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MR. COLM SMYTH CONTINUED TO BE CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL:

1 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Morning, Mr. Smyth?
A. Good morning, Mr. McDowell.

2 Q. Just in relation to the letter of the 18th of May?
A. Yes.

3 Q. The letter to the Commission itself, I wanted to ask you a few questions. I think you have very fairly indicated that this was drafted by one of your fellow counsel, is that right?
A. But I take responsibility for it.

4 Q. I'm not suggesting --
A. It was drafted, yes.

5 Q. And I fully accept that you are doing the right thing in saying that it was a corporate effort and all the rest of it. But it was, as we are agreed, I think everyone is agreed, it was emphasised to the people to whom it was circulated that it had to be right in every particular, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely, and -- yes.

6 Q. I see. And further from that, it was drafted, I presume you would say, very carefully?
A. Within our instructions.

7 Q. Yes. And I just want to be absolutely clear, because yesterday I think you said this, but I want to be 100 percent clear, it was drafted strictly in accordance
with your instructions?
A. You can take it, and I am very careful about what I can say, that was done that way.
8 Q. Yes. I don't want to penetrate --
A. Yes.

And from that point of view, this was not a clerical error of "to" appearing rather where "against" might have appeared, or vice versa, isn't that right?
A. Mr. McDowe11, I can speak for myself in respect of this, $I$ was left in no doubt about this; my clear perception was that this was "against" rather than "to" at the time.
12 Q. Yes. And that perception, in your mind, continued on through June because submissions were put in on 11th June, again on a corporate effort, which said that the allegation of lack of support from Superintendent Clancy was part of -- that that allegation was motivated by a desire to get the DPP's directions?
A. As I say, it is what it is and it's on that basis.

13 Q. Yes. And am I right in thinking, just I am not challenging your evidence inform any respect --
A. Sure.

14 Q. -- I think you told the Tribunal yesterday, Mr. Smyth, that you think you didn't see the transcript that Sergeant McCabe provided of his meeting with Superintendent Cunningham, until 24th June, day five of the Tribunal, when it resumed?
A. I think when we resumed is my understanding of it, my memory of it, the Commission made it available to us, and it was on1y at that stage that $I$ became aware of the difficulty that had arisen.
Yes. Now, I just wanted to be clear about that.
A. Yes.

16 Q. So that the misstatement in the letter of the 19th, I am not going to call it just an error, it was a misstatement --
A. Yes.

17 Q. -- on instructions, was only detected by you on the 24th June?
A. That is correct, when we became aware of the transcript.
I see. And again, I don't want to pierce your veil of
A. Yes.

19 Q. -- but at any point in the intervening period had anybody pointed out to you that there was a question-mark over the documents you have produced or, alternatively, the questions which you on foot of those documents put to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, if it had been done, I wouldn't have -- I certainly would have acted in a different -- obviously
Q. Yes. So we can draw -- we can take it from that, and I do not want to tear down the privilege, but we can take it from that that at no point were you alerted to the fact that something had gone wrong?
A. That is my position. I was not.

21 Q. And on that day, in the course of a discussion with Mr. Justice O'Higgins, the fact that Superintendent Cunningham's report -- which you hadn't seen up to that point, is that right?
A. I hadn't seen -- apparently there was a report sent in by Superintendent Cunningham which I hadn't seen. Again that would have revealed a different picture to us than what was contained in the letter.
22 Q. Yes.
A. And I hadn't seen that, as far as --

23 Q. And the difference, so to speak, between what was in the transcript and what was in Superintendent Cunningham's report, which coincided, they both -- they were both to the same effect, it only became apparent in the course of the transactions at the Commission on the 24 th June in the course of submissions?
A. This was thrashed out then and it became patently obvious that a significant mistake had been made. And that, as I say, what transpired was that the note of Superintendent Cunningham and the transcript were compatible. If we had known that to begin with, things would be much different.
24 Q. And again, just going back to it, as a misstatement of
the facts on instructions, I think you'd agree with me that it was a fairly serious misstatement of the facts?
A. Well, anything of that nature, you can't be putting to a witness something that is clearly wrong.
Q. Yes.
A. And, as I said, I apologised for that yesterday and I indicated --
Q. I fully accept that.
A. Oh no, I understand. I am not trying to labour the point, but of course in any of our dealings with the court and with clients we have to act in good faith and you have to act on proper and sound instructions. You can't be -- we can't be making things up. Of course, anything, regardless of the content of it, the fact is it was wrong and it shouldn't have been wrong.
I see. Without getting unduly argumentative with you, could I suggest to you that there was a theme in your conduct of the Commission that Sergeant McCabe was making or had made complaints in respect of matters in which he personally had some degree of responsibility?
A. Well, we had this debate or this conversation yesterday evening.
28 Q. Yes. I am trying to recast it in more --
A. I know, I appreciate that.

29 Q. -- cool terms.
A. And of course it was important, I mean to me, to find out where the responsibilities lay -- or, not for me, but it was to explore that for the benefit of my clients and the Commission. And in that, I did discuss
with him his role and his responsibilities and that's how it came up in that context, and where his responsibility lay for some of the matters of which he was complaining.

Yes.
A. And in that context I certainly did put questions to him.
Yes. And I have got to suggest to you that it was a vigorous -- that you presented your point of view vigorously to him on occasion.
A. Well, I would hope that I was in no way rude or unpleasant to Sergeant McCabe. It was my perception that I was not being that way.
Q. Exactly.
A. You know, I mean because you are caught up in the drama of the moment, if I might put it that way. It's really for the judge who is level headed and who is trying to be objective -- fair to everybody, if he felt that there was a problem and I would deserve, if it was the case, I would deserve a rap on the knuckles. But I don't ever recall getting a rap on the knuckles. Now I haven't read this transcript from page to page.

34 Q. I am not going to go through to find instances, but I am suggesting to you on a number of occasions Sergeant McCabe became visibly upset.
A. Now, I will accept that there were a couple of occasions when Sergeant McCabe became upset. But, Mr. McDowe11, I will not accept responsibility that that was caused by anything that I said to him. I mean, we can all be caught up -- I mean, I fully appreciate that Sergeant McCabe is a man who has been under a lot of strain, for one reason -- I mean, I fully accept this. This has been, for all of us involved in this process, $I$ now can fully appreciate what the position is. And one can become, when one is trying to make their point and so on and so forth in the belief that they are right, the suggestion that somebody is saying they could be wrong, I understand people can be upset about that, and some -- and people can become emotional. But it was never my intention to cause any upset to him by any question. And in fairness, if the judge felt that $I$ was being -- he certainly would have stepped in and said, look, this is really oppressive, nobody like -- I know Judge O'Higgins for a long time, we was my Circuit judge for two-and-a-half years, he is a man for whom $I$ have the greatest respect and he is one of the finest
individuals I have ever had the honour of appearing before, he would not allow, knowing that man as we all do, as barristers here, any kind of oppression or bad behaviour by counsel.
Q. I want to bring you through it very quick1y, if I may.
A. No but, I just want to say --

CHAIRMAN: Let's hear the end of the answer, if you
A. I just want to say, Mr. McDowel1, that at the time that I saw that document during the Commission, I made it my firm intention that I was not going to deploy any of
the content of that in my examination of Sergeant McCabe.

41 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I see.
A. And I mean, some of the words that were mentioned yesterday were never put.

42 Q. I appreciate that. But you do remember now when your memory was jogged that you did have access to --
A. I had access to some documents that were given to me which revealed the background or whatever it may be in relation to Sergeant McCabe. I never wanted or sought the Byrne/McGinn report. Not that I never wanted, I didn't seek it. But it was circulated to my two colleagues, who wanted to read it, and I had too much to read as it was, but if there was anything they wanted to bring to my attention they would. But I did see, I do recall seeing, which I now believe are these documents which you circulate.
43 Q. I see. And I think that it appears to be from the fact that there is a roman numeral down on the bottom right-hand corner, it appears to be from a preface to the Byrne/McGinn report?
A. The vii, is it? Yes, I see what you are saying. We11, presumably it does.

44 Q. Yes. And it appears to be part of the preface to the Byrne/McGinn report, it starts on page --
A. Probably is a preface of some kind.
Q. viii.
A. Yes.
Q. And if we could just look at it, states at the top of
page 4849:
"Background to Sergeant Maurice McCabe.
To assist the reader the following background details of Sergeant Maurice McCabe may provide an understanding 10:23 or context in which his allegations were made."

And it then gives his career history in An Garda Síochána and personal history, and it states at the fourth paragraph:
"On September 2004 a vacancy arose to fill the position --"
MR. SREENAN: Chairman, sorry, can I just intervene in relation to a ruling that the Chair made earlier? I just notice that this document, which has been redacted by the Tribunal, does not seem to have been entirely redacted in accordance with the wishes of the Tribunal, as indicated previously.
CHAIRMAN: what is the problem?
MR. SREENAN: Perhaps that can be just looked at before it's put on the screen or else not put on the screen.
CHAIRMAN: Just let's see.
MR. SREENAN: I am just looking at the very start of the sixth paragraph.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sreenan, just give me a chance to get to it.

MR. SREENAN: And the fifth paragraph.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. There seems to be a reference to
sergeant where Mr. D's name --
CHAIRMAN: Yes. We11, it has of course been mentioned on a number of occasions, but I have simply indicated to the media - and I am afraid it is a ruling - that you can't mention a rank in relation to the father of Mr. D. So, can we leave it on the screen on that basis?

MR. SREENAN: Absolutely, Chairman. I thought I should just draw the Tribunal's attention to that.
CHAIRMAN: That is fair enough, Mr. Sreenan. I wasn't terribly worried about it. That is the ruling. Everybody has abided by it and been completely responsible and I would like to thank them for it. But I mean, I don't know how many sergeants there are in Cavan-Monaghan, which is the area we are talking about. I can't imagine there is more than a couple of dozen in which case it certainly narrows it down. So, let's just leave it on the basis that he is a garda of some rank.
MR. MCDOWELL: I am grateful to Mr. Sreenan, I hadn't 10:25 noticed that.

47 Q. But in any event, at paragraph 4 it says:
"Sergeant McCabe alleges that he was being undermined and ridiculed by Mr . D after his appointment and believed that Mr. D was not supervising or managing his unit properly. He alleges that Mr. D went drinking while on duty, while on over time and allowed certain Garda members to take the working weekends off and yet
allowed them to claim allowances. Mr. D was subsequently appointed to another position."

Which we won't mention.
"Sergeant McCabe alleges that Mr. D and two other members of the crime unit --"

And he describes a scene at a suicide, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

48 Q. And then there is other matter which I don't think we have to get into the detail of?
A. No.

CHAIRMAN: That was all in Superintendent Cunningham's report on the $D$ investigation, yes.

MR. MCDOWELL: It was, yes.
49 Q. And we get down to the next page, page $i x$, the second paragraph:
"On 25th February 2008 Sergeant McCabe forwarded a written report --"

Which is appendix to the Byrne/McGinn report I suppose.
"-- to Superintendent Clancy in which he sought to have the DPP's direction conveyed to the D family so that he could be exonerated."

Now, I just want to stop there. You are aware now, and I think you probably were aware after the 24 th June 2015 --
A. Yes.

50 Q. -- that that communication to Superintendent Clancy was in response to a request by Superintendent Clancy that he should put the grounds for this action to ask that the DPP's directions be conveyed to the D family, that he should set out the grounds on which he was doing so?
A. Yeah, I think that is recorded in the transcript, that we had this debate yesterday about what Sergeant McCabe saw the position to be and he said it was exactly it, what he wanted, said he wanted to --
51 Q. And then they cite a paragraph of the letter, having set out the difficulties that he was experiencing in Bailieboro Garda Station relating to the outcome of the D matter, he says:
"I am very a dedicated member of An Garda Síochána and each officer I have worked with can vouch for this. I am married with five children and this scurrilous allegation has ruined my life forever. I am a completely changed person in that $I$ don't trust anyone any more."
A. I see that.

52 Q. Yes. And then they said:
"These comments made tend to suggest that sergeant McCabe was under an inordinate amount of stress. The
fact that he didn't trust anybody anymore was corroborated by the fact that he started recording conversations with people, both within and without the Garda organisation, without their knowledge. while not justifying any wrongdoing that may be brought to attention by this investigation, it is obvious that the D allegation had an undermining impact on Sergeant McCabe regardless of the fact that the DPP directed no prosecution in the matter."

So, we stop there. I think that that is what you understood to be the case as well, isn't that right?
A. I was getting a picture of what was going on in the background. I didn't get it from this document.
53 Q. No, but that is the picture --
A. There is a picture given about the wrongdoing.

54 Q. "The position in which he found himself came to a head on 4th March 2008 --"

And that is after the 25th February report.
"-- when he vacated the position of sergeant in charge Bailieboro. Throughout this investigation he repeatedly asserted that his decision to resign as sergeant in charge was tantamount to constructive perception that Superintendent Clancy failed to support him in his position as sergeant in charge. At no time has Sergeant McCabe ever attributed the weakening of
his position as sergeant in charge to the fact that an allegation was made against him by Ms. D.
Notwithstanding the fact that the DPP directed no prosecution against Sergeant McCabe, this report will show that he had effectively lost control of the station at that stage and that his position as sergeant in charge was untenable."

Now, I will stop there, to say was that your understanding of the situation as counsel in the O'Higgins Commission?
A. In a way, I have to say, Mr. McDowe11, this exercise is a little bit unfair to me because Byrne and McGinn were not my clients.
Q. I know that.
A. No, no. But I point is, I hadn't gone through or parsed, $I$ hadn't got instructions from them. So what is contained here may not be --
56 Q. I should stop there and say that Byrne and McGinn had separate representation.
A. I appreciate that. So what I am trying to say is what they had written down here I hadn't a chance to discuss with them. The nuances, there may be material in here which was not -- which I would say was not exactly instructed to me. So they may have particular views or 10:30 opinions about Sergeant McCabe that may not be held by my clients. So when you say to me, you read out a document and say was that what you understood, I have to say, now, it is not exactly fair because some of it
would maybe -- maybe the opinions of Byrne and McGinn may not be the opinions of my clients necessarily.
57 Q. I accept that.
A. Do you follow? So it's not really a fair exercise.

58 Q. No, no, sorry, I am not trying to put anything unfairly 10:31 to you.
A. I mean, what I am trying to say is, if I agree with this, you are saying, wel1, Mr. Smyth agreed with all of this. I don't necessarily agree with the opinions and views of Byrne and McGinn.
59 Q. I fully accept the distinction.
A. As put by the client.

60 Q. But this document has been circulated by your solicitors, not on your say-so, but I mean, it presumably is relevant to something we are going to hear about.
A. But I never read the Byrne/McGinn, nor did I seek it and really $I$ am getting this -- I paid very little attention to these pages that were handed to me $I$ have to tell.

61 Q. You are in precisely the same position as Sergeant McCabe, who has been fastidiously denied access to the Byrne and McGinn report for seven years.
A. Well, I can't get into that debate. I don't know anything about --
CHAIRMAN: Mr. McDowell, I think --
MR. MCDOWELL: I am not suggesting this Tribunal is fastidiously denying -- but he does seek access to it. CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, I am not touchy, but, you
know, I am not denying anybody anything.
MR. MCDOWELL: I am not suggesting you are, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: No. And if you want all eleven volumes of the Byrne/McGinn report and want to peruse the whole lot of them, well then do. I haven't.

MR. MCDOWELL: My client would like to see it, Judge. CHAIRMAN: It's not a question of would he like to see it. I mean, that is all very well. The question is, is it relevant to anything going on here?
MR. MCDOWELL: He can't make -- he can't have a view on 10:32 that until he sees it, Judge. He can't.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it's your view that counts as to whether something is relevant. Now, from what I hear, you have got the highlight, but I mean, I may be wrong about that because as I said I haven't read it myself. Now, if we can get it, for instance, in electronic format from the Gardaí as opposed to loading you down with yet another donkey's cart of documents, I personally, you know, can't see the relevance of it. If it was deployed, it was deployed. If it wasn't
deployed, it wasn't deployed. The question is, were unjustified grounds used to challenge the credibility of Sergeant McCabe?
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, yes. And in that context, Judge, what -- well, we will come to that in a moment. I
don't want to delay with this witness too much.
CHAIRMAN: But it doesn't seem to have been deployed at a11. And the other thing is this: As I said yesterday, Mr. McDowe11, people have opinions, and the
first thing judges do is ignore everybody's opinion and see what the facts are. And then the other thing is this: You know, it may be, I could well be driven paranoid, for instance, if I was here for another two or three years, but then people would have driven me paranoid and they could say oh, he was paranoid right from the beginning. You know, I am aware of all of these nuances.

MR. MCDOWELL: I accept, I accept the points the Tribunal is making. well, just on this issue, it is my 10:34 view that my client should be entitled to see this document because it was the framework -- it was given to counse1 --
Chairman: Let's find how much was given to counsel and then let's go back to it, but I am certainly not going to deprive you of anything. We don't have any secrets in the Tribunal, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: I am not implying that you are keeping anything secret. But I mean, Sergeant McCabe protested on many occasions before the o'Higgins Commission that he had been given no opportunity to see it or to respond to it.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I know, but I mean, everything that I see indicates to me that Mr. Justice o'Higgins did a great job, you know, so --
MR. MCDOWELL: I am not criticising Mr. Justice O'Higgins at all. It's quite clear that he used the -portions of the Byrne/McGinn report as a framework, as a useful framework document.

CHAIRMAN: That would seem correct. It seems he did, he filleted out the relevant bits and pieces or certainly counsel on his behalf did. But, Mr. McDowe11, 1et's go back to this. But as I say, we have no secrets and if I can get you that on a memory stick, well then, if you think you can use it for other modules.

MR. MCDOWELL: I would appreciate it, Judge, because it's like being an in a submarine without a periscope. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure it's that bad, Mr. McDowe11, seriously.

MR. MCDOWELL: When you see a document, Judge, which says that this report will show that Sergeant McCabe had effectively lost control of the station.
CHAIRMAN: But we have all read Garda reports.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, Judge?
CHAIRMAN: No but, we've all read Garda reports and they say things like that, you know.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, Judge, the relevance is this -and maybe I am not making myself clear, but the
relevance is this: That if it were the case that due to his own inadequacies he had lost control of Bailieboro Garda Station, if that were the case, of course it would colour the question as to whether he was now thrashing around accusing other people of poor policing. Nothing could be more central or relevant to that point. That if everybody believed that it was his fault or largely his fault or his inadequacy that policing standards had collapsed in the station, if
that were the truth, that it would colour the whole way in which he was approached and indeed it would justify putting to him that his own responsibilities had not been lived up to. Do you follow me, Judge?

CHAIRMAN: No, I do, I follow that. And equally, I
10:36 think I follow, as Mr. Smyth said yesterday, you know, it is very upsetting to be accused of an offence of this kind. And you know my views in relation to provability and non-provability in relation to this kind of offence. It's very upsetting to be investigated and it's also very upsetting to have the incidents that happened afterwards happen. You know, that is so. So --

MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, I think we are missing each other on this. I just want to be very, very clear. I am not saying that in relation to the poor policing standards, the Byrne/McGinn report apparently to the satisfaction of its own authors, demonstrates that Sergeant McCabe had lost control as the sergeant in charge of the station.

CHAIRMAN: Right. No, I get that, Mr. McDowe11, and I think the question --
MR. MCDOWELL: That is the issue that is of significance here, because.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right. That is fair enough. MR. MCDOWELL: Because if Mr. Smyth was putting to Sergeant McCabe repeatedly in the course of the O'Higgins Commission that he himself bore responsibility for poor policing standards --

CHAIRMAN: Well, that certainly is one I think that did come up from time to time, but as for losing control of the station, $I$ don't think that is ever mentioned in the transcript.
MR. MCDOWELL: No. But poor policing standards and control of the station and control of what probationers were doing and control of how prosecutions were going and control of whether deadlines for prosecutions were being met, all of these things feed into -- if a man has lost control of a station he is in a very poor position, may $I$ put it this way, Judge, to start criticising anybody else in the station for the chaos. CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, I hear what you say and it could well be a good point, but I think, you know, deploy has now become a very popular word before this Tribunal, $I$ think the issue is what was deployed. So I think if we stick to that.

MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly. But if the narrative was that the man had lost control and was personally culpable for the inadequacies of the policing, that is something
which is relevant to the points $I$ have already put to Mr. Smyth. And that is, that it was a theme of his examination of witnesses and cross-examination of Sergeant McCabe that Sergeant McCabe was personally responsible for these --
CHAIRMAN: Well, let's here the answer to that question. I do want to hear the answer to that question.
A. Yes. I want to make it clear to you, Mr. McDowe11, and

Chairman, rather, I did not use any of the content of this document. It meant nothing to me. I deliberately made a conscious decision not to use anything contained here. I never was of the view -- well, I never, for example, considered paranoia as -- I never deployed that word, for example, against Sergeant McCabe. In relation to losing control --
62 Q. MR. McDOWELL: That is fully accepted.
A. Yeah. But in relation to losing control of the station, my questions to Sergeant McCabe were quite simply this: Sergeant McCabe had said in his own evidence that he had failed, he told Judge O'Higgins that he had failed and Judge o'Higgins wanted to hear a11 about that I presume, and arising out of what he said in that respect $I$ explored it with him, what did he mean by failing. It wasn't that I would ever start my question by saying, look, isn't it plain, Sergeant McCabe, that you lost control of the station? I never said that to him. And it would be improper to say that. And it's for that reason -- this is the danger, this was, as far as I was concerned Byrne and McGinn was history to me. I was dealing with what Guerin was about.

63 Q. Yes.
A. What is the issue with Guerin? That is what the seminal document as far as I was concerned that led to the Commission, and all the things around that, to Guerin.

64 Q. Yes. I take your point, Mr. Smyth. I'm just putting
the proposition to you that Sergeant McCabe volunteered under cross-examination that by the period that he left he had failed in his role as sergeant in charge due to the circumstances which he outlined, isn't that right?
A. His case was very simple in one way. He said, look, I have been trying to get cooperation from the people upstairs, for want of a better word, the senior management, and they just won't do anything for me, they won't listen to me, there are things going on below downstairs that I am concerned about them and senior management will not cooperate. And that was the theme of what I took Sergeant McCabe to be saying. And I had to explore on behalf of my client because there was issues surrounding malpractice and serious issues that had to be explored, and it was in that context that I probed Sergeant McCabe about that.
65 Q. Yes.
A. The interaction between himself and upstairs if I put it that way, and you may recall, and we don't need to go into this too much, but you may recall there was a suggestion that they weren't turning up on time and they weren't dressing up properly and they were -apparently they were out in the public area when they shouldn't be, all sorts of that. Now, I know that Superintendent Clancy -- and you may recall this because it stuck in my memory, I think it was Superintendent Clancy who came in, if it wasn't him it was -- I can't remember, but I think it was Superintendent Clancy, came in actually on a christmas

Eve morning and I remember him saying that if one particular morning you were ever going to see slackness in respect of staff, it would be Christmas Eve morning, and he was actually astounded, they had actually all turned up on time. So the test was -- he had actually carried out a test to see if what Sergeant McCabe was saying was correct. Now, there were plenty of issues surrounding that, Mr. McDowel1, we don't need to be tedious about this and go on about it forever, but if you can point to me a specific example in the
transcripts where I may have erred or may have gone offshore I would be delighted to deal with it and I am not being in any way impertinent to you.
66 Q. I am not trying to rerun the o'Higgins Commission.
A. I know that, but if there is any particular part of the 10:42 transcript --

CHAIRMAN: Let's just leave it at this, please, gentlemen, rather than having a conversation. And you know, this is actually very weird, you were on one side of the case, Mr. McDowell was on the other side, there is a transcript but he is cross-examining you as to what you did. Now, I think we really have to focus on the term of reference and can we just move on, on that basis, please, gentlemen?
67 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Now, could I ask you about -- well, sorry, the next sentence is something on which you expressed no view and you never deployed it yourself, is that what you are saying?
A. which is the next sentence?
A. We11, can I say this: It wasn't just -- you have heard the Commissioner o'Sullivan's evidence in that regard, the Chairman has heard it, but what I wanted to emphasise was that I saw no spite or il1-wil1 towards Sergeant McCabe from the clients, the other clients that I was representing, the people who had been accused. And that I can tell you, Mr. McDowell, I would be awake to any such spite or hostility to him, because clearly, I would be dealing with people who were, to say the least of it, weren't balanced in their view and would be skewing their instructions to counsel so I had to be awake to that.
Q. I accept that.
A. That I wasn't be used. Now, I don't mean to use the word again in that respect, $I$ could be used as a mouthpiece and that would be wrong and I would not tolerate that.
71 Q. I see. I see. of the transcript. on day 31 of the transcript there was a discussion between yourself and sergeant -sorry, Mr. Justice O'Higgins, there was a discussion between you as to whether or not it was necessary for

Superintendent Cunningham to give evidence the following day.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What is the date of that, Mr. McDowe11, please?

MR. MCDOWELL: It's the day before -- it is day 31, page 252.
CHAIRMAN: And the actual date is?
MR. MCDOWELL: It was in December.
CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, it's later then.
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
72 Q. And perhaps we could go to -- could we go to page, the page is 2770 in volume 4.
A. Did you say Volume 4, Mr. McDowell?

