finished with the file, that the file would then have been closed?
A. Correct.

147 Q. And would have been returned --
A. Correct.

148 Q. -- to Cavan, all right, and that it was then effectively closed and kept safe, all right?
A. Archived, yeah.

149 Q. And that is the file that we have been presented with, right?
A. Mm-hmm.

150 Q. I am going just to go through these documents with you. You have had time to consider these documents, as to whether or not they were on the file, have you?
A. Yes, I had a look, yes.
Q. I mean, I am not springing this on you now?
A. No, I did have a look, yes.

152 Q. Yeah, I am sure you did, arising out of the evidence that had been given by Clare Tobin, you would have been concerned about this.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

153 Q. So I am sure you have given this some considerable thought, have you?
A. Yes.

154 Q. Because it would be quite serious if documents were 11:12 taken away and out of the file and those documents were the only documents on the file that referred to the notification to the Gardaí being made in error?
A. I don't recall notifications being on the file.
Q. Right.
A. I have said in my risk escalation that the information on the file was scant, it was a small file, it was clear that there was missing information.
156
Q. If we just go on then in relation to 2337 , please. This is the --
A. This is the draft, no?

157 Q. This is the draft notification. Clare Tobin believes that this was on the file.
A. Mm-hmm.

158 Q. Do you have a recollection of seeing that on the file?
A. No.

159 Q. No?
A. I don't recal1, it could have been, but I just looked at the file with my risk escalation. Clare would have held the file and had it more and I would trust her judgment, if she says it was on the file.
CHA RMAN Mr. Marrinan, I just got a message, you'11 be about another half an hour, 20 minutes or thereabouts.
MR. MARRI NAN: Yes.
CHA RMAN It's just you have duties.
A. okay.

CHAI RMAN We are going to rise for 10 or 15 minutes to enable you.
A. Yes.

SHORT AD OURNENT
AFTER A SHORT AD OURNMENT, THE TRI BUNAL RESUMED, AS

160 Q. MR. MARRINAN Thank you, Ms. O'Logh1en. If we could go back to the file, please, that you were examining. You have it there, yes?
A. Yes, yeah. Tobin believes this wasn't on the file, and that's a Garda notification and it sets out the history?
A. That was on the file, the draft notification?
A. I thought that she thought that the draft notification was on the file.

163 Q. No, this isn't the draft notification?
A. oh, sorry, okay.

164 Q. This is the notification. You say:
"Our department forwarded a formal Garda notification to the Bailieboro Garda Station in rel ation to al l egati ons recei ved by Laura Brophy. "

Then it goes on and sets out the history of it. She believes that that document wasn't on the file, right, do you recall that document being on the file?
A. I don't remember seeing any Garda notification on the file.

165 Q. Then, if we could look at page 2340, please. She also believes that this document wasn't on the file, it's a notification of suspected child abuse, again to the

Gardaí, and you'11 see:
"Laura Brophy, counsellor with Ri an Counselling Service, reported the foll owing inf or mation. "

And it, in fact, contains the wrong information and I'm not going to go through it with you in detail, but she believes that that wasn't on the file.
A. Again, I don't recall any Garda notifications on the file.

166 Q. That is signed over the page, at 2341 , by Seamus Deeney, and is dated 2nd May 2014, but, in fact, was signed by him in June 2014. Then, at page 2342 , this is a draft document. And again, at the operative part, it says:
"Laura Brophy, counsellor with Ri an Counselling Service, reported the following inf ormation to the Child and Family Agency in August 2013. "

And again it has the wrong allegation in it, but appears to be only a draft, right?
A. Yes.

167 Q. Do you recall whether that was on the file when you examined the file?
A. No.

168 Q. You don't recal1?
A. I don't recall it being on the file.

169 Q. You don't?
A. I don't recall any Garda notifications being on the file. But, as I said, Clare Tobin would have held the file, she would have been looking at it a lot more regularly, so $I$ would trust her judgment.
170 Q. Then if we go on to page 2355, please?
CHA RMAN That's the one that Clare Tobin said was on the file as far as she remembered, isn't that right? MR. MARR NAN Yes, she believes it was on the file. CHA RMAN Yes.
171 Q.
MR. MARR NAN 2355, this is an email, Clare Tobin
indicated that she believed that there were emails that weren't on the file?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

172 Q. This is from Laura Brophy to Eileen Argue, and it says:
"Following our phone conversation yesterday, l'm contacting you to informyou that l had another call in rel ation to the retrospective report which, as you are aware, contains a clerical error. I was informed that the superintendent in the jurisdiction referred to in the report was not yet aware of the clerical error and has been asked to meet with the Garda Commi ssioner in rel ati on to the case. I have agreed to send the superintendent the amended and correct report by regi stered post today. If you have any queries rel ating to this, please don't hesitate to call me."

And it's signed off by Laura Brophy. Do you believe that was on the file?
A. No.
Q. You believe it wasn't? Then, over the page, again Clare Tobin believes that these weren't on the file, you'11 see an email from Eileen Argue to Gerry Lowry, who is the Regional Director, and then it says in the third paragraph:
"A Garda notification was forwarded by our department based on the information recei ved from Laur a Brophy, Ri an Servi ces. As stated bel ow, Laura Brophy contacted 11:43 our department today in rel ation to her referral and the content of same. She advi sed that there was i nf ormation provi ded whi ch di d not rel ate to and was in rel ation to another person agai nst another man and not the man MMEC. This notification needs to be amended as 11:43 soon as possi ble and the rel evant superintendent needs to be updated with regard to same."

Signed off by Eileen Argue. You believe that wasn't on the file
A. No.
Q. And then below it, from Pamela Armitage:
"Dear Eil een.

Laura Brophy, Ri an, just called to say that she had made an error in a report to us re --"

That's Ms. D

A. No.
Q. If we could then turn to page 2403, this is an email from Kay McLough1in to Emer O'Neil1. It says:
"Dear Erer.

I amfollowing up in rel ation to Garda Maurice McCabe, who, you may remenber, made allegations agai nst in 2007. Fromthe file l understand the Garda statement was gi ven to you by the parents back in 2007 and was to prevent Ms. D having to go through the allegations agai $n$. I wonder if I could have a copy or vi ew the statement as currently l amassessing what risk, if any, Mauri ce McCabe poses to his children."

