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THE HEARING RESUMED, AS FOLLOWS, ON THURSDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY 2018:

MR. MCGUINNESS: If Mr. Dunne could come back to the witness-box, please.

MR. CYRIL DUNNE CONTINUED TO BE CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. ROGERS:

1 Q. MR. ROGERS: Mr. Dunne, you were, throughout your career really very intimately involved in corporate affairs, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I was. Particularly latterly in my career.

2 Q. Yeah. And when you say latterly, you are talking about your time in An Garda Síochána?
A. I was particularly thinking of my private sector career, to be honest.

3 Q. Right. I noted yesterday when you were answering Mr. McGuinness, that he asked you rather globally about your various private sector engagements.
A. Correct.

4 Q. And it looks as though your career really started in the banking sector?
A. That's correct.

5 Q. And where you had sort of IT responsibilities?
A. It started with systems development.

6 Q. Yeah. And there is a passage in your statement at 2972, where you describe how you had been with AIB for nine years, and then you moved to Permanent, now Permanent Trustee Savings Bank?
A. Which volume is that, sorry, Mr. Rogers?

7 Q. It might be Volume 5, I think.
A. Sorry, I beg your pardon. Yes, I have that.

8 Q. Do you see there 2972?
A. Yes.

9 Q. And you describe how you were with them, that is Permanent, for five years, Head of Systems Development?
A. Yes.

10 Q. And then you sort of took a diversion into a firm that we never hear of now, Power Supermarkets, sort of a -- 10:04 for the older people, they might remember Power Supermarkets.
A. So, it was a different industry --

11 Q. Yeah?
A. -- but similar role. So Power Supermarkets was the
holding company at that point in time for a supermarket market chain Quinnsworth, Crazy Prices, Lifestyle Sports and Leisure. So it was a very significant business in Ireland at the time. We got to a turnover of about a billion in Ireland.

12 Q. Yeah. And your role there?
A. My role there, I was Executive Director. So on the board of that group holding company, so with the subsidiaries under me. And my specific role was change management and particularly driven by IT.

13 Q. I see.
A. So we were -- to use the jargon, we were replatforming, both operationally and technologically the whole of the business, so that we could position it for the future.

And that was my responsibility.
14 Q. Right. And that company became sort of caught into the Tesco Group, isn't that right?
A. Well, caught into -- we actually positively decided, there was a subgroup of the board, so not the whole board, which worked on, at the time, preparing for an IPO of that business. It was at a time when competitively, again to be euphemistic about it, we saw that we were going to have the guns of one of the big supermarket chains in the UK moving into Ireland. The question that we had strategically was: Do we take on those guns, in other words join with them, or do we allow them to be trained on us? Our decision was that we would sell to Tesco.
15 Q. Yes. Whatever way --
MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, I wonder about the relevance of this, subject to your views.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCGuinness, I think we are clearly going somewhere and I am happy to let it proceed.
16 Q. MR. ROGERS: I mean, this is quite different from IT change, this is big commercial stuff you are now involved in?
A. Absolutely. I mean, I was involved at a strategic level in the organisation, correct.
17 Q. Yes. And what I'm trying to see if I am right, really you did become quite heavily involved in what one might describe as corporate and directorial senior management?
A. Absolutely. I mean, I would say for the last 20 to 25
years of my private sector career I worked at executive board leve1 and indeed non-executive level, and in my final role, I was chief executive of a bank and chaired two other banks, one in Ireland and one in Luxembourg. Now my role in that one unfortunately was actually shutting it down. This was back in 2007/2008, where I was asked specifically to take on that role. So yes, I have got a very significant background at board level.
18 Q. Yes. Well, you have alluded to something now that is a little bit later, because the way your resumé goes, you 10:07 went from Tesco to Bank of Ireland --
A. Correct, I did.

19 Q. -- isn't that right? And the way you put it is, you were approached to go there?
A. That's correct, I was.

20 Q. So are you saying that you were headhunted, as it were?
A. Yes, I was.

21 Q. And was that by Anderson Consulting?
A. No. That was directly from Bank of Ireland.

22 Q. I see. And you were then with Bank of Ireland for I think seven years?
A. Seven years, yeah.

23 Q. Yes. And then the way you put it in your statement, what you said in your statement is you were approached by Hypo Real Estate?
A. Correct. Let me just check that now. Did I say I was approached by them?

24 Q. Yes, you do. The bottom of 2972.
A. Yes, sorry, that is correct. So let me explain
exactly, if that's what is needed, as to what went on there. My particular skill set was in large scale change management, that was my skill set. The last role that $I$ had taken on in Bank of Ireland was a significant restructuring of that group. We took what were 28 business units, each with their own back office functions and we consolidated them into what we called a manufacturing division and took out, from memory, about 200 million out of the cost base. So I was very heavily involved in restructuring banks, that was my background. what was going on at that point in time, and this is not particularly public knowledge, but it's long enough ago that I can talk about it; there were discussions going on between Hypo Real Estate Bank and Depfa Bank Plc with regard to effectively a merger, but 10:09 it would be positioned as a takeover of Depfa Bank Plc by Hypo Real Estate. I was approached to take on the role at executive board level, first of all in Depfa Bank, with a view that if and when -- and there was no certainty that it would actually happen, that if and when the acquisition happened, that I would move to Hypo Real Estate Bank and that I would take on the role of bringing those two organisations together.

25 Q. You see --
A. So, that's --

26 Q. So it's quite clear that as a matter of sequence, when you left Bank of Ireland you were approached, you say in your statement, by Hypo Real Estate, but in fact you went to Depfa Bank?
A. That is actually correct, yeah.

27 Q. So what it says in the statement is incorrect?
A. That's right, yeah.

Well, let's be clear: It is incorrect. what you told the inquirers of you is incorrect. In fact, you went directly to Depfa Bank in April 2007.
A. That's correct. I went to Depfa in April 2007 and then in October that consolidation happened.
29 Q. I will come to that. What I am anxious to establish is that when you say in your statement that you were approached by Hypo Real Estate, in fact it is the case that you were approached by Depfa Bank because that is where you went?
A. That is actually true. That is actually true.

30 Q. What I am saying is true?
A. what you are saying is true.
A. Yeah.

32 Q. And isn't it the case that in fact you became the chief Operating officer of Depfa Bank?
A. That was the original appointment, yes.
A. That was my first appointment.

34 Q. Yes. And in fact, we don't really need to get into an awful lot of the banking engagements that ensued, but isn't it the case that Depfa was in serious trouble and in May 2007 they made a debt issuance in respect of which you were one of the signatories, as a non-executive director of Depfa Bank?
A. I think you may be mixing up Depfa Bank and Depfa ACS Bank. So Depfa ACS Bank is a subsidiary of Depfa Bank, of which I was a director.
Q. Right. But it's within the Depfa group, is that right?
A. Yeah, it is within the Depfa group. And that was the function of Depfa ACS Bank; was to issue what were called covered bonds. So yes, in the normal course of its business there would be regular issuance of securities.

Yeah. You see, in fact, the Hypo Real Estate
engagement with Depfa didn't mature until the acquisition of Depfa was agreed in 1ate July 2007, isn't that right?
A. That would be around about right, yeah.

37 Q. Yeah. And in fact, you were the actual Acting CEO of Depfa Bank from September '08 to December '10, isn't that right?
A. So I can explain what went on there? So, in August of 2008, when I was Chief operating officer at that point in time on the board of Hypo Real Estate Group, which
by then owned Depfa Bank, we had an issue -- sorry, Depfa Bank had an issue with the Regulator and the specific issue was, $I$ don't need to go into it, but the then CEO --
38 Q. I am not asking you to get into it. If you feet it's necessary, fine.
A. Well, I originally didn't feel it necessary, so in my statement I didn't see how this related to the Commission but I want to make sure that I answer all of
your questions.
39 Q. The concern I have is --
A. So if you would let me finish that, then. So, I was -so the then-Chief Executive of Depfa Bank in August 2008 1eft the business because there was a significant issue. I was asked in August of 2008 to take over that role as Chief Executive of Depfa Bank and to basically sort it out, for want of a better term. One of the biggest issues that I identified at that point in time was the relationship between Depfa Bank and its executive, and the Regulator in Dublin, which I immediately went on to try and fix. Subsequent to that then, not very long afterwards, there was implosion in banking markets, both in Ireland and across the world, in effect. Depfa Bank and Hypo Real Estate Bank were badly affected by that, and Hypo Real Estate was, to a11 intents and purposes, nationalised by the German Government. Now, I was asked at that point -- sorry, the other thing I need to say here is that there was significant difference of view between the German Government and the Irish Government as to who -- and the German Regulator and the Irish Regulator as to who was responsible for the support of Depfa Bank and Hypo -- sorry, specifically Depfa Bank. Hypo Real Estate was clearly German Government. I was asked to take up -- sorry, there were two directors of Hypo Real Estate Bank who were asked to remain after that implosion; I was one, there was one other, who was American. And all the other directors exited the bank
at that stage. This was when it was in German Government control. I was asked to continue my role in Depfa Bank as CEO and I had two main mandates: One was to manage the relationship between the German regulators and the Irish regulators and indeed the Irish Government and German Government so that relations didn't break down. That was one mandate. The second mandate was actually to all intents and purposes shut down Depfa Bank. So, I proceeded to shut down offices all across the world. We exited a large number of the staff of Depfa Bank and that was my mandate, which I pursued for about three years. So that would have -- so that was the situation. My role then in Depfa Bank -- sorry, I suppose the focus of Depfa Bank then changed. The decision was by German Government. It changed so that we were looking to sell it to see what value could be got from Depfa Bank by sale rather than through winding it down over a long period. At that point, I had no background in capital markets and in that particular type of transaction. At 10:18 that point, we put in a CEO and it was important from the markets' point of view that we do that, put in a CEO into Depfa Bank Tom Glynn, who was the other director who had been asked to stay on back in 2008, 2009. He had a capital markets background and he took it forward to try and position for sale. I continued with what would be called the Chief Operating Officer type role, which was again shutting down and taking cost out of Depfa Bank. That is the totality.

40 Q. So you reverted to the role of Chief Operating Officer in January 2011, I think, and continued in that role until your resignation as a director on 31st December 2012?
A. That's correct. My contract was finished at that point 10:18 in time and $I$ decided not to renew it.

Really how all this arises is, $I$ was asking you about your role in the corporate world, and you had set it out for the Tribunal in your statement in your answers to their questions. "I have been asked to provide --" You say at 17 on page 2972:
"I have been asked to provide a brief background to myself in respect of my career to date and particularly detailing my career in An Garda Síochána."

But in that resumé, although you have spent some few minutes here now describing the very significant contribution you made to Depfa Bank in the period 2007 to 2012, in fact it's not mentioned in your statement.
A. Again, if you take the question: "I have been asked to provide a brief background to myself in respect of my career to date and particularly detailing my career in An Garda Síochána."
42 Q. Yes. I just find it --
A. And that is what I did. And I certainly at that point in time wouldn't have thought that the Disclosures Tribunal was particularly concerned about Depfa Bank.

43 Q. No. But you didn't -- Depfa Bank was your employer for
five years and you didn't mention it, isn't that right?
A. For -- I was part of the -- so again, let me go back -Depfa Bank was your employer. That seems to be a simple question.
A. For four months -- sorry, for six months. So take it from April of 2007 to October 2007. But, as you said yourself, in July the agreement had been made, informal agreement that the takeover was to happen.
But you weren't employed at that point by Hypo Real Estate?
A. That is what I said. I said that I was employed by Depfa Bank from April until October 2007. In October, the acquisition happened, and I was employed by Hypo Real Estate group. That is what happened. So that was the situation. It then back in -- at the end of 2009.
46 Q. Can I suggest to you it was only until September 2008 that you were employed by Hypo Real Estate?
A. September 2008 -- No, that is not correct. It was actually, I think, the end of -- and this is the formal position, I think the end of 2009, was my memory of it. ${ }^{0: 21}$ Because I think that was the point when I came back to Depfa Bank. So I am trying to get this clear in my mind. It's ten years ago, just on the dates. So '07 I was six months with Depfa. 2007. So, yeah, then to the end of 2008, that is correct.
A. So, I beg your pardon. So to the end of 2008. And I actually stepped down from the board --
48 Q. of what?
A. -- of Hypo Real Estate Bank at that point in time, and that is correct. And then I came back to Ireland -sorry, I had been in Ireland since August of 2008 as Chief Executive of Depfa Bank, but employed by Hypo Real Estate at that point in time. I stepped down from 10:22 the board of Hypo Real Estate at the end of 2008, and my sole focus, because the world had imploded, my sole focus was on Depfa Bank as CEO.
49 Q. By whom you were employed for the next three-and-a-half years?
A. Correct. Absolutely. Yeah.
Q. Exactly. And we wouldn't have known that and the investigators here weren't told that, isn't that right, by you?
A. Well, that's correct. Again, I go back: "I have been asked to provide a brief background to myself in respect of my career to date and particularly detailing my career in An Garda Síochána." I had no sense that the Tribunal was interested in my career in Depfa Bank and the banking situation at the time.
51 Q. But you had a very significant contribution in Depfa?
A. Absolutely.

52 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Absolutely.

53 Q. And it must have been a massive segment of your past experience, recent past experience --
A. Oh, yeah, absolutely.

54 Q. -- to report and record for the Tribunal so that they would know where you had come from?
A. Well, again --
Q. Isn't that right?
A. I go back to what I was asked, right.
Q. I see.
A. I was asked to be brief, right. And I was asked to focus particularly on An Garda Síochána. That is what I did.

57 Q. Yeah. And I mean, when you say that you were approached by Hypo Real Estate, the reality is that you were approached in 2007 by Depfa?
A. Correct, it was actually -- yes, that is correct.

58 Q. Yes. Now, I just want to ask you a couple of questions about yesterday, if you don't mind.
A. Not at all.

59 Q. Because I noted that you, on a couple of occasions,
A. Is there a copy of --

CHAIRMAN: We are getting you one now.
MR. ROGERS: It will come up now.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are getting it for you. If you
wouldn't mind hanging on a minute, Mr. Rogers. It's only down the corridor, as I say, and we will get the paper copy.
MR. ROGERS: I will move on to something else for the minute, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: If you like.
MR. ROGERS: I will try to do that.
60 Q. We will leave that for a minute, Mr. Dunne, if you don't mind, until we get organised. I just want to ask
you something about yesterday in relation to the meetings and I just want to be clear. I want you to understand, Mr. Dunne, I am not challenging you about this.
A. No.

61 Q. I think there may be an error, but I am not sure, and I can't find it out, are you sure there were four meetings on the 25th? Could it that be there were three meetings on the 25 th and one on the 26th, early on the 26th?
A. I'm not aware of any meeting on the 26th.

62 Q. Yeah?
A. But I do know that there were four meetings -- sorry, I need to be very specific. I do know that there were three meetings, because those were the three I was at, and I'm told that there was a fourth meeting, which was with Sergeant McCabe, which I absolutely accept, to be clear, I can't -- I wasn't at it.
Yes. Just to see if I can clear this up. I wonder could we put up page 4871 for a moment. Mr. Dunne, this document is the transcript, the transcribing of Mr. Ruane's note.
A. What page is it? I beg your pardon.

64 Q. 4871.
A. Volume 9 .

65 Q. Just look at that for a second.
A. Yes, I have 4871.

66 Q. If you just, if you just look at it for a minute so to familiarise yourself with it because I suspect, and I
don't mean any challenge to you, I suspect that it was by reference to this document that you concluded that there was a meeting early on the morning of the 25 th, earlier in the day on the 25th. If you just look at it for a moment. You see there the Commissioner, yourself, Mr. McLough1in, Mr. Ruane - I don't know who MM is - Frank Walsh and Mr. Twomey, Commissioner Twomey. Do you see those --
A. I do.

67 Q.
-- listed. If we go down through it very quickly, I will bring you to a point which is four lines from the bottom of the page please. Do you see the word "Comm" arrow "Decision 8:30pm last night, need a point quickly"? Do you see that?
A. I do see that, yes.

68 Q. I want to suggest to you that that suggests to a reader who was possibly a little bit sceptical about the date on the top of the memo, do you see " 25 " to is on the top, if you were doubtful about that, that possibly Mr. Ruane wrote 25 instead of 26 , one could read this memo as, in fact, indicating that the Commissioner had convened a meeting the morning after the long evening meeting when you were talking about Mr. Barrett on the phone, and that she -- in this, she refers to that meeting:
"Decision 8:30 p.m. last night, need to appoint quickly."

That would seem to refer to the matters that were referred to in the meeting of the evening of the 25 th wherein it was decided to introduce various, what I wil1 call mediative agents such as Mr. Mulvey, Mr. Kerr, I think there is a Mr. McGahon or McMahon as we11. I just want to -- could it be, Mr. Dunne, that in fact this meeting was on the following day? Because my client wasn't at the meeting that you describe and he wasn't at this meeting either. You say it was on the -- you thought it was on the 25th. I am just suggesting to you that perhaps there were not four on the 25th, perhaps there were three, and that on the following day, the 26th, there was a review on the morning when the Commissioner sought -- if one goes through this note, you will see you were there, if you just look up -- go down five lines from the top of it, four lines from the top of it it:
"Commissioner, JB and BOB meeting. Issues raised."

Do you see that?
A. On page 48 --

69 Q. This is 4871. Three lines down from the top:
"Commissioner" arrow "JB and BOB meeting. Issues
raised: Position not to engage on PD, HRM take any concerns seriously, appoint an independent person and work with us, independent panel or person."

That seems to suggest that, in fact, the meeting between Mr. Barrett and Mr. McCabe had happened with Mr. Barry O'Brien, isn't that right?
A. I don't see any reference there to the meeting with Mr. McCabe.

70 Q. No, but if you look at it, Barry O'Brien and John Barrett, the only other meeting they had together was with Mr. McCabe, and the Commissioner refers to issues raised, and it's in the past tense. So it can only have been the meeting that was yesterday, the 25th. I am suggesting that to you.
A. That is not my -- that is not my recollection.

71 Q. A11 right. We11, so you are saying then that -- I entirely respect that, Mr. Dunne, I want you to understand this, I am just trying to make sure that we al1 have it right.
A. Sure.

72 Q. It does look like, when you look at the bottom of the page when there is a reference to the "decision of 8:30pm last night, need appoint quickly" that is the Commissioner actually referring to something that happened the day before, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, absolutely. It's referring to the day before.

73 Q. Yes. And if you go over the page then at the top of the page, you will see the Commissioner makes an intervention in three lines and then there is yourself:

[^0]Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q.
"Someone. JB and Mr. MCCabe. Emai1."

We don't know what that is, but that seems to refer to last night as well, doesn't it?
A. That does, yeah. It refers to the previous night.
Q. Yeah. And then if you go down the page a little -well, if we look at it from the bottom up, if you go up to the indent where there is a reference to the Commissioner, with an arrow:
"JB touch base. Holding response Minister."

Do you see all of that?
A. I do.

