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THE HEARING RESUMED, AS FOLLOWS, ON TUESDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY 2018:

## SUBMISSION BY MR. MCDERMOTT

MR. MCDERMOTT: Good morning, sir, I appear on behalf of Tusla and I'd like to make some closing remarks on behalf of my client.

The term of reference these remarks relate to is term of reference (d). That is: The creation, distribution and use by Tusla of a file containing false allegations of sexual abuse against Sergeant Maurice McCabe that was allegedly sent to Gardaí in 2013 and whether those false allegations and/or the file were knowingly used by senior members of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant McCabe. And that term of reference seems naturally to fall into two parts, and it appears on the face of it that it is the first part that is most relevant to my client, which is the creation, distribution and use of the false allegations in the file that were sent to the Gardaí. And then the second part of the term of reference, insofar as it deals with how the Gardaí then used that information, logically that would appear to be a matter for other parties in the room to deal with. So, my remarks will focus on the first part. At this point the Tribunal has carried out an extensive investigation into the creation, distribution and use by Tusla of the file containing the false allegations. Tusla hopes the Tribunal will
accept that it has cooperated with the investigation to the fullest extent possible, it's tried to identify every relevant witness and to make them available and it's tried to identify every document that could be of assistance and sought to make it available. At all times, Tusla has accepted that deficiencies existed in the case management of the file and that a sequence of errors occurred in respect of how it dealt with the matter. These errors initially arose from a failure to identify the erroneous information received from Rian, and then consequent failures to correct the error when opportunities arose, and Tusla accepts full responsibility for each of the errors it made. It recognises that it is entirely a matter for you, sir, to make findings of fact and the only submission it wishes to make in that regard is it submits the evidence shows that the errors made were bona fide, that there isn't evidence of a conspiracy of any malicious or deliberate plan on the part of Tusla to harm sergeant McCabe, that the errors were errors.

Tusla acknowledges the time and effort of the Tribunal in examining the matter and looks forward to its report. And in particular, Tusla wishes to apologise to those who have been affected by the sequence of again, in public, apologise to Sergeant McCabe and to each member of his family for the impact on them of Tusla's errors in this regard and Tusla is sincerely
sorry that its standards did not meet those which might reasonably be expected, in particular which might reasonably be expected by sergeant McCabe and his family.

The final thing I want to inform the Tribunal of, is that at the moment Tusla is seeking to introduce a revised procedure for dealing with how it addresses retrospective allegations of abuse. This new procedure is being informed in part by court decisions which are delivered from time to time, and the Court will be aware that like any public body, Tusla is the subject of judicial reviews and receives judgments where the courts indicate their view on what it's doing or not doing, but equally, it will be informed by the report of this Tribunal because it seems likely this Tribunal is going to make comments and findings relating to what Tusla did in this case, and clearly, that will form an important part of any new policy. And obviously, the new policy has to balance two things: It has to
balance the protection of children, which is, I suppose, the paramount concern, but equally Tusla is aware it has to ensure fair procedures for those persons who find allegations made against them and to ensure those persons know what is happening, are told what is happening, are told accurately about what is happening, and are given a full opportunity to engage properly and to have their position explained and understood. And so, hopefully those new procedures
will improve the practices adopted by Tusla. And another development in common with every public body, it's perhaps of lesser importance but I think every public body now has to introduce new procedures because of the General Data Regulation which is coming in and that will have some impact because, for example, the new regulation makes it clear that if a body holds data on you they have to immediately tell you. So there can't be a situation where the body holds a piece of information about someone but the person has no idea that that particular purported allegation or purported fact has been written down somewhere. So, again, that hopefully will feed into better procedures. But I don't propose to make any particular submission on the facts because you have heard all of the witnesses over a very large number of days, they have been fully cross-examined, examined in chief by the Tribunal team and the other legal representatives here, and Tusla is happy that you, sir, will make your own findings as to those facts. May it please you.
CHAIRMAN: I was proposing, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. McDermott in particular, just to hear people out and then if I have any questions that particularly on my mind, that I think you might help me with, just to address that at the end.

CHAIRMAN: So as we know, Ms. D returned to counselling on I think it was the 6th of August 2013, but what worries me is the revival of the file on, is it the

30th of April 2014, in the context of everything that is going on there. And not to worry for a moment in relation to any particular exactitude in relation to dates because we know that the letter to Sergeant McCabe was sent on 29th December 2015 and arrived sometime early in January 2016, and that happened. But what worries me at the moment is the whole notion of whether the revival - in other words, this being plucked out of the files of Measuring the Pressure filing cabinet - was accidental, was inspired by something. And certain7y the evidence has been that it is denied that either of a number of people who could have been involved inspired it, I'm expected to accept that it was a coincidence and that is worrying me. So I don't know whether you want to say anything about that.

MR. MCDERMOTT: Yes, sir. My recollection is the evidence was that after the referral from Rian came in, and I think it came in in August 2013, that between September 2013 and Apri1 2014 the case was unallocated, there was then some activity in April and May 2014 when the intake records were completed for the children, and the notification was made to the Gardaí. That was then the time when Rian forwarded their correction and indicated that wrong information had been given and you 09:38 will recall that, at that point, the file was corrected, an amended notification was sent to the Gardaí but then the case is unallocated for a second period of time between July 2014 and May 2015.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDERMOTT: And my recollection is: Cases were unallocated because there weren't sufficient resources. So cases were simply going into a file -- into a waiting area, and then, as resources were available, cases were taken out to then be worked on and somebody would open a file and see what needed to be done. And whilst again it's entirely a matter for the Tribunal, it was accidental in the sense it came out on the day it did but it wasn't accidental in the sense it was always going to be looked at again. So it was in this holding pattern with, it appears, a large number of other unallocated files, and at particular points in time those files were being worked on. But my understanding is, again subject to any findings you make, sir, is, it was always going to be looked at again, it was just a question of when persons were available. You have heard from the people involved and I think they were cross-examined and questioned was there any particular reason on a particular day why that file was taken out as opposed to the file in front of it or the file after it, and my recollection is none of the witnesses could offer any particular explanation that it was Sergeant McCabe's file in particular they were looking for. They were simply seeking to address files that had work done. I don't know if that assists the Tribunal.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is of assistance. Thank you. The second matter that was on my mind, Mr. McDermott, was
the whole question of social workers who apparently spend a lot of time in the car going from place to place being unaware of sergeant Maurice McCabe and the relevant controversy at the time in question. And you will be aware of the evidence on that, which is that they weren't, they don't read the newspapers, etcetera. And that was another thing that was worrying me. And then there was a third thing but maybe you would like to -- if you have anything that you could put that. MR. MCDERMOTT: I can't put it any further than obviously social workers I imagine in the most part have degrees, are professional people, have qualifications and in the normal course one would expect people operating in the public sphere to be aware of important public events, but I think the Tribunal will then have to reach its own conclusion on evidence given by any one witness. But I think Tusla would accept that its personnel, its employees, are working in a public service and it follows, I think, that any member of the public service, in the normal course, one would expect to be aware of important public events. So, I think, I can't disagree with the Tribunal's comments in that regard.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. And then the third and the last thing is, and it's this: I think everybody realises, who is I suppose not a child and certainly anyone who has done legal practice for 20 years or more realise that coincidences do occur, but this coincidence in the context in which it does occur, namely the report, for
instance, by Assistant Commissioner o'mahony at that time, the entire movement of this into a position where it was being one of a series of controversies that was going to emerge above the waves, if you like, is a very strong coincidence; in other words, that the mistake is o9:42 made in relation to Ms. Y, translated into Ms. D, and it occurs at a time -- I mean, it may be said, Mr. McDermott, that if it was going to happen at all, it was going to happen at some stage, and that perhaps Tusla had nothing to do with the fact that Ms. D returned to counselling on the 6th August 2013 and it was in that context that the error occurred. MR. MCDERMOTT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: But I don't know if you can help me at all on that.

Mr. MCDERMOTT: I can. And could I add one addendum to my previous answer, just to be fair to, I think there was one particular witness the Court may have in mind, about their knowledge of current affairs. whilst I stand over the general comments I made, I think in
fairness to that witness, it's a matter for the Tribunal as to whether there was any evidence she wasn't telling the truth when for whatever reason she simply said she wasn't listening to the news and wasn't aware of these matters. And I think she was saying her 09:43 job was very difficult at the time, she was overworked and that was her evidence in any event. So I simply want to be fair to the witness to suggest, and it's only a suggestion, it's a matter for the Tribunal,
there was no particular, I think, piece of evidence that would suggest she wasn't telling the truth when she said, look, she simply wasn't aware of these matters. That was her evidence and obviously you have
to weigh that. secondly, to indicate, as the Tribunal has already adverted to, there were certain events which could not have been controlled by Tusla. So, for example, the original error made by Rian, and it was simply an error, where the wrong allegation was cut and pasted The moment they realised it was an error of course they should have acted immediately to deal with it. Again, Tusla would have had no control over the movements of

Ms. D insofar as at points in her life when she engaged with the issue and points of her life when she didn't. So, there are features where Tusla is responsible fully for what happened, but equally, there are features where events occurred entirely without the control of Tusla, and obviously we would lay emphasis on those as showing that this was a coincidence that Tusla was making this series of errors at the same time as other things were happening in Sergeant McCabe's life that were causing him distress and concern and worry. And clearly, Tus7a's series of errors added to his problems in that regard and we fully accept that.
CHAIRMAN: Well, at the end of the day, it may be that things occur which are beyond what might normally occur, I suppose you would make the point that if they were to occur they were going to occur at some stage, so there was never a good time. This is a particularly bad time, and at the end of the day it may resolve down to a matter of credibility. Would that be fair?
MR. MCDERMOTT: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right. Thank you very much, Mr. McDermott.

MR. MCDERMOTT: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: You want to go 1ast, Mr. McDowe11, I presume?
MR. MCDOWELL: I thought so.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. That seems fair. Are there any submissions on behalf of Ms. D? Mr. Cush, did you want to go first.

MR. CUSH: I have no issue on the order, but I do want to say something on behalf of the HSE.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. We11, I am happy to hear things in any order that anybody wants. If you want to defer to the HSE then please go ahead.

## SUBMISSION BY MR. CUSH

MR. CUSH: Chairman, you are concerned under the terms of reference with the creation, distribution and use by Tusla of the file, and there's just no getting away from the fact that it was the error made by Ms. Brophy that is the catalyst for the creation, distribution and use of the file. And I want, therefore, just to say something about that error, if I may. The Tribunal was correctly concerned to investigate whether it was simply an error or whether it might have been an error with some motive, and ultimately that is a matter for your assessment but if you will permit me I just wanted to point to some aspects of the evidence that I suggest bear on this idea of it being just an error. And I will just high1ight them, if I may.

Firstly, Ms. Brophy had no personal or family connection with the Gardaí.

Secondly, he she had little prior connection with the area, having only recently commenced working in the area.

Thirdly, she had no prior knowledge of Sergeant McCabe personally or professionally. And you may recall, $I$ think your own investigation, Chairman, identified that it was really around the beginning of 2014 before Sergeant McCabe came to any public prominence, and we are speaking about events in August 2013.

Fourth1y, then, just looking at some of the detail of it, the oral referral from Ms. Brophy which preceded the inaccurate written referral was accurate and recorded as being accurate by Tusla.

Fifthly, Chairman, there is an intake record completed by Briege Tinnelly and signed off by Keara McGlone, and these are two Tusla employees, if you recall, and that form confirms that Ms. Brophy was told, confirms her own evidence that she was told that this child/family was not previously known to the Social work Department. And that of course was the reason why she sent in the written report. And her own evidence was, had she got a different answer and had she been told that this was previously known she wouldn't have sent in a written report.

And then when it comes to the written report, Chairman, 09:49 the forensic evidence I suggest is at a minimum consistent with Ms. Brophy's own evidence as to how the error occurred. Although, frankly, she remained unclear right to the end and through her evidence as to
precisely how it occurred.

And then lastly, there is her own evidence, Chairman, I suggest it's a matter for you ultimately, that she was manifestly honest; her evidence revealed a woman who had made a terrible error and who was horrified on discovering it, and who reacted in a way of a person who was horrified, did everything in conjunction with her supervisor, Ms. Ward, to retrieve the situation as best they could, and, at the end of their efforts, they had good reason for believing they had done so. If you recall they -- I am saying they, but collectively, they ensured that letters were written to Tusla and the Gardaí separately, in each case informing them of the error and in each case enclosing an amended report. They also sought return of the incorrect report. They did achieve its return from Tus1a, but unbeknownst to them, Tusla had created its own report and forwarded it to the Gardaí.

And then, there is the fact that Ms. Brophy never attempted to conceal her error, either at the time of its disclosure in 2014 or more recently on the establishment of the Tribuna1. And I do suggest to you therefore, Mr. Chairman, this was a terrible error but an error without motive, and that the evidence also suggests that.

Just on a point of detai1, Chairman, you will recal1
some of my witnesses dealt with the transfer of the file in May of 2014 onwards to Waterford, and there is little enough perhaps that turns on that, save one point of detail, in that, you will recall the evidence to the effect that there was a letter of apology on the o9:52 file when it arrived in waterford. It's just a small point of detail, there was some discrepancy perhaps between the evidence of Ms. D and Ms. Brophy as to the receipt, and it's not the same thing as the sending but Ms. D said she did not receive an apology, and

Ms. Brophy was clear that she had sent an apology. And again, just a point of detail; the copy was on the file when it arrived in waterford. And she did also give evidence that she had apologised orally to Ms. D. CHAIRMAN: Well, one was certainly living away from her 09:52 normal residence, and then her normal residence had -a lot of households have a chaotic system in relation to dealing with post.
MR. CUSH: Yes, Chairman. Chairman, just a point of detail, if I may, on the terms of reference. You are clearly directed to what is described as the false allegations in 2013.

CHAIRMAN: Mm-hmm.
MR. CUSH: And I suppose part of the narrative, certainly, is the allegation made way back in 2006, and 09:53 its handling perhaps is again part of the narrative, but just to say that it doesn't appear to be part of the investigative part of the Tribunal, if you follow me. It's directed to the 2013 allegations. And you
wi11 recal1 there was some evidence from some of my witnesses in relation to the 2006 allegation.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it's a necessary part of the background but as to any fact in relation thereto, I'm not at liberty to go beyond anything, for instance, the 09:53 DPP said, and I think that is part of the background but that is where it ends. I can't have any opinion beyond that.
MR. CUSH: I respectfully agree, Chairman. That is as much as I wanted to say, unless I can help the Tribunal in any other way with any other matter.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. There just may be a couple of matters. You referred to the forensic evidence, you are talking about the Forensic Service of Northern Ireland evidence which indicated that in terms of everything Ms. Brophy said had happened to the file, the computer history as recorded on the hard drive indelibly shows precisely the same thing.
MR. CUSH: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And was there anything else apart from that, 09:54 that you felt was worthwhile to be taken into consideration on that?

MR. CUSH: I don't think so, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Cush. MR. CUSH: Thank you, Chairman.

MR. BUCKLEY: Chairman, Niall Buckley on behalf of Ms. D, instructed by Fanning Kelly Solicitors. For convenience sake I have prepared a very brief written submission with reference to the appropriate date to the evidence and they will be handed in. If I might very briefly speak to the few matters that bear on Ms. D's evidence.
CHAIRMAN: Do you want me to look at those, Mr. Buckley, as you are speaking? would that help? MR. BUCKLEY: Certainly. My solicitor can hand them up. A summary can be quite brief, Chairman. [SAME HANDED]
CHAIRMAN: I have that now, thank you. MR. MCDOWELL: I would like to see the written material.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it's fair that you would. Have we got a copy for Mr. McDowell?
MR. BUCKLEY: There is some additional copies. [SAME HANDED]

So obviously it's a matter for the Tribunal to arrive at such findings it thinks fit but insofar as Ms. D and members of her family are concerned in respect of the evidence I submit as follows. That, Ms. D had salient interactions with Rian in the summer of 2013 and May
2014. The evidence, it is respectfully submitted, was that the Tusla file came to contain a particularly serious allegation which had never in fact been made and the genesis of that mistaken allegation was
erroneous content in a retrospective referral generated by Rian Counselling Service. And that was the clear, unchallenged evidence of ms. Brophy. And I say the contemporaneous notes disclose that the true content of the discussions in those attendances between Ms. D and Ms. Brophy and both their evidences were consistent with that, and the subsequently, I would say, retrospective referral came to be generated because it was understood to constitute a proper discharge of Rian's duties rather than on the urging of Ms. D. And Ms. D then was unaware of its erroneous content until May 2014, and immediately when it was brought to her attention, through a contact from her father, she made contact with the Rian service to try and ensure its prompt correction.

Those are essentially the submissions on the evidence, unless I can help the Tribunal. They are set out in some greater detail but I don't think there is any need to traverse all the matters addressed in the written submissions.
CHAIRMAN: They are. And I think I am going to find this very helpful, so thank you, Mr. Buckley. So, was there anything on my mind? Yes, there was just a couple of things. You will be aware that what was
alleged to have happened occurred sometime around Christmas time in 1998, and that a complaint was ultimately made on 4th December 2006 and that matters continued on effectively with some clusters of facts
around the DPP's 1etter of the 5th Apri1 2007, and then that, if you like, was the end of matters for a considerable period of time. I think it's not correct to say that on 19th of February 2014 the dossier of cases handed to the Taoiseach from Micheál Martin had anything to do with Ms. D, I think that is correct. MR. BUCKLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It was other cases, it was the Cavan cases. MR. BUCKLEY: That's correct, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: And that the $D$ matter revived in consequence of an article by Paul williams following on his visit in April of 2014 to the D household, which was arranged through a chief superintendent and Mr. D, the father of his D.

MR. BUCKLEY: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN: And then that, thereafter, there was the GSOC complaint of the 29th April 2014, essentially a complaint against Superintendent Noe1 Cunningham, that he hadn't investigated matters properly. And then further articles came out and then Ms. D went into Dáil Éireann, met certain politicians, the matter was raised in the Dáil on 19th June 2014. And I'm just wondering, in the context of a ruling by a responsible public official charged with the duty of ruling on criminal cases, have you anything to say as to whether that series of events was justified or fair or in the public interest? Just that.

MR. BUCKLEY: We11, I suppose Ms. D subsequently made complaints around the handling of the original
complaint and insofar as there was any airing of that criticism of how the original complaint had been handled, I think the prospective of Ms. D was that she was entitled to progress it and once subject matters became the subject of public interest she was entitled to ventilate her position on it. But she's also engaged the process of the Garda Ombudsman in relation to these complaints as well and she also raised the matters with Mr. Guerin previously, and decisions were taken in respect of those various courses of actions pursued.

CHAIRMAN: And you also appear on behalf of Mrs. D and you appear on behalf of Mr. D, who is himself a Garda officer.
MR. BUCKLEY: That's correct, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Now, in that regard, you will be aware of the two scenes that have been referred to in evidence; one occurring in Bailieboro District Court, where Sergeant McCabe was traversed publicly and the other involving Ms. D and a scene on the Main street in Bailieboro spilling over into a scene actually in the Garda station in 2007. You will also be aware that Mr. D, in whatever way it is characterised, was involved in bringing in further publicity some seven years after these events had been ruled on by the DPP, and do you want to say anything about any of that? MR. BUCKLEY: Well, Chairman, I wonder if I might reserve my position, $I$ might file slight supplemental submissions dealing with that, partly because I have
principally prepared dealing with the issues in relation to the creation of the Tusla file rather than any other, I suppose, airing of differences between the D family and Tus7a. I think it can be dealt with very briefly. But --

CHAIRMAN: What I am particularly interested in is the whole notion of, we have Superintendent O'Reilly and Mr. D meeting as fellow Garda officers and that leading to the involvement of Paul williams, the public airing of this matter and that is not uncoincidental, in fact out, and whether you want to say anything in relation to whether that was fair or not fair, given that the Director of Public Prosecutions had ruled on this matter and ruled definitively in the strongest possible 10:04 terms back in Apri1 2007, how can that be right, is the question that is on my mind.

MR. BUCKLEY: We11, I suppose, Chairman, the DPP exercises a prosecutorial function and makes assessments about what action and what processes should 10:04 be pursued, and family members of affected people may have different perspectives on those things. It's not a judicial determination, it's a prosecutorial discretion decision and it's clear that members of the D family have a different perspective on events. But I 10:04 don't think there is any expectation that this process would make substantive findings in relation to those matters or that it really, I suppose, bears precisely on the overarching terms of reference insofar as they
concern the use of the false allegations contained in the Tusla file, which I think are all commonly understood to involve the specific serious allegations which were referenced and circulated which were never made against Sergeant McCabe.

CHAIRMAN: We11, thank you for you. No, well, I suppose, what might worry someone listening to the evidence is: Given that a number of people in Cavan-Monaghan, particularly members of the Gardaí, would know, referable to the Paul williams articles, that what was being talked about was Sergeant McCabe, was it right or wrong to engage in that exercise at that time, a time of particular strain in Sergeant McCabe's life? And, was it right or wrong to not leave things as decided by the DPP and to move on? And, was it right or wrong to keep this series of events effectively before the public eye through measures which, on scrutiny, turned out to be without foundation; namely, that GSOC ultimately found that any complaint in relation to an improper investigation against Superintendent Noel Cunningham was completely misplaced? So those are things that are worrying me. I just thought it might be right just to mention them to you, and representation was granted to Mr. D, to Mrs. D and to Ms. D in that context. In other words, I 10:07 suppose if you put it into a very short and pithy question: why not leave things be? Was it right to revive this? Is there anything behind reviving this at a time when Sergeant McCabe is becoming a public figure
when it was very, very likely to hurt him?
MR. BUCKLEY: Well, I suppose, I'd submit that there is certainly no evidence that there was any coordination in relation to that. The evidence of Ms. D has been that she was not happy with the manner in which Sergeant McCabe was being portrayed in the media at that time, and that the contact which led to the interview with Paul williams emanated from a certain discontent that he was being portrayed in perhaps a glorified manner by certain sections of the media as engaged in heroic whistle-blowing and she felt there was a different perspective on matters. Her focus particularly was -- I suppose her perspective on the investigative process ultimately that led to the GSOC conclusion which arrived at certain conclusions and those are matters of record.
CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, thank you for those submissions. There was just one other question that I had on my mind and that was this. In consequence of this particular process, the investigation file by Superintendent Cunningham, then Inspector Cunningham, has been circulated. Now, I have a tentative view in relation to that, that it was nothing less than completely thorough. GSOC said it was completely thorough, there was nothing wrong with it. Superintendent Cunningham and publicly aired that there was something wrong with this; in other words, that it's on a parallel with the truly ghastly
investigations that are dealt with in detail in the o'Higgins Commission reports, nothing could seem on a tentative view to be further part. Do you want to say anything as to whether there was anything wrong in any way with the investigation by Inspector Cunningham, now 10:10 Superintendent Cunningham, of the D complaint back in -- from December 2006?
mR. BUCKLEY: I suppose, we certainly didn't cross-examine, in the context of this Tribunal, mr. Cunningham on the conduct of the investigation. There are, I suppose, always certain challenges when various parties are known to the subject matters in an investigation, but I don't think the D family are agitating any particular criticisms beyond anything they have previously aired in relation to it and are not looking to this Tribunal to make any findings in respect of the handling by Superintendent Cunningham of the complaint, the investigation at the time.
CHAIRMAN: Well, there was a second investigation as well in relation to the D family by Superintendent Cunningham, wasn't there? And that was to say that when Sergeant McCabe was agitating in relation to whether the DPP's directions of the 6th of April 2007 ought to be circulated he wrote to Superintendent Clancy and he indicated to them that certain incidents had occurred and that there was certain difficulties that he was having in terms of a working relationship and, again, Superintendent Cunningham was tasked by Chief Superintendent Rooney with investigating that,
notwithstanding his protest that had been made in relation to the earlier D investigation. Do you want to say anything as to whether that particular investigation -- or are you now saying it was in any way lacking in rigour? Do you know what I am referring 10:12 to, Mr. Buckley?

