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MR. MCDOWELL: Chairperson, before we proceed further there is a matter that I want to raise with the Tribuna1. My client, Judge, made a statement to this Tribunal on the 15th March 2017 in relation to a number of issues, but one of the issues, the things that he informed this Tribunal, was that he had never seen the Byrne/McGinn report and was only given a summary of it, 10:01 a very short summary of what was in it. And to this -until yesterday, he was in that position. Yesterday, Gleeson McGrath Baldwin Solicitors, on behalf of counse1 appearing on -- appearing on behalf of counse1 in the o'Higgins matter, circulated a document which now appears at paragraphs 4849 to - I just want to be precise about it -- 4851.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Smyth, you don't have to sit there if you don't want to. But if you want to sit there, you are more than welcome.
MR. SMYTH: I will stay here for the moment.
MR. MCDOWELL: Might as well hear it, in any event. In any event, Chairman, this document appears to be, on the face of it, an extract from the Byrne/McGinn report from 2011, and it appears to set out -- it's an extract 10:02 from the introduction to the report, I gather, because it's in roman numerals at the bottom, and it appears to set out a factual account of the dealings between Sergeant McCabe, Superintendent Clancy and other
matters which go back to 2004, 2006, 2008, and cover the territory that we are dealing with now, Judge. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I haven't actually read that yet. MR. MCDOWELL: Well, it's important that you should, Judge, because if, it could be brought up --

CHAIRMAN: Is it in volume 8?
MR. MCDOWELL: It's 4849 in the last book, it's just a recent addition.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Yes. So this is Byrne and McGinn. I mean, I suppose I know about Byrne and McGinn, it's 11th October 2010 was when the report was made to Sergeant McCabe.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. You will recal1, Judge, that I asked on numerous occasions what instructions had been given to counse1 in respect of these factual matters, and both Chief Superintendent Healy and the Commissioner, both of them agreed with me repeatedly that the only source of factual instruction to counsel on these matters was the three witnesses which we discussed yesterday; Superintendent Clancy,
Superintendent Rooney and Superintendent Cunningham -Superintendent Rooney and Chief Superintendent Cunningham. Almost as soon as the Commissioner leaves the witness-box at this Tribunal, without being asked any questions by counse 1 for the barristers appearing, the solicitors for the same people circulate this document. Now, I'm presuming that it doesn't come from Rooney, Clancy and Cunningham, because they have claimed privilege throughout, and I have not been
allowed to ask about anything that they told counsel or instructions they gave to counsel. It would appear to me, subject to correction now, that it must have been furnished and briefed to counsel by the commissioner. If counsel are in possession of it, and are going to rely on it now as part of a defence of their instructions, it would appear that they were given it by Commissioner o'sullivan or people acting on her behalf, that they were furnished with it.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not sure about that, Mr. McDowe11.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, Judge?
CHAIRMAN: I am not sure about that. MR. McDowell: I am at a loss to understand where it came from then.

CHAIRMAN: No, again, I suppose it's again, if you like, the tidy legal mind. I am sorry, that was a phrase used against John Kelly, I think, on the Late Late Show about 40 years ago by Gay Byrne; it's all very well in your tidy legal mind. But look, trying to, I suppose, pin things down in terms of this I suppose if there is no legal professional privilege attaching and the Commissioner didn't claim any, I need to know where the instructions came from. Now she is saying in terms of the facts on the ground the instructions actually came from the individuals who were represented, whom counsel met. Again, looking back in relation to how this is to be joined into what the law says, well, what the law says is, it's improper
for counsel to proceed on a line of inquiry into, let us say, discreditable conduct or anything like that without actually getting instructions on the matter. And I suppose one of the best ways of getting instructions is to sit down and talk to people, but another way is to be briefed with documents. And as I understand it, there was certainly one legal case that was briefed to counsel and that is in relation to the defamation cases and the systemic failure letter of the 4th July 2011. And I asked were there others, and apparently there are two others; one against Tusla, which is probably a recent of recent origin in any event, and the other was the false imprisonment case arising out of the meeting of 11th October 2010.
MR. MCDOWELL: Well, the first thing I would ask this 10:07 Tribunal to do now is to ascertain whether the document circulated by Gleeson McGrath \& Baldwin was furnished to their clients by the Commissioner, or persons acting on behalf of the Commissioner.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I mean, they can tell me that if they wish.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry --
CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, I appreciate where you are coming from, but what is more in my mind is this: I mean, why should I read this, unless it was part of the 10:08 briefing material to counsel before the o'Higgins Commission?

MR. McDowell: Exactly. And why should it be circulated? And then, Judge, and this is the important
point, how is it that I am now in the position that I have seen the back of the former Commissioner and Chief Superintendent Healy, if this document was given by either of them or on their behalf to counsel? Because these are factual instructions of the clearest kind. And, Judge, I just ask you, in particular, to look at the second-last paragraph of -- yes, the second-last -the third-7ast paragraph on page 4850.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, why don't you just -- I will just read the thing, it will only take me a couple of minutes and then we can proceed.

MR. MCDOWELL: If you read, Chairman, the whole of that page.
CHAIRMAN: Mm-hmm. well, I will have a look at it now, Mr. McDowell, if you don't mind.
MR. McDOWELL: Sorry, I have no objection to anyone seeing what I am talking about.
Chairman: Let's leave it off the screen just for the moment. Let's see where we are at.
MR. MCDOWELL: Fair enough.
CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, I mean, not a lot of this comes as a surprise, I would have to say, in terms of various facts that other people have said in the course of various statements or various reports, etcetera. MR. MCDOWELL: First of a11, Judge, you will see from the cover page, that this was a confidential report apparently dated 2011, I think, or 2010, and given -2010, and given to the Commissioner, which, almost eight years later, my client has never seen, until
today -- until yesterday.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, I didn't see the Byrne/McGinn report either. But I am not complaining about it. A lot of it is actually quoted in Mr. Justice O'Higgins's report and he says look, this is what Byrne/McGinn found, this is what I'm finding.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. But he was dealing with the actual complaints, he wasn't dealing with this question of motivation, Judge, or anything like that.
CHAIRMAN: In bullet-points, Mr. McDowe11, would you mind just telling me what --

MR. MCDOWELL: where I am going?
CHAIRMAN: Yes, what is your point on this.
MR. MCDOWELL: The former Commissioner and Chief
Superintendent Healy led me to believe that the only
source of information about these matters covered in
this territory was the three witnesses who --
CHAIRMAN: Was the live people?
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. I didn't quite get that, Mr. McDowel1.
I actually assumed and thought that there would be briefing material as wel1.
MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: That is what I assumed.
MR. McDOWELL: Exactly. And I was left with the
position that she claimed that she had given no instructions on these matters other than making these witnesses available to Mr. Smyth and his fellow colleagues. That was her evidence.

CHAIRMAN: No, but there was also --
MR. MCDOWELL: The point that arises from that --
CHAIRMAN: I don't mean to cut across you, but I think there also was evidence in relation to briefing on the 1egal cases.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And I think one of the barristers, certainly mentions briefing material, including certain documents?
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. And I checked Annmarie Ryan's email, Judge, which is to -- to counsel, the first one at any rate, which is at page 4046 in volume 8 , and it doesn't include, on the face of it, the Byrne/McGinn report or anything to do with it. It has the Guerin Report in it. So, I am just making this point, Judge, but you are asking me to put it in bullet-points. I have conducted a cross-examination of Commissioner O'Sullivan and I have met and I have respected fully, every time I came to the stone wall that what other people told counsel was privileged and I couldn't go there, I asked her what she, what her instructions were to her counsel, and she told me that in relation to all of these matters, it came from -- it must have come from the mouths of those three witnesses. But it now transpires that that is completely untrue. If -- now, Judge, if, if, I am saying, if this material was given to counsel by or on her authority, because this -- if it was given by or on her authority to counsel, and I am not saying she wouldn't have been entitled to do it,
but if it was done, it completely undermines the proposition that all of this territory was the subject of privileged instruction. And, Judge, without canvassing in too much detail, it shows -- for my client to see this for the first time yesterday and to see the analysis of him, and in particular, I mean, there is no point in avoiding it, the allegation that he was a paranoic, and that he lost control of his station and should not be put back in it - this is fairly shocking stuff, Judge. And $I$ have no doubt that 10:16 it's very relevant, if this was part of Mr. Smyth's instructions, if it was --
Chairman: well, let's find out about that first. MR. McDowell: I want to know where this document came from.
CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, let's find out about it. So, Mr. Sreenan, I think you are -- you are not the origin of the document but you are the conduit through which the document came, your solicitor.
mR. SREENAN: Yes, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: And what is the situation in terms of my tiresome reiteration of the ruling in Browne v. Dunn; your instructions on this are?
mR. SREENAN: Well, I have my understanding of my instructions but may I say, Chairman, that Mr. McDowe11 has raised this matter now without any advance warning to me --
CHAIRMAN: I think we should get over those things and just deal with what is there. I certainly amn't
thinking any less of you for anything, Mr. Sreenan, that is the way I look at things.
mR. SREENAN: I am grateful for that, Chairman, but before I answer the Tribunal's question I would like to verify and reconfirm my understanding of my
instructions by talking to my three clients together including Mr. Smyth, who is currently in the witness-box.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, what do you want me to do? Do you want me to rise?
MR. SREENAN: We11, it's a matter for the Tribunal, I think, but it seems to me that Mr. McDowell is essentially rehearsing a line of cross-examination that he may wish to engage in with my clients and try and find out the answers in advance. If the Tribunal
thinks it's an appropriate way to proceed I am happy to take instructions.
CHAIRMAN: No, no, no. Well, this is the situation as I see it, Mr. Sreenan, having been absorbed in this matter now for very close to a year: I know there was a Byrne and McGinn report, I know the date when it was revealed to Sergeant McCabe that I think eleven out of 34 of his complaints were being upheld in the Byrne and McGinn analysis, I know that there was an assistant commissioner then who did an analysis of that, it was a 10:18 desk study and said, well, that's fine, it wasn't I suppose a re-examination of it. As a matter of plain and practical common sense, I know that when we come to the point where the o'Higgins Commission is set up,
there are various stances being taken on both sides; on the one hand counsel for the Garda Commissioner is saying, look, there was a lot more in this than merely mr. Justice o'Higgins inquiring into ten individual incidents, there was an allegation of corruption as well and besides that, the whole interaction with the Department of Justice and with senior Garda management and their reaction to complaints is important, that is the case that's made on behalf of the Garda Commissioner and it seems from the limited evidence so far that counse1 who are representing the Garda Commissioner are taking a similar view, and on the other hand, on behalf of Sergeant McCabe, the case being made is this was an inquiry and he was merely there as a witness of fact. Now, I asked the Garda commissioner certain questions on that right at the end.

The next, I suppose, practical matter is this: I mean, I have been a practising lawyer, I know how cases are built up. So, you get some background material, sometimes it's in short supply, and nowadays with email, etcetera, usually there is a great deal of it. You read it, and then you sit down and you talk to your client and you try, insofar as is possible, to get a coherent account of events given that people aren't normally trained in giving a chronological and detailed exposition of anything that is important. And then having done that, you proceed to conduct the case as
best you may. Now, there was a particular issue here, which is in relation to cross-examination as to credit, which is a term of reference before me.

So in the light of that, I think what I need to know is: what was actually briefed to counsel? who were the briefing personnel involved? what were the documents? And who were the individuals from whom instructions were being taken? The next thing I think I need to know, which is number two, is: what is this being deployed in aid of? And then I suppose it will be easy for me to say in terms of simply relevance and jurisdiction of the term of reference as to where we go from here. That's what I would like to know and I would also like the assistance of counsel for the Garda 10:21 Commissioner, if I may, please. If my voice is expressing any annoyance, $I$ don't think it is, I'm not; I just want to know, I just want to know where we are and where we are going. And it would help me, and I am certainly not blaming anyone for this coming in late or 10:21 anything else like that, $I$ just want to know where we stand, that is al1. So $I$ will rise for ten minutes.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED BRIEFLY AND THEN RESUMED
AS FOLLOWS:
MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, might I just say one matter, lest it might influence the approach of parties here today, and it's this: That it's certainly my intention to explore as fully as is necessary and insofar as I
legally can any relevant instructions given to counsel either at the so-called hand-over consultation of the 11th May and the other consultations on 12th, 13th and 14th, prior to the inquiry commencing, so that the matter will be inquired into on your behalf in that manner. So that may or may not affect what parties -what the parties wish to express to you at the moment. CHAIRMAN: No, I appreciate that, Mr. McGuinness. Now, where do we stand, first of all, Mr. Sreenan, please? MR. SREENAN: Chairman, I have taken instructions on this. The position is that, as the Tribunal is aware from the testimony that has been given, my clients were briefed initially with very limited material. In the course of the hearing of the Tribunal, sometime after June, junior counsel, Mr. Byrne, requested a copy of the Byrne McGinn report, which was provided to him and a copy of it was also provided to Mr. MacNamee, the other junior counsel. Mr. Smyth, as far as he can recollect, did not receive a full copy of the Byrne and McGinn report. It was used to some extent by Mr. Byrne 10:34 as a reference source in respect of evidence given by Assistant Commissioner Byrne before the o'Higgins Tribunal on day 32, the transcript of which was not circulated by Mr. Justice o'Higgins when it came to drafting submissions. But with each module before the o'Higgins Commission, the Commission circulated to the parties a core book and included in that core book on each occasion was an excerpt from the Byrne and McGinn report of the relevant pages to deal with that
particular module. So Mr. McDowell and his client would have seen those excerpts, not the entire report, but those excerpts as circulated and the Commission itself had the entire of the Byrne/McGinn report. And when Assistant Commissioner Byrne was testifying he referred to his conclusions on page, 1 think it was 7 or 9 of the report, the part that has been circulated. And accordingly, it was used as a convenient summary of the testimony that he had given to the Tribunal -- or to the Commission in that respect.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. No, I understand that. I am familiar with reading Garda reports and the background to the deceased, for instance, is something that happens in relation to, if it's a murder. This thing, background to Sergeant McCabe was known to -- was part of the briefing material to counse1, as and from sometime in June.

MR. SREENAN: Sometime after June, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. But as regards any reference to individual incidents, the Byrne and McGinn report was
simply deployed as a handy reckoner in terms of a series of facts and their finding on that.

MR. SREENAN: Yes. Well, both deployed by the
Commission and used as a reference source by junior counsel.

CHAIRMAN: Sure.
MR. SREENAN: Mr. Smyth himself did not use it, other than to the extent to which he was aware of the briefing material circulated by the Commission itself
in its core book.
CHAIRMAN: All right. Who would have been responsible then for circulating it on behalf of the Garda, on your instructions?

MR. SREENAN: They requested it from Ms. Annmarie Ryan of the Chief State Solicitor's Office and she supplied it to the two junior counsel.

CHAIRMAN: So they would have had the entire Byrne/McGinn report?

MR. SREENAN: Yes. And their evidence, Chairman, will be that the nature, the dynamic nature of that Commission and their late instructions meant that they were getting briefing documents on an ongoing basis so that, although you very properly described, what should be the appropriate way in which counsel would be briefed and then consider papers and then consult with witnesses in that order - because of the constraints of time that is not the way it was operating on this occasion.

CHAIRMAN: No, I can understand. It's catch-up and
it's not an ideal world.
MR. SREENAN: No.
CHAIRMAN: So given that is the situation, Mr. McDowell?

MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, there's a number of things which flow from that. I don't know why it was circulated yesterday. I don't know with what in mind this material, which is high1y offensive and highly damaging to my client, was circulated yesterday.

CHAIRMAN: Well, 1 think I can gather why it was circulated yesterday myself.
MR. MCDOWELL: Was it to assist this witness's examination?

CHAIRMAN: No, I wouldn't imagine so, Mr. McDowe11. I 10:37 think the probable reason it was circulated yesterday was that at some stage reference is going to be made to what the instructions were.

MR. McDOWELL: Exactly. well, that is the first thing.
CHAIRMAN: And that is not legal professional
privilege. This is a matter of fact. This is just a fact.

MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly. And the second then, Judge, is, and there is a lot of issues which arise here: I was never aware, and neither was my client, that the Commissioner had access to this document and to this allegation that he was acting in a paranoid way. My client was never aware of that, until yesterday. A whole series of questions arise from that, as to how the Commissioner dealt with my client. And I have never -- I am now in the position that the ship has sailed as far as the Commissioner is concerned. I was never in a position to ask her did she hand this to the Department of Justice, for instance. was the Department of Justice informed that Assistant
Commissioner Byrne was writing everything off to my
client's paranoia? There are a whole series of issues --

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, that is part of it certainly,
but it's not quite what is said. I mean, I suppose being used to listening to what people say about things, I tend to say, we11, that is all very well but what is the truth of the matter? And I would say a
judge -- one would hope, Mr. McDowe11, that a judge would be in the same position or indeed any rational person would be in the same position.

MR. MCDOWELL: I am not doubting your rationality for a second.

CHAIRMAN: No, I know you are not.
MR. MCDOWELL: But I am doubting the veracity of what I was told, that counsel for the Tribunal -- or sorry, for the Commissioner at the Commission were entirely dependent on what three people told them.
CHAIRMAN: I didn't honestly think that on the basis of the evidence.

MR. MCDOWELL: It seemed implausible, but every time I came up against it I was told that privilege had been claimed and pages were excised from the book for privilege, and I have had no inkling as to whether this, what we are dealing with here was discussed with counsel at any stage or whether the gist of this was given to counse1 at any stage.
CHAIRMAN: We11, I wasn't thinking that, Mr. McDowe11. But I suppose one of the things that I suppose one might have asked was: Was the Byrne/McGinn report in full given to counsel? It would be a useful thing to have, certainly, if you are going into this. I mean, isn't that --

MR. MCDOWELL: And the strange thing, Judge, is I appear to be the only person -- or sorry, my client appears to be the only person who has never been furnished with a copy of this. Presumably it was discovered to the Tribunal.

CHAIRMAN: We11, do we have the Byrne and McGinn report?
MR. MCDOWELL: It was discovered to the Commission, presumably. Mr. Justice O'Higgins probably very charitably --

CHAIRMAN: We11, I can tell you, I have read the whole of the O'Higgins Report, but I didn't read the Byrne/McGinn report. But there is a statement I think from Chief Superintendent McGinn and Assistant Commissioner Byrne in relation to their approach to things. That may be deployed later on or not. I don't know.

MR. MCDOWELL: It may we11 be, Judge, that Mr. Justice O'Higgins, out of common decency, decided that my client should not be exposed to this kind of damaging and offensive material, but --

CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe he simply thought that is one person's opinion, I am going to make my own mind up. MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly. But it was the opinion furnished to the Commissioner at the time, Martin but if, if he accepted what Assistant Commissioner Byrne was saying he was effectively discounting my client as somebody who was acting in a paranoid manner.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We11, you keep coming back to that word, Mr. McDowe11. There are times I feel somewhat paranoid as well, I must say, that everybody is against me.

MR. MCDOWELL: The old phrase, Judge, that just because 10:42 you are paranoid doesn't mean they are not trying to get you, applies here very much.
CHAIRMAN: Well, there is another phrase as well: Just because you are paranoid doesn't mean that everybody doesn't hate you.

MR. McDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: We11, that is the way it is. Look, someone expresses an opinion, I mean, I am inclined to -MR. MCDOWELL: No, but, Judge, this isn't just an opinion.
CHAIRMAN: No, but what are we going to do, Mr. McDowe11? I mean, you are representing Sergeant McCabe.

MR. MCDOWELL: If you look at those four pages, Judge, if you look at those four pages, it does appear that Annmarie Ryan was given this material by Fergus Healy, who was the Commissioner's liaison officer with the O'Higgins Commission. It does appear that, contrary to what has been said here, it is very likely that Commissioner O'Sullivan was aware of this material.

CHAIRMAN: Maybe so. Look --
MR. MCDOWELL: If she was so aware, Judge -- if I can just finish on this. If she was so aware, the instructions she gave to her counsel have to be read in
the light of a statement by Assistant Commissioner Byrne to her predecessor, that all of this, all of the material that had gone to the o'Higgins Commission came from the mind of a paranoid man, or a paranoic, whatever you want to call him. And that, Judge, utterly changes the, if I may say so, the absolutely anodyne and hands-off evidence that you have heard in relation to this.

CHAIRMAN: Well, in an ideal world, therefore, what would you like to happen, Mr. McDowe11?
MR. MCDOWELL: I would like to have her back, Judge, and ask her about this and I would also like to have a copy of the full report, because I don't like having four pages of an analysis put before me, because presumably the whole report justifies the conclusions that a lot of Sergeant McCabe's allegations which Mr. Justice O'Higgins upheld, presumably the reasoning as to why they were dismissed will appear.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. And do you know, when I read through the transcript and I see what Mr. Justice O'Higgins did and the ruling that he actually made, I mean, there is a certain latitude that has to be made in relation to people who feel they need to make a case, and I think judges tend to allow that, whether it's admissible or relevant or not, once it doesn't go on too long, but he 10:45 made a ruling, the effect of which was to steer this thing in a particular direction. Now, I'm left at the stage where I'm now looking at whether there were any unjustified grounds relied on by Commissioner

O'Sullivan to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe before the Commission.

MR. MCDOWELL: Well, it would appear from what Mr. Sreenan has just told you that this material was relied on at a later stage, this report was relied on, rather, at a later stage in relation to the submissions which were ultimately made after June, towards the end of that year.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. That could well be the case. I think the right thing to do, Mr. McDowe11, is for me to simply note what you say, it may be necessary for Commissioner O'Sullivan to return, it may be that you wish to ask certain other witnesses about this, and we will continue with this and --

MR. MCDOWELL: I am not trying to delay anything.
CHAIRMAN: I know you are not. But in the event that an application is made in relation to the recall of Commissioner O'Sullivan, well then, 1 will hear it at the time and in the light of what we have heard. I am not saying yes or no in relation to this, I am not making any comment about this. It's part of the material that is being put before me and I will consider it in due course.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. So maybe if we can go on then,
Mr. McGuinness.
MR. McGUINNESS: Just before I resume with, Mr. Smyth, I should say to the parties here that Ms. O'Sullivan is a witness who has travelled into the State from abroad
to give evidence, and if Mr. Smyth is not finished by lunchtime I am going to stand him down to put in Ms. O'Sullivan I think very briefly after the lunch break.

CHAIRMAN: Who is Ms. O'Sullivan?
MR. MCGUINNESS: She is a witness from the Department of Justice. She is on the witness list for today after Mr. Smyth.
CHAIRMAN: I know. Well, there is a bit of a mix-up with the surnames, Mr. McGuinness. Yes. Okay.

## MR. COLM SMYTH CONTINUED TO BE EXAMINED BY

## MR. MCGUINNESS:

1 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Thank you. Mr. Smyth, can we just resume from where we left off yesterday?
A. Yes.

2 Q. You had given an answer which related to the obvious stress and effect that you saw on persons you were dealing with who had been involved in dealing with the complaints of malpractice, etcetera?
A. Yes.

3 Q. But I just want to go back to the nature of the inquiry. You obviously heard Mr. Gillane say at the opening of the inquiry that it was inquisitorial?
A. Yes.

4 Q. That the core booklet was neither a book of evidence nor a statement of claim?
A. Yes.

5 Q. And you probably will have heard Mr. McDowell repeating submissions here, perhaps twice or more, as to what he said in the Commission; that Sergeant McCabe was approaching it, he says, apparently on the basis that he wasn't there to be making accusations or to lay all about him, I think was a phrase he used at one stage, but did you see the inquiry in a different way? Did you perceive it to be a different sort of inquiry?
A. No, I did not.

6 Q. All right. But from the point of view of the parties whom you were representing, did you see it as a necessary part of that representation that you would have to, as it were, test any allegations, if one uses that word, or test the evidence that was being given in relation to each of the incidents?
A. I thought it was necessary in the best interests of my client as I am ethically bound to do so, regardless of the consequences to myself, to test the veracity of those allegations.
7 Q. Yes.
A. And it was in that context that credibility and motivation was raised.

8 Q. Yes. I will come back to what you understood that to embrace in due course. But from the point of view of the structure of the hearings, unlike the Fennelly Commission, Mr. Justice O'Higgins adopted a sort of a multiparty hearing approach at which he permitted persons to attend and listen to evidence that was relevant to them and to permit cross-examination then.
A. Yeah.