76 Q. And that would seem to contemplate that the section 41 response would be possibly held or delayed a little.
There is no point being made about that except that it would appear to be a review meeting, isn't that right?
A. I'm -- I don't -- I don't particularly take that from it, but --

77 Q. I see.
A. -- if you could elaborate.

78 Q. Yes. If we go to the next page, please, 4873. If you look at the very end of that, we see the reference there to -- six lines down from the end of that, there is a reference to the Commissioner, Mr. Kerr, James Doherty. Then yourself:
"Action and ratifying 8:30pm decision. who is available and interested?"

The Commissioner says. And then there is a list of names, including possibly a retired judge or an SC.
"Must ensure safe and harmonious place of work for Mr. McCabe."

I simply suggest to you that that seems to be open to the construction that in fact the meetings were three on the 25 th and one early on the 26th. Are you unsure?
A. I'm not, actually.

79 Q. I see.
A. I am not, actually. Sorry, I beg your pardon, in your reading of it and what you have taken out, you could construct that. That is not my recollection is really what I am saying.
80 Q. I see. Okay. I will come back to those meetings in a minute. I think you now have the transcript of yesterday, do you? If you look at page 105, you wil1 see 517 on that page. I think you are being asked questions here by me, and if you just look at 517, you see:
"What I don't understand is if you didn't have the level of recollection how it was you were able to say that Mr. Barrett may have been wrong or how is it you
are able to say now that Mr. Barrett may have been wrong about those who were present at the meeting?"

And then you answer:
"Because I knew that I was never in a position to be briefing Mr. Barrett on a broad range that would give the Tribunal insight into the manner in which Sergeant McCabe and the issues that had been raised by him were perceived in Garda Headquarters at that time. So I was 10:36 very specific in my mind that $I$ was not briefing and I think that that has been borne out. So think of my position when these are presented to me."

And this is the bit that I just want you to have regard 10:36 to. The transcript seems to be spinning now. We are on page 105 of the transcript. Have you got it there now in your hand?
A. Yes, I have.

81 Q. Mr. Quinn tells me that perhaps we have the wrong day up, that that is the -- we want 56. So I will just continue reading what is next in the passage. You say:
"And I think that has been borne out. So think of my position when these are presented to me. I have been presented with a claim that $I$ have said that we are going after him in the Commission. Okay. I read this part of the statement which was presented to me and I read it -- I read into that, that that would be
indicating that $I$ was, as $I$ would call it, a directing mind in this whole thing and that the directing mind was going after Maurice McCabe in the Commission. And that was far from the truth. okay. And that is why I said what I did, and it was in an effort to help the Tribunal to see all what was going on."

Okay. If you will just hold that in your mind for a moment, and if you wouldn't mind just going then to page 108, and if you look at 528. I had asked you a question in 527:
"There was no reason for you to be reserved, withdrawn, careful that it would contaminate your answer in respect of that meeting."

And you said:
"Oh, I was very concerned. Yeah."

I said:
"Yeah."

And you respond then:
"Right. And the reason, and the reason I was concerned was because in one of the paragraphs that I was shown Mr. Barrett said that Cyril Dunne said "We are going
after him in the Commission". So that very much drew me into or represented me as directing things and calling it as to what should happen. So that was one statement. And this one that we are talking about now, what worried me or concerned me about what was being said here, and that was misleading, was that myself and the Commissioner had briefed a series of named officers as to what was going on. Because if you take those two together, it also said, you know, this particular one says that $I$ am directing or have a level of knowledge of what is going on that I simply did not have. That was my concern when I read it."

Now, I just want to -- frankly, the significance of the word "directing" didn't occur to me when you were speaking yesterday, and it does seem, Mr. Dunne, that you were concerned, yesterday, to explain yourself in terms of what I will call your concern, agitation, about what was said by Mr. Barrett because of the word or what is implied by the idea that you might be "a directing mind in this whole thing" or that what he said you said implied that you were directing things and calling it, or that you were directing. Am I right that in fact your response to Mr. Barrett, and what he said, arose from that concern that it might be represented that you were a directing mind in respect of what was going on or might -- sorry, might go on at the O'Higgins Commission?
A. That was one of my concerns, absolutely.
A. And the reason for that is because I had nothing other than what I could say, I had no documentation, I had no access to anything, and I clearly read this as saying two things: One was that Sergeant McCabe was going to be going -- gone after at the Commission, that was one; and secondly, that the "we" implied clearly or insinuated that $I$ was involved in that. And the briefing point was where I was concerned -- why was I concerned about the use of the word briefing? It was because that that gave an impression that I was, with the Commissioner, actually directing, quote-unquote, what was going on. So yes, I was absolutely concerned about that.
83 Q. Yes.
A. But I was also -- and I said this yesterday: I was particularly concerned as well that the Tribunal would be given the same impression as I was given. And I frankly couldn't understand the level of specificity on the one side, or in part, of each of the extracts that I was shown, and then the complete vagueness in other parts. And I just couldn't understand what was going on, and that's why I said it. --
84 Q. Yes. You were concerned that --
A. Absolutely.
-- that you were being represented as having a directing role, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that really is the burden of what you said
yesterday; that you were concerned about that?
A. I said two things yesterday, I think. I said -because you asked me was my concern solely for myself, and I won't quote it but I will go to it now in a moment, to the detriment of the understanding of the Commission -- of the Tribunal, I beg your pardon. And if I could go on, maybe, because I do have concerns, so if we go on -- yes. So, what you were putting to me yesterday, Mr. Rogers, was that -- and I am at 529 on 109, so I am in the same conversation. You put to me:
"The Tribunal wouldn't have known anything about those meetings if we had, or if there had been no disclosure by Mr. Barrett of the detail of the meetings in the course of his evidence. You told the Tribunal nothing about the meetings of the 25th February."

Was what you said. And I agreed with you in the statement. And then if you go on, I think I was asked, if I can find it, there was a statement where -- yes, at 534, I say:
"I have been asked whether I recall that meeting, right, as referred to by Mr. John Barrett. That was what I was asked. And I said no. However, I went on to say in my response, which I believe was helpful to the Tribunal that actually one of the attendees that Mr. Barrett said was there would have detailed notes. The Tribunal then got these notes."

I will go on to the next bit in a moment.
CHAIRMAN: No. If we can just perhaps try and focus on an issue, because I actually was here yesterday and I'm listening to all of it. So --
A. Can I put one sentence?

CHAIRMAN: If you wish, please.
A. I now know, because I went back and looked at just the documentation of the Tribuna1, and what was put to me was that the Tribunal would not have known other than by the intervention of the solicitor of Mr. Barrett, would not have known about those meetings and those notes. I believe that is incorrect. Because on the 12th Mr. Ruane gave evidence to those meetings. In that evidence Mr. Marrinan asked him did he have any notes, he said he did. Mr. Marrinan asked him to provide those notes, he said he would. In the letter then on the 17th from Noble Solicitors to the Tribunal, Noble Solicitors actually refer back to the evidence of Mr. Ruane and back to the notes. So the contention that the Tribunal would not have known other than through --
CHAIRMAN: I actually appreciate the point you are making and I realised it was incorrect at the time when the question was put but I didn't want to interrupt.
A. I beg your pardon.

MR. ROGERS: We11, I wonder, I think there was a letter from Noble Solicitors on the 5th January -- 5th January, raising the question of Mr. Ruane's notes.

CHAIRMAN: Sure. But we heard all of Mr. Ruane's evidence.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Including the meetings, etcetera.
MR. ROGERS: I think the point is that the notes which referred to the meeting of the 25th February, meetings of 25th February arose from questions raised by Noble Solicitors.

CHAIRMAN: It may be that I'm asked to sort that out, but I am determined I am not going to sort it out. I have got enough to sort out myself. It's just one thing that does worry me, though, is going back to what the core allegation against Mr. Dunne is, that he was asked to remain after a meeting and that he said we are going after Maurice McCabe, that is how it was put here 10:47 in the Commission, and that Mr. Barrett turned and said, you must be joking, and Mr. Barrett's observation in evidence was:
"It seemed odd in the context of the work we had done. I didn't understand it until after the fact. I find it shocking in the context of the cottage industry that was around seeking to improve the working conditions in Mullingar. I went and checked the terms of reference of the O'Higgins Commission. Cyril Dunne sat at the apex of the organisation with three others and must have discussed it, meaning the O'Higgins Commission, even though he had no responsibility."

That is the allegation against Mr. Dunne. It's a very serious allegation.
87 Q. MR. ROGERS: You see, yesterday, you gave evidence in respect of the meetings on the 25 th, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

88 Q. And those meetings, one of them was a meeting which occurred in your office about lunchtime on the 25 th and it was a meeting with the Commissioner, Chief Superintendent Barry O'Brien, as he then was, I think he was Chief Superintendent then, is that right?
A. That's correct.

89 Q. And then Mr. Barrett. So there were four people there. And in that meeting, all of which of -- these meetings were all happening in the context of the urgent emails that had been received by various office-holders, ministers, An Taoiseach, the Commissioner, from Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And Mr. Barrett says that at that meeting he was briefed about how he would find Sergeant McCabe, do you recal1 that?
A. I do.

91 Q. Yeah.
A. I do.

92 Q. And --
A. But not by me.

93 Q. No. No. But you were there?
A. Oh, yes, absolutely.

94 Q. Yeah. And I think there was an expectation that

Mr. McCabe would come to the meeting that day with his solicitor?
A. I don't particularly recall that, but I accept that.
Q. Yeah. And do you recall Mr . Barrett being warned that he would be recorded?
A. I don't know -- I don't know whether it would have been in the context of a warning, but certainly I was aware that there were meetings with Sergeant McCabe at the time which for very good reason he was recording. So I don't particularly recollect it but $I$ can absolutely imagine that it would be something that would be said. issues would be raised respecting his recent complaints he would become evasive or fidgety?
A. I don't actually recall that.

97 Q. Now, the meeting occurred between Sergeant McCabe and the two other officers and Mr. Barrett --

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Mr. Rogers, I don't mean to interrupt unnecessarily. I am just, I suppose, words kind of jump out at me and fidgety and evasive, I don't think I have heard that before and I am wondering where it comes from, if anywhere. That if he was asked about recent matters he was involved in he would become fidgety and evasive, I am just wondering, where is that? Where does that come from? I mean, none of --
who was at the meeting who could make that report? Mr. McGuinness, am I getting something wrong? MR. MCGUINNESS: I think there may be a passing reference to it in one of the notes.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. We11 then, thank you for correcting me. Sorry for interrupting, Mr. Rogers.
MR. ROGERS: Thank you.
98 Q.
We know that the meeting then ensued with Sergeant McCabe and the chief superintendent. It was a much longer meeting than people expected, isn't that right?
A. I don't personally remember an expectation about it -at the length of the meeting. But I do accept the evidence that has been given, which was that there was an expectation that it was going to be an hour and that 10:52 it lasted almost three hours. to direct this to the issue that the chairperson has just raised. The purpose here was to form an engagement with Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

101 Q. At the very -- which was directed from the very highest 10:53 levels of An Garda Síochána?
A. From the -- I now know that, yes, that the Commissioner, or Acting Commissioner at the time, had personally written to Mr. Barrett, so, yes, that's correct.

102 Q. Yes. And we've seen the letter that was written, directing this engagement, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

Commissioner as being necessary and of enormous significance?
A. I believe it was seen as being necessary and of enormous significance by just about everybody. But yes, absolutely by the Commissioner. from Superintendent Frank walsh.
A. Sorry, I beg your pardon, which volume is that -sorry, I have it. 3013?

105 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I have it here.
Q. Yes. So with this was attached certain email correspondence from Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. It's referring to email correspondence from Sergeant McCabe, yes, dated 22nd February.
Q. And that was actually attached?
A. Sorry, I missed that last point? I beg your pardon.
Q. That the correspondence was actually attached? I think it's a fact that it was. It says in the first sentence:
"I am directed by the Commissioner to forward the attached email."
A. Yes, yes. Obvious7y it was.

109 Q. And then it says:
"As discussed, you should liaise with Assistant Commissioner Fanning and Chief Superintendent O'Brien and thereafter contact should be made with Sergeant

McCabe to arrange a face-to-face meeting. At the meeting at this office on 12th February last the only issue raised by Sergeant McCabe was in relation to not being able to appear before a named district judge while his solicitor, Mr. Costello, referred to a toxic work environment, ongoing harassment and lack of action by local Garda management. He also asked whether the people Maurice had identified were going to be interviewed. Sergeant McCabe should be asked to identify the exact issues, incidents, personnel which 1ed him to him leaving work on Saturday night last and whether these were brought to the attention of the local management team in Mullingar. Please arrange and provide an update to this office today to facilitate an update for the Department who are also in receipt of correspondence from Sergeant McCabe."

So it's quite clear that, $I$ suggest to you, that it would not normally be the case that a Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, would be engaged in what I would call the micromanagement of events happening in a particular Garda station which were of the nature of disputes between individual Gardaí who might be assigned to this or that, isn't that right? That would be most unusual?
A. That would be most unusual.

110 Q. Yes. And it's quite clear that this had been elevated on to a level of management, departmental and ministerial interest, that the Commissioner was
concerned to ensure that there was direct intervention with Sergeant McCabe on foot of her direction, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely.

111 Q. So this was a major step now, and the meeting that you were involved with Mr. Barrett and Mr. O'brien and the Commissioner, was a meeting which was the lead-on from this letter, this direction to Mr. Barrett?
A. It was after that, yes.

112 Q. Yes.
A. Yes. I wasn't specifically aware of this particular letter at that point in time.
113 Q. Yes. But you knew the general background.
A. oh yeah.

114 Q. Mr. McCabe had, from 2014, become -- from January 2014, had become a noted figure in the public domain who was in dispute with An Garda Síochána?
A. Oh, absolutely.

115 Q. Yeah. So I mean, we know the content of the meeting because you have received -- I wonder could we put up 3019, please. You received the report of John Barrett in respect of the meeting that he and Chief Superintendent O'Brien had with Mr. McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

116 Q. And have you read this recently?
A. Yes.

117 Q. Right. We11, we have all read it here, and it is a long, detailed, resumé of the two-and-a-half hours
meeting and it seems to indicate a level of engagement with Sergeant McCabe was achieved, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely. I read it as extraordinarily positive at the time. And still do.
118 Q. Yes. And it was a most useful event, carried out by the Chief Superintendent and Mr. Barrett, which seemed to involve some commitment on the part of Sergeant McCabe, on the one hand, to desist from intermittent or ongoing communication to officers at all ranks and levels of organisation and a commitment on the part of An Garda Síochána, voiced through Mr. Barrett, to engage with Mr. McCabe, Sergeant McCabe, in a meaningful way?
A. Correct.

119 Q. Isn't that right?
A. That is absolutely right and I thought it actually a very positive step at the time.
120 Q. Yes. And I think we are all agreed about that, that that was a major hurdle crossed, an achievement?
A. Yes.

121 Q. Okay. Now, it would appear to have been so good that ye all convened later in the day, sometime about 6:40, we know from Mr. Ken Ruane's note, and there was a protracted meeting, which we have gone through here in the past, you have read it recently, I take it, the note of the meeting, will we call it a sort of a plenary meeting, to which Mr. Barrett called in and which went on until nearly half eight or so that night?
A. That's correct, yeah. It was particularly to debrief
from Chief Superintendent O'brien and from Mr. Barrett as to what had gone on at the meeting, how that meeting had gone, which turned out to be, as we see, very, very positive, and what other steps we might take on the back of that.

122 Q. Yes. And the steps that were going to be taken were really discussed in some detail at the meeting of the evening on the phone and in the Commissioner's conference room. It was a detailed meeting, and it embarked upon touching on and discussing individually measures that might be taken in respect of improving the relationship between An Garda Síochána and Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. I think so.

123 Q. That is the general drift of it?
A. I think that is the general drift. Maybe if you could remind me where the notes of the meeting are.
124 Q. If you go to 4860 .
A. 4860?

125 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I have that.
Q. Now, I know you wanted to see it. Is there anything in it that you want to draw attention to?
A. No, not particularly. I thought you were going to ask me particular questions, that is why I --
127 Q. I know. You agree generally with what I have just said about it, about this meeting?
A. That it was a debrief from --

128 Q. Yes.
A. -- the earlier meeting and it was --
Q. Yes. But in essence -- sorry, in reality, it's more than that, than a debrief, because doesn't something come across in it very powerfully, and that is this: That the Commissioner was deeply committed to finding a 11:03 resolution?
A. Oh, absolutely.
Q. Yeah?
A. Yes. And others, actually. But led very much -- very much led by the Commissioner.
Q. The most important person in the room was the Commissioner, she had directed this move to -- that Barrett and O'Brien would meet McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. And we are dealing now with the outcome of that.
A. Yes.
Q. So she had the fruits of that step?
A. Yes.
Q. And she was moving on from that, isn't that correct?
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. And I just want to put it to you, I mean it's no mistake on her part and it couldn't be in any way second-thoughted that you were in the room as the Chief Administration officer?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. I mean, this was of singular importance to you as the

Chief Administration Officer?
A. At that point in time, in terms of my role and my brief, it didn't encompass actually dealing with the specific issues. Was I concerned? Absolutely, with the generality of it. My view, but -- and I think I said it yesterday, it is only a view. My view as to why I was engaged at this point in time, because this was my first engagement around the issues raised by Sergeant McCabe, my view is that the Commissioner, because she often did this, brought me in to bring an alternative perspective if one needed to be brought. And again, I think I said yesterday that the style that we had between us was a style that she was trying to develop across the whole of the organisation, and that would be one where it was a challenging and questioning style. That is why I believe I was brought into this, particularly when I was -- and this was actually in the earlier meeting, I would say the only concern I had was that there was group think going on, and that group think was, we11, what we need to do is find somewhere different for Sergeant McCabe, and I wasn't comfortable with that or just accepting that, but I actually challenged it earlier, $I$ actually said -- my point of view was that the issues that had been identified by -sorry, I hate to say the issues with Maurice McCabe, because that is not what I mean. Maurice McCabe's issues may not be resolved simply by finding somewhere different for him to work, right. And I put that challenge to make sure that that wasn't what we were
defaulting into. It was clear to me from the response to that, by the way, that that had been considered, right, and I remember particularly Chief Superintendent o'brien at the time was saying, you know, if we don't have somewhere for him to work, it could be seen -because I was thinking would we agree with him, and I do say agree, agree with him that he might stay at home, okay, and Chief Superintendent o'brien, who had obviously thought about it said, from my recollection, that that would give an indication that Sergeant McCabe was running away and we didn't want to have that. That was my recollection of it.
138 Q. Yeah.
A. It's a long --

139 Q. It might help you there if you look at 4863.
A. 4863. Yes.

140 Q. You are caught there at about 15 lines from the bottom:
"CAO: Insolvable problem. Normalised versus McCabe interpretation.

1. Waved magic wand... part reform.
2. Always investigation will not change dynamic, problem our employee."

And then another point is made by you:
"1. Somewhere else for him.
2. Search, he has more problems.