MR. BUCKLEY: I am afraid I am not quite clear as to what the Tribunal is referring to. I apologise. CHAIRMAN: Maybe just give me a wee minute and I will just --
MR. MCDOWELL: I think, Chairman, most of that came in the last module. Mr. Buckley wasn't here.
CHAIRMAN: I appreciate it did, yes. I appreciate it did. Well then, I think you can't indeed have any view on that, Mr. Buckley, and that is fair enough. No,

Mr. Buckley, I'm not --
MR. BUCKLEY: I don't think Mr. D was aware of those formally prior to --

CHAIRMAN: No, I don't think he was, but I mean, just to complete the picture: As you are aware, there were the incidents, there was a certain working difficulty, I don't think that Mr. D has denied that in the witness-box, and there was complaint to Superintendent Clancy about that, which Sergeant McCabe said he didn't want to go any further; in other words, no charges, but 10:13 nonetheless, Chief Superintendent Rooney asked Superintendent Cunningham to investigate that. It was investigated, and then there was the meeting in Mullingar which led to other things, perhaps a mistake
or perhaps something else. I don't know. But I think it is fair of you to say, Mr. Buckley, that it has nothing to do with your client. It did, however, arise out of the incidents immediately following the DPP's 1etter.

MR. BUCKLEY: I am not sure Mr. D would have been aware of certain other incidents the Tribunal may be referring to. There's some matters he was aware of that involved members of his family, but beyond that -the court, Bailieboro court and the Garda station, but beyond that I don't think Mr. D was aware of any other matters. And I suppose, in respect of those, obviously, as Mr. Cush has indicated, those reference back to events in 2006 that are perhaps part of the narrative but not part of the investigation, I'd respectfully submit. As to their conduct, I suppose family members have perspectives on what their other family members tell them about events, regardless of DPP decisions and insofar as they impacted or influenced on their subsequent conduct or behaviour I think that has to be understood; that family members may rely on the accounts provided to them by close family members, and that they will continue to have a bearing on their perspectives.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right. Thank you for your help, Mr. Buckley. So who wants to go next? Garda sergeants and inspectors, maybe?

MR. DOCKERY: We11, perhaps I might hear first or the Tribunal might hear first from the Garda Commissioner's
team. It's a suggestion.
MR. O'HIGGINS: No difficulty with that, Chairman, if that suits.

## SUBMISSION BY M. O'HIGGINS

Chairman, on behalf of An Garda Síochána and certain senior members of the force, we have prepared a written note which I propose simply speaking to, but hopefully it will be of assistance to the Tribunal and to you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Do you want me to have it, Mr. O'Higgins? MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes. And there's copies available for the other parties that are relevant to these matters. [SAME HANDED]

Chairman, we have endeavoured to set out in the contents page the role played by individual named members of An Garda Síochána in the matters the Tribunal is investigating in this module. They being principally Superintendent Cunningham, Superintendent McGinn, Chief Superintendent Jim Sheridan, Assistant Commissioner Kieran Kenny, Superintendent Frank Walsh, former Commissioner O'Sullivan and Detective Superintendent O'Reilly. With your leave, Chairman, I propose to pass from the genesis of the false rape allegation, which is primarily a matter for other parties. We hope, in providing with you this analysis of the evidence, that we are not in any sense trespassing on your functions, but nonetheless,
hopefully it is useful insofar as we have sought to identify what are relevant portions of the transcript with respect to the main issues and with respect to the principal players in the controversy.

So, the first, I suppose, relevant matter concerning Garda involvement was Noel Cunningham, Superintendent Cunningham, and we treat of that at paragraph 11 and onwards of the written note. You will be aware, you will recall, Chairman, that Keara McGlone had sent -had prepared a letter, which was marked "private and confidential" to Superintendent Cunningham, and that was on 15th August 2013. And a degree of, I won't say criticism, but, focus was placed upon that in questioning by counsel for the Tribunal and I think Mr. McDowell's side. The Tribunal may take the view that this letter was perhaps something of a red herring; however, nonetheless, it is proper to treat of it and we have endeavoured to do that in the paragraphs that follow. Importantly, I think the letter suggested that they were the allegations that Superintendent Cunningham had already investigated back in 2007, and that is plain from the reading of the document itself. And while it's a matter for you, Chairperson, we say that the superintendent could not have known about Ms. Brophy's error, well, I think that is possibly common case across the room, because even the author of the letter, Ms. McGlone, was unaware at the time of drafting her letter of that. And she indicated in her
letter that it was to discuss the case, a case which, as far as An Garda Síochána was concern, had been closed since April 2007 when the DPP had given the direction that he gave.

It is the case, of course, that Superintendent Cunningham did not respond to the letter, and nor did he at any stage meet with Ms. McGlone. He remained unaware of the false rape allegations until after media coverage of the matter in the form of the 'Prime Time' television programme in 2017. He gave evidence of his regret in failing to respond to this letter, and confirmed that the failure occurred through inadvertence on his part. I would ask you -- I would suggest to you, Chairman, that on a reasonable construction of the evidence, it would appear that Superintendent Cunningham placed the letter on the investigation file that he had personal custody of since the 2000 investigation. He had kept the file secure in a press in his office and no one had access that between July and September 2013 personal matters had resulted in him being absent from work. His extended absence from his office and his desire to protect the confidentiality of the complaint, which was 10:20 of course for the benefit of both Sergeant McCabe and Mr. D, combined together, with the result that the letter effectively slipped his mind. And the Tribunal will be aware as to his acknowledgement of the error in
that regard, that he had put it on the long finger and then he put forward the view that it wasn't his normal practice but he acknowledged it was an error on his part. And we simply say, Chairman, that while it's of course a matter for you, I think every day experience tells us that in many walks of life, a professional person will sometimes not respond to a letter, or will put it to one side and forget to come back to it at a later date. while this of course should not happen, an everyday omission such as this we say hardly warrants serious criticism, still less a finding of misconduct or intentional wrongdoing. And we say if that is the case for barristers or solicitors or doctors or accountants or anybody else, it's difficult to see why a more exacting standard of criticism should apply to a 10:21 Garda superintendent who has to deal with a large number of items of correspondence on a weekly basis.

It was put to Superintendent Cunningham by Tribunal counsel, obviously doing their job entirely
appropriately, it was suggested perhaps that his failure to address the letter was deliberate as Sergeant McCabe was a thorn in his side. And we say that perhaps these suggestions were put in an effort to tease out the issues and to afford the witness an
opportunity to address the range of possible interpretations that might be placed upon his actions. Nonetheless, we say that any finding to the effect that this was a deliberate act would be a speculative leap
and one which would, in our respectful submission, not be based on evidence and we offer the view that any such conclusion in fact perhaps even would be outside the terms of reference of the Tribunal, which is primarily directed to investigate if members of an Garda Síochána used the sexual abuse allegations to discredit Sergeant McCabe. And we mention this at paragraph 21 on page 8 of the note, chairman, that entirely properly, Mr. McDowe11, for Sergeant McCabe, acknowledged openly during the hearing that it was never being suggested to Superintendent Cunningham that he filed the letter away out of some animus towards Sergeant McCabe. That case was simply never made and that acknowledgement was fairly received by our side, as it were, and we simply mention that at paragraph 21.

Now, also before I move off Superintendent Cunningham, it was also suggested again by counsel for the Tribunal, again doing their job properly, that perhaps history would have been different if the letter had been answered and we have endeavoured to treat of that issue at paragraphs 22 and onwards. And I won't dwell on that. It's spelt out in detail and we offer the view that it was something of a red herring and that is treated of in the succeeding paragraphs.
Chairman: well, it would help if you would address that, if you wouldn't mind.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Certainly, yes. we mention on page 8 there at paragraph 23 of the note that Keara McGlone,
as the team leader, had directed the opening of a file on Sergeant McCabe. The McCabe file had not been opened by the HSE when they considered the matter in the aftermath of the allegations in 2006. The purpose of it appeared to be -- arising from Keara McGlone's evidence, appeared to be to commence a risk assessment, a job that had not been carried out by the HSE in 2007. And she gave evidence of having reviewed the file, the Ms. D file, in August of 2013, and of her intention to direct the completion of work that had not been completed in 2007.

Now, the notation on the intake record made by Ms. MCGlone to notify An Garda Síochána was made immediately on receipt of the verbal referral from Ms. Brophy, and before the incorrect Rian notification containing the false rape allegation was received. And so, we suggest that her decision to write the letter was not taken on the basis of a belief in a more serious accusation. The Tribunal will be aware that the Gardaí were formally notified by Tusla as anticipated by the intake record, but this was not until May of 2014.

Now, Sergeant McCabe was, as anticipated by
Ms. McGlone, eventually written to in December of 2015, but unfortunately the letter also contained details of the false rape allegation, that is the Barr letter, notwithstanding that the error had been brought to

Tus7a's attention. The errors that were made in the creation of each of the critical documents that incorrectly carry the false rape allegation - which were, the notification of suspected child abuse sent by Rian to the HSE on the 9th August 2013, the notification of suspected child abuse dated 2nd May 2014 sent by Tusla to the Gardaí and the Barr letter sent by Tus7a to Sergeant McCabe on 29th December 2015 - were created by the relevant HSE or Tusla employees, and no member of the Gardaí was directly or indirectly involved in their creation. And we suggest that there is simply no evidence that in any way links or implicates any member of the Gardaí with the creation of these documents and each author of each of the relevant incorrect documents quite properly accepted this to be the case. And we make that point at paragraph 29.

And we offer the view in paragraph 30 that whether or not there was any need to notify the Gardaí as a result of the referral to the HSE by Ms. Brophy in August 2013 at all was a matter that was explored during the module D hearings. There appeared to be little agreement between social workers about the issue perhaps, but the Gardaí had made a formal notification to the HSE in January 2007 in accordance with its guidelines, shortly after Ms. D first complained about Sergeant McCabe in 1ate 2006. And we say perhaps as a matter of common sense, if the Ms. D file from 2006/2007 had been
properly examined and if the allegations made in 2006/2007 by Ms. D were substantially the same as the allegation that was repeated in 2013 to Ms. Brophy, we suggest that there could be little point in notifying
the Gardaí in 2013. And we say a cursory examination of the Ms. D file would have revealed that a police investigation had already been carried out into these allegations and that no prosecution had been directed by the DPP. Though it was noted on the file as being in the possession of the HSE since 2007, the statements 10:27 made by Ms. D to the Gardaí in 2007 were not retrieved by Ms. McGlone and examined before the decision was made to Garda notify. And we say that none of the persons involved in the creation of the Tusla Garda notification or the Barr letter ever examined the statements made by Ms. D in 2007. And similarly, we suggest that whether there was an obligation pursuant to the Barr judgment to notify Sergeant McCabe about the allegations was also a matter that few of the social workers, although it's a matter for the Tribunal, perhaps agreed on in their evidence.

And at paragraph 31 we instance the fact that Cormac Quinlan from Tusla gave evidence to the effect that prior to a retrospective notification of the type carried out was a preliminary assessment and part that have process would have been to review the Ms. D statements. At the end of that assessment a decision
could have been made as to whether there was any need to take the matter further. He also indicated that before approaching sergeant McCabe he would expect that as a preliminary step in the assessment the complainant would have been contacted. And other Tusla witnesses also shared his view. Linda Creamer was questioned about this by Tribunal counsel and we mention that at paragraph 31. And we say that this approach was evident in actual practice when the SART team took over management of the file, after attempts were made to contact Ms. D and she refused to engage with the service, the file was closed with no further action -with no further need for action. And the SART team identified a number of matters that are relevant, and we outline that at paragraph 32 . And we say in paragraph 33 that whilst it's evident that staff from the HSE and the Child and Family Agency made a number of perhaps errors in drafting the documents concerned, it might also have been unwise to have placed a notation on the file to precipitately suggest that Garda notification was required without allocating the file to a social worker to carry out a preliminary assessment. And we mention the evidence of Lisa o' Loghlen from the SART team who reviewed the file, we mention that at paragraph 34, following the letter that 10:29 had been received from Seán Costello \& Company, solicitors for Sergeant McCabe, who had confirmed that -- and she confirmed what she would have done had she reviewed the file in 2013, and we instance her
evidence there in paragraph 34.

And we mention in paragraph 35 that the Tribunal was also concerned to investigate if a cover-up had taken place because of what appeared to be evidence concerning the removal and replacement of documents from the McCabe file. That is really not a matter for the Garda team to address, that has already been addressed by Mr. McDermott quite properly.

And at paragraph 36 we mention that the serious consequences and disruption caused to Sergeant McCabe that followed the creation of the document containing the false rape allegation was, we suggest, not in any way caused, contributed to or orchestrated by any member of An Garda Síochána let alone by any senior officer within that organisation. And we say in that sense, whilst it was a legitimate matter to canvass, we say that it cannot crisply be suggested that history would have been different had that letter been
answered. But in any event, it was one item of correspondence that was not followed up on and I don't mean this as a matter of criticism, it's just the facts, it was not followed up on by the person who sent it, but that doesn't take away from the fact that Superintendent Cunningham quite properly acknowledged it was a miss on his part, it was an error on his part in not responding to the document, but I would ask you, Chairman, to take into account the context in which he
was being assiduous in, as he put it, protecting the interests of sergeant McCabe in keeping in his press all documents pertaining to that particular file, which is something he had done over the years. And in terms of framing matters in the overall charge, so to speak, within the terms of reference, I think that it is of relevance, that Superintendent Cunningham's intention, far from broadcasting far and wide any matters sensitive to Sergeant McCabe, clearly his intentions and desires, and actions, were in the opposite direction; it was with a view to protecting Sergeant McCabe that he kept the documents confidential and safe in his own press in his office.

On page 13, then, Chairman we treat of Superintendent McGinn. I won't dwe11 on that in any tremendous detail unless you prefer that I did.

At paragraph 37 we outline his role in matters. And we have sought to treat of the role of Superintendent Leo McGinn, Chief Superintendent Jim Sheridan and Assistant Commissioner Kieran Kenny as a unit of three, because, as it were, they were the participants in the Mullingar meeting, a different Mullingar meeting from the Mullingar meeting the subject of the last module. And the Tribunal already have the notes of that meeting, which featured with a degree of prominence in the Tribunal in module (d).

We have offered our submissions as to the various possibilities as to how the evidence might be construed, and we hope that doesn't trespass upon your function too much. And that is dealt with at
paragraphs 39 and onwards and I won't dwe11 on that.

Superintendent McGinn, at paragraph 47, we mention his response to -- on receipt of what was revealed to be a notification containing the false allegation he gave a particular recommendation, but that was then overtaken by events. And then, in paragraph 47, he also spoke -I think this is well-established in the evidence, he spoke with Mr. D and through that contact indirectly put in train a process whereby the false rape allegation ought to have been forever arrested and corrected. At least it did commence the process but regrettably it didn't altogether arrest it at source, so to speak, and further actions took place thereafter.

At paragraph 48 on page 16 we mention the fact that Laura Brophy quite properly made contact with him and explained the error. She also requested the return of the incorrect Rian notification that Superintendent McGinn had never in fact received at this point. At this point when he received an amended Rian notification from Laura Brophy with details of the actual allegation that had been made by Ms. D he forwarded it to Chief Superintendent Sheridan in his letter of the 20th May 2014. Tus1a then sent a new

Garda notification dated 10th June '14, that was signed by Séamus Deeney, and that was received in the superintendent's office in June, on 24th June 2014. Superintendent McGinn then forwarded the new notification to the chief superintendent's office in Monaghan on the day of receipt and dealt with that in a prompt fashion. He also attended the Mullingar meeting as the junior office and contributed to what might be loosely described as a brainstorming exercise to wrestle with the implications for An Garda Síochána following the more recent referral. And while Superintendent McGinn initially advocated a review of the McCabe case in May 2014, it is likely that this recommendation was in all probability made before he realised or was informed, we suggest, that the incorrect Tusla notification contained the false rape allegations. And his evidence was that he believes he likely spoke to Mr. D on 8th of May '14 and on 12th of May. And we suggest that no action taken by Superintendent McGinn could remotely be interpreted as an action to discredit Sergeant McCabe.

And then in paragraph 52 and onwards we treat of the position of Chief Superintendent Jim Sheridan. And, Chairman, you will recall that he, that particular officer was in a position to -- he had a better understanding of matters arising from the discovery role he had played, that is to say the role he had played in preparing for the discovery of, I think it
was the Seán Guerin Report or investigation, and now retired Superintendent Sheridan was Superintendent McGinn's immediate superior line officer. He was based in Monaghan. And he received Superintendent McGinn's report on 8th of May 2014 which he in turn forwarded to his line manager, Assistant Commissioner Kieran Kenny of the Northern Region in Sligo, and he did that by 1etter of the 14th May 2014. And he stated that the allegations contained in the incorrect Tusla notification had been the subject of a previous Garda investigation which resulted in the DPP directing no prosecution against Sergeant McCabe. And we have set out what he said there in paragraph 52 . He also gave evidence that he spoke to no one about this referral other than Superintendent McGinn. And he had additional knowledge of matters concerning Sergeant McCabe, as I have pointed out, because of dealing with the discovery raised by Seán Guerin. He also gave evidence that he had spoken to Superintendent McGinn prior to writing the letter who told him about the error in the notification and that the false rape allegation was incorrect. And we say that a review of the transcript, we mention at paragraph 55, shows that on a number of occasions a theory was put to Chief Superintendent Sheridan to the effect he and his colleagues may have been pleased to use the incorrect Tusla referral for the purpose of discrediting Sergeant McCabe. And again, we don't cavil about that, that was done as a proper exercise for teasing out the arguments
by Tribunal counse1. In that connection Chief Superintendent Sheridan was asked why, if he knew that the false rape allegation was an error, that he neglected to address that matter in his letter to the assistant commissioner and the chief superintendent gave his response, which we have reprised at paragraph 56. At paragraph 55 and 56 and in paragraph 57 we mention that in answer to the suggestion that the Gardaí had used the referral to put new life into the old allegations the chief superintendent responded very clearly. And we have repeated it there in paragraph 57. He utterly rejected that and indicated that that simply wasn't the position. And perhaps, actually it's more fully covered in paragraph, the quotation in paragraph 56, where it was suggested to him that, it was put to him that there might be a theory that the incorrect allegation was being deployed to more senior officers at a time when his district was more than likely to be subject to an investigation by the Commission of Inquiry, and his response to that was saying that:
"Nothing could be further from the truth. I was trying to find out how this error occurred. I accept in hindsight that perhaps I should have outlined in the report what the information was, but there was certainly no malice in anything that $I$ was doing in relation to the matter."

And it will be a matter for you, Chairman, to assess whether that evidence was given bona fide, whether it was correct, and obviously we are urging the view that that was genuine evidence which there really is very little evidence against and we suggest that ought be accepted.

At paragraph 58 we suggest that one way of testing matters is to assess not just the words of chief Superintendent Sheridan but also the evidence as to the 10:39 actual steps he took to deal with the incorrect referral. And we say that the chief superintendent at all times had the interests of sergeant McCabe in mind firstly, in not broadcasting the Tusla referral to the wider world; secondly, in not disseminating the tusla referral to anyone other than his immediate superior officer; thirdly, no not ordering a review of the Ms. D file; and fourthly, not reopening the entire Garda investigation or referring it on to the DPP for a possible reconsideration.

And we submit at paragraph 59 that the steady and calm manner with which the chief superintendent dealt with the issue, by effectively closing the matter down and not giving it oxygen, represented a reasonable and responsible approach which at all times was designed to protect the interests of sergeant McCabe and the D family. And we submit that it would be unsound to imbue that reasonable and professional manner in which

Chief Superintendent Sheridan treated these matters with any sinister connotation. And moreover, when one looks at the correspondence that was received in his office relating to the issue, we suggest the evidence indicates this was dealt with promptly and in a responsible fashion. And we instance the communication of the 20th May 2014 where Superintendent McGinn had sent a copy of the new Rian referral received from Laura Brophy on to the chief superintendent and then in turn he sent a short update to the assistant commissioner and pointed out that the previous referral contained incorrect information and should therefore be withdrawn and replaced. And he referred to the fact that the referral by Tusla related to an incident which was reported and investigated by An Garda Síochána back in 2006 and 2007. The DPP had directed there should be no prosecution. And he referred to the attached referral and indicated that it did not disclose any new information or evidence in regard to these matters, and therefore, at this time, did not require any further action by An Garda Síochána. So essentially, his position was it should be closed down and that was, we say, a reasonable position to adopt.

And then paragraph 62 we mention the role of Fiona ward, I can pass from that.

Chief superintendent received a letter from Assistant Commissioner Kenny cautioning against dealing with the
matter by email and directed that no document should be destroyed. It had been the request of chief Superintendent Sheridan that it perhaps ought be. And the assistant commissioner set out his position there on paragraph 64 and onwards, and we say he gave a clear 10:41 order to his officers beneath his rank that nothing should be destroyed because it represented an original document effectively and we say that was a perfectly reasonable position to adopt, but nonetheless a very practical step was taken by Chief Superintendent Sheridan to line through the particular incorrect referral so that a reader of the file from thereafter would be clear that an error had occurred and that no consequential steps should be take on foot of that, and that is mentioned in the written note as well.

CHAIRMAN: You don't have a second copy of this, by any chance, Mr. O'Higgins? Do you have another copy of this.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Oh sorry, Chairman, I thought you had a copy.
CHAIRMAN: I have a copy, but I want another copy. MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes. We will provide it to you straightaway. [SAME HANDED]

And at paragraph 67 -- just, we might deal with the matter warts and a11, as it were. At paragraph 67 we refer to the fact that counsel for the Tribunal, again discharging their function, directed a degree of criticism about Chief Superintendent Sheridan for
failing to send the assistant commissioner a copy of the new notification from Tus7a of the 10th June '14 with his detailed report of the 3rd July '14. And we suggest, however, that from the evidence it would appear that, and indeed from his letter of the 22nd of May 2014, that that had already been done, because that letter, and we quote it at paragraph 67, says:
"The previous referral contained incorrect information and should therefore be withdrawn and replaced with the 10:43 attached."

And as I mentioned already at paragraph 68, we instance I think quite an important fact when one looks at the overall actions of Jim Sheridan. Chief Superintendent Sheridan placed two large lines in ink through the face of the file copy of the incorrect Tusla notification of the 2nd May 2014 and in large handwriting marked the notification as "Withdrawn, see referral 16/5/14". And we again suggest this was a simple and practical step to take which was designed to alert anybody reading the file to the fact that an error had occurred, and far from indicating a plan to discredit Sergeant McCabe this practical step perhaps speaks volumes and shows that he was anxious to protect the sergeant's position and ensure the error was not compounded further.