9 Q. So were you seeing it as part of, as it were, the Defence of your clients' interests that you would be enabled to cross-examine and briefed in an appropriate way to permit you to do so?
A. We11, clearly, as I said yesterday, the principal document that sprung out at us was this proven facts document, which set out a list of serious malpractice on the part of my clients, but more importantly it set out serious criminal issues touching on their behaviour 10:50 and their -- in their capacity as senior officers within An Garda Síochána. And more importantly, the document set out quite clearly how these facts would be proven. There was listed -- a list of witnesses, two district judges, there were 14 solicitors, two State solicitors, a number of high-ranking members of An Garda Síochána, about the rank of chief superintendent I understand, there were victims of crime, which were about 80 in number, all of this was to be supported by 70 audio recordings, considerable number of text
messages, I think about 120, if my memory serves me correctly, from the document $I$ read the other day, and all of this was presented to us as a menu of accusation against my clients which would have had the most serious consequences for them in the event that there was to be a finding in the Commission of corruption against any of them. And bear in mind, I felt I was acting in the best interests of my clients, and ethically bound to do so, regardless of the
consequences for myself to raise the issue of credibility and motivation in that context.
10 Q. We11, could I just tease that out now because you have used the phrase "my clients" there and will you accept that from me that that document didn't, on its face, appears to raise any allegations as against the Commissioner?
A. No, there were no --

11 Q.
In particular Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. That's correct. There were no allegations of corruption or of malpractice on the part of Commissioner o'Sullivan. They were directed against the other nominated clients, who were, as I said, the Clancy, Cunningham, former Commissioner I think Callinan was included in that, and I think Chief Superintendent Rooney, but more particularly, as he was at the time of the allegations, Superintendent Clancy, later Chief Superintendent Clancy, he seemed to be the focus of attention for much of the --
12 Q. But certain7y in your two previous answers when you are 10:52 stressing the issue of my clients, are you including Commissioner o'Sullivan in that?
A. Yes, I am. She was my client, she was my primary client.
13 Q. She wasn't the target, as it were, if I can use that word, or the object of any of the complaints?
A. No, she wasn't. No, she was not.

14 Q. Did you see it as necessary on her behalf then to engage in an examination of motivation and credibility?
A. On her behalf, and this is the reason why we sought instructions from the Commissioner in this respect, we wanted to know if we had clearance in relation to credibility and motivation. Because, as I said to you yesterday, in the event that there was a conflict between the primary client, the Commissioner, and these four people, who were also my clients, against whom serious allegations had been made, well obviously issues would arise in respect of that. And we would have to continue to represent the primary client, being 10:53 the Commissioner, or completely vacate from the proceedings altogether and that other parties -- other lawyers could come in to represent both the senior Gardaí, another set of lawyers to represent the Commissioner in the event that we found ourselves conflicted by what we had been told by either.
15 Q. Okay. We11, I will come back to the issue as to whether you perceived yourself to have any such conflict at any particular time. But can I ask you to look at Inspector McNamara's typed notes of the first consultation on the 11th May of 2015. They are at page 71 of book 1, going on to page 72 and 3. Now it appears that a portion of this meeting started, if one goes down to the very bottom of that page on the screen, the meeting started in the Chief State Solicitor's room. You joined it at a slightly later stage with your other counsel, but on page 73 -- 72 , the middle of page 72 , there is a list of personnel then who are represented by different parties. And had
you joined the consultation at that stage, do you think?
A. If -- I will be bound by what the note says in that respect. I don't have a memory as to what time I joined the consultation.

16 Q. Okay. We11, just turning on to page 73, there is mention of "McCabe's JR adjourned for some day this week". Were you briefed about that at that time?
A. We11, I understand that there was an application being made by Mr. McDowell in relation to another matter touching on this -- touching on the Commission, which perhaps, and I have to say I was hopeful that he might succeed because it would give me some breathing space in an adjournment to deal with the matter properly, but -- and we thought, even up to the Monday, that that $10: 55$ might be so, but it didn't happen. I don't know what happened in relation to that, but Mr. McDowe11 can deal with that if he is ever asked about it.
17 Q. okay. well, it records then:
"Chief Superintendent CPE representing --"

Presumably that is the Commissioner. Were you introduced to Chief Superintendent Healy when you arrived?
A. Yes.

18 Q. Then it says:
"Need to get filings - Lorraine Browne."

And then:
"McCabe - full dossier of al1 the legal actions alleged causes of action accrued."

And then there is a reference to Mr. wilson. what discussion was there about getting files, can you recollect?
A. Well, look, we were coming into this, as I say, in the normal way. Any barrister here present in this room knows the routine: You get a briefing document, you get, whether it be a bankers box of documents or whether it be a smaller type briefing document, you know what the case is about, you know the background, it's all set out to you in black and white. we were coming into this completely and utterly -- we had no clue other than what was in Seán Guerin's report, senior counsel, that this Commission was being set up on the basis of that. We needed to know -- we saw this document, which -- with the risk of being tedious, this proven facts document, and I said look, we need to get some background, we need to know where we are going with this, what is this all about, we need to know what is the background to this man. I was told, without digressing too far, about his background in a general way. I did not glean that from any document that has been mentioned by Mr. McDowell this morning. I didn't ask for the Byrne/McGinn report. I never got the

Byrne/McGinn report. And insofar as I saw that document that Mr. McDowe11 had, I did not deploy any of the negative material to which he refers against his client. Nor would I do so.

A11 right. Thank you for that. But do you recollect was there a discussion at this meeting, the first meeting on 11th, about Sergeant McCabe's brief statement of facts document? Were you discussing it at this first meeting?
A. The brief -- the statement of facts, proven facts?
A. We11, obviously I was very much concerned about it and I wanted to know what the background was. I was given the background that this was a man who was high1y regarded by An Garda Síochána -- by the authority, that he was a man who had served for a number of years in Bailieboro, for ten years, I understand, and I am open to correction on that, that from my memory, he was a man then who went to Clones and he came back, he entered a competition for the position of sergeant in charge in Bailieboro, and he was highly regarded and he succeeded in that competition and that was a post which was highly prestigious. I then found that I was led to believe then that everything was going along very well, he was highly regarded by his superintendent, he was the eyes and ears and had the back of his superintendent, who had great respect for him. I must say that was the position $I$ was led to believe. And then suddenly something happened in relation to these
other matters, or this matter, which had to be considered by, who I keep calling the authority but it was, as we all know, it's out in the open, it's the DPP.

21 Q. Yes.
10:59
A. I had no interest in what it was all about, other than it was an allegation made by a young lady.
Q. Yes.
A. I wasn't voyeuristic, I didn't inquire into what it involved. I was told that since that time, since the time of that investigation, this man's personality changed significantly. I was told that from then on, and it seems to be borne out by documents that allegations were being made against certain high-ranking members of An Garda Síochána, superintendents and such like.
23 Q. Yes.
A. So that was the general background to it.

24 Q. Yes.
A. And --
Q.

I don't want to telescope all the consultations into one or get --
A. I appreciate that.
Q. --- or get mixed up. Was this discussed at this point?
A. Well, from my memory, I don't know if the full detail 10:59 in relation -- in fairness $I$ want to be fair, in relation to it, but this was the general outline of what was being told to me. Now, obviously they didn't come to that consultation with all of this
documentation which informed me of that one way or the other. So as I said yesterday, this was a meeting which was, I suppose, a meeting about another meeting, which was to be more thorough, if you like, because we hadn't got briefing material.
27 Q. Yes. But the reference here, just, and perhaps it's unfair to ask you to comment on what somebody else intended "full dossier of all the legal actions" and then "alleged causes of action accrued", was that something that you sort of were made aware of or requested and did that embrace the DPP's investigation?
A. We11, no, I think -- I think that that may have referred to -- there was another -- giving us the full background, there seemed to have been some -- and I am open to correction on this again, doing the best I can with my memory.
Q. Yes.
A. There seemed to be some employment issues that this sergeant may have been raising in respect of his -- or there may have been other actions in relation to -there was some issue, I think, in relation to I think another client that I was representing, and I think it was mentioned here yesterday. I think that they may have been the matters that we were trying to get information on. an adjournment there, which --
A. Well, as I said yesterday --

30 Q. A hope.
A. Hope, hope.
Q. Hopeful.
A. And hoping that Mr. McDowell would finally get it on the judicial review and might get the adjournment that I so anxious7y needed.
Q. Yes. Ms. Ryan has fuller notes at page 3777, and we might perhaps just turn to those. It's a more, if I can put it this way, orderly structured note, as you would expect from Ms. Ryan. She lists all who were present there.
A. Yes.
Q. And none of your other -- none of your other clients, I suppose none of your clients were there as such.
A. Absolutely. As I said, this was a meeting about setting up a meeting with the relevant clients.
Q. Yes. Okay. She lists then at the bottom of that who you would be representing, superintendents and upwards?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was scheduled for different days, consultations to be arranged. And then on the next page, there is
obviously a reference to the probationer, at the top of that page. There is reference to the Chief Superintendent McGinn in Donegal and the outcome of the Byrne/McGinn report. And did that give rise to a request for the Byrne/McGinn report?
A. I did not request -- I never got -- you know, the documents you listed yesterday, I got my briefing documents from Annmarie Ryan.
Q. Yes.
A. And you listed them yesterday.
A. I have no recollection of ever asking for the Byrne/McGinn report.
Q. Yes,
A. I understand that my two colleagues may have, and certain7y Mr. Byrne asked for that report.
39 Q. At a later stage?
A. At a later stage, as $I$ understand it.

Al1 right. So, as far as you were concerned, it had no 11:03 impact in terms of either your giving advice on the 14th or seeking advice or giving written advice on the 15th or seeking instructions on the 15th?
A. Well, rightly or wrongly, Mr. McGuinness, can I say this, this is rather like -- there was a situation -- 11:03 the Byrne/McGinn report was challenged by Sergeant McCabe in a sense, he didn't -- what should I -- get a you neutral word -- he didn't accept the results of the Byrne/McGinn report. And so, what I was dealing with was issues arising as a result of an independent review 11:03 which Mr. Guerin conducted under warrant from An Taoiseach.

41 Q. Yes.
A. And I was more concerned myself with the contents of that, I have to say. well, maybe rightly or wrongly but that is how I saw it.
42 Q. That was the latest word, as it were, is that --
A. I'm sorry?

43 Q. Did you regard Mr. Guerin's report at that stage as the
latest word on the allegations?
A. Absolutely, absolutely. And, if you like, the allegations that were being made at that point, and they were fresh in time as well, like. I suppose it may be a wrong analogy but when you come to somebody doing a Circuit Court appeal to the High Court, the judge will always say, I have no interest in what happened in the court below. It was more or less in that context that I saw this. Because clearly there was no acceptance of the Byrne/McGinn, I respected the position on that. I did not glean any material from Byrne and McGinn, rightly or wrongly, and any negative information that was contained therein. I was more concerned with what was in Guerin's report, and the up-to-date, if you like, allegations that were being made.

44 Q. Okay. The next heading there "outcome of McCabe investigations", does that relate to the Byrne/McGinn findings? Do you recall being briefed about the findings, as it were, that so many were upheld or not upheld or?
A. I think there may, in a general, have been reference to the number of complaints and the number that were upheld by Byrne/McGinn, but beyond that, as I say, I can't say there was any other discussion, as far as I 11:05 am concerned, about it.

45 Q. Can I ask you, who was the source of the information at this meeting about matters? was it Chief Superintendent Healy?
A. Absolutely, I relied on Chief Superintendent Healy to fill me in on the background and to give me the background details insofar as he could.
Yes. And did he tell you, for instance, for example, that he had had some personal involvement in the sense that he had been superintendent in the Cavan-Monaghan division, in fact, in 2006 but left in 2007?
A. Do you know, Mr. McGuinness, I really don't have a recall of that. But I understand from his evidence that he had that information available to him and was able to deploy it.

47 Q. We also heard from his evidence that he had been dealing with communications with GSOC in relation to their investigation in relation to Ms. D's complaint about the matter not having been properly investigated very close to this point in time in March 2015. Did he mention anything to you about the detail of --
A. Again he never mentioned anything --

48 Q. -- the investigation from?
A. From my recal1, he never mentioned any that have detail to me.

49 Q. A11 right. There seems to be recorded there an account of what happened when Sergeant McCabe was told of the outcome of the Byrne/McGinn --
A. I understand that.

50 Q. -- etcetera, et cetera.
A. I was made aware --

51 Q. Skip over that. It goes down to:
"Daughter was a minor at the time of incident. Daughter of work colleague in Bailieboro late '06/early '07. McCabe from outset was subject of allegation. File sent to DPP. DPP found no crime. Allegation of indecent assault made against him. Mr. McCabe had issues with way this issue was investigated. McCabe sought access to this file and was refused the file."

All of that came presumably from Chief Superintendent Healy?
A. I would think so, yes.

52 Q. And obviously this was fresh knowledge to you?
A. Absolutely.

53 Q. Yes. Did it appear relevant to you at that stage?
A. No. As I say, not at that stage. Because the fact 11:07 that this incident really wasn't of concern to me at that stage, it was -- as I say, I can deal with that later if you ask me further about it, but it had no concern to me. Because I was not going to deploy the fact that this man had this difficulty or whatever it may be, how you would describe it. It was not going to deploy it against him as far as I was concerned.
54 Q. Can I take it, were you ever instructed to do so impliedly or expressly?
A. I was never instructed, nor would I do so, to use any allegation of this nature against him.

55 Q. All right.
A. I want to put that firmly on the record.
Q. Could we skip down to the very last third of that page?

Further down, please. There is a reference there to a remark, and I think Chief Superintendent Healy said he wasn't quoting it exactly but it's recorded there. Did you take account that have or --
A. Sorry, which remark?

57 Q. "McCabe said to Derek Byrne "I wil1 bring this job to its knees"."
A. Ok, no, I did not deploy that against Sergeant McCabe in any of my cross-examination against him.
okay. But did you understand it to -- was it being conveyed to you or did you take it as an indication that perhaps Sergeant McCabe had a grudge against the Guards?
A. As I say, think point, Mr. McGuinness, this was all background information to myself and my two colleagues who were faced with this, again at the risk of being tedious, this very difficult task. This was a meeting about a further involved meeting that we were going to have with the various clients, I hadn't exactly -- or I don't think we had at that point made any assessment of 11:09 al1 of what we were hearing. So, it was just background information. And as I say, none of that was used against Sergeant McCabe; the fact that he said "I will bring this job to its knees", that was never spoken by me.
59 Q. At the bottom of the page there, that last sentence:
"Noe1 Cunningham will give us full details of this."
obviously that information was provided by Chief Superintendent Healy, but did you understand that it was being imparted to you as something that was relevant?
A. No, I think what that meant, Mr. McGuinness, was this: Chief Superintendent Healy was not involved in any way with the investigation of this matter, and that the person responsible who was appointed to carry out that particular investigation, was Superintendent Noel Cunningham. And I think what that means is that he would be in a better position to explain to us what that investigation was about or otherwise, or what relevance it may have, if any. And as far as I was concerned, from what I was hearing at that point, I was satisfied it didn't have any relevance.
60 Q. Okay. On the next page, 3799, there seems to be more substantive detail about the module coming up, what had to be done. There is reference halfway down then, if we go down the page, to the two juniors going out to speak to counsel to see if there is any possibility of an adjournment from the Commission. And there was a very firm answer.
A. Yeah, they saw their opposite numbers. I know that Annmarie Ryan I think maybe consulted with Mr. O'Hagan and I certainly tried to get the -- laid this application at the door of Mr. Gillane, and while he was very pleasant about it he said to me in no uncertain terms the judge was not for turning.
61 Q. Yes. That is the end of Ms. Ryan's note. Mr. Ruane
had a note which he gave evidence about, at page 3755. And at the bottom of that he lists who is present and then he lists your arrival with junior counsel at 2:20 and then it would appear you were present for all of the other discussion on the next page?
A. Yes.

62 Q. And at the top of page 3757 there appears to be -obviously a discussion has gone on to Sergeant McCabe at this stage. There is reference to pulse data.
"The Commissioner barred two members from Pulse in Mullingar traffic unit. Allegation file DPP doubtful crime at all. Indecent assault. Highly thought of role sergeant."
A. Yes.
A. What was coming to us was that this man was highly thought of, that this man was highly regarded by all -right through the organisation, people who had contact with him --
64 Q. okay.
A. -- until a certain point.

Mr. Ruane records himself there as I think referring to the litigation that is pending and presumably you would 11:12 expect to be informed or briefed of any such issues, there is nothing irregular --
A. In relation to litigation?

66 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, as I say, it was background, we needed to know the background information.
67 Q. Yes. It seems to record you there as referring to the "N Cunningham investigation MMC".
A. It may well be --
A. It may well be that was raised in the context that maybe -- I don't know what way that was brought up. That Noel Cunningham obviously can fill in more background about that, about the investigation.
69 Q. It may have been a question?
A. It may have been.
Q. And Chief Superintendent Healy then appears to be saying what it related to?
A. Yes.

71 Q. Chief Superintendent Healy has his own notes of that meeting at 3813.
A. Yes.
Q. They are not very detailed. There is, however, a reference at the bottom of that statement of facts. "Core", presumably that means core documents. I am just waiting for it to be rotated there. And it says at the very last sentence:
"what is emerging from the statement of facts."

And do you recollect, is that something that you would have started the discussion about or --
A. The statement of facts in --
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4 Q.
We11, I mean, do you recall, did you raise the issue of Sergeant McCabe's brief statement of proven facts or is that the Commission's statement of facts?
A. It may well have been, because that is the point I am making, Mr. McGuinness. Because I think the Commission would refer to the statement of facts. What I'm -- the 11:15 document $I$ have been referring to previously was the proven facts statement or document. So I take it that that relates to what the Commission was telling us.
A. Yes.

It's not quite clear what is -- do you recollect what that might relate to? Is that "no prosecution", perhaps?
A. I have no recollection of what that is. But I just
want to make it clear, Mr. McGuinness, there was no preponderance of views in relation to this incident or whatever you are going to call it, relating to the personal matter with Sergeant McCabe, there was no preponderance or weight put on -- at anything at that 11:16 stage. There was nobody building up a case to put against him in relation to that. I want to make that clear.

79 Q. Yes, yes.
A. And if people want to mention something they may 11:17 mention it but --

80 Q. It does seem to have -- or, as it were, the follow-on consequences perhaps seem to have been discussed. And if we go to the top of page 74 there, it says:
"Letter of demand from Sergeant McCabe for file of superintendent to DPP... and any report... got no support. Meeting in Mullingar. Sergeant Yvonne Martin present. He said reason for making complaints to Superintendent Clancy was to force his hand to get a copy of the file. Sergeant Yvonne Martin, Delvin."

And who explained that to you or how did you --
A. It may have -- it must have been, it must have been Noel Cunningham.

81 Q. It must have been --
A. Well --

82 Q. Yes.
A. I don't know. I mean, of the people who were present,
if it's the Mullingar meeting, he was the person at the Mullingar meeting.

83 Q. Yes.
A. Yvonne Martin -- well, Sergeant Martin wasn't there, so I assume it's Superintendent Cunningham.

84 Q. Yes. Obviously, it seems to be correctly recorded there about the --
A. That is so.

85 Q. -- complaints being made to Superintendent Clancy?
A. Yes.

86 Q. Now, I suppose just to be clear, when it ultimately came to the drafting of the letter of the 18th May, I think none of the counsel would have had these notes?
A. No, they wouldn't -- we wouldn't have had the notes, obvious7y, no.

87 Q. A11 right. Now, Ms. Ryan's note is at 3780, but it doesn't relate to that, but we had received a statement from Superintendent Cunningham in which he proffered as a waiver of his privilege for that --
A. Yes.

88 Q. -- solicitor's note, and that is at 4291. Perhaps we might just look at that. And if one scrolls down the solicitor's note should be further on, on the next page, perhaps. And this is Ms. Ryan's handwritten note, it says:
"Up to 2008, over 26 years service, Noe1 never had one single complaint against him by anyone. Since then there have been numerous complaints from public about
him. Question about whether McCabe behind these allegations -- these --"

Maybe that is a full stop.
"Allegation that Noel didn't carry out proper investigation. No adverse --"
A. Finding.

89 Q. "-- finding to date but some still ongoing."

And then scroll down.
"Noel met with McCabe in Mullingar, Yvonne Martin in 2008 about complaint to Mike Clancy, McCabe linked his deep -- wanted his DPP file. Noel made report of this meeting the next day. He has copy of this. Sent the report to Monaghan. This was his reason for making complaint to Mick Clancy. Gardaí to send on report by Noel. Counsel want this."

And did you recollect that being discussed in those terms?
A. We11, I see there maybe I requested that report.

90 Q. Yes, that is your initials there, CS?
A. Yes.

91 Q. "Counsel want this." And certainly Chief Superintendent Healy's note saying "get copy of the report", but he has got March 2008 in his note, whereas you clearly wanted the report relating to the August
meeting?
A. August meeting in Bloomfield Hotel -- or in Mullingar station.
92 Q. Do you recollect when you got that?
A. We certainly didn't get until after the -- I think leading up to this, where the letter was drafted, where matters kicked off at the commission, we didn't have any of the notes prepared at that meeting.
93 Q. Yes.
A. Nor I don't think -- we certainly didn't have the report.

CHAIRMAN: Maybe just help me on this one. The report we are talking about is the report by Sergeant McCabe about the D family, is that what we are talking about? MR. MCGUINNESS: We11, that is not the report I am talking about, Chairman. It's the report of Superintendent Cunningham, consequent upon his meeting in August 2008 with Sergeant McCabe.
CHAIRMAN: With Sergeant McCabe?
MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes. Mullingar.
A. I didn't have that report at the time.

CHAIRMAN: Well, you would need two things for that, Mr. McGuinness. I presume you would need what Sergeant McCabe had written out, in other words bad relations with the D family and with his colleague, and then the report by Superintendent Cunningham in consequence of that.

MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Which was also signed by Sergeant Martin.

94 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Yes. It's just, I am trying to elicit from the witness, was your request relating to both reports or simply the report of the meeting that Superintendent Cunningham had with --
A. Clearly I would want to see the notes of the meeting as 11:23 well. A11 right.
A. But certainly the report would be a comprehensive account of what took place, but the notes would be very relevant.
96 Q. Yes. I think you had a consultation the next day, on 13th May, and if we could look at Inspector McNamara's notes, they are at page 74. They are very brief. It says there:
"Ordering of materia1, examination of materia1."

Do you recollect that meeting yourself?
A. What date was this meeting?

97 Q. This is the 13th May, which would have --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the Wednesday.
A. Yes, yes, I think there was a meeting in Headquarters, yes.
99 Q. There is a better note perhaps, Ms. Ryan's note at page 11:24 3781. This is a note of a consultation first with Chief Superintendent Heller in relation to, it seems, the Module 1 issues. Was there any discussion at that meeting about Sergeant McCabe's motivation that you are
aware of?
A. I can't recall at that time.

100 Q. okay.
A. I just can't recall at that time. If it's not recorded in the notes then my memory is certainly not going back 11:25 that far.

101 Q. Yes. It would appear you had a separate consultation with retired Superintendent Maura Lernihan as well that day?
A. Yes.

102 Q. And if we turn to the next page, 3782, there is a reference there in the third sentence:
"We showed Maura copies of docs that Noe1 Cunningham gave us yesterday, i.e. his review meeting with management on the day after bus incident."

Were those documents purely related then to the Module 1 Kingscourt bus issue?
A. I would say so, yes.

103 Q. Okay. There is a reference then further down the page to Maurice McCabe and "need to find out about his sick leave record". Was that relevant to when he was on duty or was that part of the issue in Kingscourt?
A. It may have been. I just can't recal1 at this stage. 11:26 There may have been some issue as to maybe -- maybe an arising issue as to when he was or was not in the station. I do not know, I can't recall at this stage. But it would have been something that perhaps some of
us considered relevant.
Q.

Ms. Ryan has given evidence that at the end of this day, following the consultations, you raised the issue of credibility or motivation, about where this evidence was going and what it would be leading to. Do you recollect that?
A. If that is what she has recorded, she has a clear note of it, it must -- it must have been so.
Q. She is not saying she has a note of it, but it seems to have been sort of a reference to -- some mention of the 11:27 issue of motivation at that point in time. Do you have any clear recollection of that yourself?
A. I don't have a clear recollection. There may have well been an issue. that issue may have come up.
CHAIRMAN: Was it in the context of how did all of this 11:27 come about, type of thing?
A. Well, we were still leading -- we were still getting to grips with that, as to why all this came about, as to why this man changed and what could possibly have given rise to it. We were running out of time, of course, at 11:27 this stage, we were fast approaching the hearing date, and I know that a decision was made whether -- I mean, you may have more notes or whatever, to assist me on that, but a decision certainly was made on credibility and motivation in advance of the hearing.