73 Q. In Volume 4, Judge. Perhaps we could start at page 2759.
A. 2759 .

74 Q. Which is the 8th December, Judge. I am sorry, it was the 8 th December was the date.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, this has been opened before, Mr. McDowe11.
Q. MR. MCDOWELL: And Superintendent Cunningham wished to give evidence on that day, isn't that right?
A. This is page 2759?

76 Q. Yes. He had asked the previous day to be called to give further evidence at the end of the Commission?
A. Is that what the transcript says? I can't --

77 Q. You may take it, it does. I don't want to bring you to a portion of the transcript that is not in the books.

But you may take it that on the previous day, Mr. Justice O'Higgins said he didn't consider it necessary that he should give evidence but if he wanted to be called again, he could, the following day. And he was called the following day.
A. By the Commission? He was called by the Commission?
Q. Yes, at his request.
A. okay. I wasn't --

79 Q. And I have got to suggest to you that he then dealt with, at some considerable length, his dealings with Sergeant McCabe. And if I could bring you to page 2766 -- or 2765. He advanced an allegation against Sergeant McCabe to the effect that he had wrongly interfered in a dangerous driving case. Do you remember that?
A. At page 2765?

80 Q. Yes, at question 19.
A. Question 19?

81 Q. Yes.
A. In relation to "...sergeant in charge that I..." is that what you are talking about, "...that I am corrupt..."?

82 Q. This is the incident to which Mr. Sreenan made reference.
A. Yes.

83 Q. And this was during the management module. He was reminded at question 21 on page 2766 by Mr . Gillane that this was an incident which is not within the terms of reference of the Commission, but he was making
complaint about Sergeant McCabe interfering in a driving case.
A. Can I just say, Mr. McDowell, really, you have to contextualise where this is coming into play here. This, as I understand, comes into play in a situation where there is -- am I not right in this, that where there was issues around support? Your client was maintaining that he had no support from the superintendents and so on and so forth and he said he just couldn't simply carry on. And I didn't call
this -- I can't -- I couldn't have called this witness, he was called by the Commission, and he was giving information as to what he -- he was contextualising himself what he understood the position to be in trying to defend himself in relation to the charges that were being made against him as I understand it. And he was referring to incidents and he was referring to the fact that he was being accused of cover-up and lies, which was the case.
84 Q. Yes.
A. And he was essentially trying to put his case forward, as I understand it. But Mr. McDowell, he wasn't -- I had no hand, act -- he was called by the Commission.
85 Q. Yes. But I think it is relevant to point out that he made a series of complaints against Sergeant McCabe and 10:51 at page 2770, he -- sorry, at page 2769 , he says, having been told that the Commission understands his position, he says:
"It doesn't, it doesn't in one way feel --"

This is at ine 18.
"It doesn't, it doesn't in one way feel artificial because, Judge, you have been very clear in all of your remarks and you have been very fair in relation to these modules, you have been very clear to everybody that you have given them the opportunity to illicit whatever information they have which will assist you in the investigation. I am trying to do exactly that because I have since my promotion to superintendent not only not been supported by Sergeant Maurice McCabe but I have been undermined at every turn by him."

You would agree with me that this indicated a considerable degree of hostility by Superintendent Cunningham to Sergeant McCabe?
A. We11, I think to be fair, to ask me to cast an opinion -- but I have to tell you and I have stressed already, day one of my evidence, that I was dealing with people from my observation who were highly stressed and who had dealt with these difficulties for eight -- up to that point seven years, since 2008. I do not agree with you, Mr. McDowell.
86 Q. Yes.
A. Mr. McDowe11, I do not agree with you that it demonstrates hostility. what I see here and what I remember is a man who was trying to defend himself
against the allocations made by your client. There was no hostility. he had no spite or ill-will, $I$ can tell you that, or hostility towards Sergeant McCabe. In fact, he considered Sergeant McCabe -- he invited Sergeant McCabe to please remain on in his position as a sergeant in charge of the station. Because you remember he had resigned that position because of his difficulties, as he perceived it, with Superintendent Clancy. And when Superintendent Cunningham came into being -- into place, he said will you not stay on, I want you to stay on. He had a great regard for him. But the problems continued on the watch of Superintendent Cunningham, as we all know. And I think this was a man more demonstrating his frustration and how he felt and how emotionally caught up in the thing he was with the various issues that he raised rather than a man who was displaying hostility. Because I have to emphasise I never -- I never observed in consultation with these people hostility or il1-will or spite towards Sergeant McCabe. In fact, quite the contrary.

87 Q. Do you think that in any of the written submissions that were put into the Commission of Investigation, that anything favourable to Sergeant McCabe was ever included?
A. Well, I think -- I suppose submissions are prepared on the basis of what evidence has been, obviously based on the transcripts of evidence, based on people trying to contextualise their position within the evidence,
trying to focus, I suppose, the judge or the chairman, who has to deal with these matters in certain areas that are more -- that puts forward the position in a better light of one party or the other. I mean, I don't ever -- I mean, if you are asking me were they going to submit submissions, they were really addressing issues of serious concern to them, they were trying to defend themselves in relation to serious allegations of criminal corruption and malpractice, now, in fairness. And they had to address those issues ${ }^{10: 55}$ in the light of the evidence that was given, to try and demonstrate that there was no issue here of criminal corruption or what I would describe -- or the serious malpractice, what was described by Sergeant McCabe. And that is the basis on which these submissions were done.

88 Q. I see.
A. I mean, it's their only chance, they had to try and defend themselves I suppose in the best way they could and counsel had to assist them. And I know that
Mr. Byrne and Mr. MacNamee are very fair, they are very -- I have to say, I was very lucky to be assisted by these two people. They are excellent lawyers, they are well balanced, they have a very sound temperament in every respect. They weren't in any way caught up in 10:56 any hostility or any il1-will towards Sergeant McCabe.

89 Q. No one is suggesting that counsel was spiteful or whatever.
A. I know, but when you use the word negative --

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, can we please get back to the point which is --
90 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I am suggesting to you that although you said yesterday that you had never said anything bad about Sergeant McCabe, I suggest to you nothing favourable to him was ever submitted to the Commission.
A. But can I say this, Mr. McDowell: We have been in the practice of law for a long time. I mean, you know the position; parties get entrenched in position in respect of their view and so on. And that is the way -- that's the way it is. It's one party sees their case through a certain set of lenses and the other through another set of lenses and so on. I mean, I don't think you could ever say that this Commission was ever going to be a great demonstration of reconciliation between the parties. I mean, it was an attempt by a commission to try to get to the root of the problem and present and produce a report based on solid evidence presented, what is the realistic position here, and that is as I saw it.

91 Q. And in that context, do you accept that Sergeant McCabe was in the position that Chief Superintendent Rooney had effectively discounted al1 his complaints as lacking substance in his circular to the Monaghan division, Cavan-Monaghan division?
A. Well, you are asking me to trespass into an area which is none of my concern, in this way --

92 Q. Maybe I am and maybe I shouldn't --
CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, seriously, I am actually looking
into were unfair grounds used to discredit Sergeant McCabe before the o'Higgins Commission. I respect that there is a background to all of this but I am also aware of that letter. I am also aware of, you know, the first blush look at the pulse thing and what the result of that was. Now, I am not going to give a view about any of that but I am aware of all of that. But that particular letter wasn't mentioned anywhere in the transcript nor --
MR. MCDOWELL: The reason it wasn't mentioned was it was ruled out by Mr. Justice o'higgins.

CHAIRMAN: But I mean, he was right. I wish I could be so strict, but people might not listen to me.

MR. MCDOWELL: Well, in respect of motivation perhaps, Judge, it was relevant, I think, if you think about it.
CHAIRMAN: The one thing I am not going to do is, I am not going to second-guess Mr. Justice O'Higgins in his conduct of the --

MR. MCDOWELL: No, I am saying in relation to motivation, as we are discussing it here, and in
relation to the question of whether he was
ill-motivated in any respect, that letter must be relevant, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I mean, then the question seems to be, Mr. Smyth, you would have been aware of that letter which could have been pinned up in every Garda station in Cavan-Monaghan for all I am aware --
A. It could be.

ChAIRMAN: -- but certainly within the text of it, it
says, you know, te11 all the members involved the following. Now, was that ever given to you, that particular letter?
A. The concern -- I think the judge had concern about this letter because it was a subject of other proceedings. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. And he simply would not allow people to explore or go near it in any respect. CHAIRMAN: And you didn't either.
A. And I didn't either.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. So you actually did what the judge told you to do.
A. Yes. I did what I was told to do. And we didn't explore it down. And it was closed down on the basis there was an objection taken.
93 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: The point I am trying -CHAIRMAN: I think the point you are trying to make, is it could have been used.

MR. McDOWELL: No, I am not.
94 Q. The point I am trying to make is that when it came to considering Sergeant McCabe's motivation, and as to whether he was being fair in suggesting that his superiors were covering up his allegations of poor policing, that letter was something which in the full light of day, was very pertinent?
A. The difficulty we have now is that it was not dealt with at the Commission.

95 Q. Exactly.
A. And the point I am making -- sorry, it's not for me to
make any point but --
96 Q. We11, I was going to put to you that that reflects the fact that Mr. Justice O'Higgins was not concerned with motivation?
A. Well, no. I think, to be fair now, Mr. McDowell, I was 11:00 there as well at the Commission, and we can go back on the transcript if needs be. Mr. Justice O'Higgins closed this down because it was the subject of other proceedings.
A. And they are extant and they were extant at the time.
Q. Yes.
A. You know, you can't -- he didn't want anybody to start trespassing into an area that was the subject of judicial proceedings, and that is the reason, not because of issues around motivation and you know that to be --

99 Q. Well, we know that Mr. Justice O'Higgins in the end said that the questioning of Sergeant McCabe's motivation by some people, and we know who they were, was unfair and wrong.
A. Well, I don't know --

100 Q. We know that in the end he felt that. And I am suggesting to you --
A. Where is that referred to?

101 Q. What I am putting to you, Mr. Smyth, is this: That in fact Mr. Justice O'Higgins did not consider and at no stage felt relevant to his Commission Sergeant McCabe's motivation, despite your persistent effort to raise it?
A. He said that -- he said -- it's in the transcript, that he said that he wasn't ruling out motivation. And in fact, he at one stage indicated that motivation at this stage is peripheral. So there were issues around motivation, Mr. McDowell, it's not something that I persisted with when the judge said it's of no relevance. It was relevant.

102 Q. I see.
A. You know that.

103 Q. We11, okay. We11, maybe we can agree on this proposition: That he signalled strongly to you that motivation was at best peripheral?
A. And I think at one stage, if I can find reference to it, he said that motivation has not been ruled out.
104 Q. Yes. But that is because he was told -- you signalled to him if he ruled it out completely there could be a challenge to his findings.
CHAIRMAN: Well now, Mr. McDowell. I have read that bit, but I mean, you are now asking me to believe that Mr. Justice O'Higgins is like a shivering toad at the bottom of a hole and is worried about these things. He wasn't. I mean, that point was made. But as Ms. Leader said in opening the case, what could possibly be the grounds for judicial review, you know? And I read it and thought exactly the same thing. Maybe people were a wee bit upset that they were being shut down, and that happens in court cases, and maybe they say things that are a bit exaggerated. That's my reading of it.

Q
Q. MR. MCDOWELL: We11, al1 I am suggesting to you, I mean, you did, in one way or another, persist throughout with a questioning of Sergeant McCabe's motivation, and you did it even on the last day -sorry, not on the last day, on 4th December?
A. 4th December. Em, in what way, though? I mean, look --
Q. You said that his motivation in respect of the allegations he had made was still and his credibility was still on the table?
A. But credibility in relation to the allegations and whether or not there was any evidence to support the allegations he was making. And I mean, obviously if there is no evidence to support the allegations, you have to ask the question, why was the allegation made in the first place? of course, Mr. McDowe11. I mean, I don't think there is anything necessarily oppressive by that approach. It's just natural justice, I would have thought.
107 Q. What I am suggesting to you, very simply, is, that motivation -- your assault on his motivation was persisted with throughout the proceedings and in the end the Chairman said that challenges to his motivation were unfair and wrong.
A. First of all, I believed that what $I$ was doing was correct and in the best interests of the clients.

108 Q. Yes.
A. Secondly, I don't see how in any way I was being oppressive in asking and probing him to see what facts
were there to support the allegations, and if they are not there, why were they made in the first place. Now I know what you are saying, to answer the last part of your question, Judge o'Higgins did state that in his conclusions, that he said some people cast aspersions on the motives and that that was wrong. But I don't think he ever said that I was wrong in probing the issue with Sergeant McCabe. And I think that's the real crux of the matter. If barristers, engaged by the Commissioner, if he had said that they were wrong, that 11:05 they were absolutely wrong in the manner in which they conducted the advocacy in this case and that the way they did it was unfair, well then your point is well made, but that is not what he said. He said some people. He didn't say -- if he had -- I don't think 11:05 that Judge o'Higgins would -- if he wanted to say something adverse, make adverse comment about the barrister he would have said it. But he didn't. 109 Q. We11, the full paragraph was:
"Some people wrongly and unfairly cast aspersions on Sergeant McCabe's motives, others were ambivalent about them. Sergeant McCabe acted out of genuine and legitimate concerns and the commission unreservedly accepts his bona fides."

If I stop there. It was the Commissioner's case, was it not, that he was not acting out of a genuine and legitimate concerns?
A. It was a Commissioner's case?

110 Q. Yes, that he was not acting out of bona fide and acting out of genuine and legitimate concern?
A. But that is not so, Mr. McDowe11. That is not so. She never made that case to me, she never gave me those instructions. You know that. We have been through that. And can I say this to you: At the end of the day, Judge O'Higgins found that your client, that his allegations of corruption were unfounded and he used the word exaggeration. Now look, those are the facts. I mean, in the light of that, where are we going with this?

111 Q. I am suggesting to you that you have -- and we will come to this in submissions later, but I just want to be clear about it. There were two grounds: You were assailing his credibility where it was inappropriate, I am suggesting, and secondly, that you were assailing his motivation where it was inappropriate, that is what I am suggesting to you.
A. Well, these are really military terms; assault, assailing and so on. A11 I was doing was probing the evidence. I mean, it's important because what the media will pick up and what they put out there is that I attacked this man.

112 Q. okay.
A. We didn't attack the man.

113 Q. Can we use a neutral term --
A. We probed him.

114 Q. -- you were challenging --
A. Or challenging, yeah.

115 Q. -- his credibility and challenging his motivation?
A. Arising on foot of the allegations that he was making. No more, no less than that.

116 Q. And we will be submitting to this Tribunal -- I just want to be fair to you.
A. That is okay.

117 Q. The case law --
A. You have to do your duty, Mr. McDowe11. I accept that.

118 Q. I have to do my duty by my client and in respect --
A. Absolutely.

119 Q. I am at the end going to suggest that it was wrong to challenge his credibility and it was wrong to challenge his motivation.
A. Mr. McDowe11, at the risk again of being utterly tedious here, what was I faced with? I have a duty to act in the best interests of my client, regardless of the consequences that may befall me. That is the central ethic that we all abide by, and you have it as well, you are bound by it as well. I was met with serious allegations of criminal conduct by these guards, corruption, as well as serious malpractice. Am I to sit on my hands and not try and probe these allegations? Try and find what is the -- if there is no evidence to stack them up why were they made in the first place? And I indicated fairly to you that that was that was going to be the position all the way through. Now, if I am wrong in that and if this Tribunal makes that finding against me I fully respect
the Chairman for that finding, but if you are asking me, Mr. McDowell, would I do it again, yes, I would. knowing now what I have gone through personally myself, and having regard to the personal consequences for me, they are secondary to the interests of my client. But Mr. McDowe11, as I said yesterday, can I just say this, the consequences for me not doing it, if it all went wrong in some way, would be even greater than what I am suffering now. And that's how I feel about it. But my conscience is clear on it. But if the Tribunal finds to the contrary, I fully respect it, but my conscience will remain clear.

120 Q. We11, I am not attacking your conscience; I am querying the line that you were instructed to take by the Commissioner.
A. But I have dealt with that and I have been asked questions of whether I fell on my sword. I fell on my sword for no person. I stand fearlessly in the interests of my client. I put the case made by the Commissioner, which was she asked me to test the truth of the allegations, and I believe I abided by those instructions fully.
121 Q. I see. And just briefly then, can we come to the consultations prior to the 4th November. I think we dealt with yesterday the question of whether or not the 11:10 Commissioner was cross-examined on these issues?
A. Yes.

122 Q. But on the different issue of whether there was a discussion about withdrawing anything, have you any
explanation as to why Chief Superintendent Healy's note would record at that consultation "would the Commissioner considering withdrawing?"?
A. I can tell you, Mr. McDowe11, that the meetings, these two meetings, or certainly the one, certainly on the eve of her arrival at the Commission to give evidence, now we weren't coaching her, but we were informing her that she was likely -- we anticipated that there was going to be a challenge by yourself.
123 Q. Yes.
A. And I know I have your explanation -- the Tribunal has your explanation about all of that. We anticipated a serious challenge because you had flagged it very early on, that you would do that. When you got the opportunity you would cross-examine her and she would not like -- she would not, I think, enjoy the experience, is I think how you put it.
124 Q. Yes.
A. So, I think that is a fair declaration of intent on your part and you have got to do your duty, as much as I had.
Q. Yes.
A. So we had to inform her of this impending doom and we had to put her in the picture as to what the questions were likely to be. And in that context, I said to her, 1:11 it's likely that Mr. McDowell will insist, as you are still insisting today, and I accept that, that she was acting -- that she believed that Maurice McCabe was acting mala fides, and in that context, Mr. McDowell
will press you to withdraw any such allegation and so on and so forth. And that is the type of questions you are going to be asked. will you now withdraw your allegation? I can tell you that there was no question of -- I think the way that you are reading that is, and 11:12 you have to obviously see it from your client's perspective, you see it in a different light. I see it in reality for what it was. That is the context. It was in the context of this vigorous cross-examination that we were anticipating and the questions that might be put to her. And I think she recites in that that all along she was only interested in the truth, getting -- I may be wrong in that, I haven't got them up in front of me here but there are references within the consultation which puts the other side of the story 11:12 if I might say.
126 Q. Can I ask you this question and this, you will be glad to know is the final question I want to put to you: At any point was it queried by anybody, either by the Commissioner herself or by counsel on behalf of the Commissioner, that you had in fact stated that you were going to challenge Sergeant McCabe's integrity?
A. Sergeant McCabe's, sorry?

127 Q. Integrity.
A. No, she never asked me -- sorry.

128 Q. I am saying -- I didn't ask you what she asked you, I am saying was it ever put to you that you had in fact done that, that the transcript showed that you had done it?
A. No.

And how would this be dealt with?
A. No, that is not so. That is absolutely not so. Never. That is not so. And my colleagues will -- they can say what they want to say, I hadn't anticipated you were going to ask me that question, you can ask them when they come into the witness-box. No one had ever said to me that you have challenged this man's integrity.
Q. Nobody ever drew that portion to --
A. Nobody ever drew that to my attention.

131 Q. -- to your attention?
A. No, no. Nobody ever said that I challenged his integrity in the sense of attacking his character o otherwise. Never put to me.
132 Q. And nobody ever asked you on that occasion --
A. Of the meeting? of the consultations?

133 Q. In preparation for that day on 4th December, nobody ever pointed out, well, if Mr. McDowell is going to ask the Commissioner about this --
A. No.

134 Q. -- how does my statement on day 3 -- day 2 and day 3 that I was challenging his integrity, how is that going to stack up that?
A. That didn't arise, Mr. McDowe11, I can tell you. If it did arise $I$ would tell you it did arise, but it did not 11:14 arise.

135 Q. So it appears that nobody had read the transcript?
A. We11, Mr. McDowe11, we had a debate about the transcript, you have heard what I said in my answers on
those points. If you want to rehearse them again, so be it. But I have made my position clear.
136 Q. I am asking a slightly different question. I am saying nobody ever discussed your remarks --
A. No.

137 Q. -- on the transcript with you or queried them at any point?
A. No, they did not.
Q. At any point --
A. At any point.

139 Q. -- over the six or eight months?
A. Absolutely.

140 Q. I see. Thank you.

141 Q. MR. McCANN: Mr. Smyth, I am at you two o'clock. You have found me now. Mr. Smyth, just really one issue I want to address with you, and that is: In your evidence yesterday you said that, so going back to the 15th may 2015 and that afternoon when you were being asked to reconfirm your instructions --
A. Yes.

142 Q. -- that is the period we are talking about?
A. Yes.

143 Q. And I think you told the Tribunal that during the flurry of telephone calls between Chief Superintendent Healy and the Commissioner, and if I just might identify the time for you there, those telephone calls
took place between 15:23 and 16:13, so over an hour -an hour or so. And I think you've said that you understood as a result of what people might have said or what you -- for whatever reason, that the Commissioner and the Minister might have been together in the one place at that time?
A. That is my -- that is what I was told.

144 Q. Yes.
A. That she was with the Minister.

145 Q. Yes. Okay. And I think we know that, I think we know, 11:16 we know now from the Commissioner's evidence that she was in Garda Headquarters, she had been at a security briefing, I think we know that?
A. A11 right.

146 Q. And we also know, we also know that she was making
A. A11 right.

147 Q. So we can locate her at Garda Headquarters. And then, it will be a matter for evidence in due course but the Minister will be saying, and her diary is in the
Tribunal papers at 3389, she will be saying that -- you may not -- you may remember, but this was the -- the Minister was in campaign mode that week.
A. A11 right.

148 Q. It was the marriage equality referendum. The vote was 11:16 taking place either on the Friday -- I think on the Saturday, and the Minister was that afternoon at 15:00 hours -- sorry, at 14:00 to 15:00 in her diary, she was at Newcastle National School in Dublin 22, and then at

15:30 she was in her constituency office in Clondalkin. And so, knowing those things now you would accept, Mr. Smyth, that you may have been wrong?
A. oh --

CHAIRMAN: I have never believed, Mr. McCann, that the Minister and the Garda Commissioner were sitting together, chatting having tea, discussing matters of State with other officials or whatever together at this time.

MR. MCCANN: very good.
CHAIRMAN: I never, ever believed that. If I do, you can judicially review.
MR. MCDOWELL: Chairman, nobody is suggesting that that is the case.
CHAIRMAN: No. You are clarifying that and that is fair enough.
MR. MCCANN: Absolutely. It's certainly important from my client's point of view to do that.
149 Q. And then just a final question for you: As far as you were concerned, you were not taking instructions directly or indirectly from the Department of Justice or the Minister?
A. I was not, I wasn't in any way involved -- they were not my client, I wouldn't take any instructions from them.

150 Q. Thank you very much.
A. We11, maybe in the future.

151 Q. We all hope that. Thank you very much, Mr. Smyth.

## THE WITNESS WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM:

152 Q.
MR. DIGNAM: Mr. Smyth, there are three areas that I want to cover on behalf of An Garda Síochána and I will be very brief. Firstly, just in relation to -- you have been very clear about your desire to get firm instructions on the 13th/14th May, and can I take it that whilst you were looking for those instructions you were also advising that those instructions should be given? In other words, that the Commissioner, the then-Commissioner --
A. Absolutely.

153 Q. -- should adopt the course that was being suggested by you?
A. Absolutely, yes.

154 Q. In relation to the letter of the 18th May, I think you have said, but I just ask you to confirm, that Ms. O'Sullivan, the former Commissioner, didn't give any instructions in relation to the contents of that letter?
A. Absolutely none.

155 Q. And if I could refer you, Mr. Smyth, to -- in fact I don't need to open the transcript but Ms. Ryan when she was giving evidence on day 43 , on page 58 , she indicated that when she circulated the letter of the 18th May she also attached Superintendent Cunningham's report of September 2008 with that letter.
A. Yes.

156 Q. Do you remember that?
A. I just don't have the memory of that, but if that is
what she says, as I say, she was quite -- if Ms. Ryan says that is it, I believe it.

157 Q. Again, I don't want to trouble you with going through the core booklets but on page 771 we find the letter of the 18th May 2015, which is the letter which contains the mistake in paragraph 19, where the word "against" rather than "to" is used. And then on page 776, we find the report of Superintendent Cunningham on the 12th September 2008. So this was the report --
A. Yes.

158 Q. Perhaps if I could just jog your memory, Mr. Smyth, this is the report that Superintendent Cunningham sent to Chief Superintendent Rooney following his meeting of the 25th August --
A. Yes.

159 Q. -- 2008 with Sergeant McCabe.
A. Yes.

160 Q. And if I could just ask you to refer to the second paragraph of that report, which reads:
"Superintendent Cunningham explained to Sergeant McCabe that his function on this date was to investigate the allegations made by him in his report of 25th February 2008 to Superintendent Clancy and to obtain a statement from Sergeant McCabe supporting these allegations."
A. I see that.

161 Q. If I could then direct you to the final paragraph on that first page of the report, I don't need to read the whole paragraph -- sorry, the paragraph ends on the
same page:
"Sergeant McCabe stated that he high1ighted these allegations to Superintendent Cunningham in 2006 at the time of the Ms. D investigation. Superintendent Cunningham informed Sergeant McCabe that he was aware of some of the details but not all of the allegations which are included in his report --"

And again
"-- to Superintendent Clancy."
A. Absolutely.

162 Q. Yes.
A. And we would have been very pleased to have all of these documents before that letter was drafted.

163 Q. And I think Ms. Ryan's evidence is that that was handed in to Mr. Justice O'Higgins, to the Commission, and then it was directed that it be circulated to the parties --
A. Yes.