And then at paragraph 70 we treat of the Mullingar meeting. This of course had been originally scheduled
to take place on an earlier date, in June. It eventually took place on 16th July '14. And the parties discussed the errors -- the parties who were present discussed the errors that were made by Ms. Brophy and by Tusla. The notes of the meeting were 10:44 recorded by Sergeant Karen Duffy, and we suggest showed this was a wide-ranging discussion about matters concerning Sergeant McCabe, including the Ombudsman's investigation into the complaint lodged by Ms. D, the appointment of a local, Inspector Cunningham to
investigate the Ms. D complaint of 2006, the failure to record the original allegations in 2006 on Pulse and an incorrect belief on the part of all of those present that the Gardaí had failed to formally notify the HSE of the Ms. D complaint in 2006. Superintendent MCGinn is recorded as having made a query "Is there a risk?" I just pause there, Chairman. I think that is important. In large measure, in large measure, the focus, perhaps understandably, of matters at this mullingar meeting was on possible Garda exposure as to
potential inadequacies in the 2006/2007 treatment of matters, which $I$ say is a far remove from any conspiracy theory that those present were engaged in some class of malicious conspiracy to do down Sergeant McCabe. It appeared to be substantive issues of potential Garda exposure stemming from possible failings back in 2006/2007, in large measure that form the subject matter of this wide-ranging discussion. It largely took the form of a brainstorming, I suggest,
rather than any terribly organised discussion, perhaps in a part, to borrow language that has been used perhaps by you, chairman, in the past, perhaps chaos theory was ruling rather than any conspiracy, but that will be a matter for you to assess the evidence.

At paragraph $70 / 71$ we mention the minutes of the meeting, which mentioned that some further legal advice would be sought. I won't dwell on that. That is there. At paragraph 73 we do mention an up-to-date matter, suggestion made by Mr. McDowell for Sergeant McCabe, who sought to make something of this, of this meeting when questioning retired Commissioner o'sullivan on day 46 in the module just gone by. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. O'HIGGINS: And it was suggested to
Ms. O'Sullivan that Kieran Kenny was investigating the matter, as to whether Sergeant McCabe was a risk to his own children. And we offer the submission, respectfully, that that is an exaggeration and somewhat 10:47 of an unfair appraisal, to conclude that the diverse comments that were noted down during the discussion in mullingar amounted to anything even close to an investigation. We say a better, a fairer construction would be that the facts demonstrate there was no such investigation by the Gardaí, the facts demonstrate that these discussions were in effect the end of the matter as far as the Gardaí were concerned and it appears plain that it did not result in any subsequent action
on the part of any member of the Garda Síochána to the detriment of the Sergeant McCabe following the brainstorming exercise that took place in Mullingar.

We do acknowledge, at paragraph 74, that Superintendent 10:47 Sheridan was asked to liaise with the HSE in order to determine what their intentions were on the matter. In evidence to the Tribunal the retired chief superintendent accepted that he did not do this. He formed the opinion after the meeting that the matter was from a Garda perspective completed and required no further action. He had said as much in his detailed report of the 3rd July 2014 and he took no further action on the matter as he considered no further action was required. And we have instanced in an exchange with counsel for the Tribunal, which we suggest makes clear, and it's at paragraph 74, that his decision not to take the matter any further was not motivated by any desire to keep the allegations against Sergeant McCabe alive. And that quotation is there, and I needn't open 10:48 it up.

At paragraph 75, we mention that counsel for the Tribunal also queried why he or any member of the Gardaí failed to bring the errors made by Rian and Tusla to the attention of Sergeant McCabe and Chief Superintendent Sheridan gave his response, he said that it was certainly his opinion that it was a matter for the HSE to address, there may have been data issues in
relation to the issue, and the other way he looked at it he said, was that if he had gone or somebody from the Guards had gone to Sergeant McCabe to tell him about it "we may not have been in a position to answer all of his questions in relation to what had happened as well" because "as we had only the information that was provided to us by the HSE on how this happened" and as far as Jim Sheridan was concerned, that was a matter for the HSE.

Chairman, you might take the view, and it is of course a matter for you, that it would have been preferable to go to Sergeant McCabe. We couldn't demur from that, but we say that again, locating it in terms of the overall jigsaw, of the overall charge contained within the term of reference we say there is simply no evidence under this heading that there was any organised conspiracy or any malicious plan to discredit Sergeant McCabe.

At paragraph 76, and I will be finishing up quite shortly --
CHAIRMAN: Yes. We are moving from the mullingar meeting about now. MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Was that in the same room as the meeting of 25th August 2018 ?
MR. O'HIGGINS: It was in the same county, I can reliably answer. But I am not sure if it was in the
same room.
MR. MCDOWELL: It was in the same station.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Maybe it was --
CHAIRMAN: It's just a bit of a coincidence that this room comes up on two occasions and causes trouble.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes. The room is not separately represented but we'11 endeavour to find out the answer to that, Chairman.

At paragraph 76 and onwards, we treat of the position of Kieran Kenny, Assistant Commissioner Kieran Kenny. And his first involvement with the Tusla referrals came about when he received a copy of the referral on 2nd May '14. And I needn't perhaps dwel1 on this too much but we outline from paragraph 76 and onwards, up as far 10:50 as paragraph 80 , his role in matters, and we respectfully offer the view that the role, the position he took was appropriate, was reasonable, and was correct, and that there is simply again no evidence that could implicate him in any suggestion of a conspiracy or larger plan to do down Sergeant McCabe.

Then, on paragraph 81, we treat of the position of Superintendent Frank Walsh, who was private secretary to the Commissioner, and he indicated that he brought the letter from Assistant Commissioner Kenny to the attention of the then Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan and acknowledged it. He sent a further note to Assistant Commissioner Kenny on 17th July and we
mention that at paragraph 82, and that unfortunately was not replied to. And we offer the view at paragraph 83 that it would appear that everyone at that time, shortly after the Mullingar meeting, had reached the point where they each considered that no further action was required in relation to the matter. The assistant commissioner confirmed in evidence that he did not have any further dealings relating to the particular matter though he did meet Sergeant McCabe on other matters after that. And that is mentioned at paragraph 83.

And then the last two persons whose role i will treat of, Chairman, are former Commissioner Nóirín o'Sullivan, and we treat of that commencing at paragraph 84 on page 27 of the note. Retired Commissioner o'sullivan confirmed to the Tribunal that she had no memory of reading the Tusla notification with the false rape allegation that was sent to Garda Headquarters by Kieran Kenny. She certainly took no action on foot of it and she confirmed that at no stage did she share any such information with the Department of Justice. And when asked by you, Chairman, I think in the last module to comment on Superintendent walsh's evidence that she had read the letter without comment and just proceeded on, she stated that:
"If a Tusla referral comes to the Commissioner's office it would normally be dealt with by local Garda management."

She offered the view that in relation to this piece of correspondence the relevance of the letter was not evident to her when it was brought to her attention by Superintendent Walsh. And we say it is of some significance that when later cross-examined by counsel for Sergeant McCabe, the former Commissioner was not challenged on her evidence that she had no memory of reading the document which was brought in by Superintendent walsh in the normal course of dealing with the post. And we instance the relevant excerpts from the transcript in the footnotes to paragraph 85.

And then, Chairman, we treat of a matter you have already canvassed with Mr. Buckley, and that is the meeting with Paul williams and Ms. D, and we treat of that at paragraph 86 and onwards. And we suggest what is important when considering the evidence of Mr. Paul Williams and Ms. D is that the articles that mr. williams wrote and the meetings he arranged for Ms. D with public figures were not written or arranged for the purpose of damaging Sergeant McCabe, their purpose as far as Ms. D was concerned was a desire on her part to publicise her view that her criminal complaint against Sergeant McCabe had not been investigated properly or that persons within An Garda Síochána had conspired to cover up her allegations against Sergeant McCabe. And we say two things about that, effectively, Chairman. we say that Ms. D's
complaint was that the Gardaí had effectively been guilty of a cover-up and had failed to investigate her allegations against Sergeant McCabe. So I suppose -CHAIRMAN: I wonder did she ever go as far as to say a cover-up. I don't mean to interrupt your submission, but it's just that is a bit --

MR. O'HIGGINS: Sorry, I think that's fair. That is perhaps unnecessarily dramatic language. That it had not been properly investigated was the gist of her complaint. And we say perhaps that could be regarded as being the very antithesis of the core allegation facing An Garda Síochána in this Tribunal; namely, that they spread word of the false allegations far and wide in order to discredit Sergeant McCabe. And we say there is a certain irony in that and intention in that which perhaps could be regarded as a point of defects, as it were, to the allegations facing An Garda Síochána.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, again, if you don't mind me just asking you at that point, I'm just not getting this
thing about were the Gardaí trying to spread allegations far and wide. I mean, where is that based on? I mean, the evidence has been certainly that things were kept within a very tight circle. MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But you are referring to an allegation that things were spread far and wide. I am sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, but I just don't understand what you mean by that.

MR. O'HIGGINS: The point I am not making terribly we11, is this, Chairman: That locating the evidence as you have heard it within the overall, overall charge, so to speak, contained within the terms of reference, namely that An Garda Síochána wrongfully used -- just looking at the terms of reference:
"...whether the false allegations and/or the Tusla file were knowingly used by senior members of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant McCabe."

CHAIRMAN: Just direct me to the paragraph number, please.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Well, sorry, I have lifted that from paragraph 2 of our written note, the actual term of reference.

CHAIRMAN: Oh. Sorry --
MR. O'HIGGINS: The term of reference is:
"To investigate the creation, distribution and use by Tusla of a file containing false allegations of sexual abuse against Sergeant McCabe that was allegedly sent to the Gardaí in 2013, and whether these false allegations and/or the file were knowingly used by senior members of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant McCabe."
CHAIRMAN: okay.
MR. O'HIGGINS: So locating them in that framework, I was seeking to make the point that if it be your conclusion, and of course it is a matter for you, but
if it be your conclusion that the view that was taken by the relevant Garda actors in the matter was to close it down, was to not give it oxygen, was to confine it to a small a number of persons as possible, we say that is the opposite of the charge within the terms of reference being made out, in effect. And that the concern was at all times to maintain the dignity of matters from the point of view of Sergeant McCabe and also Ms. D, and to, as I say, not give the matter oxygen, and we say that the evidence you have heard is consistent with that overarching position. And we say that we do acknowledge that -- sorry, we do offer the view, at paragraph 90, that any suggestion of a Garda conspiracy to discredit Sergeant McCabe involving, for instance, Paul williams, we suggest have been set at naught, really, following the evidence before the Tribunal in module (d), and we reprise the quotation from -- at paragraph 90 referable to that. And we say that, at paragraph 91, irrespective of who it was that the Tribunal ultimately concludes initially suggested that Ms. D meet with Paul williams, the evidence was clear that Ms. D alone was the one who sought to meet with the member of the media that she could trust so that she could have an opportunity of venting her grievances against the Gardaí, and we suggest there is no evidence to suggest that her meeting with the journalist was part of a conspiracy involving the Gardaí to denigrate Sergeant McCabe. And then, Chairman, we treat of the position of Detective

Superintendent John O'Reilly --
CHAIRMAN: Just before we go on to there, Mr. O'Higgins, please, what is the quote you have there at footnote 85 , is it, or is it footnote $86 ?$
"As I said to you, when he suggested Paul williams, as I have already explained, I knew of paul williams. I felt he was a credible reporter. I was happy to speak with him."

That is from Ms. D?
MR. O'HIGGINS: Ms. D, is my understanding of matters. CHAIRMAN: There is other evidence as well, obviously. MR. O'HIGGINS: Oh, there is.
CHAIRMAN: No, you are entitled to obviously point to this and say, look, that is what your case is, and that is fine.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes. And we have also, hopefully in a balanced way, Chairman, we have also itemised where we think there is not just tension but actual conflict on the evidence. For instance, there is one aspect of conflict between Mr. D and Detective Superintendent John o'reilly, and that is, and we've mentioned actually at paragraph 94, that Mr. D and Superintendent O'Reilly were not in exact agreement in evidence to the 11:00 Tribunal as to the circumstances that led to the initial call being made by Mr. D to Paul williams. Mr. D's position was that he told Superintendent O'Reilly that Ms. D had indicated to him that she
wished to tell her side of the story, possibly to a journalist. He stated that he referred to this desire on the part of his daughter during a social encounter with Superintendent O'Reilly, and Mr. D stated that Superintendent O'Reilly then inquired if she would like 11:00 to talk to Paul Williams, and we have reproduced the quote there at the bottom of paragraph 94, the bottom of page 29. And Mr. D stated -- we say at paragraph 95 that Superintendent O'Reilly then gave him Paul Williams' number. When Mr. D went home and talked to Ms. D following this conversation, she asked that her father arrange a meeting, and this meeting then took place on 8th of March '14 at the home of Mr. and Mrs. D. The Tribunal is furnished with a transcript of the meeting and it revealed that Ms. D was motivated to 11:01 have the investigation into Sergeant McCabe reopened as she considered the matter was not taken seriously or properly investigated by the guards in 2006/2007. And the Tribunal -- Chairman, you will be aware that Paul williams thereafter published a number of articles
which were considered by the Tribunal and he also arranged for Ms. D to meet with Micheál Martin, TD, to seek assistance in having her case reopened, and that meeting took place in April of '14, and that meeting is also heralded in one of his articles on the 15th April 2014, and Ms. D also subsequently made a complaint to GSOC, which she initiated on 30th Apri1 2014 , complaining about the quality of the initial investigation, and her statement to GSOC was made on

3rd Ju7y 2014. And I think it is important, and we mention this at paragraph 97, that Ms. D confirmed in evidence to the Tribunal that no one prompted her to complain to either Mr. Martin or to GSOC. She also later met with former Commissioner Alan Shatter in June 11:02 of '14 and that was -- former Minister Shatter, I should say, and that meeting was also arranged through Paul Williams, but Ms. D understood that Mr. Shatter had requested the meeting. And later on, she also spoke with Conor Lally, journalist, who published an article in The Irish Times in February of 2017.

And we mention at paragraph 99, and I have a1ready referred to Mr. D's version of this, which is in conflict, Superintendent o'Reilly's recollection differed from that of Mr. D in one respect, and his clear recollection was that it Mr. D who first brought up the name Paul williams, and he stated that:
"He --" that is Mr. D "-- said to me 'we were thinking about Paul williams'. He asked did I know him, to which I replied, yes, I did."

And Superintendent O'Reilly's recollection was that when Mr. D returned to him having talked to his daughter, Superintendent O'Reilly contacted Paul williams by phone and asked if he would take a call from Mr. D or Ms. D, and he gave evidence that that was the end of his involvement in the matter, other than
giving him directions to the D home by telephone.

And we offer the view, Chairman, and again this is of course a matter for you, but we offer the view at paragraph 100 that what is accepted by all witnesses, 11:03 Mr. D, Ms. D, Mrs. D, Superintendent O'Reilly and Paul williams, is that the first contact made to Paul williams was made by Mr. D.
ChAIRMAN: No, that is not accepted by everybody, Mr. O'Higgins.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Al1 right. Sorry.
CHAIRMAN: No, sorry, I don't mean to challenge you, and obviously I am getting great value out of these submissions, but, in fact, I think Superintendent o'Reilly rang paul williams to say, there is a phone call which you might expect from Mr. D.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Excuse me. That is accepted.
ChAIRMAN: So that is the first contact with paul williams.
MR. O'HIGGINS: That is undoubtedly -- we have said 11:04
elsewhere, Chairman, I hope this didn't in any sense mislead -- that was loose.
CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. o'higgins, my problem is, we have had a mountain of facts and they are all over the place.
MR. O'HIGGINS: of course.
CHAIRMAN: I am not upset if anyone gets anything wrong because unfortunately I am struggling to get things right myself, so please don't worry about that.

MR. O'HIGGINS: I think elsewhere in the submissions we had mentioned that -- yes, we had understood that, and I think it's abundantly clear from the transcript evidence that it was, of course, accepted that he had played an introductory role.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. o'higGIns: yes. And we say, indeed we stated there, Chairman, in paragraph 99, that Superintendent o'Reilly contacted Paul williams by telephone and asked if he would take a call from Mr. D or Ms. D. And we hope that is a faithful reflection of the evidence that you heard.
CHAIRMAN: Mm-hmm.
MR. O'HIGGINS: There was a second issue, and we hope this again is helpful in terms of our warts-and-all appraisal of matters, at paragraph 101 we mention a second issue that involved Superintendent o'Reilly insofar as Ms. D was recorded to have said during a GSOC interview that Superintendent O'Reilly had told her father that, and we mention that allegation there, relating to some suggestion that Sergeant McCabe would go to a local secondary school, and of course Mr. D denied ever stating such a conversation had taken place with Superintendent o'Reilly, and we have reproduced at paragraph 102 the relevant excerpts from that with the 11:06 relevant transcript references.
CHAIRMAN: Well, it went, unfortunately -- it became official when it was reported to GSOC and it's ascribed.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes. Not by any member for whom the Garda team is acting, Chairman. And we say that it's a matter for you, of course, but that the unequivocal direct evidence of both Superintendent O'Reilly and, in fairness to him, Mr. D, we suggest, at paragraph 103, should be preferred over what appears to have been a hearsay statement purportedly recorded by a third party who indeed was not a witness before the Tribunal. And we say that Ms. D's understanding concerning this comment, Ms. D's understanding appears to be simply a misunderstanding on her part, but that, of course, is a matter for you, Chairman, to form a view on. I think it has relevance --

CHAIRMAN: We11, I am sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, Ms. D was a witness before the Tribunal. I mean, are you referring to her or to somebody else?

MR. O'HIGGINS: She was, but insofar as it appeared in the GSOC materials, there was no additional witness, other than Ms. D, produced in relation to that. And I think we instance at paragraph 104, Chairman, that Mr. Williams, Paul Williams that is, was unequivocal that his involvement with Ms. D and the stories that he subsequently wrote, the articles that he wrote, were written by him as an independent journalist and were not motivated by any external influences such as by members of An Garda Síochána, and again the relevant exchange with counse1 is reproduced at 104, hopefully of assistance to the Tribunal. Mr. williams, at paragraph 105 we mention, confirmed that he did not
discuss Sergeant McCabe with former Commissioner o'Sullivan or with former Commissioner Callinan at any stage and he also confirmed that the meeting with Ms. D did not come about directly or indirectly through any intervention on the part of Superintendent Taylor. Subsequent to the meeting, he did make contact with Superintendent Taylor in an attempt to seek further information concerning the McCabe investigation, but the contact was made on his initiative and yielded no new information. And at paragraph 107, we mention the fact that Mr. Williams also confirmed that at no stage did he have access to the Garda investigation file from 2006/2007, and he confirmed that there was no ulterior motive to, as far as he was concerned, to Superintendent o'Reilly's involvement in the case, and again, the relevant excerpt is reproduced at paragraph 108. And that is our -- that is what we have to say in relation to the role of -- Detective Superintendent O'Reilly's role in matters.

And finally then, Chairman, we conclude the final page of the document of the written piece to respectfully submit that the evidence heard by you in this module appears to support no conclusion other than the guards had no involvement whatsoever in the creation or our respectful position that the input from the Gardaí and the senior officers, for whom we are acting, was at all times motivated not by any malice or animus towards

Sergeant McCabe, but by a desire on the part of those concerned to ensure that any issue concerning Sergeant McCabe was dealt with sensitively and in a professional manner. And returning finally then to the terms of reference, we offer the view that there is no evidence to justify a conclusion that the false allegations against Sergeant McCabe or the Tusla file were knowingly used by senior members of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant McCabe in any way.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. O'Higgins. I had a couple of questions. I just was trying to find something, if I just may detain you for a moment, please. MR. O'HIGGINS: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN: It's probably right to say that not too much significance should be attached to any question. It's a question. It's not that $I$ am actually thinking this; it's something that is going through my mind as being something worthy of being asked. That doesn't mean anything more than that.

First of all, in relation to Superintendent Cunningham, now we have the investigation file. I am not sure all of it -- in fact, $I$ know all of it wasn't distributed in the context of this module, for very obvious reasons, because there are other persons involved, a lot of it is very private, and that is the right decision to make. But have you any submission to make as to whether Superintendent Cunningham's investigation was thorough or not, of the original D allegation?

MR. O'HIGGINS: I have nothing further to add on that, Chairman. I simply submit that a third-party agency was tasked with looking into that, GSOC, and they appear to have formed the view it passed muster. It was a professional --
CHAIRMAN: Yes, but it may be important in the sense that, obviously the job of someone deciding facts is to try and nit things together, not to take things in isolation. But, Mr. O'Higgins, you will be aware of the situation that used to occur in the past where four people were saying "I was sexually abused by $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}$ ", and bizarre applications were made to split the trial so the jury never knew there were four people making the same allegation as opposed to one. So you can draw an inference from things appropriately, provided you exercise caution. But if it was, let us say, a very thorough investigation, if it was, let us say, a model of how a garda should conduct an investigation of this kind, then certainly, as of the time when he submitted it and as of the time we come up to the DPP's ruling on the matter on the 6th of April 2007, it would seem from that that he had absolutely no animus whatsoever against Sergeant McCabe.
MR. O'HIGGINS: I would respectfully agree, Chairman.
And it may be that it was -- Sergeant McCabe was
unaware of quite how comprehensive and detailed a professional job had been done by superintendent Cunningham, and that may have played a part in how matters unfolded thereafter.

CHAIRMAN: The preliminary view that I have taken, having read the whole thing, and as I say the whole thing wasn't actually circulated or discussed here, was that it would be a very good example, for teaching purposes, as to how to conduct an investigation of this 11:14 kind. If that indeed is the case, it's hard to see how, at that remove, he had anything whatever against Sergeant McCabe, in fact quite the opposite, although, at the same time, there was an objective consideration of each fact, each supporting fact, each fact in relation to credibility. That's one thing that I wanted to ask you about.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes. Well, I think it's not without significance, Chairman, that in his ultimate -- in his report, in his ultimate recommendation on the file to the Director, Superintendent Cunningham recommended against a prosecution, but didn't leave it at that; he gave a basis for that recommendation, which ultimately appears to have been acted on or accepted by the Director's office.

CHAIRMAN: We11, then again, so did the State solicitor. Now, this, on the face of it, doesn't seem to be, this is against a fellow officer so, therefore, that is an allegation that could be made in these circumstances, and perhaps people might think that. But rather, it seemed to be a genuine drilling in to whatever facts might be relevant and a determined pursuit of any fact that could assist in casting light on the matter.