106 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Chief Superintendent Healy then had notes which he made on the 14th, which, according to his evidence, relate to the day at the Commission, but also his consultation with the Commissioner later that
evening. And perhaps could I ask you to look at those, at 3817.
A. Sure.

107 Q. The piece about the hearing seems to be in the middle there.
"An opening statement from the judge.
2. Out.
3. Lorraine Browne gave evidence.
4. Ferghal McCarthy.
5. Regina McArdle."

And according to Superintendent Healy then the matters at the bottom were written by him as prompts to enable him to speak to the Commissioner about advices that counse1, presumably you and the others, had given to him, seeking instructions on credibility and motivation.
A. Yes.

108 Q. And what is your recollection of the advice that you
gave on that day to seek instructions?
A. From the Commissioner?

109 Q. From the Commissioner.
A. Well, you know, respecting the privilege of the witnesses concerned, it became necessary, in my view, 11:29 to seek permission from the Commissioner in respect of credibility and motivation in relation to the question of what turned out to be the incorrect version which was set out in the letter ultimately over the weekend,
commencing on the -- I think it was that weekend after the 15th. We asked, there seemed to be a suggestion -well, there was need to seek permission from her in relation to credibility and motivation in relation to -- how best should I word this? In relation to, there was a question about how Sergeant McCabe wished to get access to certain -- to directions.

110 Q. Yes.
A. And the reason for that. And what I was not aware of at the time, was that complaints had been made against Superintendent Clancy a couple of weeks earlier, sometime at the end of January, I was not aware of that until the second module. And I think what happened, there may and there must have been some conflation between what was said before in relation to allegations 11:31 and what was occurring now.

111 Q. Yes.
A. And it was considered that while on the face of it, Sergeant McCabe was making allegations and we were led to believe by his counsel that he was making
allegations against Superintendent Clancy to get access to this file.

112 Q. Yes.
A. To get access to the directions, rather.

113 Q. Yes. I just want to tease that out a little bit. But 11:31 I should have asked you, did you keep any notes yourself of any matters?
A. Whatever notes I have or had, sorry, were boxed, contained, dispatched, because there was -- the whole
thing was highly secretive, there was a risk that things may get out.
Q. Yes.
A. As it happened, sadly, that is what happened. But the leaks did not come from my source; I disposed, through shredding at the Law Library, I was authorised to do that through the service we have there.
Q. Yes.
A. And other documents were sent back or given back to Annmarie insofar as she could carry them at a particular time as modules ended.

116 Q. So you have retained no papers and have no notes of any matters?
A. I have no notes.

117 Q. And to your knowledge, do your juniors have notes in particular of this period?
A. We11, I think that that is a question that perhaps is best answered by them.
118 Q. Yes.
A. And I don't mean to be impertinent about that. Because ${ }^{11: 32}$ I don't immediately know, I presume they may have, I don't know.

119 Q. All right. But leaving aside now what happened in relation to the letter, because that wasn't an issue obviously on the 14th, but Ms. Ryan has recorded at paragraph 9 of her statement, and perhaps we would just look at, at page 3271. It's paragraph 9. Now, it says:
"Following consultations with all witnesses, counsel advised that Sergeant McCabe should be challenged on his motivation in making numerous complaints of serious allegations of corruption against several senior officers. At the request of counse1, Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy was to discuss this issue with the Commissioner."

Now, the issue as you have put it relates to credibility and motivation, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

120 Q. And at that point in time, just to understand the basis for your request, did you think it was necessary because of a belief on your part that Sergeant McCabe's -- the entirety of Sergeant McCabe's complaints were fuelled by this dispute over getting access to the DPP's file?
A. No, not necessarily. No, not necessarily, because as I said to you, there were other separate matters which he had alleged. He had alleged criminal conduct on the part of the clients that I had mentioned, and I thought it necessary to get instructions in relation to the credibility. In other words, as to the facts of those allegations when they came up. And if there was no evidence to support those allegations, well then you would have to ask why were they made in the first place? In other words, what was the motivation? So that's the context of what is recorded there.
121 Q. Yes. But the request doesn't seem to have been
formulated -- perhaps you might correct me on that, formulated or transmitted on the basis that there was any distinction between Sergeant McCabe's complaints. were you seeking instructions to question his credibility and motivation in relation to all of his complaints that were relevant to the Commission?
A. Yes, absolutely. Because of course right the way through, as I saw it, because there was no point in raising it halfway through because the corpus or body of allegations that were contained in the module 1 ran all the way through the entire Commission, as I saw it. So if we were going to raise it, we had to raise it from the beginning.
122 Q. okay. Well, in the context of the Commissioner not being, as it were, factually involved in any of the incidents under investigation, and knowing nothing and giving you no instructions, why would you need to seek instructions from the Commissioner to choose to challenge his credibility or motivation --
A. Because --

123 Q. -- in relation to incidents that she had no knowledge of or involvement in and couldn't be a witness to?
A. Because she was the primary client and we had to consider these issues in the realm of conflict. If, for example, Commissioner o'sullivan said to me that she was not permitting me to do that, she is the primary client, I had an obligation to represent her primarily. And the others were there by nomination. And in the event of a conflict, if Commissioner

O'Sullivan said to me I am not permitting you to do that, that is fair enough, well then a conflict arises and those men would have to be represented by somebody else.
124 Q. A11 right. But in essence, did you want to be free to make the case to the Commission that all of Sergeant McCabe's complaints were groundless and motivated by frustration or anger or revenge or --
A. No.

125 Q. -- whatever label you might want to put on it?
A. No, I never used the word revenge against Sergeant McCabe, never.
Q. No.
A. As the Commissioner said --

127 Q. Yes.
A. -- and she is absolutely 100 percent accurate in this, she wanted me to test the allegations and she gave me instructions to do that by credibility, and to test the credibility and motivation of the allegations as raised by Sergeant McCabe.
128 Q. Now, I mean, I can apply a number of different adjectives in relation to the matter, and embittered, frustrated, but were you seeking instructions, leave aside the use of any adjective, to make the case that Sergeant McCabe had made these complaints to get back at the Guards?
A. No. I want to make it perfectly clear, I wasn't making any case that the man was embittered. I wanted to test the evidence, as I was instructed to do. I said that
it was necessary to do so to see where, when these allegations came up, as I presumed they were coming up, the criminal conduct allegations, so on and so forth, were very much uppermost in my mind, but I wanted to test them, test them on the facts and if there is no evidence to support them, what is the point of making them? what motivated the man to do that? And that is something -- but I hadn't formed a view as to why he was making these at that time.
129 Q. Yes.
A. And that is maybe -- can I say, Mr. McGuinness --
Q. Yes.
A. -- that is why I didn't contaminate my mind with matters contained in the Byrne/McGinn report. I wanted to come to this with a fresh mind. I wanted to be fair. Yes.
A. And it was my duty, in the best interests of my client, to be fair, and also to be fair to Sergeant McCabe because $I$ was bearing in mind that this is an inquiry. I didn't come to this with embittered notions myself about Sergeant McCabe.
132 Q. Yes. We11, this is the point I am coming to: You hadn't formed any judgement?
A. No, I did not.

133 Q. And were you seeking to achieve any particular result for the Commissioner or were you just simply seeking to allow the Commission to examine Sergeant McCabe's behaviour and complaints in the way that the Commission
might consider it appropriate?
A. Well, achieving a result for the Commissioner was not -- she was not accused of any criminal conduct.
A11 right.
A. So clearly I needed the green light to deal with the issues that affected the remaining clients against whom these serious allegations had been made. So I wasn't trying to achieve anything for my primary client, the primary client, as she has correctly said on many occasions, had a duty to all members of the force, and she had a duty to Sergeant McCabe and she had a duty to these people against whom these allegations were made and she had to hold the line between the two. That has always been her position.

But in seeking and receiving instructions to question his motivation, would seem to suggest that at some level a decision had been made that he was improperly motivated or had an ulterior motive or may have had?
A. Well, do you know, Mr. McGuinness, I hadn't formed that view. I had not formed that view. And to do so would be very wrong. Because my job was to test the evidence. I mean, if someone makes allegations, if you take it in the criminal context, of which this is not in the criminal context, innocence is presumed. I mean, $I$ couldn't come to this with a view that this man 11:40 was guilty of something that he -- that what has been suggested here earlier, the negative matters that were referred to by Mr. McDowe11, I wasn't interested in any of that.
Q. Yes.
A. I wanted to test the evidence, and I wanted to see on what basis are you saying, for example, that people -or this officer suppressed that document which was done to cover up wrongdoing in that particular -- I wanted to know what the facts were on that, I wanted to know exactly if that case was being made.
137 Q. Yes.
A. And, in due course, how it was he was making that case. But could you not always make that case based upon relevant instructions relating to each particular module on the facts of that case? why did you need this overlay of permission on one view, on one interpretation, to go and attack Sergeant McCabe at the inquiry?
A. Well, sorry, Mr. McGuinness, I take exception to your suggestion that I attacked anybody.
139 Q. I am suggesting that one interpretation of it, and one possible interpretation that may be put forward, is that this was, in some way, seeking a sanction to go after Sergeant McCabe and suggest that he was actually il1-motivated or had some ulterior motive?
A. Well no, Mr. McGuinness, I want to put it firmly on the record here, there has been intemperate language used in respect of myself, both in Dáil Éireann and in other 11:42 places, and in the media, that $I$ went after this man, that I attacked him; I did not go after this man or attack him. I want that to be clearly put on the record. I have suffered personally because of serious
allegations made by certain elements of the media about my behaviour at that Commission. Now, can I just say this: If you use the criminal analogy, or the book of evidence analogy, if $I$ had a book of evidence on all matters, all modules, if it came in a complete package to me, I would have the opportunity of reading and getting an idea of where this was going, but I was getting this in segments, and I don't want to sing the song of oh poor me, I was coming to this with less than 48 hours to deal with it.
A. I asked for an adjournment. This was something that very much was going to have serious effect on the management of An Garda Síochána, it was going to have repercussions politically and for Government. And a
Minister for Justice was forced out of office on a wrong premise as a result of this. This had wide-ranging consequences. And I was asked to take this on with less than 48 to prepare. Mr. McGuinness, can I say to you, I am sorry to get -- what I find frustrating about this is that people who arranged up here today to ask me questions, the staff available to the Commissioner, my former client, it's nowhere resembles what I had to contend with. I had two junior counsel and I had a very assiduous and hard-working solicitor. That is the extent of it. And we had to deal with a massive amount of documentation. The people who were lined up against me today to ask questions have had months of preparation, you have hung
on every word that I have used in that Commission, and you are free -- and you are well prepared, I had to take this on the hoof. And to come back to your question; the reality of life is, $I$ had to raise this at this stage because I did not know what was coming down the track against these clients.

141 Q. Al1 right. Yes. I mean, obviously one does have to look at it from the perspective of what was happening then at that time and what people knew at that time. You couldn't foresee necessarily what evidence might emerge at the Commission?
A. Of course.

142 Q. You couldn't foresee what documents might be relied upon and you couldn't necessarily foresee any particular outcome of the Commission?
A. Of course I couldn't. I had no idea what was coming in the next module.

143 Q. Yes. But obvious7y then your judgement as to seeking instructions in relation to credibility then, why did you seek instructions to, as it were, test his credibility?
A. Because, with the risk again of being very tedious, I was told that the proven facts here by Sergeant McCabe, he had produced a document where he listed out serious allegations against these people, I needed to have permission from my primary client, the Commissioner, to deal with those issues and to seek permission to test the credibility of these allegations. And if there is no evidence to back them up, then I have to say, I
asked the simple question, why are these allegations being made? what is the motivation? And it's a pure and simple approach taken to that, and that is what I took.

144 Q. Okay. Would you accept, and you can answer this in whatever way you think appropriate, but would you accept that if one is seeking and receiving instructions to challenge somebody's motivation or challenge their credibility, that it necessarily calls their integrity into being --
A. Can I say this, and this is, as I say --

145 Q. -- in to question?
A. This is what I want to deal with. Because firstly, my former client, the Commissioner, Commissioner o'sullivan, who I consider to be a very good and decent 11:46 person, I have to put that on the record. She is a lady who gave me straightforward instructions, she has never wavered. I do not want and never wanted this man's character to be attacked and nor would I, because I didn't see any reason for it. But as a lawyer
looking at this, and Commissioner o'sullivan is not a lawyer, if I challenge, which is the better word, somebody's credibility on the facts and if there is no evidence to support it - What was your motivation for making these allegations in the first place? - it necessarily seems to me, as a lawyer, that there are issues of integrity surrounding those allegations. Not the character, but issues of integrity surrounding the allegations. And I know I am going to be asked
questions of this probably all day long about my, what I said or what I didn't say to the Commission, but that's as I understand the position. But Commissioner o'sullivan never used the word integrity.
146 Q. All right.
A. And when I said at the Commission on day 29 that that was an error on my part, I meant an error because she never said to me the word integrity.
147 Q. Yes.
A. That was my -- and can I say this: I was being asked at the Commission, I had to -- I had to revisit my instructions, which is most unusual, I never had to encounter it before, I was sent out of the room to get them re-confirmed. My instructions were being interpreted by the judge. He introduced the word integrity. The word malice was used -- was introduced by him. I never used the word malice. And where I fell into the trap in all of this is that I was trying to interpret what the judge's interpretation was of integrity. And my interpretation of integrity is what I have just given to you.

148 Q. Yes.
A. And it's as simple as that, Mr. McGuinness. Yes. Well, obviously, I want to be fair to you as to any other witness, but I understand what you are saying 11:48 is that where questions of credibility do arise and if questions of credibility call into question why some particular allegation was made, it does raise the issue of motivation, and in those circumstances it
necessarily impinges on the integrity of whoever has made the allegation?
A. As to the -- only, and I said that at the commission, in that respect. In that respect. In respect of the allegations. And that may well be lawyer language. It 11:48 wasn't Commissioner O'Sullivan's language. She never gave me instructions at any stage and that is clear --
A. -- to challenge this man's character.
we will come back to that in a minute. I am just ${ }^{11: 49}$ obviously still dealing with the basis upon which you were seeking the instructions. Can you recollect how you put it to Chief Superintendent Healy on the 14th?
A. Well, my colleagues may back me up on this, you can ask them the same questions --

152 Q. Yes.
A. -- I don't know what way they will answer it, but my understanding of it is simple: This man has made serious allegations. They will, if proven, have serious consequences for one or other or more of them. I need to be able to challenge these allegations as they come up in turn, if they do, and I need to know on what basis they are being made, I need to know the facts, I need to challenge the credibility of these allegations, and I need to know if there is no evidence 11:49 to support them, it follows naturally that there will be motivation issues raised as to why. Why would anyone make these allegations if there is no evidence to support them? why? And the question must be there
has to be a reason and I needed permission, the green light, to explore that, with Sergeant McCabe.
Q. In other words, you wanted to be free at the end of the day, should the evidence support it, to be able to make a case that certain allegations were baseless or appear 11:50 to have been il1-motivated or appear to have no basis for them?
A. At this point I wasn't making any assessment that this man --
Q. Yes, I understand.
A. -- Sergeant McCabe was ill-motivated. I was merely seeking to explore all issues relating to these allegations. I had made no prejudgment about this.
Q. Okay. Now, what did Superintendent Healy tell you the next morning?
A. He gave me the go-ahead. He said that the Commissioner has said that you have instructions to do exactly as you said.
Q. To challenge the motivation --
A. Insofar as it related to the allegations contained in 11:50 -- allegations of corruption and malpractice.
Q. okay. well, did that embrace then, in your understanding, all of the allegations under scrutiny by the Commission?
A. All of the allegations.
Q. Yes. So --
A. And may I say, Mr. McGuinness, it's been quoted in the press that all of these allegations have been upheld. None of these allegations were upheld against my
clients. None of the corruption allegations. And insofar as serious malpractice is concerned, none of those were upheld against my clients. The malpractice was held against the rank of middle management, including sergeant and sergeant in charge. And it's easy for people to have hindsight and say that I acted in an improper way. If I had sat on my hands, Mr. McGuinness, and not taken any action, and if, for any reason, those clients were found guilty of corruption, the consequences for me would be far more severe than the consequences which I now suffer, having to answer up for my actions as a professional lawyer of nearly 40 years' standing, as to how I dealt with this matter. I mean, this has weighed heavily on me.

## 159 Q. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, if I can just intervene. Mr. Smyth, I will appreciate very readily that being in the public eye is not an easy thing and being in the public eye in a bad way is a very nasty experience. I can appreciate as well that although I am not following media reports that I am aware that in respect of some things wrong facts were reported as facts where they are not. Now, I am not saying what they were, but I appreciate if that happens to anybody, it's a very unpleasant experience. However, what I'm doing here is not judging the media and I wouldn't have the competency to do that because as I say, I am not following it, but rather I am simply trying to get to the bottom of the questions that are asked of me by the Oireachtas to
give an answer to. And what it now boils down to in relation to this is whether there were any unjustified grounds relied upon by your client to discredit Sergeant McCabe at the O'Higgins Commission, and let's focus on that.

160 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: One thing that I just want to be clear about is: when Chief Superintendent Healy came back to you on the morning of the 15th, did he tell you that the Commissioner had given instructions that Sergeant McCabe's integrity was not to be challenged?
A. He told me that, as I had requested, I was given permission to challenge credibility and motivation relating to the allegations of corruption and malpractice.
161 Q. okay. And it would appear --
A. I did not ask for instructions about integrity.

162 Q. I understand that. But the confirmation of instructs came back with no restriction, as it were, that you weren't to do this or that, in particular you weren't to challenge his integrity or suggest that he was acting mala fides?
A. I never suggested he was acting mala fides, I never suggested that to him.
163 Q. I understand that. I am just trying to --
A. Nor did I seek any kind of concession that if -- do I have liberty to be wide-ranging --

164 Q. Yes.
A. -- in relation to other matters.
Q. I am just trying to be clear and to ask you to be clear
about what specifically Chief Superintendent Healy said and whether, in particular, he conveyed to you any restriction on your instructions or any limits to it?
A. I got permission for the instructions that I sought.

166 Q. Okay.
A. And there was no question of anybody -- if you are asking me was I at liberty to trespass into other areas, I did not seek that and I didn't do it.
Q. All right. Well, the next day, or that day, the row blew up, if I can put it this way, and I am sure you don't forget that. But if we could look at page -it's 178 to 179 of the transcript. At page 663. CHAIRMAN: So this is Friday, 15th May? MR. MCGUINNESS: The Friday, yes.
CHAIRMAN: 2015. PM.
168 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: And the issue arose in the context of the cross-examination of Chief Superintendent Rooney, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

169 Q. And Mr. Gillane objects, at the top of the next page, 11:56 179?
A. Yes.

170 Q. And he says:
"I don't mean to cut across the witness but I think just in relation to this matter, unless the parties have a different view, I think it's evidence concerning a matter that the Commission isn't directed to investigate, whether it's relevant or not is a matter
for the parties."

And then you reply:
"Can I say, Judge, perhaps you should hear us since this is a private hearing. The relevance may be in context of motivation for certain facts or for certain matters or, indeed, credibility in relation to the certain matters."

And the issue was stated by you there, and that certainly appears to be consistent with what the instructions you sought were and what the confirmation given by Chief Superintendent Healy was, you'd agree with that, I take it?
A. Yes.

171 Q. And obviously it's fair to say you don't make the case or are recorded there as saying that you wished to make a positive case that Sergeant McCabe was ill-motivated or was acting mala fides --
A. No.
Q. -- or that you wanted to challenge his integrity?
A. No, no.

173 Q. At that stage, the Tribunal rose, according to the transcript, at 15:10, and Mr. McDowell had raised that issue of the Commissioner's instructions at that point in time?
A. Yes.

174 Q. Now, you hadn't consulted with the Commissioner

> yourself obviously at that point in time?
A. No.
Q. And did you give advice that the Commissioner should reconfirm her instructions?
A. At that point?
Q. Yes.
A. No. The judge requested ultimately that they should be reconfirmed.
"Went back to Colm Smyth and informed him of Commissioner's instructions as per Fergus Healy. Commission asked do we want five minutes. We say yes. Before rising, Judge asked: Does this have to be introduced in this module?"

It then records that he made numerous calls directly to the Commissioner. Were any of the calls made in your presence or --
A. No, these calls were not made in my presence.

178 Q. All right. okay. And were you informed at any stage that the Commissioner consulted with anyone else?
A. There was a reference, I asked -- I remember Fergus Healy talking to me. I said, what is the position? I 12:00 said, we need to move this along. Some words of that nature and he informed me that he had phoned the Commissioner -- or phoned the -- yes, phoned the Commissioner and she was ringing back, as I understand
it -- or no, that he rang the Commissioner and said she wasn't -- it may be that she wasn't able to talk, that she was -- I understood it to be that she was with the minister. But that may be my interpretation of it, but that's as I understood it.

Yes. And was it at that stage that you were asked to put your advices in writing, do you recollect?
A. I think we were requested to put advices in writing by the judge?
Q. No, no, advice -- your advices to the commissioner in writing?
A. Yes. Well, I think what happened next was that we -when the Commissioner was freed up, we got a call to -she dealt with the matter and she said that she was giving us permission and she requested -- she requested -- yes, I think what you could describe it as a letter of -- I am describing it as a letter of comfort perhaps for the advices given, or for the oral advices and then she wanted to follow up by letter, to be advised as to the reasoning and so on.
181 Q. Yes. You were describing it as a letter of comfort. was that the way you saw it?
A. Well, that is the way I saw it.

182 Q. Or was that the way it was conveyed to you as a request for a letter of comfort?
A. We11, she certainly wanted a letter setting out -- from memory, she certainly requested a letter and would have been entitled to one, obviously, setting out the reasons for this, and why we were doing it, so that she
was clear in her mind as well, she was giving the oral advices based on -- or giving the oral instructions based on my oral advices and she wanted obviously a paper trail in relation to that. That is as $I$ saw it. Yes. There is everything to be said for having a degree of certainty about what advice is --
A. Yes.

184 Q. -- and what advice has been proffered?
A. Yes.

But the Commissioner seemed to make it clear yesterday that, from the time the terms of reference were published, that she saw the Commission as, I won't say an ideal opportunity, but the appropriate opportunity where everything concerning all the suggestions of either malpractice or irregularities or corruption, etcetera, to do with Bailieboro and arising from Sergeant McCabe's complaints, as being appropriate to be considered by the Commission, including Sergeant McCabe's involvement in it all?
A. Yes. As I understand, I think in fact the words were 12:03 she welcomed this opportunity for the matters to be aired in this way.
186 Q. So she appears, would you agree from having her evidence yesterday that she appears to have in fact been of the mindset that all of the matters connected with Sergeant McCabe's complaints, the appropriate place was the Commission, where they could all be aired fully?
A. That is as I understood it, yes.

187 Q. And did you understand that the instruction that she gave to you, through Chief Superintendent Healy on the 15th, was consistent with that intention?
A. That is as I understood it, yes, because she had a
clearance to deal with the credibility and motivations of all matters raised.

188 Q. And obviously she has told the Tribunal that one of her intentions was that the respected High Court judge, former High Court judge, could look into the matter and make recommendations and findings which would be of benefit to the force and to everyone?
A. Precisely.

189 Q. Without any impediment to him as to how he should inquire, other than the terms of reference, obviously?
A. Yes.
A. Yes, Mr. Byrne was responsible for the drafting of that.

192 Q. And perhaps we'11 just look at that at page 667. It says:
"Dear Chief Superintendent Healy As counsel appointed to represent the interests of An Garda Síochána before the o'Higgins Commission, it's our view that it's appropriate and necessary that the
190 Q. Is that the way you saw it?
A. That is the way $I$ saw it.

191 Q. But the letter of advices that was sent in your name and the name of your other counse1, I think Mr. Byrne did that up on his laptop, is that right?
conduct of any member of the force be challenged by cross-examination if and to the extent necessary."
A. Yes.

193 Q. Now, just pausing there.
A. Sure.

194 Q. You don't mention Sergeant McCabe expressly in that. Did you consider that it was part of your brief to necessarily challenge the evidence of any member insofar as it was relevant to the issue?
A. As I say, absolutely. Absolutely.