164 Q. -- before the Commission.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dignam, can I just make sure that I understand what you are saying? okay, I do understand the letter of 12th September 2008, and if you wouldn't 11:21 mind just reminding me of the particular page reference you are going on.
MR. DIGNAM: It's page 776 of the core booklets.
CHAIRMAN: 776, yes. And that is the one that is
countersigned by Sergeant Yvonne Martin.
MR. DIGNAM: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. So that was handed in on 18th of May, together with a letter effectively which contradicted it. But you are not saying that counsel had that before the weekend in drafting the letter?

MR. DIGNAM: No, Judge. Sorry, Judge, the copy that I am referring to at page 776, I don't see Sergeant Martin's signature on that copy, but certainly that is the report that was signed by Sergeant Martin. I am not sure where the actual --

MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, just to be clear, there were two things: There were notes, manuscript notes which Sergeant Martin countersigned, which are not relevant to this, really, and there was a report --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: -- which it was stated that Sergeant Martin -- wrongly stated that Sergeant Martin had approved its contents, or would approve its contents. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, $I$ think the point all along is that the Cunningham/Martin report said the right thing, which later accorded with the transcript of the conversation that had been recorded. That is the point and that has been got very badly wrong by a number of people all the way through. Vis-á-vis the letter going 11:22 in on 18th of May on behalf of the Garda Commissioner and clients from the Garda team, if you like, to the o'Higgins Commission, that gets that wrong, but in addition, the letter or the report of Superintendent

Cunningham was also handed in and that, in fact, was what, on I think the 4th November that Mr. Justice O'Higgins then referred to and said, look, you are all getting this wrong.
MR. DIGNAM: Precisely. I think Judge O'Higgins raised 11:23 that on 24th of June.

CHAIRMAN: 24th June, correct, yes.
MR. DIGNAM: I don't need to pursue that. I think you have the point I was coming to with Mr. Smyth. CHAIRMAN: I think I do, but it helps to get the 11:23 sequence.

MR. DIGNAM: Yes.
165 Q. And then finally, Mr. Smyth, on page -- sorry, yesterday Mr. McDowe11 read out a portion of the transcript of day 1 of the 0 'Higgins Commission, page 11:23 162. If I could just ask you to look at page 162. And just for completeness, Mr. Smyth, at page 165 of yesterday's transcript - bear with me, Mr. Smyth. Sorry, Judge - beginning at the top of the page, Mr. McDowe 11 introduced the section from day 1 of the 11:24 O'Higgins Commission and he started at lines 26 on page 162 of that transcript, and he read that:
"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."

Now, if I could just ask you to then look at page 162 of the core booklets, which is the page that Mr. McDowell is quoting from. Sorry, Chairman. So what Mr. Justice O'Higgins said at page 162, I will begin where Mr. McDowell started:
"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."

Now, if you look immediately before where I started there, Mr. Smyth, Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"The scope of this module is to hear evidence into the investigation by An Garda Síochána of a public order
incident and possible sexual assault on a bus at Kingscourt, Co. Cavan on 25th February 2007. Evidence will also be taken concerning the investigation by an Garda Síochána of complaints made by Sergeant Maurice McCabe in relation to that incident and into the investigation by An Garda Síochána and by the Garda síochána ombudsman commission of Garda disciplinary issues arising from the incident. This module is, therefore, quite limited in scope."

Now, did you understand from that that Mr. Justice O'Higgins would be looking at the Garda authority's consideration of Sergeant McCabe's complaints in relation to that the investigation of the Kingscourt incident?
A. I assume that that is what he intended to do.

166 Q. Thank you.

THE WITNESS WAS EXAMINED BY MR. SREENAN:
167 Q. MR. SREENAN: Mr. Smyth, could I ask you to look at page 153 of the core book? This is the cover page for the documents circulated by the O'Higgins Commission for Module 1, and you'11 seed headed: "O'Higgins Commission of Investigation, Module 1, terms of reference 1(a), (j) and (k)."
A. Yes.

168 Q. And if we can then look at the terms of reference for the O'Higgins Commission, I think you are familiar with them, 1(a) we know is the Kingscourt incident, but (j)
is the investigation by An Garda Síochána and the Minister of complaints made by Sergeant McCabe in relation to the incidents (a) to (i). And (k) then was the investigation by An Garda Síochána --
A. Yeah.

169 Q. -- and GSOC of Garda disciplinary issues arising out of that.
A. Yes.

So the first module, as I understand it, addressed those three terms of reference.
A. Yes.

171 Q. And if we then look at the Brief Proven Facts document, which is 4739 --
CHAIRMAN: Sorry, your point here, maybe the witness could answer that, the question you are asking is
whether it was wider than what happened on the bus, is that the question you are asking?
MR. SREENAN: It is, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: And what is your answer to that, Mr. Smyth?
A. Well, I expected that was the case; that it was wider than what was envisaged about the bus. That it was malpractice and corruption issues were going to be involved in.
172 Q. MR. SREENAN: And in fact I understand that all of the papers circulated for the different modules for the
A. Absolutely. There were excerpts from -- in every module containing the statement from Sergeant McCabe of wrongdoing and so on. something that permeated or ran through the various modules?
A. They were al1 1inked back to the -- as I say, to the proven facts document, as I saw it. That was the seminal document that I was presented with from the beginning.
174 Q. And that seminal document is at 4739, if we can just look at that for a moment, where it starts, and this is $11: 30$ Sergeant McCabe's document:
"I brought several issues to superintendent and he ignored every one of them."

The superintendent referred to there is a superintendent who was your client or one of your clients?
A. Yes, Superintendent Clancy.

And this document is one of the documents that would have been provided to you at the very beginning of the O'Higgins Commission?
A. Yeah, that is so.
Q. You already indicated that the task with which counsel was faced was unusual, in that you had a very limited period of time in which to prepare for the commencement of this commission of inquiry?
A. That is correct.

177 Q. And also, that you were not briefed in the traditional
way of receiving a set of instructions to counsel associated with proofs of evidence of witnesses or potential witnesses?
A. That is correct.

178 Q. So at the beginning, I take it, your evidence is that you had a very limited amount of information available to you, but principally the Guerin Report?
A. Well, we were relying on $I$ think Chief Superintendent Healy to give us all the background information and then to direct what materials we would need for the next meeting.

179 Q. And one of the documents, as we say, we are looking at it here is this "Brief Proven Facts pertaining to my complaint" document, and we have looked at a long list of those bullet-points there, but the sixth bullet-point is "supporting corruption to save themselves"?
A. Yes, that was a particularly serious allegation.

180 Q. And on the second page of that document there is: "List of evidence and list of witnesses supporting my complaint."
A. Yes.

181 Q. And that runs to a very large number of bullet-points but it refers to an undefined number of exhibits, 120 text messages, 70 voice recordings, reference to
victims of crime, injured parties, 80 members of the public, two District judges, two State solicitors, 14 solicitors, etcetera. Did you know anything about the detail of this evidence and list of witnesses that you
might be forced to deal with in the course of the Commission at some stage as further documents were circulated?
A. Well, as I say, the big concern for us on reading this, this had, if I might put it this way, there was
something of an imprimatur about this because we had the Guerin Report which as I said was prepared under warrant from the Government and these were matters which were very serious and it wasn't just a crank's charter. I can tell you now we didn't consider this to 11:33 be a crank's -- nor could it be, nor could it be, because it had the imprimatur, as I say, of an independent investigation by senior counsel Guerin. So this was very serious and, as I said at the outset, red alert.

182 Q. And in that report of senior counse1, Mr. Guerin, effectively concluded in its recommendations to Government that there was sufficient evidence in relation to certain matters to justify the Government in deciding to set up a commission of inquiry?
A. Yes. Now in fairness -- that is correct, but $I$ think in fairness, $I$ think there were matters also at that stage before the, is it the Confidential Recipient which had been referred corruption issues, which I can't second-guess what he thought about that, but they 11:34 were serious issues -- I think it's chapter 19, page 314 of Guerin, which refers to further serious issues of perversion of the course of justice by my clients, which was also very much in my mind. That this was
matter was now gone to the Confidential Recipient and there are serious issues at play, and we have to be very careful.
183 Q.
If I could ask you then to turn perhaps to the day that a lot of attention has been focused on, 15th May 2015, day 2 , and we might go to page 663 of the Tribunal's books. And as I understand it, we are looking here at a part of the transcript where Chief Superintendent Colm Rooney is being cross-examined by you, I think, is that correct?
A. That's correct, that's correct.

184 Q. And this is the point at which Mr. McDowel1's objection is first made.
A. Yes.

185 Q. Not when Superintendent Cunningham or Chief
Superintendent Clancy is giving evidence?
A. That is correct. And I think I made the point, for what it was worth, that it was prematurely. But anyway, it is what it is, he made his objection and he was entitled to make the objection.
186 Q. The question at 787 is:
"Before you retired did you have contact with him?"

And the answer:
"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 angry, he was very annoyed and he was very upset. MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: When was this?
A. It was late 2006.

MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Very angry?"

And you then asked the question:
"Q. Do you think in December or November, was it late in 2006, was it wintertime?
A. No, I am sorry, Judge, it was 2007.
Q. Was it late in 2007?
A. It was probably late 2007, yes, definitely. He came to my office and he was in that state and he demanded of me that I write to the Director of Public Prosecutions and I challenge a decision that the Director of Public Prosecutions had made in respect of him."

And Mr. Gillane then intervenes for the Tribunal, and says:

[^0]MR. SMYTH: Can I say, judge, perhaps you should hear us, since this is a private hearing. The relevance may be in the context of motivation for certain facts or certain matters or indeed credibility in relation to certain matters."

Can I just pause there and ask you, is it the case that the issue in respect of which the dispute then arises between yourself and Mr. McDowe11 arises in the context of Chief Superintendent Rooney giving evidence of a conversation that he had with Sergeant McCabe in relation to the DPP --
A. Yes.

187 Q. -- or the DPP's directions rather?
A. Yes, it was his objection in relation to the leading of 11:37 this evidence. You see, the matter, I think, in this way could be best explained; there was obviously an overriding concern by Mr. Justice O'Higgins not to delve into certain areas and of course that was never my intention. And I think Mr. McDowe11 read the
situation, he was concerned too and undoubtedly
objected at what he saw was the relevant time. And that was what occurred here. But it was my intention to lay the groundwork for what was to follow in relation to this famous letter that was written ultimately setting out the complaints that were made. Why Sergeant McCabe wanted to get access to the -- or not why he wanted, but he was making allegations essentially to get access to the directions of the DPP.

188 Q. Okay. So the evidence from Chief Superintendent Rooney was in the context of the request made to him which, as I understand your evidence, then leads on to the issue being raised at the Mullingar meeting --
A. Yes. refused his request to assist him in getting access to the directions.
CHAIRMAN: So we are talking about 25th August 2008?
A. Yes. I think it's important, Superintendent Cunningham did not know at that point there had been a refusal for these directions by these two officers.
190 Q. MR. SREENAN: And in terms of your understanding of your instructions at that stage, you understood that Superintendent Cunningham was at that meeting Superintendent Clancy, although that was in fact incorrect, as we now know.
A. No, he was there to address the -- he couldn't have
been there to address an issue in relation to Superintendent Clancy because he was only an inspector at that time. He couldn't have been investigating that. And obviously, that was another error that should have been spotted. But the fact of the matter is that he was there to investigate the complaints that were made by the sergeant, I think it was against the colleague, Mr. D, as I understand it.
Yes. Those were the facts, but in fact, your understanding, as $I$ understand it, at the time was that 11:40 the complaint in February 2008 had been against Superintendent Clancy?
A. Oh, yes. That was my understanding. That is the error. I mean, that is the point. But of course that it was against Clancy, yes.
192 Q. And that was your understanding at the time you raised this question with Chief Superintendent Rooney?
A. Yes, yes.

193 Q. And when you raised this issue, you have indicated already to the Court -- or to the Tribunal that you never intended to raise the original allegation?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Were you conscious of dealing with this matter discreetly?
A. Absolutely.

195 Q. And was that your intention?
A. Absolutely my intention.
Q. And do you consider that you did deal with it discreetly?
A. I do. I did deal with it discreetly. In fact, as I say, $I$ never got to deal with it -- with the issues surrounding the transcript and the official and transcript and so on, when the error was uncovered. CHAIRMAN: In fact, you did deal with it, I think, on the Monday, I think you put it to --
A. Yes, I put the incorrect --

CHAIRMAN: -- and he said that is absolutely false.
A. That is absolutely correct; I put the incorrect version, Chairman. That is correct.
CHAIRMAN: You didn't press the point, Mr. Smyth. You simply put the point and you left the point and that was it.
A. Put the point. Yes.

197 Q. MR. SREENAN: when we return to the transcript,
Mr. McDowe11 then intervenes and asks to be heard, and Mr. Justice O'Higgins says:
"The matter is délicat, I will rise for ten minutes."

And Mr. McDowe11 says:
"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 instructions of the Commissioners and that he knows the answers that he is seeking from this witness and that on his view as a professional senior counsel it is relevant to the module."

So that is how the issue is raised at that stage.
A. Yes.

198 Q. And you have already indicated that you have never been asked to confirm your instructions like that before?
A. Well, it is what it is. It was unusual, I have to say. But look, we will move on.

199 Q. okay. Now, I don't necessarily know what was in Mr. McDowell's mind at that stage as to what he thought perhaps that you were pursuing, but if I can just ask you to turn then perhaps to the period after that brief adjournment, which seems to take place at 15:10, and we resume the transcript on page 671. And Mr. Justice O'Higgins has come back at that stage, Mr. Gillane has made a submission and Mr . McDowe11 says at 15:39:
"Judge, in relation to the line of questioning which we had arrived at just before the Commission rose, I apprehend that Mr. Smyth is asking this witness questions which relate to my client, his motivation and 11:43 his character."

Now I think that is the first use of the term "character" and it wasn't used by you, is that correct?
A. No, it wasn't used.

200 Q. And then going over to the next page, he refers to the limited role that his client had in terms of the adequacy of the investigation by Garda Ferghal McCarthy. And at line 18 he accepts that you are
entitled to pursue a line of questions on that matter, or at line 3 on page 673 of the book, that there may be some responsibility of his client. But I think that was not the matter you were pursuing at that point in time?
A. No. That was not the matter, no.

201 Q. And then if we go to page 675, and we are still with Mr. McDowe11, he says at line 4:
"Secondly, if my client's credibility is being called into issue or his motivation, bearing in mind that my client has been told by his own legal advisers that his presence here is largely marginal and his contribution on the facts is going to be to the marginal in the whole process, that if a collateral attack on his credibility is now going to be launched that Mr. Smyth fully establishes his entitlement to do that bearing in mind what the Commission has indicated is the extent of this module."

And again, the reference there is credibility and motivation by Mr. McDowell.
A. Yes. That's correct.

202 Q. And just to see how the debate proceeds, going to page 276, at line 8, Mr. McDowell says he finds it astonishing that the Commissioner should feel in some sense upholding her rights "involves questioning the motive and the credibility and the behaviour of Sergeant McCabe in this matter". Again, the reference
there "motive and credibility", but he adds in "behaviour".
A. Yes.

Yes. And going to page 677 -- sorry, I should stay with 676 for the moment because again at line 23 , the terms used by Mr. McDowe11 are "credibility, motivation and behaviour".
A. Yes.

On page 677, Mr. McDowell, at line 4 is now using the terms "motives" or "behaviour" or "standards" or "credibility", isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And Mr. Justice O'Higgins says at line 9:
"First of a11, insofar as you canvassed the question about the efforts to put responsibility on Sergeant McCabe in relation to these matters, they are matters to be considered by this module and no doubt you will make those points in relation, they will be better made in relation to your submissions on the module rather than in the course of this application."

And that is Mr. Justice O'Higgins to Mr. McDowe11, isn't it?
A. Yes.

206 Q. And Mr. McDowe11 says:

> "I only say in relation to that, that we have had no notice that that was their intention."

And then we have Mr. Justice O'Higgins.
A. Yes.

207 Q. And this passage now that we are looking at was opened by Mr. McGuinness on behalf of the Tribunal during your 11:47 earlier examination, but can I just ask you to confirm that before that, despite the lengthy intervention by Mr. McDowe11, Mr. McDowell never used the words integrity or malice or bad faith?
A. Not at that point.

208 Q. No. And Mr. Justice O'Higgins is then coming in with questions of his own to you. Mr. McDowe11 having made his objection, saying:
"Secondly, the matters that you have raised are important in relation to this. It's an inquiry, it's not an adversarial thing."

I think in fairness Mr. Justice O'Higgins is at this stage addressing himself to Mr. McDowe11.
A. Yes.

209 Q. He says: "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 11:48 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 this 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 apprised of that."

Now, am I right in saying that this is the first introduction of the word "integrity" and it's introduced by Mr. Justice O'Higgins?
A. Yes, that's as I said before, yes.
Q. It's not your word?
A. No, at that point certainly --

211 Q. And likewise, the term "improper motivation" introduced 11:49 by Mr. Justice O'Higgins?
A. No, I never introduced that.

212 Q. And further down, still with Judge O'Higgins, line 17, he is saying:
"I think in view of that particular nature of the matters under discussion that it's not unreasonable of Mr. McDowe11 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."

Now, again, $I$ think it's the second use of the word "integrity", again it's by Judge o'Higgins, but again

Mr. McDowell had not in fact asked to find out whether an attack on the integrity of his client was part of the case.
A. No. The Judge was probing at this point as to what the position was.

213 Q. And then at line 28, again in argument with the Judge, you say:
"I appreciate that but my instructions are to challenge the integrity certain7y of Sergeant McCabe, and his motivation."

And Judge O'Higgins asks:
"The integrity?"

And then you clarify that, you say:
"His motivation and his credibility in mounting these allegations of corruption and malpractice."
A. That is the position, yes.
Q. And you have already said, and you said it to Judge O'Higgins subsequently, that to say that you had instructions specifically to challenge his integrity, that you were in error in saying that at line 29 on it's his motivation and credibility in mounting these allegations of corruption and malpractice.
A. That is correct.
Q. But I think Mr. Justice O'Higgins then pursued the matter and at line 6 , he questions you further, and says:
"Well, 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 he is 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 actions of Sergeant McCabe on your instructions were motivated by -- his motivation was dishonest or wrong. In other words, that he made these 11:51 allegations not in good faith but 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. MR. SMYTH: So be it, that is the position, Judge. MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Yes. ...the evidence will demonstrate that, Judge."

And you have already said that you were responding there out of frustration, really, to the Judge at that 11:51 stage, at the extent to which he was apparently putting words in your mouth?
A. Yes. There was a debate about my instructions which -anyway, look, it's unusual but, as I say, I moved on.
Q. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I am not sure it's fair to say, Mr. Sreenan, that the Judge was putting words in anybody's mouth. I mean, I think you read the textbooks on this matter and you will appreciate that there are various words used for various concepts, but we are all aware of the concepts.
MR. SREENAN: Then I withdraw it, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, I don't think it was, but certainly there were words coming and going, Mr. Smyth certainly hadn't used mala fides, integrity, behaviour or attack. They were used by other people. And one of those certainly, integrity one, was taken up in the course of argument in answer to the Judge. It's maybe fair to say that.
MR. SREENAN: Yes, I think that is a better way to put it, Chairman.
217 Q. The words good -- "not in good faith" or "motivated by malice", those were not your words?
A. No. No, they were not.

218 Q. And then if I can ask you to turn to page 682, the bottom of 681, this debate has continued with Mr. McDowel1 joining in and making submissions, but Mr. Justice O'Higgins, at the back of bottom of 681 , start of 682 , is saying, and addressing himself to you:
"...you are saying that Garda McCabe's complaints on your instruction are motivated, that they are not properly motivated, that they are not genuine, that
they are done for improper motives."

And you say:
"Whatever the reasons are for it on his side and it runs right through all of this.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: But you are attacking his motivation and you are attacking his integrity.
MR. SMYTH: Right the way through.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Full stop.
MR. SMYth: Yes, full stop."

It can be hard sometimes to get the impression of what's going on there from the transcript, but I think we have heard the audio recording at the beginning and essentially there is a conversation going on here I think with one person to some extent punctuating what is being said by the other.
A. Yes.

219 Q. When you say "right the way through" what were you referring to?
A. I was going back again to the proven facts document, that as far as I was concerned we had to put this in train, there had to be a credibility and motivation for what I was seeing in the proven facts document and these were going to be issues that were coming through, right the way through all the modules.
220 Q. And then at page 683, continuing the argument which seems to be going on, line 14, Mr. Justice o'Higgins:
"And he said --"

And the "he" I think he is referring to is Mr. McDowell.
"He said if you are so instructed that the integrity and motivation of Sergeant McCabe is on the instructions of the Commissioner to be attacked or to be questioned, you are entitled to do it and the question then arises in relation to the question of notice."

Now, again, that is Mr. Justice O'Higgins' summation of the matter. I don't think, with respect to McDowell, it accurately summarises what Mr. McDowe11's position was.
A. Yeah.

221 Q. But at that stage the issue seems to turn to notice of exactly what is to be put?
A. Yes.

222 Q. Then we go to page 685. In the course of debate on the particular Kingscourt matter, you say at line 20 to the Judge:
"Yes. Well, not necessarily the supervision, Judge, but the whole issue surrounding the reason why for nearly one year, or in fact it was over one year, it was May 2008, for the first time that Sergeant McCabe
has any hand, act or part in relation to what happened in relation to the incident in Kingscourt, he marches off or rings up or makes contact in some shape or form, I don't know how precisely he does it, as he hasn't given evidence, but we know from Regina McArdle that both himself and Regina McArdle make contact with a member of the public and encourages them to go to Gsoc."

That was in relation to a subsequent involvement after the incident, sometime after the incident --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you understood Sergeant McCabe had with Lorraine Browne, is that so?
A. I am sorry, what did you say, Mr. Sreenan? what was your question?
Q. That's what you understood was the subsequent encounter in relation to the kingscourt incident?
A. Yes.

And then if we go to page 687, Mr. Justice O'Higgins, again, and if I can just pause there. You were in the position, as I understand it, Mr. Smyth, at that stage, that Sergeant McCabe had not given evidence in the o'Higgins Commission, so you didn't know exactly what he would be saying when he came to give evidence?
A. We11, that's so. That is correct.

226 Q. And in the normal course of events one could tailor one's cross-examination then on the basis of what actually was said?
A. That is so.

227 Q. But you had the Brief Proven Facts document and were trying to anticipate the scope of what you might have to --
A. That's correct.
-- represent the interests of your client --
A. Anticipation.
A. Anticipation.
Q. -- represent th
Q. -- in relation to?

Yes. Then Mr. Justice O'Higgins on line 21, again he 11:57 says:
"If that were the case it might be that issues of integrity, motivation and so forth, that you say you were instructed or to be levied against you might not arise in this particular module, in other words Mr. Gillane is indicating that as far as Sergeant McCabe is concerned, in relation to this module, he will be essentially be confining himself to the circumstances of meeting Lorraine Browne and encouraging her or otherwise to go to GSOC."

And then he just says he is going to rise, would ten minutes be enough, and that is at 16:10, isn't that so?
A. Yes.

So the issues then at that point seem to be notice to Mr. McDowell of what is to be put and the limits of any cross-examination on that module, is that so?
A. Yes.

232 Q. And you then return at page 695, and I appreciate, Mr. Smyth, that this is to some extent, as you indicate, very artificial because we are here micro analysing --
A. Yes.
-- transcripts and interleaving bits of instructions between that, but this is a very dynamic situation --
A. Yes.

234 Q. -- that you were caught in at the time?
A. Absolutely.

235 Q. Yes. And you had to respond at the time?
A. Yes.

236 Q. And you got your instructions there obviously, because at the top of that page, line 5 you say:
"My instructions are reconfirmed.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Very good. Your instructions, as I understand them, are that Sergeant McCabe acted as he did for improper motives.
MR. SMYTH: Yeah.
MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: Okay. And that his integrity is being challenged in that respect.
MR. SMYTH: In that respect."
A. In that respect.

237 Q. In other words --
A. "In that respect", I did say in my evidence that I had concerns about the word "improper" at that stage, that certainly was something that should have -- insofar as his motives were concerned, but "in that respect" his
allegations, his allegations.
238 Q. In respect of the allegations --
A. Yes.

239 Q. -- of corruption and malpractice that he had levelled, is that it?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then if we go to the letter of the 18th May, I don't think we need to turn it up for this purpose, but the -- I think you have already confirmed, and I appreciate you have to respect the privilege of other clients --
A. Yes.

241 Q. -- but the matters contained therein were not based on any instructions from the Commissioner?
A. No, they were not.

242 Q. And in particular, the contents of paragraph 19 were not based on any instructions from the Commissioner?
A. No, they were not.

243 Q. And in fact, I think although you weren't aware of it at that time, had there been in the month prior to the 28th February complaint, which was the subject of the Mullingar meeting -- sorry, 25th February complaint, I think, the subject of the Mullingar meeting, a 28th of January complaint also by Sergeant McCabe?
A. There had been, but $I$ was not aware of if at that stage. That did not come into play until the second module, so I wasn't aware of -- all I have to -- I suspect that the people -- we11, the people -- my clients were obviously aware of that complaint in

January. Certainly Superintendent Clancy was not present at the consultation, the first one, because he was obviously on matters -- he was not due until the second module, but the point $I$ am making is that the -you are asking me, Mr. Sreenan, what was the point? Mullingar meeting was about a complaint that Sergeant McCabe had made on the 25th February 2008 --
A. Yes.