MR. O'HIGGINS: And I think as well, Chairman, it is clear from the file that has been circulated, or the portion of the file that has been circulated in the materials, that great care was taken in obtaining statements from all necessary and relevant witnesses and put onto the file and summarised for the Director's consideration ultimately when the file went in to the DPP. I think that was an appropriate course to adopt. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We11, it is to be appreciated, as well, that, in a way, the ball hadn't been set rolling at that point, in the sense that Sergeant McCabe first wrote to Superintendent Clancy saying, look, there is a number of things that have happened in this station over the course of the last six months that are well below standard - gardaí reading newspapers in the public office, watching the television, not turning up for duty, not wearing uniforms, not completing investigation files - and then these are referable, obviously, to the ten incidents that were considered by O'Higgins, Mr. Justice O'Higgins, but that was set in motion as of the 25 th February 2008, which is nine months, or so, later - well, ten months later. So is it possible that the inference that I draw, therefore, would change as one goes along, or what -- do you want to say anything about that?
MR. O'HIGGINS: Chairman, you are speaking about the position that followed after the closing of the file and the DPP's decision not to direct a prosecution? CHAIRMAN: Yes. In other words, the first port of call
for Sergeant McCabe, and I'm taking it as a given because it is in the o'Higgins Commission report, that he was well-motivated and motivated in a public spirit to engage with the Garda authorities and then to go further when that apparently met with no response that addressed his concerns, that this happened on the 25th February '08. You know the letter I am referring to, I think, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: It is the letter which says: Dear Superintendent Clancy, there are a number of things that are happening in the station that I need to have an urgent meeting with you about. And then there is a whole load of bullet-points listed, there is about 15 or 20 of them, including files not being investigated, matters not being followed up, evidence not being gathered, Gardaí sitting around doing no work, not justifying the money that the taxpayer pays them. In other words, is there any sense in which the inference resulting from a very, very thorough investigation file 11:19 by Superintendent Cunningham at that stage should change as these matters go on or could change as these matters go on and Sergeant McCabe is apparently required to take matters further and higher and eventually to Byrne/McGinn, to -- then ultimately to the O'Higgins Commission? In other words, that some bitterness may be building up against. And that is the question, really. MR. O'hIGGINS: Sorry. well, Chairman, I say that it
appears to be common case between the parties that certain tensions flowed from the mere fact that an investigation had taken place --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. O'HIGGINS: -- and straining of relations, indeed I 11:20 think it was in what might be termed the D letter penned by Sergeant McCabe himself, as to the straining of relations, without using unnecessary language in relation to that, and that perhaps did strain relations. But nonetheless, in my submission, the professionalism and competence displayed by Superintendent Cunningham in the file that he submitted to the DPP and the manner in which he investigated the matter, was mirrored by many of the steps taken by him and his colleagues in later dealings with the issue 11:21 when it arose subsequently. But I say that the -insofar as, Chairman, you are referring to the letter of the 25th February 2008, you are not talking there about the D letter, you are talking about the complaints concerning -- I wonder is that the January 11:21 letter?

CHAIRMAN: Let me just go back on it so that I am -- on the 28th January '08, Sergeant McCabe writes a letter to Superintendent clancy basically about supervision, non-completion of work and the Pulse issues. Now, what 11:22 happens after that is that Superintendent Clancy asks Sergeant McCabe to make a business case in relation to releasing the DPP letter. MR. O'hIGGINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Now, that is then followed up by the letter of the 25th February '08 to Superintendent Clancy re the $D$ family and the problems that are occurring, and a lot of that hasn't been gone into, quite properly, because it's nothing to do with the Tribunal. And Sergeant McCabe asks for no prosecution of Mrs. D or anybody else. And he says: this allegation has ruined my life forever. I am a completely changed person in that I don't trust anyone any more. And then Superintendent Cunningham is tasked by Chief Superintendent Rooney with investigating that, and the upshot of that is the first Mullingar meeting of the 25th August '08.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Perhaps in the same room, indeed, as the later meeting of the 16th July 2014. But I suppose that's the chronology of the events. And I suppose the question I'm asking you is, even if I do draw an inference that the thoroughness, the fairness, the objectivity, the textbook example of investigation, if that be the case, of the Superintendent Cunningham police work on the D allegation shows that he was a decent and fair-minded person as we11 as a first-class investigator, let's suppose $I$ am of that view, all I'm really asking you is, do matters not shift as time goes 11:23 on?
MR. O'HIGGINS: In my submission, matters don't shift in terms of the core allegation, so to speak, within the terms of reference, as to whether there was any, in
the (d) module, as to whether false allegations and/or the file were knowingly used by senior members of the guards to discredit sergeant McCabe. In my submission, and I would remain firm on that, nothing shifts in relation to that. I don't offer the view, in my submission, nor should I, having regard to the evidence that you have heard, that everything was perfect in terms of how letters were responded to or matters followed up. That isn't the position I'm offering to you, Chairman. But I say, nonetheless, that with respect to the role, for instance, played by Superintendent Cunningham, clearly on foot of the business case, so to speak, that was made by Sergeant McCabe for obtaining the DPP's directions so that he might provide it to other parties, on foot of that it is clear from the evidence that superintendent Cunningham was tasked with the job of investigating the allegations surrounding, if I could call it, the Ds or the D allegations contained within the letter of 25th February 2008 from Sergeant McCabe, and I say that it was in -- the whole controversy that subsequently became something of a media issue where perhaps there was rather inaccurate reporting surrounding that issue, the whole controversy concerning the mullingar meeting stemmed from what I say was a legitimate, proper and necessary step taken by Superintendent Cunningham to investigate what were, on their face, serious allegations. He sought a statement from Sergeant McCabe. It wasn't forthcoming. And in fairness to
him, he offered the view, look, that is the end of it, and he wasn't anxious to progress the matter further, notwithstanding that he had made those allegations as recently as 25th February 2008. Superintendent Cunningham's position was, he was there at that meeting 11:26 to take a statement, to action that further, and then when that didn't happen, he reported appropriately to his line manager, and I say that was an appropriate step, and again, shows the absence of any malice or wrongdoing on the part of Superintendent Cunningham with respect to that aspect of the transaction.

CHAIRMAN: Well, yes, I understand what you are saying. I suppose it may be more a matter for the o'Higgins Commission, but was there no sense in which somebody could have stepped in at that point and ensured that matters didn't go off the rails --

MR. O'HIGGINS: Chairman --
CHAIRMAN: -- within the Gardaí?
MR. O'HIGGINS: -- are you talking --
CHAIRMAN: I am talking about the Garda.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Are you referring to the DPP directions issue?
CHAIRMAN: No, the way everything then escalated out of that point, in the sense that if sergeant McCabe felt he was being ignored, if things were really as bad as the O'Higgins Commission later reported, and they were, I am taking that as a given, what is it about the Gardaí that would have allowed all of this to escalate in the way that it has done, as opposed to people
coming in appropriately addressing it and thereby at least having a chance of stopping it?
MR. O'HIGGINS: We11, I say that an appropriate and reasonable attempt at addressing it was made, in the form of the investigation that was carried out in the Byrne and McGinn investigation, into these matters. Now, again, we are not suggesting that it was pristine and perfect, but we say it represented a reasonable effort. Now, obviously Sergeant McCabe was not happy with the Byrne/McGinn conclusions, or certain of them, but we say that, nonetheless, it represented a reasonable effort at addressing these matters. It wasn't as if the complaints made, many of which were found to be legitimate and we11-founded, by Sergeant McCabe were ignored or that nobody looked into the matter. It was taken very seriously at a high level and two senior officers were tasked with investigating these local issues and carried out a very thorough investigation, aspects of which were not ideal, as found by the o'Higgins Commission u7timately, but I say 11:28 that that represented a reasonable attempt at that, and, again, could not be regarded as simply ignoring Sergeant McCabe's complaints, in my respectful submission. And you will be aware, Chairman, as well, that matters weren't left at that, because following 11:28 the delivery of the Byrne/McGinn report, there was a further review of matters by Nacie Rice. CHAIRMAN: Assistant Commissioner Rice. MR. O'HIGGINS: Assistant Commissioner Rice. which
again represented a reasonable effort at addressing these matters.

CHAIRMAN: We11, it was a desk study.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: We11, I suppose one wonders in the overall, and again it is only a question, whether, if the Gardaí have standards, and certainly Superintendent Cunningham emerges as having standards that things are to be done a particular way, and other people fall short, is it a question that the Gardaí avoid scandal by not literally washing their dirty linen in public, or, perhaps by not doing that, they cause much bigger trouble down the line? In other words, does the organisation protect itself, Mr. O'Higgins, as opposed to actually saying, we have standards and we are going to abide by them, and anyone who falls short of them, I'm afraid we are just going to call that out? That is, I suppose, the bigger question.
MR. O'HIGGINS: We11, I say that, Chairman, there was a reasonable effort made in Byrne/McGinn. It was an
investigation that took place over a lengthy period. It was, of course, the subject -- its adequacies were the subject of the o'Higgins Commission in certain respects. Many, many of the findings of Byrne/McGinn were adopted and upheld; some of the findings were not, and indeed there was some criticism directed at aspects of the report. But I say that it is relevant as well, of course, that there was a full participation, of course, in the o'Higgins Commission, not just on behalf
of individual Gardaí but also at corporate level in An Garda Síochána, and again I say this -- it couldn't be suggested of the force that they simply failed to engage with matters. They did engage, not in an ideal fashion, undoubtedly, but they did engage and made reasonable efforts at addressing the concerns that had been made quite properly by Sergeant McCabe. And I think it is important to restate, chairman, that at all times throughout this Tribunal the position of An Garda Síochána has been to accept the findings made by Mr. Justice o'Higgins, even those findings that were critical of the approach adopted by the force, and of course to accept the findings where the force were cleared in relation to many of the high level allegations of corruption made by Sergeant McCabe that were ultimately found to be unfounded or not borne out by any evidence.
CHAIRMAN: And is there any sense of where the buck stops, in the sense that it was quoted, what Mr. Justice Morris said in the Morris Tribunal Report, that if there is a superintendent in charge of a district, anything that happens is ultimately that person's responsibility and that person should take responsibility?
MR. O'hIGGINS: Yes. Well, I think perhaps the best answer to that, Chairman, is the evidence that you heard from former Commissioner Nóirín o'sullivan herself, who accepted responsibility for the Garda conduct of matters at the o'Higgins Commission, who
accepted the findings made that were critical of the approach that was taken, of the subject matter of the o'riggins Commission concerning the local issues that were the subject of that, in one sense, and also the findings that were made concerning the high level allegations, the macro allegations that were made by sergeant McCabe as well. It has at all times been the position of An Garda Síochána in this Tribunal that, particularly from former commissioner o'sullivan, that she accepts responsibility and was in charge of all matters, and we say that that was a reasonable position to adopt, not in any sense shirking responsibility, which we say was shared by the senior officers who gave evidence before you, who did not seek to minimise their role in matters and gave their evidence as to their individual role in the various issues that arose by way of controversy.
CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can I go on then - I have just a few more questions, Mr. o' Higgins, and thank you for your help - to a question that was asked by Mr. Marrinan of, 11:33 I think, Chief Superintendent Sheridan, and which I think certainly inspired some of the questions asked by Ms. Leader of Assistant Commissioner Kenny. Maybe she didn't take Assistant Commissioner Kenny, but perhaps it was Mr. Marrinan all along. So if this is a difficult question, you have got to blame Mr. Marrinan, not me. And again, it is only a question. But it may be that you say, this is the first aspect of it, that the same thing would have happened had Superintendent

Cunningham answered the letter of the 15th August 2013, and obviously I am going to consider that, and I have your submissions on that and they are very interesting and thank you for them. But I have a wonder, which is this, and again it is a question of, like in the trial where you have four separate trials of four separate children who are alleging abuse against one person, forgive me for using this analogy, it's not to say that that is particularly pertinent to this case, it is that, when looking at things on an individual basis, it's very often the case that one can fail to see the bigger picture. One has to try and see the bigger picture, and this is the bigger-picture question. So Chief Superintendent Sheridan doesn't contact the HSE after the meeting in Mullingar on the 16th July 2014. We know that. Now, we just go on to the next one. Superintendent Cunningham doesn't open and then forgets about the letter, which remains unanswered, of the 15 th August 2013. Inspector 0 'Conne11 does not read or act on his email from Fiona ward re Eileen Argue, et cetera, on 28th Ju7y 2014. Assistant Commissioner Kenny sends a rape-offence notification to Garda Headquarters, but never retracts it when he learns that it is wrong as of the 16th May 2014. Am I not entitled to look at all of those facts together and then ask myself the question, what is actually going on here? MR. O'HIGGINS: Well, I say, Chairman -CHAIRMAN: In other words, are there too many coincidences?

MR. O'HIGGINS: We11, again, the construction to put on the evidence that you have heard, is, of course, a matter for you, but, in my submission, a fair construction supports the proposition that the Gardaí who were involved with matters when the incorrect notification came in from Tusla, namely Superintendent McGinn, Chief Superintendent Jim Sheridan, Assistant Commissioner Kenny, ultimately when one -- when the matter shakes out, when the Mullingar meeting takes place, and even before that in the context of the clear input from Jim Sheridan, it is clear that the overall position of An Garda Síochána is, they come to a realisation, this is -- this is reheated old dinner; this is 2007 -- 2006/2007 allegation. There has been a mistake here, this should not go further. And Chief Superintendent Sheridan goes to the practical step of scratching on the incorrect notification that there is an error and puts that on the file. And I say all of these actions -- I take your point concerning there could have been further liaison with the HSE, and Jim Sheridan acknowledges that, that he did not do this, but he formed the opinion that, after the meeting, that from a Garda perspective, it required -- no further action was required at all. So no further input or steps were needed from An Garda Síochána. And ultimately, and I say that the evidence supports this when viewed in its totality, the Garda position was, this is -- this has come in by mistake, this is the stuff from 2006/2007, no further step be taken. Now, I
do acknowledge that, if you like, the outcome from the Mullingar brainstorming was that certain steps be taken, and they weren't taken, and perhaps there was a degree of dis organisation in that, but again, the evidence from the witnesses concerned was to the effect 11:37 that ultimately the view was taken that it wasn't necessary to take any further steps, and Jim Sheridan had already corrected things with Rian and the HSE, and, in our submission, was undoubtedly entitled to believe that they had corrected their records, and, quite properly, the HSE witnesses have acknowledged that where they did -- and /Tusia, I am using that umbrella term -- where errors had occurred, each HSE or Tusla official acknowledged the error was theirs, and there was no input from An Garda Síochána or no wider influence involved in the making of that error. And we say, to borrow from the title of the book, this was a series of most unfortunate events. That is a matter for you to assess in terms of the HSE role in matters, but these were not Garda errors, and they took steps, reasonable steps, to correct it, and ultimately decided not to give the matter further oxygen and closed it down, and we say that was a reasonable position to adopt, and is again the antithesis of any suggestion of a conspiracy or a wider plan to discredit Sergeant McCabe.

CHAIRMAN: In that context, again arising out of that concern, and it is simply a concern, it should be taken on7y as a concern, the non-correction by Assistant

Commissioner Kenny of a rape allegation sent about Sergeant McCabe to Headquarters and him saying that a person who is a sergeant and who is acting effectively in a secretarial role, and there is nothing wrong with that, had the responsibility of correcting it, is there 11:39 an inference to be drawn from that in the event that $I$ find facts a particular way, as to what attitudes may have been in Garda Headquarters towards Sergeant McCabe?

MR. O'HIGGINS: I say not, respectfully, Chairman. We 11:39 acknowledge that was an error, undoubtedly. And it's no part of my submission, and I think this appears from the written note, to suggest the error was that of his assistant in the office, Ms. Duffy. Ultimately, it ought to have been sent up. But again, we say, having regard to an overall appraisal of Assistant Commissioner Kenny's position, he took the reasonable step of organising the Mullingar meeting, and perhaps, perhaps a fair construction would be that, when the meeting eventually happened, events had been overtaken by the corrections that had finally been made on the file and by dint of the appropriate communication that took place between An Garda Síochána and Tusla/HSE. And we say that even if there was a slip on the part of the assistant commissioner in not sending that up, there is no evidence that that formed part of any conspiracy or any attempt to keep the matter percolating with a view to damaging Sergeant McCabe, as was canvassed as a possibility in evidence.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Could I move on then to the actual reading of the allegation in Garda Headquarters by Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Superintendent Walsh, his evidence was that she read through it making absolutely no reaction and making absolutely no comment. The evidence of Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan is that she never remembered reading the rape allegation. Now, I'm not asking people making submissions to put themselves in the place of anybody, but I am simply making reference to how a reasonable person would react or could be expected to react to something. The allegation as sent up by Assistant Commissioner Kenny is horrible, it concerns a person in the public eye, and yet I'm told, on the one hand, that the Commissioner simply read through it making absolutely no comment and not in any way reacting to it, and secondly, I am expected to accept that she has absolutely no recollection of reading it. Do you want to make any submission about 11:42 that?

MR. O'HIGGINS: We have endeavoured to treat of that, Chairman, in the written note at paragraphs 84 and 85. I will simply say, Chairman, that it's not, of course, binding on you in any sense, but $I$ think it is of relevance that when former Commissioner o'Sullivan, and obviously she gave her evidence in the module just completed, as to her role in matters in the (d) module, she gave evidence that she had no memory of reading the

Tusla notification with the false rape allegation that had been sent to Garda Headquarters by Assistant Commissioner Kenny. I think the evidence displays clearly that she certainly took no action on foot of it. It also displays -- well, her evidence was that at 11:43 no stage did she share any such information with the Department of Justice, which again is a further indicator that -- supporting her position that she did not recollect it. And I think actually, Chairman, on the transcript, $I$ should note, in reviewing matters last night, and these will be fresh perhaps in your own mind, but when asked by you to comment on Superintendent walsh's evidence that she had read the 1etter effectively without comment and had proceeded on, she had offered the evidence that if a Tusla referral comes to the Commissioner's office, it would normally be dealt with by local Garda management. And she offered the view that, in relation to this correspondence, the relevance of the letter was not evident to her when it was brought to her attention. She doesn't for a moment disagree with the evidence of Frank Walsh, Superintendent Walsh, that he did bring it to her attention. She doesn't disagree with that. And I think it is significant that when later cross-examined on the point by Mr. McDowe11, she -- it 11:44 was not suggested to her and she was not tackled on her evidence that she had no memory of reading the document which was brought in by Superintendent Walsh effectively in the normal course of dealing with the
post. I take the point, Chairman, this wasn't -- this wasn't a, as it were, bog standard letter that one receives every day. But I think it is important to point out that former Commissioner o'Sullivan didn't, unlike others, for instance Jim Sheridan, didn't know the content of the 2006 allegation, but was aware, I think, of the DPP direction in a broad sense, and, of course, was aware of there having been some class of investigation but wasn't aware of the substance or content of it, and that also may have played its part in her perhaps non-reaction or modest reaction to matters and her failure to recollect it when brought to her attention. But I simply would ask you to take into account that we are dealing with somebody who is in charge of the force and all its aspects, has a lot of correspondence to deal with, has a lot of duties in terms of the security of the State, and this was done as part of an appraisal of the post that day. It was perhaps not trivial, $I$ accept, trivial post, but nonetheless, it didn't dawn on her as to its absolute relevance to matters, and she, I say, wasn't cross-examined on that to any significant context by parties at the Tribunal.
CHAIRMAN: Right. Then the last matter is really in relation to Chief Superintendent O'Reilly. Now, I know 11:46 what you have said about that, and what you have said is helpful in the sense that we have one person saying one thing, the other saying another, and then you have Ms. D saying a report, indeed, of something entirely
different. But was it a good idea vis-á-vis bringing the press into this thing? Is that how a superintendent ought to behave? That is the question. MR. O'HIGGINS: Well, I think --

CHAIRMAN: I mean, an officer rank member of An Garda Síochána.

MR. O'HIGGINS: I think, Chairman, while you might perhaps have understandable misgivings about that, could I say this: a consideration of it can't be divorced from the human relationships -- in fact, many 11:47 of these issues had their origins in local issues, personal relationships and sometimes the breakdown of personal relationships. But on this particular issue, I think it is relevant to point out that Superintendent O'Reilly was a friend of Mr. D for over 20 years and a friend of Mrs. D for, it seems, approximately 30 years, as they have been school friends, and he met regularly with Mr. D, often for a drink and a chat. And the evidence, and I don't think it has been challenged, was that Mr. D called Paul williams and arranged for him to 11:47 come to his house and meet with Ms. D, and Superintendent O'Reilly, when asked, had provided Mr. D with Mr. Williams' telephone number, and, if you like, done that introduction. He had also spoken to Paul williams and inquired if he would take a call from Mr. D. So undoubtedly he was the introducer. But I say, Chairman, that insofar as the question of putting -- - being critical, inquiring as to whether that was a misstep or wrong step, even if, Chairman,
you take the view that it was a misstep, and ideally the advice back might have been, listen, what are you going to the press about, $I$ think it's fair to point out this was something which had its origins, or appeared to have its origins, in a request coming from Ms. D. In turn, her parents had asked for some help and had gone to a guard with whom they were friendly, in this case Superintendent o'reilly. And perhaps in a perfect world he might have stopped to think, is that a great idea? And might have given the human advice, perhaps it isn't a tremendous idea. But I say that, whatever step he took in introducing them to Mr. Williams, I say should be viewed in the context he was asked to do that by the D family, on behalf of their daughter, who at that time had -- was agitating a 11:49 certain position and intended to go to the press. And it may be, Chairman, in terms of this issue as to whether history would have been different, had he not done that, there is every chance that a journalist would have been contacted by some alternative means. As it happened, he was that means, ultimately. But I say that it would be difficult to draw the conclusion that history would have been any different, because it seems at this point in time Ms. D was intent on agitating her position, and she wished to do so, and I 11:49 think the subsequent contact with politicians bears that out. So perhaps ultimately, even if it was a misstep by Superintendent D [sic], and perhaps, looking back, he might prefer if he hadn't got involved from
his perspective, but, in any event, it doesn't appear at any rate that that actually altered history one jot, but we don't know.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the work you have put in, and your colleagues, Mr. O'Higgins. Thank you.

## FURTHER SUBMISSION BY MR. BUCKLEY

MR. BUCKLEY: Sorry, Chairman, just to supplement those comments insofar as they relate to the journalistic contact. I think the evidence on day 10 was also that calls had been made by journalists to the house of the D family before that contact was made.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is certainly the case, including a lady who I think was expecting.
Mr. BUCKLEY: Yes, I think who was identified as Debbie McCann, the journalist.
CHAIRMAN: Again, I am not saying anything against her, and, as appreciated, I don't want to drag her into things, but you are correct in pointing that out. Thanks. So I think it's the AGSI next.

## SUBMISSION BY MR. DOCKERY

MR. DOCKERY: Yes, Chairman, very briefly. Sergeant
O'Conne11 submitted -- Inspector O'Conne11, as he is now, submitted three statements to the Tribunal, sir: one on the 8th May 2017, which I might term an initial statement; a more complete and comprehensive statement
on the 3rd July 2017; and a further very detailed statement on the 15th July 2017. Inspector O'Conne11 held sergeant rank at the time in what was an administrative role as the divisional clerk to the chief superintendent in the Cavan-Monaghan division. He reported to that chief superintendent, who was Chief Superintendent Sheridan. He was not a party to any decisions made by senior Garda management with regard to the original incorrect referral. He was not present at the Mullingar meeting of the 16th July 2014. And he 11:52 had no direct contact at any time with Assistant Commissioner Kenny with regard to the assistant commissioner's view of the original incorrect material or whether it should be returned or destroyed. He had no direct contact with Garda Headquarters at any stage, 11:52 either. His only contact with anyone other than the chief superintendent was with Fiona Ward of the HSE. He had no direct contact with anybody from Tusla or from Rian Counselling. And his contact with Fiona Ward, sir, arose purely and simply from her letter of the 22nd May 2014 to the Chief Superintendent, in essence calling for a return of all copies of the incorrect report. And Inspector 0'Conne11's on1y involvement after that was merely to type the Chief Superintendent's reply as dictated and sent to Fiona Ward on the 9th June 2014, seeking clarification as to (a) how the error occurred, and (b) how it came to 1ight. And you will recall, sir, that her response to that query was on the 18th June 2014. And on one
reading, it was partially incomplete, or somewhat incomplete, in that it addressed the question posed as to how the error had came to light, but was entirely silent on the question of how the error had occurred in the first place. And arising from that, the chief Superintendent asked Inspector o'Connel1, or Sergeant o'Connell as he was then, to contact Fiona ward directly, which he did on the 30th June. She says, I think, the 24th June. And arising from that telephone conversation, or discussion, sir, Ms. Ward corresponded again with the chief superintendent on the 1st July 2014 and clarified that question of how the error occurred, as she understood it, and again, repeated her request for a return of the original report. Now, then on the 21st July 2014, Inspector O'Connell emailed Fiona ward at the request of the chief superintendent, and this was ostensibly to ascertain, at the behest of the chief superintendent, further details concerning, or any details concerning how the HSE proposed at that juncture to address the error. And arising from that email of the 21st July, Ms. Ward telephoned Inspector o'Connell the same day and they had a discussion, and Inspector o'Connell has accepted the reliability of Fiona Ward's notes of that telephone conversation. And according to Ms. Ward, further action, if needed, lay within the remit of the Social Work Department and the HSE would not be involved in that, and she said she'd contact -- she would obtain contact details for the social work Department and pass them on to Inspector

O'Conne11. She did so then on the 28th Ju7y. And the inspector fully admits and accepts that he has no recollection of ever receiving that email. He cannot explain how that is so or why he was unable -- or did not get it. He has carried out extensive searches and trawls to try and establish where it went or where it might have gone. Now, when he and Fiona ward had that telephone conversation on 21st July 2014, it was Inspector O'Conne11's last day in the Cavan-Monaghan division and it seems likely that this would have been mentioned to Fiona ward in passing. The telephone conversation was received by Inspector O'Conne11 while he attended a lunch to mark his departure.