195 Q. "It's likely that in the course of the process which is a private hearing it will be necessary to put to Sergeant McCabe certain background issues which touch upon and concern the history of his dealings with members of Garda management."
and what did you envisage as being embraced in that at that point in time?
A. Well, there were issues running right through the modules. I mean, for example, to take one example, I
mean there was allegations of dereliction of duty being presided over by Superintendent Clancy, for example, and the whole interaction around that and as to how Superintendent Clancy on the one hand was making -- you know, he was there doing his job with at a senior charge was running the station, and there was interaction between the two. And Sergeant McCabe was satisfied that Superintendent Cunningham was presiding
over this dereliction of duty, and, you know, probing questions were asked in respect of that. So that's the type of thing that was envisaged, as it happened, but not obviously at that stage. That hadn't come up at that stage. Do you follow?
A. But that is the type of thing that we were seeking liberty for. Yes. It continues on:
"In particular, we consider it necessary and in the interests of a fair and balanced examination of the subject matter of the investigation, that specific issues be put to Sergeant McCabe regarding his conduct and interactions with senior management following the completion of a formal Garda investigation into a complaint against Sergeant McCabe which resulted in a direction by the DPP that no further action was to be taken against Sergeant McCabe."
A. Yes.

198 Q. Now, can I ask you, can you recall at this point in time, the reference there to specific issues to be put to Sergeant McCabe, what had you in mind at that point?
A. This was the interaction regarding his -- this is the investigation, and it envisaged what took place at this 12:07 Mullingar meeting in August of 2008, and the reasons he wanted to get access to the file, as $I$ understand it. Now, as it happened, arising out of that interaction I don't know if you want me to deal with the
interaction in particular or are you just asking me about the letter - but that is what we had in mind, to deal with that interaction as between, for example, Cunningham and Yvonne Martin and Sergeant McCabe at that point in relation to what he wanted, vis-á-vis this file and what had been said at that meeting. And we were always led to believe that there was -- he said at that meeting, as I understand it, that he made allegations against Superintendent Clancy for the purpose of getting access to the full directions, not just the letter which says there will be no prosecution or there will be a prosecution under a section whatever, but the full reporting, as I understand it, as the DPP sometimes does, and to which no citizen is entitled. So that is as I understood it. But as it turned out of course, Mr. McGuinness, that was wrong. But I won't jump the gun on that, I want to come back to that for a particular reason as well.
199 Q. Yes. I was concerned to know whether the specific issues were limited to that --
A. No.

200 Q. -- as it were, Mullingar meeting, the outcome of it?
A. No. But it's quite clear that in the letter we say, we point out:
"It will be necessary to put to Sergeant McCabe certain background issues which touch upon and concern the history of his dealing with members of Garda management."

And then, "in particular".
201 Q. Yes.
A. So it was a wide-ranging -- wide-ranging authority.

202 Q. Yes. But was it your intention to make the case essentially that because of Sergeant McCabe's frustrations about not getting access to the DPP's letter or file, it doesn't perhaps matter at this stage, that that was the reason for making all the complaints?
A. It could have been one aspect of it, Mr. McGuinness, because as I say, what troubled us initially is why does someone change from being someone who is well-1iked and well-respected and someone who has been -- you know, senior management are very happy with Sergeant McCabe and suddenly all of this changes at the end of 2006 and kicking off in 2007, the train of allegations are fast approaching various stations. And I mean, they are allegations made against chief superintendents, superintendents, and so. Of course we 12:10 were looking for the trigger and it seemed perhaps that this was the trigger. I don't know.
203 Q. The trigger for all of the complaints?
A. May it may we11 be and it may not -- you see, Mr. McGuinness, I don't know that, because as yet we had to see, as the modules went on, what is behind these things.

204 Q. Yes.
A. What has caused him to do this.

205 Q. That appears to be an important part of what you're saying; that you weren't actually making a judgement and you didn't have instructions to that effect but you wanted to see what would emerge or might emerge?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?
A. That is what we wanted to see.
Q. Yes. I mean, I am --
A. We were desperately -- sorry to cut you off. We were desperately seeking to find what is it that has caused this fine, upstanding member of the force to suddenty become like this. It just did not make sense to us. 208 Q. I mean, I am not passing any judgement in any way by using the words I am about to use --
A. Sure.

209 Q. -- or suggesting that they are appropriate, but the perception, was it this sort of thought process behind it, that Sergeant McCabe had turned into a whinger, a moaner, a complainer, arising from these things, and that, for that reason, his complaints didn't have veracity or accuracy or credibility?
A. I never viewed Sergeant McCabe in that light.

210 Q. Yes.
A. I never -- I never seen considered that he was a whinger or a complainer.
A. Nor did I ever put it to him that he was a whinger or complainer. I want to make that clear. But I also want to say this: That the perception I had, and it
was said here yesterday by Mr. McDowe11, I understand in cross-examining the Commissioner, that there was a certain spite or hostility.
212 Q. Yes.
A. From my observation, and I can't say anything else but purely from my observation, I have to say, and I have said it many times to my two colleagues, it is remarkable, quite remarkable, that in all of what has gone on since 2008 that the men of which I speak of, that is Clancy, Cunningham, even Callinan, former Commissioner Callinan, and I think is it Rooney, those people who were brought in to focus, there was, from my observation, no element of spite or hostility towards Sergeant McCabe at any stage. And it is something, I have to say, I would be well awake to because it would something we would have to take into account; were we getting a skewed view from these people? was there something more behind them? I mean we had to look at that.
A. We have to see, because we will -- I was ascribed yesterday as a mouthpiece by Mr. McDowe11. I am not a mouthpiece for anyone. I was prepared to be objective, as I had to be objective in these matters.
214 Q. Yes.
A. And I have to have a balanced view and if I saw any hostility or spite coming from clients, I may have taken another view altogether. That is all I am saying on that point.
Q. All right.
A. And I take that very serious7y.

217 Q. Yes. Going back to the advices and the final line is:
"The purpose of such a line of inquiry is to open to the Commission of Investigation the full factual background surrounding the complaints made by Sergeant McCabe so that all of the circumstances are clearly put before the Commission for consideration.""
A. Yes.

218 Q. And that I think probably neatly encapsulates what you have said --
A. Yes.

219 Q. -- in a number of your answers. Now, one of the striking things is that the advices don't refer in any explicit way to the motivation, good or bad, of Sergeant McCabe or the credibility of Sergeant McCabe or his integrity or whether he was acting mala fides, but this has been -- the advices that you have given orally are being referred to as motivation/credibility issues?
A. Correct, yes.

220 Q. Yes. Is there any reason why they are not, as it were, sort of explicitly addressed in the written advices or --
A. As I say, the oral advices were given. We received, orally from Fergus Healy, permission and the green light. We were asked, asked to provide a letter of comfort, as $I$ call it, in relation to the reasoning behind what we were doing. You make a fair point, Mr. McGuinness, you make a very fair point. On hindsight, it should, of course, include the words "credibility" and "motivation", and I take responsibility -- well, it's collective responsibility, I suppose, but I, as a leader of the team, have to take 12:16 responsibility for that. It should have included the word -- words "credibility" and "motivation", but as I say, I already had my advices -- I already had my instructions as per my advices.

221 Q. Yes, yes. It's just from the point of view of understanding that and considering it, and it was read over the phone to the Commissioner?
A. Yes.

222 Q. And it didn't, obvious7y, as read over, if read over accurately, contain those matters. You weren't intending to exclude those issues?
A. Oh, without -- not at al1. Sure I was calling for these at all times. This is why I wanted -- I wanted instruction -- I wanted instructions on these matters. And I know that Annmarie Ryan -- I mean, we could have got them earlier, perhaps. The Commissioner is responsible for An Garda Síochána, I know she was busy --
CHAIRMAN: I think I understand matters up to this point very well. Thank you.

223 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: In any event, the Commission recommenced, and we can perhaps go to page 671 of the booklets, it's booklet 1A -- 1B. Mr. Gillane is taking up the issue here. I don't intend to read what has already been said there. Mr. McDowell intervenes at the bottom of page 671, expressing his shock, going over on to page 184 of the transcript, 674 of the book, 675. Judge O'Higgins, at page 676, there saying it's in private. Mr. McDowell then raises the issue of impugning his client's credibility, questioning his client's motivation or behaviour. He says he is looking for confirmation of instructions there. Judge O'Higgins then raises the issue directing the
discussion, and at the bottom of page 188 says the following:
"Secondly, the matters that you have raised are important in relation to this -- it is an inquiry. It is not an adversarial thing. The question of credibility of witnesses can be probed in the normal fashion in relation to clearly the accuracy of somebody's memory bears on the credibility of their evidence and so forth but if it goes beyond that, if it is the Commissioner's case that she wishes to impugn the motivation and the integrity of Sergeant McCabe, if those are the instructions that you have, Mr. Smyth, I think you should say so in so many words. If they are not your instructions, that is a different matter

If those are your instructions that Sergeant McCabe acted out of improper motivation and that his character is -- so be it if those are your instructions but if not -- if they are, I think the Commission bearing the nature of the Inquiry should be appraised of that.

If that stage is arrived at, then the question of notice to the other parties or whether they were taken by surprise will be dealt with by the Commission. As I indicated in my opening statement, nobody is going to be ambushed. But that doesn't arise at the moment.

I think in view of the particular nature of the matters
under discussion that it is not unreasonable of Mr. McDowell to say whether an attack on the integrity and motivation of sergeant McCabe forms part of your case or whether you are saying that, no, he is inaccurate or mistaken."

And then you say:
"Do you want me to respond?"

And the Judge says: "Please".

And you are quoted as saying:
"I have instructions from the Commissioner, Judge.
This is an inquiry dealing with the allegations of malpractice and corruption on a grand scale by members of an Garda Síochána.
MR. JUSTICE O'higGINS: No, this part of the Inquiry -MR. SMYTH: I appreciate that but my instructions are to challenge the integrity certainly of Sergeant McCabe and his motivation.

MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: The integrity?
MR. SMYTH: His motivation and his credibility in mounting these allegations of corruption and malpractice.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: There is a difference. In relation to the question of credibility, as I have already indicated, that is an everyday matter. One can
suggest to a witness that his evidence shouldn't be believed because of something but an attack on somebody's credibility, on his motivation or integrity is something that really doesn't form part of this Inquiry. It would be necessary I think for you to go further and say that the complaints and the actions of Sergeant McCabe on your instructions were motivated by, his motivation was dishonest or wrong. In other words, that he made these allegations not in good faith but because he was motivated by malice or some such motive and that impinges on his integrity. If those are your instructions from the Commissioner, so be it. MR. SMYTH: So be it. That is the position, Judge. MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Those are your -MR. SMYTH: Yes, as the evidence will demonstrate, Judge.

MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Okay, those are your -MR. SMYTH: If we are allowed to proceed.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Those are your instructions from the Commissioner.

MR. SMYTH: Those are my instructions, Judge.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Very good.
MR. SMYTH: I mean, this isn't something that I am pulling out of the sky..."
CHAIRMAN: No, I have all of that, Mr. McGuinness. And 12:21 if you go on a few pages, Mr. Smyth says:
"whatever the reasons are for it on his side and it runs right through all of the --

MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: But you are attacking his motivation and you attacking his integrity.
MR. SMYTH: Right the way through.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Full stop."

That is the important bit. MR. MCGUINNESS: Page 682.
224 Q. Now, obvious7y in the heat of advocacy you didn't mention the word "integrity", as such, but you do appear to have married yourself to it, if I could put 12:22 it that way?
A. Could you just go back to the top again, please, to where I say what my instructions were?
225 Q. Yes.
A. Where I mention credibility and motivation in mounting these -- those were my instructions. And in any event, you know where it is. But those were my instructions from the Commissioner. I had a situation where I was faced by Judge o'Higgins, who was asking me persistently about interpreting my instructions.
A. An element of frustration was certainly creeping in. He was interpreting my instructions as including malice. He mentioned the word "malice". I never mentioned the word "malice". He first mentioned the word "integrity", and he mentioned the word "character". I never mentioned the word "character". There was an element of frustration creeping in at that point. I had to revisit, again, my instructions. I
was sent out of the room, and so on. So the point -this matter was clarified in greater -- in great detail on day 29 --
227 Q. Yes.
A. -- when Judge O'Higgins revisited the matter.

Yes. But just in terms of the interchange there, I mean, presumably you didn't believe that you were going outside your instructions, and you didn't intend to?
A. I did not intend to go outside -- nor, may I say, Mr. McGuinness, I did not go outside my instructions. I never challenged this man on character. I never challenged him -- it was suggested yesterday by Mr. McDowell that I challenged -- that I said that this man was not trustworthy. I never challenged him. I never said he was untrustworthy. It was suggested that I said he was malicious. I never put that to Sergeant McCabe. It was suggested that he was acting out of good faith -- or lack of good faith, and all that. I never put any of those matters. And, in fact, can I say, Mr. McGuinness, the invitation and the gauntlet was thrown down to Mr. McDowe11 on day 29, on the eve of the Commissioner giving her evidence, because Mr. McDowell, with all due respect to him, had, and perhaps rightly in his own way, blown a gasket on this; he had said the Commissioner, when she is down here to give evidence, or if -- I don't know -- in fairness to him, he hadn't known at that stage she was coming down, but I will insist on her coming down, I think is what he said, and, when she does, $I$ will be cross-examining
her and she will not like the experience. Now, on day 29, for whatever reason, this matter was raised by Judge O'Higgins, just before the Commissioner stepped into the witness-box, and he addressed this issue again with me, as to what my instructions were. And I explained to him in a polite way, as I am required to do: I did not, Judge, use the word "malice"; that was your interpretation of my instructions.
229 Q. Yes.
A. My instructions, I told him, extended to credibility and motivation, and the Judge explained that he understands the position. Mr. Gillane stepped in and gave his version as to how he saw the position vis-á-vis my instructions, or otherwise. Mr. McDowe11 did not cross-examine Commissioner o'Sullivan. And to my mind, he accepted the position as at that time.
Q. Yes. Well, we will come to that, Mr. Smyth. But just sticking with the transcript here, I mean, what is recorded is recorded?
A. Yes.

231 Q. And it does appear that you adopted the proposition that you were attacking his integrity?
A. I have explained to you already, Mr. McGuinness, I did not stray outside the instructions that I was given.
232 Q. Yes.
A. And whatever else -- however this may be interpreted -as I say, Roger Casement was hanged on a comma. I may be hanged on my version of what -- on a word that I uttered in the Commission.
Q. Yes. I --
A. Can I say this, Mr. McGuinness - sorry to cut across you - I have explained to you already that my interpretation of the word "integrity" is -- came from me, that was my word.
Q. Yes.
A. Firstly, it was the Judge's word, but my interpretation of what the Judge saw as integrity, that's where $I$ fell into the trap, and I saw integrity as being something that flows from someone or concerns allegations which have not been stood up in evidence, have not stood the test of credibility, there must be an issue of integrity attaching in that respect.
Q. Yes. So I think if I am summarising your position correctly, the freedom to challenge his motivation and credibility could lead in a situation where, if the allegations were found to be without foundation or were rejected, they could reflect on the integrity of the allegations?
A. On the allegations only, not on the character of the individual, which I never challenged.
Q. All right. You draw that distinction?
A. Well, that is as I see it.

237 Q. Yes. A11 right.
A. I did not challenge his character. This man was of
relation to -- and I said in that respect, in respect of the allegations, but the Commissioner did not instruct me to attack his character and I didn't do it. MR. MCGUINNESS: And it would appear that there was some attempt to give you instructions and Superintendent Healy had been on the phone a second time. Had you been aware, prior to the exchange we have looked at, that the commissioner had wanted an adjournment if possible?
A. I'm -- I have no recollection of that, Mr. McGuinness. I am afraid I can't -- this was at a point -- sorry, could you just refresh my memory again on this, please, just if I could see --
CHAIRMAN: There is a time for that, isn't there? I am just looking back. Anyway, sorry, please carry on. And the Commission rises then and -CHAIRMAN: The time of that one is? MR. MCGUINNESS: Pardon, Judge? just.

Yes. Well, the issue of the instructions first arose, it would appear, if we are looking at the time-1ine on the transcript, $15: 10$, that is at page 664 . There was an adjournment then, your instructions are confirmed and the tribunal -- or the Commission resumes at 15:36. 12:29
A. Yes.

241 Q. And --
A. And during that time I get my instructions re-confirmed, is that the question?
A. Yes.

243 Q. And your confirmed instructions are re-confirmed in that period. But could I ask you to look at Chief Superintendent Healy's typed notes for that, at 3825, 12:29 and just to read it in whole. It said:
"Made several telephone conversations with Commissioner o'sullivan to get instructions to question Sergeant Maurice McCabe on the Commission. The requirement was to question the motive of the member for making various complaints. Commissioner sought time to speak to DoJ. Then returned with instructions that we:

1. In the light of developments on the front that Sergeant McCabe had issues with now working in Mullingar and his welfare, could we seek a deferral until we seek advice."

Now, just stopping there. Do you recal1 being informed 12:30 of any concern that the Commissioner had about Sergeant McCabe's welfare and working issues in Mullingar at that point?
A. I do know that there was ongoing support for Sergeant McCabe during the entire Commission.
244 Q. Yes.
A. As there was for other members --

245 Q. Yes.
A. -- who needed it, who needed that support. I'm not
aware of --
246 Q. Were you aware of any of the details of any of the support that was being provided, in the period up to the Commission or prior to --
A. No, I was not. I was not. I had -- I had no idea of what was going on in the background. I do know at this -- I know that, during the Commission, maybe not at this point but during the Commission, there were supports provided for not only Sergeant McCabe but for another member who was upset.
247 Q. A11 right.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right, Mr. McGuinness, it's after half past twelve now. Can I just ask you, just with a view to seeing where we are going, you have other things to go through, clearly; how long do you think you will be? MR. MCGUINNESS: I think I won't be more than 30 minutes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That is great. I am just worried, if someone has flown in to give evidence, it's not going to disturb me in any way, and please excuse if this 10 or 20 minutes, well why don't we do that immediately after 7unch --

MR. MCGUINNESS: I think so, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: -- because otherwise anxiety levels do tend 12:31 to rise. And then, Mr. McDowell, do you think you will be --

MR. MCDOWELL: I shouldn't be too long with this witness.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. We11, then you might finish today, Mr. Smyth, with a bit of luck. Okay. So it's half past one. Thank you.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH:

THE HEARING RESUMED, AS FOLLOWS, AFTER LUNCH:

MR. MARRINAN: Fiona O'Sullivan, please.
CHAIRMAN: Just before we go on. Mr. O'Higgins, I see you there, and I was wondering was there anything I could do for you?

MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: No.
CHAIRMAN: There is nothing here that's relevant to David Taylor, who I think is your client, isn't that right?
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: We11, in the event, Chairman, that anything arises, obviously it would be -[inaudible - microphone not on] -- you gave the ruling. I did speak to Mr. McGuinness over lunch about a particular matter, but I indicated to him before we started that I wasn't interested in pursuing it.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. But it is just as regards this module, it's nothing to do with your client.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Well --
CHAIRMAN: You are very welcome to be here, of course, but you will appreciate it is not on the basis that $I$ could ever award costs in your favour for being here. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: We11, that matter hasn't crossed my mind.
CHAIRMAN: No, I appreciate it wouldn't.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: We're afforded representation, and there are issues in some -- there are matters in some of the witnesses' testimony which are relevant to our client's case, of that $I$ have no doubt.

CHAIRMAN: Like what?
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: We11, Chairman, I don't want to air them at this stage. I'm sure the Tribunal wants to get on with its work, without me indicating or giving the Tribunal a view as to how we're approaching our case.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. O'Higgins, I don't think there is anything relevant to your client here. As I say, you're very welcome to stay, it's always a pleasure to see you, but in the event that anything that comes up that is potentially relevant to your client, according to the analysis of the Tribunal, 1 will let you know. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Of course. And I note your comments, Chairman, I take them on board, of course, but we have our own assessment.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it's my assessment that counts, Mr. O'Higgins.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: No, no, of course it is, in the event that we are seeking to cross-examine, but we're not.

CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. O'Higgins, it's very simple: there is nothing to do with David Taylor now going on, and there won't be. In the event that, very unexpectedly, something comes up that is relevant to David Taylor, we will let you know.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: May it please the Tribunal.
MR. MARRINAN: Fiona O'Sullivan, please.

MS. FIONA O'SULLIVAN, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN, AS FOLLOWS:

MR. MARRINAN: Ms. O'Sullivan's evidence is to be found at page 3465 , sir.

I think, Ms. O'Sullivan, that you're an assistant principal officer with the Department of Justice and Equality, is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah. I'm on secondment at the moment to the Department of Foreign Affairs and I'm posted in Brussels, but I belong, so to say, to the Department of Justice and Equality, yes.
249 Q. And I think that between June 2014 and July 2015 you were the Press Officer in the Department of Justice, is that so?
A. That's correct, yes.

250 Q. And on foot of that, I think that some -- or a number of emails were copied to you, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

251 Q. And arising out of the disclosure of those emails to the Tribuna1, I think the position is that the Tribunal wrote to you on the 4th December of 2017, requesting of you whether or not you may have had discussions with the former Minister for Justice, Frances Fitzgerald, or the former Garda Commissioner, Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. That's correct yes.

252 Q. And I think that if we could just go, first of a11, and deal with the emails. I think they're at page 3484 , it's the first one. Have you got that?
A. I do.
Q. And why would it have been copied to you by Mr. O'Leary?
A. As you said, at the time I was Press officer in the Department of Justice and Equality, and I would assume that as the email related to a media query, I was copied for my information.
256 Q. And then if we just turn over two pages on yours and if we could have page 3486 on the screen, please. This is an email sent by Mr. O'Leary again to the Minister for Justice and Equality on the same date, at half past nine in the evening, correcting the information and but it has been copied to Marian Mannion, william Lave11e, Noe1 Waters, who we've already heard from, Dale Sunderland, and yourself, along with Michae1 Flahive and Christopher Quattrociocchi. Is that right?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection of receiving that email?
A. I don't recall receiving the email, no.
indicating that the queries came, in fact, from Mr. John Burke, who is an investigative reporter with 'This week'. Again, that has been copied to you. Did you have -- or have you any recollection of ever having received that email?
A. No, I don't recall receiving that email either. Like, in my statement, I did do an email trawl around the time of those emails to see if I had done anything with them, so I did see that I had forwarded the first email to my colleague, Andrew Kelly, who was the officer on duty at the time from the Press Officer -- from the Press office, so he would have been dealing with any out-of-hours queries that arose. So I definitely did open the email and read it and forward it to him, but I don't recall doing that. But from my email records, I can see that I did do that with the first email, but I did not forward the second email that we were just discussing there, the 21:30.
257 Q. So, having received the email, you believe that you would have read the email. Having read the email, would there be any action required on your part?
A. No. The email was forwarded to the Minister, in the first instance, and for her information, and generally when people are cc'd on emails, it's for their information also. As Press officer with the Department of Justice, I would have been dealing with queries that were relevant to my department. This was a query that was put to the Garda Press office and it was something that was simply just being forwarded for information.
Q. I suppose our principal concern would be whether or not you discussed the matter with the Minister. Did you?
A. No, no.
Q. Either of the emails?
A. No. As I said, I don't recall receiving them, but I don't think I would have had a conversation with the Minister about them. As I said, the matter was forwarded to the Minister by Ken. I was only in cc on it, so I wouldn't have thought that there was any follow-up necessary. And also within the first email that Mr. O'Leary sent, it had some suggested lines for the Minister. So, with that, I would have seen the matter to be resolved, that there wouldn't have been any further work necessary on my part.
MR. MARRINAN: Very well. Thank you very much. Would 13:43 you answer any questions.
CHAIRMAN: There isn't any questions. Yes. Thanks very much for coming along.
MR. MARRINAN: Thank you very much for coming.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW.

MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, if we might resume with the evidence of Mr. Smyth.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. COLM SMYTH CONTINUED TO BE DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS:

260 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Mr. Smyth, just before lunch we were
looking at the transcript of day 2, 15th May, where you were obviously on your feet in the Commission, and at 16:08, according to the transcript, you said you were receiving instructions and you rose for five minutes?
A. Yes.

And then I was asking you to comment on Chief Superintendent Healy's typed notes at page 3825. I had asked you about the first paragraph in the middle, which reads:
"1. In the light of developments on the front that Sergeant McCabe had issues with now working in Mullingar and his welfare, could we seek a deferral until we seek advice."