245 Q. -- which Superintendent Cunningham was --
A. They were allegations made in January of which I was not -- of which we were not aware of. And I suspect that the conflation arose here because -- well, it may be that they may be, conflating the complaint which was made a couple of weeks earlier when they were giving -- 12:01 instructions may be given.

CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the meeting on 28th of January 2008, Maurice McCabe with Superintendent Clancy, was about supervision, non-completion of work and the use of Pulse.
A. But I think --

CHAIRMAN: I think that is correct. And the 25th February was in relation to the $D$ family and the problems in relation to the $D$ family.
246 Q. MR. SREENAN: Yes. The 25th February complaint was in 12:02 fact in relation to the D family. The 28th January 2008 complaint was in relation to Superintendent Clancy.
CHAIRMAN: No. It was a letter to Superintendent

Clancy complaining about poor supervision, non-completion of work and the pulse records being incorrect. And I am using "incorrect" advisedly. mR. SREENAN: Yes. But perhaps I should clarify it with the witness, question to the witness, Chairman, rather than answering it myself.

CHAIRMAN: Sure, yes.
247 Q. MR. SREENAN: when you became aware of the 25th January 2008 complaint, who was that complaint about or against?
A. It was about Clancy, and it came up in -- I think there was a statement, I may be wrong, my memory may be faulty but as I understand it the construction around that was that that a complaint against Clancy, whether or not that was something that was contained in
Sergeant McCabe's statement or whatever he had said about that matter, why he brought the complaints to him at that stage, there was an issue around that. And the general consensus was that it was a complaint against Clancy.
248 Q. We11, one way or the other, by the time the 18th May 2015 letter was drafted, had you or your co-counse1 been briefed with either of those letters of complaint?
A. No. No, we had not those letters. We didn't have them.

Now, can I then just ask you to turn to page 797 of the book. This is Mr. Justice O'Higgins' ruling on the matters dealt with in the letter of the 18th May. And just to be clear, your evidence is you had not received
the attachments to the letter of 18th May, is that so?
A. No, I hadn't got the attachments.

250 Q. No. He says that:
"It would appear on the face of it, Mr. Smyth, that the 12:04 contents of this document are irrelevant to the terms of reference in relation to this module."

Mr. McDowel1 then intervenes and line 24, Mr. Justice o'Higgins says:
"It would seem to me that the matters contained in this document are irrelevant to any findings that I might have to make in this module."

And again, what he was referring to was in that module. And you respond by saying:
"wel1 thus far, Judge, you are hearing the evidence of Colm Rooney, ex-Chief Superintendent Colm Rooney. He 12:05 will be giving evidence in other modules, I assume related modules. I am laying the ground for -- in this module and other modules for a conversation that Sergeant McCabe had with ex-Chief Superintendent Rooney and in particular without saying too much to offend the ${ }_{12: 05}$ sensitivities of Mr. McDowell in relation to this -MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: It's not just the sensitivities of Mr. McDowel1."

And then:
"These things are dealt with."

And at line 15 you say:
"It's relevant in this way, Judge, because I say that Sergeant McCabe was motivated to do certain things, to make certain allegations based on the fact that he required clarification from the DPP on certain matters touching on his situation."

At line 27 you say:
"Because he made complaints directed to Superintendent Clancy, there was a letter of the 28th February 2008 --"

I think it should be the 25th of February, in fact.
"-- he told Inspector -- Superintendant Cunningham, who will be one of the next witnesses in this module, that he was withdrawing, he only made those complaints on the basis that he wished Superintendent Clancy to seek further clarification from the DPP."
A. Yes.

251 Q. And again, at line 16 in response to a question from Judge O'Higgins you say:
"It flows right through all modules, the motivation and credibility of Sergeant McCabe."

So you are back again to the issue of --
A. In making the allegations.
Q. In making the allegations, which is specifically what you say, sorry, I should have completed the sentence.
"The motivation and credibility of Sergeant McCabe in making the allegations he made. And he withdrew, he was prepared to -- the only reason we have Yvonne apparently Sergeant Yvonne Martin who is a witness to a statement that he made. The only reason he made the allegation she made on 28th of February in a letter which was sent to Superintendent Clancy ultimately was that he was making those allegations to force the hand of Superintendent Clancy to seek further clarification from the DPP."

So again, there, in argument, you are dealing with it as issues of credible and motivation, isn't that so?
A. That is correct.

253 Q. And then Mr. Justice o'Higgins, going over to page 800, says that he thinks:
"...the contents of the document are irrelevant to any matters that he has to inquire into in this module in relation to the question motivation, the motivation I am not certain that it can be excluded as a background
consideration. I will allow you to establish this much and no more, that Sergeant McCabe had a real or perceived grievance against somebody."

You say at line 10:
"And I am permitted to pursue with this witness the conversation he had with Sergeant McCabe."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins rules out the conversation with Chief Superintendent Rooney.
A. Yes.

254 Q. And says, at paragraph 18:
"His motivation, as I say, is only peripheral, very peripheral, but his motivation you are suggesting was that out of a grievance he had, the details of the grievance don't seem me to be irrelevant."
A. Don't seem to be relevant, yes.
Q. That is, I think, what you referred to earlier in your system, that Mr. Justice o'Higgins wasn't ruling out motivation entirely but in relation to that module he was saying that it was peripheral, certainly in relation to that module?
A. That's correct.

256 Q. Yes. But he would allow it to the extent of suggesting that there was a grievance?
A. That is correct.

257 Q. And you made it clear that you did not intend, at line

22 , to go into the details of the background, but you needed to establish that there was a grievance:
"It has to be sanitised, it has to be sanitised in some shape or form, I don't want to parade all of the background information."

You said.
A. That is correct.
Q. And Mr. Justice $\mathrm{O}^{\prime}$ Higgins concludes that section by saying:
"I will allow you to establish that he had a grievance, real or perceived, and no further, so the contents of this document are irrelevant for this module."

And that is his ruling.
A. That is the position.
Q. Could I ask to you turn to page 977 of the book, again we are on day 3. Mr. Justice o'higgins at line 21 returns to his view about motivation and says:

> "The matter was canvassed on friday as wel1. It was decided that in relation to the question of motivation that it wasn't entirely irrelevant, but was peripheral and perhaps it might be more germane, might be more germane to another module rather than this."

And that was the position that he articulated, I think
the words speak for themselves.
A. That's correct, they speak for themselves.
Q. On page 978, Mr. Justice O'Higgins says, line 17, to you:
"I am not precluding you, as I said, from raising issues in relation to credibility based on your assertion that there is bad and improper motivation for this, I am not precluding you from making that but I would repeat that in the conflict the question of credibility in relation to this particular module seems only to arise in relation to conflict and the conflict in relation to facts seem to be very limited, it seems to be more a degree of would you agree with an emphasis rather than facts."
A. Yes.

263 Q. And again, that's Mr. Justice O'Higgins there using the words bad and improper motivation, rather than you?
A. That is correct.

264 Q. And then if we go to page 979, we see -- we have been looking all along simply at the argument, I shouldn't say simply, but we have been looking at the argument or the interchange between yourself and the Chairman of the Commission and Mr. McDowell, but we will look now to see at what is actually happening in cross-examination and what is actually put, on page 979 you say, at line 2:
"I don't want to waste more time on it, just very briefly two questions $I$ want to ask you, Sergeant McCabe. The first one is: On 26th February 2008 you sent a letter to Superintendent Clancy containing a number of complaints that you had, is that correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. One matter I want to ask you again, just arising, finally, out of that, I think that Superintendent Cunningham met you for the purpose of discussing that..."

And he agreed with that and he identified the date of the meeting, the 25th August 2008. And going over the page, 1 ine 7 , question 733 , you put the question:
"In the course that have meeting, sergeant, you advised Superintendent Cunningham that the only reason you made a complaint against Superintendent Clancy was to force him to allow you to have the full authority directions conveyed to you."

And the answer is:
"That is absolutely false.
Q. Right."

And you asked one more question and then you essentially leave it, as I understand it. But when you put it to Sergeant McCabe there in question 733 that the only reason he made a complaint against
Superintendent Clancy was to force him to allow
Sergeant McCabe to have the full authority directions conveyed to you and he says that is absolutely false, you accept that you were wrong to describe it as a complaint against Superintendent Clancy, but those were 12:13 your instructions?
A. Those were my instructions, yeah. That's correct.
Q. And that was made clear subsequently I think?
A. Yes.

266 Q. And spotted first by the Judge.
A. Yes.

267 Q. But when, in fact, the transcript -- it transpired, as I understand it, that Sergeant McCabe had recorded that meeting with Superintendent Cunningham, although Superintendent Cunningham didn't know it at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. And Superintendent Cunningham had also his own notes of the meeting?
A. That's correct.

269 Q. And both the transcript of the recording made by Sergeant McCabe and Superintendent Cunningham's notes were in agreement?
A. That's correct.

270 Q. And they were in agreement with the fact that the complaint was not about Superintendent Clancy but rather to him?
A. That is correct.

But they were also in agreement that Sergeant McCabe did say that the only reason he had made the complaint was in relation to, in order to have the directions of the DPP conveyed, was to the D family?

CHAIRMAN: Again -- yes?
A. Well, in fact what he said was that he was requested by Superintendent Clancy to make the complaint against the 12:14 colleague -- the person for the purpose of --
CHAIRMAN: And again it's not about Superintendent Clancy, it's about the D family, the incident in the court, running up and down the street, etcetera, etcetera.

MR. SREENAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: That is what it's about. I am sure you know that, Mr. Sreenan, but I just don't want you to be misled on that.
MR. SREENAN: No sorry, I thought I had correctly

CHAIRMAN: You did, but there was a certain ambiguity there, hence the intervention.
MR. SREENAN: Thank you, Chairman.
Q. And can I then just ask you to turn to page 1465 of the book. We have the observations of Mr. Justice o'Higgins where he identifies, on 24th June 2015, this is on day 5 , that the statement in paragraph 19 appears to be incorrect, and he says at line 17:
"It does not appear that Superintendent Cunningham was not appointed to investigate a complaint against Superintendent Clancy. The meeting was not about complaints against Superintendent Clancy but concerned a request to him. No complaints were made about him. Neither in the report of Superintendent Cunningham nor
A. That is correct.
Q. And insofar as you put that question at question 733, you referred to the full authority directions. Was the use of that word "authority" conscious and deliberate on your part?
A. Absolutely. I was trying to sanitise the thing at that point.
Q. In other words, in the cross-examination, you didn't wish to specifically refer to --
A. No.
Q. -- the DPP, is that it?
A. Absolutely correct, yes.
in his note of the meeting is there reference to a complaint about Superintendent Clancy. Neither is such a contention supported by the transcript of the recording of the meeting."

Now, that is the 24th June 2015.
A. That's correct.
Q. And it's identified there, on the basis of both transcripts, what the error was, isn't that so?
A. At that point, yes.

279 Q. But as of that date, the submissions of the 11th June 2015 had already gone in, and they were based on the original error in the letter of the 18th May?
A. That is correct. That is the position.

All right. And that position is then accepted, going to page 1493, you point out at paragraph 20 to the Judge that at that stage you didn't have the transcript, and Mr. Justice o'Higgins says:
"Does it change anything? As Superintendent Cunningham put in his report. He said in his report what he thought the motivation of Sergeant McCabe in making the observations and the request on February, the 28th, he says what he thought. The transcript would appear to offer some support for Superintendent Cunningham's view of it."

So in terms of Superintendent Cunningham's view of the motivation for that complaint, the Judge is indicating
that the transcript offers some support for that.
A. The Judge had made that observation, that's correct.
Q. Yes.

ChAIRMAN: well, I suppose the issue would then arise as to which view it was, but I can see.

MR. SREENAN: Yes. I suppose, I would simply suggest, Chairman, that it offers some support for the fact that Mr. Justice o'Higgins wasn't completely ruling out the question of motivation.

282 Q. And then if I could ask you perhaps to turn to page
2024 of the core book. This is a letter of the 6th July 2015 that you wrote to your instructing solicitor, describing the then-state of the evidence before the o'Higgins Commission, is that right?
A. I was asked by Annmarie Ryan to write that letter.

283 Q. Yes. And you outline the evidence that is given at that stage and the position on the evidence as to motive in relation to complaints about chief Superintendent Michael Clancy and Superintendent Cunningham, and you say in the middle of the second paragraph:
"You will recall that in a previous module that he withdrew allegations of cover-up against chief Superintendent MCGinn and Assistant Commissioner Byrne".

And that was a previous module of the o'Higgins Commission, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You say in that statement, commencing on the last line of the first page:
"Sergeant McCabe states the following:
'Superintendent Clancy was a man who cared more what Chief Superintendent Colm Rooney would think of the decision he made rather than caring for what happened to victims of crime or injured parties.'

This statement was made in the context of the release of Jerry McGrath from custody in Bailieboro Garda Station."

And as we know, Jerry McGrath is the person who, as I understand it, went on to commit a crime of murder in Limerick?
A. That is so.
Q. And dreadful and tragic consequences.
A. Yes.
Q. And to the fact that Jerry McGrath was out on bai1. So that allegation made in that context. And you say:
"I asked Sergeant McCabe to withdraw this statement and 12:20 he refused to do so. Judge o'Higgins intervened and asked Sergeant McCabe to consider that his allegation against Superintendent Clancy were harsh -- his allegations against Superintendent Clancy were harsh.

Despite this intervention, Sergeant McCabe again refused to withdraw the allegation and stated that it was a matter for the Commission as to whether or not the statement was harsh."

Is that correct?
A. That is correct.

ChAIRMAN: Well, that letter has been produced. So far, there has been no cross-examination to indicate that anything in it is incorrect.

MR. SREENAN: No. But I thought, for completeness, perhaps I should have drawn it up, but --
CHAIRMAN: So I would be entitled to rely on the text of that letter as to what had occurred.
mR. SREENAN: In those circumstances, I don't need to open it further, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Well, there was no cross -- there was cross-examination on an awful lot of things, but that letter was never mentioned in cross-examination. mR. SREENAN: No, that's correct, that's correct, Chairman.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, it was never -ChAIRMAN: It's not a blame-game, Mr. McDowel1. It just never was.
MR. MCDOWELL: No, no, I am just saying that -- I am not saying that I accept that everything that Mr. Smyth said in that letter is correct, but I would have to look at each one of them.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I mean, everything else that
apparently was incorrect has been pointed out so far, but that was -- it wasn't even glossed over. It just didn't come up at all.
MR. MCDOWELL: We are dealing with the Commissioner's instructions on motivation. I just can't say just off the top of my head that everything in that is conceded as correct.

CHAIRMAN: No, well, I think that's what Mr. Smyth genuinely believed, having been -- and you will appreciate, Mr. McDowell, that an advocate appearing in 12:22 a case -- well, as the old phrase, it's the person who believes that all their geese are swans. So take -putting that caveat on it, that is what he genuinely believed at that point.

MR. MCDOWELL: That was a report by Mr. Smyth,
doubtless made in good faith to -- for the purpose of his client at that point. I did not pursue the content of that letter because, as has been pointed out on a number of occasions, Mr. Smyth's view of these matters is not the relevant view, and it's his client's view of $12: 23$ the matter that is the relevant view.

CHAIRMAN: It's true. But he is saying to his client, look, it seems to me that there is some kind of disharmony between Superintendent Clancy and Sergeant McCabe.

MR. MCDOWELL: We11, we might even adopt his word "animus".

CHAIRMAN: Well, it has a technical meaning in -- only in psychology. I know what you mean.

MR. MCDOWELL: we11, all I am saying is, Judge, I just don't want it to be, without me reading this letter very carefully again, to say that I concede that the Tribunal should accept everything in it is absolutely correct.

12:23 happened so far, that informs the person's decision as to where they go from there and as to whether, for instance, any issue in relation to credibility, and if there is no credibility in relation to particular facts, motive for making those allegations might arise. 12:24 MR. MCDOWELL: I accept that that is a reasonable view of it. A11 I am saying is that $I$ have never gone through it line by line or debated it with Mr. Smyth. CHAIRMAN: No. And thank you for that clarification.
287 Q. MR. SREENAN: Mr. Smyth, insofar as that letter records 12:24 the evidence given and the state of evidence before the o'Higgins Commission at that time, is it accurate?
A. I am satisfied it's accurate.

288 Q. And I think it's correct to say that nowhere in that letter do you use the word -- or the words "integrity", ${ }^{12: 24}$ "mala fides" or "malice"?
A. Not at all, no.

289 Q. Just on one other point. The o'Higgins Commission was, of course, at all times supposed to be a private
hearing, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct.

290 Q. And as far as you were concerned on the 15th May 2015, were people respecting that privacy?
A. Absolutely.

12:25
Q. Yes. And we know that, subsequently, there were a lot of leaks in relation to evidence given, or supposedly given but not given, and questions supposedly put and not put, at the o'riggins Commission, but can I ask you to confirm that those leaks didn't come from you or, to ${ }_{12: 25}$ your knowledge, anyone on your team?
A. I can absolutely guarantee they didn't come from our team.
Q. Yes. If I could ask you to turn to page 1944. I think that is an example of you -- of cross-examining sergeant McCabe in relation to allegations that he had made and then subsequently withdrew, is that right?
A. Is that the context -- yes, if that is what you say the context is. I am seeing it on the screen, yes.
Q. I mean, just by way of example, question 168, you ask the question:
"why then did you make an allegation which you now have to withdraw in the face, a considerable time after you have made the allegation, may I say, after two investigations you are telling this Commission that you did not have access --"
A. Yes, I understand the context. It was he made -- this is the one where he made the apology, I think, to

Superintendent Cunningham.
294 Q. Yes, I think so, yes.
A. Yes.

295
Q. And you say:
"After two investigations --"
CHAIRMAN: Maybe just give me the date of that, Mr. Sreenan, if you wouldn't mind, please, for the convenience of my note. Simply, what is the date that is happening on?
MR. SREENAN: The date?
CHAIRMAN: The date of that transcript.
MR. SREENAN: Sorry, Judge, it's day 10.
CHAIRMAN: And it's, therefore, November, is it? MR. SREENAN: Day 10. And I will get the date -CHAIRMAN: Do you remember what date it was?
A. I can't, Judge. What volume is it, Mr. Sreenan? MR. SREENAN: It's, I am told, the 1st July. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
296 Q. MR. SREENAN: So the question you pose then:
"why then did you make an allegation which you now have to withdraw in the face, a considerable time after you have made the allegation, may $I$ say, after two investigations you are telling this Commission that you did not have access to this file but yet you were prepared to make an unfounded allegation against my client, Noe1 Cunningham, to the effect that he permitted as a Superintendent a gross dereliction of
duty. why did you not seek out the information that supported that criticism before you made it?"

And Sergeant McCabe's answer was:
"A very good question. When I was interviewed in relation to Byrne McGinn I expected them to come back to me in a month or two or three or six month and say: Hold on here, Maurice, you are wrong, and that is what they should have done. I would have said: Yes, I am sorry."

So again, we don't need to open the whole of that passage, but that is perhaps an example of a cross-examination in relation to an allegation against ${ }_{\text {12:28 }}$ one of your clients that he had withdrawn, is that right?
A. That is the position, yes.

297 Q. Could I ask you then to turn to 2568 . This is day 27 , Judge, and I will get you the date of day 27.
CHAIRMAN: Is this the 4th November? No? MR. SREENAN: It's probably a little before that, I suspect, Judge. Page 2569.
CHAIRMAN: Somebody can come back and tell me, Mr. Sreenan. Don't worry. Mr. Sreenan, are you going 12:30 to be much longer?
MR. SREENAN: The 22nd of October, I am told. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. will you be much longer, Mr. Sreenan?

MR. SREENAN: I could be another 15 or 20 minutes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Let's -- sorry, Ms. Downes, is that all right with you?

STENOGRAPHER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: I really want to finish and let's actually get Mr. Smyth out of the witness-box. I feel we will have actually done something then.
MR. SREENAN: So do I, Chairman.
298 Q. Can I ask you just to go to page 2569.
A. Yes.

299 Q. This is Sergeant McCabe being examined not by you or cross-examined by you, but by Mr. Gillane, who is counsel for the Tribunal.
A. Yes.

300 Q. And he seems here to be cross-examined by the Tribunal counsel on an issue of motivation. Mr. Justice O'Higgins says at line 21:
"Just in relation to that specific question Mr. Gillane 12:31 was asking you about --"

And this, Judge, relates to the letter that was sent through the Confidential Recipient in -- to the Minister in January of 2012, I think 23rd January 2012. 12:31 Mr. Justice O'Higgins says:
"Just in relation to the specific question Mr. Gillane was asking you, was this complaint against Commissioner

Callinan a technique, a device, legitimate, but a way of getting your concerns about chief Superintendent Clancy revisited?
A. It was that I couldn't belief he was actually on a promotion list.

MR. GILLANE: All right, well just to flesh out this issue, and I will come back to the promotion list in a moment just to hear what you have to say in relation to that. It seems here at this stage, and I know there are other events, it maybe difficult to see that Commissioner callinan had done anything wrong, if I can put it that way at this stage. It might be suggested that Commissioner Callinan is complained about at this stage because it would mean that the complaint would then necessarily have to find its way to the Minister's desk.
A. Yes.

MR. JUSTICE O'HIGGINS: That was the purpose of it?
A. Yes, that was the purpose of it."

You remember that evidence, do you?
A. I do remember that, yes.

301 Q. So he was being questioned there by Tribunal counsel and by Judge o'Higgins in relation to his motivation for making the complaint against former Commissioner Callinan to the Confidential Recipient?
A. That is correct.

302 Q. And then if we can go to the transcript, which is in book 7, and we have looked at this already, on page

3508, Mr. McDowe11 put it to you yesterday that at that stage Mr. Justice O'Higgins raised the issue which was dormant for some time, and Mr. McDowe11 described the issue that had been dormant as one of motivation, but I think the record shows that the issue that was dormant was, in fact, not motivation but what was described by Judge O'Higgins as the question of integrity?
A. Yes.
Q. He says at line 11:
"Before we commence, there is one matter that I would like a bit of assistance and clarification on from you, Mr. Smyth. It is in relation to a question that has been dormant for some time concerning the integrity of Sergeant McCabe and his mala fides or bona fides in making his complaints."

CHAIRMAN: You can take it that I have read this multiple times, Mr. Sreenan. And the question you want to ask about it is? O'Higgins describes it as dormant, had there been any cross-examination by you on the issue of integrity or mala fides in the intervening period?
A. No, there had been none in relation to the man's mala fides or character, none.

305 Q. And at any stage did you put it to Sergeant McCabe that he was malicious?
A. I never did.

306 Q. Or that he was acting in bad faith?
A. Absolutely never did.

307 Q. Or that he was lacking in integrity?
A. I never put that to him.

308 Q. It was suggested to you that Sergeant McCabe,
12:35 understandably, had become upset at times. I think the first time Sergeant McCabe became upset was on day 3 when he was under questioning by Mr. Gillane for the Tribunal, is that right?
A. I think that is -- -- I have no memory.

CHAIRMAN: But, honestly, you know, in court cases people do become upset. Indeed, I think, according to what I heard at home, it was reported yesterday that you were upset. I actually was looking at you, and we are right beside each other, you were never upset. You 12:35 did get a little cross on one occasion, but these things --
A. It was reported widely that I was very upset and apologised for being upset.
CHAIRMAN: Well, don't worry about it. I don't know -- 12:35 well, fortunately I am never going to write a report about people being upset or not upset. But, look, the reality of it is, in court cases people sometimes do get upset. MR. SREENAN: Yes. But just insofar as there was some 12:36 suggestion by Mr. --
CHAIRMAN: You are saying it's Mr. Gillane's fault for him being upset?
MR. SREENAN: I am saying it is --

CHAIRMAN: I know you are not doing that, Mr. Sreenan. I am going to correct myself immediately. The plain reality of things is that when people have to speak about matters that are close to their heart, they may get upset, and I understand that, but, on the other hand, I appreciate the reason you are asking the question, which is in the context of what Mr. Smyth called the military terms deployed in cross-examination this morning, and there was no military assault or assault or vicious attack, is what -- the point you are 12:36 trying to get across here.

MR. SREENAN: And indeed the suggestion that might have emerged from the cross-examination, that it was Mr. Smyth who was responsible for making Sergeant McCabe upset in the first instance.
CHAIRMAN: We11, did you ever upset Sergeant McCabe?
A. I am satisfied I did not.

309 Q. MR. SREENAN: Can I ask you to look at the O'Higgins Commission report. You indicated on a number of occasions that the o'Higgins Commission did not uphold the allegations of serious wrongdoing and corruption made against your clients.
A. That's correct.

310 Q. Can I just ask -- this starts on page 4370. It's Volume 8, I'm told. And if I could just refer you to paragraph 3.5 and 3.6 by way of example:
"Sergeant McCabe made complaints of corruption under the Garda Síochána (Confidential Reporting of

Corruption or Malpractice) Regulations 2007 against the then-Garda Commissioner Martin Callinan. The charter established under those regulations does not define corruption or malpractice, but includes not only matters which constitute criminal behaviour but also other conduct, such as breaches of discipline, abuse of authority and a range of other matters. It was submitted on behalf of sergeant McCabe that he had not intended to make allegations of criminal conduct against the Commissioner, but rather, of an abuse of power only. The allegation was understood by the Commissioner to be one of criminal conduct. The hurtful allegation was based on the belief, unsupported by any evidence, that the Commissioner had put superintendent Clancy on a promotion list. The complaint was in part a device to ensure that the complaint came before the Minister for Justice and Equality. At that time, a complaint against the Commissioner had to be referred to the Minister. The matter is dealt with in chapter 13 of the report where the former Commissioner is vindicated. Complaints of corruption in the context of the charter were also made against Assistant Commissioner Byrne, Chief Superintendent Rooney, Superintendent Clancy. In each case, the Commission has found those hurtful complaints 12:38 unfounded and those against whom such complaints were made had to live for many years under the strain of those allegations. No direct allegation of corruption was levelled against Superintendent Cunningham, but so
far as may be implied, they are also unfounded."