Insofar as anything turns on it, Chairman, one could make the case that, perhaps that Fiona Ward was already we11 aware of the contact details she required in Tusla. The contact point in Tusla at all times to that stage was Ms. Eileen Argue, and, on one reading, perhaps that information was readily to hand, readily to hand so far as Fiona Ward was concerned and it was information she was already well familiar with and could perhaps have given to Inspector O'Conne11 there and then on the telephone. But in any event, it was followed up a week later, but at that stage Inspector O'Conne11 had left and he was acting divisional officer in Listowel at that stage, one week later, and it's regrettable that email was not received. He has no recollection of ever reading it. In my submission,

Inspector O'Conne11 was a very assiduous officer, and it's a matter of great disappointment to him that he cannot account for that email. But I think the tenor and character of his evidence and the way he approached all matters indicates that he was a conscientious, upright and reliable officer who carried out his duties to the best of his ability and to the satisfaction, apparent satisfaction of his superiors.

The on7y other thing I want to add, Chairman, is that one step Inspector O'Connell did take was to follow up on a request from the divisional office at Monaghan to the assistant commissioner's office at Sligo for a return of the erroneous Tusla referral. A Garda Patricia Maguire had, in the divisional office, had sent an email to the assistant commissioner's office in S1igo, attaching Fiona Ward's letter of 22nd May 2014, calling for a return of the material, and Inspector o'Connell followed up on that, he believes on the 5th June 2014, and he did so with Sergeant Karen Duffy in Assistant Commissioner Kenny's office in Sligo. And to that extent, he was clearly trying to give effect to the divisional office's intention to carry out or to act on Fiona Ward's request to return the material. But Assistant Commissioner Kenny took a different view. 11:59 Mr. O'Higgins has alluded to it. Assistant Commissioner Kenny gave reasons for that; he sent a 1etter on the 10th June 2014 to that effect. And it was followed by the Mullingar meeting. And as I say,

Inspector O'Conne11 was not present at that.

So I will just conclude by saying that, in the round, despite the unsatisfactory fact that he cannot account for the email of the 28th July 2014, I submit that Inspector O'Conne11 was we11-disposed towards Sergeant McCabe, gave evidence that he didn't believe the contents of the original allegation, he didn't believe that Chief Superintendent Sheridan accepted it either. He was we11-disposed towards Sergeant McCabe, and was not involved in any conspiracy or any effort, subtle or express, to frustrate Sergeant McCabe or to damage his reputation, sir. That is my submission.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Dockery. Mr. McDowell, maybe the right thing to do is to break for an hour now because we have been on the go since half past nine.

MR. MCDOWELL: That is a good idea.
MR. CUSH: Chairman, one point, if I could mention a matter?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.
MR. CUSH: This morning, Mr. MCDowe11 very fairly indicated to me that, in one particular respect, his submissions would be critical of my client, and that relates to the non-compliance with the National

Counselling Guidelines introduced in December 2012, and I do have something to say about that. I haven't said it so far, and I can say it relatively quickly. CHAIRMAN: Do say it now if you like, yes.

MR. CUSH: Thank you, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: I must say, there has been so many sets of guidelines and there is so many references to so many sections of them, I'm -- we11, the head swims, and maybe you'd try and lead me to shore on that, please. 12:01 MR. CUSH: I will certainly try and do that, Chairman.

## FURTHER SUBMISSION BY MR. CUSH

MR. CUSH: These guidelines were introduced in December 12:01 2012, so shortly before the events with which you are concerned. They are National Counselling Service guidelines. Now, the National Counselling Service is run by Rian out of the HSE, so they are my clients' guidelines, if you like. And what they envisage, and this I think was the relevant of part of the proposition, is, they envisage communications - in fact, regular meetings, monthly or bimonthly, between the National Counselling Service and the Social Work Department, and that is Tus7a. So that was the -- that 12:01 is what is envisaged by the guidelines. And in this particular case -- or, sorry, in or about this time, no such regular meetings were being held, and that became a feature of something in the case. So could I just make four points, if I may, about that, Chairman.

Firstly, the whole point of these regular meetings as envisaged by the guidelines is to ensure communication between the counselling service and the Social work

Department, but in this case there was communication because Laura Brophy telephoned the Social Work Department on four occasions and on the fourth occasion finally got to speak to Briege Tinnelly. And I will just give you the book reference where you see the diary entries for those four telephone calls. It's on page 963 of the book, you will see that she telephoned on the 26th Ju7y, the 30th Ju7y, the 8th August, and finally made contact with Briege Tinnelly on the 9th August

CHAIRMAN: But she was saying what exactly, Mr. Cush? MR. CUSH: She was discussing with Briege Tinnelly what had been reported to her, and crucially, and this is borne out by the intake form to which I referred earlier, she was inquiring was this child/family known to the Social Work Department before. Because the evidence was, if previously known, if this was previously known, then there is no need to do a written report, whereas if it's not previously known, she'd have to follow up with a written report. And that is the intake form. It's signed off by Briege Tinnelly and her supervisor, Keara McGlone. So there was, in fact, communication, and unfortunately there was an error in it. So that is the first point I would like to make. The underlying purpose of the guidelines was, 12:03 in fact, met in a different way here.

Secondly, Chairman, and I will say this with a caveat I wil1 identify in just a moment, if there had been a
meeting, a monthly or bimonthly meeting, the assumption seems to have been that the error would have been discovered earlier than it was discovered. And the caveat, I must identify this, is that Ms. Fiona Ward appeared to accept that in evidence as a probability. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CUSH: But could I just identify something for you, and it's a submission that has to be seen in the light of that evidence: what the guidelines envisage is meetings of this bimonthly type in respect of cases where there is a lack of clarity as to what course of action should be recorded. Now, the guidelines say that in two different places, and again I will give you a page reference on the book, they are both on page 807. So it's not certain to me, making a submission at 12:04 least, that this is one such case, in the light of the communication that had already been had, and, in fairness to my client, Ms. Ward, who said what she said, she did also identify that communication as having taken place.

The second thing, just on that aspect of matters, is to say that the personnel envisaged in these meetings is either the director of counselling or a team rep on the counselling side and then a representative of the social work side. So it's by no means certain that the particular person who attended the meeting on behalf of the counselling side would have picked up the error had the case been discussed at a11. So not certain that it
would have resulted in earlier discovery, that is the second point $I$ want to suggest.

The third point, Chairman, is, would earlier discovery have made a difference in this case? And I suppose I would point simply to the fact that a great deal of what you are concerned about in this Tribunal concerns what happened after the discovery of the error in this case.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is, yes.
MR. CUSH: And that, $I$ suggest, speaks for itself. And then lastly, the fourth point, in terms of the reasons for non-implementation of the regular bimonthly meeting, Ms. Ward did say something about that; she did, we did meet internally on the clinical side, the counselling side as she put it, but the difficulty was organising the other half of the meetings. I am very grateful to you for that opportunity.
CHAIRMAN: Right. So it's what? Ten past one we resume, if that is suitable.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH

THE HEARING RESUMED, AS FOLLOWS, AFTER LUNCH:

SUBMISSION BY MR. MCDOWELL

MR. MCDOWELL: Good afternoon, Chairman. The submissions that I want to make on behalf of Sergeant McCabe fall into four broad categories. Firstly, there's the circumstances in which Laura Brophy of Rian came to initiate reengagement with Tusla arising from two sessions that she had in July and August of 2013. And secondly, the handling by Tusla of the notification that it received from Ms. Brophy and the Rian service. The third area is the manner in which An Garda Síochána dealt with the notification of allegations of rape offences in relation to Sergeant McCabe by Tusla. And the last category deals with the actions of the Ds, D family, Paul Williams, and some general observations on the effect on Sergeant McCabe and his family of the matters referred to at 1 to 3 .

Now, the Tribunal heard evidence from Ms. Laura Brophy and from Ms. Fiona ward on the 4th, 5th and 6th July 2017. And I suppose I can cut to the chase, Judge, and say this: that Sergeant McCabe accepts that the evidence establishes that the inclusion of the Ms. Y material on the written notification, as distinct from the verbal notification, made by Ms. Brophy, was some form of cut-and-paste error by Ms. Brophy, and he also accepts that that error, which he believes was a very
grave and negligent error, was not the result of any deliberate action or malice or ill-will or deliberation of any kind on the part of ms. Brophy. And to add to the, I think, six reasons mentioned by Mr. Cush, there is, of course, the most persuasive reason of all: that 13:15 if there was any such intention, Ms. Y's name would not have been used in the written notification.

But having said all of that, Judge, I do make this submission: that this is an error which, nonetheless, however unintentional, was one which should never have occurred. And if, as appears to be the case, one highly sensitive file was used as a template for another highly sensitive file, this was the kind of error that could occur if you start using templates, one file as a template for another, in whatever shape or form. And I know that Ms. Brophy wasn't clear that she had used one as a template for another, but she wasn't really clear about how the cut-and-paste error took place at all. But it is our submission that the written document should have been carefully checked before it was sent, and it's also our submission that it should have been at some stage, at some proximate stage, either before it was sent or immediately after it was sent, the subject of a careful check by Ms. Brophy's supervisor, Fiona Ward, and that failure to do that has had very significant consequences for the McCabe family, as the Tribunal will see.

So therefore, what I am saying in relation to that is that, undoubtedly, Ms. Brophy presented, and not merely presented but appeared to be in every respect a decent, honest, honourable witness who was contrite for what happened, and that is accepted. But nonetheless, the error, such as it was, that was made, shouldn't have been made, should have been checked upon, should have been the subject of some kind of review proximate to the time that it was made, and, if any of those things had happened, the sequence of events that followed from 13:18 it would not have happened.

Now, the next thing I want to say, and this was what Mr. Cush was referring to just before lunch, is this: that Ms. Ward gave evidence to the Tribunal about the guidelines that had come into effect in December, I think late December or early January of 2012/2013. And if those guidelines had been followed, if there had been adherence to those guidelines, including face-to-face meetings between Rian and the Tusla service, even if, as Mr. Cush says, they wouldn't always consist of the same people or people who would have firsthand knowledge of everything that was described at those meetings, again it is quite likely that the files would have been brought out on the table 13:19 and the error would have been noticed some time proximate to its occurrence. And it is striking that these were new guidelines and the evidence was that they were already falling into desuetude by July/August
of the year in which they were in effect adopted.
So I hope it's not seen as churlish in any way to say that while one accepts that Ms. Brophy was being truthful and that the error was hers and she accepts responsibility and has apologised for it, nonetheless for an arm of the HSE to make such an error and not to have systems which pick up on such an error, is a matter of deep concern obviously to Sergeant McCabe.

Now, there's one thing I want to say strongly in favour of Rian, and that's this: that when the error came to light, Ms. Brophy was required to complete an incident report outlining what had happened. And when I come on to the next section of my submissions, that is in stark contrast to what happened in Tusla. None of the staff, the Tribunal will be aware, who individually or jointly were responsible for the preparation of the Garda notification which purported to record that Ms. D had alleged that Sergeant McCabe had raped her, was asked at any proximate time or required by their superiors to 13:21 create any form of incident report or written explanation for their behaviour and for the extreme carelessness which happened on their watch and in their organisation. And that's not just an observation, Judge. Because I'm going to ask the Tribunal to ask itself why did that not take place? why did nobody in Tusla inquire of the people involved in the generation of the notification document that went in in May -- of the 30th April and went in in May 2014, why were none
of them at the time asked for any explanation as to what they had done? It's not simply just a query for its own sake; I'm going to ask the Tribunal to draw some inferences from it, which $I$ will come to in a
moment.

The Tribunal has heard evidence, the overwhelming consensus of which is -- on the part of witnesses, is that there was absolutely no need to engage in a Garda notification arising from the Rian retrospective notification if Tusla had been aware that the matter had been notified to the Gardaí in 2007 and investigated by them, and that indeed Inspector Cunningham, as he then was, had interacted extensively with the child protection services in the course of his investigation, and that there was complete awareness on the part of the child protection services and social workers at that time of the Ms. D allegations.

I stop there just to say, Judge, that this Garda notification was something which was absolutely unnecessary and should have been known to be unnecessary if any elementary analysis of the situation had taken place within Tusla. Because Ms. McGlone, on the Monday following the receipt of the oral Cunningham clearly indicating that Ms. McGlone knew of a prior Garda investigation into this matter and wanted to speak to Superintendent Cunningham about it. And
yet, a number of days earlier, Ms. Tinnelly, in a telephone interview with Ms. Laura Brophy, had indicated that there was no file in relation to this matter. And the Tribunal has been given evidence that while this information came in orally on Friday, it was 13:24 considered at a routine meeting on a Monday and the written notification may not have come to hand containing the Ms. Y error until later in that day, and that, in consequence, somebody ticked a box saying "Garda notify", or something to that effect, and a process kicked off then which was almost automatic, automatic pilot, leading to the events of the 30th April. That is the picture that is effectively being proffered to the Tribunal for acceptance. And I imagine that the Tribunal will have no difficulty in coming to the view that many very, very serious errors were made in Tusla and many inexplicable steps were taken, and, in that context, that Tusla will come in for some criticism, which Mr. McDermott has said they wi11 accept if it is coming their way. But I would ask 13:26 this Tribunal not to simply say that things were so awfully bad and things were so chaotic and the administration was so poor in Tusla that this was a kind of an error which is as innocent as is made out, and the reason that $I$ am saying that is the following:

While there's massive evidence of a gross systems failure on the part of Tusla in the manner in which it dealt with the Rian notification, sloppiness,
procrastination, whatever you want to call it, and while much of what happened seems to paint a kind of chaotic and totally unacceptable standard of professional behaviour, I submit that the Tribunal should not merely be sceptical about some of that evidence, but reject some of it as untrue as given by certain witnesses, whom I propose to identify to the Tribuna1. And I say that there is a danger that the Tribunal might justly condemn Tusla for the slipshod and chaotic administration that they have and not analyse the evidence of a number of key witnesses, and they include Laura Connolly, they include Gerard Lowry and, most especially, Ms. Argue, Eileen Argue.

Chairman, the picture that is painted for you by all of the, if I may say, the group of people who first dealt with the Rian referral, is that they had a Measure the Pressure system, which somehow was supposed to prioritise which files were taken and when they were dealt with. But I don't think that I need push very far with the argument that the Measure the Pressure system seemed not to be a system at all; it seemed to have virtually no measurement attached to it at all, except in distinguishing between retrospective cases and live emergency cases on the day, so to speak. And that when the Tribunal is asked to explain how the Measure the Pressure system routinely operated, you're invited to accept the proposition that files which weren't going to be dealt with as a matter of extreme
urgency, were filed together in no particular order in a filing cabinet, that when a duty social worker had nothing more immediate to do, that some form of lottery, hand into the cabinet, take-out-a-file-to-work-on system operated, and that that was how the work of Tusla was prioritised and organised.

Now, that is a very convenient explanation for what happened on the 30th April, because it would suggest that, although there was a confluence of events nationally in relation to Sergeant McCabe, that his file was, so to speak, the lucky or unlucky winner of a random lottery on the 30th April, and that Ms. Connolly, not knowing what file she was dealing with, just randomly selected his file and decided to work on it on that day, that's the picture you're being asked to accept. And the problem with that picture is that there are two pieces of physical evidence which strongly suggest that that is not so, and I refer in particular to the presence on her draft Garda notification document of a post-It file written in the -- sorry, a Post-It sticker, written in the handwriting of Eileen Argue, apparently directing somebody to prepare a Garda notification and replace a possible explanations for the presence of that Post-It on that particular draft prepared by Ms. Connolly. One is, and I hope you won't mind me repeating myself, that
it fluttered in from another file accidentally and just appeared on a page to which it appears to have been highly relevant, or the other, and this was the subject of extensive cross-examination, that it was a direction from Ms. Argue to somebody to work on that file, prepare a notification and to replace the file in the cabinet. of course, if it were the latter, it would mean that Sergeant McCabe's file had been taken out, read, in part at least, by Ms. Brophy -- or, sorry, by Ms. Argue, a decision made that a Garda notification was to be carried out on it, and that it was thereafter to be replaced in the filing cabinet. And as to the date of that yellow Post-It, Ms. Connolly, in cross-examination, admitted, and I think Ms. Argue accepted as well, that it could not have been contemporaneous with the original intake of the Rian referral, because Ms. Argue was not in a position at that stage, her position -- she was not the senior social worker who would have given such an instruction at that time. I think you' 11 find that in the cross-examination, Judge.

Now, if the accidental fluttering-in theory is discounted, Judge, it suggests that Ms. Argue, as I said, had possession of the file at some time immediately proximate to the 30th April and directed that work was to be done on it and it was to be replaced in the cabinet. And if that is accepted, if the Tribunal accepts that that Post-It is not just a
major coincidence appearing on that page, it suggests that the evidence given by Ms. Connolly as to selecting it randomly from a filing cabinet is not to be accepted and must be rejected. And if that evidence is to be rejected, there are certain consequences which flow, and I will come back to them in a moment.

But on the file, too, was a document which was a note in Ms. Connolly's handwriting of an interaction which she must have had on the 30th April with Ms. Argue, and this was the manuscript note going to two pages, headed "McCabe children". And in that note, she records that she has elicited that there are four children, not two, that two are adults and two are minors. And that having discovered that information, she sought directions from Ms. Argue as to whether all four children were to be the subject of an entry intake, a separate entry intake for each of them in the records of Tusla.

And in order, and I'11 be brief on this, chairman, in order for Ms. Connolly to become aware that there were four McCabe children, it required her to take out the file in which Mr. D's statement, which was the only evidence of the existence of four children, was present, to be carefully read to that point. And the question that you have to ask is, in those circumstances, I submit, is: how come Ms. Connolly was reading, not merely one file but two files to elicit
that information? If we discount the random taking out of the filing cabinet idea, we have at this stage two files in the possession of Ms. Connolly, and she gave evidence that, having written out that request for a direction from Ms. Argue, she placed it in a tray, it was taken off to Ms. Argue, she must have had a conversation with Ms. Argue about it, and she was told that she was to open a file or an entry documentation -- intake documentation, whatever the phrase is, in respect of all four children.

Now, Chairman, those interactions are very notable from one point of view: that Ms. Connolly did not seem to be aware of it when she made a statement to the Tribunal, and Ms. Argue seemed to be wholly unaware of it when she made a statement to the Tribunal, and both of them gave as an explanation that they had forgotten about the matter. But in the case of Ms. Argue, if she had indeed, as is evidenced by her Post-It document, requested Ms. Connolly to deal with files which were already out of the filing cabinet, on or about the 30th April, and if she had indeed directed that intake documentation in respect of the four McCabe children should be prepared on that day, and directed Ms. Connolly to do it, she could not possibly have forgotten that when, within two weeks, or I think 14 or 15 days, she is told that the notification prepared by Ms. Connolly was grossly wrong and was accusing Sergeant McCabe, in the wrong, of a rape offence.

Whatever about the passage of time from those events to when she made a statement to the Tribunal, she could not have possibly forgotten, I submit to this Tribunal now, at the time, that she had had this interaction with the McCabe file just two weeks earlier, and nor could she have forgotten that the person who appeared to have prepared that document was Ms. Connolly, and yet you're asked to believe, Chairman, that nobody ever informed Ms. Connolly that she had made this colossal error, not merely at the time when it came to light in Tusla and Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney and Ms. Argue were analysing what to do, not merely when Mr. Lowry was dealing with the file in 2014, 2015 and 2016, and it was being sent off to SART, but that Ms. Connolly was kept in the dark that she was the perpetrator of this mistake, until, I think, the 27th June of 2017, when, for the first time, she says she became aware that she was the person who had written out the rape offence notification.

Now, Chairman, that is astonishing, and that is why I contrast it with what happened to Ms. Brophy; at least she was asked to make out an incident report. But in this case, it would appear that Ms. Connolly was never ever apprised of the fact that she personally had made a huge error because she had not merely -- she'd not merely taken the written notification from Rian, she had ignored the fact that it referred to Ms. Y in two parts and she had inserted into it the text, her
narrative text, the reference to six and seven years of age, and had produced this conflated document naming Ms. D as the victim and sergeant McCabe as the perpetrator.

Now, I stop there and just ask: what organisation would not ask the person who made that mistake for some account of it, or, even if it was the most non-judgmental organisation, mention to that person, by the way, you seem to have made a terrible mistake a fortnight ago which has now come to light and which has caused some, I use the phrase crisis, and you asked me was there a crisis when I used it in examining some witness, but a mini crisis, if I may use that phrase, about the wrong notification to Bailieboro Garda Station in May of 2014? what organisation would keep the person who did that in the dark and why would they do it? And if I can leave that question hanging for a moment, Judge, and then ask you to deal with another issue, and that is this: that Mr. Lowry claims that he, and he's the only person who volunteered this, that he was aware that the Sergeant McCabe who was the subject of national publicity was also the subject of a referral to his organisation. He says that he was aware of that. And when asked how he became aware that 13:44 there was a referral and that he linked the two together, he claimed that he believed he had spoken to a Ms. Louise Carolan and that she had informed him of these matters and that he knew it was a re-referral,
according to his evidence. Now, he said, and you will find it at day 5, page 129, he says that he gave a direction in these circumstances to whoever informed him of this matter, deal with that case in the normal way. And again, Judge, that must have happened before the 30th April, because he certainly didn't say after the 30th April, deal with that case in the ordinary way, once the mistake became apparent. Now, if he's to be believed about that, it suggests that he certainly, and whoever he gave that direction to, which we're left 13:45 in the complete dark about, because Ms. Carolan emphatically rejected that she was given any such direction or that she had any such knowledge, that he was aware of that, but that he told somebody to deal with this case in the ordinary way.

And the other leg in this factual situation is Ms. Argue, because she gave evidence, Judge, that she had understood that there was a correlation, as she put it, between Sergeant McCabe, the national figure and the subject of the Rian referral. And so you have two people, Ms. Argue and Mr. Lowry, who both -- and if you look at Ms. Argue's evidence, she seems to suggest that -- in her testimony, as to her awareness of this correlation, that she might have mentioned it to
Ms. Connolly as well. But again, Ms. Connolly says that was absolutely not so. But it does appear that there were at least two people in Tusla who knew that there had been a referral relating to Sergeant McCabe
and knew that this was the sergeant who was high profile. And it does appear, if, Judge, the Tribunal is so minded to accept, that the yellow Post-It direction was in the handwriting of Ms. Argue, that it was on or about 30th April that it was given and that Ms. Connolly set about preparing the Garda notification and the intake documentation that day.