In agree McCabe, stay at home.

If he sought: at home while we solve issue."

And then Chief Superintendent O'Brien is recorded:
"People go out sick as running cover. I have to go home. No place to put this guy. Surely we have a place for $x$ to go."

And then you and the Commissioner come into it and the Commissioner expressed concern about the paid leave precedent. Something about forcing him out. I suppose the difficulty with that.
"If what MCC is saying "endemic culture and behaviour issues". Points of contact, no faith and trust."

And those words that are there, you have put it quite differently, but it's catching the same issue, isn't it?
A. Yes.

141 Q. This question of taking him off the pitch, as it were, or putting him somewhere else, isn't the solution, is what you are saying you were saying and the Commissioner as well?
A. What I said was that that was my challenge.

142 Q. what?
A. What I said was that that was my challenge.

143 Q. I see.
A. Because I was concerned, because in my experience in
these types of situations, what can happen is that the objective becomes fluffy - I can't think of a better word - it becomes unclear, and I was afraid to make sure that we hadn't just come to a point where everybody was actually trying to find a different place 11:09 for sergeant McCabe. That was not the problem, right. The problem was that Sergeant McCabe was in a situation which was absolutely unsustainable. I had also felt that, in looking at what had been going on that there was a level of volatility. And what I mean by that is that Sergeant McCabe, we would find for a period that actually there was a positive role for him, but that it would become an issue again for him like this, for example, this had blown up. In my view, that was probably stress-related. My sense at the time was that 1:10 Sergeant McCabe must be under a serious amount of stress. And again, in this context here, I wasn't sure that even finding the right job for him, for a period, would make it any less stressful for him, that there would come a point where he would find it untenable again and that is what I was trying to get to.
144 Q. Yes.
A. And I believe, I can't say it, I haven't discussed it with her, but I believe that it was that type of challenge that the Commissioner wanted me to bring. Because that is the type of relationship that we had. And it was the type of challenging relationship that we wanted to instill into the organisation, which the organisation found difficult to digest at that point;
found it very strange, found it very strange that I would challenge the Commissioner, right, and but it was something that was very, very important to us. That is all.

Are you seeking to convey, and I am not challenging you on this, are you seeking to convey that in these notes there is an indication of you challenging the Commissioner to take the type of thinking that you are suggesting?
A. I was clearly here, and this is my absolute recollection, what I was trying to do was challenge the debate around, we11, what is the right job for Maurice McCabe or the right position for Maurice McCabe. That was what I was concerned, that we drifted into that as being the problem. I didn't see it necessarily that that was the problem that needed to be resolved. I saw it as something much bigger than that, and that by just doing that we could have in X months' time have had another issue --
146 Q. Yeah?
A. -- for Sergeant Maurice McCabe, that we wouldn't actually have moved it on.
147 Q. If you look at 4864 there for a minute. There is an intervention in the very middle of the page there you will see "JB", Mr. Barrett?
A. Yes.
Q. "McCabe, loads of engagement, not dealing substance issues." Do you see that?
A. Yes.

149 Q. Is that really what you are talking about; that there could be lots of engagement but we are not really dealing with the substance of it?
A. Not actually, no. No. It was more that from Maurice McCabe's -- I am actually just reading that. It probably does actually say the same type of thing. Yeah, it probably does.
150 Q. Yes. I suggest to you it does, and that I want to suggest to you this: That in fact yourself and Mr. Barrett -- arising from the meeting that had ensued 11:13 with Mr. McCabe on the 25th, yourself and Mr. Barrett were very much concurring in a view about all of this?
A. Oh, I think there was a general concurrence. So that meeting in the evening when we were debriefed after the meeting with Maurice McCabe, we would have taken it as very, very positive and a very positive engagement, absolutely. And Mr. Barrett would have, I think, taken it that way, I took it way, I believe the Commissioner took it that way, so it was seen as positive.
151 Q. Yeah. And I don't want to get caught up in the detail of what is in these pages here, but it's quite clear that strategies involving the engagement of third parties such as Mr. Mulvey, Mr. Kerr and a Mr. McMahon, all of these strategies were being discussed in the course of the evening of the meeting with Mr. McCabe?
A. Absolutely, yeah.

152 Q. Yes. And could I just suggest to you that Mr. Barrett's reportage or brief to the meeting by telephone was that, in fact, he and Chief

Superintendent O'Brien had an engagement with Sergeant McCabe which was quite different from what he, Barrett, had expected, that in fact it became a much more positive engagement by Sergeant McCabe?
A. Oh, I think -- I think that's right. And I think everybody felt that this was a very, very positive engagement. So we took a lot of comfort, actually, I would have said, that evening, having heard the debrief.

Yes. So if we just look at 4867, at the top of the page you seem to be making a specific suggestion about engaging McCabe with future deployment, "Start tomorrow. Tony McLough1in can engage"; is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.

154 Q. And what would that have meant?
A. So that was about, from my recollection, Chief Superintendent McLough1in engaging with Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and Chief Superintendent McLough1in engaging from that following day, that is the "starting tomorrow", with Sergeant McCabe about what his -- what 11:16 future role would work for him. That was my understanding.
155 Q. And that was, in fact, a very big step because Sergeant McCabe now was in a sense being asked to opt into a discussion which was, in a sense, open-ended as regards 11:16 his role, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's right.

156 Q. And I think that it would have been clear at this stage that Sergeant McCabe in a sense was yearning for some
engagement, in the sense that he had been involved with this Garda Síochána Professional Standards Unit review of the penalty points problem, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

157 Q. And he had had significant personal satisfaction out of doing that work, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

158 Q. So it wasn't as though he was an unproven entity; this fellow was somebody who could be worked with and would engage in something that engaged him, isn't that right? 1:17
A. That's correct.

159 Q. So if you just go on then, please, to the next page, 6868 -- 4868. And you will see there there is a block in the bottom half of the page where the Commissioner says to Mr. McLoughlin and Mr. O'brien to contact him and then there is a discussion about who the individuals would be and those names are there, do you see those names, Ultan, Cassells, Mulvey, McLoone, those names, these are the third parties, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

160 Q. And then if you look at the bottom of the page, there is "CAO" and you are going through a number of indents there, making points about particular persons that would be useful on policies and procedures, isn't that 11:18 right?
A. I think that's correct, yeah.

161 Q. Yes. And I just want to remind you, do you remember when I asked you earlier about the meeting that I
suggested might have been on the following day, this seems to be the decision being made at 8:30 on the 25 th, this section here, the lower half of this page, indeed all of this page and the previous page about Mr. McLoughlin -- Chief Superintendent McLoughlin engaging, all of that appears to be decision-making about how to proceed and then the following -- I suggest to you that what we spoke about earlier sort of fits into that context as an event that happened afterwards?
A. I actually don't agree. Sorry, I think you could take that, you could take that just simply from this page. However, my understanding was that there was engagement and discussions, particularly around Tony Kerr, which had gone on significantly before that, before my
involvement at all. Remember, I only came in on the 25th. That actually these had been discussions that had been going on for quite a period of time. So it's not that there was a decision on that evening, for example, to engage Tony Kerr, right. There was a
discussion, I remember, about -- I would have had a concern to make sure that whenever we went back to Sergeant McCabe, that if we were going back with an individual who was going to engage directly with him from externally that, one, we had the agreement of that individual, right, so that we could actually put it not as a possibility to Sergeant McCabe -- sorry, not as something that we may or may not be able to deliver on but something that we knew that we would be able to
deliver on. And that is what that was about at that point.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunne, it's fine. I do understand all of those things.
162 Q. MR. ROGERS: In March of 2015, the --
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rogers, forgive me for thinking it's February, now we are going into March, I am not sure how this is feeding into the central question that, as Mr. Barrett said, that the dark truth, and I am using his phrase, is what he alleges Mr. Dunne, but I mean, you have to take your own course.

MR. ROGERS: Yes. If you will allow me, Chairman. CHAIRMAN: I will of course.
MR. ROGERS: I won't be long more but I would like to just finish this, as I think I should.
CHAIRMAN: Well, if you feel that, $I$ think you should carry on. I am happy with that, Mr. Rogers, yes. MR. ROGERS: Very good. Yes, very good.
163 Q. The issue of engaging Mr. Mulvey became a little bit complex or controversial. There was discussion about 11:22 expanding the terms of reference that might be given to him, isn't that right? That arose from an intervention by the Department. We have seen this here before, I don't want to have to open it up.
A. No, no. So after this meeting, so after the 25th, I am 11:22 not sure exactly when, but fairly close to it, and I was not involved in this, there was a discussion, I think it was led by acting Deputy Commissioner Twomey at the time, Mr. Barrett, I think Chief Superintendent

McLough1in as we11, and it was all about who -- from my memory, it was about who was the right person to engage, and then moved on also to terms of reference. And I have seen a series of emails around that. And I was brought back into that because Mr. Flahive, from the Department, in a reply, right, put my name into the chain of reply recipients, and he raised the question as to whether we should have a broader engagement from the person who was to deal directly with Sergeant McCabe versus the engagement that had been identified for Mr . Kerr to take on, which was more a policy review. I was asked my view on that, and there were terms of reference, $I$ think there was both a broad and a narrow, that they were referred to. The broad meaning that the individual who would engage with Maurice McCabe would also look at the policies and procedures. My view was that that was not the way to go, that we should separate the two, and that, as it was, Mr. Kerr, who had already been decided on I think quite a time before that, well before the 25 th, should look at the policies and procedures and we should focus whoever -- Kieran Mulvey was the eventual decision, focus Kieran Mulvey on the direct engagement with Maurice McCabe. That was the discussion.
164 Q. Yes. Now, could I ask you for a moment just to look at 11:24 3719, please.
A. Sorry, it's a different volume. Yes, I have that.

165 Q. And if you just tell us, can you identify that? This is an email from Mr. Barrett to Mr. Ruane of the 17 th

March, after 10:00pm in the evening, and I just want to draw your attention to the fourth indent in it:
"The terms of reference for the involvement of Mr. Kieran Mulvey have received much consideration over 11:25 recent days. On Friday Cyril Dunne and I agreed a final format which incorporated the views expressed by Michael Flahive and these have been forwarded to the Commissioner's office by Cyril to complete the section 41 paperwork and comprehensive update to the Minister." 11:25

Do you see that?
A. I see that, yes.

166 Q. Yes. So I mean, you were involved in this question of the terms of reference for Mr. Mulvey?
A. Absolutely.

167 Q. But more than that: You were actually involved in the completion of what I would call the return to the Minister on foot of her questions or seeking of reportage in respect of Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That is actually not correct. What -- if you read what is there, "I agreed a final format which incorporated the views expressed by Michael Flahive and these have been forwarded to the --" So, those views -- sorry, the 11:26 final terms of reference, "-- have been forwarded to the Commissioner's office by Cyril --" I can't actually confirm that $I$ did that, but that is what it says. "-- by Cyril, to complete this section 41
paperwork and comprehensive update to the Minister." Now it wasn't that I was doing section 41 paperwork or comprehensive update to the Minister, I wasn't involved in that. I did, reading this, send on the final terms of reference that had been agreed, to the Commissioner's office. So that's what I read into that. What I can't actually say is that I actually did that. I don't know if I did. well, are you sure you didn't do the section 41 paperwork?
A. Absolutely.

169 Q. You are very definitive about that?
A. Absolutely. Absolutely.

170 Q. Well, I mean, in your role as Chief Administration officer, would it not be part of your function --
A. No.

171 Q. -- to be a participant in that?
A. No.

172 Q. I see.
A. No. It was very much something that was within the
office of the Commissioner. So, you know, a section 41 return to the Minister is a very significant intervention that was done within the Commissioner's office.
173 Q. Yes. But the CAO is the like of, say, a company secretary in a more commercial organisation?
A. Not at all. There is nothing in my role that actually relates to that.

174 Q. I see. So, are you telling the Chairperson then that
you would have nothing to do with a section 41 report to the Commissioner?
A. That is what I am saying, yeah. Absolutely. Unless there was some specific input that was required from me, but in the preparation of section 41s, absolutely not.
Q. But this particular section 41 --
A. No.
-- just a second. This particular section 41 letter concerned a human resources matter related to Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

177 Q. And human resources was directly within the ambit of your responsibility?
A. As I explained yesterday, elements of human resources were in direct ambit of my responsibility, other elements, which were anything to do with policing, were not. And I think, again, if you see there, because you brought us through it earlier, the direction from the Commissioner directly to the executive -- or director of $H R$ about the engagement. If there was line accountability through the CAO office what would have happened would have been that the Commissioner would have directed me or the CAO to actually make something happen. So you have got to understand that a11 of

CHAIRMAN: I actually do understand your evidence. I do understand.

178 Q. MR. ROGERS: So your evidence is that although you
were, as CAO, the accountable officer for the function of human resources within An Garda Síochána, you would have no role in the preparation of a letter of this type which related significantly to a major human resources issue that arose in respect of a particular garda?
A. Absolutely right, that is what $I$ am saying. But what I need to make clear to you again is that I had responsibility for some elements of human resources. The executive director had responsibility for all of those elements but some of those reporting lines of executive director went in different directions. And this did not come to me. It was not in my responsible.
179 Q. What didn't come to you?
A. Sorry.

180 Q. What didn't come to you?
A. Anything to do with policing and anything to do with what was either protected disclosures, what was then confidential recipients, anything like that did not come to the office of the CAO. So it's not actually about me as an individual, it's through the office of the CAO.

181 Q. Yes. So --
A. I mean --

182 Q. Is it the case then --
CHAIRMAN: Honestly --
183 Q. MR. ROGERS: -- that you did not have a role in the matters that were the subject --

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, sincerely, I am not actually really
interested in the internal working of Headquarters. I mean, the allegation against you is that you sat on the apex of the organisation, you accept that you are one of the four key people at the very top.
A. Absolutely.

11:31
CHAIRMAN: Your responsibilities went a particular way.
A. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That is as much as needs to be said.
Q. MR. ROGERS: Could I just ask you to look at your statement at 2974?
A. I have 2974.

185 Q. Thank you. Do you see 53 there?
A. 53 , yes.
Q. You answered the question wherein you were asked to characterise your relationship "both professionally and 11:32 personal, with the following parties, Commissioner Callinan, Commissioner o'sullivan and superintendent Taylor", and what you say in respect of Commissioner Callinan is:
"I had a working relationship with the former Commissioner callinan but it was not a close working relationship. I had no relationship with the former Commissioner callinan outside work at all."

And you then go on to say that you had a different working relationship with Commissioner o'sullivan, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

let's see and also of course, you may not be aware but the Tribunal has written many, many dozens of letters to people asking questions in and around that area and the investigators have interviewed a number of people in and around that area again, but it's a different thing entirely, unless there is something here you feel is significant.
MR. ROGERS: No, it's just, and I will be quick with this, Judge.
190 Q.
You seem to be saying in the sentence at 117, 118, that 11:35 your relationship with Commissioner Callinan was not one where you would have a one-to-one conversations with him, that seems strange, do you agree with me?
A. If I can try and paint it for you.

191 Q. Why would it be you would not have one-to-one 11:35 conversations with your superior Commissioner?
A. Of that nature, right. So, that's what I said. I didn't say that I wouldn't have one-to-one conversations with the Commissioner. I said one-to-one conversations of that nature, which were around his use 11:35 of the word "disgusting" in reference to Garda whistleblowers. I mean, that is a very -- that requires a level of relationship which is deeper than I would have had with Commissioner callinan at the time. Now, the reason for that, and there is nothing sinister 11:36 about my relationship, it was a very professional relationship with Mr. Callinan, was that his focus, I would say, was much more on operational policing, right. That is where his focus in his role as

Commissioner was. And as I said earlier, I had no involvement in operational policing. So actually, our paths wouldn't have crossed very much and that was because of the, 1et's call it, agenda that he would have seen as being the most important. The Deputy Commissioner at the time, which was Nóirín O'Sullivan, and subsequently as Commissioner, her focus in terms of what she saw as being really, really important, was much more -- not so much on the operational policing, it was on cultural change, reform, and particularly what's now been launched as the modernization and renewal programme. And we would have -- so we would have had just much, much more engagement because that is what I would have spent a lot of my time on. That is the only reason for --
192 Q. Yes. You make that point very pointedly at 2980, where you are discussing Commissioner o'Sullivan's approach. Do you see 146: "She was scrupulous in making sure he was supported."
A. Yes.

193 Q. "Went to a lot of effort, both specifically with him and also generally." And she made sure that --
"She was very conscious at the same time actually of making sure that it was not focused on Sergeant McCabe, 11:37 very conscious not to isolate him?"

And then in the last sentence at the bottom of page there you say:
"It would have been different to the demeanour earlier under a different Commissioner where the consciousness of dealing with the personal challenges for people involved was less in focus."

That seems to capture what you have just said?
A. Yes, it's slightly different. I think it goes more to personal style rather than mandate or agenda. They would have very different personal styles, the two commissioners.

194 Q. We11, does one get the impression that you were more improving of the Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. No, I had a closer relationship -- remember now -- or former Commissioner o'sullivan and myself were peers for quite a period of time and you develop a peer-to-peer relationship, which then obviously moved on to a different relationship, when she was Commissioner. I never had a peer-to-peer relationship with Commissioner Callinan, I was always subordinate, so it creates a different dynamic.
195 Q. Right.
A. But there is nothing sinister in it.
Q. But your position to the Chairman is that in May of 2015, the way you put it yesterday was that you weren't 11:39 conscious of the Commission at all.
A. That's correct.

197 Q. Well, that seems a very unlikely mental condition to have, given what was going on. This was a commission
looking at the predicament of An Garda Síochána in respect of allegations made by Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, but in private.

198
Sorry?
A. That is correct, but in private. So the Commission, by definition, was private.
199 Q. Yes, but you knew -- you must have known the terms of reference of that Commission?
A. oh, yeah, absolutely.

200 Q. And you must have known the extent to which Sergeant McCabe was involved in it?
A. Absolutely. And the terms of reference were all
focused on policing matters and how policing matters had been dealt with, and I had no involvement at all in 11:40 the organisation with policing matters. That was my --
201 Q. Are you contending that in fact you weren't conscious of the o'Higgins Commission?
A. And what was going on in it, no, I wasn't. well, it's a pretty global thing to say, Mr. Dunne, 11:41 that I wasn't conscious of this commission.
A. The O'Higgins Commission was going on in private, so there was -- you know, there was no discussion about it in the organisation. There were two things that were happening, as I now understand it: One was that there 11:41 was engagement with individuals who were going to be appearing at the Commission with legal counsel, okay. I understand that. I wasn't involved in that at all, okay. The second thing, as I now understand it, was
that -- sorry, I understood then that Chief Superintendent Healy was at the Commission all of the time, I did understand that. I now understand that the transcripts of the Commission were being provided on a daily basis but not to me, and I wasn't conscious that they were being provided to anybody at that point in time. So, that is the reality of it. So notwithstanding that the Commission was to be concerned with the investigation of complaints by Sergeant McCabe which were complaints which were ongoing and which were part of his general frustration over the previous 18 months/two years, and of which everybody had become conscious and particularly by reason of the meeting on the 25th February, you, quite literally, didn't engage at all, is what you are saying?
A. So first of a11, the meeting on the 25th February had no relationship and did not discuss at all any of the elements of the o'riggins Commission. No, but it was a meeting that arose out of Sergeant McCabe's general and overall frustration, isn't that right?
A. That is correct. But as I understand it, the o'Higgins Commission was focused on looking at specific cases, which were policing cases, and how they were handled. That is my understanding of it. And I had no engagement or involvement in that. That's the fact of it. Where I would have expected to be engaged, had I still been with the organisation, was on the
implementation of recommendations coming out of it, if any of them fell into my area and generally, indeed.
But the workings of the Commission, the -- you know, I couldn't even tell you what, you know, what is the right investigative process. I just simply don't know, 11:44 Chairman. So I had nothing to contribute.
205 Q. Could I just ask you to look at, now, finally, at 2985 of your statement.
A. 2985. Yes.