Were you informed of that, do you recall?
A. I cannot recall that, Mr. McGuinness, honestly.
Q. phone calls show that the call from the Commissioner commenced at 16:06, so if they are both accurate times, 13:45 this may have been relayed to Chief Superintendent Healy while you were actually on your feet?
A. Yes.
Q. It then says:
"Commissioner then rang a second time and advised that, on reflection --"

And the word "if" should be there.
" -- that if it came out in the course of questioning then counsel should explore it. And it was her view that if he (counsel) was advising that we explore the motive and that it was necessary that she was inclined to give instructions to him to explore this issue, it would be remiss of her not to instruct counsel to proceed. Therefore, Commissioner instructed counse1 to pursue that specific line of questioning."

And do you recall being informed of that in those terms?
A. I recall that whatever the original instructions were, were now re-confirmed.
264 Q. That is what was relayed to you, is that right?
A. Yes, that is what was relayed to me.

265 Q. Well, if we go to page 695, where the hearing recommences. You seem to say that in very plain terms. If we just turn that around. I'm sure you've seen this before, Mr. Smyth?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. At the top of that page it says:
"MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Yes.
MR. SMYTH: My instructions are re-confirmed.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: very good. Your instructions, as I understand them, are that Sergeant McCabe acted as he did for improper motives."

You're recorded as saying:
"Yeah.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Okay. And that his integrity
is being challenged in that respect."

And you say:
"In that respect."

So that was -- I think you qualify that, do you, by, as you understood, the issue of integrity might arise?
A. Yes. I'm not so sure at that stage that I was -- I'm comfortable with the word "improper motives", because I don't -- I would say that that was -- if that is the position, that was a mistake on my part, but to explore, acted as he did for motives, whether they be proper or improper, was a matter for -- yet to be determined. But I wasn't making a judgement that he was acting improperly.
267 Q. Yes, I understand that nuance. In any event, the discussion turned to --
A. Sorry, yes, but in that respect --

268 Q. Yes.
A. -- only in relation to the allegations.

269 Q. Yes. At page 208, the issue of credibility is being discussed by -- that is page 702 of the volume of our documents. You're recorded as saying:
"I think the issue of credibility arises in all modules. Sergeant McCabe has raised serious allegations of malpractice and corruption against An Garda Síochána."

And leaving aside the discussion about whether it arose in the module or not, I think the upshot of that day was that the Commissioner, or the legal team acting on behalf of the Commissioner was directed to prepare a document setting out --
A. That is correct.
Q. -- in form --
A. That is correct.

271 Q. -- the nature of what was going to be suggested in relation to Sergeant McCabe. And I think the hearings for that day concluded. And did you have any discussion with Ms. Ryan as to seeking the directions of the Attorney or consulting with the Attorney in any respect?
A. No, I didn't, actually. I didn't.

272 Q. Were you aware that she would be reporting in normal course up the line to the Attorney's office?
A. I was not.

All right. And did she make you aware of any discussions that she had with Mr. Dreelan on that day?
A. She didn't make me aware of any discussions she had with Mr. Dreelan. I always knew that Annmarie Ryan was always concerned about a motivation module, that this was always hanging out there, there was some talk about
this. It never came to pass, that there was a motivation module ever going to be considered, but I think that there was some exchange about that. That seemed to be in the background, but I did not know that Ms. Ryan was actually, who she was communicating with or whether she was communicating at all with anybody in the AG's office.

A11 right. Perhaps I can ask you to comment on some notes of hers at page 692 of this volume. And this follows a phone call -- a number of phone calls to Mr. Dreelan, and she received some emails that were copied to her from the Attorney's office. And then it says:
"I telephoned FH and informed him of AGO's comments not directing - Commissioner decision - line of questioning may have some validity."

And then she has recorded:
"Political dynamite! He'11 brief Commissioner. I'11 circulate draft letter once $I$ get it from counsel."

Did she make you aware of that at the time?
A. I certainly don't have any recollection of that, Mr. McGuinness, as to what was going on in the background.

275 Q. Pardon?
A. I had no idea what was going on in the background with

Ms. Ryan and the AG's office, or otherwise.
Q.
A. I certainly heard the word "political dynamite". reflect on it and to consider Mullingar issue and issues relating to Sergeant McCabe, were they of any concern to you or were you aware of them in any real sense?
A. That I remember.
Q. On that day or on the following Monday?
A. I think possibly it was -- I would imagine it must have been that day, because it was foremost in her mind.
Yes. And in what context was that, if you can recollect?
A. I don't know in what context that came up. It was probably that here we had -- really, Annmarie was -Ms. Ryan was always of the view that this was a very sensitive area to tread, given the, I suppose the wide publicity she saw attaching to Sergeant McCabe, given the political momentum behind Sergeant McCabe, given the media momentum behind him, that whatever we -maybe she was more prescient than any of the barristers she was engaged with, because she probably could see that perhaps we'd end up where we are today, for a11 I know. She could see that this was a sensitive area. I suspect that is what was in her mind.
And just in terms of the apparent anxiety, is one description of it, of the Commissioner to want time to
A. Well, save this: if I was aware that the Commissioner was under intense pressure at that time, I would have perhaps sought a longer -- or sought an adjournment, made some efforts to have that facilitated. I don't appear to have done that --
Q. Yes.
A. And sought an adjournment of some half hour, or whatever it may be. You certainly weren't going to get longer than twenty or half an hour from the Commission. 13:53

283 Q. You think not?
A. I already --

CHAIRMAN: I take that as a given. I have read the transcript.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Insofar as the Commissioner is
concerned, she seemed to have, in her evidence, been suggesting that she might have been willing to come down to the Distillery if need be or -- did you get any sense that she was anxious to make herself available on that afternoon, if required?
A. We11, Chairman, I wasn't aware of that.

285 Q. okay.
A. I wasn't aware of that.

286 Q. And in terms of consulting with her, did you have any
discussion with Ms. Ryan and your co-counsel about wishing to consult with her over the weekend?
A. Well, Mr. McGuinness, can I say this: We were into, whatever day it was, are we in day 3,2 at this stage?

287 Q. Yes.
13:54
A. We haven't yet met the primary client.
Q. Yes.
A. It was in our minds that perhaps we should.
Q. Yes.
A. And --

290 Q. Did you te11 Ms. Ryan that you --
A. Sorry to cut across you, Mr. McGuinness. If for nothing else but to apprise her of how matters were proceeding and to seek further instructions it may be -- or have concerns or --

291 Q. Yes. But did you tell Ms. Ryan to try and organise a consultation as soon as possible over the weekend, or Monday morning even?
A. I think Ms. Ryan took -- she didn't need instructions from us in that regard. She had a definite view on it. 13:55 292 Q. Yes.
A. And she sought -- had her own counsel on that, in the sense that she went to look for time -- or look for -the Commissioner to make time to talk to us.
293 Q. Yes. And were you informed of the results of her
A. I think Annmarie, she told me that -- I think she may have contacted me over the weekend. I said, look, I'm available, I'm within 50 miles of Dublin, $I$ can be
available on any day this week, you know, Saturday, Sunday, if the Commissioner wishes to meet, I gave her that clearance. So, to that extent, I was aware that she was experiencing difficulty. But I want to emphasise, Mr. McGuinness --
A. -- that, as I saw it, I suppose from the Commissioner's point of view, there was no allegation against her of serious criminal misconduct of any kind and, you know, my concern was that we should meet the primary client at the same time --

I understand that. Were you told that the Commissioner wasn't available over the weekend?
A. I was informed by Ms. Ryan that the Commissioner wasn't available. Now, what day that was -- Annmarie would ring me quite regularly to update me, she was regularly 13:56 on to me about that over that weekend. How many times, I don't know, but she was frequently in touch with me to tell me that she was experiencing difficulty.
297 Q. Okay. Well, the issue of the letter arose, and did you -- were the legal team liaising directly, as it were, through Ms. Ryan with a number of contributors to the letter?
A. We11, as it happened, it was a weekend of course. I know that Mr. MacNamee can deal with this, he was
delegated to deal with the instructions surrounding that and he was primarily responsible for the draft. I think he sent me the first run of the letter, the draft. I can't be certain that I saw the last draft, but I don't think it varied greatly from the first. In ${ }^{13: 57}$ other words, what I am saying is, I impressed upon and we all impressed, and Mr. MacNamee himself was very much aware that it was very important that this had to be right, there was no room for error.
298 Q. Yes.
A. It was of the utmost importance that the matters were accurately described in that. And the salient part, important part of that letter was the actual, what it was that Sergeant McCabe wanted to achieve. We were asked to lay out the background. The background was never going to be put, I want to make that quite clear, and it never was put, but we couldn't be more particular about the manner in which we said to our clients, and we -- I think he set it out in his email, this is of the utmost importance that matters are clearly and accurately set out.

299 Q. Yes.
A. And, as it was, they were not accurately set out. And now, a matter came up I think yesterday, and the question of an apology. Can I say this: it was remiss ${ }^{13: 58}$ of me not to apologise to Sergeant McCabe in relation to that matter. It should have been done. And I'm not making excuses for it, but I think it happened in the context of the way matters were moving. Because this,
again, was revisited in June. We were dealing -things were moving at a fast pace, but that is no excuse. There should have been -- I regret that it was done. It was done on the explicit instructions of the client, who got it wrong.
Q. Yes.
A. And I should have apologised at the time.
Q. Yes. Well, the way you put it in your statement is that:
"A misunderstanding in instructions which came from client other than Commissioner o'sullivan, resulted in an inaccuracy relating to an interaction with Sergeant McCabe on the 25th August 2008 in Mullingar Garda station."
A. Yes, that does not remove the responsibility to apologise for the false matter which was put.
CHAIRMAN: You have said it now, Mr. Smyth, and I do understand.
A. But I want to make clear that what I meant by my statement was as follows, and I want to clarify that, lest it be seen to be in any way trying to weasel my way out of something: the fact of the matter was, there was a meeting in mullingar.
302 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes.
A. There was a note taken of that meeting in Mullingar by Superintendent Cunningham and witnessed by the sergeant --
303 Q. Yes.
A. -- I can't remember --

```
304 Q. Sergeant Martin?
```

A. Sergeant Martin.
Q. Yes.
A. That note tallied, it was on all fours with what was transcribed from the audio equipment used by Sergeant McCabe, it was exactly on all fours with that. There was no -- they were totally compatible. And what the note and the transcription -- transcript from the audio said was that Sergeant McCabe wanted to -- he wanted to -- he was asked by Superintendent Clancy to make a report of the difficulties that he was encountering with Mr. D, who was a colleague --
A. -- a fellow guard, so that the DPP could be apprised of those difficulties, and that, in that way, he could get access to the DPP's -- or that both parties would be given access to the DPP's directions. Now, that -what I've just related to you there was put by way of an overal1 assessment by Superintendent Cunningham to
Sergeant McCabe as to what he wanted to achieve, and the reply from Sergeant McCabe was, that's exactly it.
307 Q. Yes.
A. So what was put, of course, we all know, and at the risk of being tedious, was the wrong version. There were no complaints made against Superintendent Clancy. There were complaints made to Superintendent Clancy. But the difference, of course, in the actual correct document, was, he said they were made at the request,
as I outlined, to Superintendent Clancy.
308 Q. Yes. Well, we will come back to that in a minute. But I wasn't quite clear what you had understood in your statement as the misunderstanding in instructions. Was that a misunderstanding of what counsel understood?
A. No. I think there was a misunderstanding as to the precise -- the proper instructions should have been that this, just as I have related to you, we weren't given the correct version, and there was a clear misunderstanding - not so much a misunderstanding, there were clearly wrong instructions.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. No, I understand that, Mr. Smyth. We can move on. You're saying that you didn't get Superintendent Cunningham's note from the meeting in Mullingar.
A. I'm sorry, Judge?

CHAIRMAN: You didn't get the note.
A. I didn't get the note, I didn't get the note. CHAIRMAN: All right. we can leave it at that.
309 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: In any event, Ms. Ryan obviously
A. Yes.

310 Q. And her evidence was -- it was uncontradicted, I think, that she also sent in the documents, including Superintendent Cunningham's report. And could I ask you just to look at that, at page 776. That is in Volume 2. And do you recollect seeing that on the morning of the 18th or not? You see the second --
A. I just want to -- sorry, refer me to the what -- second
paragraph, is it?
311 Q. Yes.
"Superintendent Cunningham explained to Sergeant McCabe that his function on this was to investigate the allegations made by him in his report of the 25 th February... to Superintendent Clancy."
A. No, I --

312 Q. And then if you go down to the third paragraph:
"Superintendent McCabe stated that this report was composed by him to high1ight matters that occurred in Bailieboro district while he was sergeant in charge of Bailieboro Garda Station. He stated the report was a bid by him to have the full DPP directions conveyed to him and the Ms. D family in relation to the allegations made against him by Ms. D and the subsequent investigation."

And do you recall seeing that on the morning of the 18th or not?
A. I don't recall seeing that document.

313 Q. All right. But that certainly is consistent with the instruction -- or the information given to you at your consultation on the 12th May, which has been noted by Mr. McNamara and Ms. Ryan, isn't that correct? We looked at them earlier this morning.
A. I didn't have the report and I didn't have the detail about what he was trying to achieve. The difference
was that there is a lot of talk about a Mr. D and why he wanted to get that. There was reference -certainly there was reference in the note, the consultation note, to "to Clancy".

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I think I need to intervene just for a second. Up to now we have scrupulously avoided using any rank in relation to the $D$ family and the father thereof, because if the rank is given in a small station, it's fairly obvious who it is. So I am simply requiring that his rank not be reported, simply that he 14:04 is a member of the Gardaí, and that is up to now.

314 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: In any event, Mr. Smyth, the draft, which became the letter that was sent, contained the "against" in the final paragraph?
A. Yes.

315 Q. And then on day 3 you put that final paragraph to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Absolutely.
Q. On the basis that you thought it was correct, obvious7y?
A. Yes.

317 Q. It proved not to be correct?
A. Yes.

318 Q. He said it was absolutely false?
A. Yes. And he was correct.

319 Q. There was agreement reached that Sergeant McCabe was right about that?
A. Correct.

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

21 Q. And in --
A. But not until the next -- I think it was June, or something, that this came up again, raised its head. This was May.
Q. Yes, yes.
A. But there was an agreement that that was -- he was quite correct, it was wrong.
Q. Certainly then, Judge o'Higgins, having got the letter, he ruled that the contents of it were inadmissible in the Commission, isn't that right?
A. Yes, he ruled that he wasn't allowing any cross-examination out of this document.
Q. And he ruled that insofar as the issue of motivation, it was --
A. Peripheral.
Q. -- peripheral at best?
A. That's what he said. He said it was peripheral.
Q. Okay. It's just, I'm not clear how it came to be included as an issue, therefore, in the submissions that were put in on Module 1, which were drafted and sent in on the 11th June?
A. Well, the matter was revisited, as I say, at the hearing which I think was after the -- am I not right in saying that the matter -- Superintendent Cunningham came back in June and the matter was --
Q. He did, he came on 24 th June.
A. 24th June.
Q. But the motivation having been ruled to be peripheral
at best and the contents of the document irrelevant, you seem to have sanctioned the draft which went in on the 11th June which referred to these matters.
A. Could I see the particular --

329 Q. Yes. It's page 1439 of the subs. I think it starts at 14:06 paragraph 63, paragraph 63 to 72 . You see, because this records then the fact of the complaint there, the investigation into the complaint, paragraph 65, the DPP directions. And if one goes down then to paragraph --
A. Can I say, Mr. McGuinness, that if this is wrong, I take responsibility for it, but could I ask you to defer maybe to Mr. Byrne on that point, because he drafted this document.
330 Q. All right. Well, I think it's fair to note that obviously the Commission was adjourned until 24th June. 14:08
A. Yes.
Q. But this didn't become apparent to you perhaps then until the 24th June, is that right?
A. I think that would be fair to say.

All right. And on that day, then, the Judge raised the 14:08 issue, if we could look at page 1460. And this is day 5 then of the hearing, isn't that correct? The Judge raises this issue about paragraph 19, and I'm sure you've seen this transcript --
A. Yes.

335 Q. -- on many occasions. And it goes on to deal with that issue and the issue of the tape, isn't that correct?
A. It would seem so.
A. So --

338 Q. And there's an exchange between yourself and the Judge at page 51, and perhaps you might like to comment on that. It's page 1510. You agree with the Judge here:
"This document, the 28th February, and the subsequent
tape and the subsequent report are in the context not of any complaint against Superintendent Clancy but a request to Superintendent clancy in relation to matters arising out of the D family affair."

And you say:
"Directions of the DPP, and that deals with the motivation."

Mr. Justice O'Higgins says:
"This does not deal with any complaint against Superintendent Clancy with which we are concerned in this investigation."

And you say:
"I think that that has been established."

And I think that ended the issue of the letter insofar as the hearings were concerned, is that right?
A. As far as I'm aware, Mr. McGuinness, yes. we were not allowed to proceed to cross-examine any more out of the --
A. We weren't allowed to proceed any more in relation to the transcript.
340 Q. Yes. And where did that leave the testing of the
credibility and motivation then?
A. Well, the credibility and motivation continued apace in a11 the modules as it arose. We were awaiting whatever allegations were going to be brought forward, and they would be tested in the same way, the allegations would be tested, and if there was no evidence to stack them up, we would, as I said to you this morning, we would say, if there is no evidence, why were they made in the first place?
well, isn't that really back to the position perhaps as it should have been in the first place, that the allegations were to be tested on the merits of the facts relating to them and/or any defects in the investigation, and not by reference to a so-called general issue about credibility/motivation; are they not separate matters?
A. What you have been dealing with is a specific issue -342 Q. Yes.
A. -- that came up or was brought up at that time in relation to this, these directions, as we call them. That wouldn't have been -- that wouldn't necessarily -while that might apply to whatever other allegations were coming up, we had a -- if it was true, if the true version was put or allowed to be put, I could foresee that there would be -- I can't say what my instructions 14:13 were, but, at best, I can safely say there would have been a complete conflict. And why do I say that? I say it because what was in the correct version was a suggestion that Superintendent Clancy had requested

Sergeant McCabe to write in to him the difficulties he was having with D --

343 Q. Yes.
A. -- so that these could be contained -- or, sorry, could be added or sent on to the DPP so that he could consider them, and, having done that then, in the hope -- the hope would be that the final directions would be made available to both -- now the difficulty, I can straightaway see with that. Superintendent Clancy had already received serious complaints against him in the earlier letter, which we didn't have, as I say, in May, we came up in the second module, and it was highly unlikely, in my view, or it was subject to, as I say, a test, how could a man against whom he had already made complaints be now requesting him to make further complaints against another gentleman? I could foresee serious difficulties on that, and I can't say what my instructions are, but I can tell you, I could see straightaway there are difficulties with that, with the credibility of that position.
344 Q. Yes.
A. So if the correct version investigation --

345 Q. Yes.
A. -- Mr. McGuinness, had been put, or if we were allowed to pursue the correct version, who knows what the outcome could have been.

346 Q. We11, you see, there was no attempt to either say to the Judge on day 5, look, we've got this wrong, allow us to recast it in the way that is appropriate, having
regard to either the Commissioner's instructions or your other clients' instructions?
A. But there was, Mr. McGuinness.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. There was. We weren't allowed to proceed. The Judge closed it down.

348 Q. Yes.
A. It's on the transcript. He wouldn't allow us to proceed to cross-examine out of that document.

Okay. Well, did that result in the abandonment of the Commissioner's position in challenging credibility and motivation? Because there was now no subsisting admissible letter before the Commission?
A. No, the Commission --

350 Q. And each module or each element of the inquiry would be $14: 16$ examined on its own merits?
A. We11, insofar as that document was concerned, we couldn't be pursuing motivation or credibility --

351 Q. Yes.
A. -- because we weren't allowed to pursue it. But it
didn't close down my original point that, as I was instructed to do, was to test every allegation as it came up on credibility and motivation. I don't see, Mr. McGuinness, where we're at odds on that.

352 Q. okay.
A. I've said that --

353 Q. You see no conflict or incompatibility there?
A. We11, first of all, may $I$ repeat, we weren't allowed to pursue the issues arising on the correct version.
Q. Yes.
A. So that closed off that avenue, but that didn't mean that I was closed off from pursuing every allegation on the same basis of credibility and motivation. I had to test all of the allegations.
Q. Yes.
A. If they came up.
Q. Yes.
A. And as they came up.
Q. And as they came up, solely by reference to the facts in relation to each specific incidents?
A. Precisely.
Q. Yeah. And was that not the way --
A. Sorry.
Q. -- it should have originally been started and commenced, that the issues arose, if they arose, in relation to each particular investigation?
A. Well, the issues arose in each -- I don't quite follow. Are you suggesting, Mr. McGuinness, that I had no basis on which to challenge the credibility and motivation in Module 1?
Q. Well, I am wondering where it stood at this point in time in terms of your instructions to do it vis-à-vis the Commissioner?
A. After --
A. I still had those instructions.
Q.

A11 the way through.
CHAIRMAN: We11, you weren't quite closed down, Mr. Smyth, because in the transcript there's a reference to -- and Superintendent Cunningham saying Sergeant McCabe was saying to me let's speak off the record but he had a tape recording machine, equipment, or something like that, so it was mentioned. But I think certainly you were limited on that issue to a grievance, real or perceived, and then that was it.
A. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: But what you seem to be saying is that, vis-à-vis every allegation made, it was what have you got to support that?
A. Correct.

CHAIRMAN: And if you have nothing to support that, aren't you shooting from the hip?
A. Yes.
Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: I think you did challenge Sergeant McCabe on that issue, sort of shooting first and asking 14:18 questions later?
A. Well, now, I put it to him fairly. I said, look, would you never consider what information or what -- I can't remember what way I phrased it, but that before you
level criticism at somebody, would you not ensure that you had something to level criticism about.
Q. Yes.
A. I think that might be an inarticulate way of saying what I expressed at the time, but, in other words, shooting from, and asking questions later.
367 Q. The Judge, I think we've noted already, the transcript at day 18, page 2154, the Judge seemed to take up that theme at one stage, in which he asked Sergeant McCabe about that issue. That's at volume 3 of our documents. 14:19 I don't know if you recall that exchange?
A. This exchange that is up on the screen at the moment?

368 Q. Page 2. The cross-examination starts at page 2154 and the Judge intervenes, if we go to -- it's page 86 of the internal transcript, at page 2235 . Do you recall that exchange?
A. Oh, yes. I think the Judge intervened at one stage, yes, yes, I remember this.
369 Q. At question 369, sergeant McCabe has said that he didn't accept the proposition that was being put to -there, but he seemed to be thinking, the Judge seemed to be thinking along the following lines. нe said:
"Maybe you got the wrong end. Obviously each and every module here concerns an incident and I will have to make a report as to whether the investigation was good or bad or indifferent as to whether GSOC, in the ones that they were concerned with, dealt with the matter well or otherwise. And I also have to report in relation to complaints that you made."
A. Yeah.
Q. And Sergeant McCabe says:

> "Yes."

And Mr. Justice o'Higgins:
"Whether those complaints were dealt with properly or engaged with fully."
A. Yes.
Q. And he says: "Yes."

And Sergeant McCabe sets out what he was trying to do there, and he wanted reasonable standards in the matter. Did you ever seek instructions from the
Commissioner as to modifying your stance in any way, or were you happy that she was content that you would challenge his credibility and motivation all the way through
A. Absolutely. Those were my instructions.

372 Q. Did you discuss that matter when you met the Commissioner on 21st May, as I understand you did?
A. Where was that meeting?
Q. I think in the Commissioner's office.
A. Well, that was a meeting which was -- there was a Commissioner wished to meet me. I expressed to Annmarie that, was this a consultation, and she said it wasn't a consultation, she just wanted to meet her
senior counsel.
Q. Yes.
A. I expressed to Ms. Ryan that I -- I asked her was she going to be in attendance and she said she wouldn't be in attendance, that it was wasn't a formal consultation, and I said, you know, I had reluctance about meeting a client in the absence of an attending solicitor who could take a note of what was said.
Q. Yes.
A. And that is the cardinal rule. She said that this wasn't a formal meeting, that she wasn't attending, that the Commissioner just wanted to meet me personally in her -- I then suggested to her that I could meet her with my two colleagues, and she said no, she only wishes to meet you alone. And I went on that -- I indicated to her that, as far as I was concerned, there would be no discussion. It wasn't a consultation, there was no instructions to be taken, there was no advice to be given. And on that basis and on those parameters, I agreed to meet the Commissioner.
376 Q. Yes. And did you discuss any matters with the Commissioner, in fact?
A. The meeting lasted, $I$ think, in all, it couldn't have lasted beyond 20 minutes. I was escorted to her office by Chief Superintendent Healy. There was an her about -- I congratulated her, I do remember that, congratulating her on her -- it was then her full appointment. I can't remember the precise or full
details of what we discussed. There was a general conversation. I think there was some mention of Kerry, I think she may be from Kerry, and I think there was also some mention about family. She said she had a child attending university in America. I can't remember now which State.
Chairman: i'm not sure I really want to know these personal details.
A. Well, that's the tenor of the discussion. There was no consultation with the Commissioner. There was no mention as to what was happening vis-à-vis the 18th or the letter or anything else. Now, I did say to her, as I was leaving, or about to leave, that matters were proceeding and that we were working very hard and that we would hope that all matters would be dealt with expeditiously.