So two things, in my submission, follow from that. we have an almost invincible amnesia on the part of Ms. Connolly, who claims to have known nothing, seen no significance, been totally unaware of Sergeant McCabe, on the one hand. We have a very similar situation in relation to Ms. Argue. She actually claimed that when she prepared her statement for the Tribunal and went through the file to refresh her memory, she didn't notice the reference in handwriting to herself or her own direction to Ms. Connolly to take in all four children. You have that evidence. If it the Tribunal accepts that this was not a coincidence, that what happened on the 30th April was not a random selection from a filing cabinet but a direction to Ms. Connolly to deal with it, a number of clear implications follow from that: that the random selection evidence as given to the Tribunal is wrong and should be rejected, and that Ms. Argue was the person who directed Ms. Connolly to carry out this operation, and that, if you add into that, that Ms. Argue was aware that the national -- to use her phrase, that there was a correlation between
the Sergeant McCabe in the headlines and the Sergeant McCabe in the referral, the random explanation simply falls apart.

And I then go back to the point that I left hanging, if I may, earlier, if I may say so, earlier, and that is: why would Ms. Connolly not be contacted about this matter within the following 14 to 20 days to ask her what had gone wrong? And in my respectful submission, the obvious person who should have done it was Ms. Argue and Mr. Lowry. They didn't. They didn't seem to want to know what had happened that day. And as I will ask the Tribunal later to infer, they didn't want to be reminded about the incident at all.

Now, under cross-examination, Ms. Argue did accept, and this is of some importance, Judge, she said that while she had no recollection of it and she accepted that it was possible that somebody had mentioned the case to her in or about 30th April. of course, she was forced to that position because she was claiming to have no memory whatsoever, and, confronted with the fact that she appeared to have directed Ms. Connolly to carry out the Garda notification via the Post-It and that she'd interacted with Ms. Connolly on the day by directing the intake documentation for the four children, confronted with that she couldn't then exclude and categorically state that nobody had mentioned the matter to her.

Now, if, then, the Tribunal examines the reaction -or, sorry, there's one other matter that I wanted to just mention to you, Chairman, and that was the use of the letters "M McC" in an email from Ms. Argue to Mr. Lowry when the mistake came to light, and I just ask the Tribunal to draw the inference from that that both Ms. Argue and Mr. Lowry knew that the letters "M MCC" were sufficient for her to impart to him about whom they were talking in the circumstance.

So one is left with the situation that neither -Mr. Lowry never asked for an explanation from Ms. Connolly as to what had happened, Ms. Argue didn't either, neither of them seemed to want to know what had gone wrong on the 30th April, how Ms. Connolly had further developed the error in the original Rian notification from Ms. Brophy and developed it into a fully-blown explicit notification of a rape offence against Sergeant McCabe.

So either the evidence on the balance of probabilities, or whatever standard, Chairman, you're going to apply to this, and I know that there are theories about bringing things well down the line or just past the
51/49\% point, but either this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the random explanation is the true one, however chaotic and unjustifiable it is, or the Tribunal examines, I submit, the alternative evidence,
which is that there was a direction proximate to the 30th April, that there was an interaction between Ms. Connolly and Ms. Argue, and yet, within two weeks of the matter, no attempt at an internal inquiry as to what had gone wrong happened and no notification to Ms. Connolly that she'd made a mistake happens and no attempt is made to do what at least Ms. Brophy did, and that was to carry out an incident report at the time which would describe who was responsible for taking out this file, who was responsible for working on it, who was responsible for the error and for some acceptance of -- not some acceptance of responsibility, some picture of the actual sequence of events laid out at a time when it was demanding, crying out, for somebody to say, what happened here? How have we done this to this man? No attempt was made to do any of that.

Now, the next thing that you have to, in my submission, look at it in context, Judge, is the evidence of Ms. Creamer. And it's in this respect; it wouldn't immediately leap off the page as relevant to this issue, except that she, from a totally outside perspective within Tusla, looks at the decision to prepare intake documentation in respect of four children, two of whom are minors and two of whom are find it, is that this was high1y unusual; that to open intake documentation in respect of an adult was certainly very unusual and to open intake documentation
without any credibility assessment was unusual. As against that, evidence, I think, was given by Ms. Argue, or maybe Ms. Connolly, that this was standard practice in Cavan-Monaghan as regards preparing the intake documentation without any assessment of credibility of the allegation, but nobody seems to have suggested that it was anything other than high1y unusual for intake documentation to be prepared in respect of two adults. And I needn't remind the Tribunal that the intake documentation that was prepared in respect of each of the four McCabe children also set out the digital, anal and the vaginal penetration rape offence.

And if it was so unusual, no explanation has been given, and none was attempted, Judge, that I can recall in any event, and I hope I'm not missing something in the transcripts, as to why intake documentation would, in highly unusual circumstances, be opened in respect of adu7t people by Tus7a, and yet that particular transaction was the subject of a written request for guidance by Ms. Connolly directed to Ms. Argue, and the subject of an oral direction, which was recorded in writing, that all four were to be the subject of intake documentation. No explanation is given for that.
Highly unusual event. And again, that seems to have completely faded from the mind of Ms. Argue and indeed it seems to have completely faded from the mind of Ms. Connolly, despite its unusual nature, and yet all
of that took place on the 30th April 2014. we11, it does come down, Judge, to this: you have two competing theories; the random selection out of a filing cabinet by somebody who had no other duties on a particular day of this file, or the other theory, which I suggest has a far more probable ring to it, that the yellow post-It did refer to that file - and I just put in brackets there, Judge, both Ms. Connolly and ms. Argue argued that it might not have been, that it might have been a Post-It that came in from some other file or somehow obtruded itself onto the relevant page - and that there was a direction, a highly unusual direction, given by Ms. Argue on that day to include adults in the intake documentation prepared for each of the four McCabe children. And these two competing theories, in my respectful submission, on the balance of what is reasonable to believe, I am asking this Tribunal to reject the random selection from the filing cabinet explanation and to accept that the post-It referred to the document to which it was attached, and to accept that the interaction between Ms. Connolly and Ms. Argue showed unusual steps being taken in respect of the McCabe children on this day and that none of these things could have been forgotten about two weeks later when it's discovered that Ms. Connolly has made her
terrible mistake. It could not be forgotten about. CHAIRMAN: That Ms. Brophy?
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry?
CHAIRMAN: That Ms. Brophy had made a terrible mistake?

MR. MCDOWELL: No, Ms. Connolly. Ms. Connolly, on foot of Ms. Brophy's original mistake.
CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: But Ms. Connolly brought it -- just to be absolutely clear about this, Ms. Connolly found a reference to Ms. Y on a document and she stitches together the two sentences from Ms. Y narrative and puts in the middle a reference to Ms. D, and produces a coherent -- an apparently coherent rape notification concerning Sergeant McCabe, which she puts into the system. And, Judge, in case there's any doubt about Ms. Argue's memory on this matter, it is Ms. Argue who actually has to produce the corrective notification in June to An Garda Síochána. And you're asked to believe that she has forgotten all of these things. And the point I had here in my notes, Judge, is: these surely must be memorable events, that you're accusing a man who you definitely know -- or, sorry, you're not accusing. You're notifying the guards about a man who you definitely know is at the centre of public attention and you've misnotified them that he's alleged to have committed a very serious rape offence, and you have to yourself prepare, as Ms. Argue did, the corrective notification within weeks of the event, and all of this to have simply been obliterated from your mind and never remembered as a stand-out event in your 1ife, we11 I suggest to you that is not acceptable. That any professional social worker who did such a thing or was involved in such a series of events would
remember those events. And the strange thing is, that Ms. Connolly would certainly have had every reason to remember it because she would have been at the very centre of things were it not for the fact that you're asked to accept that nobody bothered to tell her she had made that mistake for three years or to draw it to her attention for three years, and that she on7y found out about it after she had made her original statement for this Tribunal and when she was studying the documentation in the run-up to giving evidence here in June of 2017. That's when she says she first realised that she was the person who had prepared the rape Garda notification.

Now, I'm also asking the Tribunal to look at the actions of Mr. Lowry thereafter. Firstly - I don't want to labour the point - he takes no retrospective action whatsoever. He doesn't attempt to assemble the facts to put on one piece of paper anywhere an account of what had gone wrong. Secondly, he gives this
Tribunal a short statement, which to say it is utterly uninformative would be charitable, Judge. It is a statement which doesn't deal with any of the relevant facts hard7y at a11, and gives no explanation whatsoever for what had gone wrong at a11. And nobody, 14:04 in fact, committed, apparently, to paper that Ms. Connolly had made this mistake or indeed ever notified her that she had made this mistake at all.

And one has to ask -- I mean, there are two possible explanations for that kind of behaviour: that this was a complete disaster and there was a psychological unwillingness to revisit it in any shape or form and a desire to wash hands completely, or, alternatively, that Mr. Lowry did give that direction, deal with this case in the ordinary way, knowing it was Sergeant McCabe, that he did so at some stage prior to the 30th April, that that instruction was given to Ms. Argue, and that she was the person who told Laura Connolly to work on that document that day, to prepare a Garda notification and to carry out an intake, a highly unusual intake in respect of adult children, two adult children and two other children.

And Mr. Lowry says, Judge, that he was aware, and he says this in his evidence, that he was aware that it was a re-referral. In my respectful submission, these are the actions -- Ms. Argue's actions and his actions, especially in failing to mention the matter to Ms. Connolly, are the actions of people who are probably the alternative explanation to the random taking out of the file explanation, these are the people who were somehow concerned in the generation of action on the 30th April. Mr. Connolly with his -remembering that he said this case was to be dealt with in the ordinary way, Ms. Argue as the person who told Ms. Connolly to take action in respect of a file which was already out of the cabinet, and Ms. Argue as the
person who directed the intake documentation be prepared in respect of two children and two adults.

So that's my broad submission on that point, Judge, that there are two conflicting scenarios. One of them is highly improbable. And the slightly beguiling thing is, Judge, that you might think, or you might be invited to think, that this was such an appal1ingly-run organisation that the random out of the filing cabinet, dressed up as Measure the Pressure, was the explanation for what happened. But the physical evidence of the documentation on file, coupled with both Ms. Argue saying that she saw a correlation between Sergeant McCabe the national figure and Sergeant McCabe the subject of the referral, and Mr. Lowry's similar evidence that he was aware that it was a sensitive case and had given a direction that it was to be dealt with in the usual way, is much more consistent, in my respectful submission, with a probable explanation of what actually happened on this occasion
CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, as you are finishing on that point, I mean, I suppose what is on my mind is: let's suppose that $I$ find the whole notion of chaos attractive but not tenable, and let's suppose you're right in relation to all of these things that were said from the three individuals most closely involved, what does it all amount to, except for, 1 mean, an inference that could be drawn is that, lo and behold, we have unfinished business?

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And this unfinished business is Maurice McCabe, and we haven't dealt with it and we'd better deal with it now.
MR. McDOWELL: Exactly. Because he's in the headlines now.

CHAIRMAN: And then, when we get around to it, we deal with it in utterly chaotic fashion, but is there anything more sinister than that involved in it?
MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, I'm not going to move from that to the smoking gun theory that somebody in An Garda Síochána rang up and said, where is your referral in respect of Sergeant McCabe, we are expecting it? I'm not suggesting that.
CHAIRMAN: We11, I don't think you need to do that, Mr. McDowel1. I mean, I think if the reality is that this is out in a public forum and there is a realisation of unfinished business, well then, with a view to ensuring that there is no criticism, action is taken which unfortunately may result in a worse situation than simply ignoring it totally in the first place.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm posing that as a question. MR. MCDOWELL: We11, can I put it this way, Judge:
What I am saying to you is that the random-selection-out-of-the-filing-cabinet explanation doesn't stand up to scrutiny. And you have to ask yourself why was it proffered to this Tribunal as an
explanation of what happened on the 30th April. And that it is more likely that there is a different explanation and that the different explanation is corroborated by the yellow post-It and the non-inquiry into what happened on the day and that is that somebody 14:10 in Tusla said, we have done nothing with this file, this man is now in the headlines, we'd better notify the guards. Now, that may not bring the Tribunal very far, but I'm asking the Tribunal at least to do this, to reject the suggestion that it was a purely random act and that it was wholly unrelated to what was happening in the national sphere at the time in the sphere of national politics. That's as far as I can put it, Judge. I can't now ask the Tribunal to speculate as to who or what caused that action on the 30th April. What I am asking the Tribunal to do, though, is to reject the suggestion that it was a purely random act and to prefer the explanation that Tus7a, as an organisation, decided it had better get its act together, this man is in the headlines, we have 14:11 done nothing with the file, of which we are aware that we have been sitting on now for six months or seven months, or whatever it was, and we'd better get on with the notification. That's as far as I am putting it, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: I know.
MR. MCDOWELL: In my respectful submission, it's a preferable explanation to the one which Tusla has given you.

CHAIRMAN: But if Gerry Lowry knew it was a re-referral, then the puzzle becomes even more peculiar.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, he did accept it was a re-referral.

CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe he did. Maybe he's wrong. MR. MCDOWELL: And that is the second point I'm coming to, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: In which case, what is going on? I mean, sometimes -- you know, sometimes, one is just left with 14:12 a situation which there's no point in saying the following happened because literally you're just sticking a pin in a - well, whatever you stick a pin in, I don't know.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, Chairman, I do accept the proposition. What I'm suggesting is, this isn't a matter of sticking a pin in explanations. I do accept the proposition that, in the end, you're going to be left with an unresolved mystery as to what spurred the action on the 30th April. But I'm inviting you to reject the suggestion, which you were asked to take by a number of witnesses, that this was an entirely random event.
CHAIRMAN: Right. Well, before you go -MR. MCDOWELL: Can I deal then with the re-referral 14:12 bit, Judge, because this is relevant.
CHAIRMAN: No, please do. I asked you, yes. MR. MCDOWELL: You see, all of the evidence was that if the Gardaí already knew about this, there was no point
whatsoever in referring the case back to them -- or, sorry, doing a second notification. And Keara McG1one was certain that it had been investigated before because she writes to Superintendent Cunningham about it. Eileen Argue was part of the original 2006/2007 social work intervention and must have known that the Gardaí were aware of it at the time, because it was the Gardaí who brought it to the attention of the social workers at the time. Mr. Lowry says that he was aware that it was a re-referral, and the implication is that quite a number of people in Tusla were aware of the fact that the Gardaí had been involved in the Ms. D allegation some, whatever it is, seven years previously.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is the problem, it is seven years before.

MR. MCDOWELL: I know. But quite a number of them were so aware, and yet nobody -- and the real thing, Chairman, if you look at this question; in order for Ms. Connolly, let's take Ms. Connolly, to go through the files and find out that there were four McCabe children, two of which were unnamed, but they were -sorry, I think they were named by Mr . D , he seemed to know their names, or whatever, and two of whom were adults, she had to go through the file and had to have been aware that there had been a Garda reference at the time.

CHAIRMAN: No, I get that point, Mr. McDowe11, and you've made it very well.

MR. MCDOWELL: It's just a huge mystery as to why anybody thought that a Garda referral was needed in the circumstance. The only explanation is that somebody ticked a box saying "Garda referral", and that's supposed to give rise to, as I say, the random lottery extraction of the file out of a filing cabinet by Ms. Connolly to work on it and she sees the box to be ticked and she works on it. But Ms. Argue directed that there should be a Garda notification on the yellow Post-It if the Tribunal accepts that that is what that was.

And this is the second point I want to make in relation to this. The whole idea of making a Garda notification at this stage seems very, very strange. It requires a kind of an amnesia coupled with an automatic process with nobody applying their intelligent mind to what they are doing, and it raises the question why was a second -- why was a notification being prepared at all in April 2014.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, there are some books which say that, you know, large organisations are like that. They are utterly mindless in the way they go about things. So that is why if things are going wrong, like, say, in some part of the world they have actually no sense of what is right and wrong in relation to that. MR. MCDOWELL: But isn't it strange, if I may ask this question rhetorically, isn't it strange that, as soon as the second notification caused an incident, I won't
cal1 it -- a mini crisis in May 2014, that nobody even then said why were we doing this notification in the first place? why was Ms. Connolly asked to do this? Who asked her to do this? In which case it might have emerged that Ms. Argue had asked her to do it and had put the Post-It on the file.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just, I know you are moving on to the second point, but I take it the other point that you're making in relation to this is that if you consider just the various things that were happening at these dates --

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- 23rd January, Commissioner Callinan before the Public Accounts Committee; then, shortly after, Maurice McCabe in private; then there's the dossier to the Taoiseach in February; there's the Government appointing the Guerin investigation; there's the resignation of Commissioner Callinan on the 24th March; there's the Fennelly Commission report on the 25th May.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: There's the Ms. D articles in relation to Paul Williams. No, I'm sorry, I'm getting this wrong. MR. MCDOWELL: No.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, there are the Ms. D articles then that appear, I think there's four of them. And then there is a complaint to GSOC by Ms. D on the 29th April, and then on the 30th April the file is somehow -MR. MCDOWELL: Well, I heard what you asked of the

Garda counsel in relation to coincidence and the like, Judge, but it is a remarkable coincidence that a wholly unnecessary action is taken in highly suspect circumstances that I submit -- on the 30th April, which seems to be -- I mean, supposing the notification had been correct, supposing Ms. Connolly hadn't made her error, even then you'd wonder what was she doing. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. MCDOWELL: I mean, supposing she had put down the original sofa facts, or whatever, you'd have to ask yourself, what was this about and why was it being done on the 30th April 2014? And I just -- again, Judge, I'm not going to start speculating and dreaming up wild conspiracy theories, but I am asking the Tribunal to be extremely circumspect about the explanation it has been given, because it doesn't seem to stand together.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. So you're going to go on to number two, which was the handling by Tusla of the notification.

MR. MCDOWELL: I am on number two, really.
CHAIRMAN: Well, that's really done that then. MR. MCDOWELL: I'm coming to the end of number two, except to say this, Judge --
CHAIRMAN: okay. And then it's three - how did the Garda deal with the social work notification -Tribunal's time at all.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: But I do ask the Tribunal, when
examining Mr. Lowry's behaviour, to look to what he did thereafter, and, in particular, to look at his claimed failure to read Ms. McLoughlin's Barr letter. Why he would fail to read it is very difficult to understand. Because if he had done that, Judge, no letter would have been sent to the McCabe family in the end. If he'd looked at it, he'd have said: for heaven's sake, you're repeating the same mistake as Ms. Connolly and Ms. Argue caused us to make in April 2014, why are you writing that again?
ChAIRMAN: well, there was others involved in that, too --

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- you know, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: And there were, and there was Mr. Deeney and there were other people, Judge. And I don't want to waste the Tribunal's time, but I just want the Tribunal to remind itself in this context that then you had the SART episode, and the file, or parts of the file, are sent off, sanitised or hoovered, or whatever, to a different agency to complete the social work, an agency which was established, Judge, for the purpose of dealing with backlogs of cases, and this is sent off in those circumstances to that body in what appears to be a sanitised state, and, when it arrives there and they begin to examine the whole matter, the people in SART say it should never have been sent to them in the first place.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I have the evidence of Linda Creamer
in that regard.
MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: And really that comes from the inside and is very critical of the organisation.
MR. MCDOWELL: of course it is.
CHAIRMAN: But there it is.
MR. MCDOWELL: And I am not querying that, but I'm just saying that there is a pattern here of utter denial and evasion of responsibility, and it starts before 30th April and carries on until the infamous letter is sent to the McCabe household, arriving in early January 2016. I think I have said enough about that now, Judge. Could I then go on to An Garda Síochána, Judge. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to enable people to have a short right of reply, Mr. McDowe11 --
MR. MCDOWELL: of course.
CHAIRMAN: -- in the event that they feel they want to say something. That applies, obviously, to Rian and to Tusla, the HSE, the lot.
MR. MCDOWELL: And, Judge, I had intended to have a fully footnoted submission, but logistics crept up on me, I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. McDowell, all I need is basically what your thoughts are on the matter, and that is much more valuable than yet another lengthy piece of paper.
MR. MCDOWELL: Now, Judge, could I come to what actually happened when this -- sorry, there is one thing I do want to say, Judge, though, and, I mean, I think it is important just to put down this marker,
that we are going next into a module and some of the potential evidence may suggest that Sergeant McCabe was reported to some people in authority as being a threat to his own children, and I am just asking the Tribunal to bear in mind that we haven't yet dealt with that. But again, that would be yet another major coincidence, if we had intake documentation of those children prepared in a semi-State agency and somebody tells Deputy McGuinness something along the same lines, and I won't push that any further because I don't want to prejudge or ask this Tribunal to prejudge.

CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure there's any allegation that anyone is supposed to have said that Sergeant McCabe is a threat to his own children.
MR. McDowell: well, we will see what Mr. McGuinness' 14:24 evidence is.

CHAIRMAN: Well, yes, but $I$ have read it. MR. McDowell: Well --
CHAIRMAN: But I think don't worry about it -MR. MCDOWELL: There's no point in us being sidetracked 14:24 on it now.

CHAIRMAN: No, I agree. Don't worry about it for the moment.

MR. MCDOWELL: Now, the evidence is that Superintendent Leo McGinn gets the notification on the 7th or 8th May 2014 at Bailieboro Garda Station. And you have an indication, either that day or in a corrected version the next day, he sends off his missive to Chief Superintendent Sheridan, recommending that the matter
be reviewed possibly by the cold cases unit of An Garda Síochána in the NCBI.

Now, Superintendent MCGinn, reading that reference or reading the notification and until he spoke to Mr. D, must have taken the view this is a very serious offence, the reference he received, because it was a rape offence that he was reading about and he hadn't yet had an opportunity to speak to Mr. D, who would, over a few days, disabuse him of the possibility that Sergeant McCabe had committed a rape offence. And Superintendent McGinn -- there are just a few pieces -bits of evidence that I just want to remind the Tribunal about -- he did indicate that there was a current view in Bailieboro, and, Judge, in case there's 14:26 any media people here, I'd ask you to give a direction that this should not be reported --
CHAIRMAN: I'm --
MR. MCDOWELL: Just let me finish.
CHAIRMAN: No, forgive me for being -- maybe it's better not to say it.

MR. MCDOWELL: No, no --
CHAIRMAN: I can read between the lines.
MR. MCDOWELL: Mr. D had a particular position in the station by this time.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Right.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, I just don't want to identify -CHAIRMAN: No, I know you're not identifying it. I mean, the reality is, $I$ have given a direction that his
rank should not be reported. So let's say he has a particular responsibility, so that is fine.
MR. MCDOWELL: He has a particular responsibility. But Superintendent McGinn tells this Tribunal that there was a general view in 2014 that the original case had not been properly investigated in Bailieboro. CHAIRMAN: Really?
MR. MCDOWELL: You'11 find that, yes, he did. He said there was a general view that it had not been -- that the investigation had not been proper, the original investigation.

CHAIRMAN: Really?
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: I'm surprised to hear that, Mr. McDowe11, I really am. I mean, I know -- I mean, we've heard tons of evidence. I mean, we're day 58 now, or something like that.