Now, he goes on in paragraph 3.9 to say:
"There were a large number of complaints against Chief Superintendent Clancy examined in detail in this report. He is exonerated of any wrongdoing and is the subject of only occasional and very mild criticism."

Now, those were the ultimate findings of the o'Higgins Commission, and Mr. Justice O'Higgins goes into considerably greater detail in subsequent chapters in elucidating the basis for those findings. But those were the findings against the persons who you and your colleagues were instructed to challenge the allegations ${ }_{12: 39}$ that had been made against them?
A. That is so.

311 Q. And insofar as paragraph 3.5 refers to the motivation for the complaint to the Confidential Recipient, including a complaint against former Commissioner
Callinan, who was also a client of yours --
A. Yes.

312 Q. -- that paragraph dealing with that motivation follows immediately after paragraph 3.4, which you were referred to by My Friend, Mr. McDowell?
A. Yes.

MR. SREENAN: And, Chairman, if I could just clarify, there are a number of other passages in this report that go into more detail. I am taking it that, in
closing, I can refer to those and I don't need to bring the witness to them particularly --

CHAIRMAN: NO, absolutely. And those passages were referred to earlier on by Mr. Murphy certainly on a number of occasions.

MR. SREENAN: Then that ends my examination of this witness.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, thank you very much. Did you have anything else, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. McGUINNESS: No, Chairman.

MR. COLM SMYTH WAS QUESTIONED BY THE CHAIRMAN:

313 Q. CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to ask you a couple of things, Mr. Smyth, and I don't need to turn into a law lecture, 12:41 or anything else like that. But this whole thing about cross-examination as to credit, cross-examination as to credibility, et cetera, it seems to, because of the closeness of the concepts, cause some confusion. Now, you will appreciate that cross-examination on the facts 12:41 is cross-examination as to whether, for instance, the witness really perceived the man with a knife going into the house.
A. Yes.

314 Q. CHAIRMAN: And that simply as to whether the person was 12:41 there, what they saw, and then if you pursue that by saying to the person, look, were you tired? Do you normally wear glasses? Were you wearing your glasses on the day? when did you first of all make a report of
this? what you are, in effect, looking at there is, you are looking at the weight to be attached to what the witness said, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Now, cross-examination as to credit is somewhat different, which is to suggest that the man who is the witness saying that the man with the knife went into the house, actually, for instance, hates the accused because the accused slept with his girlfriend. Did you ever or were you ever instructed to pursue an issue as to credit, that is to say that there was something about Sergeant McCabe's character that rendered his evidence less trustworthy?
A. I was never instructed to do that, Judge.

317 Q. ChAIRMAN: Now, when you refer to cross-examination as to credibility, using the word correctly, and I am using "weight" interchangeably, you said on a number of occasions I needed to probe what was behind those allegations, that is to say the allegations against the senior officers you were representing. what did you mean by that?
A. To see what the facts were, what was he relying on, what were the facts that suggested, for example, that this man was presiding over dereliction of duty, what are the facts -- in one instance I asked him to name the people who were derelict in their duty, that
superintendent was presiding over, and he couldn't do that. But that is just an example of what I was trying to do, and to find out -- but probe him in relation to the evidence that he had to support such a contention, or allegation, rather.
318 Q. CHAIRMAN: Now, there was just two other things. You have covered that, I'm sure, pretty thoroughly in answer to Mr. McGuinness, but I just wanted to make sure that my understanding is correct. Reference has been made to public statements made by the Commissioner 12:44 in relation to supporting Sergeant McCabe and putting in place, you know, particular structures in that regard.
A. Yes.

319 Q. CHAIRMAN: And there has been mention indeed of a man called Oliver Connolly [sic], who is very well known in the industrial relations and has done great work in that respect.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAIRMAN: were you ever instructed that this was what 12:44 the Commissioner was saying?
A. Never. I had no idea of the public statements. I wasn't even aware of it as a citizen.
321 Q. CHAIRMAN: And were you at that stage -- you weren't following in any particular detail the news on those events?
A. Not in -- no more than the ordinary citizen. I had a fleeting interest in looking at the news and whatever it may be. I had no view on it one way or the other
and I wasn't up to date with the details.
A. But I wasn't made aware of any of that. It didn't form part of my instructions. And I am not just saying that
in hindsight. It's something you would have to obviously consider.
CHAIRMAN: Now, I think sometimes I speak before engaging my brain, and I said on an earlier occasion it seemed to me that Annmarie Ryan was begging to have a consultation, which had to be done, very, very unusually for a client. Normally the solicitor interacts directly with the client?
A. That's correct.

Chairman: on this occasion it had to be done through Chief Superintendent Healy. Was my characterisation to say that on that particular weekend when this issue came up, the 15 th, in other words, to the 18 th, that you felt from Annmarie Ryan that she was desperate to get a consultation to get you face-to-face with the Commissioner?
A. She certainly was -- I think she communicated with me a number of times over that weekend. It's clear that she was trying to get a consultation arranged. That is fair to say.

326 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. And in the event, for whatever reason, it didn't transpire?
A. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: That is all I wanted to ask. Thank you. So will we break? It's what, it's ten to one. So ten to $12: 47$ two. Thank you.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH

CHAIRMAN: I just want to say something before we go on. I think it is correctly said that if the word "if" is included in an apology, it is not an apology at all. Now, there is a correction that I want to make. I had indicated that it had been reported that a portion of the o'Higgins Commission transcript had gone missing and that had been reported in the media. Now, apparently it was first reported in a particular place, 13:54 and I didn't actually see that. what I actually saw was, if you like, a report way down the line which was possibly based upon that statement, and it seems that the implication that occurred way down the line was that portions of the transcript had not been given to the Tribunal. We11, they had, all of the portions of the transcript. But looking back, although the facts are uncertain, it seems that in relation to one day or another day, and I have two numbers in my mind, I think it's 3 and 28, there was a separate storage of one of the portions of the transcript by the o'Higgins Commission, or the non-release thereof to the parties, which possibly led to the later down the line piece which I read, which may or may not have been accurate, I don't know, I thought it was inaccurate at the time, 13:55 but certainly in terms of the original source, which was the 'Prime Time' programme, they having corresponded with me, I'm satisfied that they, in fact, got it right and I would like to apologise to the
journalist in question for getting it wrong. And while I didn't mention her or even think of her in this context, it's right that I correct that now.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, the next witness is
Mr. Michae1 MacNamee.

MR. MICHAEL MACNAMEE, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS AS FOLLOWS:

MR. MCGUINNESS: Mr. MacNamee has provided a statement to the Tribuna1, which is at page 3323.

Mr. MacNamee, you're a barrister-at-1aw?
A. That's correct, Mr. McGuinness.

327 Q. Practising as such?
A. Yes.

328 Q. And how long have you been in practice?
A. This is my 22nd year of practice.

329 Q. And what area of practice have you had and where have you practiced?
A. I would describe my practice as a general common law practice with an emphasis on employment law and issues related thereto.

330 Q. Now, I think at the end of Apri1 2015 you received a phone call from Ms. Annmarie Ryan asking you to take a brief in the Commission, is that correct?
A. That's correct, Mr. Chairman, yes.

331 Q. And I think that was followed up with confirmation of that and a letter of instruction which was couriered out to you with some materials, and the Tribunal has
seen those. I don't intend to re-open them at this point.
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.

Obviously the issue of who you would be representing wasn't dealt with in that letter, but can you recollect 13:57 when that was clarified for you for the first time?
A. Yes. We were to be appointed to represent the interests of the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, in addition to any members who sought representation over the rank of inspector - in other words,
superintendents, chief superintendents and assistant commissioners - unless those individuals had a conflict of interest, in which case a decision was to be taken as to what to do with that, and I wasn't aware of what the decision was to be at that time.
Yes. I'm not suggesting that it was part of your duty to question your decision as to who you were representing, but when you got the papers did you quickly discern that there was no complaint against the then-current Commissioner?
A. Yes, there was nothing that I could see that was laid directly at the door of the Commissioner.
Q. Yes.
A. It was, in the main, allegations and criticisms of certain senior officers.
Yes. But in that context, did it cross your mind as to what role you would have to act on behalf of the Commissioner?
A. Yes. The role was to act on behalf of the

Commissioner, the entire -- and the entire force, except to say this: that the rank and file members were individually represented by their union and they had fielded a full legal team to represent rank and file members. The sergeants and inspectors were represented by the AGSI, who had also fielded a full team. In addition, the Byrne and McGinn officers were also separately represented. And generally the victims of the various crimes which were the subject matter of the modules, would always be represented as well, usually by solicitor and counsel. which then left the Commissioner and the officers that I've just mentioned. And in relation to how that was to be dealt with, my understanding, and I proceeded on this basis, was that we were to receive instructions from any officers who were coming under our wing, who were to require representation, and we proceeded on that basis.
336 Q. Yes. But presumably you saw an obvious distinction between the rank and file, as you say, and the senior officers and the position of the commissioner in that?
A. Yes.

337 Q. All of those officers, high or low, were implicated or were related in some way to the incidents or the investigations or the complaints, whereas the Commissioner was not?
A. That is so, yes.

338 Q. What role did you see for the Commissioner, acting on her behalf --
A. well, this was --
Q. -- in each of the modules?
A. This was a Commission of Investigation which was exclusively related -- almost exclusively related to the conduct of various investigations by members of An Garda Síochána, and the Commissioner's role, I think, as I understood it, was to oversee the Commission and to provide whatever assistance that she personally could or, through any of her officers, to provide such assistance to the Commission as they required.
Well, on one view, that might be done perhaps entirely by an appropriate liaison officer simply acting as such. But did you consider there to be anything unusual or different about being asked to represent the Commissioner in those circumstances?
A. As I understood it, it was the precedent that was already in being and that this is the way things were done, so I didn't question it, although I did have to think about how, in my own mind, it worked, because we were receiving specific instructions at all times from specific officers, but we were not receiving any instructions from the Commissioner in relation to the issues which were the subject matter of the complaints that we were to deal with.

341 Q. And I think it's correct to say that at no stage up until you consulted with the Commissioner in October and early November did you receive any factual instructions from her?
A. That is absolutely correct, yes.
Q. And you received nothing in writing?
A. No, nothing in writing.

343 Q. And prior to commencing upon the work necessitated by the hearings in the Commission, did you consider it less than satisfactory that you hadn't received any briefing as to how the Commissioner would be approaching the hearings in general, and in particular dealing with Sergeant McCabe?
A. Less than satisfactory, that would sound pejorative. I don't want to criticise anybody. I took the brief on the basis that I would receive instructions, and I did receive instructions to the best extent possible. However, there was an issue with the totality of the instructions. We didn't have full instructions at any stage. And I'11 say that one of the issues there was that the documentation wasn't coming from the Commission in advance, it was coming in advance of each module, and in advance of Module 1 we only had the core booklet for Module 1. So there was an issue with getting instructions which were highly complicated, involving very complex investigations, at a very late stage, which required full engagement with those instructions to bring ourselves up to speed.
344 Q. Yes.
A. So was it unsatisfactory? It was very challenging.

345 Q. I mean, from the point of view of An Garda Síochána, they had, from the publication date, essentially, of the Guerin Report and certainly from the laying of the terms of reference before the House, they had some very considerable period to plan for Commission hearings
which was inevitably going to take place at least from the end of 2014 onwards, I take it you'd agree with that?
A. I'm not fully au fait with it, Mr. McGuinness, to be frank.
Q. Yes.
A. As I said, I took the matter as I found it. But it is my understanding that there was -- there were difficulties collating documentation and forwarding the documentation to the Commission. So insofar as that was the case, I think the Commission was certainly -or, rather, Mr. Justice O'Higgins was very anxious to proceed, he had a tight time-line, and I think the documentation issue probably set him back somewhat. CHAIRMAN: So, Mr. MCGuinness, it seems that this
witness is agreeing with everything that Mr. Smyth said in that regard and it has not been challenged.
MR. McGUINNESS: Yes. It doesn't appear to have --
347 Q. Obviously from your point of view, you're briefed and you get the module 1 documents?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it perhaps as few as three days before the hearings?
A. I think that is about right, yes.

349 Q. And certainly in terms of the totality of events, certainly matters stemmed from perhaps 2005 to 2015, a ten-year period, that was coming into focus in different modules, in different respects?
A. Yes.

350 Q. Arising out of different issues that had been raised?
A. Yes.

351 Q. And presumably you had no familiarity with any of the events --
A. No.

352 Q. -- prior to that?
A. None whatsoever.

353 Q. Just to deal with one thing, first of all. Were you briefed with the Byrne/McGinn report by the Commissioner at the start?
A. No, Mr. Chairman, I was not.

354 Q. Did you seek that at some stage?
A. I recall getting it from Annmarie Ryan, from the Chief State Solicitor's office. I can't recall whether it was before June. It was some time as the investigation was proceeding. I got it in a box. I brought it back home where it was put with the other boxes, and, to be frank, I never opened it and I never read it. The on7y access I had to it or the only information $I$ had about it was in relation to the segments or excerpts from that report, which were subsequently inserted into each of the individual core module booklets.

355 Q. Yes.
A. But I never actually read the document from cover to cover. It remained in the box, and it went back with finished.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I don't understand. So you got a box?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It takes a box --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- to put Byrne/McGinn in, but you didn't actually ever read it?
A. That's correct, sir, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Were you curious enough to kind of take out the start and read that?
A. If I had the time to be curious, sir, I would have been curious, and I certainly was anxious to read as much as I could. There was already voluminous documentation to be read, and it was coming at us before every module. I never got the chance.

CHAIRMAN: The answer seems to be no.
A. No.

But if I am correct, Mr. Byrne, Assistant Commissioner Byrne, he gave evidence of what he had recorded in that about his view that Sergeant McCabe had lost control as sergeant in charge and his position became untenable, and I think Mr. McDowell cross-examined him on that, on
the day, isn't that correct?
A. I think he did, yes.
Q. But just going back to the issue of instructions, do you recall any discussion about seeking instructions on the evening of the 13th, after you'd finished that day's round of consultations?
A. It became apparent relatively soon after we engaged with our clients that there was an issue in relation to events that had occurred prior to the events that were the subject matter of the immediate module. It was apparent to us that our clients had read the Guerin Report and had identified themselves. The individual officers, Mr. Chairman, were -- the nomenclature was --
Q. Code names put by Mr. Guerin in his report in relation to some of the officers?
A. Correct, yes. And the individual officers had been able to identify themselves from those code names and were in a position to advise us that there were serious allegations to be made against them, and they were anxious to advise us as to the background -- their understanding of the background to those allegations. 363 Q. Just to be clear, the Commissioner had no input into any of those consultations with those officers and no input into any instructions in relation to those
issues, is that right?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.
Q. Yes.
A. -- at any stage. The instructions were to be sought from certain individuals. It became clear who they where. I think there is no doubt about that at this stage, who they were. Does that answer your question?
Q. Yes. But was Mr. Smyth talking about getting instructions from the Commissioner?
A. No, at no stage -- no. The Commissioner was not required to give us instructions because the Commissioner had no direct knowledge of these issues as she wasn't in any way involved.
Q. Yes.
A. But we obviously, we did want to speak to the Commissioner at some stage, that was very important.
Q. Yes. But the Tribunal has heard, and I'm sure you have been here for it, that the issue of the Commissioner's instructions certain7y arose on the 14th May, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

369 Q. Now, could you explain the context in which that arose
and the reasons for that?
A. The issue arose when questions were put to Chief Superintendent Colm Rooney in relation to a meeting which he had with Sergeant McCabe, and effectively the issue went from there. That was the first time it was opened and it was opened by Mr. Smyth examining Mr. Rooney directly.

CHAIRMAN: And again, I have read this transcript. MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It literally doesn't [inaudible] this point. 14:10 MR. McGUINNESS: Chairman, I hadn't got to the stage where I was going to tell you --

CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, I know you're asking a different question, Mr. McGuinness. I'm just pointing that out to the witness.
MR. MCGUINNESS: I'm not intending to open the transcripts that are so well known, unless necessary.
370 Q. But was there discussion amongst you, as counse1, as to what instructions you were seeking from the Commissioner?
A. Yes. We had sought instructions from the Commissioner to explore the factual background to the complaints and to explore any possible issues of motivation for making those complaints, and we required instructions from the Commissioner to explore that in the Commission, which was a private hearing, and it was considered that if issues of this nature were to be explored, this was the opportunity where it should be done.

371 Q. Just to tease that out slightly. In circumstances
where the Commissioner had no involvement and gave you no factual instructions, what do you think she could instruct you to do insofar as exploring the motivation for Sergeant McCabe's reports or complaints or actions?
A. Well, we took instructions from those who were in a position to give us factual instructions. we implemented those instructions and we acted at all times upon those instructions.
Q. Yes.
A. We had the approval of the Commissioner to take those instructions and to act upon them.
Q. So you saw it as a, as it were, a supervening level of authority based upon the foundation of the officers' instructions, is that a way it could be put?
A. I think that puts it very well, yes.
Q. All right. And the reference to motivation was -- were you concerned to be allowed to suggest that he was improperly motivated?
A. We were instructed to explore the factual background and possible reasons for his motivation.
Q. Yeah. I mean, had you reached any sort of tentative or prima facie conclusion as to whether he might have been motivated in relation to different matters at different times?
A. We received very firm instructions from three particular clients - well, two at one stage and then from a third.
Q. I don't want to --
A. Yes.

377 Q. And I can't --
A. No, I wasn't going to go into those instructions. But from those instructions, we were able to ascertain that this was a serious issue, which clients who were at all times in full jeopardy as a result of the allegations of corruption and malpractice made against them, they drew to our attention. As practitioners, we listened carefully to what they were saying, and our concern was, these are clients who are raising a very serious issue, which we feel, as a duty to our clients, we need to act upon to the extent that we may. We then looked at the terms of reference, and it was obvious that there wasn't a specific module which dealt with this issue particularly. It was possibly tangentially related to the end of the terms of reference. And our difficulty was how to raise it, when to raise it, and that was a challenge for us, because this was an inquisitorial proceeding. There were no pleadings as such and there was very little communication in terms of formal communication, and to flag this issue in advance was a concern. We were concerned that if it wasn't raised as early as possible, that we would be accused of leaving it in abeyance and then bringing it in at a later stage, but we were also concerned that it hadn't been formally notified. And probably the most 14:14 important aspect of it is the time element, the pace of this Commission, I think that's clearly established and I won't go over there again, but the pace of the Commission was very, very fast, and the question of how
best to raise this issue, and whether or not we would be allowed to raise the issue.
378 Q. Yes.
A. But I think, as Mr. Smyth said yesterday, we took a view that to explore this issue was a matter of professional obligation and that we had to do that at whatever cost to ourselves, and that was the way that we approached the matter and that was the basis upon which we sought the instructions to proceed.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not sure -- I'm mean, this idea of cost to yourself has been raised on a number of occasions by people.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But I don't -- what's the cost to yourself about raising an issue? I mean, it's been emphasised --
A. Other than the fact that I'm sitting here explaining it, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: -- this is in private.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I mean, unless you're anticipating leaks of a selective variety that led everybody astray, I can't see why this kind of --
A. No, nobody anticipated the leaks. Nobody anticipated any leaks.
CHAIRMAN: Well, then, I don't think there's any cost to a barrister doing a case. I certainly have never felt that.
A. Very well. It did exercise us, Judge, and we were
concerned.
CHAIRMAN: okay.

MR. McGUINNESS: proposition that if you're exploring somebody's motivation, you're perhaps suggesting that they were improperly motivated or might have been improperly motivated?
A. The whole issue is very difficult to parse. The instructions that we had were that there were grounds to explore the motivation. How that was to play out or 14:16 how that was to be interpreted, we couldn't predict.
Q. Yes.
A. But it was very important that, in exploring the motivation, that we were careful not to impugn Sergeant McCabe's integrity or his honesty or his bona fides.
Q. But you sought instructions on the issue of motivation and credibility. would they not inevitably impinge upon his integrity or his honesty, if this was the road that the Garda Commissioner was going down and was knowingly going to authorise you to go down?
A. Yes. We had no way of knowing how the various allegations made against Superintendent Clancy, Superintendent Cunningham and Chief Superintendent Rooney were going to fare in relation to being challenged in the individual hearings, and this issue be put and had to be put. As to what we were attempting to establish, we were attempting to establish the facts.
Q. All right. I mean, was there any sort of overall thesis with a conclusion that Sergeant McCabe had made these complaints for $i 11$ motives or ulterior motives?
A. There was never any suggestion of ulterior motives, and without going into detail as to what $I$ was told by clients who have asserted privilege, there was certainly the case that individuals who knew Sergeant McCabe for a long time had noted that his attitude had changed, that his demeanour had changed following the unfortunate events which we have been discussing all along, and that was a very serious issue which we were clearly put on notice of inquiring into further, as to why the behaviour changed and what was the reason for that.
Q. But whether he changed or not, and he may indeed -- he seems to have accepted he changed to some degree, would that matter really or count at all where the Commission was charged with looking at the investigations in relation to the facts?
A. And I think it's important to point this out: the individual modules concerned individual investigations.
Q. Yes.
A. And the possible shortcomings of those investigations. But I am at pains to point out that, from the very outset, when we had a document which was described as Brief Proven Facts, amongst the details in that document was a considerable list of serious charges that were to be laid against some of our officer clients, and, on that basis, that that seemed to be a
very serious matter which required as much possible protection or as much possible action to defend those clients as was required.
Q. Well, would it follow that you obviously, perhaps having regard to the nature of the inquiry, you didn't and couldn't necessarily see Sergeant McCabe as an accuser, but he was, perhaps to use a neutral word, the progenitor of these concerns, and you, on behalf of all your clients, were entitled to explore them?
A. I think that is a fair comment. He wasn't seen as an accuser. However, he had made a great deal of statements. There were, as far as I can gather, at least three sets of statements, if not more, which had extended the allegations beyond allegations of incompetence. They went way beyond that. They went to the point of suppressing documentation, covering up and corruption.
Well, I think in the Module 5 hearing, the core booklet of documents included some 290 tab documents and there was a supplemental one which included perhaps 10 or 12 statements made by Sergeant McCabe, is that right, do you recall?
A. That is correct, yes.

387 Q. But can you tell the Chairman about getting the instructions on the morning of the 15th? were you
A. No, I wasn't present. I understood that Chief Superintendent Healy had given verbal instructions to my leader, Mr. Smyth, and he told me some time before
we went into the hearing room itself that he had gotten the approval from Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy to explore the issues.
And how did he describe the approval of the instructions, insofar as you can recollect?
A. Again, if you'll bear in mind that we were -Yes.
A. -- quite engaged in the process, and it was fast-paced, I think he said something like we have the instructions or we got the instructions from the Commissioner.
390 Q. Nothing more descriptive?
A. That's about it.
Q. And he didn't convey to you, did he, that there was any restraint in terms of not going after his integrity or not accusing him of mala fides or --
A. Well, he didn't get time, but it was clearly understood that the instructions sought were on a limited basis to explore factual matters related to motivation, and it was understood by all that we were not to challenge.
Q. And credibility, that was included also, was it?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
-- but obviously the issue arose and there was a number of adjournments and a request for an adjournment of the 14:21 Tribunal, but were you present when Chief Superintendent Healy conveyed the re-confirmed instructions?
A. The recollection $I$ have of the afternoon, and it was a
busy afternoon, as we know, was that a decision was -we were asked whether we would confirm or provide written confirmation of the advices that we were giving upon which the instructions were to emanate.
Q. Yeah.
A. Myself and Mr. Garret Byrne adjourned to his desk, which was actually close to the hearing room itself.
396 Q. Yes.
A. In the same building.

397
res.
A. Mr. Byrne had his laptop out, and, between the two of us, we drafted the wording of the email, which subsequently was sent from Garret Byrne's computer.
Q. Presumably Mr. Smyth sanctioned that or settled it or expressed his --
A. We11, he was shown the document, and I don't think we had a hard copy, it was being emailed at the time.
399 Q. Yes.
A. He certainly was aware of the document and he read it.

400 Q. Can I just ask you of your recollection of, when you got the request to put your advice in writing, was that at the first adjournment that day, which appears to have been some time after three o'clock?
A. I think it probably was very close. There were a few adjournments. I don't want to take a chance.
A. It was sometime towards the afternoon, yes. I can't say when.
402 Q. But certain7y, you weren't drafting that while the

Commission was sitting?
A. Oh, good Lord, no, no. No, the whole point was, it was an emergency exercise; we had to go and do it straightaway.
okay. And that appears to have been sent by you, I think, is it, at 15:29?
A. It was sent from Garret Byrne's computer at that time, that's correct, yes.
404 Q. From Barrett Byrne's computer at 15:29. But was it printed off or paper copies?
A. No, I don't believe so, not at that time.