206 Q. And this is where you are asked to deal with what Mr. Barrett says occurred at the encounter with you when he says -- he said you said "we are going after him in the commission". And you say there that in response:
"I have no recollection of meeting with John Barrett."

That is just one sentence. Is that intended to be referable to the issue of when this event occurred?
A. It's referable to what was put to me in Mr. Barrett's 11:45 statement. That is what it's referencing. And if I can just point to that, right, where he says -- I will quote:
"Mr. Dunne asked me to remain in his office after the 11:45 other attendees had left and with reference to Sergeant Maurice McCabe."

I definitively know and I had no basis of saying that
we are going after him in the Commission. I am also conscious that that now is a different position now in terms of what the meeting was, because it's now a meeting between myself and the Commissioner and Maurice McCabe rather than myself and other attendees. At the 11:46 time I read this as likely being a meeting of my management team. So that's -- and I had no recollection of that meeting and I certainly was able to say that $I$ never said we are going after him at the Commission. I understand now, though, that it's different, it's a meeting with the Commissioner and myself.
207 Q. Well, earlier you had said you were not aware that Mr . Barrett had been appointed interlocutor, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Well, did you have a complete loss of recollection of his role arising from the direction of the Commissioner on the 23rd February?
A. I wasn't aware of the direction of the Commissioner on 23rd February.

209 Q. I see.
A. But again, if $I$ can go back --

210 Q. You knew --
A. -- because you brought this up earlier.

211 Q. Yeah?
A. There was a letter which went from the office of the Commissioner direct to Mr. Barrett, didn't involve me.

212 Q. Yes.
A. Right. And that would not be unusual, because I didn't have line responsibility for the particular HR issue. So I wasn't aware of that letter. I read this as some kind of formal appointment. I wasn't aware of it.

But you knew that Mr. Barrett was the person who had engaged in this new way with Mr. McCabe on the 25 th February?
A. Absolutely. And I also knew -- I also knew that Chief Superintendent McLough1in had continued to meet with him, that Chief Superintendent O'Brien had continued to 11:48 meet with him, so I had no sense of -- sorry, to be clear, I was aware that Mr. Barrett was meeting with him and that it was positive, but this context of being appointed as an interlocutor was new to me.
214 Q. We11, are you saying that Mr. Barrett misunderstood his 11:48 role?
A. No, no, I am saying that I didn't -- I didn't relate to what Mr. Barrett was saying, that, you know, he was the -- he had been appointed as an interlocutor and a principal point of contact. That is al1 I am saying.
215 Q. So when you made this statement, you didn't actually know of the 1etter of the 23rd February --
A. Correct.

216 Q. -- engaging Mr. Barrett?
A. Correct.

217 Q. And thereby it may well be that if Mr. Barrett was so appointed, as is clear he was, when he had this encounter with you on what he says was in mid-May, his view of his position would have been that he had a specific role with Mr. McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Yeah.
A. But I am just thinking, actually, though, that my memory is that that appointment was the 23 rd.
Q. Sorry?
A. My memory, and maybe it could be checked, was that that appointment letter was the 23 rd of --
Q. Of February?
A. -- of February, sorry, I beg your pardon.

221 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. But if Mr. Barrett had that role, and had you said something like we are going after Maurice McCabe in the Commission, his reaction to it would not be unexpected if it was a reaction of surprise and anxiety?
A. I would expect that to be the case. But that was never said to us, so we are in the hypothetical here.

223 Q. Yes. But you see, John Barrett says that when you said to him we are going after Maurice McCabe in the Commission, his response was immediate and one of saying you must be joking.
A. Reading -- and I only know the response, but there have been a number of different responses that Mr. Barrett has said that he has given.

224 Q. Yes.
A. So that is one of them.
Q. Yes. But it wouldn't be a surprising response, having regard to the role he had been designated?
Q. No.
A. And not even -- but to be clear, not even in relation to the role; I mean, in relation to all of the discussions and everything that was going on, it would have been shocking, I would have thought, if that had been said. And not just Mr. Barrett, I think anybody else who was involved in, for example, those meetings around the 25 th February would have been absolutely shocked.

227 Q. You see, I just want to suggest to you, Mr. Dunne, first of all, that Mr. Barrett's recollection and his description of this is clear. You deny it, isn't that right?
A. I absolutely deny it, yes.

228 Q. Yes. And I suggest to you that your evidence yesterday where you evinced a concern about being seen as a directing mind, $I$ suggest to you betrays a concern on your part which might cause to you deny it?
A. I don't follow that.

229 Q. Okay. Are you sure you don't follow it?
A. If could you put it to me again.

230 Q. Yes. Yesterday, and I went through this with you earlier, I pointed to the use of the word directing or directed --
A. Yes.

231 Q. -- in certain answers you gave yesterday?
A. Yes.

232 Q. And I'm suggesting to you that those words betray on
your part a concern not to be seen to be intimately involved as a director directing action against --
A. Sergeant McCabe.
-- Sergeant McCabe in the Commission.
A. And that is absolutely right. Because when I read the two elements or the two extracts from the statement that were put to me, that was the impression that was left with me, was that -- was two things, right. One was that I had said we -- so, including me, we are going after him in the Commission. So that I was somehow involved in going after Sergeant McCabe. That was not the case. And in the other statement, as well, it was talking about briefings that $I$ had given. So that was my concern, about me, right, and I did say to you yesterday, I think, that, yeah, I was concerned about myself.

We11, you see, what I want to suggest to you is that really your statement to the investigators revealed that, in that in answering the investigators' questions you sought to distance yourself, even from the meetings
of the 25th February?
A. But there was nothing -- there was nothing put to me about the 25th February. I mean, if I can go back to what was actually put to me, it didn't talk about --
A. We did. But if you want to bring it up again and challenge me about it, I want to give a response. to the investigators betrays a determination to distance yourself from virtually anything to do with discussion about Maurice McCabe?
A. But that is the fact.
Q. It isn't a fact.
A. It is a fact.

239 Q. You had substantial discussion about Maurice McCabe and 11:55 intensive discussion about him.
A. Not with regard to the Commission. If I had felt that -- if we can just separate out that meeting of the -- or meetings on 25th of February and the engagement with Sergeant McCabe, now, in those meetings. If I had felt that that was something that was what this Tribunal was focused on, I probably would have tried to go back and put together a statement myself, but my understanding was that the focus was on the Commission of Investigation, okay. Now, I didn't 11:56 relate the meetings of the 25th February at that point in time with the Commission of Investigation. They were totally different, in my mind. So, yes, you know, I wanted to make sure that it was clear that I was
distant. No dispute about that. Because I was. But I was faced with a very grave allegation. By the way, most of which in its detail has changed, other than I said that "we are going after him in the Commission". That is my reading of it. So if you take the statement, the extracts of the statement that were put to me and the evidence that has been given an awful lot of the detail has changed. And that was my concern about myself, that I wouldn't be -- that I was being accused, for want of a better word, which I knew to be 11:57 false. And secondly, as I said to you yesterday, I wanted to make sure that I could get as much information which was documentary-based provided to the Commission, so I particularly -- sorry, to the Tribunal, I beg your pardon -- I particularly mentioned 11:57 that the notes of Ken Ruane would give documentary evidence rather than something I would say or somebody else would say. That was my thinking.
MR. ROGERS: No questions.
CHAIRMAN: You are finished, yes, thank you. Was there 11:58 any other questions?
MR. DIGNAM: I just have a few questions that I would like to ask Mr. Dunne, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: There's no questions from Justice or -MR. MCCANN: No.
CHAIRMAN: I don't mean that as an abstract concept. MR. McCANN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: I of course mean the Department.

## THE WITNESS WAS EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM:

240 Q. MR. DIGNAM: Mr. Dunne, I just want to ask you a few questions and $I$ am going to focus on the allegation that has been made against you, and I want to do so in the context of a suggestion that was floated by Mr. Rogers towards the end of yesterday. Firstly, if I could ask you to look at your own statement on page 2985 of the booklets.
A. Yes, I have that.

241 Q. And the reason I am asking you to look at that page, Mr . Dunne, is that the allegation which is made against you in relation to this module is quoted and it's quoted as being:
"Prior to the announcement --"

Sorry.
"-- commencement of the o'Higgins Commission hearings,
at the conclusion of a meeting in the office of the Chief Administration Officer, Cyril Dunne, Mr. Dunne asked me to remain in his office after the other attendees had left and with reference to Sergeant Maurice McCabe said quote "We are going after him in point of contact with Sergeant McCabe was well-established at this stage and I indicated my shock and dismay that such an approach would be taken in the

O'Higgins Commission."

Now, that's the allegation that was made against you by Mr. Barrett. And one of the concerns which you have had, which you have just discussed with Mr. Rogers, was that it was suggested, as you understood it, by the use of the word "we" that you were part of a plan or a decision to go after Sergeant McCabe in the Commission. I think you have probably been keeping a close eye on the evidence that has been given, and in particular given by Mr. Barrett, and on day 53, page 195 -- [SAME HANDED]
A. Sorry, what is the reference?

242 Q. Day 53, page 195.
A. Yes, I have that.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give us a moment, Mr. Dignam, so we can get it here for everybody. Thanks. MR. DIGNAM: Certainly, Chairman.
243 Q. You see at question 70 -- sorry, yes, question 702, this is Mr. McGuinness questioning Mr. Barrett, and he says to Mr. Barrett:
"You seem to have characterised the remark --"

And that is the remark allegedly made by you.
"-- as being a decision that was being conveyed to you, but did Mr. Dunne ever say anything to that effect?"

Mr. Barrett answers:
"I took it to be, you know, we're going after him in the Commission to be a decision. And I didn't understand the import of it until some time later."

And then the Chairman intervenes:
"I beg your pardon, Mr. McGuinness, again a decision by who?"

And Mr. Barrett says:
"Well, it would be the executive of the organisation would make a decision of that order."

Now, you are a member of the executive of the organisation, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

244 Q. There are four members?
A. Four, yes.

245 Q. Now do you interpret that answer to be that a decision was made by the executive, four-person executive of which you are a member, to be to go after Sergeant McCabe?
A. That is how I interpreted that.

246 Q. And does that cause you concern?
A. Absolutely.

247 Q. Yes. Now, am I correct in saying that when you
received the statement by Mr. Barrett containing the allegation and up until last Friday when Mr. Barrett first started giving evidence, that all you knew about the context and the surrounding circumstances in which this was alleged to have been said was: One, that it happened in your office; two, that it happened after a meeting about something else entirely; three, there were other attendees, plural; and four, and I suppose this is a known/unknown, the date of it was unknown because it was unstated in the statement. Does that summarise the state of your knowledge up to the commencement of the evidence by Mr. Barrett last Friday?
A. That is absolutely correct.

248 Q. Yes. And that was three weeks into the evidence of the 12:03 Tribunal, two-and-a-half weeks I think into the evidence.
A. Sorry?

249 Q. That was approximately two-and-a-half weeks into hearing evidence in this module.
A. Yes.

250 Q. And is it fair to say then that you now know that, in fact, there were not other attendees in addition to you and Mr. Barrett, but in fact one other attendee.
A. That's correct.
A. That's correct.

252 Q. The second thing which you now know was that it was at the tail end of a meeting on another topic entirely, is
how it was now put in the evidence, so it wasn't a casual encounter. You also now know, am I right in saying, that Mr. Barrett is saying that the meeting happened on the 13th May 2015, is that your state of
knowledge now?

12:04
A. Just, it is correct, but $I$ don't know the topic that it was -- I know it was supposedly another topic but I don't know what that topic was supposed to be.
Q. Yes.
A. Everything else is correct.

254 Q. Now, I don't propose to laboriously bring you or the Tribunal -- the Tribunal has already has the transcript in all of the evidence, I don't propose to bring you through the transcripts where Mr. Barrett identifies the meeting as happening on the 13th of may and this remark being made in that context, but if I could ask you to look at day 54, page 47 [SAME HANDED].
A. I have that.
Q. And you'll see Mr. Barrett gives an answer in explaining the date, etcetera, of the meeting and how he fixed it as having happened on the 13th May, he says -- sorry, I will wait for the transcript. Page 47, Mr. Kavanagh. And this answer is in response to a series of questions that I had been asking Mr. Barrett about fixing the date of the meeting and what led him
"I am going to say that I was genuinely concerned about the focus on the date rather than the content of the
discussion and I was somewhat taken aback by that and I tried to facilitate the Tribunal with the work I did overnight. I think there is an email in there that refers to a conversation with the Commissioner, Cyril and $I$ think it's the evening of the 12th."

Now, we will come back to that in a moment, just in light of what Mr. Rogers had to say yesterday. Mr. Barrett goes on to say:
"And I think that from my triangulation of it I believe the meeting took place on the 13th."

So Mr. Barrett uses the conversation which he says took place on the 12 th to identify that the meeting, and therefore the remark made by you, happened on 13th of May. And he goes on to say:
"And I think that from my triangulation of it, I believe the meeting took place on the 13th. For me, I am in absolutely no doubt that this was sent to me, it was sent to me in advance of the Tribunal commencing. I appreciate that there is a requirement to consider the period of time between when this was sent to me and when the Tribunal commenced. I am offering you my best evidence and I am speaking truthfully..."

And I say:
"Now, Mr. Barrett, let's be clear, you said that it was on the 13th May."

And he answers:
"Yes."

I say:
"And you confirmed that in your evidence yesterday."

And he says:

> "Yes."

And there is then a series of questions and I am not going to laboriously bring you through all of the sections in the various transcripts where the 13th May is identified by Mr . Barrett as the day in question. But I just ask you to keep that transcript open for the 12:08 moment, that section of the transcript open for the moment. Now, late yesterday, Mr. Rogers raised a possibility in the face of that evidence that the meeting -- or that the remark -- the meeting and therefore the remark, may have happened on another day, 12:08 possibly the 11th, 12th of May. And if I could just ask you to look at one other transcript, which is day 56, page 98 [SAME HANDED].
A. Yes, I have that.
Q. And what Mr. Rogers says is that:
"And he has told the Tribunal that, certainly when he commenced giving his evidence he said that he believed it was on the 11th, 12th, 13th of May that he had had this encounter with you in your room wherein you said that quote "We are going after him in the Commission". Now I just want to suggest to you that it's quite clear that Mr. Barrett certainly on the 12th May 2015, in the evening of that day, had the opportunity to have heard you to say the words that he says you said. Do you agree with me that that opportunity arose?"

And I will come back to that question of the opportunity in just a moment. But that is the way Mr. Rogers said yesterday that in fact Mr. Barrett believed that the meeting may have happened on the 11th, 12th, 13th of May. Now, I am sorry to be throwing transcripts at you, Mr. Dunne. If you could look at day 54 , page 16.
A. 54. Page?
Q. 16 .
A. 16. I have that.

258 Q. Yes. And Mr. Barrett, in response to questioning by Mr. McDowe11, where Mr. McDowell is raising the
"What I am seeking to do is to position my week, so I can now explain to you what I did on each of the days of the week courtesy of these emails and the review I did of various documents. These are what I was asked to do as I understand it yesterday by the judge. Q. Yes.
A. On the Monday the 11th I had a review of a case in the Distillery Building in Church Street.
Q. All right."

And he makes no reference to the meeting possibly taking place on the 11th. He goes on to say:
"A. On Tuesday I had a series of meetings in the Department of Justice with officials of the Department of Justice relating to the unwinding of FEMPI legislation. On Wednesday I was in the office, that is the 13th May. On 14th, I was at a briefing delivered by the Department of Finance in the offices of the Department of Justice, in the atrium of the Department of Justice. On the day following, the Friday, I was all day in the Garda College.
A. On the Thursday evening, I drove to Adare, County Limerick."

Now, are you aware -- that is the only section that I see that Mr. Rogers could have been referring to

Mr. Barrett as having said the meeting possibly taking place on the 11th, 12th, 13th. Are you aware of any of the other parts of the transcripts where that was raised as a possibility by Mr. Barrett?
A. I don't think I am, no.

CHAIRMAN: We11, I noted the question and I said to myself, there isn't actually a statement to that effect. But there it is. We all make mistakes. It's not a problem.
MR. DIGNAM: And I am not levelling this as a criticism.

CHAIRMAN: No, I appreciate what you are doing, Mr. Dignam.
259 Q. MR. DIGNAM: Now, it's a matter for the -- sorry, if I could just ask you, as I understand it, Mr. Dunne, the suggestion that is now being made, that the meeting may have taken place on -- and therefore you making the statement, may have taken place on 12th of may, not the 13th as stated by Mr. Barrett, there's I think two elements to that. One is, two emails that were sent by 12:13 Mr. Barrett and secondly, a presumption which is being made by Mr. Barrett. And if I could ask you to turn to 4985.
A. Yes, I have that.

260 Q. Now, the first of those emails at the bottom of the people, including you, and I think the Commissioner's office, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Sent at 23:30 on the night of the 12th May. And I am not going to read the whole email, Mr. Barrett, but what Mr. -- sorry, Mr. Dunne, what Mr. Barrett says is:
"Dear Mr. Banks
Following our meeting this evening I spoke with the Commissioner as promised."

Now, that clearly suggests that Mr. Barrett had a conversation with the Commissioner on the night -- on the evening of the 12th May.
A. That's correct.
Q. Yes. And above that is an email from Mr. Barrett to -addressed to you -- a number of people, but including you and the Commissioner. And on the second paragraph, 12:14 he says:
"As I said last night."
okay.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, again, that refers to a conversation. We don't know precisely with whom, but it does seem to connect with the first email which I opened to you which refers to him speaking with the Commissioner, is that the way 12:15 would you read that?
A. Yes, that is how $I$ would read that.
Q. Now they are the two emails that have been identified by Mr. Barrett as, with this triangulation exercise,
identifying the 13th May as the date of the meeting but, if I understand what Mr. Rogers was asking you yesterday correctly, they are being suggested as suggestive of the meeting taking place on the night of the 12th May?
A. Yeah.