377 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Yes. Chief Superintendent Healy seems to have suggested in his evidence that you raised the issues of corruption as being one of the main factors in the commission and you had a discussion about that?
A. There may have been, there may have been, as I said, about the -- there may have been the elephant -certainly, there would have been some mention, there was no point in meeting without some mention about the Commission itself, but there was no discussion backwards or forwards about what was happening. I may have said that -- I suspect and I knew that she was concerned about the -- about all matters that were going on and the allegations that were made, and so on,
and she had an obligation to both parties. She never mentioned Sergeant McCabe's name, she never mentioned any of my clients' names. And I said to her, well, obviously I understood that the most serious allegation was corruption. And that's all we discussed.
378 Q. Al1 right. So you had no discussion about the advices that had been requested and given in writing?
A. No discussion.
Q. No discussion about her instructions?
A. No.

380 Q. Or the reconfirmation of instructions?
A. Absolutely not.

381 Q. And no discussion about the outcome of what had happened on 18th May?
A. Absolutely not.

382 Q. All right. well, you did meet her in actual consultation then, I think on the 20th October 2015, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I think we -- I can't remember was that in Headquarters, or wherever it was, Garda Headquarters, but we met her.

383 Q. Yes. Mr. McNamara has a note of it at page 100, and there are other notes that I will ask you to comment on, if you don't mind. In this meeting, down the page there, it says:
"Meeting with counse1. 7:00pm. Meeting 2013 with Sergeant McCabe, four months' delay, wanted interim report."

Can you recollect what that is about?
A. I have --

384 Q. okay. It says then:
"Cannot be questioned on lawyer-client privilege. Sought advice and gave instructions."

Can I ask you the context -- does that ring a bell with you, by the way?
A. I don't know anything about a meeting in 2013. That does not ring a be11 with me, I must say. Maybe my colleagues will be able to assist you better on that. I don't have any recall of that.
385 Q. Okay. We11, then the next issue then:
"Cannot be questioned on lawyer-client privilege."
A. Is this in October?
Q. This is October.
A. Sorry, was that on the eve of her giving evidence?

387 Q. No. Apparently, you appear to have had two consultations with her - one on the 20th and then one on the eve of her appearance.
A. which what was --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, the year 2013 has been mentioned twice now, and correctly taken down in the transcript. It is, of course, 2015.
A. okay.

CHAIRMAN: And it's about, it seems to be three weeks
before she gives her evidence before the Commission.
A. I honestly can't assist you on that, Mr. McGuinness, on this particular one, but we will move down and see if there is anything that comes to mind, if there is anything else.

388 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: We11, it says:
"And second choice, if Commission is going to force to answer re instructions choice."
A. I'm wondering, I'm wondering is this in relation to the ${ }_{14: 28}$ consultation we had on the eve of her -- because I do recall we had a consultation with her in relation to that, and I'11 tell you why, if it is -- it may be in relation to this, because, as I said this morning, there was -- Mr. McDowell had indicated that he would be cross-examining if he got the opportunity and that the Commissioner would not like the experience, so we were anticipating that, because she was due to give -due to give evidence, that there would be issue that we had to -- that she had to address, and it was likely that Mr. McDowell, who raised the issue of attacking the character of Sergeant McCabe, that she could be asked details of this. And it may be in that context that she wouldn't be required, couldn't be compelled to give details of what took place between herself and her 14:29 lawyers, I understand that, but -- and I think options were laid out as to what way she might deal with Mr. McDowe11, but it was thought that the better approach would be, if it happens, that you just answer
the questions as are asked. And as I said, it didn't arise because the Judge intervened and the matter was resolved.
A. And Mr. McDowell accepted the position, it seems. does appear to have been raised at this meeting of the 20th October --
A. It may well have been.
-- because Ms. Ryan has a better note, and perhaps it might be fairer to ask you to look at that first, at page 3803:
"Consultation Commissioner 20/10/15 Bridewell station
7:00. Present: Annmarie Ryan, Colm Smyth, Garret
Byrne, Michae1 MacNamee, Fergus Healy, Michae1
McNamara. Discussed McCabe's motivation."

The next -- is that correct? Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I now recall that now, because this is a meeting
we had with her, I think -- I thought it was on the eve of her giving evidence, but, in any event, it was in anticipation of her giving evidence.
392 Q. Yes.
A. And we were expecting that Mr. McDowell would --

CHAIRMAN: We have that point, Mr. Smyth.
A. Okay. We were making her aware of that. And as it says here, that -- is it the line --
393 Q. MR. McGuINNESS: Yes.
A. The line of question -- no doubt Mr. McDowell will try this line of question, so either deal with it head on or object, or whatever it may be. We laid out the options for her. Much preferable that she dealt with it head on, but we had to lay out the options. First of all, what was the discussion about Sergeant McCabe's motivation, do you recal1?
A. Because we were referring back to -- this is what you could call the row that took place and what was the motivation, and Mr. McDowe11 was saying this is all about his character, and so on and so forth, and we anticipated Mr. McDowell would be saying to her that she was making public statements about Sergeant McCabe and, yes, she was coming in -- instructing me to come in and put a different position and to essentially, as he put it, attack his credibility and to attack him, attack his character, and we discussed that with her. And when you see "motivation", that was general discussion around what our instructions were and what I knew my instructions to be and what Mr. McDowe11's perception of what my instructions were, and as he had outlined to the Judge.the Commissioner. Would you care to comment on that?
"Responsible for corporate body, duty to all employees, cannot be one-sided Tribunal, show Commissioner has responsibility."

I don't see how -- came from the Garda Commissioner, you mean?
Q. I'm just asking you?
A. Came from the Garda Commissioner?
Q. Do you think so?
A. I would say they certainly came from the Garda Commissioner, I would say, that she'd explained to us what her responsibility was and what her duty to everybody was. We were anticipating that it would be said to her how can she be making all these public statements and yet coming in here, as suggested by Mr. McDowe11, attacking her, attacking one of her members.
398 Q. Yes. I presume you never foresaw that she would waive her privilege or had an expectation that these notes would be --
A. Oh, no -- absolute -- how do you mean?
Q. Well, first of all, was there a decision made at that time that she would stand on her privilege --
A. No, no.
Q. -- and refuse to answer questions?
A. It was my understanding that we laid out the options for her and it was my understanding that we had to explain to her what her options were.
401 Q. Yes.
A. But it was my understanding she was going to be giving evidence, and if she's dealt with by Mr. McDowe11, she will have to deal with the questions, and that is what
she wanted to do.

But that is what I am anxious to ascertain. Was it your understanding that the Commissioner decided at that meeting that if she were cross-examined by Mr. McDowell about her instructions, that she was prepared to meet it head on?
A. I have that impression, that that's my recall. Because why would I say otherwise? Because we were anticipating this onslaught, we prepped her for the likelihood that she would be attacked -- challenged in this way, and our belief, my belief is that she was going to deal with it head on.
403 Q. Ms. Ryan seems to have noted correctly there that the role, her role in Module 5, presumably referring to her role, is during her time as AC in HRM?
A. Correct, correct.

404 Q. So it would perhaps be difficult to foresee how
Mr. McDowe11 could 1egitimately cross-examine her about her instructions to counsel, particularly if they were privileged. So I'm not quite clear how the discussion arose at that time?
A. Because Mr. McDowe11 had already flagged we11 in advance that, when the opportunity came, he would take the opportunity to cross-examine. We had this belief that he could seek to do it. preparation for you standing up to clarify her instructions?
A. Oh, no. Well, no, this was a prep -- she was about to
give evidence. As you say, it was in relation to her time as AC of Human Resources.
406 Q. Yes.
A. But we did foresee that there could be a challenge -407 Q. Yes.
A. -- on her original -- on her instructions to me.

408 Q. Yes. We all know what actually happened, Mr. Smyth, and I just want to be --
A. Okay.

409 Q. I am trying to be clear about the purpose of this meeting and the discussion that then took place at the next meeting. Was it a preparation for the Commissioner, and you, on her behalf, conveying to the Commission a change in position vis-à-vis sergeant McCabe?
A. No, there was no question of changing. Changing of position in relation to instructions?
410 Q. Yes.
A. No, there was no question of that.

411 Q. So all of this is a preparation just for dealing with a 14:35 line of possible cross-examination?
A. Absolutely, absolutely.

412 Q. Not a preparation for you clarifying her instructions --
A. No, no.

413 Q. -- at the beginning of the module before she stepped in?
A. Well, the preparation for that was very simple. It was essentially, all she did in relation to her role as AC,
she was responsible for appointing, I think it was, I think it's the McGinn/Byrne report, correct me if I am wrong in that, but, because of her position, she had to appoint people to carry out that function, as I understand it, and that was her role, so there was nothing much to consult about.

414 Q. Yes.
A. She could be asked questions surrounding that, but, I mean, her role was essentially one of appointing someone under the regulations to carry out an investigation, under disciplinary procedure or whatever, as I understood it.

415 Q. Okay.
A. And we took that opportunity to discuss with her, that when she would be giving evidence, it was an innocuous, it was a walk-on role, if I may put it that way, that Mr. McDowel1 may take the opportunity -CHAIRMAN: All right. I do understand.
416 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: It's just that both you and the Commissioner in evidence seem to have laid some emphasis on the fact that Mr. McDowe 11 never taxed her about these issues and that your expected preparation has gone to naught then?
A. Gone to naught. But what happened when she did -- when she was ready to give evidence and when she appeared to ${ }_{14: 36}$ give evidence, matters took another turn.

417 Q. Yes.
A. That the Judge, without any forewarning to me certainly, and I wouldn't expect it, needless to say --
Q. Yes.
A. -- introduced the topic himself, so that he must have been in some way anticipating, and perhaps, I don't know, perhaps he wanted to take the sting out of what was to follow and brought the topic up himself and asked me -- he said that: I want to revisit a matter which I mentioned some time ago. I'm quoting as best I can. I haven't got the transcript before me.
Q. Yes.
A. And he said: Look, I want to revisit this. And he again, for the third visitation to my instructions, and then we had the discussion which I set out earlier. Now, I think he was either taking the sting out of what was to follow, maybe he didn't want a confrontation --
420 Q. We11, obviously --
A. -- or maybe he was laying the ground out for

Mr. McDowe11 to see what the correct instructions were.
I do not know.
A11 right. We11, factually, I think, and perhaps we will come to it in a moment, but, factually, Commissioner o'sullivan was present in the room sitting at the back of the room?
A. Correct.

422 Q. The Judge could see her there, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

But he certainly perceived, in his words, that the issue of motivation had been dormant for some months, and it didn't appear to him, therefore, that --
A. I don't agree with that, Mr. McGuinness, because I
think, you know, in every module that came up, we addressed issues with Sergeant McCabe, and we can go through the transcripts tediously, but I don't see that things were -- I think it was more that the Commissioner was always very anxious, I suppose, maybe he was anxious to avoid a confrontation and to take the sting out of what might follow, if there was a confrontation.

424 Q. okay.
A. And he took the opportunity to confirm with me, finally, what is the position, $I$ meant to revisit it, I'm going to revisit it now, $I$ think he said.
425 Q. Okay. We11, can I ask you to look at the notes of the second consultation --
A. Yes.

426 Q. -- on the eve of her appearance. There's Inspector McNamara's notes first at page 104.
A. Now, this would have been on the eve of her arrival at the Commission.
427 Q. Yes, yes.
A. Yes. Yes, we would have had to -- sorry, Mr. McGuinness -- we would have to meet her for the walk-on role, in any event, so we dealt with the issue, and then we said -- we met her a final time.
428 Q. But the first matter seems to be an issue in relation to a HQ directive 105/08, and then it seems to be counsel, perhaps counsel raising -- is it raising the issue of motivation and bad faith?
A. Yes, because that came up in the context of where the

Judge had raised this as an issue. No one else had raised it except -- well, Mr. McDowe11 had mentioned character, I think, firstly. In fairness, I think I got it wrong in the summation. I was suggesting to the Judge Mr. McDowell had mentioned it first. I was wrong in that, it was remiss of me to say that, but I only realise that now. But he did raise issues on his character. The Judge raised issues in relation to malice or mala fides, and we were acquainting her of this situation, that this could be presented if Mr. McDowel1 got the chance to address her and to confront her in relation to bad faith, mala fides and the malice of Sergeant McCabe as he saw it, as he perceived that we were suggesting.
429 Q. I mean, on a point of fact, when you agreed with the Judge or appeared to agree with the Judge in his choice of words on day 2 --
A. Yes.

430 Q. -- and day 3, relating to integrity and motives, etcetera, nobody had come to you and said you'd acted outside your instructions, isn't that correct?
A. No, nobody had said that to me.

431 Q. But the issue of withdrawals of something seems to have been the discussion here?
A. You see?

432 Q. Because there's a "CS", which is presumably you there, and just above that is:

[^0]on the issue of mala fides."
A. Yes, but you have to see that in terms of what is said there. His evidence in this case is bad faith.
Q. Yes.
A. Put another way, that that would be what Mr. McDowel1 will be saying, that his evidence -- it will be that it is bad faith -- sorry, that Sergeant McCabe will say it is bad faith.

Yes. But, you see, I'm wondering is that sort of loosely or quoting you in shorthand?
A. In what way now?
Q. In the way that you were drawing attention to the fact he had withdrawn a number of claims, that perhaps this bullet-point is meant to represent your view that his evidence in the case is bad faith. Was that a view you 14:41 expressed at the consultation?
A. No, I never suggested that -- I never suggested that -you mean that Sergeant McCabe in his evidence was --

436 Q. Yes.
A. -- was giving --

437 Q. I'm just asking for your comment on the note as it is there. I mean, one interpretation might be that --
A. My view on this is that -- my view on this is that it would be perceived by Mr. McDowell that we were suggesting that his evidence in this case is bad faith and as perceived by -- you know, the Judge introduced the term. There was discussion around that. We were concerned about what Mr. McDowe11 would be doing the next day.
Q. All right. okay. It appears to quote the Commissioner, if we just move on a little bit.
A. Yes.
"The Commissioner said we didn't question his mala fides."
Q. "We questioned his motivation. It may well be mala fides but that is a matter for the Commission."

Do you think that's something she said or somebody else 14:42 said?
A. No, I don't know how that could possibly come into the frame. It may well be mala -- there was no mala fides.
Q. The issue of mala fides, in the Judge's mind certain7y, seems to have been triggered by your submission on motivation and credibility and integrity, and it seems to have been lurking there, but the Commissioner seems to have been content to let the issue of mala fides lurk in the Commission room --
A. No.

441 Q. -- and leaving it as a matter for the Commission?
A. I can tell you positively, Mr. McGuinness, that that is not the case.
Q. Right. Okay. Ms. Ryan's note of that same consultation is at 3803?
A. You can see there, Mr. McGuinness, by the way, you see "I challenged his credibility".
Q. Yes, I saw that. Yes.
A. I didn't say I challenged his mala fides or malice, and

I never did it, in any event.
444 Q. I understand your evidence. Thank you. This is Ms. Ryan's note. Sorry, 3805 it should be. There's a heading there:
"Motivation: we questioned this. No particular mala fides against Sergeant McCabe, just his motivation. The initial letter from counsel re motivation, email and letter from us to Commission."

There's then a mention to a report there. There's a reference to:
"Supports in place for McCabe."

Do you think that is something the Commissioner was referring to? Just go down the screen.
A. I would imagine that supports, and so on, would be in her bailiwick.
445 Q. Yes. There's also a handwritten note from Chief Superintendent Healy at 3944, where it says:
"Standing over the allegations of motivation."

And is that a correct statement of the position?
A. Yes. Standing over the credibility and motivation, yes.
446 Q. "Mala fides - bad faith. would the Commissioner consider withdrawing?"

Is the next note.
A. Again, I see that that was put in the context of the next morning, when she would be asked by Mr. McDowel1 to withdraw her allegations of bad faith because if he still persisted with his interpretation of what my instructions were.

447 Q. It says then:
"whistleblowers may not always be right but we must listen to them."
A. Correct.

448 Q. And was that something said by the Commissioner?
A. Yes. And she wouldn't have said that in the context of at the same time as saying -- it just wouldn't make sense.