405 Q. But Chief Superintendent Healy appears to have relayed it to the Commissioner over the phone? Did he have access to the laptop?
CHAIRMAN: Annmarie Ryan's evidence was that it was printed and a number of copies were circulating.
A. Very well.

CHAIRMAN: And she took one and read it over the phone. That is what her evidence was.

MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes, I'm just trying to clarify that.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
406 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Do you recollect that?
A. I don't recollect it, but if that is what Annmarie Ryan says, then her memory is probably better than mine. CHAIRMAN: You're in the Distillery.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I presume there's a printer in the Distillery, and all you've got to do is take out a thumb drive, put it on and go to a printer?
A. Yeah. I've no doubt it was printed, sir. I just don't recall myself getting a copy of the document.
CHAIRMAN: That is fine, that is fine.
407 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Now, I'm not going to take you through the transcripts for the interchanges that afternoon, but did you understand that you had been advised to proceed in accordance with the advices in writing, or were the terms "motivation" and "credibility" used to confirm what you were to do?
A. I think it was more the latter. We already had instructions to proceed. This was just simply a confirmation document to confirm those instructions.

408 Q. Yes. So the Tribunal may take it that you saw no difference in your position from, as it were, the beginning of the interchange about what you were authorised to do --
A. Yeah.

409 Q. -- than at the end?
A. I agree with that, there was no difference.

410 Q. And from the point of view of the various exchanges and 14:25 interchanges, did you have any concern or worry that Mr. Smyth was at any stage exceeding his instructions in what he was saying in the course of argument or debate with the Judge?
A. It was a very fraught afternoon. Mr. Smyth was, though 14:25 he was seated, he was on his feet, as such, if I can use that expression amongst barristers in the room.

411 Q. Yes.
A. Mr. Smyth was on his feet, Mr. Smyth was engaging with
the Judge. The Judge was putting propositions to Mr. Smyth which he was engaging with. I do recall the word "integrity" being used. I remember being somewhat concerned about it, but I did not think it appropriate to intervene. The only other suggestion I could have had, having thought about this, was that I might have suggested reading out the email, but of course that would have gotten us into difficulty with legal professional privilege because it would have been reading out advices that had been given, and at that stage there was no question of privilege being waived.

412 Q. Yes. We11, can I ask you, did you discuss those concerns with Mr. Smyth?
A. My recollection of that evening is that $I$ had other fish to fry, Mr. McGuinness.

413 Q. Yes.
A. I was dispatched -- or, rather, I undertook to do a certain drafting exercise, which I'm sure we'11 get to shortly. It occupied my mind that evening, I have to say. That was the main thing I was occupied with.
414 Q. We11, had you any knowledge of or any interaction with Ms. Ryan insofar as her contacts with the Attorney General's office were concerned?
A. I have to say I have very little knowledge of what Ms. Ryan was doing. We were all in a large consultation room and there was quite a lot going on. I was aware she was on the phone, but a lot of people were on the phone. I don't know who she was speaking to or what she was doing.

415 Q. But did she convey to you at any stage before you went off that evening that she had been speaking to Mr. Dreelan?
A. I have no knowledge of that, Mr. McGuinness.

416 Q. And had received --
A. No.

417 Q. -- emails back --
A. No.

418 Q. -- and was saying that it was really a matter for the Commissioner?
A. No, I've no recollection whatsoever, but that's not to say it didn't happen. I just wasn't aware of it.

419 Q. A11 right. In terms of the letter that was to be drafted, were you the primary drafter of that, then?
A. Yes.

420 Q. A11 right. And without going into any instructions, we know, obviously, that Ms. Ryan arrived with the letter and also with Superintendent Cunningham's report relating to the August --
A. Yeah.

421 Q. -- 25th meeting of 2008, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

422 Q. And had you seen that report just physically before then?
A. Now, doing the best I can, I have to say I didn't.

423 Q. A11 right.
A. If $I$ can bring it back a little bit, if I may --

424 Q. Yes.
A. -- just to give you the context, very briefly, if I
may, Chairman. That afternoon, we had been hearing about the motivational issues, the background issues for quite some time. They had been on my mind as an issue that needed to be tackled and pinned down very carefully and that was a fortiori on my mind following the direction from Mr. Justice o'Higgins to put these instructions into a letter, and, on that basis, I think Mr. Byrne was occupied doing something else, Mr. Smyth was occupied doing something else, and it struck me that it would be appropriate for me to undertake the instructions that were required.

425 Q. Yes.
A. Now, I'm not going to go into the instructions --

426 Q. No.
A. -- except to say that I had instructions available to me from two of my clients.

427 Q. Yes.
A. And a third of those clients, Superintendent Cunningham, was, at that time, as we will have heard, was busy on protecting -- or, rather, providing
security for the visit of the Prince of wales. So he was on that detachment all weekend and he was unavailable to us physically. So what I did was, I took instructions from Superintendent Cunningham and superintendent Rooney.
428 Q. Yes.
A. Mr. Smyth sat in with me for a minute, but he was otherwise occupied, and Ms. Ryan did not sit in with me while I was taking these instructions. I took out my
notebook and I wrote down longhand the instructions that were being given to me.
Q. Is this from Chief Superintendent Clancy?
A. No, no, no. From Chief Superintendent Rooney, who was present, and Superintendent Cunningham, who was also present.

430 Q. A11 right.
A. Now, when I got back home that evening, I knew that there was a job to be done, so I started to uplift my manual or manuscript notes into the draft of the letter, and that then was -- it took me quite some time to do that.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCGuinness, there is a confusion now as to who was absent.
A. Yes, I will clarify that, Mr. Chairman. I have no difficulty with that. I'm just about to get to that. Superintendent Clancy was not available that weekend. CHAIRMAN: You said Superintendent Cunningham wasn't available.
A. I am sorry. I beg your pardon. I am sorry, Judge. So 14:30 the parties I had present before me on Friday evening were Chief Superintendent Rooney and Superintendent Cunningham.

431 Q. MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.
A. Superintendent Clancy, as I said, was elsewhere.
A. And he was unavailable. So what I decided to do was to do the best I could drafting the master draft, if you want to call it that, which was then sent to Annmarie

Ryan and to Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy.
433 Q. Yes.
A. The purpose of the latter's involvement was so that he could, in turn, distribute that to the relevant members who had given me the instructions. This would have included, and did include, Superintendent Clancy, who was asked when he could and when he was free to look at the draft and to give an input into the draft. And again, without going into the details of what I was told by my clients, I got feedback from each of the three clients, by email, which I wove together -- or wove into the draft itself, and that is how the exercise was undertaken. I would have undertaken a consultation with those clients if it had been possible. The proper way -- the best way to have done this, if time had permitted, would have been to ask for individual statements from each of the three contributors, to have asked for all of the documentation from each of the contributors, to have executed the draft, sent it out to them and then possibly to have met them yet again to sign off on it.

434 Q. Yes. Now, I think you've probably the statement that was volunteered by Superintendent Cunningham in which he says that he had been unable to print it off for whatever reason and read it on his small phone screen don't know whether that was ever brought to your attention or not?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. But it did contain the error -CHAIRMAN: No, sorry, it was the statement of Superintendent Cunningham that was brought to your attention, not the error, at the time? I'm sorry, I'm just not following.
MR. MCGUINNESS: The assertion that he hadn't been able to print it off and didn't read it from his phone, that was said to you at the time, is that what you are telling me?
A. No.
Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: In any event, we know what happened;

Mr. Smyth, obviously in good faith, took the letter and the factual content of paragraph 19 of draft and he put it to Sergeant McCabe, and we have seen what happened, in the transcript.
A. Yes.

442 Q. The Judge ruled that the contents were not relevant or admissible.
A. Yes.

443 Q. And other than to say that it might perhaps relate to the issue of a perceived or real grievance that Sergeant McCabe was believed to have had, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

444 Q. And on one view, if that was being -- the error was discovered, was there any question of redrafting the letter to put the issue of motivation correctly, as it were?
A. Okay, I'11 deal with that on the following basis, Mr. McGuinness: I was disappointed, as you can we11 imagine, when the error came to light. And as a practitioner, personally I was anxious to have it put right. Two things happened: we got on with the rest of the modules and we became immersed in them very, very quickly.
445 Q. Yes.
A. And second7y, I was unsure as to the status of the issue at a11. It would appear, and I think we worked on the assumption that the issue was either off the table completely or certainly in abeyance, but it did not have -- it didn't occupy our minds because we had our minds occupied on the next module or the module after that.
446 Q. Yes. But if you could follow this line of thought with me: the requirement to provide the letter had been brought about by Mr. Justice O'Higgins taking the view that Sergeant McCabe was entitled to be told what was
the basis upon which his motivation and credibility --
A. Yes.

447 Q. -- was being attacked, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

448 Q. That letter was now out of the picture, out of the Commission, effectively, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

449 Q. As the basis for that?
A. Yes.

450 Q. There was no other letter then, drafted or redrafted, $14: 34$ or proposed or sent to the Commission --
A. Yes.

451 Q. -- notifying the Commission and/or Sergeant McCabe as to the basis upon which his motivation and credibility would then be challenged, isn't that right?
A. Well, I don't -- I don't recall having any clear picture as to how the issue was then going to be resolved.
452 Q. Yes.
A. I think what happened is, we got on -- everybody got on 14:35 with the work that we were doing.
Q. Yes.
A. And it was, I wouldn't say forgotten about, but it was certainly off the table and it was not front of mind.
454 Q. Yes.
A. I'm not sure if that answers your question? $I$ hope it does.

455 Q. But Mr. Smyth in his evidence, which I think you were here for the whole of it --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

456 Q. -- I think was telling the Tribunal that, you know, the letter was gone as such, but the whole issue of motivation and credibility was still to be pursued all the way through, throughout the modules and in submissions; was that your understanding?
A. Yes, it was my understanding. As to the extent to which it was to be explored, remained to be seen.
457 Q. Yes. We11, perhaps, maybe it's more accurate to say that the means by which it could be explored was limited to an examination of the factual matters relating to each individual incident?
A. That's how it developed, yes, that's right.

458 Q. And perhaps how it should have started in the first place?
A. I don't think I would agree with that.

459 Q. A11 right.
A. Because -- and effectively what we were faced with was a situation where we had very -- a very large number of allegations, they were serious allegations. We had instructions to the effect that those allegations were incorrect. And insofar as we might have thought, if we rely on pure factual challenges, our clients, who were in jeopardy, would be all right, we weren't prepared to take that risk with those particular clients because they had so much riding on the outcome of the Commission of Investigation and, in particular, in relation to the allegations against them. I should say there was a fourth one, former Commissioner Callinan as
wel1.
460 Q. Yes.
A. We took a view that with clients in maximum jeopardy, we had to deploy, if I can use that word, Mr. Chairman, a11 the resources that were available and appropriate to us to vindicate the rights of those particular clients.

Was that discussed amongst you at the beginning or can you recollect at what stage, or did it come back into play, or did it arise at this stage after the letter had been ruled out?
A. My recollection is that I wasn't sure what was to become of the issue, and I think I was the one who certainly suggested or thought that it would be an idea to have a motivational module. Now, I wasn't aware that that had been considered at the planning stage of this and ruled out, I wasn't aware of that at al1. And 14:37 it struck me as being perhaps a way of dealing with it as fairly as possible, because in that way all the evidence could be gotten out and there would be a finding one way or the other which would then at least give us clarity. That wasn't -- that didn't happen, and I don't think it ever -- it didn't ever happen.

463 Q. Okay. But was it mooted with the Commission, to your know7edge?
A. The best that I can say is that I recall making a phone
call to one of the Commissioner's [sic] counsel suggesting it, but I heard nothing back.
Q. A11 right. We11, in any event, you were obviously also involved in drafting the Module 1 submissions?
A. I would say that they were in the main drafted by my colleague, Garret Byrne, and I had a look at them but I don't recall having a significant input. Now, that's not to say that I don't take responsibility for them, which I do, but I don't recall having a strong input into those submissions.
Q. Al1 right.
A. It was literally left hanging.

469 Q. okay.
A. And I was conscious of it. I was very conscious of the fact that there was an error. I was minded to want -I wanted to correct it, I wanted to streamline it and
make it as fair as possible. The opportunity didn't arise and I personally didn't seek it. And as I said, we simply got on with the rest of the work and the issue seemed to just stay there.
470 Q. All right. It was going at a cracking pace?
A. It was.

471 Q. I think anyone around there knew that?
A. Yes.

472 Q. But just bringing you forward to October and then November in advance of the Commissioner's --

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCGuinness, if you don't mind me intervening here, there is just one point that I am a little bit uncertain about, and that is this: what I am being told is that on the morning of Monday 18th May 2015, the submissions on behalf of the Garda Commissioner were handed in, and we have had a lot of focus on that letter, the accuracy or inaccuracy thereof, but, in addition to that, it seems Annmarie Ryan also handed in the letter -- or the report of the meeting from Superintendent Cunningham of 25th August '08, and I'm just wondering, if that was handed in to the Commission, was it not handed in to you? Because it does -- there's a big contrast between that --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- and the submission.
A. I can understand your question, Mr. Chairman. And the situation was that I was sitting in my work position, with Mr. Smyth, ready to get on with the work. The delivery and the signing-off was being done in my
absence. And there was also a delay, I think Annmarie Ryan gave evidence --

CHAIRMAN: No, but it's just did Annmarie Ryan also hand you the report from Superintendent Cunningham?
A. No, sir, she didn't.

CHAIRMAN: She didn't. But it was handed into the Commission?
A. I understand that. And just to say, I didn't actually see the attachments to the letter, nor did I see the final draft that morning.

CHAIRMAN: No, and I understand. And she perhaps arrived late and there was a lot of things happening.
A. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: But that is how the thing transpired?
A. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: So Mr. Justice O'Higgins would have got two contradictory documents.
A. I don't quite follow, sorry, sir.

CHAIRMAN: We11, the letter of the 25th August 2008, that, as I understand, Superintendent Cunningham's report of that date has a different reportage of what happened at the meeting than the document you put in.
A. Yes, I think the enclosures to the letter would certainly have been quite complicated and they would have given a fuller picture than the one that $I$ had.
A. That's correct, sir, yes. CHAIRMAN: A11 right.

473 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Just in preparation for the

Commissioner's appearance then, you did consult with her on two occasions?
A. Yes.

474 Q. You've seen the notes of the meetings made by a number of different people, Chief Superintendent Healy and Inspector McNamara and Ms. Ryan, is that right?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And can I ask you, was there a discussion of the Commissioner withdrawing anything, at that?
A. I have very, very poor recollection of these two consultations, except to say that I don't recall us getting into any huge detail. There was a discussion as to what might arise, what questions Mr. McDowe11 might put, but I don't recall any of us giving the Commissioner advice on how to deal with those questions. There was certainly discussion about legal professional privilege. There, $I$ think, was a discussion about, if that privilege was not relied upon, what the Commissioner would say, but I don't recall personally or my colleagues giving the Commissioner advice on the issue specifically. It was discussed. And I don't think any of us anticipated what was going to happen the next day.
Q. Okay. We11, that is what I am wondering. We11, was it part of discussion at the consultation or consultations 14:43 that the Commissioner would take the initiative in telling the Commission that she was modifying her position vis-à-vis Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, the impression that I had, Mr. McGuinness, is that
we had discussed the issue with the Commissioner, we'd given her some brief advice in relation to legal professional privilege, but I don't recall us giving any specific advice as to how she should handle the issue, whether she should waive privilege or whether she should make a statement. I don't recall anything of that nature.

477 Q. But can you remember what she decided to do on that?
A. No. She did not make a decision as to what to do that evening, to my knowledge.
Yes. But she got into the box then and gave evidence, as it were?
A. Yes.

479 Q. And did she not tell you before she actually stepped up to give evidence what she was going to do, was she going to waive her privilege in the box or was she going to assert it?
A. No, I was not aware of what decision she had made at that point in time.
Q. A11 right. We11, the issue of waiver then, was any view being advocated to her or just the options being put to her?
A. The options. Right. So when Mr. Justice o'Higgins raised the issue on the morning of day 29 , that was a complete surprise then?
A. A total surprise, yes.

482 Q. And did it convey to you that certain7y whatever had been going on in the various modules between day 5 and
day 29 , that he seemed to think that the issue hadn't surfaced in any of the modules, do you take that point?
A. He did use the phrase that it's been in abeyance, I think he used that word.

483 Q. Dormant.
A. It hadn't specifically arisen, as I recall, in any of the modules. I'm sorry, I've lost the train of thought, what was your actual question?
Well, the question was: Did you take it from his raising the issue, and this issue of dormancy in particular, that he didn't regard the issue of motivation as having been in play for the last several months?
A. You're asking me to express an opinion on what the Judge thought, Mr. McGuinness. I'11 do my best. I
think it hadn't arisen, and I think his main concern with it was not whether it had arisen in the past but that it was about to rise now, in other words that morning, and that there was to be a robust cross-examination of the Commissioner.

485 Q. Yes. But on a procedural point, had the Commission not, in advance of every module, in notification sent out with the core booklets and the statements of fact, made it quite clear to all of the parties that they weren't -- they were only going to be allowed raise issues connected with that module, explore the issues?
A. Yes, that's correct.

486 Q. Yes. So, on one view, Mr. McDowe11, unless he was intending to do it improperly, couldn't have raised the
issue of what Commissioner o'Sullivan's instructions were about challenging Sergeant McCabe's integrity or motivation?
A. Well, he had raised it once before.

487 Q. Right.
14:47
A. And we were concerned that he was going to raise it again.
488 Q. You think he was going to go outside the terms of the module and do it?
A. I can't say what he was going to do.

489 Q. Al1 right. Is that what you feared --
A. But obviously we were trying to look around corners and we were trying to anticipate what might happen.
490 Q. All right.
A. And there had been a basis when Mr. McDowell had said that he would be planning to cross-examine the Commissioner and that she wouldn't enjoy the experience. whether he could do it, whether he intended to do it, I simply cannot say.
491 Q. But when Mr. Smyth clarified matters on day 29, as recorded, did you think he was doing that on the Commissioner's instructions?
A. Again, I think it's idle for me to speculate. I had absolutely no notice that this was going to happen. I didn't know what to expect and I didn't know, and Mr. Smyth didn't know either.
492 Q. Yes. But was he getting those instructions on his feet while he was, as it were, addressing Mr. Justice o'Higgins, or was he doing that himself, as it were?
A. My recollection is that Ms. Ryan approached where myself and Mr. Smyth were sitting, and I think Mr. Byrne as well, on possibly three occasions, saying can we ask for some time, but I don't know whether Mr. Smyth applied for the time, but I do recall that he 14:48 engaged with the Chairman directly and we didn't break for specific instructions.
493 Q. okay. In the intervening period between day 2, day 3, day 5 until day 29, had anyone, in particular Chief Superintendent Healy, raised the issue with you about Mr. Smyth going too far or acting outside his instructions?
A. I don't recall Chief Superintendent Healy raising that issue with me.
494 Q. okay. I take it you'd remember it if he had done it in 14:48 your presence?
A. Yes, I think I would. Yes, I would.

495 Q. And you would expect to know about it, surely?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't know about it, is that it?
A. It was on my mind, but $I$ don't recall it being discussed by Chief Superintendent Healy and I don't recall any queries coming from the Commissioner in relation to it.

497 Q. And just jumping ahead then to the overview of submissions --
A. Yes.

498 Q. -- did you have a substantial part in drafting those?
A. What I'11 say is that Mr. Byrne took charge of that.
Q. Yes.
A. And I would have had an input into it, but again, I will take responsibility and stand over the document. If you want to question me on it, I will happily answer questions.
Q. Okay. But are you satisfied that the observations on Sergeant McCabe's motivations were included on the basis of your overall instructions from the Commissioner?
A. They were based on instructions received from the clients that I have mentioned. They were approved by our client/clients, but the material in the actual submissions was based on those instructions.
501 Q. Yes.
A. But it also did mention evidence that was available from another member of the force who was separately represented. That was Assistant Commissioner Derek Byrne.
502 Q. Yes. But obviously, as I understand it, you're saying, quite clearly, they obviously had the imprimatur of the 14:50 Commissioner herself?
A. As I understand it, all submissions delivered were approved, and I can't say, because I wasn't involved directly when they were being approved, I can't say whether they were approved by the Commissioner, by by, but I do know they were approved before they were delivered.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. MacNamee.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGuinness, could I just query that last point with you. I didn't understand the commissioner to be saying that she had read any of the two sets of submissions and had approved them. I didn't understand her to say that. In fact, I was understanding her to say the opposite, but I may be picking it up wrong, that can be the problem.
MR. McGUINNESS: Well, obviously I can't speak for the Commissioner.
503 Q. But it was your understanding that they had the approval of HQ, if I could put it that way?
A. That would be fair.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, well that could be chief Superintendent Healy or something like that.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Acting on her behalf.
A. That is quite possible.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you for clarifying it. MR. McGUINNESS: Thank you.

MR. MICHAEL MACNAMEE WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY
MR. MCDOWELL:

MR. MCDOWELL: Good afternoon, Mr. MacNamee.
A. Good afternoon, Mr. McDowell.

504 Q. I'm not going to keep you long at a11. Could I ask you 14:51 firstly to look at page 694.
A. Which volume is it?

505 Q. Of volume 1B. Just to explain to you what this is. This is a note of --
A. This is Chief Superintendent Healy's diary from the 15th, if I'm not mistaken.

506 Q. It's his diary note on the 15 th extended on to the Tuesday --
A. Yes.

507 Q. -- the following Tuesday, do you follow that?
A. I see.

508 Q. And I'm only interested in what appears at 1400 onwards there on the left-hand margin:
"Commissioner then rang a second time and --"

Something.
" -- that, on reflection, 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 should explore the area of motive and that it may be --" sorry.
A. Necessary?

509 Q. I will have to get the typewritten copy.
A. No, no.

510 Q. Just, my eyesight doesn't quite deal with it.
A. Nor mine.

511 Q. But the real question is, that I want to come to, is 14:53 that did you ever get this idea that there was a conditional approval given to going further with it, that it was only to proceed that day if it came out in the course of questioning?

A. I don't think I was privy to this communication.
Q. No. But you were presumably privy to - maybe you weren't - to Chief Superintendent Healy coming back with the Commissioner's second thoughts on the matter?
A. I have to say, Mr. McDowe11, I think it would be unsafe 14:54 for me to offer a view on that. I don't recall. I was quite busy with other matters -Yes, I can imagine.
A. -- as I think I've discussed.

I can imagine. But does it follow from that that you never had any impression that the Commissioner, who was looking for an adjournment to consider this matter more fully, only authorised the matter to proceed on the basis if it came out in questioning, that never -- you don't seem to have been aware of that conditionality?
A. I wasn't aware of that. I can't help you with that. I'm not saying it didn't happen.
515 Q. Yes.
A. I'm not saying it -- it wasn't imparted to me. Yes. So you thought you'd got the green light the second time?
A. I think that's fair enough, the green light, yes, I think so.

517 Q. Now, could I --
A. In fact, if I can just clarify that.

518 Q. Yes.
A. My recollection is: Proceed as suggested, or words that effect. Proceed as suggested.

519 Q. Proceed as suggested?
A. Yes. Something like that.

520 Q. So you've no recollection of any sense that there was, so to speak, a conditionality or a leash being put on the use of this line of questioning?
A. No, I don't have that recollection.

521 Q. Or it being confined to an authority to proceed that afternoon if it came out in the course of questioning, but not otherwise?
A. No, I don't recall that. It actually had come out in the course of questioning earlier on, already.

522 Q. We11, the only question that was put to Chief Superintendent Rooney --
A. Yes.

523 Q. -- was to ask him about this meeting --
A. Yes.

524 Q. -- and Sergeant McCabe, as he claimed at the time, angrily making a demand of him, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. So that was hardly in the course of questioning, that was Mr. Smyth eliciting this for the first time?
A. Okay. That is so, yes.

526 Q. Do you follow my point?
A. I do, I do, yes.

527 Q. And what you are saying is that you never had any sense that the Commissioner was playing for time and saying, you can proceed if it comes out in the course of questioning?
A. No, I don't recall the Commissioner playing for time. I would say that clearly in any case of this nature,
time would have been welcome.
528 Q. Yes.
A. But I don't recall her playing for time.

CHAIRMAN: Vis-à-vis Mr. Smith eliciting anything, Mr. McDowe11, all he said was: Before you retired, did $14: 56$ you have contact with Sergeant McCabe? It seems to me to be one of the more innocuous questions I've ever heard in my life.
mR. McDOWELL: No, I think it went slightly further than that. I think he actually managed to elicit from him that Sergeant McCabe had approached him. CHAIRMAN: The witness said that, there was certainly no question of putting words in his mouth. I have just checked the transcript. He didn't say, didn't he come in to you very angry or something like that.
MR. MCDOWELL: No, no, he didn't ask him that. He just asked him about that meeting.
CHAIRMAN: He simply said: Before you retired, did you have contact with him?

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: That's all.
MR. MCDOWELL: Well, he elicited.
CHAIRMAN: But it's there in black and white, Mr. McDowel1.