Clare Tobin wasn't sure whether or not that document was on the file. Do you recall seeing that on the file?
A. No.
" -- the line that the abuse invol ves di gital penetration, both vagi nal and anal is an error and should not be in the referral, it is, in fact, a line from another referral on another adult that has been pasted in, in error. Laura has apol ogi sed and is sending us the amended report ASAP."

Again, can you say whether or not that was on the file?
fromkay Mcloughlin to Emer oineil. It says: prevent Ms. D having to go through the allegations
Q. Do you believe it wasn't on the file?
A. I don't think so.

177 Q. And then if we could go over to page 2410. This is from Gerard Lowry to Kay McLough1in:
"Dear Kay.

Thanks for the update and bringing this matter to my attention.

I have a memory that this matter was reported to An Garda Sí ochána at some stage, so we would need to coordi nate with them bef ore taking the steps outlined bel ow.
l will di scuss with you."

Signed off by Gerry Lowry. Clare Tobin doesn't believe that that was on the file.
A. No. I don't believe it was on the file.

178 Q. You don't believe it was on the file when you were given the file?
A. No.

179 Q. That deals with the file. The documents that both of you seem to believe were not on the file, that you had referred to the matter going outside to An Garda Síochána and the Garda referral, isn't that right?
A. Sorry, can you repeat that?

180 Q. The matters that you and Clare Tobin seem to be in agreement on that were not on the file, are matters
that refer to the file or to the Garda notification and the matter going to the Gardaí, the issue being corrected by Ms. D and Laura Brophy then seeking to deal with the matter?
A. Yeah. well, it was clear that the wrong information 11:47 had been sent, but not through those documents.
181 Q. Well, it's not clear from your risk escalation that there had ever been a Garda referral?
A. No.

182 Q. Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

183 Q. You don't refer to it?
A. No.

184 Q. At all?
A. No.

185 Q. And, in fact, in all the documentation that you have provided to the Tribunal, that you were responsible for, and I will come to your final report in relation to this matter, there is absolutely no reference to the matter being referred incorrectly to the Gardaí, isn't 11:48 that right?
A. That's correct.

186 Q. Even though it appears that there were a large number of documents on the file that we now have?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

187 Q. That dealt with this aspect of the history of the file, isn't that right?
A. It appears that way, yes.

188 Q. These were substantial matters that had occurred,
errors that had occurred within the HSE/Tus7a, isn't that so?
A. Yes. But again, that wasn't, like, my function.

189 Q. Well, they were matters that, first of all, caused upset to Ms. D, because she was the person who was confronted with them by her father and had to ring Laura Brophy?
A. And had the investigation proceeded and we had met Ms. D, these matters may have arisen more for us then, but because they didn't.
190 Q. Don't cast the blame on Ms. D not pursuing these matters. This was back on a review of the file. If you had all the documents, a review of the file would disclosed material that suggested that Ms. D's
allegation had been misrepresented in a referral to the 11:49 Gardaí?
A. Yes.

191 Q. And that she had to correct it in circumstances where the error was brought to her attention by her father and that she had got on to Laura Brophy, who had then writ answer number of letters, some of which don't appear to have been on the file, that she wrote letters to Eileen Argue seeking to correct it. That would have been of concern in relation to the management of the case?
A. Yes. I'm not in any way blaming Ms. D.

192 Q. Yes.
A. What I am saying is, I just reported what was on the file and it wasn't on the file. Had it come to my
attention, I may have done another risk escalation.
Q. The error couldn't in any circumstances be regarded as a fair procedure for Sergeant Maurice McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

194 Q. In terms of what we were dealing with in relation to your review, in terms of this has been a risk to the organisation, it was substantial, isn't that right?
A. It was.

195 Q. So, here we have three matters, all of which cover the reason for your audit, all of which have been flagged and the red flags are flying, aren't they?
A. They are, yes, it's very concerning.
Q. But you don't refer to any of these in your risk escalation or ultimately, which I'll come to in a minute, in your report, do you?
A. Because I didn't see them.

197 Q. Yes. Well, that's what I am coming to, and we really do need to nail this down, because we can't have it just sitting out there.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Because there is a suggestion that somebody deliberately interfered with the file and removed these documents from the file in order to cover up the substantial errors that caused upset to Ms. D, that 11:51 Sergeant McCabe is now aware of, and which were embarrassing to Tus7a/HSE. You understand?
A. I understand.

199 Q. That suggestion is there. Then one looks at your
report in relation to the case, your risk escalation report, and I'11 come to it in a minute, your comprehensive review of the file to your superiors, you don't make any reference at all to this debacle that had occurred in 2014. I'm just really suggesting to you, because you seem to have dealt with the matter competently, that you would have made a reference to this had you been aware of it?
A. I agree with that. I just see myself as reporting any concerns, I reported was on the file and that's why I don't believe that they were on the file.

200 Q. So, I mean, having considered this before you came here, because you knew it was going to be an issue, having considered it, do you believe that there had been an interference with the file and that these documents had been revolved so that you wouldn't have sight of them?
A. I don't see why it would have made -- I think it's more that they weren't put on the file in the first place. That would be my -- but I can't say for sure.
201 Q. We11, these are the on1y documents that appear to have been removed from the file, you understand?
A. okay.

202 Q. So it would appear to have been something that was done deliberately, because they're al1 focused on the Garda 11:53 referral?
A. Okay.

203 Q. A11 right?
A. They should have been on the file.

204 Q. So it's not a matter of -- they should have been on the file?
A. Yes.

205 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. Yeah.

206 Q. MR. MARRN NAN But it's a little bit more than that. I mean, do you believe, you're the person who was dealing with this, you reviewed this file, you did the best that you could do in terms of your review --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

207 Q. -- of dealing with all the issues that arose, of writing out to Ms. D, perhaps looking at errors that happened along the way, and you have highlighted them in your final report that you provided to the Tribunal. There's a hole in your report insofar as this matter isn't dealt with, isn't that right? You agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's not your fault, because the documents aren't on the file?
A. That's correct.