265 Q. And the second element of that, it seems, the presumption made by Mr. Barrett, if you look at day 55, page 71 --
A. I have that.

266 Q. -- you see right towards the bottom of the page, Mr. Barrett is asked:
"And if neither the Commissioner went back to the Headquarters on the night of the 13th, when she returned and if Mr. Dunne is correct in saying that he was away at a sporting meeting, it would appear that neither of them were there on the night or evening of the 13th, but they were there on the 12th, is that right?"

And Mr. Barrett answers:
"I said I met with them, so I presume "As I said 1ast night" I think it refers to a meeting."

So, it seems that the height of what is being suggested is that there is a possibility that there was a meeting on the night of the 12th, but Mr. Barrett hasn't said
that there was a meeting with you and the Commissioner on the night of the 12 th, simply that he presumes because he refers to speaking to somebody that there was in fact a meeting, but he doesn't give any such evidence of any such meeting taking place. Now, you were asked yesterday don't those emails show that there was an opportunity on the night of the 12th for you to have made the comment that you did, and you answered yes. I think that follows if there was a conversation with you at all -- and that is not clear, but if there was a conversation with you then there was a possibility that you could have said something, and that you could have made this remark. I have to put it to you and do you agree, Mr. Dunne, that it is also open to understand those emails to the effect that there wasn't a meeting but there was a conversation, perhaps on the telephone, isn't it open to that interpretation?
A. I think it is. Yes.

267 Q. And is it open to the interpretation that Mr. Barrett spoke with the Commissioner but not to you?
A. Absolutely.

268 Q. And if I could just then ask you to look again at day 54, page 47. And this is the section that I asked you to keep open, Mr. Dunne. You see halfway through Mr. Barrett's answer, he says:

[^1]Which I take it to refer to the emails I have just opened.
"-- That refers to a conversation with the Commissioner, Cyril, and I think it's the evening of the 12th."

Now, is that open to the interpretation, in your view, that it was a telephone conversation or may have been a telephone conversation rather than a meeting?
A. It does, yeah. And it doesn't necessarily -- I am only just reading this, it doesn't necessarily -- sorry, I think it's saying that it was a conversation with the Commissioner and with me.
269 Q. Yes.
A. I am not reading it that it says at the same time. But that is the best that I can do.

270 Q. Now, the evidence from Mr. Barrett was to the effect that he was at a Department -- at a meeting or series of meetings I think in the Department of Justice on the 12:20 12th May?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

271 Q. Were you at those sessions or meetings?
A. No.

272 Q. No. Now, the emails which Mr. Barrett has produced as 12:20 being the basis for him identifying the 13th of May as being the date of the conversation and you allegedly making this remark, contain -- on page 4979 and 4980, they contain a series of emails back and forth between

I think the Department and Mr. Barrett and a number of other recipients, including you, in relation to -- and they start at the bottom of page 4980, in fact. There is a meeting, Mr. Banks of the Department of Justice and Equality says that:
"I can now confirm that the initial discussions on the above matter --"
which is the unwinding the FEMPI measures.
"-- involving yourselves are scheduled for 4:30pm next Tuesday, 12th of May 2015 in the atrium at 51
St. Stephen's Green. I would also like to invite to you a general briefing session on the fiscal situation to be provided by the Department of Justice on a different day."

And there is then a further email immediately above that from Mr. Banks:

## "Hi Al1

Further to my email below, I would be grateful if you could be present at 51 St. Stephen's Green for 4:00pm tomorrow, Tuesday, 12th May. For security reasons and access to the building it is critically important that the names of those attending the meeting are provided to --"

A named person
"-- in advance and the contact details are provided below."

So I think that logically refers to the meeting which is fixed for $4: 30$ in the atrium in the Department of Justice. And then, if you go immediately above that there is a further email from Mr. Banks on the 11th asking Mr. Barrett to let him know in the morning who will be attending on the management side from An Garda Síochána, and then a reply from Mr. Barrett on page 4979 saying that:
"I will be there from 1:45 --"

This is on 12th of may.
"I will be there from 1:45 and Chief McLoughlin will be there with me for 4:00pm."

And I think Mr. Barrett has given evidence that he was in the Department of Justice at those meetings on that day, and I think there for $4: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ for the meeting to start at 4:30.

Now, would you agree that that suggests that Mr. Barrett was engaged at briefing sessions and meetings in the Department of Justice on the afternoon
of the 12th May?
A. Yes, it does. And what it suggests to me is that, and this is based just on my reading of the -- of the people receiving the various emails, so they are actually -- they are the associations, the Garda associations, so GRA, Garda Representative Association, the Garda sergeants and inspectors, the superintendents and the chief superintendents, so it's an industrial relations meeting --
Q. Yes.
A. -- with outside -- with members of An Garda Síochána, but outsiders really.

274 Q. Everybody will understand the -- everybody's desire to unwind the FEMPI legislation.
A. Yes.
Q. And have you any idea from your experience how long that type of briefing session or meeting would 1ast?
A. We11, unless it broke down, which is always a possibility, it would tend to go on for an extended period of time.

277 Q. Yes. Now --
A. But I can't say --

278 Q. You can't say.
A. -- on this particular meeting.
Q. Now, just for completeness' sake, Mr. Dunne, and just to avoid any suggestion that you are focusing on a
particular day, can I ask you -- you have been very clear to the various people who have questioned you. you say this meeting and conversation, and therefore the remark by you, didn't take place on the 13th May?
A. Correct.

280 Q. Yes. Did it take place on the 12th May?
A. The remark, no, it didn't.

281 Q. Did it take place on the 11th May?
A. No, it didn't.

282 Q. Did it ever take place?
A. No.

283 Q. And how can you be so sure of that?
A. Because I was not in a position to -- first of all, I wasn't involved -- I didn't know what was going on in the Commission. I wasn't involved in the strategy. I am not even convinced that there was a particular strategy prior to the 12th or 13th May, and that is based on my understanding of what has gone on in this room. I had no engagement, no involvement. There had been no discussions at the executive. I had no basis on which to say it.
MR. DIGNAM: Yes. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dunne.

THE WITNESS WAS RE-EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS:

284 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Mr. Dunne, yesterday, Mr. Rogers was asking you about your answer on page 2987 of your statement to the investigators, and perhaps we could bring that up. But the question being put to you by the investigators was:
"I have been asked whether I attended any other of the Garda senior management team preparatory meetings in advance of the O'Higgins Commission of Investigation."

So it was directed to your state of knowledge in advance of the Commission commencing, you understand that?
A. Correct.

285 Q. And your answer was:
"I didn't know there were any such meetings. Certainly
it was never an agenda item at the Garda senior management meetings. My memory is that those centrally 12:27 involved were the Garda Commissioner and Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy. I do not recall being at any such meeting. I certainly had an understanding that the approach was to be putting questions, going back to the duty of care. The approach was not one of taking everything that was presented and letting it lie. As such, there would have been questions put. I must have been on the periphery of these matters to know this. However, I cannot recall any specific meeting that $I$ attended in this matter."

Now, what I wanted to ask you is this: Firstly, had you any knowledge of how the Garda Síochána had approached other commissions that may have been in
being, after you came into office in April '13?
A. I was aware of the Fennelly Commission and -- yes, so I was aware of that.
Q. Yes. Were you aware of how that was operating or --
A. Yes, I was aware of how it was operating because I was actually a witness. I appeared in front of Justice Fennelly.

Yes. He had counsel engaged on his behalf. But were there any other parties --
A. No.
Q. Any other parties present or any cross-examination?
A. No.
Q. okay. understanding of envisaging the putting of questions here, didn't come from that?
A. No, it didn't.

291 Q. No.
A. No.

292 Q. Okay. Now, the second issue then is, the Judge in charge of the O'Higgins Commission, Judge O'Higgins, wrote to the Commissioner on the 24th February outlining how he intended to proceed and providing the
rules of procedure and setting out a time, an indicative sort of timescale for certain matters. Did you become aware of how Judge o'Higgins intended to operate?
A. No.

Okay. Mr. Ruane, Head of Legal Affairs at the time, and who has given evidence, he gave evidence of writing a letter, a case, as it were, in relation to the representation of An Garda Síochána at the o'Higgins Commission, and he was suggesting that there were corporate and reputational issues at stake and he suggested that the commissioner would need to be represented separately from the Department and recommended that nominations of counse 1 be sought, et cetera. Were you aware of that proposal?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. Al1 right. Well, it went to Deputy Commissioner Kenny, and he sent a minute on to the Commissioner on the 7th April, endorsing the recommendation. Would something like that, or did that, in fact, come before the executive body?
A. No, no, it didn't.
Q. okay.
A. No.

297 Q. So those sort of issues about -- obviously, deputy commissioner -- Deputy Acting Commissioner Kenny envisaged that that would be a charge on the Garda
vote, as it were; it would come out of Garda resources?
A. I would --
Q. Would that be something that you would be involved in considering?
A. No. No, the approval for spends was not done through the CAO office or indeed the finance function within the CAO office.
Q. Yes.
A. The approval was within the operating unit.

Yes. And the issue of protecting the, as it were, either the corporate reputation -- reputational issues for the Commissioner, did you have any discussion with Mr. Ruane or with the Commissioner about doing that?
A. No.
okay. The exclusion then of any, as it were, residual knowledge about how the Commission would operate from not be [sic] familiar with the rules and not having discussed it with Mr. Ruane, how is it that you had this peripheral knowledge of how An Garda Síochána were going to approach matters at the Commission?
A. I think, as I was saying yesterday, my own -- I have racked my brains about this. The only possibility that I can see is that it was actually later, so that my timing is wrong, because, as I explained, there was a superintendent who had been running my office and had the -- sorry, by the -- in the Commission.
Q. Yes.
A. Was to give evidence in the Commission. He was
preparing for that, actually, in my office, and he would have been there a number of days and over a number of days, and I can only believe that that is where I picked that up, because he was there preparing
and looking to arrange things with his own counsel.
All right. But his answer seems to envisage what was going to happen, and you seem to have contemplated, in your answer to the investigators, that certainly there would be challenge to parties' or witnesses' evidence, embracing presumably Sergeant McCabe?
A. That was my understanding. And again, I would have had, and this is why I said about the duty of care, I had a general understanding, not to do with the -- not to do with the Commission, but the Commissioner, on a regular basis, would talk about her duty of care to everybody in the organisation. That is where I think I picked it up.
304 Q. Yes. And prior to receiving Mr. Barrett's statement and being questioned about it by the investigators, did anyone at any stage in Garda $H Q$ or did Mr. Barrett ever 12:33 suggest to you from May 2015 until November 2017 that you had made this remark or that it was being attributed to you in some circumstance?
A. No, it came as a complete surprise to me. MR. MCGUINNESS: Thank you, Mr. Dunne.

CHAIRMAN: Just two things I wanted to ask you about.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAIRMAN: This bank that has been referred to, I didn't, in fact, pick up the spelling from what was --
A. DEPFA, D-E-P-F A.
Q. CHAIRMAN: I don't mean to denigrate anybody. Is there something, in other words, that one could be worried about in relation to that bank?
A. Not at this point in time. It was a significant failure of a bank in the financial crisis. If it had been for the account of Ireland, it would have been probably bigger than the combination of AIB and Bank of Ireland in terms of impact.
Q. CHAIRMAN: So we are talking about more than 30 bil1ion?
A. It had a balance sheet of, from memory, about -- from memory, about 200 billion.
Q. CHAIRMAN: Is that in the negative?
A. That was the balance sheet. The particular issue --
Q. CHAIRMAN: The deficit?
A. The particular issue was liquidity. CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, it's just I hadn't come across -I sat in the Commercial court for five years and that is one bank I hadn't come across.
A. Right.
Q. CHAIRMAN: Do you speak German?
A. No, I don't.

313 Q. CHAIRMAN: I was just wondering how the Germans would ask you to do a job which would be based in Germany?
A. The working language was English --

## 314 Q. CHAIRMAN: okay.

A. -- in Germany. It was in Munich. 12:35

315 Q. CHAIRMAN: Where they speak German. But that is the way it was. A11 right. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MR. MARRINAN: Sir, the next witness is Chief Superintendent Anthony McLough1in, please.

CHAIRMAN: The plan today, by the way, is to break at a quarter to and to come back at quarter past, not 1:00, 2:00.

MR. MCDOWELL: Chairman, could I just inquire, because I made a commitment for tomorrow reasonably confident that today would be the last day of the hearing, could I have any intimation from anybody as to whether the recall of Mr. Waters and Mr. O'Leary is likely to be a 1engthy matter.
CHAIRMAN: Well, what I said yesterday I hope is going to be true, Mr. McDowe11. Surely it's going to be very quick.
MR. MCDOWELL: That is what I would have --
CHAIRMAN: Yes. I don't see a great deal to be asked.
MR. MCDOWELL: I don't want to break commitments that I have made to other third parties, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: No, no, and I understand. Look, if
necessary, Mr. Barnes can speak to the stenographers at lunchtime and we will see what we can do about sitting late, if necessary. Yesterday it was nearly 6 o'clock, by the way.
MR. MCDOWELL: In that context, could I just indicate 12:37 that, at least on my client's part, he has no objection to Chief Superintendent McLough1in being 1ed to whatever the relevant bits are.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I would be a wee bit worried about the particular bits that are actually of importance. MR. MCDOWELL: No, just to those bits. That's all I am saying, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, well, he can be led up to those bits certainly. But I have a serious worry about the particular issues that are now very much in question. So, sorry, Mr. Marrinan, so we might get started. We have seven minutes.

MR. MARRINAN: Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, please.

SWORN, WAS DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN:

316 Q. MR. MARRINAN: I think, Chief Superintendent, you are attached to the Human Resources and People Development 12:38 section of An Garda Síochána?
A. That's correct.

317 Q. And how long have you been so attached?
A. I was there initially as a superintendent and I went back in 2013 as a chief superintendent.
318 Q. And I think you were -- your line manager was Mr. John Barrett, is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.

319 Q. From what year?
A. From the time he joined the organisation, which I think 12:38 was in, was it the latter end of '14.

320 Q. So in 2015 there was a meeting on the 23rd February of 2015 that we have heard about. Were you present at that meeting?
A. I believe I was, but I would like to see the -- if I could, please.

321 Q. Yes, wel1 you can take it that you were, but I am just going to ask you because I want to move this along, you are here to deal with a discrete issue.
A. Yes, no problem.

322 Q. But just in terms of the general background. I am not going to into the details of the meeting. But were you familiar with the efforts that were being made in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes, I was, and I was a party to that.
Q. And those were human resource issues and that is why you were involved?
A. Yes, primarily, and I also have responsibility for a confidential service that we operate as well and that was part of the support mechanisms that was put in place.
Q. Now, if I could come to the discrete issue on which you are being called. Were you aware prior to the commencement of the O'Higgins Commission of any strategy that was being adopted in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. No.
Q. Were you present at any meetings up until the 14th May of 2015 when it commenced, were you present at any meetings where a strategy in relation to how Sergeant Maurice McCabe would be approached at the Commission?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Did you hear any talk from any quarter at all in Garda Headquarters in relation to a stance that was being adopted in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.
Q. In 2015, at any point in time did Mr. John Barrett come to you and indicate to you that he had a conversation with Cyril Dunne that had shocked him in relation to the Commissioner going after or "we" going after Sergeant McCabe at the O'Higgins Commission?
A. I have no memory of that conversation.
Q. Well, is it something that you would remember?
A. Most probably. It would depend on the context of how it was mentioned, but probably would, given the context of it and the seriousness of it, but some of it would depend on how it was said, where it was said as well, but I don't have a memory of it and I have no note of it and I have no recollection of it, I'm afraid.

329 Q. We11, you know this has become an issue at the Tribunal, don't you?
A. Yes.

I have, long and hard.
Q. Yes. And I am sure you appreciate the significance of this?
A. Absolutely.

332 Q. And effectively, when he was giving evidence,
Mr. Barrett indicated, and we will come to the exact words that he used shortly, but he indicated to the Chairman that this was something that he had mentioned to you, namely his conversation with Cyril Dunne in May of 2015, that it was something that he had mentioned to 12:42 you some six weeks or two months afterwards?
A. I was aware -- I am aware that that is what Mr. Barrett's evidence was, yes.
333 Q. Yes. And you appreciate in the overall context of the term of reference that the Tribunal is looking into, the significance of a remark like that indicating that a decision had been made to go after Sergeant McCabe at the O'Higgins Commission, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So surely this would be a matter that would stick out in your mind if it had, in fact, been said to you and Mr. Barrett had expressed his shock at the stance being taken by the organisation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes, most probably, yes. Well, can we exclude the possibility that it was said to you then?
A. Well, all I can -- my evidence is that $I$ have no memory. I do not remember Mr. Barrett saying that to me.

Yes. But you expect to have a memory of it had it been said?
A. In all possibility, yes.
Q. Was it said in 2016, do you have a recollection of anything being said to you by Mr. Barrett?
A. No, no.
Q. And then we come to December of 2017.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have a recollection of this issue coming to 1ight?
A. Yes, I do.

340 Q. Will you tell us about that?
A. I don't have the times or the dates, but it was raised with me by Mr. Barrett in a kind -- in a conversation that we were having, and he just simply asked me did I remember him saying remarks associated with a meeting with Mr. Dunne, and I said, "no, John, I don't".

341 Q. Was that the end of the conversation?
A. Yes.

342
Q.

And was referring back to a conversation that he allegedly had with Mr. Cyril Dunne in 2015?
A. And with me as well, yes.

345 Q. In circumstances where you appreciated the significance of this conversation because it had come into the public domain, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

346 Q. So you were then aware of the significance of this conversation that was -- allegedly took place between yourself and Mr. Barrett --
A. Yes.

347 Q. -- in 2015?
A. Yes.

348 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

349 Q. You had no recall of it?
A. No.

350 Q. And you indicated to him that you had no recall of it, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

351 Q. So when was the next that you heard of it?
A. The next was the 26 th January last, a few days ago -or a few weeks ago. I had a missed call from John it's in my statement - I think it was around 9:00, 9:30, or thereabouts, on the -- I think it was a Friday
morning, and then I had a text message that I missed as we11, and I was halfway through a meeting when I picked up on both. And then before the meeting finished -generally when I am at meetings, and in this case I was at a meeting with the representative bodies looking at an IR issue with them, I don't answer my phone, but later on in the meeting, closer to lunchtime, the phone rang again, and it was John's number, and a colleague of mine took it and she indicated to me that I needed to go down and visit Mr. Barrett's office as quickly as I could. So once the meeting finished, I went down to John's office, and I think, I am not sure of the time, I think it was about half one by the time I got down to him, and John was preparing to leave the office. He had shown me his files and the things that he had put together in preparation for a visit to his counsel, and he raised it again with me there about did I recall a conversation he had with me, and I said, "no, John, the only conversation -- "
At that time, was he asking you did you recall the conversation that you had had allegedly in May or June --
A. No.