MR. McDowell: well, we'll see.
CHAIRMAN: It came out, is certainly the -MR. MCDOWELL: Because you'11 recall, Chairman, that he had to be directed several times to what meeting -- or he had to be given a hint as to what meeting he was
being asked about.
CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that is the case. If necessary, we can go back on it, Mr. McDowell. MR. MCDOWELL: It's not all that hugely important.
CHAIRMAN: No.
MR. MCDOWELL: In any event, the only reason I'm putting it to you is that it would appear, if that note were correct, that there was a conditionality to the Commissioner's authorisation, but you, you are saying that you and your fellow counsel thought you'd got an unambiguous green light from the Commissioner to proceed?
A. We were told to proceed as instructed, or as advised, yes.
Now, could I ask you one other question, which it's not just purely for the purposes of personal curiosity, but at what stage did you and your fellow counsel become aware that this was not going to be like the Grangegorman Commission or the Dublin Archdiocese Commission, that it was going to follow the internal format of a tribunal, although strictly in private? At what time did you -- at what stage did you become aware that the room was going to resemble this rather than a small dining-room table with witnesses coming into it?
A. I think it was fairly obvious from day 1.

531 Q. Yes.
A. It was very disorganised, you'11 recall it yourself, Mr. McDowe11, the room was full of lawyers.
532 Q. Yes.
A. To the extent that I could barely get sitting with my leader, that is how busy the room was. Yes, I do recall that.
Q. I'm just wondering were you aware in advance that it was going to be a matter of putting questions to witnesses in front of 40 or 50 people, or was it going to be done in a private room where some people might be allowed to be there and others not?
A. I think, Mr. McDowe11, I've a tendency not to be too optimistic when I approach my work. I was expecting it 14:58 to be pretty busy, and it was, and it was a busy room with lots of lawyers there.
534 Q. But the format did not come as a surprise to you, in other words?
A. No, I don't think it was a surprise, no.
Q. Well, could I ask you about your recollection, I just want to be clear about this, in relation to Ms. Annmarie Ryan's desire for an urgent consultation with the Commissioner. You may have been intending to mention that with Mr. McGuinness?
A. Right.
Q. What's your memory of that issue?
A. Now, my memory, as I think I've said already, was that my head was in other areas, I had other fish to fry at the time. From my point of view, I would have liked a consultation with Superintendent Clancy in particular, because he was absent. I would have also liked a formal consultation and more time to talk to Chief Superintendent Rooney and Superintendent Cunningham.

Was I concerned about a consultation with the Commissioner? I'11 be frank with you, Mr. McDowe11, I had other fish to fry and it didn't really strike me. If there was a consultation set up, it would have been -- clearly, I would have gone to attend that. But 15:00 I think the way I had it in my mind was, this was my job, I was doing this part of the work. So in terms of me demanding a consultation, no, I didn't. I wasn't looking for one. And whether I knew about whether Annmarie was looking for one, I can't say. I think she 15:00 did mention that she was looking for a consultation and I recall that the Commissioner was unavailable. I see. And could I ask you then whether, when it came to at the end of day 2 , which is Friday, the 15 th, when the Chairman had directed that a document be drafted setting out the basis for putting these matters into evidence, isn't that right, and what would be put to Sergeant McCabe, do I understand it that you and two witnesses secluded yourself in a room where you could actually take down instructions from him in peace, is that the idea?
A. It may have been a table in the corner of a larger room where other matters were going on, or it could have been a side room. It's more likely to have been a side room because I needed quiet and peace to kind of concentrate on what I was hearing.

538 Q. And I'm not going to trespass into your privilege with those two people, but over the course of the following 48 hours, or even more, you generated, firstly, a
primary text in manuscript, is that right?
A. When I say that, what I did was I wrote down the instructions that I received on the Friday.
539 Q. Yes.
A. I then put them into a word document.

540 Q. Then into a draft, the first draft --
A. Yes.

541 Q. -- of the letter of the 18th, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

542 Q. And now we're talking about -- are we talking Friday evening or Saturday?
A. The email that was put up there, the one where I say it's of the utmost importance --
543 Q. Yes.
A. -- that email, that's what I call it, it went out on the Saturday evening, I think, at 9:45.

544 Q. So you were working across the Saturday on it --
A. oh, yes, absolutely, yes.

545 Q. -- at some points?
A. Yes.

546 Q. And then we get to the point where you said that you got input from each of the three people --
A. Yes.

547 Q. -- who you were relying on, is that right?
A. That's right, yes, yes.

548 Q. And none of them was -- none of them was saying they had nothing to do with the letter or was --
A. Oh, no, no, there was active input from all three contributors.

549 Q. All three had an input into it?
A. Yes.

550 Q. And then the final text is produced and circulated on the Monday morning, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

551 Q. And again without trespassing on your client's
privilege in any way or asking you to compromise it, do you agree with Mr. Smyth's evidence here today that what was in the letter of the 18th May faithfully reflected the instructions you received?
MR. DIGNAM: Chairman, just in relation to that question, $I$ didn't object when it was asked of Mr. Smyth because he had frankly said that he wasn't involved in drafting the letter, and simply signed off on the final draft of it, but, in fact, while the question is prefaced with saying that Mr. McDowel1 didn't want to trespass into privilege, the effect of that question is, in fact, to trespass into privilege. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr. Sreenan, what's your view on that? I know you're not the client, but it's the duty of the lawyer to uphold the privilege in the event that it is there.
MR. SREENAN: I'm concerned that Mr. McDowe11 is pushing the witness into an area which is properly covered by privilege.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, maybe I will rephrase my question and get around it.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I know, but I am always suspicious of rephrased questions like, in consequence of the
whatever, did such and such happen? I mean, I got it fairly -- no, my thinking at the moment is this: they're careful, but they're rushed. There has been mention of the possibility of something being conflated with something else.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Smyth, I think, I don't know, it's certainly not a criticism, but I actually was worried when that came out, but it came slightly sideways, I didn't have a chance to say anything. But it is actually my job to uphold the law.

MR. McDOWELL: Oh, I accept that.
CHAIRMAN: And I just worry about that.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, maybe if you would rule on whether
I can ask this question.
CHAIRMAN: We11, I'm listening very carefully, Mr. McDowe11.

552 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: On the 24th June, when it became fully apparent that the letter was contained in error, did you have any sense that it was your error?
MR. DIGNAM: Judge --
CHAIRMAN: I think it's the same question, Mr. McDowell.

MR. DIGNAM: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: It's intensely clever, and you know --

MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, may I make a submission to you on the matter? I think I'm entitled to ask this witness whether the error was his error, full stop, as far as
he's concerned. I think I'm entitled to ask him that. CHAIRMAN: Then I do think we have to go into the whole consultation. I mean, I think that is the problem. I mean, in the event that anyone else is here, I mean, if they have a privilege which they don't want to waive, they're absolutely entitled to that. The one thing that should never ever happen is that people are put under pressure to waive a privilege. I mean, that's just wrong.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, Judge --
CHAIRMAN: I mean, if it spontaneously happens, that is a different thing. I mean, just take an instance, Mr. McDowe11, of 1et's suppose there's a boardroom and there's five people and there's a leak of a document, if someone goes around and gives a waiver of privilege to every one of those, $I$ mean how is that not, as the French would say, harcèlement morale?

MR. MCDOWELL: We11, I didn't realise, Judge, that you were uncomfortable with what Mr. Smyth had said so -CHAIRMAN: It's not a question of being uncomfortable; it's a question of the harp, even though it's not here, being above my head, and that is what $I$ go by all the time. I just follow that.

MR. MCDOWELL: I see.
CHAIRMAN: So that is the position that we're in. I 15:06 mean, you may ask me at the end in submissions to raise an inference that it wasn't an error, that it was deliberate. I mean, you're entitled to do that, based upon this fact, that fact and the other fact, from
which a fact may be inferred. But I actually -- I don't know if we reach that stage or whether that is going to happen. But we just can't go into a consultation that lawyers were having with their client for the purpose of receiving legal advice. And in this instance, which is the second aspect of the privilege, for the purpose of litigation, which this was, they were involved in. Their reputations were in jeopardy, that is certainly the case. I can't either be happy about it or unhappy about it. If it's the law, it's the law, and that's it.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, can I ask the witness this: Insofar as you realise -- sorry, can I ask the witness this, and I'm asking you, Judge, can I put this question to him: Insofar as you realise there was an error on the 24th June, was it a clerical error or an error as to meaning?
CHAIRMAN: It's the same thing. Honestly it is. And I know notices for particulars, Mr. McDowe11, lawyers are taskmasters at saying the same thing 15 different ways. It seems legitimate to ask the following question: who was in the room when the question was asked by Mr. Smyth on the Monday the 18th?

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And was there any approach in relation to whether an error was made. I don't know, but, for all I know, the answer to that may be that the room was as chaotic as has been described and no one was paying any particular attention. I don't know.

MR. MCDOWELL: Of course, if I ask a question, Judge, of this witness: who was in the room on the 18th and did any of them come to correct the error? That effectively means that none of them did, and we're back to privilege then.

CHAIRMAN: We11, I think -- I don't know. Are we? MR. DIGNAM: No, Judge, I have no difficulty with that question being asked, and, in fact, I don't think there's been any evidence that the error was corrected before the 24th June. I think the evidence is to the contrary.

CHAIRMAN: No. I think, yes, it is the case that the error wasn't corrected.
MR. DIGNAM: That's right.
CHAIRMAN: Now, how obvious the error was when it came through, but, I mean, again, I'm looking at the transcript, well I'm not physically looking at it now, but God knows I can practically see in front of my eyes, and the question was asked twice. Now, I don't know who was in the room. And I certainly know it wasn't corrected. But that can be asked, Mr. McDowell. MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, obviously I don't want to waste the Tribunal's time on this, but I do want to put it on the record -CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MCDOWELL: -- that former Chief Superintendent Rooney has, in my submission, clearly waived privilege in this by giving a contrary account as to the instructions he gave to his counsel.

CHAIRMAN: And we will have to look at that down the way, Mr. McDowe11.

MR. MCDOWELL: But I want to reserve that point, Judge. CHAIRMAN: No, I think you are reserving that point, and I do think we need to look at that down the way. And I don't know whether it is the same as informer's privilege, where the informer can't waive privilege in relation to one particular fact that the informer reports on. If it is to go in at all, the whole thing goes in.
MR. McDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: But I don't know if that is the case. I'm not agreeing with you, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: But my submission will be perhaps in colourful layman's terms, that once you expose a bit of 15:10 ankle, it may have to go up the knee, Judge. That is what I am going to say.
CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that legal submission is really helping me in any way, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: It's hardly a legal submission. In any 15:10 event, very well, I will move on from that.

553 Q. But it is clear, is it not, from your submission of the -- your legal submission on the 11th June, that at that point you were making a submission that the complaint that Superintendent Clancy had failed to give 15:10 support, that that complaint was motivated by -- or, sorry, that that complaint was motivated by a desire on Sergeant McCabe's part to have the DPP's directions conveyed to the D family?
A. Your question is, was that put into the submission in June?

554 Q. June, yes. You're 11th June submission?
A. That's a matter of record. It's in the submission, as I understand it.
Q. And it was repeated. It wasn't just a "to" or "against", it was clear that it was --
A. Oh, it was certainly repeated. That's correct, yes. CHAIRMAN: And as I understand the evidence in relation to that legal submission, that submission was
circulated among the parties who were involved.
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And nihil obstat at least, I mean, nothing stands in the way, was obtained.
MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: Am I right in thinking that? The clients got the submission prior to it being lodged?
A. Yes. Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN: And in the event that there was any query by email or any other way --
A. That was the way that that was done, Judge, yes. CHAIRMAN: -- as to a particular paragraph, you read in whatever the change that was necessary. Yes.
A. Yes.

556 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Did I understand your evidence -- can I 15:11 move on from that now, because $I$ think I've got as little as $I$ am going to get out of that line of questioning. Could I ask you, Mr. MacNamee, in relation to the debate which took place, and we don't
have to go into the detail of it, on day 2 and day 3, that you were apprehensive about the introduction of the term "integrity" into the issue?
A. Yes, it was introduced by the Judge, in fact, rather than by Mr. Smyth.
And you were apprehensive about that. Did you think that that was in conformity with the green light you'd got on the previous friday? I don't want you to be critical of Mr. Smyth, but from your own point of view, did you consider that that was part of the green light that had been given to you?
A. The best answer I can give you, Mr. McDowe11, is that it would have been easier if the word hadn't emerged in the debate. It would have been simpler.
I see. And the same applies to the use by the Commission Chairman of the term "bad faith" on occasions, is that right?
A. Yes, except I can say for absolute certainty that that phrase was never used by anybody on my team.
559 Q. Yes. And did you, in your own mind, draw any distinction between the issue of credibility and creditworthiness and credit in relation to the line of questioning you were engaging on?
A. The distinction between the phrases clearly would be familiar to me because of what I do it for a living, but I don't think $I$ had come across a situation where the differences were so nuanced and so complex. We're looking at the difference between credit and credibility, and the Chairman has given some useful
indications in that regard. I think the purpose of the exercise was to test the facts, was to test the basis of the allegations, and the idea was to have as wide a latitude as possible to test those allegations because of their severity.

560 Q. Yes. And you said that you had in your own mind at any rate the notion of having a special module or where the question of motivation would have been concentrated on, is that right?
A. Just, to my mind, it would have been maybe a more structured way to deal with the issue. It would have allowed all of the evidence, including that of your own client and indeed others who hadn't been called or hadn't even been aware of the fact that they were being brought into the matter. It was just a thought that I expressed. I don't think I did anything about it other than what I said. It just seemed to me to be a more appropriate way to deal with an issue, out of fairness to everybody, but it was also apparent that the Commissioner [sic] had -- was constrained by his terms of reference, and I think, in the end, he chose not to make any findings about the issue at all, which I think was probably the fairest thing that he could have done. The issue, in other words, did not arise in his final report at all except to the extent it was very briefly mentioned at the start.
561 Q. Would you agree with the following proposition: that whoever was responsible for the error, or however it came into being, that the imputation in paragraph 19

And I'm not trying to provoke you into doing that. I'm 15:16 suggesting that if it were the case that Sergeant McCabe had made complaints against Superintendent Clancy with a view to forcing him to give him private satisfaction in respect of a different matter completely, which was the D direction from the DPP, that that would be an accusation of acting in bad faith against Sergeant McCabe?
A. I don't agree that it would amount to acting in bad faith. It would perhaps amount to looking for assistance, or trying to address an issue that was on his mind.

564 Q. But if his sole motive, which is what was put in the letter, if his sole motive in making an accusation against Superintendent Clancy was to force his hand on the D allegations, that would be an accusation of bad faith, wouldn't it?
A. It would be an accusation that your client would have to deal with in evidence.

565 Q. Yes. But wouldn't it be an accusation of bad faith?
A. I'm not going to agree with that, Mr. McDowell.

566 Q. Well, would you agree that it would be improper motive to say I am accusing you of misbehaviour on a number of issues because I want to force your hand on a different issue?
A. It would have required a full exploration of the facts, a presentation of the facts as set out in a letter or as corrected and to allow your client an opportunity to address the issues that have been raised. It did not make an imputation and it didn't use phrases such as "bad faith".

567 Q. No, I'm saying the imputation, not the explicit message, was that he was making these allegations against Superintendent Clancy for lack of support because he wanted Superintendent Clancy in respect of a private matter, which was his desire to have the D ruling of the DPP conveyed to the D family, complied with by Superintendent Clancy?
A. It would have represented an unusual stratagem which would have required explanation from Sergeant McCabe.
568 Q. But anyway, we know that it was, in the hee 1 of the hunt, found to be an error, is that right?
A. Yes.

MR. MCDOWELL: I see. Thank you.
MR. DIGNAM: I have no questions, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: You have no questions?
MR. DIGNAM: No, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: And, Mr. Sreenan, have you any questions? MR. MICHAEL MACNAMEE WAS EXAMINED BY MR. SREENAN:

MR. SREENAN: Can I just ask for document 762 to be put on the screen.

CHAIRMAN: Can you say that again, please, Mr. Sreenan?
569 Q. MR. SREENAN: Document 762 -- sorry, page 762 of the book. This is your email on Saturday evening, 9.45pm.
A. Yes.

570 Q. Sending the draft to Annmarie Ryan and Fergus Healy, copying it to Garret Byrne and Colm Smyth, and in your second paragraph you say:
"It is of the Utmost --"

And utmost in upper case.
" -- importance that the content be as factually accurate as possible such that there are no misstatements and nothing that cannot be backed up by oral or documentary evidence with the exception of the facts alleged, recited or admitted by McCabe himself."

That is what you said.
A. That is correct, yes.

571 Q. And thereafter, did you leave the finalisation of the draft or at least bring it into the forum where it was submitted to the Commission to your instructing solicitor?
A. Now, as I understand it, Mr. Sreenan, there are several other emails but they're all redacted because of
privilege. This is obviously not the first time I saw the document. This is, $I$ think, the first time I sent my first draft. I would then have received instructions by email making amendments or raising questions on the draft that $I$ had been -- I had originally sent.
A. I don't recall having received a final, final draft, if I can put it to you that way. I think it was finalised 15:20 very late on Monday -- very early on Monday morning, and by the time I got to the Tribunal, the letter had been printed, signed and submitted.
573 Q. And then if I could ask that page 3508 of the book be put up. This is the transcript of the hearing before the Commission when Garda Commissioner O'Sullivan was due to testify on the 4th November 2015?
A. Yes.

And it was put to you by Mr. McGuinness, it was suggested to you that the Judge thought that the issue of motivation had been dormant for some time, but I think the words used by the Judge, we can see here, line 13:
"It is in relation to a question that has been dormant McCabe and his mala fides or bona fides in making his complaints."
A. Yes.

575 Q. So do I understand it what was being referred to as being dormant was the issue of Sergeant McCabe's integrity or bona fides or mala fides in making the complaints?
A. Yes.

15:21
576 Q. And finally if I can put this question to you. We know that this hearing in the --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Sreenan, I beg your pardon, I know that is there, but the question you wanted to ask the witness on it was what? If you wouldn't mind just helping me on that. what was the point you were making?
MR. SREENAN: Sorry, it was a point of clarification, Chairman, that Judge o'Higgins was not indicating that the question of motivation had been dormant in the intervening period; what he was indicating was that the issue of Sergeant McCabe's integrity and bona fides or mala fides had been dormant. Does that clarify? CHAIRMAN: Maybe I will just look at it. Just give me one second, if you wouldn't mind.
MR. SREENAN: Yes. It's line 13.
CHAIRMAN: No, I know. Forget about the lines. I have it all printed out separately. Yes:
"Concerning the integrity of Sergeant McCabe and his mala fides or bona fides in making the complaint, a question that has been dormant for some time."

And the point you wanted to make, Mr. Sreenan? I want
to get it -- what was --
MR. SREENAN: I was really correcting the record, Chairman, because Mr. McGuinness had mistaken7y suggested to the witness that the Judge had referred to the issue of motivation as being the issue that was dormant, whereas motivation was being canvassed at various times in the intervening days, as we can see from the transcript.
CHAIRMAN: Well, $I$ think the whole issue, it's fair to say, was raised there, and that was what Mr. McGuinness 15:23 was getting at. I think that is fair to say. MR. SREENAN: Very well. Can I just turn, so, Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: And it also seems to me, I may be wrong about this, that the reason for going there was -well, there's two possibilities. Mr. Justice O'Higgins was reading al1 the papers himself and then re-read that because the Commissioner was coming in, and read the letter and also the Superintendent Cunningham report of the meeting in Mullingar in August 2008, or
else perhaps he had a chat with counsel who referred it -- that to him and then he read it, but certainly that's probably how it arose. It wasn't, I think, in consequence of talk between counsel.
MR. SREENAN: No. It seems to be coincident, at least, 15:23 with the fact that the Commissioner was --
CHAIRMAN: Well, there's probably no coincidence about it at all. I'm sure the Judge knew what he was doing. MR. SREENAN: I'm sure he did, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So, in any event, the correction was that what the Judge raised was mala fides, integrity, that brings in the whole concept that had been raised. MR. SREENAN: Yes, the whole concept. But issues of motivation had been canvassed in the intervening period.

577 Q. And the proceedings before the Commission were, of course, intended to be private, isn't that so?
A. They were intended to be private, that's correct, yes.

578 Q. And again, as far as you were concerned, I take it, at that time, you expected everybody to respect the privacy of the proceedings?
A. I most certainly did.

579 Q. And can you confirm that any leaks - we know there were leaks - didn't come from you or, to your knowledge, anybody on your legal team?
A. I can absolutely confirm that, Mr. Sreenan. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm taking it that it's like the known unknowns and the famous comment, I'm never going to know that but I'm not required to inquire into it, and 1et's suppose everybody in the room is called, $I$ just don't want that to happen, Mr. Sreenan, I'm assuming that everybody acts properly. And besides, it's none of my business. If the Oireachtas made it my business, I'd make it my business, and I wouldn't dream of assuming that anybody had done that.

MR. SREENAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: It's just not the right thing to do. MR. SREENAN: No. But I suppose, Chairman, it might
only be fair to observe that, from the point of view of my clients, this particular module comes about as a result of the reporting of what was allegedly said or done at the Commission, which was supposed to be in private.
CHAIRMAN: Well, yes, I appreciate that, and I think the other problem which it may be the media people have, is that if they get snippets, they're snippets, and I think you know my views on that, Mr. Sreenan. Even in the High Court, if it's a question of somebody opening a passage from a judgment, I always asked for the headnote to be opened as well, just to try and put it into context. After all, people do spend an awful lot of time summarising what, supposedly, the decision is about and it's usually a very good guide.
mR. SREENAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: But I do take your point, but I wouldn't ever dream of thinking that anybody here had done that. mR. SREENAN: Thank you, Chairman. I have no further questions.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sreenan.
A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MS. LEADER: Yes, the next witness, sir, is Mr. Byrne, barrister-at-1aw.

MR. MCDOWELL: Chairman, could I be of some assistance, perhaps, in relation -- in relation to this witness
anyway, if he's asked whether he's in general agreement with the two other witnesses, I'm happy to take his evidence as given.
CHAIRMAN: We11, I'm just wondering, Mr. McDowe11, why should he not have to suffer like the others? I think 15:26 what we will do is, we will fly through his evidence. All right.

MR. GARRET BYRNE, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MS. LEADER AS FOLLOWS:

MS. LEADER: Mr. Byrne.
A. Ms. Leader, good afternoon.
Q. You're a barrister-at-law. How long have you been in practice?
A. Since 2006.

581 Q. Okay. Now, we've heard a lot of evidence in relation to the Commissioner's instructions and, as I understand the situation, you were specifically involved in two aspects, those being the email that was sent to the Commissioner on the Friday afternoon and the drafting of submissions?
A. That's right. I mean, I wouldn't say I drafted every single set of submissions, but I think the ones we've been talking about in the last couple of days,

582 Q. And in relation to the obtaining of instructions and the various meetings, are you at divergence from the evidence given by Mr. Smyth?
A. No, I'm not.

583 Q. okay. If we could just turn to that email on the 15th May 2015 at page 689 at the materials, which also should be on the screen in front of you.
A. I will take the hard copy, if that is okay.
Q. Could you first of all explain to the Tribunal how it came about that you ended up drafting that email at that time on the 15th May?
A. My memory is that after the first adjournment that afternoon, during Chief Superintendent Rooney's evidence, we all went back out into the consultation room we had in the arbitration centre, and it was suggested, but I can't remember whether it was by Chief 15:28 Superintendent Healy himself or by Ms. Ryan to me on behalf of Chief Superintendent Healy, that he or the Commissioner wanted our advices to date to be put in writing.
586 Q. Okay. And the email has already been opened in detail to the Tribunal, but if I could ask you this question Mr. Byrne --
A. Sure.

587 Q. -- was it your understanding that you were getting permission from the Commissioner to put to Sergeant McCabe questions in relation to the aftermath of the $D$ investigation?
A. That's correct. And the "aftermath" being, I suppose, the important word. .

588
A. Yes, just as an intermediate step, I suppose, is that having -- myself and Mr. MacNamee having drafted it, it seems Mr. MacNamee doesn't remember this part of it, but I did actually print it off because I wanted it to be reviewed and settled by Mr. Smyth, and I was conscious that I was putting his name on it so I didn't 15:30 want to send it without his express approval. So I printed off what was the draft, the unsent draft.

591 Q. Yes.
A. Because obviously my desk was in the, you know the

Shanley room up in the Distillery Building, which is, I mean, about 15 feet from where the Commission was sitting, and I printed that off in one of the printers in that room, took it over to Mr . Smyth, he read it and approved it, and then I went back to my desk and sent it.
okay. So there was a hard copy of that email available on that afternoon?
A. There was at least one. I may have even printed some time. I think I did print more than one copy of it, because I was conscious that there was more than one person who wanted to see it.

593 Q. Do you remember if you made a copy of it available to Ms. Ryan in particular?
A. I think I probably gave them all to Ms. Ryan. I don't think I gave it to Chief Superintendent Healy directly, but maybe -- I'm not absolutely certain on that.
594 Q. And were you present when Chief Superintendent Healy was making various phone calls to the Commissioner that afternoon?
A. No, I wasn't. I think for a lot of them I would have been off -- well, I'm not sure the time exactly works in terms of this. And I suppose, actually, that's one thing that did occur to me as we were going through all the timing on this. We're looking at a lot of different clocks, if you know what I mean.
595 Q. Yes.
A. So the $15: 29$ is on my computer, I think there is a note in Chief Superintendent Healy's handwritten note where
he says 15:37 or something, that's probably his watch. There's the times on Vodafone, or whatever, for the Commissioner's phone calls and for chief superintendent Healy's phone calls, so there may be -- and of course the transcript has its own time. So everything might be out by a couple of minutes here or there.
A. But roughly they must be within a few minutes of each other. So I wasn't with Chief Superintendent Healy, I think, for any of this, and partially because I was over at my desk and partially also probably because I just gave him privacy to have the conversation.
597 Q. Yes. Have you any specific memory of a hard copy of that email being given to Chief Superintendent Healy?
A. No, I think, is the answer to that. I presume he did, but I don't remember it being handed to him.
598 Q. If I can just turn then to the submissions which were submitted --
A. Yes.