209 Q. So they weren't there for your consideration, isn't that right?
A. And if this was the only file in the region that had difficulties, $I$ may think that, but there was a lot of files I came across that were missing information, important information wasn't on the file and that's why it went to staff, they just hadn't been put on files. So, this wasn't the only file where details, important
details were missing off files, not just in
Cavan-Monaghan, in our region.
210 Q. This isn't just a matter -- I think you know it's just not a matter of detail, this is a matter of substance?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
A. Or they were never put on it.
Q. or?
A. Or they were never put on the file in the first place. We11, you appreciate and I'm pointing out to you that we are given the file in circumstances where it has been kept secure after being signed off by your department?
A. Yes.

217 Q. Or your team. A11 right, you're not going to put the matter any further, are you?
A. On7y to the best of my knowledge or recollection.

218 Q. CHA RMAN I think the point is, if I can just
intervene at this point. There's a lot of things that obviously can go wrong with cases and one of them is, failing to speak to Maurice McCabe and the allegation initially made.
A. Absolutely.
Q. CHA RMAN And then we come to 2013 and you get the pasting error, but the pasting error goes to the Gardaí.
A. Yes.

221 Q. CHA RMAN So, the person who at most was accused of, you know, a fully clothed encounter, which might be a misconstruction on a couch, is suddenly in a completely different category. In other words, you move from not even being on the ladder of sex abuse, if it's a ladder, you're way up there at number 7 or number 8 , you know.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN And that gets notified to the Gardaí. But every bit on the file that you're reviewing when it comes to the SART team historical child allegations, every bit that records the error going to the Gardaí; in other words the digital anal and vaginal penetration is somehow removed.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN Then it comes back sealed, the Tribunal gets it and 10 and behold the documents you haven't seen, which are the worst red flag of all the red flags you could come across --
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN -- are back on the file.
A. Okay.
Q. CHA RMAN So, what conclusion is one to reach? I mean it is a very, very stark set of facts confronting you. I suppose you don't have to take the fence if you don't want to take the fence, but I may have to take the fence and that's why Mr. Marrinan asked you the question. I mean, it's really -- weird, is not the word.
A. Yeah. No, I can see how it looks that way and it was very poorly managed in my opinion, from the start in 2006 right through.
Q. CHA RMAN I know, but, you know, there's the chaos theory and there's a conspiracy theory.
A. Yes.

227 Q. CHA RMAN Let's say there's a chaos theory, there's a conspiracy theory and there's the cover-up theory.
A. okay.

228 Q. CHA RMAN The cover-up theory, you know, it has to be 11:58 supported by something before you reach that conclusion. But in the event that the worst thing that happened is not on the file when you're reviewing it in your professional capacity.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAK And reviewing it competently, I think everybody accepts, that suddenly when the file is sealed, it reappears on the file.
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN It's kind of hard to reach the conclusion isn't it --
A. Yes, yes, I accept that.
Q. CHA RMAN -- that somehow these documents were lost, al1 about the same thing, and suddenly come back in the 11:58 right order in the file. That's the problem. I don't know whether you would like to comment on that. That was the whole purpose of Mr. Marrinan's questions.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Would you like to?
A. I can absolutely see how it looks that that is the way that it happened, yes. I just can't point a finger at any individuals in particular.

MR. MARRI NAN Very well.
Q. CHA RMAN So, I mean, so your view is it looks like a cover-up but you can't say who was doing the cover-up.
A. Yeah, because if they'd been on the file I absolutely would have reported on them, and that's why I'm so sure that they weren't on the file.
CHA RMAN And do you think it was a cover-up?
A. I don't think that there is a -- between Tusla and the guards no. I do think it was poor management and incompetence.
Q. CHA RMAN Well, I mean, if anybody makes a mistake, I
mean it's hard to own up to it, but sometimes one also can cover oneself in paper or remove the paper --
A. Yes.

236 Q. CHAL RMAN -- that shows the mistake.
A. Yes.

237 Q. CHA RMAR In administration we all realise that that kind of thing happens. Does it look as if this has happened here? without having to point the finger at anybody, does it look as if that's what happened.
A. That there was a cover-up?
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. It looks that way to me, yes.

239 Q. CHA RMAN But you can't say who may have --
A. I can't say, yeah. I can't.

CHA RMAN Fair enough.
240 Q. MR. MARR NAN If we could have page 1453 on the screen. This was a letter, 8th September 2016, from Séan Costello \& Company, solicitors for Maurice McCabe?
A. What page?

241 Q. Writing to --
A. What page, sorry?

242 Q. Could you deal with the screen?
A. Sorry, yeah.

243 Q. 1453?
A. okay.

244 Q. This is a letter addressed to Kay McLough1in but I think that it came to you, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.

245 Q. You subsequently dealt with that, and I'11 come to that
in a moment, but if we could go over to page 1454, just identify these. These were a case supervision record, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

246 Q. This is yours, is that so?
A. That's mine.

247 Q. Then it's headed "Maurice McCabe" and it's dated the 14th September, is that right?
A. If you just scroll down. Yes, 14th September, yeah.

248 Q. Then it refers to:
"Wote to Mb. D to offer appoi nt ment and she does not want to proceed".

Okay, that had become clear, we have the documentation, I'm not going to go through it, but Ms. D was written to?
A. Yes, and she telephoned our office, yeah.
Q. She contacted the service and indicated that she didn't want to proceed, and we already have evidence in relation to that. Then, under that, I can't read your handwriting?
A.
"Li ai sed with Tusla I egal and write to Maurice McCabe's
sol icitors cl osing."
Q. Closing?
A. And then the decisions were to follow up with Tara in the legal office and prepare the file for close. . 4 .
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Q. And then if we go over to page 1455. This is an email sent by you to Mr. Coste11o, dated 20th September 2016:
"I acknow edge recei pt of your correspondence dated 8th Septenber 2016, whi ch was addressed to Mb. Kay
MELoughlin. I would like to advi se you that the case was recei ved by the regi onal soci al work teamfor revi ew following the concerns raised in your correspondence with Mb. McLoughl in."