353 Q. -- of 2015 , or was it the conversation that you had had with him in the December gone, December 2017?
A. I assumed it was his reference to the earlier conversation he thought he had, and I just replied, "No, I don't, John. As I said to you in November/December, I don't recal1 or remember having

8 that conversation." 354 Q. Yes. Now, if we could have page 5012 -CHAIRMAN: I think it is probably the right time to break.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH

Q. Chief Superintendent, you appreciate the reason that you're here is to deal with this discrete issue?
A. Yeah.

356 Q. And it arose on day 53 of the hearing. If we could have page 5012 on the screen, please. This is an extract from the hearings that was read to you by our investigators, all right?
A. Yeah.

357 Q. I'm just going to go through it.
A. I'm waiting for it to come up.

CHAIRMAN: You will find it in volume 9. MR. MARRINAN: You should have it on the screen. Yes. 14:16
"Chairman: Did you talk to anyone about it at the time?"

This is a reference to the conversation with Cyril
Dunne.

> "A. I didn't.

CHAIRMAN: At the time?
A. At the time, no, I didn't. I talked to people

CHAIRMAN: You mean a year later?
A. Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Two years later?
A. Weeks and months later. As it became significant. And no, at the time.

CHAIRMAN: what are we talking about?
A. My first discussion around this would be probably
in the six weeks or two months after, when the whole issue began to emerge in full technicolour.

CHAIRMAN: what did you say to who?
A. My first correspondence -- correspondent was Chief Superintendent Tony McLough1in, who is a member of my staff.
Q. And you wrote to him?
A. No, I didn't write to him. I would have had a conversation with him about it."

So if we just stop there. Before lunch, I dealt with you --
A. Yeah.

358 Q. -- your recollection of such a conversation. You have no recollection --
A. I don't, no.

359 Q. -- of such a conversation. And your feeling is that if you had had such a conversation, that you would recall it, is that a fair summary of your position?
A. Yes.

360 Q. If we could then just move further down:
"CHAIRMAN: I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about telling Chief Superintendent Tony McLoughlin.
A. He came to me, sir, and he said that I did raise it
with him and I don't know what his date on that is, or whether he has one.

CHAIRMAN: How can he know about raising it?
A. Because we talked about --

Chairman: -- with you, unless had you previously raised it with him?
A. Yes. He says I did. And that's how it is that I am reporting this to you. And I am talking with him in advance of coming here to give evidence.
CHAIRMAN: When?
A. The last number of days. I said, Tony, did I raise this with you and he said --

CHAIRMAN: And he said?
A. He said yes, you did.

CHAIRMAN: Raised what?
A. The meeting at which Cyril said to me that you know we're going after him in the Commission, that I had made reference to that.

CHAIRMAN: Right."

If can I just bring you up to the line here, in answer he says:
"He came to me, sir."

That's actually not correct, and I think that he now accepts your report --
A. Yes.

361 Q. -- and accepted it the following day on day 54.
Q. That your report in relation to the conversation --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- on the 26th January was correct?
A. Yes, absolutely.

364 Q. But when he says there "he came to me, sir", that's not correct?
A. No.
Q. And then he says:
"I don't know what his date on that is or whether he has one."

That seems to be referring to the 26th January.
A. Yes.

367 Q. And then it seems to be an oblique reference to perhaps a conversation that took place earlier and the one that 14:20 you referred to --
A. Yes.

368 Q. -- in November --
A. Yes.

369 Q. -- or December?
A. Yes.

370 Q. Is that right?
A. That's correct.

371 Q. Well, whether it's either of those two dates, on both
dates he raised the issue with you, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely.
A. Both dates.

375 Q. -- the November/December discussion or the discussion on the 26th January, is that right?
A. Yes, it was both dates.
Q. I don't know, Mr. Barrett may have inadvertently given the impression, but the impression that he gave was that you could support his contention that this conversation took place with Cyril Dunne, because he had told you about it. You say that that is wrong, is that right?
A. I cannot support that contention. I have no recollection or memory of that conversation.

377 Q. Just on a general note, were you aware of the fact that John Barrett was acting as, he describes it, an interlocutor with Sergeant McCabe?
A. I wasn't aware of the use of that word "interlocutor",
but I was aware, because obviously John is my boss, that he was dealing with issues associated with Maurice and that he had a lot of contact with Maurice and that he had a lot of -- you know, a lot of work to do in relation to supporting Maurice. I was aware of that, 14:22 definitely.

378 Q. And that work started in 2015?
A. Yes.

379 Q. And continued into 2016 and on into 2017, I think, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes.

380 Q. And at any time did he discuss with you any problems that Sergeant McCabe may have had in relation to how he was dealt with at the Commission of Investigation?
A. No, no.

MR. MARRINAN: Okay. Would you answer any questions, please.
MR. MCDOWELL: No questions for me, Judge.
MR. MCCANN: I have no questions either, Chairman.
MR. ROGERS: No questions.
MR. DIGNAM: No questions, Chairman.
MR. MARRINAN: Thank you very much, chief Superintendent.
the witness then withdrew

MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, the next witness is Mr. Noel Waters, who gave evidence first on the 12th January.

MR. ROGERS: Chairman, I propose to withdraw. Thank you.

381 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Mr. Waters, you were here on Friday, 12th January?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. And you were sworn to give evidence.
A. Correct.

383 Q. And I think you were then away for some period?
A. Yes.
Q. And obviously you -- I think you left your position, and you're in retirement now since November of 2017?
A. Correct, yes, yes.
Q. But we didn't have the benefit of those documents when we were taking your evidence?
A. That's correct, yes.

387 Q. And I just wanted to ask you about some few of them, just to try and assist us in our recollection -- in your recollection. Could we just look at your
statement, though, which is at 3351 of the book. It's book 6.
A. Can you put it on the screen, please?

388 Q. Yes.
A. Thank you.

389 Q. On the next page -- sorry, 3351, yes. 3351. Now, you say obviously in your first paragraph, introducing it, that the information set out refers to the period from the establishment until its reporting. But obviously in your second paragraph you go on to say:
"As the Disclosures Tribunal will be aware, shortly after the publication of the report of the 11th may, controversy arose following the leaking of an apparent section of the transcript concerning the alleged legal strategy of the Garda Commissioner at the Commission. In preparing materials for responding to parliamentary questions, Dáil debates, and so forth, in relation to this matter, there would have been contact between officials, the minister and the Garda authorities. It would have been normal practice and, as indicated, arose following the completion of the Commission of Inquiry and publication of its report. Therefore, the question of any party seeking to influence the legal strategy in question did not arise."

Now, obviously you're referring to that period after the publication, but did you not think it relevant to disclose to the Tribunal that you had two meetings with
the Commissioner in that period, one on the 16th and
one on the 19th?
A. When I provided my statement to the Commission -- or to the Tribuna1, I beg your pardon --
Q. Yes.
A. -- at the time, I had no knowledge or had no recollection of those meetings. It was only subsequently, in fact in recent days, and having been away, as you said, that those meetings came to my attention, when $I$ reviewed the evidence of other people 14:27 who were here.
Q. Yes. Now, "at that particular time", are you talking about the time when you made your statement?
A. When I made my statement, yes, yes.
Q. Yes. But when you were Secretary General, when the

Tribunal was established in February, did you recal1 that you had meetings with the Commissioner which involved a discussion of her strategy at the Commission?
A. No, I didn't at the time either, no. statement to the Tribunal, which was I think in early December, did you recollect on any occasion the controversy which you do refer to here, but which
involved the Commissioner, as it were, being called to account by the Minister?
A. No, I didn't.
okay. And I'm not going to take you through the various answers that you gave me, but you did assert on a number of occasions that you had no recollection of certain issues I was putting to you on day 40, 12th January, when you came here. You probably recall that?
A. Yes. And could we look at document, it's 4820. It's in volume 9. If you would prefer to take the books out.
A. The screen, I think, is -- yes.
Q. This is an email from you to Ken O'Leary, and which you see:
"I see the Commissioner is coming in to her --" I presume that is the Tánaiste "-- this pm. I will be in at lunchtime."

And if we go down the screen, you will see that you had been previously replying to Mr. o'Leary, who had sent
you, sort of, a text of material, you see it there, you're commenting on it to Mr. o'Leary there on the 16th May, early in the morning. And then if you go down further, we can see the original text of

Mr. O'Leary. He says -- this is to, obviously -- to the Tánaiste from Mr. O'Leary. It says:
"Chris mentioned you were looking for a note on the story in the Sunday Independent about tapes introduced into evidence at the O'Higgins Commission of Inquiry disproving the evidence for the Gardaí. what seems to be happening is that sources are putting out their version of what happened at the Commission, despite that being unlawful, knowing full well that people who respect the law cannot respond. while it might be idle to speculate about motivation it would appear to be an attempt to re-run in public matters dealt with by the Commission on the basis of partial leaks. I should mention that I understand that the Commissioner is considering whether she could usefully make any further public comment, but there were obviously clear legal constraints on what she could say."

And then the text of Section 11 is set out, and we don't need to go through that. If we go on to the following page, just here it says:
"On the face of it then, it would not be open to us to ask the Commissioner to disclose any details of what happened in relation to evidence at private sessions of the Commission. In the circumstances, it would seem the only public response you could make to questions about these matters is along the lines of the replies
we gave on Friday to queries about reports which had appeared in the Irish Examiner."

And I think they were written by Mr. Clifford. You probably recall that?
A. I do at this stage, yes, yes.

399 Q. Yes. And it says:
"You are aware there is a prohibition in law on the disclosure of evidence given in private at the
Commission. In those circumstances, it would be wholly inappropriate for you to comment on any partial disclosure as to what may have occurred. In any event, you would have no knowledge of the accuracy, or otherwise, of disclosures made, notwithstanding the provisions of the 2004 Act, nor could you properly ask the Garda Commissioner to inform you about evidence given in private at the Commission because of the legal prohibitions that are in place. what you can say is that Mr. Justice o'Higgins was in a position to hear all the evidence. It was entirely a matter for the Commission, having heard all the evidence, to reach its own conclusions and deal with whatever matters it considers appropriate in its report. That is exactly what the Commission has done and it would not be appropriate now for you to seek to go behind the conclusions he reached and in some way to try to re-run publicly the Commission's work. (It would be very strange to suggest an investigation into what evidence
was given to a Commission of Investigation). You have expressed hope, the hope that all who are affected by the report can accept, as you do fully, that Mr. Justice O'Higgins looked at all the facts fairly and dispassionately and made every effort to do justice to the position of all.
while you are not in a position to comment on any evidence given to the Commission in private, you are aware that, on publication, the Garda Síochána indicated that they accepted the report in full, and of course that includes all reference to Sergeant McCabe, including what it said about his having acted in good faith."

It goes down then, and this portion appears to be in brackets:
"It is for the Commissioner to make a statement. It is, of course, entirely a matter for the Commissioner whether she feels she is in a position or considers it would be appropriate to make any further comment, though I think, in fairness, we have to recognise the very legal constraints that everyone is subject to here."

Now, do you recall getting that email?
A. Not at the time.

400 Q. All right.
A. Not at the time, no.

401 Q. Not at the time. And do you recall now getting it?
A. Having reviewed it now and having reviewed other evidence, yes. And when I was referring in my statement to ongoing contacts after the publication, this is the type of thing that $I$ had a sense of what was going on, in the immediate aftermath of the publication and following the leaking, this, as I think I described, to-ing and fro-ing at the time.
402 Q. Yes. We11, I mean, did that trigger any memory of the receipt or the content of the email of the 15th May?
A. This is the 15th May 20 --

403 Q. 2015.
A. No, no, no, no.

404 Q. Did it trigger any memory of a conversation with the Commissioner on the afternoon of the 15th May?
A. No, absolutely not. No.

405 Q. Well, there was a briefing note prepared by the Department for the Commissioner -- for the meeting with the Commissioner, and could we look at page 4803. It's 14:33 quite a lengthy document.
A. This is the meeting of the --

406 Q. The meeting on the 16th.
A. Of May --

407 Q. Of May 2016.
A. -- 2016, yes, yes.

408 Q. Do you recall seeing that?
A. Not at the time when I was giving my evidence, but subsequently in recent days when $I$ was reviewing
evidence that was put before here, yes.
409 Q. Yes. But have you a recollection of considering that with the Minister before meeting the Commissioner?
A. No, I don't. I think my -- again, having knowledge of this now at this stage, on that particular meeting --
A. -- I understand that it was actually the day before the Minister was due to take oral PQs in the Dáil.
Q. Yes.
A. That, in the normal course, it would be departmental practice that if there was something -- you know, something major, for example, a production of a report, that the Minister would have a conversation with the Commissioner or the head of the prison service, or whatever the issue was. So I think that meeting may have been held -- at this remove now, I think it may have been held in that context and that the minister was answering oral PQs the following day.
412 Q. Yes. And we have seen some PQs, and a PQ in response that was prepared for the Minister in relation to a question, and we've seen, and I've asked you previously, about the Minister's contribution at Leaders' Questions on the 18th May.
A. Yes.

413 Q. You recall that?
A. Not specifically, no, not the particular point.

414 Q. Yes, yes. But there were calls, am I correct in saying, for the Commissioner to, as it were, disclose the legal advice that she got, isn't that right?
A. There were calls in the media, certainly. And if I remember correctly, at this remove there were also calls in the House.
Q. Yes.
A. In that members of the opposition had said that this could be cleared up by the Commissioner disclosing her -- breaking privilege effectively and disclosing her legal advice.
Yes. And Deputy Martin, in particular, I think, gave the example of he having waived, while Minister, his privilege in relation to matters being considered by, $I$ think, the blood inquiry, if you recall?
A. I don't recall that, no.

417 Q. It's on the record of the House anyway, for the 18th. But he, apart from the commentators, raised the issue, isn't that right?
A. I can't say who precisely it was, other than I knew that it was raised, yes.
Q. And it was raised on the 17th, isn't that right, in the House?
A. I can't get -- I don't have the quite sequence.
Q. Yes.
A. But I take it if you say it is, that it was, yes.
Q. We11, what I want to ask you is: You didn't seem to recall, the last time you were here, whether the Commissioner raised this issue in the meeting with the Minister on the 16th May --
A. I --

421 Q. -- as a way of defending herself?
A. I don't believe that she did. I don't believe -- there may have been some discussion, but that meeting was primarily, $I$ think, to deal with the issues that were, in terms of pure -- of bad policing practices in the Cavan-Monaghan division, the core of the issues that were investigated in O'Higgins. So I can't be certain, but there may have been some marginal discussion, given that this was an issue in public discourse at that stage.
422 Q. Yes. You seemed uncertain the last time we were here about whether the Minister had sought the Attorney's opinion on the release of the advice?
A. That's correct.

423 Q. You did make, I think, passing reference to it.
A. Yes.

424 Q. But we know that Mr. Forsyth sent the Attorney's advice, because we have the details of the transmission of the email relating to that, on the 17 th May at 12:03. So it would seem that the Attorney's advice had been sought and obtained and given to the Minister and transmitted by Mr. Forsyth to the Commissioner by 12:03 on the 17th. Did you know that that was happening?
A. I can't say that I did. As I said the last day, I knew -- I had a question in my mind about the minister having sought the Attorney's advice, but I now know subsequently that she did. But the sequence of events that you set out there, I wasn't aware of those in terms of -- and, ordinarily, I wouldn't necessarily have been aware of that.

A. Sure.
Q. And it says " $18 / 5$ meeting with Noe1 and Ken."

Now, I know you told us obviously when Minister, Ms. Fitzgerald disclosed the emails that she apparently 14:39 thought had been sent on to you --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

429 Q. -- on the 18th, you said you didn't get them, is that right?
A. Yes. There was an issue, if I remember correctly the last day, in terms of the incorrect email address being put to me, yes. Yes, yes. And just to have your evidence, was there a meeting involving yourself and Mr. O'Leary on the 18th, either with the Tánaiste or with Ms. Mannion or anyone else?
A. There was a meeting, yes, I do know now, I do remember now that there was a meeting on the 18th with Mr. O'Leary and the Tánaiste and myself. I hadn't recalled that when $I$ was giving evidence the last day --
431 Q. A11 right.
A. -- here. But I do know now that there was, yes.

432 Q. Yes.
A. Yes. This note helped to refresh my memory on that.

433 Q. I see. Because we've seen, obviously, that the Commissioner sought from Chief Superintendent Healy a copy of the legal advice that had been emailed in 2015 to her, and Chief Superintendent Healy forwarded that on to her, on the evening of 17th May 2016. And we've seen obviously from the Commissioner's recovered emails from the iPad, that she sent a number of emails to the Minister on the morning of the 18th, isn't that right? You saw those on the previous occasion?
A. Yes, in the light of this note here, yes. This has triggered this, yes. This has refreshed my memory, yes.
434 Q. So the fact that your email address wasn't right or
that they didn't come through to you on email, do you recall discussing the fact that the commissioner had sent in the advice and what the Minister was to do with it?
A. Again, in the light of the information I have now, which is not what I had, as I say, when I gave evidence, yes, there was a discussion with the Minister on that day.
Q. On the 18th?
A. On the 18th.
Q. After she had come out of the House?
A. I think it was in the afternoon, so I think that was a wednesday.
437 Q. Yes.
A. And ordinarily I think the minister would be in the House in the morning. She was Tánaiste, I think, at that stage.
438 Q. Yes.
A. So she would be doing, I think, the order of business of the House. So I think the likelihood is, it probably was the afternoon, I would have thought.

439 Q. Yes. Would they normally be taking Leaders' Questions at 2:30? Am I wrong?
A. Depending on the day.

440 Q. On the day?
A. Or the order of business, perhaps.

441 Q. Yes. Okay. But, I mean, did the Minister make you aware or did you learn from somebody else that effectively she was sticking by the Attorney's advice
and wasn't going to be publishing the Commissioner's advice?
A. There was a discussion. I can't put my hand on my heart to say precisely what the Minister or the Tánaiste said in terms of the Attorney's advice, but it was clear from the discussion between Mr. O'Leary, the Tánaiste and myself that we'd all agreed that this was a bad idea; this was, as I said before, this was setting up a very dangerous precedent. And I think, as well, on reflecting on it now again, our view of it would have been that it probably wouldn't have solved the issue either at the time had this been put into the pub1ic domain, because it would have probably given rise to further questions in the nature of political discourse in the country. But in any event, I think we were all of the view that publishing this advice wasn't a good idea.

442 Q. Yeah. As a matter of fact, were you consulted in 2017 when the Commissioner actually waived her privilege --
A. No, no.

443 Q. -- while you were stil1 Secretary General?
A. No, no, and nor would I expected to have been.

444 Q. Right. okay.
A. Yeah.

445 Q. And to your knowledge, was the Minister at the time consulted?
A. Em, not to my knowledge. I have no knowledge of that. But again, I would find that surprising if she was.