599 Q. -- at the end of Module 1, which appear at page 1439, volume 2 B of the materials.
A. I have those. Thank you.

600 Q. Yes. Now, they deal with the module itself and evidence that was given, and then there is a section of those submissions which appears beginning on page 1451, 15:34 which is headed "Other"?
A. Yes, I have those.

601 Q. Now, first of all in relation to the inclusion of that section of the submissions, Mr. Justice o'higgins made
a ruling at the end of day 3, as I understand it, which said that the letter of the 18th wasn't admissible, save insofar as to say that Sergeant McCabe had a grievance with certain people, that grievance, be it real or perceived?
A. Yes.

602 Q. Was any thought given to not including this section of the submissions, in view of that ruling?
A. In view of that ruling, no. I mean, I think there was a discussion as to whether they ought to be included in 15:34 the submissions of this module because we should maybe -- by doing it separately from just the submissions on this, and that was partly covered by the fact or partly by reason of the fact that we knew that Superintendent Cunningham hadn't given evidence -- oh, sorry, he had given evidence, but he was due to give more evidence on day 5 , on the resumed first day of what would be Module 2.

603 Q. Yes.
A. So we were conscious of that, that maybe that we didn't 15:35 have the finalised picture to be making submissions on it. That was sort of one point.

604 Q. Yes.
A. But in terms of including it, I suppose the Judge had said he was excluding it except in relation to establishing there was a grievance.

605 Q. Yes.
A. And we knew that the superintendent was coming back to give evidence in relation to those interactions, so it
seemed appropriate -- oh, sorry, maybe -- it didn't seem to us that it was completely off the table in the Judge's mind and that, therefore, we should be putting the picture before the Judge.
606 Q. And that formed the rationale to including that section 15:36 in the submissions?
A. Let me say that was my rationale, I suppose.

607 Q. That was your rationale?
A. Yes.

608 Q. So you took it, because Superintendent Cunningham was to give -- come back to give evidence, that the ruling that was delivered on day 3 was somewhat fluid, or if you could be more precise than that?
A. We11, I mean, the ruling had been given at the beginning of day 3.

609 Q. Yes.
A. But the Judge had allowed Mr. Smyth to ask the question --
610 Q. Yes.
A. -- in relation to what we understood to be our
instructions at the time, later on that day, and then the transcript of the Mullingar meeting had become sort of, we had become aware of its existence at the beginning of day 4 , and because there was some technical difficulties with that, Superintendent

Cunningham's evidence -- sorry, Superintendent Cunningham was going to be called back to give evidence in relation to it, and that was going to be deferred. So, in that light, I think I understood that it wasn't
completely off the table and therefore would be appropriate to make submissions in relation to it.
611 Q. Now --
A. And, of course, if the Judge disagreed with me, he was entirely free just to ignore that section of the submissions.

Yes. Now, in relation to the --
CHAIRMAN: Sorry, there's just one point there, Ms. Leader, I'm sorry, I am going back and looking at it again. I appreciate what you said about the Judge's 15:37 ruling, but he seemed to say -- well, he does say:
"So the contents of this document --"

Referring to the letter.
"-- are irrelevant for this module."

I don't know where were we in terms of the submissions? Had Module 1 finished at that point?
A. No, I --

MS. LEADER: Well, factually, sir, superintendent Cunningham was to return to give evidence in relation to Module 1. These submissions were completed, as I understand it, and filed --
CHAIRMAN: On the 11th June.
MS. LEADER: -- on the 11th June. Superintendent
Cunningham was coming back on either the 22 nd or 23 rd June, and you will see that these submissions relate to

Module 1.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. okay. well, thank you for that. MS. LEADER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So it was the answer -- the question asked and the answer given which was permitted by the Judge then, seems to be the answer to that.

MS. LEADER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Okay.
613 Q.
MS. LEADER: So if I can then continue in relation to these submissions in relation to Module 1. They contain the same, if I can put it, mistake/misunderstanding that was contained in the letter of the 18th May in relation to a complaint made to Superintendent Clancy, which appeared as a complaint made against Superintendent Clancy?
A. Exactly.

614 Q. Now, as you understood it, that was the state of the evidence when these submissions were submitted, is that correct?
A. Yes, subject just to the smal1 caveat that you will see 15:39 part of the submissions are drafted in anticipation of what Superintendent Cunningham's evidence would be --

615 Q. Yes.
A. -- rather than what it already had been. But other than that, yes, I agree.

616 Q. And that appears at paragraph 70, at the bottom of page 1452, I think?
A. Exactly.

617 Q. Yes.
A. So it's written in the future tense there, "will give evidence".

618 Q. "It is understood that Superintendent Cunningham and Sergeant Martin will give evidence of what Sergeant McCabe said at that meeting."
A. Exactly.

621 Q. Thank you. And any understanding that you had in relation to what she may be saying was based on something totally -- nothing she had said to you?
A. Nothing from her.

622 Q. From her?
A. Absolutely. I realise we're trespassing on another issue.

623 Q. Yes.
A. But nothing from her.

624 Q. Yes. So in relation to these submissions, they turned out to be factually incorrect, that's the case?
A. Absolutely.
A. On day 5, yes.

626 Q. On day 5. Now, was a transcript of Sergeant McCabe's tape ever made available to you before day 5 ?
A. It was. I've seen it in your core book, and I can't remember exactly where it is.
627 Q. Yes.
A. But there is a letter, I think, from Ms. Ryan to Mr. O'Hagan, I think dated 17th June.

628 Q. I think my note of it is, if we go to volume -- I think the 19th June was the day Ms. Ryan sent it to Chief Superintendent Healy.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. And day 5 is the 24th June. Am I right about that?

MS. LEADER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right.
A. Sorry, Judge, yes.

629 Q. MS. LEADER: So Volume 8, 4072.
A. There's even, which is probably even slightly more helpful in that sense, is, $I$ think there's something in Volume 1, of a letter from her to Mr. O'Hagan on, I think, the 17th June --

630 Q. Yes.
A. -- asking for the transcript.
A. So obviously she couldn't have had it at that date.
Q. Yes.
A. So we received it some point thereafter. And if you are saying there is an email to Chief Superintendent Healy of the 19th --

633 Q. On the 19th.
A. -- she must have received it in between those two dates.

634
Q. 4072, Volume 8.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, when did you say she was looking for it?
A. She was looking for it, I think, in a letter dated 17th June.

MS. LEADER: 17th.
CHAIRMAN: To Mr. O'Hagan?
A. To Mr. O'Hagan.

CHAIRMAN: Who is the solicitor to the tribunal.
A. Who is the solicitor to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: To the Commission, yes.
MS. LEADER: And by the 19th June she had received it.
That's at page 4072 in Volume 8.
A. I see that, yes, here on the screen.

635 Q. Yes. So the 19th June, and she sent it. It went to Chief Superintendent Healy and Ms. Ryan from Mr. O'Hagan, who was the solicitor to the Commission?
A. I see. So, in fact, that is an email from Mr. O'Hagan, so that must be it.

636 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. So did you actually listen or look at the transcript afterwards?
A. I did -- sorry, I didn't listen to it, we never got it on the audio recording.

638 Q. Sorry, yes.
A. But I did read it. But I'm not sure if we read it in advance of the 24 th, in advance of day 5. My memory of that is not entirely clear. Obviously I did read it at





some stage and I did compare it to Superintendent Cunningham's note, but did we do it before the 24th or on the 24th, I'm afraid I can't be clear on that. Prior to Mr. Justice o'Higgins pointing out the error in paragraph 19 on the 24th June, was it apparent to you that there was an error in that letter?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Yes.
A. I am trying to remember at what point we became aware of the mistake or error, or however you want to describe it. I honestly can't say exactly when we became aware of it. I have a memory and I don't think I'm trespassing on privilege to say I have a memory of standing around discussing it in that room, in the Commission room, which would suggest that we were all there only because it was day 5.
641 Q. Yes. Okay. Was there any thought given to correcting those submissions after the error became apparent, which had to be, at the latest, on the 24th June?
A. Honestly, no. I mean, I think I'm sort of, in a sense, 15:43 thinking back and reconstructing what we were thinking, but I think the simplest answer is that the matter became clear in the back and forth with the Judge and the transcript on that day, and we moved swiftly on to the hearing of module 2, Part 1 -- is it 2, Part 1, I 15:44 think is what we did first?

642 Q. Yes.
A. It just --

643 Q. Perhaps it was just one of those things?
A. It just slipped our minds. We just didn't do it. Now, did I ever think about it afterwards, changing it? I suppose the view -- again, I'm, to a certain extent, putting thoughts back in my own head, but I suppose we thought that the Judge had the point so why would we be 15:44 making alternative submissions to him on something he already knew.
644 Q. If we can just turn to the overview submissions then. They're at page 2897 of the materials.
A. What book is that, sorry, Ms. Leader?
A. I'm sorry, 2897, is that it?
Q. Yes, yes.
A. I have those yes.

647 Q. These are submissions which would appear to have been completed on 1st February 2016 and they contain a commentary on the motivation of Sergeant McCabe?
A. That's right. I can't remember whose idea it was but if it was my idea obviously then that's that, but if it was somebody else's idea it was something I certainly very much agreed with, that in addition to making submissions on the individual modules --

648 Q. Yes?
A. -- that the Judge had been making comments along the way about general themes and also just as I a general summing up ourselves it made sense to do a set of submissions on what we perceived to be the overall picture that had emerged from the individual modules, which may not be immediately clear from reading
submissions on each individual module at the time. so, these were thematic submissions?
A. In a sense. I mean, you can see the things that we wanted to cover. It's there on page 2897; the context, summary of the evidence against the main members of the 15:46 An Garda Síochána who we were representing, some general issues arising, then we just decided to include a point about the motivation, and then the effect of the allegations, and then we made submissions on what we hoped we could persuade the Judge to put in as findings in the report, and recommendations in the report.
650 Q. Okay. And if we could just go to the commentary on the motivation of Sergeant McCabe, obviously by very virtue of the fact that these submissions, or this paragraph is included in those submissions, there was no sense that anybody was going outside instructions furnished by the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána at that stage?
A. No, that's not the view that we had.

651 Q. Yes. You were very comfortable putting these in as representing your instructions?
A. That's correct. I mean, I would have drafted them on the understanding that they would have been checked before they went in and approved either by her or probably more likely on her behalf, but they were drafted on that basis.

652 Q. And in relation to the evidential basis of this particular section of the submissions, everybody was happy that each paragraph of those submissions could be
stood over by reference to evidence, is that correct?
A. I think that is correct, yes. Yes. But the actual reference to the evidence wasn't included in each of the paragraphs?
A. No. And maybe that might have been better if we had done it that way, but we hadn't been doing specific references to transcripts or to sections of transcripts as we were going up to then, so we didn't. We continued on with that approach again.
Thanks very much. If you would answer any questions anybody else might have.

THE WITNESS WAS THEN CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL:
Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Very briefly, Mr. Byrne. In relation to the letter of the 18th May which is at page 771 of the book.
A. Sorry, excuse me.

656 Q. It's book 2A, the first part.
A. Yes, I have it, Mr. McDowell.

657 Q. Apart from paragraph 19 I just want to ask you about paragraph 16. It reads:
"Sergeant McCabe sought an appointment to see Chief Superintendent colm Rooney and this was facilitated in June/July 2007. At the meeting Sergeant McCabe expressed anger and annoyance towards the Director of Public Prosecutions. He demanded that Chief Superintendent Rooney communicate with the Director of Public Prosecutions to seek a declaration of his
innocence from the Director of Public Prosecutions in relation to the allegations."

Now obviously those instructions do not come from the Commissioner, isn't that right?
A. I would imagine so.

658 Q. And could I just ask you then to go to book 2B, when Superintendent Colm Rooney on day 4 -- we're at pages 1113 and 1114.
A. Yes, I have those.

659 Q. At page 1113 he was asked at question 48:
"Secondly, this is, Sergeant McCabe will say that at the time he knew and he said this in evidence yesterday, that he knew the substance of the DPP's directions."

And Colm Rooney said:
"Yes, Judge, I accept that."

And he said:
"And he will say that the only issue that he complained to you about was that this direction having been given and he being aware of it and formally through the state solicitor, though he never mentioned how he was aware of it to you, that Superintendent Cunningham had sat on it for three weeks.
A. No, definitely not, Judge. That is not what the meeting was about.
Q. Was that mentioned at the meeting?"

The Judge asked him and he said:
"A. Sorry?
Q. Was that mentioned at the meeting?
A. No. Well, I have absolutely no recollection that
it was a complaint, if you like, from Sergeant McCabe in relation to Inspector Cunningham, because if it was his complaint I would certainly have acted on it by issuing a written report to Inspector Cunningham to sort the matter out."

And later then we go to, over the next two pages there is a discussion about whether he did or he did not express anger or annoyance towards DPP, and at question 53 he was asked:
"I've got to suggest to you (a) that he never expressed annoyance or anger towards DPP and had no reason to."

And Chief Superintendent Rooney, retired said:
"No. He certainly didn't use those words to me, Judge. Those were my interpretation of what Sergeant McCabe was saying to me. From what he was saying I took it he was angry with the Director of Public Prosecutions that
may not --"

And I said:
"Sorry, let's stop there for a second. We were given a 15:52 letter yesterday stating that he had sought a meeting with you in June or July, which was facilitated, and it can only be on the account that you gave to the Chief State Solicitor's office: 'At the meeting Sergeant McCabe expressed anger and annoyance towards the Director of Public Prosecutions.' Now neither that is true or it's not true, is it true?"

And what he answered, he said:
"What I said, Judge, is that he did not use those words to me. It was my interpretation of the form of the conversation that he appeared to me to be annoyed with the Director of Public Prosecutions. That was my interpretation of what was coming across to me. That 15:52 may or may not be what Sergeant McCabe actually meant."

And Mr. Justice O'Higgins said:
"Forget about what words he used. Did he express anger 15:53 and annoyance at the DPP or did you just infer that he was angry?
A. I would have inferred rather than he actually said it, Judge."

Do you remember that?
A. I do.

660 Q. So there is that letter within 24 hours of its final approval by Chief Superintendent Rooney being resiled from?
A. Em, I'm not sure if it is being resiled from. CHAIRMAN: I think the point that is being said Mr. Byrne is this: That we know the DPP has a policy, indeed there is a document there, and I think it changes sometimes, there's a new version of it, and vis-à-vis victims, victims charters, all the rest of it, I know there is a pilot scheme now, but it was always the case that people who said they were the victims of crime were told we're not prosecuting
because of insufficient evidence and that was it. There was no reasons given. Now obviously what I am inferring is that the Garda authority said, look, as much as we can do, that's what we told you, to Sergeant McCabe, you may know more in consequence of what the state solicitor told you on ringing you up, we haven't got a problem with that, but we can't do any more vis-à-vis Ms. D. That is what I understood. Now, I don't think there was ever any evidence, certainly I haven't heard it so far, that Sergeant McCabe asked
that somebody write to the DPP and get him to change his policy or that the DPP had been written to, refused to change its policy and that Sergeant McCabe was angry in consequence of that. I don't think that's there
anywhere. That is what you are being asked about essentially.
A. Yes. Now I mean, in terms of the very specific question about resiling from, I mean I'm not sure whether it was described as Chief Superintendent Rooney inferring anger from Sergeant McCabe in relation to the DPP or stating that he said that he was angry about it. I'm not sure the letter of the 18th actually says that. But in a more general sense, I think the point about Sergeant McCabe being aware of the details of the DPP's $15: 55$ directions by having had it read to him I think only became known to anybody but Sergeant McCabe during the Commission when he said it in his evidence. So it may be that people's understanding of the conversations they had with Sergeant McCabe in relation to the DPP, in relation to the DPP's directions, would have been influenced by the fact that they didn't really he knew the full directions.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, maybe not. We're speculating a bit.
A. I certainly am, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowell, I take the point that there is a contrast between the submission on 18th and that particular evidence.
MR. MCDOWELL: And the evidence on the 19th.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, I take the point. where I go with that 15:55 is a different matter.
MR. MCDOWELL: It is indeed.
661 Q. Just on one other topic, Mr. Byrne: The last witness said that he didn't read any of the Byrne/McGinn report
and kept it sealed up and sent back, and the witness before him, Mr. Smyth said that he hadn't read the passage that was circulated by your solicitor, was it your idea to circulate this passage?
A. It was. Or at least rather I discussed it with my lawyers as to whether it would be appropriate to do it. what had happened in the background to that is that at some point I think either during or after Module 2 I was conscious of the fact that we were getting excerpts from the Byrne/McGinn report and people were talking about it in general terms and I didn't have it. So I asked Ms. Ryan for a copy of the Byrne/McGinn report. And she provided it to me on that request. So that would have been probably some time in July. It may have been September. But probably some time in July. And I'm not sure if I then actually spent a lot of time looking at it. I do remember looking at the bit, the second page in it, which is included, the one behind the cover page in relation to the finding, the summary finding in relation to Superintendent Clancy, now Chief Superintendent Clancy, and the question of malice. I'm not sure how much further $I$ went into it in terms of the preface. But the reason I asked, or discussed it with my legal team for the last day or two, was because you had been asking questions in relation to the motivation --
CHAIRMAN: You realise you don't have to tell us any of it.
A. I'm aware of that detail.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. But just $I$ think it is relevant just to say that the reason I felt it was important or useful to have it before the Tribunal was because you have been asking questions in relation to the motivation submissions, which being in the overview submissions, so I was conscious that that was -- the primary basis of me drafting that was that section of the Byrne/McGinn report. I think also circulated with that section of the Byrne/McGinn report was an excerpt from the evidence, is it day 31 or 32 , of Assistant Commissioner Derek Byrne, where he had referred to that. So there is a back and forth where he discusses his view on the motivation issue with I think it was Mr. Gillane who was asking him questions and Mr. Justice O'Higgins asked him some questions on top of that as well. If you remember at the end of that day Mr. Justice o'Higgins decided not to circulate the transcript for that day, so we didn't actually have a transcript at the time. But I knew that Assistant Commissioner Byrne 15:58 had said effectively this is all in the Byrne/McGinn report, I think you will see from the transcript, he says at page ix or page 9. So I knew that was there and that was the basis for me using that to draft a lot of the section of those submissions.
CHAIRMAN: So you looked at it, but you seem to be the on7y one that looked at it.
A. That does seem to be the case. I'm not sure I would have discussed it with -- I'm sorry, I didn't discuss
it with Mr. Smyth or Mr. MacNamee.
662 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Could I ask you to look at page 4848?
A. Do you know where that would be, Mr. McDowell? MS. LEADER: Volume 9.

663 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: It's in volume 9 I think. I think there 15:59 are a number of bullet-points on that, this is before we get to the background to Sergeant Maurice McCabe bit.
A. I'm sorry, Mr. McDowe11, say that again.

This seems to be part of the foreword to the report which --
A. Yes.
Q. -- precedes the background to Sergeant Maurice McCabe which has already been discussed today.
A. Yes.

666 Q. The first bullet-point deals with a recommendation that there should be a professional standards review of Bailieboro Garda Station, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

667 Q. And then there's a paragraph on motivation and I just 16:00 want -- this is Superintendent Byrne's summation:
"Sergeant McCabe as the confidential reporter has made a significant effort to malign and impugn the character and professionalism of Superintendent Michael Clancy, which efforts are not substantiated by the outcome of this investigation. The evidence available to this investigation is significantly weighted in favour of Superintendent Clancy who is found to be a very
honourable, effective and experienced district officer, who is very professional in the discharge of his functions. It is not definitively established why Sergeant McCabe made this personal attack on Superintendent Clancy and no mala fides is established. 16:00 In this regard it is appropriate that both Superintendent Clancy and Sergeant McCabe be advised of the findings in the investigation."
was that relevant to your view on how you draft the final submission?
A. Absolutely. Because of the fact that they say no mala fides.
668 Q. Could I ask you one final question, and maybe it's the $€ 64,000$ question, Mr. Byrne: Motives, someone can do something motivated in bad faith, someone can do something bona fide, acting in good faith --
A. Yes.

669 Q. -- is it too binary to say that when you are motivated to do something you are doing it either in good faith or bad faith?
A. That's probably a philosophical question that is above my pay grade.
Q. I don't want to trap you too quickly.
A. But.

671 Q. What I am really putting to you is this: That, if no mala fides were established was that an acceptance that he was acting bona fide?
A. Em, I think that's probably a matter for Assistant

You were relying on this page, I assume, and this paragraph to assist you with your submission?
A. Yes. But $I$ was going to say, in terms of my view on it, $I$ felt that there was in the most neutral sense an ulterior motive maybe, if you might put it like that, in terms of what we felt at the time, but that that was not a malign ulterior motive, if you know what I mean. So I think that would put it in the category of good faith or certainly not bad faith.

674 Q. Well, I follow your point, that neither being malign nor benign it was ulterior, is that the issue that you were concerned with?
A. Yes, that there were other considerations in his mind.

675 Q. Yes. And were they to --
A. Or rather his mind was affected by other considerations maybe.
676 Q. And were they to force a decision on the D -- revealing 16:03 the D reasoning to --
A. Oh, by this stage, absolutely not. No.

677 Q. I see.
A. By the time you get to the later submissions obvious7y, I mean after day 5, after 24th June, the question of forcing anything in relation to the $D$ investigation.
Q. That was abandoned?
A. We accepted that was not the case, yes.

679 Q. So you were searching for some hidden ulterior motive
is that right? Perhaps hidden is the wrong term. Unclear ulterior motive, is that right?
A. I wouldn't put it in those terms at all. I think there was, as Mr. Smyth put into his advices in July, it was relatively clear that there was some degree of a grievance or an attitude that Sergeant McCabe had against particularly Superintendent Clancy and to a lesser extent Superintendent Cunningham and that that was affecting his view of those two men and that needed to be taken into account or needed to be put in its proper context. That was about it.

680 Q. To go back to a word that Mr. Smyth used, and I understand from the Chairman that there may be a technical meaning of which I am unaware, would the word animus be what you had in your mind?
A. No. The very word animus, no. And the idea that he had kind of a deliberate negative intention against them, I don't think so. In fact, I don't believe so. My sense of it -- and again, we're now getting into sort of my subjective view rather than what our instructions were, but my subjective view of it was that in the circumstances where Sergeant McCabe had found himself in this very stressful situation, etcetera, etcetera, had taken an unnecessarily negative view of the two officers and that had affected his judgment in relation to the allegations he was making against them.

681 Q. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

## THE WITNESS WAS THEN CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM:

Q. MR. DIGNAM: Mr. Byrne, I just have two or three very brief questions. Firstly, just in relation to that paragraph that Mr. McDowe11 has just read out to you, the Chairman has this point, but is it correct to say that Superintendent Clancy, there were in fact no findings of corruption or malpractice against him in the O'Higgins report?
A. Absolutely. And you can probably nearly go even further to say that he was very much vindicated by the report.

683 Q. Turning to paragraph 70 of the submissions that were opened to you on page 1439, paragraph 70 is on page 1452.
A. Yes, sorry, Mr. Dignam.
Q. If I can draw your attention to the final sentence in paragraph 70:
"This is recorded in a report of the meeting prepared jointly by Sergeant Martin and Superintendent Cunningham."
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall what document you were referring to, the team rather was referring to in that paragraph?
A. In a sense I was referring to the letter of the 18th of May, in that $I$ don't think $I$ had those documents in front of me when $I$ was writing that submission. But in a more general sense $I$ would have been referring to

Superintendent Cunningham's report of, I think it was, 12th May September 2008 of that meeting.
A. That's correct.
Q. And it was left that these matters were dealt with in his report and Judge o'Higgins indicated that they had the report?
A. That is right, and that he didn't need to be referred to it specifically.
Q. Thank you.

THE WITNESS WAS THEN RE-EXAMINED BY MS. LEADER:
MS. LEADER: Just to clear that up. I think the transcript of Assistant Commissioner Byrne's evidence appears at page 4852 of the materials and at 4853 -which is in volume 9, Mr. Byrne, volume 9 ?
A. Yes. Yes, Ms. Leader, I have it now.

693 Q. -- assistant commissioner Byrne referred directly to the paragraph at number 9 of his report, is that correct?
A. Yes.

694 Q. It is at line 13 of the transcript
A. That's right. And I think does he say further on, maybe, that --

695 Q. Yes.
A. -- to the Judge effectively that's there and it's available.

696 Q. So, he directly refers to it. And it turned out that that transcript wasn't available to you when you were drafting submissions, but you did have an actual copy of what Assistant Commissioner Byrne had referred to in his evidence?
A. That's right.
Q. And it is in those circumstances that you referred back to it?
A. Yes. Just, it seemed to me that given that $I$ was
likely to be asked about the motivation submissions that in fairness to everybody that they should have that basis of it in advance.

698 Q. Thank you very much, Mr. Byrne.
A. Thank you.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

CHAIRMAN: We might go off transcript now. Thank you very much, Ms. Kelly.
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[^0]:    "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 11:36 a matter that the Commission isn't directed to investigate. whether it's relevant or not is a matter for the parties.
    MR. JUSTICE O'hIGGINS: Yes.