Is that really the basis on which you were brought in to review the case?
A. Because of the difficulties with how Ms. McLough1in had managed the case?
Q. No, you say there:
"To advi se you that this case was recei ved by the regi onal social work teamfor revi ew following the concerns rai sed in your correspondence with ME. MELoughl in."
A. When we did our audit, that was part of what we audited and saw was a concern.

253 Q.
"I can inf ormyou that the revi ew has been compl et ed and correspondence outlining the outcome of that revi ew will be forwarded to you by the end of this week."

Then, if we just over to page 1456 , this is your
report, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's headed:
"SART revi ew of file."

And then $2 / 8 / 2013$ and $3 / 9 / 2005$, what's that a reference to?
A. That would have been the ex-reference file to the case back in 2006. Does it say 5? That was the date that 12:04 must have been on the ex-reference.

255 Q.
"Case was transferred to SART in July 2016. Pur pose of this revi ew. To assist legal in their response to Mr. MKCabe's legal team and outline how the case has been managed si nce re-openi ng. "

The re-opening there refers to the re-opening in 2013, is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
"Al ong with Children First, the Child and Family Agency's policy and procedures for responding to allegations of child abuse and negl ect September 2014, is the pol icy the agency must use when responding to referrals of historical allegations of child sexual abuse.

On revi ewing the file that led it Mb. Loughlin's letter
to Mr. McCabe on 29th December 2015, the following was est abl i shed.

First of all, with regard to the allegations by Ms. D in 2006, the HSE Soci al Wbrk Department at that time did not complete a child protection investi gation into the allegations made by Mb. D. There is no evi dence on the file to indi cate that they met with Mr. McCabe to di scuss what had been alleged and to subsequently gi ve hi man opportunity to respond to what had been al I eged. "

Al1 right. So you're dealing with the position in 2006 there and a review when the file was first dealt with, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

257 Q.
"A standard report was then recei ved by the Child and Family Agency in August of 2013, whi ch outli ned allegations made by Ms. D of hi storical child sexual abuse. It would appear fromthe file that the case remai ned on a waiting list unallocated following that ref erral."

That's Laura Brophy's referral?
A. Correct.

258 Q.
"The referral made in 2013 contai ned inf ormation that was not correct and whi ch was subsequently amended by
the referrer in May 2014 and forwarded for the attention of the Social Wbrk Department accordingly. The case remai ned unal locat ed. "

Had there been any reference on the file that you examined to the Garda notification, that's where it would have appeared, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

259 Q.
"The file was revi ewed on 7th May 2015, a deci si on was made to respond to the referral recei ved in line with the af orementioned policy. This led to
Ms. MELoughl in's correspondence to Mr. McCabe on 29th December 2015.

There is no evi dence on file to indi cate that Mb. D was deal t with by the Social Wbrk Department to corroborate the information recei ved in 2013 and subsequently amended in 2014. Ms. MLLoughlin's letter to Mr. McCabe det ailed inf or mation that was contai ned in the initial referral in 2013. It is not clear why Mb. McLoughl in rel ied on that referral inf ormation as opposed to the amended inf ormation sent in 2014. It is al so not clear as to why a decision to proceed with the allegation was made without cooperation and corroboration of the al leged vi ctimand without having formed some opi ni on with regard to credi bility of the allegation that was ref er red. "

Had you at any time spoken to Kay McLoughlin in relation to how she had dealt with the file?
A. No.

260 Q. Was there any reason for that?
A. Because I had risk escalated my concerns to Linda Creamer, so those matters would have been dealt with by Linda and the Local Area Manager.
261 Q. Did you think of perhaps asking for an explanation from Kay McLough1in as to why these matters hadn't been dealt with?
A. I could have asked, but I assumed it was human error.

262 Q. Were you aware of what we've termed the five-point plan that had been put in place by Gerry Lowry and Seamus Deeney in 2015, in May?
A. I don't recall that.

263 Q. CHA RMAN It's just a letter just with five points on it.

MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN This is what we need to do.
A. Okay.

264 Q. CHA RMAN I think one of them was, we can't proceed without verifying what Ms. D is actually saying.
A. Okay.
Q. MR. MARRI NAN The first one was, yes, the very first one.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN which was kind of a sensible thing to do.
A. Yes, that's the first step.

CHA RMAN Given there were two different things
floating around on the 4 file.
A. That Ms. D was reluctant? Yes, I did, I saw that, but she was willing to attend, and that's why we made our efforts at a later date. I think her mother
contacted --
271 Q. I wasn't sure about that, but in any event, you decided -- was it a conscious decision that you made not to discuss the matter with Kay McLough1in?
A. I spoke with my principal Social Worker and then because it was risk escalated, I'm not Kay's manager, Ms. McLoughlin's manager, it's up to Linda Creamer and Gerry Lowry to speak to and then come back to me. You then go on to deal -- the next bullet point:
"While it has been presented as information of si gni ficance fromthe correspondence of Mr. Séan Costello dated 28th January 2015, most likel y a typo, and meant to be 2016..."
which is, in fact, correct, given the timeline of events.
"...the DPP di rected no prosecution and the DPP clearly stated that no criminal offence had been described or di scl ose (referring to the allegation made by Mb. Din 2006). There is no evi dence on file that this inf ormati on was commini cated to the HSE Soci al Wbrk Department at the time by An Garda Sí ochána. Withstanding that, the HSE will conti nue to have a
stat utory duty under Children First policy to i nvestigate all allegations of child abuse referred to its department."

The next bullet point is:
"It is important to note at this point that a Garda i nvesti gation and child protection investi gation are t wo separate investigations and al though both agencies work collaborativel y in responding to allegations of child abuse, the out come of one agency's i nvesti gation does not di ctate the out come of the ot her agency's i nvesti gation. "

That would appear to be the situation. But certainly communication between both agencies in relation to the same complaint is encouraged, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely.