MR. MCDOWELL: He did, Judge. I mean, I think -- now it may be that he was just simply dealing with the fact that there was a general view that Noel Cunningham shouldn't have done the investigation.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that is a different thing. Yes. MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. But that there was a
dissatisfaction with the investigation in the station. CHAIRMAN: Well, it could be, or it could be there was 14:28 a dissatisfaction with Chief Superintendent Rooney telling Noe1 Cunningham to do it despite his protest. I mean, I can understand that, but that's a different thing. I mean, I think it's kind of dangerous to
allege there was anything wrong with this investigation, because it seems to me there wasn't; on the contrary.
MR. MCDOWELL: I'm not suggesting that, I'm not suggesting that at all. But I'm suggesting that two
things happened: You have the evidence of Superintendent McGinn that he liked to see timber by the end of the day, as he put it, and that he cleared his desk, and that, therefore, he processed this in very quick order and made his recommendation of a review and the like. And secondly, you have evidence that, unusually in this case, the Garda notification did not go to the sergeant in Bailieboro Garda Station whose function it was to receive, deal with and acknowledge Garda notifications. Effectively between himself and his secretary, he seems to have kept it to himself and put it up the line.

Judge, he sends it to Chief Superintendent Sheridan, who, coincidentally, because of the Guerin Commission, was very definitely conversant with the Ms. D file and had recently studied it again. And Chief Superintendent Sheridan, he says that almost as soon as he saw of the notification, he believed it was erroneous, not an inflation of the original allegation, 14:29 but was simply erroneous. But he flags it on to his superior, who is Assistant Commissioner Kenny, initially without stating that to him, although he later does communicate and, as was pointed out by my
friend earlier here today, he goes to the trouble of scrawling lines through the document on his file to point out that it is an error, lest it lie in that condition.

And I want quickly, Judge, to move on to the mullingar meeting, whichever room in mullingar Garda Station it took place in, in July. There's one thing that I think that the Tribunal should take into account in respect of that meeting: that it was very definitely in the shadow of an already-commenced GSOC investigation as to whether the original Ms. D allegation had been properly investigated. She was claiming that it hadn't been. And as you know from the documentation, she was making a number of claims that sergeant McCabe hadn't even been interviewed in relation to the matter at the time. And she made the claims -- she had made the claims that were published by Mr. Williams in articles which had all been published before the July meeting in mullingar. And I'm asking you, Chairman, to look very, 14:31 very carefully at the minute of that meeting. It was prepared by then-sergeant, now Inspect or, Karen Duffy. Some attempt was made I think by Assistant Commissioner Kenny to suggest that the language was hers rather than the participants' language. Inspector Duffy told this 14:32 Tribunal that that was not the case, that she had recorded what happened at that meeting faithfully and that she had submitted the note that she had prepared to Assistant Commissioner Kenny and that he had
approved of it. Some allowance, I concede, Chairman, must be made for the fact that the participants were not to know whether GSoc would say that the original Cunningham investigation was all wrong and got everything wrong, and whatever. There must have been a ${ }^{14: 33}$ sense among the participants at that meeting that this was business which was not going to be concluded other than by a GSOC report, that there was a question-mark over whether GSOC might say this should all be re-investigated. There could have been many outcomes to the GSOC investigation for all the people sitting around that table knew. And some allowance must be taken -- must be made, and this is a concession I am making, Judge, for the fact that they were discussing this matter in the shadow of the possibility that everything might be turned upside down again and people would look at the whole process and the Garda's performance and be critical of it, GSOC being an independent organisation. But that having been said, the language that was used in that room does have one common thread to it; none of them seems to have said, once, anything sympathetic to Sergeant McCabe. None of them ever said, this poor man, he's been the subject of a wrongful rape allegation, what an injustice. None of them, even -- unless, unless this was left out of the note, none of them seem to have thought an innocent man has been the subject of a very, very serious flawed notification accusing him of a rape offence, what about him? And I think you hinted at it earlier, Judge, they
did seem to be looking at it from a Garda perspective, or at least that inference is to be drawn, and an organisational perspective; you know, how are we going to come out of this? Have we done all the right things in respect of these matters? But it is strange indeed that he was referred to as the suspect. He was an innocent man. Chief Superintendent Sheridan knew he was an innocent man, and they are talking about the accused and suspect and they're talking about should we treat this as a new notification. They are talking about -- they are raising the issue, should we be looking at the question is he a risk to children? None of them seems to have -- and the picture that was painted by Mr. O'Higgins to you today was that this was a session where they were effectively closing down on the issue. They weren't closing down on the issue. Everything was open on this issue. This was not the last word on the subject, except that, in one sense, it turned out to be the last word because no further actions were taken thereafter. But if the Tribunal looks at the language and the questions and the issues that were being considered at that meeting, none of them operated on the basis an innocent man is being re-accused in the wrong of a far more serious offence, what do we do about him? That tone, that question, that very obvious question, in my respectful submission, simply doesn't surface at that meeting. It appears that different considerations, and maybe entirely reasonably, were being looked at, like: how
is the organisation going to appear if this is reopened, or whatever? How are we going to have dealt with the issues that have arisen arising out of the re-notification of this offence? But the very fact that they were asking themselves should we consider this as the same notification or a new notification, and should we be on inquiry as to whether sergeant McCabe constitutes a risk to children, those -- the very fact that those questions are being raised speaks volumes, Judge.

Now, I did use the word, and I was wrong, when I asked the Commissioner, former Commissioner O'Sullivan, I said, but sure weren't they investigating whether he was a risk to children. They weren't investigating it, Judge. They were asking should they be inquiring as to whether he was a risk to children. And I used the word "investigate" and it should be, should they be inquiring on this issue. But the bottom line on that memo, Judge, or that minute of a meeting, or however way you want to describe it, is that there was absolutely no sense of the injustice being done to Sergeant McCabe. There was purely -- that was probably the only issue that wasn't considered in their discourse. And it is equally striking that two decisions were actually made at the meeting: one, that Assistant Commissioner Kenny would consult Ken Ruane about the legal situation they were in at the time, and that went absolutely nowhere, apparently. Mr. Ruane,
who I think the Tribunal will probably take the view was a very sensible head on sensible shoulders, was never bothered with the issue at all and his advice wasn't sought on it. And the second issue, the second decision for action item coming out of it was that Chief Superintendent Sheridan was to establish contact with, I think it's the HSE, which was slightly wide of the mark, because it was Tusla would have been the much more important body to contact, with a view to seeing what their strategy was, how they were going to deal with this matter thereafter. And Chief Superintendent Sheridan in his evidence said that as far as he was concerned, it was a matter for, I'm not sure whether he said it was HSE or for Tusla, but it certainly wasn't a matter so much for the Gardaí, but for the other state agencies to deal with the matter thereafter and to deal with the wrong that had been done to Sergeant McCabe, that was not a Garda matter. And curiously, Judge, in a paralle1 universe occupied by Mr. Lowry, he is saying to Ms. McLough1in, we should be finding out from the guards about what they are doing about this matter. That is what he wants to do at the same time. And yet, these two bodies, Mr. Lowry and the Gardaí, seem to miss each other completely and inspector or Sergeant O'Conne11 or -- Inspector O'Conne11 is sent off on what 14:41 turns out to be a cul-de-sac engagement with Fiona ward, which goes nowhere.

And, Judge, you asked Mr. O'Higgins the question, you
asked what is to be made of the fact that Assistant Commissioner Kenny had notified the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána of the false notification without any indication that it was false and took no further action to retrieve the situation, so to speak, up the line from himself. And it's quite clear from chief Superintendent Frank Walsh's evidence that no action was taken, despite the fact that the Commissioner's office was sending reminders asking to be kept fully -or I think two reminders, well maybe one, asking to be kept -- sorry, $I$ think Mr. Costello is right, it was one request for information and one reminder. That no attempt was made to correct the record up the line. Now, the comment was made here that when former Commissioner O'Sullivan testified in the way she did, I 14:43 won't try to summarise what she said, but I think she said at one stage she had no memory of reading the letter and then she accepted that whatever chief Superintendent walsh said about her reading it, she didn't question the correctness of his evidence, but she implied that it didn't register with her in some sense, but that Sergeant McCabe's counse1 - I presume myself - did not cross-examine her on this subject. She was clear in her answers to Tribunal counsel, and there was, with the greatest of mock modesty, I don't think I was going to change her mind on that by asking searching questions and produce the answer: oh, yes, Mr. McDowe11, I now do recal1 that I did read it carefully, and the like. So I don't think anything is
to be written into my failure to pursue the points she had made in evidence to the Tribunal's counsel.

But it is extraordinary that somebody in Sergeant McCabe's position could be left with that material sitting in the Commissioner's office and no attempt made to correct it. And the suggestion, and I think the Tribunal is alert to this, that the sergeant clerk, Karen Duffy, was supposed to have, on her own initiative and without instruction, somehow initiated a 14:45 correction of the situation, is, in my submission, not merely unfair to her but it's unfair to common sense. She could not possibly take it upon herself, uninstructed, to write to the Commissioner on this subject.

Judge, it was never corrected, and one of the great ironies of the whole matter is this: that if Sergeant McCabe hadn't received the Tusla letter at the beginning of January 2016, for all we know nothing would have been corrected in Tusla and nothing would have been corrected in Garda Headquarters. And as Mr. McGarry reminds me, the Commissioner, whatever registered in her mind and however she did or did not take in what she read on that day, she was meeting with Sergeant McCabe later that year, in the company of his solicitor, and to have such a thing uncorrected or to leave it uncorrected, was a very serious matter indeed, and I'd ask this Tribunal to take the view that it is
al1 of apiece with regarding Sergeant McCabe as not really being at the centre of their concerns when it came to dealing with the matters which were dealt with in Mullingar or the informing up to the Commissioner. He doesn't seem to have been the priority that many people have claimed he was in Garda thinking at the time, and certainly no effort was made to contact him and say, look, somehow you may learn at some stage that a disastrous error was made and we just want to give you our account now and tell you that this has happened. Again, there seems to have been a kind of a willingness to hope that somebody else would deal with the issue and that An Garda Síochána would never have to disclose to Sergeant McCabe that they had received this wrong notification, hope that Tusla/HSE would deal with this issue and put the record straight with Sergeant McCabe, whether they could have told him - and they couldn't have told him - that Assistant Commissioner Kenny had sent matter up to the Commissioner and left it uncorrected, nothing that they 14:48 could have done could have alerted Sergeant McCabe to that state of affairs.

Now, Judge, I'd ask the Tribunal, therefore, to -- in respect of the Garda treatment of this matter, not to just simply say that these things happen. There was fault in the way in which it was dealt with. It was -the minute from Mullingar is not happy reading from the point of view of being vigilant to protect the
interests of Sergeant McCabe, and I won't put it further than that.

CHAIRMAN: We11, Mr. MCDowe11, if you're on that, I don't know whether you're drawing to a close on number three?

MR. MCDOWELL: I am. I am finishing on the Garda bit, yes.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. The question, I suppose, that would be uppermost on my mind, and it's probably better that I ask you as we go along with each section as opposed to waiting until the end, in which case we have to reiterate a lot --

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- but let's suppose that a false notification was sent, knowing it was wrong, that a false notification was sent further on, knowing that it was wrong, up to Garda Headquarters, let's suppose it was left uncorrected, let's suppose Garda Headquarters raised a query, sent a reminder and it's left uncorrected, and let's suppose I am expected to believe 14:50 that a sergeant should overrule an assistant commissioner and correct things herself when she's acting in a position of being a, it's not incorrect to say a servant.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Because a secretary is a servant, and I know it is now a derogatory term.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: But it is not.

MR. MCDOWELL: No.
CHAIRMAN: And was never intended to be. You are serving someone, you were doing their will. what is behind it all? I mean, what do you say is behind it a11, if anything? I mean, just a couple of possibilities, Mr. McDowell, in terms of the evidence. There is some evidence to say that people couldn't approach Sergeant McCabe because if they didn't have all the answers they might find themselves enmeshed in a spider's web, whereby, if this is how people felt about it, and I'm not saying it was true, it was like the judge who deals with the lay litigant's case who suddenly finds himself at the receiving end of yet another case --

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- where he is named, together with the President of Ireland, etcetera, as being part of things. So there is that possibility. Another possibility is that they couldn't be bothered. Another possibility is that he had made himself -- he had put 14:51 himself outside the fold, kind of a heretic thing. Another possibility is, it is just a simple error or a series of errors. Another possibility is that the mood in Headquarters was dead against him and this is evidence of it. Now, I don't know in relation to any of those things, I mean, on the evidence, or do you want to make any submission on that? That is, I'm not going to say cornucopia, I know that word has been misused already, you could say smorgasbord, perhaps, of
possibilities. Now, you don't have to take those, you can put something else on the menu if you want, but I can't go there unless there is something to indicate it.

MR. MCDOWELL: We11, I fully appreciate the point the Tribunal is making. Can I just go back to one proposition that $I$ put before the Tribunal earlier, which should be among -- put out on the smorgasbord as well, if I may put it that way, Judge, and that is this: that GSOC was hanging over the Mullingar meeting. It was quite possible that everything was going to unravel. It was possible that -- I mean, you have had the privilege of reading the file and coming to the conclusion that it was impeccable, the Cunningham file I'm talking about. But it was possible 14:52 that with people making claims to politicians, writing articles in the newspapers -- or, sorry, not writing articles, but giving rise to articles being written in the newspapers, GSOC engaging in the process, GSOC querying Superintendent Cunningham and Superintendent Rooney, and all the rest of it, about the appropriateness of how the original Ms. D complaint was being dealt with, any garda in the position of Assistant Commissioner Kenny and Chief Superintendent Sheridan would be saying this is not finished business, 14:53 this is something which could come back to bite us in a big way, this is something which Ms. D, if she succeeds in getting the independent GSOC to take a different view from the one that you take, Judge, and I don't
demur from, that there was nothing wrong with the Cunningham investigation, the whole issue of whether sergeant McCabe would be, at the end of it all, the innocent man, or, alternatively, the man who benefited from a botched investigation which should never have been carried out the way it was, was up in the air. And that was -- that must have been of some interest as a possibility to members of An Garda Síochána. He may not be vindicated by a GSOC inquiry. The public may be told that the -- first of all, all of this may come out 14:54 into the public, and secondly, sergeant McCabe may face a reopened inquiry recommended by GSOC on the basis that what happened before was defective and biased and shouldn't have been carried out by Superintendent Cunningham in the first place, and that is reflected in 14:54 the documentation, because Assistant Commissioner Kenny notes that Superintendent Cunningham had -- and we don't know where he got this information from, but he notes that he didn't want to do it in the first place. And, of course, if that took wings with GSOC, you could ${ }_{14: 55}$ have a very, very different outcome to all of these events, Judge, a very different outcome, in which GSOC were saying, we're not happy with the way in which Sergeant McCabe was investigated in the first place, it should have been done by somebody more independent, and ${ }_{14: 55}$ happily they didn't come to that view from Sergeant McCabe's perspective and I think from the perspective of decency to Superintendent Cunningham as well. But I'm just making the point to you, Judge, that this was
a black cloud hanging over that meeting and it was by no means clear that Sergeant McCabe was in the clear and that, you know, that it was a closed book as far as An Garda Síochána was concerned. I mean, just, if one just develops for a second, Judge, the idea that GSOC might have said, this is right, Superintendent Cunningham was a wrong man, he knew both people, what in the name of heavens was Chief Superintendent Rooney asking this man to investigate? This woman, Ms. D, has a legitimate cause of complaint. If that had happened, everything was open and the great public hero, Sergeant McCabe, the poster boy of the liberal media, or whatever, may end up -- may end up in a very different place, publicly stated to have been given the benefit of an unfair investigation.

So, I mean, it was in that frame of mind that they met that day, Judge. It wasn't -- they weren't sure that GSOC was going to say, nonsense, this was a mode1 investigation, forget about that. And they couldn't have been so sure. And therefore, what I'm really saying, Judge, is this: that there was an element of, let's keep our options open here, we don't have to come to a conclusion and close the whole matter down here today in mullingar, we don't have to, the matter is
open. And, of course, this is only correct if they are looking at the original complaint and not the false complaint. But I'm just making the point that if you look at the Mullingar minute in that context, it's much
more understandable than it might be just to someone taking the approach, here is an innocent man who has been wronged, this thing has gone off the tracks. The language used in it, "suspect", they talk about arresting people and the like, these things were live issues, Judge. This was not idfe chatter in that meeting.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. So, you know, if one goes back to the two meetings, possibly in the same room in mullingar -MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- Superintendent Cunningham was presiding at the one on the 25th August 2008, and for good reason, of course, that he had been asked to investigate everything to do with the letter from Sergeant McCabe to do with issues on the D platform, so 14:59 to speak, and then on the 16th July 2014 when he was the one who had done the investigation and he knew absolutely everything about it, he wasn't there. So what inference am I to draw from that? MR. MCDOWELL: That was a point that I was going to raise, because obviously my mind and your mind were working on exactly that point.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I hope not, Mr. McDowell, because I'm supposed to be independent and you're representing a client.
mR. McDowell: I had forgotten to make it and I was just thinking to myself.
CHAIRMAN: I was just wondering, is there a point to be made about it?

MR. MCDOWELL: We11, I think there is, Judge. I think there is one extraordinary thing about that Mullingar meeting in July 2014, and I meant to make it - last night I thought about it but I had forgotten about it by today - the empty chair in that room in Mullingar was Superintendent Noe1 Cunningham's. They should have brought him in.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. We11, let's suppose it's sane to bring him in, but if they didn't bring him in, and that's not a sensible thing to do, what inference is open to me in relation to it?

MR. MCDOWELL: The strange thing is that none of them actually contacted him or conversed with him on this subject. And what's the inference to be drawn from that? In my belief -- or, sorry, in my submission, Judge, the inference to be drawn from that is that he would have closed down the issue instanter and they wanted to leave it open.
CHAIRMAN: why did they want to leave it open? MR. MCDOWELL: Because, as I said, the GSOC thing could 15:00 change everything; Sergeant McCabe could go from hero to zero, you know. He could have had a totally different outcome if Ms. D had somehow persuaded GSOC that there was something wrong with the original investigation.
CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. MCDowell, I mean, how sensible would that -- I think every individual on earth who has had any kind of a life at all realises that they are themselves a flawed individual.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And, you know, you mentioned that Sergeant McCabe was the hero of the liberal media.
MR. MCDOWELL: You used the liberal media the other day.

CHAIRMAN: No, I didn't.
MR. McDOWELL: You did, I think.
CHAIRMAN: I didn't. What?
MR. MCDOWELL: I think you did. Anyway.
CHAIRMAN: Did I? I'm beginning to doubt myself,
Mr. McDowe11.
MR. MCDOWELL: I think you did, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: In what context? Well, we will just put in the word "liberal" into the search and we will see what comes up.
MR. MCDOWELL: I think they made leaks and all the rest of it.

CHAIRMAN: They made what?
MR. MCDOWELL: Leaks. I think you did. If I am wrong,
I am wrong, Judge, but I think you did talk about the
media.
CHAIRMAN: Oh, no, I have been careful not to. MR. MCDOWELL: I think you may have lapsed.
CHAIRMAN: On occasion I have, and indeed I made a mistake, which $I$ have had to apologise for.
MR. MCDOWELL: In any event --
CHAIRMAN: No, no, the point that I would appreciate your help on, look, is this. Everybody is flawed. If you read the o'Higgins Commission report, it says
there's exaggerations, there's an untruth.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: There is a kind of an emotional reaction to things by times. He apologised, for instance, to Superintendent Cunningham.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: He withdrew another allegation against superintendent Clancy, and then the allegation then against Commissioner Callinan was regarded as made in good faith, but frankly --

MR. MCDOWELL: Wrong.
CHAIRMAN: -- completely lacking in any basis whatsoever in evidence. I mean, those are all flaws. mR. McDowell: yes.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, it may be some people want to portray people as Cú Chulainn, or whatever, but that is just mythical thinking.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sergeant MCCabe expressly disavowed that. He never asked to be regarded as a hero.
CHAIRMAN: No, I can imagine. Yes, I can imagine. He 15:02 hasn't given evidence. I'm sure he's a very nice man, and all the rest of it, but he's a human being, the same way as the rest of us.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
ChAIRMAN: But I just -- I don't understand this kind of hero of the liberal media to zero.

MR. MCDOWELL: No, I'm saying, Judge, that a person who was a thorn in the side of some people in An Garda Síochána, and, I mean, you can -- I don't want to
generalise, but some people in An Garda Síochána, and who had caused the organisation some difficulties, if I may put it that way, Judge, if it were to end up that, in the context of mr. Williams publishing his articles, that GSOC conducted an investigation which raised a question-mark over his exoneration by Superintendent Cunningham, a very different picture of sergeant McCabe might begin to emerge.
CHAIRMAN: Right. Okay.
MR. MCDOWELL: That is all I am saying.
CHAIRMAN: Okay. No, I see your point. I'm not saying I accept the point, but I see the point. All right. So then number four you were going to.
MR. McDOWELL: Number four, Judge. And I do want to say, Judge, that just before I leave number three, that ${ }^{55004}$ no explanation was given by anybody as to why they didn't contact Noel Cunningham.
CHAIRMAN: Well, there was explanations given, but whether they are accepted or not is a different matter. MR. MCDOWELL: Well, no -- sorry, maybe I shouldn't say -- no reasonable explanation. He seemed to have been stationed in the same place or the same -- in Monaghan, to be easily available, and no reasonable explanation was given as to why any of the serious -of the senior Gardaí asked him during any of this period about any of these matters.
CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, he certainly was the expert.
mR. McDowell: yes.

CHAIRMAN: So --
MR. MCDOWELL: Now, can we come to the last bit then, Judge, which is about Paul williams and the Ds and Sergeant McCabe. I don't want to, Judge, to sort of re-open old wounds here now, and I'm going to be careful in what I am saying, but I do want to say this: that if you look at the submission that was made to you today on behalf of An Garda Síochána, paragraph 86, it leapt off the page at me as I scanned through it today, Judge, the statement:
"What is important when considering the evidence of Mr. Paul Williams and Ms. D is that the articles Mr. Williams wrote and the meetings he arranged with Ms. D with public figures were not written and arranged for the purpose of damaging Sergeant McCabe."

Now, I don't know why the Commissioner's team of counsel would say such a thing, because the avowed purpose of Ms. D was that she was tired of hearing
laudatory things about Sergeant McCabe and she wanted the people to see the other side of him. That's what she said. And the idea that he could have been writing those articles other than with a view to raising a question-mark over whether Sergeant McCabe had indeed been wrongfully acquitted of any responsibility by the DPP for doing it --
CHAIRMAN: Well, I mean, $I$ think anyone can make a
mistake, but certainly that was the evidence of Ms. D. And indeed I think the evidence of Mr. Williams was that he was considering, first of all, writing an article to the effect that a particular person abused a particular child.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And then considered it and then what he -maybe he discussed it with his editor, I will go back and look at the evidence, but the next aspect was, what about the investigation, was that a bad investigation? absolutely right in saying yes, she did say -MR. MCDOWELL: And it's hard to see, Judge -- just being fair to everybody involved, and Mr. McCabe doesn't feel particularly inclined to be leaning over backwards to accept the view of others on the central issue of the investigation, but being fair on his behalf, one has to say that the purpose of those articles was to raise a very grave question-mark over the probity of sergeant McCabe, in effect, and to ventilate a different vision of Sergeant McCabe to people who could identify him from those articles and to say there is another side to this story of the sexual assault. Now, I'm just saying that, and I won't put it any further than that, but I do make the point that it is strange indeed that Mr. Williams took the view that because he didn't name Sergeant McCabe in his text, that there was no need to go to him and get his side of the story or to give any credence to his side
of the story or to give any balance by reference to his side of the story.