449 Q. The next sentence then:

```
"But the matter of mala fides is a matter for the Commission."

Is that something said by the Commissioner?
A. The matter of mala fides, the ultimate decision on mala fides, as to what I was putting or saying, to what his interpretation of what \(I\) was doing, was a matter for -- 14:45 I was making my case that \(I\) was not making any case of bad faith against Sergeant McCabe. But ultimately, these matters would have to be decided by the Commissioner. I mean, as far as I was concerned, in
his submissions we made it quite clear that there was no question of -- and you can search the transcript, Mr. McGuinness, there's no case ever -- I never suggested he was malicious, never suggested he was a man not to be trusted. It didn't arise. And I know at 14:45 this meeting the Commissioner was not suggesting that she would -- I mean, what is contended for there in that note, you can read it in three or four different ways, perhaps.

450 Q. Yes.
A. But I can tell you straight up that there was no question of the Commissioner maintaining a line of mala fides against Sergeant McCabe.
451 Q. okay. well, she appeared the next day, and I think the transcript -- the correct transcript is at page 3508. You've seen this before?
A. Yes.

452 Q. And did this take you by surprise?
A. Absolutely by surprise.
Q. Okay.
A. Because Annmarie Ryan came up to me three times during the currency of this exchange.
454 Q. And was she handing you some notes or suggestions?
A. No, no, she was just -- she was completely taken aback by what was happening, as to why I was being put on the 14:46 spot again, the third visitation, and I said, look, I'm going to deal with this.
455 Q. And what you said to the Commission there and then as recorded, is that something then that you were
instructed to say on the day?
A. What does it say here?
Q. Yes, perhaps in fairness to you, we will open that. If we go down the page. There's an exchange over several pages, in fact. Perhaps we should open all of them. CHAIRMAN: We11, the crucial point seems to be that Mr. Justice O'Higgins specifically questioned the integrity of Sergeant McCabe.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes, and motivation.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. And Mr. Smyth said in making the
allegations of corruption and malpractice.
MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: "Yes, but I never used the words mala fides and any reference to any question of integrity was a mistake on my part."
MR. McGUINNESS: Yes. And I'm just wondering, had you had a discussion with the Commissioner about withdrawing the challenge to his integrity insofar as you had adopted what the Judge had been saying?
A. There was no discussion with the Commissioner, nor I think, Mr. McGuinness, could there be a discussion with the Commissioner about such -- are you talking about the Commissioner, the Garda Commissioner?

457 Q. Yes.
A. No, I didn't have -- sorry, could you pose the question again?
Q. Did you have a discussion with the Commissioner, your client, about this and withdrawing the challenge to --
A. No.
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463 Q. Yes. Obviously you've seen this portion of the transcript on a number of occasions?
A. I have seen it a few times.

464 Q. Is there anything else you would like to say in relation to that?
A. No, it speaks for itself.

465 Q. Yes.
A. As to -- look, there was no -- it speaks for itself and I had no pre-warning that this was going to happen, that there was going to be -- and I still maintain in my own mind, I might be only speculating, and I shouldn't speculate, but I think the Commissioner [sic] may have been trying to take the sting out of what might have happened, just as the Commissioner was about to get into the witness box.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. But essentially the question Mr. McGuinness is asking you is, you're falling on your 14:50 own sword, it would seem, by saying, look, I made a mistake in referring to integrity, and that was my fall, and, in terms of mala fides, well, I never used those words but other people may have used them in the course of the exchange, but what Mr. McGuinness is questioning you about is, are you falling on the sword the Commissioner herself should properly have fallen on if she had told you to interrogate --
A. No.

CHAIRMAN: -- witnesses in relation to the integrity of 14:50 Sergeant McCabe? That is the basic question.
A. No, I'm not falling on the sword for the Commissioner.

466 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Okay. And you're obvious7y -- I mean, the bottom line, as it were, is that here you are, in
fact, reconfirming, in the presence of the Commissioner, that you're challenging Sergeant McCabe's credibility and motivation?
A. That is correct.

467 Q.
Yeah. And certainly, as I understand your own personal analysis of what that may lead to, is that if it is -if the challenge is sustained and the credibility of someone making allegations is found to be lacking, it does reflect on their integrity?
A. In respect of the allegations.
Q. Yes. Okay. Now, can I just ask you a couple of questions about the overview submissions that were lodged. They are to be found at volume 5, 2897.
A. Mr. McGuinness, they were in the bailiwick of Mr. Byrne.

469 Q. Pardon?
A. The submissions were drafted by Mr. Byrne, as I understand it.

CHAIRMAN: Did you read through them?
A. Oh, I read through them and I take responsibility. CHAIRMAN: And passed your quill pen down on the bits you didn't agree with?
A. I accept responsibility for them. CHAIRMAN: We11, senior counsel quite often change a word here and there just to show that they have read
A. Yes. Well, I'm not so sure that it happened in this case, Judge, that I made any amendments.

470 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: It's just obvious7y they're quite
lengthy submissions, but they appear to have been put in in addition, as it were, to submissions on individual modules, is that right?
A. I'm not familiar -- I'm not necessarily certain about that.
Q. And then this is sort of an overview?
A. Yes, at the end --

CHAIRMAN: And the date of this one, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. McGUINNESS: It's 1st February.
CHAIRMAN: Of 2015?
MR. MCGUINNESS: 2016.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes.
A. So that would have been the overview towards the end of the Commission?

474 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.
A. Yes, I follow.
Q. Sort of final submissions, really?
A. Yes, absolutely, that's what I wasn't sure of, what you were saying is, because \(I\) haven't got the date in front of me. It's the final submissions.

476 Q. But at page 8 of the submissions, from paragraph 39
on --
A. Again, \(I\) haven't got paragraph 39.

477 Q. I'm sorry?
A. I haven't got paragraph 39.

478 Q. Yes. It might be easier if you take the volume.
A. which volume is it?

479 Q. Volume 5.
A. What page is it again?

480 Q. Page 2904 now, it's page 8 of the submissions.
A. From paragraph 39?

481 Q. Yes. It's a commentary on the motivation of sergeant McCabe, and obviously this has gone in under your name and other counsel's names and on behalf of the Commissioner and others, isn't that right?
A. That would seem to be the case.

482 Q. And it recites a number of factual matters. I'm not going to raise an issue as to whether all of them were supported in evidence or not, but paragraph 44 seems to 14:54 take a fairly large swipe, if one could use the word, at Sergeant McCabe, by saying that:
"Sergeant McCabe then takes the approach if anyone to whom he makes a complaint does not agree with him, he 14:54 makes a further complaint, in some cases knowingly without justification, to a further authority."

And there's three paragraphs on the effect of the allegations, paragraphs 47, 48 and 49 , which presumably 14:54 you've seen and you considered and you were happy to put your name to?
A. Well, can I explain -- do you want me to explain that?

483 Q. We11, yes.
A. In respect of that, it has to be said that Sergeant McCabe effectively admitted making a complaint against Commissioner Callinan for the purpose of getting his complaints onto the desk of the Minister. I accepted -- there was clearly no case against Commissioner Callinan. And he followed that up. He already had -- there was a complaint -- then when that complaint was made, it landed on the desk of the Minister. The Minister then writes out, or the official, it was made on -- I think it was a confidential recipient thing, private and confidential, made its way onto the Minister's desk. Letters were written by the Minister to the effect that, look -well, the Department, to the effect, would you mind taking off the clause "private and confidential" because we want to move this matter on. And I think there were five reminders sent to Sergeant McCabe, and he never gave consent to remove the "private and confidential" clause, which meant that the minister came under attack and ultimately led to his -- came under attack firstly in the Guerin investigation and ultimately led to a lot of -- led to his having to leave office when the Guerin Report was published. So that tells us, number one, that he -- when you go to paragraph 2 , he was prepared to make complaints, and you see from that that, in the first instance, there was no justification for making a complaint about Commissioner Callinan; it was done for the purpose of getting it onto the Minister's desk. When it arrives
on the Minister's desk, he doesn't follow up.
484 Q. Well, of course, the Minister wasn't a client of yours in this.
A. No, he wasn't a client, but --

485 Q. He was separately represented?
A. -- at the same time, this is an overview of the position as we see it at the end of the Commission.
486 Q. Yes.
A. So I know he wasn't a client of mine, but, but, but Commissioner Callinan was a client of mine.
A. So they're interlinked in that way.

488 Q. Yes.
A. And he didn't -- he held -- he alleged corruption against Commissioner Callinan. There was absolutely no 14:57 corruption. But he interpreted corruption in the meaning of the Act, as he saw it, the regulations, as they saw them. And he got it onto the Minister's desk, and then he didn't follow up, despite five, if not six, reminders. And if he had followed up, probably
Minister Shatter would not have had to resign. So this is an overview in relation to what was going on in the background.
489 Q. We11, I don't want to engage in an issue about Mr. Guerin's report and Minister Shatter.
A. But it just wasn't --

490 Q. None of that was within the terms of reference, isn't that right?
A. Well, Commissioner Callinan's matter was dealt with
within -- that was a matter which came up within the Commission, and he was cross-examined by the Commission's senior counse1, and that's when the matter was brought to the attention of the Commission and he said -- and I think he said, when he was asked the question, he was asked the question, why did you not reply? And then Mr. McDowell said, hands up. And that was the end of that. And that was, unfortunately, the end of Mr. Shatter.
Al1 right. Well, I don't want to stray outside our terms of reference, but obviously Sergeant McCabe, facing into the Commission, he couldn't have regarded himself as being immune to questions, or he was, perhaps, on your view, centrally relevant to all of the modules --
A. Well --

492 Q. -- but was it necessary to put in this sort of overview of his motivation in addition, as an overlay, as it were, in relation to each individual module where he had had to give evidence, as it were, and subject himself to scrutiny, was that entirely appropriate?
A. But it wasn't a question of him subjecting himself to scrutiny. This is a man, in fairness, who had made serious allegations all the way through, and none of them were stacking up. I invited him to withdraw allegations, and he steadfastly, in some instances, refused, even when the Judge stepped in. You see my 1etter in July --
493 Q. Yes.
A. -- which I wrote in --
A. Good afternoon, Mr. McDowell.
Q. There are just a few general questions I want to put to you first. Do you accept now that Sergeant McCabe told the o'Higgins Commission that he had the full DPP's directions given to him by the State solicitor in 2007?
A. Mr. McDowe11, as I understood, full DPP directions would not necessarily be given to any party. You would get -- you would either be told there was a prosecution
or there wasn't a prosecution. The actual full document would never be given to any citizen.
497 Q. No. Do you accept that he had the full direction from Rory Hayden, the State solicitor, who had read them to him?
A. Yes, he was told by Rory Hayden.

498 Q. You accept that?
A. Yes, he was told by Rory Hayden. And he was told by Superintendent Cunningham.
499 Q. Sorry, he wasn't told the same by Superintendent Cunningham?
A. Sorry, Mr. McDowe11, he was told by Superintendent Cunningham as soon as Superintendent Cunningham became aware.
CHAIRMAN: Well, forgive me for being tiresome and intervening at this point. Being given the DPP's directions, I would imagine, is like being given a pen, you get the piece of paper, and I do understand, and I have always had the understanding, that when the State solicitor got the letter, he immediately rang Sergeant McCabe. They would have been on friendly terms. There's nothing wrong or improper about that. It is read over the telephone. I made the comment about four days ago to say that unless he had a photographic memory and then wrote it down himself, he didn't have the actual text. He was certainly told it. But what he was told by Superintendent Cunningham in the hotel, and obviously there is a bit of to-ing and fro-ing in relation to that and meeting and who was accompanying
him and whether it was necessary, etcetera, was the general Garda shibboleth - insufficient evidence.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That is my understanding today. That is what Superintendent Cunningham has told me.
A. Fair enough.

500 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: We11, then, do you also accept that various motivations that have been attributed to him, such as that he wanted to challenge the DPP's directions, is not correct?
A. No, he wanted to get access --

501 Q. Yes.
A. -- to the directions.

502 Q. And I was going to come to that. He never wanted access to them, he just wanted --
A. Well, sorry --
Q. Sorry, just let me finish.
A. Yes.

504 Q. He wanted them conveyed in the same terms to the D family as they had been to him?
A. But they were conveyed to the D family.

505 Q. But not in the same terms. They were told there was insufficient evidence?
A. We11, I don't know what terms that -- Superintendent Cunningham -- maybe it will be best addressed -- I can't remember what he said in the Commission about that, but he said that he went to the D family and he went and he contacted Sergeant McCabe to convey the decision.

506 Q. Yes. And we have had this in another module, Mr. Smyth, you're probably unaware of that?
A. So be it. I'm unaware of that, so...

507 Q. But it is clear that he did not say --
A. okay.

508 Q. -- to the D family --
A. Okay.

509 Q. -- he didn't convey to the D family --
A. The same.

510 Q. -- what Rory Hayden had conveyed to him?
A. I see. Well, I didn't know that.

511 Q. I see. Do you accept that he never wanted the DPP's directions clarified, which a number of documents suggested he did?
A. I think that if you look at the -- if you look at his own transcript, which is the truth of what he wanted -512 Q. Yes.
A. -- and which is compatible with the actual note of Superintendent Cunningham, which he took on the day.
513 Q. He said very clearly in his own transcript that he wanted the D family --
A. No.

514 Q. He wanted -- he wanted that the Gardaí would inform the D family so that -- so that they would know what the directions were?
A. No, Mr. McDowell, if you look, I think, I don't know if the Commission -- or, sorry, if the Tribunal has the actual transcript of the audio?
515 Q. They do. They do have it.
A. And if you look at, \(I\) think, from memory, it's page 18 of that, it shows exactly what he wanted.

516 Q. Yes.
A. I don't have it here with me.

517 Q. Well, we will come back to it.
A. No, no, I need it to be addressed now, Mr. McDowe11. Please.
518 Q. I will come to it.
A. No, but I need it to be addressed now because you asked me the question.

519 Q. Okay.
A. Because what he wanted, he wanted the difficulties he was having with D to be conveyed to the DPP, so that the DPP would be made obviously aware of the difficulties, and, to that end, the hope that he would get the directions shown to both parties. That's what's on the audio.
520 Q. Yes. So that he knew them himself, but he wanted them shown to the other parties?
A. No, you see there is a crucial difference. He wanted to make more -- he wanted to make known to the DPP the difficulties he was having with D.
521 Q. Yes. And he wanted Superintendent Clancy to be in a position to tell -- to ask the DPP for permission to te11 the D family, isn't that right?
A. No. Again, if you look at paragraph 18, I think it is very important that you look at that because he said that's exactly it. It's vitally important. MR. MCGUINNESS: It commences at page 4156, Chairman.

MR. MCDOWELL: what book is that?
MR. MCGUINNESS: It is Volume 8, 4156.
CHAIRMAN: The idea you're trying to convey, Mr. Smyth, is that the DPP might relax its usual rule, is -MR. MCGUINNESS: 4156.
A. That is the kind of thing. I don't know what was in his mind.

CHAIRMAN: That's what I always understood.
A. Yes. And that he might then release the --

522 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I think the letter he wrote to Superintendent Clancy --
A. But I think I just really need to see this, if it could be possibly brought up, because I think it is very important to clarify, because there has been a misstatement, and I shudder to say it, but a lot has been said about this tape and about where would Maurice McCabe be today if he hadn't got this tape.

CHAIRMAN: Don't worry. We will get it up.
MR. MCDOWELL: I will come back to it, Mr. Smyth, I will not try to --
CHAIRMAN: Well, you know, we have been -- I'm sorry, Mr. McDowe11, it's not for me to interrupt your cross-examination --
MR. McDOWELL: I know that.
CHAIRMAN: -- and direct certain things, but I just
feel there's going to be an agitation in the room unless we get rid of it. why not get rid of it. And if you won't get rid of it, \(I\) will get rid of it. MR. MCDOWELL: If it will come up, I would be happy,

Judge, on the screen.
A. which volume is it?

MR. MCDOWELL: It's on page 18 of this transcript, is that right?
A. I think it's page 18. I might be wrong in that. Yes. 15:07 He says at the bottom of page 18:
"All I wanted was for --

MAURICE: Al1 I wanted was for the DPP directions to be 15:07 shown to each party.

NOEL: Is that where this stands now, are you saying? Do you want to make a report or statement to that effect now to say to me that the reason you outlined these was --"

These being the complaints against \(D\).
" -- these was in response in a request from your
then-district officer, Superintendent Clancy, to highlight the difficulties that you were having with Mr. D in order that the DPP should be apprised of it, or whatever, as a result of which the directions of the DPP would be made known to each."

And he said:
```