273 Q. You didn't think of contacting the Gardaí when you were 12:12 doing this report?
A. It had been investigated, Séan Costello, it was clearly it had been investigated and there was no prosecutions, so there was no need.
274 Q. Then:

[^1]The Child and Family Agency under Children First has a duty to respond appropriatel y to all allegations of
child abuse recei ved in its department, current and hi storical. While it was appropriate to respond the concerns that were referred in 2013, given that they were not previ ousl y addressed by the HSE Soci al Wbrk Department, this is an assessment that shoul d have been 12:13 compl et ed in 2006/ 2007, when the allegation was first nade.

The file does not present any evi dence of a credibility assessment with regard to the allegation made in 2006/ 2007.

Thi s should have been compl et ed prior to any cont act bei ng made with Mr. McCabe in Decenber 2015."

Next bullet point:
"The case was revi ewed by the --"

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan, can I just stop you there, if you wouldn't mind.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
275 Q. CHA RMAN Early on in this, and it is months ago now, I was told all kinds of things, like if someone goes to the trouble of making a statement to the Gardaí, social 12:14 workers just take the statement at face value, that was one thing I was told. Other people have subsequently told me, at your level, that's nonsense.
A. $M m-h m m$.

276 Q. CHA RMAN Another thing I was told was, look, it's really difficult to interview teenagers, so we don't interview teenagers, $I$ mean that's again nonsense, I presume.
A. Yes.

277 Q. CHA RMAN And I presume you're saying both of those things are nonsense.
A. Absolutely.

CHA RMAN A11 right. Fair enough.
278 Q MR. MARRI NAN

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "The case was revi ewed by the sexual abuse regi onal } \\
& \text { teamin Dubl in Northeast, whi ch was establ ished in } \\
& \text { April } 2016 \text { and who has responsi bility for retrospective } \\
& \text { child sexual abuse cases. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The Sexual Abuse Regi onal Team of fered Ms. D an appoi nt ment to meet with a member of the Sexual Abuse Regi onal Teamto di scuss the allegation made. The purpose of the meeting was to corroborate the information recei ved in the standard report form, amended version, sent in May 2014, gather further rel evant information and assess the credi bility of the allegation being made, expl ai $n$ the role of the Sexual Abuse Regi onal Team and the process the teamfollows when responding to allegations of abuse and to establish her wi sh to proceed and engage in the process."

Then over the page, at 1458:
"Mb. D failed to attend for her scheduled appoi nt ment. She later made contact with the Soci al Wbrk Department and advi sed that she di $d$ not $w i s h$ to pursue the matter further.

In the absence of ME. D's cooper ation and the inability of the Sexual Abuse Regi onal Teamto compl ete an assessment with regard to the credi bility of the all egation being made, the case will now cl ose to the Sexual Abuse Regi onal Team and the Child and Family Agency.

It should be noted at this point that in the event Mb. D comes forward in the future to make a compl ai nt with regard to the allegation initially made in 2016, the Child and Family Agency will be obliged to re-open the matter and follow the necessary procedures as are outlined in the pol icy previously referred to."

I think that remains the position, is that right?
A. That's correct.

279 Q. And you signed off on that?
A. Yes.

280 Q. As did Clare Tobin, as being your report in relation to the matter. And it is comprehensive, but, as I've already indicated to you, it doesn't deal with a significant aspect in terms of the history and how the
file had been dealt with and the errors that had been made which gave rise to lack of fair procedures for both Ms. D and also for sergeant McCabe.

Is there anything you would like to add --
A. No.

281 Q. -- that might be of assistance to the Tribunal?
A. Not that I can think of, no.

MR. MARRI NAN would you answer any questions, please.

MS. LI SA O LOGLEN WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MtGARRY, AS FOLLOVS:

282 Q. MR. MEGARRY: Thank you. Paul McGarry is my name, I am one of the lawyers representing Maurice McCabe and I have a few questions for you. I just want to go back to a question you were asked at the outset by Mr. Marrinan in relation to the concept of high risk and what SART was set up to do. I think you agreed that there were three types of risks in essence; a risk 12:17 to children, a risk to the person against whom an allegation had been made, you referred to fair procedure and the like, and then you talked about a risk to the organisation. You referred, I think, a few times in your evidence to organisational risk. Would it be fair to characterise your evidence as amounting to -- or an acceptance that what you were looking at here was in the third category, the risk to the organisation?
A. Yes.
Q. That was as a consequence of, as you understood it al1 along, the inadequacies or the poor management, as you describe it, of the file?
A. Correct.
A. No, it's just from experience and professional knowledge. I had worked a lot of these cases and I deemed this to be one of organisational risk and others 12:18 of child protection risk, there's no criteria that was set out.
Q. Your concern is to ensure that the organisation carries out its functions properly?
A. Yes. There's a policy to be followed and from my audit 12:18 that wasn't being followed from within the region, hence the purpose of my team to try and roll out that policy and up-skill staff in the local areas to use it, because it is a fair procedure policy, it offers everyone fair procedure.
Q. Is it fair to say that one of the concerns that have you is to ensure that the organisation isn't subject to any criticism because of the way it manages its files and documents?
A. Yeah, absolutely, that's part of my role.
what sort of sanction does SART have within the organisation?
A. Can you explain to me?
Q. Well, perhaps $I$ will ask the question a different way.

Supposing you had seen on the file the various things that we now know were not on the file in relation to the Garda notification, what would your report have said?
A. It would have been in the risk escalation that there was details sent back and forth between Tusla and Gardaí that was not correct and it would have been up to higher management to follow up on that.
Q. Would your report have gone so far as to criticise the local team for the way in which they had managed the case?
A. That's not in my nature, to criticise any individuals in particular. But, this case was badly managed and I think $I$ got that across in my risk escalation.
In the context of what SART is trying to do, which was to create a scenario whereby criticism of Tusla can be avoided, is it part of what SART can do, to identify who is responsible for making these mistakes and point that out in the report?
A. Well, I named people in my risk escalation.

291 Q. Let me take it a step further: Supposing you had discovered that the documents that weren't on the file at the beginning when you were looking at them, subsequently reappeared on the file before you put your report together, what then would your report have said?
A. I would have reported that to my Principal Social Worker, that was a concern, that there was very important missing information from the file, and decided whether that needed to be then further risk
escalated.
Q.