446 Q. okay. And I've asked you previously about the letter
that was sent to the Commissioner on the 19th, but this was then followed by a meeting on the 19th, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

447 Q. And have you been able to refresh your memory as to the 14:43 circumstances of the meeting of the 19th?
A. Again, with the documents which have since been discovered by the Department in recent days, yes, I've seen that there was a short note $I$ think done by a colleague who was at the meeting, and I think
Ms. Mannion also did a note, from my review of the Tánaiste's -- former Tánaiste's evidence as well.
448 Q. Yes. And did it trigger your recollection of the actual meeting then?
A. Not particularly of the -- well, the fact that the meeting took place, yes, but in terms of what actually happened at the meeting, not -- I don't have a specific sort of verbatim, put it like that --

449 Q. Yes.
A. -- a verbatim record in my own mind about what happened 14:44 at the meeting. But I think one sense I have, again looking back on it now at this stage, is that I think we were all walking on eggshells in many respects around this issue, to the extent that we had the issue of the o'Higgins report and the integrity of that process.
Q. Yes.
A. We had the Commissioner and the major issue around -- I think following on from 'Prime Time' when the Tánaiste
had been on and immediately turned to the Government having confidence in the Commissioner. I think, as well, from -- at the time, the Government had literally been in office only about ten days. I think also we were -- gangland was an issue as well, gangland crime. So all these things were swirling around --
451 Q. Yes.
A. -- and it was uncertain. But that was my sense of the context of the meeting, rather than, as I say, the particular issues that -- or the sense of what actually 14:45 happened at the meeting.

452 Q. Yes. But it does appear from Ms. Mannion's notes, and I don't know can you recall this at this stage, that the minister seemed to have fairly put it to the Commissioner as to whether she was, in fact, saying one 19:45 thing in public and treating Sergeant McCabe one way publicly and doing an entirely different thing in private, do you recall that?
A. I've seen the notes on that. I can't say, hand on heart, that $I$ recall that conversation having taken place at the meeting, but I've seen Ms. Mannion's note of it and I have no reason to in any way dispute that, because I would have worked with her for the previous two years, and, you know, it was never an issue about accuracy, or anything like that.
Yes. Well, Ms. Mannion records the Commissioner responding to this, obviously talking about the selected leaks, apparently asserting that she had never accused or asserted that Sergeant McCabe had acted out
of malice, and she said there was a transcript that referred to that above, and she is recorded as saying there was complete confusion between malice, integrity and motivation. Do you recollect any of those matters being discussed, in broad terms?
A. Again, I can't, hand on heart, say that I have a recollection of, you know, any words or any conversations or any sentences being used, but I'm -in the sense of a verbatim recollection of the meeting, but I have no reason not to believe that they didn't happen on foot of Ms. Mannion's note, no reason at all not to believe that that would have -- that those words would have been uttered at the meeting.
454 Q. Yes. And Deputy Commissioner Twomey seems to have joined in the discussion, and do you recall that?
A. Again, on foot of the note of the attendance at the meeting, Deputy Commissioner Twomey was there as wel1, yes, on the day.
Q. You see, obviously the emails that gave rise to a political controversy before Christmas, that we're not concerned with but which dated from May '15, they weren't disclosed to the Tribunal. And the only person who asserted that they had any recollection of receiving them was, in fact, Mr . Flahive, who had sent it. And he said nobody came to him to look for the email. He said that he thought, you know, people would come looking for the email. Are you clear that you didn't discuss the email of the 15th May with anyone?
A. I had no recollection, as I said in evidence the last
day, of having received that email. I have absolutely no recollection at all. So the question of me discussing it wouldn't have arisen --
A. -- with anybody.

457 Q. Well, does it follow that you didn't search yourself for any documents that you thought would be relevant to this Tribunal?
A. No. The context of -- when the political controversy broke out, as you know at the time, the Tribunal subsequently wrote to me on foot of any knowledge I had, and my statement was my response to it. But prior to that, I hadn't done any search, although we were answering parliamentary questions or attempting to answer parliamentary questions in the Department around that time and we were trying to find some information that would have been of assistance in answering those questions. And that's how that email was unearthed, in fact, on foot of that.
A. At the time.

459 Q. We11, leaving aside 2015, you had been present at a meeting with the Commissioner in which she appears to have explained, and been required, perhaps, to explain what she was up to at the Commission. And I have difficulty in understanding why we didn't receive statements from all concerned, setting out their knowledge of that when the Tribunal was established or soon thereafter. would you like to comment on that?
A. A11 I can say at this remove is that the terms of reference of the Tribunal were very broad, you know. It didn't occur to me, I have to say, it just didn't occur to me that, you know, that $I$ should have made a statement at the time, and, look at, if, in hindsight, I should have, I do apologise, but it certainly didn't occur to me that a statement in the context of the very broad terms of reference, I didn't see that the Department itself would have had a major impact or major role in respect of the Tribunal at that time, but 14:50 obviously as things evolved on foot of the controversy that broke out, it was different.
460 Q. Yes. But, I mean, you must -- obviously the drafting of the terms of reference for the Tribunal happened, as it were, under your watch as well?
A. Yes.

461 Q. And under the Minister's watch?
A. That's correct, yes.

462 Q. Yes. And obviously one can perhaps say because of the leaks this issue remained and the provisions of the 2004 Act restraining sort of people knowing what had happened at the Commission, they obviously restrained the Minister and the Commissioner from perhaps releasing as much information as they might want to release?
A. That remained the position, yes.

463 Q. But in that context then, this term of reference was put into this Tribunal, and it's just there's obviously a pool of people who had explanations from the

Commissioner as to what her strategy was or what she had, in broad terms, pursued at the Tribunal, and we didn't receive statements from anyone until --
A. As I say, I can't, I can't -- it never occurred to me that, you know, that we should have responded. But as I say, in the context of the Tribunal coming to me looking for a statement, I did provide a statement.
A. But as I say, at the time it certainly didn't occur. But there was certainly no question, I can assure you, that we were seeking to not -- or conceal anything. We certainly were not trying do that. There would have been no reason for us to do that.
465 Q. Okay. And just looking at page 3352, just you've a couple of different paragraphs at the bottom of this, it's the second page of your statement.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

466 Q. And the third-7ast paragraph says:
"In relation to the minister having any knowledge of the Commissioner's legal strategy at the Commission, I have no knowledge beyond the materials set out in the emails of the 15th May 2015, 4th July 2015."

And would you accept that that is perhaps not accurate or not strictly accurate in the sense that the minister received an account from the commissioner at this period we're talking about?
A. My statement, as you know, was framed in the context --
Q. Yes.
A. So my comments were in that context.

And then the second paragraph does go on to discuss the post-publication events. But would you agree that obviously insofar as that relates or was intended to relate to the period up to the publication of the report, it just then doesn't deal with the post-publication period and couldn't be accurately applied to the post-publication period?
A. Yes, I do. But as I say, the context of my statement was the pre-publication period.
472 Q. Yes. The second-last paragraph, can I just ask you to sort of explain that to me? I have some difficulty in following it. It says:
"I had no discussion with the minister about the legal strategy adopted by the Commissioner, no more than I had with the Minister or officials in relation to any
legal strategy adopted at the Commission concerning the issues which were being inquired into by it."
A. What was in my mind --

473 Q. Yes.
A. -- there was that, as you know, colleagues in the Department were also before the Commission in respect of other issues --
474 Q. Yes.
A. -- and I was very conscious of that and I had no discussions with them, so $I$ wanted to make it clear that not alone was I not having conversations with the Minister, but equally, colleagues who I worked with every day. I didn't have any conversations, I didn't know what was happening at the Commission, I didn't know who was representing them, and I was very clear in 14:54 my mind that this was something that I should not be going to because of the issues that would be involved in doing that.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Waters.
A. Thank you.

MR. MCDOWELL: No questions.
MR. MCCANN: I have no questions, thank you, Chairman. MR. DIGNAM: No questions, Chairman.
A. Thank you.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MR. MARRINAN: The next witness, sir, is Ken O'Leary, please.

MR. KEN O'LEARY, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY SWORN, WAS FURTHER EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN:

CHAIRMAN: We can sit late, if necessary, if people want to go over these emails and meetings for another couple of hours. I'm sure you don't, Mr. Marrinan.

475 Q. MR. MARRINAN: Sorry, Mr. O'Leary, I'm going to be very brief, but there's one matter that has arisen, and it arises out of a number of emails that Mr. McGuinness had referred Noe 1 waters to there. The first one is at 4820. If we could have that up on the screen, please. You, at that time, had drafted a letter to the

Tánaiste. You see it down there at the end? Have you got that?
A. Yeah, I know about that.

476 Q. Pardon?
A. I know about that.

477 Q. You were responsible for drafting that?
A. I was, yeah.

478 Q. Yes. And I think that it had been sent to Noe1 Waters for his observation, is that right?
A. I'm not sure if it was -- sorry, could you give me the page number again?
479 Q. 4820, sorry, Volume 9.
A. I have it now.

480 Q. Can you follow that?
A. I can, yeah.

481 Q. You see from Noe1 Waters to yourself on the 16th May,

8:33?
A. Yeah, I do.
Q. And that's to you. Maybe you didn't run it by Mr. Waters, but regardless, if you just go up the page a sma11 bit, you see there from -- again from Noe1 waters to you at 9:58:
"I see the Commissioner is coming in to her this pm. I will be in at lunchtime."

And then at 10:44 from yourself, I think that's to Mr . Waters, in fact:
"John OC -- "

I think that is John O'Callaghan, is that right?
A. That's right.

483 Q. " -- argues we might be breaking the law ourselves by asking."

> You see there?
A. Yeah.
Q. Was there any sense at the time that perhaps the Department shouldn't even be discussing what evidence had been given at the o'Higgins Commission?
A. Oh, very much so, and we didn't. Like, we took the view that the confidentiality of the Commission proceedings was absolute and it wouldn't be appropriate to ask the Commissioner anything that would impinge on that.

485 Q. And, you see, we have the briefing document that you prepared on the 16th May, and that's at page 4803. That's your briefing document for the Commissioner -for the Minister for a meeting to take place on the 16th May 2016, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

486 Q. And we also then have the minutes of the meeting of the 19th May with the Tánaiste and the Commissioner meeting. And we also know that Mr. Forsyth had been involved in getting the Attorney's view in relation to the Commissioner disclosing her legal advice at the Commission, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

487 Q. And there seems to have been a very strong argument adopted against that by the Department, isn't that right?
A. Very much so.

488 Q. Yes. And the Commissioner was -- effectively at that time was anxious that she should put into the public domain, in answer to the allegations that were being
levelled against her, the advice that she had received from counsel on the 15th May 2015, isn't that right?
A. In fairness, I'm not sure that fully would set out the position. I think what happened was, at a particular point that week the Commissioner felt, because of the severe criticisms that were being made against her, that the only answer may be to put the legal advice.
489 Q. Yes.
A. I don't think there was any enthusiasm on the part of the Commissioner to do that.
Q. Yes. Well, I mean, in the sense of defending herself as the last resort, as it were. obviously, nobody would want to be going into the public domain and laying out advice.
A. I think so. And, I mean, she wrote to the minister, I think, on the morning of the 18th. There were a number of emails. Now, I think what she said in the emails was, you may wish to use this. I'm not sure she was actually advocating it, but putting it on the table as an option that she'd be happy for the minister to use.
491 Q. We11, you'11 see, you will appreciate that, from an examination of the documents, that one may think that there is some sort of a sub-plot here within the Department, because there is no reference whatsoever in any of the emails to the fact that the Department had been advised of this issue when it arose on the 15th May of 2015.
A. of which issue on the 15th?

492 Q. The issue that arose at the Commission on the 15th May.
A. But, I mean, in the 2016 sequence of events, I don't think anyone was particularly conscious of what had happened in October 2015.
No. What had happened, as we know from your evidence, on the 15th May of 2015, when this matter arose, we know that Annmarie Ryan contacted the Attorney General's office, Mr. Dreelan there, who thought that it was such a significant development that he should bring it to the attention, he thought, of the Attorney, but he contacted Richard Barrett, who thought that it was of sufficient importance that he ought to notify Mr. Flahive, and we know that Mr. Flahive then spoke to you, and, in the meantime, you had spoken -- or, earlier on, you had spoken on two occasions with the Garda Commissioner in relation to this self-same issue --
A. Mm-hmm.

494 Q. -- isn't that right? And yet, here we are a year later and there isn't any discussion at all in relation to the fact that this matter had been notified to the Department at the time, do you understand?
A. Yeah. But what I am saying is, I don't think -- I certainly wasn't very mindful or conscious at the time of what happened 12 months previously. The situation we were in was, Judge o'Higgins had reported on the Commission proceedings and we were relying fully on what Judge o'Higgins said. Like, we weren't carrying out -- there had been a leak of two or three pages of transcripts and a particular story. Like, we didn't
see ourselves as carrying out, at the time, an investigation into what the Commissioner did or didn't do at the Commission. We regarded the o'Higgins Report as not raising those issues and we certainly didn't regard the leak or selected leak of parts of it as warranting us to say to the Commissioner, what exactly did you do at the Commission of Investigation? so you're completely satisfied that there wasn't, either by your or anybody else, a sub-plot here of not referring to the fact that the Department had been notified of this in 2015?
A. We1l, I mean, as I explained before, like, we were notified of a very, very, very limited piece of information which related to, in my case, one question and the reaction to that question. Genuinely, at the time of the 2016 thing where things were getting difficult in terms of what had been leaked and the response to it, I can't recall being particularly mindful of what happened in 2015.
496 Q. Well, on a one-to-one level, talking to the Garda Commissioner, which you did frequently, did you remind her of the call that she had made?
A. I don't think I reminded myself of the call that had been made, quite frankly. As I say, we had the o'Higgins Report. Our view was that we had to rely on the o'Higgins report. There was no basis, although there was public concern that was being expressed, our view was Judge o'Higgins had dealt with all these matters and people should rely on the report. We
weren't, as far as I was concerned, on the basis of a few minutes of what apparently happened at the Commission, starting a new investigation as to what approach the Commissioner had taken.
497 Q. And I think that you've already given evidence in relation to this, that your primary concern at the time was to protect the position of the Commissioner who you felt was being extremely hard done by?
A. Well, I mean, our primary concern was, Judge o'Higgins had been the person who carried out the Commission. He 15:06 had fully reported on it. We felt that was what had to be relied on. And it was also the case, because of the various things that followed from the leaking of the transcripts, that the Commissioner's position was difficult at the time. And our objective was that we didn't want to do anything to undermine the o'Higgins Commission report and we didn't want to do anything that undermined the position of the Commissioner because we didn't think that was warranted in any way. MR. MARRINAN: I fully understand. Thank you very much.

MR. KEN O'LEARY WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL:

498 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Just very briefly, Mr. O'Leary. At this 15:07 time did the Department receive any advice on the statutory prohibition on the disclosure of evidence set out in Section 11(3) of the Commissions of Investigation Act?
A. I think we did receive some material from the Attorney's office.
Q. I mean, I don't want to break privilege or break the Department's privilege, but $I$ think it's clear from some of the documents that there was an awareness in the Department that the prohibition applied to the disclosure of evidence given by a witness or the contents of a document produced by a witness, isn't that right?
A. I mean, I'm in difficulty because I don't know the position about privilege and what the AG may have said. If $I$ can tell you the Department's understanding.
Q. Yes.
A. If that would answer it in a different way without -501 Q. Te11 me that, yes.
A. -- causing difficulties. Our understanding was that, you know, on a literal reading of it, there was an argument might be made that arguments -- legal argument wouldn't be covered.
502 Q. Yes.
A. But that it was very difficult, in the sense that if a legal argument related to evidence that had been given at the Commission, that you might be in difficulty there.
503 Q. Yes. But that clearly would be so, but legal argument about evidence that might be given in future at the Commission was not covered?
A. To be honest, I'm not sure how much thought we gave to that at the time.

MR. MCCANN: We11, I mean, I wonder how fair it is to ask this witness legal questions.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, I'm being interrupted.
CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I didn't hear.
MR. MCCANN: Sorry, I was making a comment, Judge, that 15:09 I was wondering how fair it was to be asking this witness questions of law.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it is fair to ask a question as to what the understanding of the Department was.
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, the Department can say, we11, Section 11 is utterly untouchable or we'd have to go to the High Court. I don't think that is going to trespass on any advice the AG gave. And in the event that there was advice, we11 I'm not interested in what it was.

504 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I think the Department was aware of that as an issue, isn't that a fair way of putting it?
A. As to what exactly was covered by Section 11?

505 Q. 11(3), yes.
A. We certain7y gave some consideration to it at the time.

506 Q. Yes.
A. Now, I have to say we were conscious as well that whatever the literal meaning of Section 11 , that Judge O'Higgins, $I$ think, clearly in the report, regarded it, 15:09 the proceedings of the Commission as confidential.

507 Q. I see. Could I ask you then in relation to -- and I just want to tease this out because it may be of significance and it may be of assistance to this

Tribunal. Was any attention given to the proposition that you could ask the Commissioner what strategy she was deploying in relation to witnesses, because that clearly - or, sorry, I won't say that clearly, but there was a strong argument that that was not caught by 15:10 Section 11(3), what approach you were taking to witnesses?
A. As Mr. Waters was saying at the time, we felt we were walking on eggshells in relation to this, that we couldn't ask the commissioner what happened at the Commission.

508 Q. We11, just, for instance, and I'm not trying to be argumentative at all, Mr. O'Leary, going back to the conversation you had with the commissioner about what she might or might not do on the afternoon of the 15th May 2014, clearly -- I take it you never thought that there was a question of infringing the criminal law in that conversation when she was seeking advice as to the approach she might take?
A. We11, I mean, as I said before, she asked me were there ${ }_{15: 11}$ any issues to be mindful of.

509 Q. Yes.
A. And I mentioned issues that I think would apply to most commissions. So I don't think there was any legal issue there.
510 Q. And then if we go forward then to whenever it was in 2016, likewise there was no major legal issue, I have to suggest to you, in asking her about motivation, credibility, integrity --
A. Well, in as much as --

511 Q. -- was that part of her strategy or not?
A. Certainly we were very careful in relation to the whole thing. Like, the transcripts that were released, we would have been uneasy about saying, look, it says this and it says that and it says the other, because they were matters that happened at the Commission itself. And as I say, we didn't feel at the time that there was some obligation on the Commissioner to account for the approach she took, given that the only basis for that was what was happening in relation to the leaking of documents.
512 Q. I follow the point you're making, but I am just making a slightly different point. I have to suggest to you there was nothing really to stop the Minister, the Department, or anybody else, saying, there was nothing wrong with discussing motivation, integrity and credibility all getting mixed up, as Ms. Mannion's note describes the conversation, there is nothing wrong with that discussion.
A. I don't think there was anything wrong with it, but it could only take you so far in the sense that I think it's a bit artificial to say you could divorce all this from what happened at the Commission.
513 Q. I take your point on that. But the only point I'm asking you on, and it's purely the view of the Department as to how far the Section 11(3) prohibition actually extended, and I'm suggesting to you, maybe you don't agree with it, that it was perfectly open to the

Minister to say, would you mind telling me generally what approach did you instruct your counsel to take in respect of sergeant McCabe or any other witness?
CHAIRMAN: Suppose she knew, what could she do? MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, Judge?