The second thing is, rightly or wrongly, he took up the cause with a degree of enthusiasm that had him arranging meetings with Micheá Martin and Alan Shatter on behalf of Ms. D.
CHAIRMAN: Well, Alan Shatter was then the minister, isn't that right?
MR. MCDOWELL: No, he wasn't. He had resigned at this stage. But he did make reference to Mr. williams' articles in the Dáil after his resignation on the 19th June.
Chairman: well, I'd go back on the evidence, but I thought she had met the minister and said the minister had done nothing.

MR. MCDOWELL: No.
ChAIRMAN: And whereas Micheá 1 Martin had taken the matter more seriously, or something. MR. MCDOWELL: I stand to be corrected, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: I think that Mr. Shatter had already resigned by the time Mr. Williams arranged that meeting.
CHAIRMAN: You could be right. I will look back on it. 15:10 MR. MCDOWELL: And without dwelling further on the purpose and effect of those articles, I would invite the Tribunal to consider what Sergeant McCabe's attitude and feelings were as he saw those matters
being obtruded under a thin-enough veil of anonymity into the public domain in the circumstances.

And then the question arises, Superintendent o'Reilly, whichever version is taken into account, whether he suggested Mr. Williams as a journalist to the D family or they suggested to him and asked him did he know it, a Garda officer in his circumstance should have paused before either he made such a suggestion or he facilitated them in making such contact, simply on the basis of what the likely outcome of press publicity on this matter was likely to be, not least for her but also for Sergeant McCabe.

I would also ask the Tribunal to bear in mind that sergeant McCabe was reading in the newspapers that she was going to bring this into the political domain, she was going to bring it to GSOC, and she was going to bring it -- she was minded to bring it to civil litigation and was consulting lawyers for that purpose. 15:12 These were trying times for Sergeant McCabe and his family and it's very difficult to see in retrospect what purpose was served by Mr. Williams' articles at all, what constructive or positive purpose was served.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Just before we go on, do you mind if I 15:12 just correct something, because I'm startled to think that it has been ascribed to me that I somehow described the media as the "liberal elite media", I didn't. In fact, I have looked up the transcript. It
was a question to Mr. Rogers and Mr. Rogers had complained, and this is on day 55, that he hadn't actually seen the magazine, whatever it is called, Patrol, produced by --

MR. McDOWELL: The GRA.
CHAIRMAN: -- the Garda Representative Association, and he said I haven't had the benefit of reading that, and I think a copy was passed down and he said I don't have enough time, and I said to him, well, I can summarise it, and I then said what the piece seems to say is that 15:13 these Gardaí --

MR. MCDOWELL: That is my mistake. I didn't see the quotation marks.
CHAIRMAN: No, no, no. There are definite quotation marks. That the particular Gardaí who are being
traversed in relation to the ten incidents that are going to be investigated have never had the chance to have their say, while the "liberal elite media" - and I would never use that - and this is a quote from -MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN: -- the GRA article - are attacking them. MR. MCDOWELL: I'm sorry, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: And I also said that the Gardaí in question are interviewed under assumed names, like Bronski, Tango, Mike and Delta. I certainly didn't lick that up 15:14 off the floor either. That was a quote too. MR. MCDOWELL: That was clearly my mistake. I just didn't pick up the inverted commas.

CHAIRMAN: We11, I think I better do something in
future then.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry?
CHAIRMAN: I think I better do something in future. MR. MCDOWELL: That is my mistake.

CHAIRMAN: Not to worry.
MR. MCDOWELL: I'm sorry. In any event, I was -CHAIRMAN: So it wasn't me saying that, it was the GRA article.

MR. MCDOWELL: It was the GRA's view that he was being --

CHAIRMAN: Cosseted.
MR. MCDOWELL: -- cosseted by the media, by the 1iberal elite media. Sorry, Judge, I didn't see the inverted commas.
CHAIRMAN: Well, you did have the article in front of you, Mr. McDowe11.

MR. MCDOWELL: I didn't have it to hand.
CHAIRMAN: Al1 right. Look, it doesn't matter. MR. MCDOWELL: In fact, I remember when you made those remarks asking Ms. Ward to try and get me a copy of that immediately because $I$ wanted to check it.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that was it. It has to be said, it's actually a well written piece but as to whether the views being expressed in it are good or bad is a different matter entirely.
MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, there's just one other point that
I want to make and that is that Superintendent
O'Reilly, it has been pointed out here, was a family friend of the D family, and Ms. D did give her
interview to GSOC mand at page 108 of the materials she ascribed to Superintendent 0'Reilly, via her father, certain views about Sergeant mcCabe and hanging around at schools to look at the young ones coming out and the rest. well now, I don't know, Judge, it is hearsay. CHAIRMAN: It is double hearsay. And furthermore, Superintendent o'reilly just said, look, that didn't come from me. And I must say, I tend to believe him. MR. MCDOWELL: Well, whatever she thought she clearly thought that somebody had said, attributed this to him, 15:16 which -- and she also, I just want to remind the Tribunal, she also said that some other girl in Clones had been reported to her as the victim of an assault by Sergeant McCabe and she also --
Chairman: And we know that didn't happen either.
MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly. But I mean you will recal1, Judge, that when she heard about the Ms. X, Ms. Y -sorry, Ms. D, Ms. Y mistake originally, one of her first queries was, could the Ms. Y be the girl in Clones? That was -- so I mean, these aren't just top of the head remarks that were being made, Judge, they are of significance.

Judge, can I deal with one point that --
CHAIRMAN: You can come back to it in a second if that ${ }_{\text {15:17 }}$ is all right, if you don't mind, Mr. Buckley. I'm inviting you to reply to anything that you feel -- and indeed anybody, feel you need to reply to, please do. It's not going to take long.

MR. MCDOWELL: You asked Mr. O'Higgins one question of a general kind during his submissions or at the end of his submissions and that was in relation to, you know, could something not have been done at an earlier point to, you know, stop all this sequence of events in An Garda Síochána going back, I presume you meant back to 2007/2008 could something not have been done to arrest what happened.
CHAIRMAN: It's really January 2008 on I suppose. MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, exactly. One thing I would ask the 15:18 Tribunal to look at is that that issue in an inchoate form did arise in correspondence between Superintendent Clancy, Chief Superintendent Rooney and Assistant Commissioner --
CHAIRMAN: Kenny? No. Assistant commissioner what? 15:18 MR. MCDOWELL: -- Byrne.

## CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MCDOWELL: And assistant commissioner Byrne raised the question, here we have a situation on the ground in Bailieboro which really requires to be addressed and he 15:18 adumbrated, from memory, and I don't have the papers with me, because they're back down in my office in the Law Library, but he adumbrated could some mediation or something not be attempted to try defuse the situation, and it is interesting to note that Chief Superintendent 15:19 Rooney's view was that Mr. D and Sergeant McCabe were two adults who should be able to settle this out among themselves. And, you know, when Ms. D spoke to Laura Brophy her view of the world, right or wrong, was that
following her allegations Sergeant McCabe had been, to use her own phrase, forced out of Bailieboro Garda Station. And I know it is probably early in the process of this Tribunal to be looking at the woods and the trees issues at this stage, but I do believe that that correspondence between those three people if it had been differently handled might have led to a very difficult outcome in this case, this whole matter. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, did you wish to make any submissions? Forgive me for forgetting who you are for, but I know you're for somebody.

MR. MCDOWELL: He appears for Alison O'Reilly, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Who represented Paul williams then?
Mr. Costelloe.
MR. KELLY: I am here for Paul williams. No, I have nothing to say, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: You're fine?
MR. KELLY: Yes, I am.
CHAIRMAN: Grand. Thank you for that. I think that is everybody, is it? Certain7y everyone was told today if they wanted to make submissions they could turn up, and I'm not leaving anybody out, am I? No. All right. Did anyone want to say anything brief in reply then? Mr. Buckley, do you want to start? You wanted to say a couple of things.

## FURTHER SUBMISSION BY MR. BUCKLEY

MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you, Chairman, there's two very brief points. The first is obviously I think there were no issues concerning Clones the subject of Ms. D's oral testimony to the Tribunal and there were no
questions put to her on that subject. I think there was a single question asked of Mr. D and he said he wasn't the source of that remark. So I think it is important that there wouldn't be conflation of the disclosure material and the testimony given to the Tribunal.

CHAIRMAN: It's just, okay, thank you for the point, it is a fact, however, that it does appear in the GSOC statement as coming from her.
MR. BUCKLEY: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, how do I get over that? I can't -- 15:22 if it is important $I$ can't ignore it.

MR. BUCKLEY: No, no, I mean, I suppose it is a matter of record.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. BUCKLEY: And the Tribunal can treat it as it
features in that report appropriately. I suppose it's just careful to bear in mind that there were no questions asked of Ms. D in relation to it, there may be a limit as to what it lends itself to concluding. Although that is obviously for you, Chairman.

The second point, I suppose, is in relation to, there were questions made about media contact that might be taken up again, $I$ don't know if there is going to be
separate submissions in respect of terms of reference (h) but just insofar as they were addressed this morning and raised again by Mr. McDowe11, I suppose he posited a counterfactual of a different outcome on the GSOC report, and I suppose Ms. D's submission would be that one perhaps shouldn't look back with the benefit too harshly of hindsight through the prism of that report on her media conduct at the time. It has to be understood in the context of what was happening in February 2014; Mr. Guerin had been appointed to inquire ${ }^{15: 23}$ into whistleblowing allegations, of mishandling of Garda investigations, she felt that her claim fell within that sphere and that there was, I suppose, a certain irony in that Mr. McCabe was being associated as a very prominent whistleblower of the mishandling of other Garda investigations. It should also be remembered that she wasn't aware of the content of the DPP correspondence from April 2007. It isn't something that had been brought to her attention and there had been approaches by journalists to visit her home and it 15:23 was her who made the decision to engage with the media response. I suppose you, Chairman, have already made remarks about the GSOC report, I suppose that report itself we don't look to go behind it, but it does acknowledge some factors which might have led to queries about the original investigation optically, which included views being expressed about the optics of sergeant Cunningham investigating it, the non-recording on the Pulse system and the practice of
reading out a witness complaint to the subject of inquiry prior to interview not according with best practice. Obviously, on a whole, the GSOC report vindicates the investigation, but $I$ suppose just saying in February 2014 there were objective factors that might have caused her reasonable grounds to entertain dissatisfaction with what occurred.

CHAIRMAN: We11, she didn't know about any of those things, did she? Like, who told her that it wasn't put up on Pulse?

MR. BUCKLEY: No, no.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, how would she know that?
MR. BUCKLEY: No, no.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, she's not a garda, she wouldn't be entitled to know, would she?
MR. BUCKLEY: No. I suppose the principal issue might be the personne 1 handling the investigation and the optics of that, Chairman. The GSOC report addresses all these matters and I'm not looking to re-open it or go behind it.
CHAIRMAN: How would a young lady know about conflict of interest unless somebody had said that to her? Again, you know, where does that thought emerge from? It's not a thought natural to someone of her age, is it, or her profession? I mean, she was a student at

MR. BUCKLEY: She was studying -CHAIRMAN: No, don't tell me. Don't tell me. But go on.

MR. BUCKLEY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Let's supposing she's studying something in the social sciences, which would include law, even still, where does that idea come from?
MR. BUCKLEY: I suppose, Chairman, one doesn't necessarily have to frame it as a formal conflict of interest to understand that someone inquiring into matters who is a professional colleague of the subject of an inquiry might cause a certain discomfort or unsettlement on the part of a complainant. I don't think one has to necessarily use the language of conflict of interest to suggest or understand a level of dissatisfaction that might be felt on the part of a complainant.
CHAIRMAN: If that issue was there though it could have 15:26 been raised back in 2007, couldn't it?

MR. BUCKLEY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Rather than waiting for seven years. It's just a query.
MR. BUCKLEY: We11, obviously, Ms. D was significantly younger in 2007, Chairman. I suppose the Tribunal has heard evidence about the reengagement with the Rian services in 2013 and then matters became quite prominent in terms of the media coverage around February 2014 when there was a focus on the appropriate 15:26 handling of investigations. I don't think there's specific evidence erred as to what mindset was formed but it was certainly around that time that she expressed a view that her experience might occasion
further or might warrant further investigation as to the appropriateness of the investigation.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. So you are saying that basically this was a time when there was a general suspicion over Garda investigations and she felt something similar in relation to her own matter.
mR. BUCKLEY: Yes, Chairman.
Chairman: yes. And that fed into the whole thing. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Buckley. Did you want, Mr. O'Higgins, address a couple of points?

## FURTHER SUBMISSION BY MR. O'HIGGINS

MR. o'higGins: yes, very briefly, Chairman. Just addressing two points made by Mr. McDowell in his contribution. In relation to the incorrect
notification coming in from Tusla into An Garda Síochána, Mr. McDowell took issue with the suggestion that the evidence did not support a Garda desire to effectively close the matter down. I'd respectfully take issue with that and I would just point you to two particular documents which I think support the submission I sought to make under that heading. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. O'HIGGINS: They are both documents, as it happens, written by Chief Superintendent Jim Sheridan and they
were respectively at 1722 and 1723 of the materials that were circulated, and they are the letters he sent up to his line manager on the 14th May and 22nd May 2014. I simply just instance those. I won't read them
out.
CHAIRMAN: No, do please, if you don't mind. MR. O'HIGGINS: A11 right.
CHAIRMAN: Just to refresh my memory. We're talking about again, we're in 2014, aren't we?

MR. O'HIGGINS: So the first one then.
CHAIRMAN: Can you read me out the high1ights, if you don't mind.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN: I will look at them later, thanks.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Thank you. In the first one then, which was written by, as I say, Chief Superintendent Sheridan to the assistant commissioner based in sligo, he referred to the correspondence that had been received on the 8th May 2014, and said:
"The allegations contained in the attached referral have been the subject of a previous Garda investigation which resulted in the DPP directing no prosecution against the alleged offender, Mr. McCabe."

And it says, it treats of the Micheá 1 Martin matter and says:
"In the circumstances I recommend that we await further 15:29 communication from the parties listed above prior to commencing a review of this investigation. A full copy of the Garda investigation file is available at this office."

Then he followed that up with his communication of the 22nd May, in which he stated that:
"The previous referral contained incorrect information and should therefore be withdrawn and replaced with the attached. This is a referral made by Tusla relating to an incident which was reported to and investigated by An Garda Síochána in 2006/7. The Director of Public Prosecutions directed there should not be a prosecution 15:30 in the case. The attached referral does not disclose any new information/evidence in regard to these matters and therefore at this time does not require any further action by An Garda Síochána."

And he reiterates that:
"A full copy of the Garda investigation file is available at this office. I also wish to advise that a complete copy of the Garda investigation file was disclosed to the Guerin inquiry."
CHAIRMAN: okay.
MR. O'HIGGINS: And I say that that is consistent with the actions, not just judging the man on his words but his actions, of an overall desire to shut the matter
down and I say that the mullingar meeting represented the end of matters and not the start of anything and there's simply no evidence post the mullingar meeting to justify a contrary conclusion.

And finally, Chairman, insofar as it has been suggested by Mr. McDowe11, and there was reference to what perhaps might be regarded as new theory or black cloud,
as he put it, that the participants in the Mullingar meeting were under, it is a matter for you, Chairman, but it seems this new theory was not a theory developed with the witnesses concerned during cross-examination. It's a little bit unfair to be introducing it at this late hour. In any event, I say, it's a matter for you, but I say that there doesn't appear to be any link or substance to that position concerning what might have been the outcome of the GSOC investigation. It is clear that the officers concerned were viewing matters from a corporate level, potential exposure and I say that if one again searches for evidence post the Mullingar meeting suggestive of opening up matters there appears to be none. And that concludes my submission.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think maybe just, I should maybe ask 15:31 you the same question, and it is a matter in my mind, as you know, I think Mr. O'Higgins, is: why Superintendent Cunningham was completely left out of that particular loop as the person who literally knew more than anybody, and who could possibly -- I mean, is a lot of what ifs, but that is definitely a what if. MR. O'HIGGINS: Well, two things in response, Chairman. I say that if one looks at the participants who were
present, they were clearly the Garda officers who were initially in receipt of the relevant notification, and then the immediate two line managers. Jim Sheridan was in a position, because of the knowledge, additional knowledge he had from dealing with the disclosure in the Guerin inquiry, he knew all about the file. And you heard the evidence, the answers that were given by the witnesses to that question, which was posed during the inquiry, and I say it was a reasonable position taken. Jim Sheridan was au fait with the matter, knew the substance of it was 2006/2007. It wasn't necessary, it was felt, to contact Noel Cunningham in that context. He wasn't at the meeting, that is acknowledged, they were, and they were the people who participated in the correspondence going up and down the line.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your submissions. Nobody else has anybody else?
MS. MCKECHNIE: I wonder could I address you briefly in reply to a number of matters, Chairman?
CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course you could, and I am sorry, I didn't mean to not call on you. Thank you.

SUBMISSION BY MS. MCKECHNIE
MS. MCKECHNIE: I will be very brief. Ordinarily I think when you're asked to reject a line of evidence it is normally in favour of an alternate line of evidence. In this case Mr. McDowell is asking you to reject the evidence that was given by Tusla in relation to the
random selection of files from the Measuring the Pressure system. He's asking you instead to accept a theory which he says, he refers to in his closing submission, as the other theory with a probable ring to it. And that theory is of course that Sergeant McCabe was in the news at the time and it was for that reason that his was deliberately selected. In that regard all of the evidence on behalf of Tusla has been that it is not ideal that there are unallocated files at any stage, however that is the reality of the situation. And the evidence that was consistently given by the witnesses on behalf of Tusla was that those files are selected at random and moved along whenever there is time to do so. The evidence that was pointed to by Mr . McDowe11 in support of his alternate theory I would respectfully submit is evidence of the deficiencies in the case management that Tusla has, and always has from the outset, accepted and acknowledged as being deficiencies in their case management system and in the handling of this particular file. In any event, I think Mr. McDowell fairly accepts in his closing submissions that there is no smoking gun here and Tusla relies on the knowledge that the Tribunal will rely on the totality of the evidence that it has heard before it and will have regard to the number of witnesses that 15:35 it heard from on behalf of Tusla with the extensive level of documentation, none of which pointed to any mala fides on the part of Tusla or any malicious intent to disseminate or use the information against Sergeant

McCabe or to do so in cooperation with the Gardaí. I would simply ask the Tribunal to bear that in mind.

CHAIRMAN: So you what are saying, essentially is - and this is not to be ascribed to me, this is, I am summarising your submission - that what is being asked for in relation to Tusla is the rejection of testimony in favour merely of a theory.
MS. MCKECHNIE: That is exactly it.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

FURTHER SUBMISSION BY MR. MCDOWELL
MR. MCDOWELL: Chairman, two things, just to correct myself if I could. What Superintendent McGinn said on day 13 , page 101 --
CHAIRMAN: This is Leo McGinn?
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. He said:
"Just look around Bailieboro station, some said I was told Noel Cunningham was investigating it, who I don't know told me that or who mentioned it to me, even the commonly held view in Bailieboro, by Bailieboro Gardaí, it should have been investigate from outside of the division or to speak of the district."

So that is the criticism that was generally held, that he said was generally held. It wasn't that the investigation was wrong itself.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. It was pick someone -- and indeed that is what happened when the thing came up.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: The Mullingar meeting mentions that, and indeed when the social work thing came up they mentioned another division. That was I think Westmeath, yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: The second thing, Judge, I just want to mention is this, that $I$ forgot in finishing up on Mr. Williams, what $I$ consider to be a very important point if I may respectfully submit, and that is that the assistance given by Superintendent Taylor to him in 15:37 confirming facts about the submission of a case to the DPP and the like. Mr. Williams told the Tribunal that he had, after he'd interviewed Ms. D, got assistance from Superintendent Taylor in the sense that he got confirmation of the fact that there was a file in respect of my client sent to the DPP -- sorry, there had been an investigation, there had been a file sent to the DPP and that Superintendent Taylor confirmed that the DPP had directed that the case should not be proceeded with. And I forgot just to make point, and I 15:38 don't want to drop it in any sense, Judge, that that was wholly inappropriate. And you may recall, Judge, that I asked him well, supposing it was Michael McDowe11, do you think that seven years ago you can confirm that an unwarranted allegation was made against 15:38 me, and you then, Judge, said well, let's use, let's say a parish priest or a teacher, do you think it's appropriate for An Garda Síochána to tell a journalist in a particular case that a prosecution -- sorry, a
file had been sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions and directions given. And I reiterate that now, Judge. I think that Mr. Williams had no right to ask that question of Superintendent Taylor and Superintendent Taylor had no right whatsoever -CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MCDOWELL: -- to tell him about those things. CHAIRMAN: Let's bear in mind that Superintendent Taylor wasn't represented in relation to that.

MR. McDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: He will be represented and you will have a chance to ask him any question arising out of that, but I am certainly not going to raise any anything against Superintendent Taylor in relation to this. MR. MCDOWELL: No, no. I'm not suggesting that. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. MCDOWELL: But you wil1 reca11 I did raise that. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, he was represented. Superintendent Taylor was represented.
MR. KELLY: Sorry, I'm here for Mr. Williams obviously, 15:40 and just what was actually stated, Superintendent Taylor denied that conversation occurred at al1. CHAIRMAN: He did. The two of them were definitely contradicting --
MR. KELLY: He was cross-examined by Mr. Ferry, Mr. William was cross-examined by Mr. Ferry, and his position is that:
"Our instructions are simply --"

Sorry, it's at line 18, page 105 of day 11:
"Our instructions are simply that Mr. Williams notified Superintendent Taylor that he had been at the house, that he had interviewed her --"

That is Ms. D
"-- and that, in relation to Maurice McCabe and that he 15:40 would be writing an article that would be damaging to Maurice McCabe."

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Yes, I noted the instructions as put to Paul williams in relation to that.

MR. KELLY: I think you allowed a break over lunch for Mr. Ferry to take instructions so that he could put that position to Mr. Williams.

CHAIRMAN: I did. Indeed, you're absolutely right about that. And he did indeed put that, and put it very squarely to him, yes.
MR. KELLY: And I think with respect Mr. McDowell is entitled of course to make a point but I think that is something better held over, there's another module yet to go here to deal with these interactions and
Superintendent Taylor will obviously be a key person in that module.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.
MR. MCDOWELL: Judge, I don't dispute any of that, I
just didn't want it to be later said that I did not -that I had somehow abandoned that point in not making a submission to you about it.

CHAIRMAN: No.
MR. MCDOWELL: It is my submission, and I won't put it 15:41 any further than this --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: -- that it was highly improper for that to be imparted to a journalist in the circumstances.
CHAIRMAN: You appreciate as well that --
MR. MCDOWELL: I'm not asking you to comment on it, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: No, no -- certain denials were put, so I can't actually go there and make any finding against somebody or make any comment against somebody. A11 right.

Mr. Marrinan, $I$ think the tradition is that you don't say anything.
MR. MARRINAN: That is so.
CHAIRMAN: Very good. Well, our intention, I believe, is to try and start as soon as possible between two and three weeks, there's a vast amount of work as I said already. As regards this, if $I$ was sitting as a judge in the High Court I would now give a date but what I
intend to do is to prepare a report and as to whether it comes out now or whether it comes out later, I'm afraid that's up to me, but I'm going to think about that. I would like to thank you all very much for your
assistance today.
.
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