Would that not have prompted you to enquire as to who had taken the files -- sorry, taken the documents off the file?
A. That's not my role, that's the role of above me to do that. I report what I have found. It's not up to me to discipline people. Like, the people that $I$ was dealing with down in the local area in Cavan-Monaghan were on the same level as me. So, I risk escalate my concerns and it's up to management above me to do the discipline, if there is.
Q. I'm not talking about you personally disciplining people, Ms. O'Logh1en, al1 I'm asking about is, would you not have considered it appropriate for you to enquire as to how come these documents were not on the file?
A. If that had occurred.

Q. Yes.
A. Well, either the team leaders or the managers, between the team leaders and the principal social workers, they are normally in our offices who holds the Garda notifications. It's not social workers, it's team leaders and principals.
Q. But there is only one file, isn't that right?
A. That I saw, yes.
Q. Well, procedurally there is only one file?
A. Yeah, there should be, but then across the area, people 12:22 had different -- there could be two or three files, depending.
300 Q. Leave aside the question of the emails for a moment, the Garda notifications and the draft Garda notifications, they're physical documents; isn't that right?
A. Yes.

301 Q. So they are pieces of paper, isn't that so? So, if they are not on this file, they must be somewhere?
A. Yes, because when you print them off, well in our Dublin offices, you get three copies, one is for the file and one should be kept by the team leader and one is sent to the guards. So, that should be how --
302 Q. So somebody physically has to have possession of them?
A. Absolutely, yes.

303 Q. If they're not in this file?
A. Yes.

304 Q. They're not on any other file, isn't that right, because there isn't any other file?
A. No.

305 Q. Okay. But now that we know, as Mr. Marrinan has pointed out, that by the time the Tribunal comes to investigate, they are on the file?
A. Yes, that's factual, yes.
A. So many different hands.

CHA RMAN Saying that something happened is one thing but pointing the finger of blame as to who did it is very ding.
A. It's different, yes.

CHA RMAN Yes.
308 Q. MR. MGGRRY: We11, I suggest to you that by the time
it comes to you there are only a very small number of people that have control of the file?
A. We11, I say there's a large amount of names on that file of who it had passed between over the years.
309 Q. Well, I'm not going to go back into the issue of coincidence and the documents themselves. So, you're saying that it's no part of what SART has to do to identify or to apportion any responsibility for what might or might not have happened to documents on the file?
A. If I had uncovered that I would have risked escalated it and I would have seen that the higher management would have taken it from there in terms of -- but I would have had to enquire as to what was missing and
why was it missing to report that to my line management.
310 Q. Can you say anything now about your own view of what happened, having regard to the fact that certain very specific documents were not on the file when you a look 12:24 at it?
A. As in were they deleted or were they taken off the file?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know whether they were ever put on the file. They may have been removed from the file when the error was seen because they were thought that they don't need to be on the file, or they may have been removed.
312 Q. Okay. Ms. Tobin, I think, used the word horrified to describe her reaction to what had happened here?
A. We were both very -- yes, it was a file that stood out to us as one that would have been one of the worst managed in the region.

313 Q. At the time?
A. Yes, and I audited a lot of files with the team.

314 Q. This is before you even discover as you now have --
A. Exactly.

315 Q. -- that these documents were taken off the file?
A. Yes, and we only heard about that at a very later date. We weren't aware of that.

316 Q. So, it was already one of the worst managed files you had come across?
A. Yes.

317 Q. Before you discover about the file?
A. Within the ones that I audited, yes.

318 Q. So, during the course of the discussions you had, I think you had some contact with the legal advisers, isn't that right? You said that in your report.
A. Tara Downes, yes.
Q. You see, I'm suggesting to you that that's an indication of an attempt to try to make things look better from the perspective of the organisation?
A. No. That's about a new team restarting the investigation so that fair procedures can be offered and that we would begin at the start without --
321 Q. But you have accepted in your evidence that this was an organisational risk?
A. Yes.
Q. This wasn't a child protection issue.
A. No, but Mr. McCabe hadn't been offered fair procedure 12:27 and that was our role then, was to offer him fair procedure.

323 Q. Ms. O'Logh1en, you have already accepted that that wasn't the concern, the concern was not the fair procedures issue vis-à-vis Mr. McCabe and not the child 12:27 protection issues, it was the way in which the file had been managed?
A. Yes, but $I$ have said in my risk escalation as well that the fair procedures was a concern, that he hadn't been Except that this all happens after you have been corresponded with by Mr. Costello complaining about all of this?
A. Hence we would have thought that is what would have been the fairest way, would to give Mr. McCabe the fair procedures and restart the investigation, because he was never offered them, he was never met by anyone in Tusla and we wanted to offer that.
Q. Are you aware of any subsequent enquiry in relation to the absence of the documentation on the file?
A. Subsequent enquiry by?

327 Q. By anybody.
A. No.
A. I think there's an internal review being done within Tus7a.

329 Q. CHA RMAN At the moment.
A. At the moment.

330 Q. MR. MEGARRY: You weren't at the meeting with Mr. Deeney in September of this year that Ms. Creamer went to, were you?
A. No, I'm on maternity leave since June.

Right. Did you see the emails from January of this year, 24th January, enclosing briefing notes and chronologies?
A. No, I wasn't involved in any of those meetings or those emails. I would have sent on our review and as part of 12:29 what they would have been discussing, but I wasn't part of those discussions.
332 Q. So, when you finished your final report, that was the last time you spoke to anybody about the subject matter?
A. No. At later dates, when they started to have those meetings, they were asking us to send on -- we were emailed to send on the review or the reports that we had, was there anything else that we had? And we gave everything that we had, but it was already on the file. 12:29 These are just copies.

333 Q. Did you provide any additional information other than the information that's --
A. No, I didn't have any additional information. I closed and archived the file in September 2016. I didn't complete any further actions after that.
MR. MEGARRY: Thanks.
CHA RMAN Did you want to ask anything.
MR. MEDERMDIT: when the evidence is finished, sir.