CHAIRMAN: Could she do anything lawfully?
MR. MCDOWELL: No. But since it was discussed, since the question of integrity -- I am making the point that it was discussed on the 16th May and I'm suggesting that --
CHAIRMAN: That was way after the Commission had ended. MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: But I'm suggesting that wasn't a criminal offence --
A. I understand.

514 Q. -- to discuss it or to ask her about it. I'm just wondering, at what stage -- at what stage did the Department come to this kind of very strict taboo, we cannot ask the Commissioner what approach she took to her strategy?
A. Well, as I say, we were starting from the basis that we couldn't ask about what happened at the commission, and, like, we were just very careful in relation to the whole thing. I mean, I can't give you a conclusive, by any means, legal view, on how far you can stretch that, if had you to stretch it.
MR. MCDOWELL: Thank you very much. I think you have been very fair. I'm not going to push it any further.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is there anybody else? No. MR. MARRINAN: Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW
15:14

MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, the next witness is Deputy Commissioner Twomey.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is he going to be long, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MCGUINNESS: I anticipate not terribly long. CHAIRMAN: We11, what does "not terribly long" mean? I'm sorry, I'm just not feeling well now. I've really had enough at this point. So what do you think? MR. MCGUINNESS: I'm sorry, I'm talking about ten or 15:15 fifteen minutes.

CHAIRMAN: Great.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JOHN TWOMEY, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS:

515 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Deputy Commissioner, I think you were formally appointed as such on the 20th October 2015, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

516 Q. And prior to that you had been acting up, as it were, as deputy on a temporary basis since 10th July 2014 ?
A. That's correct.

517 Q. And prior to that, had you been an assistant
commissioner?
A. That's correct.

518 Q. And what were your responsibilities at that stage, when you were an assistant?
A. In 2014, I was the assistant commissioner in charge of the Dublin metropolitan region. I also had part responsibility as assistant commissioner for traffic, and then in July of 2014 I was appointed as the acting deputy commissioner in an administrative capacity.

There were a number of vacancies. There were no other deputy commissioners at that particular time when I was given the job.

CHAIRMAN: If you try and keep your answers as short as you possibly can.
519 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes. Can I take you to the beginning of 2015, just very briefly, and ask you to look at page 4738. It's in Volume 9. I think it's a typed copy of your original notes which you'd provided. And I think this was a meeting that was called to discuss a recent emai1 from Sergeant McCabe concerning his treatment by GRA and some named persons and lack of support. And you appear there with Assistant Commissioner Fanning; Mr. Barrett, who was executive director; and the two chief superintendents, Chief Superintendent Curran and McMenamin, is that right?
A. It's Superintendent McMenamin.

520 Q. Superintendent McMenamin.
A. He was the district officer with responsibility for the area where Sergeant McCabe was working.

521 Q. I'm not going to ask you any detail about it, but there were a number of issues which were actioned at the bottom of the page, and perhaps we will just look at that, under different headings. There's legal action and HR issues, and it seems like Mr. Barrett was to obtain details of those, is that right?
A. That's correct.

522 Q. Workplace support, that's Assistant Commissioner Fanning to deal with that, is that right?
A. That's correct.

523 Q. Ongoing investigations, Assistant Commissioner Fanning. "GMTB", that seems to be your responsibility. what was that?
A. That was in relation to the previous inquiries that were gone for the fixed charged penalty notices.
524 Q. Yes. And the Commissioner's secretary and the Commissioner's office was next. You were to deal with that as well?
A. That is correct.

525 Q. And the "JOM investigation", what was that?
A. That's the John O'Mahony investigation.

526 Q. which one?
A. This was done -- that was an original investigation that was done into the fixed charged penalty notices.
527 Q. A11 right. Okay. In any event, you seem to have continued to be assigned by the Commissioner in dealing with these matters and participating in discussion, is that correct? If we look at page 4879, you're there with the Commissioner, Chief Superintendent McLough1in,

Mr. Ruane and the Assistant Commissioner Fintan Fanning, at page 4870. Do you recall that? 4870.
A. 487-?

528
Q. 4870 .
A. That's correct.

529 Q. You've found that?
A. Yes.

530 Q. A meeting of the 12th of the 2 nd.
A. That's correct.

531 Q. And I'm not going to ask you about developments in the interim that aren't relevant. But I think you continued to be involved, and if we look at 4860, you were at the meeting that includes people there on the 25th, which is the Commissioner, Ken Ruane, Tony McLough1in, yourself, Barry O'Brien, Cyril Dunne and Frank Walsh. And that was a lengthy meeting to consider the response, inter alia, to Sergeant McCabe's issues, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

532 Q. And there was a subsequent other meeting that day, if we go to 4871, and you appear to be at that meeting as well later on the 25th, is that correct?
A. That is correct.

533 Q. You seem to have been then, therefore, directly involved in the strategy to deal with Sergeant McCabe insofar as the workplace issues were concerned, is that right?
A. I was, Judge, involved in ensuring the workplace supports were put in place for Sergeant McCabe.

534
Q. Now, the Tribunal has heard evidence of the Commissioner's phone call to Mr. O'Leary, the previous witness, where she was looking for advice on any issues that she might take into account in her approach to Sergeant McCabe in the Commission of Inquiry. Did she consult with you about her approach to how she would deal with Sergeant McCabe in that context, in the Commission?
A. No, Judge, no.

Were you privy to no discussion with her about how she would instruct counsel to deal with it?
A. I had no conversations in relation to that particular subject.
536 Q. We11, had you any knowledge of the intended approach?
A. No.
A. None. I had no knowledge. Were you not participating at this stage, having been made deputy, or acting deputy, in the executive board meetings with the Commissioner?
A. Em, I was an acting deputy commissioner at the time, but the executive board, because we weren't formally appointed, didn't meet as regularly as it did at a later stage. I think in the context -- at this particular time in 2015, I was primarily the assistant commissioner in charge of Dublin. We had just had a very serious gangland crime issue in the Regency, and that was my primary focus. I had no conversations with the Commissioner about the legal strategy.

539 Q. All right. I'm just going to skip very quick7y forward in time to February 2017, because the Tribunal has seen some emails that came from Ms. Prone to you, which relate to another issue the Tribunal is concerned with. But were you dealing with Ms. Prone on the Commissioner's behalf when she couldn't?
A. I think there was a number of us that were involved to try and bring as wide a knowledge and full extent of the information to the debate and I had some information in relation to the workplace issues that I was involved in. So I was involved in some emails back and forth.
540 Q. Just one inference that could be drawn is that you were, as it were, close to the mind and the intention of the Commissioner dealing with different issues connected with Sergeant McCabe, and I'm just not clear how you wouldn't have knowledge of how she intended to approach the Commission vis-à-vis Sergeant McCabe?
A. I wasn't involved in any discussions with the Commissioner about the legal strategy. I was involved in the workplace issues. I had become involved with Sergeant McCabe at an earlier stage, and that was the reason my involvement continued across into the workplace issues. But I had no conversations whatsoever in advance of the legal strategy.
541 Q. Well, just finally, coming to 2016, the Tribunal has seen a brief that was prepared relating to the Commissioner's instructions relative to the Commission, prepared by Chief Superintendent Healy and I think

Inspector MacNamara. Did you see and receive that brief?
A. I don't believe I did, no. I have no recollection of receiving that.
542 Q. Well, what was the purpose then of your attending with the Commissioner at meetings with the Minister on 16th and 19th May?
A. I think at one of the meetings they were talking about the gangland issues, they were also speaking about the pending industrial relations issue and I was involved in both of those. I was also involved in the workplace support issues and I had also been given responsibility for the implementation of the recommendations Guerin Report and subsequently the report from the o'Higgins Commission. So I was involved in the implementation of those recommendations and I was able to give both a global view on the action that was being taken and some of the more detailed questions. But I was not involved in the legal strategy.
543 Q. okay. It's just you have no notes of the meeting of the 19th, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct. That is correct.

544 Q. And is there any reason why you didn't take notes?
A. No. It was at a meeting in the Department. And I have no notes on that.

It's just, according to Ms. Mannion's notes you chimed in on a number of occasions to explain the strategy to the meeting, including the Minister, is that right?
A. I don't believe I chimed in on the strategy. I think I
may have chimed in on what might be a more general observation in relation to a strategy that may be taken. But not in relation to a specific -- not specifically in relation to the strategy in this case. As I say, I had no involvement in this case.

So you're just talking generally, is that right?
A. That's correct. In relation to that specific instance, yes.
547 Q.
You've no knowledge as to how the Commissioner approached it actually in fact, is that what you are saying?
A. Em, we11, in 2016, there was some information in the public domain. In 2016 the issue had evolved. So at that stage I certainly was aware of some of the general detail. I wasn't specifically aware, I wasn't aware in 15:25 advance of the issue in 2015, but I only became aware generally afterwards, I think through some interaction that I had with Sergeant McCabe, I think there may be correspondence following the o'Higgins Commission, but again I wasn't involved or privy to what happened at the Tribunal or the legal strategy.

548 Q. Yes. But you went to both of these meetings and did you know that the commissioner had sent counsel's advice to the Minister and there was, I won't say it, a controversy, but a debate about whether that advice would be released; were you privy to seeing what the advice was even?
A. No. I don't believe I have ever seen the advice, even up to today. As I say, I was aware generally that
there were issues raised at the Commission, but I was not aware of what the specifics was, because I wasn't privy to the o'Higgins Commission, nor was I privy to any of the information that was specifically raised.
549 Q. Okay. Thank you deputy Commissioner.
MR. MCDOWELL: No questions.
MR. MCCANN: No questions.
MR. MURPHY: No questions, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm going to take the floor for a moment. As I understand it now, we're at the end of this. Sergeant McCabe of course is going to give evidence, which of course may include something in relation to his own reaction to the manner in which the O'Higgins Commission proceeded. It is to be noted, however, that the Tribunal has searched the transcripts for use of the word shouting. It occurs on two
occasions. I have indicated what they were; which were apologies from counsel saying 'I need to shout' or 'I have to shout because otherwise you won't hear me'. Other than that, there is no issue of that. And also, the Tribunal has read or had people read the entire transcript and has listened to portions of the transcript, on audio. So I fee1 that the Tribunal should be in a good position to know what happened.

Now, the first thing a judge does when she or he goes into their room is to say: what do I need to decide in this case? And it seems to me - and it's subject to correction or submissions by people, this is put out with a view to trying to assist as opposed to with a view to trying to curtail people in any way - that given the context of the terms of reference there are a number of questions that $I$ should ask. That doesn't necessarily mean that $I$ have to report on them and it doesn't necessarily mean that $I$ have to give an answer to al1 of them, but they are certainly questions that are on my mind at this time.

Let's bear in mind, first of all, that the Tribunal is tasked to investigate whether "the false allegations of sexual abuse or any other unjustified grounds were inappropriately relied on by Commissioner O'Sullivan to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe at the Commission of Investigation into certain matters in the Cavan-Monaghan district under the Chairmanship of Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins." That is what I am actually asked to do. So, in the light of that, it seems that reasonably at this point, given that there is only one small piece of the jigsaw left to fill, and of course I would pay particular regard to that, I would need to ask myself the following questions.

One: Were there false allegations of sexual abuse relied on by Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan to
discredit Maurice McCabe at the O'Higgins Commission? Everyone seems to be agreed that no, that there weren't.

The second question then is: were any unjustified grounds relied on inappropriately by Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan to discredit Maurice McCabe at the Commission? And please note the words "by Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan" - that is what I am required to
report on.

Three: what are the limits appropriately of (a) cross-examination, (b) cross-examination as to credibility and (c) cross-examination as to credit? Now as I understand it, from the textbooks and reading the relevant cases, cross-examination consists of the asking of any questions, including questions that, for instance, may not even be cross-examination at all, such as to a witness 'Isn't it the case that...' to which the answer is obviously yes. Cross-examination as to credibility is a question of tests as to a person's means of knowledge, their recollection, whether they were wearing their glasses, whether they had a few drinks, whether they were confused, whether they were tired, whether they had the flu; in other words, the ordinary testing of a witness's evidence as to weight. Cross-examination as to credit is the third category, and I'm still on number three in terms of questions. Cross-examination as to credit is something
which involves putting to a witness or eluding to something that is outside facts in issue but which undermines the creditworthiness of a witness, such as, for instance, that the witness had behaved inappropriately in a completely different setting. A classic example being, slept with his best friend's girlfriend, which has nothing to do with, for instance, a criminal or civil law, because it is a lawful activity, but which may make the tribunal of fact think less of the person and in that context may make the tribunal of fact consider that the person is therefore less worthy of being believed in terms of their evidence.

Now, there is just a matter there that I feel I need to mention. I'm not sure the name of the case is Bailey v. Flood, it possibly is, but $I$ know that there is a duty on, for instance, this Tribunal, and every tribunal, to disclose material which potentially has the ability to undermine credit. And I'd be grateful to counsel for the Tribunal, to Mr. McGuinness, if that is how it is chosen to address me on that issue. Because it seems to me that if there is a duty on a tribunal to disclose material, potentially undermining credit - and I'm not saying credibility, I'm saying credit - then there seems to be an entitlement to deploy it. And if it can be lawfully deployed therefore the answer to question number two may be in the negative, if indeed anything like that happened.

Right. That's the third issue.

Then the fourth issue is: what evidence is there that the 19th May letter from the Garda Commissioner and certain represented individuals was (a) a mistake, (b) an uncorrected mistake that was allowed to stay in an inaccurate form due to recklessness or perhaps inadvertence, or (c) was it deliberate ab initio? And the second and supplementary question that arises out of question four, which is actually very important: what has this, if anything, to do with Nóirín o'sullivan?

The fifth question is: was there any evidence on the transcript or from waived privilege documents or discussions that the Garda Commissioner intended (a) to challenge credibility in the ordinary way and then motive in the event that there was a lack of weight attaching to particular allegations? In other words, the challenge to credibility in this instance would be, on the evidence before me from Mr. Smyth principally is to challenge: look, what evidence have you got of that? how do you know the particular fact? and if you don't know the particular fact, well then, what was your reason for bringing forward this allegation in the light of the fact that you don't have any evidence to back it up; or, was it on the basis, again of the transcript, and any other waived documents as to privilege (b) to challenge the bona fide, mala fides,
integrity of Maurice McCabe? So, those seem to be the two choices.

Question number six seems to be this: Is leading counsel for the Garda Commissioner at the Tribunal correct in saying that his acceptance of integrity when it was put to him by the Judge was a mistake something said in the heat of the moment - or was it a question of the Garda Commissioner saying one thing publicly, that is to say, supporting Sergeant McCabe and then using a strategy of undermining Maurice McCabe as to his integrity privately at the Commission? Added into that is the necessity to look, to my mind, at the actual transcript of the day in question and the reference to the Commissioner having an unpleasant experience should she come down.

Seven: Is there any evidence of an aggressive stance by Garda Commissioner's counsel? I don't see any. And it was never put to counse1. There's no reference in the transcript to shouting, apart from 'Will you excuse me for shouting because I need to keep my voice up, as the tribunal has said?' And given that the Department of Justice actually authorised the phrase "aggressive stance", what finding should I make in relation to that 15:35 since that was not the query in the first instance from the media?

It seems to me the eighth question that arises having
heard the evidence is: Is there any evidence of a dark truth of going after Maurice McCabe at the Commission which emanates from the apex of the Garda organisation and is in particular to be ascribed to Nóirín o'Sullivan?

Question number nine would be: Did the Department and did the Minister behave lawfully in leaving any question as to strategy at the Commission to the Garda Commissioner? And added into that, it seems to me it is very important to note as to whether the Department themselves and the Minister were themselves under investigation by the Commission within the terms of reference.

Question number ten, to the which the answer it seems to me is no, immediately: Is there any way in which the Commission itself did not appropriately handle matters? It seems to me the Commission handled matters absolutely perfectly.

Eleven: Was there any proper basis to ask the Tribunal to investigate this particular module or was it entirely based on leaks and on conjecture?

So those seem to me to be the important questions. Now as I understand it where we're going, Mr. McGuinness, maybe you will be so kind as to just fill us in again, give us an update on that.

MR. MCGUINNESS: Thank you, Chairman. We11, Chairman, submissions in relation to portion of the Tusla module is next, scheduled for next Tuesday, 13th February. Subject to concluding that then, Chairman, on the day, it's intended to adjourn the continuation of evidence before the Tribunal until the next phase. And obviously, Chairman, you'11 be aware that the intense preparations for that are continuing and we will continue to try and ensure that sufficient material is available and distributed in sufficient time to give proper notice to the parties. It obvious7y will commence, as indicated, with the evidence of Sergeant McCabe, which is intended to be a comprehensive elucidation of all material matters from Sergeant McCabe, insofar as it's relevant of course. And after that, it's intended to start the technical module, which wil1 deal with al1 matters related to technical examination of devices, etcetera.

CHAIRMAN: Before we get to that -MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- I understood when Sergeant McCabe had given his evidence, and maybe other people will have questions for him apart from the Tribunal, and perhaps his own counsel --

MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- that we were going to have the submissions on this.

MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And if people have different questions that
they feel I should pose to myself or perhaps consider answering, they are perfectly at liberty to tell me that.

MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes. I should of course have said that. That after that, after the conclusion of

Sergeant McCabe's evidence, the opportunity will be there to make submissions on this phase of it. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MCGUINNESS: No doubt that will be taken up by the relevant parties.
CHAIRMAN: And then we envisage then running through to the end. I mean, I know I'm having this conversation with you publicly, but we have nothing to hide and it's appropriate that people should know. We're going to try to run through to the entire end of the Tribunal then.

MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes, Chairman. Insofar as possible. Obviously there will be -- there's obviously times when the hall isn't available and you, Chairman, will have some other duties elsewhere, and the Easter holidays
will intervene, but obviously we will publish our intended schedule and notify parties as soon as we can. But it is intended to engage in a continuous examination of all of the remainder of the Tribunal's work to bring it to conclusion insofar as it can be done.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you very much for that, Mr. McGuinness. As I understand it, we're in a position where we have mapped out the rest of where
we're going, but obviously the duty on any Tribunal is to gather documents, to gather evidence and then to distribute it and that is a mammoth undertaking, even for this, which was about a thing for which we actually had the transcript and actually had the audio, we have gone to nine volumes and 5,000 pages. I understand for the next, the volume of documents is not going to be as bad as for previous things, but under the strictures that tribunals operate under terms of law - and I'm not complaining about that, I just abide by it as opposed to making any comment on it - we do have the obligation to distribute and that also includes distributing anything, as I understand it, that may go to the credit of a witness of which we're aware. I think I'm right in thinking the last thing, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes. Yes, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: I would appreciate some submissions on that when we come to the --
MR. MCGUINNESS: At the appropriate time.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

THE TRIBUNAL THEN ADJOURNED UNTIL TUESDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY 2018 AT 10:00AM
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