"That's exactly it."

```

523 Q. That's what I am putting to you.
A. No, but the subtle difference is Mr. McDowell --

524 Q. If we can scroll back up.
A. No, no, I appreciate that, but this is summation.

525 Q. And he says:
"And so what do you want? A11 I wanted was for the DPP directions to be shown to each party."
A. Yes, but in terms of what he wanted Superintendent Clancy to do, there's an important difference, because he wanted Clancy to acquaint the DPP of the difficulties he was having with D.
526 Q. Yes.
A. So it's --

527 Q. okay. There may not be much between us on that.
A. It may not be, but it is important.

528 Q. Let's be clear about this. He was not looking for -- I mean, we have had various different iterations put in writing, such as that he wanted to be exonerated, that he wanted to challenge the DPP's directions. Those are 15:09 not true, are they? He didn't want to challenge any DPP's direction?
A. I don't think that that's --

CHAIRMAN: We11, I mean, the way I understand it now, and maybe it would help if I say what I think I understand about this.
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Just going back to what was happening, well we know that the DPP made his -- her, in fact, decision
on 5th April 2007. We know that there was some delay in relation to Superintendent Cunningham being on duty in a particular place because of assignment to somewhere else, we know that the protocol is you go to the victim, alleged, first, then you go to the person who is the alleged perpetrator, that came later, but even though Superintendent Cunningham wasn't there, the State solicitor rang up Sergeant McCabe and read out the DPP's letter over the phone. So, in terms of the way the letter is cast, it sounds like an exoneration. MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So when, sometime later, Superintendent Cunningham met him, he felt that all he could say to him was lack of evidence. Similarly, I think in relation to the D family, or Ms. D, I think all he could say was lack of evidence. There was then two incidents: one in the courthouse, where Sergeant McCabe was attacked; and one in the main street of Bailieboro, where he was attacked. By "attacked" I don't mean with a machete, or anything like that. I mean obviously attacked in the sense of verbally confronted. Now, the aftermath of that was that difficulties, as I understand it, continued, and Sergeant McCabe then wrote an account of those difficulties in January 2008, difficulties with the D family. And then on the 25th August 2008 he made what I would regard as the plea, using that in a legal sense, to Superintendent Cunningham that would he, through some agency, try and get the DPP to lessen the
strictures about telling people the result of a ruling by the DPP's office as to prosecution or no prosecution, under the Prosecution of Offenders Act 1974, and further, that the letter to Superintendent Clancy complaining about D, the D family, the incidents in the courtroom, the incident in Bailieboro town, was related to that and not related to anything else. Now, that is what \(I\) understand.

MR. MCDOWELL: Just with one correction, Judge, if I might: that Superintendent Cunningham had arrived in August 2008 to ask him to substantiate his complaints on the instructions of Chief Superintendent Rooney, and he made it very clear he did not want to start making further complaints in the matter.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right.
MR. MCDOWELL: That he was now in Mullingar and that this was -- there was no point in making complaints. CHAIRMAN: No, I do, I do understand that, and, in fact, we discussed this --

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- not you and I, at an earlier stage, and I think I indicated that in the letter in relation to the D family, the attack in the courtroom, the attack in the town, he said I do not want any prosecutions taken. So, in other words, he wanted it to die.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: So maybe that helps, I don't know.
529 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Now, could I ask you then to go to volume 1A, please, and, in particular, could I ask you
to go to page 162. This is the first day of the Commission, Mr. Smyth, and this is the opening of the Commission by Mr. Justice o'Higgins. And could I ask you to look at the lines 26 onwards on page 162. The paragraph reads:
"Certain witness, in particular the Garda witnesses, need have no fears they will not be heard on wider issues, structural, organisational, or otherwise, which may fall within the scope of the Commission's terms of reference. They will be given an opportunity to do so as other modules unfold. The scope of this phase of the hearings shall not include the investigation of the Minister for Justice and Equality or by the Department of Justice and Equality in relation to the incident. The issues for the Minister and the Department will be the subject of hearings later in the year."

And then at line 6 he said:
"It is a Commission of Investigation and I intend that the hearings be heard, as far as possible, in an inquisitorial rather than an adversarial fashion. The very fact that, under the Act, cross-examination is permitted only on the direction of the Commission underlines its inquisitorial nature and I earnestly ask the legal advisers to bear this in mind at all times." 530 Q. You were there and you heard that, isn't that right?
A. Yes, absolutely.

531 Q. Yes. Could I ask you to go to the next page, 164, and to line 12:
"The hearing will be led by counse1 for the Commission, Mr. Gillane. Parties whose interests, in the opinion of the Commission, may be affected will be allowed representation. On the direction of the Commission cross-examination may be allowed in accordance with the provisions of Section 11(2)(c) of the Commissions of Investigation Act 2004. That cross-examination should be focused on the matter under inquiry in any particular module."

You heard that as well?
A. Yes.

532 Q. And can I bring you to page 166, where Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"I draw your attention --"

And this was addressed to all of the barristers there.
" -- to the fact that in the event of a version of events being disputed or a person being criticised it is necessary to put the matters in dispute on the basis of such criticism to the relevant witness in order that he or she can deal with it."

And later on he said:
"It is not our intention that anyone should be ambushed or taken by surprise."

You recall that?
A. Yes.

533 Q. And you also recall that, and Mr. Justice O'Higgins made it clear, that if any person -- any witness proposed to criticise any other witness, permission from the Commission should be obtained and the factual basis for the criticism laid out in advance, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

534 Q. Now, I fully appreciate that you were acting in rushed circumstances --
A. Absolutely.

535 Q. -- and preparing for this event. But I have to suggest to you that you didn't, and your legal team, I'm not attributing personal blame to you on this at all, but that you didn't seek permission to go into the question of motivation and/or tell the Commission in advance that you were going to rely on particular facts?
A. Well, of course the matter arose on cross-examination of Chief Superintendent Colm Rooney. The matter arose because, I suppose unlike other commissions, there was a stark difference here because Sergeant McCabe was coming in with a menu of accusations which he says were backed up by -- as I've already indicated -- I won't go there again, but you know the point I'm making in
relation to the proved facts, or the proved facts document, I think it is called. So I'm on the back foot in relation to the people that I'm representing. I have no forewarning of what allegations, other than they are allegations of a criminal nature, four or five 15:18 of them, if not six. The others are allegations of serious malpractice at a high level of senior Gardaí. But in relation to the criminal matters, we have more concern -- I have a concern about everything, but particularly about the criminal matters. I don't have anything set out by you, Mr. McDowe11, or your client, as to how they are going to be stacked up. So you understand the position I'm in. I'm trying to -- and I do accept that, you know, in strict principle, I should have put the -- you should have been put on notice, you 15:19 shouldn't have had to stand up and bring this to the attention of the Commissioner, I fully accept that, and it was remiss of me to do so.
536 Q. I just want to put that in the context, that when we get to book 1B, which is what happened on Friday 15th, the following day, you started to ask questions of Chief Superintendent Cunningham, which led to an objection firstly from Mr. Gillane, counsel for the Commission, and secondly from me on behalf of sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
MR. SREENAN: I think it is Chief Superintendent Rooney.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, Chief Superintendent Rooney.
A. Chief Superintendent Rooney, yes. what page is that

Mr. McDowell?
537 Q. It's --
A. I recall it anyway. I know what it is. I think I know what you are saying.
538 Q. We will get to the point. The objections are to be found -- at page 166, you say:
"I have a few more questions to ask you --"
A. 166?

539 Q. No, no. 177 of the transcript would be the best one to 15:20 put to you.
A. Yes, yes.

540 Q. You said at question 782, 1ine 23:
"Did you have any other contact with Sergeant McCabe, 15:21 to your recollection?"

And Chief Superintendent Rooney said to you:
"Is there any particular, I don't recall."

And then you said:
"At any time thereafter did you have any contact with him in relation to it?
A. Oh, indeed I did, yes, I would have met -- "

And you said:
"were you friendly with Sergeant McCabe?
A. I was, I was.
Q. Did you serve with him? He's not a contemporary obvious7y?"

And there was discussion there. And then you said at question 786:
"Did your friendship continue?"

And he answered:
"I haven't had any contact with him since I retired, but there's nothing unusual about that, I haven't much contact with anybody."

And then you asked him:
"But before you retired had you any contact with him?"

And he said:
"Yeah, Sergeant McCabe came to see me, sought an appointment to come and see me in my office in Monaghan. He contacted my office and made an
appointment and I saw him. He came to me. He was very, very angry, he was very annoyed and very upset."

And the Judge asked you:

1

29

> "when was this?"

And he replied:
"It was in late 2006."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"Very angry."

And you said:
"Do you think it was in November or was it late in 2006 or was it wintertime?"

And Chief Superintendent Rooney said:
"No, I'm sorry, Judge, it was 2007."

And you said:
"Was it late 2007?"

And at this stage you asked him:
"Was it probably late 2007?
A. It was probably late 2007, yes, definitely. He came to my office. He was in that state and he
demanded of me that I write to the Director of Public Prosecutions and I challenge a decision of the Director of Public Prosecutions had made in respect of him."

Now, we know that that is not true.
A. That is certainly not correct.
Q. Yes. And Mr. Gillane said:
"I don't mean to cut across the witness but I think just in relation to this matter, unless the parties have a different view, I think it is evidence concerning a matter that the Commission isn't directed to investigate. whether it's relevant or not is a matter for the parties."

So the first person to object was counsel for the Commission.
A. Yes.

542 Q. And it was a few lines down that Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"The matter is délicat. I will rise for ten minutes."

And I said:
"I want Mr. Smyth to inform, since this process is happening now in front of my client, I want Mr. Smyth to formally inform you, Judge, that he is asking these questions on the firm instruction of the commissioner
and that he knows the answers that he's seeking from this witness, and that on his view as a professional senior counsel, it is relevant to the module we're dealing with now. I want that clarified, because I will deal with it, I want to consult my own legal team, 15:23 but in any event --"

And Mr. Gillane says:
"I think Mr. McDowell wants to be heard on the issue."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"I think that might be reasonable enough. But I intend to abide my original intention and rise for ten
minutes. The matter can be clarified after that."

Now, just to be one hundred percent clear, you were being asked to -- and it is quite unusual for one counse1 to ask another counsel to confirm that their instructions -- the questions they are putting --
A. Yes.

543 Q. -- arise on instructions, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

544 Q. And we know that you at that stage sought
confirmation --
A. Yes.

545 Q. -- isn't that right?
A. That's so.

546 Q. And we also know, and we have heard from Ms. Ryan that she was surprised that you were pursuing this line because she hadn't advance notice of it. In her statement, she says she did not expect you to take this line.
A. Em, I'm not so certain about that, Mr. McDowell, because it didn't come up out of --
547 Q. We11, in any event, she said she was taken by surprise.
A. Yes.

548 Q. Whether she is right or wrong about that, she said she was not expecting -- what she actually said in her statement was -- and we also know that Chief Superintendent Rooney said that he was not expecting to be cross-examined on this issue as well.
A. Well, I think that Ms. Ryan may have a different view 15:25 on that, but again, we cannot -- we cannot go there because of privilege.
549 Q. I see. I see. We11, can we then go on to what transpired thereafter. This is at page 695 of the book, 200 of the transcript. You came back after this adjournment and said:
"My instructions are re-confirmed.

MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Very good. Your instructions as I understand them is --"

Sorry, maybe we're missing something here.
"Your instructions, as I understand them, are that sergeant McCabe acted as he did for improper motives."

And you said:
"Yes."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"Okay. And that his integrity is being challenged in that respect."

And you said:
"In that respect."

Have you any doubt that you led Mr. Justice o'higgins to believe that you were challenging Sergeant McCabe's integrity?
A. As I said, as I said earlier to Mr. McGuinness, the word "integrity" was raised first, in my view, by the Judge, and that having been raised, I was interpreting and he was interpreting what my instructions were, as I took it, and I was trying to interpret what he meant by "integrity". And as I saw "integrity", in lawyer
language, I just explained that earlier, that if someone lacks any evidence for making serious criminal conduct allegations, there must be motivation, why did they do it. And it's in that respect that integrity
could come into play, but only in relation to the allegations they're making, not in relation to their character.

550 Q. Yes.
A. But the Commissioner did not instruct me --

551 Q. Sorry, I possibly skipped too far forward.
A. All right.

552 Q. At page 181, at page 670 of the book, the Tribunal resumed. Do you see that?
A. Yes. 181, yes.

553 Q. And after some other matter was being discussed about what was corrupt or improper conduct, Mr. Gillane, at page 671, said:
"I wish to emphasise that I hold no brief for or against any party before the Commission but I interrupted on that basis."

Which was that he had -- and he said in the previous paragraph:
"That I apprehended a line of questioning in relation to an area or areas that are not relevant to this module or to any module to which the Commission is concerned."

And then he went on to say:
"And I was mindful of the fact that the Oireachtas has
directed the Commission to exercise discretion in relation to the scope and intensity of the investigation that is considered necessary. In the circumstances which arise, I recommend to the Commission that Mr. McDowell might be invited to make such a legal objection as arises, if it does arise, in relation to the apprehended line of questioning, and that Mr. Smyth might set out a basis for the line of questioning if he wishes to pursue it, and that in relation to both in terms of the topic that is to be canvassed, no detail in relation to it is necessary and it could be dealt with in legal terms.'

Do you recall that happening?
A. Yes.

554 Q. And then what follows after that is a submission by me for a number of pages, in which I conclude at page 187 by saying:
"I find it astonishing that the Commissioner should feel that in some sense upholding her rights involves questioning the motive and the credibility and the behaviour of Sergeant McCabe in this matter. I find it absolutely astonishing and happily this event is in private, though semi-private, there are so many people here but nonetheless it is self-contained."

And the Judge remind me it is in private. And I said:
"It is in private, but I find it, Judge, I find it deeply wrong that the Commissioner would, without any notice to me, who is a witness, a retired witness, with a view to launching an attack on my client."

And I said:
"What I am asking for, firstly, is absolute firm confirmation from Mr. Smyth that he is instructed by nobody else but the Commissioner to impugn my client's credibility."

Can I stop there? You had a number of clients.
A. Yes.

555 Q. So I mean, if, for instance, it was quite possible to
somebody who was not privy to your instructions that one of your other clients was putting you up to this 1ine of cross-examination, isn't that right?
A. Well, there was nobody putting me up to anything.

556 Q. No. I'm saying --
A. The fact of the matter is that I had clients, I cannot say what their instructions to me were.

557 Q. Exactly.
A. But I want you to understand, Mr. McDowe11, I had to defer to the Commissioner because she is my primary client.

558 Q. Exactly. But the point I'm making to you is: That you were being asked to state positively that this line of questioning was being done on the instructions of the

Commissioner?
A. Yes, I was being asked. Because she is the primary client.
        Yes. And Mr. Justice O'Higgins --

CHAIRMAN: I get the rest of it. Indeed we've heard it.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And then the next thing that happens is Mr. Justice O'Higgins uses the word integrity, and at 15:54 Mr. Smyth says:
"Do you want me to respond?"

And he says, and he says:
"This is an inquiry in relation to allegations of malpractice and corruption on a grand scale. My instructions are to challenge the integrity certainly of Sergeant McCabe and his motivation."

MR. MCDOWELL: Before that, Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"No. This part of the inquiry?"

And Mr. Smyth said:
"I appreciate that, but my instructions are to challenge the integrity certainly of Sergeant McCabe and his motivation."

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Sure. One comes back to the question of where are the two witnesses conflicting so that you will have any question in relation to where is one witness coming from as opposed to doing their honest best to recount facts.

560 Q. MR. McDOWELL: Exactly. And Mr. Justice O'Higgins queries it, and says:
"The integrity?"

To you. And you answered:
"His motivation and his credibility in mounting these allegations of corruption and malpractice."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins then said:
"There is a difference. In relation to the question of credibility, as I have already indicated, that is an every day matter. One can suggest to a witness that
his evidence shouldn't be believed because of something, but an attack on somebody's credibility or on his motivation or integrity is something that really doesn't form part of this inquiry. It would be necessary, I think, for you to go further and say that the complaints and the actions of Sergeant McCabe on your instructions were motivated by his motivation was dishonest other wrong. In other words, that he made these allegations not in good faith, because he was
motivated by malice or some such motive that impinges on his integrity. If those are your instructions from the Commissioner so be it."

And you said:
"So be it. That is the position."
A. And I explained to Mr. McDowell earlier that that was out of frustration, because I'd had several visitations as to what my instructions were, I had never encountered that before in any hearing, a judge asking me and sending me out of the room to get confirmation. But "so be it" was meant purely in the sense if the judge was interpreting my instructions as that, that is fair enough.

561 Q. I see.
A. But that's not how I interpreted my instructions. And I never used, nor did I ever put mala fides, malice. And you said yesterday, in fairness, to the Commissioner that I put to Sergeant McCabe that he was untrustworthy, that he was malicious. I did not. And please refer me to any part of the transcript where I put such a thing. I did not do it. And you know that.
562 Q. I'm suggesting to you that when the judge, when you were asked by the presiding Chairman of the Commission, in the plainest of terms whether Sergeant McCabe was making these allegations not in good faith, but because he was motivated by malice or some other such motive that impinges on his integrity, and he asked:
"If those are the instructions from the commissioner so be it."

And you told him positively:
"So be it. That is the position."
A. And I have given you an explanation. Can I go further, Mr. McDowell?
Q. Yes.
A. The matter was then addressed on day 29 and you were present.
564 Q. We will come to it.
A. No, no. We will come to it now, Mr. McDowell. Because he revisited it on day 29 just before the Commissioner was due to give evidence. And the matter was clarified. By me. In the presence of the Commissioner. And if you took issue with that, if you had any doubt about it, you would have raised an objection and you would have cross-examined the Commissioner. But you did not. And you know that.

565 Q. You've made that point three times, Mr. Smyth, now.
A. It's a very important point.
Q. It is. And we will come to it later, because you will hear precisely what the situation was. Well, maybe we
will deal with it now. The Commission had gone, through its solicitor, to Séan Costelloe, solicitor, and had emphasised that there was to be no cross-examination other than in relation to Module 5,
management matters.
A. Well --

567 Q. And to emphasise that point had printed off the terms and conditions -- sorry, the terms of reference of the Commission and had delivered them to the solicitor to make it very clear that that was the only basis on which the Commissioner was to be cross-examined and the on1y basis on which she was to give evidence?
A. Mr. McDowe11, I have no knowledge of that.

568 Q. Yes, I know.
A. And I mean, you have to understand that.

569 Q. You have put it three times --
A. Yes.

570 Q. -- in your own evidence, but it's already been dealt with in evidence before this Tribunal.
A. So be it. But I didn't know that. So be it.

571 Q. Now could I ask you then to look, to move to volume 2A, please?
CHAIRMAN: which day are we moving to, Mr. MCDowell? MR. MCDOWELL: We're in day 3, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: That's the Monday 18th.
Q. MR. McDOWELL: Monday 18th. I've got to suggest to you that when you said "so be it", whether you were frustrated or not, everybody present in that room was led to believe by that remark that those were your instructions.
A. But how could you be, Mr. McDowe11? At the end of this process how could you possibly be? Because you knew that \(I\) never put an allegation as to your client's
character. I never said he was malicious. I never put it to him that he was a whinger or anything else that may be suggested. I never attacked his character in one iota. You know that. And it suits you to say that now.

CHAIRMAN: Listen, we're not going to have an argument. MR. MCDOWELL: We will come to all of these matters. CHAIRMAN: The other thing as well is: You know, whether you made a mistake or not, Mr. Smyth, what I am required to look into is whether the Commissioner instructed you to use inappropriate grounds to challenge the credibility of --
A. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN: -- Sergeant McCabe. So, in a way you have a lesser part. And I don't want this to get off the rails, because I have a nightmare looking at this transcript, where we're having a Tribunal into a transcript of a Commission that there may be a Tribunal into this Tribunal, and my handling of this. So let's please keep it on the rails, gentlemen.
573 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Can I ask you to go to page 973? And line 4 please.
A. Yes.

574 Q. And this is Mr. Justice O'Higgins giving his understanding of what you were doing in respect of Sergeant McCabe. And he said:
"Certainly there is no doubt that the integrity of the witness is being impugned in no uncertain terms.

Secondly, in relation to the inquiry it seems to me the case is being made that I cannot accept the evidence of your client. This is the case that's being made."

Now, you heard that.
A. Yes. Just can I ask you, Mr. McDowe11, is this in relation to -- you refer me to the page, what are we discussing here?
575 Q. I will read out the preceding matter. I said -- the Judge said:
"It is not semi public."

And I said:
"It is, Judge. Because, as I say, she is entitled to see everything although she's not here. If she's going to impugn his integrity, is she asking to come along and stand over these imputations or am I going to be left dealing with somebody who sent in lawyers and stayed up in the Phoenix Park and presented herself to the public as somebody who values this man as a member of the force and at the same time is launching a very savage attack on him in private? I object to all of that."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins in response to that said, in your presence:
"Certainly there is no doubt that the integrity of the witness is being impugned in no uncertain terms. Secondly, in relation to the inquiry it seems to me that the case is being made that I cannot accept the evidence of your client. That is the case that is being made."

Now that was said in your presence. And I have got to suggest to you --
A. where --

576 Q. -- that it is utterly, utterly unrealistic for you to suggest that any other impression was given both to the Chairman of the Commission and to all present but that you were attacking Sergeant McCabe's integrity and secondly, that you were saying that his words should not be accepted?
A. Mr. McDowe11, could you please refer me to any question that I put to your client where I said his words should not be accepted or that I was attacking your client's character? Could you please do that?
577 Q. I will come to what you did and did not put to my client. First of al1, I am putting to you that you had somehow persuaded the Chairman of the commission that those were your instructions and there can be no doubt about it.
A. Sorry, Mr. MCDowel1, I think you persuaded the Commissioner [sic] that I was impugning his integrity. You cannot point me to any part of a transcript where I impugned your client, or told him he was a liar, or
told him he was a person who couldn't be believed, or told him he was a person being malicious or acting in bad faith. There is nowhere in any of the transcripts that I did that. You convinced the Commissioner [sic] through your own advocacy of that fact. I left the Commissioner [sic] in no doubt, through my questioning and certain by clarification subsequently that there was no question of attacking the man's integrity and that all along I was instructed by the commissioner [sic] to deal only with credibility and motivation in relation to allegations that he was making.

578 Q. Can we deal, for instance, with the first module and your cross-examination of sergeant McCabe?
A. The first module dealing with the Kingscourt.

579 Q. Kingscourt, yes?
A. Well, in relation to --

580 Q. First of a11, can we deal with it --
A. Yes.

581 Q. And I just want to put it to you --
A. What question?

582 Q. That I want to put it to you that you asked questions criticising him for allegedly telling Ms. Lorraine Browne to go to GSOC?
A. Mr. McDowell, that is a very selective view of the case.

583 Q. Did you --
A. Can I just explain to you what was being done there. This was a young probationer, from my memory, he was about three weeks out. He had, probably -- he was
under the tutelage of Regina McArdle who was his training sergeant. There was an assessment to be done in relation to his progress. Now when I say, he was out very recently on probation from Templemore. There was an assessment to be carried out, and your client and Regina McArdle formed two of the three-people panel of that assessment board. At that assessment board meeting, your client and Regina McArdle were informed that as to his progress, he indicated that he had been involved in a public order incident, which was the Kingscourt incident. The point being raised against your client, as you well know, was that apparently it was much over a year later when he took it upon himself to go directly to GSOC, I was putting to your client that in circumstances where he was sitting on a panel reviewing this young man and was a sergeant in charge of the station, where his training sergeant, who apparently is friendly with your client, was also sitting on the board, as a training sergeant, I inquired on the credibility of that; how could it follow that he could maintain that he didn't know anything about the incident and that instead of calling the young probationer in to question him as to what this was all about -- I was not disputing that he was entitled to go to GSOC, my only point to your client was: why was it that he didn't take the matter in hand knowing about the incident or Regina McArdle, why she didn't take the matter in hand, and if they felt there was a disciplinary issue in the first instance, why was
it not referred upstairs to the superintendent? Instead of which they decided to bypass the superintendent and make the complaint, ask the client -- ask the victim rather to make the complaint to GSOC. That is the context in which he was -- and that, may I say, Mr. McDowell, was the kick off of my instructions. This was the beginning of my instructions on credibility. The matter didn't come to light or it didn't dawn on you obviously the dramatic intervention relating to Colm Rooney. But that is the context in which I challenged his and Regina McArdle's, by the way. Regina McArdle's credibility was challenged as well.
584 Q. Let's stop there. Their credibility in relation to what?
A. The credibility in relation to your client, as I understand it -- I haven't got the transcript in front of me, but my understanding of what he was saying was that he had no knowledge of this incident. That when he became aware of the incident he went to the victim or himself and Regina McArdle went to the victim and said, look, this is a matter for GSOC.
585 Q. I see.
A. And what I was trying to ascertain was how could that be when he sat on the board and he knew that there was an incident in Kingscourt.

586 Q. I see. So you're underlying point was that he was making a complaint about behaviour that he himself should have been, should have been in a position to
stop?
A. Well, first of all --

587 Q. -- to rectify, is that right?
A. First of all, I was making the point that, as I understood it, now I may be wrong and perhaps you will correct me, he was trying to say that he knew nothing about to the incident and when he became aware of it he went to the victim and told her to go to GSOC. But he sat on the board, as I understand it. He sat on the board with Regina McArdle. He was informed about the incident. And rather than take it in hand, or have Regina McArdle take it in hand, the two of them decided to go to this lady and say go off to GSOC. And the major point of course was that they didn't direct it upstairs to the superintendent who was in-house and complain to him about it. That's as I understand it, but if I'm wrong about that please correct me.
588 Q. How does that affect credibility, even if that were true?
A. Because it shows, it shows in my view that he was by passing the superintendent. The superintendent should have been told about that disciplinary matter. He himself should have taken it in hand or he should have ensured that the training sergeant of that young man took it in hand. But more importantly of course, they were made aware of the incident and never followed it up with the young probationer and they never brought him in to question him.
589 Q. Mr. Smyth, do you believe that in those circumstances

Sergeant McCabe could make the complaint that he had made in good faith?
A. Can I say to you, Mr. McDowell, your client made serious allegations of criminal conduct - just let me finish please - against my clients. That's the first thing. He made serious allegations of malpractice of a highly leve1 against senior management. He's the accuser. He accused my clients of serious wrongdoing. And I in return wanted to explain in a simple way, what was actually going on in this instance.
590 Q. Now --
A. That this is a situation where this man knew about this young probationer's first public order incident, which resulted in a very serious issue, where he saw himself in a position to mediate and placate the victim by taking \(€ 150\) from somebody else and giving it to the victim. He wasn't followed up. That's my point.
591 Q. Sorry, I asked you a different question.
A. All right.

592 Q. Do you believe that if is correct, which is hotly disputed, that my client could have been behaving in good complaint in making the complaint?
A. What I'm saying --

593 Q. Will you answer the question, please?
A. I will answer the question. There's no reason to raise 15:47 your voice to me, Mr. McDowe11. What I'm saying to you quite simply is this: It showed an animus on the part of Sergeant McCabe that he was prepared not to go to the superintendent, that he was prepared to bypass the
superintendent and go directly to GSOC to high1ight what otherwise could have been dealt with internally. I'm not saying he shouldn't have gone to GSOC, but I raise the issue in this way: why was it necessary to deal with it in that way? It showed a certain animus on the part of Sergeant McCabe. And that was the issue that I raised, and it wasn't spotted by you until of course the dramatic incident.

594 Q. And what do you mean by the term "animus"?
A. It shows that he was not referring the complaint upstairs.
Q. What do you mean by the term "animus"?
A. It shows that he has an intention to bypass, in my view that is what it was trying to show, that he had an intention to bypass him.
Q. To act improperly?
A. It is a matter that will have to be decided on hearing all the evidence, from Regina McArdle, she gave evidence, your client was giving evidence also, and also other people.
597 Q. Now you've had plenty of opportunity to consider the question, \(I\) 'm putting it to you for the third time: Do you believe that if any of that was correct, which is disputed, do you believe that my client in making the complaint was acting in good faith?
A. He was acting properly by telling the victim to go to GSOC. My point was, having known of the incident, having sat on the board with the training sergeant, why did they deal with it in that way? was it to embarrass
the superintendent? was it to create difficulty for the superintendent who would have to fill out plenty of forms in relation to GSOC investigation when he wasn't made aware of it in the first place?
Mr. Smyth, I asked you a simple question, do you believe that in that context my client could have made the complaint he did acting in good faith?
A. I think he acted to the detriment of Superintendent Clancy by telling the victim to go to GSOC. I'm not disputing he was entitled to do that. I've answered that. But it shows that he was prepared to embarrass -- while at the same time complaining about inactivity by Superintendent Clancy.
599 Q. So --
A. When he didn't give him the chance to deal with the issue.
Q. Now will you answer the question please --
A. which is?

601 Q. -- we're going to it for the fifth time: Do you believe that that behaviour was behaviour in good faith?
A. I believe he was acting not in the interest of Superintendent clancy in doing that.
CHAIRMAN: All right. I feel I need to intervene here. I'm going back to the term of reference, and it could be that your question, Mr. McDowell, is related to it, because it could be that you're asking me to raise an inference or you feel an inference could be raised:
"were any unjustified grounds relied on by Commissioner o'sullivan to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe at the o'higgins Commission?"

That's what I am actually inquiring into. Now let's suppose that Mr. Smyth is in a case and let's suppose he is prosecuting a man for rape, and let's suppose he believes that the man in question is not only a rapist but a serial rapist, a danger to the community, a danger to society and the man is acquitted, two rules apply: Firstly, he's not making the decision, and secondly it's always been the case that counsel are never allowed to express their own opinion --
MR. McDowell: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: -- in the course of a court case.
MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: So whether he believes something or not is neither here nor there.

MR. MCDOWELL: No.
CHAIRMAN: And also, I suppose --
MR. McDOWELL: I fully accept that.
CHAIRMAN: -- your mind can change.
MR. McDowell: I fully accept that, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. McDOWELL: But I mean --
CHAIRMAN: so, what's it got to do with Commissioner o'sullivan if he believes, for instance, that Sergeant McCabe is a really nice man -MR. MCDOWELL: No, Judge, that's not the --

CHAIRMAN: -- or the opposite?
MR. MCDOWELL: That is not the point. It's whether -the term of reference isn't just what was going on in Ms. O'Sullivan's mind, it's whether counsel instructed by her relied on unjustified grounds.

CHAIRMAN: I wonder about that, Mr. McDowe11.
MR. SREENAN: Chairman, I don't think so. I think the term of reference refers to Commissioner o'Sullivan and what was done by her. Obviously counsel acting within her instructions is relevant to that question. But if counsel was to act outside the scope of the instructions that doesn't go to what Commissioner o'sullivan did.

CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that your instructions are that counsel was acting outside their instructions, Mr. Sreenan?

MR. SREENAN: Absolutely not, Chairman. But I'm intervening in relation to what Mr. McDowell has submitted in relation to the scope of this module -CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SREENAN: -- which in my respectful submission is wrong and casts the module too wide. Because the subject of this module is Commissioner O'Sullivan and the instructions that she gave and in my submission that is what the Tribunal is requested to address in this aspect of the case, of the matter.
CHAIRMAN: Look, it is clear to me, and module (e), and let's not go into a kind of pleading point here, but it is asking me to investigate whether any unjustified
grounds were inappropriately relied on by Commissioner o'sullivan.
MR. MCDOWELL: Before the O'Higgins Commission.
CHAIRMAN: Well, yes.
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: Un7ess we're going to say that nothing that happened at the Commission is relevant --
CHAIRMAN: Oh no, we're not.
MR. MCDOWELL: -- it must be that if counsel were
operating on her instructions, Judge, she bears responsibility for that.
CHAIRMAN: But I keep coming back, I suppose, to Cross and wilkins and what it says is: Cross-examination on the fact is cross-examination on the fact. Were you
there? Cross-examination as to credibility is, for instance, were you wearing your glasses? And the third thing is, cross-examination as to credit is whether or not you have some problem --
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- bubbling around in the background, which makes you consciously or unconsciously take a view of things which may not be. Obviously the consciously one is the very serious one, because it means you've a motive to lie. If those instructions were given by Commissioner O'Sullivan she would have to justify them. MR. McDOWELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You're entitled to explore what happened, Mr. McDowe11, certain1y. But it's with a view to
saying to me, look, from that you can raise an inference that Commissioner o'Sullivan did the following or that maybe the grounds for counsel's brief on this were too wide. You might say that, I don't
know.

MR. McDOWELL: We11, the point I think, Judge, and I don't want to get into a legal argument with Mr. Sreenan here now, is that if inappropriate grounds were relied on at the o'Higgins Commission and if they were in accordance with the instructions of

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: And to put the opposite, I am saying that it's a wrong approach to this module for the Tribunal to do as Mr. Sreenan is suggesting and say it doesn't matter what counsel does at the Tribunal even because all that is relevant is her state of mind. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mr. Sreenan, would you like to reply to that?
MR. SREENAN: Yes. I didn't make that submission that is whether or not Commissioner O'Sullivan inappropriately relied on unjustified grounds in the
questioning of Sergeant McCabe. Accordingly, the focus is on what Commissioner o'Sullivan did or did not and the instructions she gave. The state of mind of mr. Smyth, which is what is being pursued in cross-examination now, is of little, if any, relevance, 15:55 in my submission.
CHAIRMAN: You think it could ever be of relevance? I'm not asking that by way of a joke, Mr. Sreenan. I'm asking for your assistance on it.
mR. SREENAN: It's hard it see how it could ever be of relevance, Chairman.

MR. McDOWELL: Well, Judge, this --
CHAIRMAN: Could it be something from which an inference could be raised in relation to a client, given that the duty of counsel before cross-examining on a matter of credit is to get specific instructions from their client, that is clear.
mR. SREENAN: Yes, it is, Chairman. But it is still hard to see how the state of mind of counsel is relevant. Because this module is not set up to inquire 15:56 into counsel. Counsel is not the subject of the module. Counsel are private clients. of course what they do in the context of representing the Commissioner is very relevant to your inquiry here. But this is not an inquiry into the instructions given by
Superintendent Cunningham or Chief Superintendent Clancy. It relates to whether or not Commissioner o'Sullivan inappropriately relied on unjustified grounds.

CHAIRMAN: Can I leave it like this and say look, I see your submission, \(I\) also see the terms of reference and I'm sure we're not going to stay on this point too long, Mr. McDowell.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: If that is all right. Can I just leave it there in the interests of world peace as one might say. MR. MCDOWELL: I think we can park that there. But it is a matter of fundamental importance, as the Tribunal wi11 appreciate. I mean, if it is the case that, as

Mr. Sreenan says that counsel acting within
instructions, the purpose of questioning and the purpose of behaviour and the line of questioning adopted is irrelevant to this module, the only question is, whether Commissioner O'Sullivan was conscious that line of questioning was being done on her behalf. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. MCDOWELL: That would be a very subjective view of the whole thing.
CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. McDowell, a classic example is two people witness a traffic accident, one happens to be the neighbour of one of the people involved and gives evidence to the effect that the neighbour actually went through a red light --
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- whereas other witnesses are saying no, the neighbour went through a green line. And then, on specific instructions counsel are entitled to mention that the particular neighbour who is giving that
evidence made an application for planning permission to which the neighbour who she is putting in the wrong objected.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: That is the classic example of cross-examination as to credit. And the difficulty with this is, I suppose, the specific facts and where are the specific facts that were being put to undermine credit. But you're entitled to say, look, this is what happened and therefore you should raise an inference. So I think you should just go on. You'11 bear in mind what my thinking is on the matter. I'm not shutting you down.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. What I am really saying, Judge, is that far from just asking the Tribunal to raise an inference, what I am really saying, and I want to be clear about this, is that the presumption is that if counsel pursues a line of questioning with the witness that they are acting on the instructions at the time. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would very much hope so.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. And then Judge, then Judge, you'11 appreciate that in the particular case Mr. Smyth had been asked to identify is this on the instructions of the Commissioner, to the exclusion of his other clients, so that it could be quite clearly understood that the Commissioner was pursuing --
CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, there is nothing wrong with that question. mR. McDowell: yes.

CHAIRMAN: You please just carry on -MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- and let's see where we're going on that. I think the clarification on both sides is helpful. Thank you.

602 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I've got to suggest to you, Mr. Smyth, that throughout the modules, and we needn't go through each module one-by-one, but I do have a list of them, of the occasions, on which it was put to Sergeant McCabe that he bore responsibility for the bad or the poor policing because he was the sergeant in charge at Bailieboro, do you recall that happening on many occasions?
A. Mr. McDowel1, there were no findings against my clients -- just listen to me for a minute, please. There were no findings against my clients in relation to malpractice, that were alleged by Sergeant McCabe. The malpractice was found to be at sergeant or sergeant in charge level. So that is the first part of the question I'm going to answer. I'm entitled to ask Sergeant McCabe what his responsibilities were in the station and I did ask that question.
603 Q. Yes. I want to put it further than that, I know you asked him what his responsibilities were --
A. Yes.

604 Q. -- but I think you did attempt on countless occasions through him and through other witnesses to drive home the point that if something had gone wrong in the particular module you were dealing with it was the
responsibility of Sergeant McCabe as sergeant in charge?
A. I drew attention to the Commission of the responsibilities of sergeant in charge. You will recall there was a major debate about the role of the sergeant in charge and the definition of that role within the policy of the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána. I explored his role. He at one stage indicated that he was in charge of some administration, I think plumbing and electricity and all of that kind of thing. He saw his role in relation to being aloof from the overall situation in the station. And there was a debate around that, Mr. McDowe11, as you well know, and the Commissioner was concerned to find out what is the actual responsibility of the sergeant in charge. But what are you trying to suggest is that by doing that \(I\) am in some way impugning the integrity of your client.
605 Q. No, I'm not.
A. I wasn't doing that.

606 Q. I'm not. I'm suggesting to you that in doing that you were seeking to shift responsibility to Sergeant McCabe in respect of these incidents?
A. That was entirely a matter for the Commission. My job was only to ask the question. If the Commissioner at, that may be so. A11 I know is that there was a finding ultimately that the problems were at sergeant and sergeant in charge level, as you know.

607 Q. I will come back to that at a later point, if I may. But the point I'm putting to you is that on many occasions, Mr. Smyth, you sought, your line of questioning was with a view to assigning responsibility for the poor policing alleged by Sergeant McCabe with Sergeant McCabe himself?
A. Not necessarily Sergeant McCabe, but at the area of middle management, more so than where Sergeant McCabe says it rested. Your client came into the Commission, he came in making charges that it was my clients' responsibility and their malpractice and that it had nothing to do -- and I asked him on many occasions -and you will recall on one occasion I asked him, he was alleging serious dereliction of duty, and I asked him please to name the people that he says were derelict in their duty, and he said he wouldn't name them. And he said I'm not blaming them because I'm blaming the superintendent. So that is the difficulty I had and you know well what I was trying to do, Mr. McDowe11, and you can look at snippets from the Tribunal. We could be here for another 30 or 40 days trying to go through it.
608 Q. That's the point. I'm trying to avoid that. I'm trying to put to you, and maybe you will agree with me, that you engaged in this line of questioning with a view to bringing responsibility for the incidents which Sergeant McCabe had complained about back on to Sergeant McCabe himself, personally?
A. I was trying to do it in a sense that a lot of what he
was saying should have been the responsibility of unit sergeants in charge and that is how the commission found it be.
609 Q. Now, on that Friday afternoon, 15th May, you were asked to provide a written statement of the facts on which you were going to rely in relation to your desire to --
A. That's correct.

610 Q. -- cross-examine Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

611 Q. Did you understand that to be the facts on which you were going to rely not merely in relation to that module but other modules or was it confined to that module?
A. The judge specifically requested me when this issue arose -- on which you took objection, you demanded that you wanted notice of the line of questioning that I intended, as \(I\) understand it, and the judge quite rightly directed me to set out the background that led up to this, that would justify this line of questioning.
CHAIRMAN: All right. We've done more than five hours today, so I think we should just take a break there. we don't need to have this on the transcript. You'11 be back tomorrow, Mr. Smyth, if that is all right.
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