CHA RMAN Are there any questions?
MR. DI GNAM Chairman, I have two areas I wanted to ask Ms. O'Logh1en about.

## MS. LI SA O LOGLEN WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. DI GNAM AS

## FOLLOVG:

334 Q. MR. DI GNMM There are two areas I wanted to ask you about. The first is, and I listened carefully to your evidence and, indeed, the documents that have been opened to you by Mr. Marrinan, can I take it that you consider interviewing Ms. D to have been an important step to have taken?
A. Yes.

335 Q. Yes. Can I take it from that, that if you had been a social worker or social work team leader who received the referral in August 2013, that you would have considered interviewing Ms. D to be very important step to take?
A. Yes, absolutely.

Can I take it that, in fact, it would have been the first thing that would you have done?
A. First thing.

337 Q. Yes.
A. You can't go by third party referrals because that's information that is coming from someone else and their interpretation of someone's allegation, we need to get it direct, if possible, from the complainant.
338 Q. You had an exchange with Mr. Marrinan and the Chairman
in relation the documents which weren't on the file when you saw them, and you very fairly said you don't know whether they were on the file before you received the file or whether they were taken off the file before it was given to you. The Chairman asked you did you think it was a cover-up and you said "I don't thi nk there is between Tusla and An Garda Sí ochána"?
A. No.

339 Q. Can I take it that that is your opinion?
A. That is my opinion.

340 Q. Yes. Then there was a further exchange between you and the Chairman, and the Chairman said, look, that when people make a mistake, it's hard to own up to it but sometimes one also -- sorry, the chairman said, well I mean, if anyone makes a mistake, I mean it's hard to own up to it, but sometimes one can also cover oneself in paper or remove the paper that shows the mistake.
A. Yes.

341 Q. And you were asked then:
"Whout having to point the finger at anybody, does it look as if that's what happened?"

In other words, that somebody removed the paper. The mistakes in relation to the information and what was contained in notifications and referrals have been accepted by all of the relevant Tus7a/HSE witnesses to
have been mistakes made by Tusla or HSE people. In response to that question, whether there was a cover-up to cover that mistake, you said:

```
"It looks that way to me, yes."
```

To the extent that you express a view there that there may have been a cover-up, can I take it, that cover-up is to cover-up mistakes that were made?
A. Yes.

342 Q. And that that cover-up could on7y have been a HSE and Tus7a cover-up?
A. Yes.

343 Q. Thank you.
CHA RMAN That's it. Mr. McDermott.
MR. MEDERMDTT: Yes, Chairman, it is perhaps not a question for the witness, but really just a question of clarifying the record for the Tribunal, only because it's been, $I$ think, a couple of months since we've heard any evidence in this module and obviously an issue has come up today about whether or not the file given to SART was complete but in particular whether if it wasn't complete, some unknown person deliberately removed certain material from it. Just purely because of the passage of time, $I$ just wanted to remind the Tribunal that Kay McLough1in, who is the person who had custody of the file before it was handed over to SART, made an additional statement to the Tribunal in which she said:
"I wi sh to state under oath, I did not remove any document fromthe file. I did not try to sanitise the file. I did not try to pretend things weren't as bad as they were. I did not cover up anything in rel ation to the Maurice McCabe file. I have no know edge of anyone el se removing documents fromthis file and ret urning them at a later date."

And when she was questioned on day 18 , at page 19 of the transcript:
"Q. Is it your evi dence you removed nothing from the file.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you try to sanitise the file?"

And she confirmed that her position was that she didn't. And also Mr. Gerry Lowry, when the matter was raised with him, indicated that he wasn't aware of anything being removed the file. I think the particular thesis put forward this morning, which is that it must have been deliberate because it related to Garda communications, I don't think that was put to either of those witnesses. But in any event, the
Tribunal has their evidence, I'm sure will take it into account before forming any conclusions.

The only other observation I wanted to make was
obviously insofar as the word cover-up is being used, a file was given to SART, they immediately saw the problems, they immediately said Mr. McCabe hadn't been given fair procedures, so there was no cover-up in that sense, but I appreciate all of these matters are matters of fact and they are entirely matters for you, Chairman, but I purely wanted to make those observations simply because it has been so many weeks since that evidence was heard, people may have -- it may not be to the forefront of everybody's mind. That is all I want to do, Chairman

CHA RMAN Yes, Mr. McDermott, I appreciate that intervention and obviously I will think very carefully about whether or not documents were deliberately removed from the file. There are a number of startling 12:36 coincidences, they are, perhaps, the most difficult to deal with and one that has to be thought about is the biggest red flag with the deepest colour, namely the referral of the errors to the Gardaí, wasn't reported on by somebody who, at the moment, in light of the evidence I heard so far, Ms. O'Loghlen strikes me as being a highly competent person and someone who would do that.

As regards the send point, as to those who have said, look, I didn't alter the file, well, that's fine, it may be that the conclusion $I$ reach on the first - and I'm not saying what it is, and I can't say that now may be such that I find myself in a position where I
can't say how it happened, if I find that it did happen. But it's very helpful to have that observation because it reminds one of the difficulty of I
suppose --
MR. MEDERMOTT: May it please the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN -- condemning people simply on the basis of a hunch and I'm certainly not going to do that. But thank you.
MR. MEDERMOTT: Thank you.
MR. MARRN NAN Nothing further arising.
CHAN RMN Thank you very much for coming.
A. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MARI NAN That's the evidence that we have for today, sir.
CHA RMAN Rather than breaking for lunch, I think I will be aware because of the correspondence that I received and also because of what the Tribunal has set out to other people, that this is not really a question of finalising things today, because we have to look at this in the light of a lot of other evidence that we're trying to get into shape and put in place, but the observation just made, for instance, by Mr. McDermott is helpful, I didn't want people to give me closing submissions on this today in the same way as I got closing submissions in relation to the matter of the

Garda in Donegal, which is unrelated to this, yesterday, but in the event that anyone had any observation to make because this is the point at which I think a new page is turned, I would be very happy to hear such an observation, similar, for instance, to that given to me just now by Mr. McDermott, but if people feel they don't want to, I understand that, and certainly I fee1 that any final submissions, which hopefully, and hope sometimes evaporates, will in due course, and due course is an alarming thought at this point, be brief, they can make an observation now or not. It is not a question of, like the Anglican marriage ceremony, speaking now or forever holding your peace. So, if anyone wants to make an observation, please do, and if they don't, well then we have the sound of silence instead.
MR. MEDOVELL: Chairman, can I briefly say this: That we certainly will have observations to make but we regard it as premature for us to make them at this point.
MR. CUSH Sorry, Chairman, if I may just indicate, we had envisaged saying something because we thought that the Tribunal had decided that this was the appropriate time, we were always intending to be very short, but if it's to go back for a more complete observation, it's probably preferable, for example, that I might hear Mr. McDowe11 make his submissions before making submissions. So, on that basis perhaps it's best to leave it over.

CHA RMAN Yes. We11, I mean, look, we've got to the point where we discovered the report of Ms. D, how that was dealt with in 2006, we've got the again referral, self-referral in consequence of what her mother felt was her being troubled in 2013.
MR. CUSH Yes.
CHA RMAN what was taken down then, the word processing error, that's what everyone is saying that it is, what happened to the word processing error, where it went, the attempts to correct it following upon it being discovered in the Garda station, the futility apparently of those attempts. Notwithstanding those attempts, the letter to Maurice McCabe on 29th December 2015, and then we have now this issue of the file, when the review comes to be made by
Ms. O'Logh1en, which doesn't contain the referral to the Gardaí. So, those are the things, I suppose, that are uppermost in my mind. I don't think that will come as a surprise to anybody.
MR. CUSH No.
CHA RMAN But if you want to hold back. Sorry, Mr. McDowe11, I'm tempting you, it seems.

MR. MEDONELL: If those are the issues on which submissions are sought or observations are sought at this juncture, we would need time to consider it.
CHA RMAK That's fine. That's fine. But I mean you realise those --

MR. MEDONELL: Apparently there will be time. You're not going to start --

CHA RMAN We11, you will have time, I won't have time. MR. MEDONELL: You're not going to start -- sorry, you won't have time but we will have time to do that.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEDOVELL: I would prefer to take that time.
CHA RMAK Do those points seem to you to be sane and sensible?

MR. MEDONELL: Yes, except there are some --
CHA RMAN Additional things.
MR. MEDONELL: -- hanging threads.
CHA RMAN what are you worried about?
MR. MEDOVELL: I will make that clear when I make my observations, Judge.
CHA RMAK A11 right. Okay. So, does anyone else want to say anything? If there were hanging threads, for instance, Mr. McDowe11, that you were worried about, like you feel that we haven't perhaps focused on particularly, I mean if you feel that there are those things there, I mean there's the ordinary way of communicating with Mr. Marrinan or Ms. Leader or Mr. McGuinness.

MR. MEDONELL: Indeed.
CHA RMAN That's always very helpful. And then the other thing is, if you want to, you can write a letter, I must say, I prefer the first rather than the second, but you're not going to be ignored, that's for sure if it's half reasonable.

MR. MEDONELL: Certain7y. We will make our views known one way or the other, Judge.

CHA RMAN A11 right. And similarly.
MR. DI GNAM Judge, I think in the circumstances there's no point in me making submissions or observations rather than them all being taken together. I propose to hold off.

CHA RMAN As you are there, I mean one of the major things is: what happened internally in the Gardaí -MR. DI GNAM Yes.

CHA RMAN -- when the very serious allegation came in and it led obviously in the context of what was
happening to other things, including a face-to-face meeting in Garda headquarters with Sergeant McCabe in circumstances where what was then identified as a complete and catastrophic error wasn't, in fact, notified to those whom he was talking to in Garda headquarters. I mean, that's a very, very big thing in my mind and I should maybe tell you that now. MR. DI GNAM I appreciate that, Chairman, and I also suspect that is probably one of the hanging threads that Mr. McDowell is referring to. I will take that on 12:43 board, Chairman.

Just in relation to today's evidence and I don't propose to get into it in any great detail and the suggestion of removal of documents and cover-ups, appreciate, nothing of that was ever put to any of 0the Garda witnesses.

CHA RMAN Again, I have to try and be sane insofar as
that's possible.
MR. DI GNM Yes.
CHA RMAN But no one is saying that the Garda had -the Garda didn't have the file.

MR. DI GNAM Yes.

MR. BUCKLEY: Niall Buckley for Ms. G. I think our position is much the same as Mr. Cush's, we had anticipated making very brief submissions today, nothing the Tribunal has said in terms of its current thinking poses any concern but it's to be deferred back to another date to make fuller submissions, it seems be more appropriate to be done then.
CHA RMAN We11, it may be that everything to do now with Ms. D is finished and, if you like, I mean I don't see that Ms. D is going to be coming up again, I think 12:44 that's all done now and there has to come a point where you say, right, that's it, but if you wanted to make submissions on that and you clearly don't have to come back, it may be all irrelevant to you from here on in,
you'11 need to look at the shape of the witness list and any documents obviously to decide that, but that's the way it's looking to me at the moment. If you, for instance, wanted to simply make written submissions, I would accept written submissions as well if that was more convenient.

MR. BUCKLEY: Okay. Very wel1, Chairman. I suppose we wi11 just see what is being proposed by the other parties in terms of their representations at a later date and what is the most efficient means of addressing 12:45 them. Thank you.
CHA RMAN A11 right. The Tus7a is going to be in the same position as the HSE effectively. Okay. Well, that is it then.
MR. MARRI NAN That's it.
CHA RMAN I can't promise anything in terms of what we're going to be working on.
MR. MARR NAN No, not at the moment.
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[^0]:    "Garda notification corrected in May 2014 due to mi si nf or mation from Ri an."

[^1]:    "In summary, it is clear that Mr. MkCabe was not offered fair procedures with regard to the allegation made by Mb. Dinitially in 2006 and whi ch was re-referred to the Soci al Wbrk Department in 2013 as a result of a standard reporting procedure.

